AMENDED AGENDA

SPECIAL MEETING, OCONEE COUNTY COUNCIL

MONDAY, AUGUST 29, 1994

8:30 AM

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Invocation
- 3. Discussion & Possible Action Regarding Future Status of Inmate Labor in Oconee County, Personnel Adjustments & Budget Adjustments
- 4. Old Business
- 6. New Business
- 7. Adjourn

MEMBERS, OCONEE COUNTY COUNCIL

Mrs. M. Fran Burrell, District I Mr. Harrison E. Orr, District II Mr. Michael E. Harper, District III Mr. Roy B. Strickland, District IV Mr. Alton K. Williams, District V

MINUTES, SPECIAL MEETING, OCONEE COUNTY COUNCIL

The Oconee County Council held a special meeting, Monday, August 29, 1994 at 8:30 am in Council Chambers with all Council Members and the County Attorney present.

Members of the press notified (by mail): Journal/Tribune, Keowee Courier, Westminster News, Anderson Independent, Greenville News, WGOG Radio, WCCP Radio, WBFM Radio, WZLI/WLET Radio, Northland Cable, WYFF TV & WLOS TV.

Members of the press present: Dick Mangrum - WGOG Radio, Alan Bowie - Greenville News, & Kathleen Stoll - Anderson Independent.

The meeting was called to order by Supervisor-Chairman Crain.

The invocation was given by Mr. Strickland.

Mr. Crain informed those present who supervise inmates of the following:

(1) Council determined August 16, 1994 that state inmates would not be used on the roadways in keeping with the July 29, 1994 memorandum (copy attached) from the SC Department of Corrections delineating how inmates could be used.

(2) Council met with Donald Dease, SC Deptartment of Corrections, August 4, 1994 at which time he verbally answered questions regarding the memorandum and indicated he would respond to specific questions in writing if he received them in writing regarding the use of inmates.

However, Mr. Busch, LEC Director, received a letter from Mr. Dease on August 6, 1994 which stated in part...
"This letter is to confirm my conversation of Friday, August 5, 1994 at which time I advised that the Memorandum dated July 29, 1994 from Mr. Parker Evatt, Director, to all designated facility administrators entitled 'Procedures Involving SCDC Inmates at Designated Facilities' is the policy of the Department of Corrections...."

(3) On August 16, 1994 Council voted to terminate its contract with the SC Department of Corrections, Mr. Evatt then indicated he would not answer any questions in any detail. On August 18, 1994, Council reversed its decision to terminate the contract and Mr. Evatt was asked to respond to

Call to Order

Press

Invocation

Meeting (Inmates)

Page 2 August 29, 1994

the questions, but as of this date no letter has been received.

Mr. Crain updated his previous recommendation regarding the hiring of personnel to replace the inmates that can no longer be used outside a compound area:

Public Buildings:

Four Custodian I

PRT:

Five Custodian I and funds for one full time equivalent during

the busy season

Motor Pool:

Automotive Serviceman already

in CCS budget

Road Department:

Six Equipment Operator I

(One to be used in 911 Office)

One Equipment Operator II

One Equipment Operator I already

in budget

One Part Time Security Guard

(16 hours per week)

continue to use county inmates

Rock Crusher:

One Equipment Operator III

Rock Crusher continue to use five

state inmates convicted of non

violent offenses

LEC:

Reduce two Correctional Officers

Mr. Crain's recommendation remained the same in that Oconee County not house any inmates convicted of violent offenses.

The total amount of funds needed for Mr. Crain's recommendation is \$242,124 for salaries, insurance, clothing and bloodborne/pathogen vaccinations.

By law the County has to house unsentenced inmates which averages twenty (20) to thirty (30). Also, by law the County will continue to house all County inmates, Mr. Crain further recommended that the County continue to house approximately fifteen (15) State inmates convicted of nonviolent offenses.

Mr. Bob Busch, LEC Director, addressed some of Council concerns regarding salaries for Law Enforcement personnel asking them to keep the following items in mind:

Page 3 August 29, 1994

- (1) Responsibility for Making Decisions
- (2) Accountability
- (3) Liability
- (4) Job Security if Things Wrong Fear of Action Taken or Not Taken, Self Preservation
- (5) Compensation for Making Decisions

See attached handout from Mr. Busch.

Mr. Jim Smith & Mr. Albert McWhorter of Public Buildings stated they could use no state inmates under the guidelines of the July 29, 1994 memorandum.

Public Buildings

Mr. Smith further stated that the four (4) Custodian positions that Mr. Crain is recommending will hopefully be sufficient.

Mr. Alex James and Mr. Kerry Kerns of Parks, Recreation & Tourism stated that they could not work inmates and adhere to July 29, 1994 memorandum.

PRT

Mr. James further stated that as long as he could retain part time summer help he hoped the five (5) Custodian I positions and the one (1) equivalent to a full time employee would be sufficient.

Mr. Lee Davis, Motor Pool Foreman, stated he would try to work with the one person that is already budgeted in the CCS Department. Mr. Davis further stated he could not work the inmates under the quidelines of the July 29, 1994 memorandum.

Motor Pool

Mr. Clyde Mosely, Road Foreman, stated he could no longer work State inmates under the guidelines of the July 29, 1994 memorandum. He further stated he thought he could continue the level of services with the recommended personnel:

Road Dept.

One Equipment Operator II
Six Equipment Operator I
One already in the Budget
One for 911 Signs
One Part Time Security Guard

Mr. Buddy Hawk, 911 Coordinator, stated they maintained signs on a seven day work week, they also maintain stop signs on County roadways, dead-end signs, barricades and make signs for other departments. They could not do this with just one additional employee.

Page 4 August 29, 1994

Mr. Crain stated a part of the recommendation would be to keep approximately fifteen (15) inmates and five (5) of them would be assigned to the Rock Crusher because they are in a compound. Further the recommendation is to hire one (1) additional employee for the Rock Crusher.

Mr. Tommy Crumpton, Rock Crusher Director, stated the best inmates he has had over the years have been inmates who have been convicted of violent offenses. He further stated he would try to get by with two (2) employees and give up the inmates.

Rock Crusher

LEC

Mr. Bob Busch, LEC Director, stated he would need a total of six (6) inmates: four (4) cooks, one (1) in laundry, and one (1) janitorial person.

After discussion, Mr. Busch stated that he would like to go on record as stating it would take fifteen (15) employees to replace six (6) inmates (Cooks, Custodial & Laundry).

Mr. Orr presented the following recommenda-

tion:

Cut twelve (12) employees from Law Enforcement Department for a savings of \$262,340 plus estimated savings of \$47,000 for fringe benefits, cut the travel line item by \$1,200, operational line item by \$15,000, food line item by \$40,000, phone by \$200, electricity by \$15,000, medical by \$30,000, uniform line item by \$13,750, dues by \$125, school line item by \$1,100 and water by \$500 for a total of \$116,875.

Mr. Orr further recommended the following employees be hired to replace the inmates:

Road Department Five (5)

911 One (1)

PRT Three (3)

Rock Crusher Two (2)

Public Buildings Three (3)

TOTAL NEW EMPLOYEES: Fourteen (14) at \$20,000 for a total of \$280,000. (See attachment)

Page 5 August 29, 1994

Mr. Orr also stated that after listening to the department heads he realized that cutting twelve (12) Correctional Officers may be too many, but he felt there could be enough cut to pay for about half the new employees that were going to have to be hired.

Mr. Orr stated these employees should be transferred to other positions within the County when possible.

Mr. Orr's recommendation is to send all state inmates back.

Mr. Orr further recommended that the Law Enforcement, Safety, Health, Welfare & Services Committee look at the operation of the Laurens County jail.

Mr. Busch stated he felt he could reduce his Correctional Officer staff by two (2) if the County housed no state inmates.

The Law Enforcement, Safety, Health, Welfare & Services Committee scheduled a meeting Tuesday, August 30, 1994 at 6:30 pm to further discuss the inmate matter.

Upon request of Mr. Buddy Hawk, 911 Coordinator & Ms. Marianne Dillard, Mr. Harper made a motion, seconded by Mr. Orr, approved 5 - 0 that the County enter into an open contract with Contech for culvert pipe to repair the County roadways that have been damaged by tropical storm Beryl.

Mr. Harper made a motion, seconded by Mr. Orr, approved 5 - 0 that Council go into executive session for a legal briefing regarding a company that has requested a JEDA loan.

When open session resumed Council scheduled a special meeting Thursday, September 1, 1994 at 6:30 pm in Council Chambers to consider the JEDA request and the inmate situation.

At the request of Mr. G. N. Hunnicutt, Finance Director, Mr. Harper made a motion, seconded by Mr. Strickland, approved 5 - 0 that \$13,429.60 in Accommodation Taxes be sent to the Seneca Chamber of Commerce to disperse as required by law.

Council then went to tour the Oconee County Law Enforcement Center.

When Council returned from touring the facility, Mrs. Burrell was unable to return due to having to go to work.

Culvert

Executive Session

Open Session

ATAX

LEC

Page 6 August 29, 1994

Adjourn

Norman D. Crain Supervisor-Chairman Oconee County Council RECEIVED

AUG 2 9 1994

OCCNEE COUNTY PURCHASING DEPT.

August 26, 1994



engineering, environmental and laboratory services

Ms. Marianne Dillard Oconee County Purchasing 208 Booker Drive Walhalla, SC 29691

Re: Change Order

Five Points Landfill

Project 22.11.7

Dear Ms. Dillard:

Enclosed as we previously discussed are spreadsheet calculations of various scenarios for the change order. Also enclosed is a copy of a letter to DHEC requesting an extension of the closure deadline.

CHANGE ORDER ITEMS

The items in the proposed change order are as follows:

Item #1: On approximately 2.5 to 3 acres of the landfill is soil that does not provide a suitable base with which to construct the landfill cap. The contractor will be required to bridge over the soft area and provide a suitable base to compact against.

Item #2: The contractor has requested additional soil to fill in areas along the top of the hill and ruts along the hillside. This soil was originally to come from on site material that is not available (see Item #3). The ruts have developed as a result of all the rain that has occurred this summer.

Item #3: Due to onsite constraints (soft soil and shallow garbage), the contractor was not able to excavate the quantity of soil anticipated. This has lead to a deduct item of 11,000 cubic yards.

Item #4: Because of the decrease in the amount of usable onsite material, the contractor is requesting an additional 6,906 yards of offsite soil for the erosional layer.

Ms. Marianne Dillard August 26, 1994 Page 2 of 3

Item #5: We recommend that two additional gates be placed along the back part of the property to allow for ground water test drilling and other equipment access to areas outside the fence.

Item #6: We recommend that a contingency be provided for the contractor to haul additional soils. We would anticipate that this would be utilized if further problems develop that would require additional soils. We would like to manage this by allowing the contractor to use this soil only after the approval of the Engineer. Basically, we would like to set up an option that provides fast access to additional soils without having to go through the timely process of a change order.

Item #7, #8 and #9: 80% of the Erosional Layer was originally planned to come from the Rock Crusher site. In an effort to reduce costs and time, the County may want to consider all the erosional layer comes from the present borrow site. Using the borrow site exclusively will require further topsoil stripping as included in item #9.

ESTIMATED COSTS

There are basically four options to choose from as indicated in the summary section of the attached spreadsheet (lines 50 - 53). These options allow for soil to be derived from either the Rock Crusher or Borrow site, with either a Rock bridge lift or a soil bridge lift.

Based on the estimates, the least expensive option is the Soil Bridge lift with all the soil coming from the Borrow Area. This would also have the least affect timewise on the project. The contractor favors this course since he would be able to continue in his current state of production without having much disruption.

If all soil has to come from the Rock Crusher, then the costs between hauling soil for the bridge lift and rock becomes similar. The only significant difference would be the cost to the County in stone (line 12).

If switching the source to the borrow site exclusively is not an option, then we would prefer to go with hauling stone for the bridge lift. Although this will be more expensive, there will be time savings which is critical to this project.

Ms. Marianne Dillard August 26, 1994 Page 3 of 3

DEADLINE EXTENSION REQUEST

Although it appears that the County may be able to get an extension from DHEC beyond the October 9, 1994 deadline, we would still like to obtain certification prior to that date so that the County could avoid any liability for not meeting the deadline. As DHEC has recently indicated to us, they will probably be able to issue a consent order for an extension, but this will not free up the County from the potential of lawsuits for not meeting the deadline. Of course the governing factor in completing the job before the deadline is the weather, assuming the contractor can maintain his current production rate. The attached letter is a copy of the extension request.

We would like for this change order request to be finalized by Tuesday August 30 at the latest since the contractor is going to need direction in order to keep up his production at the current rate. I have included costs in both money and time. Thus not only additional monies but also work days above the original 75 will have to be accounted for.

Please review this material. If you have any questions, don't hesitate to call.

Sincerely

GOLDIE & ASSOCIATES

David R. Devoe Group Leader

Environmental Services Group

DD1\CHANGE.ORD

FFIDGE LIFT Item Unit Cost OTY Total \$7.00 7500 TN \$52,500.00 \$3.40 14550 YD \$49,470.00 \$2.30 14550 YD \$33,465.00 Ē. Rock* Soil - Rock Crusher . Soil - Borrow Area 10 * DOES NOT INCLUDE GOST TO COUNTY IN ROCK - SEE BELOW 12 Cost to County in Rock 3 7500 TN \$22,500.00 13 14 OTHER SOIL NEEDS - SOIL SOURCE = ROCK CRUSHER 17 18 # Total Office Unit Cost OTY Item 20 2 Fill Material - Offsite \$3.40 2500 YD \$8,500.00 21 3 Fill Material - Onsite \$0.95 -11000 YD (\$10,450.00) 22 4 Additional - Erosion Laye \$3.40 6906 YD \$23,480.40 23 5 2 Additional Gates \$650.00 2 EA \$1,300.00 24 6 Additional Soil \$3.40 5000 YD \$17,000.00 26 \$39,830.40 27 28 30 ALL SOIL FROM ROCK CRUSHER 31 32 # Item Unit Cost GTY Total 34 2 Fill Material - Offsite \$2.30 2500 YD \$5,750.00 2
S5 3 Fill Material - Onsite \$0.95 -11000 YD (\$10,450.00) -3
S6 4 Additional Erosion Laye \$2.30 6906 YD \$15,883.80 5
37 5 2 Additional Gates \$650.00 2 EA \$1,300.00 0
S8 6 Additional Soil \$2.30 5000 YD \$11,500.00 4 39 7 Crusher Site | \$3.40 | -27000 YD (\$91,800.00) 40 S Borrow Site \$2.30 27000 YD \$62,100.00 41 9 Topsoil Removal \$1.00 15000 YD \$15,000.00 \$9,283.80 43 4 45 47 SUMMARY (* does not include costs of rock to crusher) 48 TIME ((Am) 49 OPTION \$92.330.40 *Rock Bridge/Soil From Crusher **\$61,**783.80 51 *Rock Bridge/All Soil From Borrow 52 21 Soil Bridge/Soil From Crusher **\$39,**300.40 53 Soil Bridge/All Soil From Borrow • **\$42,748.8**0 54

55 c:\LANDFIL2

Who Chairmand I would Like to fresent a plan I'tech Could help Defray the lost of New Lieing.

First of All I'll give my presentation of Just and also Recommendation for New employees-cuts from OLEC - Beginning with loop

#1. 07/00

#1. 07400 7 02718 2. 07401 8 04709

3 27402 9 07410

5 07404 16 07413

5 07405 11 07414

6 07406 12 07/15

DAVISAD ON SALVIES - \$262,340.00

12/- - 3 emp. Roccinson. 2 emp. Blos. 3 cmp. , 24 / Emp oges -2 ave **20,000-00**

Acc Back

ROND 5 cmp.

911 - 1 cmp

280,000.00

JAVINGO ON FULLY & 5.5, lle,000.00 25,000.00

with my. 600000

47,000,00 SAVINGE

Dinge 47,00000. Salaries 262, 340,00 Instrums 4 117, 375.00 426,715.00

this Prayer 863,301.00

JANINGO on Line Tems TVAVEL - 1200,00

aparetion 15,000,00

400D 40,000.00

Thone - 200 Gernay _ 15,00000 Medial - 30,0000

aujumo 1375000

Dues 125.25

30,00 / 10000

residential 500,00

04. Spring 11 158 : 30

Init

AN JUAL BUDGET ESTIMATE JALARIES AND WAGE REQUEST

наса Year: 1994 - 1995

		D e of	Present Salary	Requested Salary	Recommended Salary	Approved Salar
Linployee	Losition	iri ease	Annual	LeunnA	Annual	Annual
Thomas Cox	Chief Jailer	14B	19,606	19,606	20.503	20,503
Paul Mode	Jailer - SGT.	11B	16,894	16,894	17,401	17,401
Amelia Davis	Jailer	8A	14,204	14,204	14,914	14,914
Mane Satterfield	Jailer	8B	14,560	14,560	15,027	15,027
Cathy Franklin	Jailer	8D	15,338	15,338	15,798	15,798
Gloria Herp	Jailer Jailer	8D	15,338	15,338	15,798	15,798
Luther Richardson		8A	14,204	14,204		14,914
and the second of the contract	Jailer Jailer	8A	14,204	14,204	14.914 14.914	14,914
Lloyd Simpkins	Jailer Jailer	8A	14,204	14,204	14,914	
Tommie Boiter NEW JAILER HIRED MARCH		OA	14,204	14,204	14,914	14,914
Jacqueline Bailey	Jailer	8A	14,204	14,204	14,914	121. 021.
Brian Bridges	Jailer		14,204	14,204	14,914	14,914
Kenneth Porter	Jailer	8A	14,204	14,204	14,914	14,914
Anne Hunter	Jailer	8A	14,204	14,204	14,914	14,914
Joe Harett, III	Jailer	8A	14,204	14,204	14,914	14,914
NEW JAILER REQUESTED IN	v 94-95 budget					-}
	Jailer	8A		14,204	14,914	
	Jailer	8A		14,204		
	Jailer	8 <u>A</u>		14,204		
The second secon	Jailer	A8		14,204		
	Jailer	<u>8</u> A		14,204		
				ļ	 	
A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O			•	·		-
						
Company of the second s				<u> </u>		
A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O						
The state of the s						
error or spirituals and the second of the second of						
2 3 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5					<u> </u>	
TOTALS	The state of the s		209,572	280,592	233,667	218,753

ACTIVITY/DEPARTMENT DETAIL

	423.01	GËNERAL FUND					
	ACTUAL 92-93	BUDGET 93-94	Y-T-D 93-94	REQUEST 94-95	RECOMEND 94-95	APPROVED 94-95	
, 						·	
	674,610	756,356	405,041	853,681	793,341	793,341	
	49,184	25,000	32,684	50,000	40,000	40,000	
	21,615	25,000	16,134	25,000	25,000	25,000	
				17,000			
DEPT.		3,000		5,000	3,000	3,000	
TOTAL =	745,409	809,356	453,859	950,681	861,341	861,341	
	2,987	4,000	2,549	5,000	4,000	4 000	
	12,969			12,500	12,000	4,000	
		12,000	7,741 19,642	30,000		12,000	
	48,020	25,000	•		30,000	30,000	
en han 'an	2,811	2,000	1,855	2,500	2,250	2,250	
RES	78,366	70,000	30,813	70,000	70,000	70,000	
	64,537	50,000	34,847	60,000	40,00 0	60,000	
	1,786	3,250	6,780	3,500	3,250	3,250	
E	6,217	4,000	2,318	4,000	4,000	4,000	
	13,866	9,000	9,070	15,000	12,000	12,000	
	18,348	18,500	11,996	23,000	23,500	23,500	
HYSICIANS	19,071	18,500	14,576	25,000	25,000	25,000	
	5,763	6,000	5,172	6,000	6,000	6,000	
	7,452	6, 500	3,168	6,500	6,500	გ,500	
ROPERTY PRO	1,445	1,000	1,057	2,500	1,000	1,000	
	1,140	1,000	575	1,000	1,000	1,000	
GRAM	1, 5	1,000	443	1,000	1,000	1,000	
TOTAL =	284,793	231,750	152,602	267,500	261,500	261,500	
OTAL	1,030,202	1,041,106	606,461	1,218,181	1,122,841	1,122,841	
ACI	<u>CIVITY/DEPARTM</u>	ENT SUMMARY					
	745,409	809,356	453,859	950,481	861,341	861,341	
	284,793	231,750	152,602	267,500	261,500	261,500	
	0	0	0	Q	0	O.	
TOTAL ==	1,030,202	1,041,106	606,461	1,218,181	1,122,841	1,122,841	

			SHERIFF	423.01	GENE	ERAL FU
·····	?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	CATEGORY	ACTUAL 92-93	BUDGET 93-94	YT
	•	PERSONAL	SERVICES			
					•	
	3	101 102	WAGES & SALARIES OVERTIME	674,610 49,184		
	3	104	HOLIDAY PAY RESERVE DEPUTY	21,615		
		110	SUPPLEMENTAL SALRIES DEPT. TOTAL =	745,409	3,000 809,354	
	•	NON-PERS	ONAL SERVICES			
	3	209	POSTAGE	2,987	4,000	
		210	OFFICE SUPPLIES	12,969	12,000	
		211	TELEPHONE	48,020		
	*	215	TRAVEL - MEETINGS	2,811		
		216	AUTO SUPPLIES-GAS, TIRES	78,366		
	_	217	AUTO MAINTENANCE	64,537		
	. •	218	AIRPLANE EXPENSE	1,786	3,250	
		227	COMPUTER MAINTENANCE	6,217	4,000	
	_	233	DEPT. SUPPLIES	13,866	9,000	
	•	241	UNIFORMS	18,348	18,500	
		248	MEDICAL SUPPLIES & PHYSICIANS	19,071	18,500	
	_	264	TRAINING	5,763	6,000	
	3	269	TRANSPORTS	7,452	6,500	
		271	DRUG FUND & STOLEN PROPERTY PRO		: 1,000	
		272	CONSTRACTED SERVICES	1,140	1,000	
	_ •	273	CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAM	15	1,000	
			TOTAL =	284,793	231,750	
			ACTIVITY/DEPARTMENT TOTAL	1,030,202	1,041,106	
	•	47,77,404,4164,79,48,294,44,14,14,14,14,14,14,14	<u></u>	<u>TIVITY/DEPARTME</u>	ENI SUMMARY	***************************************
	_		PERSONAL SERVICES	745,409	809,356	
	, •		NON-PERSONAL SERVICES	284,793	231,750	
		-	CAPITAL OUTLAY	()	0	
			ACTIVITY/OEPARTMENT TOTAL =	1,030,202	1,041,106	

				·
CATEGORY	ACTUAL 92-93	BUDGET 93-94	Y-T-D 93-94	REQUEST
PERSONAL SERVICES				
101 WAGES & SALARIES	136,510	136,277	68,804	28
TOTAL =	136,510	136,277	68,804	
NON-PERSONAL SERVICES				
220UTILITIES	29,573	32,500	12,747	·
222 DEPT. SUPPLIES	14,183	15,000	6,144	1
242 FOOD - PROVISIONS	53,081	52,500	33,133	7
243 LAUNDRY & LINEN	1,648	1,500	398	
TOTAL =	98,485	101,500	52,422	11
ACTIVITY/DEPARTMENT TOTAL	234,995	237,777	121,226	39
	ACTIVITY_DEPARTME	NT SUMMARY		
PERSONAL SERVICES	136,510	136,277	68,804	28
NON-PERSONAL SERVICES	98,485	101,500	52,422	11
CAPITAL OUTLAY	Ō		0_	
ACTIVITY/DEPARTMENT TOTAL =	234,995	237,777	121,226	39
	The second secon		and the same and t	
				and the second s
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
The gas to a section of the contract of the co				
			9	