

## BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Charles W. Oddo, Chairman  
Randy Ognio, Vice Chair  
David Barlow  
Steve Brown  
Charles D. Rousseau



## FAYETTE COUNTY, GEORGIA

Steve Rapson, County Administrator  
Dennis A. Davenport, County Attorney  
Floyd L. Jones, County Clerk  
Tameca P. White, Chief Deputy County Clerk

140 Stonewall Avenue West  
Public Meeting Room  
Fayetteville, GA 30214

# MINUTES

## Special Called Meeting

June 30, 2016  
7:00 p.m.

---

### Call to Order

Chairman Oddo called the June 30, 2016 Board of Commissioners' Special Called Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

### Acceptance of Agenda

Commissioner Brown moved to approve the Agenda. Commissioner Ognio seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

### PUBLIC HEARING:

1. **Public Hearing on Fayette County's recommended annual budget for Fiscal Year 2017 which begins on July 1, 2016 and ends June 30, 2017, and adoption of Resolution 2016-08 establishing the annual operating, capital, and CIP budgets for Fiscal Year 2017.**

Assistant Chief Financial Officer Sheryl Weinmann gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on the Fiscal Year 2017 budget. County Administrator Steve Rapson stated that Resolution 2016-08 was prepared to officially adopt the Fiscal Year 2017 budget.

No member of the public spoke in favor of or in opposition to the proposed budget.

Commissioner Rousseau moved to adopt Resolution 2016-08 for Fiscal Year 2017 beginning July 1, 2016 and ending June 30, 2017, with said resolution establishing the annual operating, capital and CIP budgets for the next fiscal year. Commissioner Barlow seconded the motion.

---

*Verbatim Transcript of the Meeting begins at the 7:08:11 timestamp of the audio recording.*

**Chairman Charles Oddo:** Any discussion?

**Commissioner Steve Brown:** If I could, I just wrote something down today so I will be very brief with it and then we can go on.

**[Commissioner Brown read his comments from a prepared paper. The written comments are:]**

The Board of Commissioners had a vote that said no to a cost of living raise in FY 2016, offering instead a one-time 2% bonus, but no cost of living increase. It was discussed at that time that the need for the increase was not reflected in governmental statistical data, evaluating from 2013 forward. Those meeting minutes are worth reading.

The cost of living increase was brought back and placed on another agenda. This time, the same cost of living increase proposal moved forward on a 3-2 vote. This was in addition to the 2% one-time bonus.

Later, the Board's retreat was the weakest I have ever attended, and the overwhelming majority of departments were not included. The retreat, along with some previous policy and procedure disputes, gives the appearance that administrative staff wants to create a wall between the commissioners and the concerns of the departments.

At the retreat, the Board was told that revenue projections were incorrect, adding to the reductions in the title ad valorem tax, which is called the TAVT, from the state, but the cost of living increase remained unchanged. Staff should have given this information publicly to the Board prior to the vote approving the cost of living increase.

We are showing a tax increase in all of our taxing districts, but there is no increase proposed to cover the permanent pay increases in the general fund.

I agree with a point Commissioner Rousseau made in a previous meeting. We should accommodate unexpected changes by prohibiting departments from spending all their allocations, holding back on permission to hire new staff or make other contractual commitments if indicators give reason for concern.

My personal desire has always been for revenue to equal expenditures.

I believe we should review our strategy on fund balance and that we need to increase our focus on measuring performance to determine what has been accomplished with scarce government resources and then budget accordingly.

The Water System Director's nothing less than extraordinary turnaround of the water system, clearly measurable on performance, should be recognized and rewarded in some sort of pay increase. He is one of the least paid directors in metro Atlanta.

When I requested a proposal for compensation for that exceptional performance, an administrative comparison was made of the Water System Director salary versus other department heads. This "apples and oranges" comparison is unacceptable with no connection in logic and was never applied when calculating compensation for other department heads in the past.

Our budgeting should have a long-range perspective, but I feel as though this preparation reflects a "one year at a time" approach. The greatest downfall of elected officials is the failure to consider the long-term consequences of their actions and to insure the impacts of their budget decisions are understood over a multi-year planning span.

We need to assess whether program and service levels can be sustained, along with the pay and benefit increases, without increasing taxes. I do not believe it can be sustained without future tax increases the way we are heading.

Here is a warning which I hope we heed. Forces are now aligned to considerably increase population and traffic in and through our county. Some will attempt to induce the philosophy that those increases will bring economic prosperity. In reality, the increases will bring more government expense, higher taxes and a dilution of our quality of life.

If increased population and automotive traffic were the engines of prosperity, we would all be flocking to Gwinnett County.

The state is receiving \$900 million in road funds annually from the HB 150 gas and hotel sales tax. Leadership is not fighting for our share; thus, we have to scrape it out of our general fund which will mean increased taxes later on.

I disagree with the budget fundamentals herein and I will not support the proposal.

**[End of Commissioner Brown's written and read comments.]**

---

**Oddo:** Any other comments?

**Brown:** If I may too, just to add, I'm sorry, I did put on the dais, just for the record if any wants a copy of it, a *Citizen Letter* to the Editor from Mr. Paul Lentz, as some of you may recall, who was one of the largest critics of the Water System in 2013 when we were having the severe problems and knowledgeable about water. And he gave the new director and the system, as is, a glowing review from where it was in 2013. I just put that on the dais.

**Oddo:** Any other comments?

**Commissioner Charles Rousseau:** Yeah, I had a couple of things. My colleague raised some particular issues. I want to be clear, I guess, on these issues. There's a number of them. One being, I don't see a pay and class study that has been proposed. And you saying, you mentioned, on one occasion one particular department head that may be out of whack, I'll use that term. Or I think you did. Is there, has there been any discussion with respect to pay and class for all of our people so that we are being fair to them and evaluating the duties that they perform on a daily basis, and that it is in line with their classification. I know sometimes these lead all over the place so I want to be real targeted and specific. I would like to see where the discussion might go with respect to pay and class study. Is that one element of what you're describing Commissioner Brown? Is that an element?

**Brown:** Well, yeah, I was not looking for anything across the board at this point. But I was just pointing to the fact that in one particular instance where I did make a request on this specific instance where we had an extraordinary set of circumstances. I mean, to put it into context, most of the people that I knew in Peachtree City were buying bottled water and drinking water out of a bottle and out of a jug. And they were washing their car and their clothes with our water but they weren't drinking our water. And now, we have won several awards and we've brought the system up to where even the critics, the biggest critics we had, are now praising the performance of the system. I thought that was worthy of something and I thought, in addition, looking at some of the other counties and what they are paying, and I'm talking about counties of reasonable size comparison wise: Henry, Douglas, Cherokee. I thought it was a reasonable thing to do to look at some sort of increase.

**Rousseau:** I just want to take an element of that, and Mr. Administrator, if you could share some insight, if you've evaluated that, if you've looked at that. And I would like to advance it with my colleagues if you are open to consideration. I don't know what the cost would be. I am sure we would have to bid it out and all that kind of stuff.

**County Administrator Steve Rapson:** I think over the last four years pay and class has come up at least two of those years. It did not come up this year, but it came up the year before you actually were put on the board. The first year was the same year that Peachtree City happened to be doing a pay and class study. Their pay and class study was radically different than what we as a staff were proposing. We were proposing a pay and class study to validate classifications and ranges of that classification, whether it is a min-and-max classification as opposed to trying to fix what I call righting pay parity-type issues where there's compression within different classifications within a department. So, based on that, we had estimated the cost to be somewhere between \$100,000 and \$125,000 to review all the classifications with the county. At the time, we had some issues with the water and at that point we did a classification study on the water department, but only a section of the water department, which is the operational section. We have also, since I've been here, done a

classification study for the 911 department. We have not done one for everyone. The reason we think its not that huge of an impact is because there are lots of pay parity type issues but we do not think there are a lot of positions that are misclassified. Since I've been here in the last four years, we have taken some departments and we've certainly given them a lot more responsibilities than what they've had in the past. IT Department is a good example of that. Purchasing Department is a good example of that. And with those positions, based on the job duties they are doing today, because we went from a, and I know you have some Purchasing background which is why I am focusing on that, we went from a very decentralized Purchasing organization to a very centralized Purchasing organization. At the same time, we changed our policies and now we are focusing on the 20% of those contracts that are material contracts, so now they are getting involved in a lot of procurements that they didn't get involved in before, which drives the volumes which also drives the responsibility. So we would, I would assure you that our Purchasing, well, our Personnel Director thinks we are warranted and due for a pay and classification study. We've always done that through UGA for the consistency sake. They are the ones that have looked at everything we have ever done. They created the original system and any modification we've had to any positions would funnel through them. The Water Director, which is one of the positions that Commissioner Brown mentioned, is one of those positions that we do think is probably okay in regards to how its classification would be, but there are positions in other departments that probably would change. And so, you have to look at the entire organization to be able to determine whether that is warranted or not.

**Rousseau:** And that's why I raised the issue for equity sake across the board. We have a, in some instances, a written contract with some employees and we have an implied contract. But in both of those, our employees expect us to always treat them with the upmost fairness. Not saying we don't, it's just an implied contract. When you come to work for an individual or a corporation or an entity such as this, am I being evaluated and looked at fairly in terms of a number of things. One is pay. As I look at the reclassifications that are done in this budget for some other departments, for a few departments, and that's, you know, it's half-dozen [on one hand] or six on the other hand, I don't know if that is something that my colleagues are open to. I would like to advance as part of this discussion or part of this budget, for us to volley back and forth.

**Rapson:** I will tell you there is a little bit of distinction in regards to the pay and classification for what's in this particular budget. For instance, I would say that there are two classification changes in regards to the Human Resources and Buildings and Grounds, but the vast majority of the changes that you see in here that are going to be merit-related based are due primarily to the water department reorganization, some of the staffing level changes in the Sheriff's Department, and of course, the Tax Appraiser's Department.

**Rousseau:** It's just in my years of working in government, when you, when employees see this, it is always, right, wrong, or indifferent, they are taking care of the few but not taking care of the many. And that's just the essence of it.

**Rapson:** I would not disagree with that at all.

**Rousseau:** You can't get away from it. So I want to know that we are deliberate in our discussions and our evaluations of this process that we are putting the necessary resource in place to make sure that there is integrity in the system for all our employees. And so, that is the extent of my comment. I won't continue. But I just throw it out for my colleagues to consider as we look at adopting this budget. I don't know where the dollars will come from. I'm sure that's a discussion we can have. I know you have given a preliminary cost from your previous evaluation, \$100,000 to \$125,000, I think you said. I am sure it has to be bidded out.

**Rapson:** The study itself we estimate to be somewhere between \$25,000 and \$30,000. We're thinking the impact may be closer to maybe \$40,000 or \$50,000 which is where the \$100,000 came from. So it's not \$100,000 to do the study, it's \$100,000, because what you don't want to do is you don't want to do a study and then not be able to fund it and give the folks that are warranted increases some increases.

**Rousseau:** And I don't know if we will be. We have to be thoughtful in our deliberation. And so, Lewis, you're indicating that Carl Vinson, you would partner with them?

**Human Resources Director Lewis Patterson:** That would be my preference, yes.

**Rousseau:** Yeah, I mean they're the resident expert, neutral if you will, and do a comparative analysis on population, things of that nature, and blah, blah, blah, blah. Anyway, those are some of the comments I have with respect to the budget. I agree, as stated before, and Commissioner Brown you just reiterated that on the issues of sweeping when when we know our projections are falling short, we need to be able to have that authority or give the authority to the Administrator on a daily basis to sweep those funds so that we don't run into this issue of, you know, looking for dollars. I don't know what it takes to do that, if it is already in place and the Administrator has the authority to do that, or is it something we need to confer upon him in his daily responsibilities. But, as dangerous without having the ability to do that, that's why I raised it a couple of months ago. I certainly agree with your assessment right now. Thank you, Mr. Chair, those are the comments I have for right now.

**Oddo:** Any other comments?

**Vice Chairman Ognio:** Yeah, I guess when I look at these kinds of things I look at, you know, over the past couple of years with the raises and the bonuses and all, I feel like we've been doing, you know, the right thing for the employees. But I also look at things knowing that we got to make decisions where we are headed and what we are going to have to deal with. I mean, just like Commissioner Brown said, I mean, if all this housing comes about in the county, that's not a real profit for the county. That is costly. Houses end up costing us in services. Businesses usually help the county budget. But when you add all these houses and the traffic and all, I mean, we've got to have some long-term planning on that kind of stuff. It's just really hard to see. I know how tight this budget is. And I'm thinking what's going to happen next year. I mean, we may be in a real fix and have to have a big hit to the citizens, and I really don't want that to happen, so. But I also look at the employees and I don't think the employees understand that the county absorbed the healthcare increase. They didn't pass it on to the employees and I think that's a benefit to the employees. I mean, employees don't see that as dollars because they don't see it on their check, but, I mean, if they had to pay that increase out of their check they would definitely complain about it. So, I mean, we've kind of played the budget in both directions. I know the Water Director has done a fabulous job with the water department. I've looked at the numbers. I've looked at all the stats, how many peoples under him compared to how many people other department heads got under them. I will weigh all of that out, and, you know, while you think, well, he done such a great job we need to raise his salary, but some of the other departments have done great jobs too. Some of the other department leaders have more people under them, I mean, so, it's hard to pick out one person and raise their salary. I mean that's just. And as the pay class study, I've never really liked those. And one of the reasons why I've never liked them is there's never apples to apples, they are always apples to oranges. This county has more people doing this or that, so it is really hard to compare. But, I think we are on the right track, but I really worry about, I mean, this budget is a good budget. It's balanced. We talk about transfers, we are not using fund balance. We're using vehicle replacement, transferring it into the general fund so we can buy the vehicles. We're transferring the money in for the Griffin Circuit Court because we do all their pay services to pay the bills. So, we are not really using fund balance to balance the budget. The budget is balanced. And, so I would have to vote it. There are a lot of issues we need to, over this next year, we are really going to have to start talking about where the county's headed and what we're gonna do on the next budget. I would like to start early and I would like to meet with all the department heads, even if we have to do a two-day retreat or whatever, we are going to have to really get their input to how we are going to move forward in the future.

**Oddo:** I would like to add a few comments. I don't think that the COLA really, I don't know how that came into this. I haven't actually heard anybody this year ask for it. I think most of the staff is understanding of the situation the county is in. We don't want to lose sight of the fact, and I don't want to make this a discussion just a follow-up, but we don't want to lose sight of the fact the employees are and the staff is an integral part of getting this budget balanced. You sometimes you

have to pay more for one in order to get it balanced against another. The staff really worked hard. Finance Department worked extremely hard to get this balanced. Could we do it without the staff? Well maybe we could and maybe we couldn't. Maybe we'd find ourselves having to increase the budget just because we had a different staff. This staff is working hard and you do reward them. They haven't had their rewards for a number of years. You can look at anything. We at one point had a park that was proposed that would have been \$300,000, \$350,000 by itself that we turned down without even thinking of a COLA, but I just did not feel comfortable with that. And that was, fortunately, turned down. Yes, our job is to manage uncertainty. This Board of Commissioners is here to be here when the future get to be the present. We have a staff in place to help us manage that. If this was a private business we would be looking at our expenses and we would be trying to cut our expenses where we could without hurting our services. And most private businesses that are still functioning do just that, they cut their expenses where they can and they keep their staff animated and working with them. This is something that everything goes hand in hand. So, this budget here, I think is just an excellent budget in a very difficult situation nobody expected this year. We managed it, fortunately, because we have a staff that can do that. Next year, we don't know what's going to come. We may have a difficult time next year. We may have a much easier time. We don't know that now. I do know that every year that I've been here we've managed to add something to the general fund. Am I right about that, we have not missed a year without adding to the general fund? That's wise management of the resources of this county has. So I think this, I think we are being very efficient. I think we are trying our best to watch our dollars and the taxes that the citizens pay. And I know that there, you know, you look at the future with anticipation and people look at what is going on now with the general election and wonder what is going to become of this country. What we can do is watch out for ourselves, and I understand that. But this county is in good shape compared to most others, and we don't want to lose sight of that. We have things we will have to manage. We can talk to the department heads. We can work on things. We need to plan. There's nothing, that's the proper way to do things. I think we've been doing that, and I'm really quite proud of this staff that has put this together. So I just want to get that point out. And I do want to point out, yes, we've had some, Mr. Pope has done an excellent job in the Water Department. And, I think he knows that we understand and appreciate it. And I hope that the other department heads who have also done excellent jobs understand that we appreciate them. Some of their work is not as public as Mr. Pope's, but is just as critical. And we need to weigh that. We are in a situation where, if we want to reward somebody, we have to think of we are managing a staff of 728 people, and all of them feel like they are contributing. Some more than others, we know that. But we have to be very careful how we do this. This is not the time to be considering, when I see the time is right to consider increases, I think we know I am more than willing to do that. This is not the time and I don't think that's a negative comment about anybody's work performance. It's just this isn't the time to do it. So, I think the budget we put together is excellent and I have no other comments. Mr. Rapson?

**Rapson:** There are a couple of statements that were made that I would not be a very good county manager if I just let them lay. So let me just, let me just make a couple of observations. You know, first of all, we've had four balanced budgets the last four years we've been here. That's radically different, we can show you the blue and red line, but we made some pretty tough decisions that first year. Second year wasn't a whole lot better quite frankly. This past year caught us all by surprise because we've had a lot of growth but most of that growth came at the tail-end of the year. And since the assessments were impacted as opposed to growth we didn't reap those benefits of keeping the millage rate even rolling back and grabbing a bunch of revenue. This is the first year we've had our Public Safety funds, the 911, Fire, and EMS actually catch up to the point where they got some pretty good increases in fund balance, and that's one-hundred percent because we're not rolling back the millage rates associated with those funds. We've done, over the last four years, two full rollbacks. That means we have [foregone] \$3 million plus more dollars that we do not have available to us that the citizens [have realized as reduced taxes] do that are not part of this budget. So when we talk about balancing the budget, rolling back the second year, foregoing the \$1.3 million increase we would have had if we left the millage rate the same, which, quite frankly, everyone else around that's exactly what they're doing. So we are an anomaly in that regard. And while it is true that I will say that the county stepping up and actually providing the health care, that is one of the reasons why we can afford to pay our employees at some of the lower salaries compared to the corporate world is because of that healthcare. One of the

things that concerns me as the county manager is when I hear comments that we don't think long-term or that we are balancing the budget one year to the next. That is one-hundred percent, absolutely false. We look at where we are going to be three to four years out. Anybody can balance a budget from one year to the next. We're very, very hyper-focused in regards to our operations, our capital. We've got a vehicle and equipment replacement cycle plan put in place that are the envy, I can assure you, of all the county managers I speak too. We kind of hyper-glide over the fact that we've gotten there without fighting with our Justice Center and our Sheriff and everyone else. That is not the normal routine for a county. And the reason we do that is because we got 728 people rolling in one direction. And while I will agree that I have an outstanding water director, I can assure you I have other directors that are just as outstanding that have taken their departments to a different level compared to where we were four years ago. It gets down to a, it's a balance of equity and a balance of fairness for all of our employees. And I would be remiss to say that this budget is not taking care of those employees. There's no merit associated in this budget. If you talk to the employees they are appreciative of the two COLAs that we did, but that just treads water in regards to increases associated with living from one year to the next. I'm not a big COLA fan, so don't get me wrong there, I do think it should be merit based in regard to those increases, but the fact of the matter is for the last four years we haven't had those merit increases. And what you end up having and what you are going to end up seeing if it continues is you are going to see our best and brightest find other jobs because, quite frankly, they can. And at some point, we've got to do something to fix that. I personally think next year will self-correct itself because the growth that we are seeing now is not going to be your reassessment but is based on houses. We've got the Planning Department, we've got the stats that show that, we've got the Tax Digest that's showing that. So I just want to make sure that the Board understands my biggest thing that I think we do as a county is how we plan and how we approach our finances and the responsibilities that I have delegated to the department heads and the fact that they keep those budgets on track. They are going to do that, quite frankly, whether we compensate them or not. But at some point, we are going to reach a point where we can't do that anymore, and I think that, you know, I think one of the things that Mr. Rousseau was talking about is the pay study. When you do a pay study, and you do a pay study based on just the pay classification min-and-maxes, you are not rewarding the vast majority of those employees with that type of study because all that is going to do is change those employees you just hired, maybe move their minimum salaries up. But if you are in the right classification, and you penetrated that scale 20% maybe now you penetrated 30% because the scale moved but you don't get any increase associated with that. I don't know of any county that can afford to do what I call a pay parity type modification. Those are millions of dollars. So we're going to be stuck with some of the problems we currently have, there's no way around that. But I do think from a classification perspective, we are doing our employees a disservice by not rewarding those employees that are in essence working out of a classification, which we can validate through a third party, Carl Vinson and UGA. And I think that is probably something that is long overdue. We said that three years ago. I still feel like that's long overdue. So, I know we discussed it but I get the feeling we're getting ready to vote on a budget that does not include it. So, if there is something you want to do let's make sure we include that in this budget.

**Rousseau:** Well, I was just getting ready to ask Mr. Davenport since I made the motion can I modify my motion?

**County Attorney Dennis Davenport:** You may certainly amend your motion if you choose to do so.

**Rousseau:** I would like to, gentlemen, amend my motion to include the cost to adopt this budget with the included cost of \$50, \$30?

**Rapson:** I would safely say \$75,000.

**Rousseau:** To include \$75,000 not-to-exceed, if so, county manager administrator would have to bring it back to us, not to exceed to do a pay and class study, not a parity study, a pay and class study to be included for \$75,000 in my amended motion. I'd appreciate a second for discussion sake, or if it needs to go further, or maybe it will die.

**Rapson:** I could make a recommendation because the \$75 is kind of a loose number. If you pick \$60,000, then we could realign the money we currently know we have now in savings in regards to the balloon festival because we know we have \$64,500 budgeted for that. And we had a very successful event that won't require all that money to be allocated that way. I know that is Recreation money, but that is something you could do and it wouldn't change any of the budget numbers we have in front of us.

**Rousseau:** If that is acceptable do I, Mr. Davenport, do you follow that?

**Rapson:** Basically \$60, just change the \$75 to \$60,000.

**Rousseau:** Okay, I said not to exceed \$75 but \$60 is fine if that is acceptable. Again I would like to amend my motion for adopting the 2016-2017 fiscal year budget to include \$60,000 out of existing funds to conduct and pay and class study.

**Commissioner David Barlow:** Well, I seconded the first motion, but I don't think that we need that study. The latest report that I've read from the Harvard Business School said that salary was the third reason that people accept positions. The first is the working environment and the fact that they feel respected and appreciated for what they do. And they are happy with what they have. I doubt very seriously, the little bit I know of Mr. Pope, I doubt if he is an unhappy person. If he is, then I just have missed it somehow, because I think that he has a position that has allowed him to soar. And very few counties allow their directors to have the freedom that we have allowed all of our directors to have through the excellent leadership of Mr. Rapson. And it's difficult for me to sit here and listen to Commissioner Brown create controversy, like he is prone to do, and he'll be blogging about it. Just be sure and read what "Husband and Father of 2" says and be sure and read what "Upanatom" says on *The Citizen* blog because that's what he does. He goes back in and backstabs everybody with his comments, but he loves to create controversy. There is no controversy in the salary of our employees. We have the finest employees of any county in this state. And I've never heard Mr. Pope complain about anything. But Commissioner Brown has used the Water Department to be his soapbox ever since I've been a Commissioner. And sadly, I didn't get reelected because I would love to sit here and to browbeat him for the next two and a half years that he is going to be here because I am going to help him make sure that he is not here because he has publically said he is only going to run for two terms. He's got two and a half more years to sit up here and get on his soapbox and create controversy, and I for one am getting tired of it. But I do not want to second the study. I do not think we need that.

**Brown:** I wouldn't second it either, and I never blog anonymously. If I blog I got my name on it and my photograph.

**Barlow:** Oh, you're "Husband and Father of 2" and you're "Upanatom."

**Brown:** I never blog anonymously.

**Barlow:** Oh, yes. You blog about yourself. It's really the saddest thing, the narcissistic individual that you are.

**Brown:** Okay.

**Rousseau:** Order, Chairman, order . . .

**Brown:** Thank you, David.

**Oddo:** Let's get back on board here.

**Brown:** But the reason I don't support it, Commissioner Rousseau, is that I think it leads us right into the problems that I listed in my program as we can't afford the results of that study. There's no money to cover that, and with the other things that we have to do, that's what I'm talking about taking the approach and making sure you have the revenue to be able to do the things that we're going to have outstanding in the years forward. And I'm not sure you have the money to cover that.



**Rousseau:** I appreciate that discussion. I want to caution those who are listening in the room as well as viewing this on the screen, no way, shape, form, or fashion is my discussion, my issues associated with an individual. We're talking about the operation, and I think we're debasing our total operational needs when we get it down to individuals. That's not how this works. We need to be mindful of that. This study is designed for us to show equity, clarity, fairness with our people. Anyway, I don't want to invoke one individual's name as it has been bantered about this evening. We're talking about our operation, and it falls within the context of each and every individual that performs for us on a daily basis the services that we need. So, that's my issue, I am looking at big picture. And if we are in our operational structure, we just heard from our Administrator that he would support it, his evaluation says its needed, he just indicated and I wasn't here that over the last three or four years of budgets, two or three have been discussed, thrown out. I don't know when a good time is to evaluate our operation. You should be evaluating our operation daily and long-term. And I think he is doing that. I do agree when you look at budgets you do not look at calendar year to calendar year or fiscal year to fiscal year, you've gotta look three, five, ten years out. You mentioned the CIP and things of that nature. Excellent job in doing those kinds of things. But there are people in this equation. They are not widgets. They are not cars. They are not supplies. They are not equipment. They are individuals who make it happen. We may be going automated this, automated that, but somebody is pushing the button. And so anyway, I don't want to get on a soapbox while I do want to remind us of, my issue has nothing to do with individuals it has to do with the operation. And as long as we stay focused on that, which I think 90% of the time we do, and don't get caught in personalities, I think we are wise, prudent, and doing our job. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**Rapson:** And for purposes of information to you, Mr. Rousseau, the last study was done seven years ago. We originally pitched something in 2000; I'm sorry, nine years ago. And we pitched to do the same type of pay classification that we are pitching now in 2014 and 2015. It was not pitched as of last year's budget, I want to make sure we're clear on that.

**Rousseau:** Not a problem.

**Brown:** And we had a couple of departments that we knew we needed to look at.

**Rapson:** We did.

**Brown:** And we did. I mean we went in there. And I understand your holistic approach.

**Rousseau:** Yeah, I don't care about a department . . .

**Brown:** And I owe Lee Pope an apology for where this meeting is going here today. I was citing this as an example because I'm gonna vote against this, so I needed to have my examples of why I was going to do it.

**Rousseau:** Okay.

**Brown:** It was just a rare example as someone who has worked in some of the largest corporations in the world and three-person start-up operations, I've never seen a dramatic turnaround like that ever; ever. And I was part of a really big corporate turnover that was, had incredible benefits, I never saw anything even close to what you have been able to pull off. You have my upmost admiration for what you had done as somebody who was intimately involved in that situation. That was a very, very deep hole to get out of and I thought it should be recognized. That was the point I was trying to make.

**Rousseau:** And I think to a man I wouldn't be wrong if all of us sitting on the dais right now wouldn't say the same thing. Remarkable, under some trying circumstances based upon what I have learned in the short tenure here. And I don't want to minimize it. But I going to say this also, that's the job he's hired to do. Fix it. Compensation is a part of that. And when you say that we've taken it down when you say, when we say that a couple of departments have been evaluated that's where you fall. That's where you get in trouble. A couple. The others feel as though they are left out and they are not a part of that holistic equation. But anyway, I am through Mr. Chair. I thank you all for indulging me. I didn't get a second. So, the original question stands, the original motion?

**Oddo:** That's a technical question.

**Rousseau:** Or do I need to restate the original motion?

**Oddo:** Excuse me just a second.

**Rousseau:** I'm sorry.

**Oddo:** Can I ask a technical question? Can somebody else second the amended motion?

**Davenport:** No. It takes Commissioner Barlow to second the amended motion. Now if Commissioner Barlow wants to withdraw his original second, someone else could second the original motion and do the amendment that way. But the way it stands right now, only Commissioner Barlow can amend the second.

**Brown:** Call the question.

**Rousseau:** Call the original question.

**Ognio:** So, I want to say a couple of things here. When I was talking about future things, I think staff does an excellent job. Vehicle replacement. Capital improvement. Budgeting. And all that. What I think we are going to fall short on in planning is we got no trigger point for when we add staff in anything and how we compensate for the added staff members. I mean, at some point with the growing population, there is going to need to be more firefighters, more sheriff's deputies, more, and I don't know how we're planning for that. I don't see that we've got any, you know, planning for that additional stuff. When it becomes available, the need's there and you have to raise taxes. That is going to be the only way to handle it it looks like, the way we are going now. But maybe if we could kind of have some kind of plan we can start planning ahead for these kind of things. And I, like I said, I think the staff did an excellent job with the vehicle replacement and the CIP. You know, I went to one of the classes that the ACCG puts on, and they actually used our Vehicle Replacement Policy as an example. I mean, you got to think you are one out of 159 counties and they picked your policy to be the best and making an example out of. So, the staff is doing an excellent job in those departments, but we still got to start doing some long-term planning on how we are going to increase staff when population increases. How we're gonna, we got a Transportation Committee now that hopefully will start dealing with some, how we are going to handle traffic, is it come. So I mean, we're headed in the right direction, we just got some more work to do.

**Oddo:** I might add, though, that I appreciate that, I understand that, and I agree with it. But there are ways to do it. One of the things that Carl Vinson does if we want to do it and if we want to pursue it is they'll do an analysis and tell us pretty much where our break-even is. Not all homes are drains. And I don't know what the break-even would be in Fayette County, but when you get a home around \$300, or \$330, or \$350,000, it actually starts providing more money than it requires in services. And we don't know what that point is. We do know that most of the homes in the county are probably in that range. You know there's a lot, there's a lot to what Commissioner Ognio said and there is a lot we can do to plan, but part of it is knowing where the point is at which services are a drain. Are we contributing to them or draining them, so? We are, probably, far ahead of most counties in this state already. And we need to keep on the track and do whatever we can to keep planning, and we are doing, I think we are doing that, so. At this point, unless anyone else has any more comments, I think we need to call a vote. Ready? Call the vote.

**Rousseau:** Call for the question.

**Oddo:** All in favor of approving public, approving the Resolution 2016-08 establishing the annual operating, capital, and CIP budgets for Fiscal Year 2017, signal by saying "aye" and raising your right hand.

**[Chairman Oddo, Vice Chairman Ognio, Commissioner Barlow, and Commissioner Rousseau voted in favor of the budget.]**

**Oddo:** Opposed?

**Brown:** Nay.

**Oddo:** Passes four to one with Commissioner Brown voting nay.

*Verbatim Transcript of the Meeting concludes at the 7:52:23 timestamp of the audio recording.*

---

Copies of the request and the newspaper article provided for the record, identified as "Attachment 1," follow these minutes and are made an official part hereof.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Commissioner Brown moved to adjourn the June 30, 2016 Board of Commissioners' Special Called Meeting. Commissioner Barlow seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

The June 30, 2016 Board of Commissioners' Special Called Meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

---

Floyd L. Jones, County Clerk

---

Charles W. Oddo, Chairman

The foregoing minutes were duly approved at an official meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia, held on the 14th day of July 2016. Referenced attachments are available upon request at the County Clerk's Office.

---

Floyd L. Jones, County Clerk