

The Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia met in Official Session on April 4, 2001, at 3:30 p.m. in the public meeting room of the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue, Fayetteville, Georgia.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Greg Dunn, Chairman
Linda Wells, Vice Chair
Harold Bost
Herb Frady
A.G. VanLandingham

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris W. Cofty, County Administrator
Carol Chandler, Executive Assistant
William R. McNally, County Attorney
Linda Rizzotto, Chief Deputy Clerk

Chairman Dunn called the meeting to order, offered an invocation and led the pledge to the Flag.

TARA CREDIT UNION'S PRESENTATION OF PLAQUE:

Mr. Jimmy Wiggins, Chairman of the Tara Credit Union, presented a plaque of appreciation to the Board of Commissioners. He said Tara Credit Union wanted to thank the Board of Commissioners for allowing the Credit Union to utilize office space to provide the services of the Credit Union over the last two years. He said they did not have a credit union in the Fayette County area and the office space was worked out and used to offer services to members in this area. He said during this last year the Credit Union had been fortunate enough to open up its Fayette County office on Gingercake Road to fulfill a long term goal to have an office located in Fayette County to better serve its members. He said the credit union appreciated the space that the county provided and also appreciated what each Board member did for the community. He welcomed the Board to visit their new facility and to join the credit union.

Chairman Dunn thanked Mr. Wiggins for the plaque and remarked that this had been a win/win situation. He said the credit union had taken very good care of the county employees. He welcomed the Tara Credit Union as a business as well as a friend. He thanked Mr. Wiggins for his long time service.

PRESENTATION OF EMPLOYEE SERVICE AWARDS:

The Board of Commissioners presented personnel service awards to the following employees for years of dedicated service to Fayette County:

Charles Hogan, Appraiser III/Tax Assessor's Office, 5 years

April 4, 2001
Page 2

Ellen Mills of the Tax Assessor's Office stated that Charlie had come to Fayette County in 1996 as a tax appraiser with the Tax Assessor's Office. She said his experience was more than five years in tax appraisal because he had previously worked for Fulton County since 1969. She said Charlie retired as Deputy Chief Appraiser of Fulton County. She said Fayette County was very blessed to have his experience in the Tax Assessor's Office. She said Charlie had trained virtually everyone in the office on personal property, commercial property, mapping and so forth. She thanked Charlie for the great job that he does.

Brian Williams, Deputy Sheriff/Sheriff's Office, 5 years

Chairman Dunn remarked that Brian would not be present today because he had just gone on his shift. He expressed the Board's congratulations and asked that his longevity award be sent over to the Sheriff's Department.

Donna Hilton, Secretary/Sheriff's Office, 10 years

Major Robert Glaze remarked that Donna was his secretary and she had started her job in April, 1991 as a records clerk at the Sheriff's Office. She said she was promoted to a secretary in November, 1997. He said Donna was one of his right hand people and had to prepare a lot of reports and other information for him. He said she also types warrants for the Criminal Investigation Division and the Field Operation Division. He said he appreciated the work that she does and he hopes that she will be with the Sheriff's Office ten more years.

Chairman Dunn remarked that Donna was currently working on a detailed data base that would help the Sheriff's Office manage the jail facility and also supply data for the Board as well as the other municipalities.

Clara Brossoit, Custodian/Building & Grounds Maintenance, 15 years

Fred Heath remarked that Clara had started her job with Fayette County in 1986 and she had spent her entire 15 years with the custodial care group. He said in 1994 Clara had developed cancer and it was now in full arrest with no problems since then. He said all during that time and any other time that you see Clara, she has a smile on her face and a very pleasing and happy attitude for everybody. He said Clara was always happy to see people and greet people. He said she was greatly appreciated.

Unable to attend: Kaye Nolan, Administrative Secretary/Engineering, 15 years

Chairman Dunn remarked that Kaye Nolan was unable to attend. He said she was an Administrative Secretary with the Engineering Department and had been with the county for the last 15 years.

Chairman Dunn said the Board appreciated these employees and remarked that they have had a longevity with the county. He said if people were to observe the way people in the county sometimes do their job they would see that they act like a family in a lot of ways, work together and also do some good things. He said 99 out of 100 comments that he gets from the public about the county employees were very positive ones. He said this was very unusual in a service oriented business.

PRESENTATION OF REVISED CHILD ABUSE PROTOCOL PROCEDURES:

Debbie Barron, Chief Deputy Clerk and Office Manager for the Magistrate Court who also serves as chair person for the Child Abuse Protocol Task Force for Fayette County asked for the members of the Task Force to come forward.

Ms. Barron said the objective of the Child Abuse Protocol Task Force was to have a program and a plan in effect for the county where everyone can work together and when these cases come in the procedures would be carried out, expediently and carefully and most of all children would be cared for. She introduced the members and their immediate supervisor. She said her immediate supervisor was Judge Melear; Phyllis Harris and her supervisor was Judge Terry Shell from the Juvenile Court; Detective Debbie Chambers and her supervisor was Chief Johnnie Roberts of the City of Fayetteville Police Department; Detective Renee James and her supervisor was Sheriff Randall Johnson; Michelle Ivey and her supervisor was Bill McBroom who was the District Attorney for the Griffin Judicial District; Terry Pitts who was the intake officer from the Department of Juvenile Justice; Lisa Reeves who was the case worker supervisor for DEFACS and Paula Fish who was the Director of DFACS; David Griffith who was with the Marshal's Office; and Cynthia Grant from the Fayette County Health Department. She said this was about half of the members. She said they meet every month and review cases that need to be staffed and also review all of the procedures that need to be followed to make sure that everybody has done what they are supposed to. She said not one case had fallen through the cracks. She said she wanted to say how much she appreciated all of the Task Force members and everything that they had done for her.

Ms. Barron also introduced Sheila Studdard who was the Clerk of Superior Court. She presented to Mrs. Studdard with a written procedure manual for protocol.

Chairman Dunn commended the members of the group for what they were doing for the children of Fayette County.

DISCUSSION OF DEEDING PARKING LOT BEHIND THE HOLLINGSWORTH HOUSE TO MAIN STREET FAYETTEVILLE:

Chairman Dunn remarked that discussion of this issue went back to April, 1998. He said at that time the City of Fayetteville had asked the county to lease them a piece of property to relocate the Hollingsworth house. He said three of the members of this Board were not members of the Commission at that time but that Board did lease to the City, the land which amounted to a little more than 6/10 of an acre to relocate the Hollingsworth house. He said this would allow events to be held there and also would allow interaction with the Main Street Fayetteville activities and the downtown Development Authority. He said the Board leased the property for a period of five years so that the City could have that available to them for these events.

Chairman Dunn remarked that in March of 2000 the City of Fayetteville came back to the Board and requested that the county deed the property to them. He said it had cost several hundred thousand dollars to get it into the condition that it currently was and it has become a permanent fixture in downtown Fayetteville. He said this Board with the exception of Commissioner VanLandingham deeded half of that property to the City at that time. He remarked that recently the City Manager of Fayetteville asked the county to deed the remainder of the property to them as well. He said this Board thought it had done what it should have done in March of 2000. He said what the Board did in his mind was inadvertently give the City the land that the building was sitting on but there was misinformation that was put out at that meeting. He said the misinformation was that in response to some questions about who put the parking lot behind the building the county was told that it was the county staff who had put the parking lot there and that it was built by the county. He said when the Board deeded the property, the parking lot was not deeded. He said the county deeded the building and the land that it sat on. He said now the county has found out, thanks to City Manager Joe Morton's request and the research that followed his request, that the City put the parking lot in and put it on property that the City was leasing from the county at the time. He said he would have voted differently a year ago. He said some of the votes had been cast because the Board thought the parking lot belonged to the county and it turned out not to be so.

Chairman Dunn said there was a situation today where the building was sitting on land that was deeded to the City and the parking lot was on land that has been leased to the City. He said he had requested this item to be placed on the agenda tonight so that this issue should be straightened out and do what should have been done a year ago. He said he was not sure if all of the Commissioners agree but he certainly would like to have this issue put out on the table, discussed again and voted on again. He felt what the county had done was inhibit some of the use of the property by not giving them the parking lot the City had built. He said he would like to make a motion.

On motion made by Chairman Dunn, seconded by Commissioner Frady to have Fayette County deed the entire six tenths plus of an acre to the City of Fayetteville, including the building and the land it sits on and the parking lot that the City built. In addition to the motion, Chairman Dunn requested if there are any events in the future that the Fayette County Board of Commissioners have the ability to use this City parking lot as overflow

parking, as the City uses the County's parking lot for events. Chairman Dunn further stated the County would not use the City's parking lot anytime there was an event being held there. The motion carried 5-0.

Chairman Dunn requested Attorney McNally to draw up a new deed and deed the property to the City of Fayetteville. He wished the City of Fayetteville well with their activities at the Hollingsworth house.

DISCUSSION OF ANNUAL RENEWAL OF INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS AND BENEFITS:

Director of Human Resources Connie Boehnke felt things had turned around this year. She said staff was very pleased with the recommendations that would be made this year. She said this past year they had expanded the insurance committee to include approximately a ten member advisory committee. She said they had been charged with providing being a communicator between the employees and the insurance committee. She said they hear and talk to a lot more individuals about these issues than the small committee did. She said from that point there was also a wellness committee, that once decisions were finalized, that they would communicate the results to the employees within their particular departments. She said a lot of review had been done this past year. She said several changes had been made and they did feel very comfortable with these changes and also that they were working. She stated that there were a few things that she would like to adjust a little bit. She said the first area was wellness. She remarked in the area of wellness a \$500 benefit was provided. She said the \$500 benefit was intended to provide a wellness physical for every employee or every eligible participant covered under the plan. She said what happens was that the employee makes their appointment and sometimes they wait for almost ninety days to get the appointment. She said when the employees goes for the appointment a diagnostic code was placed on the bill, sent to Shelton Administrative and was then denied as a wellness visit. She said it was her recommendation to develop some type of language in the plan to continue to provide that \$500 benefit but to accomplish what the goal was and that was to provide a full wellness benefit regardless of the diagnostic during the wellness itself. She said this was one area of consideration.

Mrs. Boehnke remarked that last year when the county had gone to the PPO network it did not anticipate everything that happened. She said one of those areas was emergency room visits. She stated if an employee or their family member selected a hospital on the network, they virtually have no control over which physician treats them, which lab that hospital uses or which x-ray technician that they might see. She said employees have been experiencing that the hospital bill was being paid the network but the services provided were not being paid and were being considered as out of network. She said this was another area that she was asking for consideration to be given. She said if emergency

room treatment was performed at a participating hospital that all charges be inclusive for that one visit at the in-network rate.

Mrs. Boehnke said she would like to defer the prescription discussion for a moment and proceed to the vision benefit. She said the vision benefit was a reimbursement benefit and it was an out of pocket expense to the employee and it was reimbursed to them through their paycheck. She said through the employee survey that had been conducted earlier this year, several employees noted that the \$100 benefit was not adequate. She said a survey was done of the top five providers and this determination was correct. She said these charges range from \$200 for an exam that could run anywhere from \$50 to \$150 or higher depending on a diagnosis. She said if the person has to get contacts, frames, lenses and so forth it was a lot more. She said it was never intended that 100% of the benefit be paid but it was intended to try and give the employee adequate coverage and not to put the entire burden on the employee. She said she was requesting consideration to be given to increasing that benefit from \$100 to \$200. She further remarked that the health experience in that area was improving. She said last year was an extraordinary year with a lot of large claims and illness among employees and their dependents. She said this year it seemed with the implementation of the full PPO that the county had gotten back on track and that the claims would come in under the 2,000 claims that were done last year.

Mrs. Boehnke remarked on the dental area. She said no changes were being recommended in this area. She noted that last year for the contribution level employees were only charged for what was necessary to cover the actual claims. She said they would try and stick with this for another year. She said the county did take a hit last year but according to the claims year to date, she felt the reserve balance can be maintained and still provide that same benefit.

Mrs. Boehnke stated that the other area of consideration was the benefit waiver. She said there had been an unwritten rule that had been in place ever since she could remember. She stated that rule was that if an employee elected benefits this meant that the employee elected their health, reimbursements and life insurance. She said there were currently employees who were opting out and waiving their coverage for health which in turn takes away their life insurance benefit. She said she would like consideration to be given to the area of excluding life as being in part of that waiver. She stated it was a matter of determining if that was the same type of benefit as health in the reimbursement plan or what she considered to be a staple product. She said she was going to defer the prescription discussion to Commissioner Bost since he had researched some additional information since March 26th.

Commissioner Bost remarked that the cost saving provisions that were effected last year were working. He stated it looked like the county would come in no higher than last year and this was quite an accomplishment in the face of the rising cost of drugs as well as medical. He said the recommendation that the committee was making this year was

another small step to try and help maintain the county's cost so that the contributions could be kept at the same level again this year as it had the last two years. He said this came under the prescription benefits. He said the county had been having just two tiers on co-pay. He said one was zero for generic and \$30 for brand name. He said some time ago before he had come on the Board there was a decision made to have zero on generic and have a substantial co-pay on the brand name. He stated the reason for that was to encourage the employees to talk with their physicians and get the generic prescribed instead of brand name because they were so much cheaper. He said according to the last report that he had seen, the generic brand which was a zero co-pay for the employees, the average cost to the plan was just under \$20. He commented on the brand name prescriptions. He said with the \$30 co-pay it had still averaged \$60 cost to the county plan. He remarked there was a difference in the total cost in the area of \$20 for generic and \$90, when the co-pay was added and what it had cost the plan, for the brand name. He said he had met with Charles Platt who was the Regional Sales Director for Benescript, the administrator for the county's prescriptions, here last Friday. He said Mr. Platt had complimented Fayette County on the high usage of generic drugs. He said the county was somewhere around 52% of the prescriptions being filled with generic. He said Mr. Platt remarked that this was much higher than average. He said the encouragement of the employees to use the generic where possible had been working and had helped a great deal in saving money.

Commissioner Bost said what was being suggested at this juncture was that there a three tier set up as far as co-pays were concerned. He said there was something known as formulary which meant that there were certain drugs most of which would be in the brand category where there are contracts with drug manufacturers that Benescript has that the manufacturer would give discounts for prescribing their particular drug. He said as a consequence the total cost was quite a bit less. He stated in an effort to try to save money it was being recommended that this go to a \$25 co-pay for any of the brand name drugs that are listed on the formulary list, and have a \$40 co-pay for the brands that are not. He pointed out that most insurance coverages whether government or private industry usually have a generic and a formulary. He said if a particular drug was prescribed and it was not on the formulary and it was a brand name then there would be zero coverage. He said it was being proposed not to go to a straight generic and formulary approach but the three tier approach and keeping the generic at zero, \$25 for any drugs on the formulary list and \$40 on the name brand drugs. He said this would save the county somewhere in the range of 8% to 10%. He said this was just another cost saving device that the county could have. He stated that he had five maintenance prescriptions and out of the five prescriptions two were out of the formulary list and three were not. He said when he gets renewals on his prescriptions he would sit with the physician and state that three of the prescriptions were not listed on the formulary list and asked him what was available and would do the job just as well.

Commissioner Frady asked if the brand name prescription was going to be raised from \$30 to \$40.

April 4, 2001
Page 8

Commissioner Bost replied yes with the exception of those drugs listed on the formulary list and those would cost \$25.

Commissioner Frady asked if the county was staying within the contributions why would this be increased.

Commissioner Bost replied to further put in encouragement to save money. He said today was only one point in time and any money that the county could start to save now would help keep the contributions down next year and in the future.

Commissioner Frady said it was his understanding that the contribution needed to go up when the cost actually increased. He felt if the county was staying within the contributions he could not support increasing the name brand by \$10.

Chairman Dunn asked if there was a requirement that there be a \$15 difference between the formulary and the non-formulary brand name.

Commissioner Bost replied yes there was a requirement in the contracts with the companies that give the extra discounts that there must be at least a \$15 difference in the two co-pays. He said the \$25 to the \$40 would give the \$15 differential.

Commissioner Frady asked if this was the first time the formulary cost was in the plan.

Chairman Dunn remarked there had never been a formulary option before now. He said in part II of the discussion of prescription drugs there would be more discussion. He asked if the Board wanted to consider voting on these other four aspects in the packet first and Commissioner Wells responded yes. He said this would include the wellness item, emergency room visits, vision and benefit waiver.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he had a question. He asked if someone had already waived their benefits and the life insurance was removed from that waiver would that person be reinvested with coverage and Mrs. Boehnke replied yes they would.

Commissioner Bost asked if the dental was included in the motion and Commissioner Wells said there was no change in the dental.

Commissioner Bost said the Board would still have to approve no change.

Chairman Dunn remarked the Board would have to approve everything except for the two prescription items.

On motion made by Chairman Dunn, seconded by Commissioner Wells to approve renewal insurance and the wellness, emergency room, vision, dental and benefit-waiver benefits with the exception of the prescription benefit. The motion carried 5-0.

Chairman Dunn asked that the Board make a motion regarding the new levels of the prescription so that discussion could continue.

On motion made by Commissioner Bost, seconded by Chairman Dunn to have the three tier benefit as presented, discussion followed.

Commissioner Frady asked who was making the rule that there had to be a \$15 differential between the formulary and the name brand.

Mrs. Boehnke replied the county's contract.

Commissioner Frady asked if this was a recommendation.

Commissioner Bost replied no it was not a recommendation. He said this was a requirement in the contract between Benescript and the drug manufacturers. He said the reason that they are giving the extra discounts was an incentive to have those particular drugs prescribed when there was a certain illness and there being a lot of different medications to treat that particular illness. He said this was a matter of giving incentives to get their particular drug prescribed. He said they were willing to give some pretty good discounts to make that happen.

Commissioner Frady remarked that there was no history with this formulary.

Commissioner Bost replied the county did not personally have any history but this was something that was in the large majority of coverage plans that did have the formulary in it. He said some plans have the three tier but there was a lot of places where there was only the formulary and the generic.

Commissioner Frady said the plan could always go to zero, \$15 and \$30 and keep it in tact.

Chairman Dunn asked what the \$15 level would do to the plan.

Commissioner Bost replied that it would increase the cost.

Commissioner Frady said this was unknown. He said since there was no history with formulary, an increase in cost was unknown. He felt this could always be adjusted later.

Commissioner Wells said the current co-pay for a non generic drug was \$30. She felt this should not change the ratio at all if the high end was left at \$30 where it had been. She clarified there was no deficit now.

Mrs. Boehnke replied no there was no deficit.

Commissioner Wells suggested leaving the non generic and non formulary at \$30, a ratio would not be changed now in any fashion. She said if there was no deficit she did not see why the county should jump ahead and penalize the employees at that level. She said she could support leaving the high end at \$30 and then if it had to be adjusted down to \$15 that would be fine. She said she personally knew of a lot of drugs that there were no generics for and she was reluctant to allow the pharmaceutical companies to describe which drug she would buy on a formulary. She felt the pharmaceutical companies had a lot of control over her health anyway. She said if someone wanted to get a generic and was capable of getting a generic that was fine. She said she had a prescription that was not generic and she was pretty sure it would not be listed on the formulary. She said she would have no option on that and she was sure she was not alone. She said if this was raised \$5.00 every month this would be a big hit in their pocket book. She said if there was no deficit she felt the Board would be misguided to increase this in anticipation of one. She said she could not support raising it that much.

Commissioner Frady said he would hate to take the money and build up a large pot of money.

Commissioner Bost said the projection was that there would be a 20% increase in drug costs this year and this was a method of trying to help hold that increase down as much as possible. He said if the county did not go with this kind of structure, it would be better served to leave everything at \$30 as it was now.

Commissioner Frady felt if the plan was zero, \$15 and \$30 then this could be monitored and see what it was costing.

Commissioner Wells felt the employees had been encouraged last year to try and get generic drugs when possible. She said cost had not gone up significantly and had not gone down significantly and she felt that was indicative of the fact that there were drugs out there that did not have a generic. She said she did not want the employees penalized for that.

Chairman Dunn remarked if this was left alone there were a lot of drugs that were not generic that are listed on the formulary list. He said now the employees pay \$30 for the brand name drugs and they might only have to pay \$15 if it is listed on the formulary list. He said some employees would save money.

Mrs. Boehnke remarked that of the total number of prescriptions filled, approximately 52% were being filled as a generic.

Chairman Dunn remarked that 48% of employees were paying \$30 for a name brand. He said from what he heard most of the name brands would be listed on the formulary list.

Commissioner Wells said "most" could not be projected.

Commissioner Bost said it was projected that almost half of the drugs would be on the formulary list. He stated his intention would be to talk with his physician to see what else he could take that was on the formulary list.

Chairman Dunn said some employees would get a reduction of \$5.00 and some would get a raise of \$10.00.

Commissioner Wells interjected that this was not fair. She said there was no deficit and this was not fair.

Chairman Dunn said if this went to the \$40 this would be very expensive for the employee.

Commissioner Frady remarked that the cost of those drugs was running close to \$60 as an overall average. He said the employees would be paying \$40 instead of \$30 and 48% of the employees would be paying more money. He said this was something that he did not understand.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he hated to see a drug company or money drive health issues. He said this was not a very good engine and he felt health suffered when this was done. He said his impression of benefits was that the county was trying to provide a benefit and not restrict it to the point where it was prohibited for anyone. He said he was familiar with a drug that was not available in generic form. He said his wife was not on the health plan and this would not affect him at all. He said most times when these serious illnesses require exotic drugs they are already in a situation in the outset. He felt to add this to it would be bad for the Board to do. He said generic drugs were wonderful and they saved money but they are not the answer to some problems. He said he would rather see zero, \$15, and \$30 that would leave the high end where it was and monitor this for six months and see where it would go. He said changes could always be made. He said it would be hard to come down after the money was collected than to go up. He said he would rather do that.

Commissioner Wells interjected that the Board would have to wait one year to make any changes.

Commissioner Bost said rather than go to the zero, \$15 and \$30 he would recommend that the Board keep everything as a straight \$30.

Chairman Dunn said there would be no opportunity to encourage the use of the formulary. He asked if there were any other estimates that the Board could have. He said if this was left the way it was currently there would be 48% paying \$30 and 52% paying nothing. He said he did not want to do anything that would cost the county an inordinate amount of money.

Commissioner Wells said this would not increase the county's time as far as oversight or administration if the middle one was put in. She felt this was a win/win situation for everyone to make it zero, \$15 and \$30. She said if there was a deficit next year then the employees would understand if this had to be increased. She said at this point in time she was just not comfortable in increasing it until it was determined that it was something that had to be done.

Chairman Dunn asked for the Board's pleasure in this matter.

The motion failed with Chairman Dunn, Commissioner Wells, Commissioner VanLandingham and Commissioner Frady voting in opposition to the motion.

Chairman Dunn asked if the Board would like to make another motion.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham to approve a 3-tier prescription plan of zero dollars for generic, \$15 for the formulary and \$30 for brand name, discussion followed.

Commissioner Bost said what this would do was going to increase the county's cost somewhat and not keep it stable. He said he could not support the motion for that reason. He said he would support keeping it at \$30 so that it would not take the county back any further than that.

Commissioner Wells remarked that if this happened one year from now she would stand up and say that Commissioner Bost was exactly correct and the Board was wrong.

Chairman Dunn said he could see where this would run up the cost if the middle ground was put in.

Commissioner Wells asked if Chairman Dunn would rather pay zero or \$15.

Chairman Dunn remarked that employees would still pay zero for generic drugs.

Commissioners agreed and said that this would not drive up the cost. She felt this would go down.

Commissioner Frady remarked that if a brand name drug cost \$35 then the employee could get it for \$30 and it might possibly be on the formulary list and they would pay \$15.

Chairman Dunn said the county would not get much of a reimbursement that way.

Chairman Bost remarked that the total overall cost would go up for a number of different reasons. He said first what had been successful in getting generic drugs prescribed would now eliminate a good portion of that incentive. He felt what the Board would end up seeing

would be instead of having 52% generic it would change to possibly 40% to 42% generic. He said overall if the Board approves the zero, \$15, and \$30 there would be a substantial increase in the prescription costs.

Chairman Dunn remarked that was the only fear that he had on this because he could see where it would go.

Commissioner Frady said an increase would not be seen from the employees.

Commissioner Bost remarked there would not be an increase to the employee but when the county has to raise the contributions in the future it would affect the employees. He said there was no free ride either way.

The motion passed 3-2 with Commissioner Bost and Chairman Dunn opposing.

Commissioner Bost commented that the next issue was something that was discovered some time ago. He said whoever was the contractor on the prescriptions had come in and given a presentation as to how mail order would reduce the county's overall prescription cost. He said somehow and some way it was set up that an employee could get a three months supply or a ninety day supply for paying the same single co-pay that someone would pay at the local drug store every month. He stated he had some personal experience on the prescriptions and would like to give the Board some figures on it. He said currently, based on the \$30 across the board co-pay, because of his ordering the prescription by mail and getting the ninety day supply and paying the one co-pay his five prescriptions cost the plan \$955.84 more per year than it would cost if he went down to the drug store every month and picked it up. He said it was not saving across the board. He said there was some savings when total cost was looked at. He said it would take a 2.5 times the monthly co-pay for the county to break even. He said this was recommended by the representative from Benescript. He said because of the way this was currently set up, there was a lot of excess cost for him to order the prescriptions by mail. He said the recommendation was to have a double co-pay for a ninety day supply. He said this would still save the employees quite a bit of money. He said this was never intended to shift all of that excess cost to the plan when this was originally set up. He said this was just a misunderstanding or lack of understanding as to what affect it would have. He said if a double co-pay for a ninety day supply was chosen based on the \$25 and \$40 co-pay, it would still cost the county an extra \$344.52 annually for the prescription drugs that he was getting. He said he would like to make a motion.

On motion made by Commissioner Bost, seconded by Chairman Dunn to approve a double co-pay amount of \$60 for a ninety day supply of prescription drugs by mail order, discussion followed.

Chairman Dunn said he tended to agree with Commissioner Bost but he was sure there would be some questions.

Commissioner Frady asked how many employees are ordering a ninety day supply of drugs.

Commissioner Wells felt a lot of people do and they do this for convenience.

Commissioner Bost remarked that according to the report that he had a copy of this was for the period 9/1/00 through 11/30/00. He said 10.7% of the claims were through the mail. He said the number of employees making those claims was 4.1% of the total number of people who got prescriptions filled during that three month period. He said there were 2,336 prescriptions and a total of 249 was through the mail. He said on numbers of prescriptions this would be 10.67%.

Commissioner Frady asked Commissioner Bost to clarify if this cost the county an additional \$900.

Commissioner Bost responded this was the amount it cost the county for his five prescriptions that he received each quarter. He said because of the way the co-pay is set up now it was costing the county plan \$955.84 more if he went to the local drug store once every month to fill the prescriptions. He said there was only one co-pay for a ninety day supply versus one co-pay for a thirty day supply. He said this was where the error came in when this was originally set up. He said there was a big selling job stating that everyone was going to save a lot of money. He stated this was not figured through. He said he had just started to question this approximately one year ago that this must be a tremendous discount going through the mail. He said the real bottom line was that it was only about an 8% discount on the drugs themselves and the extra cost was being shifted over to the plan and this was not what was intended.

Commissioner Frady asked Commissioner Bost in his case what exactly was he doing to save money from \$955 down to \$300.

Commissioner Bost responded that this was going to a sixty day co-pay. He said it would be two thirty day co-pays and getting a ninety day supply.

Commissioner Wells felt this was the logical thing to do. She said the employee was currently getting a ninety day supply and paying only one co-pay and this was never the way it was designed. She said by taking it to two co-pays for a ninety day supply, the employees who choose to do this would still be getting a benefit but the county would not take as big a hit. She felt this was the logical thing to do.

Commissioner Frady asked if the employees would be saving money too.

Commissioner Bost responded that there would still be a substantial savings to the employee because of two things. He said first the employee would get a one month co-pay that they would not have to pay and the lesser cost would be their benefit.

Commissioner Frady clarified that the employees would pay twice instead of once.

Commissioner Bost responded that the employee would pay two co-pays instead of one co-pay for a ninety day supply. He said if an employee went to the drug store they would have to pay three co-pays and go every month.

The motion carried 5-0.

Chairman Dunn said he would like to point out that these were the recommendations from the committee and Mrs. Boehnke replied yes.

Chairman Dunn asked who was on the committee.

Mrs. Boehnke responded that the committee consisted of Commissioner Bost, Finance Director Mark Pullium, herself and Lori Smith.

Chairman Dunn asked about the advisory group.

Mrs. Boehnke replied the advisory group had come up with several of these ideas and advised the committee but when it actually came down to dollars and cents the committee discussed that.

CONSENT AGENDA: Commissioner VanLandingham requested item no. 3 be removed for discussion. On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Bost to approve the consent agenda as presented with the exception of item no. 3. The motion carried 5-0.

BILL HEARD CHEVROLET - AWARDED BID FOR STAKE BODY TRUCK: Approve recommendation to award the lowest bid for a stake body truck to Bill Heard Chevrolet in the amount of \$46,751.00.

WATER SYSTEM: Approve request from the Water System to advertise on April's water bill, the Water System's annual "Customer Appreciation Day," to be held at the Water System Building on Friday, May 4, 2001 from 10:00 am to 3:00 pm.

ENVIROSEAL - TO TEST DUST CONTROL ON QUARTERS ROAD: Approve by the Board of Commissioners to test dust control application on Quarters Road. The low bidder, Enviroseal, is recommended in the amount of \$13,316.00. These funds will come from the reserve account.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he had received, along with the other Commissioners, several methods of communication in support of the dust control on Quarters Road. He

said he had also received some concerns about the environmental impact that the treatment would possibly produce. He said he had two questions about this. He remarked that one of his questions had been answered. He said he had spoken with Mr. Cofty and he had secured enough information on the environmental impact to satisfy him that it was of no adverse impact to the environment whether that be aquatic, atmospheric or plant life. He said that part was settled. He stated the other thing he would like to look at a little closer was the cost. He stated that the first treatment was going to be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$13,316. He said this was the first treatment. He said the second treatment was going to be \$11,000. He said this was approximately \$25,000 for two miles of dirt road. He asked if the county could afford to treat dirt roads in this manner. He said he was aware that it would stabilize the top layer of service on the road. He said it was also reported to be a very good product that would do this and it would eliminate some of the maintenance. He said his concern was if the county does Quarters Road and then other dirt roads in the county would have to be done. He felt this might create some situations that the county would have to face if this starts with Quarters Road. He said he would like to find out if the county does pursue this at what dept would it be pursued. He questioned if the county would be doing this just as a test on Quarters Road at a cost of \$25,000 for two miles or what. He said he had calculated that out and the county would be looking at approximately \$750,000 every year for the dirt roads in the county. He asked if the county should do this or could it do this. He asked if the county was willing to pay the price to maintain dirt roads in this fashion.

Commissioner Frady asked for the life span of this treatment.

Director of Public Works Lee Hearn responded that this would depend a lot on the material that was treated. He said without experience on this he was not sure. He said based on the clay and the materials the county was dealing with, it would be anywhere from four months to six months and perhaps a year depending on the level of traffic and how well the road was drained. He said it would also depend on how good a job the county did applying and compacting the materials. He said this would be a new program for the Public Works Department.

Commissioner Wells said according to the information that the Board received, she understood if the product was applied properly it should last a much longer period of time than that.

Mr. Cofty replied that the information he had received from Zack Taylor of the Road Department it stated that initial stabilization should last approximately six to nine months on this road. He said this would also depend on traffic and weather. He said traffic counts had been done on Quarters Road. He said in looking at both entrances there were approximately 500 vehicles per day that traverse that road. He said Zack had indicated six to nine months.

Commissioner Wells recalled when this was previously discussed they had said when the material was applied properly the second time it could last a year or so.

Mr. Cofty said Zack Taylor of Public Works had recommended that within six to nine months it would be sprayed. He said the cost would be less on the second application. He said it would cost approximately \$11,000 to do the second application. He said it would not be quite as labor intensive and it would only take one day to apply the application according to Zack.

Commissioner Wells asked that once the second application was applied would the county have to reapply every six to eight months?

Mr. Cofty replied that based on what he had seen he felt there was a good chance that the county would be back out there treating the road again. He said the item on the agenda related only to a specific test. He said there was no long term arrangement to try and do this. He said the county wanted to see how this product worked and then to evaluate if it was worth pursuing in the future. He said most of the manufacturers say that by a process of treating these roads, potentially you could reduce the ongoing maintenance such as gravel and so forth. He said that was what he understood but he was not an expert in that field.

Commissioner Frady asked if this was a hard surface.

Mr. Hearn replied yes.

Commissioner Frady asked if anything mixed with the dirt.

Mr. Hearn responded that it would actually bind the fines together and give a hard surface to run on. He said the process included plowing the road up with a motor grader. He said once the road was plowed up, the material would have to be worked up and get a pretty uniform gradation on the material. He said once it was loosened, the polymer mixed with water would be applied. He said they would let it sit for a approximately one hour. He stated then a vibratory roller would be run over it and compact it. He said they would let it sit and then put another application on it. He said that was the first basic treatment. He said once the material sets up then that was the road surface.

Mr. Hearn remarked that the problem he had with this product was that he could not put a motor grader on that road if there were potholes. He questioned how he would handle potholes in areas that do not drain that well. He said Quarters Road had some areas that form after large rains. He said patching would be an unknown and he did not know exactly how this would be handled. He remarked that most of these applications are for roads that have relatively light traffic on them. He said they recommend this for many farm roads. He said the county might get a year or two service on it but it would not involve 500 vehicles per day.

Commissioner Frady asked if the product looked like asphalt.

Mr. Hearn replied he was not sure.

Commissioner Frady remarked that down in the Bahamas they put a treatment similar to this and it was like a hard surface. He said there was not as much traffic there but those things did not stay down. He said they had to keep repairing them and usually when the hole was filled up that was there, that was all you would wind up with.

Mr. VanLandingham said it was his understanding that this was not a one day application. He asked if traffic could go on the road while this was being prepared.

Mr. Hearn responded yes. He said they would have to keep one lane or half the road open. He commented that obviously the less traffic there was the smoother the construction would be and the better the job they could do.

Commissioner Bost asked what it would cost the county to pave the road with asphalt.

Mr. Hearn replied the cost of paving the road. He said the Georgia D.O.T. would give the county the money for the asphalt and for the stone to pave that road. He said that was typically the way Spear Road, Old Senoia Road and even Swanson Road were done. He said the Georgia D.O.T. provides Fayette County with a State contract. He said the county's obligations involve acquiring the right of way and coordinating utility relocations which sometimes could be expensive but generally were fairly reasonable. He said the county's expense was involved in grading and the actual laying of the asphalt and the stone.

Commissioner Bost asked how wide would the right of way have to be.

Mr. Hearn said in order for the county to get Georgia D.O.T. funding for the stone and asphalt there must be 60 feet of right of way. He said they prefer 80 feet of right of way but with 60 feet they would provide the matching dollars to pave the road.

Commissioner Bost said there was a tremendous amount of large pine trees lining both sides. He asked if these trees would have to be taken out.

Mr. Hearn responded that in order to receive the money, the 60 foot right of way would have to be cleared of all obstructions.

Commissioner Frady said if they were fortunate enough, one side might be saved.

Commissioner VanLandingham said the county was caught in a catch twenty two. He said there was a problem out there. He said there were some residents who had put in a lot of work on this trying to find this product. He commended the residents on Quarters Road

in trying to deal with their problem in a very real way. He said the county was in a situation where it must make sure it was doing the right thing for all of the county. He said he was afraid that this might be the wrong direction. He said he was aware that this would not help the dust situation at all. He said anything that the county does to that road was going to increase that traffic. He said if the road was improved, the traffic would certainly increase. He said it was going to happen. He felt the money that the county spends must be spent in a prudent manner and not just chasing something that might not be real.

Chairman Dunn said he had gone to this location before the rains a couple of times to check it out and he came home both times and washed his car. He said this summer was going to be brutal down there because of the increased number. He stated the residents of many of the dirt roads in the county would shoot the Board if their road was paved. He said the Board had that problem too and everybody had a solution to the problem. He said he understood the recommendation to be was to do a one time attempt to test this product to see if it had any long term utility for the county's Public Works Department. He said he was still willing to do it on that basis. He said at least through the summer the residents there would get some relief. He said at this point if the Board decided to wait and build a road it would be years before they had relief. He said the county would have to purchase rights of way and do so many things that would be procedurally time consuming that there would be no relief there for several years. He said he would be willing to do this on a one time basis and at least assess whether or not this would be worthwhile.

Commissioner Frady said he would go along with that so long as the county was not planning to do this forever. He said the county could spend enough to pave this road over the next ten years. He said he was aware that the residents there did not want it paved.

Chairman Dunn said there had also been some inquiries as to whether or not this product would be environmentally safe on plant life in the garden and along the way. He said the county had been relatively assured that it was safe.

Mr. Hearn replied that based on the information that he had received, it was recommended that this be used in farm land and the crop yields were up because the dust was not on the corn or whatever. He said it was recommended for that use.

Commissioner Frady asked if this was what was called ASTM or in other words environmentally safe and Mr. Hearn replied that was correct.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by commissioner Frady to proceed with item three with the understanding that it would be as a test basis, and that at the end of this second application, the county would evaluate the situation and determine where it will go from there, discussion followed.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he would be in favor of this motion as long as it was understood that the county was not set into a program. He suggested waiting until the dry

weather gets here so that it would last longer throughout the summer. He said this would give the residents the relief that they needed.

The motion carried 5-0.

FAYETTEVILLE - APPROVAL TO USE LIBRARY FOR ELECTIONS: Approve request from Mayor Ken Steele to use the library for elections with the understanding that if for any reason the City would have to hold a Special Election that would interfere with the county election, the City would move their precinct to another location. A copy of the letter of request and the letter confirming the understanding is identified as "Attachment No. 1", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

RFP FOR CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION STUDY: Approve request to do an RFP for the Classification and Compensation study.

RFP FOR TIME AND MOTION STUDY: Approve request to do an RFP for Time and Motion study for staff.

WEICKUM CONSTRUCTION CO. - AWARDED BID: Approve bid award for the removal of an underground storage tank and installation of an above ground tank to Weickum Construction Co. in the amount of \$8,118.00.

TAX COMMISSIONER: Approve request from George Wingo, Tax Commissioner, to transfer funds from account #5105 and related accounts, to account #5770, equal to the \$28,000 necessary to cover the cost of this computer equipment.

FAYETTEVILLE CARPET - AWARDED BID: Approve recommendation to award a bid for installation of carpet in the 911 building to the lowest bidder, Fayetteville Carpet in the amount of \$4,786.32; and, to purchase three chairs from Atlanta Office Equipment (state contract price) in the amount of \$1,471.80.

ENNIS PAINT AND TECHNICAL COATINGS - AWARDED BIDS: Approve request from Lee Hearn to accept the bids for traffic paint and beads as follows: the bid from Ennis Paint in the amount of \$13,625.70 and 2000# glass beads to Technical Coatings in the amount of \$500, for a total of \$14,125.70.

MINUTES: Approve minutes of the Board of Commissioner's meeting held on March 22, 2001, and Bid Opening Minutes for the Criminal Justice Center held on March 27, 2001.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Members of the public are allowed up to three minutes each to address the Board on issues of concern other than those items which are on this evening's agenda.

Jeff White: Jeff White, 215 Quarters Road, said his issued pertained to Quarters Road but that it was not the dust issue. He stated he would like to have, if possible, someone from the Public Works Department put a sign on Quarters Road restricting truck through traffic. He remarked there was a high level of trucks and other vehicles through that area and Bernard Road is paved and as everybody knows it is a nicely maintained road. He said there was already a sign on Bernhard Road stating "No Thru Truck Traffic".

Chairman Dunn advised Mr. White to speak to the Public Works Director Lee Hearn.

STAFF REPORTS:

DISCUSSION OF BIDS ON THE NEW JAIL EXPANSION AND COURTHOUSE

COMPLEX: Chairman Dunn asked David Yeager of Mallett and Associates to come forward and review the bids for the jail expansion and courthouse project.

David Yeager of Mallett and Associates stated that a bid opening was held for the jail expansion and court house/criminal justice center project on March 27, 2001. He said there were five bidders for that bid opening. He said these bidders were prequalified. He said there were seven bidders that were invited to bid after the prequalification process and of those seven, five submitted bids. He said the low bidder was Ray Bell Construction at \$31,982,000 for the base bid. He said the next three bidders ranged from \$32.2 million to \$33.38 million and the last bidder was \$36,900.00. He said the bid package did include three additive alternative bids. He said the first two additive alternatives were associated with site work for the proposed senior services facility and the third additive alternative was for a substitute for the generator that was specified which would have allowed peak shaving capabilities for the county in the future. He said he had been informed by the architect for the senior services project that they had declined the additive alternatives no. 1 and 2. He said this would leave additive alternative no. 3 which was the substitution for the peak shaving generator and this was the only one being considered.

Mr. Yeager said Mallett and Associates was recommending after review of the bids that the bid be awarded to the low bidder Ray Bell Construction and that the contract include additive alternative no. 3 for the substitution for the peak shaving generator. He said the combined total of the base bid and alternate no. 3 would be \$32,148,000.

Commissioner Wells asked Mr. Yeager to explain the alternative nos. 1, 2 and 3 regarding senior services.

Mr. Yeager replied that the bid packages included three additive alternatives which would be added to the base bid if accepted. He said the first two of those additive alternatives

were associated with site work for the senior services proposed building which was adjacent to this project. He said the intent of this was to offer senior services the ability to get a better price on site work by including it in with the larger construction. He said in discussing this with the architect for the senior services he had understood that they declined to accept that and that they would handle that process on their own as part of the building construction.

Commissioner Wells asked why alternate no. 3 was being added in.

Mr. Yeager replied that alternate no. 3 was for the generator for the criminal justice center and jail expansion.

Chairman Dunn said the bond money could not be used to do the grading work for the senior center. He said since they would have these crews assembled on the ground the county could do the work and they would be billed separately for that. He said subsequently they had decided because of some local people had come to the center and said that they might be able to reduce some of their costs by getting some in kind donated work. He said they had pulled out and those would no longer be expenses for either party.

Commissioner Frady said he had some letters from local people talking about security systems. He asked if security systems were included in this bid.

Mr. Yeager replied that the security system package was included in the base bid figure.

Commissioner Frady asked who had secured that bid.

Mr. Yeager responded that Southwestern Communications out of Decatur, Alabama was written in by the general contractor on his bid form. He said it was one of a half a dozen or so subcontractors.

Commissioner Frady said the letter he had received was condemning the Board for choosing that firm for the security system package. He said the Board did not choose that firm.

Chairman Dunn remarked that he and Mr. Yeager had a lengthy meeting with a local security systems company. He said this gentleman understands the process now and he would now probably be one of the people who gets to install some of the equipment.

On motion made by Commissioner Bost, seconded by Chairman Dunn to recommend to the Public Facilities Authority to award the contract to Ray Bell Construction for the base amount of \$31,892,000 plus alternate three for \$166,000 for a total of \$32,148,000, discussion followed.

Chairman Dunn remarked that this was not the cost for the total project. He said the \$32 million plus only included the two jail pods, some of the new office buildings for the jail and the courthouse. He said the renovation of the old courthouse would be done separately.

He remarked that in thirty minutes there would be a meeting in this room with the Public Facilities Authority who technically must approve this bid. He said the Board would in effect be making a formal recommendation to the Public Facilities Authority.

The motion carried 5-0.

EMPLOYEE INCENTIVE PROGRAM: Commissioner Wells stated she had asked some time ago for Administrator Cofty to investigate a way to create an Employee Incentive Program because we have some employees who have been coming up with some very innovative, cost-saving concepts for the county and she felt it deserved some recognition, and maybe some monetary reward or some days off. She remarked that Mr. Cofty designated a group of people to sit down and look at this and she was very impressed with the number of people and the diversity of these people who were willing to serve on this Committee. She said the Board had been presented with a draft of an incentive plan. She pointed out that the members did a fantastic job. She said this was an excellent program. She added it would reward people for saving time, money, and efforts. She stated there are monetary rewards, there are days off rewards, as well as recognition and rewards for people who come up with time saving, not monetary cost savings, but it is something that can affect every single employee and give them a vested interest in wanting to help the county run more effectively and smoother. She asked that the Board review the draft or put it on a future agenda for discussion, or go ahead and adopt it now because it really was an excellent program. She thanked Connie Boehnke and everyone who worked on this program.

Commissioner Wells stated there was one error on page 8 where the word "excepted" and it should read "accepted."

Chairman Dunn said he had read the document and had four or five concerns with the program. He said he had worked with several of the programs before and every question he had was addressed in the document. He said staff had done a great job on this.

Commissioner Wells agreed that this was done very, very well and was very comprehensive and it was also very fair to everyone. She thanked everyone who had worked on this.

Commissioner Bost said the only question that he had was the issue of days off being included in the W-2. He said he did not believe that you could charge income tax on days off.

Commissioner Wells asked if the Board could set a date as to when this item would be voted on so that it would not be forgotten. She said she was not pushing for the Board to take action on this item today but did not want it to be forgotten.

April 4, 2001
Page 24

It was the consensus of the Board to place the employee incentive program on the agenda for April 12, 2000.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Commissioner Wells made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:05 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Frady. The motion carried 5-0.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Dunn adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Linda Rizzotto, 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 4th day of April, 2001.

Linda Rizzotto, Chief Deputy Clerk

Prepared by: Karen Morley