

# **Minutes - Draft**

# FAB-Finance, Audit & Budget Committee

Wednesday, July 7, 2021

11:00 AM

### **Special Called Meeting**

This meeting will be conducted via teleconference (Zoom). Simultaneous public access to the meeting will be available (1) via live stream on DCTV s webpage, (2) on DCTVChannel23.TV

Meeting Started At: 11:02AM

Attendees: Commissioners Rader, Johnson, Patrick, Bradshaw, Terry, Davis Johnson

Present3 - Commissioner Larry Johnson, Commissioner Jeff Rader, and<br/>Commissioner Lorraine Cochran-Johnson

#### I. DISCUSSION

Midyear Budget

-meeting called to consider amendments to the FY21 midyear budget and setting of millage rates for the 2021 tax year -Z Williams: we provided the board with a budget prior to the ARP modifications; the CEO is currently going through some of those; his direction to us is to receive from the Board those projects, initiatives that you would like to have in the budget be presented to the Administration

-Question JR: Could you provide your timeline regarding additional projects be integrated into the process? We are trying to maintain a level of review that would help inform a decision by the entire Board, that the commissioners can see and support that are in consistency with programmatic objectives within the Board.

-LCJ: appropriations should be sent through committees of jurisdiction. Question for the Administration's timeline, when should we have these items through a committee so that we can move forward?

*Z* Williams: we were thinking we would receive today these individual initiatives with some sort of endorsement, and provide that back to you Friday. We will have found a way to fund each of the items. In that scenario, if there were another meeting on Monday the committee(s) would endorse them.

-Question JR: A vote on the millage rate will be coming Tuesday correct?

Z Williams: that is correct

-JR: we can dispose of the setting of the millage rate Tuesday, let the actual budget amendment go on another two weeks, so that we can finalize the Administration's proposal and add these potential amendments

-LJ: I agree we can pass the millage rates Tuesday then come back with budget amendments in two weeks. The tax anticipation note is key; that is part of the millage rate package, and can keep us funded for a while

-Question JR: Is there a necessity to act on the TAN (tax anticipation note) by Tuesday?

Z Williams: we have that projected to go through FAB next Tuesday, before full BOC approval afterward

JR: Requests Staff to prepare a separate item that would adopt millage rates, in order to stay on schedule with publishing the tax bills in a timely fashion, and defer action on the mid-year budget proposal until we have the final version of the midyear budget from the Administration, and received amendments from the commissioners regarding their inputs.

*-LJ*: Motion for 2 week deferral on the budget amendments, and millage rates prepared for standalone adoption on Tuesday 7/13/2021

-Second LCJ

Vote: yes unanimous

-JR: Requests Central Staff to draft memo to cover this motion explaining the intent to the other members of the BOC -Z Williams: at what point should we receive items from the BOC?

JR: I'd like to propose that between now and next Tuesday, commissioners would work to craft a memo that identifies any missing items seen thus far in the presentations; it would be

appropriate for Commissioners to try to run those through committee process between now and a subsequent special called meeting on 7/21 or 7/22 (to finalize the committee substitute with any amendments), and then adopt an amended budget on 7/27 with the tax funds budget, and anticipate a proposal for the ARP funding subsequent to that.

-Z Williams: Regarding ARP funding and CSB, I would like to place on next week's agenda a vote on the incentive bonus from the ARP funds

-JR: I will be out of town and out of cell phone range between 7/16 - 7/26. The committee could still meet however, with committee recommendations already in place

*-LJ*: *I* would like to make a separate motion of the incentive portion. Also regarding the CSB, could we expound on their vote that happened in PECS recently in July?

-TT: That was a program that was funded by the CARES Act that was for a year. This is regarding the opioid residential program services. Was time sensitive because the period ended soon. That is why we added this to the ARP budget recommendation.

-JR: to make action timely next Tuesday, it needs to be in the form of a substitute amendment to the midyear budget as opposed to a new item

Z Williams: that makes sense

-Question JR: are you discussing passage of the retention bonuses for Public Safety or countywide retention bonuses? Z Williams: The budget would be adopted, and that's where the non-public safety retention bonuses are. I'm specifically referring to the ARP funding for the Public Safety retention bonuses.

-Question JR: Now the question is do we fund public safety bonuses through ARP? What is the necessity of having to act on the public safety bonuses at this next BOC meeting?

Z Williams: we made the commitment that we would have this passage occur in July

-Question LCJ: I'd like to see the comparative data. I'm not against the bonuses, but the bonuses were announced prior to us having the discussion. Regarding recruitment, has there been a budgetary line item created for recruitment? We all have

needs as it relates to policing, and we haven't reached where we need to be regarding this allocation from ARP funds. Z Williams: we'd be happy to provide comparative data. Recruitment would have to be presented in ERPS. We have also provided a number of data related to crime rate and policing strategy in comparison to other counties. We will provide comparative data for salaries as well as our recruitment strategy.

-JR: the bonuses have moved from ARP to budget to ARP due to new federal guidance. But we need to address the tax funds budget on Tuesday, and now it seems ARP funding will also be discussed on Tuesday.

Z Williams: the data will be available tomorrow on the public safety salary comparisons.

-Question LJ: since we're in a different type of year with both ARP funds and normal budget, we can expect these hiccups in terms of what can be utilized for ARP due to updated Treasury guidance. For the comparative study, I haven't seen it. Not sure if we need that for an incentive bonus; this incentive would go a long way if we have something to send out for our public safety. Our officers have not had a rest or break during the pandemic; this is a great first step. After we see the comparative data, not sure if it will relate to what we need regarding incentives.

-Question TT: question for our Sheriff - regarding the ARP public safety incentive, that is money that has been received has been generally supported. Regarding the 2 week additional timeline, I did not have OPS make a recommendation on the DeKalb Growers program, I'd like to have that recommendation in the next 7/20 OPS meeting. Regarding Sheriff - There was a request from the department withdrawn, that comprised of \$2,721,008 in salary increases. What is the reason for that? Sheriff Maddox: the importance of that bonus is to keep the individuals that we have. I am 153 detention officers short and 54 deputies short for example.

-Z Williams: we can provide the written answers for the Central Staff questions document

-LCJ: I'd like to suggest that those replies be in writing. I do support the bonus, but I am concerned beyond the bonus in what we are going to do; we need a plan beyond the bonus.

-Question LJ: I agree about the written questions. Any follow-up can be done on 7/21

-CEO Thurmond: I am lending my support for the retention bonuses particularly for public safety personnel. I agree with everything that has been said. Regarding what the Sheriff said, it takes 6 months to train a police officer. What I have not done in my tenure, I haven't spent a lot of time talking to those public safety personnel who get the job done. This has been the most difficult time to recruit and retain officers in the history of our nation. We have provided raises for law enforcement every year since 2017. These bonuses are important to the men and women that we all support. I would encourage that you support this minor gesture in who we are as a public safety team.

-JR: since we are focused on these budgets, and another motion for recommending them on Tuesday, I have another couple of questions. First, are there any parameters built around the retention bonuses; for example are any recruits eligible or any payment over a period of time?

-CEO Thurmond: there will be parameters, just like any raise. These are retention bonuses, so these are prospective -JR: requests COO incorporate this into the report on comparative data that is being shared with the BOC

-MDJ: I would like to voice my support for these public safety bonuses

-Question RP: I echo the comments of support for the bonus. I have spoken with businesses within district 1 and there are concerns of retainment. As a former staff person, it is the appreciation that is key that elected officials don't always see -Commissioner Rader requests a report from the Administration on comparative data and also on the parameters under which the bonuses would be allocated to the staff

*Z Williams: for clarity, there will be two separate items. The millage rate and the ARP funding; we will work with Law to flesh that out.* 

-JR: it seems to me that our current action does not include a recommendation on the bonuses as a standalone item, out of ARP funding. Committee members do you have a motion?

-LJ: motion to approve the public safety bonuses and CSB funding be approved under the ARP Act.

-second LCJ

-vote: yes 2-0-1 (JR abstain)

Meeting Ended At: 12:08PM

## MOTION was made by Lorraine Cochran-Johnson, seconded by Jeff Rader, that this agenda item be adjourned meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Rader, and Commissioner Cochran-Johnson Barbara H. Sanders-Norwood CCC, CMC