

The Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia met in Official Session on April 3, 2002, at 7:38 p.m. in the public meeting room of the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue, Fayetteville, Georgia.

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

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

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

OLD BUSINESS:

ADOPTION OF THE RFP FOR THE FAYETTE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLAN

UPDATE: Public Works Director Lee Hearn stated he hoped the Board had a chance to review the recommendations on the Fayette County Transportation Plan Update. He said he had spoken with each Commissioner about certain phases and aspects of the Plan and he was really here to answer any questions the Board may have.

Chairman Dunn asked Mr. Hearn to inform the media and the people in the audience what the transportation plan update was.

Mr. Hearn commented at the Board retreat last Fall, staff was charged with a way to update our Transportation Plan. He said staff put together a list of items that comprised an RFP that went out to a number of firms and we received six proposals back. He said of the six proposals, the Committee comprised of himself, Engineering's Ron Salmons, Planning Director Chris Venice, Purchasing Director Tim Jones and Zack Taylor his assistant, the Committee short listed three firms which were interviewed. He remarked the Committee unanimously agreed to recommend the firm of URS Corporation to conduct the work in the amount of \$140,000.00.

Commissioner Pfeifer said Mr. Hearn had already answered his first question and that was the discrepancy between the cover letter and the time line that was included originally. He said we now have a new time line.

Chairman Dunn asked if everybody had a copy of the new time line and Commissioner Wells reminded everyone that the time line was in each Commissioner's mailbox. Mr. Dunn said the original time line said February and the new one should say December. He

said Mr. Hearn and he had to present their case to the ARC in the January/February time frame, and we needed this done before that and URS said that they could do it.

Commissioner Frady said he thought he read in his information where it was going to be finished in November in any case.

Commissioner Pfeifer stated the time line didn't agree with that date.

Chairman Dunn said URS Corporation confirmed they would be done in time, and we wanted to make the record clean and have the schedule in the book in case there was any problem down the line.

Mr. Hearn said the call for projects for the 2030 RTP, the long range update was going to occur in January so we need this work done prior to that call for projects.

Commissioner Frady commented he had been wrestling with this issue because \$140,000.00 was a lot of money and, of course, we paid \$110,000.00 for the first proposal. He said he looked at all of the information yesterday and came in today and discussed this with Ms. Venice. He said there was a lot to take into consideration here. He stated this was an unfunded project, at least that he knew of at this time. He said he would support this project and the models which Ms. Venice will get from this will be very valuable to her down the road. He asked if the other cities were going to participate in this. He said it was his understanding that the cities would not be participating. He was also concerned how URS would be able to get information from the cities but said he was sure this could be worked out. He stated he did not want to see the plan in place that was about to expire next year, deviated from too much, because we have done a lot of work in the area to move traffic in and out of the county. He commented it was not to say that they could not come up with a better idea but he felt he would not like to see them deviate too far from the traffic flows in the current plan. He added it was a good plan and what he has seen in the URS project was they were integrating a lot of that in there and he thought this was good.

Chairman Dunn referred the Board members to page 6 of URS's proposal. He said there is a section there that said they were going to coordinate with all of the planning partners and they list the cities in Fayette County. He said they were also going to be working with the ARC, GRTA, GADOT, and the School Board. He said our road list that we submit to GADOT was their road list too, so he assumed the cities would work with us.

Commissioner Frady remarked there were some questions about some other circumstances but he would not like to see this proposal go beyond \$140,000.00. He said they did mention in one area here where their fees would be established in a not to exceed number but it did not give this number.

Vice Chair Wells said that was if the URS representatives had to come here for some of the meetings.

Mr. Hearn said if the scope of the project was changed he would come back before the Board.

Vice Chair Wells clarified on Page 7, they are talking about newsletters and things of that nature and she has been reading some RFP's where printing and mailings and things of that nature were extraneous and we would be billed for that separately. She said she wanted to make sure that all of this printing, the glossy's, all of that is included in this figure.

Mr. Hearn said yes, that was his understanding.

Mr. Hearn introduced Mr. Tim Priest, a representative of URS Corporation and said Mr. Priest would be a big player in this project.

Mr. Priest promised the Board members he would have the price in the contract.

Commissioner VanLandingham questioned in Task 7, where it mentions they would look at bicycle paths and pedestrian improvements which was on the time line schedule. He said they did not mention anywhere in there about public transportation, but in talking with Mr. Hearn there was a place in the proposal that would allow them to include questions about public transportation. He said he highly recommends that we do this. He mentioned if we were going to do a survey this would be a part of that and it would be a way to accomplish it all at the same time.

Commissioner Pfeifer said he also had some concerns in that area, particularly as they design the public input process. He said he hoped the Board shared his feeling on this, and that we make it clear this is primarily a "road" transportation plan. He said our problem was with roads and he did not want to get back a plan like the ARC had and somebody was recommending we spend half of our money on bus stops, etc. He said nothing he had seen in any plan around this area, that included bicycle, pedestrian, or public transportation had any meaningful transportation. He commented the people were not going to commute to work on bicycles, nor do their shopping on bicycles. He said he thought we could accommodate the desire for someone to bicycle in the county along with the plan, but he didn't think the plan should be driven assuming that people were going to ride back and forth from Fayetteville to Peachtree City on bicycles.

Chairman Dunn asked Mr. Hearn how much money was in the Redwine Road bike path plan that was just eliminated and Mr. Hearn thought it was \$60,000.00 the county had and

the City of Fayetteville had about \$40,000.00. Mr. Dunn said this was cut out by the ARC and GRTA because it served recreation but not transportation.

Commissioner Pfeifer said at the last meeting, he forgot exactly what the topic was, but he always had a concern when people talked about doing public meetings because there would be interest groups and people who want to come to drive their point of view. He said we would not be getting the average person who was primarily affected by driving around Fayette County.

He commented he thought the level of service numbers that we were going to be generating would indicate that because people were voting or indicating their desires by where they drive. He said as we see where the traffic was going, you could draw your conclusions from where they are coming from and where they were going.

Mr. Hearn said that public involvement served two purposes: (1) The public can render an opinion, a need and (2) It was real good in informing the public on where our thoughts were, and what projects we were looking at. He said occasionally people will come up and say it would be a lot easier if the county did this item instead of what we have there. He remarked somebody sitting in traffic could get pretty creative when they thought about alternatives, be it turn lanes or whatever. He stated it was real good to get public input early and it was real good to get the public involved in informing them on what we were doing and what we are about.

Commissioner Pfeifer said, quoting from the proposal, "instill a sense of partnership with the public" and he thought this was crucial to achieving the support level we were going to need from the citizens to go forward with whatever plan comes out of this process.

Mr. Hearn said URS has been successful in Newton County and were presently working in Rockdale County and they are highly respected around the region. He commented that GRTA has them on a retainer as well as ARC so he thought they would do a good job for us.

Vice Chair Wells said one of the things she saw in the proposal she liked was it said they would look at what ARC, GRTA and all of those people were proposing etc. but one of the statements that jumped out at her was, "in any case, URS will seek policy guidance from the county." She remarked regardless of what everybody else was saying, and however much money they were paying that gentleman to develop their philosophy, the philosophy that we want developed here was particular to Fayette County.

Chairman Dunn stated the Board should know going in, and he was sure they did know, that we were one of two counties that did not always see things GRTA's way. He said further that every submission we have made to GRTA since they came into being, we have

a caveat in it saying that we were going to plan and work with GRTA and meet all of the time lines and everything, but we would not execute anything that this Board did not feel was in the best interest of its citizens and we were going to continue to do that. He said because it was a dictate from high didn't mean that we were going to do it. He commented there was always that risk that what we would do in the future would not be exactly what GRTA and ARC would like.

Commissioner VanLandingham stated his comment was not in support of bicycle and pedestrian improvements, his was in the transportation area of moving people and commodities. He said it seemed very logical that we would pursue this one item in that area where it is allowed by the contract to do that. He commented the second thing that he had was the adoption of this proposal and the findings of this company. He said if we were not actively going to seek funding for this, then it was going to be a waste of money and he felt we had to remember that our budget would not take care of anything that was coming out of this study on a short term basis. He said he felt we needed to be prepared to look at some ways for funding this. He said he assumed that by adopting this that we were going to carry the plan out.

Commissioner Dunn stated the planning and programming and the budget system we have adopted recently would indicate that this was where we start and we will follow through. He said the Moreland Altobelli will be studied in depth and this was a good study. He said it lacked in being executed over the past ten to fifteen years and he didn't know exactly why but he knew like Commissioner VanLandingham said, once we have that study in hand, we should be planning and preparing to have the money to execute it and that did not always happen. He said what we were embarking on now with the new system here was that once we commit to it, we are also committing to funding it somehow, and the funding strategy would be developed after the projects were developed. He said he agreed with Commissioner Pfeifer when he said this was why we needed the public's involvement because ultimately the public has to pay for everything. He said we also had to be in a position to give them a good product.

Vice Chairman Wells stated she was excited about the County doing this now. She said she knew that the Altobelli study did languish for a number of years but the difference now from then was that we now have a CIP and we can start planning for these projects when we identify them and their critical nature and then we can also start the planning for funding of those projects so that we will be a step ahead of things. She commented that it was crucial that we do this in conjunction with the CIP. She remarked we have a plan and then we will decide how to fund it with everything else. She said she was excited about seeing some good reports out of this.

Commissioner Pfeifer said he agreed with what Commissioner Wells said. He commented that having the CIP in place turns the whole process right side up. He said

before when they did the plan somebody had to initiate a phase, but with the CIP in place, it will require initiation not to do it.

Chairman Dunn said he understood since one of the baseline documents that they will use in their review will be the old plan, then he would expect to see some of the old projects find their way into the new plan. He stated the other thing we really need to look carefully at was there was a lot of great stuff in the old plan and now some of them are not doable because we did not buy right-of-way at the appropriate times. He said for instance, we still need a bypass or something like it, around Fayetteville. He mentioned we cannot put it where we wanted to in the past because now we would have to go through a golf course and probably a couple of subdivisions to achieve it, and he did not want to have a northern arc debate down here. He said we still need those same projects but now we will have to look for different routes. He said he hoped this was the beginning of a great transportation system down here. He mentioned that we also needed to be realistic in that our transportation was nothing compared to what it was north of Atlanta, and the big money was going up north. He remarked that when we decide to solve our problems down here we will get some money, but we were going to have to raise a lot to do these things and he felt the people just need to bite the bullet.

Commissioner Frady said he thought they had inflation built into the Moreland Altobelli study but they didn't do that, they used 1989 dollars, and it was an 85 million dollar project. He remarked the State was aware of the bypass because in the study, the State was willing to move Highway 279 to intercept the east bypass over there and it would be this side of where it is now. He added he thought the State needed to be aware of this whole plan at some point in time so that they can know what we were coming at them with.

Chairman Dunn stated one of the interesting things that he and Public Works Director Lee Hearn face at the ARC and GRTA was when you want to do something, there were some targets of opportunity sometimes, but if we have 100 million dollar road program down here, and something gives way up there like Gwinnett can't build something, there may be money available. He said when he and Mr. Hearn walk in, they tell them that we want our road pushed up and we do that all the time. He commented they asked us if we have the twenty percent match and they will move it. He said in the future if the county decides to do all of these things we will have to do some of the funding strategies to have that money so that when there were targets of opportunity we could move to.

On motion made by Commissioner Vanlandingham, seconded by Commissioner Frady to adopt the RFP for URS Corporation not to exceed \$140,000.00 in any segment of the study. The motion carried 5-0. A copy of the RFP for URS Corporation, identified as "Attachment No. 1", follows these minutes and becomes an official part hereof.

APPROVAL OF AWARD FOR THE RECREATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND CONCEPTUAL PARK PLAN TO AL&DH NOT TO EXCEED \$35,800.00:

Engineering Director Ron Salmons introduced Mr. Louis Downer, of AL&DH who submitted the RFP proposal. He said he was here to request approval to award the contract for the Recreation Needs Assessment and a Concept Park Plan for the new park in the northern part of Fayette County. He stated with the acquisition of the additional land in the north part of the county, it, at least to him, became apparent that we needed to do a little bit better job of planning a Needs Assessment than what we have in the past. He commented he thought the last Needs Assessment was done approximately ten years ago and the Board did not care to endorse that plan at that time so we have sort of been languishing along without a good guidance for the Recreation Department as far as future development.

Mr. Salmons stated we put out an RFP to develop a Needs Assessment and the methodology we were proposing in the RFP was to have the consultant develop recreational levels of service. He said essentially this meant we wanted to know how many athletic fields per X many people, like so many baseball fields, should the county provide for a population of 5,000 people. He added this was through the whole series of various athletic and recreational opportunities, the number of trails, the number of acres of greenspace, conservation lands, etc. He commented this concept was also consistent with what the Board may consider later today which was the CIP. He said it was consistent with that approach of developing levels of service for various departments. He said this was the main reason for this methodology. He added this methodology was also used by the National Park and Recreation Association. He commented we were basically going to use those standards as a model, and modify those to reflect the needs and desires of the citizens of Fayette County.

Mr. Salmons remarked that six firms responded to the county's RFP and we short listed it to four companies. He said all four were interviewed by the Selection Committee which was made up of Mary Alice Lawrence, and Anita Godby with the Parks and Recreation Department, Ed Quattlebaum and Billy Shaw of the Recreation Commission Board and himself. He said as a result of the interviews and discussions the Selection Committee came to the conclusion that the firm of AL&DH Associates provided us with the best proposal to accomplish the work. He commented that following the interviews, the Committee had further negotiations and discussions with Mr. Downer, and the final fee that was proposed was \$24,400.00 for the Needs Assessment and \$11,400.00 for the Concept Plan for a total of \$35,800.00. He said this amount covered all costs associated with this study, and there were no extra costs, and no hidden costs. He stated obviously if we change the scope of the study, then it would come back to the Board for approval as well as any fee change in the fee schedule itself.

Mr. Salmons commented the reason the selection committee was comfortable with this particular firm was that the committee felt the company was providing the county with a good approach to assessing what the feelings of the entire county were, not just selected interest groups. He said they were going to hold five public meetings spread around the county and they were all going to be held in public facilities. He said there will be one meeting here in Fayetteville in the Commission Chambers, one meeting in the northern part of the county, one meeting in the Starr Mill/Brooks area, one in Peachtree City and one meeting in Tyrone. He remarked the consultant was also proposing to do some surveys on week ends in front of business institutions just to get the person off the streets' input. He said we were also proposing to use a comprehensive telephone survey and the firm doing the survey was the same firm the Atlanta Journal Constitutional uses to do their surveys. He said the person doing the surveys has indicated that the telephone survey should give the county a reliable rate of 90 percent, that this would reflect what the people in the county truly believe. He remarked he wanted to make sure that we got that input and not a special interest group that would dominate the direction that the county really should go. He said they would also be talking with the special interest groups that have an interest and we were going to talk to those groups too. He added they were going to gather information from all of the athletic groups also.

Mr. Salmons said for lack of a name for the north park, we will call the concept plan "North Fayette County Park." He added perhaps we should name this park at a later date but at this time this was what we have been calling it. He said we were going to utilize the results from the Needs Assessment to determine what facilities we were going to try to put into that park. He commented we would develop a master plan for the park. He said right now we were looking at a three year schedule and providing budget costs for those three years. He commented obviously if the cost exceeds what the Board has resources for, that can be spread out over a longer period of time. He said he didn't mention this to the Board but it should be obvious to the Commissioners that he intends to come back to the Board for its approval once the level of services have been established and before they go forward. He said it was extremely important that we have total agreement on that because that sets the tone for everything else they do. He said they would also bring the Master Plan to the Board for approval and input, once they feel comfortable with it, and before they move forward in that development process.

Vice Chair Wells requested that the Board see the Master Plan before it was presented to the public.

Mr. Salmons commented it would be in a public viewing because it will be brought before the Board, but it will not be taken to any other group prior to the Board seeing it first. He said the Commissioners were the folks we need to make sure that we were in sync with before we try to do anything else and obviously we would bring it back to the Commissioners first.

Chairman Dunn said the Board was trying to do an objective Needs Assessment here and the Board did not need a lot of lobbying from anybody on this.

Mr. Salmons commented that was the tone he was trying to set here. He said he wanted an honest and objective study on the Needs Assessment.

Vice Chair Wells said she thought she read where the contractor might bring three concept proposals for the north park.

Mr. Salmons said initially yes. He stated the idea was that once the Needs Assessment has been identified, as with any particular piece of land, you always have the opportunity to arrange your facilities. He remarked the particular piece of property there has been sort of pre-determined to be the north park which was going to be passive in its conservation, and that was only going to be trails and picnic tables and this type of thing. He said this was a given because of the type of money that was used to purchase it.

Mr. Salmons stated that more concentrated activities would occur in the southern park. He added there would be three concept drawings presented, and we may take the three plans and turn them into one solid plan.

Vice Chair Wells asked that the public not see the concept plans before the Board did.

Mr. Salmons said the references have been checked for the principals who would be doing the work and Mary Alice Lawrence would be happy to discuss this with the Commissioners if this was of interest to them. He said he also had Mr. Downer here if there were any specific questions anyone would like to direct to him. He said he would try to answer any questions the Board has that he had not covered.

Vice Chair Wells asked Ms. Lawrence if she received the references on Mr. Downer and Ms. Lawrence said she had made calls and was waiting to hear back. She said that was just in reference to design of the concept plans, not for the work that Mr. Downer had done in other areas. She said she did have other references for those people who would be working on the concept plans and there were all excellent.

Vice Chair Wells said to Mr. Downer that she understood his expertise was in landscape architect.

Mr. Downer said more recently he had moved toward doing wetland delineation, wetland permitting, wetland design and those types of things because that was what the market was leaning toward. He remarked he was currently involved in a large project up in Detroit. He commented he was integrating 12 - 15 acres of wetland with a golf course and park. He said he was also going to team with the University of Michigan at Dearborn and

their Biology Department to help create educational opportunities at that wetland/golf course.

Vice Chair Wells asked Mr. Downer exactly what his responsibility was when he did the parks in Perry, Georgia, and Decatur.

Mr. Downer said he was the only Landscape Architect on staff with Arcada so he was principally involved with doing everything but the actual CAD work. He said he did not do the CAD work but he did all the other design work on the parks.

Ms. Wells asked what Landscape Architect entailed.

Mr. Downer said Landscape Architect was a pretty open wide field, it involves the shaping of the land, from designing subdivisions to shopping centers to recreation facilities. He said he was not licensed to design potable water, sanitary sewer or detention ponds that will detain an area over fifty acres. He commented other than that, he was licensed the same as other engineers in the State with some overlap obviously. He said it was really the manipulation of land and design of the land and how you can contour it to make it fit for whatever the purpose was.

Vice Chair Wells asked what contour meant.

Mr. Downer remarked contour meant figuring out how to put the pieces together where they fit, both for the environment, and for the landscape. He said we obviously did not want a basketball court next to a tennis court because you have a loud component and a soft component. He said this was making sure all of the elements fit together like a puzzle would fit together.

Vice Chair Wells wanted to know who would be responsible for determining what facilities were part of this concept.

Mr. Downer said the Fayette County citizens would do this. He said this was what the Recreation Needs Assessment was going to do. Mr. Downer said we were not going to have any preconceived notions of what the park would be until after that Recreational Needs Assessment was done. He said once the Assessment was done we were going to sit down and program out the park. He stated this could easily be done in an evening work session with the Board. He remarked we would talk about what the elements of the park would be. He said if the Assessment tells us we need twenty five tennis court, then maybe that will be what we want to go for, but we will not preconceive what will go in that park right now until we do the Assessment.

Vice Chair Wells asked how large the parks were that Mr. Downer worked on.

Mr. Downer replied that one of the parks was approximately about 120 - 130 acres, it included about a 10-acre fishing pond, a large community center, 6 tennis courts, 4 baseball fields, 2 soccer fields, basketball courts, and parking.

Vice Chair Wells asked Mr. Downer in what capacity did he work at this park and he said he did the overall concept and layout and master planning of it. He added he also did some of the detail design, but again he did not do the CAD work.

Vice Chair Wells stated the county was always trying to save money, she did not know Mr. Phillips, but it says that he is an Architectural Designer and in Mr. Downer's own document it says, while no architectural services was requested, we felt that it would be beneficial to include him." She added Mr. Phillips' costs money.

Mr. Downer said "No." He said he wanted the Board to know he was pulling together a really good team. He said if something comes up, and again this was a lump sum cost, he was not considered to have any duties, the same way with Adias and Consulting was mentioned in there also but they have no real role here. He said this was just to let the Board know he has the resources and if we start getting to the point where we have other questions, he has the resources to tap into.

Vice Chair Wells asked if this was going to be Mr. Downer's first job with this company and he said, no, that he was working on a golf course in Detroit, he is the expert witness on Planning and Zoning for Cobb County, he was currently working on about 15 cases now. He said this would be his first endeavor like this as AL&DH Associates.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he had two questions to ask. He confirmed the phone survey would be done with the Genesis System which was an automated system. He asked if the company was going to generate 1,000 calls or was going to complete 1,000 calls.

Mr. Downer said the Genesis System would complete 1,000 calls with interviews conducted.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked if the questionnaires that will be mailed out would be signed and Mr. Downer said they would be asked to put their name on the questionnaire. Commissioner VanLandingham was concerned that a group of people who were avid in any one particular sport might get a hold of ten questionnaires and put in ten responses and this would throw the survey out of kilter.

Mr. Downer said he had worked with this before and had experience to weed out the surveys with the same wording. He said he would rely on the phone survey and the public

meetings where we actually talk to the people. He said, again, at the public meetings, the people will be filling out the same questionnaire.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he noticed in the information before him that under Task B, that there would be dialogue in these Town Hall meetings between the county officials, AL&DH representatives and the residents. He said further that the Commissioners would be present at those Town Hall meetings.

Chairman Dunn said this Board would not necessarily be there. He commented that the staff could be there and any member of the Board who desires to attend can be there.

Vice Chair Wells inquired how many people Mr. Downer intended on getting this information from because it came out on the news the other day concerning GRTA that the majority of the people, in the Atlanta area, support the northern arc. She commented they talked to nine hundred and of the nine hundred only thirty-seven percent strongly supported the northern arc. She stated the question was, "Did you plan your daily driving around traffic?" She remarked if they said "yes" then they were counted as strongly supporting the northern arc. She said that was convoluted at best and misleading at worse. She asked how many numbers would Mr. Downer be getting so that whenever he came back and said nine-five percent of the population surveyed want X, Y, or Z, this going to be a valid ninety-five percent.

Mr. Downer remarked how they conduct the phone survey with the Genesis System, that will accrue ninety percent accuracy. He said they had no control over the fact that we have a public hearing and every person that plays soccer shows up there and votes. He said they would be able tell if it was swayed one way or another. He said they would rely more on the random survey to give them the truth. He stated the public meetings would give them more banter between ourselves and the residents and you will be able to pick things out from that. He said people that do not have a strong opinion were not going to take the time to go somewhere to do this. He commented this was why they were going to stand out front of businesses. He said that Recreation Director Mary Alice Lawrence suggested to set up a table and poll people when they have their middle of the month garage sale.

Vice Chair Wells asked again for the target number as far as the random survey was concerned.

Mr. Downer said there would be one thousand interviews conducted by phone.

Vice Chair Wells asked if five hundred interviews may be conducted at a meeting.

Mr. Downer said yes, in some cases there may be duplication. He added that one of the questions on the questionnaire would be, "Have you been contacted by the phone survey?" He remarked that he called several survey companies before he decided on the final one.

Vice Chair Wells inquired whether the other short list individuals had to opportunity to come back and diminish their cost and do a phone survey to make them more competitive.

Mr. Salmons said he had further negotiations with the Facilities Group who did lower their fee but it was still higher than what we are recommending now. He said he did not go beyond the Facilities Group because we felt the other companies did not provide us with what we were looking for as far as the needs assessment.

Commissioner Wells said the others weren't considered regardless of the price.

Mr. Salmons stated that after they went through the interview process we narrowed it down to two firms which we interviewed. He said the committee ranked these firms prior to the fees and Mr. Downer's firm was our first choice and he had the lowest price from the beginning.

Commissioner Frady questioned how many firms sent in a bid and Mr. Salmons said the county had six responses, and short listed it to four firms which they interviewed. He added out of these four firms, we had further negotiations with the fees with two of the firms. He said the committee felt the other two firms did not have the concept of what we were looking for. He said they were not consistent, however, we felt the other two firms could produce a good needs study.

Commissioner Frady asked County Attorney McNally if he felt comfortable with this situation.

County Attorney McNally remarked that since this was a professional service that will be rendered and inasmuch as the top two firms that were picked to do the work were both surveyed relative to, and he said he assumed it had been reduced to just two firms that we would be willing to use. He asked Mr. Salmons if this was correct.

Mr. Salmons replied at that point in time yes.

Mr. McNally stated that inasmuch as both firms had the opportunity to negotiate the price down, then that would be appropriate. He continued that it would not be appropriate in a situation where we were contracting for a construction job or something of that nature, but inasmuch as this was a professional service, he believed this would be all right.

Mr. Salmons commented that he would never bring anything to the Board that was a contract for services for construction, fencing, or anything else that was not done on a low bid.

Commissioner Pfeifer inquired when the firm did the assessment, etc., it would not only be where we stand as far as the facilities go, but where those facilities ought to be located.

Mr. Salmons commented that was not the case at this time. He stated we were going to find out what facilities we were lacking. He remarked we would know how the people feel from the five area meetings we contemplate having. He stated we have not said where these facilities would go. He said he felt this would run up the cost considerably because then we would have to start looking, assuming you have additional land in other places or that you have to put all of your facilities in the current land that we have for parks. He said he didn't feel this was appropriate if we could determine what levels of service we should be providing as the county grows. He commented we would have an opportunity to add those facilities that we were deficient in. He said we may well have too many of one activity right now.

Commissioner Pfeifer asked if the firm was going to look at the needs assessment of the cities.

Mr. Salmons commented that as far as the assets, when we compare the wants, needs and desires it would encompass all of the assets within Fayette County. He stated right now we were using the school system's gymnasiums for basketball and indoor winter sports. He said the asset list would encompass everything that we have here in the county that was open to the public.

Vice Chair Wells stated one of the things that we might be able to glean from this was whenever we have the five meetings, if someone would make note of where those comments came from so the Board would know what the people in a specific area want or feel they need.

Mr. Salmons commented he would certainly make sure that all of the questionnaires and input that we receive from those individual public meetings were pulled together by those public meetings and then aggregated together for the entire county. He said this would not be a problem.

Chairman Dunn said he was concerned about the asset list Mr. Salmons was going to come up with. He remarked there was nothing in the study plan that talks about doing close co-ordination with the City Planners and City Recreation Departments. He said the Board needed to know more than just what was there now. He said we could go out and

count things ourselves. He commented the Board needed to know what at least three of the cities were planning to do in the near future as well as long term future.

Mr. Salmons said that was going to have to be a part of the plan. He stated that Peachtree City had a lot of assets.

Chairman Dunn said he understood that but there was nothing that speaks to this issue in the plan and he felt we needed to do that. He said this thing would not make much sense unless we had the cities as integral players. He added that if we were going to put something in a portion of the county, we did not want to be redundant but if the cities plan to put five more ball fields somewhere, we might want to put more of our ball fields somewhere else because some of our people use the cities and visa versa. He said another thing that concerned him that we could lose focus on this process. He remarked that we were hiring someone to do a county wide needs assessment, but the way this was laid out and the way things sometimes happen in this community, we could very easily end up being focused on what do we do with the park in the north side of the county. He said this park could become the focus of the whole study, and to him the study is the county-wide needs assessment, and what goes in the park in the north end of the county would be a logical outflow of what we develop county wide. He stated he did not want to see too much emphasis about what was put in any one park. He said he was trying to keep the emphasis on the broad plan because we were trying to use this as a basis for long-term capital planning.

Mr. Salmons said he could not agree with Mr. Dunn more. He said this was why he wanted to do the north park first because the county cannot do anything on the concept plan until it gets past the levels of service which will be brought to the Board for approval before we move forward on anything else.

Commissioner Frady said we already know what we have and what we ought to do was what has been outlined before us today, a needs study for the future.

Chairman Dunn remarked that he wasn't sure if Mr. Salmons understood what his concern was. He said there was a lot of pressure on everybody as to what we were going to do with the new park. He said he understood this and we would service the community as best we could but the game was bigger than that.

Mr. Salmons said he thought Mr. Downer covered that fairly accurately and concisely.

Chairman Dunn remarked he was just concerned about the focus changing.

Mr. Downer said he would not even look at the north park until the needs assessment had been completed and the study told us what should go in that park.

Mr. Salmons stated if we move forward with this contract from Mr. Downer we were going to put something on the web site to keep the public informed as to our progress.

Chairman Dunn commented when individuals were concerned, one often wants what the other guy has, and what the other guy here has, is Peachtree City which has the best recreation program in the United States probably. He added there was no way in the world the county commission could compete to get to that level of service for everyone so we have to keep focused that what we were looking for was a realistic baseline of service countywide. He said he felt some of the comments that would come back to the Board would be, "Well, I want a roller dome". He said we cannot compete with anybody, we can just do what we believe was the best baseline of recreation service available. He asked if there were more comments and there were none. He asked for a motion.

On motion made by Commissioner Pfeifer to approve the award of the Recreation Needs Assessment in an amount not to exceed \$35,800 to AL&DH. Vice Chair Wells seconded the motion for discussion.

Vice Chair Wells stated she was not comfortable with this early on but she has scrutinized this very carefully and she felt the county had a good firm here and she could support this. She said to Mr. Downer that she was excited to see what he would come up with. She added to keep in mind that the prior plan that was done for the county wide recreation services was \$11,000,000 which was outlandish. She mentioned that it was not considered and we do not want another \$11,000,000 recreation plan.

Chairman Dunn commented that there was some good things in that recreation plan too but for some reason there was no process in place to insure that things would happen over time.

The motion carried 5-0. A copy of the Agreement identified as "Attachment No 2" follows these minutes and becomes an official part hereof.

BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD, HEALTH CARE PROVIDER APPROVED FOR HMO/PPO:

Finance Director Mark Pullium stated he was bringing a proposal to the Commissioners which the Insurance Committee has been working on to provide for the choice of an HMO or PPO Health Insurance Plan. He said this was a dual plan and what he meant by a dual plan was that the employees would be given the option of participating in the existing PPO type plan or they could choose to participate in the HMO option.

Mr. Pullium said he would describe briefly the process that staff has gone through and Vice Chair Wells commented that was not necessary. He remarked the recommendation

as set forth will save money and would offer our employees an option. He said he was excited about the opportunity to bring this forth to the Board. He commented Consultant, Mr. Guy Morrison was here to answer any questions the Board may have.

Vice Chair Wells said just as a point of information for the audience, the Commissioners did not need for Mr. Pullium to go through the process because Mr. Morrison met with each Commissioner for at least one hour. She said if anyone was interested in hearing it any Commissioner would be glad to share it with them, however they had heard it.

Commissioner Frady remarked he had heard it and he assured those present that it was one of the best programs he had seen in awhile as far as he was concerned. He said he thought it was going to be great for the employees and he felt it would save the employees some dollars.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady to approve staff's recommendation to go forward with a PPO/HMO, Blue Cross Blue Shield, fully insured option with the caveat that the reserve funds we currently have would stay in place for insurance purposes only. The motion was seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham, discussion followed.

Commissioner Pfeifer said he did not have any problems with the addition of the HMO component but he did have questions concerning the self-financing versus fully insured option and his feeling right now was that we were doing fine with the self-insured program we have. He said he did not see that there were any problems with it and would support remaining self-insured.

Chairman Dunn said the charge the staff was given was to develop an HMO option, plain and simple. He said what we have done here has taken care of that and it went a step beyond that. He commented what Commissioner Pfeifer was referring to was the way in which we insure ourselves. We were not only giving another option to the insured, but it was also changing the way this county would do business in the insurance that we provide. He said he also had some problems with changing from self-insured to fully insured. He remarked that we have a very strong insurance fund, he did not think we had a lot of risk there. He said the county has reinsurance which leaves our liability for any one person at \$75,000.00. He stated whether we went self-insured or fully insured really didn't matter to Mr. Morrison. He said the county has been self-insured since he has come on board and asked if it would be much more difficult for us to change something in the program.

Mr. Morrison replied that if the county was self-insured we were exempt from the URISA requirements of the State and Federal government, so if we did go fully insured the changes that we would make would have to be in line with the Federal and State requirements of a medical plan so Mr. Dunn was correct.

Chairman Dunn said it was unlikely then if we found some thing that we wanted to change that we could get it done very quickly.

Mr. Morrison said what he was able to do on the fully insured side would not impact the county whether it went fully insured or self-insured. He said he was able to match up the county's current plan (PPO) with Blue Cross and Blue Shield whether we wanted to go fully insured or self-insured. He remarked for example, if the county wished to eliminate mental health, substance abuse benefits, or not have direct access to annual OB visits, some of those things that were consumer friendly, we would not have the opportunity to do that in a fully insured arrangement.

Chairman Dunn said in his mind, we have made very positive changes in some of our coverages which would have been harder to do if we were not self-insured too. He said further we would have to go through Blue Cross Blue Shield to get it done, we would not be able to change it ourselves.

Mr. Morrison said this was correct.

Chairman Dunn stated he thought the study was well done and that the staff and Mr. Morrison did an excellent job. He said he agreed with Mr. Frady that it was a super document that we have and the information was superb. He said his only concern was the self-insured versus the fully insured option. He commented he wanted to go with the dual option and asked if we could defer the option to go fully insured or self-insured.

Mr. Morrison said Blue Cross has given the county the option to do either one. He said further it was absolutely correct that if we go with the fully insured or the self-insured option, we were winning in terms of where we were today. He commented we were winning financially so the question would be if we went to a fully insured program, and it was just a funding mechanism, the benefits would stay the same as you know them now. He said further that we could always go through Blue Cross Blue Shield and go back into a self-insured arrangement. He said it was easy and it was also a definite. He stated that if the county went self-insured, and we find that we have a bad claims year, they would not bring the county to a full insured program because they no longer wanted to assume the risk. He said this was the question at hand, whom did we want to assume the risk, did the county want the risk or did we want the risk in the hands of Blue Cross Blue Shield. He added that both options were good and both saved the county money over the current program.

Commissioner Frady said his comment to that would be that if we went fully insured, the county would save \$400,000.00 plus the first year and try it for a year and see how this worked.

Mr. Morrison said the way to look at the difference was if the county did a self-insured program through Blue Cross and the plan ran, in terms of experience, exactly as we expect, there could be between \$40,000 - \$50,000 savings going self-insured. He commented if for some reason the plan did not run as well as the county had hoped it would, there could be exposure to the tune of about \$400,000.00. He said certainly looking at it this way, your upside or potential expense would be much greater than a potential savings.

Commissioner Frady asked what the county's cost was to go fully insured, about \$2.5 million dollars and Mr. Morrison said yes. He asked how much it would be to stay self-insured.

Chairman Dunn said self-insured was \$44,000 less than fully insured.

Mr. Morrison claimed the county's current program, we expect to run at \$2.9 million dollars. He said the fully insured program, which is a guaranteed cost, would have been \$2.5 million dollars and the self-insured program, at the expected, would be \$2.5 million dollars plus change. He said again about \$40,000.00 less, but there was the opportunity to spend as much as \$3,000,000.00. He said the \$3,000,000.00 comes about because we are assuming additional risk in the claims dollars. He said the answer, simply put, was if we think that the county medical program was going to run fairly well or even average this year, there was a potential for a \$40,000.00 plus savings in going self-insured.

Commissioner Frady said his savings of \$400,000.00 was the present plan versus the Blue Cross Blue Shield plan. He remarked he hesitated when we were discussing this to agree with this recommendation but he thought it was something worthwhile trying and he would go along with staff's recommendation that we do this.

Vice Chair Wells asked what the county would do if it went self-insured and then we decided we wanted to make some changes for whatever reason. She asked if the county had to wait an entire year or were there certain time constraints as to when we could change over.

Mr. Morrison asked if this was due to funding or a change in plan design.

Vice Chair Wells replied it would be a plan design change. She asked if we had to wait on a cycle in order to make changes.

Mr. Morrison stated the county has a 12-month contract and every June 1st, we have an opportunity to make changes based on our plan. He added at that time we could change benefit levels or we could change funding arrangements. He said we could do one of two things. He commented that historically the big positive of being self-insured was two

things, (1) you do have the ability of write your own benefit level so if you want to give 50 chiropractic visits each year, we could do this no questions asked. He said (2) some people may look at the plan and say you have a better cash flow which means that instead of paying a certain amount of money every month, you can pay the claims as they occur. He said these were two of the historical benefits. He said on the fully insured side what we have here that makes this a little unique is Blue Cross is pricing the fully insured quote a little more aggressively because some of the things like reinsurance they are able to do in house versus outsourcing to a third party administrator. He said this was making this plan a little bit quirky.

Commissioner Pfeifer said what bothers him about the switch is something you referred to and he knew Commissioner Wells was talking about something else at the last meeting and that was control. He added when we are self-insured we have control over what happens. He said Millimen USA was not able to give us exact numbers on our trends because of past events that have happened with the third party administrator. He stated if we were to switch at this point to the fully insured plan, we would still have no real data on what our claims actually are because they keep that internal. He said his concern was in a year's time we may get bumped on a fully insured program, twenty-five percent to thirty percent next year, and we will have given away a whole year of real data that we can actually take projections against. He said at that point in time next year we will be right back where we started, but now we have this big increase staring us in the face, and now we are guessing again is self-insured the best way to go. He commented the funding behind our self-insured plan right now was excellent, he felt we should go insured and carefully monitor it for the next year and then the following year look at a fully insured plan because we would have a better basis for comparison then.

Commissioner VanLandingham remarked that in the aspect of being self-insured, you also assume all of the claims that come in. He added that we could potentially lose that \$45,000.00 we gained with the frequency of our claims. He stated once we are self-insured and we have a bad year, then we cannot go fully insured.

Vice Chair Wells said we could go fully insured, it would just cost more.

Commissioner VanLandingham commented we could go from fully insured to self-insured, however, we could not go the other way. He added that when we are talking about control we are also talking about potential costs.

Mr. Morrison said that was a good point because what would happen was if there was a decision to go with a self-insured product and there was a bad claims year, we would not have the opportunity to come back next year to Blue Cross and say that we want to be fully insured and lets have Blue Cross obtain all of the risk because they wouldn't want it and they wouldn't do it. This would not make sense to them. He said the county could go the other way.

Mr. Morrison said Commissioner Pfeifer had mentioned a good point when he talked about the rate increase exposure. He said he wanted to make sure that when the Board made its decision this was clear because it was very important in his recommendation, as well as the Board's decision. He said because we have over 500 employees on the Blue Cross plan, that was the magical number, our renewal, whether we were fully insured or experience rated, was going to be one hundred percent based on our experience. He said it didn't matter what we did there. He added that Blue Cross would give the county quarterly data and in more detail annually, complete claims data, that would show us complete claims data we would get on a self-insured program. He said he wanted to make sure these two things were understood so the Board could make an intelligent decision.

Commissioner Frady stated he thought that the catastrophic, when we were discussing that, was something that came to his mind too, because the county has more than 600 plus employees with vacancies and he thought there was 570 on the insurance plan. He said we were growing so our opportunity to have more catastrophic cases was coming to us, so to speak. He commented he weighed into his mind to be fully insured.

Chairman Dunn stated that was what reinsurance was for, to limit our liability.

Mr. Morrison said if the county did decide to go self-insured, the nice thing and the reason he has enjoyed this process was whatever we did, we have a good program for the county and we have achieved adding an HMO goal at a better price. He remarked that people would argue that the larger you become, the more sense it makes to be self-insured, because you were spreading the risk and we have more premium to kind of cover the claims that might be out there. He said once more Blue Cross has provided us a more competitive fully insured quote than they have a self-insured quote. He said there was one thing to recognize when the Board made its decision, and that was there was about a \$44,000.00 savings if we went the self-insured route that was based on expected claims. He said however, on the flip side of that, there was more than a \$400,000.00 potential increase over the fully insured cost if the county went self-insured. He said the additional \$400,000.00 was only going to happen if the plan ran worse than expected. He remarked as Commissioner Dunn had pointed out on the specific (\$75,000) and he had a major claim, if its \$200,000.00 then the county knew it was subject only to the first \$75,000.00 in costs. He commented there were some protections in there, but there was an opportunity to pay more than the fully insured plan. He said this decision came down to how we felt about the risk.

Chairman Dunn said he thought there was a potential but we have had a pretty good run here and there was no reason to expect that we were going to have a disaster this year. He asked if there was something in the data that told him there was something looming on the horizon here.

Mr. Morrison said Mr. Dunn was correct in his analysis. He said in any given year it would be difficult for anybody to say that you were going to have a good year or a bad year.

Chairman Dunn inquired as to how much scrutiny were we talking about or how many rules were we exempt if we stayed self-insured. He asked if this was a substantial benefit.

Mr. Morrison said "No". He said this was viewed as possibly more of a negative because there were certain legislative agendas that would suggest on a self-insured plan, we would be potentially obtaining some liability based on the decisions we make on the plan. He remarked on the fully insured side you have a company like Blue Cross and many others in the state that file the plan design options. He commented with the State, John Oxendine's department approves them, and they can use them, so we were kind of out of the middle of the whole process. He said these were not things he could speak of as done and several of those he would guarantee would not be done, but there were some things out there.

Commissioner Frady said he didn't think the county could go wrong either way and Mr. Morrison said he was absolutely right.

Mr. Morrison said to make the change from fully insured to self-insured, he felt we would win. He stated if the Board felt as a committee more comfortable saying, let's make the change and get into this on a self-insured basis and see how we run, time would tell.

Commissioner VanLandingham said he still felt like if those actuaries sat up there and they reveal the \$45,000 savings, he felt this was just a fact that's stated and as Commissioner Dunn said we are not looking for any catastrophe, but strange enough, you cannot forecast these things. He said it didn't take but one automobile accident with three or four of the family seriously hurt to throw this out of kilter. He remarked to him the potential greatly outweighs the reality that a \$45,000 savings could be gone with just one accident. He said to spread this cost out where we can always go back the other way, but we can't readily go back to fully insured and he would rather try this for awhile and see how it works because whatever our frequency rate was, it was going to adjust to that whether we do it or whether they do it. He said it was not going to increase on that basis, it will be that \$45,000 savings and that's it. He commented this was not going to be recurring, it was not going to be on every case, it was going to be a one-time shot we stand to lose a great deal more than that.

Vice Chair Wells stated she could see the Board going either way on this but she felt we needed to try for one year as fully insured, we could always go back the other way. She remarked that she thought this was an opportunity that we could see for a year how the government plays, see how much meddling they do. She commented that everyone knew she was a proponent of self-control and was for us doing it our way. She commented if

we found that this was something that was burdensome, that the Insurance Commission and others were going to put unrealistic demands and requirements on us, we could always go back the other route. She stated this was something the Board needed to try, we would not lose anything and we could save some money.

Chairman Dunn said he could not imagine ever doing it and then going back because then we would be in the same position we are now and we will be sitting here saying how do we get out of this if things go bad.

Vice Chair Wells said then we would make the decision that we would not be going back.

Mr. Morrison said wanted the Board to recognize that if it did decide that the fully insured program makes sense to look at and go with for at least a year, in addition to the group being experienced rated either way, there were protections in the plan. He said for instance on the self-insured side, we would have a \$75,000 specific which meant that we would not be subject to any claims above that. He stated the same held true on the fully insured plan so any claims above that amount would be thrown out because Blue Cross uses their reinsurance pool to absorb those claims. He said for example, the City of Fayetteville had a claim in excess of \$175,000 for a premature birth. He said this was a much smaller group of about 125 people in the plan, fully insured, and they came back with a rate increase that was under 6 percent for the year because they threw out all of the claims above the pooling level. He added there was protection in both plans.

Chairman Dunn said he was happy to be doing business with Mr. Morrison and happy to offer the employees the dual option. He stated he could live with either one but he was just more comfortable staying self-insured for a year and that was the way he would vote on that.

Commissioner Frady restated the motion to approve staff's recommendation to go forward with a PPO/HMO, Blue Cross Blue Shield, fully insured option with the caveat that the reserve funds stay in place for insurance purposes only. The motion was seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham. The motion carried 3-2 with Commissioners Dunn and Pfeifer opposing. A copy of the Blue Cross Blue Shield proposal, identified as "Attachment No. 3" follows these minutes and becomes an official part hereof.

APPROVAL OF REVISED INTERIM OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES IN THE PREPARATION OF DEVELOPING A CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. THIS ITEM WAS TABLED FROM THE FEBRUARY 28, 2002 MEETING: Planning Director Chris Venice referred the Commissioners to their copy of the Interim Objectives and Policies that was being proposed to be used in the development of the CIP. She noted it had been amended and refined based on our previous conversations. She said staff would continue

to refine and amend these objectives and policies over the next year at which time they will ultimately be incorporated into the county's Comprehensive Plan. She said what she was asking for today was for the Board to endorse these interim objectives and policies so that staff will be able to use them with some confidence in the development of the Capital Improvement Program.

On motion made by Commissioner Pfeifer to accept the revised copy (red lined) of the Interim Objectives and Policies as presented by staff. Vice Chair Wells seconded the motion for discussion.

Commissioner Pfeifer said this county was a model in many, many ways for our government at work and he felt this process would take the county to the next level where it needed to be. He added he was very pleased to see it happen.

Commissioner Frady remarked concerning page two where it says the elevated water storage facilities should be grouped together and be screened as much as possible. He said further under CFS 1: Policy a., that he thought he could destroy four or five of them as easy as he could one, if we were thinking about the safety issue here, or terror if we want to use that word.

Commissioner VanLandingham said in referring to Page 3, CFS 4, that the Health Department has already been initiating some of this and he would make sure that Ms. Venice's Committee was informed of the final outcome of that.

Chairman Dunn asked Mr. Frady if he wished to make a change to amend the motion.

Commissioner Frady offered a motion to change the wording under Objective CFS 1, Policy a., to not group the storage facilities.

Commissioner Pfeifer asked Mr. Frady if he (Frady) wanted him (Pfeifer) to amend his motion and Mr. Frady said he just did. Commissioner Pfeifer said he accepted this change in the motion.

Chairman Dunn said this was a Planning objective so it should not be worded in the negative like there was something we did not wish to do.

Ms. Venice stated at this point if this was not something the Board wished to pursue, we should probably just delete it.

Vice Chair Wells said we should delete it. This was the consensus of the Board.

Chairman Dunn confirmed that we were just deleting policy CFS 1.a. and all of the others were good. Other members of the Board agreed.

The motion carried 5-0. A copy of the revised Interim Objectives and Policies, identified as "Attachment No. 4", follows these minutes and becomes an official part hereof.

CONSENT AGENDA: *On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Chairman Dunn to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. The motion carried 5-0.*

CHANGE ORDER FOR FIRE STATION SEVEN: Approval of change order for fire station seven in the amount of \$228,435. Copy of change order identified as "Attachment No. 5" follows these minutes and becomes an official part hereof.

BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS: Approval of request from the Finance Department for budget adjustments as presented. A copy of the adjustment request, identified as "Attachment No. 6" follows these minutes and becomes an official part hereof.

WATER COMMITTEE APPROVED RECOMMENDATIONS: Approval of Water Committee recommendations as follows:

(A) Recommend the County put out bids for painting the Crabapple tank and logo and have the contractor do test spots on the 250,000 gallon Peachtree City tank

(B) Recommend Option 2 on additional fencing at the South Fayette Water Plant for a cost of \$60,103.00

(C) Recommend to the Board to refinance the 1992 Water Bonds, to fund the Ellis Road tank site for \$1 million, the New Hope Road water line connecting the 92 tank with the Ellis Road tank for \$1.8 million, and construction of a new distribution shop on Dividend Drive for \$.8 million. This would be an additional \$3.6 million.

BID AWARDED FOR AUCTION SERVICES TO ARWOOD AUCTION COMPANY: Approve recommendation from Tim Jones to award the bid for auction services to Arwood Auction Company and enter into a contract using a 10% Buyers Premium with 51% of the Buyers Premium being returned to the participating government for their items sold and the remaining 49% of the premium to Arwood Auction as their fee. The auction will be held on June 8, 2002. A copy of the contract, identified as "Attachment No. 7", follows these minutes and becomes an official part hereof.

FIRE DEPARTMENT, APPROVAL TO PURCHASE RIDING LAWN MOWER: Approve request from the Fire Department to purchase a Snapper riding lawn mower from Campbell's Hardware in the amount of \$2,002. A copy of this request,

identified as "Attachment No. 8", follows these minutes and becomes an official part hereof.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

There was no public comment.

STAFF REPORTS:

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT: County Attorney McNally stated he had a request from the Chief Judge of the Superior Court of Fayette County requesting that the Board of Commissioners approve a contract for BI Incorporated to supply community correctional services to the Superior Courts in both Fayette and Spalding Counties. He said this was for misdemeanor probation services. He said there were no charges to the county involved here. He stated this Agreement has the courts recommendation.

On motion made by Vice Chair Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve and authorize Chairman Dunn to sign the Community Correctional Services Agreement with BI Incorporated. The motion carried 5-0. A copy of the Agreement, identified as "Attachment No. 9", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

County Attorney McNally requested Executive Session to discuss one legal matter and one real estate matter.

Commissioner VanLandingham requested Executive Session to discuss one matter of potential litigation.

Chairman Dunn requested Executive Session to discuss one personnel matter.

FAYETTE COUNTY WINS THE DISTINGUISHED BUDGET PRESENTATION AWARD FROM GFOA:

Vice Chair Wells brought to everyone's attention that Fayette County had for the third year won the coveted Budget Award given by the Government Finance Officers Association. She said although this department was under the leadership of Mark Pullium, and he was to be commended, she understood that Margaret Malone did a tremendous amount of work toward obtaining the award. She reiterated about how this distinguished award was only earned by seven counties of the one-hundred fifty-nine Georgia counties.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: ***On motion made by Vice Chair Wells to adjourn to Executive Session after a brief recess to discuss one legal item, one potential litigation, one real estate and one matter of personnel.***

LEGAL:

County Attorney McNally advised the Board concerning a legal matter.

REAL ESTATE:

County Attorney McNally advised the Board concerning a real estate acquisition matter.

It was the consensus of the Board to direct Attorney McNally to proceed in this matter.

POTENTIAL LITIGATION:

The Board discussed a matter of potential litigation. The County Attorney advised the Board of their legal position.

No action was taken.

PERSONNEL:

The Board and the County Attorney discussed a matter of personnel.

No action was taken.

EXECUTIVE SESSION AFFIDAVIT: *On motion made by Commissioner Pfeifer, seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham to authorize Chairman Dunn to execute the Executive Session Affidavit affirming the discussion of one legal matter, one matter of potential litigation, one matter of real estate acquisition and one matter of personnel. The motion carried 5-0.* A copy of the Executive Session Affidavit, identified as "Attachment No. 10", follows these minutes and becomes an official part hereof.

There being no further business to conduct, Chairman Dunn adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Linda Rizzotto, Chief Deputy Clerk

Gregory M. Dunn

The foregoing minutes were duly approved at an official meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia, held on the 1st day of May, 2002.

Linda Rizzotto, Chief Deputy Clerk