

The Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia met in a Special Called Budget Workshop on May 3, 2006, at 8:30 a.m. in the Commissioners' Conference Room, Suite 100, at the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue, Fayetteville, Georgia.

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris Venice, County Administrator
Carol Chandler, Executive Assistant
Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk

DISCUSSION OF THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007:

COUNTY PURCHASING CARDS

Commissioner Frady said he would like to make a motion to phase out the County's purchasing cards as soon as possible.

Commissioner Wells said with Mr. Pullium leaving the County's employment she felt it imperative that this be done as soon as possible.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Chairman Dunn to terminate the County's Purchasing Card Program by the close of business on Friday, May 5, 2006 at 5:00 p.m.

Commissioner Frady said the purchasing card was supposed to be used to offset petty cash and it had gotten out of hand.

Chairman Dunn said the County had tried this program for the last two years to try and make things easier for the County and it had turned out to be a problem.

Commissioner Frady said petty cash would now fall on department heads.

Mr. Pullium said he agreed that this program had not worked out the way that it was envisioned. He said he fully supported the idea of removing these cards.

Commissioner Wells questioned the time to close out this program and Commissioner Frady felt it should be done immediately.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 2

Mary Holland said code blocks could be placed on all of the merchant type codes except for travel related hotels, meals and that kind of thing. She said some employees had already made reservations for June and July and were already in the system.

Commissioner Wells suggested everything but travel and hotels be terminated by Friday, May 5th.

Ms. Holland said there would be some things that would have to be cleared up before this program was discontinued.

Mr. Pullium interjected that the discontinuation of this program would have an impact on the recently adopted travel policy.

The motion carried 5-0.

OVERVIEW PRESENTATION OF THE BUDGET

Mary Holland remarked that staff was recommending a budget for the general fund of \$49.4 million and for the fire fund a budget of \$7 million. She said these were the two funds that were impacted by the millage rate. She remarked that the expenditure fund was \$52.7 million and this was the total of what all of the County departments had asked for. She said the revenues had been projected at \$48 million. She said this resulted in a huge transfer from cash reserves of \$4.6 million. She said staff realized that would not be possible. She compared last year's adopted budget with this year's proposed budget. She said expenditures for 2006 were \$47.6 million and there was a transfer from cash reserve of \$1.4 million.

Ms. Holland felt the revenues would come in a little bit stronger than what was projected for 2006. She felt the expenditures were going to be very, very close and this would depend on fuel prices for the next two months. She said staff had made some changes to the capital and C.I.P. that amounted to \$1.8 million. She said staff felt like those programs could be delayed or could be moved out to future years where the Board would decide the time and place that this would take place. She said the remaining adjustments were actually made in the operations budget. She pointed out that some of the departments affected were the Sheriff's Department being reduced by \$605,000, Road Department reduced by \$719,000 and Recreation reduced by \$372,000.

Chairman Dunn clarified that these reductions were to the departments' original requests and not their current budgets.

Ms. Holland said this was how staff had arrived at the \$49.4 million which leaves staff taking some money from the cash reserve in the amount of \$1.2 million. She said this

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 3

would allow a roll back of the millage rate as the Board had desired to do again this year.

Ms. Holland discussed some capital and C.I.P. items. She said staff felt two of these items needed to be moved forward because of the requirements within. She said they were currently listed in future years. She said the third item was a replacement phone system for the rest of the County.

Chairman Dunn questioned the \$176,000 for storm water.

Ms. Holland replied that \$100,000 was for a pole barn type shed that had been recommended by the consultant who was brought in to do the storm water study. She said she understood that County Engineer Phil Mallon would be updating the Board on this issue.

Chairman Dunn said the pole barn would be used for vehicles that were left outside. He said the State was now saying that the Counties would have to find a way not to allow any fluid from the road machinery to drain to the ground when it rained. He said the State wanted the Counties to put up pole barns to cover this machinery to keep it dry. He said this would be required in order to keep the stormwater ordinance in place.

Commissioner Wells said this was an unfunded State mandate.

Chairman Dunn said the second item was \$200,000 to increase the County's capacity for gas.

Ms. Holland said this only included expanding the County's capabilities and did not include any of the work considered at the Sheriff's Department where they have their fueling station. She said it also did not include any potential future stations if the Board decided to do that.

Ms. Holland commented on the third item. She said staff had carved out a piece of a current C.I.P. project that was geared for 2007 in the amount of \$240,000 for telephone systems for the administrative complex as well as McDonough Road. She said these were the two complexes that were still on the old system. She said staff had this scheduled for replacement this year but decided that the administrative complex could go for one more year without a new phone system. She said staff felt McDonough Road needed to proceed with a new system because of current operational problems. She said staff had taken out that piece in the amount of \$43,000.

Chairman Dunn said this would leave \$200,000 for next year to do the project.

Mr. Pullium remarked that Nina Madrid was responsible for the telecommunication system will be discussing this with the Board.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 4

Ms. Venice said Ms. Madrid did have some legitimate concerns that the Board needed to be aware of.

Commissioner Wells questioned the pole barn issue again. She asked if Fleet Maintenance had space available to store the equipment and machinery.

Ms. Venice said there was limited space that might be used on a weekend but it was not nearly enough for the volume of vehicles. She said there would also have to be discussions regarding a catch pad being installed underneath the pole barn.

Commissioner Wells asked if there might be some other space in the County that was currently not being utilized that this equipment and machinery could be stored. She felt the building of a pole barn at a cost of \$100,000 would be a tremendous expense.

Ms. Venice suggested discussing this later today when Lee Hearn and Zack Taylor were present to discuss their budget. She remarked that there were some maintenance pits that would be available but nothing with a canopy.

Chairman Dunn asked if anyone was opposed to the \$200,000 for increased fuel capacity.

The Board agreed that this was not a problem.

Mr. Pullium interjected that the County had a significantly lower price for fuel than the regular gasoline pumps. He remarked at the Fleet Maintenance facility there was a system called a pro key system. He said this system was car specific. He said someone puts in a key, the odometer reading and that person would be in the system. He said that system would then authorize that person to pump fuel into that vehicle. He said one of the great benefits of this system was the built in accounting controls. He said the Sheriff's Department fueling stations did not have the same systems and controls in place.

Mr. Pullium also remarked that the canopy would need to be raised and widened to provide proper coverage from weather and so forth. He said this would allow bigger fuel tankers to drop off fuel. He said currently only a 5,000 gallon pumper could get in there. He said the capacity at the pumps was 10,000 and there had to be two trucks delivering fuel. He said this might also have an impact on the County's pricing. He said there was only one vendor in the area that had a 5,000 gallon tank. He said this was the reason the County was locked in with one vendor.

Mr. Pullium remarked that the Fleet Maintenance facility was paying \$2.33 for 87 octane. He said 87 octane got all of the County's vehicles where they needed to go and back. He noted that all of the specifications for the vehicles at the Sheriff's Department were for 87 octane but the Sheriff's Department was using 89 octane. He said 89 octane cost \$2.52 per gallon and the County was paying 20¢ extra per gallon for these vehicles.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 5

Commissioner Horgan interjected that it did not help a vehicle one bit by putting in a higher octane.

Mr. Pullium remarked that the cost for utilities had gone up and this would affect the County's budget. He noted that building projects would cost more.

Mary Holland said she would proceed with discussion on the general revenue portion of the budget.

Commissioner Frady questioned the cost for the 24 new hires. He asked how staff had arrived at the \$80,000 figure.

Ms. Holland called the Board's attention to the health insurance category. She said staff had anticipated an increase in the benefit costs of 3.75%. She stated that the 3.75% was applied to this year's health cost.

Commissioner Frady said this figure related to everybody and not just the 24 new hires. Ms. Holland said staff also knew the cost of living adjustment was 4.1% and staff had proceeded in calculating that.

Commissioner Frady said his point was that these figures did not just apply to the 24 new hires but to every employee.

Chairman Dunn clarified that in the general fund there were only 11 people who were listed in the general fund for base salaries and benefits. He said the rest of the people were listed in the fire fund, E-911 fund and the Victims Assistance Fund.

Ms. Holland discussed the recommended expenditures by function. She said these were just the expenditures for tax supported funds. She said the majority of these funds were geared toward public safety and 47% of all tax dollars were being spent on that. She remarked that the next highest was the general government which was 15.49% and the judicial was 7.1% and so forth.

Ms. Venice remarked that public safety included animal control, coroner's office, marshal and sheriff.

Ms. Holland said this did not include special revenue funds and she pointed out that the E-911 was one such fund. She said the major fund of the special revenue funds was fire services and that was almost a budget of \$7 million. She remarked that 63% of the total expenditures were on governmental funds while 15% of that was for special revenue.

Ms. Holland remarked that staff had received some preliminary numbers from the Tax Assessor's Office and they indicated that there was an estimated tax digest of \$4.9 billion.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 6

She said based on that digest, staff had estimated an increase in the general fund of 9.3% overall property increase. He noted that estimated rollback would result in \$26.2 million.

Ms. Holland remarked that the total reassessments totaled \$244 million. She noted that staff was recommending the rollback and the general fund was based on that. She commented on the sales tax which is the other big revenue item. She said staff had projected an 8% increase in that and over \$10 million was expected this year.

Ms. Holland briefly discussed the fire fund. She said the overall increase in the real property not considering the property exemptions was 10.8%. She called the Board's attention to the total M & O digest showing 9.7% after considering all of the other items that were taxed as well. She said the fire fund was in pretty good shape and there should be contributing amounts back to the cash reserves of almost \$570,000

Mr. Pullium said he would like to make a comment about the fire fund. He said when he first came to work in Fayette County the fire fund did not have enough cash reserves to be able to carry their operations and in effect the general fund had to finance the operations of the fire fund. He said he would like to commend this Board for recognizing that fact and turning this fund around.

Ms. Holland said staff was recommending the millage rate with the rollback for the fire fund as well and this would generate \$6.8 million in taxes as opposed to \$7.3 with no rollback. She said this was a difference of \$500,000.

Ms. Holland remarked that the County was also funding the vehicle replacement fund.

Commissioner Frady said he would like to research the cost of automobiles being driven home by employees.

Mr. Pullium questioned violation of the Internal Revenue Service regarding turning in expenses for income.

MAGISTRATE COURT

Judge Chuck Floyd and Debbie Barron appeared to discuss this budget.

Judge Floyd said he wanted to discuss the supplemental budget that he had presented in the form of a letter. He said he was requesting an across the board increase for the Magistrates in the amount of \$3,000 per Magistrate. He said they were considered part time elected officials and felt they should have been included in the legislation regarding Superior Court judges' compensation and they had not been. He said he had suggested that this situation be corrected but it had not happened yet. He stated there had been very few and modest increases in pay from the point that the Magistrate system was set up in

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 7

1983. He said the current total for Magistrates was \$15,000 although his package including everything was slightly higher at \$21,000. He felt the judges's salary structure needed to be changed. He said at the point that this entire system was set up in 1983, Fayette County was a much different place then than it was now. He said there were approximately 28,000 citizens that they were providing service for. He remarked the Magistrate Court at that time did not deal with felonies at all. He noted that the Magistrates were compensated on a per writ basis and every warrant that they signed. He said things had certainly changed and the County had approximately 100,000 citizens. He said Magistrate Court issued warrants with regard to misdemeanors and felonies now and had taken over responsibilities that were far in excess of what was in place back then. He said the Magistrate Court was now taking over the Superior Court functions in terms of handling domestic violence matters. He said they also handle bond in all cases except for capital felonies. He said this was also an expanded role that was granted to the Magistrates by the Superior Court.

Chairman Dunn interjected that some of the functions the Magistrates had taken on willingly by themselves. He said a lot of the functions had not been imposed on the Magistrates but they just started doing them.

Judge Floyd said the Magistrates did not want to remain in the 1920's in the way the Magistrate Court should be operated. He said Magistrate Court as used in the greater sense outside of Fayette County did a whole lot more than they did here in Fayette County. He said the Magistrates feel like they were capable of providing that same service and in some instances they were already doing that with designation by the Court.

Chairman Dunn interjected that Fayette County also had a State Court that many of the other counties did not have. He said there was also a Probate Court that no longer did the functions that it used to.

Commissioner Frady remarked that the State Court now handled traffic violations and Probate Court used to do the traffic.

Judge Floyd remarked that one of the things that would happen when the Magistrate Court was developed to its full potential was that there would in essence be a sitting Superior Court all of the time. He said the Magistrates would like to be paid as full time judges and he hoped this was the way it was heading. He said he realized that issue was not part of this discussion. He said since there were circuit judges there were no sitting Superior Court judges on the premises all of the time. He said with the new building they did have the structural facilities to accommodate that. He felt this was an idea whose time had come. He said it was supported by the District Attorney's Office, the Solicitor's Office, the Bar Association and all of the other courts see this as a potential benefit to them. He said there were specialty courts that could be developed that could not be developed now because there were not enough man hours available.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 8

Commissioner Wells asked Judge Floyd for the compensation fee structure for the surrounding counties.

Judge Floyd replied that they did receive set salaries.

Commissioner Wells asked if those judges were full time judges.

Judge Floyd responded that not all of the judges were full time but all of them start with a slate of full time magistrates and then they have part time magistrates as needed. He said the part time magistrates in the other counties were appointed positions and their hours would primarily be weekends and after hours.

Commissioner Wells asked how the part time magistrates in other counties were compensated.

Judge Floyd replied that he thought the statute provided a minimum and then it was up to the County Commission as to how they were compensated.

Commissioner Wells asked if the State also had a situation where the part time Magistrate judges were willing to clock their hours that there was a compensation model that was different from the County.

Judge Floyd replied the statute was what it was relating to. He said he was not aware of a single Magistrate in the State of Georgia who submits time records to be compensated.

Commissioner Wells remarked that the State allowed for that.

Judge Floyd remarked that he did not know for sure if there was an hourly figure involved. He said as a practical matter he was not aware of one Magistrate in this State who submits a time record. He said he did not feel that was a desirable outcome. He said he would certainly not want to go in and punch a clock. He said he just did not think it was appropriate for a judge.

Commissioner Wells asked if the statute just sets the minimum and leaves the judges with nothing.

Judge Floyd said he agreed.

Debbie Barron remarked that the Magistrate Court Judges were the only ones who did not have a retirement system. She said the Magistrate Court Council had been fighting for years to get one passed and right now it was looking promising. She said this would only apply to full time Chief Magistrates. She said currently in the metropolitan Atlanta area Fayette County was the only one who has part time judges. She said not only that most

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 9

all of the metro area they were all attorneys. She said Fayette County was fortunate now in that three of the four Magistrate Judges were now attorneys.

Judge Floyd said what he had proposed to the Commission addressed both of those concerns. He remarked that Fayette County was the only County of this size in the entire State that did not have full time Magistrates. He also felt that Fayette County was the only County within this Circuit that did not have full time Magistrates.

Chairman Dunn asked how many counties did not have a State Court.

Judge Floyd said he could not answer that since State Court was not his expertise.

Chairman Dunn said he thought there were many counties who did not have a State Court. He said Fayette County had to fight to get one here. He also noted that no one on this Board submitted the legislation that raised judges and Board of Commissioners' salaries.

Commissioner Frady remarked that Commissioner Wells was on the Board when the Commissioner's salaries were tied in with the Superior Court Judges' raises.

Judge Floyd interjected that the Board of Commissioners' salaries were more than the Magistrate Judges' salaries.

Chairman Dunn remarked that Judge Floyd's salary was \$21,200 with the \$300 per month and the rest of the Judges receive \$16,800 which was \$13,200 plus \$3,600. He said Judge Floyd was suggesting that the Board increase this by \$3,000 for each Judge.

Judge Floyd remarked that was correct. He said one of the things that he based this on was the fact that there had been some turnover in his office in terms of Clerks and a Constable that had been replaced within the last year. He said those high end salaries were replaced with low end salaries. He stated the net impact on the Judges' salaries would be minimal.

Chairman Dunn said he understood the vision that Judge Floyd had for the Magistrates but in context with the entire court system here, everything seemed to be running smoothly and adequately. He remarked that there were no complaints and also noted that the Superior Court only had couple of big sessions every year. He said Fayette County did not have people waiting a long time to go to trial compared to other jurisdictions. He felt if there was a problem, the other Judges would be complaining.

Judge Floyd said all of the other Judges strongly support the request he was making to the Board.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 10

Chairman Dunn felt the County was giving raises not based on need but based on what was going on somewhere else.

Commissioner Frady interjected that before the State Court came along the court system was backed up 2,000 to 3,000 cases. He felt things were running smoothly now and the Magistrate Court had taken on some extra responsibility to hear additional cases. He asked Judge Floyd if the Magistrates were still working one week per month.

Judge Floyd replied that the Magistrate Judges sit for one week every four weeks.

Commissioner Wells asked Judge Floyd what the Magistrate Judges roll was during the other three weeks.

Judge Floyd said the Judges were on an "on call" basis during those three weeks to the extent that they defer hearings or there were conflicts in hearings.

Commissioner Wells asked if it was conceivable that a judge could go two weeks without stepping foot in the courthouse or doing anything in a Magistrate's roll.

Judge Floyd replied yes, it was conceivable but he did not think this happens.

Debbie Barron remarked that routinely the Magistrate Judges were in and out of the office handling cases that need attention because of motions coming in. She said these cases could not wait.

Chairman Dunn pointed out that three of the Magistrate Judges were in a law practice for themselves.

Commissioner Frady asked if any of the other Counties had the same set up that Fayette County has here with part time Magistrates.

Judge Floyd replied there were no counties with 100,000 population who operate in this manner.

Chairman Dunn felt something needed to be done with the entire Magistrate Office. He felt there needed to be a full time Chief Magistrate to start with but that issue was not today's agenda.

Judge Floyd said he would like to introduce legislation to have this discussed in the next Legislative Session.

Commissioner Frady asked if the Magistrate Judges were on the County's medical program and Ms. Barron replied yes they were.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 11

Commissioner Wells clarified that a Magistrate Judge other than Judge Floyd was in the court at least one time per week.

Judge Floyd replied yes that was correct. He said the Judges would have to prepare pretrial work on incoming cases that come in before the calendar was heard.

Commissioner Wells said she agreed with Judge Floyd that the Magistrate Court had changed tremendously in the last seven to eight years. She said she really would not have a problem with giving them a \$3,000 per employee net increase. She said out of the \$3,000 they would have to pay F.I.C.A., State, Federal and all of those things.

Mr. Pullium clarified that instead of a \$3,000 gross salary increase that it be a \$2,594 gross salary increase which was \$216 more per month. He said then by adding on the County benefit of matching retirement, matching pension and those kinds of things it actually comes out to \$3,000 cost per judge that the County was going to incur in total.

Chairman Dunn remarked that Judge Floyd would be coming back to the Board in a couple of months regarding legislation.

Commissioner Frady said he would like to see that legislation come through.

Commissioner Frady further remarked that he was not in favor of this because it was not done anywhere else in the County.

Chairman Dunn said these were the only part time employees in this particular situation.

Commissioner Wells said these individuals were being referred to as employees but they were not getting the cost of living raises that the rest of the County employees were getting. She said these individuals were not getting anything else nor have they been.

Commissioner Wells said even if this went through in legislation it would have to be done in phases and would take a minimum of three years to fully implement it.

Chairman Dunn said this could not even go in for consideration in the Legislature until January, 2007.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Pfeifer to approve a salary increase for each judge in the amount of \$2,594 plus benefits of \$406 in the Magistrate Court for a total amount of \$12,000 for the four judges. The motion carried 5-0.

RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 12

Anita Godbee and Tony Parrott appeared to discuss this budget.

Ms. Godbee remarked that the two main issues were Kenwood Park and Kelly Park and making sure that there were enough funds for both of those facilities to complete construction. She said she had asked Mallett Construction to send her an updated construction cost for Kenwood Park. She said originally in the C.I.P. the Board had voted to appropriate \$500,000 each year for five years.

Chairman Dunn questioned the \$3.7 million listed for Phase I.

Ms. Godbee said this was one of the reasons she had tried to increase her proposal this year to at least \$1 million. She said currently there was \$1.7 million remaining in the Kenwood Park C.I.P. budget from expenditures since 2002 that had not been expended yet.

Chairman Dunn clarified that there was \$2.5 million total currently that was committed in the C.I.P. and Phase I was at \$3.7 million.

Ms. Godbee said this included everything on the concept plan. She said she would be making a presentation to the Board later this month so the Board could actually vote on each individual element and whether or not the Board wanted to put it in the park.

Commissioner Wells asked why the amount was \$3.7 million when the Board originally wanted items phased in.

Chairman Dunn clarified that Ms. Godbee was asking for \$1 million this year instead of \$500,000. He felt there did not need to be horseshoe pits.

Commissioner Frady asked how long it was projected for completion of Phase I.

Ms. Godbee replied that they were hoping to complete it within at least another year.

Chairman Dunn interjected that when the Board approves projects it receives estimates from County staff. He said the degree of difference for this project was phenomenal. He said the original total bill was going to be \$2.5 million and that was based on the information from the staff. He said now it was \$3.7 million for Phase I. He asked for the projected cost of the other Phases.

Ms. Godbee said Mallett Construction had given her an estimate for Phase II at \$2.5 million and Phase III was \$5.1 million.

Chairman Dunn said the County might have to take a longer time to develop the park. He remarked that these costs were phenomenally different from the estimates.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 13

Mr. Pullium asked how many items had already been completed in the \$3.7 million figure.

Ms. Godbee said most of the items were not completed. She said item #19 had been approved and construction should begin on S.R. 279 lane widening some time this month. She said this would involve \$400,000 just to widen the lanes. She said this did not include the Kenwood Park entrance for the curb cut and the decel and accel lanes.

Mr. Pullium said in looking at the overall C.I.P. he asked if it would be possible to defer some of the other items for some of the other parks. He asked for the realistic time frame for completing Phase I if the money was available right now.

Ms. Godbee replied probably one and a half years. She said Public Works felt they would be completed with the road grading by September 1st without weather delays. She said after that, the contractors would move in and she felt they could be in and out in one year.

Commissioner Wells clarified that another \$500,000 was needed to take care of just this year and then next year there would need to be another \$500,000.

Commissioner Wells asked if some of the other park enhancements were moved forward and take their money and use that for this which of those would that involve.

Ms. Godbee replied that either at Kiwanis Park or McCurry Park. She said she would be fine with that and noted that some of the projects could be postponed in those parks. She felt those parks were where they were supposed to be and she would be willing to give up that money or postpone those projects until future years.

Chairman Dunn said staff had recommended no increase.

Mr. Pullium replied that staff was saying that the C.I.P. had programmed in it \$1.5 million less a couple of items that had already been completed by the Board. He said the Board was not tied to which parks or which projects this would go for.

Commissioner Wells said the money could come out of McCurry Park or Kiwanis Park either one.

Chairman Dunn asked if there had been any money in the capital program for Starr's Mill.

Mr. Pullium replied yes there was. He remarked that in last year's budget book for Starr's Mill there was a listing for completion of a trail system. He said these were programmed in for 2006 and included \$70,500 for installation of a picnic pavilion. He said he understood that \$37,500 was used out of this amount for ballfield lighting.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 14

Chairman Dunn said this project had now been put in 2007 to be done. He questioned that Starr's Mill was something that was being rethought right now and felt the money could go to 2008.

Ms. Venice remarked that the walking trail was the only project that remained in Starr's Mill as a possible project.

Mr. Pullium clarified that \$70,500 was programmed in fiscal year 2006 and \$37,500 was borrowed out of that amount. He said the Board would have options on the remaining money and if anything should even be done.

Chairman Dunn felt the money should go to 2008 since there was no definite decision on what the money would go for.

Mr. Pullium remarked that \$33,000 was in the bank and was available out of the Starr's Mill project that the Board could use. He said the trail system was \$70,500 and \$37,500 was borrowed from that leaving \$33,000 in that project. He said if the Board moved this out to 2008 or 2009 there would be \$70,500 that could be used in 2007.

Chairman Dunn said this would mean that Starr's Mill would come out of the C.I.P. unless it was programmed for 2008 or 2009.

Commissioner Wells said the walking trails for Starr's Mill could be moved to 2010 or 2011.

Commissioner Frady said this would mean moving the \$500,000 over to Kenwood Park.

Ms. Godbee said she would like to discuss Kelly Park. She said she had increased the budget on this park and a lot of it she had moved from the out years into 2007 so that this could be completed. She discussed the estimated cost minus the retaining wall and the \$250,000 that was deducted from the \$970,000.

Chairman Dunn said there had been a total project cost for Kelly Park of \$360,000 and now the report stated it would be \$970,000. He expressed concern with these cost increases and said the County could not continue this. He said there was a planning program and budgeting system in place for a reason. He said now the figure would be \$720,000. He noted that this figure was double the program.

Commissioner Wells said in this year's C.I.P. there was only \$60,000 allocated for Kelly Park. She said now staff was wanting to increase that to \$720,000. She said she just did not see how this was possible.

Chairman Dunn said he would like to see the original cost estimates.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 15

Ms. Venice replied that there were no cost estimates and this was the whole problem. She said the original figure floated for Kelly Park was the amount of money that the consultant estimated that the County should spend in that quadrant of the County.

Chairman Dunn questioned a project being estimated at \$360,000 and now coming in at \$970,000. He asked when was the build out for Kelly Park projected.

Ms. Godbee replied that the plan was to move forward.

Chairman Dunn asked if this park would be completed this fiscal year.

Commissioner Wells interjected no because this was proposed as an ongoing project. She said she just did not see how this park could be expedited.

Mr. Pullium said money could be put aside each year for the next three years for Kelly Park. He felt Kelly should be deferred until Kenwood was completed.

The Board briefly discussed Phase I, Phase II and Phase III for Kenwood Park.

Chairman Dunn exited the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

Commissioner Frady felt funding should begin for Kelly Park.

Commissioner Wells suggested the \$60,000 could be carried over to next year.

Commissioner Wells asked if Phase I of Kenwood Park would have any walking trails.

Ms. Godbee replied yes there would be walking trails.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Wells to leave the bottom line of the Recreation Department's C.I.P. budget at \$1,417,500, shift \$500,000 from McCurry Park project to Kenwood Park and add back \$70,000 which would get Kenwood Park project back on track. The motion carried 4-0. Chairman Dunn was not present for the vote.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

District Attorney Scott Ballard and Susan Harper appeared to discuss this budget.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 16

Attorney Ballard said he wanted to follow up on the promises he had made to the Board previously. He said one of the promises was that his office would re-evaluate the way the load was shared among the counties for this budget. He said by law this was done according to case load. He the previous figures were for 2000 and he realized those were outdated and things had shifted. He said this year he had used more recent case load figures and this would reduce Fayette County's burden significantly. He said Fayette County had been good enough to pay the entirety of the salary of one who was based in Fayette County. He said he had tried to move people where the need was and said this year this would be a salary that they would request funding from all of the counties on. He said he had done this as well. He stated another issue was the pretrial diversion program. He said for every person who participates in that program a \$300 fee is paid to the Fayette County Registry. He said it had been his intent to bring the Board a check for what they received last year. He presented a check to the Board in the amount of \$15,890 that was recovered from the pretrial diversion program. He said it was nice to receive these funds but it was also beneficial in helping people turn their lives around and keeping them from having to prosecute cases that were not going anywhere to begin with.

Attorney Ballard further remarked that he had requested from Fayette County the creation of two additional positions. He said one position was for a receptionist that would be used in the Fayette office and the other position was for an investigator that was desperately needed in the Griffin office. He said they had been using investigators from the other counties to help with the Griffin office. He said all too often that had been a Fayette investigator who was helping with work on the Griffin cases. He stated another investigator would be of great benefit to Fayette, Griffin and Spalding if the Board would approve this position. He noted the receptionist position in the amount of \$29,000 for Fayette was greatly needed. He said they had been using another lady in the office who was their IT expert and this was taking her away from her expertise. He pointed out that staff was recommending that the Board not approve either of those positions. He said last year the Board approved Fayette County's portion of the District Attorney's budget in the amount of \$367,463.94. He said because of the adjustments that he had mentioned earlier and shifting the load to the other counties and changing one position to be paid by all of the counties, this year he was only requesting \$269,969.14 from Fayette County. He said this would be a savings in the amount of \$97,500. He said with staff denying these positions, he would be getting \$119,651 less than last year. He said he had broken down what they felt Fayette County's share of the two new programs was going to be and that was \$23,856.66. He said they had already given back nearly \$16,000. He said he would certainly appreciate the Board going against the staff's recommendation and actually approve these two new positions.

Commissioner Wells asked for the total amount of what Attorney Ballard was requesting.

Attorney Ballard replied that the amount that he was requesting this year was \$269,969.19.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 17

Commissioner Wells said she had a figure of \$271,669 and Mr. Pullium said that figure was correct.

Commissioner Wells clarified that the new investigator would be working in Griffin and Attorney Ballard replied yes that was correct.

Attorney Ballard said this would be a tremendous benefit to Fayette because the Fayette investigator would not have to go to Griffin and help them.

Commissioner Wells said she would be more inclined to approve the secretary who would be based in Fayette County rather than pay for an investigator in Griffin.

Attorney Ballard interjected that Upson County would now see double from it paid last year because misdemeanors and felonies were handled there. He said because of all of the misdemeanors they surpassed Fayette County. He noted that Fayette County now had the third highest case load in the Circuit. He said he would be the first person to admit that Fayette County had carried more than its fair share in the Circuit through the years.

Commissioner Frady questioned the District Attorney's case load.

Attorney Ballard responded in 2004 Fayette County had 554 felony cases that were filed and in 2005 Fayette County had 625 cases. He said right now he did not feel like crime was exploding in Fayette County.

Mr. Pullium asked Attorney Ballard if there had been any increases from the State in terms of positions.

Attorney Ballard asked Mr. Pullium if he was referring to adding another State A.D.A. or a State secretary.

Mr. Pullium replied yes.

Attorney Ballard said no there had not been anything added. He said they still had one State paid A.D.A. per judge plus two for a total of six. He said there were two State paid secretaries and one State paid investigator for the whole Circuit.

Mr. Pullium asked if the workload for the investigator in Griffin would be mainly for Griffin cases or would this investigator be circuit wide.

Attorney Ballard replied that every one of his investigators could be called to any of the counties for a job. He said what he really needed was another investigator to assist the one they have in Spalding County in getting the cases prepared there. He said his dire need was for another investigator to help him in Spalding County.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 18

Attorney Ballard remarked that he wanted to have a really top notch web site so that anyone could get on the site and see what was pending at any given time. He said he could also post crime alerts if somebody was on the run. He said he intended to put a designated secretary on this project.

Commissioner Wells suggested a high school or college student who would be doing this as part of their degree program rather than taking one of his secretaries to accomplish this. She felt this could be outsourced.

Attorney Ballard replied that was a good suggestion that perhaps he would do.

Commissioner Horgan also felt it was a good idea to have this work outsourced.

Commissioner Wells said this would also eliminate the need for paying of benefits. She said if this was outsourced that would eliminate the need for an additional secretary.

Attorney Ballard said he would like to see this position filled but he needed the investigator position more if he had to make a choice between the two positions.

Commissioner Wells remarked that she counted three secretaries already in that office and she just could not approve another secretarial position there. She said on the other hand she was really torn on this decision. She said she was good at cutting budgets but Attorney Ballard had been very good about cutting his requests too. She said that alone could not go unrecognized. She remarked that Attorney Ballard had cut his own budget almost \$120,000. She said that fact needed to be recognized.

Commissioner Wells asked if the pretrial diversion monies would continue coming in and Attorney Ballard replied yes.

Commissioner Wells asked if Upson County decided that they were not going to pay their portion.

Attorney Ballard replied that he did not know what he would do in that case.

Commissioner Frady said he would not mind paying the \$23,857 but he wanted to just pay Fayette County's portion.

Commissioner Wells said the investigator could be hired but the County would not pay anymore than what Fayette County's portion would be and this amount would not be exceeded.

Commissioner Frady said he could not recall any of the other counties failing to pay.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 19

Attorney Ballard pointed out that last year all of the counties paid what he had asked for except Fayette County.

Commissioner Frady said he was in favor of paying the \$23,857 and just Fayette County's portion.

Commissioner Wells interjected that this did not include benefits.

Mary Holland said the benefits would come to \$10,800.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve the District Attorney's budget in the amount of \$261,027 including the new program for the new investigator of Fayette County's portion not to exceed \$13,215. The motion carried 4-0. Chairman Dunn was not present for the vote.

Susan Harper asked if the Board had any questions on their portion of the 5% money that was requested. She said it was her understanding from the information that Mr. Sawyer in the Finance Department had faxed to them was that the Finance Department had approved their recommended amount.

Commissioner Wells asked if she was requesting an increase this year.

Ms. Harper replied that the only increase was the difference in the violence against women grant. She said they got \$78,500 out of that and they have to match 20% of that.

Mr. Pullium asked for the amount of their total request.

Ms. Harper replied that the total amount over and above what they were getting was approximately \$40,000.

Mr. Pullium clarified that this was a one time expense.

Ms. Harper remarked that the salaries would reoccur but the computers, desks and things like that would not.

Mr. Pullium asked for the length of time for the Federal grant and Ms. Harper replied four years.

Mr. Pullium asked if the County was expected to take this over in the fifth year.

Commissioner Wells said this would definitely not happen. She said the question was if this was absolutely necessary. She said sometimes grant cost the County more money. She asked if this was something that the County absolutely needed to have.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 20

Attorney Ballard said he did not know yet how effective this would be but he felt it would really be beneficial for the crimes against women who were 12 years of age and older. He said they would revisit this issue with the Board next year and see how it goes this year.

Commissioner Wells said it had never been this Board's position to fund those.

Commissioner Wells said with the victims assistance surcharge fund request there was also the promise place included in that.

Mr. Pullium said the grant would continue for four years and they would have a certain percentage for salaries coming out of that. He remarked that at some point in the future the County might have to take this position over.

Attorney Ballard said they had never promised this position to be permanent. He said if the position turned out to be beneficial to the public then he would ask for consideration for the position at that time.

Mary Holland said the Board had taken out \$103,709 last year and this year it was \$213,939. She said this totaled \$317,648.

Attorney Ballard asked if there was any money in the 5% fund even including all of the money brought in this year.

Mr. Pullium replied that as of June 30th last year there was \$300,000. He said this year the County had spent \$137,000. He said this leaves the County \$224,000 at the end of June 30, 2006. He said staff was recommending using \$213,000 of that. He said this fund was almost gone.

Ms. Holland said revenues for the year were projected at \$130,000.

Commissioner Wells remarked that next year the money would not be there. She said the Board could recommend this for this year but there was no guarantee that the money would be there next year. She noted that the investigator's salary for the Solicitor's Office also came out of this money.

Attorney Ballard felt if this position could be in place for the next year they would have a better idea of how effective it was going to be. He felt the position would benefit the County in terms of crimes against women and domestic violence.

Commissioner Wells remarked that the programs in the Victims' Assistance Fund were in jeopardy for the next couple of years. She pointed out that it had never been this Board's

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 21

position to fund those in the general fund. She said this was something that everyone needed to be very aware of.

Attorney Ballard felt it was encouraging that the defendants could pay for this and the taxpayers would not have to.

Commissioner Wells said the Promise Place budget was included in this as well. She asked Attorney Ballard if he was advocating on their behalf this year or was this just included in this budget.

Attorney Ballard said the Promise Place organization was a great organization but they had not asked him to speak on their behalf.

Ms. Holland remarked that Promise Place had requested \$15,000 and staff actually recommended \$10,000.

Commissioner Wells said she did want that amount to be reflected and the final number on page 5 would be \$187,192. She asked for the Board's feelings on the victims assistance surcharge fund. She said this related to the victims assistance program and for crimes against women.

Commissioner Frady said he did not have a problem with it this year.

Commissioner Wells said the Board's other option would be just to continue to fund the victims assistance like it did the year before last and not add the new one.

Commissioner Frady said he did not feel like this amount of money needed to be kept in the bank and felt the County should be using it especially since it had already been designated for this purpose.

Commissioner Wells remarked that this would include the reduction of the extra \$5,000 on the sheet making it a total of \$187,192.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Pfeifer to approve \$187,192 for the victims assistance fund. The motion carried 4-0. Chairman Dunn was absent for the vote.

Ms. Holland clarified the amount of money for this budget that the Board had just approved for this department. She said it would be a total amount of \$10,000 to be budgeted for Promise Place.

Commissioner Wells remarked that Ms. Holland had brought to the Board's attention that Promise Place had been entered in the area that the Board just voted on and they also

have a separate request. She said it was not the Board's intention to fund Promise Place twice.

Commissioner Frady clarified that the Promise Place budget would come out of the Victims Witness fund.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

Attorney Joe Saia appeared to discuss this budget.

Commissioner Wells clarified that the base request for the department was \$263,360. She said staff had recommended \$198,002. She asked Attorney Saia why the Board should reconsider his base request.

Attorney Saia remarked his office would be getting a refund of approximately \$55,000. He said there should also be a little money coming from line items as well.

Commissioner Wells said staff was recommending keeping this budget at the same level as last year.

Mr. Pullium remarked that Spalding County was the administrator of this fund. He said Spalding County sends Fayette County an invoice and then Fayette County sends them the money.

Commissioner Wells clarified that the total recommended budget for this department was \$450,000 and Attorney Saia had requested \$495,748.

Mr. Pullium asked Attorney Saia if the County was looking at \$395,000 in expenditures at the end of fiscal year 2006. He said now there was a request for \$495,000 and this was a \$100,000 increase from one year to the next.

Attorney Saia responded that overall there was an indication that the budget went up approximately 6% or a little over \$80,000. He said this figure covered the salary increases. He said the reason for the increase was because of the population. He said there were two breakdowns and one was for caseload and the other was population.

Commissioner Wells asked Attorney Saia if he was requesting supplements in addition to this.

Attorney Saia replied no. He said the supplements were already included in the request.

Commissioner Wells said the Board did not pay supplements and these would have to be removed.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 23

Chris Venice said the \$450,000 figure did not have the supplements included.

Mr. Pullium noted that there had been a lot of management issues and Attorney Saia had come in and made a lot of changes.

Commissioner Wells suggested approving the \$450,000 with no supplements and with the understanding that Attorney Saia could always come back to the Board and ask for more. She said the Board would need documentation and justification for any additional fund requests.

Attorney Saia said he was looking at two proposed budgets.

Commissioner Wells said there was \$198,002 for the circuit wide contract and \$251,998 for the lower court. She said that totaled \$450,000.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Horgan to approve the Public Defender's budget in the amount of \$450,000. The motion carried 4-0. Chairman Dunn was not present for the vote.

Chairman Dunn entered the meeting at this time.

WATER SYSTEM

Tony Parrott appeared to discuss this budget.

Mr. Parrott said he really did not have any issues with this budget. He commented on the S.R. 74 pressure improvements regarding the tank site for the year 2007. He said this was now listed in the C.I.P.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve the Water System's budget as presented in the amount of \$12,888,086 including the C.I.P. with all projects being moved to out years in the program. The motion carried 5-0.

ROAD DEPARTMENT

Public Works Director Lee Hearn appeared to discuss this budget. He presented a summary of the C.I.P. for this department. He reviewed a five year equipment replacement schedule and asked for the Board's consideration based on the Road Department's needs. He said he had several pieces of equipment that were older pieces that were used every day that would need replacing this year.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 24

Commissioner Wells asked if outsourcing of paving had ever been considered.

Mr. Hearn responded that the Road Department had bid out 22.5 miles of resurfacing with S.P.L.O.S.T. funds. He said the bid on that work was a little over \$4 million. He said it included a little bit of patching and repair work but did not include any striping, markers or anything of that nature. He said last year the County paved approximately 34 miles of roadway with in house crews. He said they budgeted approximately \$2 million last year in asphalt and support for that in terms of equipment and labor would probably in the \$650,000 to \$700,000 range.

Ms. Venice interjected that in April the County started capturing labor as part of projects and in another year or so there would be a good indication for total cost for any particular stretch of road.

Commissioner Wells asked if the cost also included benefits and things of that nature that was being paid to employees.

Ms. Venice replied the figure was per person so whatever the pay grade was for that person would apply.

Ms. Holland said a percentage would be added in for benefits but this had not been done yet.

Commissioner Frady asked Mr. Hearn if any type of amortization schedule was used on vehicles in order to get a cost figure.

Mr. Hearn replied yes. He said he had discussed the approximate life of each piece of equipment at the Road Department with Mr. Pullium and how much it costs each year to operate that piece of equipment. He said they had done a lot more resurfacing last year for a lot less money than what it was being subcontracted out for. He said the paving crew was also involved in cleaning out ditches and working on maintenance items when they were not paving. He said the County was getting a lot more than just the paving operation out of this crew. He said they did not just do one or two streets in a subdivision but they paved them all.

Commissioner Wells asked if the cost estimate for asphalt for the 34 miles of paving was purchased by the County. She clarified that was approximately \$2 million extra for the cost of labor and equipment.

Mr. Hearn replied that the labor and equipment would be more in line with \$600,000 to \$700,000 range. He said when the County does resurfacing the asphalt costs were bid out. He said last year they had approximately \$2 million as a line item for that. He stated out of the Maintenance and Operating budget there was labor, fuel, repairs, grease, oil and everything that goes with that. He said he was not certain of the exact numbers but there was a little over \$1 million in the total labor at the Road Department.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 25

Commissioner Wells said she recalled for the 22.5 miles that was contracted out that it cost the County approximately \$4 million. She asked if the County had provided asphalt for that paving.

Mr. Hearn replied no and remarked that was all inclusive and that was already provided as a total package.

Commissioner Wells asked if the County could purchase the asphalt cheaper.

Mr. Hearn replied no. He said the County was actually buying it from the company

Commissioner Wells said it was her preference that until the costs were captured for paving and asphalt would be to put off purchasing equipment for paving. She said outsourcing could be further investigated as a possibility for contracting out the County's resurfacing or whether or not it was worth the County doing this in house.

Commissioner Frady asked if there was any type of amortization schedule being run on County equipment.

Mr. Pullium replied yes. He said there was a need to refinance the replacement of equipment and this need was recognized by staff. He said money had been programmed every year to go into the vehicle replacement fund so when it was needed for equipment it was there.

Commissioner Wells asked Mr. Hearn how many paving machines the County had.

Mr. Hearn replied there was one paving machine.

Chairman Dunn remarked that these major end items should have been programmed over the last several years in the C.I.P.

Mr. Hearn interjected that he had been asking for equipment during the last budgets.

Mrs. Venice remarked that Mr. Hearn had been asking for equipment through the general M & O budget and not through the C.I.P. process. She said now this had been corrected and equipment would be coming through on the C.I.P.

Chairman Dunn said none of the Board members could determine when machinery would break down and need replacing. He said that was up to the Department Head to budget for this. He said a paving machine would have to be in the upcoming budget because there was only one of those. He said he would be comfortable with putting nothing in 2007 and then asking staff to come up with a plan.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 26

Commissioner Frady felt the five year plan would have to be in place and budgeting proposed for this equipment.

Mrs. Venice suggested Mr. Hearn could get the data and maintenance records for these items and submit to the Vehicle Replacement Committee and have them look at these along with Lee Hearn and Bill Lackey. She said a recommendation could be made to the Board beginning in 2008.

Mr. Hearn said the paving equipment and the right-of-way cutting equipment would have to be on the replacement list. He said his latest cost estimate for replacement of the equipment at the Road Department was \$6 million. He said if he spent \$250,000 every year it would take him 24 years to replace all of the Road Department equipment.

Commissioner Wells questioned if all of this equipment was needed. She asked if some of this could be outsourced.

Chairman Dunn said he was not talking about a major outsourcing but there might be pieces of equipment that were not used very often. He suggested approximately 45 days to two months for staff to come back to the Board with a recommendation. He said there needed to be a functional C.I.P. for the Road Department in place for next year in case equipment had to be moved up for replacement.

Mr. Pullium questioned some of the roads listed on the C.I.P. He said these roads were not addressed in the S.P.L.O.S.T. or otherwise addressed.

Commissioner Wells questioned the paving of Snead Road and Old Road.

Chairman Dunn noted that Old Road was listed for repair in 2008.

Commissioner Horgan asked how the priority of these roads was determined.

Chairman Dunn replied that the County determines this.

Commissioner Wells questioned if the cost of the paving of Snead Road was known.

Mr. Hearn replied that the engineering and right-of-way funding would be required in 2007 and this was in the amount of \$325,000. He explained the way the priority list works. He said they take petitions from residents who live on a road and if there was 80% of the residents willing to donate right-of-way, he would then bring this to the Commissioners. He said if the Board of Commissioners approves this, the road would then go on a project list as a dirt road that was going to be paved. He said Snead Road was the only road that meets that criteria that was on the list at this time.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 27

Chairman Dunn said Snead Road was projected to cost \$821,000 for two miles worth of paving.

Commissioner Wells asked Mr. Hearn for the most critical project as far as transportation movement.

Mr. Hearn said those projects were identified in the transportation update. He said these were the highest projects in the S.P.L.O.S.T. work.

Commissioner Wells asked if any other projects would fall in a nearby category to that.

Mr. Hearn said the only road on the list that would affect public welfare and safety was Old Road for base and paving. He said the Kenwood Business Park was tied into this and there were large trucks that can exit out onto S.R. 279 if that section of Old Road was paved. He said as he understood it the trucks would not be allowed to exit through that section and the tie had not been made for the Kenwood Business Park. He noted that while this was a dirt road, they could not exit that.

Commissioner Frady said part of that road had been paved where the service station was located.

Chairman Dunn asked if the engineering work had been done on this road.

Mr. Hearn replied that some preliminary engineering work had been looked at by David Yaegar and Jim Mallett but there was no final decision.

Chairman Dunn felt it was a good idea to break this out the way the regions plan indicated such as engineering, acquisition of right-of-way and then construction.

Mr. Hearn said this was the reason he had listed under this that engineering and right-of-way funding would be \$325,000.

Chairman Dunn said the engineering would be done in one year and right-of-way acquisition in another year. He said construction would then occur a year or two later. He said he would like to be able to get visibility of the recommendation on Old Road and Snead Road about the same time that the truck replacement list was received. He said this would be in the out years.

Ms. Venice said it was very important for the Board to set the priority of the roads. She said Old Road was a safety issue and the citizens along Snead Road had been waiting for the last fifteen years to have it paved. She asked which was more important to the Board.

Commissioner Wells interjected that safety was more important.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 28

Ms. Venice said now that staff was aware of this they could proceed.

Chairman Dunn said that was the reason that Old Road was listed and not the other road.

Ms. Venice interjected that Old Road was listed for paving for 2010.

Mary Holland remarked that Old Road was listed for paving in 2008 in the amount of \$70,000. She asked if the \$70,000 was included in this \$193,000.

Ms. Holland clarified that \$70,000 was already listed in the C.I.P. for Old Road. She asked if the \$70,000 was part of the \$193,000.

Mr. Hearn replied yes. He said it would cost \$85,000 for the engineering work for Old Road.

Chairman Dunn noted that Old Road was listed twice in the C.I.P.

Ms. Holland said it was listed as the preparation and paving of 4.2 miles of dirt road.

Chairman Dunn asked what the other \$123,000 was for.

Commissioner Pfeifer said there would have to be acquisition of right-of-way and engineering.

Mr. Hearn remarked that the section of Old Road that was being discussed runs from S.R. 279 to Highway 85.

Chairman Dunn said staff needed to revisit this issue and make recommendations to the Board on where these roads should be on the list. He said there were only two roads that should be on the list because the County did not have the right-of-way for the rest of the roads.

Mr. Hearn replied yes that was correct.

Chairman Dunn said the County also did not have 85% of the residents on the road who want this.

Commissioner Frady said the County had cut the bank on Old Road to make it a better entrance to that road approximately a year and a half ago.

Chairman Dunn questioned the cost of the turn lanes on S.R. 279 into Kenwood Park.

Tom Sawyer of the Finance Department replied the cost was \$379,000.

Chairman Dunn asked why this cost was so high for a turn lane.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 29

Mr. Hearn replied that the work involved more than just a turn lane. He said S.R. 279 had to be widened out for approximately 300 yards because there had to be tapers for all of the left turn movements and there must also be the actual decel lane. He said the scope of the project was a lot more than just building a turn lane. He noted that the speed limits set the length of the taper and there must be a full lane width for the taper. He remarked that G.D.O.T. originally asked for the County to clean up the intersection at Kenwood Road and put turn lanes so the length of the project would have been double from what it currently was. He said the County reported to G.D.O.T. that it was not going to use Kenwood Road as access into the Park. He said that was going to be for maintenance. He said people using the Park for recreation would have to use the main entrance to the Park.

Chairman Dunn asked Mr. Hearn if he was happy with his budget as Staff had presented it and Mr. Hearn replied yes.

Chairman Dunn asked Mr. Hearn if he was happy with the Capital Improvement Program for his department and Mr. Hearn responded yes.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve the Road Department budget as presented in the amount of \$4,728,550. The motion carried 5-0.

FLEET MAINTENANCE

Director of Fleet Maintenance Bill Lackey and Director of Public Works Lee Hearn appeared to discuss this budget.

Mr. Lackey questioned staff's cut in his request for cleaning supplies.

Assistant Finance Director Mary Holland remarked that \$5,500 had been requested for cleaning supplies and the recommended figure was \$4,000.

Chairman Dunn said he saw no problem with the recommended amount. He said if Mr. Lackey was to run out of supply money, these supplies would still be provided.

Commissioner Frady said this department was spending \$3,600 per month. He suggested \$4,500 for this line item.

Mr. Lackey remarked that the cost was lower during the cooler months because they were not washing cars.

Chairman Dunn said he would agree to the \$4,500 for cleaning supplies and the Board agreed.

Commissioner Frady asked Mr. Lackey if there were any concerns with his budget.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 30

Mr. Lackey responded that the only other concern was operating equipment services.

After a review of the figures, the consensus was to keep the operating figure at the recommended amount and if there was a need for additional Mr. Lackey could make a request.

Ms. Holland asked if the pro key system needed to be discussed in regard to the Sheriff's complex. She said the Finance Department would have no way to account for their usage at their complex.

Chairman Dunn said the pro key system would allow the County to know what every vehicle was getting at the gas pumps.

Chris Venice said another issue that would be coming up was the proposed pole barn. She asked if there was any physical space at the Fleet facility to put this.

Mr. Hearn replied yes. He said it was estimated to be 200 feet in length and 39 feet deep and with a 14 feet clear height. He said the consultant was concerned with the County hauling asphalt that had a lot of grease and oil and that sort of thing in it. He remarked that when it rained it would then run off of these trucks and run directly in the ground. He said this was the problem. He said the State wanted a shed to cover this equipment from the weather. He said they estimated for a three sided shed and it would not have to be all the way to the ground.

Commissioner Wells questioned the estimate for this pole barn in the amount of \$100,000.

Commissioner Frady asked if the shed would have a door on it and Mr. Hearn replied no.

Chairman Dunn remarked that these County vehicles were out on the road a lot and not parked.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve the Fleet Maintenance budget in the amount of \$227,330. The motion carried 5-0.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Director of Information Systems Russell Prince and Nina Madrid of the Purchasing Department appeared to discuss this budget.

Nina Madrid said she was present to discuss the County's current telephone system. She felt the current system needed to be replaced and budgeted in this year's budget.

Chris Venice remarked that staff recommended the capital budget for this department which did include the server upgrades, air conditioning and environmental controls.

Chairman Dunn questioned the current phone system and its replacement for this budget year.

Mrs. Madrid gave the Board a brief history of the current phone system. She said approximately 12 years ago the County had direct phone lines coming into every department with single line phones on the desks. She said every main site at the County government had a building operator and that person handled all of the incoming calls and transferred all calls to the various departments. She said as the County grew the one person could not handle this. She said customers were getting busy signals and employees were having difficulty getting outside lines. She remarked at that time instead of adding more lines into the site, the Board at that time decided to install PBX phone systems. She said a system was installed at the three main sites with a voice mail system with auto attendants. She said that was in 1995 when voice mail and phone systems were installed at the three main sites. She pointed out that the McDonough Road site handled the Public Works, Building and Grounds Maintenance and the Water System. She said the system located at the Johnson Avenue site included the courts, Sheriff's Department and the jail. She said the system here at the Stonewall Complex included the library and the fifteen departments located here with the exception of the Tax Commissioner. She said that equipment was ten years old at the time it was installed. She said the equipment at that time was fine because it provided the County with features and functions that it did not currently have before.

Chairman Dunn asked if the system installed at that time was a used piece of equipment.

Mr. Prince replied that it would appear that the system installed was refurbished and not new. He said that system was installed in 1995. He noted that the manufacturer's stamp on the cabinet was September 22, 1983 and the system was a twelve year old piece of equipment when it was installed. He said when he reviewed the bid for this system it had not indicated that the system should be new one.

Mrs. Madrid further remarked that in the Fall of 2003 with the building of the new jail and justice center the County installed a new phone system and a new voice mail system that was capable of handling all of the County's facilities. She said two circuits were also installed that provided back up. She said in the Fall of 2004 the County upgraded equipment at the Animal Shelter and Parks and Recreation. She said those two areas have had a long history of phone problems. She stated a lot of those problems were due to their location and the facilities where they were located. She said all of the problems at the Parks and Recreation facility have been solved and were now routed through to the Center Drive system. She said the same solution could not be provided for the Animal Shelter because of their location and the cost of the facilities located in Peachtree City. She said the Animal Shelter has a more reliable system right now and they have the capability of being connected to the Center Drive with some additional software. She noted that they were currently a stand alone system.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 32

Mrs. Madrid further remarked that in December of 2004 the County upgraded the phone system at the Crosstown Water Plant. She said they have a system similar to the Animal Shelter's system and with additional software they could also be connected on. She said they were currently a stand alone system. She noted that currently the systems at McDonough Road and the Stonewall Complex were over twenty years old. She said the parts for these systems had not been manufactured for many years. She said the County had been using refurbished parts in order to keep the system maintained. She said there were frequent failures on the phone cards. She noted that each phone and/or extension at Stonewall was connected to a port on a phone card and these ports go bad on a regular basis. She said sometimes this was caused by storms and lightning. She said she could swap ports around in order to keep the essential extensions available for use but while someone was waiting for a card to come in their station would be down. She said sometimes a person might be down for a week or more where their phone extension was not operational.

Mrs. Madrid further stated that in July of 2005 there was a "brown out" at the Stonewall Complex. She said they lost the system card, disk card, and scanner card. She said it took three days to restore the lost data. She noted that in October of 2005 the power supply was lost. She said there was a melt down here on Saturday. She said the County was lucky because a replacement power supply was found and taken from a stack of cards that were destined for the garbage can. She said that power supply was put in and the system has managed to stay up and running. She said the McDonough Road system has been experiencing busy signals. She pointed out that someone would get a busy signal coming in and a busy signal trying to get an outside line. She said both of these systems were pretty much at maximum capacity right now. She said she had room to add two more supersets phones on this system and one more at the McDonough Road site. She said there was currently no backup for the McDonough Road site.

Mr. Pullium asked Mrs. Madrid if a phone card could be added to the system to help with this problem.

Mrs. Madrid replied that some money would have to be spent on the system and programming done to make some changes in the system. She said she was not sure if a card was available and not sure of the cost.

Mr. Prince replied that the card would cost approximately \$1,500.

Mrs. Madrid said she receives complaint calls on a regular basis regarding the lengthy phone menu at the Stonewall Avenue Complex as well as the disconnects that occur. She said she also receives complaints about the delay time line regarding incoming calls, hangups and the delay in receiving voice mail messages. She said there had been times that it would be a day or two before a voice mail message would actually enter into a phone. She said this had occurred on more than one occasion. She said it was a good thing that the County facility was

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 33

not a critical facility such as the Sheriff's Office. She said the Sheriff's Office was experiencing this type of problem before they were converted over to the new system.

Mr. Pullium questioned if there were any phone cards or anything from the system used previously by the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Prince replied yes, the County still had this system. He said the County was paying Ultimate Security to replace the parts but in an emergency these spare parts could be used temporarily if they would work in this system.

Mrs. Madrid remarked that currently at the Justice Center there were six phone lines coming in over there and the County was paying approximately \$1,000 for that service. She said the Sheriff's Office and the jail had twenty-two phone lines coming in on one circuit and their cost was approximately \$1,600 per month. She said the Stonewall Complex had approximately 46 phone lines and one circuit and it costs approximately \$1,900 per month. She remarked that McDonough Road had twenty-two phone lines and no circuit and their cost was approximately \$600 per month. She said currently there were two phone maintenance agreements and the County was paying \$25,000 per year for the jail, Justice Center, Sheriff's Office, Parks and Recreation, Animal Shelter and Crosstown Water Plant. She said the County also had another contract for \$30,000 for the Stonewall Complex, McDonough Road and South Fayette Water Plant. She said these contracts involved two different vendors. She said in the very near future the County was planning on connecting the new Senior Center facility to the phone system on Center Drive. She said it was also hoped that in the near future to upgrade the phone equipment at the South Fayette Water Plant with a system similar to the Crosstown system. She said this would give the County the capability to connect together.

Mrs. Madrid further remarked that if the upgrade was not approved, the Board needed to be aware of some things. She said the County needed to add more phone lines at the McDonough Road site because their current volume calls were getting a lot of busy signals. She said the McDonough Road site had a PBX similar to the Stonewall Complex system. She said the McDonough Road site included Building and Grounds Maintenance, Water System and Public Works and Fleet Maintenance.

Mary Holland said staff had actually included that cost in its recommendation for McDonough Road and did include the Water System. She staff had not included the Stonewall Complex.

Mrs. Madrid remarked that the current Stonewall Complex system would not allow the six new employees who had been approved by the Board to have telephones here.

Mr. Pullium said if the new phone card was added for \$1,500 then these additional phones could be added.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 34

Mrs. Madrid replied that there would be more involved than just the cost of a phone card. She said programming would also have to be done and this would be done by the vendor who was Ultimate Security Systems.

Mr. Prince felt there might be more involved to it than that. He said the system itself was pretty much full. He said a new phone card could not be put in a slot if there was not a slot. He said there might have to be some card swapping and so forth.

Mr. Pullium asked if everyone in the County government had a phone extension here at the Stonewall Complex.

Mrs. Madrid replied no.

Commissioner Wells interjected that not everyone needed a phone.

Mr. Pullium said there might be six or eight employees here at the Stonewall Complex who might not need a phone. He asked if this would be an option.

Mrs. Madrid replied yes it could be an option but someone would have to make that determination. She said there were several superset phones where people were not at those desks a lot and might not need these phones. She said she had some single line phones available.

Chairman Dunn said it was being recommended to put off replacement of the Stonewall Complex system until next year. He asked if this current system would last until that time.

Mrs. Madrid replied that would be uncertain. She said there could be a "brown out" or something else that would cause it to crash. She also commented that replacement parts and how hard it was to get some of these, the Stonewall Complex could possibly be down for an extensive length of time with no phone service.

Chairman Dunn clarified that all of the phone lines and computer lines were located in one room at the Justice Center.

Mr. Prince remarked that the recent problem with the computer outage. He said only one server had been lost and that was for e-mail.

Mrs. Madrid said she would also like to comment on the new system. She said all of the equipment would be covered under warranty the first year with any system. She said there would be no need for two maintenance agreements and that would be \$30,000 that the County could save in one year. She remarked that equipment including Parks and Recreation, Animal Shelter, all of the courts, and the Sheriff's Office had been removed from their agreement and their price on their contract had not gone down. She said Ultimate's reasoning for that was

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 35

because the equipment was so old that it takes more money in order to keep that system up and running. She suggested if the County did not go with the total package that this should go out for bid and the Board agreed.

Mrs. Madrid further remarked that the County would still have two different maintenance contracts. She said if the Stonewall Complex did not go over with the upgrade, there would be a system that would just be for Stonewall because McDonough Road would be upgraded. She said the cost for Stonewall and the South Fayette Plant would stay the same and that would be the maintenance agreement that would go out for bid.

Mr. Prince said the current vendor who was servicing the Stonewall Complex was costing the County \$30,000 per year to support one phone switch in the Stonewall Complex which was ridiculous.

Commissioner Wells asked Mrs. Madrid if there was anything else she wished to discuss and Mrs. Madrid responded not at this time.

Commissioner Wells said the Board was convinced that this had to be done but it would be next year.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Horgan to approve Information System's budget as recommended by staff in the amount of \$598,145. The motion carried 5-0.

TAX COMMISSIONER

George Wingo appeared to discuss this budget. He said he had some concerns about his budget. He remarked that his department was seeing more delinquent taxes. He said the cost of legal advertising had increased. He said normally his office starts the year with 35 or 40 and this year his office started with 110 delinquencies. He said he had requested the \$28,500 in the area that would cover this expense and staff had denied this. He said if he did not have this money in his budget he could not sell these houses and collect the taxes. He said the County recoups every dime that was spent on this since it was included in the tax bill. He said when the tax bill was paid, the County was reimbursed.

Mr. Pullium asked Mr. Wingo who did the title searches.

Mr. Wingo responded that for the last two years he had been using Appalachian Mountain Services.

Mr. Pullium asked what exactly was involved in these searches based on Mr. Wingo's request for an increase.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 36

Mr. Wingo said there were a lot more delinquent properties. He said he did not put houses up for sale until the taxes were two or three years behind.

Chairman Dunn remarked that Fayette County used to have the highest rate of collection in the State of Georgia.

Mr. Wingo remarked that by June 30th the collection would be 99%.

Commissioner Frady felt foreclosures would probably be increasing due to the financial problems of the airlines, Ford Motor Company and others.

Commissioner Horgan interjected that there were more homes coming under foreclosure now and this was coming to approximately 3,000 homes per month in the 21 County metro area. He said he could certainly see this trend occurring.

Mr. Pullium pointed out that as of this date only \$5,400 had been spent. He said last year a little over \$6,000 was spent. He said if Mr. Wingo got into a position where the \$12,000 in his budget was exhausted, he could come back to the Board and make a request. He said there was money in the contingency fund that could be used if necessary.

Commissioner Wells pointed out that Mr. Wingo had additional funds in his budget last year.

Mr. Wingo responded that there was additional money because three employees had left.

Commissioner Wells questioned the replacement of communication equipment in the amount of \$3,000 and then a request for computer equipment in the amount of \$8,000. She said the Information Systems Department had said that Mr. Wingo's office was scheduled for computer equipment replacement at the same time the rest of this complex was scheduled and it would be some time next year. She said it was a good idea for the County not to spend \$3,000 this year since the equipment was scheduled for replacement next year.

Mr. Wingo questioned where Commissioner Wells had gotten the \$3,000 amount.

Commissioner Wells responded that this amount was listed in Mr. Wingo's budget request under Office Equipment Services.

Mr. Wingo remarked that the telephone system in his office was failing. He said Ultimate Security had already informed him that it would not be able to replace any part of the current phone system equipment if it failed. He said he had 19 units in his office that were failing fast.

Chairman Dunn interjected that next year the County would be spending upward of \$200,000 for an entire telephone upgrade for this entire building.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 37

Mr. Wingo said the issue that concerned him more than anything was the fact that parts for his telephone system were no longer being manufactured and were no longer available. He remarked that the fax machines were also failing. He said his office had paid \$375 for each telephone that he had to previously replace.

Commissioner Wells said she would like Mr. Wingo to tell the Board how he had come up with the \$3,000 figure for the telephone system. She asked how many telephones were involved.

Mr. Wingo replied that this was a conservative estimate. He said he had no idea how many telephones he would be losing but he felt sure there would be some.

Commissioner Wells questioned Mr. Wingo as to how much his office had already spent on this problem of failing telephones.

Mr. Wingo replied that one or two telephones had been replaced every year for last two or three years.

Mr. Pullium interjected that Mr. Wingo had spent \$7,800 in total on this particular category and this had not gone over his request for \$8,000.

Chairman Dunn remarked that Mr. Wingo's current request was for \$9,110 and staff was recommending \$9,110. He asked what the problem was.

Commissioner Wells said she was just wanting more clarification on the request. She said Mr. Wingo had a copy machine and fax machine with maintenance and no numbers listed at all. She said there was no justification listed for this request.

Commissioner Frady said if Mr. Wingo needed additional money during the year for items necessary to run his office, there would be money there for him. He said the Board was trying to use historical numbers to determine these budgets. He said this had been done throughout every County department during the budget process.

Mr. Wingo pointed out that the County would be getting all of its money back if he spent it in order to collect the money from delinquent taxpayers.

Commissioner Wells questioned the computer software and upgrades portion of this budget. She asked for a history on that portion of the budget.

Mr. Wingo replied that this item had never been what it was currently. He said he was paying \$400 per month to maintain a website. He said he had been paying \$300 per month last year and beginning July 1st it would go to \$400 per month. He said this was under a contract.

Commissioner Wells asked if this was outside of the County's website maintenance contract.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 38

Mr. Wingo replied yes it certainly was.

Commissioner Wells asked how much the County was paying every month for its website contract.

Mr. Pullium said this figure had increased but was running approximately \$700 per month for all County departments.

Mr. Wingo said the County website person could not maintain his website anyway since it required access to the Tax Commissioner's property tax data base and she was not set up to do that.

Commissioner Wells said the Board had already transferred \$8,000 for this year for computer equipment.

Ms. Holland said this item had been on a recent Commission Consent Agenda and approved. She clarified that the recent transfer was for \$19,200 and this was at the Commission meeting held on April 13, 2006.

Mr. Wingo said this was for replacement of the property tax server and the peripheral equipment that goes with it.

Commissioner Wells said the County had replaced equipment in the Tax Commissioner's Office on a very regular basis.

Mr. Wingo interjected that his office had 60 pieces of equipment that was constantly in use and it was not word processing equipment.

Mr. Pullium said Mr. Wingo still had \$24,000 in his budget to spent on this equipment.

Mr. Wingo said he never understood why \$19,000 was transferred but he felt someone must have combined Mr. Prince's estimate with his request to come up with this figure.

Mr. Pullium remarked that the \$8,000 was already funded and Commissioner Wells agreed that this money had already been programmed in 2006.

Mr. Wingo said his request was for computer equipment that he was going to need next year not this year.

Ms. Holland said the \$19,000 included a Dell power edge server which was \$12,123 and three PC's for the counter in the amount of \$3,177 and also the SQL software which was \$3,900 and this came to a total of \$19,200. She said the Board had already approved this request on April 13, 2006.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 39

Chairman Dunn asked if the \$19,000 figure was included in the \$24,000 figure.

Ms. Holland replied yes it was.

Chairman Dunn said Mr. Wingo would actually have only \$5,000 left.

Ms. Holland remarked that the memorandum stated that Mr. Wingo would have asked for this equipment in 2007 if he did not get it in 2006.

Mr. Pullium said the bottom line was that Mr. Prince in IS had done some research based on inquiries from the Tax Commissioner's Office. He said Mr. Prince had made the recommendation for this as a need for next year.

Chairman Dunn asked why this was not in the capital budget instead of the M & O budget. He asked what the original budget was for this line item last year.

Mr. Pullium replied that it was zero. He said Mr. Wingo had some money that was for computers that was always intended for Mr. Wingo's office. He said that figure was \$12,410 and originally set up in the computer contingency where they would order through the Information Systems. He remarked that all budget requests for computers for every department were put into a separate line item so that this could be tracked.

Mr. Wingo said that Mr. Prince had provided a price quote of \$19,200. He said this was for the replacement of units and not repair of units.

Chairman Dunn asked if there was anything else that the Board would like to discuss on this budget.

Commissioner Wells said she would like to take out the figure for the vehicle repair service since there was no reason to provide a vehicle to the Tax Commissioner's Office.

Mr. Wingo responded that he had an employee who was on the road four or five days every week collecting taxes. He asked if the Board wanted to stop this collection.

Chairman Dunn asked if this procedure had always occurred or had Mr. Wingo's office just started collecting taxes by having an employee drive around the county.

Mr. Wingo replied he had started this process approximately one year ago having this person make personal calls on personal property which had become a little more difficult because of growth in the county.

Commissioner Wells remarked that the County's collection rate remained at approximately 99%.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 40

Mr. Wingo asked what figure the Board was anticipating for his budget.

Chairman Dunn said the Board would have to discuss this and make a motion. He asked Mr. Pullium for the differential figure that Mr. Wingo has asked for and what staff was recommending.

Ms. Holland replied that figure was \$16,000.

Mr. Pullium said in 2004 Mr. Wingo had indicated that he was anticipating an expenditure for Appalacian Mortgage Company. He said it appeared to him that in 2004 Mr. Wingo had written that company a check for \$10,000. He noted that there had not been any expense since then.

Mr. Wingo said this was correct. He said he had delivered a net check of \$3,400 to Mr. Pullium back in November which was the difference between the work they had actually done and the original \$10,000.

Commissioner Wells questioned the \$100 for the title search and asked if he had gotten bids for this.

Mr. Wingo said he had questioned Bill McNally's office and they wanted \$250 for a title search. He said he had gotten bids for this and most of the other companies who responded also charged \$100. He said he had selected this company because he liked them.

Commissioner Wells asked if these bids were oral or written.

Mr. Wingo said the bids were oral.

Chairman Dunn asked for the Board's pleasure on this budget.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Horgan to approve the Tax Commissioner's budget including a vehicle for this department. The motion failed 2-3 with Chairman Dunn, Commissioner Wells and Commissioner Pfeifer voting in opposition.

Mr. Wingo remarked that he needed the employee to go out to collect these delinquent taxes and it was up to the Board to decide whether or not they wanted him to continue this.

Commissioner Frady said the collection rate for delinquent taxes was expected to be 99.25% and he felt this should be continued and the vehicle would help this person in collection.

Chairman Dunn remarked that the County had this collection rate before a car was used for an employee to go door to door.

Commissioner Pfeifer said he did not favor setting a precedent with providing a car.

Commissioner Wells said the Board had always tried to keep a handle on the number of vehicles and she did not favor approving this one.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Pfeifer to approve the Tax Commissioner's budget as recommended minus the \$1,000 for the vehicle repair services in the amount of \$1,028,691. The motion carried 3-2 with Commissioner Frady and Commissioner Horgan voting in opposition.

SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

Wayne Hannah and Brian Woodie appeared to discuss the Traffic portion of the Sheriff's Department budget.

Chairman Dunn remarked that the Board would be making a motion on the total figure for the Sheriff's Department and not making motions on every division of the Sheriff's Department. Wayne Hannah reviewed the capital projects with the Board. He said there were four items listed under the capital projects portion of the budget.

Brian Woodie said this was the second year they had been told that the radios had been recommended so this was not listed. He said they had been asked to be prepared to discuss video camera systems, the video enforcer and improvements to the firing range.

Commissioner Wells asked if there was any justifications for the requests under the C.I.P.

Brian Woodie said he had already given this information to the Finance Department.

Wayne Hannah remarked that in 2003 they had gotten an estimate from Mallett and Associates for improvements to the firing range and replacement of some buildings. He said Mallett had given them an estimate of approximately \$460,000. He said he understood that this was in the 2011 budget.

Commissioner Wells asked if 2011 budget was a good time frame for them or was any part of this more critical than others.

Chairman Dunn asked who would use it.

Wayne Hannah replied currently it would be for all safety officers in the County.

Brian Woodie said it would include the City of Peachtree City, the Town of Tyrone, the City of Fayetteville and the Marshal's Office.

Commissioner Wells interjected that there was also \$178,000 spent on a shooting simulator.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 42

Brian Woodie said the laser shot simulator that was purchased with drug money and under Major Hannah's control was installed in the Sheriff's Department and less than \$30,000 was associated with that.

Commissioner Wells asked if there was any item listed on the Capital Improvements Program that needed to be moved up before 2011.

Wayne Hannah remarked that a large cost would be for dirt. He said if this could be tied into the project of the lake or the dirt could get there sooner.

Commissioner Wells said if the County had some type of system of identifying dirt that needed to be moved somewhere, it could be deposited in that location.

Wayne Hannah said he felt something could be worked out. He said Mr. Jaeger had said the drainage equipment had to be in place before an actual berm was put in place. He said if there was somewhere that the dirt could be stored until it was needed, it would be great.

Brian Woodie said the dirt issue was the single largest item on that list. He said the County had the equipment to move dirt but there had been a problem in finding dirt.

Chairman Dunn asked Major Hannah how many years he thought they could use the range before it had to be redone. He said currently it was scheduled for 2011.

Major Hannah replied possibly parts of the range proposal. He pointed out that what was listed as the operations building which would include classroom space and storage space might be moved up. He said there would also be engineering fees other things included that would involve erosion control and drainage. He said those items would have to be in place before the dirt goes in place.

Chairman Dunn felt some of the items could be moved forward in time but he was not in favor of doing all of them at the same time. He suggested they break these items out in the sequence that they felt it should be done and the Board could break out the cost.

Major Hannah said they could get with David Jaeger at Mallett and Associates to discuss this further.

Brian Woodie remarked on the communications equipment. He said when they had gone to the new radio system, some of the oldest radios that they had were not fully workable with the system and some of the oldest radios that they had would not fully work with the system. He said these were radios that parts were not available. He said instead of buying the radios all at one time they had spoken to Mr. Pullium and this was proportioned out. He said they received half last year and expected to get the other half this year.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 43

Brian Woodie commented on the digital video camera systems. He said currently the Sheriff's Department has analog video cameras. He said these were never designed to be used in cars and they wear out in time. He said they have had tremendous expenses this year with those cameras breaking down in the car. He said they were also extremely labor intensive and time intensive to compare a video tape of a traffic stop and getting it out of the car and getting it to court. He said the current equipment was first generation material as far as imaging and it was breaking down and wearing down and not ever meant to be used as VHS tapes in cars. He said they had gone as far as they could with that technology. He said the equipment in their cars was continuing to break down just with age. He remarked that they have an ongoing replacement plan and replace these cameras all of the time. He said they hoped to replace the analog systems with digital imaging. He said the real advantage to this was two fold. He said firstly the equipment would be better suited for use in the field and the second advantage to it was purely from an efficiency standard.

Chairman Dunn asked if this item could wait until 2008 or did it need to be addressed now.

Brian Woodie said they would need the \$65,000 for this upcoming fiscal year and nothing for that next year and then allow for an average of replacement for two cameras after that. He said based on current prices that would be approximately \$12,000 per year after that. He said they had also requested \$3,000 for repair of the five systems that they currently have and now they would be asking for \$1,000 instead of \$3,000.

Commissioner Wells remarked that this money was currently in the fund balance and it could be budgeted this year.

Brian Woodie commented on the communication services. He said the department had been told to identify its share of the Sheriff's Department phone bill.

Ms. Holland replied that this was the same issue that Linda Jones of the Sheriff's Office has. She said because they put the new phone system over at the annex, finance was able to charge each division their appropriate charge whereas before it was just being allocated. She said she had reviewed the entire communications service and she determined that the jail actually had a little bit more than what they need. She said it was her recommendation that this portion in the amount of \$5,000 be moved to administration.

Commissioner Wells said this Board could not delineate line items and could only approve a total amount of money and then it could be distributed by the Sheriff.

Chairman Dunn said once the Sheriff's Department gets an approved amount of money he could do with it what he wanted. He said the only thing the Sheriff could not do was dispose of any property without coming to the Board first. He said this reduced the conflict in dealing with all five departments. He felt there would have to be more discussion among staff and the Sheriff to determine who needed to have items moved around.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 44

Commissioner Wells said the Board would be voting on the Sheriff's Department budget in totality but it did need staff's information. She said the Board would then make a decision as to whether or not to fund this item this year or not.

Brian Woodie said the Communications issue was a main concern to them and also the gasoline issue.

Commissioner Wells said staff had determined a bottom line number and then went back and plugged in numbers to get the bottom line number. She said the deputies had whatever gasoline they needed and this was just for the Board's edification.

Mr. Pullium said the problem staff had was that it had no idea how much gasoline every division in the Sheriff's Department was using. He said the information that staff receives was not reliable.

Chairman Dunn said it had nothing to do with Sheriff's staff being reliable but there was no way to track who goes to the pumps.

Brian Woodie said what was confusing to them was that there was an amount listed and they could not determine where it came from. He said the request was for \$43,000 and had gone down to \$13,000.

Major Linda Jones said the communications issue was the only one she had.

Commissioner Wells said the Board was looking at a total amount that would be allocated to the Sheriff's Department for communication type things. She said the Board had not voted on any of these budgets yet but would do so later.

JUDGES AND COURT REPORTERS

Judge English, Judge Hankinson, Judge Edwards and several judicial assistants were present to discuss this budget.

Judge English asked for the Board's consideration to revisit the issue of the supplement. He said he recalled the issue with some of the Commissioners at the last meeting where this was discussed was the issue of whether or not the question of a supplement was irrevocable in the event the State was able to meet what the Secretary of the Judicial Systems was trying to do. He said nothing had been done on this. He said he recalled from Chairman Dunn's remarks that the Board was going to do a December review and then get back to the Judges on this. He said he was made aware of the review just a couple of days ago. He said it was at that time that Chris Venice alerted him to the fact that the Board would be discussing this budget today.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 45

Chairman Dunn remarked that the Board of Commissioners had not reviewed this and had not made a decision on this. He said the Board was still reviewing the staff's recommendation.

Judge Edwards said it was their understanding that staff's recommendation was to give Judge Schell who was the Chief Juvenile Court Judge the small increase that would authorize him to get the additional 2% funding from the State. He thanked the Board for that approval. He said there were two issues that were of interest to them today. He said one was the issue of the supplement. He said the current status was that the other three counties were paying this and had been paying it all year and the judicial systems have been receiving it. He said on the State level as he understood it the public defenders' secretaries make the most money in the entire system. He said district attorneys were somewhat behind them and judicial assistants who were certainly at least as qualified were third in terms of what they were paid by the State. He said there was a move afoot to affect some degree of parity on a State level that this was moving very slowly. He said the individuals most affected were their judicial assistants. He said these assistants were also in the hole with regard to their retirement circumstances and noted that they had a vastly inferior retirement arrangement than the individuals in the other two offices. He said they were not really present today to address that but to ask for \$8,641 which would allow the assistants to have a supplement that would put them at some degree of parity and would be in proportion to Fayette County's regular contribution along with the rest of the Circuit to make that complete.

Judge Edwards further remarked that where they had left off last year was that with a lot of questions. He said one question was if a supplement was paid to this State employee then why not to other State employees. He said one that he recalled was a County Extension Agent that might have been used by some kind of analogy. He said there was a law that stated that the governing authority of the County or Counties comprised of a judicial circuit may supplement the salary or fringe benefits of any State paid personnel appointed pursuant to this article which pertained to Superior Court Judges' staff. He said the contemplation of the State's scheme was that it was a divided responsibility to some extent.

Judge Edwards further commented that the other issue was left up in the air was supposed to be studied by Attorney Dennis Davenport and that was if the State did establish parity in the salary scheme of the judicial assistants could the supplement then go away. He said he had really never heard anything from Attorney Davenport on this point but he did not really know of any reason why it could not occur. He introduced April Woodall who worked with Judge English, Sherry Molloy who worked with Judge Hankinson and Judith Sanders who worked with Judge Caldwell. He said the Judges appreciated their assistants so much and if it were not for them they could not operate. He asked for the Board's consideration in this matter. He said they had all been active with the Legislature. He said there was a State wide committee to establish parity in these salaries among the judicial assistants organization which meets on a regular basis. He said this was an active effort that was under way for them to establish some kind of parity in their salaries. He asked if any of the assistants would like to comment on this issue.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 46

April Woodall said the assistants had been fighting this battle for the last three years. She said the House of Representatives and the Council of Superior Court Judges Executive Committee had passed this but the Senate had not passed it and this stopped the issue from going further.

Chairman Dunn asked for the status of this now and if any Legislation was at the State level now.

Ms. Woodall said they would be meeting next Thursday to see what the next step was going to be. She said the assistants were unclassified with the State merit system and nothing had ever been done on this issue. She said she had been in this job for the last nineteen years in July and after thirteen years she could not advance to a higher level and her salary was just frozen.

Judge English interjected that this issue would not go any further now with the end of this Legislative session. He felt it was quite offensive as to how these ladies were being treated by certain people who were in positions that could make these decisions and basically table what the House had already approved and prevent this issue from going to the Senate. He said this was very frustrating that this had occurred every year. He said these ladies go to the Capitol after work just as much as the Legislators during the Legislative Session to meet with the Legislators. He said the only relief that they have was the ability that the State had recognized that the problems of the judicial staff were recognized. He said this was the only way that they could keep their staff afloat. He said if it were not for sheer loyalty that these ladies would have moved on years ago. He said these assistants were called State employees and monetarily they were State employees but they did not do one bit of State business in their jobs. He said they do Upson County, Fayette County, Pike County and Spalding County business. He said he did not have the statistics in front of him but he felt Fayette County runs the statistics. He said 95% of his business was here in Fayette County. He commented that Judge Schell had generated a lot of money as a result of fines from his Court that have gone to the County.

Judge Schell remarked that this issue had passed the House but apparently the Speaker of the House decided to share authority and power over the budget office Senate. He said the Senate had a little bit more power over the budget as a result and this issue did not move forward. He said this had been approved by the House Appropriation Committee and the House of Representatives and would probably have passed without any problems but the Senate used some of its power and it did not move forward.

Judge English remarked that the Judges had discussed this issue exhaustively with the Commissioners and he thanked the Board for allowing them to come and discuss it further. He said one of the important questions regarding this supplement was if the supplement was put in place, could the Board of Commissioners ever retract it in the event that the State did

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 47

what they should do and the answer was yes. He said Attorney Dennis Davenport had not provided one piece of information contrary to that. He felt \$8,000 was a pittance.

Commissioner Wells interjected that the amount would be \$12,622.

Judge English said he disagreed with that figure. He said some money had already been paid and would have to be subtracted out.

Commissioner Wells said Fayette County's portion of the total supplements and benefits was \$12,622.

Ms. Woodall said she certainly did not want to double dip. She said she had been receiving something since 1989 when Judge English came to Fayette County. She said Fayette County had been paying her a separate check. She said she was the only individuals receiving the salary supplement.

Chairman Dunn said the County was already paying Ms. Woodall and would not be paying her that amount again.

Judge Edwards said he would have Fred Roney call Mark Pullium tomorrow to discuss this issue with him.

Chairman Dunn felt this supplement would continue forever because he did not feel the State would ever take care of this and the County would have to be prepared to take care of this forever if that occurred.

Commissioner Frady said he would like to make a motion.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Pfeifer to approve \$12,622, discussion followed.

Chairman Dunn questioned if this was the correct figure.

Judge English suggested that Fred Roney call Mr. Pullium tomorrow to get the exact figure. He asked the Board if there was any hope in their proceeding with this request or not. He asked the Board to tell them if they were spinning their wheels. He said if there was the possibility of this not going through then he questioned why they had even come to this meeting to discuss it anymore. He said he was not going to beg but he felt this was what he had been doing.

Chairman Dunn replied no that they had not begged and he hoped that they did not feel that way. He said he felt there was hope that this could be approved but he also felt there were

some who might not approve it. He said at this point in time he could not speak to what five people would want.

Judge English interjected that the Board had been discussing this request with them for a long time and it was nothing new. He said they just wanted to know if there was some hope

Chairman Dunn said if the Board voted on this issue now, then there would have to be a definite figure and he felt this figure was still being disputed. He said the Board could decide on this after Fred Roney speaks with Mark Pullium on the exact figure.

The motion died for lack of any action on the vote.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Chief Jack Krakeel, Deputy Chief Allen McCullough and Director of Communications Cheryl Rogers appeared to discuss this budget.

Cheryl Rogers said it was her understanding that in the C.I.P. the expansion for the 911 center had been put in the year 2011 and the request for the computerized dispatch program had been set out in future projects. She said in 2012 the CAD would be fourteen years old and technologically well past obsolete. She asked for the Board's consideration to begin this in 2011 and complete it in 2012. She said the maximum cost for this would be approximately \$400,000.

Chairman Dunn remarked that the 911 center addition was listed in the C.I.P. for 2011 and that would cost approximately \$1,000,000. He asked Ms. Rogers if the CAD or the 911 center addition was the most important.

Ms. Rogers replied the expansion of the center if it was before 2011. She said the CAD was listed as a priority 2.

Chairman Dunn clarified that the 911 center would go to the 2010 budget and the CAD system would be in the 2011 budget. He said there would need to be a motion on public safety.

Chief Krakeel remarked that Fire, Emergency Services, Animal Control and E-911 were also part of the Public Safety budget as well.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Chairman Dunn to approve the Public Safety Department's budget for the Fire Department in the amount of \$6,997,890, Emergency Management in the amount of \$174,150, Emergency Services in the amount of \$2,885,002, E-911 Communications in the amount of \$3,084,912 and Animal Control in the amount of \$304,848 for a total of \$13,446,802. This also includes the changes in the C.I.P. with the E-

911 Center expansion in the amount of \$772,387 going to the 2010 budget and the CAD system in the amount of \$40,000 to go in the 2011 budget. The motion carried 5-0.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

Director of Engineering Phil Mallon was present to discuss this budget.

Chairman Dunn said the Board had questions for Mr. Mallon regarding the \$100,000 request for a pole barn.

Mr. Mallon remarked that the Maintenance Shop required an individual stormwater permit. He said this would have its own set of conditions. He said in order to apply for this permit a consultant had been hired last year to do that work and prepare a stormwater pollution prevention plan. He said one requirement of the plan and the intent of the permit was to minimize exposure of pollutants to stormwater. He said one of several pollutants that was identified was the equipment itself including the dump trucks and the paving equipment. He said these trucks get loaded up with asphalt and degreasers were used to keep the equipment clean and functional. He said the obvious solution to staff to help minimize the exposure to stormwater was to get the equipment under cover. He said to build some type of shed or barn to put the equipment under cover was the conclusion that they had come to.

Mr. Mallon further remarked that whether a \$100,000 was needed to construct the structure was not definite. He said if a structure was not built, then the County would have to determine another way to keep stormwater away from this equipment.

Chris Venice remarked that these vehicles did not come back to the maintenance shop every day. She said a lot of days the heavy equipment was just left on the roadside where the crews were working.

Mr. Mallon replied that the dump trucks do come back to the shop every day. He said he was referring to the dump trucks and the paving equipment and those vehicles did come back to the shop every day. He said there were ten dump trucks and one paving truck.

Ms. Venice asked what kind of time frame this involved. She asked if there were deadlines imposed by the State for the County to get this done.

Mr. Mallon replied that this was different than some of the other programs that he had spoken to the Board about recently. He said the time frame would be as soon as possible. He said this was a permit that the County should have had in place a long time ago. He said the County would need to be in compliance as soon as possible.

Commissioner Wells asked about an existing pole barn.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 50

Mr. Mallon said he was familiar with that pole barn but there was already a lot of equipment underneath it already. He said this could be investigated but he felt there would still need to be some kind of storage.

Ms. Venice asked if there had to be a catch basin underneath the pole barn.

Mr. Mallon replied yes there would need to be a catch basin. He said there were a few options. He said one option was to put the whole thing on a concrete pad with sand with cleaning once or twice every year. He said Fayette County was not alone with respect to the stormwater regulations. He said one thing that would be reasonable would be for the County staff to talk with other communities to see how they were addressing this problem. He said the permit was ultimately a Federal permit under the Clean Water Act.

Mr. Mallon further remarked that the primary concern was with the dump trucks. He said these trucks frequently spray the beds so asphalt does not stick to it and eventually this would run off. He said the heavy equipment tended to leak different fluids over time.

Chairman Dunn interjected that there would be no way to control the pollutants from equipment that was left out over night on the roadways.

Mr. Mallon felt the intent would be to minimize it to the greatest extent practical. He pointed out that many fleets were under cover and protected.

Commissioner Horgan interjected that there would be a lot of water run off involved with heavy equipment.

Mr. Mallon remarked that it was not just the asphalt but the cleaning chemicals that were applied to the equipment. He said for conceptual purposes the building might hold ten dump trucks. He said a design for the pond would have to be done first with sand filters and infiltration trenches. He felt this could all be accomplished with the \$100,000.

Chairman Dunn asked where the estimate for the \$100,000 had come from.

Mr. Mallon responded that the Public Works Department had given him that estimate.

Commissioner Wells asked if there might be some vacant facilities in the County that might work.

Mr. Mallon said the facility would have to be close since the equipment would be coming back to the building every night. He said he was not sure how feasible this would be from a daily standpoint.

Ms. Venice said this issue goes back to the outsourcing issue.

Budget Meeting
May 3, 2006
Page 51

Commissioner Wells said the more items that the County outsourced then the smaller the facility would have to be to accommodate these trucks.

Mr. Mallon said if the County can meet the requirements, the pole barn could probably be put off for one year.

Chairman Dunn said a plan would need to be put together first. He asked if the Board wanted to make a motion on this budget.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Chairman Dunn to approve the Engineering Department's budget minus the \$100,000 in the C.I.P. for the pole barn which would be moved to the 2008 budget with \$15,000 to be used for a study to ensure compliance with the pollution plan and municipal good housekeeping plan regarding requirements for construction of the barn. The motion carried 5-0.

It was the consensus of the Board that a budget workshop would be held on Monday, May 8, 2006 beginning at 8:30 a.m. in the Commissioners' Conference Room, 140 Stonewall Avenue, Fayetteville.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Dunn adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

Karen Morley, 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 28th day of September, 2006.

Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk