

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA, HELD ON FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 2003, IN THE COMMISSION MEETING ROOM ON THE SECOND FLOOR OF THE CHATHAM COUNTY COURTHOUSE, LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, 124 BULL STREET, SAVANNAH, GEORGIA.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Billy Hair called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., Friday, April 11, 2003.

=====

II. INVOCATION

Commissioner Odell introduced Mr. Van Johnson, who gave the invocation.

=====

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All pledged allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

=====

IV. ROLL CALL

The Clerk called the roll.

PRESENT:	Dr. Billy B. Hair, Chairman Dr. Priscilla D. Thomas, Vice Chairman, District Eight Frank G. Murray, Chairman Pro Tem, District Four Jeffrey D. Rayno, District One Joe Murray Rivers, District Two John J. McMasters, District Three Harris Odell, Jr., District Five David M. Gellatly, District Six B. Dean Kicklighter, District Seven
----------	---

IN ATTENDANCE:	R. E. Abolt, County Manager R. Jonathan Hart, County Attorney Sybil E. Tillman, County Clerk
----------------	--

=====

YOUTH COMMISSIONERS

Chairman Hair introduced the following Youth Commissioner who were in attendance: Vernon Taylor, Jr., a Senior at Windsor Forest High School.

=====

V. PROCLAMATIONS AND SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

1. PROCLAMATION TO DECLARE THE MONTH OF APRIL FAIR HOUSING MONTH.

Chairman Hair read the following proclamation into the record:

WHEREAS, the Federal and State of Georgia Fair Housing Laws prohibit discrimination in housing based on race, color, religion, sex, disability (or handicap), family status or national origin; and

WHEREAS, the month of April has been designated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as National Fair Housing Month; and

WHEREAS, April 12, 2003 marks the 35th anniversary of the passage of Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, the Federal Fair Housing Law; and

WHEREAS, the first housing discrimination court decision under the State of Georgia's Fair Housing Law was resolved in Chatham County; and

WHEREAS, Chatham County supports the efforts of local agencies, non-profits, the private sector, and individuals in ensuring compliance with the Federal Fair Housing Law; and

WHEREAS, Chatham County affirms the right of all citizens to choose where they wish to live without encountering discrimination.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Dr. Billy B. Hair, Chairman, on behalf of the Chatham County Board of Commissioners, do hereby proclaim the month of April, 2003 as:

“FAIR HOUSING MONTH”

in Chatham County, Georgia and call upon all citizens of our city to participate in ceremonies and activities supporting the Federal Fair Housing Law.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of Chatham County, Georgia to be affixed this the 11th day of April 2003.

Dr. Billy B. Hair, Chairman
Chatham County Commission

ATTEST:

Sybil E. Tillman, Clerk

Mr. Wayne Dawson said, I'd like to thank you on behalf of the Board of the Savannah-Chatham County Fair Housing Council for proclaiming April as Fair Housing Month. It seems very fitting that on the 35th anniversary of Dr. King's birthday that was just last week, that we should recommit ourselves to making sure that people in all areas of our community have equal housing choice of where they want to live in all types of housing. We invite you to join us on April 23rd for our Annual Fair Housing Luncheon. We've got a featured speaker coming down from Chicago from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and also we have our three potential mayoral candidates who will share their prospective on fair housing. Again, thank you.

=====

2. PROCLAMATION TO DECLARE APRIL 12, 2003, AS EARTH DAY - COURTNEY POWER OF THE MPC WILL BE ACCEPTING.

Chairman Hair read the following proclamation into the record:

WHEREAS, Earth Day was established in 1970 to have a national demonstration of environmental concern and to force environmental issues onto the agenda of national priorities; and

WHEREAS, April 22nd is recognized internationally as Earth Day; and

WHEREAS, the environment is key to our economy, prosperity and quality of life, and future generations rely on current generations to conserve natural resources for their well-being; and

WHEREAS, Earth Day 2003 in Chatham County will foster environmental awareness and provide a wholesome family atmosphere in which to learn about natural resources; and

WHEREAS, the theme of EarthDay 2003, "Education for Conservation" is a celebration of our environment and ways that each of us can be environmental stewards in our communities.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Dr. Billy B. Hair, Chairman, on behalf of the Chatham County Board of Commissioners, do hereby recognize and support:

EARTH DAY 2003

to be held April 12, 2003.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of Chatham County, Georgia to be affixed this the 11th day of April 2003.

Dr. Billy B. Hair, Chairman
Chatham County Commission

ATTEST:

Sybil E. Tillman, Clerk

Ms. Courtney Power said, I'd like to thank the Commission for recognizing Earth Day and its importance to the community and I'd like to remind the Commission and everybody here to come out tomorrow to Earth Day. It's in Forsyth Park from 11:00 to 3:00. There will be food, fun and lots of environmental exhibitors. Thank you very much. Chairman Hair said, thank you.

=====

VI. CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS

1. DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITION OF THE TYBEE PIER.

=====

VII. COMMISSIONERS' ITEMS

1. OPERATION YELLOW RIBBON (COMMISSIONER RAYNO).

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Rayno.

Commissioner Rayno said, thank you. I'd like to thank my fellow Commissioners for their support of Ms. Hendricks and her daughter for the activities they're going to conduct at Lake Mayer in May, and I only have one additional request and that would be that Ms. Hendricks asked that perhaps the event be televised in some way, shape or fashion. I know that Pete Nichols' plate may be full, but perhaps he has maybe contacts with the three major stations in town, that he might talk to them. What they wanted to do was to get just people on camera to send messages over to the people over in Iraq to tell them how much we support them and wish them the best and set up a little area for that, and if we could get conceptual approval to at least have Pete [Nichols] either do it himself or ask one of the stations to do it, I'd appreciate that. Vice Chairman Thomas asked, what date? Commissioner Rayno said, I think it was May 17th.

Chairman Hair asked, do you want that in the form of a resolution, Commissioner Rayno, or how do you want to handle it, or —? Commissioner Rayno said, it doesn't need to be a resolution. It just —, we need to have Pete [Nichols] ask if somebody can do that or if he could do it himself. Chairman Hair said, okay, I don't think there's any problem with that. We'll make sure that that takes place. Commissioner Thomas said, right. Chairman Hair said, Pete [Nichols], if you'll make —.

Mr. Nichols said, no problem, Commissioner Rayno. I'll be glad to help you out with that. I spoke with that group after they were here at the last Commission meeting and, as I told them, any work, any help they need on the PR end of things, I'll be glad to do it, so I'll go ahead and get in touch with the stations and see if we can set that thing

up. Commissioner Rayno said, thank you. Mr. Nichols said, I think it's a good idea. Commissioner Rayno said, I think it's going to mean a lot to the troops when they get that. Mr. Nichols said, sure.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. We appreciate that.

=====

2. ~~TAX CORRECTION (COMMISSIONER RAYNO).~~

=====

CHATHAM AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

The Board recessed as the County Commission at 9:45 a.m., and reconvened as the Chatham Area Transit Authority.

The Chatham Area Transit Authority was adjourned and the Board reconvened as the County Commission at 9:55 a.m.

=====

VIII. TABLED/POSTPONED ITEMS

Unless action is contemplated at today's meeting, staff report and file material has not been duplicated in your agenda packet. The files are available from the Clerk. Those on which staff is requesting action are indicated by asterisk (*).

- ** 1. ~~REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL OF A PILOT PROJECT FOR INCLUSION OF LIMITED COMMERCIAL COLLECTION AT WILMINGTON ISLAND RESIDENTIAL DROP-OFF CENTER AND AN AMENDMENT TO THE CHATHAM COUNTY REVENUE ORDINANCE ARTICLE W. SECTION 2. REFUSE DUMPING FEE. At meeting of February 28, 2003, second reading was tabled.~~**

Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to take it off the table. Commissioner Kicklighter said, so moved. Chairman Hair asked, second. Commissioner Thomas said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to approve. Commissioner Murray said, so moved. Chairman Hair asked, second? Commissioner Odell said, second. Chairman Hair asked, any discussion?

Commissioner Rayno asked, is there anybody in the audience that would like to speak to the issue of Chatham County Revenue Ordinance, Article W, Section 2, Refuse Dumping Fee on Wilmington Island? [NOTE: No one responded.]

Chairman Hair said, all right. All those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

1. Commissioner Kicklighter moved to untable this item and place it before the Commissioners for consideration. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.
2. Commissioner Murray moved to approve an amendment to the Chatham County Revenue Ordinance, Article W, Section 2, Refuse Dumping Fee. Commissioner Odell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Proposed Revision to Chatham County Revenue Ordinance

Article W, Section 2, will be eliminated in its entirety and replaced with a new schedule.

The following will be deleted:

Section 2 Refuse Dumping Fee

Commercial landfill users are billed a fee of thirty-six dollars (\$36.00) per ton for solid waste deposited in County landfills. Commercial users are required to establish a landfill account and pay a deposit prior to using the landfills. The deposits range from two hundred dollars (\$200.00) to one

thousand dollars (\$1,000.00), depending on the customer's type of business. Non-profit organization and other governments are exempt from the deposit requirement.

The deposit is non-interest bearing and is held until such time as the commercial user terminates landfill usage. After account termination, the deposit is applied against any outstanding balance. The remainder is then refunded to the customer.

The following will be inserted:

Section 2 Drop-Off Center Fee Schedule

Commercial users will be able to use the Drop-Off Center by use of a pre-paid card* with the following fee schedule:

For clean separated recyclable loads:

Each standard pick-up truck load charge is:	\$36.00
Each trailer load charge is:	<u>\$36.00</u>
Combination of pick-up truck & trailer load charge is:	\$72.00

For mixed loads requiring landfill disposal:

Each standard pick-up truck load charge is:	\$60.00
Each trailer load charge is:	<u>\$60.00</u>
Combination of pick-up truck & trailer load charge is:	\$120.00

For clean yard waste loads:

Each standard pick-up truck load charge is:	\$33.00
Each trailer load charge is:	<u>\$33.00</u>
Combination of pick-up truck & trailer load charge is:	\$66.00

* **Prepaid cards \$5.00/card. Replacement cost for lost card(s) is \$10.00 per card per incident.**

To estimate the dollar amount needed per prepaid card, multiply the estimated number of loads of material generated on the Island areas multiplied by the foregoing costs.

=====

* **2. CHATHAM COUNTY HOSPITAL AUTHORITY RESOLUTION (COMMISSIONER ODELL).
Commissioner Rayno requested reconsideration at meeting of March 28, 2003.
Additional background information from the County Attorney as requested.**

Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to take it off the table. Commissioner Odell said, move to untable. Chairman Hair asked, second? Commissioners Kicklighter and Thomas said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to approve. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I make a motion to approve. Chairman Hair asked, second? Commissioner Thomas said, second. Chairman Hair asked, any discussion? All those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. Chairman Hair and Commissioners Rivers, Murray, Odell, Gellatly, Kicklighter and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Commissioners Rayno and McMasters voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of seven to two. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

1. Commissioner Odell moved to untable this item and place it before the Commissioners for consideration. Commissioners Kicklighter and Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.
2. Commissioner Kicklighter moved to approve adopting a resolution in support of proposed legislation to amend an Act providing for the manner of appointment of members to the board of the Chatham County Hospital Authority approved April 25, 1969, so as to provide for the appointment of a member of the Chatham County Commission to the board of the Chatham County Hospital Authority. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion. Chairman Hair and Commissioners Rivers, Murray, Odell, Gellatly, Kicklighter and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Commissioners Rayno and McMasters voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of seven to two.

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED

AN ACT

To amend an Act providing for the manner of appointment of members to the board of the Chatham County Hospital Authority, approved April 25, 1969 (Ga. L. 1969, p. 3603), so as to provide for the appointment of a member of the Chatham County Commission to the board of the Chatham County Hospital Authority; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA:

SECTION 1.

An Act providing for the manner of appointment of members to the board of the Chatham County Hospital Authority, approved April 25, 1969 (Ga. L. 1969, p. 3603), is amended by striking in its entirety Section I and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“Section 1. Whenever any vacancy shall occur on the board of the Chatham County Hospital Authority, the Chatham Commissioners and Ex-Officio Judges thereof shall, by resolution, appoint a person, who may be a member of the Chatham County Commission, to fill said vacancy.”

SECTION 2.

All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this Act are repealed.

=====

- * **3. REQUEST BOARD AUTHORIZE A RETIRED POLICE OFFICER RESERVE PROGRAM FOR THE CHATHAM COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT. Tabled at meeting of March 28, 2003, pending response from County Attorney on legal issues raised on liability. See attached.**

Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to take it off the table. Commissioner Murray said, so moved. Chairman Hair asked, second? Commissioner McMasters said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to approve. Or to disapprove, either way. Commissioner Rayno said, you've got to take it off the table first. Chairman Hair said, we've already, we just did that, Commissioner Rayno. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I'll make a motion for discussion purposes. Chairman Hair asked, to approve or —? Commissioner McMasters said, discuss. Commissioner Kicklighter said, to approve. Chairman Hair asked, do we have a second? Commissioner Odell said, I'll second. Chairman Hair said, second. Any discussion? Chairman Hair said, all right, without that, I'll entertain a motion to approve or disapprove. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I made a motion to approve. Chairman Hair said, we already have it. Commissioner Murray said, that's what I thought. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor of approval vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

1. Commissioner Murray moved to untable this item and place it before the Commissioners for consideration. Commissioner McMasters seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.
2. Commissioner Kicklighter moved to authorize a Retired Police Officer Reserve Program for the Chatham County Police Department. Commissioner Odell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

**CHATHAM COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT
GENERAL ORDER**

TO: ALL PERSONNEL #GO03-000
 FROM: CHIEF OF POLICE ISSUE DATE: 00/00/03
 SUBJECT: RETIRED POLICE OFFICER RESERVE PROGRAM EFFECTIVE DATE: 00/00/03
 PROFESSIONAL STANDARD(S): CALEA 16.3.1 thru 16.3.7

PURPOSE:

To establish a Retired Police Officer Reserve Program within the Department and define the duties, authority, and training for Retired Police Officer Reserves.

POLICY:

The Department shall organize and maintain a Retired Police Officer Reserve Program for the purpose of augmenting the normal full-time force of Officers available for extra-duty employment under the auspices of Homeland Security.

DEFINITION(S):

RETIRED POLICE OFFICER RESERVE: a RETIRED Chatham County Police Officer, in good standing, used to work extra-duty employment in defense of Homeland Security, when no full-time Chatham County Police Officer is available to work.

PROCEDURE:

- I. RESERVE SELECTION

- A. Candidates eligible for reserve status must be:
1. A retired Police Officer from the Chatham County Police Department, in good standing,
 2. In good physical condition, and
 3. Georgia P.O.S.T. certified or registered;
- II. UNIFORMS AND EQUIPMENT
- A. Reserve Police Officers will wear Class C uniforms that are not distinguishable from that of full-time Chatham County Police Officers.
1. The Uniforms shall be the same style and type with identical markings.
 2. Reserve Police Officers will be issued:
 - a. One tan "Polo" style shirt with an embroidered or screen-printed Chatham County Police badge over the left breast,
 - b. One pair of Brown BDU pants,
 - c. One uniform belt, and
 - d. One pair of black boots.
- B. Any equipment used by a Reserve Police Officer must be approved by the Department Quartermaster.
1. Reserve Police Officers will be issued:
 - a. One gun belt,
 - b. One holster,
 - c. One set of belt keepers,
 - d. One can of mace with holder,
 - e. One set of handcuffs with case, and
 - f. One magazine holder.
 2. Reserve Police Officers are responsible for supplying their own firearm.
 - a. A Glock 19 (9mm) is the only authorized primary firearm.
- III. RESERVE POLICE OFFICER TRAINING
- A. Reserve Police Officers must:
1. Receive minimum annual training as defined in O.C.G.A. 35-8-21,
 2. Receive annual training in the use of deadly and non-deadly force,
 3. Receive biannual firearms training and attain a minimum passing score, and
 4. Receive training in all policies, procedures, rules and regulations.
- IV. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
- A. Reserve Police Officers are fully sworn officers and are required to adhere to the Department's Policy and Procedures Directives.
1. Reserve Police Officers will be issued a field operations manual and all updates.
- B. Reserve Police Officers will be used to fill extra duty vacancies at facilities identified by the Chief of Police as security risk facilities under Homeland Security **ONLY**.
1. Reserve Police Officers will only be used when positions cannot be filled by full-time officers.
 2. Reserve Police Officers are not authorized to act as extra-duty coordinators.
- C. Reserve Police Officers will have the same law enforcement authority and powers as full-time officers while working in an extra duty capacity.
- V. LIABILITY PROTECTION FOR RESERVE POLICE OFFICERS
- A. Reserve Police Officers shall be entitled to the same liability protection provided to full-time officers of the Chatham County Police Department.

This order supersedes all written directives issued prior to 00/00/03 pursuant to Retired Police Officer Reserve Program.

BY ORDER OF:

/s/ Thomas C. Sprague

THOMAS C. SPRAGUE
CHIEF OF POLICE

=====

*** 4. REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL OF THE NEW FRANCHISE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CHATHAM COUNTY AND U.S. CABLE. Tabled at meeting of March 28, 2003. See additional information from Mr. Nichols.**

Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to take it off the table. Commissioner Kicklighter said, so moved. Chairman Hair asked, second? Commissioner Murray said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to approve or disapprove. Commissioner Murray said, so moved. Chairman Hair asked, to approve? Commissioner Murray said, to approve. Chairman Hair asked, second? Commissioner Kicklighter said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. Commissioner McMasters said, I have questions about it. Chairman Hair said, okay. State your question.

Commissioner McMasters said, Harris [Odell], you might be able to help me a little bit on this. This is legalese. The question relative to disallowing any substantial increase in the franchise fee in page 8, Section 6, Compensation and Other Payments, the language —, I have a problem with this. It's 6.1.1 Franchise Fees —

Amount. It says the company shall pay to the franchising authority franchise fees in the maximum amount permitted by applicable law, but in no event —, but in no event for any 12-month period shall the franchise fee be less than an amount equal to 5% of the gross revenue derived from the operation of the system to provide cable services. How does that —, does that, Harris [Odell], say that if there's an increase allowed by the FCC that that larger amount will be paid? Mr. Pete Nichols said, my understanding of it is that the FCC would supersede this agreement, meaning that —, and first of all, I discussed this with the Georgia Municipal Association, who are our consultants on this, after the last meeting and your questions on this. They informed me that should the FCC again raise the bar, and 5% right now is the maximum allowed by the FCC, should they raise that bar during the course of this agreement, then those fees again would be raised to that maximum allowance.

Mr. Terry Robertson said, you would just pass an ordinance or —, you would just pass an ordinance or a resolution to raise those fees. The Clerk asked, what is your name please? Mr. Robertson said, Terry Robertson with U. S. Cable.

Commissioner McMasters said, I understand that we would have the authority to potentially do that and capture that revenue, but why doesn't the contract that we're entering into simply say that if there's an increase allowable by the FCC, that the contract would be adjusted accordingly? From the language I can't come to that conclusion. Commissioner Kicklighter said, make a motion to amend it then. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. I make a motion —, I have a couple of other questions. Chairman Hair said, we already have a motion. Why don't we just get them all out of the way —. Commissioner McMasters said, okay, let me get all of the questions out of the way. County Attorney Hart asked, could you repeat that section again that you're asking —? Commissioner McMasters said, yes, this is Section 6 and the subsection is 6.1.1, entitled Franchise Fees. County Attorney Hart said, okay. Commissioner McMasters said, and the other question I have about this contract is Section 3, page identified as E-3, Customer Communications, Notices and Billing. Section 3.1 says Notifications to Subscribers. Item (b) says customers will be notified of any changes in rates, programming services or channel positions. It says as soon as possible using reasonable means at the Company's sole discretion. Mr. Robertson said, per the FCC law we have to provide 30-day notification upon rate increases. Commissioner McMasters asked, in writing? Mr. Robertson said, yes, sir. And the same way with any channel changes if we should be dropping any channels, we have to provide 30-day notification as well. There are a lot of laws at the FCC level that would protect Chatham County. Commissioner McMasters asked, well, then why do you write that you can do a rate change at any means that the company's sole discretion might be? Mr. Robertson said, well, that means maybe in the form of a newspaper article, it may be in the form of a letter, or it may be in the form of a billing message. Commissioner McMasters asked, but your intent is so that as long as it prescribes to the FCC guidelines? Mr. Robertson said, that FCC guidelines is what covers us as a nation and an industry. It also protects you in that no subscriber would receive a rate increase without practical notification. Commissioner McMasters said, I appreciate that. I'm just trying —, I just tried to read this as a consumer might read it, and that language concerns me that a rate increase would be handled in any way —, communicated to your customers and our constituents in any means that the company deemed —, at your discretion. Mr. Robertson said, the question is in so many different areas that you'd be announcing rate increases, because we usually do this on a [inaudible] area, some customers would not see a newspaper article, some would not get their letter by mail, and some people wouldn't see it on the cable channel, so we take many different modes and this allows that opportunity to widen that area in which we notify. Commissioner McMasters asked, well, would your company have any problems with notifying customers in writing in their bills of any impending rate increases. Mr. Robertson said, we have done that for the last three years to my knowledge. Commissioner McMasters asked, would you have any problems agreeing to do that on the scope of this? Mr. Robertson said, no. In fact, that's our normal way is that we place them in the bills and that way if they return back to us —, but we also at times do letters depending on if we're doing other activities as well, like adding additional channels and things like that.

Commissioner McMasters said, yeah, well, that's good. I'm wondering about rate increases. Okay, and on Section —, page E-4, the next page, under Customer Complaints, Section 4.2, Referral of Complaints from the Franchising Authority to the Company, section (a) it says the franchising authority is —, if the franchising authority is contacted directly about a complaint concerning the cable operator, the franchising authority shall notify the company. So if some —, if I understand this correctly, if a customer contacts their elected official or somebody in the County government to complain about some facet of the service or the bill, who is that person at the County? Mr. Nichols said, that's me. Commissioner McMasters asked, that's you? Mr. Nichols said, yes, the Cable Access Coordinator, and I've gotten calls in the past four and a half years that I've been here even from Comcast subscribers or folks out on Tybee Island that have U. S. Cable. There's a form I fill out that documents that and I do pass along to both the company and to the Georgia Municipal Association. Mr. Robertson said, and those also go into the public inspection file. County Attorney Hart said, the reason that provision is in the contract is they are required by law to keep tabs of that and they want to make sure they get all complaints. Commissioner McMasters said, it's a relatively new government guy, I wanted to know how this government was processing constituent observations about this franchise that it services and/or billing. Lastly, in (b) it says within seven business days after the local manager is notified about the complaint, the company shall issue to the franchising authority a report detailing the investigation thoroughly, describing the findings, explaining any corrective steps which are being taken and indicating that the person who registered the complaint has been notified of the resolution. Again, Pete [Nichols], are you the point of contact for that? Mr. Nichols said, yes.

Commissioner McMasters said, okay, I'd like to make a motion to approve this. Chairman Hair said, we have a motion to approve and a second already. If you want to make an amendment to the motion, make your motion —, state your amendment. Commissioner McMasters said, I'd like to make an amendment to this that, first and foremost, in Section 6.1.1 that it somehow say that franchise fees will conform to FCC rate increases and on Section 3-E, I just would like it inserted that —, identify who the government point of contact is on discrepancies or problems within the system.

Chairman Hair asked, will the person who made the motion accept that? County Attorney Hart said, Mr. Chairman, if you read 6.1.1, and I wasn't asked about this, that language in there basically says that the franchising authority is going to be allowed to get their fee as the rates increase, but notwithstanding in any event for the 12 months sets a floor, which means that they can't go below the 5% they're in now. So really that provision works to the advantage of the County rather than the —. Mr. Robertson said, it works throughout Georgia as well in all other counties. County Attorney Hart said, so what it's doing is it's setting the floor that we'll never get less than 5%, but if the FCC comes along and says, you know, franchising authorities should have a rate increase, and they pass that as an FCC regulation, then this contract requires them to increase the fees to the franchising authority.

Chairman Hair asked, does that —, does Commissioner McMasters's suggested change affect that? County Attorney Hart said, other than the fact that it takes out the floor. Commissioner McMasters said, no, I'm not saying take out the floor. I'm talking about anything above the floor. County Attorney Hart said, okay. Commissioner McMasters said, as prescribed and authorized by the FCC shall be paid to the County. Chairman Hair asked, who made the motion? County Attorney Hart said, okay, we'll be glad —. Commissioner Murray said, I did. Chairman Hair asked, will you accept that amendment? Commissioner Murray said, yeah, that's fine. Commissioner Kicklighter said, that's fine with me as well. Chairman Hair said, you accept that. All right, all those in favor of the motion vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes with the amendment.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. Mr. Robertson said, thank you. Chairman Hair said, thank you.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

1. Commissioner Kicklighter moved to untable this item and place it before the Commissioners for consideration. Commissioner Murray seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.
2. Commissioner Murray moved to approve the new franchise agreement between Chatham County and U. S. Cable with the amendment that Section 6.1.1 include that should the FCC approve a higher rate allowance, then this contract requires the cable company to pay the increased fees to the franchising authority. Commissioner Kicklighter seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

IX. ITEMS FOR INDIVIDUAL ACTION

(Unless the Board directs otherwise, adoption of an Action Item will mean approval of the respective County staff report and its recommended action.)

1. **REQUEST BOARD APPROVE THE FOLLOWING: REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL TO REPLACE TWO (2) CHATHAM COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT VEHICLES AT A COST OF \$48,343. SOURCE OF FUNDS IS SSD CIP.**

Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to approve. Commissioner Odell said, move for approval. Commissioner Thomas said, second. Chairman Hair said, second. Any discussion? All those in favor —. Commissioner Rayno said, I have a question. Chairman Hair said, yes, sir.

Commissioner Rayno said, I'm in favor of this. Will the parts of the flooded cars be cannibalized for replacement on other vehicles as they occur? Chairman Hair said, Mr. —. County Manager Abolt said, you'll notice in the staff report they reference the actual police hardware. I would have to defer to Mr. Chatham as to the serviceability. Chairman Hair said, there's also some laws against that too in terms of flooded parts being used on vehicles that go back on the road, so we'd have to —. Commissioner Rayno asked, you can't use a turn signal cover or things like that? Chairman Hair said, I'm just saying there's a law that governs that.

Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously.. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Odell moved to approve the request to replace two (2) Chatham County Police Department vehicles at a cost of \$48,343, with the source of funds being Special Service District Capital Improvement Program Fund. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

2. **TO CREATE AND FUND THE POSITION OF ASSISTANT FINANCE DIRECTOR AND FUND A CURRENTLY AUTHORIZED BUT UNFUNDED POSITION OF FINANCIAL SERVICES MANAGER FROM RECURRING REVENUE. FURTHER, TO GIVE AN UPDATE ON CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANNED FOR AUDIT FINDINGS LISTED IN THE FY2002 CAFR.**

Commissioner Odell said, so moved. Commissioner Kicklighter said, second. Chairman Hair said, we have a motion to approve and a second. Chairman Hair asked, discussion? Commissioner Rayno said, yes. Chairman Hair said, all right, Commissioner Rayno.

Commissioner Rayno said, I have a presentation to make about the CAFR since it's all part of this same —. Chairman Hair asked, is it germane to the motion? Is it —, to approve this positions? We don't need —, CAFR is not on the agenda. If it's germane to the motion, that's fine. If it's not germane —, if it's just about CAFR it's not germane. Commissioner Rayno said, well, all right. Well, let's just talk about the Assistant Finance Director. Chairman Hair said, okay, that's fine. Commissioner Rayno said, it just seems to be putting the cart before the horse to hire an assistant to the Finance Director when you don't have a Finance Director, and how attractive is it going to be for a man or woman to come to Chatham County and take the position of Finance Director if they've already put in place an Assistant Finance Director who they've had no say or any opportunity to have any input as to who this person may be, and also we're only talking about —, we're in April now. Even if you put in a request for a person, it's going to take 30 to 60 days to get them anyhow. Why not —, I'm all for this motion. Why not do it, but with the caveat that it will come out of next year's budget as opposed to trying to take it out of this year's budget. The Finance Department right now is running at expenditure at 79 point something percent, it's close to 80 percent and at the three-quarters they should be at 75 percent. Taking money from the LOST negotiations, which were for helping to bolster up our cost of prisoners, is going to put the Sheriff in a dire position later on down the road. That money should be allocated for what we negotiated for rather than trying to find additional spending for it. It's just not prudent to do it at this point in time. If you're going to make personnel changes, you make them during the budget cycle with a plan. But to come in like this and also to insist that this is suddenly an emergency, if I had the chance to make this presentation, which I will take the opportunity to do after the motion passes or fails, is I'm not so sure that I'm confident that, you know, Mr. Abolt's been looking over this department a long time. There were mistakes that were happening last year such as when Mr. Persaud presented us with budget information with pages and pages of missing data, just blank sheets, and I questioned that, and it seems to me if the County Manager was overseeing the Finance Department, he would never have allowed the Finance Department to submit to the County Commission a budget report, a three-quarter budget report —, that was on May 10th of 2002 —, where there's just pages and pages of missing data.

Chairman Hair said, Commissioner Rayno, I would just caution you against discussing personnel issues in a public session. Commissioner Rayno said, well, you remember at the last meeting I wished to bring it into Executive Session and I was told by the Board that this was not an Executive Session thing, that we should discuss it out in the open. Again, I will make the motion to go into Executive Session if you'd like to do that. I asked to do that last meeting and you told me it was not appropriate. Chairman Hair said, if you can make a motion and get the five votes, that's fine. Commissioner Rayno said, well, I'd like to go into Executive Session. Chairman Hair said, all right, we have a motion to go into Executive Session to discuss personnel. Do we have a second? Chairman Hair said, motion fails for lack of a second.

Commissioner McMasters said, I have a question. Chairman Hair said, well, Commissioner Rayno still has the floor.

Commissioner Rayno said, my only concern is the letter that was sent from David Persaud. I'm not going to mention the contents of that letter because they definitely are Executive Session items, but last year we were told by Mr. Abolt David Persaud was just a fantastic job —, doing a great job, and then the picture we get from Mr. Persaud is one that is completely 180 degrees different from what Mr. Abolt is saying.

Chairman Hair asked, Commissioner Rayno, does that deal with this issue? I mean, you're discussing personnel issues that don't deal with the motion. Commissioner Rayno said, I believe it is, sir, because you're asking for us to trust the Manager and I'm not sure that I do. I'm at a point now with Mr. Abolt where I was Mr. Udinsky with the Assessor's Board at that time where I'm not feeling so confident. Chairman Hair asked, are you finished? Commissioner McMasters then Commissioner Rivers then Commissioner Kicklighter. Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner McMasters.

Commissioner McMasters said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question relative to the funding on this, and it suggests that the money received from the housing of municipal prisoners will be a funding source. Have —, to my knowledge we have not resolved the arbitration issue with the City of Savannah, or have we? County Manager Abolt said, but remember right after we dealt with the disposition of the Richardson Creek property we had some good news, and this marks a very good relationship between ourselves and the City of Savannah. The City of Savannah did pay us and they realized that more negotiations were required, but they agreed to pay us an amount of money, number one, that they did not disagree to and also because they were very sensitive and appreciative of our cash flow problems, for which I was most grateful and told Mr. Brown thank you. This is money in the bank. These are not dollars in effect that might come in. You'll notice even in our financial analysis I'm asking for \$20,000 to take care of the balance of this fiscal year, but at the same time I'm meeting my commitment to y'all when you took the temporary loan from the Richardson Creek sale and you bought equipment for drainage and so what is left over after the \$20,000 expense would go back to reimburse in part what amounts to a contribution to fund balance. This is very sound. It's very sound also because obviously the needs are well known, they've been known for some time. No one has denied that. We have people that obviously that have problems and those problems can be discussed in Executive Session, if you would like, but the overall summary that I have from you as your Manager is there's a very serious need within the Finance Department to relieve many men and women that literally for months now have been working beyond the normal call of duty. I have employees, one of them is today in the audience with you, that is sick as a result of it, we're creating a situation where, like Mr. White said, in Fact and Findings number four, we have a work force that for a variety of reasons is getting very anxious and some in fact have been burnt out. What is needed? What is needed is any situation —, is to have a person within

the work environment that can provide appropriate supervision. We have never had that within the Finance Department, the reason being is we don't have the money.

Chairman Hair said, continue Commissioner McMasters.

Commissioner McMasters said, I'd like to suggest that the issues that Commissioner Rayno has been darting around ought to be addressed just to have some finality to it, and it indeed an Executive Session thing. We don't need to go any further in this meeting on it. County Manager Abolt said, I can speak in generalities, if you wish. This is so important to me and my recommendation to you, and I take it so seriously I would ask that you deal with it today one way or the other, and I will do my very best, given what you may want to know, to answer your questions if I can. This is a very critical issue. Commissioner McMasters said, you understand our concerns —. Commissioner Rivers said, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner McMasters said, — and why we have those concerns. Chairman Hair said, wait, he's still got the floor and you're next. County Manager Abolt said, sir, I work for y'all and if any one of you are concerned about anything, that makes me concerned, but I would not come to you in the manner in which I am coming to you today with hope with a passion that I bring on this issue were I not to feel very seriously this is a very grave problem. Commissioner McMasters said, I think we need to support the County Manager in this, but we also have an obligation as the board of directors, if you will, that Russ [Abolt] reports to, to answer in the proper venue, which is Executive Session, some of these things that have come to our attention that are obviously in need of addressing. So I'll support —.

Commissioner Rivers said, Mr. Chairman —. Chairman Hair said, Commissioner Rivers and then —. Commissioner Rivers said, I call the question.

Chairman Hair said, call for the question. All those in favor of the motion vote yes, opposed vote no. Chairman Hair and Commissioners Rivers, McMasters, Murray, Odell, Kicklighter and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Commissioners Rayno and Gellatly voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of seven to two. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

Commissioner Rivers said, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Hair said, yes, sir. Commissioner Rivers said, first of all, I don't like witch hunts, and here we come again comparing Russ [Abolt] to somebody else and taking it personal. Now I've been around here for 19 years and I think I've been close to the budget and close to the Finance Department and I think I know what's going on in that Finance Department better than any Commissioner sitting at this table here. The man needs help us there, and he should get that. Now if you think the man is incompetent, which I don't, I will tell you and I will tell the public that we're almost back to 1985 in the Finance Department. When I first came on board, we couldn't correct or reconcile our bank account, which meant we didn't know what we were spending from month to month. We had over \$400,000 going into the pension plan over and above what it required. We have made leaps and bounds by adequately financing —, adequately staffing that department. Through all the cuts that come normally on the Commission side, we have decimated that department up there. I haven't read Persaud's letter, but I will tell you that I spoke with Persaud at least once a week, sat at his desk. Brilliant guy, but there were certain things that Persaud couldn't handle, which I won't even go into, but we know —, we know that this department needs —.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, I kind of agree with what he's saying, but we're totally out of order.

Commissioner Rivers said, well, personal privilege, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Hair said, okay. Commissioner Rivers said, personal privilege. I'm not out of order. I'm going to say what needs to be said. You guys come up here with a witch hunt, got it on your agenda even prior to getting here. We spent a whole lot of time trying to get the end of Udinsky. Luckily enough there were some things going on wrong and we were eventually able to resolve that issue, but not through a good method, not through good methodology, and here we go again taking pock shots at the County Manager. Well, I'm tired of it and it needs to come to an end and if it doesn't stop, then I'm going to oppose some of this little sleazy stuff that some of the Commissioners have been doing going around trying to fine a way to get rid of and inquiring and coming back and not finding it. It's ludicrous. I through with that, Mr. Chairman.

* * *

Chairman Hair said, I'm going to call on Mr. Dawson to introduce his guest who I think have arrived. Commissioner Rayno said, Mr. Hair, we're still on that item with the CAFR. Chairman Hair said, that item has already been passed, Mr. Rayno. Commissioner Rayno said, yes, but there's an update on corrective action planned for audit findings listed in the CAFR that's on the agenda, sir. Chairman Hair asked, where's it on the agenda? I don't see it. Commissioner Rayno said, number two, Individual Action, update on corrective action planned for audit funding [sic] —. Chairman Hair said, all right. I'm going to call on Mr. Dawson and then we'll deal with that issue later. Commissioner Rayno said, thank you, Mr. Hair.

Mr. Wayne Dawson said, we're real pleased to have with us the Board of Directors of the Association of Programs for Rural Independent Living and I'd like now to introduce Dr. Glenn Flythe from the University of Kansas and he will come up and make just a brief statement if that will be okay.

Dr. Flythe said, good morning, Dr. Hair. Chairman Hair said, good morning. Dr. Flythe said, I want to thank you for just allowing this time just for a few moments and we're here visiting with our executive board for the Association for Programs for Rural Independent Living and this October we'll be having our conference. There will be about 250 people with disabilities from all over the country coming here, and just a concern we had, and this is a beautiful town and a wonderful place to visit. We want to just make sure and it sounds like accessible

transportation is starting to come on line here. We want to make sure that we can appropriately plan for those individuals, both with City transportation as well as thinking about the transportation from the airport to the community as well. Many of our individuals use wheelchairs to get around and that's just a big concern of ours.

Chairman Hair said, well, we appreciate you being here. Dr. Flythe said, we appreciate you working with us. Chairman Hair said, you have an open invitation. Any time you can come back, you're welcome. Dr. Flythe said, this is a very interesting meeting. I wish we could stay. Chairman Hair said, it's going to get more interesting if you want to stick around. Okay, I'm going to go ahead and do the requests for the hiring freeze [sic] and come back to the CAFR because we've got a lot of department heads that need to get back to work.

* * *

Chairman Hair said, I'll call on Commissioner Rayno to discuss CAFR. Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Rayno.

Commissioner Rayno said, if I could, I'd like to do some things in the front and then come back to my seat afterwards. Chairman Hair said, that's fine. Commissioner Rayno said, thanks. For the benefit of the audience I have [inaudible] some of the things from the CAFR so they can see them better and I've given the Commissioners a handout that they can look at concerning property tax rates and that's on the first page that I gave you there. I think there's some message of hope within the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report that we need to address and look at. I'm sorry Dr. Hair just left. Every year that I've made a budget presentation he's left for those too. I state that for the record. As you notice in the CAFR for this one right here, property tax rates have decreased every year since 1993 with the exception of 2000 with the passage of the Stephens-Day Bill, when they flattened out. According to some Commissioners, because of our rollbacks over all those years, it caused this huge deficit we've got. But, as you notice, the amount of assessable taxable property has increased each year. So even though the property tax rollbacks flattened out, the digest has grown so we [inaudible] more money. As a matter of fact, last year we came up with 4.8 million more dollars than the year before because of digest growth. And you'll also notice that the general revenues increased every year. Rolling back the taxes didn't hurt the amount of money that was coming in at tax time. This year here is low because of the half year. We changed the fiscal year that year from December to June so that's why that's half, but if it was extended, you'd still see the increase. Expenditures by function in Chatham County increased ever since 1993. It never stopped. Rolling back the property rates didn't hurt at all, but you'll hear that. Every time budget comes up somebody will stand up there in front of you and say, "Hey, we rolled back the millage rate so it hurt the budget." Then we also heard about last year when we were trying to do the budget that we had an \$11.5 million deficit or something to that neighborhood, but according to the audit that was done by our independent auditor, they show that last year we had actually \$2.2 million that was unreserved. Restated fund balance was actually \$2.3 million, excuse me, for a total of \$4.6 positive. That's a completely different picture than what we were given last year when we were trying to do the budget. Now how can we, as Commissioners, do a budget when we're not given the proper numbers and we're told to trust the numbers that we're given. Mr. Tindol is here to show you, if you want to ask any questions, that right now in our general fund we have 2.3 —, well, \$2.3 million, and I was dismayed when I was called by the *Savannah Morning News* and I was dismayed when I was called by WSAV and told that Mr. Abolt was telling them that we only had \$1,300 and I —, we need to know. Do we have \$1,300 or do we have \$2.3 million?

County Manager Abolt asked, are you asking me? Commissioner Rayno said, yes. County Manager Abolt said, I'm answering you then, sir, in your agenda, as I give you every time, it's a rundown on your contingencies. In that agenda it shows, as I believe you may refer yourself, but I'll look at mine for your reference, the M&O contingencies are listed at \$1,595. Those are not the same issues you raised regarding the fund balance. This is a contingency account for one budget. It's \$1,595. The overall, as you know, cost of M&O is about \$100,000,000, sir.

Commissioner Rayno asked, so when the press comes to you why do you tell them that we only have \$1,300 as opposed to the \$2.3 million in unreserved funds, which we could spend for whatever we wanted to? County Manager Abolt said, if I may, let me restate. I don't words to be put in my mouth. The status of the M&O contingency is as I gave you. In my estimation you're mixing two different issues. I have never said unreserved dollars in the context of the question asked. The question was, what do we have in contingencies for M&O, period and that's the figure I gave you and that's also the figure I gave the news media. Commissioner Rayno asked, Mr. Tindol, if someone asks about contingencies, would they include the unreserved fund if they were answering that question? Mr. Rick Tindol said, I think we're talking about a matter of semantics here. The contingency is a particular line item for the current year in the general fund, so I think that number to dwell on the contingency is an insignificant number to look at. The important number is your unreserved fund balance for the general fund. If I had to pick one number in the thousands of numbers in an audit report to look at, it would be what is my unreserved general fund fund balance.

Commissioner McMasters asked, Mr. Tindol, is that the larger number? Mr. Tindol said, that number is the \$2.2 to \$2.3 million. Commissioner McMasters said, I just wanted to understand. That's okay. Mr. Tindol said, correct. And the —. County Manager Abolt said, if I may, please understand too though the question asked was how much is our contingency and I answered that question. Also, you'll remember in our discussion on cash flow Mr. Tindol pointed out that in effect we have problems because our M&O —, not just our M&O, but our overall fund balance situation is in very grave situation. That's why we have to borrow money, that why we have cash flow issues.

Commissioner Rivers said, Madam Chair. Vice Chairman Thomas recognized Commissioner Rivers. Commissioner Rivers asked, Mr. Tindol, is that non-restrictive? Mr. Tindol said, unrestricted fund balance is the \$2.2 to \$2.3 million. Commissioner Rivers said, \$2.2 million. Mr. Tindol said, that's the amount that this

Commission could legally appropriate for any purpose. It's not been spoken for by any other reserve or —, whatsoever. Commissioner Rivers said, okay, my —, you know, my question would be that in the audit if we used up all our catastrophic loss money, which is a fund that we borrowed money from, why if we've got a reserve, why did we replace the catastrophic loss money or why was there a recommendation to replace that rather than leave it in unreserved? Mr. Tindol said, well, we're talking about two different things too. We're talking about actual cash monies versus fund balance. Now unreserved fund balance should represent [inaudible] resources, but you've got to actually collect those near term cash items, your receivables, in order to make those tangibles. Also, at the time that this was done, the transfer, the fund balance of the general fund had not been restated for the interpretation of the six items that we talked about two weeks ago. Commissioner Rivers said, okay. If I'm catching you right, you're telling me that we don't have real cash in hand? Mr. Tindol said, well, to compare cash with unrestricted fund balance would be incorrect. However, there is a relationship that we covered in the cash flow workshop some months ago too that the fund balance should represent near cash items. If you collect your current receivables and you pay those current obligations, then you should have \$2.3 million in cash in a very short period of time. Commissioner Rivers said, okay, then we're looking at projected monies rather than actual. Mr. Tindol said, well, they're not so much a projection as they are the numbers that should be coming in in the next few months. Commissioner Rivers said, well, if you project —, if you project revenue, that's projected. It may or may not come in. Mr. Tindol said, the only difference that I'm saying right here, Commissioner, there's a big difference between projection, which I only think to be a budget. These are real numbers that just haven't been realized as of that point in time. Commissioner Rivers said, okay, but real numbers, all we're looking at is a paper chase if we're looking at real numbers rather than the actual cash. If I can't go in here and put my hands on \$2.5 million, if I have a hurricane or whatever to come up, then what happens? I go out in and put the hunkers down on those people who owe me? Hey, man, I couldn't run a business like that. Mr. Tindol said, I agree. The catastrophic fund has been depleted, there's no question about that. The real issue, if you want to get right out of the spin and get down to the bottom line, the real issue is this. The real issue that this Commission needs to face is this. We're talking about numbers that are nine months and two weeks old coming up next week. These are ancient numbers in terms of financial history as far as I'm concerned. The real problem is that you have a material weakness which is that this entity has been unable to produce meaningful timely financial information. You can't run a business on information that's nine months and two weeks old. So what your charge is to come up with how do we best get out of this situation. We need to have timely useful financial information, whether it be for a budget or any proper planning, and that must be accomplished first. Then if you get that useful information, you can properly plan and budget and then the question that you should be asking each and every month, let alone a quarter, what is our unreserved fund balance in the general fund, and know that that number is a good number, that it's not an illusionary number. But that is —, the real problem is how do you get there. You only get there with qualified trained people. Unfortunately —, I won't get into personalities or individuals or anything else —, you do not have a qualified trained finance staff to get the job done. Bottom line. Commissioner Rivers said, now that's your evaluation and if you say that point blank, that would tell me that there are no people up there that's competent of doing the job that they're supposed to do. Mr. Tindol said, I didn't say no people, but I said as a group. Commissioner Rivers said, okay, so what I would look at up there, and you tell me if I'm right or wrong, when you extract your chief accountant, when you extract your financial investment officer, when you extract the caliber of people that we have extracted from up there, I will tell you —, I will tell you and I hope you would agree with me, when Shirley Lopez was up there you could almost put your hands on anything and with the other people around that left, left a void. Mr. Tindol said, you're absolutely right, Commissioner, and as a matter of fact I was here at the time and the retirement party for Shirley Lopez and I commented to the Commissioners, I believe you were one of them at the time at that retirement party, we are losing a valuable asset of the County. There have been at least four or five people of the same caliber as Shirley [Lopez] that have left over the last several years which represent cumulatively probably 125 or more years in experience. You just don't go out and replace those over night. Commissioner Rivers said, and that's where your innovation comes in, when you have people who are working on something over the years and years and years, they find all the nuances of making this thing work and keeping it together. When you loosen that glue, brother, it's gone. If anybody knows anything financing, you can make one trip-up there and it takes you years to get straightened out. But I'll agree with you that we don't have sufficient enough personnel up there to do the job. I think you may have some incompetency in some areas, but I think that that needs to be evaluated and we need to look at bringing people back on board that will do what you're talking about, having people with the capacity to do the job and to get us through this thing on time. That's very vital. If not, like I said, we're back to the point that we were in 1985, and you very well remember that when we couldn't reconcile the books, we couldn't keep up with what we they were doing in the courts over there and then we had to come out and put it in the audit department and all those kinds of things. Memorial was taking us for a whole lot of money. You see, all of these things that people are talking about and don't know about and don't know all the nuances of it, yes, it's kind of strange as to what is going on up there now, but if you know the department and see how it was decimated, then one can understand why we're where we're at.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, point of clarification please. Chairman Hair said, well, let's stay in order and we still have two Commissioners and he still has the floor. Commissioner Kicklighter asked, may I just get him to identify —? Mr. Tindol, if you would for the public, I think it would be good to identify who you are and what your relationship is. Chairman Hair said, okay. Mr. Tindol said, my name is Rick Tindol. I'm a partner with Karp, Ronning and Tindol, CPA's, who are the independent County auditors. Let me add, we were the independent County auditors. Our contract ran out with the June 30th audit. Commissioner Kicklighter said, thank you. I just thought that would helpful.

Chairman Hair said, all right, Commissioner Rivers, you still have the floor. Commissioner Rivers said, no. Chairman Hair said, Commissioner McMasters and then Commissioner Murray.

Commissioner McMasters said, thank you, Chairman Hair. Mr. Tindol, as our outside auditors, in the failure to reconcile cash bank accounts on a timely basis there are —, there are three accounts. The collection account not

reconciled since June 2002, the accounts payable account not reconciled since September 2002, and the tax deposit account was not reconciled except to September 2002. All these other accounts seem to have been reconciled to January or February of 2003. Do you have any idea —, is there any correlation between these three accounts or do you have any insight why these three accounts were that overlooked? I'm just curious. Mr. Tindol said, I may call on Derrick Cowart to get his insight on this too, but these accounts are probably your larger accounts that are more difficult to reconcile. Commissioner McMasters said, to reconcile. Mr. Tindol said, that's certainly no way of an excuse. All accounts need to be reconciled at least monthly. Commissioner McMasters said, and I'm not trying to fix any blame here or get anybody involved. I'm just trying to understand from a reconciliation prospective. Is it safe to assume that had these particular accounts been reconciled properly or on time that our cash on hand might have been a different number? Mr. Tindol said, that's very, very true. Commissioner McMasters asked, there is a correlation between these and our cash point is there not? Okay. Mr. Tindol said, and I would think this particular instance, cash being the most liquid asset, that's the thing that needs to be done if nothing else gets done. Commissioner McMasters said, so three of our most important accounts that are cash in hand or cash in the bank were the ones that were neglected the most? Mr. Tindol said, correct.

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Murray.

Commissioner Murray said, I appreciate the information that you brought and clarification on a lot of it, but I would also like to say that this Commission is the one that froze the position of Finance Director and we did that in this year's budget. I personally believe we made a mistake. We have now given the Manager the authorization to go ahead and advertise for that position. We just approved today earlier for two more positions in that department. I don't know how long it's going to take to get these people on board to do the job that needs to be done up there, but I would also like to commend Reese White for stepping into something that I believe I'd had told the Manager where he could put it and I would have left the County to go into that department. County Manager Abolt said, thank you. Commissioner Murray said, Reese [White] has done a great job trying to come in here and clean up some things. Now I don't know who's at fault, don't care who's at fault. Right now the major thing is get it back where it needs to be and let's get it where we're supposed to be so we can move forward and then we can sort out what the causes were and why it got to where it did. Mr. Tindol said, you're 100 percent, Commissioner.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, with the exception of we did not freeze that position. County Manager Abolt said, yes, you did. Chairman Hair said, yes, we did too. County Manager Abolt said, yes, you did. Chairman Hair said, we froze it. County Manager Abolt said, you froze it, sir. Commissioner Murray said, we sure did.

Chairman Hair asked, Commissioner Rayno, do you want to continue? Commissioner Murray said, we sure did. We froze all the rest of them. Chairman Hair said, yeah, we froze them, all of them. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I'm sorry, Russ [Abolt].

Commissioner Rayno said, the picture is even better in the SSD department where we have a fund balance of June 30, 2002, of \$4,342,000, which is a lot more than what we were told at budget time last year. Incredible difference between the two. I'd also like to point out that one of the reasons that we got to the point where we had the savings was the fact of the some of the things the Commission did that were quite controversial, but they made a big difference in us starting to come back in a positive direction. One of those things was the work that we did with the privatization of EMS. Although it was very controversial, it was larger contributor to helping our fund balance situation. Also some of the savings we made with our health care change. It was very controversial, but it put the County back in a positive direction. Also, some of the savings that were done by some of the folks in general government, the judiciary, public safety and debt service categories. Those were based on some of the hiring freezes we did. They beared some of the things and we started back on a positive track, and we should not look at these fund balances today as something that we can go in to [inaudible] and start spending again. We still need to continue down the path of fiscal responsibility for a year or two more and we'll be in a position then where our bond rating will increase, we'll be able to issue TAN notes. In the meantime, our cash flow position will improve and I think it's time to realize we did the right thing even though it was controversial and I'm sure there's going to be challenges ahead in this budget, but I hope that we dispel some of the myths that rolling back property tax rate or leaving it the same hurts government or you can't grow on tax digest. Now there's going to be a point and it's evidenced by the number of people here in the audience today that you can only grow to a point and that brings about a future challenge for us and that is the fact that much of our property tax equation is based on our government depending on property taxes, too much so, 70-plus percent. We need to look at moving towards a sales tax type funding of our government. We could do that through the HOST. People say it's revenue neutral, but it gets you away from the property tax equation and puts you back on a sales tax equation, which is where most people believe that we should be as you saw evidenced in the four to five to one response to SPLOST in the last referendum, and I think that people agree with that if we gave them the information they needed and moved forward. Also, I wanted you to know that people said that we're gutting government from the 2001 to 2002 general government got three million more dollars, judiciary got one million more dollars, public safety got one million more dollars, public works got 600,000 more dollars, health care got one million more dollars and cultural and recreation got close to two million more dollars. Nothing got gutted. Everything increased. As I said last year and I'll say it again this year, things increased they didn't decrease. You can see by the charts behind me, government grew, it didn't shrink. Please don't fall prey to the fallacy come budget time for people to tell you it was a dire position, when in fact we're on the road to recovery. We need to stay on that road. It's very, very important. Now I would like to move to the reportable conditions and I'll go back to my chair.

Chairman Hair asked, just for planning purposes, Commissioner Rayno, how long do you —, another hour? How long do you need? Commissioner Rayno said, it will be 20 minutes. Chairman Hair said, 20 minutes. Okay.

Commissioner Rayno said, Finding 2-01 was County's inability to produce meaningful and timely financial statements, which —, some of which Mr. Tindol addressed, and I mentioned previously under May 10th of last year we got a three-quarter financial report where one of the things talked about a change in the budget and said the change was 104 percent. I, of course, questioned that percentage. It was wrong. There's numerous other errors in that three-quarter report. There was also three or four pages of missing data. Mr. Ken Earls said, we can't hear you. Commissioner Rayno said, I guess my question, which is kind of a rhetorical question, is how can the County Commission make budget decisions when they're given incomplete data and if I question the data at the time and I say that it's fuzzy math, I'm told that it's not, we have a professional staff, and now we zoom ahead one year later and we say we're in a crisis. You can respond.

County Manager Abolt said, I don't know if it's rhetorical or not. I know you choose the term fuzzy math. To the best of our ability, given the resources that we have throughout the budget process we gave you the very best information. You made your decisions and we abide by those decisions. That information was accurate. [Inaudible] deliberations on the budget where in effect staff had misspoken. The wall behind me, remember at your last meeting, even throughout all this turmoil within the Finance Department, all the problems you are well aware of, we hung a 14th plaque on that wall from the Government Finance Officers Association recognizing the quality of our budget.

Commissioner Rayno said, well, I guess my point is it's my believe that the County Manager should review these financial reports prior to them coming to the Commission to look for errors so that we get the most update and accurate information possible, and I would think just a simple cursory glance would have noticed that there were three or four pages that were completely blank of data. And I'll move on. When the budget passed on August 9th, County Manager Abolt said, and this is from the minutes from August 9th, he said: "[W]hat I'm saying is these are not real numbers. I told you that. What I'm trying to get is at least the opportunity to raise the \$1,012,290 —. Commissioner Rayno said, you need to work off this sheet here. County Manager Abolt said, what I'm telling you is those are not real numbers." According to the audit that came in, in 2002 for the County Commissioners' budget we spent \$457,000. We budgeted \$460,000. So while they weren't real numbers, they still came ahead of the last year numbers. Jot that. The County Attorney, County Clerk, Building M&O, Youth Commission, County Manager, Tax Assessor, Tax Commissioner, Elections Board, all came in less and we gave them more money in the budget [inaudible]. Nobody's department got gutted last year in that budget process. We had inadequate training and planning for the GASB 34, which is one of the reportable conditions. Governments around the State of Georgia have know about GASB 34 since 1999. As a matter of fact, Chatham's deadline for meeting GASB 34 requirements was June 15, 2001. When I came back from a training session, I had asked about GASB 34, but a number of events occurred prior to that. The Department of Audits and Accounts from Atlanta offered two-day training sessions on the implementation of GASB 34 in October of 1999. They sent this information to David Persaud, who shared that with Russ Abolt. So since 1999 we've known about GASB 34. Persaud issues a memorandum on September 7 of 2000 alerting all departments of GASB 34 and sent the memo to Russ [Abolt] for distribution. Mr. Abolt underlines the implementation date of June 30th, 2001. On March 22nd, 2001, I sent a memo to Russ Abolt asking about the preparation for GASB 34 and I even sent him a brochure on a solution provider called FAS Suite to generate every conceivable GASB 34 report. My question is specifically: How are we positioned for GASB 34? Will there be an informal presentation? Mr. Abolt responds: "Jeff, yes. That's the answer to your question about our preparation for GASB 34 So much work has to be done. David Persaud and his highly professional staff are on top of the challenge. Currently as we evaluate proposals for the services of an external auditor, one of the determining criteria will be assistance they can provide as we make the transition. By copy of this I'm asking David to give a detailed written status on our preparation. Following your receipt of that, should you like an official presentation to the Board it will be done." On March 26th of that same year David Persaud sent a report on preparations. Included is a September 14th memo to Robert Drewry, Public Works, and Al Bungard, the County Engineer. The subject of the memo was development of Chatham County's capital assets and infrastructure assets for finance reporting as of June 30th, 2001, required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board GASB 34. The memo clearly outlined all the requirements for the gentlemen and there was a specific request for a draft by December 31st of 2000. Did Mr. Persaud ever give you a draft of December 31st of 2000, Mr. Abolt?

County Manager Abolt said, I don't recall all the facts of the situation. I'll be glad to research it, sir. On the issue of GASB 34, it was a major commitment of staff. When you talk about these different events, obviously I cannot doubt the fact [inaudible] choose not to, but you must overlay what is actually happening within the Finance Department, and during approximately the same period of time we're losing the heart of that department. We're not backing off of our responsibilities for GASB, but in effect when all is said and done and going back a year ago, we found ourselves absent those resources in a very short period of time. Now what has happened since then? It's like Commissioner Murray had said, we have had —, and I call it a blessing —, the quality of the people who were able to move in to do this work in a relatively short period of time going forward, and in my budget recommendation to you for finances next year, we will have fully identified the resources we need because, as you well know, GASB 34 and what we've done this year is just the beginning. It's a very desirable end product in normal times. I submit to you over the last year, given the transition within the Finance Department, we did not have normal times plus we had our other work [inaudible]. You'll recall the Department of Community Affairs Chart of Accounts had to be implemented. To get timely financial reports at the same time we implemented a new computer system. All this is layered on a department that was already crippled and had it not been for the ability to move Mr. White and the Internal Audit staff in, we would go back to just what Commissioner Rivers said about 10 or 15 minutes ago, we would not have the resources to get the job done.

Commissioner Rayno said, so your memo to me saying that David Persaud's highly professional staff were on top of the challenge was incorrect. County Manager Abolt said, sir, I don't know the intent of your question, and I will certainly answer to the best of my ability. The individual you mentioned is not here. Other individuals, as I —, not

by name, but others have mentioned them, are not here either. In a short period of time, through no fault of anyone, people made choices and a couple of choices those to retire. Another situation, the head of the department chose to go to another jurisdiction. I have repeatedly used an analogy that applies today, and you're just emphasizing that, remember many times I've said, when we lost the Finance Director in May, it was similar to losing the CEMA Director if a hurricane was coming down the mouth of the Savannah River. When I said that, and Mr. White was in the audience, he said, no, it's worse. And what you're seeing today and what you're saying today is just an amplification of the warnings we've given you. We have not shirked from the warnings. We've committed the very best people on staff to begin solving the problems. Commissioner Rayno said, I guess the other thing that came out is the [inaudible] findings with the timely statements and apparently in your response you said it was a recent phenomenon although in the '96 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report there was a reportable finding for the Henderson Golf Fund, in '97 there was a report on the Federal grant activity, in '98 was a report on the funds from the courts, in 2001 there was a report on books and records and few other findings, three, four and five in 2001.

Commissioner Rayno said, on decentralized cash collection points they have been entered since about 1996. County Manager Abolt said, sir, in response to that and all the others, particularly the decentralized cash points, it's true today with constitutional officers and the responsibilities they have in Georgia law, we have always reported that unless the law changes or there are major innovations from the standpoint of the involvement of these constitutional officers, we cannot have centralized cash flow —, cash accounting, I'm sorry. Commissioner Rayno asked, have you had meetings with the constitutional officers — County Manager Abolt said, yes, sir, and there have been —. Commissioner Rayno asked, — this year? County Manager Abolt said, no, sir, not this year. Commissioner Rayno asked, to address that problem? County Manager Abolt said, no, sir. This has been addressed repeatedly in the past and there are legal issues why that could not be done. Commissioner Rayno asked, when was the last time you met with them? County Manager Abolt said, I don't know.

Commissioner Rayno said, bank accounts were not reconciled on a timely basis. The reason for this was explained as being a top level employee was fired. This indicates there was no cross-training in the department as recommended to staff as early as 2001. It also doesn't account for the fact that this was listed as a problem as early as 1998. But also this is very —, very troubling because we had the potential to lose funds if the accounts are not reconciled in 60 days, and how do we know whether or not we've lost any money in the process? County Manager Abolt said, well, sir, I'm not really disagreeing with much of what you say, but I will go back to my analogy of about two minutes ago. We are in a crisis. I mentioned —, I don't mean this the way it's going to sound —, I advised the Board of that crisis as soon as it became readily apparent. What you're doing today, certainly you have the very right to do it and I support your right to do that, is underscoring and in effect emphasizing the critical nature we found ourselves come last Spring, and we're committing the resources. With your motion today you've allowed me to commit more resources. I view my responsibilities to be twofold here. It's my responsibility as your Manager to let you know when there are problems of any significance. I did that immediately. I'm also responsible for taking what resources I have to commit to solve that problem. I did that. I shifted in some very bright people to work with some other bright people to provide some cohesion to get us through it. I also came to you today and asking for, in effect, two more people, which you've given me, but you cannot find ourselves in a crisis situation trying to in effect use what amplifies and describes the crisis as finding fault. Fault can be found if, number one, you were not alerted to it and, number two, once alerted resources were not committed to begin to solve the problem. But I submit to you over the years, and if you overlay the same time line in which you've been giving us the specific information, that Finance staff has not grown. We have had an organization in the last fifteen years, and I've mentioned it on more than one occasion, where up until nine years ago we had, I think, 22 or 23 positions —, okay, 23 positions, and then nine years ago one more position was added. In the complexity of things that have gone on over the last 15 years, I think a prudent person would realize that's not enough folks to get the job done, and you add to that fact insufficient resources and then layer onto it this major work, GASB 34, DCA Chart of Accounts, new computer system, and we found ourselves in this situation. But just like Commissioner Murray said so well a few minutes ago and others, we are about to turn the corner. You've given me the authority to put qualified people in to solve the problem. To learn from what we have done in the past or not done is beneficial, but to in effect lose the moment, lose our ability to make these corrections I think is inappropriate. That's why I'm so appreciative of what you've done to approve these two positions. This is not just historical, it is a learning and a significant experience for this corporation. It means, in effect, across-the-board cuts, reductions in expenditures in very critical line items, there's no constituency for a Finance Department. In normal times obviously the high profile issue is law enforcement and recreation. There's always people that come before you and say we need more. Very few times do you ever hear anybody say let's do something more for Finance. So Finance in and of itself has been neglected. People are now and you are describing the effects of that neglect. Commissioner Rayno said, I think I can agree with you on the Finance Director and the Assistant Finance Director positions, but about adding more bodies to a body that's been described as dysfunctional I think there needs to be a cure, someone was in there to —. County Manager Abolt said, I submit to you the cure is management and the cure has to do in our on workaday lives. When we're supervising people, we have to supervise them by being in place. There has never been an Assistant Director. You all know my style, and others —, Commissioner Odell said it in the pre-meeting. I don't have —, I have one Assistant Manager. How do I get by with that? I have 12 people that report to me, 11 department heads and the Assistant County Manager. That means I must work very closely with and demand the presence and services of department heads. So what happens? I'm dealing day in and day out. A Commissioner might come in, there might be a call, I might have a need and I will call a department head, a Finance Director, and say I need you. I will then focus that person's attention. Guess what happens while he's not there? There then can be a void in supervision. We got by for a number of years because we had people that were experienced, people that were willing to take that additional load, people that went, okay, we'll get by this year, we will not ask for more people, we will in effect recognize the financial situation the County's in and we'll get by. We've got by, we got by, we got by. Until when? Until the heart of the organization chose to no longer be part

of the organization. Commissioner Rayno said, I would agree with you that the key to fixing a dysfunctional organization is better management and I appreciate the comments.

Commissioner Rayno said, the last thing I have is capital assets accounting deficiencies. In a September 14, 2000, memo to Al Bungard and Robert Drewry, it had as its number one priority reporting capital assets, and I believe if it was addressed at that time in 2000, [inaudible] was an oversight, we would not have had that finding in the CAFR. And I thank you for your indulgence, Dr. Hair and fellow Commissioners.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. Commissioner Rivers asked, can I just ask a question of Russ [Abolt]? Chairman Hair said, go ahead.

Commissioner Rivers said, Russ [Abolt]. County Manager Abolt said, yes, sir. Commissioner Rivers said, pertaining to GASB, do we have adequate people or are we going to contract for infrastructure, sending them back [inaudible]? County Manager Abolt said, thank you. Commissioner Rivers said, you know, I think people don't really have an idea of what GASB is all about and how much detail it takes in inventorying and putting value on things that we have had, like roads, for 50 years and recovered and resurfaced and all that, and we didn't —, we don't have adequate records now. If we had inadequate records back then, so putting an evaluation on a road or when a road has been resurfaced and all that and a cost and factoring all of that out takes an enormous amount of expertise, so I'm hoping that we get to that point so that they won't come back, and when they understand GASB, then they'll understand where you're coming from. County Manager Abolt said, I commend you for your knowledge of this, and I've done repeatedly —, appreciate, you know, what you've done to really understand the operation of that department. But you're absolutely right. In next budget year we have to go and seek the services of a firm that can in effect appraise and evaluate what has happened. For the general audience I think GASB 34 is just alphabet soup, but what it really means is governments across the country now must be run like a business, so all of our assets must be accounted for, valued and depreciated. Sounds good, not bad, but like Commissioner Rivers said, it's never been done before. That means that all this year while we were waiting for the books to close Reese White and others on his staff in Internal Audit were out doing what you talked about. It is a monumental job. Just not looking at stuff in recent times, this has never been done before, so the assets, all the roads, all the buildings in effect had to be calculated, valued and depreciated. Commissioner Rivers said, and that's why 15 years ago I asked for a depreciation account so that we could replace things that have [inaudible]. See, a lot of people don't even recognize what has happened to this County. We talk about monies that we've got in growth. Well, what about the monies that were taken away? I can go back to when I first came on, \$2.8 million in Federal Revenue Funds that used to come, we used to buy cars and do all the infrastructure, gone. Never replaced.

Chairman Hair said, okay.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Odell moved to create and fund the position of Assistant Finance Director and fund a currently authorized but unfunded position of Financial Services Manager from recurring revenue. Commissioner Kicklighter seconded the motion. Chairman Hair and Commissioners Rivers, McMasters, Murray, Odell, Kicklighter and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Commissioners Rayno and Gellatly voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of seven to two.

=====

- 3. REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF HIRING FREEZE:
 MOSQUITO CONTROL - ONE (1) ENTOMOLOGY TECHNICIAN
 POLICE DEPARTMENT - ONE (1) ANIMAL CARE ASSISTANT
 SUPERIOR COURT ADMINISTRATOR - ONE (1) LEGAL ASSISTANT
 DISTRICT ATTORNEY - TWO (2) DISTRICT ATTORNEY IV
 TAX COMMISSIONER - TWO (2) TAX/TAG PROCESSOR I; ~~TWO (2)~~ FOUR (2)
 TAX/TAG/ TITLE PROCESSOR II; AND ~~ONE (1)~~ TWO (2) TAX/TAG SUPERVISOR**

Chairman Hair said, first we have a request for waiver of hiring freeze, Mosquito Control, one Entomology Technician. We'll take these one at a time. Commissioner Rayno said, motion to approve. Commissioner Murray said, second. Chairman Hair said, we have a motion and a second. All those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Kicklighter was not present.] Chairman Hair said, the motion is approved.

Chairman Hair said, Police Department, one Animal Care Assistant. Commissioner Odell said, move for approval. Commissioner Murray said, second. Chairman Hair said, second. Any discussion? All those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Kicklighter was not present.] Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

Chairman Hair said, Superior Court Administrator, one Legal Assistant. Commissioner Rayno said, move to approve. Chairman Hair asked, second? Commissioner Murray said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Kicklighter was not present.] Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

Chairman Hair said, District Attorney, two District Attorney IV positions. Commissioner Rayno said, motion to approve. Chairman Hair asked, second? Commissioner Thomas said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in

favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Kicklighter was not present.] Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

Chairman Hair said, Tax Commissioner, two Tax/Tag Processor I, four Tax/Tag/Title Processor II and two Tax/Tag Supervisors. Commissioner Thomas said, move for approval. Chairman Hair asked, second. Commissioner Rayno said, second with discussion. Chairman Hair said, okay, we'll have discussion. Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Rayno.

Commissioner Rayno said, I normally wouldn't approve waivers, but we've been tracking expenditures of all these departments. Mosquito Control's been running at 71.59% at the third quarter with 71.12 in their employee line items, so they were well within their budget to keep these people on line. The Police Department, Animal Control's been running at 55% at the third quarter, which is very good, so they obviously can afford to put more people in. Superior Court Administrator their employee line item was 71%. The DA was running on their employee item at 66%. The Tax Commissioner was running at 70.92% in their employee line item, and the Tax Assessor, who all the complaints were about last week by the six people, they're running at 63.32% at the third quarter, well below 75%. I'd just like to personally thank all these departments for staying within their budget this year and following that and that's the reason why I approve of this.

Chairman Hair recognized Tax Commissioner Danny Powers.

Mr. Powers asked, Billy [Hair], how many did you mention on there? Chairman Hair said, I read your changes. Four Tax/Tag/Title Processor II and two Tax/Tag Supervisors. I made this adjustment. Mr. Powers said, okay. Chairman Hair said, that's what you asked to make.

Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rayno moved to approve the request for waiver of the hiring freeze for Mosquito Control, one Entomology Technician. Commissioner Murray seconded the motion and carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Kicklighter was not present.]

Commissioner Odell moved to approve the request for waiver of the hiring freeze for Police Department, one Animal Care Assistant. Commissioner Murray seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Kicklighter was not present.]

Commissioner Rayno moved to approve the request for waiver of the hiring freeze for Superior Court Administrator, one Legal Assistant. Commissioner Murray seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Kicklighter was not present.]

Commissioner Rayno moved to approve the request for waiver of the hiring freeze for District Attorney, two District Attorney IV positions. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Kicklighter was not present.]

Commissioner Thomas moved to approve the request for waiver of the hiring freeze for Tax Commissioner, two Tax/Tag Processor I, four Tax/Tag/Title Processor II and two Tax/Tag Supervisors. Commissioner Rayno seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

X. ACTION CALENDAR

(The Board can entertain one motion to adopt the below-listed calendar. Such motion would mean adoption of staff's recommendation. Any Board Member may choose to pull an item from the calendar and it would be considered separately.)

Chairman Hair asked, anybody want to pull anything off the Action Calendar. Commissioner Rayno asked, can we move to the Southeast Land Plan. Chairman Hair said, let's do the Action Calendar first. It won't take but a minute to do this. Let's get this out of the way. Commissioner Murray said, move for approval. Commissioner Rayno said, pull A and H. Chairman Hair said, A and H. Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to approve the balance of the Action Calendar. Commissioner Rivers said, so moved. Chairman Hair asked, second? Commissioner Thomas said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved that the Action Calendar be approved in its entirety with the exception of Items 13-A and 13-H. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

[NOTE: ACTION OF THE BOARD IS SHOWN ON EACH ITEM AS THOUGH AN INDIVIDUAL MOTION WAS MADE THEREON.]

=====

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRE-MEETING AND REGULAR MEETING ON MARCH 28, 2003, AS MAILED.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve the minutes of the pre-meeting and regular meeting on March 28, 2003, as mailed. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

2. CLAIMS VS. CHATHAM COUNTY FOR THE PERIOD MARCH 19 THROUGH APRIL 1, 2003.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved that the Finance Director is authorized to pay claims for the period March 19, 2003, through April 1, 2003, in the amount of \$4,407,634. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

3. REQUEST FROM ASPINWALL ENGINEERING, ENGINEER FOR OKATIE CORPORATION, DEVELOPER, TO RECORD THE SUBDIVISION PLAT FOR CYPRESS CREEK, PHASE 2, AND ACCEPT THE FINANCIAL GUARANTEE. [DISTRICT 7.]

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve the request from Aspinwall Engineering, engineer for Okatie Corporation, developer, to record the subdivision plat for Cypress Creek, Phase 2, and accept the financial guarantee. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

4. REQUEST FROM EMC, ENGINEER FOR GREEN ISLAND ROAD DEVELOPMENT CO., FOR THE COUNTY TO APPROVE THE FINAL PLAT FOR RECORDING AND ACCEPT THE FINANCIAL GUARANTEE. [DISTRICT 4.]

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve the request from Green Island Road Development Co., to approve the final plat for recording and accept the financial guarantee. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

- 5. **REQUEST FROM HUSSEY, GAY, BELL & DEYOUNG, ENGINEER FOR ALBERT LUFBURROW, DEVELOPER, TO RECORD THE SUBDIVISION PLAT FOR SOUTH HARBOR, PHASE 1E-2 AND RELEASE THE REMAINING MAINTENANCE GUARANTEE. [DISTRICT 4.]**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve the request from Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, engineer for Albert Lufburrow, developer, to record the subdivision plat for South Harbor, Phase 1-E-2 and release the remaining maintenance guarantee. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

- 6. **REQUEST BOARD APPROVE A RIGHT OF ENTRY AGREEMENT BETWEEN CHATHAM COUNTY AND THE CITY OF SAVANNAH FOR THE MONTGOMERY CROSS ROAD/MIDDLEGROUND ROAD WIDENING PROJECT. [DISTRICT 2.]**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve a Right of Entry Agreement between Chatham County and the City of Savannah for the Montgomery Cross Road/Middleground Road Widening Project. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

- 7. **REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION TRANSMITTING AN UPDATE OF THE FIVE-YEAR SHORT-TERM SOLID WASTE WORK PLAN.**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve a resolution transmitting an update of the five-year short-term Solid Waste Work Plan. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

- 8. **REQUEST FOR A BEER POURING AND SUNDAY SALES LICENSE IN CONNECTION WITH A SPECIAL EVENT TO BE HELD ON MAY 3RD & 4TH, 2003. PETITIONER: MICHAEL JEROME HOGAN, SR., REPRESENTING THE TURNER'S CREEK BLESSING OF THE FLEET AND BOAT PARADE, INC., LOCATED AT HOGAN'S MARINA AT 36 WILMINGTON ISLAND ROAD. [DISTRICT 4.]**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve the request of petitioner Michael Jerome Hogan, Sr., representing the Turner's Creek Blessing of the Fleet and Boat Parade, Inc., located at Hogan's Marina at 36 Wilmington Island Road, for a beer pouring and Sunday sales license in connection with a special event to be held on May 3rd and 4th, 2003. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

- 9. **REQUEST APPROVAL OF RENEWAL OF SUNDAY SALES OF BEER, WINE AND LIQUOR POURING LICENSE FOR 2003. PETITIONER: RICKY PERRY, D/B/A FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, LOCATED AT 5406 LAROCHE AVENUE. [DISTRICT 3.]**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve the request of petitioner Ricky Perry, d/b/a Fraternal Order of Eagles, located at 5406 LaRoche Avenue, for renewal of Sunday sales of beer, wine and liquor pouring license for 2003. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

10. REQUEST FOR RENEWAL OF SUNDAY SALES OF BEER, WINE AND LIQUOR POURING LICENSE FOR 2003. PETITIONER: JIMMY HARVEY, D/B/A SHAMROCK'S IRISH PUB, LOCATED AT 348 JOHNNY MERCER BOULEVARD. [DISTRICT 4.]

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve the request of petitioner Jimmy Harvey, d/b/a Shamrock's Irish Pub, located at 348 Johnny Mercer Boulevard, for renewal of Sunday sales of beer, wine and liquor pouring license for 2003. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

11. REQUEST BOARD APPROVE FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CONNIE BENTLEY AND TOMMY K. BENTLEY V. RONNIE CARTER, CIVIL ACTION NO. I01-4155-G, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$12,000 AND PAY THE COST OF THE MEDIATION THAT TOOK PLACE ON MARCH 26, 2003, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,200.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve final settlement of Connie Bentley and Tommy K. Bentley v. Ronnie Carter, Civil Action No. 101-4155-G, in the amount of \$12,000, and pay the cost of mediation that took place on March 26, 2003, in the amount of \$1,200. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

12. REQUEST BOARD AUTHORIZE CHAIRMAN TO EXECUTE A DEED CONVEYING COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY ADJACENT TO LAND OF ANNA M. BRANCATO TO ANNA M. BRANCATO AS PART OF SETTLEMENT OF CHATHAM COUNTY V. 0.221 ACRES OF LAND; ANNA M. BRANCATO; NATIONS BANK OF GEORGIA, ET AL., CIVIL ACTION NO. CV99-1008-KA. [DISTRICT 1.]

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to authorize the Chairman to execute a deed conveying County-owned property adjacent to land of Anna M. Brancato to Anna M. Brancato as part of settlement of Chatham County v. 0.221 Acres of Land; Anna M. Brancato; Nations Bank of Georgia, et al, Civil Action No. CV99-10-8-KA. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

13. REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL TO AWARD BIDS AS FOLLOWS: (Please note that new purchase thresholds of \$10,000 or more have been enacted; however, contracts and change orders of a lesser amount still will appear.)

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DEPT.</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
A. Annual software maintenance agreement	Assessor	ESRI, Inc. (sole source)	\$13,650	General Fund/M&O - Assessor
B. Two (2) SeaDoo jet skis and a dual trailer	Marine Patrol	Savannah Kawasaki	\$11,185	General Fund/M&O - Marine Patrol
C. Change Order No. 1 to the contract for the upgrade of the fire alarm system for the Chatham County Judicial Courthouse for replacement of smoke detector	Facilities Maintenance and Operations	Southeastern System Technologies, Inc.	\$1,502	Bond Funding - HVAC replacement, Courthouse Improvements and Adaptive reuse of Old Jail
D. Construction contract for the Benton Blvd. (Spur 21), Phase 2 project	Engineering	R. B. Baker Construction, Inc.	\$1,323,644.25	•GDOT •IP Realty Corporation

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DEPT.</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
E. Annual contract with automatic renewal options for four additional one-year terms to provide various types of high volume printing requirements	Various	Wynn Business Systems, Inc.	Varies by item	•General Fund/M&O - Various •SSD - Various
F. Annual contract with automatic renewal options for three additional one-year terms to provide ammunition to various law enforcement agencies	Various	•Master Cartridge Corporation •Gulf States Distributors	Varies by item	•General Fund/M&O - Various •Confiscated Funds - Various •SSD - Various
G. Third year of a five-year full service HVAC maintenance agreement with automatic renewal for each year for the remaining two years	Facilities Maintenance and Operations	Erickson Associates, Inc.	•Year 2003: \$35,000 •Year 2004: \$35,000 •Year 2005: \$40,000	General Fund/M&O - Facilities Maintenance and Operations
H. Contract for the design improvements of various County roads	SPLOST	EMC Engineering, Inc.	\$153,571	•SPLOST (1985-1993) - Reserve for various County roads •SPLOST (1993-1998) - Reserve for unincorporated local road (pending Board approval of transfer)

As to Items 13-B through 13-G:

Commissioner Rivers moved to approve Items 13-B through 13-G. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

As to Item 13-A:

Annual software maintenance agreement; Assessor; ESRI, Inc. (sole source); \$13,650; General Fund/M&O - Assessor.

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Rayno.

Commissioner Rayno asked, is somebody here from the Board of Assessors? Chairman Hair asked, anybody here from the Board of Assessors? Commissioner Rayno said, I just want to table it because, you know, if this is the COBOL Program, there's no point approving a four-year contract, prorate it. Chairman Hair said, make a motion. Chairman Hair said, I make a motion to table. Commissioner Murray asked, can we find out before —? Commissioner Rayno said, let's table it. Commissioner Murray said, before we finish the meeting though. There might be some [inaudible]. Commissioner Rayno said, well —. Chairman Hair said, let's go ahead and table it. Commissioner Kicklighter said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. Chairman Hair and Commissioners Rayno, Rivers, McMasters, Murray, Gellatly, Kicklighter and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Commissioner Odell voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of eight to one. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

As to Item 13-H:

Contract for the design improvements of various County roads; SPLOST; EMC Engineering, Inc., \$153,571; SPLOST (1985-1993) - Reserve for various County roads and SPLOST (1993-1998) - Reserve for unincorporated local road (pending Board approval of transfer).

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Rayno.

Commissioner Rayno said, I don't have any problems with the company although there was a 2002 memo from Al Bungard to the company stating that they had instances of overcharging the County and he wanted to make sure that they would resolve the errors and I was wondering whether or not the company —.

Chairman Hair asked, Mr. Abolt, is Mr. Bungard here? County Manager Abolt said, I'd defer —, Mr. Bungard's available now. He's probably in the anteroom. Chairman Hair asked, are you aware —, can you answer Mr. Rayno's question? County Manager Abolt said, no, sir. I'll have —, Mr. Bungard is my authority on this? Chairman Hair asked, Mr. Monahan, can you answer your question? County Manager Abolt said, no, he's —, we'll get him.

Chairman Hair said, let's go ahead and do the First Readings if it's okay. We'll go ahead and do the First Readings and get those out of the way, and we'll come back to that item.

* * *

Chairman Hair said, Mr. Bungard, he's present now. Commissioner Rayno has a question for you dealing with Item #H, Contract for design improvements of various County roads; SPLOST; EMC Engineering, \$153,571. Mr. Bungard said, yes, sir.

Commissioner Rayno said, in November you had issues with EMC for overcharging. Did they correct all those clerical problems that they had? County Engineer Bungard said, yes, sir. Those were deducted from their —, they had applied for a payment and we deducted all that out and the CEO after that met with me and they said that resolved it. Our records are straight with them. Commissioner Rayno asked, so you're confident you won't be wasting, as you said before, staff time and effort to resolve errors? County Engineer Bungard said, time will tell. Commissioner Rayno said, okay. County Engineer Bungard said, we'll keep checking.

Chairman Hair said, I'll entertain a motion to approve. Commissioner Odell said, move for approval. Chairman Hair asked, second? Commissioner Thomas said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor vote yes, opposed vote no. The motion carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Murray was not present.] Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

1. Commissioner Rivers moved to approve Items 13-B through 13-G. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.
2. Commissioner Rayno moved to table Item 13-A. Commissioner Kicklighter seconded the motion. Chairman Hair and Commissioners Rayno, Rivers, McMasters, Murray, Gellatly, Kicklighter and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Commissioner Odell voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of eight to one.
3. Commissioner Odell moved to approve Item 13-H. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Murray was not present.]

=====

XI. FIRST READINGS

Proposed changes to ordinances must be read or presented in written form at two meetings held not less than one week apart. A vote on the following listed matters will occur at the next regularly scheduled meeting.
 Comments, discussion and debate from members of the public will be received only at the meeting at which a vote is to be taken on one of the following listed items.

1. **PETITIONER, DOWNER K. DAVIS, JR., AGENT (FOR ROBERT B. REDDING, OWNER) IS REQUESTING REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED IN SOUTHWEST CHATHAM COUNTY, SOUTHWEST OF CANEBRAKE ROAD ON THE NORTH SIDE OF BASIN ROAD FROM PDR-SM (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT RECLAMATION SURFACE MINING) AND R-A (RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURE) ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS TO R-1 (ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) AND R-A (RESIDENTIAL-AGRICULTURE) ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS. THE MPC RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF A REZONING OF A PORTION OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY (PIN 01-1029-02-001) FROM PDR-SM TO R-1. DENIAL OF THE PORTION OF PIN 01-1029-02-001 REQUESTED TO BE REZONED FROM PDR-SM TO R-A; HOWEVER, APPROVAL OF A REZONING OF THIS PORTION FROM R-A TO R-1-A (RESIDENTIAL-AGRICULTURE-LIMITED). APPROVAL OF REZONING FROM PDR-SM TO R-1 FOR THE PORTIONS OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IDENTIFIED AS PIN 01-1029-02-018 AND PIN 01-1029-02-019. APPROVAL OF A REZONING OF AN ADJACENT PROPERTY (PIN 01-1029-02-020) OWNED BY THE PETITIONER BUT NOT INCLUDED IN THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FROM R-A TO R-1-A.
 MPC FILE NO. Z-030214-41420-1
 [DISTRICT 6.]**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Chairman Hair read this item into the record as the first reading.

=====

2. THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS IS REQUESTING THAT THE CHATHAM COUNTY Zoning Ordinance, SECTION 9-3.1C, BE AMENDED TO REQUIRE THE IDENTIFICATION OF PROPERTY LINES AS PART OF THE PERMITTING PROCESS FOR THE DETERMINATION OF BUILDING SETBACK REQUIREMENTS. MPC FILE NO. Z-03026-554977-1. NO DISTRICT - TEXT AMENDMENT - UNINCORPORATED AREA

Commissioner McMasters asked, Milton [Newton], this —, in the background it says at a recent Chatham County Commission meeting, the Chatham County Commissioners directed the Director of Building Safety and Regulatory Services to prepare an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that would require property lines to be marked prior to a foundation, slab or footing inspection. The actual change in the language, and this is my concern, says prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Department of Building Safety and Regulatory Services shall determine the need and method for marking. The first of the request was to require and to me this language in the law change says that BSRS will determine the need. Is that not in conflict? Mr. Newton said, well, it's —. County Attorney Hart said, the only reason that language was placed like that is in a lot of subdivisions they're clearly marked, clearly defined and there's no problem and what you're asking somebody to do is go out and reshoot markers that are already located and everybody in the world knows what the four property lines are and it's not a problem of determination. This ordinance change is to deal with the older subdivisions or ill-marked subdivisions that after 15, 20 years of people living on the property, property lines get moved, stobs get kicked over, lawn mowers break things, and when you apply for your building permit what we're asking them to do is the Building and Regulatory Services [sic] feel confident that they know where the four corners of the property are so there are no disputes over building setback lines, and we don't want people to have to go out and do unnecessary things —. Commissioner McMasters said, agreed. County Attorney Hart said, — that they don't need to do, but we would like to reserve to the Inspections Department or Building and Regulatory Services Department [sic] the right to go out and look at the lot and say, hey, we might have trouble determining setback lines, please go mark the corners. So rather than making it a hundred percent mandatory, the language was written so that it would apply to the applicable situation. Commissioner McMasters said, okay, well, and I appreciate that explanation. Jon [Hart], does this ability to make an onsite call simply is what it —? County Attorney Hart said, yeah. I mean, it's just a matter of going and finding the monuments that mark the spot and if you can't find them, then somebody needs to go out and either relocate them or mark them so that you've got an idea where the setbacks are. I think it will be a very helpful amendment to the ordinance —. Commissioner McMasters said, I agree. County Attorney Hart said, — so where we don't have encroachments. Commissioner McMasters said, but fundamentally though, Jon [Hart], does it mean —, does it create any comeback to Building Regulatory Services if they go out and they say, hey, you really don't need it in this case and a problem arises? Are we creating a comeback to us for the failure to —? County Attorney Hart said, yes, sir. We have the —, if we have the judgment call, then we need to exercise the judgment correctly. I mean, that's truthful in everything. Commissioner McMasters said, and Building and Regulatory Services [sic] is prepared to exercise that judgment and take the comeback if it's —? County Attorney Hart said, I would assume —, I'll let Mr. Anderson speak to that.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Commissioner McMasters.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Read into the record as first reading.

=====

XII. SECOND READINGS

1. REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL TO AMEND THE ZONING TEXT AND MAP OF CHATHAM COUNTY AND TO ADOPT THE SOUTHEAST CHATHAM COUNTY COMMUNITY PLAN. Reminder: Plan was distributed at your last meeting. Please bring your copy. See attached amendments. MPC FILE NO. Z-030128-87600

Chairman Hair said, before we begin I think it's clear to everyone that this discussion is going to take two or three hours, maybe longer because we want to make sure that everybody that wants to speak to this has a right. I'm going to suggest that what we do is start the process, go to twelve o'clock, and break from 12:00 to 1:15 and come back and stay as long as we need to stay because everybody is going to need a break for lunch anyway. So we'll go until 12:00. Okay, continue Mr. Newton.

Mr. Milton Newton said, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, we have a brief presentation. I hope it will help to frame the issues and hopefully frame some of the discussion that will follow and focus a little more into those issues I think you will probably want to most deal with. This would be about a eight or nine minute presentation and, if you'll bear with us, then we can answer any questions you have, and I think you'll find the presentation helpful.

Commissioner Murray said, before you —, if we've got any people back here that can't see and want to come around, they're welcome to come stand up here or on this wall so they can see. Chairman Hair said, okay.

Mr. Newton said, okay, so Mr. Wilson will make the presentation.

Mr. Tom Wilson said, this is the area in question. Actually, it doesn't quite include all of the yellow area. It's on a maps because the census designated areas extend out that far, but we really studied the populated areas in the —, in Southeast Chatham and divided that into three study areas, the North area that's in the pink color, South area in the blue, and Skidaway in yellow. The whole committee process going back years identified a lot of characteristics that they —, the community would like to preserve in the plan. Of course we spent quite a bit of time discussing that and identifying those characteristics and methods of preserving those as the area develops further. You can see from this chart they've experienced significant growth from 1990 to 2000 in the Skidaway area in particular. Just tremendous growth in that area. It's beginning to level off, but it's still a significant growth rate there, and I think what really got people excited and wanted to —, wanting to crank up a planning process was all of that traffic that was going through the community. You can see the growth on Skidaway that generated a lot of traffic through many —, many other parts of the community. They saw a lot of change and realized that before there's additional change things needed to be done. And to put this in the broader context, countywide context, we developed of course before this an Islands Plan. When the Islands Plan was completed, the people in the Southeast wanted to look at it, recognizing that they were a similar area. They were to the east of the urbanized area, there were access issues like the East-West Connector, hurricane evacuation bottlenecks, they have the same marsh environment, peninsulas, islands, and so forth that were sensitive environments, as well as an amenity. They had a —, developed a character about them. They were very much built-out or approaching built-out compared to other areas; however, they had a —, still even though they were well-developed and largely built-out, particularly the Islands to a great extent, about 85% level, the Southeast as well, but still managed to retain a semi-rural type of character. Different from that, of course, is the urbanized areas, City of Savannah and other areas in the central part of the County, and the West is different still. West Chatham more growth opportunities, larger tracts of land, lots of different issues out there. I talked to our consultants about it and they said they're looking at something similar in the Durham area where they're planning kind of focuses on different sub-areas and they have different approaches in those areas. So I know it's —, there's a lot of concern that what's done in the Southeast or the Islands will be a —, an environmental overlay for instance —, could have adverse affects on growth out in West Chatham. But that's a different place, it has different issues that will require different approaches.

Mr. Wilson said, those are the three geographic areas that we see emerging in our planning process that have very different characteristics. County staff review of the plan is we had preliminary comments from County staff on the Southeast Plan during the MPC review process. We had received additional comments after the MPC approved its recommendations and they had some final wording to look at and in that —, in the interim period MPC staff has worked with County staff to resolve all those issues. You have a memo in your package that gets to that, and I think other than a minor rewording that you will see in this presentation, I think everyone's okay with the current draft. The substantive staff recommendations are many, many sort of technical recommendations that went into that, but these are some of the —, these are the substantive recommendations. Primarily related to the definition of greenspace, it was not in complete harmony with the Land Disturbing Activities Ordinance and the County staff was concerned about having a zoning definition that differed from the definition in another development ordinance. So we worked with them to make that definition consistent. Right-of-way, including the MPC tree planning recommendation, was to be removed from the definition of greenspace. County staff just felt that it was inappropriate to have that in there. Open water, ponds and lagoons should also be removed from the greenspace definition. We will offer you with respect to those second —, with the second and third bullets —, will offer you a way of keeping greenspace separate, but still crediting those items which were included in the MPC recommendation. I'll make that a little clearer as we go along.

The MPC staff recommendation is to include ponds and lagoons, and in the memo —, cover memo we gave you with the staff resolution memo we did not include revising language for right-of-way, but in this presentation we'll show you how that could be incorporated as well. So there's an A and a B coming up that you can look at. Adopting A and B would be consistent with the MPC recommendation that came forward to you.

Now this is Recommendation A. This is the MPC wording with the change underlined which would allow for ponds and lagoons to be counted along with greenspace. It would not be called greenspace, it would not enter into the definition of greenspace to create an inconsistency, but it would be added to greenspace. In more recent discussions with Engineering there is a slight rewording to this, and that would be to actually delete the part that's underlined and to add the words after the —, at the end of the first sentence to add the words "and common area, ponds and lagoons."

B includes both open water, those ponds and lagoons, and right-of-way. This is essentially the MPC recommendation, but again with right-of-way and ponds and lagoons pulled out of the definition of greenspace and treated as something as an additional type of area that is counted to meet the intent of this provision. Again, this wording or a variation —, with slight variation on this, which would delete the underlined wording and would add the wording "common area, ponds and lagoons and pervious right-of-way" at the end of the first sentence, that would essentially give you the MPC recommendation and address the concerns of County staff.

The effect of the amendments is to address the County staff concern, as mentioned, separating greenspace from right-of-way, but yet giving credit for that.

You'll hear about affordable housing and that is an issue that we addressed in several ways in the plan. We —, housing affordability can be affected if the greenspace standard is effective. That's a given. We recognize that and we've tried to find a balancing point. In the R-1 district, lot yield can begin to diminish above 20%. In many cases we can maintain lot yield up to that point. Parcel size, however, is a different matter. Two variables here. Parcel size may also diminish, but will diminish sooner at perhaps the 20 to 25% level and a lot of that depends on the efficiency of the site. Every site is different, the shape is different, the terrain is different, and so there's a site efficiency factor in here that will determine parcel size. As you know, we —, in the ordinance we allowed for a 10% reduction in parcel size to work around wooded areas, to work around wetlands, to change the shape of lots a little bit more than they can be changed now, which could result in slightly 10% smaller lots in some cases. Actual lot yield and lot size will depend on site development. Efficiency is a very important point. This is a little graphic that sort of gets into that. Lot yield is lower on an inefficient site and higher on an efficient site, as is parcel size.

Mr. Newton said, a comment on there, the efficiency we're talking about is obtaining the obvious of the shape of the property, not the inefficiency of the designer.

Mr. Wilson said, well, I guess it could be that, too, but not here. The importance of an affordable diverse housing supply, as reflected in the plan —, more than that, the plan illustrates how affordability and diversity can go hand in hand with environmental quality. I think it should be something we address in all of our planning and will be a continuing effort. A good plan must effectively address both.

Why have a standard for greenspace? What is this all about at the core? A lot of reasons. These are just a few. I think these are some important ones. To ensure that site resources are looked at and preserved whenever possible, a modest amount of environmental planning on a site and preserve wooded areas and wetlands and reduce the cumulative impact of removing resource —, that removing resources can have on eco-systems and urban [inaudible] effects. I worked in Miami as an adviser to a Habitat for Humanity development. It was the time the largest Habitat for Humanity development in the country. They were very concerned —, they planned to have about 35 to 40% greenspace on —, 35% on that site because they actually calculated what the electric bills would be and they did everything possible to keep electric bills and other utilities at a minimum, and one of their strategies for keeping electric bills down was to have more greenspace on the site, as well as for other purposes.

Second bullet, to reduce impervious surface thereby lessening runoff and water pollution and third to ensure that new development is in keeping with established neighborhoods, and this is the issue —, one of the issues in the Southeast Chatham community. What's the history of this standard? There was a standard proposed and adopted for the Islands over a year and a half ago at 30%. Committee initial recommendation for the Southeast was 30%. After further deliberation and looking at affordable housing issues and site efficiency issues and those —, that was modified. MPC staff initially proposed a compromise at 25%. After further —, at 20%. After further discussions, the MPC board recommended a 25% level of greenspace that included right-of-way —, included pervious surface, usually grassed areas in right-of-way. The Homebuilders Association has offered that this should be a voluntary provision. County Commission options: 30% without right-of-way. A great goal overall, but it should —, much of that should be achieved through voluntary efforts, through —, and a lot of it is. A lot of development does have greenspace at levels 30% and above, and the proposals include a provision for a density bonus of 10% for conservation design. That's design with 40% or more greenspace. That's an option, not one very many —, that's an option, but we believe it's an option overall including the voluntary measures. We don't think that can be achieved through mandatory levels, but nevertheless there may be some advocates for that. 25% without right-of-way or 20% with right-of-way. The —, we've looked at an example provided to us by Mr. McCorkle, representing the Homebuilders, and we found that the pervious area in the right-of-way on that example was exactly 5%. We've looked at some other examples and we think they're probably —, that 5% is probably very typical for that. So that would mean that 25% with right-of-way is about the same as 20% without the right-of-way. At the 20% level or 25% with right-of-way, will not likely reduce lot yield in the R-1 district, which is the base district, the highest density district that's found throughout the Southeast area. There's some —, there are some R-A, but much smaller areas where there's no density cap and it's a different story on that, but R-A is the primary district that's been under discussion —, R-1. Average lot sizes, at the 20% level will remain above —, typically remain above 6,000 square feet, but that will depend again on site efficiency. Again, the voluntary provision is another option you're looking at.

The —, this is the last slide. Common ground. MPC staff consultants, Homebuilders Association agree that the current MPC recommendation allows the development of the same number of houses on a tract without affecting housing affordability. We also agree that in some instances, depending in large measure upon the size and shape of the tract being developed, to maintain the same number of lots a reduction in lot size below the existing 6,000 square foot minimum would be required. But again that's going to depend —, in some cases it will. We provide for that to go down to 5,400 square feet if —, if and when it's necessary.

MPC staff believes the MPC board recommendation for a greenspace standard of 25% with an allowance for right-of-way green area appears to represent a point of convergence that would be the least objectionable to most parties. And that concludes the presentation.

Chairman Hair said, any questions from staff first before we get any questions from the audience? Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Odell.

Commissioner Odell said, one of the items that you listed as an objective was to ensure that the development is in keeping with the established neighborhood. Is that true? Mr. Wilson said, yes. Commissioner Odell said, okay. And I guess my question is, is New Mayfair in that area? The subdivision? Mr. Wilson said, yes. Commissioner

Odell said, okay. Would New Mayfair comply with the 25% mandatory greenspace? Mr. Newton said, I'd have to look at the —, I don't know? Commissioner Odell said, okay. I guess my other question, so would Planters Common Subdivision comply with the 25% set aside? Mr. Newton said, I don't think it has a set aside. I don't think it has a common area. Commissioner Odell said, so effectively the answer is that it would not. Mr. Newton said, yes. Commissioner Odell said, and therefore Planters Common would not exist if this plan existed. Mr. Wilson said, well, Planters Common would not exist, I don't believe, under the current zoning ordinance even without the provisions. The way it was subdivided was before zoning. Is that correct? Mr. Newton said, right, it was subdivided maybe back in the 20's or 30's and was not subdivided according to the current zoning standards. So it had to be more or less grandfathered. Mr. Wilson said, and I might add that those small lots that were created back then, which were I think 30-foot or small, small lots, much smaller than minimum lot size now, are actually not a bad idea according to the current thinking and we would like to see, with certain provisions such as greenspace, like to see a provision for smaller lots with good design. Commissioner Odell said, last meeting I asked a question of the undeveloped property, what percentage of the whole would that be? Would it be 15 to 20% or is it —? Mr. Wilson said, approximately 15%. Commissioner Odell said, so 85% of the property is already developed. Is that a fair —? Mr. Wilson said, it is, but I think there's concern about some of that 85% that is, you might say, under-developed. A lot of properties that are two, three, four, five acres with a house on them. In planning we often call that a tear-down situation where someone wants to come in and tear-down an old or small house on a five-acre lot, let's say, and they'll perhaps a large house, but perhaps also subdivide that, the five acres, you know, and in R-1 that's potential for 20 units or so. Commissioner Odell said, okay, so 15% undeveloped we're still somewhere between 85% developed. The question, therefore, for me at least is if you took that 85% that's developed and looking at your objective to ensure that the new development is in keeping with the established characteristics of the neighborhood, my question is what percentage of that 85% remainder would comply with the recommended 25% mandatory greenspace? Mr. Wilson said, there's a lot of differentiation there. I mean, that area developed organically over a long period of time, starting out with large, you know, houses on large lots, and it developed with a dense tree canopy, it developed with —, a lot of large —, a lot of those houses built on the large lots retained their trees. They didn't clear a site. Now what we see is a different situation where someone comes in on that three-acre site or that four-acre or five-acre site and clears the trees in the middle of a residential area whereas the trees were left when it was originally developed. So this strategy would —, when someone does come in and clear that five-acre site that sits among other places that have preserved those trees, that is not going to entirely clear that entire site. It will go in and recognize the trees are, what the resources are that can be preserved. Think about that first and not clear the entire site, but think about what the resources are, preserve those resources and then go in and develop the site.

Commissioner Odell said, I guess —, I understand your answer. I'm not certain if it answers my question. My question is, if you took the plan and forced it against that 85% remainder, which is already built, of that what percentage of that 85% would comply with this plan in that we're keeping with the characteristics? Does that make sense? Mr. Wilson said, it does, but of that 85% most of it is —, was developed, as I said, organically. It wasn't developed in a subdivision —. Commissioner Odell said, I understand. So the answer to the question is that we don't have an answer to that question. You cannot tell me, or can you tell me today what percent of the 85% that's already developed would comply with the 25% mandatory set aside? Mr. Wilson said, well, I mean, it wasn't there so none of them would comply with it. Mr. Newton said, the large tracts of land that make up a portion of that 85% basically are in compliance because they already have their greenspace. So most of it, I would say, is in compliance. It's the new —, the newer subdivision portion of it that may not be. But I would say geographically acreage probably most of it is in compliance with the requirement because the requirement, you have to remember, says large lots have the greenspace; therefore, we won't impose an additional greenspace. It's the smaller lot subdivisions that really need the greenspace that this is addressing. So I would say probably most of the area would be in compliance, but the subdivisions that were more recently developed on smaller lots in the area probably would not. Commissioner Odell said, okay, so we have —, do not have a greenspace ordinance and without a greenspace ordinance we have compliance in most. Is that a fair summary of what you just said? Mr. Newton said, I am saying that the larger lots —, that the proposal is designed to recognize or appreciate those larger lots and then it would be factored in so that those were complying and still would comply with the plan. Now if you're asking what percentage of those larger lots might be developed to a small lot subdivision, then I think that's where we have a problem giving you a response. Commissioner Odell said, thank you, Milton [Newton].

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Kicklighter.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, yeah, I'd like to just ask certain —, I need your opinion on this. With the current proposal the way it is, could you —, would it be possible for a developer to go in and build a subdivision, and I just want you to picture a road a mile long with houses all the way down, with the current plan, because I think the general public has a misconception of what the greenspace, as I see it, as proposed as what's going to happen. Could you ride down that mile road, have house after house going all the way down, and not see one tree in sight all the way down that one mile road past all the houses, hundreds of them, get to the very end of that road on that cul-de-sac and there be a hundred acres set aside that meets the 25% and there's your greenspace? Mr. Newton said, you're probably correct except for the fact that the Chatham County subdivision regulations do require street trees to be planted, so you would have some trees. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I'm asking in the yards, in the yards going down, could you go that entire mile and not see one tree other than what's planted in the road? Mr. Newton said, it depends whether the developer takes the trees down or not, and that probably is a result —, that decision is a result of drainage issues. The plan basically leaves up to the developer the option of where to place the greenspace. Commissioner Kicklighter asked, did the group, and I have the utmost respect for what you're trying to accomplish and what you worked and how hard you worked, but I really think you missed what I would believe the intent to be. I go through subdivisions on the Westside with beautiful homes that I know exactly what the intent is. They build everything out in the middle of a field, it takes years for the trees to grow, and it would be

great if somehow we could mandate trees per lot or look at Richmond Hill, which they absolutely I believe, and again I wonder if you've checked, they mandate that you put like three trees per lot of a new house. That way you have trees going through. That's the difference in your Southbridge and other areas is the developers there seem to leave their trees up and it looks great riding through. It's not —, you go through a fairly new area, but it looks established because they left trees in each individual yard. My fear or whatever, and I'll tell you what I think happens here. I believe it kind of —, I believe the current plan defeats its intent and I believe that's due to the fact that y'all were rushed to come to some type of conclusion. I believe we could have looked at Richmond Hill and came up with some type of ordinance here where we mandate the developer plant three trees were yard, and after a little while that would be nice, you know, pretty trees driving down the area. Because of the simple fact of riding through an area and no trees in sight and then at the end, and you know developers are going to build it to make a profit as well as to be nice to sell, you know, because they have to have a good reputation, but I still believe what we're going to have is all we're going to do —, I believe the outcome of this passed as is, is we're going to shrink the lot sizes for the middle class and the lower class, we're still going to have no trees in the yard, and at the end of the road or at the end of the subdivision there's going to be trees because there's nothing in place to mandate anything different and, you know, again I believe ideally with what you proposed, there would be this nice beautiful greenspace area sitting in the middle of a subdivision with, you know, walking trails, really maintained, but there's nothing in this plan that does that. I believe they have a —, we have generally a false perception of what's going to happen. Mr. Newton said, I may be naive, but I have a very high opinion of developers in the County and I think that they would —, if it's adopted, I think they would try to make it work. I think they'd try to make it work for the visual look of the product that they're offering and I think that they would take every opportunity to try to incorporate it into areas of the subdivision rather than create the long canyon —. Commissioner Kicklighter said, well, let me ask you this, and I do too. I think we've got excellent developers. What I'm worried about is the middle class and the lower end. You know, in your upper echelon, upper level subdivision the greenspace is there. They have to provide the amenities to attract the people to buy a \$200,000 home. Your swimming pools are there, your tennis courts, your open areas, but you ride through an area where your middle class can actually afford and your, you know, lower class and, you know, you don't have that. So my fear for those areas is that the developers —, let's face it, they have to make a living. They're not doing it for fun. They're going to take what y'all proposed, they're going to shrink the lot sizes, and now we're going to have homes stacked on top of each other with a smaller minimum square footage, no trees around, and then a patch somewhere to meet the greenspace area. So you've hurt the middle and lower economic brackets with this proposal as far as I'm concerned. Mr. Wilson said, we talked about Planters Common, and that did have very small lots. We think that small lots have a roll in reducing costs and for a lot of other purposes, but actually the amount of lot reduction at 10% proposed does not get anywhere near where the types of smaller lots that we've seen historically that can work with the right standards. But as far as the —, as having more trees on the site, I think typically what happens in the development process is that a site is cleared and then they go back in and plant trees. Commissioner Kicklighter said, right. Mr. Wilson said, the trees themselves that were previously on the site are not preserved. It's expensive to go in and work between those existing trees. It's much more efficient to go in and clear an entire site. So the reason we took that approach, and I think it —, you know, you're exactly right in suggesting that it's good to save trees and leave them in the yards. In some cases that can be done, but in most cases it's more efficient to clear the area to be developed but having first recognized the resources that might be site, there might be a stand of trees, a small forested area, there might be a wetlands that could be preserved and could become an amenity for that, and having that standard really gets the developer to sort of look at the site first and say, okay, I have to preserve some percentage; let's see, what is a real asset on this site, and identify this and then clear the site and work around that. Commissioner Kicklighter said, but we currently have that regulation in place with the Corps of Engineers as far as wetlands and areas like that where they have to leave anyhow. Mr. Wilson said, not any more. Commissioner Kicklighter asked, that's been removed now? Mr. Wilson said, isolated wetlands has been removed. Mr. Newton said, isolated wetlands. Commissioner Kicklighter said, okay. But, like I said, I appreciate the hard work, I really do. I think it's great. I think y'all were really rushed in the end. I just think we missed the one part of it because I understand that you can't go in, how it would not be feasible to save some, but I believe we could have taken a look at Richmond Hill, who mandated a few trees per lot and really accomplished a lot more for the people without reducing the lot sizes. This way it would benefit —, like I said, the upper class, their neighborhoods are going to be nice, they're going to have the greenspace anyway because they're not going to buy in an area with no trees, but I believe we could have protected the middle class and the lower class by mandating a few trees per yard, and I just, you know, that's just my opinion, but I do appreciate it. I understand the intent, but I believe we just —, we're off a little bit on it there. Thank you.

Vice Chairman Thomas recognized Commissioner McMasters.

Commissioner McMasters said, thank you, Dr. Thomas. Tom [Wilson], was it not just your testimony a moment ago that a diverse and affordable housing supply is part of this plan and that it is not adversely affected by the plan? Mr. Wilson said, we're trying to find that balance. I think that's what you're helping us do today, and I think at the 20 to 25% level, I think the MPC recommendation is outstanding in having found that balance. Commissioner McMasters said, okay, and diverse and affordable housing in the Southeast Land Plan is not in any way diminished with a 25% greenspace requirement. Mr. Wilson said, no. Commissioner McMasters said, thank you.

Vice Chairman Thomas said, Commissioner Rivers and then Commissioner Rayno.

Commissioner Rivers asked, affordable housing, what's the average cost? Have you looked at the average cost of housing in what we call affordable housing? Mr. Wilson said, we did actually. We —, going into the MPC workshops that were part of the formulating their recommendation, we presented material that discussed the affordability throughout the County of housing and generally, and I think the MPC board agreed with this when we

were discussing it, I think a general rule of thumb, and generalizations are problematic, but as a general rule of thumb, any —, Federal and State guidelines, 80% of median County household income is a good standard to go by, and if housing is affordable at that 80% level or below, we could say that it is truly in some sense affordable housing. Now, you go down much farther and you're into requiring a subsidy and the tax incentives or other measures to help out, but at the 70 to 80% level it is possible for the private sector to produce affordable housing, and putting that in numbers that you could be more familiar with, the current median household income in the County is about \$40,000. 80% of that is \$32,000 and lenders will often provide up to about three times that amount for a mortgage. So that takes it up to \$96,000. So affordable would be under that amount, affordable at the 80% of the median income. So that would be your 70's, 80's, low 90's. It would be something that the —. Commissioner Rivers asked, have you looked at the census tracts where people of low income are at and what is the median income and can we have diversity by those people moving out of that area into the area we're talking about? I want you to answer that and then I'll —. Mr. Wilson said, okay. We have looked at that. In fact, we —, we went to a more detailed level. We went from census tract to the census block grouped level, which is a fairly large level of geography. Tracts are huge and you don't often get a lot of differentiation at that level. We went down to more of a neighborhood level and mapped every block group, every sort of neighborhood level, census geography throughout the County, and did a ratio looking at the cost of housing in that area and the income in that area to identify areas that are more or less affordable, and we did look at that data in our —, during our workshop process. We actually found that the Southeast area, except for Skidaway Island, is very affordable compared to many other areas in the County.

Commissioner Rivers said, you looked at houses. I'm talking about pop—, looked at the population, medium income population that would probably want to move out there. Let's say first-time home buyers, starter homes. What's the cost? Does this make it accessible? And this is all I'm interested in is affordable housing and people of diverse ethnicity can move anywhere in this County that they want and afford to be there. That's what I want, that's the answer that I want. I want to know cost. See? I've got five houses that were constructed across from me and they were completed maybe about eight, nine, ten months ago. All five have not —, they have not qualified people to enter all five of those houses, so —, and they are in the range of \$95,000 to, I think, the max \$125,000. So, you see, when you start talking about medium people, you see, I have a large concern. I have a large concern on the Hope 6 Project that's out there, that there ain't going to be enough of these people that they say that can go back that live there that's going to be able to qualify. I think it's going to be marginal and I think that we have to do some innovative things to get people into houses so I want to be clear that we don't restrict or we don't control the accessibility and the diversity of these neighborhoods that we're talking about. Mr. Newton said, I think that probably that last slide, we are in agreement with the Homebuilders that the proposal that's before you will not result in —, will not affect affordability of housing and it is a policy issue, but that it is not one that's based on affordability of the housing, and I think our consultants agree with that and in our discussions with the Homebuilders and our own staff, we are all convinced that that is the case, that it's not a question of will this make housing less affordable. I think everyone agrees that it will not. The issue is one of a public policy for the board as to whether or not to have a minimum greenspace standard. Commissioner Rivers said, Milton [Newton], houses that I considered affordable in my district have now become unaffordable. Mr. Newton said, I guess the only thing we can respond to that is that this proposed plan and these amendments, generally it's agreed will not raise the cost of housing that will be built. Commissioner Rivers asked, what would be the average cost of a house built in that area? And I know that style and everything, the size of the lot and all that has a factor in that, but what would be the average cost? Mr. Wilson said, I don't have an exact figure for that whole area. We're —, probably we'd want to look at each planning area separately. I think in the North area it may well be close to that affordable figure or not much above \$100,000. In the South area it's going to be higher and on Skidaway higher than that, but I'm sorry I don't have those median figures here. Commissioner Rivers said, see, the question that escapes me, I like to deal with the numbers of costs in looking at people. You know, I was a Field Operation Supervisor for the 1980 census, okay. We had a lot of poverty tracts. A lot of low income folks and the medium income. So what I want to know is what the cost is going to be and can people afford it. I'm concerned about what's happening in the inner-city and whether the people will be able to move out to outlying areas where there's land, such as folks are now moving out into Pooler. Yes, we need —, if you're going to talk about diversity, let's talk about diversity and let's treat it like it should be treated and make sure that we have some mechanisms in there to make it affordable for people to inhabit those houses. That's my concern, always has been my concern from day one when I came back to my home town in 1968. It has always been the same then as it is now. Mr. Wilson said, when I got here three years ago, one of the first things I read in going through my files was your presentation to the MPC on the importance of affordable housing and I share that interest with you. We have in the Islands Plan and in the Southeast Plan, we have attempted to create a policy structure that as we build up with these plans and as we move on to West Chatham and as we work throughout the City of Savannah to establish a big picture as to what the affordable housing issues are, I think we're doing this on a building block basis. We've identified some issues. I know I personally and I think some people on the committee will confirm this, but I raised that issue repeatedly. I said a community is stronger with diversity, with diversity of housing tied with diversity of households. If we can have a variety of housing types, and that doesn't mean the Southeast or the Islands suddenly has to have 50% apartments or something, I think those, you know, there are areas that are predominantly single family, but it's helpful to have a diversity of housing types. I know in one area there's someone who has lived in that area for some time but decided they didn't want to mow the law forever and moved to a townhouse and turned over the single-family house to a child and has another family member living in an apartment nearby, and that keeps the family together. They're all in close proximity. I think that's especially with the aging of the population and so forth. Commissioner Rivers said, apartments are fine, but I'm talking about first-time home buyers. You know, I —, that's why —, you know, I spent a considerable time in Washington fighting for the Hope Project, fighting for the Hope 5 and the Hope 6 —, Hope 4 and 5. These are the things innovative that will allow people to inhabit the areas that are diverse. So this is —, you know, my issue is the same today as it was yesterday, and that's all I want by answers, all I want is assurance that we're going to be able to get people where we are, and I still don't think that

my question has been answered in the Hope 6 Project that's coming because, I'll bet you, you will say one thing and when it ends up, those people who are displaced, the percentage will be minimal coming back. And I haven't see the design or anything like that, but I'll assure you that if we don't stay on tope of it, it will be minimal, and if we don't stay on top of this, it will be minimal diversity.

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Rayno.

Commissioner Rayno said, I agree with my fellow Commissioners' concern about diversity. It's interesting that the good folks that live in Pinpoint, Montgomery and Sandfly, which are widely diverse neighborhoods, all support this plan at the 25% level, and we appreciate that support. Also in support the letters received represents the largest socioeconomic demographics I've seen for people for an issue. The outpouring is just incredible. Realtors who are for this plan, Bonnie MacAulay and Prudential, [inaudible] signed a letter, Montgomery Presbyterian Church, which is a diverse church, is in favor of this particular plan. We have John Dravis, who lives over on Isle of Hope, the Isle of Hope Historical Association, largely diverse, you've got Leopold Adler supports this, you've got Speedwell United Methodist Church, a historical Black church in the area, Mistwoode Homeowners Association, that represents 75 home owners there that are in the area, you've got Patti King, who represents Whitfield Park, which has probably a couple hundred homes over there, you've got the Rivers Edge at Camp Strachan, which represents a couple hundred homes over there, you've got Patsy Hopkins of Herb River Drive supporting it, you've got Dale Morgan over in that area supporting it, you've got Judy Williams, who's supporting it over in the area of Isle of Hope, you've got Dr. Otto, who lives over in that area, you've got the President of the Lakeview Homeowners Association [inaudible] in support of that, you've got Joyce Murlless, who was on the Land Planning Committee, you've got John Pelli, you've got Dr. Ham, who's part of the Neurological Institute supporting it, you've got the Savannah Tree Foundation, you've got the Sierra Club, you've got Peter [Brodhead] from Brighter Day, who supports it, you've got the Ogeechee Audubon Society, you've got the Georgia Conservancy supporting it, you've got ERA Kelly and Fischer Real Estate supporting it, the Coastal Naturalist, Coastal Georgia, another letter Peter Brodhead, Historic Savannah Foundation supports it, the Center for a Sustainable Coast supports it, Historic Victorian Neighborhood Association, Long Point Neighborhood Association. The list goes on and on. The only people against it are the Homeowners —, the Homebuilders, a hundred and something people compared all the people that live in the area who are the stakeholders. Also, there was the mention of it, this plan was rushed through. How long have you been working on it? [An unidentified female in the audience said, six years.] Commissioner Rayno said, six years. Is that rushing to get this done. It's slow if you ask me. We went through the Islands Plan in, what, two or three months. Commissioner Murray said, it was longer than that. Commissioner Rayno said, okay, about a year —. Commissioner Murray said, no. Commissioner Rayno said, but certainly not six. Ms. Marianne Heimes said, five. Commissioner Rayno said, we didn't rush through this. It wasn't rushed at all. There are diverse people who are for this plan. There's all kinds of people for this plan. It makes sense. It's workable. I lived in Fox Chase. It was a small neighborhood. I liked it when I was there. I would have wanted some more greenspace. I had one pine tree out front. That's all I had. Now it's a big huge pine tree, but when I started it was only that big, but everybody in that neighborhood yearned for more space. And what happened? They all moved out and a lot of those properties in Fox Chase became rentals. There's still some of the main home owners who are still there, but that's what happens to those smaller neighborhoods. They don't stay small neighborhoods. As soon as they get older, they become rental properties, and that's the truth. [Inaudible] these older neighborhoods. They're small and that's what happens. They get bought up and they're rented. Let's talk about building bigger properties with greenspace where people build homes, build families and stay there. You reduce crime because neighbors know their neighbors, better schools because kids stay in the same schools and grow up with each other. They have something we call communities, something we don't have right now without planning. If you've got planning, you get communities. It's something Oglethorpe started and it's something we need to finish. That's it. Thanks.

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner McMasters.

Commissioner McMasters said, I only have one question for staff. Milton [Newton] and Tom [Wilson], is there any aspect of the Southeast Land Plan with regards to affordable housing that in your opinion would prevent or inhibit the diversity of the neighborhood growth in the Southeast quadrant? Mr. Wilson said, well, I think not enacting it would be a setback for affordable housing. We actually have a number of policies and initiatives and the future land use map has identified additional areas for additional potentially affordable housing, about eight or so —. Commissioner McMasters asked, okay, so you actually —, your testimony actually is that it will strengthen and help create potentially diverse neighborhoods in the Southeast Land Plan? Mr. Wilson said, yes, that is the intent I think to —. Commissioner McMasters said, sure. Mr. Wilson said, right. That's the intent and we've introduced a policy structure that I think will help do that. It needs to build up, those building blocks need to be put together for the whole County and the City of Savannah to get the big picture and strengthen that further, but that's where we're heading. Commissioner McMasters said, thank you.

Chairman Hair said, I have two questions. The first is would you agree or disagree that if this is passed the way you've recommended it that it would have a more adverse impact on smaller, cheaper lots than it would on the larger, expensive lots? Mr. Wilson said, no, I don't think it would have an impact and that common ground slide we showed, I think in our discussions, and —. Chairman Hair asked, so you're telling me that it has no —, it would have the same effect on a 10-acre lot with one house on it as it would with a 10-acre lot with 20 houses on it? It has the same effect on the lot size and cost of that lot. You're telling me it's the same? Mr. Wilson said, yes. Chairman Hair said, I respectfully disagree with you, sir, I just think that's not true. The second question, if —, what percent of the subdivisions that are currently in place with people living in them meet this requirement right now, the 25% requirement? What percent of Chatham County meets that requirement? Mr. Wilson said, well, since we don't have the requirement, they don't have it. There are some, I don't know what the percentage is —.

Chairman Hair asked, do you know what —, the last time you were here you told me The Landings had, what, 40% I believe? Mr. Wilson said, no, I think we got a letter to that effect saying they did, but —. Chairman Hair asked, so you don't know —, how can you propose an ordinance when you don't know the impact of that ordinance on the subdivisions in Chatham County? Mr. Wilson said, well, it wouldn't affect existing subdivisions. Chairman Hair said, sort of like Commissioner Odell, you didn't answer his question either. You didn't answer my question. My question is you don't know what percent of the current subdivisions meet this 25% requirement? Mr. Wilson said, no, I don't. Chairman Hair said, okay, no further questions. Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Kicklighter.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is that it would reduce or it would allow the reduction of lot size from, I believe, 60 feet down to 54 feet —, 6,000 square feet to 5,400 square feet —, and it still would not solve the problem of riding through a neighborhood without trees. You can still go right through with no trees, get to the end and have the little area there. So basically I believe that we have a huge impact on the middle class and affordable —, or the lower class as far as the homes in their neighborhood because it will stack them truly on top of each other and I don't think we're going in the right direction. With that I think the rest of the plan is great. I do appreciate the hard work, and I'll make a motion to approve the plan with the amendment stating that the greenspace is voluntary not mandatory. Chairman Hair asked, do you have a second? Commissioner Odell said, second.

Chairman Hair said, we have a motion and a second to approve it with —. Mr. Sid Nutting said, you haven't heard from the audience. Chairman Hair said, Mr. Nutting, we'll hear from everybody, sir. We can take motions and seconds without the audience information.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, Mr. Chairman, I also would like to ask, and I don't know if this is the appropriate time, but we instruct or ask the MPC to take a look at the future possibility of mandating three or four trees per lot so in the future —, because I believe that will add a lot to adding the greenery in the neighborhoods.

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Murray. Chairman Hair said, we have a motion and a second on the floor to approve with voluntary.

Commissioner Murray said, I disagree with that motion, but at any rate I'll have my opportunity to vote when the time comes. Can you tell me, Tom [Wilson], in the last eight years —, and please let's try to keep this in —, where it needs to be. We're just speaking of one particular area of Chatham County where the Southeast Land Plan covers that. That's the only area we're speaking of right now, so it doesn't matter what other parts of Chatham County have or don't have. The Westside will have their opportunity to have their land plan, but the —, my question in the area we're discussing, and you've already said there's only approximately 15% undeveloped at this time, in the last eight years how many affordable housing developments have been built in that area? I would think probably zero, but I don't know that for a fact. Mr. Wilson said, I can't think of any off hand. Commissioner Murray said, now without all this 25% or 30% or 20% greenspace we're talking about, no one's gone out there and built it and the land's there. Some of it's available. They could have been built without any new restrictions on it basically, but it hasn't been done. So does that mean if we implement this plan everybody's going to jump out and try that 15% of undeveloped land and build affordable housing? I don't think that's the issue and I don't think that's going to happen. You know, Fox Chase has come up in discussions today. A couple of weeks ago I rode out and rode through the three developments right there together with Fox Chase. I rode through each one of those, I rode through several developments that have been developed down on Ferguson Avenue. Now, to answer some of the questions that have been coming up about these small lot subdivisions, I remember the developer for Fox Chase coming to this Commission and requesting a waiver to not put sidewalks in. If the sidewalks had gone in, they would have had no front yard. That's how small those lots are. Now, they built those without the restrictions and we're being told now that, oh, we don't have to worry about it, it can be voluntary because it's going to be built differently. I understand the zoning regulations were different then, and that's fine, but my point still remains we're talking about one area in Southeast Chatham County where 25% greenspace is not going to stop the homes from being built and it's not going to mandate that you build affordable housing or you build larger lots out there. That's going to be up to the developers that purchase that land and the people who develop that land, and if they can make more money with and if they can make more money with the larger homes, that's what's going to be built. It will not be the affordable housing. Now if they can develop it and make more money with that, then certainly they will do that I would think, but we can't sit here and dictate because we don't approve it like it's submitted to us right now, but all this affordable housing is going to be built. That is not the case.

Chairman Hair said, okay, I think it's time to hear from the audience. I think the Commissioners have had ample time to give their opinions and input so we will —, I'm going to ask if everybody would like —, if you'd come up and sit on the front row, I think it will expedite the process. When you come to the podium if you'll state your name for the record and, if you represent a group, state the group that you represent.

Mr. Steve Fischer said, Chairman Hair, my name is Steve Fischer. I am the Fischer in the ERA Kelly & Fischer, and I just wanted to state, Commissioner Rayno said that ERA Kelly & Fischer Real Estate Company supported this measure. Apparently one person from my company, we have probably 60 people in my company, wrote a letter. That would be the same as if Commissioner Rayno wrote a letter to someone and they said the Chatham County Commissioners all agreed upon it. My company, as me as one of the owners, is not in favor of this because of our fear of affects on affordable housing, so I just wanted to make that clear is my only point here. It's not ERA Kelly & Fischer Real Estate, it was one person that probably agrees with them, and that's their right.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Fischer. We appreciate that. Commissioner Rivers asked, could I ask him a question. Chairman Hair said, certainly. Commissioner Rivers has a question.

Commissioner Rivers said, you know, there's a large definition for affordable housing and it takes in all kinds of things, such as style, lot size, [inaudible] configuration. The average cost of an affordable house, you're in the business —. Mr. Fischer said, yes, sir. Commissioner Rivers asked, what would be the cost. If we were to go out there and build on a lot, let's say, having 25%, what would be the average cost of that house? Mr. Fischer said, developers and builders can address the lot cost and how that's going to increase to be able to put this in effect. As far as affordable housing, there's —, it's getting smaller and smaller. The National Association of Realtors' president, Ms. Whatley, that is her initiative this year. Her whole campaign and drive this year is for affordable housing throughout the country and that's what the realtors are trying to focus on, ways to try to achieve that. It keeps getting smaller and smaller. You know, you look at Westside, Godley Station. That's one of the biggest developments right now going on. Those prices are going up again because costs keep rising. They start out now at strip down probably in the high 120's. Now that's not really affordable. Southside Savannah, someone mentioned rental property. Yeah, we have investors, those a lot of people who are coming out of the stock market and buying houses because they want real estate. That does give people who can afford though a single-family home to live in and raise their family in, which is another important thing that we need in our community. So rentals can be a positive thing if there are homes that are rentals for those who have either credit problems or now insurance issues. People can't —, some people can't buy homes. It helps them to be able to get into a house and raise their family in a house even if they're not owning it. There's a lot of issues, but from the —, even from the investor's standpoint. People wanting to buy in South Chatham, you can't find too many houses —, you can't find too many houses under about \$80,000. Investors will even probably look at it as a positive home for a rental because there's not that —, there's not really anything left. I mean, the bases keeps going up and up and up in all of our areas, and we used to think —, what used to be \$50,000 homes that people could afford, you know, they're not \$90,000 and it's getting tough for people to even rent affordable housing. Commissioner Rivers said, that's —, Pooler and the Godley Tract is really by supply and demand. Mr. Fischer said, correct. Commissioner Rivers said, and location, so that's going to be demand driven. What I'm trying to get at is when we look at that 15% available land out on the Southeast, can we look towards a house that would be affordable or are we looking at something that would sky through the roof with the opportunity to be there to do something different if you did not use the maximum 25% or if you had 25% with right-of-way? I might be asking the wrong person and I may need to —. Mr. Fischer said, well, I'll answer and then I'll step aside, but in my opinion it's going to be more difficult just —. I'm not a builder, but we work with builders. We see what land costs, developing the land, putting in the roads, and making the lots smaller is not always a positive thing either for those people who want affordable housing. They also would like a little land for maybe their children to be able to play on or use, so the idea of just squeezing in the lot size because we're going to put a few more trees, they still need some place to run and have a pet and have their social activities as well, so I don't think that's altogether the answer either. Hopefully there's something that can work for everyone, but in my opinion and 17 years in the business, I don't see how this particular plan is going to have a positive impact on affordable housing.

Chairman Hair said, Mr. Fischer, Commissioner McMasters has a question for you.

Commissioner McMasters said, just quickly. Thank you for coming —. Mr. Fischer said, I was just going to clarify about my company. Commissioner McMasters said, no, and I thank you did that well. Obviously not everyone there does. Some do, some don't. You support the concept of affordable housing, don't you? Mr. Fischer said, yes. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. You've been through the majority of this meeting and you've heard our staff state that there's nothing in the plan in their opinion that would adversely or negatively impact affordable housing in the Southeast Land Plan, you heard that mentioned? Mr. Fischer said, correct. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. Don't you think that since our staff acknowledges that and that you acknowledge that, why wouldn't you support the plan? Mr. Fischer said, I acknowledge that I don't think —, I think it's going to be adverse to affordable housing. I don't —. Commissioner McMasters asked, so you disagree with our staff's assessment? Mr. Fischer said, correct. That's what I said, I don't think it's going to be positive for affordable housing. If someone buys a tract of land and they are limited on the number of lots they can put in that tract of land —, as business people know, the less lots, the higher the lot cost generally. I mean, because the money's going to be the same. The price of the parcel of land is going to be the same no matter how many lots you get out of it, but the more lots you can get out of it, you can offer prices for a lower —, houses for a lower price than the less amount of lots you get for it. That's just —. Commissioner McMasters asked, well, isn't the converse true? The more homes you build on a given gross acreage, the more homes you can sell? Mr. Fischer said, yeah. If you take away 25, 30, 40% of their ability to have land, you're going to have less homes and you're going to have higher prices and you're not going to have as much affordable housing. That is correct. Commissioner McMasters said, well, our expert staff seems to —. Mr. Fischer said, well, that's my —, one person's opinion. I respect both opinions, but that's just my opinion.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Fischer. Mr. Fischer said, thank you.

Commissioner Odell asked, Phillip [McCorkle], should we read this before you speak? Mr. McCorkle said, no, it's not something that you'd want to spend any time reading. I'll just point out a few facts as I go along. Those are some pretty pictures and a few numbers.

Mr. Phillip McCorkle said, I would like to put a real —, get this issue down to what it really is and it will take me a few minutes to do that. From our prospective it will just be me speaking and I think three other people with very short presentations, so we won't take too long and I know there will be plenty of people who have another opinion, so if it takes me since it's only three or four of us a little longer, I would beg your forgiveness in that. I think I said my name is Phillip McCorkle. Let me say it again. I represent the Homebuilders Association, and let me say initially that we appreciate the concerns and the efforts and the citizens who make up the Southeast Land Use Plan Committee, if that's the official name. They have a fairly unique area in the County where there are a lot of

boulevards with oak trees and not very much commercial development. Some things that are different than perhaps some other areas of the County, and they have contained within the plan —, we're talking greenspace here today, open space, greenspace, but the plan was much bigger than that, and within that plan there are protections that are arguably appropriate. We have not objected, for example, to the requirement that trees along these tree corridors, like Norwood Avenue and Ferguson Avenue, be left in the case of any additional residential development, but we would agree to preserve the character of those treed streets, that treed canopy, to be developed in that manner and leave those trees so as not to disturb the character of the neighborhood. There are also some provisions for overlays for town centers for commercial areas. We're not objecting to those things. There are provisions where people have voluntarily agreed to down-zone their property from, in many cases, R-A, five units an acre, to R-1-C, two units an acre, or 1.3-5, well, 2, I believe, and we don't object to that. That's those people property. If they want to make less dense development and assure less dense development by down-zoning their tracts of land, then that's fine. So we're not here to object to or attempt to preserve the character of the southeast portion of the County, but we are here to raise a public policy issue that I think's important. It was not properly raised on the Islands Land Use Plan, it needs to be raised now. I would also like to compliment the dedication of the people who have worked on this committee for —, on and off for the last six years. Their dedication is evidenced by the fact that they are able to get folks to write all those letters to Mr. Rayno. So, they worked hard and they believe in what they're doing, but I —, we believe equally as well in the position we are taking here today.

Mr. McCorkle said, the issue is mandatory greenspace in single-family subdivisions, required mandatory greenspace in single-family subdivisions. Is that good public policy? And we maintain that it is not. I'll give you a little history and this, I think, will be helpful to you as we're throwing around this greenspace discussion. As you know, Oglethorpe got here in 1733 and somehow until 1961 we made it without a Zoning Ordinance. People bought land, divided it up into lots, built houses, sold the houses, and basically everything north of DeRenne Avenue in the City was basically developed by the time you got a Zoning Ordinance, and then there were of course developments out on the Islands and the Westside and other areas. In Thursday's paper there was an article that said that the Park and Tree Commissioner post in the City of Savannah is one of the most coveted posts in the country because of the incredible urban forests that we have. This is a very green community. It is not anything other than that, but somehow without regulations with regard to greenspace we've managed to achieve that. Zoning was adopted in 1961 and in the Zoning Ordinance, if you'll look at Tab 1 in that little handout I gave to you, there is —, you would think that in subdivisions there was nothing but pavement and houses. The truth is from 1961, when the Zoning Ordinance was adopted, there was a requirement of 60% open space in each lot. You build a lot, 60% of it has to be open space where you grow grass, plant bushes, plant trees and the neighborhood turns green. There was not an open space requirement for commercial development in the original 1961 ordinance; therefore, we have some commercial developments of an open nature that are nothing but asphalt. There's no question about that, but in the beginning and from the beginning there's been a requirement that 60% of each lot in a subdivision be open and, folks, that's where your greenspace is. That's where your open space is now. In 1985 the next ordinance that came into being was the Land Disturbance Activities Ordinance that was passed to satisfy a State mandate regarding soil erosion and those type things, and in that ordinance the 10% minimum greenspace for commercial developments was passed in 1985. In the ordinance there was specifically excluded from the provisions of the mandatory 10% greenspace residential homes. Residential homes already had a 60% requirement contained in the original Zoning Ordinance, and that 60% open space requirement has continued. In 1995 the Land Disturbance Activities Ordinance was amended. The requirement in commercial areas went from 10% to 20% and in that ordinance —, I call it the Tree Ordinance because I have a hard time remembering Land Disturbance Activities Ordinance —, but in that amendment to the Tree Ordinance residential subdivisions were again excluded from mandatory greenspace requirements, but there was enacted a provision for mandatory planting of street trees and 1,600 tree quality points per acre in a residential development. But as far as mandatory set aside of greenspace, that again was expressly excluded and the 60% open space requirement for open space continued. In 1986 there was a committee that issued a report —, I don't know how long they worked on it. That's it. In 1996, Chatham County-Savannah Countywide Open Space Plan, where they addressed issues of how do we deal with loss of open space and how should we protect open space. The committee was well rounded, there were 42 members, there were people from each municipality, the MPC, the builders, the realtors, the County Tree Commission and groups like the Sierra Club and Georgia Conservancy. So it was a well rounded group, and the open space that was discussed was defined and examples were given, and there was a scientific survey sent. A real survey was taken in a scientific manner, and it defined open space as natural resource management areas like the Savannah Wildlife Refuge, state parks like Skidaway and Wormsloe, regional parks like Lake Mayer and Scott Stell, community parks like Forsyth and Daffin, neighborhood parks like school yards, play areas and sports fields, and urban forum area like downtown squares and the Tybee Island beaches. That was the type of open space that they were concerned about, was open space that really was a public domain, the public domain. And someone asked the question in the survey, "Should we preserve and protect open space and prevent it from being developed?" Over 80% of people countywide, not just Southeast but countywide, said, "Oh, yeah, we should." Well, I don't know whether they found 15% that would say, no, we should develop, you know, those things. So apparently there's some people that have an opinion in one way or the other about anything, but with regard to developing public open spaces, the Homebuilders would not disagree. I would not personally disagree. They should be preserved. The survey went on to discuss and the committee went on to report about how do we encourage the preservation of additional open space. There were 18 potential methods discussed; 14 were adopted and 4 were reject specifically. Some of those adopted were use SPLOST money to buy greenspace, open space. They encouraged mandatory down-zoning of property. Excuse me, voluntary down-zoning of property, some of which is being done in this Southeast Plan. So there were 14 issues that were addressed and adopted, and one of them was to encourage the incentive based conservation, design and development. Now's the time for me to explain what that is. You may that, and if you do I apologize for boring you, but perhaps there's some people who don't.

Mr. McCorkle said, this is something that's going on everywhere in the country, and what means is that the planning boards, zoning authorities, are encouraging developers in residential subdivisions to leave greenspace and the incentive that they give a developer is basically eliminating the development standards to a large measure so that if you —, most of them require you to put 40, 50% greenspace in an area, but then you could put —, you don't have any lot size requirements, you don't have any setback requirements. There's no requirement and you can put the same number of units on this conservation design area as you could have under the original subdivision ordinance or zoning ordinance that was applicable. And that is to encourage in those cases where there's something worth saving for the developer to save it and not lose units and still be able to provide housing at this price point. That conservation design on a voluntary basis was recommended as something that should be done. And, again, I repeat, it's been done all over the country. The Legislature in Michigan, which has more control over zoning than the Georgia Legislature does, we have a lot of home rule in this State, passed a law two years ago that said every township that had zoning and every county had to make available on a discretionary basis conservation design to encourage preservation of greenspace without harming the affordability of housing. So it's a tool that should be used. The Open Space Committee adopted it as a tool that should be used. One of the four tools that they specifically rejected was the mandatory set aside of open space in single-family subdivisions. They specifically considered and specifically rejected it in 1996. Of course, the 60% of open space per lot requirement from the Zoning Ordinance continued to apply. The first inkling or the first change in this history of not requiring mandatory open space came about in June of 2001 when the Islands Land Use Plan was adopted, and in that plan the —, besides doing some massive down-zoning of the Islands from mostly R-1 to mostly R-1-A, there was also this change of requiring 30% common space to be set aside in residential subdivisions. Frankly, my clients dropped the ball by not raising the issue then. The reason we did not is because 98% of Wilmington Island was already developed, there are no large owners of tracts —, no owners of large tracts of lands on Wilmington Island to object, and it went through without the discussion that it deserved. At the last meeting, at the first reading, one of the Commissioners said, "Well, you know, we've got 30% on the Islands and it stood the test of time." Well, that's not true. That provision was adopted 22 months ago and in the 22 months since then there has been one eight lot subdivision on Wilmington Island. One subdivision, eight lots, the starting price \$75,000 per lot. So it has not stood the test of time. The true impact of what was done in the Islands Land Use Plan has not been felt. The constant refrain I get from the committee is —, and you will hear it today —, is we should have the same thing that the Islands did, we should have that 30% or 25%, we should have it because the Islands has it, and my response to that is we shouldn't have done in September of 2001; it needs to be undone. The mandatory requirement of dedicating open space in subdivisions is not good public policy.

Mr. McCorkle said, I want to move from the history to an attempt to keep greenspace in perspective. Again, I'm not personally attacking members of the committee, but I want you to have a good perspective of the committee's work. The committee members will say, "We've been working on this for six years and this is what we want," and I have no doubt that this is what the committee does want. There's no question in my mind, but I maintain that it's not what the citizens of Southeast Chatham or the citizens of the County of Chatham want. In the preliminary Volume I, when the committee report first came out, they said that the basis of their recommendations was a survey conducted in 1997.

Mr. McCorkle said, if you look at Tab 2, you will see what I uncovered to be the so-called survey. Now, they may not have had staff members to help them and they may not have had any funding or anything of that nature, but what this really is is a list of questions that the 18 members of the committee came up with and then they came also up with the names of 120 people that they knew to send it to. One of the questions was —, Question 3, do you know anybody else we should send this questionnaire to? They got back about 50 —, excuse me, about 80 responses to that so they sent out a send round of 80 questions, so basically 200 questions went out to their friends and associates and they got back 50 responses, and that, my friends, is not a scientific survey. It is a questionnaire sent out to people who basically think the same way you do, and from there the committee continued to work. One of the conclusions in this survey, so-called survey was —, and resulted in the committee's position that, "The strong desire of most residents to place limits on growth." I'll address that again in a few minutes from a real scientific survey, but their conclusion was from their '97 survey that it was the strong desire of most residents to place limits on growth. The process of discussing this plan continued sporadically for five years. There was not one committee meeting in 2001. Not one. So while this has been going on for six years, there were long periods of inactivity caused by various things that we don't need to get into.

Mr. McCorkle said, Tab 3 you will see the list of committee members who, once this thing got cranked back up in early 2002, went to the meetings. What happened was the MPC hired a new staff member, Florence Davis, who's no longer with us over at the MPC, and put her at the disposal of the committee and started having meetings again and putting their recommendations down in writing. So there were a few meetings, and again a total of 18 people attended the various meetings. By October of 2002 the report, according to Ms. Davis and her conversations with me, was in final form. It was done, it was printed. They had two public meetings in October attended in each case by a little over 50 people. There was a drop-by meeting in November, if I'm correct about that —, January 7, excuse me, 2003, where a number of people came by and again by that time the die was cast and the committee report was etched, and it was at this point that the Homebuilders became aware of the provisions contained in this report and became alarmed by it.

Mr. McCorkle said, we do fortunately have a scientific survey to use. In June —, excuse me, September of 2002 the Chatham County-Savannah Tri-Centennial Plan Community Opinion Survey was published, done in a scientific manner, budgeted by the City and the County and performed by Savannah State and their department. There's some seriously interesting information contained in that and everybody should read it. It's for your own good and for the good of the future development of the community. One series of questions —, if you'll look at Tab 4 you'll see where what I'm about to say is encapsulated. There were 10 possible answers. Of course, this all depends

on who's asking the question because you've got to ask what do you think of these 10 things, and they asked 10 factors that were important to a person when they moved into the neighborhood in which they live. Far, far, far and away the two most important issues were the price of the home and security. Price and security. Open space and parks was a possibility and it was sixth in the list of 10 as being important. There were another series of questions about major problems in the County, and they asked again five selected questions, five selected issues. By far and away the number one problem identified of the five that were available for you to answer was traffic. Fifth, fifth out of five, 32.9% said greenspace was a problem, a major problem. I'm just asking you to keep our discussion today in perspective. There was another portion of the survey where people throughout the County, 83.2% identified housing for young couples as a goal to be achieved; 86.4% identified more housing for low income households; 84.7 identified more housing for seniors. On the question for growth —, of growth, the question was, "Are you satisfied with the rate of growth in your neighborhood?" Now the Southeast Committee said that the strong desire of most residents is to place limits on growth. The real scientific survey indicates that 21.8% think they may be growing too fast; 21% said it was growing too slow; 57.2% said it was growing at about the right pace. So you've got over 78% of the people who are saying they're satisfied that it's either growing about right or too slow and only 21.8% of the people who responded are saying that it's growing too fast. So where do you get the conclusion that there's a strong desire to place limits on growth? This also rebuts Mr. Rayno's comment that he made a few minutes ago when he said you can only grow to a point. I don't think we've reached that point in Chatham County yet. There may be places in this country —, there are places in this country where they have reached that tipping point where they don't need to grow any more, but the residents of this County indicate that we have not reached that point. They are satisfied with the rate of growth or think it's growing too slow. While setting aside greenspace may be a slowing growth may be of paramount importance to the people on this committee, it is not of paramount importance to the people of Chatham County.

Mr. McCorkle said, the original committee proposal was the same proposal that was adopted on the Islands last year. Believe me, it was bad for affordable housing. We pointed that out. We pointed out that if you take —, you've already got 60% of your land in open space. If you take 30% and require it to be set aside for some reason for more open space, then you have fewer number of lots available. We were able to demonstrate that that proposal countywide would prevent 2,300 households from acquiring a new home out of the 89,000 households that we have, which is about 2½%. That proposal countywide would cost the lot of the lowest cost homes of people who need to buy affordable housing can afford by \$5,000 and it results in a drastic impact on the households of this community and their ability to buy affordable housing. Thankfully, we made that point clear and we made that point clear to the staff and to the Planning Commission. I'm not sure that anybody on the committee even has the nerve to continue to press for what was adopted before because of the tremendous impact it has on affordable housing. But the staff to their credit saw the truth in what we showed them and the facts and figures we showed them and they said, okay, we'll drop back to 20% and then we'll let you make your lots smaller by 10% and so you should be able to produce the same number of lots and therefore the same number of houses in a given tract of land. In running the calculations you find that you basically can, you almost can. We thought we were maybe two lots short in a 10-acre tract, but it was close. Then we went before the Planning Commission and there was discussion that resulted in modification of a definition of greenspace which made pervious right-of-way, dedicated right-of-way available as counting as greenspace, but then they raised the greenspace requirement to 25%. That basically again leaves us with about the same number of lots on any given tract, whether it's the mythical 10-acre tract or any given tract. So that's why they can stand here and say, well, it doesn't really have an impact on affordable housing to require this set aside of greenspace because you can make the lot smaller and kind of make up for it dollar-wise.

Mr. McCorkle said, now so that becomes the question. Now that we've got to this point, that is the policy question. Should you force people of modest means to live on smaller lots so that there can be some common area somewhere in the subdivision in some form? Whether it has trees on it or not, it grass on it. Should you force people to live on smaller lots, and we think you should not. In answering the question we want to make nine points, and they won't take me that long to make them. The —, you will hear that all the Homebuilders care about is making money. That's —, you're going to hear that, as if that's un-American to make a living, and to the extent that it cuts people of modest means out of buying their starter home, it certainly could impact us, but frankly we can build houses on 54-foot lots, 5,400 square foot lots, any size lot you give us we can build houses on it and you can build affordable housing and just packing it tighter and tighter and tighter. I mean, it can be done. So it won't impact the Homebuilders' bottom line, but it's bad public policy. The Homebuilders Association is doing an excellent job at providing affordable housing. If you'll look at Tab 6, on a —, as Mr. Wilson said, on a national average if you are able to provide a home to somebody living in your neighborhood that makes 80% of the median household income for your community, then you're doing a good job at providing affordable housing. In this community, when you run the numbers out based on the last census and on the fact that the affordable house —, the new clean, safe, affordable house the Homebuilders are able to produce starts at \$72,000, and you're providing housing at 69.2% of your median household income. I have heard members of this committee sneer and say that Homebuilders aren't providing affordable housing anyway. Well, that could not be more wrong, incorrect, far from the truth. Members of this Homebuilders Association are providing a service, they are providing affordable housing at 69% of the median income, and we're very proud of that. The third point, 60% of each residential lot is already preserved in open space. Where is the requirement for more open space? Fourth point, the subdivisions in the Southeast have been developed. Subdivisions all over the community, to answer Mr. Hair's question directly, do not comply with this provision. Subdivisions you live in probably do not comply. Where my mother lives does not comply, where I grew up does not comply. They just don't. Mayfair II in the Southeast doesn't comply. Mistwoode does not comply, a lovely subdivision. Old Bluff does not comply, a lovely subdivision. Why in the world is all of a sudden mandated public policy that we set aside greenspace when you go around Chatham County, including the Southeast, and you see nothing but trees? Now it is true that when you clear a lot you will cut down the trees. If you look at the front sheet, we found an interesting set of pictures on 38th Street. When the

houses were built on 38th Street during that era, there was not a tree left. You would think that modern development practices where you go in and clear the trees so that you can do proper drainage and grade your lots in the right way and you come back and replant trees, you would think that was something new and that we are bad builders and that, golly, I mean, we've got to stop these people, they're cutting down all the trees as they develop subdivisions. Well, my response is on 38th Street —, on 41st Street where I grew up, on that 60-foot lot with that shingle house that my dad bought after World War II, there was not a tree on that lot. When we left there ten years later, there were nice trees because we had pride in home ownership and we planted those trees. When you go to that subdivision today, modest homes, it's beautiful, it's green. That's the way it's always been done and the way it should continue to be done.

Mr. McCorkle said, a point that Mr. —, I believe that Mr. Kicklighter was making is if you take —, one or two things are going to happen. If you don't think you can sell houses on smaller lots and so you have to maintain the basic 60-foot lot that we've been building on for all these years, then obviously setting aside some land for greenspace is going to mean you have less lots. Therefore, the lot price is going to go up and people are going to be cut out of the market. Well, the answer to that supposedly is, well, just build on smaller lots. Well, I've got news. You're not creating greenspace. You're shifting it's location. You have 60% open space and a full 60% lot, which is greenspace. If you take 10% of that lot space out, you've removed the greenspace from the lot and just stuck it somewhere else. So you're not creating any greenspace, you're just shifting the location and on people —, and people who cannot afford luxury homes, homes where greenspace can be made available along with the fireplace and the two-car garage and the swimming pool and all those things, on starter homes and homes for people who need to buy affordable housing, you're just packing them closer and closer together to keep the cost down so that they could buy the house at the same dollar, but they've been stuck on a smaller lot, and I ask, "Is that good public policy?" I don't think it is. Don't forget that if you have common greenspace, somebody has to maintain it, somebody has to buy insurance. So there's going to have to be an association for these subdivisions. These are subdivisions where these folks barely can get in the house, barely afford it. They're going to have to pay for —, they're going to have to group together and pay dues and have administration of an association that will take those dues and maintain the common space and buy insurance in case some kid falls out of a tree, which will happen, and gets hurt. The whole —, everybody in the subdivision gets sued. So it's additional expense at the lowest level where people cannot afford that expense.

Mr. McCorkle said, something that really hurt before the MPC in the presentations that had been made was some incorrect information that I'm now prepared to rebut. Some people think that there must be something wrong with the Homebuilders Association who's so vigorously opposed to this greenspace requirement, which is —, golly, I mean, everybody's doing it, everybody's requiring mandatory set asides. The statement was made on two occasions that small sampling, 10% of the community in the State has been sampled and here's a list of all the communities that have mandatory set aside. And if you didn't think that didn't hurt my position, you're wrong, because if a staff member or anybody stands up and makes that statement, then the MPC would tend to think that's a correct statement. But I took those two lists and I have engaged for the last two weeks a lady who works for the Georgia Homebuilders Association to double check that information, and I would like to introduce here at this time, Betty Sleeth.

Mrs. Betty Sleeth said, thank you, Mr. McCorkle and members of the Commission. I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I am Betty Sleeth. I work for the Homebuilders Association of Georgia and we are a trade association. We represent about 12,000 companies around the State, over 200,000 individuals. I believe 675 of them are here from the Savannah area. But we take great pride in our goal, and our mission is to create housing opportunities for all income levels, and we take that very seriously. But I'm the Vice President of Regulatory Affairs and in that role I work with our members throughout the State, with State agencies and sometimes with local governments or help our members in working with local governments on issues such as building codes, storm water, soil and erosion, planning and zoning. And so I —, you know, I was a little surprised when Mr. McCorkle said to me, you know, there's a lot of locations —, there's several locations that have mandatory greenspace because I've been involved in a lot of this type of discussions around the State and particularly in the metropolitan Atlanta area with the North Georgia Regional Commission, the 16 counties up there, but I did call and check on those, and in addition the Homebuilders Association of Georgia, along with the Department of Community Affairs, the Atlanta Regional Commission, the Georgia Conservancy, the Sierra Club, Georgia Planners, we're all members of a group called the Georgia Quality Growth Partnership. So I called Jim Frederick's office at DCA, the Department of Community Affairs, and said, "Will you help me? Have you heard of this? Are there mandatory greenspaces?" And when you ask people if they have a greenspace ordinance, they'll say yes, yes we might have a greenspace ordinance, but when you start checking on it, and I've checked with the Planning Directors and all the lists of anybody they can turn up that said anything —, they had anything about greenspace, and what I found is that the vast majority of them have and are very enthusiastic about the ones that they have that Mr. McCorkle described as incentive-based conservation subdivisions and where they have a great deal of flexibility and give the —, they have some parameters, and give the developers some incentives, and they believe that they have come up with some great designs and are really saving greenspace. But these are all the counties: the fast-growing metropolitan area like Forsyth, Fulton, DeKalb, Gwinnett, Cobb, Douglas —, Douglas did have some large lot mandates and limits on pervious surface. They are changing that to come up with an incentive-based conservation design. The City of Atlanta, Augusta/Richmond County did consider mandatory, but they have decided against that and now have a voluntary one, only required if you have a special high density zoning next to low density. All of them if you have some planned unit developments, they may have some with of this as a condition of zoning. Carroll County. I did find one in the City of Carrollton where they were —, have just enacted a 20 to 30% mandatory open space. It was brand new though, no applications, and the builders there were quite surprised as were a committee that was working on it with the county, so now they're talking to the city to try to get them in line with the county so that everybody will be on this voluntary incentive. I checked the City of Statesboro, the City of Roswell. Lee County

had a 10% set aside for recreation. They have reduced that to 6%, and now they're considering deleting that entirely for low density single family and just have voluntary. City of Fayetteville, the City of Newnan. They were very enthusiastic about their incentive-based open space ordinance and say that has been —, gotten wide acceptance and they were just thrilled about it. City of East Point. I was surprised to see them on the list. That's a very impoverished city south of the —, south of Atlanta. Actually, our office happens to be there. They moved some development. When I called their City Manager, who said, "What can I do? What kind of incentives can I do to build some houses here? We need some more houses." They built 10 in the last three years. Dalton County, the City of Columbus, the City of Marietta, Clayton County, the City of Griffin, Walton County, Newton County, Whitfield County, the City of Valdosta. I think Richmond Hill does have 5% for recreation. But those are just some of the ones that I had the opportunity to call. I have —, and I checked web sites, so would encourage you, and I think the best way to handle this is that we can indeed continue to provide housing for our first-time home buyers, our children, our grandchildren, our veterans, our policemen, our teachers, is to come up with a discretionary conservation design that really encourages and incenses this type of development. Thank you very much.

Chairman Hair said, Commissioner McMasters has a question for you.

Commissioner McMasters said, ma'am, thank you for coming down for that. Ms. Sleeth said, thank you. Commissioner McMasters asked, where is your office based? Ms. Sleeth said, we have an Atlanta address, but it's actually in East Point. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. Ms. Sleeth said, East Point, south of the city, and I live in the City of Roswell. Commissioner McMasters said, great. Thanks and welcome. Ms. Sleeth said, thank you. Commissioner McMasters asked, have you read the two volumes of the Southeast Land Plan? Ms. Sleeth said, no, I have not read it in its entirety. I've just seen highlights of it. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. Have you —, were you furnished with a copy of the Island Land Plan, had a chance to review that? Ms. Sleeth said, no, I have not. I just have seen highlights of it. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. Thank you very much. Ms. Sleeth said, thank you.

Mr. McCorkle said, Ms. Sleeth did a wonderful job, but let me reiterate what she said. We went through a list of 20 groups which were presented to us to have been —, having mandatory greenspace requirements, and that was presented as fact. We found one, which was Carrollton City. One in the State of Georgia, one, and now people are acting like this is something that's just happening all over, why aren't we doing it in Savannah. There were —, Lee County had 6% for recreation, Athens had 5%, and I pointed out to Ms. Sleeth —, she didn't call Richmond Hill, but I told her in my knowledge Richmond Hill had a small recreation set aside provision as well. So mandatory greenspace is not the way to go, it is not the way it's being done in this State. The way to go is discretionary, voluntary development that allows flexibility in design. People —, and we know that people like trees. We all like trees. What's happening in development in Chatham County is that in areas where people can afford —.

Chairman Hair said, Mr. McCorkle, Commissioner Odell has a question. Mr. McCorkle said, yes, sir.

Commissioner Odell said, I understand that one of the 19 had mandatory. Is that true? Mr. McCorkle said, that's correct. Commissioner Odell asked, did any survey that you found where they had as much as 25% set aside? Mr. McCorkle said, Carrollton has 20%. It's the only one that has it and they have 20%. Commissioner Odell said, they have 20%. Mr. McCorkle said, right. Commissioner Odell said, and that's different than 25%. Mr. McCorkle said, and I also think it starts at a certain number of lots in the subdivision. You know, every ordinance is different. So it's not for small numbers of lots in a subdivision, but they're for big tracts of land. So there's differences in every ordinance you look at. But Ms. Sleeth talked to the Planning Director in each of these places and got the real information.

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Murray.

Commissioner Murray said, I just want something for clarification. If I'm not mistaken, maybe I misunderstood you, my ears are stopped up, so —, didn't you say 20 to 30%? Ms. Sleeth said, I believe that that 30% though in that zoning category is for multi-family. Commissioner Murray said, yeah, but there is —, it's not a flat 20% though is what we're saying. Ms. Sleeth said, no. Commissioner Murray said, that's what you would lead us to believe, I think. Okay. Mr. McCorkle said, 20% single family, 30% multi-family. Commissioner McMasters said, so 20 to 30%. Commissioner Murray said, that's right. That's what I thought I heard. Maybe I —. Ms. Sleeth said, maybe I didn't explain that correctly. Commissioner Murray said, thank you. Ms. Sleeth said, and I was going to say about Commissioner Kicklighter's comments about the trees, in Fulton County their tree ordinance, I think they're giving you a lot of credits. I heard that you have to have so many units per acre, which is pretty common, but they give you a lot of credit for saving the trees and so that might give a developer some incentive to not remove that tree when you know they've got question of replacement or whatever. So an incentive base does generally work really well to protect that.

Mr. McCorkle said, as I was saying, the —, we all understand that when people can afford the amenity of some greenspace in their subdivision, they will choose it, and many of the subdivisions being developed now for middle income, upper income people are in fact providing that. I'd like Steve Hall to address that very briefly. He's developing a good bit on the Westside.

Mr. Steve Hall said, thank you, Commissioners. I appreciate the time to speak to you today. My name is Steve Hall. I'm the President of Hallmark Homes of Savannah. I am actively involved in the home building and development industry in our area. We build in the tri-county area and this year I have the honor of being the Chairman of the Engineers and Developers Council for the Homebuilders Association. Briefly, I just want to point out that in our opinion the developers of Chatham County are doing an outstanding job of development. I tour

communities throughout the country looking for ideas and talking with individuals. I was in Seaside in Destin, Florida, two days ago meeting with Phyllis, who is the head of the Seaside Institute talking about urban planning. We take our job very seriously. We're looking at methods to develop responsibly. The fact of the matter is the economics of affordable homes gets to be an issue when you begin to talk about things like greenspace, amenities, home site size. Those are all key factors. I'm proud to be, along with my partners, the developers of the Godley —, the Villages at Godley, a community that was mentioned a few moments ago. I'll have you know that our price range does start in the 120's and that our community was land planned by a group of land planners, some of the best in the Southeast, Perry Woods out of Hilton Head, and Bill Dempsey with Branigar here in Savannah. Some of the very best and many of my development friends are using the same gentlemen to help do their land plans. Our price range begins in the 120's. We have instituted greenspace throughout our community. It works very well for those who can afford it. We also have a multi-million dollar amenity site with a 5,000 square foot clubhouse, pools and all those type of things. So families that can afford a home in the 120's to the 250's are very much enjoying living in that community. Other fine communities like Town Lake, Legacy Square, they're numerous others that are being built throughout the County where the price ranges typically start in the 120's and go up. All of those communities are implementing greenspace standards, many of which meet or exceed the numbers that we've talked about today. It is truly the affordable home buyer that's looking at that \$85,000 home where they would rather have the 60-foot home site, be able to put up their fence, their play set, to have a safe place for their children to play, those —, the market tells you those people want as much land as they can get for their money. I just don't think that it's going to be good public policy to dictate to those less affluent buyers that they have to live on a smaller home site and give up that space in order to have a few trees stay at the end of the street, and I appreciate your time today.

Chairman Hair said, Mr. Hall, Commissioner McMasters has a question. Mr. Hall said, sure. Chairman Hair said, and Commissioner Rivers.

Commissioner McMasters said, thanks for being here. Mr. McCorkle is your organization's attorney, is that correct? Mr. Hall said, that's correct. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. Mr. McCorkle said that he thought that mandatory greenspace is bad public policy. Do you share that view? Mr. Hall said, yes, I do. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. He also stated, and I presume since you're part of this organization that the Islands Land Plan is an example of bad urban planning that needs to be undone. Do you share that view as well? Mr. Hall said, I'm not familiar with the —, when the Islands Land Plan was done, our association was not active in either supporting or opposing that particular land plan. It was our knowledge that roughly 98% of the Island had been developed and we did not get involved in that. That was a huge mistake and so, you know, there are beautiful communities located on Wilmington Island today that would not meet the criteria that this greenspace plan calls for and they are wonderful communities that are enjoyed by many. Commissioner McMasters asked, would you —, could I invite you to take a look at the Islands Land Plan and get your personal opinion of it at some point in the future? Mr. Hall said, well, I can tell you that the land plan that includes 30% greenspace is —, will be a deterrent to affordable homes built on Wilmington Island. Commissioner McMasters said, thank you.

Chairman Hair said, Commissioner Rivers and then Commissioner Rayno.

Commissioner Rivers asked, Mr. Hall, the [inaudible] that you built out and stated that you have houses for \$120,000. What percentage of that up the total? Mr. Hall said, the homes in the 120's to the 150's probably represents about 50 to 60% of the homes in the community. Commissioner Rivers asked, how many of those homes now are occupied by minority? Mr. Hall said, we have 253 home sites in the first phase of Godley. The phase is just about sold out and I would say probably —, I'm not certain, but I'd say probably close to 50% of our property owners are minority. Commissioner Rivers said, so you're saying that those first time home buyers —, are most of those first-time home buyers? Mr. Hall said, no, sir. Most of those buyers are not first-time home buyers. They —, the first-time home buyers —, when you move up into the 120's and up, you're looking at in our industry what we call move-up market. You've got first-time home buyers and then you've got move-up buyers and then you move up into the luxury home buyers. So these buyers are typically what we would consider a move-up buyer. They're not first-time home buyers, younger families just moving out of an apartment or manufactured home. These buyers typically have moved up from a more affordable home. Commissioner Rivers asked, how many —, in your business and you're on the Westside, how much affordable housing is built out there that would allow first-time home buyers or starter homes? Mr. Hall said, there are numerous developments going up along the Quacco Road area where affordable housing is available. Commissioner Rivers asked, are you involved in any? Mr. Hall said, no, unfortunately I'm not. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. Mr. Hall said, many of my associates in the Homebuilders Association are.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, also, on Rodgers Street there's affordable homes ranging —, I say affordable, in that area we're talking from 85 to 105 on Rodgers. Also, in Port Wentworth a very well respected developer is about to put a ton of homes out in that area, but I won't say it's going to be in the affordable range, from what I hear being \$85,000 to \$110,000 also, so there's a great mixture. His particular development I would say ranges from the upper middle class to the wealthy in that area.

Chairman Hair said, Commissioner Rivers still has the floor.

Commissioner Rivers asked, do you see the development, if we adopt this plan as is with 25% greenspace, do you see 85 to 105,000, which puts it probably in a range that makes it sort of affordable, affordable? Mr. Hall asked, being built in the Godley area? Commissioner Rivers asked, in the Southeast, as a part of the Southeast Plan with those available lands that they have? Mr. Hall said, no I do not. Commissioner Rivers asked, you do not? Mr.

Hall said, no, sir. Commissioner Rivers asked, why? Mr. Hall said, because of the price of the raw land is going to have a lot to do with the developer's ability to develop home sites for a home in that price range.

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Rayno.

Commissioner Rayno said, I'm just unclear on the definition of affordable housing because when Fox Chase was purchased back in the 80's we paid 50 —, in the 50,000's so I'm sure today the townhome that I was living in at the time is affordable now in the 70's or 80's, and it seems to me that this greenspace plan, which the developers are saying is going to cause you to build smaller lots to meet the requirements would actually fit right into making affordable housing for people and would play right into what you say is not going to be able to happen. Mr. Hall said, it's my opinion that you're only taking space off the property owner's property and moving it down the street forcing them to build on a small home site. So the developer still is going to pay the same amount of money for the land. It has no affect on the affordability, as far as reducing the affordability I should say. Commissioner Rayno asked, what percentage of the people in the Homebuilders Association build homes in the 70 to \$80,000 range? Mr. Hall said, well, we have 170 builder members of the association. You know, many of them are very small builders that maybe just do a couple of houses a year. We probably have three or four companies in particular that focus primarily on the first-time home buyer market. Commissioner Rayno asked, so on the Westside how many developments do you know of that are in that affordable range, with like 70 to \$80,000? Mr. Hall said, the primary —, the primary developments are along the Quacco Road area and in other areas of Pooler. The Godley area that we're building at this point we don't have a development in there that focuses on that. Commissioner Rayno asked, why wouldn't you put one in the Godley area? Mr. Hall said, we would. Commissioner Rayno asked, you would? Mr. Hall said, we would certainly hope to in the future —, in the future areas be able to develop more affordable communities and we plan on it. Commissioner Rayno said, I guess my point is somebody that buys a \$120,000 in the Godley area probably wouldn't want to have a 70 to \$80,000 development go right next door. Would they? Mr. Hall said, I would think with proper land planning and buffers and things of that nature that you can inter-mix. Commissioner Rayno asked, buffers so they couldn't see them? Mr. Hall said, well —. Commissioner Rayno said, see my point is you all talk about how you care about affordable housing, but —. Chairman Hair said, we need buffers between Commissioners. I'd like to see some buffers there. Commissioner Rayno said, it's just my humble opinion, I don't they you really do and I don't think y'all really build that many affordable houses in the 70-80 range. Mr. Hall said, well, my company doesn't, but we do have other members that do.

Chairman Hair said, Commissioner McMasters and then Commissioner Odell to ask a question.

Commissioner McMasters said, Mr. Hall, you have sat through this meeting and you have no doubt listened and heard our MPC staff planners reiterate that a diverse and affordable supply has been taken into consideration as part of this plan and it is not adversely affected by it. Do you, too, disagree with our staff? Mr. Hall said, very strongly. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. Thank you.

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Odell.

Commissioner Odell said, just two points. From a philosophical standpoint I do not think that it's evil if a builder has to pay \$75,000 for a lot to turn around and look at that builder and say can you build me a \$85,000 house. I mean, it's not reasonable, it's not feasible, it's market-driven. Affordable houses are built where there's affordable land, and I don't think it's evil to be in a profit-making business. Hopefully we all should be in a profit-making business. That's just one point. From a greater philosophical standpoint what concerns me is most of this land is developed. There are a few large tracts out there, but most of it is developed. But we are having a domino effect and the next person to get dominoed is on the Westside and that's Dean [Kicklighter]. If I owned a large tract of land on the Westside, what I would do if I saw Chatham County coming with this 25% set aside, which basically says you do not need to have your yard so that you can use it for your swing, your kids, fence it off, my right to look at trees near your property is more important than your right to use your yard. To me that doesn't make sense, and I have not received a penny from a homebuilder in campaign support. Haven't received a penny. So I don't want —, and one of my good friends called me and said, "Well, you know they give a lot in contributions." The simple fact that people have different philosophical opinions doesn't mean that they're evil if they differ from your opinions. It just means that you're not the only one who's thinking. We're not obligated to follow exactly what you want. If I lived on the Westside and I owned a large tract of land, I would ask one of the smaller municipalities to fold me in —, Pooler, Garden City, what have you, anywhere but Chatham County —, so that I wouldn't have to deal with this. Here's the impact that that has on us, that domino effect. It reduces the tax pool that we have if they are now in one of those other municipalities. So affordable houses, that's good. That's good, but for affordable houses you must have affordable land. This is primo property out there. I think it's good. I think conceptually it's good, but I think realistically it's not your fault that we don't have affordable housing. It's not the builders association fault that we don't have affordable housing. You pay what the market demands and I think it's market driven. It's really not a question in there for you, it's just my opinion. Mr. Hall said, I appreciate that, but you are correct, it is market driven and developers like myself have to do a better job in order to attract buyers to our communities, and if I don't do a good job, I'm going to lose business to a developer who's going to do a good job and, you know, it's just business. Commissioner Odell said, and they go somewhere else. They go to someone who'll give them what they want.

Chairman Hair said, Mr. Hall, Commissioner McMasters has another question for you.

Commissioner McMasters said, just this last thing. Mr. Hall, do you believe that communities have a right to change and direct growth and the development patterns in their communities? Mr. Hall said, I do believe that

communities have a right to shape and grow. I do feel personally though that the governing bodies and the staffs that are associated to help facilitate that growth through the County need to have representation from people that live it every day and that know the realities of what they're doing and to have those people sit in on committees and be accepted on committees so that their voice is heard, not squashed by people who have no knowledge of the industry whatsoever engineering land planning design and to have those people dictate to the industry how they're supposed to develop. Commissioner McMasters said, but communities should have —. Mr. Hall said, absolutely. Commissioner McMasters asked, — the lead in defining their future? Mr. Hall said, yes, sir, absolutely. Commissioner McMasters said, thank you.

Chairman Hair asked, Mr. Hall, are you finished or do you have any other comments? Mr. Hall said, I'm done. Chairman Hair said, okay. Chairman Hair recognized Mr. McCorkle.

Mr. McCorkle said, I'm glad y'all had fun making sport of Mr. Hall. The point of that —, him being here was to indicate that in the medium price range and upper price range homes, we understand that people like the amenity of greenspace and he indicated that in his developments which are in that range he provides that greenspace voluntarily, not as mandated. We do have a builder, which I will now, if he still has the nerve to come up, which I'm sure he will, who is building and has built for decades affordable homes, explain to you the impact that this provision would have on his ability to provide affordable homes on full size lots. Mr. Young, please.

Mr. Louis Young said, thank you. Good morning —, it's afternoon. I am Louis Young. I was born in Savannah 67 years ago. I was educated here and been here all my life and with my partner, Jim Wilson, we started building affordable housing. Now since there are so many different definitions of affordable housing, when we started business, which was about '84 or '85, somewhere in there, we looked at the market, and where the market was not being fed, the market was not being supplied. If you look at the triangle, the money at the top and it spreads on down, the lower you can get the price of the house, the bigger your market is. So we started with 50-foot lots out in Quail —, Quail something. We had a bunch of Quails. Quail —, I think it was Quail Run was the first one. We did a Quail Run, a Quail Ridge, a Quail Forest and a Quail-something else. We did a bunch of Quails. Chairman Hair asked, you like those quail, huh, Mr. Young? Mr. Young said, there was a bunch in there. We got on one name and we couldn't get off, but the market was just tremendous out there for true affordable housing. It's very difficult to get the prices down, it's very difficult. I've heard all sorts of comments made from people that don't develop about what it takes and what the impact will be and what the impact will not be. One of you gentlemen has a daughter living in White Bluff Plantation. White Bluff Plantation was 100 and —, by my recollection, which is not a good source —, it was 138 lots, and if this ordinance as it's proposed was put on White Bluff Plantation, there would be a loss of 28 lots. A 28 lot loss at today's dollars would increase the remaining houses about \$6,000 a house. Those are the facts. You've asked, Mr. McMasters, if someone has read the thing —, I have not read. I have not been to a meeting, I have not read a report, haven't been invited to a meeting either. What the whole thing comes down to, this is your agenda, I just picked it up over there. That's your lot, that's your 60 by 100-foot lot. You tear off 10% of it and you put it down the street in open space and you tell your homeowner you've got a 54 by 100-foot lot. Will it affect sales? I don't think so. Will affect their quality of life? I think so. Is it measurable? I don't know how you'd measure that. Will their back yard be big enough? No. Most of —, almost all of our sales are to young people or real old people. My partner has jokingly referred to that as the newly weds and the nearly deads. It just turned out that way over the years. The older people don't —, they want a small lot so they don't mind coming in just a little, but the —, most of the market is newly weds. Young people who can barely afford it. The house that we started out with at \$38,900 is now \$70,000 —, \$72,000. Same house. The mix of people we don't track, but I asked my sales staff what that was roughly and they said two-thirds of our clients are minority customers. We have built over 3,000 houses. The first subdivisions were on 50-foot lots and then we went to 52-foot lots and then we went to 60-foot lots, and we went to 60-foot lots for two reasons. Number one, you had to rezone the land to what Mr. Murray's group when they were at the Planning Commission created the small lot subdivision, which was done right before I went down there. You had to go through a rezoning process and nobody on either side wanted you to have a small lot subdivision in the middle. So we just abandoned even going through rezoning and we started putting them in just straight all one zones. It has been suggested that they can't be built on the Southeast, and that's probably accurate. It's not totally because you don't know what that land eventually will sell for. Sooner or later the gun club's going to get tired of —, it's been encroached on, so sooner or later that land is going to be available, and there's another tract at the end of Ferguson which may be available one day. I've tried buying both unsuccessfully. So I don't know that it will have an impact there, but to say that —, and it has been said —, that there will be no impact, under certain circumstances there can be an impact. For instance, they take the typical subdivision and you get X-number of lots out of it with the 25 or 20 or whatever percent set aside, and they're including in there the detention areas that are required. When we did Marsh Bluff Subdivision out in the Coffee Bluff area, that has a direct discharge into the marsh so there's no detention area required, so you would lose lots there. That would be a loss of lots. Plain and simple, it would a loss of lots. If out on the Westside you were doing something and you had direct discharge into the Ogeechee River, you would not have detention and you would have loss of lots there. If on Ferguson Avenue you were doing something and you had direct discharge into whatever the creek is out there, you wouldn't have detention and you would have loss of lots there. That's about it. Real short. Any questions?

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Murray.

Commissioner Murray asked, Mr. Young, do you know roughly in Battery Point with the retention ponds and all the areas out there, how much —, what percentage of greenspace actually is in that development? Mr. Young said, no. There would be ample greenspace in there because there was more —, that was when wetlands first came out and it was very unclear about wetlands so we had some big wetlands out there and along came somebody from Carolina and they had a road contract for widening the Tybee Road or putting it in one, you know, the Islands

Expressway, and they at that time you couldn't —, they came in and dug all those wetlands so we created lagoons out there that are not necessary. For instance, when the shopping center was developed, they didn't have to have any detention at all because there was enough detention on site. Commissioner Murray said, I know they've got the lines running into your retention ponds over there —. Mr. Young said, so I don't know —. Commissioner Murray said, but my point was, if I'm not mistaken, that probably meets or exceeds the Islands Land Use Plan right now with greenspace in that development because of what was done. Mr. Young said, I can't —, I can't answer that. Commissioner Murray said, the other point, you know, and so far what I've heard from the majority of the people that have spoke one way or the other on this have all referred to other areas in Chatham County, mainly the Westside and some other areas, but not to the area that we're speaking of for the Southeast Land Use Plan. We've all agreed and all —, I think everybody up here agrees —, that each land use plan is going to be different to some degree. Some of us have even said that if the Westside wants zero greenspace, that would be fine. So I don't think you can base this plan dictating what the Westside plan is going to be like. Every area is different. Mr. Young said, I know that. Commissioner Murray said, there's only 15% undeveloped still out there. You can [inaudible]. I don't see the effect of it because I agree with you. I think the land out there is too expensive to do what all the discussion's about and on top of that I don't think —, even if it was not too expensive, I just don't believe that it would stop affordable housing if the land was down where it could be purchased for that, but —, anyway.

Chairman Hair asked, any other questions? Commissioner Murray said, I appreciate you coming. Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Young. Commissioner Murray said, thank you, Mr. Young. Commissioner Rivers said, I've just got one for Mr. Young. Chairman Hair said, okay.

Commissioner Rivers said, Mr. Young —. Mr. Young said, yes, sir. Commissioner Rivers asked, what would be the difference of 25% with right-of-way, what effect would that have or impact would that have on the Southeast situation that we're talking about? Mr. Young said, 25% versus what? What they're proposing now? Commissioner Rivers said, well, if you've got a 25% set aside for greenspace without the right-of-way and if you have 25% with the right-of-way —. Mr. Young said, I don't have an answer for that. I don't know that. Commissioner Murray said, I think what they told us when they were making the presentation it would be equivalent to 20% without the right-of-way. Mr. Young said, all I know is as far as I'm concerned —. Commissioner Rivers said, I'm talking about the impact of building now, I'm not talking about the impact of whether it met —, come out to 20%. If you had to build on a lot that size hypothetically what the right-of-way included. What impact would it have on you building that house or being there —? Mr. Young said, it's not going to have any. I'm going to make the profit, I'm going to sell the house for the same amount. What's going to happen is 10% of her yard is going to go away, it's going to go down the street some where, and that's a fact, and the lots are only 60 feet to start out with, so a strip 6 x 100 is going away. Now it's a whole new issue to where it's going, who's going to maintain it and all of that, but that's another issue.

Chairman Hair said, okay, thank you, Mr. Young. I'm going to declare a five-minute recess at the Clerk's request. A five-minute recess, we'll come back at 1:30.

[NOTE: A five-minute recess was taken at 1:25 p.m. and the meeting was reconvened at 1:30 p.m.]

Chairman Hair asked, Mr. McCorkle, are you —, have you concluded?

Mr. McCorkle said, I'll take one more minute just to sum up and then I'll get out of the way. In conclusion, I think we framed the issue pretty well. We can build affordable housing with some slight increase in cost in certain circumstances as described by Mr. Young when you're not using up part of your greenspace for detention and in some circumstances you will have more expensive homes. In normal circumstances you will build about the same number of lots at about the same cost, but you're forcing people to live on smaller lots. Is that good public policy? Should that be mandated? We have shown that in the State of Georgia it's been considered numerous times by many bodies, and if you're an autonomous body, you do what you feel's best. We found one municipality that had such a mandatory greenspace requirement. We think it's bad public policy and we ask you to reject it, and I'll reserve any additional comments in case something's said that I need to respond to.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. McCorkle. I'm going to call on Mr. Herrin next. Before I do, just for planning purposes, could I see a show of hands of how many people want to speak so I can —. Okay, it looks like about three hours. That's fine. Chairman Hair recognized Mr. Herrin.

Mr. Herrin said, I'm Billy Herrin. I'm here representing the Forest City Gun Club. Commissioner Odell asked, what is your name? Chairman Hair said, Billy Herrin. I get all these phone calls. I don't get any of his checks, but I get a lot of his phone calls. Mr. Herrin said, well, actually I got a couple of checks the first time you ran. Commissioner Murray asked, did you send them back? Mr. Herrin said, yeah, I was afraid I —, I sent them back. I'm here representing the Forest City Gun Club and we're probably —, between us and Bethesda we're probably the majority of that 15% that has not been developed. I don't think you're going to see any development at Bethesda and I don't think you're going to see any at the Forest City Gun Club. I'm here representing 400 acres of land and approximately 750 members. We're against the greenspace —, mandatory greenspace, and I, you know, since this is my first time here, I apologize to Mr. Rayno. I didn't know that I was supposed to write him a letter, but I could have got him 500 or 600 of them. But anyway, I think it's —. Chairman Hair said, it's his district too by the way. Mr. Herrin said, I think this is something that, you know, the MPC has —, needs to evaluate each piece of property on —, or each project on its own merit, and I think what you're doing is you're taking that away from them and there's some flex—, you know, there's some cases where you do need 30% and there's some cases where

you need zero. So I think if you leave it with the MPC to evaluate the individual projects, I think you'd be much better off.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Herrin. I appreciate it. All right, just come forward, sir. State your name for the record.

Mr. Henry Morgan said, yes. Henry Morgan's my name, Commissioner, fellow Commissioners, Mr. Odell. Commissioner Odell said, Henry. Mr. Morgan said, looking for Dean [Kicklighter]. Is Dean coming back? Chairman Hair said, well, I don't know. You'll have to go ahead, we've got a quorum. You can't wait on him. Mr. Morgan said, well, I'd like to, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Hair said, well, if you want to be last, we can get somebody else to come up and speak first. Mr. Morgan said, but I'm not. I'm going to go ahead. Chairman Hair said, okay. Mr. Morgan said, I'm going to go ahead. Now, I was listening carefully to Mr. Young and he's to be highly complimented on his career of building affordable homes. No doubt about that. But there's something, an error in the logic here. I've got a project I'm working on at Effingham right now. I'll show you the plan. Got it laid out by a civil engineer over at EMC. I'll be happy to show it to anybody. Okay? And it's got 100 lots on it. Now I'm not a home builder, I'm not really a developer. I just happen to have a piece of land I'm working on. But before I attempt to sell it, I want to know what it's worth. If I deal with somebody like Mr. Young or Mr. Wardlaw, who I've dealt with Mr. Wardlaw's brother before, I know they're very shrewd and good bargainers, and they're going to know already how many lots can go there or they get their engineer to look at it. Okay? Now, if I go to sell this 100-lot proposed subdivision, and it happens to be in Effingham, but it could be in West Chatham or it could be —, maybe in Southeast, but there's not much land left there and Mr. Herrin just took it off the market, and he's a good friend of mine and he's a very nice gentleman —, if 25% of this subdivision has got to be this greenspace, then am I going to be able to sell it for the same amount of money? I don't think so. I hope I could, but I kept on hearing same amount of money for the land, same amount of money for the land. If you've got two hard bargainers or shrewd bargainers, not sharp just shrewd, they're going to realize that if who's selling it's got to leave 25% there and who's buying it has got to buy into 25. A 100-lot subdivision, you know, on paper \$10,000 a lot, a million dollars. 25 of the lot's got to be in greenspace. They ain't going to get the \$10,000 a lot for that I don't think. That's my logic [inaudible]. I mean, that's a point that's got to be addressed I think. Now, as to the lots remaining, you don't have expenses for putting roads on the 25 acres here. You do not have expenses. At the end of the subdivision, Commissioner, at the end of the subdivision you don't have any further expense there. No further expense. So the expenses are still the same per lot even with the 25% deal. Think about the logic of that. Think about the logic of that. That's a 60 by 90 lot. You do not have to reduce it 10%. The law as proposed just said you could. You could go 54 —, I wrote the numbers down —, 54 by 90 or 60 by 81 if 60 by 90 is the smallest lot. I'm sure the homebuilders can tell us what the smallest lot is. I don't develop in this County. I do it in Pooler and I do it in Bloomingdale. I took Mr. Odell's words to heart. I think Mr. Kicklighter made an excellent point. I think there should be a tree ordinance in this County. My family plants trees and we plant an acre of pine trees, 600 trees, for \$300. That's 50¢ a tree. I went to the meeting the other day. I saw Mr. McCorkle's picture of I believe it was Battery Point or Berwick Lakes, I believe. There was one tree in the front yard. One tree. I mean, it's time we had a tree ordinance. I believe Pooler has one, I'm not 100% sure. I don't think they're overly —, they're not —, I don't know, for lack of a better word, Stalinistic [phonetic] or anything. I mean, 10 pine trees at \$1.00 apiece and it takes you 10 minutes to put them in the ground. Now, Harris [Odell], I'm not sure who's fault it is either. You asked Mr. Hall. I think you asked who's fault it is. We don't know who's fault it is. Commissioner Odell said, I do. Mr. Morgan said, I'm not sure. Commissioner Odell said, the fault is the government. It's unfair to lay the responsibility for affordable housing upon individual business. That's why you have government. Mr. Morgan said, and I'm here to say that my family and myself did sign a contract with Mercy Housing and we did try to do business with Mercy to put affordable housing in the City of Pooler, who stood by us, a Roman Catholic Church, but they would not go forward with it because apparently Pooler resolved to back them but not give them half a million dollars. Mercy subsequently backed out. The contract became void. I never even heard back from them. So nobody can say that I'm not for affordable housing. Nobody asked. I appreciate that, too. I understand Mr. Rivers where is coming from and I believe what he says 100%. Questions?

Chairman Hair asked, any questions for Mr. Morgan?

Commissioner Odell said, yeah. What's your point? I understand what you said, but are you for us or are you against us? Mr. Morgan said, no, I'm just making a point, but I keep on hearing the land's the same price, Commissioner. I don't buy it. Chairman Hair said, that means he's for the 30%, he's got the badge on. Commissioner Odell said, no, he's not for the 30%. Mr. Morgan said, no, it's 25. That's the point, Commissioner Odell. The land's not necessarily the same price. Chairman Hair said, thank you. Mr. Morgan said, it's not necessarily the same construction cost. You know, our figures got looked at and Mr. McCorkle did an excellent job. I just came up here, and I've been following it the whole time. I didn't join the group. My mother said, "Get there, Henry." I got here. Plus I [inaudible] working on this out in Effingham County and I know about lot sizes.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Morgan. We appreciate it. Commissioner Odell said, thank you, Henry [Morgan]. Chairman Hair said, next.

Ms. Dale Thorpe said, good afternoon. Chairman Hair said, good afternoon. Ms. Thorpe said, I'm Dale Thorpe and I'm President of the Savannah Tree Foundation, and I would like to make the following comments concerning the proposed Southeast Chatham Land Use Plan. The Savannah Tree Foundation has worked in the field of urban forestry for the past 20 years. We have participated in education, advocacy and tree planting as the significance of urban forestry has become better understood through research and documentation. In the past 20 years the road to greenspace has been quantified by technology-driven scientific research. The important function that greenspace plays in pollution abatement, storm water assistance, heat mediation and increased property

values is now better understood. As development footprints and road construction have accelerated throughout the County, [inaudible] soil pollution has become the major source of reduced water quality in our rivers and streams. It is recognized that filtering of water by natural areas can cleanse run-off before it reaches its destination. Satellite imagery has documented the heat [inaudible] effect caused by miles of pavement and the corresponding lower temperatures that greenspaces especially those with canopy trees produce. Surveys have determined that developers and homebuilders realize that properties are made more valuable and communities more livable when greenspace and trees are present. The Savannah Tree Foundation requests that the Chatham County Commission recognize the established value of greenspace and that you approve the Southeast Chatham County Land Use Plan with a mandatory standard of greenspace with at least the currently proposed 25%, if not 30. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, ma'am. Next please. Mr. Nutting.

Mr. Sid Nutting said, I hope everybody relaxes because I didn't come here to fight today. After six-plus years of scrapping and trying to dig for answers from wherever we could get them, we realized that this was a community project, the first step of a plan that is going to be good for the community, and constantly we have had to battle one way or another Mr. McCorkle's input. Mr. Rivers, he mentioned that things were lovely up until some time in the 60's and, of course, he also made that statement at the MPC meeting and he said, gee, when he was a kid there weren't any trees in the neighborhood and he planted one and 50 years later it's a beautiful tree. We concluded that we didn't want to wait 50 years. And you certainly remember because one of my very first projects with Union Camp was to be on loan to take the Tuberculosis truck down in behind the Union Station where there wasn't a damn green tree, where all the homes and the TB was rampant, and that was with no regulations whatsoever. But I said I was coming here today not to fight, but to try to say to you all, we have worked with your staff and with your MPC and from time to time with you all. We did not feel it was our place to hire expert lawyers or other kinds of experts at company —, certainly at public expense, so we relied on those staff people and we relied on their expertise. We relied on the consultants that you all were already paying for. And what these people are telling us is that our approach was fine, so I want to start out today first by reading what I prepared and I will certainly not take near the time that you have experienced today. Chairman Hair, Dr. Thomas, gentlemen. For the record my name is Sid Nutting. I'm addressing you today as the Chairman of the Southeast Land Use Planning Committee of the MPC. First, I want to thank you for recognizing the need for the effort that has become known as the Tri-Centennial Comprehensive Plan for Chatham County, of which the Southeast Land Use Plan is the second element. In tight financial times it would have been very easy for you to minimize response to the State requirement that we take this —, undertake this kind of thing, but your recognition of a serious need to do better provided the opportunity for many citizens to coalesce ideas into a vision and a road map to get there, which had long —, had too long been neglected. Our County is full of examples of what should have been and could have been had we done better, had we followed the lessons learned by General Oglethorpe, lessons which tens of thousands of visitors come to this community every year to envy. From the beginning of our study our MPC staff facilitators, and by the way one was mentioned, I think we've had three over the course of our time, plus the more permanent members. These facilitators got us to focus on what was good and attractive to us and what we could see that was not. They helped us to learn from experience of similar communities, they showed us the limits of what we could change and where we could maintain or improve the best of what we already in our largely built-out area, though very uniquely and attractive peninsula-like area, has to offer. This area covers the communities that are listed in page one in your manual. I hope you've read them. Isle of Hope, Dutch Island, Harrock Hall, Bona Bella, Nottingham, Sandfly, Pin Point, Montgomery, Beaulieu, Vernon View, Rio Vista, Burnside, Halcyon Bluff, King's Way, Skidaway and others, some 25,000 people. Our group met many more times than Mr. McCorkle's calculations. We met even when we didn't have a facilitator because of your budget problems. We met in-between when we had a facilitator because we had little subcommittees that were going on. We probably averaged 10 or 15 meetings —, excuse me, 12 to 25 meetings —, people per meeting, but with added advantage of participation from those who came when their schedules permitted but had to move on, only to be replaced by others. Word of mouth, our informal surveys, inquiries and interaction within a close-knit community provided the contacts to keep the input coming. We attended many County Commission and MPC meetings when issues in our area were discussed, and you know what that time takes. These residents spent many uncompensated dollars on travel, work interruption, supplies and endless telephone time. To my knowledge, they all did it without any monetary motive or benefit other than to try to respond to a plan for the preservation of the desired features of their neighborhood. Their first product was boiled down to a concise vision of what the residents wished for their community well into the tri-centennial era. I hope you've read that vision —, it's on page 45 of our plan —, for it is the focus of every goal, objective, strategy and policy in Volume I. The text and map zoning amendments that make up Volume II are the necessary means for accomplishing the rest. The committee proposed a moratorium in October of last year so as to allow time to get it right before more unplanned for growth pressures arose, as they are rapidly going to the MPC these days. That plan failed so the committee pushed harder following already approved —, the already approved Islands format, and that push, as you recall, was requested by you so that the staff costs could be directed to the City's portion of the overall project. The committee work was completed after refinements resulting from three well-advertised and well-attended public meetings. Hearings were completed by —, all the hearings were completed before the end of 2002. The committee report then became primarily the MPC's product. Unfortunately, after the first of 2003 the homebuilders finally came forward with last minute objections, which but for one issue has been resolved by the MPC staff, the MPC, and now it's in your first reading book. Going from page to page through the book, the MPC went through every page in it three times that we know of in open session. They made a lot of good improvements. They made lots of smaller corrections. They changed some words that we would rather they had not, but we were, in the spirit of getting on with it, felt that we could live with them. Even since your first meeting —, first reading meeting two weeks ago, the engineering and other of the County staff departments has gone through the whole thing one more time page by page and they have come up with a supplemental letter, which I think you have already seen and discussed. We understand that

the fear of the unknown is part of what the homebuilders' problem is on the Westside, but if they exploit the great opportunity that planned growth can provide, they will have even more success than they have been having, and I submit to you that now while you've got wide open spaces, brand new roads, the prospect of a huge economic balloon coming into the community, it's the time to do some very strong planning. That includes making it attractive for the long term value of those properties. To build properties that are going down in value because they start out cheap and they don't have any attractive nature, they are cheaply built, only means future trouble for the community they're in.

Mr. Nutting said, now our position on the one remaining issue in the report is this one of the greenspace. As you know, it only applies to lots —, subdivision lots with a half-acre lots in it. The homebuilders maintain there is no way, they were here today, that they can innovate and provide affordable housing with greenspace. The staff has demonstrated that it can and it is being provided in other locations by innovation, reducing lot size requirements for the same lot count, and for —, by other innovations, and by the way no one has talked much today about the definition of what is greenspace. Allowances have been made in this plan for many opportunities to classify things as greenspace. If for a specific site there are factors that prohibit success at the already compromised 30, which many in our committee would like to see because we think it's as important to us as it was to the Island plan, but the agreed on 25% level, there are variance procedures. Perhaps other new ideas and competition will bring improvement to our whole community that we're looking for and, if not, a future change is always an option, but we should try. For now this plan has been worked over too much we think, but approved by all, all along the way, all but you today. It's time for closure. We urge you to do that without weakening the effort that has gone into it and the objectives that have been made for our community.

Mr. Nutting said, now, to finish up our side of this story today, I'd like to put human faces on what you've heard of people that have been working with us, and to do that we're going to have some of them come up and quickly read —, and by the way, I think I've been here, what, five minutes. I think Mr. McCorkle got, what, 70 minutes. All right, well, we want to not take that much time —. Chairman Hair said, Mr. Nutting, you'll have as long as you need, sir. Mr. Nutting said, well, I —, what we —, all we want you to do is to understand that we've been talking generalities without faces, and what we'd like to do is to have some of the people that have —, going to or already shared the ideas we had and that have been working toward greenspace in all sorts of ways throughout this community. So I'll start off with a group of neighborhood associations. I think Ms. Clarissa Haynes is the first. Is she here? Yes.

Ms. Clarissa Haynes said, good afternoon. Chairman Hair said, good afternoon. Ms. Haynes said, Chairman Hair, Commissioners. My name is Clarissa Jones Haynes [phonetic]. I am 44 years old and I have lived 43 of those years in Sandfly. I am the Secretary and I speak on behalf of the Sandfly Betterment Community Association. I respectfully request you support the Southeast Chatham County Community Land Use Plan as part of the Chatham County Tri-Centennial Plan. This request is based upon the following facts important to all of the residents. The Southeast Plan incorporates the best possible land use for this area as envisioned by residents who spent years working with expert planners, invited input from interested parties, and we also used the previously adopted Islands Plan as a guide when applicable. We, the residents, need a plan that will preserve the special character of Southeast Chatham, as reflected in the following vision statement. The vision is to maintain our community's well-established, low density, semi-rural and residential character. Our quiet, peaceful neighborhoods and tree-lined roads shall be preserved, as well as our greenspace, natural areas, wetlands and historic sites. Commercial activity shall be limited in scale and confined to discrete areas that are identified on the Future Land Use Map. All of the goals, strategies and policies stated in the Southeast Land Use Plan support the purpose and intent stated in the vision statement. The Southeast Land Use Plan provides for affordable housing along with greenspace standards for residential subdivisions. Finally, the Southeast Plan demonstrates that housing affordability, diversity and environmental quality can coexist and even compliment one another. In conclusion, I urge, I plead that the Chatham County Commission approve the Southeast Land Use Plan because it will preserve the quality of life in this area until at least 2033 and will guarantee that same quality of life for future generations. And I thank you for this opportunity.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. Commissioner Odell has a question for you.

Commissioner Odell said, just a couple. This is the Sandfly Neighborhood Association? Ms. Haynes said, yes, it is. Commissioner Odell asked, and you are the Secretary or the President? Ms. Haynes said, Secretary. Commissioner Odell said, I guess my question is how long has Sandfly participated in the planning process of the plan? Ms. Haynes said, I have been active since probably October of 2002; however, lots of the other members have been active for several years. Commissioner Odell said, the only reason I asked is that my records indicate the first time Sandfly got involved in this was in 2002 and I keep hearing that the planning process has been going on for six years. Do you know if Sandfly's been actively involved for six years. Ms. Haynes said, I can only speak for myself; however, I have spoken with other members of the community that have been active prior to my becoming active, and there are some here today. Maybe they can answer that for you. Commissioner Odell said, thank you. Ms. Haynes said, thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. Mr. Nutting, who's next?

Mr. Nutting said, Janice Darden. I wish this group —, here she comes. I wish this group, the neighborhood associations would just lead one to the other. Chairman Hair said, if you could, Mr. Nutting, if you'd have everyone come up on the front row that will expedite it. Everybody that's going to speak on Mr. Nutting's behalf, if you'd come up, come up on the front row it will help a lot. Thank you.

Ms. Janice Darden said, Dr. Hair, fellow Commissioners, it's gotten a little bit more sparse in here. It's getting close to car pool time and there a few people that need to spend a little extra time looking at their car since downtown is a little bit foreign to them. Being —, I represent the Isle of Hope —. The Clerk asked, state your name please. Ms. Darden said, oh, I'm sorry. I'm Janice Darden and I represent Isle of Hope area. Being a past-President of the Community Club and the [inaudible] association, I will read letters that I received from them. Dear Chairman Hair and Commissioners: As President of the Isle of Hope Community Club, an organization representing membership in an area consisting of more than 1,200 households, I personally request your support of the Southeast Chatham County Land Use Plan as presented to the Metropolitan Planning Commission in its current version dated March 18, 2003. Isle of Hope is a small, primarily residential community whose residents feel privileged to live in an area of such natural beauty and historical significance. Our community has grown gradually over the past two centuries and its present appearance reflects the values of its inhabitants. An overwhelming majority of the residents on the island oppose any increased density in population as well as support any municipal zoning and land use regulations, which may enhance open spaces and preserve our natural environment. I feel the current community plan addresses land use controls that promote orderly growth and protect our residents' property values. Adoption of this plan should go a long way toward protecting our community's quality of life for future generations. Your support would be very much appreciated. Sincerely, J. Clegg Roberts, President, Isle of Hope Community Club. And I'll take the opportunity to read from the Isle of Hope Historical Association, the letter I got. Dear Chairman Hair and Commissioners: The Isle of Hope Historic Association, Inc., has a stated mission and vision among other things to —, to gather, learn, study, record, publicize and disseminate information regarding the historic and aesthetic aspects of the Isle of Hope, Chatham County, Georgia, as a unique southern community; to act as a depository for such historical information; to obtain registration as a historic district; to undertake any steps considered necessary and desirable to preserve the character and charm of the Isle of Hope community for the enjoyment of future generations. All of the goals, strategies and policies stated in the March 2003 Southeast Land Use Plan appear to support the purpose and intent stated in the vision statement and in large part run parallel to those of the Isle of Hope Historic Association. With this in mind, the Isle of Hope Historic Association joins with the MPC on a recommendation of approval for the Southeast Land Use Plan. Sincerely, Michael J. Curran, Jr., President, Isle of Hope Historic Association. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you very much. Next please.

Mr. Bob Heath said, Dr. Hair, Commissioners, good afternoon. I thought I was going to say good morning and —. Chairman Hair said, state your name for the record, sir. Mr. Heath said, I'm Bob Heath and I live in the Southeast Chatham County area and I'm a past Director of The Landings Association and The Landings Association asked me to follow the development of this plan, and I've been doing that for the last year. The Landings Association has written you on the 29th of last month, and I hope you all have a copy of that, that they support the plan and stated that they only had one concern and that was they thought the greenspace should be compatible with the Islands greenspace. The Landings is one of the most successfully developments —, one of the most successful developments on the east coast of the United States, and it has over 40% greenspace. The number is actually 42% the last time we surveyed. It includes 156 lagoons, and it includes the golf courses, but a lot of nature areas and et cetera. It does not include any of the 92 miles of road and road right-of-ways nor the center medians in these roads, which would probably boost it considerably more than that we counted. I believe personally that Mr. McCorkle and the Savannah Business —, Savannah Builders Association are concerned with the Southeast Plan mainly because they think it might invest —, might influence the Westside Plan, and that is where the major development areas are. They're not in the Southeast. In fact, were you to take out Bethesda and the gun club and a few other areas, there's not a lot left there. But the Southeast is different than many other parts of Chatham County, and that is it's environmentally sensitive, it has a beautiful tree canopy, it has scenic drives, it has many old oak trees, and many people believe it takes 100 years to build a —, to grow an oak tree, 100 years it lives and it takes it 100 years to die. So we are not, as Mr. McCorkle said, going to go and clear land, build houses and put a new oak tree in its place. So it's a different kind of an area. I brought a copy, and I hope many of you might have seen it in the *Wall Street Journal* last month, it was on March 12th, and I have a copy for each one of you on an article they call smart development. It addresses a place called the Garden Village in Denver, Colorado. This village combines economically, environmentally-friendly housing. It has 20% affordable housing. It has a variety of housing styles from individual homes, family homes, to senior apartments, and it has parks and courtyards winding throughout. The development is 75% complete and completely sold out, and every house in it sold before it was built. It's had an annual return for developers of 10% per annum on their return on investment and it's increased house values and property taxes in the town around it. I've heard a lot of people addressing affordable housing, and I'm not sure where it fits in our area because there's not much area left for major developments, but one of the major formations of wealth in our country have been the houses that people live in, and if we build them in the right environment with the right kind of open space and et cetera around them, I think that they will generate wealth and generating wealth is what we need with a lot of our affordable houses. So in closing I think that we should preserve what we have in the Southeast area and we ought to attack the Westside Plan as another plan, and it ought to contain the setbacks and the tree standards, and I think it will return better yields for everybody, the land owners, the developers, the residents and the County, which will receive higher property taxes from it as the land increases in value. Thank you very much.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Heath. Commissioner Kicklighter has a question.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, I just want to address —, everybody keeps mentioning the Westside. I ask the people to ride out there and take a look. We have subdivisions out there, such as Westbrook, which would make The Landings proud. It's beautiful, greenspace everywhere, a gated community. Mr. Heath said, good for you. Commissioner Kicklighter said, we have other beautiful subdivisions there with greenspace. My fear on this is we

also have areas with affordable housing, and it's going to go in there. It's the fact that of it going through and you have 54-foot lots with the houses on top of each other rather than 60. It's that philosophical difference that, you know —. I would prefer the no mandatory greenspace on the Westside also on that. I just wanted to clarify —, say that because everybody is talking about the Westside.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Heath. We appreciate you coming. Mr. Heath said, thank you. Next please.

Ms. Dale Morgan said, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I'm Dale Morgan. I appreciate this opportunity to speak to you. I think my son, Henry, already introduced me. I agree with him and I'm proud of him, and he's a lot bigger than I am. I am here primarily to read a letter from our President, Ralph Bowyer, on the Historic Beaulieu and Montgomery Neighborhood. I am a member of that. Dear Chairman Hair and Commissioners: On behalf of our community association, I respectfully ask your support of the Southeast Chatham County Community Land Use Plan. The plan provides the best future land use for the area in keeping with its development, low density, semi-rural and residential neighborhoods. It provides for affordable housing along with greenspace standards for residential subdivisions. The MPC staff tells us that 25% greenspace is achievable with minimal loss —, minimal to no loss of living unit construction. Affordable housing means adequate greenspace. The exhaustive work over a number of years by the Citizens Land Use Committee, the MPC staff and all interested parties has demonstrated that housing affordability, diversity and environmental qualities can all be a part of our community. In summary, we ask that you support the Southeast Chatham County Community Land Use Plan to preserve the special character of our area. Thank you very much.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Ms. Morgan. We appreciate you being here. Next.

Mr. Herbert Kemp said, my name is Herbert Kemp and I'm here to represent Speedwell United Methodist Church. Commissioners, I appreciate this opportunity to speak to you this afternoon. One picture is worth a thousand words. Would you please hold up —. [NOTE: Some members of the audience held up signs.] Mr. Kemp said, this will give you an example of what support that —, our area is giving this Land Use Plan. South Chatham County Land Use Plan Committee, we believe you have done an excellent job in appointing this body to go out and do this study. The committee has worked hard and evaluated the best use for the Land Use Plan, our guidance that will benefit all citizens of our County. It's —, time has come to receive a critical recommendation. It is about the greenspace of the Southeast Plan Use [sic], and the 25% would benefit the citizens of the County. This is, however, another vision [sic] of the issue. Some say 25% greenspace would be too much. We hope that the Commission would accept the recommendations of the Southeast Chatham Land Use Plan and preserve the area for which the residents of this community —, these communities are so very for. Chatham County has invested time and money in this study. I ask you to please value their recommendation and approve for this good for all who live and work in the Chatham County area. Thank you for your time.

Chairman Hair said, we appreciate you being here, sir.

Mr. Kemp said, they want recognition for the people that worked on the Land Use Plan: William B. Haynes, [inaudible] Harris, Ida Johnson and Alexander Luten.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. Next please.

Ms. Page Hungerpiller said, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I'm Page Hungerpiller. I'm reading this for the Mayor of Vernonburg, who could not be here. Dear Chairman Hair and Commissioners: I am writing to inform you of Vernonburg's support of the Southeast Chatham Land Use Plan. The plan was devised by the citizen taxpayers of that section of Chatham County. It would appear these are the largest stakeholders in this issue with the best interest of all Southeast Chatham residents in mind. As you are aware, from the many environmental issues facing the entire County, water quality and greenspace are two inter-related critical issues. Both of these are also an integral part of building quality, long-term affordable housing. Vernonburg zoning now requires a one-acre lot minimum to replace —, to reduce overcrowding and to protect a substantial tree canopy. I realize every community cannot have a one-acre lot minimum; however, greenspace should be a priority achievable goal. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Bill Lawler. And if I could speak for myself one moment, there's some of you that don't know that I served as a volunteer for 10 years as your Chatham County Tree Commission Chairman in the very infancy of the efforts to retain greenspace through trees in Chatham County. We fought long and hard for what we got, and that included several upgrades of tree ordinances and you all were always so receptive and so supportive of what your Tree Commission was trying to do, and for me the approval of the greenspace plan is an extension of where we've tried to go since the very beginning of your Tree Commission. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. Thank you very much. Next. Anybody else, Mr. Nutting, on your side?

Ms. Melissa Jest said, good afternoon. My name is Melissa Jest. I serve as the Neighborhood Coordinator for Historic Savannah Foundation, and I'm hoping that each of you received a letter that our Executive Director forwarded in support of the Southeast Land Use Plan. If not, I have plenty of copies. Also, I am a member of the Eastside Concerned Citizens Association, as well as Cuyler-Brownville Association and Thomas Square Association. So being a native and also working as Neighborhood Coordinator, I make sure to try to get a feel for the residents and the neighborhoods outside of this particular part of the County because I know everything that happens impacts all of us. So, just as a summation to kind of what I've heard and the concerns that have been expressed to me, I'm going to make this statement that doesn't necessarily express the views of the Foundation. Land and its use is not just for profit. It is where we live and its use impacts and in many cases determines how

we live. Therefore, planning for land use and development is more than a political opportunity. There is a necessary function that the public entrusts to its government and a government-approved plan for any part of Chatham County must provide the standards that we can all live by. The Southeast Land Use Plan must be one we all can live with and the County can grow with. It must not be a plan that just allows private developers to profit from. We all must profit, and that makes the challenge today your challenge of achieving balance. Today's discussion has revealed that developers' interpretation of greenspace and some others is that it's just going to be a lot at the end of the street. This is proof that there is a need for guidance, that there is a need for standards that will leave existing trees up and design for front lawns, front yards and trees and such. As a neighbor and a County resident myself, I view this greenspace requirement not as punitive, but as protective against private ventures that profit a few and impact many. The MPC staff has provided some alternative percentages for greenspace that seek to achieve a balance between the developers' need to profit and the public's right to a decent quality of life. This plan provides for a policy structure that will achieve this balance. Public policy to protect the public's right and to guide private profit-making to make a greenspace optional to me in my layman's mind is like a subsidy to developers that will not necessarily pass that on to the home buyer, and that is bad public policy. As a lay citizen, I ask you to support my desire and the desire of my neighbors for a residential development that is compatible with the existing character and that is compatible and sensitive to the urban forest. Without a greenspace requirement what will result will be dense institutional-type and often isolated environments. Those institutional environments will become quarters for those neighbors whose limited income and resources will not allow them to live anywhere else. Institutional environments provide —, produce institutional behavior. So instead of improving the quality of life for Southeast Chatham County residents, developments without greenspace, without a decent quality of life provided by that street scape, such as greenspace, parks, buffers and open space, will instead become incubators for despair and desperation, and no citizen voter, no matter his or her economic situation, deserves that. While Mr. Newton and others expressed confidence in our area, builders my confidence is in you, my government, my representatives and in the laws that can be enforced in approved plans like this to provide guidance to private profit-seeking ventures in this County, and it is good neighbors like myself and others who will look to you, Commissioners, to protect our right and to promote our desire for quality livable spaces. And, again, yours is a challenge of finding that balance. Mr. Rivers called for innovation. This plan is an innovation. Instead of reverting to the old clear-cutting way of development, today's builders can be guided to develop in a way that does not require demolition of our existing tree canopy. Approving a long-term plan that negates the need for greenspace, parks, trails, open space, provides in this political economy a down —, a thumbs down to Joe Citizen. It says to Joe Citizen that he does not deserve any consideration or protection to the government —, from the government or by the government, and the only way that Joe Citizen can assert his or her desires and need for quality of life will be to use his vote in the choice as to where he or she spends his or her money and et cetera. So I please urge you again as a resident, as a neighbor, as representative for various communities, to please also support this Southeast Land Use Plan. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. Next.

Mr. Nutting said, the hour has cost some order to our presentation, but you're beginning, I think, to see that this isn't some group of elitists. We've sought this kind of information from all over the County and it's been built into our thinking and words. I believe you've heard from —, the first group that we had outline was betterment association and community associations and we were picking some environmental groups. I think now we would like to call on Carl Oelschig —, oh, Joyce Murlless, excuse me. Joyce [Murlless] is still here.

Ms. Joyce Murlless said, I merely moved to be on deck. I am Joyce Murlless. Thirty-three years ago I moved to Whitfield Avenue and bought a starter home with my two young sons, one of whom was under one year old. I was lucky. I got a two-acre lot and I'm very glad to still be there and still have that beautiful area as home. I'm also a retired school teacher and I've been a member of the Citizens Task Force. I want to thank you, County Commissioners, for allowing this opportunity to speak and I also want to thank the MPC board and staff for the attention and input, the professionalism and dedication that they have shown in helping to make the community vision into a good, solid plan. When we, as a committee, began this process, we were just a few of us. We didn't know one another, we didn't necessarily trust one another. The committee had grown and changed over the years. It's become more diverse. We have listened, we have compromised, and it's been good. Thanks to working to produce this plan, we haven't —, we're no longer just a collection of neighborhoods. I feel as though we are a community. I have friends that I would never have made, and I thank you for that as well. Because of the great concern in the community, we have recently received many letters of support from several local conservation organizations. They all understood the importance of passing this plan, and they sent us and you, and I think that most of them made it into your packets, their letters. These letters all feel that this is a good plan, a rational plan, one that is good for the community as a whole; that it provides a framework for growth; that it preserves the quality of life and that it acknowledges the right of this involved community to exert an orderly influence on its own future. You will be glad to hear that I have chose to read only the shortest of the letters for the record. Commissioners: The Coastal Georgia Land Trust, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit conservation organization, endorses the Southeast Chatham County Land Use Plan with its provision of 25% greenspace requirement in new subdivisions. The Governor's Greenspace Program, from which Chatham County has previously benefitted, may not see any funding for a few years and SPLOST funds for greenspace may not be available until 2008, so the individual citizen of Southeast Chatham County has very little opportunity for preserving or enhancing their quality of life with regard to their own environment. The Commission is charged with protecting the best interest of the citizens of the County. The 25% greenspace requirement in the subdivision's provision in the plan will have a positive influence on the individuals and their environment and will do so for all future generations of Southeast Chatham County citizens. Coastal Georgia Land Trust would recommend the original 30% greenspace that is in line with the long range plan of the Governor's Greenspace Program. While we sometime take for granted the beauty of the Coastal Empire, we must plan so that Chatham County does not grow to resemble Fulton or DeKalb Counties in the future.

Sincerely, William C. Rodgers, Executive Director. There are similar letters here from the Georgia Conservancy, Center for Sustainable Coast, the Coastal Group, Georgia Chapter of the Sierra Club, Ogeechee Audubon Society, and you've heard from the Savannah Tree Foundation. I also have here about 25 emergency letters from citizens and from businesses. Some arrived too late to be in your packet. Others wrote you directly and did not send copies to us, and I believe Carol Page Johnson is still here to read one of those letters to you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. Chairman Hair recognized Ms. Johnson.

Ms. Carol Johnson said, good afternoon. Chairman Hair, Commissioners, I want to first thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today. I am a citizen resident of the Southeast Land —, Southeast area and I wholeheartedly agree with the plan, especially the provision vision statement itself. I have here a letter from a neighbor of mine who was unable to attend, but sends this letter and asks that you all please take it into consideration. Her name is Melanie Clifton and she resides at 1417 Whitfield Park Circle. Dear Commissioners: As a resident of the Southeast Chatham County Community for the past 13 years and having previously lived in the Islands Community for 13 years, I feel it is imperative that you approve the Southeast Land Use Plan. I can personally attest to the fact that unless this plan is approved, the tremendous beauty and tranquility of our community will be lost forever, not just for my personal use and enjoyment or that of my family and friends, but the community and State as a whole. I lived on Wilmington Island during the 70's and 80's. During this time, as you well know, no land use plan was in place. There were no specifications to maintain precious coastal and land resources. Now when I visit my friends and relatives who still remain in the Islands communities, it is heartbreaking to see the expansive commercialism and housing development that has been scattered throughout the area. I would never have imagined an area that was once largely wooded and marshland being developed as apartment complexes, condominiums and, God help us, a supermarket. It is truly a loss to the young people of the Islands communities not to be able to experience true nature freely in their own back yard. As the State of Georgia requires, the Southeast Land Use Plan describes the vision that the residents have for their area over the next 10 years. The State does not ask for a land use plan from the Homebuilders Association to be approved by the residents. It asks specifically for a plan from the residents of the community. I ardently request that you accept the proposed Southeast Land Use Plan as it provides a structure for development, preserved quality of life for our children, and recognizes the right of a community to apply a methodical impact to its own future. Thank you for your informed attention to this matter. Melanie Clifton. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. We appreciate it. Mr. Oelschig, are you next, I believe? Mr. Oelschig, are you next?

Mr. Carl Oelschig said, good afternoon, members of the council. I'm Carl Oelschig, a resident of the area and also a member of the committee. My part of this presentation is to present some letters, really read into the record the names of some organizations, both inside and outside the Southeast peninsula, who have voiced their support for this, and I'm not going to sit here and read this whole stack of letters. Suffice to run down here and say that we have received strong support from the following: Victory Heights Neighborhood, Mistwoode, Mayfair I, Mayfair II, Whitfield Park, Rivers Edge. And I'd like to take a moment just to read one of the more brief ones. This one from Victory Heights Neighborhood Association. It says, Dear Chatham Board of Commissioners: On behalf of the Victory Heights Neighborhood Association and its residents, please know that the interest of the community surpasses the special interest of the business groups. The Southeast Land Use Plan as approved by the MPC staff, board of MPC Commissioners, and Citizens Task Force Committee should be adopted as submitted to the Chatham County Commission. Greenspace [inaudible] are an important consideration in building new communities as well as developing established communities. The City and County are in danger of losing its tree canopies and greenspace essential for the elimination of environmental pollutants and dissipation of the Summer heat. [Inaudible] development and lack of greenspace in the Wilmington Island area should prove reason enough to support the recommendations of the Southeast Land Use Plan. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Sincerely, Dr. Felix Mayer [phonetic]. As a late addition to this pile of letters, I would like to just comment, just take some excerpts from today's editorial in the *Savannah Morning News*. I'm sure most of you have seen it. For those of you who haven't, I'll just take various bites out of it. The Chatham County Commissioners should give this plan, developed through the input of the citizens who live in the area, their overwhelming support. They speak of the compromise, that are compromised down from 30% to 25% was a very fair compromise. The Land Use Plans for the individual sections of the County don't have to be the same. They are and should be based on the needs of the residents in the affected areas. Some County Commissioners want to make the greenspace section of the Land Use Plan voluntary. This would be a mistake. The idea is to provide a comprehensive growth plan for the Southeast portion of Chatham County. What good are the specific elements if no one has to adhere to them? If any part of the plan is made voluntary, then all the time, money and expertise put into this proposal were wasted. Non-regulated development may provide easy profits in the beginning, but the impact on the community would be detrimental. And this is why it's so important to have a Citizens Advisory Panel made up of people who live in the affected area involved in the planning and make their recommendations part of the standards. And I'll just go on to say that it's a good blueprint, and I would suggest too that as born and raised in Savannah and had the opportunity to live outside of Savannah for 40 years and then returning some four and a half years ago and been working with this group for about three years, I can see a parallel here between the Historic Savannah Association that mandated some years ago that our historic buildings coming down were not exactly good for the community and positive steps were taken and we all see the result today. I suggest to you that as there are —, the land available for development outside the incorporated shrinks, there are more developers, there's more money being thrown at it, that we need to take the same preservation steps where we possibly can with the greenspace, the trees, the things that make the unincorporated areas desirable to live in as the Historic Savannah Association has done to the downtown areas. I hope you will approve our plan. Thank you very much, Commissioners.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Oelschig. Commissioner McMasters said, thank you. Chairman Hair said, next.

Mr. Kay Rapkin said, good afternoon, Chairman Hair and fellow Commissioners. Thank you for this time. My name is Kay Rapkin. I live in the Southeast Chatham area. I'm here today to share with you and the public just two letters of the numerous letters we have received from local realtors expressing strong support for the Southeast Chatham Land Use Plan and the requirement of at least 25% greenspace. I would like to thank for the record the following realtors for their letters of support: Dorothy Courington of Courington Realty, Cora Bett Thomas of Cora Bett Thomas Realty, Linda Kelly, not Mr. Fischer, of ERA Kelly and Fischer Realty, Celia Dunn of Celia Dunn Realty, Janice A. Gantt of Gantt Realty, Margery and Larry Barroll of Barroll Realty, Bonnie MacAulay, who's a realtor and a resident of our Southeast Chatham community, and Ann Sheils of Prudential Southeast Coastal Properties, who also had seven fellow agents sign her letter. And I would just like to share with you two of these letters. This one is from Ann Sheils of Prudential Southeast Coastal Properties. Dear Mr. Chairman and Commissioners: In real estate sales, agents and brokers find that the single most sought-after attribute of an individual home or development, among comparable properties, is greenspace and trees. These additionally help maintain value, long after the newness of a development has worn off, and help properties with trees or greenspace become the first that are rehabilitated. This is particularly true in marginal or low-end homes, which are often low-lying and subject to flooding. Tree roots help siphon off ground water and trees provide much needed shade when air-conditioning bills are concerned, as well as beauty where it is much appreciated in marginal neighborhoods. In high-end and historic neighborhoods one of the chief draws to investors, first and second home purchasers and tourists, especially in Savannah, is our renown tree canopy, which is rapidly disappearing. I and the following agents in my office would like to voice their support for the proposals of the Southeast Chatham County Land Use Plan. And there's Ms. Sheils and seven fellow agents in her office. The other letter is from Ms. Bonnie MacAulay. It says: Dear County Commissioners: I am writing to you to ask for your vote in favor of the Southeast Chatham Land Use Plan. It has already been passed by the MPC and because I am a realtor I feel that I can speak for the people who live out here as well as myself that this greenspace that we have is the reason we have chosen to live in the area, and I feel as a community we would want the requirement of at least 25% greenspace for residential developments. This Southeast Chatham Land Use Plan will call for 25% greenspace for residential subdivisions with lots smaller than one-half acre. This would be and still is a good thing for the community as a whole because it will help keep the character of our area alive. I strongly urge you to consider community views and wisdom on our greenspace rather than the opinions of a select few. In closing, I also ask that you please take into consideration the hard work of a diverse Citizens Task Force. This group is very much aware of the residents' concerns and opinions about greenspace. Please give the residents of this area more say in the plan for their own, my own —, she lives in the area —, district than those from the outside. Please vote in favor of the 25% greenspace. Sincerely, Bonnie MacAulay. And just personally I'd like to say, once again emphasis, that we who live in Southeast Chatham are speaking for Southeast Chatham. We're not speaking for the Islands and we're not speaking for West Chatham. We're just speaking as citizens and people, and my family has lived there for many, many generations. Thank you so much for your time and for your attention, and we hope that you will listen to us. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you. Next.

Mr. Nutting said, I think we're down to about two or three to go and I believe Freddie Patrick is still here —, okay, and Stephanie Jackel. These are mostly people from outside of our area, but would like to —.

Ms. Stephanie Jackel said, good afternoon, Chairman Hair, Dr. Thomas and Commissioners. I'm Stephanie Jackel, here to represent Downtown Neighborhood Association in support of this, but before I say anything about that, I'm going to quickly read a letter from the Beach Institute Neighborhood Association written by its President, Beth Kingsford [phonetic]. In 1956 my family moved into a two-family house in Brooklyn, New York. We had a nice back yard, a modest front yard and a small tree lot in which we planted a tree. The people next door had the same thing just in reverse. This was Brooklyn, New York, part of the City of Millions, yet developers knew then that greenspace was important to the ambience of the neighborhood. Today I see this space as being fought over to a degree that I could not imagine in the 1950's. We have a crisis of space, yet even now I see that making room for greening is crucial to the whole idea of civilization. This must take a back seat to property. If it does not, we are all losers. Demand that developers understand the importance of greenery to a community and make provision for it or demand that they be prohibited from building in your community. The alternative is bare land and barren communities. Now speaking for the Downtown Neighborhood Association, we do urge you to pass the plan as proposed with the 25% mandated greenspace. Just quickly, I will say that downtown residents can speak very personally and specifically about the importance of greenspace in our daily lives. We are extremely fortunate that General Oglethorpe had the vision to provide us with the network of squares that are such a vital part of our downtown neighborhood. The downtown neighborhood area is 500 acres and 10% or 47.5 acres of that area is devoted to our parks and squares. This is a very high percentage for such a highly urbanized area. It is one of the reasons that we all enjoy living downtown. We urge you to emulate General Oglethorpe's foresightedness to make sure that residents and property owners in suburban Chatham County will be able to enjoy the quality of life provided by greenspace. Please approve the community plan as recommended.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Ms. Jackel. Next.

Ms. Gretchen Ernest said, good afternoon. My name is Gretchen Ernest and I'm from the Historic Victorian Neighborhood Association. I'd just like to make a brief statement. Commissioners, Dr. Hair, the Historic Victorian Neighborhood Association supports the Southeast Chatham County Community Plan, as developed by the MPC in conjunction with the citizens of Southeast Chatham County. As residents of one of the oldest planned cities in the

world, we who live in Savannah's Historic Victorian District know the benefits of thoughtful community planning. As members of one of the City's and County's many neighborhood organizations, we also fully support planning that is developed and supported by the residents and are concerned at the possibility that our County Commissioners may be willing to discount the advice and hard work of the citizens who live in Southeast Chatham County. You may think that we in the Victorian District are not affected by what happens in other parts of Chatham County, but nothing could be further from the truth. We who live in the City benefit tremendously from Chatham County, as do residents of the County benefit from the City of Savannah. Therefore, we urge you to approve the Southeast Chatham County Community Plan as recommended by the MPC. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you.

Mr. Bob Wickwire said, good afternoon. My name is Bob Wickwire and I'm a resident of the Islands and I'm here in support of the Southeast Community Plan, the restoration of the greenspace provision, and after Mr. McCorkle's comments this morning, it looks like I'm going to be here defending the Islands Plan, although we have been assured by everyone involved that there would be no tinkering with the Islands Plan. I have a real question in my mind after the testimony this morning, but let's talk about the Southeast Plan. I've tried to understand why we have so much opposition, particularly from members of the County Commission, whose constituents do not live in the Southeast, and I'm at something of a loss, and let me review some of the reasons. It could be that it's because the HBA would have you believe that their principal argument against greenspace regulation is the negative impact on affordable housing. This is sheer nonsense. The staff at the MPC has debunked that theory during public testimony in front of the MPC and before you last week. Furthermore, only 15 to 20% of the area covered by the Southeast Plan is available for development and after testimony today, we're not at all sure that you can afford to put affordable housing in the Southeast. However, everybody's entitled to their opinion. In an effort to probe exactly what the opposition of the HBA is founded on, I went back and reviewed the Savannah News database and looked at the subject of affordable housing for the last several years. I didn't know much about affordable housing, frankly, and I was surprised to find that there are numerous agencies and groups involved with affordable housing and subsidized housing; however, in the database there is not one mention of any HBA activity to be found. Quite the contrary. In a report co-authored by the University of Georgia Professor Tom Rodgers in June of '02, Rodgers, the Associate Dean of the College of Family and Consumer Services, told the Mayors and the City officials at the Georgia Municipal Association Convention that, "Developers make a lot more build a quarter of a million dollar house than a hundred thousand dollar house and that's the number one reason we have an affordable housing problem." That's not my quote, that's Professor Rodgers'. Now the real reason for the opposition of the Homebuilders Association is available from Mr. McCorkle's own words. I quote from his letter dated February 11th of this year to Tom Wilson. I quote him: "We do not want the views contained in the Southeast Plan to be the basis for development on the Westside." Quite simply, the entire motivation for the HBA's opposition is money. Now there's nothing wrong with making a profit, nothing at all, but if you look at Homebuilders, and I know several in the Hilton Head area —, different market—, but they do very well and they deal more —, with more stringent regulations in terms of greenspace than are required here, and they also provide a very substantial multi-year warranty that's not required in Savannah. Nor is it offered, I might add. I suggest there's plenty of profit opportunity in Chatham County, even with a 25% greenspace requirement. There's no need to cloud the issue with fallacious statements about affordable housing. Well, it must be some other reason. Is it because so many people are opposed to the Southeast Plan? Other than the HBA no one has come out in opposition to the plan to my knowledge. There has been some discussion about individual zoning issues, but the MPC has recognized those problems and is moving to reconcile them. Only the HBA is opposed. Are you going to fly in the face of the desires of the Islands and the Southeast communities? Perhaps you think that greenspace is not an important issue to the thousands of people living in the Islands and the Southeast communities. To the contrary, McCorkle uses the tri-centennial survey to suggest that greenspace occupies a relatively low rank. He neglects to mention that 68% of the participants, the 400 participants in that survey were City of Savannah residents. Only 21% of the 86 [sic] were residents of the unincorporated area. Even so with that small sample, 63% were in favor of a greenspace set aside. The 1996 survey of the Islands residents yields far different results. Greenspace is a primary concern and the Southeast Committee found that greenspace was a prime concern to Southeast residents. Is it because greenspace and conservation are not important to Chatham County and Coastal Georgia? If that is the case, why is the State of Georgia spending so much time and effort to develop new regulations for the development of a marsh and marsh hammocks? The State of Georgia has recognized the need to protect the environment because of the encroachment of development. If you fail to recognize the need to regulate greenspace, you are swimming upstream against current thinking at the highest levels of State Government. Now, there's been a suggestion that a greenspace requirement be voluntary. I suggest to you that that's an insane notion. That's like putting the inmates in charge of the asylum. For example, Mr. McCorkle has continuously stated that we have survived 268 years without a greenspace regulation. Yes, indeed, look around you and you have ample proof of what's store if we do not enact some protection. The HBA approach, according to Mr. McCorkle is to cut down all the trees on a construction site. He maintains that this is required to assure proper drainage. Not to worry says McCorkle, plant trees and eventually they will grow. Good luck. There's more I could say, but I'm not so sure that anything I have to say will change the minds of the people opposed to the greenspace provision, and I want to assure you that what's been presented as expert testimony this morning with respect to surveys and the HBA interest is questionable, and I would hope that you would consider one point today and understand that he MPC board and the MPC staff and the committee have it right and I would urge you to support the entire Southeast Plan. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, sir. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I have a question for him. Chairman Hair said, Mr. Kicklighter has a question.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, yes, sir. What did you state that you live, sir? Mr. Wickwire said, I didn't. Do you want my address? I'm in the —. Commissioner Kicklighter asked, did you say Wilmington Island? Mr. Wickwire said, I live on the Islands, Whitemarsh Island. Commissioner Kicklighter said, Whitemarsh. Mr. Wickwire said, right. Commissioner Kicklighter said, okay. I was just —, I didn't know if you were out at Wilmington Island. Your question was why —, you know, but you're out that way. Why would a Commissioner not living in the area be concerned? Mr. Wickwire said, right. Commissioner Kicklighter why would you be concerned? You don't live in that area. Mr. Wickwire said, I live in the Islands area and —. Commissioner Kicklighter said, but not in the East —, but, but —. Mr. Wickwire said, the threat has been made. Commissioner Kicklighter said, no, but I'm just making a point. I'm concerned because —, same reason you are, it's our community. That's the only point I wanted to make. Mr. Wickwire said, oh, okay, okay. You weren't challenging my —. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I have a right to be concerned, although I don't live there, just like you have a right —. Mr. Wickwire asked, well, what is your —, what is your concern. Commissioner Kicklighter said, my concern is that they're going to stack little houses on top of each other on a 50-foot square lot —, 54-square —, 54 feet frontage. That's my concern that they're going to stack them right on top of each other because this proposal allows them to reduce the lot size. And I don't care about the profits, I'm —, no one's looking at profit on that because they will make their profit. The homebuilders will make their profit. This is not even —, the audience is throwing this out about the Homebuilders Association. I'm not voting anything because of them or whatever, it's the 54 feet on a square of —, on the lot size. It's the reduction in size that's going to just make terrible neighborhoods. Have you ever —. Mr. Wickwire asked, do you —. Commissioner Kicklighter asked, you live in a neighborhood that's 60 foot —, 60 feet footage. Mr. Wickwire said, absolutely. Commissioner Kicklighter asked, or would you say it's more? Mr. Wickwire said, I've lived in —, in my neighborhood now? Commissioner Kicklighter said, yes, sir. Mr. Wickwire said, it's substantially more, but I've lived in apartments in New York City, I've lived in five other communities and started off just like you did, you know, buying your first house —. Commissioner Kicklighter said, right. Mr. Wickwire said, that's been referred to here, and so I've lived in teeny tiny things. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I believe 60-foot minimum is the requirement in every City in Chatham County right now. I believe. I shouldn't said, I guess. This proposal takes it to 54. The smallest lot probably —, I don't know the State's statistics, but I can't imagine any other place in the State of Georgia going down to 54 feet, but there probably is. I don't know, but if so, not many. Mr. Wickwire said, but we're only talking about 20% of the available area in the Southeast Plan, and there are no plans to put affordable housing there.

Chairman Hair said, but you're talking about 100% of what's left to develop. Mr. Wickwire asked, 100% of what? Chairman Hair said, what's left to develop. You said it's 20%, but it's 100% of what's left to develop. Mr. Wickwire said, I don't know of any plans to put affordable housing in there. Commissioner Kicklighter but wouldn't you agree the higher economic —, if we're only talking about that 15% then, let's take a higher economic value or whatever for a neighborhood. Don't they normally include all of that greenspace to attract the high-end buyers? I mean, that's always a part of it on —, you don't buy homes sitting on top of each other for \$300,000. That would only affect if it was a lower-income neighborhood. Mr. Wickwire asked, are you sitting there telling me —? Commissioner Kicklighter said, I'm sorry, I just —. Mr. Wickwire said, no, no, I'm just —.

Chairman Hair said, Dr. Thomas is next. She's got a question for you, sir. Commissioner Murray said, well, he was trying to answer. Mr. Wickwire said, well, I was trying to ask Dean Kicklighter —. Chairman Hair asked, you were asking him a question? Mr. Wickwire said, yeah. This is all about —, your concern is all about this 20% that's —. Commissioner Kicklighter said, reducing the lot size, yes. Mr. Wickwire said, you've already heard testimony here that that land is too expensive to build affordable housing on. What is your real concern? I don't understand this. Chairman Hair said, I don't think he owes you that anyway. Chairman Hair recognized Dr. Thomas. Mr. Wickwire said, yes, Dr. Thomas.

Commissioner Thomas said, please correct me if I misunderstood you. You made a statement in your deliberations a few minutes ago and you said something to the effect that you're not sure whether housing affordability would be affordable. Did I take that out of context or —? You were making a statement about something and I missed part of it, and I wanted —, you said something —. Mr. Wickwire said, the only thing I said about affordable housing is that it's a paper tiger. It's not an issue here. It's an issue that's been put to the forefront by the Homebuilders Association, in my opinion. It's a false issue. There is not going to be any affordable housing built in the Southeast Plan that I know of now. Commissioner Thomas said, okay. Sends up another —, sends up another red flag for me. I thought I was prepared to go with the plan.

Chairman Hair said, all right. Thank you, sir. Next.

Mr. Nutting said, Dr. Thomas, I'd like to hear that flag and see if we can help with it. I believe you have heard today that this is not one somebody's plan or so many group's plan. We've talked a lot about what's affordable. The affordable issue is way more complicated than this study. I think it's been —, you all have asked the right questions about the likelihood of land being developed and affordable in this area and reached the obvious conclusion that there's probably not much land out here that under any circumstances would be devoted to —, on it's own to affordable if there were alternatives, and there are alternatives, and you've cited that, Dean [Kicklighter], out in your area. So I think we have taken the work of a lot of citizens of a lot of years and staff and the whole MPC structure, the consultants you pay for —, excuse me, and have boiled it down to a decision based on some of that. What I would hope you would find is that by establishing high standards, like the Japanese did to General Motors, there'll be better products coming along and help solve some of these problems that we talked about. We tried voluntary standards, if you call them that, for many, many years and we still have the affordable housing problems, and it's —, as I say, that's way beyond the scope of this thing. There are no standards that would encourage or discourage affordable housing. So we need to have a plan that makes an attractive neighborhood, makes an attractive society, and it's not by destroying this whole plan, and I think you've got the best plan that your

people and the people in this community know how to give you. So in summary today I just will have to ask for the order. I want to thank you again for bringing our area closer together. We had —, this process has made a lot of people come together that didn't have the impetus to do that, and it's now apparent to us that this is a strong movement that's going on. You've seen it at Tybee, you've seen it at —, on the Islands, you've seen it on the Westside, and I think over time this citizen involvement will be good. I want to thank you for sitting here for all these meetings, but I ask you not to turn your back on your devoted staff, and I can tell you and I certainly thank them for all the help that they have given us as we've tried to put this together. So, if I can answer any further questions, I will. Otherwise, I guess we'll have to say [inaudible].

Chairman Hair said, Dr. Thomas still has a question.

Commissioner Thomas said, I just —, first of all, let me say, you know, I appreciate the compromise and all of that that has taken place in this process. I'd like to applaud the committee and staff for their countless hours that were spent on this. I think it's an excellent plan with the exception of the —, questions that have been raised about affordable housing, diversity. The red flag that I was alluding to were words such as, you know, taking into consideration, it can go hand in hand, we'll try. Now what is that saying? Do you have a —, I mean, does this plan actually pinpoint, you know, the possibility of affordable housing in a diverse —? Mr. Nutting said, oh, yes. Commissioner Thomas said, nature? Mr. Nutting said, oh, yes. We've identified —. Commissioner Thomas asked, yes or no? Mr. Nutting said, yes. I think we've identified something —, what is it, eight? Eight areas that are pretty obvious prospects, and we —, and I think if you would look at the residents of our area, their economic capability, their ethnic background and their age distribution, we go all the way from really broken down trailer homes to 10,000 square foot homes, and there have been a wide a variety in-between. The age brackets are all over the map. It is —, because it is an old community. It has a lot of diversity that just only time can build, and it has reached an equilibrium that is the need for or the demand for different types of homes. The young folks that want to buy a mobile home and get out of it in four or five years and move on, they can do it. If they get to be Chairman of General Motors and want to move it, they've got it, and so I just don't know how to solve the affordable housing problem that's in the whole world, but I don't think the discussion here today warrants killing the whole thing over that, and I hope you won't do that. I'm asking for the order, I certainly hope you will —. Commissioner Thomas said, let me just finish up and then I'll recognize the rest of you. Okay. All right. Don't get me wrong, I'm not against what you've done. As I said, I think you've done a splendid job. We are about protecting the rights of, you know, all of the citizens and that's why I want to make sure that, you know, we're not just saying something on paper and down the road we don't have any intentions, if it should come up, you know, where houses need to be available to these people, that they can afford to go into the area, and I wonder —. Mr. Nutting said, I think they can afford it there just as they can near somewhere the auto factory. Commissioner Thomas said, anywhere, anywhere, and I hope —, I hope in the future that we won't have to be addressing this kind of thing, and it's very sad that we even have to do that today. Mr. Nutting said, you know, you're working on the Tri-Centennial Plan, which is to be defined, I guess, as we go —. Commissioner Thomas said, right. Mr. Nutting said, and it sounds like to me as this thing has evolved that this whole question of affordable housing might be a whole separate piece that you get to before it's all wrapped up. I think —, you know, there are lots of people who have good ideas. They're innovators. That's the thing we need to somehow encourage, to bring people to bear that it's good for them to find their way because that's what makes America good and prosper, and it's out there. The talent's there and nothing in this plan would stop them from doing that. I just hope you'll —.

Vice Chairman Thomas said, Commissioner Odell and then Commissioner Murray and then there was another hand. Was it you, Commissioner McMasters?

Commissioner Odell said, Mr. Nutting, I just wanted to take this opportunity to personally compliment you and to say that whatever the vote is on this matter, your efforts have been outstanding. I mean, you are an unelected community leader. This has not been easy trying to get a diverse group together. I have taken the opportunity to read the plan and it speaks of a substantial amount of personal efforts that have gone into this, not on the part of the paid staff, but the volunteer group, and I just wanted to take the opportunity thank you as a citizen of Chatham County for your continued dedication. Often in these debates just because we don't necessarily agree on every point, I don't think it says that the high level of work that you've done should not be recognized as being excellent. Whether we agree on the ultimate outcome, I think the process, your diligence, the intelligence you brought to it, this community owes you a debt of service, and I take this opportunity to thank you for doing what you've done, and I know you gave valuable service to Memorial Hospital, and we appreciate that, but that's about it. I have no questions and your presentation, this has been one of the longest meetings in the history of long meetings, but it's necessary. It impacts the lives of individuals that live in that community and, you know, and it may sound —, sound bad, but a few years ago we bought a —, purchased a home for our mother in Tennessee outside of Nashville, and she summoned me home, and I go home and she wanted to know what I could do to keep them from building some apartments in the back. I never thought of myself as being a liberator to prevent —. Mr. Nutting said, she must have been reading your news. Commissioner Odell said, but I appreciate it, Mr. Nutting. Mr. Nutting said, thank you.

Chairman Hair said, okay, Commissioner Murray and then Commissioner McMasters and hopefully we're ready to vote after that.

Commissioner Murray said, yeah, I just wanted to try to clarify if I can, and I hope I don't make it more complicated. Some of the comments that have been made about affordable housing, this plan does allow and it builds in affordable housing. The problem in my opinion with affordable housing and what some were saying is not whether the plan allows it or not, it's the cost of the property and the value of the property that's out there that's left undeveloped, and if they can't buy the property, right. Somebody made the comment earlier, with a \$75,000 lot

you can't do a house for \$10,000 and have affordable housing. And I think that's why some were saying, not that it's not going to happen. I mean, there's a possibility that if the market goes down on some of that property, certainly it could be bought and developed for that, or somebody could probably purchase a larger tract of land and do a mixed development out there. It would have some affordable housing and some higher income. So, I mean, there are ways of that happening, but it's —, I did not hear them say that affordable housing will not happen, period. I think it's all based on the —, value of the property. Mr. Nutting said, it's almost obvious.

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner McMasters. Next.

Commissioner McMasters said, actually, I want to thank Mr. Nutting, as my colleague Commissioner Odell did, but your efforts on this have been absolutely overwhelming. I remember just a year ago when I came on board and you first came up and I got my first exposure to Sid Nutting, it was quite a —, quite an enjoyable moment and it's been even more enjoyable as this process has gone on, and I just want to thank you. I —, do you have a question?

Chairman Hair asked, how many more people do we have that want to speak? Hold your hands up again, how many more people want to speak? One, two, three, four. Okay, good. Mr. Nutting said, I would just like to —. Chairman Hair asked, Mr. Nutting, are you through, sir? Mr. Nutting said, — the biggest plans that you could give, not just me, I've had a good thing doing it. It's been good for me, it's been good for the, I think, the fellows that worked together with us, but to the community, to your paid staff, to show some confidence in what they're recommending to your engineering staff and all the others was to vote for the plan. I thank you and I will tell you you have a fringe benefit waiting if you pass this plan, you'll not see much more of me.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Nutting. All right, I'm going to ask —, I'm going to ask the four people if they would come on up front please again to speed this process up and then due to the lateness of the date, I'm going to ask you to keep your remarks as brief as possible because one of the Commissioners have to leave, so please —, two of the Commissioners have to leave, so please keep your comments very brief. I think we've talked this thing to death. Okay, sir, state your name for the record.

Mr. Robert L. Jones said, my name is Robert L. Jones. I live at 631 Rose Dhu Road in the Sixth District, City of Savannah, Chatham County. I should say State of Georgia. Commissioner Gellatly is my representative. Someone may wonder why am I stepping forward. I do so as a nobody. I bring forward no credentials. I bring forward one issue, that of a concerned citizen. As a concerned citizen I look at Chatham County as a whole, not in segments. I am well aware there are different areas of the County that need to be addressed and different ways. Through all of this there arises a point that has been made many times, the quality of life. When you begin to judge that, you cannot put an economic value to it. As I have listened through these many hours, some conclusions have come to mind. First, puzzled. Given the long hours, the many years, the fact of the MPC staff, why this should even be an issue to start with. It should be a slam-dunk. So why? Why is it such a debate? And when you look at the debaters, you look at two counts. You look on this side of the room largely and you see people who are here with their roots and their homes. The other side you see a group, as it appears to me, based in the economic return. Some might call it the so-called internal rate of return. Once the economics have been drained out, in other words, once the cow has been milked for the last drop, where then is the economics? Where then is the quality of life? And to that extent, then we begin to have to judge who are we, what are we, are we a community, and where are we going to be 100 years from now? There are many points I probably raise. I'm not. You've heard many of them before. But out of this in just the last hours has arisen a thought in my mind. Without the Homebuilders Association objecting to this, what maybe would your attitude have been hours ago? Also, I would raise to you that the idea advanced about voluntary greenspace, Commissioner Odell and Commissioner Kicklighter, I agree with you two gentlemen with regards to your concern of mandated requirements. Many people complain of too much government, but I submit to you, you take government out and you leave it to the pure economic aspect of the free market place and you will then see whether or not it addresses the quality of life, and I daresay likely there's not a whole lot of difference between an element very similar to set aside greenspace, that of zoning. So to the extent of mandatory infringements by government, you have to begin to judge that land is a limited item and passed on years ago when development took place without the so-called rules there was a lot of acreage to work with so that there wasn't this kind of problem. But as the acreage shrinks, it then gets down to an issue that reduces to quality of life. And where does that take one? And the last point I would raise, and I'll leave this with you, born and raised in Savannah, Georgia, I'll die here. I'm proud of my area. The City of Savannah, the historic society of Savannah, the historic zone of Savannah, I remember Savannah when downtown was a rat's nest, when it was a bunch of shambles of shacks, of houses that were a fire hazard. The salvation of the City of Savannah has been the historic area, and I'm going to ask of you, given suburbia, what is the salvation of suburbia? And when you begin to inject economics so strongly into an issue and then you try to take out the government factor, you have to come back. Where then will be the salvation of suburbia in the long years ahead? And I submit to you that it's only through a greenspace set aside that will add a quality to areas that will give an everlasting viability, resale neighborhood that we possibly can claim as salvation for the long run, our salvation. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, sir. Next please. Next? Whoever wants to —, let's don't all be bashful.

Mr. Charlie Milmine said, good afternoon. My name is Charlie Milmine, Mr. Chairman and County Commissioners. I just have two very quick points. One is that should we decide that this particular issue of greenspace needs to be laid aside and done voluntarily, do we then deny low-income housing the possibility of having greenspace? You've heard testimony this afternoon that with a little bit of creativity greenspace can be incorporated into land planning. And I would like to see it included so that affordable housing as much opportunity to get that greenspace as

everybody else. I guess my last point is that it's been made —, the point's been made several times since I've been here that this is the Southeast Plan. It's not West, it's not the Islands Plan. I believe my Commissioner who represents me deserves to be listened to. It's his —, those are his constituents. I believe very, very strongly in community citizen-based planning, and I have been part of this, and to all of a sudden be blown out of the water at the end by a special interest is not going to encourage much citizen participation in the future. All I can say is if you, as a Commissioner, are still undecided, please listen to my Commissioner, District One, and other districts that are in that Southeast Plan because that's their district. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, sir. Next. Helen [Stone], are you going to go, or who's going to go?

Ms. Helen Stone said, I'm going to be very brief. Chairman Hair said, please. Ms. Stone said, Chairman Hair, Commissioners, I would like to thank the citizens that have spent six years on this. I'd like to thank the MPC staff, but I'd also like to thank the MPC Commissioners. The MPC is made up of people from the development side, as well as people from the environmentalist side, and we worked hard, approximately eight hours, going through this document page by page, and I think we came to a consensus that the —, we went down, we reached a compromise from the 30% to the 25% greenspace, and we did it by a majority vote, and we bring that forward to you today. There are a couple of other points that I would like for clarification. One is the existing densities of the manufactured home areas like that would remain the same. The density would not change. The 25% can include wetlands and lagoons, the small little islands as you come into a subdivision, you know, that may break up the subdivision, any unpaved recreational areas and detention, and when you add all that up, you're at about 25%, and I really don't understand what this is all about. A lot of hours have been spent, a lot of work has been done, and a majority vote from the MPC brings this forward to you today. Greenspace also adds economic value to properties, and I would hope that from every sector, whether it's high income, middle income, low income, that they're all given the opportunity for greenspace. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Ms. Stone. I guess —, Commissioner McMasters has one question for Mr. Newton and then I think we're ready to vote. Okay, after one more. Let's go ahead and get the question for you, Milton [Newton] and then we'll have the last gentleman and then we're ready to vote.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Dr. Hair. Milton [Newton], can I ask you —, I know you want to make a comment, but I have a question. How long have you —, I know you're retiring soon, but how long have you been the head of the Metropolitan Planning Commission? Mr. Newton said, it's been probably a little over five years. Commissioner McMasters said, okay. And you've been in the organization —. Mr. Newton said, 36. Commissioner McMasters said, 36. Milton [Newton], I want to be real clear on this because you're the Director. The statements that your staff made were that nowhere in the plan does it take away or detract from a diverse and affordable housing supply. Do you stand by your staff's assertion on that? Mr. Newton said, I do. The one comment that I really want to make and I appreciate the indulgence of a short-timer. The last slide that we had before you dealt with the issue of affordable housing, and it's always great to be considered, if not an expert, at least having some expertise, and our staff does have that. And the one point that our staff, who I think has some expertise, and the Homebuilders have, who also have some expertise, is that —, and I would like —, if I could read it again. The staff and the Homebuilders Association agree, and that's very important, that the current MPC recommendation allows the development of the same number of houses on a tract without affecting affordability. And we stand by that as a joint statement. Commissioner McMasters said, thank you, Milton [Newton].

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Newton. Our last gentleman and then we're ready to vote.

Mr. Patrick Farrell said, Mr. Chair, fellow Commissioners, my name is Patrick Farrell. I don't represent anybody, but I'm a stakeholder in the Southeast Chatham area, not with any organization that's represented here today. I have been following this process very closely since January, going to all the MPC meetings and listening closely to all the different testimony and read through the two volumes that changed every two weeks, and I've kept up with it, and I attended last week's meeting. One sentence I want to read from 4.0 of the Land Use Plan, page 58, dated March 18, 2003, of the Southeast Chatham County Community Plan, Volume I, states that "[s]uch a community is enriched by making it possible for three or more generations of a family to live in the same community." Having said that and thinking from my own point of view, how is this particular greenspace, how could this adversely affect me as a stakeholder, land owner in this area? So I got out my pencil and paper and I did some math and I talked to a lot of people at engineering and —, County Engineering upstairs in this building and over at MPC, and they said, well, you know, this particular greenspace applies only to major subdivisions, a major subdivision being a piece of land that can be divided into four or more lots. There are certain parameters for footage and buffers and different things, and I made a little example of how a person, such as myself, with as little as two-thirds of an acre could have a major subdivision, and the reason I state that is if let's say I have a small modest home and I had some family members and I wanted all three of them to also build small homes and live near me on less than an acre of land. Under the current regulations without greenspace, that's —, under certain parameters, that would be very feasible and very doable and it could happen. However, with 25% greenspace you very quickly, even with the little 10-foot buffer you've got to put around the property to —, for whatever reason it's already an ordinance —, even with that and you measure up the square footage, you don't have enough to meet the greenspace requirement. So basically what I just want to say is the small land owner, which is basically who we're talking about in the Southeast Chatham Plan, you're not talking about subdivisions that are already in existence, like Cresthill and Mistwoode and The Landings. Those have got protective covenants, you're not going to subdivide land. It's going to affect the person that has over —, two-thirds of an acre up to whatever. Well, there's not many land owners in the Southeast unless they live on Whitfield, Ferguson, Lehigh, Shipyard or Norwood that have that kind of land that's not already in a subdivision. So it's a very small group of people and most of them are very small land owners, an acre, two acres, maybe three at the most, and I'm just saying with 25% greenspace and

under certain parameters, if you pass this greenspace ordinance and a person wanted to go with this —, with what I stated earlier that was in there to keep family members on a piece of property, then it would take away one of the lots. You'd go from taking one lot and making four small lots into you could only get three lots total.

Commissioner Rayno asked, could I ask a question. Mr. Farrell said, sure. Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Rayno. Commissioner Rayno asked, what's your zoning now? Mr. Farrell asked, on my particular piece of property? Commissioner Rayno said, yes. Mr. Farrell said, currently it's R-2. Commissioner Rayno said, R-2. And that allows him to subdivide like that, Milton [Newton]? Mr. Farrell said, I was —, just to make a point I was —, in my example I was doing it as R-1 with single-family, not duplexes. Commissioner Rayno said, well, if it was R-1 you would never be able to subdivide it. It would be one residence per the property. Chairman Hair said, if he got a variance he could. Mr. Newton said, single-family subdivisions can occur in most zoning districts regardless of whether it's multi-family or single-family. Commissioner Rayno asked, well, he would still have to have the concurrence of the neighbors, would he not? Mr. Newton said, no. If you're going to subdivide property, as long as you follow the requirements of the zoning ordinance, the subdivision regulations, you have the right to subdivide that property as long as you meet the minimum standards. I think there may be confusion. The requirements for the buffer around the exterior is only within the voluntary conservation design subdivision. It doesn't apply to a regular subdivision.

Chairman Hair asked, sir, do you have any other comments?

Mr. Farrell said, no. Basically I just wanted to make a point that this isn't —, every example I've heard since January had to do with 10 acres and Homebuilders and big developers and all this stuff, and I'm just making the point that there are a lot of small property owners in the Southeast District, I don't know what's going on in the Westside and I don't know what's going on in the Islands, but this is where it could affect me because I am a stakeholder and this is a possibility of a scenario for myself. That's all I wanted.

Chairman Hair said, you make a very good point, sir. Thank you. All right, come on up. Briefly. Did you raise your hand a while ago, sir?

Mr. Slay Cole said, yes, sir, I sure did. My name is Slay Cole. I live at 8816 Ferguson Avenue and I'm in support of the plan, and it is a quality of life issue for all the residents that do live within the area, and Mr. McCorkle mentioned earlier that the Homeowners [sic] Association was not opposed of the tree-lined canopies, but I would like to point out that most all the tree-lined canopies are collector roads that the entire County would pay to widen once the density would increase in the area. One other thing I would like to point out is with the increased density, since that affects the greenspace, with less greenspace you would naturally have more impervious services which would also overload the County's drainage systems that we are faced with all over the entire County.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, sir. I appreciate that. Mr. McCorkle, very briefly, sir.

Mr. McCorkle said, 30 seconds. Chairman Hair said, 30 seconds. Mr. McCorkle said, I reserved the right to respond and I'll respond to one thing. The —, Mr. Newton, my dear friend, reiterated the fact that we agreed that if you make a —, the part he left out —, to have affordable housing, you're going to have to make the lot smaller. Therein lies the issue. That is the issue. Thank you.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. McCorkle. All right, Mr. Hart, very quickly.

County Attorney Hart said, real quick. I want everybody to understand this. There's two parts to this thing. Number one, there's Volume I called the plan and then number two is the ordinance, and I think —, and then Commissioner Kicklighter has got a motion on the floor to make it voluntary. Chairman Hair said, that's correct. County Attorney Hart said, I think the plan, irrespective of his motion, needs to be adopted because I don't think the plan itself is in controversy, the language in the plan. Chairman Hair asked, can he just modify his motion to make that —? County Attorney Hart said, modify the motion —. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I modify my motion to do what you said. County Attorney Hart said, it will be Volume I, the plan to be adopted and the Zoning Ordinance would go —. Chairman Hair said, and adopt —, and the second accepts that. County Attorney Hart said, and adopt the changes of April 11, 2003, as contained in the staff resolution and memo. Commissioner McMasters said, let's be clear about what we're voting on. Commissioner Kicklighter said, and to make it voluntary, yes.

Chairman Hair recognized Mr. Newton. Commissioner Thomas said, wait a minute now. Are we going to have —, we're having two motions? Chairman Hair said, no, just one motion. We just modified it to fit that.

Mr. Newton said, I just wanted to add that to the comment I did leave off the second sentence that was part of that understanding that we had with the Homebuilders Association and that was that we agree that in some instances we're in great disagreement as to what percent of instances of —, our believe is that's very few instances, the Homebuilders, I think, are of the believe that there would be more instances, but really some instances depend in large measure from the size and shape of the tract that's being subdivided, that to maintain the same number of lots a reduction in the lot size below the 6,000 square feet would be required. We are of the opinion that it will be very few. They are of the opinion there will be a more substantial number.

Chairman Hair said, thank you, Mr. Newton.

Commissioner Rayno said, Dr. Hair, I promise to call for the question I make one brief statement if I could, and it will get us to the vote. I promise. Chairman Hair said, make your statement and call —, you're going to call for the question. Commissioner Rayno said, yes, sir. Chairman Hair said, all right. Commissioner Rayno said, absolutely. Dean [Kicklighter], you know, two years ago we put together a special forum just for you and your predecessor to talk about issues and what not at the Port Wentworth Community Center, and I'm sure you remember that night, and you told the people there that night that no matter what you thought, it didn't matter, it's what they wanted and that's what you would do for them because you represented the people. Now there's all my people out there and I represent them and they're asking me, and I'm representing them, to pass this plan without voluntary, to make it mandatory. I respected you that night for that, and I'm expecting you to help me out and respect what I want to do for them. That's all I'm asking. Call the question.

Chairman Hair said, call the question. The question has been called. We'll restate the motion. County Attorney Hart said, for purposes —. Commissioner Kicklighter asked, can I respond to that. Commissioner Rayno said, call the question is not debatable. Chairman Hair said, I'll allow you to respond after. Chairman Hair said, for purposes of clarity I'd ask Commissioner Kicklighter to listen to the motion as I understand it and affirm whether he understands it to be this way. The motion is to adopt Volume I of the Land Use Plan along with those portions of Volume II including the staff recommendations of April 11, 2003, with the exception of amending Section 4-12(c)(2) to make the greenspace voluntary.

Chairman Hair recognized Commissioner Murray.

Commissioner Murray said, now if this motion passes, that means the 25% greenspace will be voluntary? Chairman Hair said, that's correct. County Attorney Hart said, will be voluntary. Commissioner Rayno said, and that's why I'm against it.

Chairman Hair said, all those in favor of the motion vote yes, opposed voted no. Chairman Hair and Commissioners Rivers, ~~Murray~~, Odell, Kicklighter and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Commissioners Rayno, McMasters, Murray and Gellatly voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of ~~six to three~~ five to four. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes. Five to four. ~~[NOTE: Commissioner Murray originally voted in opposition to the motion, but changed his motion prior to the Chairman completing the announcement of the vote.]~~ Commissioner Rayno said, I want to change my vote and ask for reconsideration and let it be shown on the minutes. Chairman Hair asked, can you change the vote after it's already been recorded? County Attorney Hart said, he can ask for a motion to reconsider entered in the minutes. Chairman Hair said, after he's already voted. Commissioner Rayno said, yes, it's been done before. I've seen it happen before. County Attorney Hart said, which way — did you —. Chairman Hair said, Mr. Hart, I'm not sure once the vote is recorded —. County Attorney Hart asked, did he vote on the prevailing side or —? Chairman Hair said, once the vote is recorded, I —. County Attorney Hart asked, did he vote on the prevailing side? Chairman Hair said, he was on the failing side first and then changed to the prevailing side. County Attorney Hart said, you have to be on the prevailing side. Somebody from the —, if somebody from the non-prevailing [sic] side wishes to enter in the minutes they have the right to make that motion to make that motion to reconsider and enter in the minutes. Chairman Hair said, on the prevailing side —. County Attorney Hart said, on the prevailing side. Yes, sir. Chairman Hair said, but he changed his vote after he voted —. Commissioner McMasters asked, which one is the prevailing side? Commissioner Murray asked, so what's the vote. Chairman Hair said, the vote was five to four initially and then Commissioner Rayno attempted to change his vote after he saw the vote. Can you change a vote once it's recorded? County Attorney Hart said, no, sir. Commissioner Murray said, we have done that in the past up here. Commissioner Rayno said, we've done it in the past. Commissioner Murray said, [inaudible] had a precedent. Commissioner Rayno said, it happened. An unidentified gentleman in the audience said, okay, we [inaudible]. Commissioner Rivers said, I have never done that.

Chairman Hair said, okay. All right, I'll call on Commissioner Kicklighter.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we ask the MPC to examine the possibility of making three to four trees per lot —, how should I reword it then? Chairman Hair said, just to ask them to come back with several options. Would that be appropriate? Commissioner Kicklighter said, several options to place three or four trees per lot, make that mandatory. Chairman Hair asked, do we have a second? Commissioner Odell said, second. Chairman Hair said, all those in favor of that motion vote yes, opposed vote no. Chairman Hair and Commissioners Rayno, Rivers, McMasters, Odell, Gellatly, Kicklighter and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Commissioner Murray voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of eight to one. Chairman Hair said, the motion passes.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

1. Commissioner Kicklighter moved to adopt Volume I of the Southeast Land Use Plan along with those portions of Volume II including the staff recommendations of April 11, 2003, with the exception of amending Section 4-12(c)(2) to make the greenspace voluntary. Commissioner Odell seconded the motion. Chairman Hair and Commissioners Rivers, ~~Murray~~, Odell, Kicklighter and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Commissioners Rayno, McMasters, Murray and Gellatly voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of ~~six to three~~ five to four.
2. Commissioner Kicklighter moved that the MPC bring back several options to place three or four trees per lot, to make that mandatory. Chairman Hair and Commissioners Rayno, Rivers, McMasters, Odell, Gellatly,

Kicklighter and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Commissioner Murray voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of eight to one.

=====

XIII. INFORMATION CALENDAR

- 1. PROGRESS REPORT ON GENERAL FUND CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT - M&O AND THE SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT (SEE ATTACHED).**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

A written report was received as information.

=====

- 2. LIST OF PURCHASING ITEMS BETWEEN \$2,500 AND \$9,999 (SEE ATTACHED).**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

A written report was received as information.

=====

- 3. INFORMATION REGARDING THE 2003 6TH ANNUAL YOUTH COMMISSION COUNTY-WIDE YOUTH RALLY ON APRIL 19, 2003.**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

A written report was received as information.

=====

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion being made by Commissioner Rivers, seconded by Commissioner Odell and unanimously approved, the Board recessed at 3:38 p.m., to go into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing litigation, land acquisition, and personnel.

Following adjournment of the Executive Session, the meeting of the Board of Commissioners was reconvened at 3:50 p.m.

=====

ITEMS FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 1. REQUEST BOARD APPROVE AGNES WILCOX SUBROGATION REIMBURSEMENT OF \$7,463.82 (JON HART).**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Thomas moved to approve the Agnes Wilcox subrogation reimbursement of \$7,463.82. Commissioner Rayno seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

- 2. **REQUEST BOARD APPROVE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO EXECUTE AN AFFIDAVIT THAT THE EXECUTIVE SESSION WAS HELD IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN MEETINGS ACT.**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Rivers moved to authorize the Chairman to execute an affidavit that the Executive Session was held in compliance with the Open Meetings Law. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

=====

APPOINTMENTS

None.

=====

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought before the Board, Chairman Hair declared the meeting adjourned at 3:51 p.m.

=====

APPROVED: THIS 25th DAY OF April, 2003
As Corrected.

DR. BILLY B. HAIR, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF
COMMISSIONERS OF CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA

SYBIL E. TILLMAN, COUNTY CLERK