

**FULTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING**

February 01, 2023
10:00 AM



Fulton County Government Center
Assembly Hall
141 Pryor Street SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30303



MINUTES-RATIFIED

This document has been ratified or approved by the Board of Commissioners, and is not binding on the County or any officer.

Ratification Date: March 1, 2023

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Robert L. Pitts **10:00 a.m.**

ROLL CALL: Tonya R. Grier, Clerk to the Commission

Robert L. Pitts, Chairman (At-Large)	PRESENT
Bridget Thorne, Commissioner (District 1)	PRESENT
Bob Ellis, Vice-Chairman (District 2)	PRESENT
Dana Barrett, Commissioner (District 3)	PRESENT
Natalie Hall, Commissioner (District 4)	PRESENT
Marvin S. Arrington, Jr., Commissioner (District 5)	PRESENT
Khadijah Abdur-Rahman, Commissioner (District 6)	PRESENT

INVOCATION: Reverend Clifton Dawkins, Jr., County Chaplain

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Recite in unison

ANNOUNCEMENTS

PLEASE SWITCH ALL ELECTRONIC DEVICES (CELL PHONES, PAGERS, PDAs, ETC.) TO THE SILENT POSITION DURING THIS MEETING TO AVOID INTERRUPTIONS.

IF YOU NEED REASONABLE MODIFICATIONS DUE TO A DISABILITY, INCLUDING COMMUNICATIONS IN AN ALTERNATE FORMAT PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK TO THE COMMISSION. FOR TDD/TTY OR GEORGIA RELAY SERVICE ACCESS DIAL 711.

CONSENT AGENDA

23-0064 Board of Commissioners

Adoption of the Consent Agenda - All matters listed on the Consent Agenda are considered routine by the County Commission and will be enacted by one motion. No separate discussion will take place on these items. If discussion of any Consent Agenda item is desired, the item will be moved to the Regular Meeting Agenda for separate consideration. **(ADOPTED AS AMENDED)**

A motion was made by Commissioner Barrett and seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, to adopt the Consent Agenda as amended by removing item #23-0066 for separate consideration as requested by Chairman Pitts. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, and Abdur-Rahman

Did Not Vote: Arrington

23-0065 Board of Commissioners

Proclamations for Spreading on the Minutes. **(SPREAD ON THE MINUTES UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)**

Proclamation recognizing "Reverend John Evans Butler, Sr. Appreciation Day."
(Abdur-Rahman)
January 22, 2023

Proclamation recognizing "Calvin Crawford Johnson Remembrance Day."
(Abdur-Rahman)
January 26, 2023

Proclamation recognizing "Walter Marvin Metze Remembrance Day."
(Pitts/Abdur-Rahman/BOC)
January 28, 2023

Proclamation recognizing "Reverend Willie Lee Langley Remembrance Day."
(Abdur-Rahman)
January 28, 2023

Commissioners' District Board Appointments

23-0066

Board of Commissioners

FULTON-DEKALB HOSPITAL AUTHORITY D/B/A GRADY HEALTH SYSTEM (HELD)

Consists of ten (10) trustees (members). The Board of Commissioners of Fulton County appoints seven (7) trustees (members) and the Board of Commissioners of DeKalb County appoints three (3). (See Fulton County Code § 13-2-11). The Fulton County Code does not prescribe the method of appointment; however, historically, each Commissioner has appointed one person to serve.

Term = 4 years

Term below expired: 12/31/2022

Bernie Tokarz (**Hausmann**)

Commissioner Thorne has nominated Bernie Tokarz for a District reappointment to a term ending December 31, 2026.

ITEM REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION AS REQUESTED BY CHAIRMAN PITTS

A motion was made by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman and seconded by Commissioner Barrett, to hold. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Barrett, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Did Not Vote: Thorne, Ellis, and Hall

23-0067 Board of Commissioners
FULTON COUNTY ARTS COUNCIL (APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)

The Arts Council shall be composed of fifteen (15) residents of the county. Initially, each member of the board of commissioners shall appoint two persons to serve on the council, one person to serve for a one-year term and one person to serve a two-year term. No term of any member shall extend beyond the term of the District Commissioner who appointed the member to serve on the Arts Council Board; thereafter, each year, each member of the board of commissioners shall appoint one member for a two-year term. Each member may continue to serve beyond his/her term until replaced. The chairman of the Arts Council shall be appointed to a two-year term by a majority vote of the board of commissioners. The council shall elect a vice-chairman and a secretary from its membership.

Term = 2 years

Terms below expired: 12/31/2022

Onaje Henderson (**Hall**)

Joan Compton (**Hausmann**)

Marie Willsey (**Hausmann**)

Catherine Fox (**Morris**)

Sadie Talmadge (**Morris**)

Sandra De Shields Hightower (**Abdur-Rahman**)

Brandon A. Tonge (**Abdur-Rahman**)

Commissioner Abdur-Rahman nominated Brandon A. Tonge and Sandra De Shields Hightower for District reappointments to terms ending December 31, 2024.

23-0068 Board of Commissioners
DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY & CHILDREN SERVICES BOARD (APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)

The seven (7) members of this board are appointed directly from the County governing authority, effective July 1, 1994, as a result of Senate Bill 469. If the County governing authority fails to make an appointment within 90 days after the vacancy occurs, the DHR Commissioner is authorized to make the appointment. Incumbents whose terms have expired continue to serve until a successor is appointed.

The Official Code of Georgia does not provide any guidance for determining which Commissioner should nominate an appointee in the event of a vacancy. However, the Board of Commissioners adopted a policy at the Recess Meeting, September 18, 1991, item #91-FM-150, assigning one position on the DFACS board to each Commission district.

Term = 5 Years staggered terms

Terms below expire: 6/30/2026

Joshua M. Noblitt (**Resigned**) (**Arrington**)

Dr. Marvin Polk (**Pitts**)

Peter Skaliy (**Hausmann**)

Commissioner Arrington nominated Brandon J. Eads to replace Joshua M. Noblitt for an unexpired District appointment to a term ending June 30, 2026.

23-0069 Board of Commissioners
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF FULTON COUNTY (APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)

Nine (9) members serve on this authority. Seven (7) regular members (each Commissioner appoints one person to serve) and two (2) housing resident members are appointed by the Board of Commissioners. The enabling statute calls the Housing Authority Board members "Commissioners."

Term = 5 Years for BOC Appointees
1 Year for Resident Members

Terms below expired: 7/13/2022

Antavius M. Weems (**Abdur-Rahman**)

Claudia E. Colichon (**Pitts**)

Commissioner Abdur-Rahman nominated Ronnie Shakir to replace Antavius Weems for a District appointment to a term ending July 13, 2027.

23-0070 Board of Commissioners**COMMISSION ON ELDER AFFAIRS (APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)**

Seven (7) appointees by the Board of Commissioners (one for each District); three (3) appointees from each of the non-profit umbrella agencies, which the County contracts with for aging services; and three (3) senior citizens elected by seniors in the three geographical areas of the County. The terms of such members appointed by the Board of Commissioners shall end at the end of the term of the appointing District Commissioner. Such members may continue to serve beyond his/her term until a successor is appointed.

Term = Shall end at the end of the term of the appointing District Commissioner

Terms below expired: 12/31/2022

Mary Blake (**Pitts**)

Rosalind R. Elliott (**Morris**)

Stephanie Fiber-Sutton (**Hausmann**)

Teri Walker (**Arrington**)

Commissioner Arrington nominated Sandra Wright to replace Teri Walker for a District appointment to a term ending December 31, 2026.

23-0071 Board of Commissioners**LIBRARY BOARD OF TRUSTEES (APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)**

Pursuant to House Bill 595 (2015), there shall be seven Fulton County appointed members, with one such member appointed by each member of the Board of Commissioners of Fulton County.

Term = Each member of the board of trustees appointed by a member of the board of commissioners shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing member of the Board of Commissioners and for the same term as the Commissioner making such appointment.

Terms below expire: 12/31/2024

Paul Kaplan (**Ellis**)

Priscilla Borders (**Hall**)

Marjorie L. Kimbrough (**Vacant/Resigned**) (**Abdur-Rahman**)

Commissioner Abdur-Rahman nominated Beverly Rice for a District appointment to replace Marjorie L. Kimbrough for an unexpired term ending December 31, 2024.

Open & Responsible Government**23-0072 Real Estate and Asset Management**

Request approval to resume services - Department of Real Estate and Asset Management, 15RFP96985C-DR, FIT Pick Micro Market, Vending Machine & Catered Events with Coca-Cola Bottling Company United, formally Coca Cola Refreshments USA, Inc. dba Coca Cola Distribution Center (Atlanta, GA) to resume services that were suspended in April 2020 due to the COVID-19 Pandemic for Fulton County facilities effective March 1, 2023 through February 28, 2024. One, two-year renewal option remains. This is a revenue generating contract. **(APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)**

23-0073 Real Estate and Asset Management

Request approval to accept a name change and authorizing the Department of Purchasing & Contract Compliance to reflect the name change of Vending Enterprises, LLC dba VendEdge to Sodexo Operations, LLC. Effective upon BOC approval. **(APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)**

Arts and Libraries**23-0074 Library**

Request approval to name the Washington Park Library meeting room in the name of Judge Marvin Arrington Sr. (Pitts) **(APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)**

Health and Human Services**23-0075 Public Works**

Request approval of a change order less than 10% - Public Works, 17RFP031617K-DJ Progressive Design/Build Services for Big Creek Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) Expansion Project Phase 2B in an amount not to exceed \$339,444.13 with Archer Western-Brown and Caldwell Joint Venture (JV) (Atlanta, GA) to cover costs associated with eight (8) inclement weather days and additional material (electrical wiring) to connect the new facility to the Georgia Power Substation. Effective upon BOC approval. **(APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)**

23-0076 Community Development

Request approval to utilize Cooperative Purchasing - Department of Community Development, City of Santa Monica, CA, in an amount not to exceed \$119,402.29 with Pathways Community Network, dba Pathways MISI to manage and provide assistance to Fulton County's GA 502 Continuum of Care (CoC) for the management of HMIS and related work to match the terms of the grant agreement. 100% grant funded. **(APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)**

Infrastructure and Economic Development

23-0077 Real Estate and Asset Management

Request approval of a Water Vault Easement Dedication of 477 square feet to Fulton County, a political subdivision of the State of Georgia, from Verizon Wireless, LLC, for the purpose of constructing the Verizon Roswell 1 MEC Project at 10325 Turner Road, Roswell, Georgia 30076. **(APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)**

Justice and Safety

23-0078 Superior Court Administration

Request approval of a recommended proposal - Superior Court Administration, 22RFP042A-CJC Consultant Services for Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF) Certification in the amount of \$16,636.00 with Mike Mamot, Sole Proprietor (Ashland, OR), to provide consultation services upon approval through December 31, 2023, with two (2) renewal options. **(APPROVED UPON ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA)**

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

23-0079 Board of Commissioners

Adoption of the Regular Meeting Agenda. **(ADOPTED AS AMENDED)**

a. A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Chairman Pitts, to adopt the Regular Meeting Agenda as amended by removing item #23-0046 as requested by the County Manager; and amending item #23-0097 to a discussion item. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, and Abdur-Rahman

Nay: Arrington

Abstain: Hall

b. A substitute motion was made by Commissioner Arrington and seconded by Commissioner Hall, to move item #22-0084 to Executive Session. The motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Nay: Pitts, and Thorne

Abstain: Barrett

Did Not Vote: Ellis

23-0080 Clerk to the Commission

Ratification of Minutes. **(RATIFIED)**

Regular Meeting Minutes, January 4, 2023

Recess Meeting Post Agenda Minutes, January 18, 2023

A motion was made by Commissioner Thorne and seconded by Commissioner Barrett, to ratify the meeting minutes. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Did Not Vote: Pitts

23-0081 Board of Commissioners

Presentation of Proclamations and Certificates. **(PRESENTED)**

Proclamation recognizing “Holocaust Remembrance Day.” **(Hall)**

Proclamation recognizing “Big Brothers Big Sisters of Metro Atlanta National Mentoring Month.” **(Hall)**

Presentation of Certificates: Youth Commission Induction Ceremony. **(BOC)**

PUBLIC HEARINGS**23-0082 Board of Commissioners**

Public Comment - Citizens are allowed to voice County related opinions, concerns, requests, etc. during the Public Comment portion of the Commission meeting. **Priority for public comment will be given to Fulton County citizens and those individuals representing businesses or organizations located within Fulton County, including their employees, whether such persons are commenting in-person, via emails or via Zoom or other electronic media (i.e., phone call). Non-Fulton County citizens will only be heard after all in-person Fulton County citizens, representatives of business and organizations located within Fulton County, including their employees, have been heard and the time allotted for public comment has not expired, except as otherwise provided in this code section. County staff shall verify the residency of each public speaker prior to such person being heard by the board. Speakers will be granted up to two minutes each. Members of the public will not be allowed to yield or donate time to other speakers. The Public Comment portion of the meeting will not exceed 30 minutes at the Regular Meeting, nor will this portion exceed thirty minutes at the Recess Meeting.** In the event the 30-minute time limit is reached prior to public comments being completed, public comment will be suspended and the business portion of the BOC meeting will commence. Public comment will resume at the end of the meeting. Similarly, written comments (that were timely submitted) not previously read, may be read at the end of the meeting. For more information or to arrange a speaking date, contact the Clerk's Office. **(CONDUCTED)**

9 Speakers: Michele Sarkisian (Elections); Kevin Muldowney (Elections); Mary Jo Peed (Elections); Brian Dunn (Elections); Jason Frazier (Elections); Lucia Frazier (Elections); Melissa Fiorillo (Elections); Russell Carlisle (Elections) and Julie Allen (Elections)

6 Zoom Speakers: Matt Rowenczak (Elections); Robby Caban (Fulton County Animal Services); Ben Howard (Senior Services); B Rohr (Elections); Brett Chromy (Elections) and Roger Naik (Crime and Homelessness)

4 Emailed Comments: Candy Muldowney (Elections); Alfonza X Marshall (Eastside TAD); AJ Robinson (Eastside TAD) and Lauren Fuller (Fulton County Animal Services)

COUNTY MANAGER'S ITEMS**Open & Responsible Government****23-0083 County Manager**

Fulton County Jail Feasibility Report. **(DISCUSSED)**

23-0084 Board of Commissioners

Discussion: Consequences of the 2023 Budget Actions **(Pitts) (DISCUSSED)**

a. A motion was made by Commissioner Arrington and seconded by Commissioner Hall, to discuss in Executive Session. The motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Nay: Pitts, Ellis, and Barrett

Abstain: Thorne

b. A motion was made by Vice-Chairman Ellis and seconded by Chairman Pitts, to call the question. The motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, and Ellis

Nay: Arrington

Abstain: Thorne, Barrett, Hall, and Abdur-Rahman

23-0045 Registration & Elections

Request approval of a Resolution amending the cost to be charged to municipalities who authorize Fulton County to conduct any or all of their municipal elections; and for other purposes. **(HELD ON 1/18/23) (APPROVED AS AMENDED)**

A motion was made by Vice-Chairman Ellis and seconded by Commissioner Thorne, to accept the Resolution with a maximum of \$5.2 million for conducting Municipal General Elections and a maximum amount of \$2.229 million for the associated Runoff Elections, with a friendly amendment by Commissioner Arrington to allocate an additional 10% as a reserve for budgetary short falls. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Thorne, Ellis, Hall, and Arrington

Nay: Pitts, Barrett, and Abdur-Rahman

23-0046 Information Technology

Request approval of a recommended proposal - Information Technology, 22RFP315692K-BKJ, Design, Development and Implementation of Employee Intranet Site in an amount not to exceed \$1,106,000.00 with Svanaco Inc., DBA Americaneagle.com (Des Plaines, IL), to create an internal-facing employee intranet portal that focuses on employee services and communications. Effective upon issuance of a Notice to Proceed and shall continue until the sooner of (a) a period of 18 months; (b) Final Acceptance; or (c) the Agreement is terminated as provided in the contract. 100% grant funded from ARPA. **(HELD ON 1/18/23) (REMOVED)**

ITEM REMOVED FROM THE REGULAR MEETING AGENDA AS REQUESTED BY THE COUNTY MANAGER

23-0085 External Affairs

Presentation of 2023 Legislative Session Update. **(PRESENTED)**

A motion was made by Commissioner Arrington and seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, to add parity to the Legislative Agenda as it relates to the MARTA Board. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Abstain: Thorne

23-0086 Human Resources Management

Request approval of a Resolution authorizing the Fulton County Sheriff to offer above the minimum salaries; authorizing a cost of living adjustment for certain employees of the Fulton County Sheriff; confirming the Fulton County Sheriff's authority to pay overtime pay as earned; directing an amendment to the Overtime Pay and Compensatory Time Personnel Policy (108-16); authorizing increased overtime pay; and for other purposes. **(HELD)**

a. A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, to approve.

Commissioner Abdur-Rahman withdrew the second and Commissioner Hall withdrew the motion.

b. A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, to hold. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

23-0087 Registration & Elections

Request approval of a statewide contract - Registration & Elections, SWC 99999-SPD-ES40199376IS-02, In-State Car Rental in an amount not to exceed \$47,501.04 with Enterprise Leasing of Georgia, LLC (Atlanta, GA) for the rental of box trucks and cargo vans to relocate to the new warehouse location at 5600 Campbellton Road, SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30331. Effective upon BOC approval. **(APPROVED)**

A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Thorne, to approve. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

23-0088 Registration & Elections

Request approval of a statewide contract - Registration & Elections, SWC99999-001- SPD0000136, Temporary Staffing - Clerical & Light Industrial in an amount not to exceed \$304,619.52 with Dover Staffing, Inc. (Smyrna, GA) to provide temporary staffing services to assist in preparation for the move to the new warehouse location at 5600 Campbellton Road, SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30331. Effective upon BOC approval. **(HELD)**

a. A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, to approve.

Commissioner Abdur-Rahman withdrew the second and Commissioner Hall withdrew the motion.

b. A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, to hold. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Thorne, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Nay: Ellis

Abstain: Barrett

Did Not Vote: Pitts

23-0089 Real Estate and Asset Management

Request approval of a statewide contract - Department of Real Estate and Asset Management, SWC99999-001-SPD0000183-0006, Law Enforcement Vehicles for the Fulton County District Attorney's Office in an amount not to exceed \$579,825.00 with Wade Ford, Inc. (Smyrna, GA), to purchase 15 total 2023 Ford Explorer 4 door, 4 x 4, V-6 Engine law enforcement vehicles. This is a one-time procurement. **(APPROVED)**

A motion was made by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman and seconded by Commissioner Arrington, to approve. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Abstain: Pitts

23-0090 Real Estate and Asset Management

Request approval of the lowest responsible bidder - Department of Real Estate and Asset Management, Bid#22ITBC135696C-GS, Law Enforcement Vehicles for Fulton County in an amount not to exceed \$214,000.00 with Brannen Motor Company (Unadilla, GA), to purchase five (5) total 2023 Chevrolet Tahoe law enforcement vehicles for the Fulton County District Attorney's Office. This is a one-time procurement. **(APPROVED)**

A motion was made by Commissioner Arrington and seconded by Commissioner Hall, to approve. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Abstain: Pitts

23-0091 Real Estate and Asset Management

Request approval of a recommended proposal - Department of Real Estate and Asset Management, 22RFPPARK050322C-MH, Parking Lot Management Services for Various Properties in Fulton County with Parking Company of America, Inc. (Atlanta, GA) to provide parking lot management services for three select Fulton County owned properties. Effective dates: January 1, 2023 through December 31, 2023, with two renewal options. This is a revenue generating contract. **(APPROVED)**

A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, to approve. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Did Not Vote: Pitts

23-0092 Real Estate and Asset Management

Request approval of the lowest responsible bidder - Department of Real Estate and Asset Management, 22ITB135741C-GS, Fire Sprinkler Protection System Maintenance Services in an amount not to exceed \$200,000.00 with VSC Fire & Security, Inc. (Norcross, GA), to provide fire sprinkler protection system maintenance services for Countywide facilities to be effective upon execution of contract through December 31, 2023, with two renewal options. **(APPROVED)**

A motion was made by Commissioner Thorne and seconded by Commissioner Hall, to approve. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Arts and Libraries**23-0093 Arts and Culture**

Request approval of a statewide contract - Arts & Culture Department, SWC# 99999-SPD-0000136-0008, Professional Temporary Staffing in the amount of \$105,000.00 with Corporate Temps Inc. (Norcross, Georgia) to provide temporary staffing services for the Arts & Culture Department. Effective upon BOC approval through June 30, 2023. **(APPROVED)**

A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Barrett, to approve. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Health and Human Services**23-0094 Senior Services**

Request approval for the Fulton County Department of Senior Services and Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Disabilities to provide a letter of support as a collaborator with Christian City and Two Sparrows Village National Institutes of Health (NIH) ComPASS grant application to fund the Lifespan Engagement & Educational Ecosystem Tool (LET). Effective upon Board approval. **(APPROVED)**

A motion was made by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman and seconded by Commissioner Hall, to approve. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

Did Not Vote: Pitts

COMMISSIONERS' ACTION ITEMS**23-0095 Board of Commissioners**

Request approval of a Resolution of the Fulton County Board of Commissioners denouncing the Fulton County Superior Court Clerk's retention of passport executive fees as personal compensation; urging the General Assembly to amend State Law to prohibit the personal retention of such fees by Superior Court Clerks and to provide that such fees shall instead be remitted to a County's General Fund; and for other purposes. **(Ellis) (MOTION TO APPROVE FAILED)**

a. A motion was made by Vice-Chairman Ellis and seconded by Commissioner Thorne, to approve. The motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, and Ellis

Nay: Barrett, Hall, Arrington, and Abdur-Rahman

b. A substitute motion was made by Commissioner Barrett and seconded by Commissioner Arrington, to approve adding this legislation to the Legislative Agenda, with a friendly amendment by Commissioner Arrington to urge the State Legislature to eliminate this practice for all individuals. The motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Barrett, Hall, and Arrington

Nay: Thorne

Abstain: Abdur-Rahman

Did Not Vote: Pitts, and Ellis

23-0096 Board of Commissioners

Request approval of an Ordinance to amend Chapter 46 (Offenses), Article 3 (Offenses involving Public Peace and Order), Division 1 (Generally), Section 46-140 (Juvenile Curfew) of the Fulton County Code of Ordinances to modify the start time for curfew hours of unaccompanied minors age sixteen (16) years or younger within the Unincorporated areas of Fulton County, Georgia; urging Municipalities located within Fulton County, Georgia to adopt similar legislation as Fulton County Code Section 46-140; and for other purposes. **(Abdur-Rahman) (APPROVED AS AMENDED)**

A motion was made by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman and seconded by Chairman Pitts, to approve as amended by amending the curfew times to 11pm. The motion passed by the following

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, Barrett, Hall, and Abdur-Rahman

Did Not Vote: Ellis, and Arrington

COMMISSIONERS' PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS**23-0097 Board of Commissioners**

Discussion: Ordinance to amend Chapter 2 (Administration), Article III (Finance), Division 2 (Budget) of the Fulton County Code of Ordinances to modify Code Section 2-261 to require the County Manager to present the budget requests for the next fiscal year to the Board of Commissioners no later than sixty (60) days before the millage rate is set; and for other purposes. **(Arrington) (HELD)**

ITEM HELD AS REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON**23-0098 Board of Commissioners**

Discussion: Commercial Property Appraisal Fairness. **(Barrett) (DISCUSSED)**

23-0099 Board of Commissioners

Presentation: Invest Atlanta - Tax Allocation District (TAD) **(Arrington) (PRESENTED)**

EXECUTIVE SESSION

23-0100 Board of Commissioners

Executive (**CLOSED**) Sessions regarding litigation (**County Attorney**), real estate (**County Manager**), and personnel (**Pitts**). (**APPROVED**)

PRESENT IN THE EXECUTIVE SESSION REGARDING LITIGATION, REAL ESTATE AND PERSONNEL: Chairman Pitts, Vice-Chairman Ellis, Commissioners: Thorne, Barrett, Hall, Arrington and Abdur-Rahman; County Manager Dick Anderson; County Attorney Y. Soo Jo; Chief Human Resources Officer Kenneth Hermon, BRE Chair Cathy Woolard; and Clerk to the Commission Tonya R. Grier.

a. A motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Thorne, to enter into Executive Session. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, and Arrington

Did Not Vote: Abdur-Rahman

b. A motion was made by Commissioner Barrett and seconded by Chairman Pitts, to decline settlement offers in items #2 and #3 as discussed in Executive Session. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, and Arrington

Did Not Vote: Abdur-Rahman

c. A motion was made by Commissioner Barrett and seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, to approve the request for representation in item #4 as discussed in Executive Session. The motion passed by the following vote:

Yea: Pitts, Thorne, Ellis, Barrett, Hall, and Abdur-Rahman

Did Not Vote: Arrington

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

FULTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONER'S
REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 1, 2023
10:00 A.M.

Alexander Solutions, LLC

(Whereupon, the meeting was called to order at 10: 00 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Good morning, everyone and welcome the Regular Meeting of the Fulton County Board of Commissioner's. Today is February 1st, 2023. It is exactly 10 o'clock a.m. Madam Clerk, please call the roll."

CLERK GRIER: "Chairman Robb Pitts."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Present."

CLERK GRIER: "Commissioner Bridget Thorne. Vice Chairman Bob Ellis."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Present."

CLERK GRIER: "Commissioner Dana Barrett."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Present."

CLERK GRIER: "Commissioner Natalie Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Present."

CLERK GRIER: "Commissioner Marvin Arrington, Jr. Commissioner Khadijah Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Present."

CLERK GRIER: "Mr. Chairman, you have a quorum."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you, Madam Clerk. Please rise for the invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance."

(Whereupon, the invocation was given by Reverend Dawkins followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.)

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you. You may be seated. Now, someone has a -- is that a phone ringing? What is that?"

CLERK GRIER: "It sounds like an alarm."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "What is it?"

CLERK GRIER: "It stopped."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Continue, Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "On page 2, Consent Agenda, 23-0064, Adoption of the Consent Agenda. All matters listed on the Consent Agenda are considered routine by the County Commission and will be enacted by one motion. No separate discussion will take place on these items. If discussion of any Consent Agenda item is desired, the item will be moved to the Regular Meeting Agenda for separate consideration."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right, any items?"

COMMISSIONERS: (No response.)

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. On page 2, Item No. 23-0066; remove that for further discussion, please. Anything else?"

COMMISSIONERS: (No response.)

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I'll entertain a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Is there motion? Motion to approve by Commissioner Barrett, seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman. Please vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion passes; six yeas, zero nays."

CLERK GRIER: "On page 7, Regular Meeting Agenda, 23-0079, Adoption of the Regular Meeting Agenda. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, we have two amendments to today's Regular Meeting Agenda. On page 9, 23-0046, Information Technology: Request approval of a recommended proposal to create an internal-facing employee intranet portal. This item will be removed from today's agenda and brought back at a later meeting. On page 11, 23-0097, request approval of an ordinance to amend the Fulton County Code of Ordinances to require the County Manager to present the budget request for the next fiscal year to the Board of Commissioners no later than 60 days prior to the millage rate is set. This item was supposed to be only for discussion today."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. Any other items? Commissioner Arrington?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Yes, Mr. Chair. On page 8, the item is 23-0084. I want to make a motion that that be moved to Executive Session. I believe that there are HR potential litigation issues, and that item should not be discussed in public."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Repeat that, Mr. Commissioner?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "No, problem. I make a motion to move 23-0084 to Executive Session because of human resources and potential litigation issues."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Human resources. Human Resources?"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "It's your item."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Huh?"

VICE COMMISSIONER ELLIS: "It's your item."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yeah."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Marshal's and other stuff. That's ligation. Human resources --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Let me think about it. Let me confer with the County Attorney on that, because to me it's just a -- this is a -- this is a budgetary considerations here, and I'm going to -- I'm going to rule that this is -- rule that this is an item for public discussion since we'll be dealing only with the budgetary considerations and nothing of a legal matter, and I'll confer with the County Attorney."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. Well, I'm making a substitute motion to move this item to Executive Session."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. That's a proper motion. Is there a second?"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Second."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Properly moved and seconded. Let's vote, please. I would hope that we would discuss this publicly. Properly moved and seconded. This is a substitute motion to remove this one item for Executive Session. Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion fails; three yeas, two nays, one abstention."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Thank you. Anything else? Back to the -- Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "I withdraw. It was answered."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Hall, you have the floor."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I have a question for the Clerk or County Attorney whichever one can answer this: In my 11 years working in the Board of Commissioners office, I've never seen where a County Commissioner's item was placed under the County

Manager's items. And so, I wanted to find out, you know, what is -- what's going on? How is this happening?"

CLERK GRIER: "Commissioner Hall, that was a request from the Chairman."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "That was a request -- I'm sorry. I can't hear you. Can you speak into the mic, please."

CLERK GRIER: "That was a request from the Chairman."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "But this is not procedurally what I've ever seen happen. You're shaking your head yes, but what does that mean?"

CLERK GRIER: "That is -- he wanted to move -- have his item to be heard after the feasibility report, so we moved it up."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Any other items on the -- I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda as amended. Commissioner Hall, you made the motion to approve, is there a second?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right, I'll second. Let's vote please, on the agenda as amended."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open to approve the agenda as amended. And the motion passes; five yeas, one nay, and one abstention."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Continue, Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0080, Ratification of Minutes. Regular Meeting Minutes, January 4th, Recess Meeting Post Agenda Minutes January 18th, 2023."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Is there a motion? Motion to approve by Commissioner Thorne, seconded by Commissioner Barrett. Please vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion passes; six yeas, zero nays."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0081, Presentation of Proclamations and Certificates. The first proclamation is recognizing 'Holocaust Remembrance Day' sponsored by Commissioner Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Good morning and welcome. It is a pleasure to see you again after all this COVID and everything; and visiting the museum, and just seeing all the -- the things that you have in the museum that really, to me, just show the connectivity that we have, you know, on the Civil Rights side as well as on the Holocaust side. And, Leslie, just, you know, your input and education on how we have literally -- the Jewish people and the African-American people have done so much together, and we need to continue to do that. And even more so, in educating our youth on the history of not only the Holocaust, but also Civil Rights; and our fight for equality and inclusion and equity and human rights and civil rights. So, it is an honor to present you with this proclamation. You're going to take pictures, okay. Give them your camera -- just go give your camera to this gentleman right here. All right. And the proclamation reads: WHEREAS, January 27th has been designated by the United Nations General Assembly as International Holocaust Remembrance Day to mark the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau, and to honor the six million Jewish victims of the Holocaust and millions of other victims of Nazi-ism. And WHEREAS, the William Breman Jewish Heritage Museum opened in 1996 and houses archives and galleries for exhibitions on the Holocaust, local history and special exhibitions. And WHEREAS, the Breman Museum is committed to preserving and nurturing the proud history of Jewish life in the Southeastern United States through exhibitions, history, resources, archival holdings, and educational offerings. And WHEREAS, the Breman Museum has trained hundreds of teachers through their Institute for teaching the Holocaust and educated thousands of students through virtual and in-person tours. And WHEREAS, Fulton County joins the Breman Museum and our Jewish community to commemorate and honor International Holocaust Remembrance Day and remember the strength, courage, and bravery of those who survived. NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Fulton County Board of Commissioners recognizes the Breman Museum for its mission to honor and remember all people affected -- excuse me -- by the Holocaust; and does hereby proclaim Wednesday, February 1st, 2023 as 'Holocaust Remembrance Day' in Fulton County Georgia. Congratulations."

RABBI PRASS, RECIPIENT: "I'm Rabbi Prass, the director of Holocaust education, the Breman Museum. And we are just so honored to receive this, that -- talking about the causes of combating hatred, of acceptance, of tolerance in the -- in today's world. It's so important to us, and to be recognized by the Fulton County Board of Commissioners is an honor and we will keep making those strides to make this world a better place. So thank you so much."

LESILE GORDON, RECIPIENT: "On behalf of the Breman, I'm Leslie Gordon, Executive Director. I just want to thank Fulton County for all of the things that they do to make sure that children are taken care of, students are taken care of, and that the arts are taken care of. So we have to put that little plug in there for the arts. Thank you for your support. Thank you for recognizing this day and recognizing all of those who didn't live, but those who did as well. Really deeply appreciate it. Thank you so much."

CLERK GRIER: "The next proclamation is recognizing 'Big Brothers Big Sisters of Metro Atlanta National Mentoring Month' sponsored by Commissioner Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "You know, you are truly a friend, not only to me, but to the youth and their families, and it is an honor to present you with this proclamation. Also, having been awarded the Impact Educator Award by Operation Push and the founder, Reverend Jesse Jackson, Jr. for my mentoring and loving on the youth in Fulton County, this is truly an honor to recognize you for National Mentoring Month. And the proclamation reads: WHEREAS, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Metro Atlanta, a youth empowerment organization creates and supports mentoring relationships that ignite the power and promise of youth in Fulton County. And WHEREAS, investing in young people's futures pays off through improved economic health and social outcomes for young people with mentors. And WHEREAS, at the request of school leaders, big Brothers Big Sisters of Metro Atlanta launched a new mentoring program in 2022 that is serving 270 middle school children, and three Atlanta Public Schools through group and one-on-one mentoring, helping to address the social, emotional needs of students. And WHEREAS, 764 youth were mentored through the big Brothers Big Sisters Program in Fulton County last year. And WHEREAS, the agency's goal is to encourage more volunteers to join the mentoring movement by giving of their time, talent, or treasure. And NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Fulton County Board of Commissioners recognizes big Brothers Big Sisters of Metro Atlanta for their unwavering commitment to igniting the potential of our youth; and does hereby proclaim the month of January 2023 as 'Big Brothers Big Sisters of Metro Atlanta National Mentoring Month' in Fulton County, Georgia. Congratulations."

RECIPIENT: "Well, I definitely have to thank my good friend, Commissioner Hall, just for all your support. Over the years, you always show up. Whenever we reach out to you, you've been there, you supported our work. We've been doing this for 60 years in Fulton County. And if you think about what young people have been going through in this post COVID world, mentorship is more important than ever. We say defending potential, and that's because young people already have it. It's our responsibility as adults to defend it. None of us got to this room without someone defending our potential, so we are honored by this proclamation. We appreciate the whole -- all the Commissioners in Fulton County in general. We have -- one of our Board Members, Richard Mickerson, and my staff along with me and we just are honored by this proclamation. Thank you."

CLERK GRIER: "Next, we'll have presentations of certificates: The Youth Commission Induction Ceremony sponsored by the Full Board of Commissioners."

REGINALD CROSSLEY, DIRECTOR, FC YOUTH COMMISSION: "Good morning. My name is Reginald Crossley, and I represent the Fulton County Youth Commission, which is a program within the Youth and Community Services Division. Today, I have the honor of kicking off our 2023 Youth Commission Induction Ceremony. This is our 24th Class -- 24 years of service in this program. Yes, 24 years of service for this program. I've had the honor of leading this program for 16 of those 24 years. The program was founded in 1999 as Board Resolution to give youth a voice in government. These young people help create laws, policy, and solutions to youth issues; and please

give another hand for our renowned Youth Commission. Hold please. At this time, I would like to call up our county leader, the Chairman of this County, Commissioner Rob Pitts who will recite our oath of service."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Please, stand Youth Commissioners. All right. And repeat after me: I -- state your name -- do affirm that I will well and truly discharge the duties of Youth Commissioner for Fulton County, and all matters which require me to the best of my knowledge and skill advise the Fulton County Board of Commissioners about how Fulton County can best address youth concerns and issues, and design techniques to present -- to prevent at risk-situations of teenagers in Fulton County; influence Commission policy that impact children and youth; I do further solemnly affirm that I will endeavor to discharge my duties in the following manner: participate in monthly meetings and community projects, maintain contact with Commissioners on youth issues, attend Board of Commissioners meetings, plan community service projects that will benefit youth, and reflect favorably on Fulton County government and citizens, and share pertinent information with my peers on youth-related issues. I pledge that I will fulfill these duties, and I will act in my judgment, which will be most conducive to the welfare and best interests of the youth of the entire county. These affirmations I hereby make on this first day of February of 2023. Congratulations."

REGINAL CROSSLEY, DIRECTOR, FC YOUTH COMMISSION: "At this time, we would like to present our certificates of induction. I'll start by calling Youth Commissioners per District. I would like to have our Commissioners stand to the left of me, please. And welcome, Commission Thorne on behalf of the Fulton County Youth Commission. Thank you. Welcome. Welcome. First representing District 1: Venkata Guvvala, Maya Cunningham, Ruhi Doddamani, Prisha Shah, Yash Varakala. Okay. Next District 2: Commissioner Ellis. First up: David Alexander. Representing District Two: Andrew Dantoulis. Next: Prisha Kalur, Kate Zurinkas, Jasmine Stewart. Okay, if you would like to take a picture with your group. Next up, Commissioner Barrett. Welcome, Commissioner, on behalf of the Youth Commission. First up, would be Shreya Sunil -- take a picture, slow down, Youth Commissioners. Next up: Maris Fantgrossi. Next up: Anish Nayak. Next up: Anusha Battacharya -- Anusha Battacharya. Next up: Melanie Harper. That is it, Commissioner. You are welcome to have a picture with your group. Next up: Commissioner Hall. First up, who have Adriana Claudio who serves as Clerk to the Commission. Next up: Arthi Devineni. Next, Sierra Pape, who serves as the Vice Chair for the Youth Commission; and that concludes District 4. Next up: Commissioner Arrington: Grace Malko. Representing District 5: Namiah Louissaint, Maia Henderson, and last, Layla Jones. Next, District 6, Commissioner Khadijah: MiCai Haywood, Isaac Nuriddin, Jada Hall, Kahyah Shabazz. And last, but not least, serving at large, Rachel Alexander, who serves as the Chair for the Fulton County Youth Commission. Rachel, you can share some closing remarks."

RACHEL ALEXANDER, CHAIRWOMAN, FC YOUTH COMMISSION: "Good morning, everyone. My name is Rachel Alexander. I am a junior at Chattahoochee High School and I am currently serving as the Chair of Fulton County Youth Commission. I wanted to share a few words about this wonderful program as we conclude our induction

ceremony. First, I would like to thank our Board of Commissioners for continually serving as examples of dedicated leaders in our community. You all have been instrumental in our development as members of society and its future leaders in our county. I would also like to thank our program director, Mr. Reginal Crossley, who has been an excellent leader, role model, and friend to all of this here at FCYC. His dedication to the program is immense. Despite the multitude of things going on in Mr. Crossley's life, he's always available for our members. So once again, thank you, Mr. Crossley, for continuing to serve as an amazing example of what it means to commit your life to your community, a goal we all share as future leaders in our community. Now, I would briefly like to share a little bit about the impact this program has had on me. I first joined the Youth Commission in the ninth grade in high school. Throughout my years in this program, I've had the privilege to participate in so many wonderful opportunities, including writing and helping produce a PSA as well as meeting influential government leaders like Atlanta Mayor, Andre Dickens. Since then, this program has enabled me to grow as a leader and as a contributing member of society. And while it was a great honor to have these experiences, I've gained even more from this program, and I speak for myself and my future fellow Youth Commissioners. Like, when I say that the friendships and connections that we make here are durable lifelong relationships. Be it through carpool groups or through committee work, Youth Commissioners are enabled to be part of something greater. We are the catalysts and future leaders for change in our messy world, but we get to do so with some of our closest friends. I'd like to conclude by sharing a quote from Tyrese Gibson. He says, 'we must all grow through what we go through. Even though we're just teenagers stuck in the complications of our youth lives, we're equipped with the privilege of serving as leaders in our community. And like I said, we get to do so with some of the best people around. So let's make it our mission to embody the spirit of the Fulton County Youth Commission and to uphold our essential tenant and being the involved leaders of tomorrow. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "On page 8, Public Hearings, 23-0082, Public Comment. Citizens wishing to participate in public comment will be allowed to appear in person or may choose to participate virtually via Zoom videoconferencing or by submitting their comments in writing by registering on the County website, www.fultoncountygga.gov. Priority to public comment will be given to Fulton County citizens, and those individuals representing businesses or organizations located within Fulton County. Speakers will be granted up to two minutes each. The public will not be allowed to yield or donate time to other speakers. The public comment portion of the meeting will not exceed 30 minutes. In the event the 30-minute time limit is reached, prior to public comments being completed, public comment will be suspended and the business portion of the BOC meeting will commence. Public comment will resume at the end of the meeting. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, we will start with the speakers here in Assembly Hall. We have received nine speaker cards. Will the first five speakers,

please come down: Michelle Sarkisian, Kelvin Muldowney, Mary Jo Peed, Brian Dunn, and Jason Frazier."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "And just as a reminder, speakers, when you have 15 seconds left of your two minutes, I'll simply say, 15 seconds. That's your key to conclude your remarks."

MICHELLE SARKISIAN, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Thank you. My name is Michelle Sarkisian. I live in Fulton County. And Commissioners, you already know that Nadine Williams is the wrong person for the job as Elections Director. Consider the following: Nadine Williams has demonstrated she has no project management experience. Even Commissioner Arrington could not vote for himself. How did that embarrassing oversight slip between the cracks? It's because no quality control, that's how. Ms. Williams, ten years in the same role, with no advancement does not make her a top selection. Tenure does not equal qualification in this case. Nadine Williams just accepted the flawed illegal placements of Jimmy Carter Center observers who did not even meet the requirements all of us poll watchers were held to. Why did she implement that unlawful recommendation? Overtime expenses at 60 percent of the enormous taxpayer-funded election budget was absolutely unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. Overtime also resulted in poll watchers being -- poll workers being fatigued, making mistakes, and struggling with seemingly simple tasks. My poll worker could not find me in the system; she just spelled my name wrong several times. She was either tired or just not very adept at her role. Poll worker recruitment proved lacking as local resident applicants did not even get contacted. A qualify director would make local residents a priority to serving their fellow residents. There were many conflicting operational processes within polls. For example, I witnessed a poll manager and compliance manager at odds over turning off scanners at night. Processes should be black-and-white, in writing; not based on alleged phone call instructions as that poll manager claimed"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Fifteen seconds."

MICHELLE SARKISIAN, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "It should be obvious that the three qualifications of integrity, obeying the law, physical due diligence, being good stewards, and disciplined project management are the most important qualifications for an elections director. Make the right decision."

KEVIN MULDOWNEY, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "I am Kevin Muldowney, a Fulton County resident. I'm here today to implore you continued consideration of other candidates for the office of director of elections. As I pointed out in my comments at the last BOC meeting, Nadine Williams has failed her more than one year interview. During her tenure, we have witnessed election staff violating Georgia elections law by shutting out public observer and poll watchers before and after closing. Even threatening arrest to one member of the public, and that staff member responsible for that was promoted to an elections trainer. We have had admissions by the elections department that they have no process to validate new voter registration, hence, thousands of voter

challenges in direct violation of the Habra Act. We have seen disregard of chain of custody practice during early voting and manager emptied ballots from a scanner, put the ballots into a ballot transport bag, and then left the ballot bag unsealed overnight. This is at the Milton Library during the runoff election. With my two-minute time limit, I can only scratch the surface outlining problems with the current management of the BRE. Fulton needs and deserves a Director of Elections that can bring professionalism and integrity to such a basic and highly important right that is our right to vote. Thank you very much."

MARY JO PEED, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Good morning. My name is Mary Jo Peed. I'm a resident of Fulton County. I speak on the support of the selection of Nadine Williams as permanent director of the Department of Registration and Elections. I'm a retired corporate attorney and have dedicated a big pile of my volunteer time to voter protection. Since the primary runoff in 2020, I've been involved as an observer of Fulton County polling places and its processing centers. I have been a vote review panelist, a member of the ballot duplication team and coordinator of poll watcher up to observations in all of Fulton County. I have observed and worked with Nadine Williams in a number of her different roles. Ms. Williams has demonstrated that she has what it takes to do this logistically challenging job at the highest level. She is creative, organized, open, thoughtful, accountable, and enthusiastic. She is a woman with nerves of steel and integrity. As to the 2022 General Election, I collected and processed the observations of hundreds of Fulton County poll watchers during early voting Election Day and early voting as the runoff. These poll watchers observed the department in all polling locations in Fulton County. The observations of these poll watchers support the conclusion reached by the performance review team and the Carter Center team, both of which have dedicated thousands of hours to the study of the department and processes. The Carter team stated that the teams observed no election administration and irregularity --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- 15 Seconds."

MARY JO PEED, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "-- that would call into question the ability of the Fulton County Department of Registration and Elections to administer secure and accessible elections for citizens of Fulton County. We have Nadine Williams and her staff to thank for that. I support this appointment, thank you."

BRIAN DUNN, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Good morning. My name is Brian Dunn. I'm a Fulton County resident, And I'm also here to question Nadine Williams' responsibilities in this position. One of the biggest concerns we have is equipment issues. There's clearly a lack of equipment testing, inadequate testing, or no oversight of the testing for so many equipment issues to be so prevalent in 2022 Elections. Several locations with less than 50 percent of BMD operable opening on Election Day which caused lines that continued throughout the day. The majority of issues were in North Fulton location. Some examples are on 11/08, the OC Library, 11 of 16 BMDs inoperable at opening with no resolutions. On 11/08, Sutton Middle School sixth grade, 13 of 18 BMDs not working on opening. On 11/08, North Fulton Training Center, power units on three of

the carriers were not working. Sandy Springs Library, seven of 14 BMDs not operable at opening. Five different issues with them. Incorrect date and times on BMDs across-the-board. On 11/08 day set, the October 2017, in many cases. How does this happen if these are supposed to go through L&A testing? Constant issues with poll pads that wouldn't poll power; they were glitchy. At the Mount Vernon Baptist Church, two of the four poll pads had old codes and should never have been put into service. This inept manager sent 20 plus voters home."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Fifteen seconds."

BRIAN DUNN, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Printing errors. Printers not connected. Paper not added prior to being sent to locations, scanner issues in primary leading to delays, lines, and confusions, and it goes on and on. There has to be somebody involved that can govern this and managed this. I'm sure that these vote -- (Mic turned off.)"

JASON FRAZIER, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Hello, Jason Frazier, from Roswell. I sent each of you a short Power Point presentation last night. I see, Mr. Pitts has -- has a copy right in front of him. Just today, I wanted to walk you through that. This is a continuation of the five people that I gave you at the last time I was down here that show to have been given credit twice for the same people; so five people, 10 votes. And again, I just want to be fully transparent. I don't know that these people voted once, twice, or not at all, but they need to be investigated. So to help with that investigation, I've given you a little more research into these people. So, looking at slide two, that is a screenshot from the voter rolls that shows each of these people, and that they have the same first name, last name, year, birth address; they're clearly the same people, and that's why I turned them into Fulton County to have them merged, as you will see on slide three. The left column on slide three shows the voter history, date last voted of November 2020 for each of these ten registrations, that's in the voter rolls. On the right-hand side, it shows that these people were merged, thus Fulton County agreed with me that they are the same people and they merged them and the date that they were merged. If that evidence was not enough to show that these people were given credit for voting twice, the next slide is an open record request from the Joplin family who requested and were given a list of everyone that voted in 2020. So I checked that file against these ten registrations and found that all ten of them shown to have been given credit for voting in that voter history file. So yet one more point of data showing that five people, ten votes. And again, to be very clear, I don't know that these people did anything wrong or even know that this happened, but somebody needs to investigate this to figure out what's going on as this is a very small sample size and a much larger problem. I would like to give you all of them, but I want --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- 15 seconds."

JASON FRAZIER, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "-- to see that you guys actually care and want to do something about this. This is very important to investigate this to restore confidence in our elections. Thank you."

CLERK GRIER: "Next four speakers: Lucia Frazier, Melissa Fiorillo, Russell Carlisle, and Julie Allen."

LUCIA FRAZIER, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Good morning, Lucia Frazier, Roswell resident. So, election costs have been high and now they're even higher. I have been touting how important it is to do cost-reduction projects to the election department over a year now, because there's way too much fluff in all the processes. I've given the elections department many ideas on how to reduce costs and have not seen the leadership that is needed to create such cost reduction projects and execute them. The taxpayers need to see a professional method of setting yearly goals and plans of action to address this. That means the election director position needs to be filled by a person who has manufacturing or engineering experience. Elections, no different than manufacturing, require process creation that uses lean principles, process maps, process evaluations on quality cost and timing, and process iterations that yield continuous improvement. This would benefit all citizens. Because our tax burden would decrease and the services we receive would improve. We need someone who isn't afraid to think outside of the box. For example, we are made to think that electronics improve processes. There's a tradeoff to every choice. You've heard thousands of complaints of electronics going wrong and the scariest thing when I start my poll is my machine going to work? Are people going to be able to vote? So someone who can think outside of the box and design a process that's just going to serve the end product, which is a secure vote. The cities in Fulton have seen this lack of responsible leadership of the elections department on many levels; the lack of checking registrations and allowing garbage to pile up, the lack of scaling down resources from municipal elections, since they should cost a lot less. Another recent example of voter registration failed screening is that there is an abandoned home with 20 registrants in it. That's on slide eight and nine of your packet. And then another blatant disregard of law that is recent."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Fifteen seconds."

LUCIA FRAZIER, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "There were a thousand voter challenges submitted every Monday in January. The law states, 21-2-229, there needs to be a hearing within ten days of a challenge. There were no hearings scheduled in January. Thank you very much."

MELISSA FIORILLO, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Good morning, my name is Melissa Fiorillo, and I'm a Fulton County resident. I'm here today as a concerned citizen. I don't understand why Nadine Williams is the only candidate for the Fulton election's director position. Surely, there has been other candidates put forward. It is also distressing that most of you actually think that the last year's elections actually went well under Mrs. Williams' supervision. Please explain why the cost of our elections are exponentially more than other counties of the same size? Why do I hear about so many voter challenges in the thousands, but no real changes in maintaining or updating the rolls? This adds additional costs to the taxpayers; it opens up the opportunity to voter fraud. Why during the recent election with record turnouts did you not plan accordingly for the

runoff to avoid one-to three-hour delay wait times? I personally waited three hours at the Alpharetta library, and that was after I had went by the Milton Library, the line was out the door, through the parking lot, to the side street, all the way to the traffic circle, and I decided to pass that one up because I thought well, I'll go to the Alpharetta library, because it'll probably be a little quicker, not so much. With so many big issues, more than I've listed here, how can you vote to continue with the same leadership? I thought you were elected to represent your constituents to protect our rights --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- 15 seconds."

MELISSA FIORILLO, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "-- and to protect our vote. The time needed to find a more accountable candidate would be time well spent. Thank you."

RUSSELL CARLISLE, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "My name is Russell Carlisle. I've lived in Fulton County my entire life. I want to thank the Chairman and Commissioners for their service. I'm here to speak to you about the consideration of reparations now. If you do a study, which I think you're planning on doing, that study should honestly assess the pros and cons of this process. Some of the pros that I see are primarily for politicians. One would be recipients will be very happy. I would be too. Politicians will gain votes on Election Day. That's probably true. On a more the personal level, some people are actually in dire need of money and will be supported and enriched by this program. I can't deny that. On the con side, the taxpayers and the citizens of Fulton County will have an additional tax burden placed upon them. Funds will be diverted from areas like law enforcement, judicial staffing, and infrastructure, repair and capital improvements on our highways and bridges, and public buildings. Big issue also, healthcare. Grady Hospital and other facilities will lose infrastructure support and support for operations. If implemented, an endless lobby of a course of demands for more reparations will ensue. So you'll be constantly harassed for more money, more money, more money. Reparations will further expand the cultural dependence that perpetuates property and discourages personal achievement. And the big elephant in the room, as I had mentioned earlier --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- 15 sections."

RUSSELL CARLISLE, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "-- is the taxpayers will have to pay for this program. I encourage you to diligently, honestly consider all the pros and cons of this so-called Reparations Act. Thank you."

JULIE ALLEN, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Good morning. I'm Julie Allen. Thank you, Ms. Barrett, for serving as my Commissioner. Thank you to each of you for serving; appreciate it. In the last Board of Commissioners' meeting on January 18th, you voted to include 250,000 to study the issue of paying reparations in Fulton County. San Francisco is not our model. It's a misguided template on how to destroy a city. We have no ability to print money. The money you spend on this issue is funded by taxpayers, working people. I moved to Fulton County in 2005; my father's relatives moved from Denmark in 1912 to Chicago, an abolitionist state, 47 years after the Civil

War ended. On my mother side, I'm a Cherokee descendent. What percentage of Georgia residents are descendents of slave owners or slaves? Yet all will bear the burden of funding including the \$250,000 wrapped into the 2023 budget. That is not a small amount of money for anyone. It should not be wasted. Money should not be given to people who were not alive by residents who were not alive. Fulton County money should be spent for opportunities and solutions for all that unite us for the benefit of current and future generations. Your misguided approval shows Fulton County government to be the problem, not the solution. The vote for Nadine Williams as election director was deferred. In previous weeks I spoke about the extreme mismanagement including voter suppression experienced by North Fulton residents in the runoff as noted by the prior speaker. And I can attest by voting in the City of South Fulton: There were four polling places there while -- and I only had to wait zero to 15 minutes, but in all of North Fulton there were 10 polling places for all those cities. So --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: " -- 15 seconds."

JULIE ALLEN, PUBLIC SPEAKER: -- please, note that I'm sharing an important article written by another Fulton County resident on reparations, considerations, in the Georgia record. Also note that the first speaker shared documents. You all have been provided evidence of confirmed problems with elections under Ms. Williams, all public record. Please review that evidence and vote, no, on Ms. Williams. Thank you so much."

CLERK GRIER: "Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, we have 14 speakers on Zoom and five e-mailed in comments."

RICO DOLLAR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Good morning, Commissioners. The first person to speak --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- just a minute. Just a minute. Let's see here. How many, 14? Okay, quickly."

RICO DOLLAR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "The first person to speak is Matt Rowenzcak."

MATT ROWENZCAK, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Good morning, Commissioners. Can you hear me?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yes."

MATT ROWENZCAK, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Great. I have one question really for you this morning and that is: Do you think we should follow the law? Really and truly, do you think we should follow the law? If you do, that is refreshing; it's part of your oath after all which is binding. Based on the actions of Ms. Nadine Williams and some of the elections department, they don't appear to have that same belief. In 2022, public observers and poll watchers were prevented from observing; literally locked out of the voting location. This was brought to the attention of Ms. Williams, and she would not

address it. During early voting in the primary, ballots were counted prematurely; this is a violation of the law. There have been challenges to the voter rolls that require hearing within ten business days, which are still outstanding. This is a violation of the law. It is been admitted as well that the department does not check the legitimacy of the new voter registrations. This is a violation of the law. Chain of custody documents have been falsified. This is a violation of the law. During the primary, Ms. Williams asked the Board of Election to recertify the results because they had changed. And she did not provide the Board with any documentation of those changes and the new results. This is a violation of the law. Do we get the picture yet? We have an inherent issue with leadership and culture within the elections department, and the Board of Elections who lacks credibility wants to perpetuate the problem with more of the same. Richard Barron was a disaster. His department violated the law, and we want Richard Barron2.O. I've heard a comment or two about Ms. Williams --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- 15 seconds."

MATT ROWENZCAK, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "-- making some slight improvements. Is that compared to Mr. Barron? Well that is about the easiest thing to do on planet Earth. We shouldn't have awarded a failing grade because it is slightly higher than the previous failing grade. An F is an F. And if you have an ethical bone in your body, you will not support the Board of Elections' recommendation for Ms. Williams. Thank you."

RICO DOLLAR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "The next person to speak is Robby Caban."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- hold on. Just a minute. How many -- how many speakers on Zoom?"

CLERK GRIER: "Fourteen."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Fourteen is 28. All right. I'm going to ask that you limit your remarks to one minute in the interest of time."

RICO DOLLAR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "The next person to speak is Robby Caban. Robby Caban."

ROBBY CABAN, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Thank you. I'm reaching out again. As I have for the last several months regarding the Fulton County Animal Services contract, publicly funded through Fulton County residents. You know you all have received e-mails with six whistleblower statements that where you were falsely advised that those whistleblower statements were old. They were not. They were from 2022. There were multiple employees who were all targeted and retaliated against and afraid to come forward due to the dangerous conditions and abuses occurring at our animal control operation, a mandated publicly funded service where our animals are at risk and it affects public safety. Ironically, in December of 2022, we allocated another million dollars to the vendor an independent contractor Lifeline where there's never been an audit despite those whistle blowers --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- 15 seconds."

ROBBY CABAN, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "-- I am (inaudible) Commissioner Pitts, your wife's dog was attacked, as you -- I don't know if that's what it meant to focus on the good. If you were able to focus on the good, I implore you, please call for an audit. There are still abuses, dangerous conditions highly inappropriate --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: -- "Thank you, ma'am. Next speaker."

RICO DOLLAR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "The next person to speak is Ben Howard."

BEN HOWARD, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Greetings, one and all, Ben Howard, Senior Advocate, Public Policy Analyst. During passage of ordinance 23-0351, control over two seats on the Board of Directors on the Commission on Elder Affairs was given to the Atlanta Housing Authority. The traditional screen display protocol was not followed in those three yes, votes were not displayed for posterity shortchanging the public. I have complained, and my complaint has been trivialized and rejected. So what do you say about this Georgia First Amendment foundation?"

RICO DOLLAR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "The next person to speak is Almnory Gutley. Almnory Gutley. Okay. The next person to speak is B. Rohr. B. Rohr."

B. ROHR, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Thank you so much. Can you hear me?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yes."

B. ROHR, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Okay, thank you so much for stepping up and serving in office for mighty Fulton County. Hopefully, we all want the best for the people of Fulton County. You and me. To get the best representative for Fulton County, we need the best election process, and so you're going to be voting on whether Nadine Williams should be the next director of elections for Fulton County. Now, well, Ms. Williams was serving as interim director, not only did she serve us, the residents of Fulton County, she served you. Has she served you well? Did you observe improvement in the implementation of our election processes? Are you continuously receiving complaints? Since my time and my fellows on --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- 15 seconds."

B. ROHR, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "-- I would say you answer that question for yourself because we're watching. We do not need Nadine Williams as our next election's director."

RICO DOLLAR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "The next person to speak is Amanda Brennan. Amanda Brennan. Okay, the next person to speak is Brett Chromy. Brett Chromy."

BRETT CHROMY, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "I'm Brett Chromy. I'm a resident of Fulton County and Milton. First of all, I think it's shameful that you're only giving people on Zoom one minute when everyone should be given two minutes. With 14 speakers on Zoom, that's 14 extra minutes you'd be waiting for lunch. That's just pathetic. You really need to give everyone two minutes on Zoom. I'm just going to give you three examples of why Nadine Williams, her hiring should be postponed. First of all, my own experience was in the General Election, it took me over two hours to vote because I was going to one location then to another. That second location was closed in the runoff. It should not have been closed. I'm not sure why you did that. You might want to blame the Secretary of the State, and I don't disagree that he hasn't done his job, but putting somebody else incompetent in, and then change their responsibilities is a terrible idea --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- 15 seconds."

BRETT CHROMY, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "-- I know that someone who was poll watching was kicked out of poll watching because he didn't wear a mask on his way to the bathroom. He wasn't able to watch for several hours until the Secretary of State had to come and force the poll manager to allow him to watch is a grave error preventing poll watching for hours to occur. Why was this even something --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Next speaker. Next speaker"

RICO DOLLAR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "The next person to speak is Dorothy Arnold-Cox. Dorothy Arnold-Cox. The next person to speak is Julie Adams. Julie Adams. The next person to speak is Roger Naik. Roger Naik."

ROGER NAIK, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "That's me. That's me."

RICO DOLLAR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Okay, go ahead."

ROGER NAIK, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Okay. We have a problem working downtown Atlanta. Can you hear me, sir? Hello?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yes, we can hear you."

ROGER NAIK, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "Okay. You know, so I have this problem for almost like 20 years or so. The question is that we have such a homeless population and then on top of that its right next to the deli, I had -- and the price -- the rent is going up; the crime is so much in downtown Atlanta that people don't want to come to the downtown Atlanta. And we really want to develop this property and if we develop the property, because now it's a rundown. There is nothing there in the building."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Fifteen seconds."

ROGER NAIK, PUBLIC SPEAKER: "All the businesses -- I'm sorry."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Next speaker."

RICO DOLLAR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "The next person to speak is Terry Hightower. Terry Hightower. Okay. With that being said, that concludes our Zoom public comments."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "What's next?"

CLERK GRIER: "We have five e-mailed in comments."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right."

REGINA WALLER, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "The first e-mail comment is from Candy Muldowney. I am speaking today to voice my concern over your possible vote of Nadine Williams for elections director. In a normal business, poor performance would not be rewarded. I know people that wanted to work the polls and signed up, being told they had to work 19 straight days with a minimum of 12-hour days. There is no excuse for this. So many that would like to work could not. With a temp agency handling the labor and scheduling, that could have easily worked out shifts. That would be better for workers. More staff efficiency with rested workers and certainly less overtime cost to the taxpayers. Wasn't there a financial audit released in 2021 with issues including a lack of transparency for funds requested? This, for one, has not improved with a lack of supporting documents --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- 15 seconds."

REGINA WALLER, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "-- why? If you are running a normal business, you will be bankrupted and out of business. The next comment is by Lauren Fuller. I was just writing to ask if something could be done about Fulton County animal services. Dogs are not being picked up, and I have heard of several very sad situations, both for the dogs and for citizens. I am very fearful and anxious about this situation. Animal control primarily function is picking up dogs and they are no longer doing this. I think doing an independent audit is necessary. Our tax dollars fund Fulton County Animal Shelter, and I would like to see where my tax dollars are going. The next comment is by Roger Naik. We own almost a block near Grady Hospital at 207 Edgewood Avenue, Southeast. We all are worried about crime and homelessness and lack of affordable housing. Development of the property can help resolve some of these issues for sure. We need to add money badly to fix some of those most dire situations our city is facing. Crime and homelessness should be reduced ASAP. Our property is rundown. It is in the heart of the city and the county. The next comment is by Ajay Robinson President of the Central Atlanta Progress (CAP). Good morning, Board of Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments to this important topic of TAD. I am Ajay Robinson, and for the last 20 years have served as president of Central Atlanta Progress and Atlanta Downtown Improvement District, a private

nonprofit representing the business community working to improve economic vibrancy in downtown Atlanta. I come before you today to voice our support of tax allocation districts as a vital source of funding for our neighborhoods, particularly at a time where our downtown is still reeling from the impacts of the pandemic. Tax allocation districts remain best practice tools across the country. My organization was involved in the creation of the initial TADs West End and East End and we've seen both in the city and the county benefit greatly from this funding. It has allowed Atlanta to attract and --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "--15 seconds."

REGINA WALLER, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "-- invest in jobs, build more affordable housing and leveraged the financial -- financing of secure larger dollars for infrastructure and improvements. At its core, served as a gap financial tool, this means that the most impactful TAD's can be capitalized on existing market interest. For example, Eastside TAD has 40 projects --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Just a minute, just a minute. Next speaker."

REGINA WALLER, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "The final speaker is Alfonso X. Marshall, and also he has similar comments as to Mr. Robinson. That concludes the e-mail announcements."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Anything else, Madam Clerk?"

CLERK GRIER: "No further speakers."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Continue."

CLERK GRIER: "On the bottom of page 8, under Open and Responsible Government, 23-0083, County Manager: Fulton County Jail Feasibility Report."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Mr. Manager, Mr. Adams, it is 11:13. Mr. Manager. Mr. Manager."

PATRICK LABAT, FC SHERIFF: "Good morning. So we're going to kick this off. First I want to thank the Commissioners, all right? This study is possible because of the vision and foresight you all bring to -- have brought to having a company come in and really tell us what the bare-bones facts are. Later today, you all will receive a copy of Colin Powell's book from me, and that is called, 'It worked for me', and I'll employ you to turn to Chapter 17. You'll find what you'll hear today. Tell me what you know, tell me what you don't know, and tell me what you think. So what we know is the jail is falling apart. What you all know, most of you know at this point is when I was sworn in, we inherited the Titanic. We've been looking for an iceberg, right? We inherited a mess. We were spending upwards of \$350,000 a month on maintenance at the time. And

thanks to Mr. Davis and his team, we've reduced that quite a bit. What we know: We've spent over a billion dollars over the last ten years continuously trying to repair the facility. To date, we know that nearly 300 -- 3,000 detainees continuously rip apart the facility to make shanks, you recall from the five wheelbarrows we brought in not too very long ago. Well, we know the building is not just outdated; the thought processes are outdated. It's simply time to stop warehousing people and treat them like they're human. A new more modern and safer facility is what we have an opportunity to accomplish together. Moving from the jail thought process to a criminal justice complex that will serve us as a county for the next 50 years. What we don't know: How much longer will the building be able to be held together with duct tape and bubble gum? What we don't know is how much longer people have to suffer being treated less than human. What we don't know is how many times I will have to text and call each of you about a power outage which then cost more money, because we have additional resources that we have to call out to continue to serve and keep the facility safe. What we don't know is how many more shanks we'll find. If you recall in my midterm and the report we put since May of last year, we've found 1,578 homemade knives and shanks. Just this week alone, we've found 83 and 19 cell phones. What we don't know is how many more people will have to be stabbed? How many more of your constituents will call you to then call me? Since May of last year, we've had a 149 people get stabbed. Really, six over the weekend when I called -- had an opportunity to call and text you. What we don't know is how many more lawsuits will our County Attorney have to defend with an already depleted staff? What we don't know is how long it will be before the feds come in and make us do what we need to do with the vision that we have, and the reason we have STV Treanor and TreanorHL here to really look at and give you a really overview, but a bird eye's view of why and how our plans are deteriorating, et cetera. The facts are quite simply is we have detainees and we have worked together to outsource detainees to Cobb and to AC/DC. Certainly, thank you all for your leadership there. But despite these efforts, we have to move from this jail way of thinking into a -- and build a criminal justice complex. We'll have more space to treat mentally ill individuals. We'll have more space for those that are suffering and that want to learn whether it be GED programs, things that we continuously do now with limited space. With all that said and done, right now, you have an opportunity to create a new vision for what Fulton County will look like as we continue to go forward. I do want to make two quick points: One, I want to thank Mr. Alton, and certainly the consultant teams, as we get ready to move forward. But what you'll also hear -- if you hadn't heard already -- is doing nothing will ultimately cost us between \$14 and \$18 million a month. So it's an opportunity for us to get it right as we get ready to move forward and, as always, I leave you by saying, first, thank you all for the recognition over the last couple of meetings of my team and certainly thank the hard-working women and men of the Fulton County Sheriff's office, and I will turn it over, Mr. Adams. Thank you, sir."

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "Thank you. Good morning. Thank you, Sheriff. Good morning, Chairman Pitts, Vice Chair Ellis, Commissioners. Twelve months ago, you approved the funding of a feasibility study for a new Fulton County Jail. We engaged in a detail RFP process and selected Treanor and their partners to lead the engagement. After an exhaustive and comprehensive process, they are going to

present those findings to you today. Make no mistake, the decision to build and fund a new jail is not an easy decision; particularly, given the many perspectives and issues regarding the criminal justice system; and the role that our jail plays in the process. Undoubtedly, we must continue to look for ways to solve the economic inequality, the violence, the gang issues that drive the current jail population. And we, Fulton County, support those goals through the many diversion programs and activities, mental health programs that we fund to in fact, allow us to address some of those as we sit here today. That having been said, our county has a legal and a moral obligation to ensure the detainees in our care are safe and healthy. We have a responsibility to ensure our correction officers are safe and supported. And we have a responsibility to the workers in our jail, the attorneys who visit their clients, their families that are waiting the next step in the judicial process to make sure that we do everything we can to fulfill our responsibility. Done right, our new jail will reduce violent attacks; it will improve care for detainees suffering from mental health issues. It will allow us to improve our medical facilities, and it will increase the ability for some of the programs -- for all of the programs that the Sheriff alluded to, GED, cosmetology, computer skills training and the like, and improve, quite frankly, our ability to support reentry into society and then since then reduce recidivism. And so, it is important as we listen to the presentation today that while we talk and focus on the physical construct of the jail, we need to appreciate that our jail symbolizes our commitment and empathy for those waiting to have their cases heard in the Fulton County system. Our current jail is a bad symbol of that commitment, and we can and we must do better. So with that, I'm going to turn it over to our team. They look forward to any questions that you may have as they go through the process."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Mr. Adams, procedurally, if there are questions, should the Board have questions, should they wait until the presentation is complete or page or slide by slide? Which way do you prefer?"

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "I think would be great, Mr. Chairman, if it's, okay, to have you ask questions as we go along. The team is prepared to address those questions as we move forward."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you, sir."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, good morning. Thank you very much for allowing us the time to present this morning. My name is John Eisenlau, and I'm the principal in charge of the STV TreanorHL joint venture. And I've been a practicing architect here in Atlanta for over 30 years. I have had the opportunity, if you will, to work on a number of your municipal jails in and around the Metro area of Atlanta, so I'm quite familiar with the building type. I have six members of the feasibility study team with me here this morning. I'd just like to quickly introduce them and let you know what their roles are. And I'll introduce them to you in the order that we will be presenting to you this morning, okay? So Patrick Jablonski, who is a statistician with Pulitzer Bogard is first up behind me. He'll take you through some of the statistical analyses of our report. Secondly, is Frank Greene. He is the

joint venture partner with me in this exercise, and he'll share with you some of the services that can be anticipated in this facility as the -- as the presentation unfolds. Curtiss Pulitzer with Pulitzer Bogard will share a slightly more detailed view of the program itself, the macro program as we call it. Bob Cousseillant, who is in my office, who is a project designer, will share with you the sites that we evaluated as we contemplated the feasibility study. Chris Scoffe is a managing director of Gleeds here in Atlanta. He is our cost consultant for the project; and then lastly, we have -- excuse me -- Jay Brown of Hayatt Brown. And I'll say that Jay is a municipal transaction advisor, and I think you'll find his portion of the presentation quite compelling. As Alton mentioned over the last ten months, we have been diligently working away at the feasibility study. There are over 10 professionals involved in this exercise. We've expended likely over 5,000 hours on the project to date. So, what've we've been doing? We have been meeting with stakeholders, and there were quite a few of them as you can imagine, probably close to 40. We've also been meeting with the steering committee to sort of test some of our thoughts. We have been gathering data with the Sheriff and the courts; and we have been touring your existing facilities. I've personally been in the Rice Street facility over a dozen times. We have spent a considerable amount of time looking at that facility. We've also looked at the North Annex here in Alpharetta -- or in Alpharetta, if you will; the South Annex in Union City. And lastly, we toured the Atlanta City Detention Center. I was actually part of the design team on that original building, and it's actually a very good example of direct supervision here in the immediate area. Of course, the Sheriff is very familiar with that facility, and there are some attributes of that building that we think are very positive. Let me say that our process -- the feasibility study process, included two very important horizons, and I just want to bring those to your attention as the presentation unfolds. The first horizon is what we call the 15-year horizon, okay? You'll hear from Patrick about how we statistically analyze what the needs are to 15 years, okay? And that day for us is 2037. And then we also looked out to 2047, which we call the 25-year horizon. This is fairly common in programming facilities of this nature. And the reason for that is that you really want to build for the short-term, and you want to plan for the long-term. So in this facility, if a facility constructed, it would be sized immediately for the 15-year horizon. It would have the infrastructure available for the 25-year horizon, and then you can add housing units on to it if you need to over time. So this is a fairly common planning tool for a facility assessment like this -- or a facility study like this. All right, so keep that in mind as it unfolds and you may have additional questions about that. I'd also like to clarify some terminology here today a little bit. There's a huge difference between a jail and a prison or a correctional facility. A correctional facility is for sentenced individuals. A jail is a pretrial facility, very, very different populations. Next slide, please. We spent, as I mentioned, a fair amount of time with our stakeholders. It was robust conversation. We certainly enjoyed it. We captured all the goals of the project and, in our mind, we distilled them into a vision, and we tried to find the simplest way to share the vision of this project, and I'll read it for you. So the vision for the new facility, this does assume a new facility clearly by that statement that provides a safe and humane, which frankly don't really exist at the current facility right now, and sustainable environment. Sustainable in our mind is all-encompassing. It's not only the public, it's the staff. It's the users. It's utilities. It's the long view of the project reflecting the best practices in

pretrial detention. Not correctional design, not prison design, pretrial detention, which is very, very specific. There are best practices across the country that are good models that we've discussed with the stakeholder team, and we feel comfortable that this, in my mind, is an achievable vision and one that's brief enough. I will anecdotally say that this facility, in my mind, is a generational opportunity for all of us. This is a significant endeavor, and it will impact a significant amount of lives. This is an opportunity to think about how the facility is branded. Is it a community justice initiative? Basically, something that expresses the mission enhancing the quality of life of the Fulton County citizens who actually interact with a facility like this. Next slide. So my agenda today is intended to represent the abridged version of the executive summary. And capture portions of our 300-page report, so we're distilling this down for you as best we can. So this presentation is deliberately organized around key questions that we asked ourselves and those are detailed in five volumes in the actual report that we will publish shortly. And I'll walk you through those a little bit. Do we need a new jail? Very simple kind of question. I think that the Sheriff alleged to a few thoughts there himself. How big should it be? Once we establish how big it should be, we'll talk about the services that are in it, where it should be located, and how much it will cost. So five very simple questions that we'll walk you through. Next slide, please. So do we need a new jail? Next slide. From a justice designer's point of view, I'll share some thoughts on this with you. Obviously, the existing facility is overcrowded. One thing to keep in mind here is that the existing facility was built in 1987 and the standards and the needs and the population of Fulton County were very different 35 years ago. So there is a significant difference between what was occurring 35 years ago and what's occurring now. And I will point to you -- point you to a very specific number on this slide. The original facility that was designed in 1987 was actually a single occupancy facility, meaning that each of the cells was attended to have one individual in them at one time. And what that did is it generated a design population of the facility which is 1125 beds, if you will. If you look at the numbers now of how the facility is being occupied, it's over two and a half times the capacity of the existing Rice Street facility which, in many ways, is completely unacceptable. A building can't survive with that kind of load on it frankly, for an extended period of time. You'll find a common theme at Union City as well. It was actually only designed for about 240 detainees and, at times, it had over 319. So, there's an infrastructure overcrowding issue that I start with here. What happens in a facility when you have identical housing units, which is what Rice Street has, is the Sheriff has no ability to classify individuals, meaning separating individuals. These could be males, females, codefendants, people that have health issues, pregnant women, aging men, things like that. There is no way to separate individuals within the facility effectively. And because of that, it creates a significant public safety hazard and concern. You can see some of the statistics here that we're quoting that fights and fires and stabbings continue to occur in the facility which is completely unacceptable. Jails normally last roughly 30 years, if you will. They age at twice the age of a normal building, so one could argue that the facility out at Rice Street, being it's 35 years old is acting as though it's 70 years old, and that's actually quite true. So the facility is aging, it's in poor condition, and expenses will continue to be spent on the facility to maintain its deteriorating situation. It's simply beyond its useful use. One of the more troubling aspects of the existing Rice Street facility is its lack of programs. And when I mean,

programs, I mean programs for the detainees, for the staff, for the public. These are people coming into the facility, these are people leaving the facility and reentry strategy. There's simply no space in the facility. And we'll show you shortly that the existing building is practically 90 percent housing. So that 10 percent that remains is quite limited, and it's not sufficient to drive the proper performance of a modern jail right now. We'll show you what those percentages should look like in a properly designed facility. And lastly, the staff, I can't stress more the importance of the staff focus of this facility. There's a huge issue nationally right now that jurisdictions are having hiring individuals. It's very difficult to hire people to work in facilities like this. The facility, unfortunately, currently, is adversely impacting the employee retention and recruitment. And you can see some of my numbers here where the authorized positions are X, but there are a number of them vacant for various reasons. And to me, what's a little more troubling actually, is that the new hires are not keeping up with the separations. So it's a downward slide of staff. This is not uncommon. It's happening nationally right now, but I really direct you to the focus of this issue and you'll hear from our team shortly on the importance of having spaces like the ones that are lacking that I just mentioned in the 90 percent. So there stress mitigation for the staff, there's recreation space for the staff, there's proper daylight, there's flexibility in the work environment. The office environment should reflect what a normal office environment should look like. That's the way to retain people. So I'll leave you with some of these thoughts as we move to the next slide."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Just a minute. Any questions so far on this? This is the B slide? Any comments? Just one question. So that 130 new hire versus 185 separations, is that a function of the physical structure or salaries?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: " I think, Chairman, it can probably be said by me that it would be both. I was focused more on the physical environment myself, but I would say that it could probably likely be both."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Could likely be both. Thank you."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Good morning, Commissioners. I'm Patrick Jablonski, and I'm a statistician with Pulitzer Bogard, Incorporated. It's my job to develop a forecast to determine how big the jail would need to be. Before I begin, I just want to express it's an honor to be here. This is my hometown. I was born in Fulton County and lived in DeKalb for about 20 years, and as my family will readily tell you, I'm very much tied to the area. I live and die with the sports teams in this town. So that said, let's look at my first slide, or the next slide. Forecasting jail and correctional populations are an incredibly complex task. There's a lot of things that go and impact what the population sizes of facilities. There's a ton of what we call variables that very much work together, and they choose -- they work to impact how a -- how large a facility grows over time. And one of the things that make this a very tricky endeavor is that public policy and other things change on a constant basis. And so, very much a lot of the time there's moving targets involved, and we've been able to, with this slide, distill the main causes of jail population sizes into really four big buckets. The two biggest

factors on the screen are bookings and average length of stay. Bookings are simply the admissions coming into the jail that itself impacted by many things; the crime rate, the -- what we call the public safety posture. In other words, in certain jurisdictions, there are more strict regulations that, you know, police will arrest people on charges in certain jurisdictions that in other jurisdictions are not arrested. I'm not calling out Fulton County specifically on this, but that's one of the variables that we look at. Average length of stay is also one of the biggest considerations for determining how large a jail's population is. Really average length of stay isn't anything that the Sheriff can control. It's very much controlled by the courts and the judicial system. And so, it's a function of criminal justice case processing. And that in turn is itself impacted by the severity of charges that individuals face over time. People with more severe charges tend to stay longer and, if you have growth over time of the number of individuals who are facing more serious charges, that increases the average length of stay and it, in turn, increases how large the jail's population is. And then we have two other considerations: The third box down, it's policies affecting the incarceration rate. This ranges from state laws; it also includes things like sentencing practices, specifically what I'm talking about here or how the judiciary, for instance, might issue probation, and then choose to revoke individuals who may violate their probation. Those practices very much themselves impact the average length of stay, but there's something else that's kind of buried in this box, and I think is very important. There's social economic factors in society that very much impact each individual's ability to secure release from jail; impacts the custody rates. The individuals with access to more resources are much more able to bond out of jail than individuals who might not have access to those resources. And that's very much an impact of socioeconomic status. The final variable over all of this is the growth of Metro Atlanta and Fulton County. Fulton County's population will grow by about 23 percent in the next 14 years. A fifth of the detainees in the Fulton County Jail come from neighboring counties. And so, when we build our models, we have to factor in to account the growth of Metro Atlanta. Seeing no questions? Yes, sir."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: Any questions? All right, I do have one. So the -- you said the courts and the judicial system more so than the Sheriff with respect to average length of stay --"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes, sir."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- that was your statement, and I agree with that. You also mentioned social economic factors, but neither of those have anything to do with the physical structure; is that correct?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "I don't think they impact the physical structure other than the fact that when you have individuals staying a longer period of time, it crowds the physical structure."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "But the answer is, those are separate, the physical structure, the building itself."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "I would agree with that."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you. I'm sorry. Commissioner Barrett."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Thank you. So just to be clear; these factors you were talking about here are not -- can be indirectly affecting the number of beds we will need?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Absolutely. But the top two directly affect. I mean, that's a mathematical fact. The two main drivers are bookings and average length of stay. But the other things down at the bottom themselves impact bookings and average length of stay."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Right, and I think it's just important to note that these are things that are predominantly out of the control of the county, if it's a state law, if it's socioeconomic factors, these are things we have to be prepared for, but are not in our control, correct?"

CLERK GRIER: "Exactly."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Vice Chair Ellis?"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Yes. I know you're going to get into the actual, you know, components of the assumptions, but regarding the assumptions on, specifically on average length of inmates stay; as you look -- as you looked at this, was there any attempt to sort of identify what should be a standard, you know, kind of average length of stay that an overall court systems should strive for? This should be sort of a benchmark."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "This was a very early question that not to name names, but Mr. Anderson asked us at the start of the project, and I rather infamously gave him a number of, you know, what the target average length of stay was, and it was not received all that well. A large urban jail prepandemic, I would say an appropriate average length of stay would be 28 days, 29 days. That's prepandemic. The impact of the pandemic --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- no, I'm looking for, you know, to live in a post-pandemic world."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Post-pandemic --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- 28 to 29."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "-- post-pandemic world is very hard to compare."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Well -- well, let just day this: In a normal world where courts were caught up; 28 to 29 should be the standard?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Absolutely."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "What the courts should strive for."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "And I would say for Fulton County 35 would be a great number to hit, but so much would have to go right for that to occur. You know, I --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- we're at 37.2 in 27 -- 2016, and I wouldn't say that a lot of people say we were optimized. We were working at an optimal level in 2016. So, 28 to 29 is sort of a general number that could be a standard to kind of shoot for."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Prior to the pandemic, yes."

VICE COMMISSIONER ELLIS: "Prior to the pandemic."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "I think -- there's no easy answer to that question. Living in the world we do now, I really think the number now is in the upper 30s. I mean, large urban jails across the country are all looking at average length of stay times of in the 50s."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Right. Okay. All right. So that was really more my question on that. And then the second question related to this in the appendix, which I don't know that you're going to get to, so I'm just going to ask it now. On 85 of the appendix, you note that 50 percent of the jail population -- of our current jail population is unindicted. Obviously, I guess unindicted sort of can plays into the average length of stay, right? But, similarly, is there a percentage of jail population unindicted sort of target, you know, that a court system, you know, should strive for and/or, you know, should create a warning signal to, you know, policymakers that, you know, kind of -- you're not functioning at an optimal level when said percentage gets above X?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "I think determining a rule of thumb is somewhat difficult. I would say off the top of my head, 25 percent would be fair. But let's back up and look at this issue, because I have analyzed the unindicted population, and they have seen it also analyzed by other organizations looking at the Sheriff's data that, you know, we're all saying 50 percent. But there's something to keep in mind. After we've conducted the main part of that analysis, I had the good fortune -- all of us on the team had the good portion of being able to discuss the matter with the District Attorney's Office in October, and I think there's a couple of factors that we have to keep in mind. Right now, when I looked at the numbers last week, about 25 percent of the

jails' population are unindicted felons who are staying past the bail hearing deadline, the 90-day mark. And on its face, that appears to be a very concerning number, but as the District Attorney's Office has pointed out to us, the jail data and the court data, even though they're part of the same data system, don't necessarily always talk to each other very well. Try as I might to connect that data, there are individuals who would show up in an analysis as being unindicted that actually do have a previously indicted case sitting on the court system that isn't coming across to the jail system. So when I tell you that 25 percent of the jail's population are unindicted felons pass the 90-day deadline, that is an absolute worst case scenario. The fact is, I don't think anybody here, at least in this building, knows what the true number of unindicted felons is due to that data issue with older cases. The other concern here is I don't pretend to know the business processes of the District Attorney's Office; but in similar jurisdictions, indictments tend to hang up waiting for other parties such as the state crime lab where you're waiting to get evidence back in DNA testing and other testing, and there's times where, you know, the District Attorney can't pursue an indictment without a fully completed evidence packet to go forward. I don't have the ability to query the District Attorney's side of the justice system, the data system, but I would imagine there are a lot of cases that are hung up, not through any decision made by the District Attorney's Office, but that they are simply waiting for other parties to forward evidence."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Would you say that every judicial system around the country has a perfect set of data that feeds in their system and people are able to, you know, look at all the stats and they're perfect?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "You would say that is the case?"

CLERK GRIER: "Yes, there are jurisdictions that have just incredible data."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. But are there other systems that do not? I mean -- so, at some point, I mean, I guess -- I don't want to belabor this so we can move on. But, you know, some point, you know, you need a real number. I mean not anecdotes and not, you know, kind of hearsay, right? So what you've told me is that, you know, I guess we can work towards getting the real number, but in a place where you feel like the data's good, 25 percent is a target."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes, sir."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Is that a fair statement?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes."

VICE COMMISSIONER ELLIS: "Okay."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Next slide."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Just a minute. Just a minute. Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Thank you, Chairman. I'm just trying to get a handle on the direction in which this conversation went. I don't profess to be an expert, but we need a new jail. So, the length of stay in a jail in our condition would be much worse than the length of stay in a brand-new jail; would you say that's correct?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "I don't --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "-- or let me rephrase it. Let me pull back and rephrase that. The fact that the new jail, from the feasibility study that I've looked at, it takes components of what we need that the jail presently now does not have. And so, a length of stay in a jail that comprises components that can service the community versus the components that we don't have now would be a more amicable position to be and are more better."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Okay. The reason I'm asking that is because sometimes I think we go around in circles unnecessarily. With all due respect, I get calls -- I have been getting calls since I came in. And with all due respect to the Sheriff, the Sheriff inherited a problem. It is my opinion that he's doing the best with what he has, but when we get to talking about unindicted length of stays and all of that, anything that can help us to decrease the time, whether it's having information, or forensic information come back from the state quicker; whether it's mental treatment, whether it's wraparound services, we are at a handicap now because we don't have what I call the optimal situation with what we have, which is a jail that is aged, it's old, and at the end of the day, it has outlived its usefulness. So, I'm just trying to get an understanding as to this conversation and how it's relevant. My only ask is if I need to be educated, then educate me. If I don't need to be educated, can we try to make sure that we get the information that we need so we can make an educated decision. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Hall, you have the floor."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you to this awesome team. It was a pleasure meeting with you and reviewing this presentation before getting to the meeting, so that I can address any new things that come up. And what I heard a few moments ago was a discussion about these four factors on page 7; and that the last two included socioeconomic factors. And that potentially the county really has nothing to do with that, and I say that we do have everything to do with that. Socioeconomic factors include income, education, employment, community, safety, social support, and so much more. And they can significantly affect how we will and how long we live the quality of life. Excuse me. I dropped my book. And we impact all of those things through many of our departments and agencies such as Work Source Fulton, the Sheriff, the DA, the Solicitor General, the judges, behavior health court, drug

court, child support court. There's so many ways that we impact the socioeconomical factors -- economic factors that impact our residents. And so, you know, one of the things that I spoke to all of you about when we met is that we have a human factor that's involved in this. It's not all about a building. It's not all about space. It's about how do we serve, not only our employees who are working in the jail, but the inmates, and the families and loved ones of those inmates. And you have more presentation to go, but I want to just say on page 7, that it is clear that we do have a way that we can support everyone involved in the jail as far as social economics -- and I see you shaking your head, yes, so I just want to make sure we stay on that point as we move forward, thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. Commissioners, now they're here to make a presentation. If we have questions of them, let's ask them questions to clarify anything that's not clear."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Well, I wasn't going to ask a specific question, but I can do it that way. You know, I think maybe this goes to the whole team, but I just want to, you know, ask again, I guess, this was a jail feasibility study that took place over a year, correct?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "And you all, I know from the conversation we had offline have multiple years of experience, not only here but across the country dealing with these kinds of facilities that this is the -- excuse me, the specialty of many of you; and I hear my colleagues asking questions that seems to be going to -- your presentation now, correct, is on how big this facility should be, assuming that we agree with the early assumption that we do need one, correct?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Right. So, it sounds like some of the questions are aimed at sort of questioning the study, and whether we're basing it on the right facts, yes?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "And I would just like to assert that I think, and you can correct me if I'm wrong because you all did this study, that the original jail when built was built too small at the time even for what we needed. And so, I think it is important to note at this moment, that if we make that same mistake again, that when we're looking at our 15-year horizon and our 25-year horizon as described, that will find ourselves in the same situation that we're in now. And so, we made by changing the assumptions at some level, be able to make this smaller or less beds or whatever that might save us some money in the short-term, but we would really just be kicking the can down the road and causing ourselves bigger problems in the long run; is that correct?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Okay. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "So two final questions, sir, these are specific questions. You indicated that 50 percent of the inmates in our jail are unindicted? Numerically, what is that number?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Out of the population the other day of 3581, it's 1650 that appear to be unindicted, but that is an absolute worst case scenario given my previous comments about the data issues."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. That appears to be unindicted. And this is coming from a neutral third-party, I would say. And the DA says that's only approximately around 800 unindicted, but we can talk about that later. You also made a statement that the courts in the judicial system may have a role and it's not the Sheriff. But you also made a statement that the fact that the jail personnel and the courts are not talking to each other, and that's why there may be --"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Allow me to clarify. The two data systems sometimes don't link up perfectly. I was the one who built the query for the study. I connected the jail side of the house to the court side of the house and there are times where not everything links up correctly."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. But again, whatever the case may be, that though is not a function of the building itself; is that a fair statement?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Correct."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you. Next slide."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Next slide."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I'm sorry. Commissioner Abdur-Rahman has another question."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Thank you, Chairman. I just want clarification for the audience that may be watching this. When you say unindicted -- that they may be unindicted, it's several variables of factors that may enter in to that. My understanding, sitting on the Diversion Board, is that when you make that statement of unindicted, it is kind of a broad statement, and so, I don't know if you can speak to it or Alton, I just wanted to make sure when we say the amount of people that are unindicted, there is a, for the lack of a better word, a disclaimer -- it may not be a disclaimer, but the laymen term of saying unindicted, there are other factors as to why they may be unindicted because they may have another charge somewhere else. So if someone could just speak to that quickly for me because I think we do a disservice to

individuals that's looking at this when we make that statement. So Alton, if you don't mind, sir, could you just speak to that on my behalf, please, because I want to make sure that our taxpaying citizens of Fulton County understands what that means when that is being said."

ALTON ADAMS. COO, FC PSS: "Certainly, Commissioner. And I think, you know, what Patrick was explaining, is that there are nuances to the data based on the way the system has been constructed. So, for example, to your point, if you did a search on Alton Adams, I might show up as unindicted on a particular charge, but I might have had a couple of other charges. I might be back in jail because of probation violation. That wouldn't show up in the way we query and the way the database is constructed. And so, to Patrick's point, that 1620 is the worst-case since everybody has one charge and they haven't been indicted on that charge. What it doesn't take into account is that there may be other charges for which I have been indicted. And so, those are some of the nuances that the team is continuing to work through. And so, when we say the DA - - Madam DA says she thinks it's about 800, Patrick says it's about 1620, we've got to go back and kind of take a look and see what exactly are the individuals who have only one -- who have one charge and an unindicted versus others who may have a number of charges, but are unindicted on one or two of them. And so that's the nuance and, unfortunately, our database, Odyssey, is constructed as an operational database to moves individuals through the system. It's not designed to be able to do quick very sophisticated analytics, which is why it's so challenging when Patrick goes and starts looking at the data. So, I don't know if I answered your question; but the point is, we know the number somewhere between 800 and 1600, and it's just too big regardless. Because before COVID, the number was closer to about 250 people. So we know it's bigger than we need to be. The question is, what's the order of magnitude?"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Well, Mr. Adams, I appreciate you clearing it up. And I don't want you to be indicted for anything."

ALTON ADAMS. COO, FC PSS: "I appreciate that."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Use Joe's name. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Barrett?"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I have a question for Patrick, just for clarity sake. There's been some mention of pre-pandemic, post-pandemic now, et cetera. I just want to ask if the determination, the factors you're using to determine how many beds and how big take into consideration the fact that we live in a post-pandemic world in the sense that we may have another pandemic. We now know this is the kind of thing that is going to happen in this world, and while we don't really know how prepared we will or will not be depending upon what it is that comes our way next. So, I just want to make clear that we should not, in my mind, be going back to a, you know, dream world in which pandemics don't happen and acknowledge the fact that there could in five or ten years or maybe sooner, you know, heaven forbid, be something that causes us to get

backlogged again in the courts and such. Is that something that's been taken into account?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes. We can't predict when the next pandemic will be, and so the forecast models that I built don't include the next pandemic; however, we did have to do some things to -- in some of the forecasts to try to control for the impact of the pandemic. You know, we did that which was necessary statistically to, you know, correct for it; otherwise our forecasts would be incorrect."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Yeah, I think the point I'm asking about is just again, if we were, for some reason, change these assumption and go to a small number of beds, we would be putting ourselves potentially into an even worse situation shoulder another pandemic type occur."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. No further questions."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Next slide. So we did a bunch of work and we end up with three final scenarios for your consideration. They would be three forecast scenarios or a status quo forecast which the assumption is, from the time that I built the forecast nothing changes. The main part of this forecast was assembled in late August of this year, but all the trends in bookings, an average length of stay and the factors that impact those, remain the same, that's the assumption. The next two forecasts modify those assumptions. There's a moderate improvement forecast that takes the status quo forecast and it modifies it to include multiple changes in the system, some of which that are actually occurring. Fulton County has expended significant resources to do some things to help our criminal justice case processing. There was a return to two tracks of trials starting on Halloween Day. There is more Zoom technology within the facility to enable hearings and meetings between counsel and defendants. There's a whole variety of things that the county has gone, that they've done recently, you have done it recently, and so we haven't really yet, at this moment, seen the improvement in case processing and the reduction of average length of stay. Our moderate improvement forecast basically says here's what we think is going to happen to the jail population based on those factors. And then we have an optimal improvement forecast, which the jumping off point for this forecast is actually February 2020. We just acknowledged statistically that there's so much change from the pandemic to the judicial system that we start the forecast at that moment and the assumption long-term is the county completely solves the COVID backlog which would be a significant lift, and that they really frankly candidly, a ton of things would have to go right for this forecast to be really what actually happens. But as you'll see, we're really going for that middle forecast because the county is acting now to try to get in front of the population. Next slide."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No questions?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Excellent. All right, there's a lot of information on here. The words at the top of this slide talk about the planning horizon that John mentioned in his introductory remarks. So we have the 15-year and a 25-year planning horizon. The key thing to remember here is that we planned for 2037, but there's certain thing that we try to put in place to support, an addition, by 2047, if things were needed for that. Essentially, you're laying the groundwork for 2047, but hoping that that the policies and programs succeed and keep the population in check. The actual table and the numbers that are there are basically looking at our three forecasts that I described on the previous slide. The status quo's the top two rows. You can see we have 2019, we have 68.3 bookings per day, and then it drops due to the pandemic; and then we have a forecast model, the best performing forecast model that we have, calling for an increase in bookings into the jail overtime. That's just simply what the math worked out to be to do that. An editorial note, we're about to see a slide with the forecasts that are there for the month of January that concluded at midnight; the base forecast which I assembled in August, was off by six detainees out of the population of say 3600. This is about one tenth of one percent. So right now, that model is tracking accurately. I don't think that's going to be how things turn out long-term, and that's the moderate forecast, which is in the middle, that we expect a small reduction in bookings. But we also expect a significant reduction in average length of stay for 20, 37, and 47 such that the population from the status quo forecast that I view very much as a worst-case scenario should not be what actually happens. It's happening now, but with time, the system is going to catch up to it. And then, again, the optimal forecast is calling for a more significant reduction in average length of stay that would drop the population further. But again, that assumes that an awful lot of things happened that I don't think would be the prudent assumption to make. And then again, population growth of the county and the region kind of operate in the background to drive some of these numbers. Questions about those?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yes. Vice Chair Ellis?"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "First off, just a couple of context in my remarks. I understand we need a new jail. I believe we need one, but also recognize that there are a lot of competing factors at play. And we do have to factor in a lot of things in the assumptions that are made, not only the information you share to us, but also the stuff that we have to take in mind as policyholders from what we're hearing from our citizens. We hear that we incarcerate too many people. And there's too much mass incarceration. There needs to be more diversion. It takes too long to get to through the Fulton County court system. You hear that sort of feedback from a lot of folks. You hear different set of feedbacks from other the folks. So, you know, I think the assumptions that are made are valid for us to factor in. I think we need a well-functioning court system. It needs to be -- it needs to be excellent and world-class. It needs to drive towards ideal numbers that track what are going on, you know, kind of in other parts of the country that are performing at an optimal level. We should strive for that, independent of what we're doing in terms of the jail being built. All right? This shouldn't all be just about hey, we should just sort of continue to assume that we're going to operate a court system that's going to limp along and perform at this kind of

level, and if that's acceptable to Fulton County citizens. Because we hear that it's not, okay? So, you know, in terms of I asked questions about assumptions, you know, they're valid question, not only to kind of ultimately what we would build, but also to kind of the policy decisions that we make and what our citizens are telling us they want to see, okay? So, I just want to offer that for context. I think we need to have realistic assumptions, you know, but I also think that we also need to have some sort of, you know, assumptions that are based on us showing improvement, significant improvement, in the operation of our court system and our judicial system. And some level of impact from investments that we're making into diversion and other things or else we shouldn't be doing it. So on this page, I've got -- you know, you established a couple of things early for me which I appreciate, you know, that may be moving toward an average length stay of 35 or so might be, you know, a good target to strive for, for us. You know, we're at -- we're at this number right now of 58.9, 2016; and like I said, we were at 37.2, you know. And so pre-pandemic, post-pandemic, whatever, you know. We should be able to drive this number down. I do think reaching sort of a number that makes some level of sense to me looks more like what you have in the average length of stay in the optimal forecast, in terms of not only sort of a target to shoot for, but something that also is realistic. And I'm not looking to pick apart all of your numbers, but I do -- it's important for me to understand them, okay? And I'm just looking at other sources that I look at, you know and I need you to kind of help me understand the source you're pulling from, okay? So let's start with Fulton County population down at the bottom, all right? You got this going to -- Fulton County being at 1.577 in 2047. So what is this sort -- I'll tell you what I'm looking at. I looked at sort of what appears to me on the state website that that number is more like 1.393 in 2047, and I'm looking at the study by ARC, that Metro County population study, and had Fulton County at 1.473. You know, statistically, that's meaningful differential in what you have here. So I'm looking to understand kind of what the number is and where it's derived from?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Allow me to explain. These population numbers for the county, 22, 37, 47 are erroneous. It's my mistake. I wrote the wrong numbers down into those cells. I have no idea how I did it. The number I get from the Governor's office of planning exactly matches yours for 2047, the 1393700. Now, let me back up and say the actual numbers that I used to build my forecast; we don't look at everybody in the county. We don't look at the number of babies in the county. And so, the actual numbers I built to use for our forecast were the forecasted number -- the projected number of adults in Fulton County through time. That's the accepted norm in jail forecasting, is that you do a count of the adults and you actually use that for your forecast model. So the numbers that I put up here, after our discussions, we decided to use the fully-loaded census numbers, and I botched it, frankly, on this slide for those three numbers. The numbers and the stats."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "All right. You know, we paid you guys a lot for this study. We had a prelim conversation on it. I pointed this out in the conversation we had. We're seeing a final presentation and the numbers are wrong. So, you know, I'm not necessarily striving for perfection, but you know this is a critical piece to, you know, kind of us understanding, you know, and how much credibility we're going to give to kind of

what's here, right? So that's, you know, I appreciate you acknowledging the error. If we get it corrected and shown here, you know, and sort of with an accurate presentation of that, I would appreciate it. The other thing, you know, just sort of say, you know, even if we were to use this population, you know, change from 2022 to 2047, and this goes to the daily bookings. It shows population growth during that period of time of like 38.4 percent over 2019. But that's a 66 percent jump in average daily bookings. So I'm just, and a lot of people say well, we're in sort of a, you know, peak crime time right now, you know. Obviously, certain cities are going to trying to say crime's on decline, that sort of stuff. It's better than it's ever been, But, you know, to a lot of citizens, well, you know, we're at sort of an optimal rise in crime within a lot of our communities. So to say then that our average daily bookings are going to grow and outpace our population growth by almost double, I'm just trying to reconcile that. That's a key input, and I'm trying to reconcile that number."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Yes. There is not a one-to-one relationship between population growth and how bookings operate. It's not that, you know, hundred people moved to Fulton County today and we know that there's a proportion that will go to jail. It doesn't work that way. The statistical modeling for bookings takes into account the charge mix of the individuals. And one of the things, there's two factors driving how we are projecting out the bookings. One is the severity of the offenses tend to be growing over the last three years. And those numbers internally in the bookings count are themselves going up. The other factor here is that we have more violations of probation returning, but that wasn't necessarily happening back in 2016 to 2019. And so, we have an internal growth in bookings that does truly outpace the population growth really due to the nature of who is coming. And if you look at our bookings number, in 2021, we had a 12 percent growth in bookings for the year. In 2022, you had a 10 percent growth in bookings for the year. January over January, this past January versus last year, it's over 20 some odd percent growth from month-to-month. So, all of our models that really passed statistical muster are calling for an increase in bookings that does outpace population growth."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "All right. Help me out on something. So 2022, we're showing average bookings 52.7 versus 2019 of 68.3. But yet you just told me they're going up month over month. Why they -- why are they down that significantly?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "The pandemic."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "An averaged -- in 2016, it was 67.4, according to -- I got old data the Sheriff gave us in 2015. I mean, if you telling us that you think daily bookings are going to grow 66 percent over the next 30 something years and that that's going to be based upon policing and, you know, views around, you know, incarceration and charging or whatever, that's what you're suggesting? We're going to have 66 percent more criminal-related and booking-related activity in this town?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "I am indeed saying that. The bookings are --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- you better not give that number to the Chamber of Commerce."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Well, I think the more fair comparison to the county would be to take it back to the 2019 number, pre-pandemic; the increase there to 2047 is what roughly, say 33 percent over a 28-year period is really -- I don't think it passes a smell test as well as the statistical tests."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Thank you, Chairman. I'll be brief. I would say it would be safe to say preliminarily these numbers may fluctuate or change a little bit? It's not an exact science; would you say that?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "There are a lot of variables that impact the forecasting over time."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Exactly. But would you agree that these numbers probably won't go lower, or that much lower? Based on what you're presenting today."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "If there are no major changes to the system. I mean, there could -- the General Assembly might pass a law this session that would turn everything on the screen on -- but everything stays the same, yes. So it's the reality."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Exactly. I am confident that you all are the experts to me, otherwise you wouldn't be standing here giving me the report. But I want to make sure that we look at something -- it could be a flaw, for the lack of a better word, but with all things equal, I would think it's the best information, because I was trying to give credence to what my colleague said, but I'm trying to also wrap my head around -- if we're looking at the variables in my mind, this is the best scenario, the best numbers. So I just wanted to make sure that we are very clear with what we say in the public and to the public. Because, ultimately, it's the Fulton County taxpayers that this burden is going to be on. And so, we know that the numbers are not going to go lower, or that much lower, unless other factors come in place, but I would have to defer back to what my colleague, Commissioner Barrett, said is that initially when this jail was built, one of the main things that happened was we didn't take into account the foresight of the amount of beds that was needed plus the services. And so, moving forward, we want to make sure that we are diligent to do that now because we will have one, the same scenario; and two, it will be a rolling effect of ultimately paying a larger cost in the long run, not necessarily what's cheaper now versus what the taxpayer will be paying in the future. So thank you for -- thank you for that."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Thank you, Chair. Just kind of quickly: This wasn't a simple linear regression model. Can you -- like what other independent variables did you -- when determining the 66 percent growth rate, what are some other things that were put in the model?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "You can't use linear regression models on time series data. Not to turn this at all into a statistics lecture; but the type of modeling that we use is called a ARIMA. It's something that has been adapted from industry and finance to do long-range forecasting. ARIMA methods are excellent at projecting correctional facilities. It's really the state-of-the-art. That said, the terms that we're going into are ARIMA model. And the final model is a simple bookings an average length of stay and population, and there's weights set up for those based on previous steps in the analyses. To come up with the bookings and the average length of stay components to that model, we are doing statistical modeling for those themselves that we look at criminal court case processing, for instance, as a major predictor of average length of stay. However, we break that into felony case processing, felony in-custody case processing. And so, at the end of the day without, you know, getting too nerdy statistically, we ran several hundred simulation models of how the jails population would grow within the ARIMA process, and we have boiled it down to really three final models to talk to you about today."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "And then did you analyze any data before 2019 as well?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "We started -- the modeling begins on January 1st of 2016, for the base forecast, so we looked at that time. You need about four years' worth of data, but the problem is we have to statistically account for the existence of the pandemic, so we had to go back to the start of 2016 and then really to the end of 2022 for our examination period."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Okay, thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right, no further questions."

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Excellent. Next slide. These are the forecasts that I warned you about. The black line on the start, on the left side, is the actual population. You can see that it begins in 2016, and it's relatively flat. We have a spike in 2019. You see the drop in 2020 from the pandemic. The population shrinks, just like in every large urban jail in America. And then we begin from summer of 2020 up until really today, a period of regular steady growth such that the population now is higher than really it has ever been in history. Yesterday, there was 3604 detainees in custody. This morning, I believe it's 3580; significantly, higher than it was in 2016, '17, and '18. I will point out that my base forecast, that is the ARIMA model that I talked

about, it's off for January of 2023 only by six individuals. It's less than one tenth of one percent. I was doing an excellent job so far of predicting what the population is going to do. You'll look at the green model, that's our moderate forecast, and there's a period there where we think there's going to be, for 2022, you can see where the points all meet; and we think there's going to be some growth to the jail during 2023. But then, hopefully, the tide turns as the county's efforts to get in front of the jails' population take hold. That's why that green line flattens out, and then long-term it's a little hazy to us in fairness. Frankly, there's a margin of error here. It's basically like if a snow storm is forecast two weeks out, we all know that that's probably not the most realistic thing. We're trying to limit that as much as possible by using state-of-the-art statistical methods. All our indicators are that the jails' population long-term will be influenced by a lot of things and continue to grow. So the moderate forecast takes the population to 4455 by 2037. And then the optimal forecasts, the kind of light blue color that is there, is really, I think, a very hopeful and optimistic scenario that if a lot of thing takes place, some of which are, you know, being attempted now that some of which are proposals that will be in our report, that would be good ideas for the judiciary -- judicial system to implement. That would reduce the jails' population in the short run, but long term, you're still going to be looking at a higher population than what you have today. Those other three forecast models in terms of just averages."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No questions?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Excellent. Next slide. All right. A little bit on its face, a somewhat confusing table, but what you have to remember is the numbers that I presented on the last slide are just -- are averages. The average daily population is well an average. There are days when the jails' population where the population is higher than average. There's days where it's lower than average. For most jails in the United States, the summer season has higher populations and then the winter season has lower populations. That is what we call a seasonal factor. And so, for the jail to operate safely and securely over time, you need capacity to be able to absorb seasonal processes. If you look at the bottom where we talk about a bed need, that's basically the size of the facility and the equation for it is simple. It's the bed need equals the average daily population from our forecast, plus that peaking factor which is the seasonal process that I just described to you. And then you've already heard about the classification factor. In the first minute of John's portion of the presentation, he's talking to you about how the current jail doesn't have enough room to maintain a strong classification system. The folks who operate the jail need excess capacity to be able to house people appropriately. You know, example, keeping 17-year-olds away from adults, you have to house them separately. If you don't have capacity in the system, you can't do that. There's probably ten or 11 examples that I think fall in that. So we statistically calculate what the peaking factor is and the classification factors such that approximately 20 percent of population gets added so that you have a bed need. So, the first set of numbers here for 2022, the average daily population that we reconstructed was 3300, right on the nose, to safely and securely house those individuals. In one location, you need 3942 beds. That takes into account summer fluctuations and also takes into account that classification factor. So that said, my three

forecast models appear in the bottom three rows. The status quo forecast right now is kind of the law of the land with how things are going and right now is highly accurate. It's showing a 5006 average daily population in 2037. In order to maintain safety and security and to have a classification system that has integrity, you need 5980 beds. The moderate forecast is highlighted in orange because that's where I think the planning needs to go. I think this is the most realistic scenario for us. And so, an average daily population in 2037 of 4455, and the resulting bed need of 5322. Honestly, I stand before you and really hope that the optimal forecast is reality for Fulton County, but I have to be realistic that there is a ton of things that would have to happen to achieve those numbers or even beat those numbers and I'm rooting for Fulton County to do that; but I have to do my due diligence and say it's the moderate forecast that I think is the best thing that we need to go with. Questions?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No questions?"

PATRICK JABLONSKI, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Excellent. Thank you."

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Good afternoon, Commissioners. Right? It's afternoon now? We've made it. My name is Frank Greene. I'm an architect whose practice for 30 plus years has been dedicated to the improvement of the justice system sometimes saying increasing the justice in the justice system. I've had the -- been tasked with the responsibility to help create the master plan for the New York City probate jail programs, close Rikers, open community-based facilities, and I guess we can go next -- so that's what I spent the last six years doing, working on one of the buildings down in Queens, which is where all the queens will be housed, which is all the women in the system will be in our building."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Could you speak up a little bit please, sir?"

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Okay, I'm sorry. Also, working on a new project in the City of Baltimore for the State of Maryland, which is called the therapeutic treatment center, working under a court order; they are building the jail that's not a jail that includes extensive medical mental health facilities and a separate stand-alone building for women, a deflection center that precedes diversion. In other words, people who are drunk and disorderly acting out with mental illness, that kind of thing, are brought to a deflection center without an arrest. They're also operating a diversion center, which is after arrest -- I'm acting like it's already happening. This is in the design. And then the deflection center to get people out of the system without spending time in jail awaiting trial. And then jail beds as we would think of them that are termed therapeutic communities, so they've really charge us as designers, but there's extensive planning for it with developing a completely rethought jail, if you will, for the City of Baltimore. That's really what we're talking about here, and it's that first bullet there. It's to create a new facility with capabilities that represents the best thinking from across the world, across the country, as John showed in the first slide, has a vision that's fundamentally different from than what drives the jail today. Sheriff Labat and his staff want to do great things; want to do the right thing, but they're completely, I guess,

handcuffed is the wrong metaphor, but completely limited by the circumstances of the existing jail. Not enough space and not enough right kinds of spaces, and it's deteriorated in condition -- an unsafe condition. And really, that's the first word that is absolutely fundamental to every single thing that you would want to do as Fulton County in turning this ship around, which is create an environment that's safe for everyone in the building. Without safety, you can't have -- thinking about -- you can't have hope. You can't have thinking about tomorrow. Thinking about a better day. People are devoting themselves to making shanks to protect themselves instead of devoting themselves to addressing their real issues, you're never going to be able to approve. So with a safe environment for staff, for the people in custody, for the service providers that come to the building to help provide these programs, then you can start to build towards a sense of hope and change. So direct supervision is the first and most fundamental way to create more safety. If you've been through the facility, today, you see the control rooms, the officers really have no idea what's going on in the housing units. Putting the officers in the housing units, dealing with the people in custody directly, first name basis, I know you, I know your story, and let's get on with that. With enough space and enough programs to keep people busy all day, they literally don't have time to make shanks, because they're going to class, they're going to programs, they're going to therapy. All of that is the next piece. The environments are normative. In other words, they don't exactly feel like home, but they feel like a place that reflects of concern and caring about your human dignity and that provokes normal responses to everyday encounters. Again AC/DC was built along these principles and the folks that work there and even if you walk through, it just feels different. And that's really a wonderful start towards on the right thing. So again, space for program and services, the square footage, the ability of service providers to get to those places to provide those services are very important to what we're trying to create here. Absolutely fundamental, again to the safety and health, physical health as well as mental health, behavior health, substance abuse treatment. The people that walk in the door are often have long-term chronic illnesses, both physical and mental, and that need to be addressed, dental. You name it. People who are living rougher and can show up in rough shape, and having the facilities to actually be able to help people on those ways again creates that sense of trust and sense of caring and a platform for change. That's what we're trying to create. Again, within the system, this kind of ability to address wraparound services when the person comes to the facility, it's not just a question of what's your charge, but what is your risk and what are your needs? And start addressing those needs while they're in the facility and connect them with wraparound programs that can travel with them outside the jail when they're released because everyone's coming out one way or the other, so that when they come home, there's community service providers they can connect with that can help them again along the path to wellness."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Again, can you speak up a little bit."

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "I'm sorry. And then finally, just quickly, creating a safe and positive environment for staff to have this be a good job where people feel like they're -- they're changing lives and they created something

positive in their day at work. They feel safe. Their challenge is not so much providing security, because security in the safe environment happens automatically. We leverage technology to create buildings that don't require people standing around with keys to lock and unlock doors because the building technology allows that; but it allows people - people's jobs, uniform staff's jobs, and other service providers to focus on this caring and healing that can be really defining of the correctional officers' job. Definitely, I wanted to underline the technology leverage that we can create here connections to the courts to provide ready processing of cases, connections to home, to families, to service providers, to attorneys for people to be able to talk to those that are going to help them on a path to recovery, and issuing tablets and all that. Who knows what the technology is going to be in another 20 years. But that's a very important part of what we're trying to do here. So, thank you. Curtiss?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Were you addressing page -- slide 14?"

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Just slide 13. Curtiss will take slide 14, so if there are any questions."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No, no questions."

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Thank you."

CURTISS PULITZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Good morning, Commissioners. It's great to be here. Many of you know me from our calls. I'm Curtiss Pulitzer. I'm managing principal of Pulitzer Bogard Associates. Patrick works for our organization. We are a national criminal justice planning firm. We do these type of needs assessment for coast-to-coast, north to south, in more or less large counties, and it's been a great privilege working here at Fulton County. My last work effort this year was up in Gwinnett County a number of years ago, so it's my first opportunity work with Fulton. So if we can go to the next slide. So, Patrick -- I'm mean, I'm sorry. Frank talked about, you know, the vision for the new facility and programs. What we did is we held a number of workshops with Sheriff Labat and his key staff, and I want to thank him publicly for their participation and their insight and help us shape the vision for this facility. The staff are amazing, and they're doing a fantastic job with a really bad situation there. So again, thank you for Sheriff and your staff. So this table talks about the comparison that we have today percentagewise with what we're planning. It's a little bit misleading; we had some questions about it, because it is not proportioned. The amount of square footage on the left -- and there will be a slide coming up two slides from now -- is 510,000 square feet while the square footage on the right is two point -- almost 2.2 million -- 2.2 million square feet. The key take away, however, on the slide is that today 90 percent of what you have available is all housing; and it's all cookie-cutter. It's all the same. There's no distinction between medical, mental health, between jail population. People will have to be in restrictive settings, protective custody. All variety of classification categories you have are all kind of lumped together. And what's left over, the top 10 percent, is hardly any other space for everything else needed in the jail; food, laundry, visiting, program services, and especially program services,

and the healthcare treatment is just minimal in the current facility. The new facility, and if you see that horizontal line that goes down, the angled line, the right side, that 30 plus 38, that's 68 percent; that is all housing. So that 68 percent is equivalent to the 90 percent; but what do you see as the big difference there? Thirty percent of our space is dedicated to healthcare and mental health housing. The needs are substantial. These are for individuals that have serious mental illness, that have substance abuse disorder, and many have co-occurring disorders. A lot of our population have both. And we need dedicated specialized housing, specialized treatment, services for these people, and that is a huge game changer that we see happening and one of the key reasons why you also need a new jail beside the fact that the jail has so deteriorated. And the other components are the other square footages that are required. The next slide gets into the detail of that, if you have any questions now, or we can wait until this slide. Is that okay, Mr. Chairman?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No questions on 14?"

CURTISS PULITZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Okay, thank you. So this is a bit weedy. It gets down to all the actual square footages. We developed a program, as John referred to earlier, there will be a full report which will have great detail explaining how all of this is to operate. It's like a 200-page component of the report, which will talk operationally. How is this all going to work? But 42 percent of the new facility is dedicated to medical mental health treatment and programs and services. Again, a huge paradigm change from what you have today, and that's going to be able to treat our population in a more humane way and, very importantly, get them back into the community. One of the things we haven't talked about as much is reentry service areas. Reentry starts the minute you arrive at booking. And it continues until the day you leave the facility. We want to be able to connect our detainees to the community, to social services, to mental health providers, both in the County and the private sector and the public sector, housing, job employment. We want to know where are our detainees going and how can we keep them coming back into the jail. The Sheriff's office does this today, but they're so hampered. They don't have the space. They can't provide the services. We can't get the volunteers to come into the building because we don't have the space for them to work in. We got to change that. That's what this is all about. So again, on the left you can see the housing. Yes, we have to house a lot of people. Thirty-eight percent of our population will be people who are the general population and some in all the classification categories we have. We have to have youth. They have to be housed separately. These are youth that are bound over as adults into the criminal justice system, unfortunately. But the rest of the building, a lot of it is focusing on medical and mental health programs. Any questions, Mr. Chairman? Any questions, I'm sorry."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Any questions? Commissioner Ellis?"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So, on the portion of the facility that's dedicated to medical mental health and special needs housing --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: -- that's my question."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- if you look at, I guess, going back in the appendix, if I'm reading this right, in AA, it might be useful to maybe show this while we're talking this question through. But you show for bed distribution, if I'm reading this right, 29 percent of the beds -- I guess this is the male population and 7 percent for women, are dedicated to medical mental health. My question and I'd ask this in sort of a prelim conversation too, is what is the mental health -- delineate the mental versus the medical, you know, because you're always going to have a medical need within a facility. The mental health piece is a potential issue in terms of, you know, if there were changes in terms of state policy and so forth that perhaps the need for significant number of mental health beds. Also, I want to call this out so we understand what it is, so it's a number that we can talk about and have conversation with at sort of a broader level independent of this study."

CURTISS PULTZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Sure, Commissioner. I'll give you the actual numbers. The total number of beds, actual number of beds, you'll see on the next slide is actually 5480. That's the capacity we're planning for."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Say that one more time?"

CURTISS PULTZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "5480, which is on this slide right here. That's the actual number of beds that have been planned. It's a little bit higher. Just everybody understands that Patrick's bedding number; and the reason for that is that we -- this is an example. I don't need to get in the weeds here, but we have 118 different housing units, and we want to create housing units of the same size, similar in nature, so when you add them all up, it does add a few more beds into the total bed capacity. As far as the medical mental health population, the total number of beds total is 1900 -- I'm sorry, pardon me, 1984. It's actually 36 percent of the total beds, and of that 1984, 400 are dedicated to medical, to healthcare, and also for people who are geriatrics, people who are like brittle diabetics. And also we are planning for that future pandemic, if it does happen again as Commissioner Barrett mentioned earlier. You want to make sure we have enough respiratory isolation spaces for them in the facility, God forbid this happens again. And, as you know, Alton Adams worked on that, you know, when the pandemic started. We did not have the proper capacity to really keep these people in an isolated and a proper manner. We are not going to have that happen in the future. We are building it into the planning numbers and our capacities."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So 400 -- you said 400 of the 1,984 beds would be medical beds?"

CURTISS PULTZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Medical related, yes, the whole continuum of medical care; skilled nursing to stepping down from skilled nursing to what we call the medical GP, which is being able to treat people, you know. They don't need to be in a hospital environment, but they do the medical attention."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So 1,584 then by default are mental health beds?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Correct, sir, yes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Describe for me the spectrum of beds in the middle -- in terms of what you mean by mental health beds? What are we -- what's there --"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "-- right, so the range, and I don't know if I have those numbers. I don't think I have them in front of me; but I instantly give those to you. But the ranges of the three major categories of mental beds are acute and the acute. Again, there's a range of people in acute. These are people who are going through severe psychosis or acting out, in the simple language, and need to be kept in very specialized small housing areas while they're being treated. They're decompensating and that's one group. They're not the largest, they're the smallest. The next largest group is called subacute. So these are the people that are stepping down from acute. In the sub-acute category, these are people who are somewhat stabilized. They can go to more treatment of programs and services than the acute. The acute are fairly violent. But the sub-acute are pretty much mainstreamed; however, that type of population decompensates very frequently, so they might wake up back in acute. So -- but there's a large number that falls into that sub-acute category. And, again, just to be very clear, now I'm a member of the NAMI which is the Nationalized Mentally Ill. We want to keep these people in the least restricted environment; that is our goal, helping to treat them. We need to treat them well, and we can treat them with respect and dignity and humanity, which is not what's happening today. So the sub-acute is a tough population, but we want to get them back in general population, that's the goal. The next group is called special needs and we have a lot of people in that category. These are people that are -- have had diagnoses of SMI, serious mental illness or co-occurring disorders, they are stabilized. They can function normally. They're on medication. A lot of them on medication. They can function in a normal environment, but they need some extra protection because when you put them into general population, they sometimes they get themselves in trouble and they can cause problems for the other detainees of the population and really need to be in a more protected environment. They're not anywhere in the treatment level needs of the other populations, but they do have more intense interactions with the clinical personnel."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Do you have -- of the three categories you just described, do you have kind of a breakout estimate of how that 1584 would break down?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "I do, sir. I can get that to you. I don't have it right this minute. I have it on my laptop, so, I gave that back to you -- that's, okay."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "In that acute category, do you have an assessment of kind of like, in general, right, if we were in more of a normalized situation in terms of what our states capacity was to take on individuals with severe mental health needs versus

them being, you know, having to sit and be incarcerated until a bed opened up, et cetera. In this acute category, are we generally referring more to people that, you know, should be in a facility like Georgia Regional versus in jail?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "That's a great question, Commissioner. It's -- I would say, to a certain number, yes. However, and I've been doing this all over the country -- the largest mental health facility, you know, compared to Fulton is Los Angeles. The problem is that the state facilities just cannot accommodate the type of individuals we have in our jail systems. And yes, they do take them in and we do send people right now to Georgia Regional, as you know, it's too small. But they are sent right back. And they -- it is theoretical that a facility could be built to compensate. Well the acute, it will be the acute population, you're correct, that will be the target group. But it would have to also have a correctional aspect to it and since they're civil facilities, I don't see that happening. And unfortunately, that's why they really need to be remaining in the jail system."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Say that last?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "In other words, the civil facility, which is like the Georgia Regional civil facility, and because of the nature that these people have committed crimes, now maybe the crimes are due to their mental illness and often they are. Those types of facilities are not designed to accommodate a population that have been charged with crimes and to keep them in that type of environment. From a treatment perspective, yes; but from the management perspective, no."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. And then the last question on this subject of the mental health beds: Is there a facility out there that resembles something like this, with that magnitude of beds dedicated to mental health? In terms of the construction up there, compared to the ones that y'all looked at?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Well, the closest one might be the new facility in Baltimore that Frank was alluding to that we also have an involvement with. LA County is still grappling with that. It was a much bigger facility. Actually, they were developing a treatment facility with 4,885 beds that were all medical and mental health, and most of them was mental health. That facility is still on the back burner there for a variety of reasons, that will be the largest in the country. New York City -- I'm sorry. Go ahead. Go ahead."

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "If I could, Commissioner, New York City, total population in the program is 3300, very similar, 37 percent."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thirty three hundred?"

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Correct. And the 37 percent of the beds will be designated as they call therapeutic treatment units, so it's exactly the same percentage, medical and behavioral and mental health."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. So they're overall facility is 3300?"

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Yes, that's correct."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. All right. And it's 37 percent. We're talking about a facility of 54, 80, and 37 percent. Okay. And then the one in LA hasn't been built, it's been discussed?"

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Correct."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "The one in Baltimore has been built?"

CURTISS PULITZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "It's in planning."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "It's in planning. Okay. Is it a similar percentage? Do you know? I mean if you don't have it. I mean, it would be useful to kind of know that. Don't speculate."

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "I'll do the math and get it back to you."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "That's fine. That's fine. All right. If you have that breakout, we can get it on the three different categories, that will be helpful. Thanks."

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Sure, Commissioner."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: " Okay. So, Commissioner Ellis -- Vice Chair Ellis asked my first question. The second question though is: Of the 38 percent housing, of the 5,480 beds, how many of those beds are for youth and how many for, I guess, adults?"

CURTISS PULITZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "The youth beds are very small, Commissioner. There are 48 beds for youth for men and for 48 beds youth for women. The population's relatively small. But again, we're oversizing them. Again, we don't want to be undersized. We don't want to make the same mistake has been said many times this morning, I'm building things too small."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Let me -- I don't think you're answering what I'm asking."

CURTISS PULITZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Oh, I'm sorry."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I didn't ask -- what I'm asking you is, of the 5,480 beds, it says 38 percent would be for housing; and I'm just asking you, of that housing, two components of the housing, adult and youth; how many of the 5,480 are for adults? What number?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Backing out the youth, sir?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "What?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Backing out the youth from that number?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Well, I want both."

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "I mean I can do the math. Approximately -- give me one second here."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You can get it back to me if you don't have it now. And then the other parts --"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Approximate 32, 3,300 would be for adults."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: Thirty three hundred for --"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "-- for general population. That would include general population -- when I say general population. I can get the full breakdown. I think you all want to see that. I can get that for you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I think that will be --"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "-- yeah, it has the drawn population. I'll give you some of the categories so you know. There's medium and close custody, medium custody, minimum custody; then we have restricted housing. We have protective custody. These are all the variety of categories. And we have them for both men and we have it for the women. But we have a complete breakdown, very detailed breakdown we can get to you. It will be in a full report that I will get that to you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "That will be instructive for us. And also, all of this mental health and the other health that we talked about. I mean, you're talking about rethinking a lot of this. We may need to have some additional, not for you, us, up here with the state, because this is going in a -- almost half of this, half of this facility, proposed facility is something we may not have to be involved in. And so that would be a function, have some bearing on the total cost."

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: It's a problem, Commissioner, and I realize that. We, you know, work across the country. Every

jurisdiction grapples with this issue. Why are we housing the mental ill in our jails. It's a good question to ask. The severely mentally ill, the acutely mentally ill."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "But is there a facility following up on what Vice Chairman -- is there a facility -- Baltimore seems to be the one. That's not up and running, though, is it?"

CURTISS PULITZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "No, not yet."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No one -- is there one that's up and running other than Columbus, Ohio?"

CURTISS PULITZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Franklin County, yes."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "That's the only one?"

CURTISS PULITZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Well, they're many -- there are many jails that have a population exactly like we're describing, but it's smaller. I mean Fulton County is one of the larger metro areas in the country. So, you know, this size and everything is exponentially larger than we see elsewhere. But this type of operation we're talking about exists in a number of jails throughout the United States; in Collin County Texas."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Columbus, Ohio. Franklin County is one that is -- can be compared to what is being proposed here."

CURTISS PULITZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "The population is similar to a smaller facility. This is the first phase of construction, yes. And it has its medical mental health treatment facility."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Barrett."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I just wanted to further the Chairman's question, thank you, by the way. Regarding the acute -- well, really all of the mental health population that's being planned for here, because there is a distinction, yes, between just people in the world who have behavioral health mental health issues versus someone who has been charged with potentially a violent crime, correct? So no matter, what? There's going to be a certain need in the jail for dealing with those kind of folks who are in both -- that overlapping category of an acute mentally ill and also having been charged with potentially a violent crime, correct?"

CURTISS PULITZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Exactly, Commissioner, yes."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: " So that's -- I'm assuming that these numbers sort of -- assuming that population and assuming the state is on the trajectory of its own in terms of behavior health facilities and such?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Okay."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Thank you, Chair. I mean, all the extra programs and everything, it truly does look wonderful, but when I met with you, you said there was no operational costs, predictions done in this study. So if we build it, can we maintain it? That's kind of a big question that I have. But you mentioned just now that in Franklin County they've phasing in their building of their jail. So I didn't know if, you know, maybe we would have to phase in programs as we can afford it, or maybe the state can give us some mental health funding to fund these things. But I mean, it looks great, and it looks great on paper. But if we build it, can we maintain it, is my biggest question."

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Well, I think -- in a few minutes, we'll talk about scheduling. One of the things -- the next thing hopefully we'll be looking at is exactly what you're saying, Commissioner, the operational costs. What would it cost to run this facility, you know, not just the treatment cost of the program services, but the entire facility. That's a critical variable."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman?"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Having traveled when we were looking at the diversion centers and the correctional facilities and how they handle, I think this is a critical piece. And I also believe that we have to look at -- because sometimes we look at numbers and we want to put a price tag to it. And I think part of the failings, not necessarily on this administration, but previous administrations, is the cost of not doing it. And I think we often get a little, what I'll call murky waters. Because we start looking at widgets and we start looking at this, that and the other and how much it costs, operational and all these things. And when I look at this particular jail, and what we have spent especially over the last ten years, it has been way more than even what we are talking about now. And so, I would say to my colleagues and I would say to the public, that one thing that the Sheriff said, what you don't know and what you do know; and what we do know is what we have now does not work. And what we do know in forecasting that a mental health component is just as important as the medical component. And I do understand with my colleague, Commissioner Thornton, we always want to look at that money part, and I'm big on us doing that, because at the end of the day, this is not our money. This is the Fulton County taxpayer's money. Let me be crystal clear about that. But the lack of foresight or the lack of planning or the lack of realizing that what we have now does not work. And if we do not go on the trajectory of making sure that we have adequate -- I'm not even asking for four-star or five-star; I'm

asking for adequate mental health facilities; adequate areas for operational, for the Sheriff to just have operational. Because believe you me, I have had conversations with individuals because I am very passionate -- this is one of the areas that has been assigned to me, and I have sent individuals and sent resumes of individuals that I want to go work in Fulton County jail, and they have been very adamant about, Commissioner, I'm sorry, I can't work in that kind of condition. I would do you a disservice, because if you hired me, I probably would quit halfway through training. And so, when you're talking about operational areas, when you're talking about areas for adequate medical treatment, when you're talking about areas for proper mental health, when you're talking about areas for to keep youth separated, when you're talking about areas for whether it's training, simulation, or whatever. We must make sure that we take into consideration of the costs that we would have if we don't get it right, because I promise you it would give a higher, bigger pay tag."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Let's be respectful of these gentlemen's time now. Questions for them; a lot of this we're going to have to talk about amongst ourselves."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "With all due respect; this is too serious of an issue for us not to do due diligence. I agree with you. I'm not trying to be disrespectful, Chairman. I respect you. But you said yourself this is going to come with a heavy price tag. And all these Commissioners down here do have concerns; and we need to get right. We need to get it right."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I'm just asking for us to ask them specific questions based upon their presentation. So we -- it's going to -- we will have to discuss all of this at some point. Commissioner Arrington, you have the floor."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay, thanks. I noticed on this slide, on one side of the page you have people and on the other side you have beds. And so I, you know, I -- that's apples to oranges. So I would need to know the number of people on both sides, and I would need to know the number of beds on both sides."

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "I know, Commissioner, you raised that and I'll explain to you why. On the left, we're talking about what we have today. If you count what you had today and you count the 1125 cells you have, that's the number beds that you really had when you built the jail. So to put that number up there, didn't make a whole lot of sense. So we really have to do it with people on the left side, these are how many people are in the system. And those included the jail in Union City. So based on the number bodies, and I hate to use that term, but individuals in the facility, it came out 157 square feet per person, shows you how little space you have because you are so severely overcrowded. So but I could -- we could --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Excuse me, I can't --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You have the floor, Commissioner."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I can't understand a comparison that is apples to oranges. You're comparing people to beds. So in order to me to digest and comprehend this information, I need to know the number of people and beds on both sides of that slide, sir."

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Okay. We can add that in, Commissioner. But that actual number -- the -- if you look on the left -- on the right, if you assume the average daily population, that's number of beds, the average daily population would be about 20 -- approximately 20 percent lower, so approximately about 1,000 fewer. So if you want to compare people to people, that's probably around 4,500. But we'll look --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. But that still doesn't give me the number of beds on the other side."

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Correct, but we'll -- 11 -- you know, we can -- we'll put that number up there. But it's -- the actual number of actual beds right now with double ceiling is probably right now about 2250 if -- because they double celled everything in the current facilities. So it'll be 2250, if you want numbers, 2250 beds approximately to 5480, if you want that comparison."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "I just wanted to clarify. I do believe that mental health is a critical area that needs to be addressed. Visiting the current location, I think it -- we create -- anybody to create a metal program -- problem if you were housed there. So I just wanted to clarify, like, looking at all the services that you mentioned at the introduction, cosmetology, and all that. But the -- if we do achieve that 28 day of average length of stay, you know, do we need to develop huge programs? I mean, I don't know if I'd want to get my hair cut by somebody who was in a 28-day program. So saying, I just wanted to clarify that mental health, I do believe, is very important. Thank you."

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "There are -- and again, Commissioner, there are a number of people who do stay in the jail, that's the average, but there's a lot of people staying a lot longer, we have that data as well, who could benefit from programs such as those. And also culinary arts and other things that they do, right, they have to be there for several months. And sadly, they are. There are many people in the jail that fall into that category today."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right, Commissioner Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. My question is, you know, we took all that time, about two hours or so, Commissioner Arrington and I met with your group."

And I'm just a little shocked that the slides weren't updated to reflect what Commissioner Arrington just brought up about the beds and the people being a part of the presentation. Did anyone take notes when we were meeting with you? Because the response to us was, yes, absolutely, we're going to go back and we're going to update these slides so that they can be more clear to everyone about the number of beds and the number of people. So was there -- were there any --"

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "And Commissioner, we did take notes and we do have the answers to Commissioner Arrington's question. We did not update the slides because the slides had already been sent the public. And so we didn't want to create any confusion about why the public had received slides that were inconsistent with the ones we were showing today, so --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I can understand that."

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "So we did take -- we did, yeah. So we did take notes to be able to address the questions, but we didn't make any last-minute changes to the slides because we're very conscious of the fact that we wanted the public to have the same slides that we're -- we didn't want to create a disconnect."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "But exactly what we stated to you when we met with you is happening right now that there is confusion anyway, because there's not enough detailed information provided in the slides that people have received. And so -- so I'm still -- can you send me an update in writing so that I have the correct information? Because people ask me often, can I provide them with the information. I don't want to provide them with just partial information."

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "Absolutely."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "All right."

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "And so -- and we've kept a running tally of all of the input we have. Like I said, we were able to update some of the information. We'll certainly be able to talk through most of it. But we didn't make any changes to the slides because they had been sent out to the public last Friday by the Clerk."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "All right. But you're going to send me the completed information --"

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "That's correct. We can update it --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you."

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "-- moving forward. Absolutely."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you so much."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Barrett."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Just a couple quick things for clarification on the slide just to kind of make sure that there isn't any confusion. The 3,256 people are currently housed in a jail that was built to hold 1,125 people."

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "You did not conclude beds there because, in fact, they now have doubled the number of people per cell and including their -- and I have been to the jail, there are people sleeping on the floor, for all intense and purposes, so saying beds here is not a really fair representation of what's happening in the current jail. And on the other side of this equation, you're discussing 5,480 beds and the potential square footage per person. But again, because of this separation of the types of categories of inmates, you're saying essentially that there's going to be a less number of prisoners essentially because there may be sections --"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "-- where they're not full at any given time, correct?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "To operate a safe and effective jail that's that peaking classification Patrick talked about. And you want to typically operate at about 80 percent of your bed capacity so you can move people around correctly, account for peaking. So, yes, it's a bit of an apples and oranges, which is the challenge. But we'll do our best to clarify that on a slide, Commissioner Hall. We did hear you."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Yeah, and just also --"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "We did hear you."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Yeah, I just wanted to make sure for anybody who -- listening who doesn't necessarily or watching that doesn't necessarily see that follow up that that is the distinction here."

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Thank you, Commissioner."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "As well as, I wanted to just ask a question for clarification as well regarding this discussion of mental health and medical beds. And well, let's stick with the mental health beds here. That -- part of -- a lot of what the conversation has been and the questions have been seems to be regarding whether or not we need to have mental health treatment of this kind in the facility because this is a, you know, we -- should the -- should folks who have these conditions even be in a correctional facility. But I think there's and acknowledgment we already had this conversation or this back and forth that there will be those folks that come into our correctional facility. But I think it just needs to be clear that part of the reason to

separate this population out is not for -- not only for the humane treatment of those folks, but also for the safety of the general population and the safety of the -- the folks that are working in the facility, correct?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Absolutely, yes. I mean, for example, Commissioner, you know, in acute we might even put individuals in small housing areas of eight or 12 individuals, as compared to a housing unit of 64, the general population. We can't mix those together. It's -- it's -- that's the problem we have today."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Correct, unsafe. And then also just to, I think, to sort of reference Commissioner Thorne's question and the comment, I think you made about reentry programs and reducing recidivism and those types of things. Having the program facilities in the -- in the jail or -- are potentially going to be an operational cost saving because -- and correct me if I'm wrong here, but because that there's less transporting of folks and ultimately we may be reducing the future number of people coming into the system because they were able to reenter general -- you know, life more successfully, yes?"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "That's our hope, yes."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Okay. I just wanted to make that clear because I think we're getting focused on the -- the mental health beds and the folks in it versus what else happening --"

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "-- in the facility. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. No further questions."

CURTISS PULTIZER, PRINCIPAL, PULTIZER BOGARD: "Thank you."

BOB COUSSEILANT, DESIGNER - TREANORHL: "Next slide, please. All right. Greetings Fulton County agencies, offices. Greetings Fulton County agencies, office, and County Manager, Commissioners, citizens of Fulton County. My name is Bob Cousseilant, I'm part of the Treanor HL team. And I'm a practicing architect. We are a national firm, and we're actually located in Fulton County, very familiar with the city as well. My alma mater, Georgia Tech, so I'm fairly familiar with Fulton County as well. That's your district as well, Ms. Hall. I'm here to present where could it be located. You can't speak about, like we suggested in the vision slide, a new jail without talking about where it could be located. Next slide. So what we decided to do, is I'm going to step you through how we thought about selecting a site, the criteria matrix involved, and our conclusion on what we decided as a team to recommend to you guys. We essentially have three options for site selections, the existing Rice Street site, county-owned properties that were provided by DREAM, and new property acquisitions or sites for

sale. A fourth option was also provided, where we looked at county-owned properties, buying adjacent lots to normalize the site. So essentially, those were the three options that we looked at and to compile as many sites as possible. In order to make sense of what would work, we have a selection criteria. So this breaks down into site criteria and service criteria. So we're going to step through that right now. We're preferably, where we're recommending, you guys need 35-plus contiguous acres for a new jail. The current Rice Street site sits on 39 acres. So, yes, that's the number, 39 acres. And so what we did was we looked at sites that was 35 plus for this study to qualify. We need something there was relatively level topography to avoid a flood ways and major waterways. These are preliminary things that we need in order for a site to even make sense. So, and we also, as you can tell, the county's fairly long. So looking for something in the middle of the county would better service the jail and citizens of Fulton County. That is your site criteria. For service criteria, we can't overlook a site that's in proximity to EMS emergency -- emergency medical services and the courts, and then access to a major roadway as well. So these were the key things that we looked at. And when I say, middle of the county, we were looking at something within a ten-mile radius of the courts and Grady Hospital as well. If you guys don't have any questions, we can go to the next slide."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No questions. No questions."

BOB COUSSEILANT, DESIGNER - TREANORHL: "So what we did was, once we qualified sites with the site and service criteria, what we have is a site evaluation matrix. We use this to essentially score potential qualified sites. To your left is nine criteria topics. And what we did was we used these nine criteria topics to then compare the three options for the county. When we look at cost of acquisition, what we already understand is that there is a huge plus looking at county-owned properties altogether. There's no -- there's no -- there's nothing to factory in, in terms of project delivery and project timeline in acquiring a new site when we're looking at what we already have. In terms of location and proximity to the courts, Grady Hospital, we discussed that as well. One thing I do want to step back and note these colors, I did not discuss that, my apologies. But we're using a dot-base, so essentially, red is for the poor conditions, yellow is for uncertain, and green is for good. So each of these were weighted in a more detailed study and they correlated to essentially scoring what the highest score would win essentially. And so moving on where I left off, site configuration, size and shape is fairly important. We're looking a square site, something one to one or fairly rectangular, three to two, three to one is what we were looking at when we were looking at building footprint. One thing we can't overlook is NIMBY. So when we're comparing all these three options, one thing the existing Rice Street site does really well is, it's already accepted as a jail site. So that's something that we did not overlook as well. So when we're looking overall at the site criteria matrix, we see more green dots in the existing Rice Street site. Do I have any questions? Next slide. So what we were recommending is essentially the existing Rice Street site. So the reason why we're recommending that, like we discussed before, we're cutting a lot out of the process in terms of speed of construction. So when we're looking at our project timeline, locating a site and financing it would be something you would have to consider. We don't have to

consider that with the Rice Street site. But one thing we need to keep in mind, when we're discussing a new jail like we suggested in the vision, phasing would be a huge challenge on that site. Reason being is, we would have to relocate the Fleet Maintenance building. We would have to also do some demolition of existing properties on that site, the old jail, the old, old jail. And we would also have to maintain operations at the existing jail. So what -- what you get in a lot of green, it also comes with a lot of strategic planning that you guys would need to do or our team would need to do or a team would need to do in the forefront. Operational efficiency, again, being in the middle of the county, there is, in terms of looking at all the sites that we had, finding something 35-plus, we were not able to locate that. So in terms of looking at the Rice Street site, we needed to understand the next best thing is probably not within a 10-mile radius of that site. Community acceptance and impact, s John alluded to the external engagement that we've done with internal and external stakeholders. And I remember we met with somebody that mentioned a damaged reputation, and that stuck with me. And essentially, this isn't about replacing what we already have. This is about doing something forward thinking, in terms of a new facility, thinking about, like we discussed, the wraparound services diversion as well as deflection including detention. And if you don't have any questions, I'll pass it off to Chris Soffe for cost."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No questions."

BOB COUSSEILANT, DESIGNER - TREANORHL: "Thank you."

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "Thank you, Jay. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, pleasure to be here today. I have the unenviable task of setting out the price tag for you for the variation we've got going on here. My name is Chris Soffe, I'm with Gleeds. And full disclosure, I've been a resident of Fulton County for some 35 years, in spite of my lower Alabama accident. So when we look at all the data these learned gentleman have produced in the terms of square footage costs, different types of functions of buildings, beds, towers, foundations, utilities, all this stuff on the side, we do what we call cost planning where we put that on some large spreadsheets for all different options. And we -- we use a benchmarking against other projects because this thing's not designed yet. So we benchmark it against other projects. And you've heard of some of those today, Cuyahoga, Ohio, Franklin County, I think, Baltimore County. And there's another one, Wayne County, Michigan as well. And some of those are constructed, some are not. But they're the most recently large, constructed large or in planning large jails as well. So that's the benchmarking exercise. We look at cost drivers on site and building. So next slide, please. You'll see those first two components there. I got ahead of myself there. But important one I think to focus on with the presentation today is, how construction costs have been impacted over the last two years with the pandemic. And also the Russia/Ukraine crisis. So there's some -- there are different metrics around. We've quoted some CBRE ones here, 14 percent in 2022. I think the important thing also to recognize that we are seeing some normalization. You'll see the general media quote the consumer price index. Next page. So we've included this graphic from the Association for the Advancement of -- sorry, the Association of General Contractors of America came out with this report in

December showing the red line is the construction cost escalation over the last two years. But you can see that the year in the middle, which is essentially April to April 2022, construction cost are running in the order of 20 percent escalating. You'll see they're falling. This is a little bit misleading, this class -- this graph because even though the line is falling, it's only fallen to 11.2 percent. So we're sitting at a time today where escalation is still a 11.2 percent according to the AGC. In the construction market it is normalizing, but it's still three times what it was at back in 2019. So we've had to take account of these numbers in this benchmarking exercise. Any questions on that? Okay, thank you. So next slide, please. So I'll take you through two scenarios. We've - you heard Patrick and Curtiss and Frank talk about the moderate scenario and the optimal scenario. And our recommendation overall, I think is that the moderate scenario is the most realistic. So we've taken 500 -- 5,480 beds and we've got a direct new construction cost as of today of one -- about \$1.3 billion. And that would be what the general contractors or a group of general contractors -- we'll talk about delivery method later -- but would come in at. And I think you have to understand that with a feasibility study and the feasibility stage or concept stage, which is what we're looking at, we're looking at a range of accuracy here of minus 15 plus 20 percent. And that's the publication from the Association for the Advancement of Cost Engineering. So there are national cost -- costing body, cost engineering body that says that feasibility stage, that's about the range of accuracy. So you know here I will say this, and I think told Dick Anderson this, you've got a range from Patrick and you got a range from us. So you can see that you're dealing with, you know, not a crystal ball here there's going to get it exactly right. I think Commissioner Khadijah mentioned that earlier. We're in a range here, we've got to give you the data and the ranges so that you can make rational decisions going forward. So we've had to the cost, soft cost to the GC cost, which is the \$316 million number there. That's for architecture, possibly program management, what we call FF&E, which is furniture, fittings and fixtures. So that would be if you turn the building upside down, everything that would fall out, the loose -- loose stuff, if you like. And then we add also, an allowance for change orders and a risk allowance for site mediation for environmental remediation and so on and so forth. So we think that's a prudent number to add to the GC cost there of \$316 million. That gives us a total project costs for the moderate option of a little over \$1.6 billion in 2023 dollars. And that would be about \$294,000 a bed. And that would be consistent with the other large projects, I think, in country. If you take the right escalations and projections and escalations and so on and so forth. So if we then factor that forward, we've got to take that forward five years because there's going to be a decision made and a little bit more groundwork in 2023. And then we'll have about two years for architecture and about three years for construction. So we don't think this facility can realistically be delivered much before 2028. And so we've got about five years, five to six years heads. So we've taken views on the escalation percentages, and we have normalized them. We're saying in 2027, 4 percent; 2026, 6 percent; 2025, 8 percent. You can see a sort of a normalization curve. I have a little bit of an advantage, I go back to the 70s when this happened before. And I know it takes quite a while for these things to -- don't just go back to three and 4 percent overnight, there's -- we've got a run in yet of several years before this gets back to normal. And we got a rouge over in Russia, you don't know what he's going to do next. And there's all kinds of stuff going on and certain

uncertainty. So we're at about \$2 billion for the moderate option and about \$1.7 billion on the right-handed column with the same set of criteria for the 4,392, which is the optimal option. Are there any questions on that, given -- given the data I've given you now?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Any questions? This is all exclusive of any operational cost, correct?"

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "No operational cost at all, sir."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "So there's no costs factored in here for relocating the current prison inmate population, correct?"

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "Correct. We've -- we know there's a site utilization exercise to do and possibly a hard look at phasing 2037 versus 2047, and what we would build up to 2037, what we would allow for on the site to be built, maybe another tower or something like that after that. But you're right, there is no -- there's no allowance there."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "And I -- I'm not completely familiar because I only looked at the jail itself, but were you using the entire 35 acres? What else is on that site that's going to have to be relocated?"

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "We were -- on the existing plan and this price and exercise on these two scenarios, and there are -- there are others that we tested, if you like. The existing jail would remain operational until 2028, when the new one came online and was available to be occupied and commissioned. And then I would suspect the existing jail would almost certainly be demolished to make way for whatever the phasing site utilization options throughout, whether that would be a, you know, a car park or another tower or for the future or whatever. But exactly right."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Is there currently a homeless shelter on --"

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "Sorry?"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Is there currently a homeless shelter on the property that would need to be relocated or --"

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "There are some other facilities aren't there, John?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Yes. Commissioner, the new facility as we've planned it right now, can -- I'll call it, fit on the existing site. But it would

require the relocation of the Fleet Maintenance and the other structures that are in that area, yes."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Okay. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Other questions at this time?"

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "Any other costs questions?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No, sir."

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "So rolling on from costs, Jay follows me on financing. Thank you, Jay."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "Good afternoon, Commissioners, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Jay Brown, I am the Chairman and Managing Director of Hayat Brown. We're a boutique transaction and financial adviser that exclusively represents and supports municipalities, public agencies in determining the best way to finance and execute a complex capital improvement and infrastructure projects. My job and which reflected on this slide, was to really answer the question, what are some options for how to finance the \$2 billion capital requirement that Chris just talked about. We took a high-level look at three financing structures, three financing options. And on your chart the financing option to your left is a general obligation bond, which is essentially, you all adding this project to some, you know, big capital program or capital event and going out and just issuing bonds to finance it directly, you know, off your balance sheet and with the full faith and credit of the taxpayers. Franklin County, they financed their project with municipal bonds that were tied to a sales tax revenue source. So that's one option, that's just sort of the basic municipal finance structure. The middle option is utilizing what we call a third-party conduit. And in your case it would be probably, the South Fulton Municipal Regional Jail Authority or Public Finance Authority to really serve as a vehicle for issuing debt on your behalf, and doing so in a way that brings certain execution efficiencies to that financing, still tax-exempt. But then you'll have the obligation of still dedicating the revenue source to repay that debt on an annual basis. And I'm going to get to the numbers in just a second. The third option all the way to the right, this industry is fast at sort of looking at what we call alternative delivery or public-private partnerships as a way to enter into an agreement called a concession agreement with a private group to build, to design, build, finance, and maintain the facility over a -- over a specified period of time, typically they're around 30 years. That contract is a performance-based contract where that consortium, we call them, would be responsible for delivering the asset and maintaining it to a performance requirement that is established in the process. And if they don't deliver it in accordance to the performance requirements, there's various penalties and hold backs. And that structure brings a number of benefits to consider. None of these right now we're recommending, we just wanted to put that options out there. There's more analysis that should be done to get you to the point where you can kind of think through the all the pros and cons. But those of the three

big, big areas. Let's talk about the numbers. The real take away is that this \$2 billion construction obligation is going to come with a, you know, a meaningful, annual debt service commitment. That's just -- it's just no way around that. Under any one of these scenarios, that's an obligation, as you all have said that the taxpayers are going to have to -- to come up with it. We've also layered in maintenance because costs. Now, you guys have talked about operating cost, but I want to distinguish operating services and operating programs from the maintenance of the building. These estimates here are really just facilities maintenance cost. And the reason we put them in is because under the public-private partnership structure, it is -- it includes maintenance as part of the contract. So we wanted to compare if you maintained it yourself with what it would cost to have the third party do that. The total annual obligation ranges between 1-point -- excuse me, 122.5 million and 124 million annually for the next 30 years to both pay back the debt and maintain the facility to its proper standard. So that's really the -- the take away from this slide is that there's lots of details around which one of these options you choose and you're not at the point where, you know, you're ready to make that decision. But wanted you to recognize that there's a significant annual obligation. One other point I would just make, this analysis does not assume any offsets to that capital requirement. Folks were saying earlier that there may be state money or federal money or grants. You know, we hope and think that these wraparound services that you're providing may put the project in a position to be attractive for additional grants. We have not assumed any of that, nor have we assumed any savings from any leases that you may be spending money on to house detainees elsewhere. If you consolidate them here, that's a savings. And probably the biggest offset, and I think I heard the Sheriff correctly this morning, if he said, almost a billion dollars over the last ten years. That's deferred maintenance. That's a huge -- that is probably the biggest offset to a project like is -- because that billion dollars bought you no long-term benefit. That -- when you - - when a facility gets to level of -- of age, that's just throwing good money after bad. So when we help analyze the benefits of a new facility, just purely from a facility standpoint, we like to take that offset into account, so you have the real numbers about what it is that -- what the incremental increase in cost is."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. We have a couple of questions."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Vice Chair Ellis."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Actually, I had a question -- I don't know -- don't know if Joe's here. Maybe somebody, Hakeem or Felicia, you may know this. What is the current contract -- contract we have with -- oh, shoot, what's the name of the group -- Johnson Controls for --"

FELICIA STRONG-WHITAKER, DIRECTOR, PCC: "Johnson Control?"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Yeah, what's their -- that's the annual figure we got on that for the --"

FELICIA STRONG-WHITAKER, DIRECTOR, PCC: "It is --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- Rice Street component?"

FELICIA STRONG-WHITAKER, DIRECTOR, PCC: "It averages about 4.5 to 5 million per year."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. All right. I realize that's just for the general maintenance."

FELICIA STRONG-WHITAKER, DIRECTOR, PCC: "Yes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "There might be special stuff on top of that. Do you have some examples of this P-3 structure that's some other folks have done? Or is this more of a concept?"

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "Well, in the -- around the -- around the world, there's lots of --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Right."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "-- most of the UK and Canada and Australia jails are financed --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Right. US based?"

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "US based, Wayne County is a bit of a - - it's a bit of a hybrid."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "They've got some P3 components because they structured it with a land swap and some additional capital that's coming from the Quicken Loans folks. But so -- but there hasn't been that I'm aware of, a pure P3 jail, but there's P3 Courthouses."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Yeah."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "There's P3 Schools. So it's a -- it's a concept that should be evaluated."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "Because the industry is sort of moving in that direction."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. But more -- but not really, it hadn't been really done before to your knowledge, in a jail setting?"

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "Not that I'm aware of for --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I mean, what I'm getting at is, is it really practical for us to consider it?"

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "Yes, it is very practical --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "-- for you to consider it."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "Because you -- all of the -- all of the infrastructure industry in the US is taking a real hard look at it --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay, okay."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "-- and the folks that would deliver it are very -- would be very interested in looking at a project --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "-- of this scale."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "All right."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "So, yes, you should."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay, all right."

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "Certainly, be done internationally on jails, prisons."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "There is a large project in Atlanta, which is DOT and I believe it's P3 delivered and that's the 400 Interchange, 285 Interchange. That's in transportation and infrastructure --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Might not want to --"

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "-- similar structure."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I wouldn't -- well, we might not want to point to that one too much, might get delivered in 2058. But, I'm just joking. I have to drive that road too often. But, yeah, I understand. And that's significant, right? It's probably close to 2 billion now at this point as well. And then on -- so I think we had talked about this and maybe it was some discussion that needed to be had. Would any of these scenarios require us to have a, take this to the voters in a referendum? Do we explore that?"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "The general obligation bonds would require a referendum vote."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "They would, okay."

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Yes, sir."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. So the other two potentially would not, okay, all right."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "I heard you speak of the P3, and I guess, nationally or internationally that is the direction that some are going. Is there potentially any cons of going that direction, any pros? I know it can -- I know it can get convoluted, but I'm not trying to do. What I'm trying to do for the general public who's watching, P3, why are we finding that nationally and internationally, some are going with it? And what's the pros as well as the cons? In a condensed version, please. Let me put that out there. In layman's terms."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "Sure. Sure. And there are pros and cons that are listed in the report. They're in the appendix there, they're summarized. But I think the main thing is, there's a clear view of the market that traditional delivery of big infrastructure projects by governments often are, you know, over budget and don't hit schedules and end up costing a whole lot more money because of the way in which it's procured and delivered. And you don't have all the right incentives to have a better certainty around timing, cost, and implementation. P3, if done right and these performance contracts are done appropriately, gives more certainty of execution, more certainty of cost. And as a result there's a savings, and then that savings is shared. But there's no one shoe fits all. We're going to come back to you with the details of that. But that's why it's being considered because it's driving faster, more efficient, and more cost-effective over the long run execution because you're tying the long-term investment and the asset and the mid-long-term maintenance back to the actual building. We build things and we pay more because we get cost overruns. And then we don't maintain them and we get deferred maintenance way before their time. When you add all that up, traditional government delivery is just -- just doesn't work out in many cases. P3, if done right, can mitigate that. I hope that was simple enough."

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "I can add a little bit of context to that, Commissioner Abdur-Rahman. And that is that the facilities for P3 and I think for Pier 5 have been predominately delivered in Canada. And they were hatched during the factory years of the British government. See, you can tell I've been around for 30 or 40 years in different parts of the world. And Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors report on why they had taken off in the States, which really, they centered on decentralization and the fact that you -- your states operate independently, whereas the Canadians could push them out in central government. And other countries like Australia and UK push them out and make them happen. But there's like, in the States, it's slower to take hold. And that was the conclusion of that report, was decentralization. But there's plenty of it around, plenty of examples around the world. I hope that helps."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "You know, I love your lower-Alabama accent. I'm just going to tell you that right now, I'm in love with it. Just quickly, when it hasn't worked, can you give an example of when it may wasn't the best option or some of the downfalls or cons of when it hasn't worked?"

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: You know, it's -- the 30-year contracts, right? So a lot of them are -- like, the Long Beach County Courthouse is one that you hear a lot about in your industry, in the criminal justice industry or in the industry of what we're talking about here. It's ten years old, it's little -- it's so far, it's swimmingly. But it's got 20 more years to go. But it -- as far as delivering the construction on time and on budget, it did. We just did one for the Travis County Courthouse that -- that had its ribbon cutting in December, ahead of budget, ahead of schedule. But that was just the construction, so that part worked swimmingly. So to evaluate, you know, what went wrong, the -- like, there's not enough years domestically. There's years in Canada and the UK, where it worked well. That said, most of the problems you hear are not after projects have been executed. They're problems that where they couldn't get to execution because they weren't properly administered at the beginning, they weren't properly structured. That's what we're going to help you do it right, if we go that route. And you won't have that problem."

CHRIS SOFFE, VICE CHAIR AMERICAS - GLEEDS: "Again, there are smattering of projects in all kinds of delivery methods that do -- don't go well and they'll fail. So it takes good management. And I think, I'd the site the one that's really important on P3 is the performance criteria and the delivery of the performance criteria. And there are cases on certain projects around the place, where the performance hasn't met the criteria and you end up with a facility that doesn't meet the criteria and then somebody has to put it right, and are they still around and so on and so forth. So there are risks with any of these delivery and with traditional delivery. And I'm arbitrator in the construction industry as well in the AAA Panel nationally. So I see -- I see failures in all different delivery systems."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Well, I'm trying to think of another question to ask you so I can hear that accent, but I'm going to -- I'm going to turn it back over to the Chairman. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just had a meeting on Monday with the Grady CEO and he mentioned, they have several P3's that they've implemented through the years. I think they've had seven or eight major products -- projects that they've funded this way and it's been a rather successful for them."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. No further questions."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Next."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Next slide, please. So next slide, please. So I'll take this opportunity to build on where Sheriff Labat began. What we do know is that we have an opportunity in front of us --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Excuse me. May I ask one question before you get --"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Absolutely."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- you're going to the summary now. All right. There's a slide that you did not show, which I had asked that you show. And it is the incarceration rate in comparable cities and counties."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "I believe that's in the appendix."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Well, can you put it up? That's -- that's probably the most instructive one of all."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "That's is --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "A6."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "I'm not sure exactly."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "That's page A6."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "A6, please."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "A6."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Yes, sir, Chairman, Mr. Chairman."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Let's talk about this one."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Absolutely."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Because, I guess, you have Wayne County, Wayne County, Michigan, which is basically Detroit, population of 1.7 million, they got 2,280 beds. Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio, population of 1.2 million, 1,900 beds. Franklin County, Ohio, that's Columbus, population 1.3 million, 2,100 beds. Baltimore, which y'all referenced quite a bit, population of 1.4 million, 3,620 beds. Then Fulton County, population basically 1 million, 5,480 beds."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Correct."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Is that apples to oranges, again, like, I mean -- I mean, you're comparing current size on one -- on these four to a proposed size. So I don't know that that really makes sense. I think, again, it's comparing apples to oranges. What is the proposed size -- what is the proposed number of beds for Wayne County's new jail? What is the proposed number of beds for Cuyahoga County's? I -- you're -- this slide -- I don't know that this slide is accurate. I think it compares apples to oranges."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "This slide represents four buildings that are under design or have been constructed."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Have been constructed?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Correct."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "What year?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Franklin County has been constructed."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "What year?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "It was finished in '22, 2022."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. What about Cuyahoga?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "That's correct. Phase 2, Commissioner, was completed in 2022."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Phase 2?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Correct."

JAY BROWN, CHAIRMAN, HAYAT BROWN: "It's three phases."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Right. Baltimore is under design, Cuyahoga is under design, and Wayne County is almost finished, if you will, the construction."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. Yeah, I -- I need more information to comprehend and digest this."

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "You're absolutely right, Commissioner. This is apples, oranges, and bananas. But it's meant to be a scale magnitude snapshot, if you will. For instance, in Wayne County, the new building is 1500 beds. And the Delta is some of the existing beds that they're keeping. So some of this is, you know, you keep some of what you have and just build for what you, you know, where the, you know, capabilities are that you don't have. But, you know, Baltimore County for instance, the new buildings that we're looking at is around 1800 beds. But again, it's keeping the existing, a lot of the existing facilities in the system. But I think the most important point that you're getting at, and you're dead on with it, is that 5400 is a 2037 number. That's what it's being planned for, if you will, and built for. Whereas, all the rest of these have much closer planning horizons, if -- there may be, you know, 2027, right. So even that ten years of growth wouldn't be reflected in the difference between Fulton County and the other four. So it's, yeah, it's not intended to be precisely calibrated. I think that's kind of why we pulled it out of the main report. It was sort of, where do we sit. And clearly, you know, as we've heard, Georgia is a red state, some of the policies in incarcerate -- are intended, you know, have -- drive larger jail populations than other places, so --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "All right."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "It's really only representative of new build."

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Well, this is a combination, right?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Right."

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Whereas, Fulton is new build."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Right."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Yeah, I just think -- I think, Mr. Chair, we have to be careful. I mean, your numbers can say anything."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yeah."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "And or we can make numbers say anything depending on how we present them. And I don't know -- and I just heard them say, this is -- this is apples to oranges to bananas. So I mean, I don't -- I don't know how -- I don't know how to digest that. I can only eat an elephant one bite at a time."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Right."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I can't -- I can't digest all of that different information with different variables and different things and try to comprehend the differences without more of a further detail into all of those intricacies that you all were just talking about."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "And we can -- we can take this diagram, Commissioner, and then we can quantify this, sir. We can add additional data to it as part of the final report to help clarify that."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. Yeah, thanks. Because I think would be good to know, you know, what year was -- were these jails built, you know, what -- you know, I want to compare the 1980 jail to another 1980 jail. I don't want to compare a 1980 jail to a 2022 jail."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Completely understood."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "And sort of related, you take -- did you take a look at our sister counties and their jails?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "I'm sorry, Commissioner?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Our sister counties, Gwinnett, Cobb, Clayton, DeKalb."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Did you take a look at those? No, we did not."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Is there reason why we didn't, or you didn't?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "It just wasn't part of the analysis at the time. We could, but we haven't as of late."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Well, I think that's relevant. I mean, that's --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I think that's very relevant, Mr. Chair. Also, do they -- are there city jails? Baltimore City jail has its own city jail, so how many are in there? I mean, we're comparing a city that has two jails to a county with one jail."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yeah."

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "I can speak to Baltimore. Baltimore City jail was taken away by a federal court order from the city of Baltimore and given to the state about 20 years ago. That's why it -- we've put the county and the city together. It's actually operated by the state. We call it Baltimore -- it is the city jail, part of the county system. But, yeah, it's -- not being funny, but, you know, it's apples, oranges, and bananas. Every place is so different from each other, every county government, you know, and its relationship to the city different. So, yeah, trying to get baselines -- and I agree the neighboring Atlanta Metropolitan area, it would be probably more similar to each other than some other places around the country because it's --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "All right. I have one last question. Are y'all trying to convince us to build a jail or to not build a jail?"

FRANK GREENE, PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE-STV: "Well, I think we absolutely need to, no doubt."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I mean, we need to -- we need to tighten it up because that -- we can't go explain that to the voters --"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Right."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "-- in that form."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Right. It needs more clarification. And we'll compare it against the county, surrounding counties."

PATRICK LABAT, FC SHERIFF: "Let me ask a question. Didn't y'all go to Gwinnett?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "We did not tour it."

PATRICK LABAT, FC SHERIFF: "Didn't you go to Gwinnett?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Well, wait a minute now. Hold it, hold it, guys. Let's just --"

PATRICK LABAT, FC SHERIFF: "No, this is a problem. It's a problem, Mr. Chair, if I may tell you, because there are things that you all have suggested that we've suggested as a team --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Come on up. Come on up to the mic, Sheriff."

PATRICK LABAT, FC SHERIFF: "There are things that you all have suggested that we've suggested for this grand moment that are not being presented. So I'm about to ask for a refund, right?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "From?"

PATRICK LABAT, FC SHERIFF: "So I mean, this is crazy. We had an entire work session with my team to include, did you go to Gwinnett? Did you talk to the folks at DeKalb, right? Understand the difference between direct supervision and linear supervision. Did you go to ACDC? Take the dots that you put up there and make it easily readable, right, so you have less questions. And so somewhere along the lines, we got to hold some people accountable. That's my job, right. And so I appreciate that. I appreciate the moment. But I am -- I'm hot, because we had this discussion. And I could not be more appreciative of Alton when it first came out. Because my -- my angst was, who's going to do the feasibility study and separate them from building a jail. I'm so glad you made that suggestion. Because right now, as stewards of taxpayer dollars, I see a problem. So, I'm going -- I apologize, Mr. Chairman. But I can't stand by as Sheriff of the next project that will -- nothing larger than the airport, right. This is legacy making for everybody sitting up there to make these decisions. And to have it taken so lightly, is a problem after 15 months. So, I digress, Mr. Chair, I apologize. And I'm going to go back over here to my seat."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you, Sheriff."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Well, I've personally worked on the Gwinnett County facility, so I'm quite familiar with it. But we would be happy to discuss in more detail if we need to."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Well, I think you need to. You want to continue with the summary or you want to wait for the summary?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "No, I'm happy to summarize if you like."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Oh, I'm sorry. Commissioner Barrett, followed by Vice Chair Ellis."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Just a point of clarification here. I sort of hate to speak after the Sheriff spoke, but I think the problem, I understand the problem that my colleagues are having here, looking at this slide as a standalone. It does not present a good picture to say to the public, look, here's what everybody else is doing, we need all these additional beds. That said, I understand the facilities that are on this slide, and just for clarification, are there because they are newly constructed facilities, being built looking at the future for those particular facilities. And that is why the comparison is being done here, correct?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "That's correct. Those are the beds that are being considered at the moment for those counties."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Right. And also just to be clear, in talking about additional information that needs to be on this slide, you know, you can't always put

everything on a slide. And I understand that the total feasibility study is how many pages?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "It's roughly 300."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Okay. So looking at one slide out of context in 300 is a challenge no matter what, right? Because there is probably context in other parts of the study and some of it's already been discussed by all of you gentlemen who have, again, decades of experience here. But I think the point I'm getting at is that part of the reason that the requirement in Fulton County for the size of the jail that you're recommending in this study is not apples to -- it's not population to size of jail. Those two things are not necessarily the numbers that we should be looking at because we're also talking about a state law, as has already indicated. It is a red state, it -- as has been indicated. If you look nationally at incarceration rates, Georgia is among the highest nationally. So in -- without taking some of these things into consideration, this slide makes it look like we just want to put a lot of people in jail in Fulton County, which in fact, is not up to us at the county level in many ways. We are not in control of sentencing guidelines that are put down by the state, et cetera, et cetera. I just want to make sure that I'm getting this right."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "You're getting it right."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Okay. So I don't know how you get all that on one slide. Or maybe this is -- should not be a slide that's there in terms of the correlation between population and size of number of beds. I mean, I think that is where the problem is coming and we're looking at, well, we have a lower -- you know, on this slide, it makes it look like we have a lower population and -- and a significantly number -- higher number of beds. So, you know, again, I don't know if you're going to be able to put enough context into this slide to make it better or if it just needs to be revisited in terms of how that information is being presented. Because again, listening to the entirety of today's multi-hour presentation, I think we have been given that information. But, you know, everybody knows that anybody who's going to have a problem with us doing this is going to pull this slide out and say, what the heck, right? So, again, not sure how you fix this from a presentation perspective, but I think it's important for all of us here and everybody watching, listening, talking about this to understand that we're talking about one slide out of 300, or you know, one chart out of how many, a 300-page study here. So I just want to be clear that this is not indicative of Fulton County wanting to incarcerate, you know, 5,480 people, right. That's it."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Vice Chair Ellis."

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "If I can, if I can just to follow up Commissioner Barrett, because your point is well taken. And perhaps the slide itself should have had some more lead in. But as context, because we've talked about this before, Georgia is one of the top five in terms of the percentage of people who are incarcerated as the percentage of the population in the state. The others include Texas, Oklahoma,

Alabama, and I forget the fifth. We're always in the top five, right. And secondly, when we benchmark Fulton County against the other ten counties that we benchmark against, the only county that had a higher percentage of people behind bars as a percentage of the population was Shelby County, which includes Memphis. So we're not going to dive into -- it's not our job to our job to dive into all the reasons why that's the case. But that particular incarceration rate is of variable that factors into why we have a bigger pop -- number than you would have in other comparable size counties. It's driven by the incarceration rate, first at the state level, Fulton County is a microcosm of that. And that's why it factors it. Perhaps it shouldn't be as big a variable, we can talk about that. But those are the two facts that we relied on when we started taking a look at, well, geez, why is our jail bigger than what you would see in other parts of the country? And one of the factors we've looked at is, well, geez, we tend to have more people behind bars as a percentage, here again, of our population than some of those other states."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Vice Chair Ellis."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I mean, you still -- it still deserves a better explanation than what we got. And, you know, go back to the earlier slides and the assumptions that we're going to have, 66 percent more average daily bookings 20-something years from now, given the focus that's being paid to criminal justice reform and other measures. It's a hard one to really explain. And to say that, you know, we need a facility that's, you know, whatever per capita of 50 percent larger than a facility that was recently designed in the city and a county that has its own sort of known issues related to crime, like Baltimore County. I mean, the Delta's pretty large. I mean, I understand that there are, you know, distinctions and differences. But, you know, to that magnitude, it's going to require a lot more explanation. I mean, I -- you know, we're doing this somewhat in a vacuum, where we don't have, you know, certain other constituents coming down here and talking to us. But I'll remind this Body of conversation we had related to getting access to Atlanta City Detention Center. And, you know, the community's response to that measure. I mean, this is not directed at you all. I'm just -- this is directed more at this Body, right. I mean, so, you know, being able to articulate the why of the size, it's going to matter. And we need more than -- I mean, I know -- you were just doing, projecting stuff out. And I'm not throwing, you know, this all out on you other than, I will say that the point that the Chairman raised about, you know, comparisons to other counties. And that's a -- that's a notable omission, which, you know, should be here. So, you know, anyway, this -- this side -- this slide is germane, right. Because these are all -- these are all newly-constructed facilities, right, within the past four to five years?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Correct."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "That were designed, I'm presuming, for future needs, you know, within those communities?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Again, that information needs to be quantified --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "-- due to the comps --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So that would be helpful to quantify. The other thing that would be helpful to quantify, you know, is we're looking at this is for those newly-constructed facilities, how many of these, where they done, to the extent that you can find out, did they do them, you know, how did they decide upon these numbers? What assumptions did they make? And are they -- are they going to have future phases of stuff that are going to be built? Or is this sort of, did they build for their need and this is a, you know, at 3620 for example, in Baltimore County, is a number that they designed for, you know, 2040 or whatever, you know, kind of thing? So I think -- I think it's a good slide. And I do -- and I think it bears up questions that we need to ask and wrestle with and debate with, so."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Arrington."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "So I think for me, part of the problem with this side -- this slide, depends on how you define comparable. I would define comparable as those five other states with the higher incarceration rate, right. And so I would want to see, to me, they incarceration rate would make it comparable. I'm not sure how the word comparable is defined here and what makes it comparable. If they incarceration rate isn't the same, I would submit to you, it's not comparable. I would submit these counties, if they're not in Texas, Oklahoma, or whatever other states that you've said that this slide that these are not comparable counties."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Again, we'll clarify -- we'll clarify this document in more detail in the final report."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "All right, thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you or bringing up A6, page A6, because it's very important. But what we also need to take into consideration is the fact that it looks like we're building a building for \$2 billion. And I'm glad that you did address what the soft costs are. Because no regular person who does not do development or anything related to jails would know exactly what soft costs are. And to the tune of \$360 -- \$16 million, I heard you say that's architecture program management, furniture, fixtures, change orders, remediation, and the like. But what we still have not even thought about is the fact that we have to pay for what are we doing in this building. Because you have a whole presentation that addresses services and programs. And if you recall when Commissioner Arrington and I met with you, I questioned and said, you know, are we looking at those additional costs other than just this building? Because it's not going to stop at \$2 billion, it's going to increase if we start talking about what those services and programs may be. So I asked you, how do we

incorporate our department's offices and agencies into providing those services and programs or our nonprofit partners, who we already fund through our grant programming? Or do we have to engage a new group of providers and nonprofit agencies and organizations to address these specific needs within the jail? These are also costs that we have to take into consideration because it may put us well over \$2 billion. So there's a lot more that needs to go into this cost that we have not even addressed yet. Thank you."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Thank you, Commissioner. The next steps slide that I have addresses that."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You're on the summary?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Can we go back to the summary slide for a moment? Just come forward one, thank you. So here at the summary slide, I was about to say that the need for the new facility is acute. There's no question about that. I think we all agree that that's the case. That the new facility will be safe and supportive and represented environment of pretrial detention. The size of the facility, we talked today, there are number of factors, standards, classification, treatment needs and program. And we're also recommending a strong look at the Rice Street facility. Next slide, please. The overall project schedule, we talked about a little bit. It's a six-year schedule that is consistent with a project of this size. So construction could end in December of 2028, and the building could be occupied in '29. If we back up about three years, which we believe a building of this size would cost to construct, that's fairly consistent, the construction would have to begin in April of 2026. Two years in front of that, is typically what you would have for your design phase of a project of this nature. And then in front of that is your solicitation phase. Next slide, please. The recommended next steps that the county could work on immediately is, starting with the cost of the operations. Commissioner, to your point, how to wrap those costs into the overall cost of the project. We certainly recommend that the county look at that immediately. And that could take upwards of three months, depending on the complexity of that exercise. But determine what those costs are, so that they can be attached to the estimates that have been developed thus far. There's normally a detailed space program that would follow that to take the square footages that have been identified thus far and looked at in a more detailed way to basically confirm, if you will, if those sizes are accurate. There's phasing options that we talked about earlier, what portions of the project you may want to phase over time. Those need to be looked at in more detail as well. You can see that in the third step our analysis or recommendations. And then you would actually start to do some concepts on the site to see if the building really fits properly on the site, which we believe it probably will. Then the cost update could occur at that point in time, because it's a lot of new factors that may drive the cost in a different direction. And then the population forecast that Patrick discussed earlier, you'd really want to go back and look at those population numbers again, giving the system more time to adjust to some of the changes that are underway right now. Simultaneously, you could discuss ways of financing and delivery, the construction delivery of the project. That would take roughly, three months to do that."

And then begin to assemble your criteria package for your advertisement to your design and construction team. So these are all things you could do during 2023 to continue to advance the project. Next slide. Happy to answer any additional questions."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "So, that's it?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "Correct, Chairman."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. It sounds like and feels like that you owe us some explanations, some additional information and clarifications on several issues."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "That's correct."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "We're in agreement? When can we expect that?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "I'll meet with the team immediately and we'll compile that information as quickly as possible for you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "And we can come back and present it if you like or we can -- we can add that as a supplemental memo to all of you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Well, related to that, the original contract was for, Madam CFO, what was it, for \$1 million? 1.2 million. And the results, we were supposed to have had the results by the end of last year, which is, things can happen. But where are -- how much of that has been -- have -- of the 1.2 million have we paid?"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Chairman, I'm going to need to go and look that up, which I'm happy --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I'd like to know --"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "-- to do."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- that. But this additional work though that -- that you're going to have to do based upon the discussion today is covered by that 1.2, I'm assuming."

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "That's correct."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Okay. Commissioner Barrett."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So my question is to this next phase. And I brought this up in our conversation that we had before today. Obviously, there is a decision that has to be made amongst this group on how we want to move forward that could potentially delay this, right? So if we don't agree on the assumptions here or the number of beds

or the size or the location or any of the things that you all are recommending, then we're going to delay the time period and have to go back to the drawing board at some level, correct?"

JOHN EISENLAU, PROJECT MGR, TREANORHL: "That's accurate, yes."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Yeah, so I'm going to ask this question, making the assumption that that is not the case, which is a big assumption, given some of the questions today. But assuming we accept the feasibility study recommendations and agree that this is the number of beds we need and the location, et cetera, et cetera, the next phase that is essentially the rest of this year -- and this may be a question more for Mr. Adams than -- or County Manager or Sharon, I'm not sure, CFO, Madam CFO, but what's the plan to move forward? In other words, do we have a cost for this next year of consulting services and a plan to actually -- because it -- it's great to say we could start it in February, that's today. So I'm guessing that's not really happening. So what does the next -- how do we really move forward on this next phase, and then again, that's giving the assumption we can agree that we should be moving forward?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Now, well, hold it now. So technically, their work is done once we get that final report. And they will be -- have been paid that 1.2 million. And where we go from there is up to us."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Right. Well, this is why I'm asking."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "It's not up to them."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "No, no, no. Well, that's why I'm directing my question to Mr. Adams, because, you know, I -- they may or may not be involved. That's a new contract I guess, right? But the bigger question is, again, with the assumption we want to move forward, what's the next step?"

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "The next step, Commissioner, if you look at the recommendations for next steps on -- for 2023, would be for us to come back to you with more specificity around what would it take to build out that cost model, what would the scope be. We know some of it, for example, would be how many -- how many Deputies we anticipate needing. What would the cost of our medical care be, et cetera, et cetera, moving forward as an operating cost as a projection. So we'd want to get into that level of detail. We'd also, in concurrent with that, be working with Sharon and her team to try to figure out what are the financing options really for us and the impact would be at a different level of detail. So we'd also want to go back and take a different look at sizing. I don't --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Yeah, one second. I just want to interrupt you for one second."

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "Okay."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Because I -- you're -- I think to some extent, you're reiterating -- reiterating the categories listed on the left side of that previous slide with the recommended next steps --"

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "Basically, that's correct, yeah."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "But --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Hold it now, both of y'all can't talk at the same time now. Now, you want him to answer or --"

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "Commissioner, please."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "What I'm saying is, I understand the steps. What I'm asking is if -- it sounds like what you're now saying is, we can do some of these in-house. Is that what you're saying?"

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "No. What I'm saying is that some of it could be an extension of the current team, some of it we'd have to go out. For example, when it -- when we start talking about design and build, we'd have to start working on the RFP to pick that particular firm. We could start doing some of that now. That's going to be informed by some of the costs. It's going to be informed by the new sizing. So some of these have -- could be done concurrently, some of that could be an extension potentially and an update of some of the stuff we've looked at. Others would have to, in fact, be a result of letting an RFP and having other firms come in and do that."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Okay. So I just want to ask for clarification here. If we - - the longer it takes us to kind of make a decision here and decide to move forward and get the, you know, the bidding on the -- all of the rest of the stuff --"

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "Right."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "-- whether it's this year or design, all of it, right, we've potentially pushed the project out by months or years. And every time we do that the costs goes up, correct?"

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "That is correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Okay."

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "Time is not our friend. The fact that --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I just want to be clear on that."

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "-- you look at the escalators, somewhere between the every month that we extend this project costs us somewhere between 15 and \$18 million a month."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "All right. So just again to be clear, it is of utmost importance, from a fiscal perspective, to move forward as quickly as possible, make good decisions, of course. But also to move the ball."

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "That is correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Other comments? Any closing comments, Mr. Adams?"

ALTON ADAMS, COO, FC PSS: "I do not. First of all, thank you. I want to thank the team and first -- certainly want to thank the Board of the Commissioners. We appreciate your input. We heard you in terms of some of the questions and some of the things you want us to dive into. I will say, as Patrick and others said, this is a pretty complex thing. There are a lot of variables at play. And then when you add the fact that we're trying to forecast out 15 years and then another -- it creates a different level of complexity. That having been said, I think directionally, we feel pretty good about where we -- what was delivered. We've got some more work to do to get to the next level of detail and make sure we address the questions that were raised. So thank you for your time."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you. It's 2:15. I thought it would take us about three hours. We began at 11:13. So we'll entertain a motion to recess for lunch, real -- items of real estate, litigation and personnel. All right, Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "And the motion passes; six yeas, zero nays."

(Recess for Executive Session at 2:16 p.m.)

(Back in Regular Session at 3:18 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Without objection, we will resume the regular order of business. Madam Clerk -- strike that. Madam County Attorney, items from Executive Session."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "Thank you, Chairman Pitts. Is there a motion to decline the settlement offers as presented in items 2 and 3 of the Executive Session agenda?"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Yes. Yeah, so moved."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. I'll second. Let's vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion passes; six yeas, zero nays."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "And is there a motion to approve the request for representation set forth in item number 4 of the Executive Session agenda?"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So moved."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Second. Let's vote, please. I'm sorry, seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman. Please vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion passes; six yeas, zero nays."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "No further action items from Executive Session."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Continue, Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "Bottom of page 8, 23-0084, Discussion, consequences of the 2023 budget actions."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Madam CFO, where are we? I've been -- I know that there are certain follow-up actions that the Board is going to have to take in order to implement the -- some of the additions that were made to the budget that we will have to do. And you had outlined some of those to me. So can you summarize those quickly? We may need to put them in writing so the Board can -- can review them. But there were several things that you think that we will have to do."

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In regard to the actions that the Board took at the last meeting, some of the follow-up items that will come forward include --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioners, please. Now, she's --"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "-- include on today's -- today's agenda, a resolution specifically to address the salary adjustments and COLA that was approved for the Sheriff's Department for the funding that was provided for the Sheriff's Department. Additionally, there were a number of actions that will subsequent action by the Board including contract amendments for Sadie G. Mays for the incremental funding for that organization. We will have to complete a contract amendment and potentially a procurement process for the Cares.com for the childcare funding that was provided. There were funding provided to several 501c3s without competition. And we will have to draft contracts for those entities and bring those back to the Board as well. There's a potential of a service delivery issue with the introduction of funding for the Bear Creek Nature Center, should the municipality that that center is located in take issue with the

county providing ARCH services in that area without that being included in the service delivery strategy. There were direct funding provided to several arts organizations that have historically received funding through Contracts for Services. There's a question of whether or not they should be excluded in the Contracts for Services competition process as a result of that. The -- sorry, I'm trying to read through this. The additional funding for the Chattahoochee Nature Center, we're working on the contract amendment. A contract amendment will have to come forward for that as well. So we'll be bringing a number of additional items forward to the Board for some additional action, so that we can fulfill the Board's desire relative to the actions that you took. I think I've covered most of -- most of the major items. The one item that isn't necessarily a separate Board action item, but there were funds provided for a new program, significant funding level for a new program in Community Development, the youth and homeless program. And there is a need to carve out a portion of those funds for the actual staff support of that program as well in order to be able to actually stand up the program and provide the requested activities. Other than that, Mr. Chairman, I mean, I think I've covered the individual actions. Some of the other -- the other item that you had asked for was for us to identify any possible unintended consequences of that. And I tried to summarize those to you at a very high level. One was that as a result of the funding being provided to the Sheriff, we have the potential for a dispirit treatment of employees with regard to COLA and overtime pay --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. I'm going to object. I'm going to renew my statement from earlier. I'm going to make a motion right now to make this an Executive Session item based on what she just said."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I'm going to second that."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "That, I'm not -- I have no objection to that. We'll take that one -- that one item in Executive Session. Continue."

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "And other than that, the only other concern that was identified was the potential to have individuals, current employees in perhaps the Marshals and the Police Department --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Madam CFO, I'm sorry. I made a motion and it was seconded. And we need to have a vote."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I said I -- no objection to it. We can vote."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. I -- she's going on, like, I don't know what she's talking about."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: Okay. Hold on. Order."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "It's Executive Session."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Order, order, order, Mr. Commissioner. All right, yes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Could we limit discussion to this item to real actionable things that need to -- need to be addressed as opposed to speculative things?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Madam CFO."

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Well, I mean, at this point --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I mean, that's -- no, that's my request. I mean, I realize you're responding to a question. But I mean, for the purposes of this discussion that's before us right now, what things would, you know, will likely have to be acted upon, execution of an IGA, consideration of this, things that are going to have to be brought back for a vote versus, you know, the potential reaction of one group that may want this because some group got that. And I -- that's -- I don't know that that's really a productive discussion along -- to have that kind of discussion in --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "We can --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I need ruling by the County Attorney, because I don't -- I don't know how you can talk about half of something and not talk about the other half it. So I need a ruling from the County Attorney. Either it's Executive Session. Either it's potential litigation or it's not. Either it's human resources or it's not."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. Madam County Attorney, on the -- he's, Commissioner Arrington is addressing the issues, there were two in particular that dealt with sort of touched on personnel."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "I understand. Commissioner Arrington --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "And I have no objections about those two being be addressed in Executive Session."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "Yes. Well, while I do think that there are aspects of the budgetary discussion that would not fall into the Executive Session category, they are very intertwined. And I do think it is tricky to delve into the practical aspects of it without touching upon the potential for legal exposure. So, I understand Commissioner Arrington's concern. But I think, as a point of order, there's a vote before the Board. And perhaps that may resolve the matter if the vote is taken."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Is that sufficient Mr. -- Commissioner Arrington?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Yes. I'm ready to vote."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "On?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Oh, my motion is that -- renewing my motion to make this item an Executive Session item."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "The two -- the -- those that deal the personnel or the whole -- all of the items?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "This is a discussion. It's not -- it's only one item. It's one item of consequences of 2023 budget actions."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. We'll entertain -- entertain a motion as -- what -- we'll entertain the motion that's on the floor. This was just a discussion item to discuss what actions are going to be required at some point in order to implement the actions of the Board at the last Board meeting. That's all this is."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I have a question. Since I seconded it."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Just a minute, just a minute. What I'd like for you to do is everything that you've stated so far about each item, put in writing so that they'll have a chance to look at it before the next meeting."

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Be happy to do that, Mr. Chairman."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Mr. Chair, if it's an Executive Session item, it can't be put --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "You can't put it in writing --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "-- in writing."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Just a minute, just a minute."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "It can't be put in writing and sent to us."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "We're going to vote on your -- on your idea that this is -- all of these items are Executive Session items, which I disagree with. But that motion is on the floor by Commissioner Arrington, seconded by Commissioner Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Hold on now. I second but I have a question --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Sure."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- because you're saying that -- you're saying that there are other parts to this item, but it's one item."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No, he's -- the motion is for everything that will be in --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Everything like what?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- containing to go to --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "It's one item. Like, he's --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "That's what I'm saying. Everything that comes under that would be --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "But what is everything that comes under that?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Whatever comes out will be in Executive Session."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "We don't even have Executive Session like that, talking about whatever comes out --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I totally agree with --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- it's categorized --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "But you seconded the motion."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "That's why I'm asking the question. Because now you're saying that there's more to this than what this says."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "She's outlined several items, if y'all were listening, several items that we're going to discuss in Executive Session, which shouldn't be in Executive Session, if the this motion passes. So let's just vote it up or vote it down --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. But you --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "That's just not true."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- you, you know, you have consistently brought up about information leaking out of Executive Session, fines --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "That happened at the last meeting too."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- that can be imposed on -- on Commissioners for discussing things that should be only discussed in Executive Session. And so Commissioner Arrington is raising a very important part of this discussion that falls directly under what you've consistently said. There are just things that we should not be discussing publicly that belong in Executive Session. And if this involves any of that, it should not be discussed publicly at all."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. So the motion, his motion, seconded by you is to have this discussion in Executive Session --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- at our next one, which I totally disagree with. But let's vote the motion --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Oh, I'm still in the queue."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Go ahead --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I don't know how anybody got to speak before me, because I'm number one."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Arrington, you have the floor."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "This is what you call sour grapes. This is what you call sour grapes, people that do not like the budget that was voted on. That list, where did you get that list from, Ms. Whitmore? Who asked you about those specific items?"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Commissioner Arrington, the executive team was asked by the Chairman to --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. So that's his list --"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "-- to summarize a list of the possible unintended consequences as a result --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. I didn't --"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "-- budgeted options --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "-- hear you talk about any of the contracts that have to do anything with the budget. So why would you talk about, oh, well, we're going to have to do a contract with Sadie Mays? We got to do contracts for everything in that budget, don't we?"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Contractual items, yes, sir."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "So why would -- why -- why would you single out Sadie Mays? And there are over -- it's a \$1.3 billion worth of contracts. Why would you single out one contract like Sadie Mays?"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Commissioner Arrington, we reviewed it based on the summarized list of actions that the Board took specifically in the adoption of the budget. I'm not at the level of every single item in the budget, but -- but there is additional items --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "The answer is because you were asked to by the Chairman. And he doesn't like the outcome of the vote. And he wrote us a letter. So I'm going to read my letter. Thank you for your letter. I am shocked to see you say that you expected to see resignations from our County Manager and Alton Adams. Why would you expect to see resignations? You think they would resign because they don't agree with the outcome of the vote? What conduct at the last meeting are you referring to, Mr. Chair? No one said anything to our County Manager or to Alton Adams that would be a cause for their resignation, nor did anyone act in any offending manner towards them. I guess, I was the only Commissioner that the executive staff did not meet with about the budget. In past years, they've come to me and requested my items for inclusion in the budget. I've served as Commissioner for eight years. This is my ninth budget cycle and every year, Commissioners have added items to the proposed budget in the same fashion as which it occurred at the last meeting Board meeting. The staff informed us at the first meeting in January that there was an additional \$22.5 million available. And the Sheriff, District Attorney, Solicitor, and Probate Judge made requests. In fact, Mr. Chair, you invited them. You sat right there and said, hey, is there anybody else? Anybody else got any requests? You invited additional requests. I was shocked that you did not accept the staff recommendation for the 2022 millage rate. Did you think that our County Manager and Alton Adams were going to resign when the Board voted to lower the '22 millage rate, thereby creating a \$80 million budget deficit for 2023? If staff is going to resign because they don't like the outcome of a vote, then they should resign now. Your talk of the budget falls on deaf ears based on your vote to lower the 2022 millage rate. If you were truly worried about the 2023 budget, you would have not -- you would not have voted to lower the 2022 millage rate. Why were you not concerned about resignations from the Board vote to lower the 2022 millage rate? A new jail and hospital will likely require bond deals and we won't be able to fund either of these project from our general fund. The new jail is anticipated to cost \$2 billion alone. And I imagine that a hospital might share a similar cost. Your idea of passing a budget that includes all requests is actually a good idea and one that I've heard before. In fact, it's an idea that I previously proposed. This would give us a true baseline of what it takes to run Fulton County government based on our needs. Our previous budgets have not been based on the county's needs, rather based on what we expect to collect. I've said many times that this is not the proper way to prepare a budget. Since 2015, our budgets have been amended on the day of the final vote. In fact, I have never seen in all nine budget cycles, a budget approved as presented or proposed. You consistently ask, where is the money coming from? But as Commissioner Darnell always stated, it's up to Finance to decide where the money is coming from or for us to

tell them where they're coming from. In this case, we changed the basic assumption in order to maintain a balanced budget. They assumed one millage rate for purposes of the budget and this Board instructed them to assume a different rate. I had to put a stop to the false and misleading narrative that you and staff presented regarding volunteer Boards with the county. All the following Fulton County boards receive funding: The Arts Council, the Veterans Empowerment Commission, the Board of Registrations and Elections, the Ethics Board, the Fulton County Development Authority, and the Board of Assessors, just to name a few. Therefore, I was shocked that you and others would present a false narrative in order to attempt to sway votes from support of the Reparations Task Force. Nevertheless, if staff won't resign because the Board didn't support their recommendation for a millage rate, why would you say that you would expect resignations because the Board didn't accept their recommended budget? That's not logical. It doesn't make any sense. Why would they resign because the budget was lower? If they were going to resign, they would have resigned when y'all voted to lower the millage rate and created the \$80 million deficit. And I won't even begin to address why you thought -- why you only identified the County Manager and Alton Adams. I had no idea why you didn't think Ms. Whitmore or Dr. Roshell wouldn't resign. I guess I should have sent a letter after your -- a letter similar to yours after the vote on the budget, after the vote on the 2022 millage rate. Oh, the 2022 millage rate, we're going to have budget consequences. It was a \$80 million budget deficit created by that. And now you want to have discussion about a budget. We should have had that when -- before -- that's why I got the resolution back on there now. We need to get the budget for next year 60 days before we vote on the millage rate. By how are we going to have that discussion? Please help me understand the purpose of this discussion, the purpose besides sour grapes, besides the fact that you don't like the way the vote turned out. Of course, they're going to have to do a contract. They have to do contracts for everything in that budget. I don't need somebody -- I don't need you to have the CFO come tell me they got to do a contract with Sadie Mays. I know that. That's what's got to be done. They can't do any of those without contracts. Nothing gets done in Fulton County without a contract. We have \$1.3 billion worth of contracts that we have to put out. Of course, staff is going to have to do those contracts. I don't understand this. This is sour grapes because somebody doesn't like the way the vote turned out. That's what this is. In those items that Ms. Whitmore start addressing are items that belong in Executive Session because there at the potential for litigation and there are Personnel and Human Resource issues that must be discussed."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You finished, Commissioner?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I am."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "For now."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Hall. All right. Commissioner Ellis."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Call the question."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Question is being called. Let's vote on call of the question."

CLERK GRIER: "Ellis called the question."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Let's go."

CLERK GRIER: "And second on call the question?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I'll second."

CLERK GRIER: "Chairman Pitts. And the vote is open on call the question. And the motion fails; two yeas, one nay, and four abstention."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Hall, you didn't want to be heard? Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "First of all, and this is me talking as an elected official of Fulton County. I want to apologize to the Fulton County taxpayers because as elected officials, we -- this is something that we really should have been able to resolve behind closed doors. I am going to support my colleague Marvin Arrington, in saying that we need to put this in an Executive Session, if for no other reason, this is deplorable. And I can't speak for anybody else, but we got a county management team, we got elected officials up here. And for the sake of not going against what I've always strived to be, which is transparent and open, I apologize. I am -- I am utterly disgusted as to how this looks to our constituents. Everybody has valid points, but now that we've gotten to this juncture, I think we need to go behind closed doors, not because we don't have transparency. So let me be crystal clear about that. But this is clearly out of control. And I apologize to every employee of Fulton County, every citizen of Fulton County, staff, and even to my colleagues. So I would have to say, I support us going behind closed doors in Executive Session. Thank you, Chairman."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Barrett."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I have a question for the County Attorney, regards Executive Session. It's my understanding that the only things that can be discussed in Executive Session are when it comes to legal matters, specific cases as opposed to just the idea that we might be sued for something. As well as when it comes to personnel issues, the -- only related to specific individuals as opposed to groups; is that correct?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "That is correct. Although, even though there isn't -- if there is not a specific lawsuit that's currently pending, there are certain circumstances where there is a real likelihood of litigation. But certainly if there's a specific case pending, then that's something to be discussed in Executive Session --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Well, I mean, what is the test for a real likelihood?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "It's a full analysis that you would have to have a specific set of facts to analyze. But it -- if there is a reasonable likelihood, if you have reasons that a court could and would likely find would put the county in anticipation of litigation --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Okay, so --"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "-- we would consider that to be eligible for Executive Session."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Fine. Thank you very much for that answer. So just to be clear, I think it might help with all of this -- I'm going to sort of second what Vice Chair Ellis said in that if we could keep the comments in this discussion item to actual things that need to be done versus potential unintended consequences, which is really just -- I mean, you can -- a potential unintended consequence of me walking across the floor here is that I could trip and break a leg. Who cares, it's -- it hasn't happened yet. So I would ask the Chairman, you know, and the executive team, if we could keep our comments to actual consequences as to potential unintended consequences, I think that would help a lot in terms of what does or does not need to be discussed privately. And also, I would just add, I know, Chairman, you value decorum. And I think it would be helpful if we just had a, you know, calm conversation about all of this without anybody, you know, accusing anybody of anything. And I do feel like this -- this agenda item does seem to be a little bit of a, to Commissioner Arrington's point, a little bit of a, shame on all of you. And I don't know that that's helpful, so."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Chairman, I'll be brief. You can't piecemeal this. I don't believe, in my opinion -- I'm not the County Attorney, so I'm -- I will lead to what she said. But you can't piecemeal this. And we know that we have employees at departments that are upset right now. And we also know that if there's potential litigation or if there is something that we have done that may or may not be affecting the morale in a particular department, we do a disservice to those that are leading the department if we don't try to rectify it. But maybe, I don't understand. I don't believe this is the appropriate venue for airing what I call, dirty laundry. Now, I may get in trouble for saying that. But I've watched this Board of Commissioners, and I've watched previous ones. And I know it was certain ideas that were hashed out behind closed doors. And I know it was certain situations where we were entrusted that the County Manager would come to us and we would have the trust and belief in the County Manager that what they brought to us, we would agree with. And so we have a lot of what I call, things that could be potential litigation or things that we -- if we do it openly here, we do a disservice to our department heads and other individuals that were told one thing and they weren't here to express to us. And so we're having unintended consequences

whether we wanted to have them or not. But again, I would plead to my colleagues, all of my colleagues, with this particular issue, I do believe whatever we define as potential Executive Session that we go behind closed doors. And not do this in public. Thank you, Chairman."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Anyone else? All right. The motion on the floor, motion to take this item, 23-0084 to discuss that item in Executive Session at our next meeting. That motion was seconded by Commissioner Hall. Just for it to clarify -- not clarify, amplify, there are certain items that can be discussed in Executive Session. There are other items that cannot. I -- so let's -- the motion on the floor is to approve. Let's vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion fails; three yeas, three nays, and one abstention."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Again, at our next meeting, the items, Madam County -- strike that -- Madam CFO, if you will reduce to writing, what you outlined as possible actions that this Board will have to take regarding some of those items. That would be helpful, I think, to the Board. The two that deal with personnel, I've already agreed that we will discuss those in Executive Session. Continue, Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "Continuing on page 8, 23-0045, Registration and Election, request approval of a resolution amending the cost to be charged to municipalities who authorize Fulton County to conduct any or all of their municipal elections and for other purposes."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Good afternoon, Chairman and Members of the Board. We come before you today to request a revision to the municipal cost resolution of the Department of Registration and Elections is willing to conduct transparent and efficient, efficient municipal elections. The current cost per voter rate will not cover all 2023 municipal election cost. Are goal in requesting the revision to the resolution is to ensure the county does not incur cost in conducting municipal election services. Next slide, please. Currently, the resolution is based off of 2017 election budgets. It is -- was to be -- it actually states it was to be reevaluated with the installation of new voting equipment. And it was to -- in anticipation of election costs increases throughout the years. It also -- it's -- we are in violation of election code if we incur cost to conduct municipal services. Next slide, please. We have outlined comparisons with the 2021 and 2023 municipal budgets for the runoff and the general. We actually emailed a itemized list for both elections to your offices for review. And on the above slide, it outlines that the estimated total cost -- it outlines the total cost for each election. It outlines how this is changed with the number of registered voters. The changes are -- take place when municipalities participate or do not participate. So that's what changes election costs as well, therefore, you see the number of estimated voters as a cost per voter on the slide above. You can note the difference in the actual cost versus the budgeted costs. How that happens is that we draft the budget at the

beginning of the year. And that which is -- it includes the municipalities that have stated they will participate. That can possibly change in August if -- during qualifying if there's an election cancellation. It can change if a polling site, even though we reserve them early in the year, there could be polling sites that decide they are not able to assist to us due to -- we've had everything from foreclosures to renovations, having to enlist emergency moves. Those things impact the number of registered -- I mean, the number of polling sites we're going to have, which changes the rate for -- because it impacts the number of poll workers. All those things affect the cost. Next slide, please. And again, for our budgets, there are some things that are beyond our control and within our control, whether it's an increase or a decrease in cost. If the new voting equipment and legislative changes, vendor rates, facility rates, security concerns, all those things impact -- impact costs. We can control some things by merging precincts and things of that nature. But there's a lot of things that could change the election costs if we go by cost per voter. Next slide, please. So our request for the resolution is -- revision is to revert back to percentage-cost based on the number of registered voters, reinstating refunds to municipalities. This will allow our department to continue to prepare for rate changes in legislations, vendor rates, et cetera. It will allow our department to continue to work on reevaluating processes to have election reductions. And again, the main goal is not to have the county incur costs. Next slide. I will take questions and answers, please."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Vice Chair Ellis."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I got several things. I guess sort of to start with, what is the date in which we need to hear back from the municipalities regarding execution of these IGAs?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Our goal upon approval or -- would be to reach out to -- we have already reached out to the municipalities in regards to who wants to have an election. We do that in the beginning of the year to find out if they need our services. But our goal would be to have the IGAs out to them by February 24th and have them respond by March 31st if they want to opt in or out for us to do their municipal election services."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So March 31st is the date we are going to give them or not?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "We will -- we will distribute the IGAs by February 24th. And then we will want them to respond to us with the IGAs by March 31st because we have to put them before our Board and before the Board of Commissioners for approval."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. So March 31st is the date we're requesting response by, or that they would be executed by?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Sorry, I couldn't hear you."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "March 31st would be the date we'd request they're executed by?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Well, we want them to return it to us because we have to put it on -- we have to work -- put it through workflow to put before you all for approval."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "So we want them to return the IGAs to us with signatures by March 31st."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "By March 31st, okay. All right. So just a little bit, just sort of background, since the two -- the 2019, you know, resolution that was proposed or that was put in place, I guess at that point in time, it was because it was a frustration by the municipalities about the proposed costs and variability associated with -- with this and folks wanting some degree of certainty. So we agreed upon this 2.96. It was pre the SB202 and that sort of stuff. So costs obviously changed. And we wind up in this position to where we were -- we subsidized the 2021 general election, correct? I don't believe in 2019 when that number was put in place, I think the cost actually fell within kind of what it was, what the resolution called for. But 2021, so the general election costs were 5.2 million, correct?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes, sir."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "And then we wound up, the county wound collecting, I think about 2.426 million. Is that the number you had there? All right. So the difference there was what was subsidized by the -- absorbed by the county, correct?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes, sir."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So what this resolution would do is it would pull that back and go back to the cost agreement, you know, that was in place prior to 2019. And I guess, also to note, we -- that decision in 2019 was sort of done midstream. Actually, there were, I believe, certain IGAs that were executed under their -- under this early agreement and this resolution was passed and then changed, correct? So this would take us back prior to 2019 to this pro-rata share agreement, right?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes, sir."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. So now I want to just sort of talk a little bit about the costs here. And I do think generally speaking, we should be, you know, when we're doing these things, we should be, you know, recouping our cost and not subsidizing them. The same time, I believe, we ought to be presenting to the folks that we would potentially perform the service to, you know, good, well thought out, reasonable number

that's not overly inflated and does not, you know, in and of itself, you know, create actions and concerns that are unwarranted or, you know, place them in sort of an awkward point and decision, right. So cities benefited in 2021, clearly, from that action that was taken -- that took place in 2019, all right. So I think we do need to -- to rectify where we are. But I have questions about, you know, kind of, this what's been suggested in terms of the cost to do this for 2023. And if I read your material right, the 2023 sort of costs proposed to run just the general election portion of this is 6.692 million; is that correct?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Currently, yes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. Now, we all recognize, there's maybe been some inflation and that sort of thing. But that's a 28 percent increase over 2021 and figure a 5.2. And that's also, if I read the material right, in this next election cycle, we know for sure that Sandy Springs is not having an election, correct, and city of Milton has chosen to do their own election?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "That's correct."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "All right. So that means not only is there a 28 percent increase in proposed costs to run the elections in 2023, but that's on the base -- that's also on the basis of, if I do my math right, about 12 percent fewer registered voters playing into that. So it's -- it makes the increase look even more significant than just 28 percent. So I'm struggling with the hard costs, and then follow through with it on the runoff, the 2021 runoff costs were 2.29 -- 2.229 million, correct?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "And the proposed is 2.848, correct? Again, 27, 28 percent increase. I mean, you know, I'm not looking to sort of get into the, all the nuts and bolts about this in terms of the different components of this, because I have asked questions before. I do think -- I don't think I've really gotten the satisfactory of answers as I would have liked. We did see, you know, this is coming off the heels of last year, where the amount of funds that was spent to run four elections were significantly less than what was within the budget. So the credibility for me in terms of, kind of, the proposed budget to run the municipal elections, I'm struggling with it because y'all haven't really proven to me that you can -- you're doing a really a good job of sort of budgeting sort of closely to what it's going to cost you to run the elections. So I have a proposal to make. And certainly, I'm fine with moving away and back to this pro-rata share argument or, you know, position as opposed to the per voter. But I would like to see us do that, you know, on the basis of setting -- setting any fixed costs of the general election at what it was in 2021, what it costs us to do it, 5.2 million, and the runoff at 2.229 million. And that we set up the billing accordingly on that and we have the refunding positions if we don't meet it. I think we're obviously going to be asking the cities that want to participate to absorb a much higher cost. They still will be absorbing a much higher cost. But it's one that's a little more founded in some sort of sense of reality because it was what it

cost us generally to do it the prior time, plus -- plus a little bit of inflationary factor given that you're dealing with a smaller, you know, voter base because of the two cities that I've mentioned, they're not participating in the elections. And, you know -- and then, you know, let's see how you all can be able to execute within those particular parameters. If that lines up -- if it winds up -- we might run up -- run up a little bit of costs on top of that, we do. But it's not evident to me that we will based upon what's been -- what's been demonstrated within the running of the last election as well as 2021. So, you know, that's what I would like to see us do is to, you know, bring forth a little bit more of what I think is a rational cost into this. It may challenge you all somewhat, but I think it's a reasonable challenge and reasonable ask and also something that, you know, is in a good-faith effort in terms of presenting something back to the cities to allow them to, you know, make a fair decision upon as opposed to something which appears to be, you know, for lack of a better term, a little bit of a go away, go do it yourself proposal, to say, hey, we're going to charge you, not only more than what you were charging before, but we're going to build on top of that, the equivalent of about, you know, 30 to 35 percent more than what it costs us to do it in 2021. I just -- I just don't think that's in the right spirit of where we're trying to get to on this. And that's what I would like to see us do. I'll listen to some of the comments and I may have to come back in and make a specific motion around it."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. And when you come back, Vice, could you quantify yours? I'd like to have a number that I can compare it what they are --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "My -- well, I quantified the numbers for you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You did?"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Yes. 5.2 million to run the general election and 2.229 million --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Cost per -- is it per --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Not, right -- well, there's no cost per voter anymore. That's what their -- the proposal is to move away from the cost per voter and it's a pro-rata share based upon the number of voters within the municipalities that are participating. Now that, you can work that out to some sort of existing, you know, kind of number on the basis of that --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Got it. I got it."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- 730,000, we can figure that out."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I got it, all right."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Barrett, then we can come back."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "To be clear, it's not moving away from cost per voter. It's moving away from a specific fixed cost per voter of \$2.96, which was set in the 2019 resolution, which I think we can all agree, is no longer realistic as it put us in the hole for \$2.77 million in 2021. While I hear what you're saying, Vice Chair Ellis, I do not think it actually makes sense logically, to base 2023 on what we paid in 2021, because in fact, costs have gone up in every industry across the board. And there is a percentage of this -- and I'm going to come back to Ms. Williams here in just a moment with some actual questions. But paper costs more, gasoline costs more, renting cars and trucks costs more. Everything costs more now in 2023 than it did in 2021. So to assume that they can perform an election at 2021 prices is just like putting your head in the sand and ignoring the fact that when we go to the grocery store, we can't pay the same price for eggs now as we paid in 2021, it's unrealistic. So, you know, if you want to do something along those lines of changing the estimated cost, then it would be the estimated -- it would be the actual cost from '21 plus the cost of all of those inflationary factors and maybe I could get my head around that, maybe. That said, I want to bring this back to you, Ms. Williams, with some questions. Because you did, in fact, have some categories in that more detailed list that you sent us in which cost went up, some of which Vice Chair Ellis detailed. But can you speak to specifically, which costs have gone up or maybe refer to the ones that Vice Chair Ellis mentioned, and why specifically, those have gone up. I know in our conversations, there were some discussion about the Board's request that we move to some more -- I don't know if the right word is permanent staff versus contract staff. But can you just help me out with what some of those items were?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Right. So, yes. So for a few the items for instance SB202, we have to -- it's competitive now between counties. You can get a waiver to work for any surrounding county. Of course, the poll workers deserved the raise, they did, because they work hard. But those things have to be back factored into the election budget. We had to increase poll worker rates to be competitive. Again, gas has gone up, rental fees have gone up. We -- I'm -- so, yeah, so those -- all these items have gone up over time. We are attempting to still streamline in the process. There is actually a new voting system that's coming out. Some things might increase, some things might decrease in regards to that. We're still currently in training in regards to that system."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I want to ask a follow-up question here, which is, you know, given the resolution that's on the floor right now to be discussed, we would be moving away from that fixed rate of cost per voter at \$2.96. But no matter what you end up doing here, you'll be able to sort of tell us what that cost per voter is in actual fact each year, correct? That we have --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes. So --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "-- that we do one of those?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes. So we will be able to tell you what that cost is. And again, we -- now having it at a set rate, allows us to work with increases or decreases as they come."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Correct. And also, just for a point of clarification, I know that the municipalities are struggling with the cost increase. They're comparing basically, a \$2.96 per voter cost to what is on this sheet that, I believe is a \$9.13 cost per voter estimate. But I -- it's, I think, important to acknowledge the fact that the cost per -- the actual cost per voter in 2021 was I believe, \$6, and I want to say, 39 cents, something like that. So in fact, we're only going up another couple of dollars here. We're not going from three to nine, we're essentially going from over six, well over six to just over nine. So it's less than a \$3 increase. Also, I think it's important to note that in this current resolution, the cities, the municipalities will never pay more than the actual cost. So what you're saying -- what we're saying here is, we're putting together an estimate based on all the things we just discussed, the previous elections, our experience, inflation, all the things. We're sending these bills out to the municipalities and if we come in under, we will refund the difference. We're not talking about making a profit here. We're talking about having them pay for the actual cost. So I just want to make that clear. I feel like the -- the proposal here is quite fair and well thought out for the future. Any time we lock ourselves into a fixed rate, whether it be a fixed rate per voter or a fixed rate in total, we are asking for this to come back every single year and be reevaluated or we will be in the red again. So I would suggest again, just any kind of fixed rate. I would also like to just, for clarification, Ms. Williams, ask you about the perception that we don't want to do the municipalities' elections. Because I've been hearing about that quite a bit. And I believe when you answered that question in the past, you were just trying to express -- and I don't want to put words in your mouth -- that they have the right to do it themselves if they would like, not that we don't want to do this for them. Is that fair?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "That is very fair. We are willing to do the municipal elections. We were just advising they have an option. If that is -- that they may be more cost effective to them, if they go -- if they do their own election. But we're completely ready and willing to conduct municipal elections."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Okay. And I just have one more point to make. And that is that, while they do have, the municipalities do have the right certainly to do their own elections, and I think that it -- it is clear that they may be able to do them for less money, it is -- I think it's important to note that the reason they can do them for less money is because at the county level, we have to follow all of the rules laid out by the state. They do not have to do that if they're doing their own. So they can do things differently --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "-- correct?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes, ma'am."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Yes. And I think it's also worth noting that if they stand up their own elections in a municipal election year, in which there are no other countywide referendums, they may only use that process once in a while, because the next time there is a municipal election, there may also be a county referendum, in which case, we would automatically be running that -- that election. So I think it's important for the municipalities to take into consideration the fact that they may do it -- be doing all of that planning and taking on all of that cost to only use their own process once every four, six, eight years. You never know, depending on referendums. All right. That's all I have."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Thank you, Chairman. So on that point of municipalities, if there's a full-county thing that you'll have to run the elections, Palmetto runs two separate elections, correct? They run their municipal election and then you guys are set up at another location where you do the countywide?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes. It's because Palmetto lies between two counties. So in order for the voters not to be confused, they have their own municipal since they're coming from two different counties into their City Hall."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "So let's say Milton, since they don't straddle two counties, then would we be obligated to pay to run the municipal election if there's a countywide thing on the ballot?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "If there's a -- if a countywide election is called, we'd have to run that election, yes."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "You would have to run it, okay. So, yeah, I agree with Commissioner Ellis. I think the budgeting has caused a lot of distrust in the elections. We had people campaigning that they were going to fully fund elections because you guys wanted \$46 million. This Board only gave you 35 million and you -- and you said that you would not be able to do a runoff, you were not going to have enough money. I heard it on the campaign trail over and over and over, how this elections was not funded by this Board correctly. And then you come in at a cost underrun of \$28 million. You funded that runoff election. We were told it was going to cost 14 million and you wouldn't be able to run that election. That cost was \$2.7 million, correct?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "I'd have to defer to the CFO in regards to that. I don't believe the numbers that you have listed are accurate, ma'am."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Well, I -- that's what you -- was quoted in the last BRE meeting that it cost \$2.7 million. That was a highly contested, highly attended election

and it cost \$2.7 million. Yet for a runoff for the cities, you want to charge them \$2.848 million. That's -- you're charging them more than what you just did, which I don't understand. Because one, you have less voters -- oh, that's another thing. On your list up here for the -- I do know what slide it is, where you have the number of registered voters. You said you had 809,000 voters on the list in November of 2021. That number is inaccurate. You had more like 744,000 voters, active voters on the rolls."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Actually --"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "If you remember correctly, you get one -- you get one drop box per every 100,000 voters."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Drop boxes are based off active voters. We are -- that number is registered voters, those are two different totals."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "So this -- you're combining active and inactive voters?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "For registered voters. They are permitted to still vote even if they're inactive. So they have to --"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "So you're charging the cities based on the inactive, which haven't voted in seven years and all that --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "But you're permitted to vote at any time."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Okay. So that's something that probably isn't a good way of trying to establish a cost. If you look down here at estimated cost per voter rate, in the November 2021 election, you guys budgeted 10.82, but you came in at 6-point -- actual cost was 6.39. Now, you want to charge the cities 9.07. So you're -- you're going up a considerable amount. You have an actual cost. And if you were going to try to project, forecast what your future cost is going to be, you're justifying that it's going to be a 30 percent increase from the November 2021 election. And you don't have Milton and Sandy Springs in this election."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "I don't know where you're getting the 9-point million from. The budget we estimated was a -- it's --"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "No, on cost per voter. When you look at the estimated cost per voter line, in November of 2021, you guys estimated that it was \$10.82 per voter. But the actual cost came in at \$6.39 per voter. So now you're projecting almost a 30 percent or 20 -- let's say, 25 percent increase to \$9.07."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Again, that covers inflation as we just discussed."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "25 percent."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "It covers SB202 regulations that we had to put in place, poll worker increases are many factors that changed our cost. Again, that's why -- that's the reason for us going by percentages and we don't want to have a set rate because it does fluctuate."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "I understand and I agree. I think it's great that you don't have to reset an IGA. But you're projecting a 25 percent increase and you're serving -- you're not serving Milton and you're not serving Sandy Springs this election. So you're having less voters on top of it. And if you look over on the runoff budget, you guys said it would cost \$9.05, but your actual expenses were 3.59."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Again, it's --"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "And then you're going to charge 4.27 --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "For a runoff, you do not know exactly what's going to require a runoff. You estimate which cities bylaws require a runoff, but again that depends on the election results. All cities might not be included, but you have to potentially have budget there in case the ballot requires a runoff -- for the runoff."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Correct. But you know, you know which cities are going to require a runoff. You had it in a memorandum here --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "I had it in a memorandum that Alpharetta, Hapeville, Fairburn are not included because their bylaws do not require a runoff for the current contests."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Right, right. So do you realize that -- do you know why Milton is doing their own elections?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "That's Milton's choice. I have spoken to them, and I don't know what their reason is. But they have all -- all cities have a choice, long before the 2020 election, it's always been an option. There's nothing new in the regulations --"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Do you not care to know, is that -- you don't want to ask them what the reason?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "I have -- I just stated, I have spoken to them, we had a --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Just a minute --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "-- very nice discussion --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- now, just a minute. Hold it, hold it, hold it, hold it. Let's -- just a minute. Let's stick to the facts."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Okay. Well, I'm privy to the facts here that one of the reasons is because of the cost. And if you remember in the early voting for the November election, Milton, you were going to place an additional precinct in Milton. And Milton, for tax -- for cost saving purposes, told you that's okay, we don't need that extra precinct --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "They did not state that --"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "You looked at Patrick Eskridge in the meeting --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Milton -- the city of Milton did not state that. No, they did not."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Well, Mark Wingate brought it up."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "The city of Milton referred us to that location."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Listen, just a minute, just a minute, just a minute. Now, where are we going with this?"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "What I'm saying is, the cities -- because I have Alpharetta contacted me, the Mayor of Alpharetta right now is -- has contacted me, Johns Creek Mayor, and City Council of Roswell. They have all talked to me about they want to do their own elections based on the cost. You're looking at another 25 percent because Alpharetta is 7 percent, Johns Creek is 8 percent, Roswell is 10 percent that are looking at pulling out. So that means it's going to be a greater cost for the remaining cities if they pull out."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Actually, the opposite if they pull out. Again, their reasons for having their own election is upon them. They have the option, whether it's they want to go paper versus machine, whether if they want to save cost. Either way, it's their choice. But if they pull out, no, it will not cost the other cities more money. It will actually decrease cost."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Well, you have overall operating cost, and then you have costs because you're going to be putting on these elections. It's not going to be that, oh, we're going to save 25 percent because 25 percent of the people are pulling out. That's not how business works. You'll -- yeah, you'll save some labor cost, you'll save some equipment cost. But overall, you have a overall operating budget that you're still going to have to have in place to operate if they pull out."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "It will decrease cost for the other municipalities."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "It will decrease cost, okay. Another thing you, in your meetings you said that shiftwork was more expensive."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "I did not say shift cost was more expensive. We stated we're -- at the meeting, we're looking into shift cost --"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Shift cost --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Our Advanced Voting Manager made a presentation. She stated that we were looking into having shift cost. We are going to do that for the upcoming election. That is in the works."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Okay. I've listened to the meeting three separate times. And somebody in the meeting, maybe it was inaccurate that they said that shift -- having shift work -- oh, it might have been the Chairwoman -- was going to be more expensive. Which, I was just wanting to get the numbers because a significant cost of running of our elections is having to use temporary workers, having to pay the premium on top of those temporary workers and having to pay overtime."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "That was one of the topics we were going to bring if -- with time -- with time limited, it's actually more expensive to have them under our HR department. There's benefits and things of that nature that go in to play. So it's actually cheaper to stay with the temp agencies."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "So I would like to see the numbers run on that. If we can get some numbers on that."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "We will forward that to you."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "But beside the point, I think that our Elections Department needs to try to work with the cities, needs to try to sit down with them and listen to them. What are your needs? If we run your elections, what are your needs? I feel like things are dictated to them. You're going to have this many precincts; it's going to be in this location; you're going to have this many days of early voting; and we are going to staff it with people that you don't even know. So that's -- no, I'm just telling you --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Listen, listen --"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "-- it's a perception."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- listen, stop, stop, stop, stop. Order, order, order. At some point, I would like for you to make your recommendation. We will either vote your recommendation up or down. This is the Fulton County Board of Commissioners. This is not the Milton City Council. This is not the Sandy Springs City Council. Either we are going to have confidence in what's presented to us or we're not. But just to go back and forth, now we're going to be here all --"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Yeah, I --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Just a minute, Commissioner, just a minute. Just a minute. At some point, I'd like for you to make a -- tell us exactly what you're proposing. And I'm assuming you have gone over that with Finance, with the Manager and everybody else on the executive team. Y'all have a proposal for us. We will either accept your proposal or reject your proposal. Commissioner Ellis has a proposal he wants to put on the table at some point. But to go back and forth about what was in the mind of Council Member X, I've gotten calls from Council Members in Milton and Alpharetta, who hate what's going up there and they want to stick with us. They think it's going to be as a disaster. So I don't want to get into that, that's not the point. What's before us now is, what are we going to charge the cities. The cities have had a choice to work with us, to leave us, to have us manage their elections, or they can manage their own. It's up to them."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "I just think it's important that we try to sit down and work with the cities. I talked about possibly a hybrid approach, where the cities pick their locations, pick their times, use Fulton County's equipment."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You still have the floor, Commissioner."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "And that's basically it. I think it's important that we listen to the cities. We don't say, that's just their choice, they don't want us anymore. We try to listen and figure out how we can work with our cities and partner with our cities instead of just say, it's our way or the highway, and if you don't like it, you don't like it. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. What is your proposal? Let me hear from Commissioner Ellis. What is your proposal?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Oh, I'm sorry. Our proposal is to revert back to the percentage-based election cost compared to cost per voter rate. That allows us to prepare for fluctuations, whether it's increase or a decrease. Our department is, again, working on decreasing election budgets, but if we're not at a set rate, it will not put us in a bind. So we're just asking for it to be back at percentage rates. If we charge too much at this particular time, as we wait -- work on reductions, we'll go back to reinstating refunds to the cities for their unexpended costs. And that's what we're asking today."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Can I ask for clarification? With this recommendation, this is on the basis of -- is this on the basis of a conducting the general portion of the municipal elections, which would not involve Sandy Springs or Milton, at a cost of \$6.692 million and a runoff for those -- for those same municipalities of 2.848 million? Is that the --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "The resolution is to change the way --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I understand that. But underlying that --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- is a budgetary figure. What is the budgetary figure that you're going to them, you know, that is going to be based with going in -- going to them to present their cost associated in those IGAs?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "It would be the -- it would be the figures you just mentioned --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "There -- they may decrease some because we have to go by the number of registered voters. If they -- we send the IGA, we also have some other changes that we're making before we sent out the IGAs."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. You ready to hear my proposal?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You want to be heard before we hear his proposal?"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Go on and let him (off-mic comments)."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You still have the floor, Vice Chair."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So my motion is that we would accept the resolution -- accept the resolution that's here before us to go back to the pro rata, pro-rata share set up where, you know, the actual cost are billed for and there's a refunding mechanism if they're less. But that it be done so with a maximum amount for -- for the IGAs to be structured on a maximum amount for all the municipal and general elections as they've laid out for us here of 5.2 million, and a maximum for conducting the runoffs associated with those municipals of 2.229 million. That's my motion. And -- and I just, before we have discussion on it, you know, a lot of people have a lot of different views on this. And there are a lot of people -- you know, and I recognize all that. But my only point of this is -- and I'll go back to this way, factually, you know, these are all -- they're all facts based -- fact-based stuff, right. You know, the proposal that you got before us, 28 percent increase with about 12 percent less, you know, in terms of registered voters."

Not -- two large cities doing their own thing. They're not factored in. And y'all significantly underran your cost in terms of running the previous elections, right? So, you know, you haven't shown consistency in terms of being able to come close to a budgetary -- your budgetary figure, it's overshoot a lot. We're making -- we're make a change, it's going to go to right now looks like, going to be a significant more cost for the municipalities. That's fine for them to bear it. But I think we've got an onus on us, this year in particular, to have an aggressive posture in terms of the way that we are seeking to manage it. And I think it's a fair trade for us to put a cap on this at the 5.2 and the 2.229, so that, you know, we challenge ourselves to operate that within that. And that we're giving them a very reasonable figure to think about, hey, what -- whether or not they want to move forward with the tough decision that's going to require a lot of operational work on their end and that sort of stuff. That they've got some, you know, some fair estimates before them to really look at as opposed to something that's, who knows, significantly inflated or that they're not going to have necessarily a lot of trust in. I think it's a good faith effort. And I hope you all will support it."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. Madam CFO, Mr. Manager, Ms. Williams?"

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "I mean, I -- actually, we talked through this --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Just -- let me ask my question."

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "Yep. Go ahead, I'm sorry."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "How does -- how does Vice Chair Ellis' proposal square with what the team is recommending?"

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "Well, there's one practical problem. I think the law requires us to bill them our actual cost. Is that not true?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes, sir."

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "All right. So it's one thing to say, we challenge ourselves to do this. But if we're unable to do it, then that's a practical problem with a setting a limit that appear -- would appear to be pretty aggressive, in that it's 2021 expenses and there was inflation. I mean, my suggest -- and when we talked about it yesterday, I said the problem is going to be the \$6 to \$9, is going to seem -- which is what everybody is falling to, may be overly conservative. So I don't know if you want to pick a number in between the two and challenge that as a compromise, would be my suggestion. But I wouldn't -- I would not suggest staying at 2021 because the department doesn't think they can operate at that level and inflation is a fact of life. And the law requires us to bill out. I don't really understand. If I were sitting in the cities' seats, in the end, they're going to be billed the actual costs regardless of what we estimate. So if they truly want us to do it and they're thinking about all of the unintended issues that they're going to get into when they try to do it themselves, they really don't

have any risk from a cost perspective. So we still support, even realizing that this was going to be the discussion, what the BRE is recommending."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay, so --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So let me ask a question on this. So in terms of this, you know, we're not supposed to, you know, kind of absorb costs and all that sort of stuff. That means we were in violation of the law in 2021? Is that what we're saying?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Madam County Attorney."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "We were in violation of the law in 2021? I mean, so -- I mean -- I mean, the notion that we could -- I mean, we could be in violation of it at any point in time if we didn't -- if we didn't operate within it. You know, we had some unanticipated costs and it ran over. I mean, this as a practical figure here of 5.2 and 2.229. And it's not apples to apples. If I was asking you to do apples to apples and you weren't doing two elections -- I mean, we don't have an Atlanta Mayor's race. We know we're not going to have that kind of significant of a runoff. We don't have the Sandy Springs, you know, election. And we don't have a Milton election. It's not apples to apples. We're saying, oh, we're going to use the same figures from 2021 with fewer -- with fewer overall elections. And you all, both the management team and you all, have presented us with an elections budget you ain't even come close to reaching. You were like, 35, 40 percent over last year, with saying you were going to need money for a runoff. So why should we trust what these numbers are? I mean, I get what you're saying, they going to go get a refund. But I'm looking to hold somebody accountable to present a damn budget that's somewhere in the close -- close factor of reality, which we haven't had in I don't know when. Not 2020, not 2021, not 20 -- 2022, and doesn't look like here, we would in 2023. So I mean, that's -- that's, you know, I think this is perfectly fair and within the realms of both performance and within the realms of what the past stuff and reflecting additional cost. I mean, you know, so trying to frame it as, you know, something else, I think is, you know, delusional."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. So we have two competing proposals here. I think what the Manager --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "There's a motion (off-mic comments)."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- right, CFO and Ms. Williams is proposing, and then you have a proposal by Commissioner Ellis. So, Commissioner Abdur-Rahman. That's what's before us now. But Commissioner Ellis' proposal is on the floor. And that is a motion to approve by Commissioner Ellis, seconded by Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Chairman, are you asking me to speak to that or are you asking me to --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No, no, if you wanted to. You don't have to, now."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Okay."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. All right. Commissioner Barrett, on the motion that's on -- before us."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Chairman, I'm not finished."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Oh, I thought you want --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "No, I want -- I'm not finished. I'm not finished. Ms. Williams, the cities have an option to go with us or not, correct?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "That's correct."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Okay. And the option whether they want to go with us or not, it is -- it is not a situation of, if you want to go with us, this is the price I'm going to throw out at you, you just basically give them the options, answer whatever questions, tell them by law what we have to do because of SB202? Because if we do it, the rules are different from us than if they do it, correct?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes, ma'am."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "That's what I thought. So County Manager, when we're talking about inflation and we're talking about trying to put a baseline in there, would you repeat what you just said? You said that you thought it was a tad bit conservative. Did I -- is that what I heard you say?"

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "Yes, ma'am. I do believe that, again, I'm using the per voter range since that should normalize I think everything, whether somebody's having a election or not having election. The cost -- and you tell me if I'm wrong, Nadine, was 6.39, the actual cost to run a general election. This proposal is 9.13; is that right? So that is apples to apples; is that correct?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes."

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "So that's a, you know, \$3 per voter increase. That is probably ultraconservative. But it gets refunded back, as was just mentioned earlier. We're not making a profit on this. So the actual cost will be that. I understand the point and that is, does that increase cause them to make a different decision? I don't know."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "I don't know either. The reason I asked you to weigh in because, if you are the County Manager and you are conservative in your thoughts process anyway, and if you say something is even more conservative, it perks me up. Because I'm thinking that at the end of the day, it's a fair assessment. But if it's

going to be refunded back, I'm not sure for me, if it would be an issue. But I don't -- I don't represent -- I represent Fulton County District 6. I don't represent the city. So I can't speak from their perspective, for one. For two, what I don't understand, if it's an option, if it can be refunded back, and if we're under different rules than if they do it, that's -- that's what I don't understand. I, like the Chairman, has been received calls and people have been telling me in some of those cities that they're not prepared, some of the Council people have said. But they said it falls on deaf ears. So at the end of the day, I guess what I'm asking you, County Manager, where the rubber hits the road, what is your assessment of this and what is your opinion, what would be best for Fulton County to do in this particular session -- situation in offering it to the counties -- I mean, to the cities? If you can answer that."

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "Well, I would be driven, I guess, by two aspects of this. Number one, I don't think we should assume any risk of not being able to meet a cost estimate that we provide the cities. I don't know why we would choose to do that. So being ultra-aggressive on our cost estimate, I don't see how it's in our best interest."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Exactly."

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "Because of the law and just as a practical matter. If on the other hand, we all sit and look at this, all the department heads said, here's a budgeted amount. And I think Commissioner Ellis' points are very well made that those budgets have been generally underrun pretty significantly. So as I said when I first responded, if you wanted to, again, pick a number between the two, 5.2 and 6.6, you could certainly do that, trying to signal that you certainly want the cities to take advantage of this service. If cost is the issue, and I don't know that we know that that is the driving issue, but if that's the issue, you could do that and probably be reasonably assured that we could make it. But I think restricting back to 2021, is very aggressive, very aggressive."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "And my concern with restricting it back, I would -- I would say that the burden is on the county; is that not correct? If we go back to that that low number, I understand what you're saying. But if we go back that -- to that low number and it ends up coming higher, are we not going to have to --"

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "Yes, then it would fall to the county. And first of all, Sharon will remind me, it's not budgeted for the county to expend any dollars at this. So if it does fall back, it'll be unbudgeted expense. But I -- again, I don't take lightly, if legal tells me this is what's required that we plan to be in compliance with the law. So I don't know if we were not in compliance, maybe we weren't. But I think we should plan to be in compliance with the law, which is the cities would fully fund the cost of their municipal elections."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "So Madam CFO that would be an unbudgeted expense?"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Yes. We have not provided any funding for the municipal election cycle in our 2023 budget because the municipalities are expected to pay for the cost of the municipal elections."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Thank you. County Attorney, can you speak to what the County Manager just stated?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "With regard to the question as to whether or not we have previously been noncompliant with the law. So the law doesn't provide for the county to subsidize the cost of the municipal elections in any way. So in that sense, to the extent that the cost of the municipal election has exceeded what we have charged the cities, then no, we have not recouped the entire funding to which the county is entitled. And there's no provision in the law for us to subsidize or supplement the municipal cost."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Interesting. Thank you, Chairman."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we know what's before us. Now, we're complicating something that's really simple. You have the floor."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I just want to second what you just said, which is, we are complicating something that is really should not be complicated at all. Vice Chair Ellis' motion potentially puts us in that same situation that our County Attorney and our County Manager just expressed, in which we are putting an artificial cap on something that may cause us to be at a deficit at the end of this, which is not allowed by law. So I don't know why we would want to put a cap on that, it makes no sense. And the BRE proposal is just a proposal. It has nothing to do with the actual numbers, it's just a proposal to send an estimate based on their budgeting, charge the counties only what we -- what our -- to charge the counties only what our cost was. So I'm not sure what all the discussion is about. It's really mind blowing in some ways. I also just want to point out that I think it's sort of amusing that we're banging our fist on the table about having a budget and then coming in under it. Because I'm pretty sure that's what we do as a county every year. We come in under budget. So, you know, the fact that the BRE budgeted more and came in under, we should be applauding that, not scolding them for that. So I'm confused by that anyway, but I -- to your point, I think the BRE's proposal is more than reasonable."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Thank you, Chair. So you said that coming in under budget, which is a great thing. Congratulations on doing that. But the fact that you miss budgeted is the issue, the big issue. And that we heard about it over and over and over everywhere we went. Are you shaking your head at me? Okay. So we do need to send an estimate to these cities based on what we think it's going to cost. And we need accurate numbers to convey to them because cost is at issue. Everyone I talked to, the

reason they would run their own elections is because they can save money, they can save cost. They feel like Fulton County hasn't listened to them. They've been screaming for two years to try to save cost. And you haven't listened to them. That's a big driver in why they don't want to sign these IGAs that you're giving them. Because basically, if we -- if you're not constrained in some way, shape, or form, you're going to have the 21 days of early voting, you're going to have 17-hours shift work for poll workers, the cost are going to be astronomical. And the cities aren't going to have any control. They're going to be signing off on it. So that's kind of my take on it that we need to have some kind of assurance to the cities that, you know, it's not going to exceed this amount. And that we've -- we have done our due diligence in trying to predict and to save money. And I -- I just don't know if they have that confidence, at least the cities that I represent."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Ellis. Okay. We're done? Praise the Lord. All right. What's before us now, let's vote, one way or the other. The Ellis proposal is before us. If you support Ellis' proposal, you vote, yes. If you support the Manager and Ms. Williams, you vote, no."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Mr. Chair, can I offer a friendly amendment to the Ellis proposal?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yes, sir."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "To allow for -- adopt the Ellis proposal, but maybe allocate 10 percent extra or 10 percent reserve. So that they can -- if they go -- if they exceed the budget, then we've got another 10 percent in order to be able to cover that amount."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Can I ask a question, since he's offering friendly --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yes, sir."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Are you suggesting that that's a -- there would be a second billing that would be a true up figure of up to, but it'll be capped at up to 10 percent additional?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Yes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I'd accept that."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You accept that, Ms. Thorne, you're the seconder? Okay. That just complicates it from my perspective. But -- no, no, I love him like a brother, but it just complicates it. But the maker and the seconder have accepted that friendly amendment, so that's what's before us. All right, let's vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion passes; four yeas, three nays."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Next item."

CLERK GRIER: "On page 9, 23-0085, External Affairs, Presentation of the 2023 Legislative Session update."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Good afternoon, Commissioners. I hope you're having a great day --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Speak up, Ms. Corbitt."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, Commissioners. We will keep our update brief. We are -- the Legislative Session is continuing along well. The Appropriations Committee has been looking at the amended FY23 budget and they'll be working on that. Last week, the Governor delivered the State of the State Address and outlined some of his priorities. And we're going to give you an update about some of the things that -- some of the activity related to our adopted legislative priorities. Next slide, please. So again, as a reminder for you and the public, the Board adopted a legislative package last fall. And the funding for the Behavioral Health Crisis Center is our number one priority. We've also talked about equitable appeals and assessments, the homestead exemption simplification, looking at the justice system and specifically, the Child Attorney's office and State Court retirement benefits, is that last one. Next slide, please. So, I just went over this. Next slide. Tomorrow, there will be a meeting of the Joint House and Senate Delegation. Since we last met, our Delegation has elected their leadership. Representative Park Cannon is Chair on the House. And Senator Sonya Halpern, Chair on the Senate side. Tomorrow at 4:00 o'clock, please ignore this room change because has changed several times. But they will be meeting on the mezzanine level tomorrow afternoon at 4:00 o'clock. And we will have an opportunity to present our Legislative Agenda to that Joint Delegation meeting. Next slide, please. Next slide, please. I wanted to give you an update about our work on the Behavioral Health Crisis Center funding. We mentioned to you at the last meeting that the Georgia Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Disabilities, we're been working with them over the last year. And in the fall, they submitted a request for \$13.3 million in annual funding to operate the Behavioral Health Crisis Center. What appeared in the Governor's budget was a 5.6 million. We originally thought this was a reduced amount for six-month funding period. We later learned after talking with Commissioner Tanner and his office that they were under the impression from the Governor's budget office that this was actually representing at full year's budget. We are now engaged with key legislators to seek the full funding amount. The facility will come online in the middle of the state's fiscal year. So half a year's funding would be over \$6 million. So we need, from where we are now, we need close to a million dollars for six months in funding. And then we need in subsequent year, starting with State FY25, \$13.3 million. So we have met with a number of legislators and are continuing to do that including our

Delegation tomorrow. The Speaker Pro-Tem has expressed her strong support for this. And of course, she has a role in the appropriations process. So we are actively working on this request in seeking this additional funding and we will keep you all updated as that goes along. Of course, this will be an important part of our presentation tomorrow to our Delegation. Next slide, please."

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "Jessica, on this one --"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Yes, sir."

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "-- are going to mention the six month?"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Right. So six months -- I'm sorry, I thought I had. But let me clarify that. So again, the facility would come online in around January of 2024, which would be midway through the State's FY24 budget. So to get six months of funding would be an addition of about \$1 million from what's in the budget right now to about a little over \$6 million. And then in FY25, we need the full 13.3 million. So we have been talking with the Speaker Pro-Tem, she is working toward that along with other. And that is the -- that is our current path forward. Thank you, Mr. Anderson. On our other priorities, let me just go over these really quickly. One is related to State Court Judges. There was legislation sometime within the last 15 years or so that prohibited State Court Judges from participating in the same retirement plan the other Judges are allowed to participate in. They were specifically excluded. So therefore, they have requested support to reverse that legislation. And Representative Bruce has agreed to carry that for us. He is also working on the Probate Court technology fee, which I understand is something that Probate Judges around the state are also looking at. Senator Halpern is -- we discussed previously, we have one very specific homestead exemption that requires a two-year renewal. And it's for very low income seniors. It's a huge administrative burden on the applicant, the homeowner, as well as for the department. And so -- and it's the only homestead exemption that requires renewal on our books. So we're simply asking to have that two-year renewal provision removed from that specific homestead exemption. And Senator Halpern has agreed to carry that legislation and we've been working with her office. I believe Legislative Counsel is currently reviewing the job that we've provided for them -- on all three of these. Thank you, Fran. And then on the last one, we have had a lot of discussion with many different stakeholders on the issue of commercial property assessments. You all may recall that in 2020, Representative David Dreyer sponsored a bill that we worked on with him that would have required commercial property owners, large valuable properties, when they submit an appeal before Superior Court to provide income data. Income is a very important part of any income-generating property. It's part of their assessment. And today, those property owners do not have to require that information. They can, but they're not required to do so. We have been talking with Chief Appraisers. We have been talking with some students at Georgia Tech, who have been looking at this issue. So I -- we've talked with Commissioner Barrett, who has expressed an interest in this issue. And we've also talked with Chief Appraisers of -- our own, our new Chief Appraiser as well as Chief Appraisers from around the metro

area and the Georgia Association of Assessing Officials. I always get their organization tongue twisted. And what I -- what we have talked about is looking at some sponsors, not only within Fulton County, but outside of Fulton County. And looking at again, requirement of income information for large commercial properties to allow us to have more accurate information when making that assessment. It is a complex issue and it's one that is taking a lot of research and education for me and others. So we're continuing to work on that one. Last, we had some -- Fran and others have had some good conversations today. The Child Attorney's office has asked for some clarification in the law about their role in representing children who they already represent in abuse and neglect cases, but also representing them in related cases of legitimation, dependency, and termination. Representative Ballinger, I believe, is working with us, who has a Juvenile Justice Committee -- Chair of that committee, so, thank you, Fran. So we're continuing to work on these. I wanted to spend the most time on these, since these are our legislative priorities, Mr. Chairman. We have a few others and I wanted to highlight one, Chairman that you have asked me about specifically. Next slide, please. And these are just a few about public health issues. I won't go over these in detailed unless there are questions. Next slide, please. The Senate Bill 28 is related to the issue of compensation for Commissioners' salaries for large metro counties. This would allow -- could allow counties to have local legislation to adjust their salaries. So that is one that we are tracking. It has not yet made it -- it's a sign to slow go. So we will watch that as it makes its way through the process. And we'll make sure that you all receive a copy of that legislation. Again, several issues related to local government issues, again, we'll -- we're continuing to monitor. Next slide, please. Again, several issues on taxation. I won't go over these unless there are questions. Next slide. On Elections, just wanted to mention that we have been House Bill 17, which is related to chain of custody issues. We've talked to the department. They do not have any concerns about this legislation. But we'll continue to monitor it in Committee. And we are expecting other legislation potentially. The Secretary of State's budget is another area where we're monitoring. Equipment such as equipment that would support the election's process from a statewide perspective, is part of the Secretary of State's budget proposal. I've been told that that includes some software that would allow for improvements in the voter challenge process, which many counties including ours have found very challenging to administer, and just based on the volume of requests that they have received. Next slide, please. Senator James, who is a member of our Delegation has introduced some legislation related to homeowners' associations and condo associations. Commissioner Arrington, I know this is something that you've had a strong interest in. So we're continuing to monitor these. Next slide, please. And then a few different resolutions. And with that, I'll just stop there and just see if there are any questions."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you. Commission Arrington."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Yes. I guess, I don't know if we need to vote or if I need to make this a motion, but the composition of the MARTA Board is unfair. There are two -- Fulton County gets three appointees, two of those appointees are

appointed by the North Fulton Mayors. And it's -- I don't know how long it's been that way, five or ten years. They're actually eight cities in South Fulton."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Yes."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "So if they're going to be -- if two of the three are going to be appointed by any one, it should be by the South Fulton Mayors because there are eight cities instead of seven. But conversely, since they've had, the North Fulton Mayors have had it for the last five to ten years, they should willingly give it to the South Fulton Mayors for the next five to ten years so that there is parity. Or just give all three to the Commission and let us decide the three. But right now, it doesn't even make sense because the North Fulton Mayors decide two of the three and then we decide the third. I don't even know -- why didn't the -- they don't think the South Fulton Mayors can -- can appoint someone? They don't think they're competent enough to make a recommendation to the MARTA Board? That absolutely has to change."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Arrington, thank you for bringing that up. We have not seen a meeting from MARTOC yet. I don't believe that committee has met to organize. But Commissioner Arrington, I don't know if you would like to introduce a motion to amend, what I hear you saying, I think is to, you'd like to see that as part of our legislative --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Yeah. So moved."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "-- package. So I will allow you to --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. There's a motion by --"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "-- or ask you to get that clarification. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- motion by Commissioner Arrington. Is there a second? Seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, to add this as a -- to our list."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "And I did speak with Representative Bruce and he said he's willing to help to a draft the legislation."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Okay. Thank you. I think Ms. Calhoun has a question."

FRAN CALHOUN, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "I wanted to get clarity on something. Good afternoon, Commissioners, Fran Calhoun, Intergovernmental Affairs, External Affairs Department. Just wanted to get some clarity on exactly what that request is. Is it for all three appointments to be made by the Board of Commissioners?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I just want fairness. And so that could -- that could come in many different forms. It could come in the South Fulton Mayors getting two choices for the next five to seven years --"

FRAN CALHOUN, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Like, a rotation?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "-- or -- or it could come in this Board doing it. Either or, I don't really care."

FRAN CALHOUN, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Okay."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I just want -- I just want parity."

FRAN CALHOUN, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "All right. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You get some sense of what his motion is?"

FRAN CALHOUN, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Yes, sir. Thank you, sir."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "And they'll have to deal with it."

FRAN CALHOUN, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Thank you. Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, you want to be heard?"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "I'll make it quick. I do believe that there is some temperature at the state for this. If you all, Fran and Ms. Corbitt, if y'all will weigh in on what that looks like. Because I know some of them down there may want us to have them, you know, have a certain amount. And I don't know if they want it to be just the South Fulton Mayors, I guess that's what I'm saying. Let's see what the best one -- if Commissioner Arrington, if you don't mind, let's see what is the best one that look like it may pass. And if you can just report --"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "We'll have some --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Yeah."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "-- additional conversations."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Additional conversations, and then if you can let us know. Because I know that some have a appetite for it --"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Yes, ma'am."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "-- but, you know, who gets what, whether it's the County Commission, whether it's another entity, I think that's what some of the discussion may require further discussion. So I would appreciate if you all --"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Thank you, Commissioner."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "-- will just, you know, lean in on that for us, we appreciate it."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Yes, ma'am."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Yeah. I just need some clarification of how it came about. And back eight or nine years ago, you had a lot of unincorporated Fulton County, so I imagine it was a much -- it needs change because the landscape has changed a lot. But I would need more background on that."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Do you want to give it to her or you want me to -- well, it --"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Chairman, if --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- came about because Republicans controlled the delegation and they made the decision to do it that way, that's why it was done, period. And that was back in the time when my seat was abolished. When you got the power, you do what you want to do for the most part as long as it's legal."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Commissioner Thorne -- thank you, Mr. Chairman for that. We can also prepare just a summary of the legislation at the time that won't necessarily incorporate all of the commentary, but we can provide just a timeline of what was adopted --"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Okay."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "-- and when."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yeah, that in -- in short, that's what happened. Commissioner Ellis."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "When you're providing that background, can you also provide the makeup of the Board --"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Yes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- and who has appointees to it. And if there are any parties other than the North Fulton cities that are signatories -- that are not signatories to the MARTA contract that get appointments?"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Yes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I mean, I think that's important to note and kind of like --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I'm not following you, Vice."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I don't know that -- who -- who were the members of MARTA, the MARTA Board and how are they appointed? And are there any appointees to that Board that are not signatories to the MARTA contract?"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Okay."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "That's really what my question is. Do you understand what I'm saying?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yeah."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I think that's important to kind of, you know, if we're a signatory to the contract --"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Right."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- and there are other signatories to the contract and this Body -- I mean, this Body is a signatory to a contract and other ones are as well and we're not getting similar representation or appointment on there, I think that's something that we need to sort of reflect upon in terms of how we want to have this position back."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Okay. Thank you. We can do that."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Anything else? Other questions, anything else?"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "No, Mr. Chairman."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Now, you started with one statement that the that Behavioral Health --"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- getting the balance of that 13 million is number one priority."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "That's correct."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "And I would hope that we're spending every hour on that. All this other stuff is good, but there's nothing in our package that is more important to us than that getting that other -- what is it -- 7-plus million?"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Mr. Chairman, I would say, absolutely, you are correct. I -- while I've been here today, I've taken three phone calls about it. So it is absolutely something we're putting our heart and soul into, and appreciate that."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Vice Chair, do you -- something else? All right. Thank you. Madam Clerk, continue."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Thank you."

CLERK GRIER: "We have a motion on the floor. Did we finish that motion?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "We did not vote (Off-mic comments.)"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Oh, on the Arrington motion, that's right. On the Arrington motion regarding -- regarding the makeup of the MARTA Board. All right. Let's vote, please."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "What -- (off-mic comments.)"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "He's asking for us to -- to --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Yeah, I'm asking for us to add parity to our legislative agenda as it relates to the MARTA Board, in whatever form that exists going forward. Either five to ten years for the South Fulton Mayors or just give it to the Board. But we need to parity."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Okay, thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. We ready? Let's vote."

CLERK GRIER: "The vote is open. And the motion passes; six yeas, one abstention."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Continue, Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0086, Human Resources Management request approval of a resolution authorizing the Fulton County Sheriff to offer above the minimum salaries, authorizing a cost-of-living adjustment for certain employees, confirming authority to pay overtime pay as earned, directing an amendment to the overtime pay and

compensatory time Personnel policy, authorizing increased overtime pay and for other purposes."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. The motion on the floor is to approve by Commissioner Hall, seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman. Any question? Ready for the vote? Commissioner Arrington, you want to be heard?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I -- well, I do. I mean, I'm happy -- I'm happy to support this. But I have questions, I guess, for the County Attorney. And I don't know if this is the appropriate forum to ask those questions. All right. Let me ask this way. Madam County Attorney --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Oh, I see what you're talking about."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "-- are -- do you see any legal issues with us adopting this resolution?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "So this resolution is the logistical step needed to -
-"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Oh, I understand that --"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "-- accompany the budgeting action that the Board has already taken. There are always potential consequences. I can -- I would be happy to discuss with you separately, what our rationale for supporting legislation such as this would be if it were challenged."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. But, so you think we could -- you think it's okay? If you say it's okay, then I'm happy to support it. But, you know, we had some talk earlier about unintended consequences. And I don't want to --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "It's okay."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Okay. That's good enough for me."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Hall, you want to be heard?"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Yes. I made a motion to approve, but I have one problem and I need a little clarity or else, I'm going to withdraw my motion. The problem is, when I read this it keeps -- it sounds like it's trying to be presented as a COLA. But it's not a COLA, it's for overtime pay. And it just feels like it's -- it may need a little bit of revision to ensure that that is not what it ends up being assumed that it is. I see you wanted to say something."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "The request that was made in terms of what we needed to draft, was for -- to address the overtime issue and also a COLA."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I don't think that that should be done together. That's not what -- that's not what we -- Sheriff, can you just -- because you know what your people need. And I know what I voted for. I voted for a separate amount specifically for your overtime pay, because you got to -- you have a whole -- you have a situation with the overtime pay. We heard a whole -- we heard an entire presentation about that and -- and I think that a COLA -- our employees, all of them deserve a COLA, period. But this should specifically be about overtime pay. We should have a separate item to vote for a COLA if that's what we're going to vote for. And I am totally in favor of that. Because I remember seeing other counties and cities giving their employees a 10 percent COLA. They just, all at once. And we did a 7 percent with the leadership of our Chairman. We didn't go back and do the 3 percent to make it 10 percent. So I think that should be a separate issue that we vote on."

PATRICK LABAT, FC SHERIFF: "So first of all, thank you again. The language as I read it and I just got, the actual -- just actual -- actually got the legislation. It's poorly written. If I'll say -- if I must say so. My understanding -- and it would take somebody to -- for you all to be tell me differently. The 5 percent was a raise for our civilian population, period, full stop. The money is there. You all approved that, it is not a COLA. Which means my people are then put at a disadvantage if you all decide later in the year, there's no special election and let's give the rest of the county a COLA, then the intent is to exclude my people. So that's the first thing. If you go through the different pages, you see language like, may and if. Now, this funding was identified. And so the language needs to be cleared up there. And then the double-time piece, we talked about triple time as a pilot, the double time was a figure that we came up with collectively with Finance. And so there is -- there was no sunset period on it, and it is not a pilot. And so the funding was made available as such. And I would ask that we take an opportunity to clean the language up because it is not a COLA. And to your point, Commissioner Hall, with respect to COLAs and double time, you all were very clear. And it was very, you know, tenuous, long meeting. And I appreciate you all's time, but this is not my interpretation. And I would challenge anybody's interpretation opposite of a pay raise specifically, and then turn around -- now, they'll be some unintended consequences, we mentioned some of that. But to that extent, that's my understanding and I would appreciate that level of support."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "So, I'm going to withdraw my motion and make a substitute motion to hold it --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Well --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I'm sorry?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- Commissioner Abdur-Rahman would have to withdraw her second."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "She -- yes, yes, absolutely, absolutely."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Commissioner Hall, go ahead and finish."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "What?"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Commissioner Hall, I'm yielding to Commissioner Hall to finish it."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No, no. You -- if she wants to withdraw her motion, you have to withdraw your second."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "I want to make a motion to -- to substitute motion. Is --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Just -- just, if I can withdraw my motion. And then we just take the substitute motion to hold --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Hold on, hold on. I've been doing this a long --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Now, you wanted to -- you want to withdraw your motion, she'll have to withdraw her second before --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Okay. I withdraw my second."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "All right."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Now, Commissioner Hall, you have the floor."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "And I'm just going to make a substitute motion to hold this and get it cleaned up. If we're going to do a COLA, bring that back separately as a COLA. I'm sorry, I see you --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Is there a second to her --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- are you trying to speak?"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Second."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- motion to hold?"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Soo Jo's trying to speak."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "(Off-mic comments) -- from passing the civilian staff --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Can you use the speaker next to you? Will it -- will the one next to you --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Mr. Chair, that sounds like Personnel and litigation --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "It sounds like Personnel, yeah."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Listen, we have a substitute motion on the floor to hold. Let's deal with that. All right. Anything else on the motion to hold? All right. Let's vote on the substitute motion to hold. Madam Clerk. Madam Clerk, come on."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "She's working on it."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open on the motion to hold. It passes unanimously."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Next item."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0087, Registration and Elections request approval of a statewide contract in an amount not to exceed \$47,501.04 for the rental of box trucks and cargo vans."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Motion to approve by Commissioner Hall, seconded by Commissioner Thorne. You have a question, Commissioner Hall?"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Oh, I got -- I have some questions. Hold on one second, please. Can -- let's see, the next one --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Is it leasing vehicles?"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "You know what, I'm going to wait until the next one. So let me -- thank you, Mr. Chair, I'm going to wait until the next one."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Let's vote, please."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Motion to approve. Thank you."

CLERK GRIER: "And the motion passes, unanimously."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0088, Request approval of a statewide contract in an amount not to exceed \$304,619.52 to provide temporary staffing services."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. A motion to approve by Commissioner Hall, it's seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I have a question."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Hall has a question."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Okay. So I don't want to assume -- oh, I'm sorry, you didn't even get over here yet. What you waiting for?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Yes, ma'am."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "All right. I don't want to assume, but the item that we just approved, 23-0087 goes with this item. Because it's all about moving to the warehouse, right?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "That's correct."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "The first one was for vehicles. And the second one was for the staffing to help us pack and move to the new location."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay, okay. So you're kind of addressing what my question is. Because when I read through this entire -- well, it's not that much stuff. But when I read through this and it took me a minute to find, because I said, okay, I'm looking at the positions. You have Regional Election Coordinator I, II, Lead Administrative Clerk, Voter Education Officers, Systems Specialist, Executive Assistant, RNE Assistant, Logistics Lead, RNE Assistant Logistics Drivers. I get the drivers, I get the couriers, I get the Courier Fleet Coordinator. Then you have, again, Executive Assistant Courier, Mailroom Absentee Specialists, and it keeps going. And then I look at the notes it says Registration Elections Absentee, Advance Voting, VEO, and Admin Divisions all have file rooms which will need to be boxed up for a move. Each of the divisions have separate file rooms to box up and prepare for the move. Supply rooms will need to be boxed up. So -- and it goes on, all permanent employees along with temps will need to box up all offices for the move. So I'm trying to understand what are all of these other positions going to do other than box up what's needed for the move?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "Right. So that's just the title that they're usually under. But they're coming in under those titles to help us move. Because they're already familiar with our -- where our items are located, what the items are. Those are the people coming in. Even though that it says Regional Coordinator or

it says Admin, they're going to help us box up. It's just listed like that in the contract. That's --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "At \$24 -- wait a minute, wait, I'm trying to understand. You got a pay rate column and then you have a regular bill rate per hour, which are different, then you have a overtime bill rate. So let me just use this one, this first one as an example. You have a Regional Election Coordinator II Lead, which has a pay rate of \$24 per hour, regular bill rate per hour is \$32.16. The overtime bill rate per hour is \$48.24. So we're going to pay this Lead to box stuff up and put it on a truck to move it to the warehouse just because they know where the stuff is that needs to be boxed up? I'm trying to understand."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "That's inclusive of the fees that the temp agencies also get paid. But after we did the calculation, I believe the strategy team can confirm, it's still cheaper than hiring a moving company to come in and box up items. If you were to hire a moving company --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I would have liked to see that in writing, the comparison between hiring all these election positions that normally do more than boxing up paper and, you know, to be moved. I would have liked to see the comparison between a mover, which I've moved -- I'm an old lady, I've worked since I was 14 years old. I've been part of moves for departments and buildings for many years and I've never seen anything like this. I don't understand why we can't just have a moving company move this stuff instead of paying somebody potentially overtime bill rate of \$48.24, and that's just one position. If you look at all of these positions, I don't -- I don't -- I didn't see anybody who made a base of less than \$16 an hour. And to -- for me to approve them to box up stuff, it just doesn't make sense to me. So, do you have the numbers --"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "I don't have --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- available that, since you guys already looked at it and you have confirmed that hiring movers is more expensive? Can you share that information with us?"

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "I don't have that in front of me. But I can have them forward that to you."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. Well, then I'm going to have to withdraw my motion and make a substitute motion to hold --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman again, was the seconder. Do you withdraw your second?"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Or do -- would you like to speak? I see you're in the queue too."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Well, I just wanted to see -- I just wanted to see if it was time sensitive."

NADINE WILLIAMS, ELECTIONS DIRECTOR: "We can technically hold. We can hold."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Okay. I'll withdraw."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. You withdraw your motion to approve and make motion to -"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Yes. To hold."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "There's a substitute motion on the floor to hold. Let's vote. Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "And the motion on the floor is to hold. And the vote is open. And the motion passes; four yeas, one nay, and one abstention."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Next item."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0089, Real Estate and Asset Management request approval of a statewide contract for law enforcement vehicles for the Fulton County District Attorney's Office in an amount not to exceed \$579,825."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. I have a motion on the floor to approve by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, seconded by Commissioner Arrington. Now, you'll recall that the District Attorney actually, I think, it -- \$800,000 was approved for her for 40 vehicles; is that right, 40? And this represents, what, 20?"

FELICIA STRONG-WHITAKER, DIRECTOR, PCC: "Yes, Commissioner."

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Yes."

FELICIA STRONG-WHITAKER, DIRECTOR, PCC: "Oh, go ahead, Joe."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Mr. Davis."

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Yes. The current pricing for law enforcement vehicles, we were only able to procure 20 vehicles. And you'll see between this item and the subsequent item, the grand total is \$793,000."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "And this gets half of what she wants, right?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "That is correct."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "In terms of vehicles, and these are vehicles, brand-new vehicles for her Investigators who will be interviewing witnesses I assume; is that correct?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "They are intended for her Investigators. As to their overall scope of duties for the jobs, I can't speak to that unfortunately."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "And these are SUVs?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Yes, sir."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Not sedans? To interview a witness --"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "No, sir."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. Second point that I'd like to make is that, these are -- what do you call them? Gas vehicles, now our Go Green Policy, we're supposed to be moving towards electric vehicles in our purchases. How does this comply? Or if it -- or does it comply?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "So, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Sustainability Policy, which requires that by the year 2030 that 50 percent of our light-duty administrative fleet be alternatively-fueled vehicles, it's somewhat mutually exclusive from this item in that, there was a sense of urgency based upon the Board's vote at the last meeting. There was also a requirement for these to be law enforcement vehicles, which is what we've always purchased as investigative vehicles for investigations. And as a result, this is what we have available right now that allows us to move forward. Unfortunately, vehicles are very difficult to come by, as well as sedans are being phased out in production. And unfortunately, this is what we have available that we can put our hands on now."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "So will these be -- take -- 20, eventually 40 take-home vehicles for Investigators to interview witnesses, SUVs, take homes?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Sir, I cannot speak to them being take-home vehicles. The County Manager would have to approve any vehicles being take home."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Have you had any discussions about this, Mr. Manager?"

DICK ANDERSON, COUNTY MANAGER: "No, sir."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. Commissioner Arrington."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Mr. Davis, what's the shelf life of a vehicle?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "According to board policy, sir?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Yes, sir."

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Non-pursuit vehicles, are five years or 100,000 miles."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "So if we purchase these vehicles, in five years we'll still be able to meet the policy because these vehicles will have -- their shelf life ends in 2028. So we'll still have two years to replace them and get her some new ones."

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "So what I would tell you, Commissioner Arrington, is that as a function of another board policy, we replace vehicles on an annual basis outside of this particular capital allocation. So each year, we select X number of vehicles across the entire county's fleet and surplus those vehicles. And then we go to you all for approval to replace them."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "All right. Well, so I was just making sure that we don't have to worry about whether we're going to make our Go Green initiative because half of the vehicles by 2030, this car's shelf life expires two years prior to 2030."

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "That is correct, sir."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Thank you, Chairman. And so, Mr. Davis, this is -- this is time sensitive? And also, it has been a challenge trying to find the vehicles that would fit the need of the DA's office; is that not correct?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Yes, both of those statements are true."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "And you mentioned the hundred thousand -- is it 100,000 miles that it gets to?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Yes, ma'am. Five years or 100,000 miles --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Five years or 100,000 -- 100,000 miles. So to what Commissioner Arrington was stating, those Investigators may hit that 100,000 miles way before that five year. And also, the policy that we have is when it hits the 100,000 miles mark that it goes to surplus; am I correct in that statement?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Yes, ma'am. The policy also affords me, as the Real Estate and Asset Management Director, to evaluate whether a surplus-eligible vehicle is in sound enough mechanical condition that it may be used by another department or the existing department."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Okay, all right. Thank you, I appreciate that."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. I think the ship has sailed on this issue. But Mr. Manager, Mr. Adams, it would appear to me though that we need to think about, seriously think about a -- and I talked with you briefly about this before -- a vehicle allowance policy. I don't know whether it's \$5,000 or I don't know what the number would be, rather than these expensive take-home vehicles that would just be sitting in driveways more often than not. So I think it's something that's from a policy point of view, it's going to make more sense than us continuing to buy individual, take-home vehicles at these prices. I'd like to talk with or work with you on that. All right. The motion on the floor is to approve. Cast your votes."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion passes; six yeas, one abstention."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Next item."

CLERK GRIER: "On page 10, 23-0090: Request approval of the lowest responsible bidder for law-enforcement vehicles for the Fulton -- for Fulton County in an amount not to exceed \$214,000."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. A motion to approve by Commissioner Arrington, seconded by Commissioner Hall. And my same comments apply here. Let's vote, please."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion passes; six yeas, one abstention."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Next item."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0091, Request approval of a recommended proposal to provide parking lot management services."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Have a motion to approve by Commissioner Hall, seconded by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman. Please vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You have a question? Hold on, question."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Sorry about that. I couldn't hit the button fast enough. So the question is, these are -- this is for our parking at -- let's see -- the Auburn Avenue Branch Library, the Buckhead Branch Library, the Auburn Avenue Neighborhood Senior Center. Services include, but are not limited to the following: Assignment of on-site parking attendant, optional installation of free-standing pay terminal on-site at each subject location. So are we going to be charging our residents to park at our facilities during operational hours or is this for after hours? How does this -- how is this going to work?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Commissioner Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Yes, sir."

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "The addition of the Auburn Senior Center is what actually makes this a somewhat different item than what we've done in the past. At the Auburn Research Library as well as at the Buckhead Library, yes, we currently do charge patrons to use the lot when they go to the library on -- for either of those locations. The reason being the location of those lots, their proximity to other businesses, it was in the county's best interest to protect our property by having a company provide oversight. And that is why we chose to go with that direction. The addition of the Auburn Senior Center came about as a result of issues that we were having at that particular location due to its proximity to other local nightlife. And so we feel that this is the best way to assist the county in ensuring that the property is squared away and taken care of over time, doesn't see a lot of trash or potentially vandalism and things of that nature."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I would not want to charge our seniors to go to our senior center."

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "I'm terribly sorry, Commissioner Hall, I should have mentioned and I failed to do so --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay."

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "We are not charging the seniors to -- for their parking at the senior center, no."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Whew, okay."

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "No. No, ma'am. I apologize."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you. Because I can understand and just to use the same example, the Auburn Avenue Senior Center, I can understand the need to have pay for parking. Because I know after hours, people will literally, if we close the gates, they'll park up on the grass. You know. And we've had several of those businesses ask about having a contract to utilize that parking lot for the after-hours events and things that they --"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Yes, ma'am."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- they do. So I understand that. But I just want to absolutely make sure that we're not charging seniors to go to senior centers. Because we're trying to take care of them and improve their quality of life and that just won't do."

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Will not happen, ma'am."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "All right, thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "And the motion passes; six yeas, zero nays."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0092, Request approval of the lowest responsible bidder in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 to provide fire sprinkler protection system maintenance services."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Favorable motion by Commissioner Throne, seconded by Commissioner Hall. Commissioner Ellis has a question."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Just a quick question, Mr. Davis. In light of some of the recent issues we had, is there anything we can do with this vendor in terms of, you know, work to prevent, you know, the freezing and bursting and that sort of thing?"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Yes, sir. In fact, one of the things that we have already moved forward is challenging our vendor to advise us on a per-location basis what upgrades we can make to our existing fire pumps and sprinkler systems to put us in a better position to avoid damage during hard freezes."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. So they've got that capability to --"

JOE DAVIS, DIRECTOR, DREAM: "Yes, sir."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- give some advice? Okay, thanks."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Please vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the motion passes, unanimously."

CLERK GRIER: "Under Arts and Libraries, 23-0093, Arts and Culture request approval of a statewide contract in the amount \$105,000 to provide temporary staffing services."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. A motion to approve by Commissioner Hall, seconded by Commissioner Barrett. Please vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion passes, unanimously."

CLERK GRIER: "Under Health and Human Services, 23-0094, Senior Services request approval for the Fulton County Department of Senior Services and the Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Disabilities to provide a letter of support as a collaborator with Christian City and Two sparrows Village National Institutes of Health Compass Grant Application to fund the Lifespan Engagement and Educational Ecosystem."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Favorable motion by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman, seconded by Commissioner Hall. Cast your vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion passes; six yeas, zero nays."

CLERK GRIER: "On page 11, 23-0095, Request approval of a resolution of the Fulton County Board of Commissioners denouncing the Fulton County Superior Court Clerk's retention of passport executive fees as personal compensation, urging the General Assembly to amend state law to prohibit the personal retention of such fees by Superior Court Clerks and to provide that such fees shall instead be remitted to a county's general fund and for other purposes, sponsored by Vice Chair Ellis."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Motion on the floor to approve by Commissioner Ellis. Is there a second? Is there a second? All right. I'll second -- Commissioner Thorne has seconded. Commissioner Arrington, you have the floor."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Commissioner Ellis, I think I agree with the -- I agree that the money should -- should be county money. But I think -- I don't think I can support this resolution as it is worded. My understanding is

that there are over 80 Superior Court Clerks that do this. And so I think it's unfair, although we are in Fulton County, but I think it's unfair for us to point the finger at one person, when there are 80 people doing it, 80 Superior Court Clerks that are constitutional officers. And frankly, I don't know that we, as statutory creatures, even have the ability to do anything to a constitutional officer in that regard. I don't know, I guess I would have to ask the County Attorney if we even have the authority to do this. So I mean, I -- I could agree -- I agree that that money should be county money. I think it the same thing even with the --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Ferdinand."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "-- Commissioner, Tax Commissioner. I think all that money should be county money. But for whatever reason, the State Constitution allows them to do that. And, you know, I don't -- I think we need a Constitutional amendment in order to stop it. I don't know. I don't know what the County Attorney says. But I -- I agree, the money should be county money. There is no dispute there. But I don't want to come out denouncing one lady, when there are 80 people around the state doing it. Well --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Is that a friendly amendment?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "No. I mean, I don't want to denounce anyone. I would recommend that, you know, I -- I'm fine saying that it -- if we want to say that we believe the money should be county money and urging them to, you know, make it county money, make a Constitutional amendment or whatever they need to do at the Capitol in order to effectuate it. But I don't want to -- I don't want to attack anyone or denounce anyone. But certainly, I believe the county could benefit from those funds."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "In the story, I think it said there are 81 other counties that collect the fees. But they didn't say that their Clerks keep -- all 81 counties keep those fees. Out of 159, 81 collect it, I think a majority kept it in their general fund, gave it back to the county. There were just two extreme exceptions with Cobb County Clerk. She -- and she offered to reimburse the county \$84,000. Our Clerk has pocketed \$425,000 in the last two years. There is a bill that seems to have bipartisan, overwhelming bipartisan support by Kay Kirkpatrick, Josh McLaurin has expressed that he is supportive of the bill as well, to make sure that in the future this money is by state law, put back in the general fund."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Well, Commissioners, I hope you would support this. I mean, just a couple of things about it. Certainly, we had no knowledge that this was going on, at least to my knowledge, you know, any -- I did not until the story was written. It wasn't something that was disclosed to us. It wasn't inform any disclosure to the citizens when, you know, said individual, you know, ran for office. And it wasn't disclosed to us when we also made the decision to increase the salary supplement for

this particular position on April 13th, 2022, so that county supplement of 25,956 on top of the base salary of 130 -- 134 -- 96. I'd venture to say, if we all knew that the Clerk was inuring another \$360,000 in compensation that we probably would not have approved that supplement. So I think that would have been valid information for us to know. You know, these -- these fees, you know, in essence what we have is, we have a person generating -- generating personal compensation on the backs of county employees that we fund through the general fund. So, you know, don't think it's right, don't think it's a good practice. You know, there's a bill in the Legislature, we can't -- I've already asked the question of our County Attorney, can we revoke that county supplement, and we can't until the term of office is over. So, you know, that's important for us to first understand. You know, we don't have the ability to change the practice. But we do have the ability to send the message to Clerk that we don't think this is right. And that's basically, what this is saying here. We don't think it's right. We think the funds should come back in to, you know, support the operations of the county. The bill that's out there or that's introduced, Senate Bill 19, would require that, you know, disclosure occur and that 50 percent of the fees would -- that are earned deposited into the general fund of the county and the remaining 50 percent are used sole for the operation of the office of the Clerk and can't be used to supplement compensation, nor to purchase non-work related items or gifts for the Clerk or any employee of the Clerk's office. And as Commissioner Thorne has noted, this seems to have had pretty broad support with 17 cosponsors. And I think it's important for us to approve it, send a message to the Senate that we want to see them act and change it. And do what's right by the taxpayers in terms of disclosure and transparency, as well as proper funding for county governments. And also would note that ACCG has supported this legislation as well."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Barrett."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I believe the article states that 54 out of the 87 Clerks collected -- that collected fees were keeping some or all. So I agree with the spirit of this resolution, Vice Chair Ellis. But also agree with Commissioner Arrington in saying I really don't like the idea of denouncing one person when this is a practice in many other counties. And so, I would just wonder why this is not part of our Legislative Agenda, is it? And can we just address it that way? That said, I would also be okay with in a version of this resolution that is a message that we want to pursue this legislatively, but not denouncement."

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "This is not part of our Legislative Agenda as is, but if the Board obviously, takes a position on that, we would certainly notify the sponsors and advocate accordingly."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Is there a requested modification?"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Well, I would like to, I guess, make a substitute motion perhaps to add it to our Legislative Agenda and leave it at that."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So then transport what, I mean that we convey to that what, that we don't think the practice is right and needs to be changed?"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Yeah, I mean --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I mean, geez --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "-- I'm fine with suggesting it. I agree that it should be changed. I agree that the money should come back to the general fund. I just don't want to have a resolution denouncing any individual when this is a practice across multiple counties. And I would like to add that we move it to our -- we add it to our Legislative Agenda and make sure that it's clear that as it --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "If you want to offer a substitute, offer a substitute."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I did."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "I mean, so --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "What's your substitute --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "My --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "What is it?"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Well, I'm making a substitute motion to add this to our Legislative Agenda."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Is there a second? You heard the motion, is there a second?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I'll second it, but I think I might need to make a friendly amendment. I think what I would love to see for our Legislative Agenda is -- (off-mic comments) -- something that encourages the Legislature to not allow this for any individuals, right. And that includes Tax Commissioners, Clerks, Probate Court, whatever, whatever else is out there that we don't know about. Like, Commissioner Ellis said, we didn't know about this --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I accept that."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "-- so whatever else is out there, you know, we believe all that money should be county money."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I accept that friendly amendment."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. Motion with the friendly amendment is before us. Any other questions, comments?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Just not to denounce anyone."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "My first question is, is this a service that the Clerk to Superior and Magistrate Court has to provide?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "No, she does not."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "It is not."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "She could choose not to provide --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "You said she does not have to provide --"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "It is not a required service."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- this service? You said it's a, what?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "It is not a required service for the Clerk to provide."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "It's not a required service."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "It's a convenience service."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "So I don't want to assume, so does that mean that the state law is written so that if a Clerk decides that they're going to take on this service to assist, then that's when this kicks in that they are able to get this money for themselves? Is that how --"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "Yes. Yes."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "In that, the state law is not specific to Superior Court Clerks. It is generically saying that if you, by way of federal statutes or regulations, our local government that is entitled to receive fees generated by services, you know, for the federal government that you can continue -- you can retain that as your personal compensation. So the federal regulation and statute allows local governments to provide passport services. And then the state legislation allows the official collecting on the behalf of the federal government under those regulations to

keep a portion of that fee for -- to keep an additional, I guess essentially, a convenience fee, in lay terms, for personal compensation. So the combination --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "And you said --"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "-- of those statutes and regulations is how she's able to retain it as personal compensation."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "And I heard you say the official, quote/unquote. You didn't say the Clerk to Superior Court."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "It's not specific --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "It's not written that way, right?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "No, it is not."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. It's the -- because it could any official who decides to this, can get this money?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "The state law -- in the state law, it's any official who is collecting --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Any official --"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "-- under a state or federal regulation. I mean, excuse me, a federal statute or regulation."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "All right. And so when was this law approved on the state level?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "I'm sorry, I did not hear the question."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I'm sorry. When was this law approved on the state level? How old is this?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "I would have to look that up. But it's not -- it's not incredibly recent. Yeah, I think -- I think it's just something that our state officials have become aware of and have started using relatively recently. But this statute has been in place for a while."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. So I want to go to something that was said repeatedly here about -- it was kind of insinuated that the Clerk should have told us and that the Clerk was responsible for letting us know and the fact that we voted on salary supplements. But I recall that it was our Chief Human Resources Officer who did the presentation to us on salary supplements and had columns that indicated, you know,

what other additional salaries may have been included. And so I don't recall this being part of that presentation at the time when we voted for the salary supplements. So I don't -- I don't think we could necessarily say it was the Clerk's responsibility or fault that we didn't know. I think it was communication. I don't see where if a person comes in and it just happens that their salary includes perks and, you know, other salary adjustments that they have to tell anybody what's going on. That's actually their personal information. But when we start looking at salary supplements, we do expect that in the presentation that we received that we get, you know, all the information that's needed. So we can't really blame the Clerk for that. I just don't -- I don't agree with, you know, Commissioner Thorne, you said something about there's a State Legislator whose -- who has a bill that may change this, right? Okay. And so is that bill coming forward, it wasn't on the -- was it on there? Okay, well, it's already on there. So I mean, what are we trying to add to it? If it's already -- if the bill is already on there. It's in our Legislative Packet?"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "Commissioner Hall, if I could just clarify. It was part of -- it was in the slides that we showed today. It is not part of our adopted Legislative Package, as is."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. But it's listed?"

JESSICA CORBITT, DIRECTOR, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: "It was listed among the other bills we are tracking."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "So do we agree with that version or are we trying to add a different version of that on to the Legislative Packet? Because that's what the motion is right now, right?"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So, we're tracking it, but we're not making it part of our legislative priority. I'm suggesting that we move it up to our legislative priority. So even though we're tracking it, we're not prioritizing it in terms of our work through our External Affairs Office currently. But I'm saying we should do it. That's what this motion is."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay, gotcha. Thank you so much."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "Commissioner Hall, excuse me, I'm sorry to interrupt. But we took another look at the statutes and I had it reversed. It's the federal laws that's generic as to local government, and the state law that is specific to Superior Court Clerks."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Thank you, Chairman. I think we have to be careful in casting certain individuals in a light -- I mean, I don't think Commissioner Thorne meant anything. But when you said pocketing, you know, if I -- if I go work the window at Popeye's and every \$10 order, I pocket three, you know, we got to be real

careful and be real respectful of our Clerks and our constitutional offices -- I think -- officers -- I think we do a disservice when we say stuff a certain way. And also, if someone was to go look at this, because when it first ran, I decided to do my own information. The Clerk that sat there before she was there, benefit from this. I'm not saying whether it's right or wrong. What I'm saying is, it's not fair to cast certain things on our Clerk, when she came into a situation that was already there. Now, if the Georgia -- if it's going to be changed at the Capitol, if it's going to become part of our Legislative Agenda that we support, I don't have a problem with that. But when you start using terminologies like pocketing or terminologies like well, we didn't know it. Was it -- was it on her to tell us? Was it part of her duties to make sure that we know? And so I would just say to my colleagues, I don't have problem supporting it, but I do have a problem throwing somebody under the bus when the predecessor had the same thing and nobody -- nobody said anything. Maybe they didn't know, maybe they did. But I know at the state, it should be dealt with so as to not single out one or two or possibly three individuals. So I would just caution us as to the terminology we use in reference to a constitutional officer that, to my knowledge, I can't speak for anybody else, but to my knowledge, has had a stellar reputation. I just -- I have issues with that, colleagues. And so I would -- I would just ask that we keep in mind. Thank you."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Just to be clear, the substitute motion that I've put on the floor is in substitute of Vice Chair Ellis' denouncement. So that would not be -- that would no longer be on the floor."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "I'll clarify. She personally profited over \$425,000 in passport application fees, so incorrect -- in correct terminology. And we have, this Board has condemned laws, resolutions, and vouched support and not support of certain things that have gone to the legislatures. So I believe it's good if we say that we are in agreement with the current legislation that's going through and that approving this would send a message. Because if it doesn't go through, then we'll be back here again talking about it."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Arrington, you want to be heard?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "No, sir. I'm fine. I just wanted to bring up the point I think that Commissioner Hall brought up is that, you know, we -- and to that extent, Commissioner Abdur-Rahman. We need to be very careful because if she decides tomorrow not to do this, then where -- where are all those people going to go. So we need -- we need to be careful and respectful. And I think we can do -- I think we can do that by adding it to our Legislative Agenda without attacking any one single person or any office."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner -- Vice Chair Ellis."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Yeah, I guess we'll vote on the substitute motion. You all know my sentiment and I'll go -- I'll be very clear. But what's wrong is wrong. And on the face of this, it's wrong. It wasn't disclosed to us. It's a bad practice. It should be changed. You know, when it came to the light of day, we learned about what was going on in our Development Authority about collection of per diem fees. They were very respectable individuals there that were denounced for their behavior, that specific behavior. And I just think that, you know, this falls in that same category, you know, I mean, Clerk may have very well done a -- done a great job. But she should not be entitled to be pocketing, taking additional compensation, however you want call it. Additional \$340,000 that she's not drive -- handed out chicken out the window for. I mean, other people are doing that work."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Just a minute."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Our employees are doing that work. You know, so I mean, we're going to vote on the substitute. And hopefully, the State Legislature will take action to address what is a bad practice. You know, I'm not looking to disparage the Clerk. I'm looking to disparage the practice that is taking place and -- I'm speaking -- and to say that it should be disclosed to us when we're making decisions around additional compensation for an individual. That should be clear and it should be transparent and our citizens should expect it."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Like, I said, I'm going to reiterate what I said. We want individuals to respect us, we should respect them. I think we have a duty to get our point across without disparaging the holder, the person. That's all I'm saying. And I'm going to stand by that. We can make the point, we can do what we need to do without saying someone is pocketing, whether they're at the drive-through window or whether they're in the Clerk's office. Because just like I've had people to call me on this, I've had people to call me and say the same thing that Commissioner Arrington said. It's something that is a service that has been for the benefit of people who have went down there to get those services. So she could stop tomorrow and do it. And so I don't have a issue with the practice, with the person that's doing the practice as much as I have a issue of the disparaging of it. Because to disparage her and we have a whole bunch of other counties that do it and we say nothing about that. I support, in theory, what you're saying. I don't support the way it's being said."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "I just want to say, prior to her collecting the fees, you would have to go to the US Post Office. And you can still go to the US Post Office to get your passports processed."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you. All right. Let's vote on the substitute motion, which is on the floor."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion fails; three yeas, one nay, one abstention."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Get back to the main motion, which was to approve. Let's vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open. And the motion fails; three yeas, four nays."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Continue."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0096, Request approval of an ordinance to amend Chapter 46, Article 3, Division 1 of the Fulton County Code of Ordinances to modify the start time for curfew hours of unaccompanied minors, age 16 years or younger within the unincorporated areas of Fulton County, urging municipalities located within Fulton County to adopt similar legislation and for other purposes, sponsored by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Is there a motion? Motion to approve by Commissioner Abdur-Rahman. Is there a second? Is there a second? All right. I'll second it. Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Chairman, I noticed that there was an error in it. It says 12:01 a.m. and that should read 11:00 p.m. And so I'll ask the County Attorney if I need to hold it or if I -- if that's a change we can make on the floor?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "That's the only error?"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "That's the only error I caught."

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "If that -- if that change is made on the floor and voted, we can make that change and --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "It should be 11:00 p.m. instead of 12:01 a.m. for the curfew. And also wanted to let the colleagues know, the purpose of this curfew is because I have received quite a bit of calls from parents, from other elected officials. And this is just the -- it is -- it's the opinion that we must do something about our teens. We've had teens to die. We have teens that are robbing and doing quite a bit of things. I know in my district, we had a teen that died at Cascade Skating Rink. And so I pass that Cascade Skating Rink often and see a lot of teens out there, midnight, sometimes 1:00 o'clock in the morning. And so even though I know this is only enforceable in the unincorporated area, a small group, I'm hoping that Fulton County will take the leadership of showing the other municipalities or all the municipalities that need some type of curfew in place. We cannot hope our way out of this issue with our teens. You

know, it used to be a saying that says, the idle mind is the devil's workshop. But I would venture to you that the -- the unsupervised teen's mind is the devil's workshop. Because we have a lot of teens that are being unsupervised in Fulton County. And we also are having parents -- and this is not saying all, but we're having parents, because I've talked to law enforcement, I've talked to social workers, I've talked to City Council Members from one end of the county to the other. And the parents know in some cases, not all, let me be crystal clear about that, in some cases, our juveniles are running the households. Our juveniles are out doing God knows what, the parents are not taking responsibility in some cases for our youth. And so in theory, even though this is only enforceable in a small amount of unincorporated area, I think it sends a message and it also speaks to the leadership that we need to let all of our municipalities know that they need to do something. We are being -- beginning to become known nationally as the area where trafficking happens, as the area that has gang violence, and as the area that is riddled crime. And a lot of all these three things that I just said are perpetrated on people 14 and under or by 14 and under. So I would ask my colleagues today, in theory, to support this so Fulton County can step out there and make it where other municipalities that sit in Fulton County can say, okay, Fulton County put a curfew in place, maybe we should do one, maybe we should follow their lead and maybe we should have an actual tea to it, where parents are turning the other way, looking the other way. There is parental responsibility that is enforced in this curfew. And I think that is very important, whether we want to have that uncomfortable conversation in front of the mic or behind the door, we need parental responsibility with our youth. Because at the end of the day, they are profiting, they are being used by older gang members, they are the ones that are being trafficked. And 90 percent of the time, there is no parental guidance to keep them from going down that route. So I would humbly ask my colleagues to support."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you. I absolutely believe in a curfew. And I understand about gangs. I have friends that I grew up with in Chicago who were gang members, but they were good kids. They just didn't have anybody to go home to. They didn't have anybody to give them any direction. Many of them not because their parents were on drugs or anything like that. But many of them because their parents were working two and three jobs. So there wasn't anybody, they were -- they were -- I grew up like -- I grew up as a latchkey kid. I had my house keys on a ribbon hanging around my neck. Chairman talking about with the pearls on; I was too young for pearls. But I, you know, most people in a business environment work 8:30 to 5:00, 9:00 to 5:00, you know, regular business hours. But you have others who do not work those type of hours. And my mother was a criminal investigator. So she used to have to go and investigate people, and it could be any time of the night. But I'd get -- I would get out of school early and have to actually get in the house myself. And then someone would come from the family and be there. So we have similar situations. Let's not forget Cameron Jackson, the 15-year-old in the Atlantic Station shooting. Let's not forget Zion Charles, the 12-year-old who died immediately because of that shooting. And the mother who literally went to City Hall and she said, you know, I work three jobs, I cannot

be at home when my son gets there. And this issue, we have to go back to Mayor Andre Dickens started midnight basketball. Because what we really need to be doing is proving programs and services for our youth to keep them off the streets and keep them in an environment where they're doing something productive while their parents are not at home and may be working. Because all parents aren't bad, they just -- they have to, you know, work. And unfortunately, many of them may not be able to work regular jobs. So I don't want to forget that -- want us to forget that the kid -- we have kids who don't even get out of practice by 8:00 p.m. and they don't have a ride home. So they're trying to make their way home on their own. And then let's not forget in that area of unincorporated Fulton County on Fulton Industrial Boulevard, we've all spoke about the hotels and how there are entire families with children living along Fulton Industrial Boulevard. And they are the least of these, they're in situations where they're working long hours or other things are going on. And those kids don't have anybody to take them back and forth. So I think that, you know, I'm glad to see that we already have a -- a curfew. And I kind of feel like the time is -- the time already on it was correct, because even midnight basketball doesn't let out at 8:00 o'clock. I have gone to -- been invited and gone to many of the Mayor's midnight basketball sessions and seen the young kids from elementary, middle-school age, high-school age there, and they're off the street, they're productive, they're doing something enjoyable. But the basketball games go for hours, they're still there until very late. I left at 8:00 o'clock because I said, this is really long. So I think we may be cutting into doing a disservice by shortening the hours down to 8:00 o'clock p.m. because I think that it was probably good at 11:00. And I'm glad Commissioner Khadijah, you caught that one about, it says 12:01 a.m. and it should say 11:00 p.m. But the other part needs to say 11:00 p.m. on line 7, page 2, where it says 8:00, it should say 11:00 p.m. because a lot of their practices don't even get out at 8:00 o'clock. And many of them don't have the transportation, they're jumping on MARTA or maybe even walking home. And I wouldn't want us to start profiling kids who are walking home, just trying to get home from one place to another and stopping them because of curfew and other things happening. I'm starting to think about the video of Tyre Nichols. I mean, we don't want to create any extra situations, so I think the time should be 11:00 p.m. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Commissioner Hall, I appreciate that. I just want to make sure, are you saying that on line 7 that 8:00 p.m. should be changed to 11:00, or on line 8 that 12:01 should be changed to 11:00?"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "No. You already said the 12:01 --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Okay."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- a.m. needed to be changed to 11:00 p.m."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Okay."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I'm just adding, on line 7 that 8:00 p.m. should be 11:00 p.m."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Okay. And so what I will ask my colleagues here today is to support this. And the reason I'm asking you to support it is because we've got to do something. Just to sit up and say how bad crime is and other things, being a person who was a domestic abuse survivor. And I had children when I was going back to school and working three jobs. I know being a latchkey kid that that can be a issue. But I also know that the times that I had to work two and three jobs that my children were not without supervision. And sometimes, like children do sometimes, they'll break the rule. One of my daughters was on a MARTA bus at 11:00 o'clock at night. And one of my neighbors saw her on the bus and called me at my job and said, I see your daughter on the bus and it's 11:15, and I know you work at night. And so where it truly takes a village, I think this incorporates some of the village aspect. Because this is truly -- and I don't -- I don't -- and I hear you, Commissioner Hall. And I don't want to come across like I am being punitive to those families that have latchkey kids or those families that's working three jobs and going back to school, because I was one. But in 2023, it is not the same. You have kids raising kids. And when I mean kids, I mean kids mentality, not a parent's mentality, not about the safety of the general public and the welfare of the public. I went to an event at in South Fulton that the Mayor there was discussing with Young Dro and this was full of teachers and full of social workers and principals. And one of the principals told me, she says, Monday through Friday, I go through these students' phones, I have conversations with them, I even get on the bus. But she said, Monday morning when she comes in, she has phones that she's looking in because the students let her. And she's seeing pictures or guns, she'll see -- she's seeing fights. She's seeing where children -- and I mean, this is at a middle school in my district that a principal is looking at all of this crime that happened over the weekend by a middle-schooler that has came and showed her something totally different. And she's trying to tell the parents what she does Monday through Friday has to be reinforced at home. And so I did not enter into this without thinking about all the repercussions and who it may be hard for. What I thought about was, we need to do something. We need to send the message for parental responsibility. We need to send the message for our kids that sometimes we have to tell them, no. We cannot be friends with our 13 and 14-year-olds, they need guidance. So I would just humbly, to the point of begging my colleagues to pass this because it sends a message that we're serious about saving the lives of our youth here in Fulton County. And we're encouraging municipalities from one end of the county to the other to follow suit and put something in place. Because we don't need another child killed. We don't need another carjacking. We don't need another 13, 14, and 15-year-old kicking in somebody's doors to rob. Now, will this stop it? No. But I think it'll be a tool and a resource that our law enforcement, our social workers, and other individuals can use to make sure there's parental responsibility and to let the children know that we are trying to save their lives even if -- if it's a requirement of adhering to a curfew. So I would humbly ask my colleagues to please support."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay, thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Khadijah, I agree on many fronts. And let me just make sure I'm clear on something. Because on page 1, lines 24 through 26 it says, whereas on October 19th, 1994, the Board of Commissioners adopted the Juvenile Curfew Ordinance via resolution 94-RC503, codified at the -- at Fulton County Code FCC 46-140 to be effective in Unincorporated Fulton County. Madam County Attorney, what exactly was the -- so there was a previous curfew ordinance that the Board of Commissioners approved and adopted in 1994. What is -- what were the hours? Are they in line 1 through -- is this what's noted in line 1 through 5 on page 2?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "The whereas' indicate the current hours and ages that are restricted."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Which is --"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "Currently --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Is it what you're -- are you referring to page 2?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "Page 2, lines 1 through 4 --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "One through four. So the --"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "-- are the current restrictions."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- current curfew policy that was adopted by the Board of Commissioner in '94 is on page 2, lines 1 through 4 --"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "Of the resolution."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- which -- which says, the curfew hours for unaccompanied minors ages 17 years or younger are 11:00 p.m. on any Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday until 6:00 a.m. on the following day, and 12:01 a.m. on any Friday or Saturday night until 6:00 a.m. on the following day. So that's what it currently is right now?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "Yes, Commissioner."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. So let me -- because I'm trying to not get this confused. So Commissioner Khadijah, if you could just clarify, you're trying -- you want to take the time down from 11:00 to 8:00 o'clock?"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "What I'm trying to do is reduce the hour, where it says on any Sunday, Monday -- line 3, where it says, or Thursday, 6:00 a.m. on the following date until 12:01, I'm dropping that down to 11:00 p.m. as opposed to midnight."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. And I would want to keep the current policy for Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday at 8:00 p -- at 11:00 p.m. because we're basically doing the same thing by dropping it from 12:01 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. on Friday, Saturday night until 6:00 a.m. So if we could just keep the Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday at 11:00 because that will help those youth that do have practices like, for instance, the midnight basketball that the Mayor's office does. And those others' practices that go until after 8:00 o'clock."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Yes."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. So, substitute motion to just edit that? Okay."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. We good?"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Yes."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. The motion on the floor is to approve. Let's vote."

CLERK GRIER: "And the vote is open on the motion to approve as amended. And the motion passes; five yeas, zero nays."

CLERK GRIER: "Under Commissioners' Presentation and Discussion Items, 23-0097, Discussion of an ordinance to amend Chapter 2, Article 3 of the Fulton County Code of Ordinances to modify Code Section 2-261 to require the County Manager to present the budget request for the next fiscal year to the Board of Commissioners no later than 60 days before the millage rate is set and for other purposes, sponsored by Commissioner Arrington."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "So, Commissioners, I put this on for discussion. I know it's late in the day. I don't have any problem holding this until the next meeting so that we can have a thorough discussion. But Mr. Chair, I do believe this addresses some of those issues we talked about earlier as fare as budget and millage rate and timing. So hopefully, we can have discussion at the next meeting in that regard."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. No objections. Thank you, Commissioner. Next item."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0098 Commercial property appraisal fairness, sponsored by Commissioner Barrett."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I'll also be quick, because I know no one gets into a long discussion right now. But there was an article in the December issue of the Atlanta Magazine bringing up the commercial property assessments. And this is an issue that's been brought up multiple times over the years in various articles. We heard about it in our External Affairs legislative update. And I just sent around yesterday for everyone's review, three different documents regarding this. One is the actual Atlanta Magazine article. And I would like to just, for the record note that my predecessor, Commissioner Morris, cared deeply about this and is quoted heavily in the article. And I am in agreement with him as this article is written. Also, I've included the -- the County Auditor's review of the commercial property assessment that was done in 2019 for your review, as well as some preliminary research done by Julian Bene, a former Invest Atlanta Board Member, who is also quoted in the article. It is preliminary research. He had done research that was conducted in the article around Atlanta. I asked him to do some additional research incorporating the rest of Fulton County. These, again, are just preliminary numbers and some examples of some of the properties in question. So I will just ask that everybody, if you have time, review that information if you have not already. And we will bring it back up in a future meeting."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you, Commissioner. Continue, Madam Clerk."

CLERK GRIER: "23-0099, Presentation, Invest Atlanta Tax Allocation District, sponsored by Commissioner Arrington."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. You want to introduce this, Commissioner Arrington?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Colleagues, I just wanted to invite Invest Atlanta to talk to us about the TADs, the expiring schedule for those TADs, when they are expiring, and all of that in the information so that we can have a better working relationship with our partners and better open lines of communication."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Good afternoon. Good evening and thank you so much for having me. My name is Dr. Eloisa Klementich and I'm the proud President and CEO at Invest Atlanta. And with me, I brought Rosalind Rubens Newell, who is our Legal Counsel, Nino Chiappetta, who is our Chief Financial Officer and Jennifer Fine, who is our Project Manager. And do I drive this or do you drive this? Sorry."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "What's the question?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "The presentation, next slide. Okay, sorry about that. Next slide. First conceived in the West Coast, Tax Allocation Districts are known as TIFs. And I'll refer to them here on out as TADs, Tax Allocation Districts, have been used in almost 50 states in our union. In Georgia, the tool was --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Excuse me, Doctor, are you going to talk to us about those two in particular or are you going to -- what are you going to --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Yeah. I'm going to talk to you about the two in particular. I just thought for those watching, it might be interesting to have just -- no, skip that?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Well, you don't have to worry about those watching because it's not that many, but --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Okay."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "No, don't say that. That's not true. People watch online as well. He's talking about the TV station."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Oh, okay."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "But they watch online."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Well, then if you like, I can skip the first couple slides --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yes, ma'am. We understand TADs."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "All right. So then let's skip to the next slide. Next slide. Okay. Here in order for these ten city of Atlanta TADs to be designated, a redevelopment plan was created that clearly identified the barriers to redevelopment, as identified through extensive community involvement and input. I mention this only to say that the redevelopment plan really directs the investments that Invest Atlanta is going to make as I noticed on the other slide. Next slide. And don't worry, Commissioner, I'm no more than eight minutes now for you to pull slides up. I'm proud to report that the TADs have been making an impact from the Publix on Moores Mill to the Beltline to the homes on Princeton Lakes. The Mayor has been keenly focused on drawing circles. He recognizes that the only way to improve distressed neighborhoods and lives is to work together. Through these efforts, he has been working with key, key local government agencies, from APS to MARTA to AH to Invest Atlanta. All of us are aligning our capital and our operation expenses in support of this goal. The results speak for themselves. 750 million in TADs have generated public and private investment of 12.6 million square feet in new commercial development, 12 million square feet of new residential, representing 12,000 units of which 40 percent are considered affordable. That means someone earning anywhere from 40 to \$54,000 can now call Atlanta home. Next slide. Here, I've zoomed in into the TADs in each of the four Fulton County Districts. Each dot represents a project to -- and this is an interactive map. You have the link and you'll be able to explore that on your own time. For a project to be considered for the TAD, let me just highlight, there are five basic steps. First, Invest Atlanta must receive an application. I will note that projects only get

about ten to 15 percent because they're really trying to get tax-gap financing only. So TAD -- we're only trying to fund gap financing. Second, Invest Atlanta has qualified staff that are going to review these and take extensive. And then all projects go through the TAD Committee of which, there is a Fulton County representative and then the Invest Atlanta Board. All projects are done on a reimbursement basis and there's annual compliance. That is important to mention. Everything that we commit to, we're going to come back on and ensure that that happens. Next slide. I'm going to skip -- well, I'm going to skip this slide and go to the next slide. And only thing I'm going to say on this slide -- next slide -- is that we do a 2021 tax allocation completion report. This informs us about which projects, which TADs are to be closed and which are not. There are two TADs -- next slide -- that should be substantially complete. That's the Atlantic Station TAD and the Princeton Lakes TAD. The Atlantic Station TAD, where substantially all of the increment is being used to pay down the debt, there are no new projects being funded. It is estimated that this TAD will close in 2025. The second TAD is the Princeton Lakes TAD, which you had asked me directly on, the debt service has been paid off in late 2022. And this TAD is scheduled to be closed later this year. Next slide. In the HN&R report, there were five TADs that they said are partially complete. I will not discuss all of them. I will only discuss the Eastside TAD, as that was the question by this Body. Again, as I've mentioned, the TADs allow us to be proactive, not reactive to redevelopment and redevelopment many of our disinvested neighborhoods. For the Eastside TAD, the debt has been escrowed. However, there are still adverse conditions that were identified in the redevelopment plan for which, increment continues to be needed. In fact, our pipeline shows there's a greater need than what is available in that TAD. Let me highlight that, of the 64 million in our project pipeline, approximately 70 percent of those support affordable housing, both in the form of multi-family and senior housing. This not only aligns to the city's goal, but per the actions of this Body, we believe supporting a affordable housing is also very important to the County Commission. I would add that affordable housing is also important to the state. In fact, the Governor allocated 62 million to address homelessness and housing insecurity. In August of last year and only in this year in January, the Governor stated, we want people to live in communities where they work. The house study -- the House -- the Georgia House Study Committee reported that Atlanta currently has a 1.9 months' supply and would need to develop 72,400 affordable housing units over the next 12 months to address the deficit. However, only 13,000 homes are expected to be built in that timeframe. I would argue that the Eastside TAD, as well as all the other TADs are primary tools to support affordable housing, preservation, and new housing. I would agree with the Georgia House Study Committee report that Georgia to continue to grow and to be the excellent state of -- and business needs to raise a family, a good supply of housing is absolutely a necessity. Next slide. Let me close, last slide, with the Corridor TADs. The Corridor TADs have not seen the boost that we've seen in the TADs, which is why the HR&A report has them as not complete. We are excited to report that the starting in 2023 as a result of the negotiates with APS, APS is now participating in these TADs. Think about Hollowell and Campbellton in the south part of the county that have been seeing disinvestment for many years. Here too, a pipeline of projects have been brought to us from community leaders and key stakeholders to surface specific projects and secure needed financing. These projects will permanently change the trajectory of

our neighborhoods and create the thriving communities and improve economic performance in neighborhoods, provide more housing options, and yet remain accessible to all incomes. Our goal is to leverage the TAD as one key financing to deliver the projects that we need in our city and in our county. What distinguishes this work from previous use of TADs is the future use of TADs will be integrated into a much larger and ambitious program for transformative change that we will believe will collectively improve incomes, the outcomes in education, health and public safety, housing, and economic mobility in our county and our city. And with that, I'd open up to any questions you may have. And I have my colleagues here to help support."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "So let me just put this -- put this in perspective. I think why you're here, the Board, this Board took action on two piece of legislation. One was to, whenever TADs would close, we set up an account where those proceeds would be used will be deposited in that account. That account to be used for certain capital projects, that's one, no discussion about that. Second one, we talked about the closure of two, the Princeton Lakes and the Eastside. Princeton Lakes, based upon everything that we've been told has met the no-existing debt requirement, as well as no-existing redevelopment obligation. That one, from our perspective, is not in dispute. No questions about that one. It's the Eastside one that I was hoping that you were going to talk about today."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Yes. And I agree, sir. The Eastside TAD, two things I think are important, yes, they're right. The -- a debt has been escrowed. What I would say is that --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "On the escrow, let me ask --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "-- if we looked at the --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- you a question before I -- thank you for bringing that up. What do mean when you say the debt has been escrowed? It's our -- it was our -- or is our understanding that the -- the outstanding indebtedness has been satisfied on the Princeton Lakes."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Yeah."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yeah. I don't think there's any dispute on the Princeton Lakes --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "No, no. Go ahead."

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "Yeah, so just to be clear, so on February of 2019, all the bond, outstanding bond payments were made into escrow. So that it could earn interest every year to pay off the debt, so it's sitting --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "But that's -- but if the money is in escrow that means the money is there to pay off the bonds. Okay."

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "The money is available to pay off the bonds, correct, and --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. So that's -- all right."

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "Yeah. So just weren't subject to early reduction. That's why the bond is --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Okay. I got -- several pertinent questions. Let's hear from Commissioner Barrett, Commissioner Hall, Commissioner Ellis, and Commissioner Thorne."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Okay."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So to be clear, there are sort of two sets of criteria, if you will, to sort of close out a TAD. And one is that there's money -- all the money is needed to pay off the bond and that there are -- that all the projects are complete, correct?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "I would say, yes. We want to ensure to close the bond -- to close the TAD, yes that the projects -- that the TAD is considered complete and that there is no debt also on that TAD."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Right. So the TAD is considered complete, meaning, the point of going into this in the first place was economic development in these areas, projects were determined to -- to make that happen. And if they are all essentially completed and we've gotten to where we want to be from an economic development perspective and the bond debt is paid off that is when the plan is to close."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "That's correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Right. And so in the case of the Eastside TAD, while there is the money in escrow to continue to pay it off, the debt and that that is all there, we don't need to pay into that escrow anymore because there's enough there to cover it. There are still at least 15, if not more, projects in the works, in which organizations need to be reimbursed, et cetera, correct?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Yes. There are projects right now that have been improved, yes, that are waiting to finish. And then I would say there are projects in our pipeline that are getting ready to come to the TAD."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So the --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "For those who understand, now, pipeline means one thing. What the language says is redevelopment obligations, not pipeline."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Well, what I'm getting at is the point of the -- of getting into the TAD in the first place, is that if we are investing in redevelopment in that area, there's several benefits to that, of course, the community benefit, the affordable housing benefit. But also the tax revenue benefit if the area improves to the extent that we expect it to based on this reinvestment, we ultimately once the TAD is closed, reap the benefits, so to speak, of that additional tax revenue from the improvement in the area and the real estate tax and all of that, correct?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "That's correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Sorry, I'm a little low blood sugar at this point in the day. But I think -- so what I'm getting at with the Eastside TAD is that we're not there yet. There's still more work to be done to finish this out from an economic development perspective, correct?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "That's correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "And so let me specifically on the list of projects that you have open in the Eastside TAD and in the pipeline in the Eastside TAD. What would be the impact to these projects and to the remaining economic development goals for that area if Fulton County no longer was contributing?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Thank you for the question. So it's hard just for me to talk about what the future will hold. But I'll tell you based on my expertise and what we're seeing in the pipeline, and this is really important. In the pipeline, there are 834 housing units, of which 76 percent or 652 are affordable. That means these families would be able to call Atlanta home. There's 149,000 new retail square feet. And there's a 164,000 square feet of commercial space within the pipeline. If all of those projects do come to fruition, that's representing a new increment in new investment in the -- in that part of town of \$1.4 billion in total investment. So I will tell you that if the TAD goes away, I am not sure that those projects will happen."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Okay. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. So what I hear is, these TADs are literally building a greater Atlanta and bringing those restaurants you mentioned, affordable housing, businesses, everything that you need to have smart development in a city and to have a better quality of life. So I can see where some may be a little apprehensive because these TADs really developing Atlanta, but what's happening outside of there. If you're drawing all the people, it may feel to others that, okay, they're going to get everybody, we don't get anybody, so maybe we need to stop this and

refocus on some other areas. But the bottom line is, we were told in December that two TADs were closed, the Eastside TAD and the Princeton Lakes TAD. And you're standing here today saying that that is not correct. It's not totally correct; is that right?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "We -- that's correct. The Princeton Lakes TAD is scheduled close later on this year. But the Eastside TAD, there has been no discussions that I know, from the city to close that TAD. There's too much work to do."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "All right. So we can safely say that in December, we were provided with wrong information. So now what's before us is the fact that Princeton Lakes TAD is scheduled to close later on this year. We just started this year. And Eastside TAD is still in the works. So what impact does the resolution that passed in December by this Board of Commissioners, and let me -- when I say that, I don't include myself because I voted, no. What does that resolution do to the projects? What kind of impact does that have if Fulton County pulls their funding out of the TADs and they're not completely closed?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "It would be very difficult for us -- well, it'd be impossible for us to be able to support all of the projects in the pipeline."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "In the pipeline. Okay. So, you know, the TAD -- the resolution we just passed at the last meeting, I believe it's okay, because it's just simply saying, if we do pull out our money on a closed TAD that -- and I want to just make -- I want to make sure this is -- this is absolutely what it is. The last resolution we approved at the last meeting, is it specifically saying that if a TAD closes and we pull out our funding that we're directing it to the account that we specified?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Yeah, because the one before that, that's --"

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Yes, Commissioner Hall. It was based on --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay."

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "-- the ultimate closure of a TAD --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay."

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "-- and in return of any residual funds in the TAD and the return of the increment to the county."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. So that's not problematic, but the TAD in December that passed is the problem. I hear little, you know, comments in the background. But you say, yes?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "The Eastside TAD, yes. That would be one we would like to continue to do the work that's needed in the Eastside TAD, that's right."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I would too and so do my constituents. I'm looking at this and now I really get a -- get to see where these projects are and why my constituents are really ticked off about that December resolution. I mean, I felt in my gut -- because, you know, I need the paper. I need to see it. If you said it's so, then you ought to have something that actually confirms it, what you're saying is true. And nobody could provide me that in December. But looking at the -- looking at these projects pretty much it looks like, these are in -- even if I go by the current districts, because our districts changed in January for some of us, well, for most of us, these are pretty much in my district, Commissioner Arrington's district may have one or two, and Commissioner Khadijah's district; is that correct?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Yeah. I think it's -- I'm not --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "The ones that are on here?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Yes. If you look at the sixth slide, it has the -- where all the districts -- all the projects are."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Oh, let me see, what page is that?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Six of the one we just sent. Right here, it's on your screen."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I can't see the page numbers. But let me just count like this, one, two --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "It's up on the screen. Yes, we have three --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- three, four, five --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "-- four, five, and six."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "-- six, okay."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "And the Beltline --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "So, yeah, that's Commissioner Khadijah, myself, and Commissioner Arrington. So these projects are all in our district. I see one that might be a little bit outside at the top here, I see a little dot above Atlantic Station."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "That's Atlantic Station."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "That will be -- that would be Commissioner Barrett."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "And the Beltline covers -- that is also a TAD and that one covers all of -- most of all the other --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Okay. Well, I do have to say, I'm really glad to see this because we're always talking about how we don't get anything south. And I'm so glad to see that they're many projects that are south. And I would not want to do anything to stop that type of development and growth. So I think something needs to be done to rectify the situation that occurred in December so that we don't have our self in a situation where our residents don't get to have affordable housing and all the things that they need in their communities. Because when I look at these, would you -- is it safe to say that these are communities that currently are -- don't really have much as it relates to grocery stores and things like that. And people are always questioning us about, why can't we get a grocery store? Why -- you know, why can't we get something other than a Dollar General? I mean, and this is working towards making sure that we do get that in those communities. So I would ask that my colleagues who voted for that December -- that resolution in December, rethink what happened and that we do some reverse action. Madam County Attorney, what would we need to do to reverse that so that we don't take money out of TADs that are still active?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "Based on the Equal Dignity Rule, the action that was taken would have to be amended or rescinded by the same type of legislation, therefore by resolution."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you so much. And thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. The lineup is as follows: Commissioner -- Vice Chair Ellis, Commissioner -- Commissioner Thorne, and Commissioner Barrett, Commissioner Abdur-Rahman. And at some point, I'd like to hear from the person who represents Fulton County in this matter. Commissioner Ellis."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Thank you, Mr. Chair."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Our Investment Atlanta --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Right."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- not Invest Atlanta, but -- yeah."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "And to clarify -- and to clarify the action that was taken last year related to the two TADs was not to close the TADs. We don't have the ability to close a TAD. We have a resolution that said, we wanted to seek out and confirm whether or not there was any outstanding debt, redevelopment obligations associated

with these two TADs. And we requested specific information from you. If we confirmed that, then there was our -- then there was our management was instructed to stop paying our increments, okay. So there was no further need for us to continue to push the increment through, because it would be brought back into our general fund to utilize for the, you know, the needs and the situations that we have, which are clear, which have been expounded upon. So that's what the resolution said. We've been trying to get this information from you. I'm glad you're down here today. But, you know, we asked you for it in a fairly simple, straightforward fashion on these two things. I think it could have been accomplished with you providing a clear written response, you know. So it's pretty -- the asks were pretty basic. I've followed up with you in a further email detailing kind of the specific information relative to the projects in the Eastside TAD. I hope you all can provide that to us. As the Chairman indicated, we understand how TADs work, we understand the benefit of them and that they've provided throughout, you know, our county. But we also understand that there is a really large amount of funding that's being diverted into TAD -- into TADs away from our general fund. And as a matter fact, you can even look at it on one of your slides, you know, the importance -- the point of the fact that TADs, specifically in the city of Atlanta, have gotten excessive in terms of representation of a percentage of the tax base. You're at 17.18 percent, whereas Georgia law sort of caps that around ten. All right. So we should be seeing great results from TADs given the significant amount of funding that is flowed into them. If we haven't, then people haven't been doing their jobs, because there are real serious money going into these things. And that would also requires real serious transparency and accountability. People are asking about it, right? So my ask and I think the Board's ask, in terms of, you know, this particular resolution was passed, was around details relating to those redevelopment obligations that exist. So hopefully you can provide us that with the Eastside TAD. And also provide us with some insight into these other projects you referenced. Because eventually, I mean, TADs are not meant to be something that goes on in perpetuity. Eventually, they are meant to close once they meet their -- met their purpose, right? And I've not really heard enough about how the evaluation of stuff that meets it -- when it's met its useful purpose. I know the Beltline, you know, we've got 450 -- \$543 million, you know, tax base at the time it was initially started. Now, there's a -- the value on it is 3.4 billion. And potentially, under -- understated based upon some of the information that Commissioner Barrett had shared with us given that some of the commercial properties that were noted were -- were not -- were most notably in the Beltline TAD or area. So, you know, look, we're just looking for real clear information around those specific projects in the Eastside TAD, dollars, commitments, obligation, timeframe for completion. Simple ask. Hopefully, you all can provide it. I mean, that's what's being sought, I mean, hopefully that's clear."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "And that's what was requested in Mr. Abdullahi --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "No, what was -- the projects --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Just a minute. Just a minute. That's what was requested in his letter of -- what is it, January 13th, I believe. We'd asked to have some information back within ten days and we still don't have it. All we want -- Atlanta is our partner. All we

want is information so that we can make an informed decision -- decision on this Eastside TAD and know what's in, what's included in it now, what constitutes a redevelopment obligation as you stand here today, period, it's pretty straightforward. We're not backing out of anything."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Well, I'm glad to hear that. Thank you. I appreciate that. I will tell you that I did receive the request for project information today at 2:30 and I've been here. So I apologize, I haven't been able to gather that. I do have the information from the letter. And I have -- we'll send that to them as well. I was told within ten days, I wanted to meet with you first to ensure that I addressed all the questions. But as you saw in my 51-page deck, all of the information is there. And the only thing I would like to highlight is that everything we do is transparent. Every single project gets heard and the Tax Allocation District Committee, of which, you have a representative. Every TAD project is post -- is then heard at the Invest Atlanta Board, of which, you have a Fulton County representative. Every single project has a fact sheet and a resolution. And all of those are found on our website. So we take great pride in ensuring that we're being very transparent to the public on how all of these projects are being invested and I'll add, compliance is imperative. Every single project has a compliance. We send teams out to verify. So you may say this is what we're going to do. I'll say, trust and verify, we go verify. So I just wanted to clarify that. And yes, you will have that information you need --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. So if you have all that detail, then it will be helpful if we could see it. That was the request --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "My pleasure, sir."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So, I mean, I don't know why we had to go through this to get to that."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "I got your request at --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "All right. So --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "-- 2:30 today, sir."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "No. I mean, the request was made back in January. You could have called Samir and say, specifically, what are you looking for instead of saying, hey, we want to come and do to presentation --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "I'll have that to you --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- of 57 pages --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "-- within 10 days --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- I mean, it was --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "-- just as you requested."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- real specific to those things. So, I mean, it's as the Chairman had indicated, I mean, we're partners, right? But partners also implies that, you know, when we request information, we're given the respect of being provided it, not necessarily what might appear to be the runaround. And so I just -- I just want, you know, that to, you know, because we are a significant partner in these. In many cases, you know, we're larger than the city of Atlanta in terms of the participation, correct?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yes."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "I would --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "It's not debatable, the answer is, yes."

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "I think it's -- I think they're both -- you're both around 20 --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. And so but in many cases, we are, right?"

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "As a great partner, we're --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Right. But we're due the same level of respect that a -- and I'm saying that the city of Atlanta is, right? You know, so, you know, our taxpayers, you know, need to know the same kind of information. So that's what we're asking to be shared with us. It's not that we're, you know, seeking to say, all of this is bad. If somebody's doing -- we're just looking for clear information."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "No problem."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "And on this, I had -- I have to unrelated questions since you are here. You don't necessarily have to expand on them at this late hour. But we do want -- I do think we want to have some follow-on detail about understanding the timeframe for the closure of Atlantic Station, okay, and seeing that sort of cash-flow disbursement around that and when that's going to occur. And, you know, I think also just because of the sheer sort of disparity in terms of the amount of growth that is taking place in it and the question about whether or not really, you know, you should, you know, should -- should still receive sort of the benefit of a TAD is the Beltline piece of it. It's sort of, what is the long-term sort of positioning of, you know, the Beltline TAD closing and out of those other obligations? And what types of obligations are going to be considered for future redevelopment? I'm trying to remember the number that was in there in terms of the Beltline TAD in terms of the outstanding debt. Do you recall what the Beltline TAD --"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "We -- I put those in the appendix just in case you asked me. So if you keep doing down, who's ever running the -- here it is, the Beltline."

SHARON WHITMORE, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: "Commissioner Ellis, their presentation indicates the Beltline TAD, 87.5 million in current outstanding principal balance."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay. So it's like 87 million, but the increment being received roughly each year is about up in the neighborhood of 74 or so?"

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "Yes. And that's all used for development projects. I believe they anticipate they'd need another 300 million to complete the Beltline."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Okay."

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "And it's scheduled to be completed around --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Yeah, I -- at this -- no need to go into it. But at some point, I'd like to get a little bit more kind of detail around sort of the future, you know, planning around, you know, kind of future projects within the Beltline."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Okay. I've written that down, sir."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "But I think, principle is just a follow up on, you know, those request specific to the Eastside TAD."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "Got it."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "So we can make the most informed decision."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you, Vice Chair. Commissioner Thorne."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Okay. So I wasn't here in December when this decision was made. So for the Eastside TAD, has the funding exceeded what the initial redevelopment plan was what it -- when it was put in place?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "No."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "The funding hasn't exceeded that amount? Or can you give numbers?"

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "So just to be clear, so there's -- when the TAD was originally started, it has a redevelopment plan. And we have a -- an assessment every three years by HR&A, which is a third-party consultant. They came

in and say, okay, here's the original TAD goals. Here's where you're at now. We estimate on the Eastside TAD that you are partially complete, or not in the substantially complete zone yet."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "So there's no dollar figure, like that we need to raise this amount of money or anything?"

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "Yeah. There might have been an initial dollar figure. But where we're right now, you know, from our slides, I think we have another -- let me see -- yeah, another \$46 million hole, which would be probably four more years."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Okay. And you -- and you put -- you said there's other stuff coming in the pipeline. And that's what you're talking that --"

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "Correct."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "-- you're just kind of adding on cost to that initial -- that wasn't in the initial redevelopment plan or --"

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "No. So the initial redevelopment, I think the Eastside TAD wasn't supposed to close until around 2030. So we did a good job of managing the debt. So now we just have projects to do. So there's still more work to be done on the Eastside TAD to get substantially completed."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Okay. But you've grown a tax base in that. You've guys have done an amazing job. Yeah. All the projects you've done is --"

NINO CHIAPETTA, INVEST ATL. CFO: "And you guys were a partner in that so, thank you."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Yes, you have done an amazing job. Just understand as Commissioners, we just had a jail feasibility study. And we're looking at trying to come up with \$2 billion. And we have some hospital, mental healthcare, we have just a lot of expenses. And your work's so good, but if we can legally get out, we might need to prioritize putting our funds in other areas. But great job, thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman. Strike that, strike that, I'm ahead of myself. Commissioner Barrett."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Thank you. I take a little bit of exception, with all due respect, to this suggestion that there was a question made by this Board in January for details about projects outstanding. Why wasn't that request made in early December prior to vote that needed that information? I mean, that makes zero sense to me. I wasn't here, I wasn't a part of that. I don't know why that happened."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "That wasn't what the resolution called for. You can ask our management team --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "But why would you -- why would you make a resolution to close something without having the information?"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "It's not a resolution to close it."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Well, the language reads that if there are -- and I don't have it in front of me. But maybe you can --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "It wasn't to close."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Well, it says if there's no bond -- if there's no debt requirement left that we want to, not close, but to remove, to stop participating, correct?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "To cease our participation, yes."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So not to close, but to stop participating?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Hold it, hold it, hold it. Whatever happened back then, we trying to resolve a situation now with a sister city, our capital city, where we can continue to work together. We're requesting some information so that we can make an informed decision. We're asking for the same information now that was requested in the letter of January 13th, which we still don't have. So if we get that, we can make an informed decision. And I think you'll probably be pleased with the -- with the decision that -- that we will make once we get the information and review it."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So just --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "And I also want us to hear, when you finish, with -- from Mr. Abdullahi, who represents us, not Invest Atlanta."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Right. So just to be clear, in the language of the current -- where are we with the language of current resolution? At this moment, have we -- are we no longer participating in the Eastside TAD based on the language in the current resolution?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "The resolution was conditioned upon staff confirming that certain conditions exist. And that letter of January 13th was an attempt to determine whether those factors exist. Because we don't have the information responsive --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So we're in this middle ground?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "-- at this point, it is still in the posture of staff trying to ascertain whether those conditions exist --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Well, I mean, I think it seems relevant to discuss that letter now then. Because what was requested in the letter, was it just the projects or was it just debt, or was it all of it?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "From memory it was asking for, was all the debt paid off for in each of those two TADs, Atlantic Station and the Eastside TAD."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So it did not request project information, correct?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "I don't recall project information, no."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I didn't either. My recollection of that letter -- can anyone else confirm that? I mean, you wrote the letter, so."

SAMIR ABDULLAHI, DIRECTOR, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: "The letter referenced what was in the resolution, which was the two questions, is there any outstanding bond debt or any redevelopment obligation, or outstanding redevelopment obligations."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Redevelopment obligations, meaning, projects?"

SAMIR ABDULLAHI, DIRECTOR, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: "Committed projects, yes."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Committed."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So in other words, you are discounting any potential additional project, you're discounting the pipeline in terms of making this decision, that's you're suggesting?"

SAMIR ABDULLAHI, DIRECTOR, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: "That's what the resolution stated, yes."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So I'm asking those who wrote the resolution. You're suggesting that whatever else is left to be done to improve that area should be forgotten, not considered? And I'm just trying to get clarification. Okay. Apparently, nobody here and was part of that wants to answer the question, fine."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No, we're -- listen --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "There's a specific ask that was made to her --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "There's not --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "-- regarding both components of it --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Right, but there's additional -- there's a third piece here, which is projects in the pipeline."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "That was specifically asked for as well."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Well --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "In my response back to her --"

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "-- apparently it wasn't."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "It is. It is."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "Today? Okay, today."

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "It is there. And then once we get it, we can make a decision around it, as the Chair has indicated."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "So as it stands right now, we're in this gray middle ground, where this ask is out there --"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "That's correct."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "We are still contributing as of this moment. And it's all dependent on these answers; is that what we're saying?"

VICE CHAIRMAN ELLIS: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Arrington."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Thank you, Mr. Chair --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No, no, wait a minute. Wait. I'm sorry, Commissioner --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "You keep forgetting me."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Abdur-Rahman."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "You know, I received so many calls -- first all, I thank you for the relationship we have. Because you and I have talked many times and your staff and everything. And so I want to go on record -- and I'm not saying that"

anybody else has an adversarial, but I don't have an adversarial role with -- with Invest Atlanta. I think you all are doing a great job. I think this is a communication issue. Because to Commissioner Hall's credit, I didn't support it, the original one. But what happened was, the information that was communicated to the community, which I had shared with the Chairman, my phone rung off the hook, saying that Fulton County is closing down the TADs. You and I had a conversation about it as well. And so we got to be careful what type legislate -- we got to be careful about two things. We got to be careful about what type legislation resolutions that we put in. And we must be respectful of when one Commissioner is ending a term and another Commissioner is coming in. Because I'm of the belief that sometimes the Commissioners can represent the same district, but the district's demographics have changed. And so therefore the Commissioner going out, may be going by ten years of demographics that changed. Whereas, the new Commissioner is representing the new demographics. So I would say openly here among my colleagues and those gazillion people that called me, I have said and I will say it again, let's respect individuals when they're coming in when there is actual -- a resolution that may affect, not only that district, but the entire county. Because I know that we have work that's being done in my district as well. And I didn't support the first one. I supported the second one that these colleagues had a chance to vote on, these colleagues had a chance to ask the County Attorney, is this about shutting down the TADs. Now, two of my colleagues did not have an opportunity to do that in December, that's problematic for me. And so what I'm saying, going on record here -- and Chairman, I know you want me to hurry up and I'm going to try, but I ain't going to try but so hard. Because my phone, my email, everywhere, if they could have sent a carrier pigeon to my house. They were upset because it was out in the community that Fulton County is shutting down the TADs. And I am going on record saying one, we can't do that. And even if we found a way to do it, I wouldn't do it, because you all are doing a great job. Does the communication, maybe with some of my other colleagues need to be better? I don't have a problem with the communication, because you all have always answered and met with me when I needed it. But what I will say, whatever we need to do to fix what we did in December, we need to fix it. Because it's almost a conditional, if you don't jump when I tell you to jump, then we getting a divorce. So if I don't jump in three days versus ten days -- and I'm just telling you, as somebody who's out of the community and not -- that's not to say the rest of us aren't, because a lot of our Commissioners are in the community. But it sends the wrong message to our stakeholders when I'm stopped in the grocery store, when I'm stopped on the way home, when I'm parking my car and I've got seniors running to me saying, Commissioner Khadijah, why are you shutting down, they've got good projects, this, that, and the other. That happened because we jumped to gun and we didn't communicate correctly, probably on both ends. So I just want to be on the record, Chairman, saying I did not vote for it. I do want Fulton County money to come back to Fulton County when it closes. I think that's fair and I think that's an agreement of all of us. But to put something conditionally in place, I think that's problematic. Did you want to -- did you want to answer anything that I said or the previous -- okay, thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay."

COURTNEY ENGLISH, SR ADVISOR, ATL. MAYOR: "I'm just here to provide a clarification on behalf of the Mayor if it's desired."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. Commissioner Arrington."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Thank you all for being here today. I think, as we've heard already, the biggest thing is communication. But what I would like to propose is, you know, so we get quarterly updates from MARTA, we get quarterly updates from our other partners. And so maybe if we -- Invest Atlanta could come down and provide a quarterly update to all the Commissioners that would help open up the lines of communication, so that we make sure we're not having any miscommunication or something is being misinterpreted by maybe one person or one member or here or there. And so I just think that that would be helpful. And hopefully, you can work with Samir and our other staff. If there are TADs that are closing or about to close, let's -- let's know what those are so we don't have to contribute anymore. If there are any -- if there are ones that are not closed and that you are active and you all have plans for, let us know that as well, so that we can make sure that we don't, you know, pull the money back or do anything to harm those plans that you have and that we have because we're partners."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Hall."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. We talked and I know you watched the meeting in December. And I specifically asked my colleagues to hold this, hold the item in December to allow our new Commissioners to come in and have an opportunity to vote on that resolution in December because of the impact that it would have to certain Commissioners' districts. And that did not fly. It was pushed through to approve it. But I'm here to say today that as I speak, the County Attorney's office is working on a resolution to rescind that December resolution and to make everything right for our constituents, so that they have every bit of the benefit of everything that the TAD can do for their neighborhoods that you have set forth in this presentation and those things that you have in the pipeline. Because that's the type of work that we should be doing in collaboration and partnership with each other. And as far as that ten days, I know how hard you work, Eloisa. I know how you are all over Atlanta. I've been at the meetings, the ribbon cuttings, the events, everything with you, have seen you there. And I know it's hard. And I know we're all understaffed. So I understand if you couldn't get in on tenth day. And I just want you to know that, you know, I know you're trying to work with us. So please, you don't report to us, you are not our employee, you are our partner, okay. And I just want you to know, you do great work. Thank you, Courtney English for being here on behalf of the Mayor. And just know that that resolution will be coming next BOC meeting."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. Commissioner Barrett. Then I want to hear from Fulton County's representative."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I just want to say quickly, I appreciate Commissioner Hall and Commissioner Abdur-Rahman for looking out for the newbies, who didn't have an opportunity to weigh in on this in December. I want to say also that I have been appointed to the Invest Atlanta Board and taking the place of Commissioner Morris. And thus far, all of my interactions with you, Dr. Klementich, and your staff, have been very easy. And you guys have been more than responsive. I've been the one who has been late to meetings, so I apologize. But I've had no problem getting information back and forth and I just want to also say to Commissioner Arrington, I will be happy to help with making sure information flows back and forth. And obviously, Chairman, to your comments, many times to make sure that I'm representing the county in these interactions. And, you know, I think several people here have said that we're partners in this. And I think it's important to also note that the citizens in these areas and businesses are not just in city of Atlanta, they're also in Fulton County. We're talking about the same people and the same places that we both represent. So we're in this together, and I look forward to working with you all. And I'm with my colleagues also on saying, I want this December resolution gone."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "You want to --"

SAMIR ABDULLAHI, DIRECTOR, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: "And I don't have a presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions from the --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Now, just how do you see it? We talked -- how do you see this? What do you think? There's some documents that we did not get. You had requested information. So now, hopefully, we're going to get the information. So we'll have it before, so we can make an informed decision. The deadlines, there was -- and what has not been mentioned is, I think, really they're two projects within that Eastside TAD that may fall into this unknown category that -- what's that old First Atlanta -- First National Bank building. What's that called?"

SAMIR ABDULLAHI, DIRECTOR, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: "Two Peachtree?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Two Peachtree and that Marietta one, those are the two that we're talking about. So what happened with those?"

SAMIR ABDULLAHI, DIRECTOR, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: "Yeah, well, so, I'll back up. Again, staff effectuated what the Board of Commissioners passed back in December regarding the Princeton Lake and Eastside TAD, which was to request information from Invest Atlanta as to whether those two standards, any outstanding bond debt or redevelopment obligations existed. If those two criteria didn't exist, in that resolution, the Board directed the County Manager to send a note to Invest Atlanta that we would pull funding. It also requested that we seek out all the different TADs, not just in Atlanta that we participate in, as to whether they meet those two standards, not performance based or pipeline based, but those two standards. Again, I think the County Attorney's office would say that's the legal way to pull out, less of a performance-based way for making decision as to why you're pulling out. If

Commissioner Hall moves forward with a resolution that kind of whiplashes that, then we'll activate on that as well."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay, thank you. We'll -- when can we expect, given your busy schedule, to receive the information that's been requested?"

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "I will have the information that you requested in the letter by the end of the week. I can have it by Friday because I was waiting for this meeting. It may take me a little bit longer per the Commissioner Ellis' request. He asked for all of the obligations, the resolutions, the fact sheets. So that's going to take me a moment. But I should be able to have that probably next week as well. So I'll send it in two parts, so that I can -- you can start to make the analysis. But the most recent request, the one I got today at 2:00 o'clock, I should have by next week."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. And then there's -- the -- now, I looked at the minutes of Invest Atlanta and I don't find any record of a discussion or a vote on that Two Peachtree. It's not in there. Everything else is there, but not that one for some reason."

DR. ELOISA KLEMENTICH, INVEST ATL. CEO: "No, it's -- it should be in there. We voted on October --"

ROSALIND RUBENS NEWELL, INVEST ATL. COUNSEL: "The resolution, it was voted on initially in Executive Session, as appropriate under the Open-Meetings Act. And then they came out in Public Session and voted. And I can provide you with the resolution."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "That will be helpful."

ROSALIND RUBENS NEWELL, INVEST ATL. COUNSEL: "Is it okay, we'll put it in the same packet?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yes, ma'am, absolutely."

COMMISSIONER BARRETT: "I want to add to the packet, not to give you more work, but could you also include information on the pipeline projects? What they are, how much we're looking at, and the benefits of those pipeline projects as well for Eastside in particular. Thank you."

COURTNEY ENGLISH, SR ADVISOR, ATL. MAYOR: "Mr. Chair, if I may, briefly? For those of you I haven't had the opportunity to meet personally, my name is Courtney English. I service as the Senior Advisor for the Mayor. I also lead majority of the Mayor's affordable housing efforts, neighborhood revitalization efforts, education efforts, and economic development efforts. And so first, thank you for allowing Dr. Klementich and her team this time. I want to say broadly, first, I want to speak to the pipeline issue. The reason that the TADs have exceeded the 10 percent threshold is because they

worked. Actually, what has happened inside of the TADs is that the tax base has grown. We haven't added additional TADs, that's not legally allowable. And so what I'm offering is that, it's a proven tool that has worked. And now, for the first time actually in the city of Atlanta's history, you have TADs that are able to be activated, really in disadvantaged communities, in Perry/Bolton, Metropolitan, Bankhead Court -- Bankhead, MLK, areas that have for far too long, gone without investment, so that's number one. Number two, as it relates specifically, to the Eastside TAD and the pipeline that we mentioned, what has also happened, candidly, because the Eastside TAD has been effective, because these folks behind me have done a good job, it's also increased property values. The single best tool that we have to increase our ability to develop or build affordable housing is actually the TAD itself. And so what we are trying to propose in adding the pipeline information into going beyond the scope of the information that you all asked for, is to paint a picture of not only what's happening right now, but what is happening into the future. So for Two Peachtree for example, Two Peachtree would be the largest single resident office to residential conversion to affordable housing in southeastern United States. It'll be -- it's a vertical civic center that will fundamentally change the face of Downtown Atlanta and bring revitalization to a neighborhood, candidly, that hasn't had it. We can do this all over the city, in your district, Commissioner, in your district, Commissioner Hall, in your district, Commissioner Arrington. And so I want to -- I want us to be clear and careful when we talk about what the pipeline is, because what we are responding to the market conditions that we are faced with because of Atlanta's explosive growth. And so we are almost victims of our own growth and we're trying counter that by using the economic tools at our disposal like TADs. And so, sure, we'll get you the pipeline information, but know that this Mayor is absolutely committed to doing development in a way that benefits all the citizens of Atlanta, that allows all people to thrive, that allows all people to take place in our explosive growth. The second thing and the third thing I'll say, and I'll be quiet, is that candidly, we've talked a lot of -- there's a lot of talk, at least, about our partnership. Your partner, the city of Atlanta, particularly the Mayor of Atlanta has -- does not know what you all were trying to do. And it's our position that, candidly, when you get the information on Monday, you will find that there's no debt currently on the Eastside TAD. Our folks are telling us, quite frankly that at that point, it affects your removal from the Eastside TAD. And so the calls that you were getting are, candidly, from businesses, from church owners, from -- from constituents who were, candidly, terrified and confused because the projects that they had been counting on -- or the money they had been counting on to do their projects, candidly, is no longer available. And so our legal -- we understand and we've reached out to your lawyers. We've reached out to your staff. And what we have been told is that at the moment she sends that documentation and we verify for you that there's no debt on the Eastside TAD, you are effectively removing your increment, closing -- which would effectively close out the Eastside TAD. That would be catastrophic for economic development in the city of Atlanta. It is not the sign of a good partner. At no point did anybody have a conversation with the Mayor about this. And so we would love to -- we -- yeah, I assure you, he would love to engage in a conversation, I think. A few of you, we've had conversations and we've had conversations. I know, Mr. Chairman, you've had conversations as recently -- but this, none of this happened in a way, candidly, that

makes the city of Atlanta feel good about the partnership that we all have. And so we hope to, you know, get that back right, get on the good foot, if you will. Because we do value your partnership. We do value your leadership and the perspective that you all bring. And we're all trying to serve the same constituents."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "So as you heard, we've had some transition --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "I'm sorry."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "I'll be quick, Commissioner Arrington. And let me say this, I'll be remiss -- it goes back to communication. But also I believe it goes back to responsibility. Because when we put something out in the community, it's out. We can't pull it back. You know, the 150 people that stopped me, either via phone on in the grocery store or whatever, it may be four times that many people, business owners, churches, what have you that believe that Fulton County is not in good faith, being a good partner. That's not the case, let me say that. And as far as the Eastside TAD, it's not being closed down, let me say that as well openly, because it's not. I go back to what I said before, we have a responsibility as elected officials to communicate effectively, not only to our partners and constituents, but also we have to look at the unintended consequences, because we heard this today. Because Invest Atlanta has a very good track record. And I'll -- I would feel bad, personally, if I even shared with you, some of the things that was said to me. And I had to say, that's not the case. And so we have to be conscientious of that. I'm not saying or excusing if someone wanted the information and it didn't come in a timely manner based on what they perceived to be timely, because like Commissioner Hall said, we see you everywhere, we're at the ribbon cuttings. So we know that you're extremely busy. I just hope this will be a lesson in how you should not put the cart before the horse. We need to all learn from this because it did cause a ripple effect. It did cause some calls to come to me where I was literally cursed out because people said, why are you closing the TAD? To the point that I had a conversation with the Chairman. And so what I would say to you, especially you, Mr. English, yes, we need to make sure that all the partners have a conversation in our concerns. Because as we see, it did have a ripple effect. I am -- I am so concerned that it did affect maybe some reputations. But I'm more confident, like Commissioner Hall said, we're going to do what we need to do to make sure that we rescind whatever needs to be rescinded. And I wanted to say that openly. So thank you for bringing that up. Thank you for the excellent work. And like I said, I'm hoping and praying that we will never be in this situation again. Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Commissioner Arrington."

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Just briefly, don't send that paperwork until 16th."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Okay. Thank y'all very much."

COURTNEY ENGLISH, SR ADVISOR, ATL. MAYOR: "Thank you."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "There's an item on page 6 of the Consent Agenda that I thought was on the Regular Agenda. And that is where we're going to be naming Washington Park Library, in part, in honor of Judge Marvin Arrington, Sr. And we're going to have a ceremony, probably next week. Everybody will be invited too to attend that, probably on the 8th, yeah."

CLERK GRIER: "Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, we have one item was removed from Consent. On bottom of page 2, District Board Appointment, 23-0066, Fulton/DeKalb Hospital Authority, Commissioner Thorne has nominated Bernie Tokarz for a District reappointment to a term ending December 31st, 2026."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Yeah, let me ask you, I know Mr. Tokarz told me he has the votes for this, so it doesn't matter what I say. But that's okay. The question is as follows -- what? He told me had the votes. Just be cool, be cool, be cool --"

COMMISSIONER HALL: "I'm cool, I'm cool."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Be cool, be cool. My position on these board appointments is two years consecutive term is enough. That's my opinion. But there was a state law passed specifically for this board, which limited the number of years that one could serve. And I don't recall the specifics of that law. But it was passed a couple of years ago when we were dealing with -- I forget, probably, I guess, was my nominee that I inherited. He would have been on that board 14 years. And the state law was passed to limit the number of years that a person could serve on this board. So my question is, with a termination date of, what is it, 2026? Yeah. Is that in compliance with the state law that was passed?"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "I'm not familiar with the state law. I would have to examine the law and determine how long -- how many terms Mr. Tokarz has served. I know he has served one previous term at least. But I don't know if he served prior to that."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "I don't know what it is today. Commissioner Hall and I can't hear. I mean, it seems like --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "She doesn't know how many terms served --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "No, it's not -- well, you know what the state law says --"

Y. SOO JO, COUNTY ATTORNEY: "I would have to look at the state law for that."

COMMISSIONER HALL: "She's not familiar with that law."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Well, I'll tell you when it came up, when it was regarding Thomas Dortch --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Thomas Dortch."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "-- when it came up. There's a state law that was passed specifically for this board that limited the number of years that -- and I don't know what --"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "If we want to hold it to find out, that's fine. But I mean, you know."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "All right. No objection with holding to get that answer?"

COMMISSIONER ARRINGTON, JR.: "Yeah, but I --"

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "I'm -- yeah. Can we make a motion to hold it because that law affected -- I, first all, Commissioner Thorne, let me say, I do support you. And we've talked about this. But you are correct, Chairman, because it affected Tommy Dortch, Jr. And so -- and when you've been on that board for a certain amount of time, there is state law that prevent you from being put back on that board. And so I will make a motion to hold this to make sure that you see the law because that would be your appointee. I want to be respectful. I want to be legal, but I want to be respectful as well."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "And I'll second it until we get the answer to question. Commissioner Thorne, you want to be heard."

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "Yeah. I mean, I appreciate that. Of course, I don't want to break any laws with an appointment. But according to my appointee, he has no term limits, is what I was told."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: According to who?

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "My appointee. So I would love to get the actual legal standing, so --"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "We'll get the answer. All right. Any other matters to come before us today?"

COMMISSIONER THORNE: "It says it caps it at 12 years. And he's been on there six."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "We're going to get the legal opinion."

COMMISSIONER ABDUR-RAHMAN: "Okay."

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "Thank you. Any other matters to come before us today?"

CLERK GRIER: "We need a -- we're going to have a vote on the motion?"

CHAIRMAN PITTS: "On the hold, motion to hold?"

CLERK GRIER: "Yes. And the vote is open. And the motion passes; four yeas, zero nays."

(There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.)