

Wicomico County Council
Open Work Session
September 17, 2013

Work sessions require written minutes that reflect each item that the public body considered, the action that the public body took on each item and each vote that was recorded. **It should be noted that at work sessions, the Wicomico County Council does not take formal action, nor is a vote taken on any item discussed.**

Present: Matt Holloway, President; Bob Culver, Vice President; Sheree Sample-Hughes, Stevie Prettyman, Gail M. Bartkovich and Joe Holloway. Mr. Hall was absent.

In attendance: Matthew E. Creamer, Council Administrator; Maureen Lanigan, Deputy County Attorney; Steve Roser, Internal Auditor, Eric Heim, Intern and Melissa Holland, Recording Secretary.

Also in attendance: Dr. John Fredericksen, Superintendent of Schools, Cathy Townsend, Assistant Superintendent of Schools; Board of Education members: Kim Hudson, Carolyn Elmore, Ron Willey and Don Fitzgerald. Brian Foret, Director of Facilities; Bruce Ford, Desmond, Hughes, Dave Reeve, Rick Smoak, Bob Langdon from the Board of Education Central Office. Mr. Wayne Strausburg, Director of Administration, was also in the audience. Mary Ashanti, President of NAACP, was also present.

Board of Education:

A PowerPoint presentation was shown. The Council office had sent a list of questions to be discussed to the Board of Education and their responses were shown in the PowerPoint. Dr. Fredericksen said they made improvements in the areas of technology and security. The first question asked was: What measures have been implemented and what other security upgrades will be done in all of the schools and what is the timeline? Mr. Foret said they had begun an effort to improve the security in all facilities and there are three main elements which needed to be focused on and they are observation, communication and control. In observation they have added closed circuit TV cameras and surveillance systems over the past several years

and that aspect has been completed in all schools. He also said that have been working to standardize all PA and telephone systems with 911 access and finalized improvements to have consistent 800 megahertz emergency response radios throughout the system. The control system has to do with physical improvements and allows the ability to regulate and authorize access and respond to actions in the schools. With the extra money received they will be able to work on this at an accelerated rate. They wanted to raise the level at all of the schools to a degree of improvement so all schools had security. He said Phase I has been completed at all schools which is a basic video, monitored/controlled access with intercom and a remote electronic latch control. Phase II will add a programmable proximity access control system meaning that there is a FOB or a card key for access distributed to authorized personnel for access to facilities. Device enhancements are added to main entrance doors. Phase III would be an entrance area modified to create a physically secure entry vestibule. Mr. Foret went over the timeline: Phase I is expected to be completed by November of 2013; Phase II by January 2014 and Phase III by August 2014. Mr. Foret said the Emergency Preparedness Plans and desktop drills add to the safe and secure environment of the schools. There are 53 bullet proof boards distributed among classrooms.

Timeline of Bennett Middle School:

Mr. Foret said the security fence and access gates are secured around the perimeter. He said they are 72 employees working on site. All the concrete footings are 100% complete on the outside perimeter and 99% complete inside the building perimeter. He said the floor slabs for the gym, stage, weight room and fitness room are complete. All of the foundations walls are complete. The masonry walls have begun. The school will have 360 geothermal wells and 300 are in place. The project is on schedule. Move in date is summer of 2015 and the students would begin in August 2015. Dr. Fredericksen explained that the county cost is \$55 a square foot and another county which is working on a similar building is paying \$75 per square foot, due to increasing construction costs. This will lead to a saving for the Board of Education.

Mr. Joe Holloway asked about water at Beaver Run to which Mr. Foret said he is meeting with the City of Salisbury and the county to see if

public utilities could be brought in at the school. He said there was a sewer problem and MDE recommend they try to hook up to a public facility. The school has two separate septic systems and one of them has been having problems. It was pumped over the summer. Some minor system upgrades have been approved by MDE and they will work with food service to eliminate some of the pressure.

Staffing Question:

"Is North Salisbury losing staff to take care of the students which are still attending North Salisbury that came from Prince Street and will any staff be replaced? The response was North Salisbury did not lose staff to Prince Street School. Dr. Fredericksen said in 2011-2012 Prince Street families were given school choice and several students went to North Salisbury. There were no additional teachers hired. There were approximately 35 choice students the first year from Prince Street to North Salisbury, and most returned to Prince Street the second year. These students were in grades 3, 4 and 5.

Mrs. Prettyman asked if additional teachers had been hired with the funding the Council gave them to which Dr. Fredericksen replied they were informed that money was for Social Workers and they have hired two social workers. The social workers have not begun yet, as they had to give notice at their current jobs but will start within the next month.

Technology: What technology upgrades are taking place at all of the schools? Mr. Bob Langdon, Director of Technology came before the Council. He showed the Technology mission to the Council. He stated there are 14,500 students; 3,000 staff; 25 locations; 729 classrooms; 10,000 personal computers; student to pc ration-2:1; there are 1100 tablets/pda's; 650 Interactive Boards; 250 servers and 400 wireless access points. He said Wicomico County has the largest technology footprint on the shore. With the budget funding received there were two projects which are being completed: Project 1 for \$610,000 goal is for laptops for online testing capacity. This will consist of 25 laptop carts, 16 laptops per cart; 1 cart per location; \$20,000 for each configured cart; flex of 4 carts from budget delta; PC Mice (3000) for grades 1-4; Project 2 (\$200,000) goal for smart interactive boards for Delmar and Mardela. Delmar-27 wall mount units, 1 rolling unit \$89,000; Mardela-37 wall unit mount units, 1 rolling unit and \$111,000. A Dell mid-

grade laptop is what is being purchased. When the full board testing begins there will be upwards of \$10,000 kids who arrive at school and go onto the computer and begin their testing. Dr. Fredericksen said this is a very big project. Online testing pilot run will take place on November 1st, 2013. The next two rounds of schools will be assessed in the near future for next budget year. Mrs. Bartkovich asked how long the SMART boards will last and what is replacement window. Mr. Langdon said at five years there is some aging and he said they buy mid-grade. Mr. Willey said some of the ones at Westside Intermediate are still in use after ten years of use. Mrs. Sample-Hughes asked how Wicomico ranks with Dr. Lowery's Superintendent of Schools timeline. Dr. Fredericksen said they are working hard and feels that Wicomico County is in the middle or just behind the middle. He would like Wicomico County to be in the first third. The timeline is for the laptop carts are to begin the online testing pilot run on November 1, 2013. The timeline for smart interactive boards is to have them ready for instruction by January 1, 2014.

School Buses:

Mr. Smoak, Mr. Reeve and Mr. Hughes came before Council. Mr. Reeve began with saying there is a push from the state for school systems to constantly evaluate how they provide bus services based on the Audit Report from December 2008. He said they are committed to supporting the small bus contractors. He said as a result of not being able to award several small bus contracts because they are not profitable and the fact that it is becoming more difficult for bus contractors to obtain credit to buy new buses, the BOE is in a difficult position to find transportation for the students to get to school.

"How many buses does the BOE own?" Mr. Reeve said in 2000 the Board of Education purchased a special needs bus to carry special needs kids to the Judy Center, which is bus 563. In 2013 a 12 year old bus was purchased from Washington County. Four additional buses were purchased and three were received in August and one more bus will be delivered in mid-October. To replace the bus to take the kids to the Ridge School a smaller bus was purchased to replace 563 and 563 will be used as a spare bus. When a special needs bus, equipped with a wheel chair lift, breaks down, it is difficult to find another bus to transport the student. Mr. Culver asked why a 12 year old bus is being

used, to which Mr. Reeve said in 2006 legislation was passed to allow the lower eastern shore counties to run their buses for 15 years. Mr. Joe Holloway asked if a contractor would be allowed to start a new contract with a 12 year old bus, to which Mr. Reeve said an existing contractor can replace a bus with a bus 10 years old or less and most counties require buses less than five years old and other counties require replacement with a new bus. Mrs. Prettyman asked how many of the buses will be used for field trips to which Mr. Reeve said all will be used for special field trips. He said there are different periods of time where field trip requests are so heavy they have to turn down trips. The BOE owned buses will go into rotation just as the contractors are placed on a rotation.

“Are the drivers of the buses contractual employees or BOE employees?”- Mr. Reeve explained that bus drivers for buses 150, 151, 152 and 153 are BOE contractual, non-benefited, hourly employees working less than 5.5 hours per school day. He also said there may be opportunities for summer runs as there is a struggle to find summer school transportation. They are building a pool of substitute drivers. The bus driver/foreman works 8.0 hours per day, 260 days per year, and is a BOE contractual, non-benefited, hourly employee. He said they operate the route to the Ridge School as well. They will be driving a bus in the summer and the Ridge School program goes 235 days. Students who through the IEP are required to have non-public placement attend the Ridge School. Most of the children have behavioral issues.

“From what fund were the buses bought?”- Approximately \$440,000 of unspent FY13 transportation funds were realigned from the contractor mileage, fuel adjustment, computer software, and special education travel allowance accounts and this was used to purchase five new school buses and one used school bus. Short term financing was considered but rejected due to available unspent FY13 Transportation funds. The majority of the funds used to purchase school buses were generated from cost avoidance in the contractor mileage and fuel adjustment accounts due to lower fuel prices and increased efficiencies in routing and scheduling through the use of Zonar Systems GPS and Edulog routing and scheduling software.

"Was there a need for five new buses?"- Mr. Reeve said at the end of the 2012 school year several bus contracts were turned back into the Board of Education due to contractors retiring, or their not wanting to buy new buses. They awarded all contracts except minimum contracts. Minimum is where they serve in town areas and it only takes one or two bus stops to pick up sixty kids. The contractors could not get financing to buy new buses for the minimum routes because they don't generate enough profit. They had to do two temporary contracts last year using the activities buses. At the end of the year two more routes became available and one was reassigned to an existing contractor. A cost comparison study of county versus public owned was conducted. The least profitable routes to the contractors' had the most cost savings to the Board of Education. The buses are housed at the Jersey Road Complex and there is a facility almost completed to hold 12 buses total. The building needed fencing and stonework to close the existing compound area for a cost of \$50,000. Mrs. Bartkovich said that student transportation showed a cost savings of \$284,000, however, the revenue increased by \$19,194 and the expenditures shows a decrease of \$116,403 and she does not understand the decrease of \$284,000. Mr. Ford said the offset is against the increase to contractor. The existing contractors were increased about 2% in hourly and 1% in mileage. He said there were savings from efficiencies of \$280,000 and they gave increases to existing contractors for \$100,000 and the net of those two is a decrease of \$100,000 overall. Mr. Reeve shared a regulation which restricts the purchase of used buses to previously registered school vehicles originally used to transport Maryland Public School students, because Maryland bus specifications are higher. WicomicoCounty can not buy a bus from Delaware. This restricts the availability of dependable and affordable used school vehicles. The Council would be willing to talk to the Delegates about not being able to use other buses from other states. Mrs. Sample-Hughes asked what the difference requirements are in other states and possibly why a bus from another state couldn't be used. Mr. Reeve said ¾ inch marine grade plywood floor is required instead of standard plywood and they require laminated glass. Mr. Hughes said Maryland is very particular and is mostly safety enhancements. He said the construction of a school bus differs among many other states.

“What was the actual cost?”- One Thomas Type II, 28-passenger bus was \$58,977; Two International Type I, 72- passenger buses at \$94,820 each; Two Blue Bird Type I, 72- passenger bus at \$6,000 for total cost of five new buses and one used bus at \$440,617. A contractor vs. county comparison was completed as well. It breaks down the individual cost. He said the county is exempt from paying sales tax and fuel is cheaper. For a contractor there is per vehicle allotment at \$18,485 and an administrative supplemental fee at \$1,560 as well as liability insurance at \$501.19. The cost to the county is depreciation over 15 years at \$6,266.67 as well as collision/comprehensive insurance at \$275 and liability insurance for \$501.19 which gives a total savings of \$13,503.33. The same miles per year would be used for contractor or county owned. The fuel rate is \$0.0181 cheaper for the Board of Education and the maintenance rate per mile is \$0.817 for a contractor and \$0.5610 for the Board of Education giving a total savings of \$2,713.59. The route hours per day are 4.25 for contractor and 4.59 for the Board of Education. The days per year are the same at 180 and days per year for students is 10 for both. There is no reimbursement factor for county owned buses and the bus will be used 765 hour per year by the contractor and 872 by the Board of Education. The driver hourly rate for the county owned bus is \$15.40 and salary costs total for a contractor is \$14,343.75 and \$13,430.34 for Board of Education owned buses. Fringe for county owned is \$2,210.63 and total salary costs of \$15,640.97. The total annual cost of a contract for a contractor is \$48,240.09 and only \$33,320.39 for the Board of Education owned buses which is a difference of \$14,919.70 and the difference over fifteen years of \$223,795.44.

“Was a new person hired to oversee the new routes for the new buses?”- Mr. Reeve said the bus driver/foreman position has been assigned the following duties. They drive a school bus five hours per day transporting students to the Ridge School in Cambridge. They also have administrative duties three hours a day which include: overseeing maintenance of the seven BOE-owned school buses; managing contracted hourly school bus drivers; securing bus driver substitutes, address customer questions and concerns regarding BOE routes and schedules and other duties are assigned. This person will be certified to do behind the wheel training and can coach and mentor the drivers for defensive driving. At this time the main four items

are able to be done by this new position. Mr. Culver asked if it was done for savings or a convenience to the students. He said they could have bumped up another driver and had the four routes done at a much cheaper rate. Mr. Reeve said there is a reimbursement formula and they can't change one hourly rate without raising everyone's. It would have to be done on a bid system and that is not currently allowed. Dr. Fredericksen said they will save \$15,000 a route. Mr. Culver said the county didn't have to finance a vehicle which makes a difference because the contractors have to finance. Mr. Culver feels there was a better use for the money than buying buses. Dr. Fredericksen said depreciation and maintenance is factored in. Mr. Reeve said they are not trying to put contractors out of business. Mr. Hughes said it is a perfect storm and in 2015 is the 15 year anniversary of opening up Salisbury Middle. He said there will be 8 contractors by 2015 by unofficial notification of them not renewing their contracts. He said with a new school opening in 2015 and being minimum contracts they don't feel the contractors will pick up these contracts. He said they have to transport the children to school. Dr. Fredericksen said the children are getting home as late as families want and some kids get on the bus at 6:01 a.m. and get off at 5:10 p.m. Mr. Hughes said very few contractors can't take a lot of field trips due to DOT requirements. The Board does not have to comply with DOT requirements. He said only three contractors have DOT certification.

"What will the total labor cost be?"- Bus 150 driver services-\$16,186.19; Bus 151 driver services- \$18,741.91; Bus 152 driver services- \$20,445.72; Bus 153 driver services -\$17,890; Bus 154 driver foreman "driver" services-\$25,586.26; driver foreman administrative service- \$15,351.75 and total projected labor costs is \$114,201.83. Dr. Fredericksen said these are estimates only.

"What is the yearly projected maintenance cost for the buses?"- The total annual FY14 cost projects for fuel and maintenance based on mileage recorded the first three weeks of school is: Bus 150-\$11,139.38; Bus 151- \$8,876.69; Bus 152- \$10,230.44; Bus 153- \$12,493.12; Bus 154-\$34,479.64 and the total projected fuel and maintenance costs are \$77,219.

Dr. Fredericksen said they were asked about their legislative audit and they will be having their wrap up meeting and they have been given questions, ideas and thoughts. He said they are going through Delmar's school information and will be having staff meetings in October. As soon as a report is received the Council will receive a copy. Any other reports received they will share with the county including the Sage Study which is being completed.

Present for the following open work session discussion on Fire Safety Fee Changes: Kevin Wright, Fire Marshal and Jack Lenox, Director of Planning and Zoning.

The Council adopted the current fee structure which went into effect in July 2010. There is one fee which covers the plan review process and all required inspections to achieve a final COP from the applicable building department. The current fee is 60% of the building permit fee of whichever jurisdiction is issuing the permit or \$75 whichever is greater. The change proposal would give the submitting party two options when paying the fee due. This does not change the amount owed just the way it is collected. The first option would be to leave the same. The second option is primarily for larger payments that have considerably larger fees than what is typical and these splits up the money due into two payments. The submitting party can choose to submit their plans for review and pay 25% of the total fee owed. The remaining 75% would be collected prior to issuing the plan review transmittal letter. The letter would not be issued until final payment is made. If the option is changed and the project being reviewed is canceled prior to the permit being issued then no refund can be issues. This will come before the Council in the form of a legislative bill. Council was in agreement with this moving forward. Mrs. Bartkovich asked if the fees were paid in the office to which Mr. Wright said they pay directly to Planning and Zoning and the payment is then sent to Finance. It will be the same as it is now. One additional level of accounting will have to be completed. Mr. Culver asked if they had spoke with Mr. Brad Gillis to which Mr. Lenox said they will show this to him to get his thoughts.

Agriculture Stormwater Management Review:

Lee Beauchamp, Director of Public Works came before Council. Mr. Beauchamp said the farming community, poultry community and County Executive office asked his department to look at their fee structure and Stormwater review process. They did comparisons with other counties, as well as, Delaware. Mr. Beauchamp said they reviewed Dorchester County, Somerset County, Sussex County, Delaware and Worcester County. Wicomico County is in the middle for fees for Stormwater review. There is currently a grant in place in Sussex County, Delaware and there is currently no charge for Stormwater management plan review. He said they have contracted out their review services for agricultural projects with Dale Pusey who also works with Somerset County. They have also reduced review time down to thirty days from initial submission to concept date after concept there would be 130 day or less review time to go from preliminary to final plat. Mr. Pusey's fee structure is not in the memo and his fee is \$60 per hour. Wicomico County has already contracted Mr. Pusey; however, they have not yet had to utilize his services. The fee structure has not yet changed. Mr. Beauchamp is proposing a pilot program to study the hours used on the review process. Fees will be monitored for six months. After six months there is shown a reduction in the time it takes to review projects, there will be recommendations to consider lowering the fees. There have not been any new projects submitted, but there are two poultry houses currently under review. Mr. Beauchamp has reached out to the Delmarva Poultry Industry for their thoughts in this matter. The County reviewers are geared more too commercial builders and he felt by getting the agricultural community a reviewer they were comfortable with would make a difference. Mr. Beauchamp said he is not proposing any changes at this time. The work session is only to inform the Council so members are aware in case constituents have questions. Mr. Beauchamp said he will come back to the Council in six months with an update.

Airport Commission discussion re: Greater Salisbury Committee membership:

Mr. Creamer said he was not present the day the vote was taken however he was there the previous meeting where it was brought up and he spoke against it. He said at the meeting after the vote was taken, he spoke in the Commissioner Comments portion of the meeting

so the record would show that he had opposed the Airport Commission being a pay-for-membership member of the Greater Salisbury Committee, as not being a proper use of public funds. Following the meeting he made specific comments regarding this topic and that is recorded in the Airport minutes. Mr. Joe Holloway said he doesn't understand what the Greater Salisbury Committee is to which he said it seems it is a private club. He also showed pictures of grass and a hole in the fence and the grass grown up around the Airport sign. He said to give \$1600 to an organization and he feels there is a better way to spend money. He would like to see the Council send a letter to the Greater Salisbury Committee asking for a refund. The County Executive is an affiliate member who is not charged and he or any of his department heads can attend and just pay for the cost of lunch. Mr. Strausburg said he spoke with Mr. Pollitt who feels it was inappropriate for Greater Salisbury to extend an invite to Mr. Bryant without speaking to him or Mr. Pollitt first. He said The Greater Salisbury Committee approached Mr. Bryant who spoke to the Airport Commission about it. Mr. Strausburg said he made it clear he did not think it was appropriate. He said Mr. Pollitt said he was not opposed to a joint letter depending on the contents of the letter. He said that Mr. Pollitt feels how the Council does. Mr. Strausburg said the Airport Commission members are recommended by the Executive and confirmed by the Council. He also does not like the tone of the email to the Council members because of an expenditure being questioned. He feels that a message has to be sent that it is not a good use of public funds and the attitude of the Airport Commission was inappropriate. Mrs. Prettyman said the Greater Salisbury Committee is a group of business and professional leaders and to be eligible for active membership a person must be a CEO or most senior local leader or considerable quality experience in volunteering in civic and or community improvements. She feels that the Airport Commission should get their money back and she is not happy with the emails from Mr. Dickey and Mr. Wyatt. Mr. Joe Holloway would like the Council to send the letter jointly with the Executive asking for a refund. Mrs. Sample-Hughes said she doesn't think that a separate committee should go out and join other committees as they are representing the county. She said the point needs to be made clear that the county doesn't want them to participate so she said to send the letter. Mrs. Bartkovich feels the Airport Commission actions were

inappropriate to join and she feels a joint letter would be appropriate. She would send the letter to the Greater Salisbury Committee and cc Mr. Bryant and Mr. Dickey. She also said since their appointments are coming up for re-appointment she feels that needs to be considered. Mr. Strausburg said the Airport Commissioner terms have expired and Mrs. Bartkovich said it is time to look for someone new. Mr. Joe Holloway feels they need to spend \$1600 on the grass. The Executive's office will be sending over appointments as they had an intern go over all Board and commissions and will be sending over appointments for other committees as well. Mr. Strausburg said the construct of the commission is a bit hard. Mr. Bryant reports to Mr. Dickey and the Airport Commission and he does not report to Mr. Strausburg. Even if he offers suggestions Mr. Dickey calls the shots. The Airport Commission has virtually total control over the Airport. Mr. Joe Holloway did say that some of the people on the committee with the history are very important as well. Mr. Strausburg said he has pushed his department heads to be proactive since he came on board. His most serious qualm with the Airport Commission is that they are on cruise control and the standards are not what they should be such as cleanliness, grounds and strategic planning. He does not feel they are aggressive or strategic in their thinking. Mrs. Sample-Hughes asked if the county was going to start with the leadership to which Mr. Strausburg said a discussion is needed to determine what role the airport plays in the future and who is in the commission seats. He feels there are a couple of really good ones and a couple who are along for the ride. He is not sure if the construct needs to change. He feels having the right people on commissions is important. He said Mr. Dickey does put a lot of work into the commission. Mr. Joe Holloway asked Mr. Creamer to craft a letter and send it to the Executive's office. The Council doesn't have the authority to tell them to get a refund, however the Council can express their concern with them joining. Mrs. Bartkovich said if a commission member wants to attend they can go under the Executive's membership. Mr. Strausburg feels there are two separate issues: the expenditure of the money which was not a good public expense and the behavior of the Airport Commission to the legislative body. Mr. Creamer said within minutes after he sent the letter to the Commission he received a call from Brent Miller who asked what the Council's objection was and that he could not attend the work session as he would be in Chicago on September

17th. Mr. Creamer said he explained the concerns of Council members. Noting that Mr. Miller had expressed his inability to meet with the County Council, and Mr. Church had not been at that meeting, the Council was not shunned by everyone on the Commission. Ms. Foxwell had said she voted in favor, believing it would be good for networking for the Commission, as did Mr. Dickey. Mr. Creamer added that Ms. Foxwell said it is a one year membership and they will re-evaluate the matter next year. Mr. Hall did not vote in favor. Mrs. Prettyman said the worst part is the way that the legislative body has been treated. She said that something has to be done. Mrs. Prettyman said the letter should say the Council respectfully requested a meeting with you all to the Airport Commission. Mr. Strausburg said the Airport Commission should be put to task because of their behavior. He said that Mr. Pollitt didn't feel that Mr. Wiseman should have approached the Airport Commission. Council decided that two letters will be sent: one to the Greater Salisbury Committee and one to the Airport Commission. They will both be joint letters. Mrs. Sample-Hughes feels the letter should be sent to the Commission as she said how Mr. Wiseman would know not to contact a county department head. She asked if it should say that county department heads should not be contacted. Mr. Strausburg said it could say that any solicitation should come through the Executive's office. Mr. Creamer will prepare two letters for the Council review.

Mr. Joe Holloway asked if there is a requirement from the FAA that there be a separate commission to which Ms. Lanigan said it is only in the county code.

Liquor Control Board Discussion:

Mr. Roser said he received the audit and a management letter from PKS for the Liquor Control Board. The current payables as defined in the formula are actually accounts payable plus Maryland retail tax payable. Recalculated it comes to the same amount. That formula should have been used. Inventory the average inventory of \$722,000 comes out to a turnover ratio of 7.21 or fifty one days. He suggests codifying the formula by putting stipulations as suggested if Council agrees as to what current payables are and a specific number of day's sales and inventory as inventory definition. He said if day's sales and inventory is calculated at 55 days instead of 51 days it comes out as

\$786,000. Their beginning is \$742,000 and ending with \$702,000 and he suggested that they have 49-53 days of inventory. Mr. Roser did say that in the management letter he said there is a finding the same as last year. The finding was there were a few expenses that lacked proper documentation relating to ATM's and this is store three and it is the same finding two years in a row. PKS believes the board should review checks at their monthly board meeting. Mrs. Bartkovich asked if it is one person or several people, to which Mr. Roser said he would look into that. Mr. Matt Holloway asked how to codify the formula to which Ms. Lanigan said the Council would do it by Resolution. All of the information will be sent to the Law Department to prepare a Resolution. Mrs. Prettyman asked if the audit showed how many raises and how much were given to employees. Mr. Roser said he is not sure who received the raises. Mr. Roser asked if the Liquor Control Board has minutes of its meetings, to which Council was not sure. Mr. Creamer said if there are minutes, the county does not receive them. Mr. Roser said he would look into that as well.