

The Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia met in a Special Called Budget Workshop on Tuesday, June 12, 2001, at 8:00 a.m. in the Commissioners' Conference Room of the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue, Fayetteville, Georgia.

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris W. Cofty, County Administrator
Carol Chandler, Executive Assistant
Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk
Mark Pullium, Finance Director
Margaret Malone, Budget Officer
Janet Camburn, Assistant Finance Director

Chairman Dunn asked Finance Director Mark Pullium to give a brief overview of the proposed budget.

Mark Pullium stated that he was very excited about this budget and he felt there were some wonderful initiatives from a lot of the departments. He remarked that several of the premises that staff had operated under in developing this budget were to hold the tax rate level, to implement the market study when the results of that study come in and to continue to position the government to be in a strong financial position at the end of the year. He remarked that the payoff of the Stonewall complex was also proposed in this budget. He said he also recommended that a contingency be established for emergencies equal to at least one month of the county's operating funds in addition to the normal fiscal policy. He said this would be a new designation of the fund equity to deal with emergencies. He said this was common practice in governmental agencies to establish an emergency fund.

Mr. Pullium remarked that all of the staff had worked very diligently on the budget. He said he would like to thank all of the departments for submitting their budgets in a timely fashion. He said staff had met with the department heads and they had been questioned quite extensively in some areas. He said staff had proposed even more significant cuts than the Board had seen in the budget documents. He said, however, through the interview process with the departments they were able to prevail upon staff that these were not cuts that should be made. He said some of these cuts were reinstated. He said the budget before the Board was one that staff felt was very doable. He said staff had tried to eliminate any waste or any areas that were not clearly aligned with a mission of a department or aligned with a mission of the government. He said this had been accomplished without a doubt. He said staff also felt there were some other issue that were very important right now and one was the economic outlook. He said there were rising energy prices that might impact the county in the upcoming year. He said he did

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 2

believe that there would be some effects from the economic slowdown that had hit throughout the country. He said this had been incorporated in the budget.

Mr. Pullium said it was prudent from the county's standpoint to be conservative as the county approaches the economic slow down. He said there were governments that had taken drastic measures and some that were taking the position such as the State of Georgia. He said he had spoken with an individual at Georgia Tech and they said that a freeze had been placed on some of the faculty positions and some of the staff positions. He said this was in light of the economic hard times. He said he was excited about this budget because it offered a lot of new initiatives and he felt that the County Administrator and all of the county departments had put together exact action plans to accomplish objectives that need to be accomplished. He said there were adequate funds now proposed in this budget to carry out those objectives. He said this budget was very well thought out.

Chris Cofty felt that as this budget was reviewed everyone would see a significant increase in services provided by the departments at a reduced rate. He said the Board would see an increase in resurfacing in the Public Works budget for 27 miles to 45 miles of roads in the county. He felt this was significant. He felt the Recreation budget was another important aspect. He said the Board might feel that less money had actually been appropriated in the Recreation budget this year than in prior years. He said there was actually \$150,000 additional dollars in the C.I.P. He said he planned to address something that had not been done in the last eight or nine years. He said every athletic field in the county would be re-crowned and re-graded and put back to specs. He remarked there were some significant improvements throughout this budget for the citizens of Fayette County. He said he would like to reiterate what Mr. Pullium had stated and that was in regard to the county department heads. He said this was a new process this year and the first time each department head had met one on one with the Finance Director and staff and reviewed their budget line item by line item. He felt the department heads had a much better perspective now and the direction that Fayette County should go. He said there were certain areas where staff had proposed a cut and staff actually went back and put money back in because the department head justified what those reasons were. He felt it was important for everyone to have an open mind as the budget was discussed. He remarked that the department heads had worked extremely hard on this budget and the commended them for their hard work. He said he would also like to commend the Finance Director Mark Pullium and his staff for all of their hard work.

Chairman Dunn remarked that for anyone to truly understand the budget one must look at the department's budget as well as the C.I.P. He pointed out that some of which would normally be in a department's M & O budget would now be in the C.I.P. He said in putting this budget together staff had assumed that this Board was going to approve of having the C.I.P. He said if there was not going to be a C.I.P. or if some of the commissioners felt they did not want a C.I.P. then some drastic changes would have to be made. He said a

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 3

lot of this would find its way back to the M & O budget if there was no C.I.P. He felt having a C.I.P. was something that several people had wanted all along. He said this was a small step in that direction. He said this was not five years worth but was just one year. He said after there was a full Board and a retreat and long term planning was reviewed then this book would take on more and more meaning every year if the Board approved this. He said the problem in the past was that there was money laying around in different things but the visibility to the Board, the public and the press was not readily available. He said now this would be laid out a lot better if the Board, in fact, did approve a C.I.P. He suggested that prior to getting into the budget that the Board decide if it wanted a C.I.P.

Commissioner Frady said there would have to be a C.I.P. He felt this was just brushing over something and pulling it out of here and putting it on a piece of paper. He said it was not actually a C.I.P. but just consolidating the funds that would be spent on improvements.

Chairman Dunn remarked that this would give better visibility to the Board and staff of what was being done during the year.

Commissioner Frady felt this was not a true C.I.P.

Chairman Dunn said he did not feel it would be either until the Board got into this for the next five years.

Commissioner Frady said the Board had been trying to work toward this for the last eight years. He said he was not going to vote against the C.I.P. but he wanted to get on into the five year program.

Chairman Dunn felt the Board would do this in mid year and the Board would have to in order to be ready for this thing next year.

Mark Pullium said one of the things that he could see from a finance perspective was by having these capital expenditures in the operational budget made it really hard to determine what was the true cost of operating any one department. He felt by pulling this out gave the Board a clear picture of what it costs to run the staff and operations of the department. He said he agreed with Commissioner Frady that there needed to be a five year C.I.P. where the future operational costs could be projected out. He said he felt that it really made it difficult having the capital budget included with the operational budget to really see what was going on.

Commissioner Wells exited the meeting at this time.

Mr. Cofty pointed out that in the infantile process of the C.I.P. there were actual expenditure recommendations that go past this year. He said the foundation had been laid to start a five year process. He said the county was positioned to pay as it goes and not

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 4

get into debt to finance some of the long term capital expenditures of over five years. He said there was more to the C.I.P. than just the first year projections.

Chairman Dunn said if a project did not get done at the department level then some of that money occasionally would migrate into the M & O and the Board would not want that to happen.

Commissioner Frady felt the Board had a hand on that now and Chairman Dunn agreed.

Chairman Dunn remarked that the Board needed to make it plan to the staff that it was unduly cutting anything that they might need. He said it was just putting it into a different accounting category and more visibility so that everyone could see what was going on at the same time.

Chairman Dunn said he would like to get an agreement from the Board on the C.I.P.

On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Commissioner Frady that the C.I.P. be instituted in the method as stated in this budget, discussion followed.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he agreed with Commissioner Frady and Chairman Dunn but he believed that this must be done step by step and cannot just go into a full blown five year C.I.P. with this budget. He felt that after this year the Board would see department heads realizing the potential of the C.I.P. He said department heads look at their M & O and feel they will not have enough money. He stated the rest of their money was in the C.I.P. He said since the county had never had a C.I.P. before it might look at little strange to them.

Commissioner Frady remarked that a C.I.P. was never cut and dried and you could always change the priorities.

Chairman Dunn said it was not set in stone but there were stake holds involved in the C.I.P. He said the Board would owe it to a department head to talk about any changes, moving anything or lessening priorities.

Commissioner Frady said there would have to be a strong reason for him to vote to change the C.I.P.

Chairman Dunn remarked that it was difficult for this Board to commit future Boards. He said it would be easier in the long term planning if things were institutionalized.

Commissioner Frady said he would like to see the Board try and work in the programs and get a list together this year as to what the Board would like to do and put some sort of millage rate on this.

Chairman Dunn felt the C.I.P. part of the budget would grow every year. He said it would be a much more significant document next year and the following year. He said he could think of some things that belong in there now that the Board did not put in there this go round. He felt this was a terrific first step.

The motion carried 3-0. Commissioner Wells was absent for the vote.

Mr. Cofty interjected that once the Board gets into the budget and sees, for example, what an excellent job Chief Jack Krakeel had done in forecasting five and ten years down the road. He said this was what everyone needed to be thinking.

Commissioner Frady said he had made a comment about Chief Krakeel and his department being the only department that had a C.I.P. He said Jack had to plan on having equipment ten to fifteen years down the road that was very expensive.

EMERGENCY SERVICES - 131

Mr. Pullium remarked that Fire and Emergency Services were two of the best assembled budgets that he read. He said there were a couple of changes and the biggest change was in connection with some personal positions for manpower staffing. He said these changes were made in connection with the moratorium on new personnel positions. He said this was the only change and this was made in both Fire and Emergency Services.

Chief Jack Krakeel stated that this budget year was significantly different from past years. He said as a department head he really appreciated the process that department heads had gone through this year and having the opportunity to sit down with both Mark Pullium and Chris Cofty to discuss the budget and areas where he felt the focus should be. He said in spite of his best efforts, Mark and Chris had held true to the Board's policy with respect to the singular item that he was present to discuss with the Board this morning. He said that item was a reconsideration of the proposal that he had presented to the Board last year for putting in place over a three year time frame a manpower squad.

Chief Krakeel further remarked that he had indicated to the Board last year, his plans that were presented to the Board last year for the manpower squad recognized that it would fulfill multiple roles and was not just a singular approach to getting additional staff. He felt this was a very cost effective way to provide the needed number of personnel for the Fire and Emergency Services program by centralizing a concentrated pool of individuals centrally located in the county to be able to respond to any point in the county. He said the unit would consist of five people per shift. He said in the plan that was presented to the Board last year would accomplish that over a three year time frame. He said he had requested seven positions per year for three years with two of the positions in each one of the three years were to assist the department with giving sufficient time off for having

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 6

sufficient personnel to allow staff to be able to take the time off that they accrue during the year and to incorporate their vacation time, holiday time, and their Kelly dayleave time and the fifteen positions over three years to institute the manpower squad.

Chief Krakeel presented the Board with a brochure that contained information that the Board should be cognizant of with respect to this request and forecast. He stated the manpower squad, in essence, would do a number of things for the department. He said it would give the department an effective response force to all of the major calls. He stated that this would provide his department with a pool of resources that would, in his estimation, significantly reduce or potentially eliminate the bulk of the department's overtime compensation that was not scheduled or planned for. He said it would further assist his department to meet response time performance measures. He called the Board's attention to the 2000 annual report and the average response time regarding the annual ambulance response time and the EMS related calls to patients seen intervention. He said in 1999 the department's average response time was five minutes and nineteen seconds. He stated in 2000 the average response time increased to five minutes and thirty six seconds. He said the average ambulance response time of six minutes and fifty seconds had increased to eight minutes and fifteen seconds. He said the EMS related calls to patients seen intervention went from five minutes and fifty two seconds to six minutes and fifty eight seconds.

Commissioner Wells questioned the reason for the increase.

Chief Krakeel responded that the biggest single reason for this was due to the increased call volume that the department was experiencing in the station 4 district. He said this results in having to pull units from other parts of the county or three remaining ambulances from other areas of the county into the station 4 response territory to handle those EMS patient transports. He said this as directly being reflected here.

Chairman Dunn felt the addition of personnel would not get those ambulances there any quicker.

Chief Krakeel interjected and stated that yes they would. He said the department had a reserve ambulance that was kept as a spare unit at station 1 and the department was required by law to maintain one reserve ambulance for every four ambulances that were on the road. He said the plan was to move that unit to station 4 from station 1 where it currently was. He said this unit was just sitting there being garaged more than anything else. He said with the manpower squad in place, he could activate that unit during peak demand periods because he would have staffing there to put on that unit and have it respond during the peak demand periods. He said this would help to alleviate some of these problems that the department was running into with respect to meeting response time performance measures.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 7

Commissioner VanLandingham clarified that this would give the department two ambulances at station 4 and Chief Krakeel agreed.

Chief Krakeel pointed out that this would not be operational twenty-four hours a day/seven days a week because that would tend to take away from the impact of the manpower squad, but it would give the department the capability to bring that unit up instantaneously. He said the unit was fully equipped and fully operational. He said by having the manpower pool of personnel available this unit could be brought on line immediately and help to alleviate some of the issues that the department was dealing with respect to response times.

Commissioner Frady clarified that station 4 was located in Fayetteville. He asked if the growth in Fayetteville would have any direct relation with the response time. He pointed out that the outlying stations would not have this problem.

Chief Krakeel remarked that the slow response was not from this unit here in Fayetteville. He said it was when this unit was already tied up on a call and the department was having to bring a unit from South Fayette County, North Fayette County or Tyrone over here to have that patient transported. He said this was where the ambulance response times increase. He said this unit here had excellent response times.

Commissioner Frady asked at what frequency was this happening.

Chief Krakeel replied that this was happening significantly more and it was being reflected in the department's analysis and also in response times. He said this was the biggest part of the reason for the increased response times.

Commissioner Frady remarked there were discussions about moving station 4. He asked if this would affect the department's response time in any way.

Chief Krakeel replied yes. He said in the department's long term plan there was a second EMS unit scheduled for this area here in the next five years. He said he did not have the personnel to staff it at this junction. He said he could move it to station 4 but it would just be in the way because he did not have staff that could respond.

Commissioner Wells remarked that a couple of years ago Chief Krakeel was before the Board asking for a reserve team and the number of reserves was increased. She said that was supposed to alleviate a lot of these problems and the Board did go ahead and fund that and bring the reserves on. She asked Chief Krakeel if he was now saying that did not solve the problem and more people would be needed. She said this was one of the reasons that the Board had supported the reserve concept. She asked if this had worked out or not.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 8

Chief Krakeel replied that the reserve program was working but it was not working during the daytime.

Commissioner Frady asked if the reserves were the volunteers and Chief Krakeel replied yes.

Chief Krakeel remarked that most of the reserves were fire related and not necessarily EMS personnel. He said at night and on the weekends the department could get six to eight or nine people to respond.

Commissioner Frady asked what percentage of the volunteers were ambitious enough to go and get an EMT license.

Deputy Chief Allen McCullough replied that out of 45 reserve members there were over half of them trained as first responders and there were close to ten who were either EMT's or paramedics.

Chairman Dunn remarked that since all of the fire personnel were dual trained, there was a medic on the scene.

Chief Krakeel said the department was getting a response unit to the scene but the time frequency and the interval were getting longer and longer and this was proportional to the volume. He said there was one other element that he wanted to bring out. He said last year when the seven positions were approved the Board also approved an increase in the fee schedule. He said this year the addition of the positions to the Emergency Services' budget we're budget neutral to you. We increased transports last year by 350. He said the department had 350 more transports last year than during 1999 effectively yielding the county \$150,000 in revenue from those transports. He said in terms of how the department would compensate and take care of the cost of these positions that were added last year, they were covered by the increase in call volume. He said there was a 13% increase in call volume from 1999 to 2000. He said the department had gone from 4,400 calls to 5,000 calls. He stated part of this increase was clearly EMS related but there were 350 more transports than in the previous year. He said this in essence yielded the county another \$150,000 in transport revenues. He said this by in large covered the cost of the positions that were added last year to the Emergency Services' budget.

Chairman Dunn clarified that five positions were added last year to the Emergency Services' budget and two positions were added to the Fire budget.

Chairman Dunn remarked that Chief Krakeel had originally asked for 21 new positions and the Board had approved the first seven positions. He clarified that Chief Krakeel was asking the Board to commit to fourteen additional persons.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 9

Chief Krakeel remarked that his request to the Board last year was a three year program of seven positions per year over a three year period. He said his request this year was for seven positions and this would be in continuance of that plan. He said he understood the Board's position.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked if the volunteer EMT's come from their homes with no emergency lights. He said this was a department that was well oiled and the plan was in place and had been in place and approved. He felt it would be ludicrous for the county to depend on volunteer EMT's when the first thing that was considered was response time. He said they could not get there quick enough. He said to depend upon the volunteers for emergency service would be a terrible thing for the Board to do. He felt the Board needed to give this serious consideration. He pointed out that Emergency Services was the part of the county where there were more areas of responsibilities. He said in looking at the position paper that was done regarding the House Bill that was in consideration now, if that passes then Fayette County would be playing catch up big time. He felt in order to solve this problem and reduce the response time, Chief Krakeel needed these additional positions. He said over time pay would increase if something was not done here. He said he did not see how the Board could, in good conscious, not give this due consideration. He said there was a factor here that was very evident and nothing frivolous about it. He said this had been well planned, well programmed and well documented. He felt serious consideration should be given to this request.

Commissioner Frady said actually the Board had put the phasing in for this last year. He said this was a three program and the first part of the program was approved last year.

Chairman Dunn remarked that taken in context for the last several years of substantial increases that this department has had, he was not in favor of this request. He said he still felt that it would be judicious on the part of this Board to sit down and review this but he did not feel that the county was in a critical state. He said he was not hearing that the county was in a critical state. He said he would certainly be happy to review this in six months. He said the Sheriff could make the same case and ask for more people. He said it was always a tough call on any of these public safety matters. He felt the Board had a very good record of supporting public safety and over time the Board had really pumped up these things. He said he would be more comfortable in having a review of this and even programming a review six months from now.

Commissioner Frady remarked the reason Chief Krakeel has had recent increase in the last years was because he was so far behind. He said there had only been one person manning the fire stations. He said if they go to a fire then they could not do anything but sit there and wait for the rest of them. He said he would find it difficult to stop this program. He said the program was started last year and he felt the Board needed to take a look at it.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 10

Chairman Dunn remarked the cost of this program would be \$187,000 just for these five positions. He said there would be a similar cost for two in the Fire Department.

Chief Krakeel stated that the total cost would be approximately \$250,000 between two budgets. He said part of that amount would be offset by increased transports. He said the transport volumes continued to increase every year. He said last year the average revenue per transport was approximately \$400. He said in 1999 his department transported 2,118 patients and in the year 2000 the department transported 2,463 which was an additional 350 transports. He said this came to approximately \$150,000 in revenue for the department.

Deputy Chief McCullough interjected that the volume of transports during January 2001 through March 2001 had increased 12% over what it was last year. He said the number of transports continued to rise in double digit proportion this year.

Commissioner Wells said she was really sorry that this was the first budget on the agenda. She said this placed Chief Krakeel in a very difficult situation and also placed the Board in a very difficult situation because the Board had made it very clear to all of the department heads that there would be no increase. She said Chief Krakeel was the first department to be discussed and the Board was very inclined to approve this request. She said she had told Chief Krakeel that she was in support of the fact that this program had already started and it was an ongoing program. She said this did place the Board in an extremely difficult situation. She said she still had her commitment to this plan. She said the Board had approved this last year and it was definitely needed this year and it would also be needed next year. She stated the Board would have to be consistent with what the Board had told everybody else. She said she would like to revisit this in six months with her commitment that this was something that the Board was going to support. She stated in good consciousness today could not support this request for additional people when she had told everybody else no. She said in order for the Board to be consistent she could not approve it today but this did not mean that she had taken back her support for this program. She said she believed that this program was necessary but she could not fund it today. She said she felt today was not a critical day. She felt things would not get out of control in the next six months.

Commissioner Frady remarked that someone had asked where would the funds come from. He said he had made the comment that he would support the moratorium but if something needed to be done he felt it should move forward.

Commissioner Wells said she was not saying that it should not be done but she felt it did not need to be done today. She said there was nothing imminent or critical today that could not be addressed in six months. She said the Board could come back and look at it at that point in time. She said the moratorium was through this budget cycle.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 11

Commissioner Frady remarked the moratorium was for the entire year and not just this budget cycle. He said he did not like to talk about not having funds for this program because of the paying off of this complex. He said there was plenty of money available to have this program.

Chairman Dunn said there were definitely enough funds.

Commissioner Frady said he would not mind voting on this item until next week but if the Board waited six months then it might as well wait until the next budget period.

Commissioner VanLandingham said if the Board waited six months and then there would be the hiring and training period it would already be into the next budget. He said if the board puts this item off now, then it might as well put it off for another year, and then this department would be another year behind. He said emergency services was not something that could be put on hold until there was a demand but you must be prepared to meet the demand. He said he had voted for the moratorium and two days later he found out that maybe the Board should have been a little more cautious and worded the motion a little differently. He said he had found out that the county had this plan and it had been something that he did not do his homework on, he voted on it and he was sorry. He said this was a program that was funded last year, started last year and had up to a ten year range in the total program. He said this program was not frivolous. He said he would listen to any department head making a request but they would not be able to demand something because of what someone else did.

Commissioner Frady remarked this was like the capital improvements program. He said the Board had a three year program in place and the Board had just approved the first part of it already. He said Chief Krakeel had given the Board a good example of response times and he felt that was the strongest responsibility that he had for public safety.

Chairman Dunn asked if there were any other issues in the Emergency Services budget and Chief Krakeel replied no.

On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Commissioner Frady to fund the program that was started last year, discussion followed.

Chairman Dunn clarified that this would add five people and \$187,000 to this budget and Commissioner VanLandingham agreed.

Commissioner Frady said this would continue the program that was started last year.

Chairman Dunn called for the vote.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 12

The motion failed with a 2-2 vote with Chairman Dunn and Commissioner Wells voting in opposition.

Chairman Dunn said the Board would just have to approve the rest of the budget and then table this particular motion until perhaps the final session on the budget. He said there might be other issues as well that might be tacked on to the final session.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked if this motion "killed" this request and Chairman Dunn replied no.

Chairman Dunn said actually it did "kill" it.

Commissioner Frady suggested that a motion be made to bring this issue back up. He said if the Board did not bring this back up then it would not be discussed again until next year.

Chairman Dunn felt a review of this issue at the end of this year would be appropriate. He said it could then be put in place by next year. He said the Board would have to decide next time if it would fund both of these years. He remarked he did not recall the Board committing to fulfilling the program. He said at this point the motion was defeated and he did not know if anyone would bring up a motion at the end of the process.

FIRE SERVICES - 210

Chairman Dunn asked if there was any discussion.

Commissioner Frady asked what the issue was in the Fire budget.

Chairman Dunn said it was the same issue involving two positions.

Chairman Dunn said he did not see anything else in the fire budget that was in any way controversial.

Commissioner Frady said he did not know if these two positions would be the thing to do but he felt the EMS positions were important.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he would like to make a motion to assign two positions to this budget.

Chairman Dunn said the motion failed for lack of a second.

On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Commissioner Wells to approve the proposed budget for the Fire Department. The motion carried 4-0.

SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT - 130

Sheriff Randall Johnson, Linda Jones and Ken Rose were present to discuss the Sheriff's Department budget with the Board.

Finance Director Mark Pullium said he would like to extend his thanks to the Sheriff and his staff. He said they had quite a lengthy session reviewing their budget and remarked that it was very detailed. He said a few adjustments had been made. He said the only one issue he saw in this budget was the one contingent upon the compensation study. He said if this Board approved the contingency fund there would be funds available for the compensation study.

Ken Rose commented on category 5105. He said the guidelines set down by the Commissioners for low or no growth budget as far as manpower, the Sheriff's Department had certainly tried to adhere to that and honor that thought process. He said they certainly understood the reduction in 5105 for the promotional issues associated in there with the understanding that the Sheriff's Department would like to revisit those promotional issues in the next budget year once the market classification study was done. He said there might be some reclassification job issues.

Chairman Dunn interjected that when the market study was completed, the Board would be looking at every job.

Ken Rose remarked on the issue of where the Sheriff's Department turns detention officers into deputy sheriffs was just an every year kind of thing and a mandate was sent in to do that. He said he appreciated the Board dealing with that issue.

Chairman Dunn said the Sheriff's Department had increases in promotion money and training and that was not a problem at all.

Ken Rose stated that overall there were no issues of controversy except for one small category and he asked for clarification on it. He remarked this related to category 5617. He said during preliminary discussions with the Finance Department because of some different expenditures based a new program in there. He said he was looking at a potential ammo budget reduction of approximately \$3,887 which reflected the criminal investigations individual ammo request. He said there was a recommended reduction of almost \$36,000 in that category and the funding of approximately \$25,000 for new programs. He said the simple request was, while there may be some issues in there that the Sheriff's Department was willing to deal with, to ask for the Board's consideration in the basic ammo qualification

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 14

and training budget which reflected monthly open range for gun toting officers and quarterly training with qualifications with long guns and hand guns with duty ammo. He said this reflected more than the amount allotted under the base item in that category. He said the Sheriff's Department asked for reconsideration of that base amount. He said he understood that there was an issue of historical expenditures divided by 3. He said while there might be some increase in the base, he felt the base ammunition request was added in there and was a little more than had been allotted.

Mr. Pullium recalled that this was the area where he was unable to get the precise number that was needed. He said for whatever reason there had been one item that had been submitted more than once.

Ken Rose said he and Linda Jones had reviewed this. He said they thought they were going to see a reduction of the basic \$4,000 for one division's ammo request out of the departmental ammo request. He said under the base that was the entire department's request in one. He stated that C.I.D. made their separate request because of some different training issues regarding plain clothes and different holsters and weapons and things of that nature. He said it was his understanding that the base portion of that item would be reduced by the amount for C.I.D. He said the three year average was going to be a little different. He said in the past two years the department had made some strides in the buddy process of increasing training. He said three years ago that was a rather small category. He said there had been some sizeable gains in that category during the last two years enabling individuals to go to the range once a month for open range day and then quarterly for training. He felt the three year average artificially deflates that number somewhat.

Chairman Dunn asked if there had been a duplication.

Ken Rose replied yes and the amount was \$4,000.

Commissioner Wells said she had seen the request in more than just one explanations.

Ken Rose said there was something about where they were sending ten detention officers into deputy sheriffs for their academy school. He said there was some training associated with the assignment of weapons pre-school. He felt this was roughly an expenditure request maybe in 5694 or 5693.

Commissioner Wells said she had not marked this but when she was going through the budget she had noticed several requests that seemed to be repetitive for ammunition for different categories.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 15

Margaret Malone interjected that 5617 was \$31,226 and that figure was through last week.

Ken Rose said there was a tentative approval of a fairly good chunk of programs in 5617.

Chairman Dunn said in looking at the budget for last year it was \$57,780 for that line and this year it was \$98,000. He asked what would account for this increase.

Mrs. Malone remarked that it was her understanding that there was a \$15,000 bill pending that was not reflected here.

Ken Rose remarked that in 5617 Commissioner Wells had referenced a duplication of ammunition. He said there was a request under footnote 2013 for \$610 for training and qualification of detention officers to utilize some jail guns. He said this could be handled under the ammunition request. He recalled the decision was to include it as a new program because it was something that they were trying to incorporate new as having pool guns for some detention officers. He said it was a negligent amount but it could be handled within the existing budget but because it was a new program it was included. He said it did appear to be duplication but that was the thought process. He said the new program would need consideration by the Board. He said the ammunition portion of the request basically affected all of the 130 personnel in the department. He said a reduction of it of approximately 25% to 26% of the ability to purchase ammunition and train those personnel was what \$36,000 off the \$50,000 represented. He said this was basically what they were asking and that was to return the base portion of that to the \$56,770 of previous years.

Chairman Dunn said one of the things that he wanted to make sure of was that the Board was not cutting training ammunition from the Sheriff's Department.

Ken Rose said this category reflected the actual bullets, targets and training supplies that would be used during the training hours. He said fortunately two years ago they were able to, with the addition of more certified officers as instructors, incorporate bi-monthly training. He said he had not had to take a gun for non-qualification in eighteen months and this was not the case in February 1998. He said he attributed this to the fact that deputies were allowed to shoot on a more regular basis, more relative training and there were not officers who were problem qualifiers now. He said this had been a serious problem in February of 1998.

Commissioner Frady said there was a request for 75,000 rounds of Winchester 40 caliber for something and then there was 75,000 rounds of Winchester 40 caliber for practice. He said there was also a request for 10,000 rounds of Federal 12 gauge. He said on the next page there was a request for 10,000 rounds of Federal 308.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 16

Ken Rose remarked that there was some 9 millimeter and some 223 inclusive in there. He said those breakdowns were fairly simple. He said this was 50 rounds per gun toting officer per month to practice with and a 150 rounds a quarter to qualify with. He said this incorporated static training as well as some operational tactical style training. He said the department needed to provide the place to train and the method to train the officers. He stated that of the \$72,000 the ammunition incorporated \$48,000. He said there were some areas there that he could address for the Board.

Mark Pullium the figure of \$36,000 was derived based on previous historical spending pattern.

Chairman Dunn remarked that ammunition costs more plus the training requirements had increased.

Ken Rose remarked that traditionally up until 1998 the department qualified annually. He said a review of the fire arms at that point revealed officers who were deficit in their skills. He said he, Major Hannah and the Sheriff discussed what options in house could be done to raise the level for the department. He said the department qualifies quarterly and practices monthly. He said the bills for the fourth quarterly ammunition practice, qualifying and targets were outstanding.

Chairman Dunn remarked that Ken Rose had said that the department would be satisfied with going back to the old program of \$57,780 plus the new program of \$25,242. He said based on what he had heard, he would be happy with that.

Commissioner Wells questioned the figure for cleaning supplies. She asked if that figure had gone down any since part of the prisoners were being transferred or were the cleaning supplies still going to remain at that level.

Linda Jones replied that there was still a high level of prisoners plus the price of supplies had increased.

Commissioner Wells also questioned category number 5494 regarding seminars and dues. She said this was a tremendous increase for training that was yet to happen for employees who had not been hired yet.

Sheriff Johnson interjected that a lot of this amount was for training. He said the department was trying to get ready and could not do all of this at one time with the new jail and prisoners coming on. He said quite a few people were going to have to be hired with the opening of the new jail.

Commissioner Frady asked if next year would be alright for that. He said this would give the Sheriff two years.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 17

Commissioner Wells expressed concern with the training being relevant two years from now. She felt this was premature since it was two years out and it was hard to tell what the configurations would be.

Ken Rose remarked that the State Police Academy had reduced its capacity to conduct tactical training. He said there was a request in the budget from him to train SWAT team members in Tocoa at a Tocoa Police Department up there. He said they were the only State Police Department anymore who was doing relative ongoing from a base level of tactical training to the supervisory tactical training. He said it was basically no cost at the Forsythe facility.

Sheriff Johnson pointed out that a lot of the deputies needed to be sent out of State to get them trained.

Commissioner Frady asked Sheriff Johnson how far ahead he had to schedule people and Sheriff Johnson said this varied.

Commissioner Frady said he was not opposed to funding the training at a point when it was time to schedule it.

Ken Rose said he would voluntarily offer a reduction in the initial part of that. He said even if it was cut in half, it would be an increase over last year. He said the department could live with \$16,000.

Commissioner Wells questioned the increase in category 5492. She said this related to travel to seminars and training. She said it stated there was also a rise in extraditions in pursuing older warrant and fugitive investigations. She asked how stale these were and if the department was taking care of these because there was more time or what it something that was imperative for the safety and security of the community.

Ken Rose said there had been a rise in out of State extraditions this past year. He said part of the request reflected the anticipation of what the department knew was potentially pending in other States. He said there would be extraditions in Pennsylvania that he was aware of. He said some of these would be settled but some would not. He said they try to send the officers to get them because commercial service for that was exceptionally expensive. He remarked the department had done better at arresting and dealing with warrants as they come in daily. He said the department had some time now to assign leads to an officer and let him begin to pursue them. He said the two officers doing this had made some arrests. He these officers just got back from Gainesville. He said the lead was passed on down to Gainesville and Gainesville was able to make the arrest. He said this money was just in anticipation of those kinds of things.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 18

Commissioner Wells asked if this particular budget had been exceeded this year. She said she could appreciate the importance of this but she wanted to get accurate information. She said she could see raising this to \$10,000 in anticipation but to go to \$16,000 might be too much.

Chairman Dunn asked if anyone had a problem with \$10,000.

Commissioner VanLandingham questioned the fund used for buying drugs.

Ken Rose replied that he assumed Commissioner VanLandingham was referring to the funds used for the purchase of information and evidence. He said this category was 5440.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked about the confiscated money that comes out of the association that the county was a member of.

Ken Rose remarked the guidelines to deal with Federal confiscated monies was quite particular. He said this county had a history of committing some funds to the purchase of drugs and evidence and information for the drug squad. He stated that once the county funds for those particular expenses, then the Federal funds can then be used to augment that. He said they certainly could not be used to supplant it.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he was aware that there were a lot of restrictions on that money.

Chairman Dunn remarked on line 5494 and stated the Board had agreed to reduce it \$15,900; on line 5617 the Board had agreed to add \$21,388 and on line 5492 the Board agreed to subtract \$6,399. He said their base budget would move from \$9,015,038 to \$9,014,127.

Linda Jones remarked on account 5609 and under footnote 211 new program. She said this was a duplication and should be reduced by \$2,700.

Sheriff Johnson remarked that the insurance carrier was telling him that he was going to drop the Sheriff's Department's insurance if something was not done about the 75 prisoners on the floor. He said the insurance carrier also said that there were not enough employees for prisoners.

Chairman Dunn remarked if this was done, the Board could handle this in a supplemental budget.

Sheriff Johnson said he just wanted to bring this to the Board's attention.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 19

Commissioner Frady said if the insurance carrier has made that remark then maybe the Board needed to discuss this with him.

Mr. Pullium remarked that one of the underwriters that was part of the insurance process that the county was going through come and examine everything. He said the county had made some improvements in the facility over the last year and some of the inmates were being outsourced to Union City. He said the agent had not gone so far as to say that they were at the point of pulling the coverage at this point in time but there were some things that the county needed to remediate.

Chairman Dunn remarked if the Sheriff's Department needed to change insurers or anything of that nature it could be done in a supplemental budget.

Chairman Dunn clarified that the total base budget for the Sheriff's Department would be \$9,011,427 and adding in the new programs it would be \$10,146,658.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham to approve the Sheriff's Department budget as presented. The motion carried 4-0.

Chairman Dunn remarked that the biggest addition to the Sheriff's budget was \$870,000 to take care of Union City and this had nothing to do with the Sheriff's Department. He said if that figure increased then it would be handled another way and not through the Sheriff's budget. He remarked that he appreciated the Sheriff working with the Board on the moratorium on new positions. He said the Board was aware that the Sheriff would have a big M & O bill when the courthouse opens. He said the Sheriff would need more personnel and more training money.

Sheriff Johnson said he appreciated everything the Board had done. He asked the Board to keep in mind the status on the adjoining counties and their starting pay. He said his department was even behind the City of Fayetteville Police Department. He said this needed to be reviewed. He said Henry County had really jumped out and he had an employee who was looking at Henry County.

Commissioner Frady remarked that the pay study should be completed in September.

Chairman Dunn remarked that one of the suggestions being made in this budget was to put aside money to implement the study. He said the money would be available to comply with the study. He said Fayette County should certainly keep fire, ems and sheriff's office competitive with surrounding counties in the area.

Ken Rose said he and Linda Jones would like to extend their appreciation to Mark Pullium and his staff for working with them on the budget. He said it had been very easy to work with Mark and his staff.

DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT AND EDUCATION - 219

Ken Rose remarked that Mark Pullium had sent a recommended expenditure and a recommended revenue fund on this budget category. He said he understood that the entire date fund which the Sheriff's Department was a small portion of the date budget was \$48,144 for this year. He said the revenue reflected a base of \$43,000 and an appropriation of \$5,144. He asked if this was the amount left over from last year.

Mr. Pullium responded yes.

Ken Rose said the Sheriff greatly appreciated the ability to fund drug abuse education through the D.A.R.E. program. He said they were able to reach approximately 3,000 children in the fifth and seventh grade and it has made a tremendous difference in the Sheriff's Department's ability to conduct drug education.

Chairman Dunn said there was a school resource officer in every school now and the Board of Education was paying half of that.

Ken Rose stated that this was the school resource program and not a drug education. He said he was speaking of the D.A.R.E. program. He said there were two officers assigned for drug education in the middle schools and some of the seventh grade except for Peachtree City. He said Peachtree City handled their own issues.

On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Commissioner Wells to approve Department 219 as presented. The motion carried 4-0.

STATE PROPERTY SEIZURE FUND - 213

Chairman Dunn asked why were there only two footnotes in this item.

Margaret Malone interjected that was all that had been submitted.

Chairman Dunn said he was just wondering why the Board did not receive any explanation on this budget.

Chairman Dunn asked who had prepared this budget and Linda Jones replied that it was Major Jordan's staff.

Mrs. Malone remarked that the county used to not budget the Federal and State confiscated funds and then the budget law changed in 1998 and required the county in 1999 to approve this in the budget.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve Department 213 as presented. The motion carried 4-0.

FEDERAL PROPERTY SEIZURE - 291

Commissioner Wells remarked that there were only two lines as far as an explanation. She remarked that in line item 5616 there was a request for other supplies. She said this jumped from \$950 to \$5,000 and she questioned the reason for that. She also questioned item 5618 regarding uniforms and supplies that jumped from \$2,500 to \$7,000. She said she did not understand why the uniforms and supplies would rise so tremendously. She said she had some serious questions regarding these increases and would like to have more information.

Ken Rose remarked on the full time patrol deputies who volunteer for assignment to the canine tracking team. He said the tracking team was funded from drug seizures for salaries, overtime, vehicles that exist and so forth. He said they do not do their tracking work out in the woods with this. He said it had been the practice to fund new utility style uniforms out of that budget as well as some enhanced self-protection gear. He said they had a turn over of three officers during the past year. He said he assumed that this increase was associated with purchasing the new officers' uniforms and the items associated with that.

Commissioner Wells asked how many people were on this team.

Ken Rose replied that Captain Meyer heads up the team and then there were four or five officers, three of which replaced other people during the past year.

Commissioner Wells said she had a problem with the \$5,000 in account 5616 without further explanation. She said further it was account 291.

Chairman Dunn asked that a one page summary be done for the Board right away and this would be handled off-line tomorrow.

Ken Rose said he was sorry he appeared uninformed but these funds were used primarily used to operate undercover drug operations and this was generally not his realm.

Commissioner Wells said she would have a better comfort level if she had an understanding.

Chairman Dunn said if he could have the summary page by tomorrow and there was no need for anybody to be here for that.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 22

Chairman Dunn said he had no problem with the Sheriff's capital budget of \$37,975. Commissioner Frady asked if this money was for the CIP program and it was.

Ken Rose said these funds were for a transport vehicle for the court. He further explained that the courts were having to deal with more people than they can fit in the patrol cars.

The Board members discussed a motion previously made instituting the CIP Program with the method set forth.

Chairman Dunn remarked that they had a difference of opinion there. He said he thought we were creating a CIP and not approving every expenditure. He asked if the members wanted to readdress this.

Commissioner VanLandingham said what we did was institute the CIP program, and not fund it.

Commissioner Frady said when something was implemented it was put in place.

Chairman Dunn commented he felt the Board was still in a position to take something out of there since this was a recommended CIP from the Finance Director.

Commissioner Frady felt if the Board approved to implement it then this meant it was approved.

Chairman Dunn clarified that it was the understanding of this Board that everything in the CIP was approved and as things proceed, if there was any objection to anything it could be pulled out. He said the Board could also add something to the CIP if it was felt appropriate.

PUBLIC WORKS - 144

Chairman Dunn pointed out that this budget had \$159,634 and another \$11,000 in the CIP for a total of \$170,634. He said Mr. Hearn had requested \$175,000.

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

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve department 144 as presented. The motion carried 4-0.

ROADS- 142

Commissioner Frady asked how much money the county would be getting from the State this year.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 23

Public Works Director Lee Hearn remarked that he had heard the LARP program was going to be trimmed significantly from what it was last year.

Chris Cofty said he would like to compliment both Lee Hearn and Zac Taylor on putting this budget together. He felt they had shown a significant involvement in trying to increase the number of roads that need to be resurfaced in the county. He said the citizens could anticipate seeing an increase of 27 miles to approximately 45 miles. He said Lee and Zac had worked hard on improving that commitment. He said initially Lee and Zac instituted programs and that enabled the county to cut the right-of-ways in the county three times a year now and before this was being done only once a year. He said he was very encouraged.

Mr. Hearn called the Board's attention to item 5456 regarding utility relocation. He said there were some funds in there for utility relocation at McDonough Road and County Line and there was also miscellaneous utility relocations at turn lanes and bridge improvements. He said since the budget had been submitted there had been two intersections that had come to mind that some work really needed to be done on. He said one was McElroy Road and S.R. 54 and the second one was Huiett Road at S.R. 54. He said Huiett Road at S.R. 54 was going to have the school traffic pouring out onto S.R. 54 and he was looking at putting a traffic signal there. He said he already had approval to put a turn lane and traffic signal at McElroy Road and S.R. 54.

Chairman Dunn remarked that Huiett Road also had the Post Office Distribution Center on the corner.

Mr. Hearn said the Board of Education had spoken to him about a light there.

Chairman Dunn asked if the Board of Education would help fund the light.

Mr. Hearn replied that he did not feel that they would.

Commissioner Frady asked how far down the road it would be before this impacted the county. He recalled that a smaller school was going to be built first.

Mr. Hearn responded that the one thing that he did not want to happen was what had happened at Redwine Road and S.R. 74. He said he wanted the intersection to be improved and turn lanes in place in advance of the school opening. He said that was the way it should be done. He said along those same lines, improvements at Goza Road and S.R. 85 were also being planned because of a new school that was going to go in there near the Kiwanis Fair grounds. He said he would need more than \$100,000 in utility relocation if he was going to make these intersection improvements at these intersections.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 24

Chairman Dunn asked Mr. Hearn if he anticipated getting this done during the next fiscal year.

Mr. Hearn responded that he would anticipate getting a portion of it done. He said if he had \$50,000 or \$60,000 for this purpose it would be better than having absolutely nothing.

Commissioner Wells clarified that this was item 5456 and Mr. Hearn replied yes.

Commissioner Wells remarked that \$15,000 was being recommended.

Chairman Dunn interjected that 5456 also had \$100,000 in the CIP.

Commissioner Frady asked Mr. Hearn if he felt the county should change its priorities or get more money.

Mr. Hearn responded that he would need more money. He said if he did McElroy Road and McDonough Road intersection improvements that would be two projects. He said whether or not he got to do Goza Road at S.R. 85 and Huiett Road and S.R. 54 was uncertain. He said if he could get the utilities moved then he would be a step ahead of where the county was down at Redwine and S.R. 74.

Chairman Dunn said he agreed with Mr. Hearn about getting these improvements done before the school was opened.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked if it was known which school would be opened first. He said if the Board knew that it would help with the planning.

Mr. Hearn remarked that it was his understanding that the elementary school on Huiett Road and Lester Road would be built first.

Chairman Dunn remarked that would be the first school to be built at that location but was it going to be the first school that would be built in the county.

Mr. Hearn replied yes. He said the proposed high school located on Goza Road near the fairgrounds was three years away from being constructed.

Mr. Hearn remarked that the elementary school on Huiett Road was scheduled for opening in September, 2002. He said he would like to have some stacking for the buses so that if there was one vehicle turning left it would not back everything else up. He felt this intersection would be much like the intersection at Redwine Road and S.R. 74.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 25

Commissioner Frady felt this could go in next year's budget. He said if this was given priority right now, Mr. Hearn could not do it anyway and said it would have to be done next year.

Mr. Hearn interjected that he needed to get the process started and get the design work done.

Commissioner Frady said he did not mind going ahead and giving Mr. Hearn the design money.

Mr. Hearn remarked that money was already plugged in.

Commissioner Wells suggested it be done that way and an adjustment could be made later if Mr. Hearn needed it.

Mr. Hearn said he just did not want to be caught in the same situation that had occurred at Redwine Road and S. R. 74 and Commissioner Frady agreed with him.

Chairman Dunn question item 5671 in the CIP regarding County Line Road and McDonough Road. He said there was \$367,000 listed for that and that was the one where Mr. Hearn had said the estimate was \$800,000.

Mr. Hearn stated that based on the options that he had outlined that were available to subcontract out the county forces actually taking on the project. He felt Mark Pullium had plugged in the money for the county crews to construct that project.

Mr. Pullium replied the figures that he recalled were \$529,000 for total cost if the county took on the project. He said it would include approximately \$200,000 as it stood today that the State would pay. He said the net cost would be approximately \$329,000.

Chairman Dunn said he wanted to know the cost of the project. He said this had not been determined yet. He felt the estimate was \$800,000.

Mr. Hearn interjected that this figure related to the county subcontracting the entire project out. He said he actually had two options. He said one option was that if the county subcontracted the entire project out and the second option was if the county handled the project with its own inhouse forces.

Mr. Cofty interjected that if the county handled this project then services would be lacking somewhere else.

Chairman Dunn remarked if the county did the project by itself the cost would be \$567,000 and if the project was contracted out it would cost \$800,000. He said the State felt this

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 26

project would cost \$270,000. He said the State was going to offer the county \$200,000. He clarified that Mr. Hearn was asking the Board to approve \$167,000 to improve an intersection of a State road where in the past the State would fund the entire project. He said this concerned him a little bit. He remarked that the numbers did not feel real strong to him and whether it would be \$800,000, \$500,000 or \$270,000. He felt this was a large differential. He said the other question had to be if the county wanted to spend that much money to change the intersection of a State road when the State had committed to doing the entire project themselves and now was withdrawing some funding.

Commissioner Frady said this was the reason he had personally insisted that a meeting be held with the D.O.T. He felt nothing would get done until this happened. He said everyone had been talking about this for a long time and he questioned if an appointment had been made with D.O.T. yet. He felt this meeting was essential.

Chairman Dunn said it was his assumption that Mr. Hearn was working up the figures with the D.O.T. officials.

Mr. Hearn responded that it had taken a little time for their staff to get together. He said they wanted to make sure that the scope of the project had not changed. He said he had been calling Mr. Bishop the State Aid Coordinator.

Commissioner Frady said it had been his experience downtown that if an appointment was made with the State, they would have the information ready at the appointment. He said the county had enough information to go downtown and speak with representatives at the D.O.T. He felt this project would not proceed until a meeting was held.

Chairman Dunn said the State remarked that it would not give the county the \$200,000 unless the county produced the \$70,000. He said the question was whether the county wanted to give them the \$70,000 to start the project. He said the other issue was Mr. Hearn wanting the Board to commit in this budget to laying out \$167,000 to improve a State intersection.

Commissioner Frady asked Mr. Hearn what he planned on doing with that money.

Mr. Hearn replied there three things that he wanted to do there. He said one was he wanted to lower the hill down by approximately five to six feet to improve the site distance from where you would come out on County Line Road. He said secondly, he wanted to put a traffic signal out there in order to improve the safety as well as the capacity of the intersection. He said thirdly, he wanted to realign McElroy Road with County Line Road

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 27

Commissioner Frady interjected that the State would not pay for decel lanes and they may not pay for realignment of that road. He felt cutting the road down was the State's responsibility.

Chairman Dunn asked why the hill needed to be cut down if a traffic signal was going to be installed.

Mr. Hearn responded if this intersection was going to be improved, he felt it needed to be done properly. He said he did not want to have a vehicle coming up on an intersection and not be able to see the vehicle that had already stopped at the stop light. He said there were some design considerations there with the designed speeds at the intersection that would have to be done properly.

Commissioner Frady felt taking the road down would take a lot of money. He felt there were flashing signs that would indicate when the light was red. He said these signs were everywhere and in order to get the project done this might be a solution.

Mr. Hearn said a complete detour would have to be built in order to do that. He said the plan was to not only take the hill down but provide a left turn lane and make a lot of functional improvements at that intersection.

Commissioner Frady said he understood that but he felt common sense would tell you that if this could not be done any time soon it would be better for the county to proceed to do what it could with other issues.

Mr. Hearn replied that G.D.O.T. was very supportive of the county in its approach to this project. He said the county had hired an engineer to come in and make recommendations. He said he had taken this plan to G.D.O.T. saying that this would make this intersection a much safer, more functional and efficient intersection. He said G.D.O.T. was very much in favor of this. He said he had never hit one stumbling block in this entire process. He said the county was going to provide the right-of-way and the design and the State would let the project.

Chairman Dunn said there had not been a problem until the county received the D.O.T.'s letter a couple of months ago.

Commissioner Frady asked when D.O.T. had first said that they were going to let the project.

Mr. Hearn replied this project had been ongoing for a better part of three years.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 28

Commissioner Frady asked when D.O.T. had told Mr. Hearn that they would go along with the project.

Mr. Hearn replied last Fall the State had said they expected to let the project this Summer. He said this meant that construction would start this Summer.

Commissioner Frady interjected that was when Wayne Shackelford was there and the new guy had nothing to do with Wayne Shackelford. He said the new guy was not responsible for what Mr. Shackelford had said.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he felt the county already had an investment started.

Chairman Dunn said the road would have to be realigned. He said he did not have a problem with approving the CIP the way it was with the understanding that the county would still be negotiating with the State on who would be paying for this.

Commissioner Frady said if it would take a motion he would make one to instruct Mr. Hearn and others to go downtown to the D.O.T. to meet with the officials there.

Mr. Cofty said Mr. Hearn had spoken with the second and third person in charge at D.O.T. and they recommended that the county give them enough time to review the project so that they could brief Mr. Coleman on the project prior to the county representatives meeting with them.

Commissioner Frady said he did not mind all of that if the county received some kind of commitment for this project. He said this project had been discussed for the last three years. He said if Mr. Hearn would make an appointment with Mr. Coleman at the D.O.T. he would have all of the information ready when Lee got there.

Chairman Dunn asked what the Board wanted to do on this item. He asked if the Board wanted to just leave this in the CIP with the understanding that the county was still going to try and get the State to pay this bill.

Chairman Dunn said he had another question. He said the county had deferred \$79,000 worth of nine projects. He felt these were relatively minor items and he asked what the reason was to defer these or was there a lack of cash.

Mr. Hearn said the one item that he was going to ask for was item number eight which was the truck mounted sand spreader for \$11,000. He said this would slide into one of the existing dump trucks.

Chairman Dunn asked if anyone had any problem in adding the \$11,000. He said this could cut the service time in half during the winter.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 29

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Wells to add \$11,000 into the CIP for a truck mounted sand spreader. The motion carried 4-0.

Mr. Hearn said he also wanted to discuss item 5680 in the CIP which was a \$120,000. He said the stop and go signal to be installed at McElroy Road and S.R. 54 had already been approved. He said he had typically put in two to three signals each year. He said if he had a signal going in at McDonough Road and County Line Road and one at McElroy and S.R. 54 then there could be one more that could be Huiett Road and S.R. 54 or Corinth at S.R. 54. He said there was \$80,000 included in there recommended by the Finance Director. He asked if the \$80,000 was for McDonough Road and County Line Road and then McElroy Road and Redwine Road would be deferred. He said he would need funds for McElroy Road available. He said typically the county's portion of signals on State routes are \$40,000 and the State would provide the electrical equipment.

Chairman Dunn asked if the recommendation was for \$120,000 for next year or \$120,000 for the next several years.

Mr. Cofty said that was for next year.

Chairman Dunn asked what needed to be done this year.

Mr. Hearn replied that McElroy Road and S.R. 54 needed to be done and McDonough Road and County Line Road also needed to be done.

Chairman Dunn asked for clarification on the recommendation. He said it looked to him like Mr. Hearn was saying to do one of the three projects this year and then defer the other two projects.

Mr. Hearn felt the \$80,000 would be fine for what he wanted to do. He said he wanted to do McDonough Road, County Line Road and McElroy and S.R. 54.

Mr. Pullium remarked that \$120,000 was what had been requested. He said the \$80,000 would be for McDonough Road and County Line Road which was the first project and McElroy Road and S.R. 54 was the second project. He said the third project would be for Peachtree Parkway and Redwine Road.

Mr. Hearn said he was not sure if there was any justification for the Peachtree Parkway and Redwine Road project.

Chairman Dunn clarified that \$40,000 would be deferred. He said the figure for item 5680 was now \$80,000 and \$40,000 deferred. He felt like the third project would be funded next year.

Commissioner Wells questioned item 5671. She said she did not have a problem with the number or anything of that nature but she would like to see those listed out. She said she liked item 5311 and how each item was listed and how much money had been allocated. She said she would like to see a definitive list as to which roads would be done.

Mr. Cofty said he had that list and was in the process of refining it.

Commissioner Wells said she would like to see a definitive check list on the 45 miles.

Chairman Dunn suggested the Board get a quarterly update on what had been done.

Commissioner Wells asked a question about item 5710 regarding land. She said there was no explanation for that item.

Mr. Pullium interjected that this was a clerical error.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve budget 142 as adjusted with the CIP and as discussed, discussion followed.

Chairman Dunn said the only total amount for old and new programs was \$4,699,731 plus \$991,000 for the CIP.

The motion carried 4-0

FLEET MAINTENANCE - 146

Mark Pullium remarked that this was what the department had requested and he had not found any reason to make any changes to their request.

Mr. Hearn said some of the improvements had been completed at the Fleet Maintenance Department. He said the new canopy and the fuel island work had been done. He said this was a significant amount of money and not something that needed to be done every year.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Wells to approve budget 146 as presented. The motion carried 4-0.

BUILDING AND GROUND MAINTENANCE - 145

Chairman Dunn remarked that there was \$76,660 in the CIP.

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 31

Commissioner Wells questioned item 5452 regarding heating and cooling services and the explanation on page 10. She said it talked about replacing systems at the old courthouse, the annex and the jail.

Commissioner Wells expressed concern about putting money into something that would not be used. She felt like it would be more economically wise to keep these units going along instead of replacing them

Mr. Cofty said he had discussed this with Jim George the Director of Maintenance. He felt it prudent to leave this funding in the budget in the event it needed to be replaced since people would be working in that facility. He said obviously if it could repaired in lieu of replacement that would be done. He said the units were extremely old and it had been his experience where the replacement was cheaper than the repair.

Commissioner Wells said it stated that they planned to replace two to four units. She said she did not want anything to be planned for replacement but something that was done if it was absolutely necessary.

Mr. Cofty assured the Board that was the way that it would be handled and it would come before the Board for approval.

Mr. Hearn interjected that historically two units have been replaced each year.

Commissioner Wells asked Mark Pullium to note if a request comes through for replacement of a unit that the Board would like to review it first.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham to approve budget 145 and the CIP of \$76,660 as presented. The motion carried 4-0.

WATER SYSTEM - 510

Water System Director Tony Parrott remarked that there was a difference in the salary figure from what he had provided and what went on the final draft. After a brief discussion, he agreed \$2,182,323 listed would be fine.

Chairman Dunn questioned training going from \$9,500 to \$19,000.

Mr. Parrott replied that this was for the eight additional operators at the South Fayette Water Plant. He also remarked that starting June 30th of the new cycle each operator must have a two year training program. He said he tried to get most of this training up front in the first year instead of waiting until the second year.

On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Commissioner Frady to adopt the Water System's budget 510 as presented. The motion carried 4-0.

LIBRARY - 161

Chairman Dunn asked the Director of the Library Chris Snell if she had any problems with her proposed budget and she replied that she had no problems.

Commissioner Wells questioned the request for postage supplies had increased significantly. She said the explanation was that it was the result of over due notices. She asked if this had become a problem.

Mrs. Snell responded no, that this was not a problem. She said the library was now in the State wide library system and there were over 130 libraries in the PINE system. She said the libraries borrow materials from one another. She said this balances itself out and noted that they do not have to pay for overdue notices. She said they pay for sending out books and borrowing books.

Chairman Dunn questioned item 5435 regarding building maintenance. He asked how the maintenance had gone down \$30,000.

Mrs. Snell said she had a new cleaning crew for the library and they charged less. She said this crew had done a wonderful job. She said this new crew had started in April or May.

Commissioner VanLandingham questioned the amount requested in the operational account and the recommended amount not being far off from the requested.

Mrs. Snell felt the Board of Commissioners sees the necessity of what libraries are all about. She said the Board cared about the institution and culture of people in libraries.

On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve budget 161 for the Library as presented. The motion carried 4-0.

LIBRARY SPLOST FUND - 610

Chairman Dunn remarked that \$300,000 would go toward the purchase of new books.

Mrs. Snell replied that this process had already begun. She said she was also purchasing books on tape.

Chairman Dunn asked Mrs. Snell to explain the payment to the municipalities.

Margaret Malone replied that this was part of the original SPLOST. She said when the county continued to get some money in, it was required to reimburse some of that money to the municipalities. She said this was part of the original SPLOST from 1992.

On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Commissioner Wells to approve the Library SPLOST Fund 610 as presented. The motion carried 4-0.

ELECTIONS OFFICE - 116

Mark Pullium remarked that the request from this requirement was \$229,217 and recommended budget was \$228,018. He said there were two cuts and these were related to a prior three year expenditure patterns. He said these were line items 5467 and 5623.

Chairman Dunn asked Carolyn Combs and Marilyn Watts if they were satisfied with this budget.

Marilyn Watts remarked that she had attended the elected officials conference in Savannah. She said they had reviewed all of the new legislation. She said she had written Mr. Cofty a letter regarding this. She said the new House Bill 302 increased the compensation for the Registrars this year. She said this had not been requested in the budget and she asked for the Board's consideration in making the office in compliance with the State Election Code.

Commissioner Wells remarked that this would be effective January, 2002.

Chairman Dunn said the extra money would have to be budgeted now and Commissioner Wells agreed.

Chairman Dunn said there was several questions here. He asked Ms. Watts if she was the Registrar or are all three of the members of the election board registrars. He said the law stated the "Registrar" would get paid either a per diem or a monthly salary. He said a monthly salary for Fayette County's population would be \$272. He said the question was if Marilyn Watts was a Registrar. He said he had not gotten a good answer to that because Fayette County did not have a Registrar. He said the county put in a board. He said the other issue was if there was a one person Registrar and the law stated that this Registrar would be paid \$272, and Fayette County had three people in that role. He said the question was should all of these individuals be paid \$272 and divide it up. He said the county already paid more than that and remarked the county pays \$100 each. He said if it was determined that all three were Registrars, then he questioned if the county would

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 34

pay each one \$272. He said he was getting several different answers from the County Attorney on this issue.

Ms. Watts said that last year Mrs. Combs had done a survey of other counties and submitted that with her budget. She said she had spoken to several different individuals that she had met at the different conferences. She said the Secretary of State's Office's position was that all three individuals were Chief Registrars. She said this was a combined board and not just voter registration but elections as well. She stated that some counties have separate boards.

Chairman Dunn said the county also had a full time staff who did some of the responsibilities of the Registrar. He said this made this a confusing issue for the Board right now.

Commissioner Wells said she could not understand how all three individuals would be Chief Registrar. She said the Chief would usually delineate a one person versus everyone on the board. She said it was very clear in saying that the Chief Registrar and other board members. She said she would have to disagree with someone who said that everybody was considered a Chief Registrar.

Marilyn Watts said that was the Secretary of State's Office making that determination.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked who the Chief Registrar would be and Chairman Dunn said that would be the question.

Chairman Dunn remarked that Marilyn was the Chairman of the Board right now so if there was to be a Chief Registrar it would be her.

Ms. Watts interjected and stated that Steve Kiser was the Chairman of the board. She said it also provided to deputy registrars. She said according to Linda Beasley at the Secretary of State Office all three individuals would be Chief Registrars.

Chairman Dunn said the Board would need to review this further. He said he would need to get with the County Attorney and discuss this further. He felt the Board could proceed in approving the budget but if the board decided that this law applied to them, it would not go into effect until January 1, 2002.

Ms. Watts said the \$272 would actually be an increase in the current election code which was now \$242.

Chairman Dunn said the wording was what was really confusing. He said the Board has had trouble in determining what the board of registrars actually were. He said the attorney was telling him now that the Commission could go either way it wanted to and there was

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 35

nothing that anyone could do about it. He said he wanted to do what the intent of law was on this. He said he did not feel like there should be three registrars. He felt there should be just one Registrar. He said he was prepared to approve this budget without a problem and then address this issue off line in the next six months.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve the Elections Office budget 116 as presented. The motion carried 4-0.

Chairman Dunn said if it was determined that the Commission would have to pay for this then a supplemental pay adjustment could be made starting in January, 2002.

Ms. Watts clarified the adjustment would have to be at the new rate. She said there was a rate that was already in place. She said they just wanted to be in conformity with the code and they weren't right now. She said Carolyn Combs had submitted the survey showing what all of the other counties were doing.

Commissioner Frady questioned the number of counties in the survey.

Mrs. Combs replied that the survey involved all of the metro counties.

Commissioner Frady asked if all of the counties made the same thing.

Mrs. Combs replied no, that the salary varied from county to county.

Chairman Dunn said before last year the county had paid \$9.04 per hour and now it was paying \$100 per month. He said the county was somewhere in the middle.

Ms. Watts remarked that the median was approximately \$220. She said most of them had at least that. She said some paid a flat rate and then so much per meeting. She said a lot of the counties just went by the code which was \$240 or \$250.

Chairman Dunn said the Board would get back with them on the Registrar/Board members.

Ms. Watts reminded the Board that the Elections Board was a combined board. She said they had two jobs and not just registration.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Dunn adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk

Gregory M. Dunn, Chairman

June 12, 2001
Budget Meeting
Page 36

The foregoing minutes were duly approved at an official meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia, held on the 26th day of July, 2001.

Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk