COUNTY COMMISSION MEETING - SPECIAL SESSION

MONDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 30, 1991

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT:

COUNTY COMMISSION MET PURSUANT TO ADJOURNMENT IN A SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SULLIVAN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AND MEETING THIS MONDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 30, 1991, BLOUNTVILLE, TENNESSEE. PRESENT AND PRESIDING WAS HONORABLE WILLIAM H. "JOHN: MCKAMY, COUNTY EXECUTIVE, GAY B. FEATHERS, COUNTY CLERK AND CURTIS TACKETT, DEPUTY SHERIFF OF SAID BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AND OF SAID COUNTY TO WIT:

The meeting was called to order by County Executive, John McKamey. Curtis Tackett, Deputy Sheriff, opened County Commission and Commissioner Jim King gave the invocation. Pledge to the flag was led by County Executive, John McKamey.

Roll was called by County Clerk, Gay Feathers. Commissioners present and answering roll call:

ROBERT L. (BOB) AMMONS WAYNE ANDERSON A. B. ARRINGTON CAROL BELCHER JIM BLALOCK FRED CHILDRESS MARGARET DEVAULT O. W. FERGUSON RITA GROSECLOSE RALPH P. HARR EDLEY HICKS MARVIN HYATT TERRY D. JONES JAMES L. KING, JR. CARL R. KRELL WAYNE MCCONNELL PAUL A MILHORN HOWARD PATRICK CRAIG M. ROCKETT, JR. MICHAEL RUTHERFORD MICHAEL SURGENOR RANDY TRIVETT

ABSENT: HAROLD CHILDRESS - JONES FORTUNE

This being a Special Session of the Board of Commissioners, there was two resolutions on the agenda - Adoption of Recommendations of McNeary Insurance Consulting Services for Property, Casualty and Liability Insurance and Reapportionment of County Commission. The following pages indicates the actions taken on each resolution.

TO THE HONORABLE Wm. H. "JOHN" MCKAMEY, COUNTY EXECUTIVE, AND THE MEMBERS OF THE SULLIVAN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS IN <u>Special</u> SESSION THIS THE <u>30th</u> DAY OF <u>December</u> 19.91.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING <u>Adoption of Recommendations of McNeary Insurance</u> Consulting Services for Property, Casualty and Liability Insurance (Copy Attached)

WHEREAS, TENNESSEE CODE ANNOTATED; SECTION _____, AUTHORIZES COUNTIES TO_____

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Sullivan County, Tennessee, assembled in <u>Special</u> Session on the <u>30th</u> day of <u>December</u> 1991

THAT <u>BE IT RESOLVED. That the Sullivan County Board of Commissioners adopt the</u> recommendations of McNeary Insurance Consulting Services for the County's Property, Casualty and Liability Insurance.

| 12/30/91 | Motion by: Comm. Ammons | To include Options 2 and 3 |
|----------|--|--|
| | Seconded by: Comm. Anderson | Motion passed by 273 voice vote of |
| | | the Commission. |
| | | |
| | ····· | |
| | | · |
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | |
| | | |
| | ······································ | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | |
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | |
| | | ······································ |
| | | |
| | | |

All resolutions in conflict herewith be and the same rescinded insofar as such conflict exist.

| | This resolution shall become 7 | me effective on | , 19_, the pul | blic welfare requiring it. |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| H. | Duly passed and approved Attested | • | | Dec. 12 30.91 |
| pa | County Clerk | | M. H. MCKamen County Executive | |
| | INTRODUCED BY COMM SECONDED BY COMMISS | | 10ck ESTIMATE guson FUND: | D COST: |
| | COMMITTEE ACTION: Administrative Budget Executive | <u>APPROVED</u> | DISAPPROVED | DEFERRED DATE |
| | COMMISSION ACTION Roll Call Voice Vote | <u>{AYE } {NAY</u> 202 | } {PASS } {ABSI 2 | ENT} {TOTAL}24 |
| | COMMENTS: Motion w to adopt the resolut | as made by Comm. ion as amended. | Harr and Seconded | by Comm. Ferguson |
| | PASSED 12/30/91 RC | ILL CALL VOTE (| AS AMENDED) | |
| | | | ······ | |

McNeary Insurance Consulting Services, Inc.

December 13, 1991

Mr. William H. McKamey County Executive Sullivan County P.O. Box 509 Blountville, TN 37617

RE: Competitive Bids — General Liability, Automobile Liability & Physical Damage, Excess Liability, Crime, Law Enforcement Liability, Public Officials Liability, Ambulance Attendant Errors & Omissions Liability, Property, Boiler & Machinery, Electronic Data Processing, and Inland Marine

Dear Mr. McKamey:

McNeary Insurance Consulting Services, Inc. was engaged to prepare specifications and seek competitive bids for the County's Employee Benefit Programs and the above referenced coverages for their respective anniversary dates. It is my understanding that the Employee Benefit Program has been placed into effect. With regards to the above referenced lines of coverage, the following agencies and companies were invited to present a proposal:

- 1. Sedgwick James, Inc. Knoxville, TN
- 2. Sam Bray Insurance, Inc. -- Kingsport, TN
- 3. Kingsport Development Company Kingsport, TN
- 4. Edwards, Tipton, Witt Agency Kingsport, TN
- 5. Burke, Powers & Harty, Inc. Bristol, TN
- 6. Paramount Insurance Agency, Inc. Bristol, TN
- 7. F.J. Brownell & Son Kingsport, TN
- 8. Pope Robinette Insurance Agency Kingsport, TN
- 9. Rogers Agency Kingsport, TN
- 10. Bennett & Edwards Insurance Kingsport, TN
- 11. Toohey & Jordan Agency, Inc. Kingsport, TN

We did not get a response from the following agents:

- 1. Rogers Agency
- 2. Bennett & Edwards Insurance
- 3. Toohey & Jordan Agency, Inc.

6525 Morrison Blvd., Suite 200 / Post Office Box 220925 / Charlotte. North Carolina 28222 / (704) 365-4150 / FAX: (704) 365-4155

Mr. William H. McKamey December 13, 1991 Page 2

Sedgwick James, Inc. respectively declined to participate in the process and specifications were mailed to the following agents:

- 1. Sam Bray Insurance, Inc.
- 2. Kingsport Development Company
- 3. Edwards, Tipton, Witt Agency
- 4. Burke, Powers & Harty, Inc.
- 5. Paramount Insurance Agency, Inc.
- 6. F.J. Brownell & Son
- 7. Pope Robinette Insurance Agency

We received proposals from the following agents:

1. Kingsport Development Company

- 2. Burke, Powers & Harty, Inc.
- 3. Paramount Insurance Company, Inc.

Sam Bray Insurance, Inc. submitted our specifications to PENCO, which is the managing general agent for the County Self-Insurance Pool and they declined to submit a proposal.

I am attaching a spreadsheet detailing insurance proposals received from the above agents as well as your current program. The following is a brief narrative on each program.

Paramount Insurance Company, Inc.

Paramount provided a quotation on General Liability, Police Liability, Excess Umbrella Liability, Public Officials Errors & Omissions, and Automobile. I used premiums quoted by Kingsport Development Company for their mono-line proposal to fill in where Paramount Insurance Company did not quote so that I could come up with a bottom line figure for this program of \$618,699, excluding the Umbrella.

This program has a \$50,000 deductible per claim with a \$100,000 aggregate. The police liability coverage was quoted on a claims made basis, which is a disadvantage to the coverages you currently have. This program also excludes injury to any volunteers, which is a disadvantage. There may be some other disadvantages and questions I would have about the program but, due to the involved, I have not spent a great deal of additional time on this proposal.

The second option offered by this agency was a Retrospective Rated Program with a \$100,000 Self-Insured Retention and a \$50,000 Self-Insured Retention. I have exhibited

N . . .

Mr. William H. McKamey December 13, 1991 Page 3

the \$50,000 Self-Insured Retention on the attached. The major disadvantage to a Three-Year Retro is that losses in any year can spill over to another year and that the total Retro program is subject to the three year maximum, which in your case would be \$2,854,118, which includes the \$900,000 aggregate deductible limit. I have to use this deductible limit since your present loss information is not credible enough to forecast accurate losses. This would translate to an average annual maximum of \$951,373. If you were to add the nonsubject premium of \$140,963, you would have a total maximum annual premium of \$1,092,336.

Burke, Powers & Harty, Inc.

This agency submitted a proposal for Ambulance Attendant Errors & Omissions, Property, Boiler & Machinery, Electronic Data Processing Equipment, and Inland Marine. As you can see from the spreadsheet, this proposal was higher than the mono-line proposal submitted by Kingsport Development Company.

Kingsport Development Company

·, .

This is your incumbent agent and they submitted three different options. The first option was a fully insured program where each policy was separate. The total premium for this program, excluding the Umbrella, is \$876,724.

The second option is an All Lines Aggregate with Lloyds, which is your incumbent carrier. This program has a \$50,000 Self-Insured Retention up to a maximum of \$350,000 for the year. There is a \$1,000 maintenance deductible per loss and a \$1,000,000 Excess limit above the \$350,000 Aggregate SIR. This program encompasses General Liability, Commercial Automobile Liability & Physical Damake, Crime coverages, Law Enforcement Liability, Public Officials Liability, Ambulance Attendants Errors & Omissions, Property, Electronic Data Processing and Inland Marine. The Boiler & Machinery policy is written separately. The total premium for this program is \$529,538, exclusive of the Umbrelia.

The third option submitted by Kingsport Development Company is an Alternate All Lines Aggregate through Crum & Forster. This program has a \$75,000 Self-Insured Retention with a \$420,000 maximum SIR. There is a \$500 maintenance deductible and a \$1,000,000 Excess limit above the Aggregate Loss Fund. This program includes General Liability, Automobile Liability & Physical Damage, Crime coverages, Low Enforcement Liability, Ambulance Attendant Errors & Omissions, Property, Electronic Data Processing equipment, and Inland Marine. The Boiler coverage and Public Officials Liability is written separately. The total premium for this plan \$447,960, exclusive of the Umbrella.

Mr. William H. McKamey December 13, 1991 Page 4

As you can see, there is approximately \$81,578 difference between the two All Lines Aggregate options. However, Crum & Forster has a \$75,000 Self-Insured Retention, with a \$420,000 maximum, plus you must take into consideration the potential \$25,000 per loss deductible under the Public Officials Liability. The Lloyds Aggregate Program includes discrimination coverage, whereas under the Crum & Forster program you must go to the Public Officials Liability policy for this coverage, and it is subject to a separate \$25,000 deductible. The Crum & Forster program offers sexual harassment coverage, whereas the Lloyds program does not. The Lloyds program will offer Premises Liability coverage for landfills, whereas the Crum & Porster program does not. I realize this is not a factor at the present time, but should the County ever elect to purchase a landfill, this could become a factor. The Lloyds program offers Fire Legal Liability, whereas the Crum & Forster program does not. The Lloyds program does not have an Aggregate limit on the liability portion of your policy, whereas the Crum & Forster policy does. The Lloyds program offers liability coverage for riot and civil commotion, whereas the Crum & Forster does not. The Lloyds program offens coverage for discrimination, whereas the Crum & Forster program does not.

Options

Nº . . .

There are several options to the Lloyds program that I have negotiated on your behalf.

- 1. Since the All Lines Aggregate has a \$50,000 Self-Insured Retention, and according to your Risk Management Department, your money and securities exposure at all of the locations listed in the specifications, with the exception of one, is below the \$50,000 limit, I would suggest that you consider deleting inside & Outside Robbery coverage from this All Lines Aggregate Program and increase the Faithful Performance Bond from \$75,000 to a minimum of \$250,000. In my opinion, Employee Dishonesty is a larger exposure to the County than the small amount of monles that you may have on hand being stolen by robbery or burglary.
- (2)) Lloyds will credit you \$10,000 on their premium if the \$1,000,000 Bxcess Loss Fund is reduced to \$500,000. In my opinion, this would be worthy of your consideration since your \$350,000 loss fund is reduced during the period of a year by the amount of losses you have. Once this loss fund is reduced, you have first dollar coverage up to \$1,000,000. For the credit that first dollar coverage would only be up to \$500,000 and then you would go back to the \$50,000 per loss deductible. In essence, you would have to have \$850,000 in losses in any one year before you would start incurring the \$50,000 deductible again.

Mr. William H. McKamey December 13, 1991 Page 5

> 3) Lloyds will give you a \$15,000 credit on their premium if you delete the liability coverage associated with your ambulances. This would include the Automobile Liability and Physical Damage as well as Ambulance Attendant Errors & Omissions Liability. You can then purchase this coverage from Volunteer Firemens Insurance Services Organization on a first dollar basis not subject to any deductibles. This coverage would cost you \$38,781 for a \$1,000,000 limit. For an additional \$5,517, you could purchase Fellow Member Liability, Portable Equipment coverage, and a \$1,000,000 Excess policy. The main advantage to this would be first dollar coverage for your Ambulance Physical Damage and Liability. The disadvantages would be the additional premium and the Ambulance Attendant Errors & Omissions Liability would be on a Claims Made form.

- 4. You can purchase an additional \$1,000,000 Umbrella over and above the limits already afforded with the Lloyds program, for \$100,000. This Umbrella would serve as excess over Public Officials, Police Professional, as well as all of your other liability coverages. This option merits your consideration.
- 5. Self-Insurance is of course another option for the County to pursue. However, in my opinion, it is not a real option at the present time. I say this for the following reasons:
 - We really do not have a true picture of what your losses will be. With only one year of credible loss experience (and it is green), it is difficult to forecast what future losses would be. In addition to losses, you would have to purchase excess coverage to protect the County against a catastrophic loss and judging from the premiums reviewed in this proposal, this excess coverage for all lines would probably be in the neighbor hood of \$300,000 -\$500,000. Based upon the premium being charged for your Property coverages on a mono-line basis, it would not make sense to self-insure that, so you would have to add the Property premium (for \$100,000 deductible) of \$65,275, plus the Boiler premium of \$8,000, and the Contractors Equipment premium of \$22,148, for a total of roughly \$400,000. On top of this you will have to add whetever your total losses would be and the cost of having these losses adjusted. In my opinion, before self-insurance can be realistically considered, the County must build a credible data base of losses in the appropriate lines of coverage. This should include both paid and reserved losses.

Mr. William H. McKamey December 13, 1991 Page 6

In summary, if it is not already evident, I recommend that the County remain with the All Lines Aggregate program through Lloyds of London. This program is an improvement over last year as a result of this process, both in premium savings as well as terms and conditions.

- 1. There is a \$58,025 savings in hard dollars.
- 2. There is a \$50,000 reduction in the Self-Insured Retention per loss and a \$75,000 reduction in the Aggregate Self-Insured Retention.

ų i

- 3. Loss expenses are included in the Self-Insured Retention.
- 4. The Fellow Employee exclusion has been eliminated, thereby offering protection for supervisors against suits from fellow employees.

I will now be happy to entertain any questions that you or the commissioners may have with regards to this exercise or the coverages afforded.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Kempton, CIC, ARM Vice President

۰..

SHELING COUNTY

| 20 | | | | | | COLC! | ter 31, 1991) | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|-------------------|----------|--------------------|
| · | Paraebunt Aponcy | Reminia | Paramount Aquinty Retro | Remerke | Burke Powers Narty | Remonks | Kingsport Development Cigua | Remotika | All Lines Aggregate (loyds | | All Lines Approprie Crueb Forste | r Roleris | Current | Remoriks |
| ieneral Liabilityr | | | | | | | | .* | | | | | | |
| \$1,000,000/%2,000,000 | \$194,415 | \$50,000 9ed | \$194,415 | \$50,000 SLR | No Quete | | 832, 133 | | \$400,000 | \$50,000 SIR | \$265,263 | \$75,000 \$18 | 90,00 | \$100,000 SIR |
| Nedical Payment \$5,000 | Neo - | (\$1,000,000) | | | | | Included | | Included | | Included | | | |
| Fire Legel \$50,000 | Included | (\$1,200,000) | | \$300,000 App. | | - | Included | | Yes | \$350,000 HAX | No | \$4250,000 MAX | | \$425,000 NAX |
| #5 Separate App. Limits. | Yes | | | | | | Yes | | Yes L | pest Exp., Included | - | Loss Exp. Inclus | | Loss Exp. Exclude |
| #6 Knowledge of Occurrence | No | | | | | | Yes | | | 1,900 Maint. Ded. | | \$500 Naint, Dec | | \$1,000 Maint. Des |
| S Errors 4 Omissions | | | | | | | Yes | | No S | 1,000,000 Excess | No | \$2,000,000 Age | • | \$500,800 Excess |
| No Fellow Employmen | No - | | | | | | Yes | | Yes | Loss Fund | Yes | | | Loss Fund |
| #10 Employee Senefits | Included | | | | | | Included | | Included | No Aggregate | Included | | | |
| #8 .90 Day Cancellation | Yes | | | | | | Tes | | Yes | | Tes | | | |
| #16 Nostile Fire | Yes | | | | | | Yes | - | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| #17 Athletic Participation | Yes. | | | | | | Inclusied | | Included | | Yes | | | |
| #19 Teacher Liability | Included | | | | | | Included | | Included | | Included | | | |
| #20 Corporal Punishment | included | | | | | | Included | | Included | | Included | | | |
| #23 Discrimination | | | | | | | | | Yes | | No | | | |
| #3 Engineers/Anchitects | Yes | | | | • | | Yes | | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| #26 x=1 | Yes | 7 7 | | | | | Yes | | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| #28 Riot & Civil Commotion | Yes | | | | | | Tes | | Yes | | NO | | | |
| Commercial Autor | | | | | | | , | | | | | | | |
| \$1,000,000 CSL | \$149,165 | \$50,000 Dec. | \$172, 113 | \$50,000 SIR | No Quote | | \$227,214 | \$200 Ded Pd | | | Included | | Included | 1 |
| Hedical Pey \$5,000 | \$1,000 | ALL Vebicies | | | | | Included | | Included | | Included | | | |
| Comprehensive \$2,500 ped. | 542,324 | Limited to Specified | | | | | 80 | | Included Callisian | | Included Collision | 50,000 SIR ACY | | |
| Collision-Ampulances | \$4,615 | ACV | | | | | Included | Agreed Value | Included | Aprend Value | Included | | | |
| #10 Broader Pollution | No. | | | | | | 90 | | WD- | | X0 | | | |
| #13 Employees As (ranks, (DAD | 933) Yes | | | | | | Tex | | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| #14 90 Day Cancellation | Tes | | | | | | Yes. | | Yes | | Tes | | | |
| #16 Feliow Employee | Yes | | | | | | Yes | | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| 817 HCS - 90 | No. | | | | | | 10 | | No | | | | | |
| #22 Gerage Limbility | \$372 | Gerage Keepers Only | | | | | Included | | Included | | Included | | | |

·--- 1

| | Persecunt Agency | | Paranount Aparty Retro | Remerks | Storke Powers Rarty | Remptits | Kingeport Development CIGUA | Rewrits | All Linns Approprise Ligyte | Remarks | Alt Lines Appresse Crue Forster | Remerks | <u>Current</u> | Rama <u>rk</u> ı |
|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| uniocetta: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$1,000,000 CSL | \$129,027 | | \$129,027 | | No Quore | | \$69,679 | | \$190,000 | | \$100,000 | | ** | |
| \$2,900,000 | | | | | | | \$116,847 | | \$140,000 | | \$140,000 | | | |
| \$3,000,000 | ** | | | | | • | \$152,542 | | | | | | | |
| #21 Athletic Participation | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>ពីភ្នំពេល</u> ទ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Faithful Perf. \$75,000 | \$8,060 | DC | \$8,060 | KDC. | No Quate | | \$8,060 | | Included | Commondial Elaniost | Included | | Included | |
| Money & Securities | | | | - · · | | | Included | | Included | ••• • • | Included | | | |
| Courthouse | | | | | | | Included | | Included | ••••••• | Included | | | |
| Bound of Education | | | | | | | Included | | Included | | Included | | | |
| av Enforcement Liebility: | \$94,781 | | \$94,781 | Claims Mode | No Quote | | \$120,000 | Indication | Included | | Included | | Included | |
| \$1,000,000/\$3,000,000 | | No Age. | | 350,000 SIR | | | - | Only | | | | | | |
| | | Claims Node | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | \$\$0,000 bed. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ublic Officials: | \$39,375 | | \$39,375 | \$50,000 STR | | | \$42,480 | 254 bed. | Included | | \$42,480 | 25it Bed. | Included | |
| \$1,000,000 | • | No Agg. | | | | | \$36,100 | 501-0ed. | | | | | | |
| Prior Acts | Included | | | | | | \$29,736 | TOOM Decl. | | 12/3/90 | | 12/3/90 | | |
| | | \$\$0,000 ped | | | | | | 12/3/90 | | | | | | |
| Inverse Condemnation | | 10 | | | | | | ŝio | | No. | | 30 | | No |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00 | issiones | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$7,000,000 | Incl. | No Professional for Nurses or | Incl. | | \$15,785 | | \$28,934 | | | Inclusied | | Included | | Included |

| | | | ۰, | | | ` | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------------|-------------|---|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|---|----------------|---------------------|-----------|--|
| | Included | \$100,000 | Included | \$100,000 | Included | | | | | | Included | | | Extra Expense \$100,000 |
| |)neluded | \$700,000 | Included | \$100,000 | Included | | | | | | | | | Madia \$50,000 |
| | 3 ne luded | \$200,000 | | \$500,000 | Included | 8 | Included | | | | | | | #10 Transit 525,000 |
| | | | | | | | 51,830 51,555 | | 52, 104 51, 710 | 8 | 91,ESO | Ř | 9025, 14 | 51,000 Deductible 55,000 Deductible |
| | Included | 500,552 | Included | 53E, 20E | Included | | | | | | | | | Hardwire \$265,335 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Electronic Data Processing: |
| | | | | | | | | | | | • | • | | • |
| | | | 7# | | ĩ | | | | | | | | arten | #11 60 Day Notice of Cancellation |
| | 39,66 1 | | 57,105 | | 35 ,000 \$7,105 | | 55,000 57,105 | | 111,895 99,570 | ğ | 12 ,000 | Ŗ | 12,000 | 52,500 Deckstible |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Caprehenive |
| • • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>Boile: & Machinery:</u> s:,000,000 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | (1500,000) | Ťes | | TR | | | ₹ | | | | | - | #18 Inc. Cost Government Ord. |
| | | | ă | | ĩ | | | Ŗ | | | | | ation | #10 60 Day motice of Cancellation |
| | | | 7# | | á | | | 8 | | | | | | to replacement cost |
| | | | Υ t a | | , 1 8 1 | | | 8 | | | | | | #4 Agreed Amount |
| | | | :: | | 11 | 5 \$100,000 Ded. | 57, 334 , | 41.04 | 5267,093 5258,873 | | | | | 550,000 Desketible |
| | | | Incluand | | Included | С , р | Included | | Inclused | 0 | 5109,925 | ğ | \$100,925 | Extra Expense \$1,000,000 \$10,000 Daductible |
| | | 1200,000 | Included | \$500,000 | Included | a | Included | ц. | Included | | | | | Inumsit \$200,000 |
| | | | Included | | Inclused | a | Included | | ₹ | | | | | Earthquake \$2,500,000 |
| | | | Included | | Included | D. | Included | | No | | | | | Flood \$2,500,000 |
| | ¥49,455 | 000,000,028 | \$49,455 | 550,000 ,000 | 54 9,455 | | •. | | | | | | | Propertor \$183,495,097 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | J | | | |
| Remaining: | Durnat | le serts | All Linns Aggrepate Dryab Forster | Romarks | ALL Linne Aggregate | | Eingeport Bevelopment ClEAA | R | Murke Powers Kenty | | | 7 19 10 17 | Permaynt | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0765 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | 500 Deductible 51,000 Deductible | interd Maring: Per Schedule - Mianbet | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | 120,027 | 52, HJ | No Quett | far good |
| | Roc. Vi | ¥, | | |
| \$1,092,336 | 5507,056 5951,377 E 5140,963 5129,027 | 122,148 | | Per mount Agency Lettp |
| 6 NAX | SS(1,056 Retro Prusius 8951,373 Estimated Arrunt 1940,943 Won Stabj. 19129,027 Rec. UL | Ŗ | | |
| | | 27,52 | | Burke Poetra |
| | | Cont. Equip. \$1,800 Ded. Specified | hadie, Etc. | |
| | 9476,774 949,670 944,374 | | к й | Kingsport Deve lapsort CIGA |
| | | | at animat | , 199 |
| 567,538 | 865, 258 862, 258 862, 628 | ¥0,800 | Included | All Lines Aggregate |
| N.C. | Surplus Lines Tex Rec. UL | 521,222 Est. Claims Fer 540,500 Aperery Fee | Blanket | |
| | 5147,960 5100,000 | • • •27,762 | Included | Ail Lines Aggregate Crueb Forster |
| \$267,960 NAX + P/0 Ded. | Nec. U. | Est, Claim Agenty M | 81, united | |
| ř. | <u> 116,260</u> 8577,563 | n, claim fee \$14,260 Agency fee \$64,900 | Humbor Included | Content. |
| | Tax | - | Plankat | logity |

•

N .•

,

•

:

| | RESOLUTION NUMBER 36 | Q |
|---------------|---|--------------------|
| | TO THE HONORABLE Wm. H. "JOHN" MCKAMEY, COUNTY EXECUTIVE, AND MEMBERS OF THE SULLIVAN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS IN <u>Regular</u> SESSION THIS THE <u>16th</u> DAY OF <u>December</u> 19 91 |) THE I |
|] | RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING <u>Reapportionment of County Commission</u> | |
| | | |
| • | | |
| | WHEREAS, TENNESSEE CODE ANNOTATED; SECTION, AUTHOR COUNTIES TO | RIZES |
| | NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Su County, Tennessee, assembled in <u>Regular</u> Session on the <u>16th</u> day of <u>Decem</u> 1991 | |
| | THATWHEREAS, Tennessee Code Annotated 5-1-111 does require C Commissions to reapportion itsself predicated by the last Census (1990), and | ounty |
| | WHEREAS, The County commission is required to reapportion by January 1, 1992 subject T.C.A. Code, therefore | unde |
| | reapportionment developed by the State Regional Planning Office and plans subjuction by Commissioners, and reapportion itsself by January 1, 1992. Motion by: Comm. Harr TO AMEND: Vote on Shbool Board's amended call Seconded by: Comm. Ferguson first. Motion passed. The amended call Calculations were approved by roll of the Commission. 20 Aye, 2 Nay, | culat nded |
| | | |
| 91 | Motion by: Comm. Ferguson AMEND: All plans submitted with less than 2 Seconded by: Comm. DeVault be deleted. Motion approved - Show of hands | 4- me m |
| | (WAIVER OF RULES REQUESTED) | 4- mem |
| | Motion approved - Show of hands (WAIVER OF RULES REQUESTED) Motion by: Comm. Hicks AMEND PLAN B as follows: Seconded by:Comm. Belcher | 4- mem |
| | Motion approved - Show of hands (WAIVER OF RULES REQUESTED) Motion by: Comm. Hicks | 4-mem |
| 91 | Motion approved - Show of hands (WAIVER OF RULES REQUESTED) | |
| 91 | Motion approved - Show of hands (WAIVER OF RULES REQUESTED) | t exist |
| 91 | Seconded by: Deviation Deviation Motion approved - Show of hands (WAIVER OF RULES REQUESTED) Motion by: Comm. Hicks AMEND PLAN B as follows: Seconded by: Comm. Belcher Change Precinct #8 to 1V Change Precinct #3 to V Change Precinct #3 to V Amendment passed by roll call vote of the Commission. 13Aye, 7Nay, 2Pass, 2Absent All resolutions in conflict herewith be and the same rescinded insofar as such conflict | t exist |
| 91 7 24 | Seconded by: Deviation Deviation Motion approved - Show of hands (WAIVER OF RULES REQUESTED) Motion by: Comm. Hicks AMEND PLAN B as follows: Seconded by: Comm. Belcher Change Precinct #8 to 1V Change Precinct #3 to V Change Precinct #3 to V Amendment_passed by roll call vote of the Commission. 13Aye, 7Nay, 2Pass, 2Absent All resolutions in conflict herewith be and the same rescinded insofar as such conflict This resolution shall become effective on | t exist |
| 91 7 2y | December | t exist |
| 91 7 2y | Motion approved | t exist |
| 91 7 2y | Seconded by: Comm. Devalue Devalue | t exist |
| 91 2 2y | Motion approved | t exist ing it |
| 91 2 2 | Motion approved - Show of hands | t exist ing it |

SULLIVAN COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD AMENDED CALCULATIONS

.

L.

SULLIVAN COUNTY REAPPORTIONMENT PLAN D 7 BOARD MEMBERS TOTAL DEVIATION = 9.83%

| | • | 11-C 11-G 11-J 12-BR 12-CB 12-LG 12-OK <u>12-WV</u> -2.37% | 3537 2282 3369 2170 2319 2437 3139 <u>1747</u> 21000 | IV ~ | 8 11-R 14-CH 14-MP 18 20 + 4.59% | 2037 4071 6008 3873 2347 <u>1235</u> 19571 | VII 4-A 3318 17-C 1899 17-E 4549 17-R 2856 17-S 3234 17-W 2919 <u>21 2814</u> -5.24% 21589 | |
|------|------------|--|--|---------|--|--|---|---|
| • | 1 1 | 11-AJ 11-S 11-W 13-C 13-P <u>15</u> 3.62% | 1908 4125 3377 3220 3372 <u>3769</u> 19771 | v | 4-0 5-N 5-S 7 <u>7-ctv</u> 4.19% | 4092 4981 4953 6831 <u>517</u> 21374 | | |
| | | 6 10-BD 10-OR 11-CG 11-E <u>11-D</u> +4.45% | 3297 6607 1393 3938 1794 <u>2572</u> 19601 | -1 | [2-HV 2-VP 3 9 16-BC 16-CG 19-F 19-H 22 0.86% | 2391 4459 1384 2069 2916 3604 1670 244 792 <u>1161</u> 20690 | | |
| 0/91 | 1 = | = 20,514 | ATION = | | | Boards' an | mended calculations. | • |

12/30/91 Motion by: Comm. Harr Seconded by: Comm. Ferguson To vote on School Boards' amended calculations. Motion passed 12/30/91 Roll Call vote of the Commission. 20 Aye 2 Nay 2 Absent

,

SULLIVAN COUNTY REAPPORTIONMENT

PLAN B 24 Commissioners

Total Deviation = 9.5%

| I | 19-H | 792 | | |
|-------|----------------|-----------|----------|--|
| (1) | 19-F | 244 | | |
| | 22 | 1161 | | |
| | 1 | 2391 | | |
| | <u>2-VP</u> | 1384 | <u>.</u> | |
| | +0.2% | 5972 | | |
| II | 2-HV | 4459 | | |
| (3) | 17-E | 4549 | | |
| | 17-C | 1899 | | |
| | 17-S | 3234 | | |
| | <u>4-A</u> | 3318 | | |
| | +2.7% | 17459 | | |
| III | 17-R | 2856 | | |
| (1) | <u>17-W</u> | <u> </u> | | |
| | +3.5% | 5775 | | |
| IV | 5-N | 4981 | | |
| (3) | 5 - S · | 4953 | | |
| | 4-0 | 4092 | | |
| | 21 | 2814 | | |
| | 8 | 2069 | | |
| | -5.3% | 18909 | | |
| v | 16-BC | 3604 | | |
| (2) | 16-CG | 1670 | | |
| . , | 9 | 2916 | | |
| | 20 | 1235 | | |
| | 3 | 2037 | | |
| | +4.2% | 11462 | | |
| VI | 6 | 3297 | | |
| (3) | 10-BD | 6607 | | |
| | 10-OR | 1393 | | |
| | 7 | 6831 | | |
| | -1.0% | 18128 | | |
| VII | 18 | 2347 | | |
| (2) | 14-MP | 3873 | | |
| ~ / | 14-CH | 6008 | | |
| | -2.2% | 12228 | | |
| 1 = 5 | Population = | = 143,596 | | |
| 2 = 1 | | | | |
| 3 = 1 | 7,949 | | • | |

| VIII (2) | 15 13-C 13-P <u>11-AJ</u> -2.5% | 3769 3220 3372 <u>1908</u> 12269 |
|-------------|--|---|
| IX (2) | 12-OK 12-BR 12-WV 12-LG <u>12-CB</u> +1.3% | 3139 2170 1747 2437 <u>2319</u> 11812 |
| X (2) | 11-G 11-CG 11-J <u>11-D</u> -1.6% | 2282 3938 3369 <u>2572</u> 12161 |
| XI (3) | 11-R 11-S 11-E 11-C 11-W <u>7-City</u> +2.9% | 4071 4125 1794 3537 3377 <u>517</u> 17421 |

PASSED AS AMENDED 12/30/91 ROLL CALL 13 Votes of the Commission

•

. .

Carpocton 12-4-91

SULLIVAN COUNTY REAPPORTIONMENT

Existing Districts 24 Commissioners

Total Deviation = 39.5%

| I (2) | 2-HV 2-VP 21 22 1 19-F <u>19-H</u> -10.7% | 4459 1384 2814 1161 2391 244 <u>782</u> 79 2 13245 | |
|------------|--|---|--|
| П (3) | 17-R 17-W 17-S 17-C <u>17-E</u> +13.9% | 2856 2919 3234 1899 <u>4549</u> 15457 | |
| · Ⅲ (1) | 4-A <u>4-OS</u> -23.9% | 3318 4092 7410 | |
| IV (2) | 6 5-N <u>5-S</u> -10.6% | 3297 4981 <u>4953</u> 13231 | |
| V (2) | 3 16-BC 16-CG 9 8 20 -13.1% | 2069 3604 1670 2916 2037 <u>1235</u> 13531 | |
| VI (3) | 7 18 14-CH 14-MP <u>7-City</u> -9.1% | 6831 2347 6008 3873 <u>517</u> 19576 | |
| VII (2) | 12-CB 13-C 13-P 15 -6.0% | 2319 3220 3372 <u>3769</u> 12680 | |

| VIII (2) | 11-AJ 11-R <u>11-S</u> +15.6% | 1908 4071 <u>4125</u> 10104 |
|-------------|--|--|
| IX (2) | 11-C 11-D 11-E <u>11-J</u> +5.8% | 3537 2572 1794 <u>3369</u> 11272 |
| X (3) | 11-G 11-W 12-BR 12-LG 12-OK 12-WV +15.6% | 2282 3377 2170 2437 3139 <u>1747</u> 15152 |
| XI (2) | 10-BD 10-OR <u>11-CG</u> +2.3% | 6607 1393 <u>3938</u> 11938 |

Total Population = 143,596

| 1 | - | 5,983 |
|---|---|--------|
| | | 11,966 |
| 3 | _ | 17 949 |

SULLIVAN COUNTY REAPPORTIONMENT

PLAN A 24 Commissioners

Total Deviation = 7.0%

| I (3) | 17-E 2-HV 2-VP 21 1 22 19-F <u>19-H</u> +0.9% | 4549 4459 1384 2814 2391 1161 244 <u>792</u> 17794 |
|------------|---|--|
| II (3) | 17-C 17-W 17-R 17-S 4-A <u>4-0</u> -2.1% | 1899 2919 2856 3234 3318 4092 18318 |
| III (3) | 3 16-CG 16-BC 9 20 8 5-S -3.0% | 2069 1670 3604 2916 1235 2037 <u>4953</u> 18484 |
| IV (3) | 5-N 6 7 7-City <u>18</u> -0.1% | 4981 3297 6831 517 <u>2347</u> 17973 |
| V (3) | 11-R 14-CH 14-MP <u>13-P</u> +3.5% | 4071 6008 3873 <u>3372</u> 17324 |

٠.

,

.

| VI (3) | 11-AJ 12-OK 12-CB 11-W 13-C 15 +1.2% | 1908 3139 2319 3377 3220 <u>3769</u> 17732 |
|-------------|---|--|
| VII (3) | 12-BR 12-WV 12-LG 11-J 11-C <u>11-S</u> +3.1% | 2170 1747 2437 3369 3537 <u>4125</u> 17385 |
| VIII (3) | 11-G 11-CG 10-BD 10-OR 11-D 11-E -3.5% | 2282 3938 6607 1393 2572 <u>1794</u> 18586 |

.

.

Total Population = 143,596 1 = 5,983 2 = 11,966 3 = 17,949



SULLIVAN COUNTY REAPPORTIONMENT

PLAN C 21 Commissioners Total Deviation = 7.2%

| | مر و رو رو رو مرو | and an and a second | TU |
|---------------|--------------------------------|--|-------------|
| I | -9 | 1235 | <u>``</u> } |
| (3) | 20 | 2916 | w.w.w.w |
| | 19-H | 792 | |
| | 19-F | 244 | |
| | 22 | 1161 | |
| | 1 | 2391 | |
| | 2-VP | 1384 | |
| | 21 | 2814 | |
| | 3 | 2069 | |
| | 16-BC | 3604 | |
| | <u>16-CG</u> | <u> </u> | |
| | +1.1% | 20280 | |
| II | 5.N | 4981 | |
| (1) | 5-N 5-S | 4953 | |
| (3) | 5-3 6 | 3297 | |
| | | | |
| | 17-R | 2856 | |
| | 4-0 | 4092 | |
| | +1.6% | 20179 | |
| ш | 11-D | 2572 | |
| (3) | 11 - AJ | 1908 | |
| `` | 11-R | 4071 | |
| | 7-City | 517 | |
| | 7 | 6831 | |
| | 18 | 2347 | |
| | 8 | 2037 | |
| | +1.1% | 20283 | |
| n. | 2 1.17 | 4459 | |
| IV (2) | 2-HV | | |
| (3) | 17-E | 4549 | • |
| | 17-C | 1899 | |
| | 17-W | 2919 | |
| | 17-S | 3234 | |
| | <u>4-A</u> | 3318 | |
| | +0.6% | 20378 | |
| v | 14-CH | 6008 | |
| (3) | 14-MP | 3873 | |
| ~ / | 13-C | 3220 | |
| | 13-P | 3372 | |
| | 15 | 3769 | |
| | +1.3% | 20242 | |
| - | - · · | | |
| Tota | Populatic | n = 143,596 | • |
| 1 = 6, 2 = 13 | 0 <i>3</i> H 1 471 1 | | |
| 2 = 13 | J,U/₩ | | |

ъ

.

.

| 1 ≖ | = 6,83 9 | |
|-----|-----------------|---|
| 2 = | = 13,670 | • |
| 3 = | = 20,514 | - |
| | | |

10-BD 10-OR 11-CG 11-G 12-LG 12-BR 12-WV -0.3% VI (3) 6607 1393 3938 2282 2437 2170 <u>1747</u> 20574 12-OK 12-CB 11-W 11-C 11-S 3139 2319 3377 3537 4125 VII (3) 11-5 11-E <u>11-J</u> -5.6% 1794 3369 21660

ì

٠

.



Total Population = 143,596

SUBMITTED BY: Bob Ammons

SULLIVAN COUNTY REAPPORTIONMENT

| | Ģ | 2916 | PLAN D 18 Commissioners Total Deviation = 7.3% | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|----------------|--|
| <u>i</u> (3) | 1 2-HV 2-VP 3 16-BC 16-CG 19-F 19-H 21 22 +1.8% | 2391 4459 1384 2069 3604 1670 244 792 2814 <u>1161</u> 23504 | | V (3) VI | 10-BD 10-OR 11-CG 11-D 11-G 12-BR 12-BR 12-LG 12-WV +3.2% |
| II (3) | 17-C 17-E 17-R 17-S 17-W 4-A 4-O 8 -4.1% | 1899 4549 2856 3234 2919 3318 4092 2037 24904 | | (3) | 11-C 11-E 11-J 11-R 11-W 11-W 11-S +2.2% |
| Ш (3) | 5-N 5-S 6 7-City 18 <u>20</u> -0.9% | 4981 4953 3297 6831 517 2347 <u>1235</u> 24161 | | | • |
| IV (3) | 13-C 13-P 14-CH 14-MP 15 12-CB 11-AJ -2.2% | 3220 3372 6008 3873 3769 2319 1908 24469 | • | | |

Total Population = 143,596 1 = 7,978 2 = 15,956 3 = 23,934

. . .

.

.

.

.

SULLIVAN COUNTY REAPPORTIONMENT

PLAN E 25 Commissioners

Total Deviation = 8.4%

| • | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| I | 19-H | 792 | IV | 14-MP | 3873 |
| (3) | 19-7 | 244 | • (3) | 14-CH | 6008 |
| | 22 | 1161 | | 13-P | 3372 |
| | 1 | 2391 | | 15 | 3769 |
| | 3 | 2069 | | +1.2% | 17,022 |
| | 21 | 2814 | | | |
| | 2-VP | 1384 | VII | 13-C | 3220 |
| | 2-HV | 4459 | . (2) | 12-CB | 2319 |
| | <u>16-CG</u> | 1670 | | 11-R | 4071 |
| | +1.4% | 16,984 | | <u>11-aj</u> | 1908 |
| | | | | -0.3% | 11,518 |
| II | 17-E | 4549 | VIII | 11-C | 3537 |
| (3) | 17-C | 1899 | (2) | 11-J | 3369 |
| | 17-8 | 3234 | | 12-LG | 2437 |
| • | 4-A | 3318 | | <u>11-G</u> | 2282 |
| | 4-0 | 4092 | | -1.2% | 11,625 |
| | +0.8% | 17,092 | | | |
| | | | | 12-BR | 2170 |
| III | 17-W | 2919 | (3 |) 12-OK | 3139 |
| (3) | 17-R | 2856 | | 12-WV | 1747 |
| | 5-N | 4981 | | 11-W | 3377 |
| | 5-8 | 4953 | | 11-8 | 4125 |
| | 8 | 2037 | | <u>11-e</u> | 1794 |
| | -3.0% | , 17,746 | | +5.1% | 16,352 |
| IV | 16-BC | 3604 | | | |
| (3) | 9 | 2916 | | | |
| | 20 | 1235 | | | |
| | 18 | 2347 | • | | |
| | 7 | 6831 | | | |
| | 7-City | | | | |
| | -1.3% | 17,450 | | | |
| V | 6 | 3297 | TOTAL POI | PULATION | = 143,596 |
| (3) | 10-OR | 1393 | | | |
| | 10-BD | 6607 | 1 = 5,7 | | |
| | 11-CG | 3938 | 2 = 11, 4 | | |
| • | <u>11-D</u> | 2572 | 3 = 17, 2 | 32 | |
| | -3.3% | 17,807 | | | |
| | | | | | |



SULLIVAN COUNTY REAPPORTIONMENT

PLAN F 21 Commissioners

Total Deviation = 9.83

| I | 11-C | 3537 | ĬV | 8 | 2037 |
|-------|---------------|-------|------------|--------|-------|
| (3) | 11-G | 2282 | (3) | 11-R | 4071 |
| 4 - 7 | 11-J | 3369 | (-) | 14-CH | 6008 |
| | 12-BR | 2170 | | 14-MP | 3873 |
| | 12-CB | 2319 | | 18 | 2347 |
| | 12-LG | 2437 | | 20 | 1235 |
| | 12-OK | 3139 | | +4.59% | 19571 |
| | <u>12-WV</u> | 1747 | | | |
| | -2.37% | 21000 | A | 4-0 | 4092 |
| | | | (3) | 5-N | 4981 |
| II | 11-AJ | 1908 | | 5-8 | 4953 |
| (3) | 1 1- 5 | 4125 | | 7 | 6831 |
| | 11-W | 3377 | | 7-City | 517 |
| | 13-C | 3220 | | -4.19% | 21374 |
| | 13-P | 3372 | | | |
| | 15 | 3769 | VI | 1 | 2391 |
| | +3.62% | 19771 | (3) | 2-HV | 4459 |
| • | | | • | 2-VP | 1384 |
| III | 6 | 3297 | | 3. | 2069 |
| (3) | 10-BD | 6607 | | 9 | 2916 |
| | 10-OR | 1393 | | 16-BC | 3604 |
| | 11-CG | 3938 | · | 16-CG | 1670 |
| | 11-E | 1794 | | 19-F | 244 |
| | <u>11-D</u> | 2572 | | 19-H | 792 |
| | +4.45% | 19601 | • | 22 | 1161 |
| | * | | · | -0.86% | 20690 |
| | | | | • . | |
| | | | VII | 4-A | 3318 |
| | | | | 17-C | 1899 |
| | | | | 17-B | 4549 |
| | | | . . | 17-R | 2856 |
| | | | · . | 17-8 | 3234 |
| | | | | 17-W | 2919 |
| | | | | 21 | 2814 |
| | | | | -5.24% | 21589 |
| | | | | | |

.

Total Population = 143,596 3 = 20,514

REAPPORTIONMENT MAPS

24 Commissioners 12 Districts

| I. (2) | 19-H 19-F 22 | 792 244 1161 | VII. 7 6831 (2) 18 2347 <u>14-MP 3873</u> | |
|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | 1 21 3 | 2391 2814 2069 <u>1670</u> | 13,051 | |
| | <u>16-CG</u> | 11,141 | VIII.11-CG 3938 (2) 11-J 3369 <u>11-C 3537</u> | Ø |
| II. | 2-HV | 4459 | 10,844 | |
| (2) | 17-Е 17-С <u>2-VP</u> | 4549 1899 <u>1384</u> 12,291 | IX. 11-D 2572 (2) 11-E 1794 11-R 4071 11-AJ 1908 7-City 517 | |
| 111. (2) | 17-R 17-W 17-S _4-A | 2856 2919 3234 <u>3318</u> | 10,862 X. 11-G 2282 (2) 12-LG 2437 12-BR 2170 | |
| | | 12,327 | 12-WV 1747 <u>12-OK 3139</u> 11,775 | |
| IV. (2) | 4-0 16-BC 9 20 | 4092 3604 2916 1235 | XI. 11-W 3377 (2) 11-S 4125 13-C 3220 12-CB 2319 | |
| | | 11,847 | 13,041 | |
| V. (2) | 5-N 5-S <u>8</u> | 4981 4953 <u>2037</u> 11,971 | XII. 13-P 3372 (2) 14-CH 6008 15 3769 | |
| | | | 13,149 | |
| VI. (2) | 6 10-BD | 3297 6607 1393 | | |

Jersov

Total Population = 143,596 1 = 5,983 2 = 11,966 3 = 17,949

<u>10-OR</u>

...

Diviction w/highe + low 6.890

<u>1393</u> 11,297

Mith drawn



AND THEREUPON COUNTY COMMISSION ADJOURNED TO MEET AGAIN IN REGULAR SESSION, JANUARY 20, 199**4**.

WILLIAM H. "JOHN" MCKAMEY, COUNTY EXECUTIVE

. .

ak on" ong mak≣ vig

·