

**I. CALL TO ORDER** (immediately following the Pre-Meeting)

Chairman Liakakis called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

=====

**II. INVOCATION**

Commissioners Patrick Farrell and Patrick Shay did the invocation.

=====

**III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present pledged Allegiance to the Flag of the United States.

=====

**IV. ROLL CALL**

Present: Pete Liakakis, Chairman  
Dr. Priscilla D. Thomas, Vice Chairman, District 8  
Dean Kickligher, Chairman Pro Tem, District 7  
Helen L. Stone, District 1  
James J. Holmes, District 2  
Patrick Shay, District 3  
Patrick K. Farrell, District 4  
David M. Gellatly, District 6

Also present: Russell Abolt, County Manager  
Jonathan Hart, County Attorney  
Barbara B. Wright, Acting County Clerk

=====

**V. PROCLAMATIONS AND SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS**

1. Sneak preview of Crimestoppers! video.

Chairman Liakakis said, this morning, as you see under the Special Presentations, we're going to have a sneak preview of Crimestoppers video this morning. And, you know, it's important for us to, you know, look at this. And what Crimestoppers has been doing under the leadership of Demery Bishop for a few years right now, that we've seen a lot of things that have occurred, many crimes have been solved because of their efforts, their many prevention programs that have been put in place, because of community service, and I think all of the community owes thanks to Crimestoppers for what they've done. Mr. Abolt?

Mr. Abolt said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is really a very enjoyable time, I know, for a lot of folks. Commissioner Kicklighter, a number of months ago, said let's do something about getting information out to the community on crime stopping. Crimestoppers' Pete Nichols, who is an extremely creative individual, along with Demery, have come up with what amounts to a very, not a long, but a very interesting two-part series. It will be on Channel 16, and I want to publicly recognize our equivalent of Dream Works Production, Mr. Nichols and Mr. Bishop. I guess they're Day Dream Productions people.

Chairman Liakakis said, in fact, they rival Fox, NBC, CBS, ABC now, with what they're coming up with. Mr. Nichols said, we actually had the flashlights, you know, for the grand opening to run in the sky, but, anyway. Mr. Bishop said, I've got a red tie on as opposed to a red carpet.

Mr. Nichols said, the County Manager is correct. This is something that Commissioner Kicklighter had mentioned a number of months ago, about doing something along the line of cold cases and to better get information out there to help solve crimes and whatnot. I do run on the channel, in cooperation with Crimestoppers and also with Fox 28 here locally, episodes of their cold case stories. But to do something a little bit further, Mr. Bishop was in my office one time back in the first part of this year, and he was telling me about a new radio show that he has on AM 1290, and it comes on -- it's called Crimestoppers Focus - - and it comes on at 1:00 on Saturdays and Sundays, and I can tell you that it is the highest rated show that comes on at 1:00 Saturdays and Sundays on AM 1290, so it's got that going for them. But he was explaining it to me, and as I was listening to him, I said at the end of our conversation, you know, Demery, we could take that same concept and do the same thing on our government channel. One thing led to another, and with the help of his able assistant, Katherine Neal, we were able to go out and put together, actually ending up with enough tape to put two shows together, and it will be continuing on, as opposed to a two-part series that the County Manager said, a continuing series. So we've put together two

shows. The first one which you'll see excerpts of explains the Precinct operations, and what we tried to do is to show all of the collaborative efforts that the Precincts use with the neighborhoods, with the businesses, with the community at large, to help reduce crime in this community. And the second show, which will be coming up immediately after it, give me a couple weeks to put the final edits together, will be on the special operations. We have interviews with the helicopter patrol, explaining their functions, horse patrol, canine, marine patrol. So we're off and running with it. And then, of course, at the end, we will display the most wanted from the Crimestoppers files. So that, itself, is a synopsis of it, if Demery wants to go ahead and add anything.

Mr. Bishop said, from the standpoint of my concern was being sure that we're telling the story in the public's environment. We're going to follow this with a similar type of show on the Sheriff's Department, and all that they do, a behind-the-scenes focus, and then we're going to follow that with the Savannah Impact Program, with what Savannah Impact is about and doing, in a very similar type of format. So they kinda compliment each other, the radio aspect and the video aspect, and it gets that message out in another medium that we have not been able to do, so I'm very appreciative of Pete's efforts, and I think you'll see -- of course, all of the work that we did -- and it was a lot of fun. I've got to tell you, we enjoyed it, and I hope you will see it. Now, Wednesday evening at 5:30, you should have all received your invitation now, we're going to have a little premiere and it will be in this room, and you'll have the opportunity not only to see what you're going to see today, but a full segment of the show. We're excited about it. It's a new area. Really, in the Southeastern Crimestoppers arena, we're the first program to do this in a full formatted version, as we are working with Pete on doing, so I'm very pleased to do that and anticipating entering this in competition, as well, to see if we can't gain some recognition in that respect. So we're having a good time but, most importantly, we're getting the message out and we're getting some criminals off the street as a result. So, Mr. Thompson, if you'll get the TV set. The video was played.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Kicklighter.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank Mr. Bishop and Mr. Nichols. I think that that was wonderful. It really addressed one of the main issues we talked about at one point with allowing the public, giving them the knowledge that we're not going to turn them in when they call in to Crimestoppers. I think that's an excellent step in the right direction. I would still like to see the District Attorney cooperate with you all, as far as on their older cold

cases of violent crimes, murders in the area, aggravated assaults, that's been unsolved. I still think that we can get together -- you two could get together with SCAD and the Savannah Arts Academy for like production assistants and actors to reenact old cases, like Unsolved Mysteries used to be on television and they could be like Chatham County Cold Cases to run after that. And the public -- I mean, this is a great step in the right -- I mean, this was wonderful, but it's still not quite hitting that issue that I would like to see, because the public would, I definitely believe, would tune in if there was a set time each week, Chatham County Cold Cases. I think they would tune in, wanting to see the reenactments of what took place and, you know, I think that could even be better. And this is wonderful. I'm sure you're going to win the awards and everything, and it's going to do a lot to help people understand the structure of how we, you know, combat crime and all, but if it's possible to carry it that step forward, and I know the legalities, Mr. Bishop, that the District Attorney was concerned about before, but, hey, they run, you know, unsolved mysteries. And there was a national television show that -- due to my father's persistence, he was able to get my brother's case on back years ago, and it was huge as far as just generating talk, you know. And I know that you know this, Mr. Bishop, most of the time in unsolved cases, people tend to be kinda proud of their crime, which is sick, so they talk. At some point, usually, they're going to talk to somebody and tell what they did, and this type television show can stir up the, you know, emotions of the public, where they tune in, and maybe somebody overheard something and then they actually see it on television and go, my God, that guy wasn't just sitting at the bar drunk when he was running it, that did happen in this county. And so if possible, going in that direction to show old cold cases, along with this, I just think it's wonderful. I thank you all. This was excellent right there. It was great. And I appreciate everything you all are doing.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Gellatly.

Commissioner Gellatly said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Pete, excellent job on the video, putting it together. And, Demery, as always, a really good job. I'm going to make a few comments on Demery Bishop, if I might. I remember Demery when I first came to Savannah, when he was -- about 20, 25 years ago. He was a young FBI agent with a lot of promise. He had a full head of hair and he was certainly one of their brighter rising stars in the FBI. He went on to, during his career with the FBI, to several very important significant positions in the FBI at different locations. When he retired from the FBI, he was the Special Agent in Charge -- was it Wisconsin? Mr. Bishop said, yes, sir. Commissioner Gellatly said, Wisconsin, which is very significant. Every state has a Special Agent in Charge,

except for some of the bigger states, and that meant he was the number one FBI agent for the entire State of Wisconsin, which was very significant. When he retired, we were very fortunate to get him to come to Savannah and to join us, and he's done a -- how many years have you been here now? Mr. Bishop said, almost five. Commissioner Gellatly said, five, wow. And I was -- had a little bit to do with trying to get him here and I'm very proud of that fact. Also, it's very significant and personal to me that when I first came to Savannah, Demery had influence over a young 1st Lieutenant in the Army by the name of Sherry Gellatly, my daughter, and through his influence, she joined the Bureau and she's been a member of the FBI now as a special agent. In fact, she's got a lot of seniority, almost 20 years now, and I certainly appreciate that. You're doing a great job and I personally appreciate you, I just want you to know that. Mr. Bishop said, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Thomas.

Commissioner Thomas said, thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, Ladies and Gentlemen, I, too, would just like to say thank you for a job well done. You're off to a good start, and with anything that you start, you have to fine tune it and we know that, but I think the suggestions that were made, you know, for fine tuning are well taken and in due time, you're going to do that. It reminds me of the television show that John Walsh, I believe, who narrates that show, America's Most Wanted, and that type of thing. I could see a lot of possibilities coming from this and just wanted to say thank you for getting us off to a good start. Crimestoppers, you do an excellent job in this community, and we just want the citizens to know that and to not be afraid to call those numbers when the need arises, you know, for help. You have been most gracious and very outstanding in this community, and we thank you for it. Mr. Bishop said, thank you.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Stone.

Commissioner Stone said, I just would like to thank you gentlemen both. Mr. Bishop, thank you for being my teacher. Mr. Bishop said, you're more than welcome.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Kicklighter.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, just remember when you all get famous, come on back and do this for us for free. Okay? When you all go national. But I

appreciate it. Mr. Nichols said, once again, the show is an hour long. I've already started to run it, and I also want to add that it's, for me, an extreme pleasure to work with Demery and his staff.

Mr. Bishop said, I want to take one more opportunity briefly. We are having a race against crime tomorrow morning in Forsyth Park. It's a fundraiser for us, and we've been advertising it, and it's a run and a walk. And again, we'll have a lot of anti crime and prevention aspects underway, in addition to that. So if you're up and about around 7:30, 8:30 tomorrow morning, Forsyth Park, come out and join us. It'll be a lot of fun. Thank you so much. Chairman Liakakis said, thank both of you.

=====

**VI. CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS**

1. Waiver of fees to use Memorial Stadium on 3<sup>rd</sup> of July.

Chairman Liakakis said, the Southside Baptist Church and the Bacon Park Community Association, on Sunday, July the 3rd -- they went to the City Council, they put together, they're going to have a large picnic and entertainment for people that live on the south side, in fact, other people in the community can attend that. In addition to doing that, the Southside Baptist Church is also funding a fireworks display, and it has been approved by the Insurance Commissioner, the Fire Safety Commissioner of the State of Georgia, John Oxendine's office, and they've got the permits and all and they have the insurance. And what they want to do at 9:00 on that same evening of July the 3rd, they want to have a fireworks display that has been paid for, and they are asking the County to waive the fees for that. The City of Savannah has waived the fees for the Paulsen Stadium, so I'd like a motion on the floor for that.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Motion was made by Commissioner Stone and seconded by Commissioner Thomas. There was no discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

=====

**VII. COMMISSIONERS' ITEMS**

- ~~1. Jump start vocational training for youth (Commissioner Shay).~~

Chairman Liakakis said, the Commissioners item, jump start vocational training for youth, Commissioner Shay.

Commissioner Shay said, I'd ask that that be withdrawn from the agenda today for a later date. We have a program that we're working on, but it's not ready for prime time yet.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

The item was withdrawn and no action was taken.

=====

**VIII. TABLED/RECONSIDERED 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. Civil Rights Education Program.  
**At meeting of May 27, 2005, item was continued to next meeting on June 10, 2005.**  
**At meeting of June 10, 2005, item was continued to next meeting on June 24, 2005.**

Chairman Liakakis said the tabled reconsidered items, the Civil Rights education program, has been continued from two previous meetings, May 27th and June the 10th. Do we have a motion on the floor now to continue that?

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Thomas said, I'd like to continue that, table it for the next meeting. Commissioner Farrell 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: (1) Transfers within the General M&O Fund Budget of: a) transfers within the following departments' budgets to the Salary and Wages line item: Bridges \$4,400; Aquatics Center \$200; County Commissioners \$10,000; Facilities Maintenance \$8,000; Clerk of Commission \$950; County Manager \$4,100; Fleet Operations \$4,000; b) a transfer of \$18,500 from Purchasing to Human Resources; c) a transfer of \$100,000 from the Insurance and Surety Bond Premium budget to Workers' Compensation; d) a contingency transfer of \$8,000 to the Board of Equalization; (2) a transfer of \$2,200 within the Parking Garage budget to Salary and Wages; (3) a resolution to establish a capital projects fund "Series 2005 DSA Bonds" with revenues and expenditures of \$30,000,000; (4) an amendment to the current Debt Service fund to recognize a transfer in of \$18,000,000 from the Series 2005 DSA Bonds Fund and appropriate \$18,000,000 for expenditures related to the refunding of the 1993 bonds; and (5) an amendment to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) fund to recognize \$509,588 in revenue from reimbursement for G-8 expenditures, and appropriate \$509,588 for: Detention Center \$341,000; Counter Narcotics Team \$17,124; Metropolitan Police Department \$132,022 and contingency \$19,342.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Motion to approve was made by Commissioner Gellatly and seconded by Commissioner Thomas. The motion carried unanimously.

=====

2. Adopt the FY2006 Budget Resolutions as shown on the attached resolutions and authorize an employee cost of living increase in the following sequence: a) the County funds listed which exclude the General Fund M&O and the Special Service District, b) the General Fund M&O, c) the Special Service District, and d) an employee cost of living adjustment (COLA) equal to the amount shown in the proposed budget presented April 29, 2005.

Mr. Abolt said, Mr. Chairman, this is the one you defer in light of Item 3, for the continuing resolution. Chairman Liakakis said, okay, and, of course, this for the

resolution to continue operating the county until we have the budget approval in July. Do we have a motion on the floor? Mr. Abolt said, to perfect the record, you're actually voting on Number 3, the continuing resolution.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, what do 2 and 3 have to do with each other? Mr. Abolt said, okay, your schedule had called for you to adopt a budget today, and we realize you're still in deliberations so you must still have it on your agenda, but not act, and then vote on your continuing resolution. So you're doing nothing on 2, but you're going to act on 3. Commissioner Kicklighter said, okay, so we're skipping -- I just want that clear, we're skipping 2. Mr. Abolt said, right. Chairman Liakakis said, to approve a continuing resolution for Fiscal Year beginning July the 1st, 2005, through June the 30th, 2006, to enable the County Government to operate until the Fiscal Year 2005-2006 budget is approved.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

No action was taken; deferred to Item 3.

=====

3. If necessary, request Board approve a Continuing Resolution for fiscal year beginning July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006, to enable the county government to operate until the fiscal year 2005-2006 budget is adopted.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Thomas said, move for approval for Number 3. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Holmes and the motion carried unanimously.

=====

4. For Board's information, we present previous grant-in-aid procedures.

Mr. Abolt said, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, you all recently said, you know, what are procedures dealing with grants-in-aid. This is purely an information piece prepared at your request. If there is ever a desire to get back in full force with some allocation to grants-in-aid, this procedure has worked in the past, and it's only for information.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

For information only, no action required.

=====

5. Consideration of options pertaining to Comprehensive Animal Control Ordinance.

Chairman Liakakis said, I'm going to call on the County Attorney to give us a report now. He's been working on that with a number of animal agencies in Savannah, also the Humane Society and a number of other citizens, who have been working hard, and the police department's input in that, so I'd like to call on the County Attorney now to give us the options on the proposed County Animal Ordinance.

Mr. Hart said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Some time ago, the County Attorney's office was directed to try to address the Animal Control Ordinance and try to bring it up to date and perhaps add or delete provisions as we thought they were needed. As part of that, we requested public input, which we had a very good response to, and, to be honest with you, we had a lot of difference of opinions, but we had a lot of good opinions in there. The dog fanciers and the county provided us personnel through Ms. Paula Wagner, Mr. Lee of the Humane Society worked with us, and I'd also like to compliment our own staff and the Animal Control officers with our local police department. They were very helpful, and I thought were very evenhanded. They wanted an ordinance that protected the animals and they wanted something that was humane and, at the same time, they wanted something that was enforceable.

Mr. Hart said, we've brought to you today a draft, a culmination of four or five meetings that we had, as well as the public input. We have generally followed the outline that is contained in the City of Savannah's ordinance and made modifications to it to fit the needs of unincorporated Chatham County. The reason for deciding to use that format was, we felt like for those that were enforcing it, you know, they could always look in the same general area and find the specific provision, albeit somewhat different. So for continuity purposes, we just followed that. There's nothing magic about their way of doing it, but we felt like for administrative purposes it was the best way to go. I'm going to flip through this thing and I'm going to point some things out. Primarily, we're at the point that we're going to need some direction from the Commission. Our intention is that once you give us some direction as to some of the specific items, that we'll go back and try to put this thing into a final form, to come back for first reading at the next meeting. There is going to have to be some tweaking to it. Since this went out on Tuesday, I've received two or three additional

memos and drafts back and forth between the parties, where there's been some discussion on minor language changes. But for the most part, this is where we're at.

The first part I'd like to point out is 22-104 on Page 3, which talks about keeping the animal shelters and the place provided for them clean and sanitary, free from accumulation of excrement. We added that so that there would be less question about how animals should be treated and to give greater enforcement power to our local Animal Control individuals.

On Page 4, we went back and revisited the distances of the various types, facilities, and moved them back to 100 feet from any structure or dwelling, insofar as the mules, animals, sheep, goats, and should you have two or more fowl. We deleted provisions allowing stockyards. We deleted the provisions allowing poultry farms. We also increased the distance from 50 to 100 feet for horse stables, primarily due to complaints of smell. The Animal Control folks tell me they have very few issues in regard to the horses. Most of the time, it is an issue concerning smell from the stable.

Page 5 is pretty much boilerplate information and the things that we put in there in regard to nuisance. We decriminalized the penalty under 22-108 for minor violations. This was done in regard to some issues that we were talking about that we'll be bringing back next time to you concerning getting rid of some of our minor criminal penalties on enforcement provisions as it affects right to counsel for indigents.

The first issue that I really think I need some direction on is 22-110, and it's about keeping of bees. The city ordinance does not allow bees to be kept by anybody within the city limits of Savannah. To be quite honest with you, we've got a number of beekeepers in Savannah, in the unincorporated Chatham County, and some of them are even in the business of producing and selling honey. I've been told by Animal Control on one or two occasions we've had bees land on someone's house, or swarm on the house, and that as a matter of fact, one of these two gentlemen would be called to come get the bees and would remove the bees and bring them back to their hive. It was not originally their bees, but Animal Control is just not equipped to handle it. I just need to know whether you want to prohibit beekeeping in Chatham County or to allow it, and don't really have a preference. It has not seemed to be a problem to date for them to be there.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, let them keep them. Commissioner Farrell said, yeah, I would agree with that. Mr. Hart said, all right, unless I hear otherwise, we're going to -- Commissioner Farrell said, if the beekeepers are keeping them in a responsible fashion, then by all means, let's not prohibit it. Commissioner Shay said, will there

be any language as to what a proper beekeeper establishment might be? Or are we just going to say bees are okay? Mr. Hart said, no, I'm just going to take it out of the Act. I'm not going to comment positively or negatively about it. If it gets to be an issue, we'll come back and revisit the issue at that point. Based on what I hear, they're pretty responsible individuals.

Page 7 and Page 8 deal with vaccination and inoculation. Some people have considered removal of the use of "rabies" and use "vaccination." We have included the language rabies, because we want it to be clear that we do expect people to have rabies shots on their animals. On Page 9, we have drawn up the fee structure that was adopted in July. There was much discussion about increasing the fees from a revenue source. There was much discussion about increasing the fees from the standpoint of trying to control the number of animals. Increasing the fee structure was felt to be counter-productive, in that the idea is to make sure that people come in and get the vaccination, so you want to make it as reasonable as possible. We don't want to raise the fees to where you get it into a noncompliance issue, so we felt that these were good. You will note that there is an encouragement in the fee structure that unneutered animals will cost more than neutered animals, and we felt that that, in a nice way, would perhaps assist people in recognizing that perhaps neutering of animals may be the way to go, and that seemed to have pretty much consensus. The quarantining provisions are pretty much required by state law.

The next issue that we deal with is over there on Page 13, and this is a commercial pet animal license facility. We have deleted the multiple licensing provisions under the ordinance. At one time, there was like a group discount. For the more animals you had, you got a better discount under the ordinance. We felt like for every animal you get, you ought to pay the same fee that everybody else does, so we deleted that language. We created this section here for commercial pet animal facilities, which are defined as, you know, operating the premises for commercial boarding, breeding, selling, trading, rearing animals, except for animal hospitals and grooming facilities unconnected with the activity. We outline in the bottom part of that all the requirements for the licensing, including meeting the Georgia Department of Agriculture requirements and proof of various items. That would allow us greater enforcement and allows us to remove people who are a problem or noncompliant there. And you can see on Page 14, we have a revocation provision there. We felt like that would keep some of these people from popping up and working out of their houses and just being noncompliant.

(NOTE: At this time, Commissioner Odell arrived at the meeting.)

Mr. Hart said, we included on Page 15 some restrictions against running-at-large of dogs. We also initially had talked about creating a citation and fine provision, much like the police department does for traffic tickets that, if you write the fine, and they come in and pay the fine before court, they don't have to appear in court. After we did some further research on that, due to the way the nature of the way the statute's written, we're not going to be able to do that. We're going to have to issue the citation and take them to court and then a fine be administered. I thought that was an excellent suggestion by Commissioner Gellatly to have that provision but, unfortunately, it's just not going to be able to be done, due to the way the law is written in regard to animal control provisions. We have some provisions pertaining to the keeping of dogs, how animal shelters will handle the dogs.

Mr. Hart said, Section 22-120 is the next item that I need your input on. This is the disposal of dog excrement provision that basically says that you must remove animal excrement from public property, and we have also expanded this to private property of third parties, which means someone's dog cannot use the restroom or bathroom on someone else's property. That's a new provision and it will obviously, at some point in the future, present some enforcement challenges. Do you wish to expand it to private property or do you just wish to keep it to public property?

Chairman Liakakis said, sometimes people are not being responsible and go to neighbors or people's private property continuously to do that. That's some concern, you know, that people have. You know, sometimes there might be an accident or something. That's a different story. But especially to go on people's property on a continuous basis, I think my opinion is that it should be noted.

Commissioner Stone said, I'm just worried about the enforcement of it. Mr. Hart said, well, it's going to be complaint-driven. Animal Control told me that they just absolutely do not have the resources to go out and actively patrol on that, so, just to be blunt, unless we hear about it, or there is a complaint from a neighbor, it's not going to be enforced. Commissioner Stone said, I just hate to have something in the ordinance that we know up front cannot be enforced unless there's a complaint, and if there's a complaint, I would think that that would have to be dealt with, anyway. I mean, if somebody is habitually letting their pet go on somebody else's property, then, to me, that would fall under a complaint, but just to be able to control dogs -- Mr. Hart said, there is no provision, though, that gives the County any teeth in enforcing anything. It's not against the law currently to allow your dog to defecate on somebody else's property. This prohibits that. Obviously, we're not going to be the doggie police out there, but if it is a recurrent problem such as the Chairman said, this provision certainly would give us some enforcement ability.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Shay.

Commissioner Shay said, I think in large part, this entire ordinance is complaint-driven. We're not going to be able to staff up the Animal Control to the point where they're patrolling the streets like we have Precinct officers patrolling our neighborhoods, and I think we do need to have some provision in there so that if there's a habitual violator, that they can be cited for this kind of activity. I don't think anybody out there should think that if their dog accidentally wanders from the foot path and goes into the poison ivy and decides to let go, that that means that the police are going to come get them. It's only in situations where there is sort of habitual and routine violations where this is going to come in play. But in the absence of it, then, you know, you can go see somebody and say, you really shouldn't be doing that, but there wouldn't be any teeth in the ordinance then. I think that's kinda how we got in the problem where this whole situation was an issue. Somebody was doing something very, very bad and, because the ordinance didn't specifically address it, they ended up not getting punished very badly.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Farrell.

Commissioner Farrell said, Mr. County Attorney, what would be the ramifications of a pet owner after their pet trespassed on a third party, and would there be any ramifications for that person trespassing to go and clean up the problem? Mr. Hart said, well, the way this thing is written, the next add-on provision, 22-101, requires that people that have custody or ownership of a dog or possession, also have a device, and we describe the device as being anything from metal mechanized all the way down to a styrofoam plastic cup for purposes of cleaning up and disposal, and there is a responsibility under that provision for them to do that. So technically, we could probably cite them under 120, and if they refuse to, you know, go over there to a neighbor's house and clean up, you could possibly cite them under 121. Commissioner Farrell said, but my question is this. Is there a ramification -- for instance, perhaps as a private property owner, I don't want somebody walking up under my bedroom window and messing around with a shovel and a scooper, removing a problem that was inadvertently deposited by an animal. Is there a ramification that, if we pass this, that it could unintentionally create a trespassing issue? Does this automatically give someone permission that if they train their dog to go underneath someone's window and use the facilities to immediately go over there under the auspices of following the letter of the law, they could be violating another provision. Mr. Hart said, it would certainly allow an owner to go into the property for purposes of removal of the excrement, yes, and if you carry it to its

extreme, sure. I mean, you know, you've either got to put it in or you've got to take it out.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Odell.

Commissioner Odell said, Jon, I think that this creates another layer of making something criminal which we don't have the enforcement powers to enforce. Some problems need to be resolved between citizens on a civil basis. If someone comes on your property, then that is a trespass, and you have remedies already in civil law that you can resolve that. I think adding this extra layer creates an unnecessary problem and will have a rippling effect. My opinion is now that it will be sparsely used, but what happens if it's not? What happens if it's not? And we have a elevation in calls to the police department saying that Pat Shay's dog is constantly going on my lawn, I want you to stop it. Mr. Hart said, Pat Shay cleans up after his dog. Commissioner Shay said, it's a fact. Commissioner Odell said, I was just using that -- okay, but my point is, I think we're making something criminal that ought to be handled civilly, which there are civil remedies for it. There are no absolutes. To think that we can have everything in the ordinance but not view the rippling effects, and the rippling effects is the impact on police, the impact on the court. In some areas, they're even moving to decriminalize minor traffic offenses, and the reason is that if you charge a person with a criminal offense, which this would be, and they say, well, I don't have money to have an attorney, are we obligated at that point to have the Public Defender to come in and represent them at this hearing? Mr. Hart said, yes, sir. That's why we took out the criminal portion of that. Commissioner Odell said, well, not if it's just a civil -- Commissioner Shay said, that's all it is. Mr. Hart said, correct. We took out the criminal portion of that for the very reason you say, Commissioner Odell. Commissioner Odell said, I think that's excellent. Mr. Hart said, you know, obviously, we want to do what the general consensus of the Commission is. I would prefer that if we remove the expansion to private property, that we keep it in public property, and the reason for that is, it gets to be a problem. People have to go into the parks and have their dog use the bathroom, or softball fields or baseball fields, and I think we need that enforcement ability there, because we've got a lot of people using those facilities, and it interrupts the flow of activity.

Chairman Liakakis said, we don't have the resources, you know, for our Animal Control to patrol, you know, neighborhoods to prevent something like that, but there is a problem and people have heard about this over the years, and there's nothing in there that states -- you know, it's not against the law for somebody's pet to go on somebody's lawn constantly. What I said earlier, you know, sometimes an animal will have an accident, you know, and it's not a continuous situation, but when you have,

you know, a pet that continues to go on a neighbor's property and to do that, there's nothing -- you know, they have the expense of going to court, you know, or they've got to go in civil court and all of that. But I think if they understand if we've got this in the ordinance that, you know, you could be cited for this, they could be warned and cited for this, you know, not to let that happen. I think we need to be reasonable. My personal opinion, it ought to stay in there so that we have protection for the public and private property.

Chairman Liakakis said, let me say this, I see we have a member of the audience that wants to make comment, but since we had public meetings on this and all, and we've had quite a bit of input, anything that you'd like to talk about, if you want to put it in a letter, or anybody in the audience, what you can do is contact the County Attorney. He has been working with the citizens. Numerous calls from citizens have come up that have given him information, so that's one of the reasons why we didn't, you know, continue with public hearing. But anybody in the audience, now, I want you to understand that you can call the County Attorney's office and he's more than happy to get any information. Mr. Abolt said, sir, also, this is your time to talk on it, because it isn't even on first reading. When you conclude your discussion today, then there'll be a document which you've agreed to, at least tentatively, that will be on the first reading on the 8th and then final reading, the second meeting in July, so there will be ample time.

Commissioner Stone said, that was my question, aren't we going to have a first and second reading? Mr. Hart said, right. Correct. Commissioner Stone said, then the public can give their input. Chairman Liakakis said, yes, at that time, if you want to do it ahead of time, but when we have it on those times in the future, we'd be more than happy to have any discussion from the audience, and you can certainly call the County Attorney anytime, and he's more than happy to do as he has in the past, to listen to your comments, and a lot of people have had good comments that he has put into place.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Shay.

Commissioner Shay said, maybe I can offer a compromise on the sentence about disposal of dog excrement. It says that they have to -- here with the premises of third parties other than the owner's property without permission of said third party, and then it says, and failure to remove said excrement shall be deemed a public nuisance and prohibited. Why don't we just strike the second half of that after "and," and it'll make it clear that it's still technically a violation to allow your dog, or I guess other animals, to go and relieve themselves on somebody else's property, but it does not say that

failure to go and correct that situation is, you know, prohibited. It just gives the opportunity for the Animal Control officer to cite somebody who refused to do that, but doesn't give them automatic permission to enter somebody else's property to remove it. It would still mean that somebody that entered somebody else's property technically could be committing a trespass. I'm not a lawyer, but I -- Mr. Hart said, no. This is your ordinance. I mean, I'll do whatever you all want me to do. All right, I will change that as suggested by Commissioner Shay and I'm going to leave the equipment provision in there, which is pretty broad. All it's asking you to do is, you know, take a piece of plastic or napkin or whatever device you have and clean up after your animal.

Mr. Hart said, Section 122 is provisions dealing with dangerous dogs and potentially dangerous dogs. Dangerous dogs and potentially dangerous dogs and enclosures, and it defines the notice provisions and what occurs. It provides for the hearing procedures. It complies with state law. The scope of the procedures, I think, are more clearly defined in how the hearing goes. It provides for the appropriate due process rights. It provides for the restraint of the dangerous dogs. It also provides for the confiscation of a potentially dangerous dog upon a finding of potentially dangerous dog under Page 24. Section 22-134, is a new provision that basically says that they can confiscate a potentially dangerous dog that is outside that is not registered, not maintained in a proper enclosure, without proper restraints. You will note in the provision above that, 22-103 provides that if you wish to keep your dog, your dangerous dog, potentially dangerous dog, you're going to be required to carry a liability policy, and the amount that was set in that, which inadvertently got deleted, was \$25,000, that it must be registered and must be maintained, and failure to provide any of the documents as required will result in Animal Control's ability to come in and relieve you of the dog. The \$25,000 assurance provision, or surety requirement or surety bond requirement, is contained in Subsection (g) on Page 22. That's a new provision. It allows someone who wishes to, to obviously keep a potentially dangerous dog or dangerous dog, but it also brings about the fact that, you know, there's harm and there's risk involved, and if they're willing to go through all those steps, then, you know, we're going to allow you to do that. You will note 22-136 makes it pretty clear liability, that if you have a problem thereafter, it's going to be your problem, it's going to be your personal liability problem. We obviously have made a situation where it could be a very expensive proposition for you.

22-137 is a new provision that outlaws dog fighting in Chatham County, and the provision has been clarified so that we think that it will give us the opportunity to be a little bit more proactive in potential enforcement of those provisions. 22-138 is a new provision dealing with animal neglect. What we tried to do in the animal neglect

provision is set up a set of factors, and these factors are outlined (a) through (e) on the next page. These are the factors that seem to be recurrent in most complaints that we get, and if we find those conditions, we're going to use that as a animal neglect. We also have 22-139 that deals with animal cruelty and the infliction of pain upon animals, disfigurement or serious injury. That was criminalized, and we're going to keep it criminalized, \$500 fine, imprisonment for not less than six months or more than one year. So I think these provisions are going to be good from the standpoint that we now have some factors to describe conditions for animal neglect, lack of proper drinking water, inadequate drinking water, lack of a wholesome palatable, free from contamination, food and sustenance provided with sufficient quality, failure to provide space for the animal to be able to sufficiently stand at full height, turn around, lay down, make normal adjustments, lack of providing shelter from weather, such as sun, rain, wind, and maintain sanitary conditions and removal of excrement and unreasonable odors. Failure to treat an animal that may have an injury, accident, may have a disease, shock, temperature, and we describe various matters, failure to make arrangements for veterinarian care.

Section 22-140 is the provision that goes over on the bottom of Page 26, top of Page 27. This is the provision involving tethering, and of everything that we had to go through in regard to trying to draft the Animal Control Ordinance, this is the provision that had the widest divergence of opinion. There were people that felt very strongly that we should prohibit any kind of tethering of dogs in Chatham County, and there were people who felt very strongly that we should allow tethering. At the top of Page 27, I did two alternatives. I wrote one that was an absolute prohibition against tethering, which is the bottom of Page 26. At the top of Page 27, I drafted something that basically said that you could tether, so long as it was on 12 feet of chain, that the animal had adequate food, water, and shelter, and that it was not more continuous than eight hours in a 24-hour day. Now, the thinking on that, if you decide to allow tethering, essentially went as follows. One, if we allow 12 feet, require 12 feet in length, it gives the animal plenty of room to move around. But more importantly, it prevents the number of dogs that you can accumulate in a specific geographic area, and that will prevent the situation that we had not too long ago, where the gentleman had chained up 100 dogs in an area. Just by the spacing required between the distances and the tethering, you're going to be in a situation where you can only put so many dogs in a confined space. Secondly, the question was, how long should it be. We chose eight hours in a 24-hour day, since eight hours was the normal workday. Some people who are very responsible have dogs. They do not wish to leave the dog in the house when they go to work. They give the dog plenty of food, water, and it's properly tethered in the morning, and as soon as they get back, they take care of it in the afternoon. So we wanted to accommodate, the thought was, this

would accommodate those type of people. The other provision that was pointed out to us is that a lot of the more planned neighborhoods now are going to smaller lot sizes and the elimination of fences, unless the homeowner's association approves it, so if you eliminate -- if you go to a neighborhood that doesn't permit fences, then what is the alternative to tethering and leaving your dog outside without your being present. That is the long and short of that. Some people felt that you should only allow tethering with animal harnesses. The Animal Control people indicated that body harnesses, in and of themselves, also have problems, so we tried to come up with an alternative provision. We will do whatever you wish us to do there. Our Animal Control folks do not have a problem if the County were to decide with the alternative we've outlined of allowing limited tethering. Again, it will be a complaint-driven situation and I leave it to you all to tell me what direction you all wish to go in.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Farrell.

Commissioner Farrell said, Mr. County Attorney, I'd like to revisit 22-139 on animal cruelty. As I read this, animal cruelty would be, a person commits an act of animal cruelty when such person causes the death of an animal. If you'd take out some of the other stuff and just go that point, does this leave legal hunters at risk, and does this leave farmers that raise domestic animals for their own consumption at risk of falling into this category? It seems a little general, and I would not want to pass an ordinance that's going to have unintentional consequences. Mr. Hart said, sure, I'll be glad to go back and revisit that language. I think those are two good points; I'm glad you caught those, because every time you read this, you see something else that you need to change. I'll be glad to go back and revisit that and try to come up with some exceptions for that. Commissioner Farrell said, thank you.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Gellatly.

Commissioner Gellatly said, just a couple of comments. You know, we keep on talking about -- and there certainly are a lot of new subdivisions and homes in areas being built where they can't have fences for a variety of reasons, but I point out that there are a lot of options besides tethering. They have these invisible fences, where there's a wire underground or something like that and they have something on the collar that gives them a sensation when they come to that line. And I know of a person who owns two Great Danes and they have such a fence and they haven't had to turn that fence on for over a year, because the dogs just come to a line and that's as far as they'll go, but you can't see anything, so I personally, from experience, I think tethering an animal, a dog, especially an active dog, it's very cruel, it's very cruel in 100 degree plus weather. A 12 foot tether or chain just means more opportunity

for the dog to get tangled up, and I know that Animal Control has, on many occasions, responded to calls where nobody's at home and an animal is all tangled and tied up in their own chain, and that can be a horrible cruel thing to occur. So there are options for people that can't have fences. I'm personally opposed, but I'll certainly go with the majority.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Stone.

Commissioner Stone said, I concur with what Commissioner Gellatly is saying. I'm opposed to the tethering personally. I also wonder how this eight hours a day is going to be monitored. I mean, how do they know when the animal's been out for eight hours? Who's going to set the timer? That's a concern that I would have. And I agree that in these subdivisions that are smaller, there are invisible fencing, people do still get out and walk their dogs. There are many alternatives to putting a dog on a chain, so I would concur with that. And, unfortunately, when you allow this tethering, this is when it gets into situations when people say, well, I've left it out all day, I think I'm going to go visit a friend overnight and we're just going to leave the dog on the chain. I think it just -- I don't know who would possibly be able to enforce that.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Kicklighter.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, well, I just want to present a different view other than the wealthier people living in the new subdivisions with codes, covenants, and restrictions. It could be the poor people throughout the county that can't afford an invisible fence. Plenty of people out there may want an animal, and they may not be able to afford the fence, they may not be able to afford to put an invisible fence in, and I would say, take it a step further and just further limit the time that you could actually have the animal tied, chained up, whatever you want to say, outside. If it was on a leash and not too tight, and, you know, that way, they would have to keep the dog in the house, but they could let it out for an hour a day if it was, you know, to go to the restroom. Maybe the owner don't want to stand out in the rain while they're holding a leash while it goes to the restroom, but limit it to one hour a day. I mean, whatever you want, and then that would go into neighbors being responsive if someone was treating the animal, you know, in a cruel manner, to call in and let people know, and then they could respond and see if they were treating them bad, and do something about it. But, you know, to just say no, flat out across the board, there's a whole -- there's another segment of the population that probably can't afford a fence, and why tell that kid he can't have an animal.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Farrell.

Commissioner Farrell said, I would caution that we be careful not to go to zero amount of tethering, because of the unintentional consequence of someone perhaps walking their dog and needs to go inside for five minutes and it would be a crime to take the leash and tie it to the post on your front porch. That would be considered tethering. Or if you were riding your horse and took the reins and wrapped it around a tree for a minute while you performed some task for 10 or 15 minutes, that would be considered tethering. So I think we need to look at this issue closely, but also to keep in mind that we don't want any unintentional consequences.

Chairman Liakakis said, Mr. County Attorney, you've heard some alternate things, you know, concerning portions of this particular ordinance. If you will -- when we go to vote on it, we'll vote on those individually because some say, you know, a low tethering and some say none and all of that. So what we'll have is a majority vote, of course, on those specific items. But break them down so that the Commission has the opportunity to vote on those specific items and we can discuss it. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I would say make it four hours a day, where they can't just tie it up and go to work for eight hours. It either has to stay inside most of the time at that point or, you know, I don't know how Pat -- because he's kinda on the same page. Mr. Hart said, I'll be glad to take comments from the Commissioners after the meeting, if they have any, and my intention then is to do as the Chairman has suggested, which is, as to the provisions that we do not appear to have disagreement, we will put that into a single format motion, so that you may have it at first reading and second reading to be adopted, and then if there are two or three provisions where there appears to be a difference of opinion, we will set those out and you all can take Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 and whatever you decide, we'll obviously incorporate that into the ordinance.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Farrell.

Commissioner Farrell said, I'd just like to say that I would want this particular copy of the ordinance to be made available to the public, not only here, but at all our public libraries and all the interested media outlets in the community, because I think this is a very important issue, this entire document, to many, many, many people in our community, and I want to make sure that not only that we have a chance to digest the information, but it be made available to the public and that they also have an opportunity to review it and make suggestions to tweak it, so to speak.

Chairman Liakakis said, and before it is distributed, then, if it's going to be distributed, that those alternatives -- because, we have not voted whether it's eight hours or ten hours or four hours or no hours, and the other portions of it, also, that we've had discussion.

Mr. Hart said, then we have Page 27, Provision 22-141, I'm going to need some guidance there. This is a provision that there is a wide divergence of opinion. It is also a provision that the disagreement over it is not uncommon to our community, but pretty much to any community you want to go to. It's commonly referred to apparently as the pick-up truck ordinance, which basically says that you can't transport any animal by public or private means without having them in some kind of secure container with adequate ventilation, food, and water, a grill system, and that allowing your animal, for example, dog, to ride in the back of the pick-up truck would violate this ordinance. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I think that's a little overboard, because if I take my dog to the vet, I don't own a big box. I'm not throwing it in the back of a truck, either, but that don't -- is there an option in there of putting it in your car? Mr. Hart said, yes, it's only as to an open top vehicle and open truck bed, unless housed in a container. We assume that most everybody is going to transport their dog to the vet inside of a vehicle.

Chairman Liakakis said, well, I think that should be well advertised, because we see that happen all along. But, of course, what we need to do is to make sure that those animals are protected, because, unfortunately, what has happened, you know, if you have loose dogs in the back of the pick-up truck and they stop suddenly, you know, no fault of their own, because something's in front of them, or preventing an accident or whatever the case might be, and an animal is severely injured or dies from that fall, or gets hit by another vehicle, so that's something that we need to do, but one of the other things, too, to consider in addition, where you said enclosed, because they might not be able to put some enclosed things, but at least that animal is secure in that pick-up truck and not loose in there, because that's really important, because we are trying to protect the animals, also, in this ordinance.

Commissioner Farrell said, Mr. County Attorney, when you say no animal shall be transported by a private or public means, are we talking about public transportation, private transportation, or are we speaking about somebody on the west side with 500 acres, he can't put his dog in the back of his truck and carry him from the barn to his house? Is this a public road or private road? Could you give me some clarification? Mr. Hart said, sure. What we're really talking about there was the mode of transportation, you know, a private individual's car or whether they're going to take them and put them on a bus or, you know, a train or whatever. Commissioner Farrell

said, so are we applying this ordinance to public roads or are we talking about private property, also? Mr. Hart said, we're not going to go on somebody's private property if he's got 500 acres to see -- Commissioner Odell said, yeah, but Jon, that's not answering his question. The law doesn't distinguish between whether or not it's public or private. The law makes a crime the act, and the act can occur, Pat, on public or private property, so the answer to your question legally is, you've got a buddy with 500 acres and he throws Duke in the back pick-up and the ordinance says that he shall not do that, it's a violation of the ordinance, because it isn't location specific, it is what did you do to the animal. That is the criminal act, so it could happen. Mr. Hart said, we could change the ordinance to limit it to animals being transported on a public road or street or something along those lines. I mean, I'm not for it or against it. I'm just offering suggestions. Commissioner Farrell said, well, I was just needing some clarity. I'm sure, again, when this ordinance goes out into the media and for public review, there'll be a lot of comments, and I don't want anybody to have any surprises out there that, you know, we passed an ordinance and then all of a sudden, they're getting pulled over left and right and getting arrested, so I want the information out there, and there to be a good open discussion between the citizens of the community and the Commission itself. Commissioner Kicklighter said, wasn't that already against the law to do that, put the dog in the back? Commissioner Stone said, no. Chairman Liakakis said, no, there's nothing on that.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, I don't know how water would actually stay in the back of the truck in a little kennel thing while you're riding down the road. Maybe you can change that wording to water will be placed in there when the vehicle is stopped, because water is going to spill out of the thing riding down the road and, legally, if you got pulled over and the water's spilled out, you can get a ticket. Mr. Hart said, okay.

Mr. Hart said, 22-142 is a provision, animal confinement left unattended in parked car provision. There's a couple of issues that go on with this. This is primarily to allow Animal Control officers to enter a person's vehicle, if necessary, to break the window to get in, if they leave their dog in a heated vehicle, say, out at the mall or whatever, and the animal's in distress and it's reported. It's very difficult to draw an ordinance to say you can't leave them in the car unless it's ventilated, because you don't know how to define that. You know, is it two inches of ventilation with the window down, three inches, four inches, or air conditioner on, or whatever. So what we tried to do was put in a provision if someone were to report that to Animal Control that a dog's in distress, then Animal Control could go ahead and take care of the situation, take care of the dog, get veterinary treatment, place responsibility -- Commissioner Kicklighter said, does this give our regular police department the authority to break the window also, or do they already have the authority? Mr. Hart said, well, they

could operate under this. They're charged with enforcing the ordinances. Commissioner Kicklighter said, because, I mean, we're kinda acting like we have 300 Animal Control people out there riding around that's going to -- so, you know, I think that's fine, if they break it off to help the animal. Mr. Hart said, this is going to be a publicly -- you know, the public's going to be the police officers in this, because they're going to probably pick up the cell phone and call.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Farrell.

Commissioner Farrell said, back to 22-141, I had another concern that we just mentioned animals. I know this, in my mind, is intended for dogs, but what about someone with cattle, moving from, say, Bethesda to Guyton, or perhaps a horse? Could we make it a little more specific to address dogs or cats? Mr. Hart said, yes, sir, we could. Commissioner Farrell said, because when you've got these provisions in here and you've got to start modifying your domestic animal trailers for large animals, it could be a little bit much, and not really be what -- have unintended consequences. I'd like for you to give that some thought. Mr. Hart said, okay. We could exclude horses and livestock. Commissioner Farrell said, well, that's what I'm saying. It could have an unintended consequence. Commissioner Shay said, this is an open truck bed. It doesn't just say pick-up truck.

Chairman Liakakis said, go ahead, Jon.

Mr. Hart said, 22-143 is an issue that you all have to tell us what you want done. Do you want to limit the number of cats that a single family residence can have? And the way we wrote this, it shall not be greater than eight cats per residence. Now, is there anything magic about the number eight? No. It seemed to get the least amount of objections, and the number ten was tossed around, the number six was tossed around, number twelve was tossed around, and we just sort of said eight.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Shay.

Commissioner Shay said, I like eight. Commissioner Farrell was recognized and he said, I assume we have a limitation on cats. Do we have any kind of limitation on dogs or total number of pets per residential household? Or has that been discussed. Mr. Hart said, no, we did not do that. What we did was, we handled that through our licensing provisions, and it became more and more expensive as you got more and more animals. We haven't had the problem with dogs as much as we have had with cats. Most of the people who have eight or nine dogs are either breeders or hunters, and they usually take care of their animals. And we felt like if we had the tethering

provision in there, if it was elected to be used at 12 feet and that sort of thing, it would limit the amount of space to handle those things, so we haven't placed a maximum limit on dogs.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Stone.

Commissioner Stone said, getting back to the cats, the only thing that you would need to maybe clearly define, because you're going to get into mother cats with kittens and you'd have to maybe associate them as one unit until they become big enough to become self-sufficient. Mr. Hart said, one of the earlier versions of this, when we were arguing over numbers, had that provision in there and when we switched from that number to this number, it got dropped, so I've made a note to put that back in.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Gellatly.

Commissioner Gellatly said, I think with cats, it's going to be difficult to come up with numbers. You know, if they're inside the house, who cares? Maybe there ought to be a limit inside, I don't know, but if they're outside, you're typically going to have people that say, well, I don't own them, I just feed them, you know, and there are a lot of people in neighborhoods that do just that, and they feed them and they've got 22 cats, but they don't own them, you know, just feed them, so how in the world do you enforce something like that? Mr. Hart said, we've got a provision for that. Commissioner Gellatly said, I should have expected that. Mr. Hart said, you make a great point. I want to go back to the number of dogs. Lt. Boulware, who's been very helpful in this ordinance, says if you have three or more dogs, you've got a 100 foot requirement, which means you can't have the animals within 100 feet of your property line, because we figure if you take 100 feet off the property lines, then if you elect to go with tethering, you've got a limited amount of space, so it's almost self-enforcing. That was the concept.

Mr. Hart said, Commissioner Gellatly raises an excellent point. We now move you to Section 22-144, stray dog, stray cat. Any person who intends to provide care or sustenance for any dog or cat shall be deemed to be the custodian of said dog or cat, unless the true and rightful owner is located. No person shall feed or provide sustenance to any animal, dog or cat, upon public property or private property of others, except with the express permission of the owner of said animal, or the property owner upon which said food and sustenance is being provided. That is basically a provision to deal with ferrel cats, okay? Commissioner Kicklighter said, I think --

Chairman Liakakis said, hold it, Commissioner Thomas is next.

Commissioner Thomas said, thank you. Commissioner Gellatly asked one part of my question. The other part of my question is this, does the ordinance take care of people walking their dog on your lawn instead of theirs? Mr. Hart said, other than the general trespass provisions, no, ma'am, it does not address that. Commissioner Thomas said that's a big problem in my neighborhood. Mr. Hart said, I will look at drafting something along those lines. I want to go back to 22-144, though. I really would like some guidance on that. What this provision basically says, is aimed at, is the situation where there are, say, a bunch of animals and people have a tendency to go out and leave food. Well, they don't want them at their house, so they provide the food next to your house, and -- Commissioner Thomas said, every time. Mr. Hart said, you know, we've had grocery store owners in this community who have had horrible experiences with animal populations, that people will come in the evening and feed the animals there, to the extent that they collect buzzards that rest on top of the grocery store roof in the morning, waiting for the animals to come out, so that they can feed on the animals. And the idea here is to prevent or to limit the spread of these type of situations. If you wish to have all these animals, you know, you can do it on your own property, is the goal of this provision, and there's going to be some people that feel very strongly in the other direction of that, that they feel like they're providing a public service by taking care of these animals.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, well, that's my question, Jon, is it in that provision you read that said you can feed these on your own property? Mr. Hart said, we did it by not excluding that. There is absolutely nothing to prevent you from providing food or sustenance to any animal you choose upon your own property. Now, if you do that, under this provision, we're going to assume that you're the custodian and owner of that animal, because we want somebody to be responsible for that animal. We can't have these never-never land situations where the neighbor on either side is going out and getting their animal properly vaccinated, properly taken care of, veterinarian care taken of, and then the neighbor in the middle has got three animals that he feeds but takes no responsibility towards those animals, or the care, health, and safety and welfare of his neighbors. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I understand the intent, but I want to flip it over to like human terms. It's almost like saying you can see a starving kid walking by, you feed him, he's your kid and, you know, you're responsible or whatever. It takes the compassion out of society as far as concern of animals, you know. I mean, the first thing kids do, they see an animal and it appears to be hungry, they want to help the animal and feed the animal and, you know, most of us, as compassionate humans, tend to do the same thing as far as people, if we can help out. And I understand the intent, but I don't know the solution, so I'm sorry I'm

bringing it up. I wish I did, but that's just -- I don't know, Harris kind of said it, summed it up in one word a minute ago, and he may share that in a minute, I don't know, but it's just not good, in my opinion, I don't think.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Stone.

Commissioner Stone said, this really is a problem. I don't think -- maybe some of my fellow Commissioners realize this, but this was a battle that we had with the Humane Society for years and years and years. These animals that are being fed out of the goodness of people's hearts, they're not being vaccinated for rabies, they're out there able to reproduce and reproduce and reproduce. They're not being spayed or neutered. And then this problem just gets rampant, and these poor animals -- I understand that people want to do this out of the goodness of their heart, but if they really want to do it out of the goodness of their heart, they need to maybe get ahold of the animal and take them to the Humane Society, where the animal could be put up for adoption, or at least some people I know do take the time to take these animals and have them at least spayed and neutered, if they want to continue to feed them and take care of them on their own premises. But I wish you all could see the results of what happens when people do continue to feed animals. I think this was a big problem for years on Tybee Island and now I understand that some of these animals are around the Skidaway boat ramp, people are coming and feeding them and, you know, if rabies becomes a problem in that area, these animals can carry rabies. It's just a bad situation, and I would encourage people that if they really want to do something out of the goodness of their heart, to take the animal to an animal organization or to a veterinarian, have the animal spayed or neutered, have it vaccinated, so it is not a threat, a health threat to this community.

Mr. Hart said, Commissioner Stone raises the issue that was repeated by most of the people who wish to have this provision, primarily to the ferrel cat population on the islands community. We're very fortunate in this community to have an abundance of wild life, and unfortunately we have wonderful, cute raccoons, but many of them are rabid. And when these cats are getting fed, there is a competition for that food and sometimes fights ensue and as a result of that, you end up with these very cute little animals that are very, very rabid. Commissioner Stone said, that's what I say. You know, I mean, I think it's great when people want to look out for animals and feed them, but if you're going to take that responsibility, then please go the extra step. Have the animal vaccinated. There are animal agencies here that help pay for the cost of spaying and neutering these animals, and that's great, if that's your choice. If not, please take the animal to an organization that can properly deal with the animal so that it does not become a threat, health threat, to the human population.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, what would be wrong with possibly the ordinance then to go with what Commissioner Gellatly said? Because I don't care how many somebody has in their house, either. If they want a hundred in their house, it's fine with me, let them have what they want, but limit the number they can have outside to two or three and above that, anything -- when Animal Control or whatever is called out and the person claims that it's not theirs, that animal will have to go, that cat will have to go to the Humane Society or to Animal Control at that point. What about something like that? Commissioner Stone said, I can also respond to that. During my time on the Humane Society, there was a situation where we had an individual, a lady who had over a hundred cats in her home, and she, I honestly believe, had some health issues herself. She moved out unexpectedly, left all these animals in there, and if my memory serves me correctly, the media had to go in there with gas masks -- not the media, the police and Animal Control, with gas masks, and clean all this up, and it was a terrible threat to the neighborhood, the odor, and I believe some of the animals may have even died in there. I can't remember the whole situation, but -- Commissioner Kicklighter said, I don't mean this mean, and I know this sounds smart-alecky, but some parents have left their kids in the cars, but we can't limit the number of kids that people can have. Commissioner Stone said, I understand, and I realize that's an unusual situation.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, if they keep them inside, away from others, I'm talking about, now, I understand not a hundred cats in one yard, on your neighbor's cars, everywhere, but if it's in the house, I mean, that was horrible, but there's probably a lot of people out there with five cats in the house that they treat them like family members. Commissioner Stone said, and I agree. Commissioner Kicklighter said, and I'll take this one step further. When I was Mayor, we dove into this animal ordinance stuff and, all of a sudden, there was a -- about a 90-year old couple that had had a chicken in their house for, I don't know how many years. That was their pet. I mean, it sat up there with the woman and, honestly, the people were in tears when the ordinance changed and they were going to have to lose their family member from the ordinance. And I mean, basically that's what it was. And thank goodness, to shorten the story, it was grandfathered in, so they got to keep it, but that's the kind of stuff if we go overboard with the ordinance, as far as people's pets and their loved ones inside. It's just kinda violating their rights, and I understand it's a fine line from violating one's ownership rights to violating your neighbor's rights or your property rights, but in my opinion, if it's not hurting the neighbors, leave people alone and get government out of people's lives.

Chairman Liakakis recognized Commissioner Odell.

Commissioner Odell said, I just want to have the court reporter to give me a copy of that chicken story. I just enjoyed that. Are we going to beat these to death? Have you got very much more to go? Mr. Hart said, I'm done.

Chairman Liakakis said, we need to be responsible on the number of cats inside a home. Over the years, and I'm telling you, over the years, and if you talk to the Animal Control officers, they can tell you this, because it hasn't got out in the news media, but they have had to contend with it, that because of the unsanitary conditions those pets suffered inside their house when they had multitudes of cats. For example, somebody has 20 cats in the house, they have 30, 40, 50, 60 cats in the house, it's almost impossible, you know, to keep them clean and to make sure they're fed properly and to have healthy conditions inside the house, so we need to be reasonable about that. Of course, all the Commissioners have a right when we come up, that's one of the alternatives, if we're going to put no limitation on the amount of cats in a house or there's going to be, we can discuss that, but, really, we need to be reasonable, because a lot of animals have suffered inside homes in our own community over the years. All right, that's it as far as the animal. We've had that discussion.

#### ACTION OF THE BOARD:

No action was required at this meeting.

=====

#### **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 Liakakis said, I want everybody to look over their Action Calendar again. I've got three items that we're going to hold before we vote. If there are any others, let me know. Item 6, 11(h), and 10. Commissioner Gellatly said, did you say you've got 8? Chairman Liakakis said, no, I don't have 8. Do you want to pull out 8? Okay. Commissioner Kicklighter said, 5 and 7. Chairman Liakakis said, okay, we're going to discuss Items -- instead of 6 -- 5, 7, 8, 10, and 11. All other Action Calendar items, we can vote on. Do I hear a motion on that?

#### ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Thomas said, move for approval, Mr. Chairman, all other items. Commissioner Kicklighter seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

=====

1. Approval of the minutes for the pre-meeting and regular meeting of June 10, 2005, as mailed. **Note: Due to illness of Clerk of Commission, minutes of the June 10, 2005, meeting are not yet available.**
2. Claims vs. Chatham County for the period June 2 through June 15, 2005.
3. Request from Thomas & Hutton Engineering Company, engineer for the developer, Southbridge Development Company, to record the subdivision plat for Southbridge at Berwick, Tract F, Phase 2B, approve the constructed improvements, accept the subdivision maintenance agreement and financial guarantee, initiate the one-year warranty period, and combine this phase into the existing streetlight assessment district.  
[District 7.]
4. Request Board authorize Chairman to sign letter in support of a grant that will provide funding for interoperable law enforcement radio communications for Chatham, Effingham and Bryan Counties.
5. Request Board approve a resolution to support an application for grant assistance offered through the Nonpoint Source Management Program administered by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division, to provide the local matching share in the amount of \$200,000 and to authorize the Chairman to sign all documents pertaining to the grant.  
[All districts.]

Chairman Liakakis said, Item Number 5, Dean.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, Russ, I'd just like a little info on 5. Mr. Abolt said, this is very innovative. I'm proud of what Mr. Bungard and Mr. Uhl have done. This is a project that was led, I know, by Commissioner Odell, having to do with West Lake drainage improvements and now we're looking at the acquisition of some private property at one time, a pond, and we're looking to possibly create a storm drainage detention basin out of it and use the grant money.

## ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Kicklighter said, motion to approve. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Thomas. The motion carried unanimously.

=====

6. Request Board grant request for tax refund of Savannah Italian Club for tax year 2004 on property located on Livingston Avenue in the amount of \$3,517.80 (PIN 10295-01-020).  
[District 3.]
7. Request Board adopt a resolution ratifying issuance of the DSA 2005 Series Bonds.

Chairman Liakakis said Item Number 7.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, thank you. An audience member asked that the item be read. Chairman Liakakis read Item 7. Commissioner Kicklighter said, one question, is this what was previously voted on that added in the projects? Mr. Abolt said, this is to recognize the actual sale of the bonds at a little over 4% interest. Commissioner Kicklighter said, and included the additional projects? Mr. Abolt said, everything you said, yes, sir. Commissioner Kicklighter said, thank you, I won't make a motion, somebody else can.

## ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Motion was made by Commissioner Gellatly and seconded by Commissioner Farrell. The motion passed, with Chairman Liakakis, and Commissioners Stone, Holmes, Farrell, Odell, Gellatly, and Thomas voting yes, and Commissioners Shay and Kicklighter voting no.

=====

8. Request Board approval to waive Aquatic Center fees for Chatham County Summer Camp participants.

Chairman Liakakis read Item 8.

Commissioner Gellatly said, I just have an observation that once we start waiving fees, why, it will set the precedent, that as my colleague, Commissioner Kicklighter has pointed out, that Aquatic Center loses money on a good day, and also, I question the fact if you're able to afford to go to camp or if you're able to go to camp, you won't pay a fee; on the other hand, if you're an individual, you have to go in there and pay a fee. I'm just pointing that out. Mr. Abolt said, if I may on this one, this is the County Summer Camp program, which is provided gratis. Commissioner Gellatly said, oh, the County? Commissioner Thomas said, county program. Mr. Abolt said this is the county program and, in the past we've done it, but we've done it administratively, and the auditors said we shouldn't be doing it administratively, we should come to you all for approval. Commissioner Gellatly said, so that's just one camp that these funds are -- Mr. Abolt said, that's correct. Commissioner Thomas said, that's correct.

#### ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Gellatly said, I make a motion for approval. Commissioner Thomas said, second. The motion was carried unanimously.

=====

9. Request from Tax Commissioner's Office for the Board to instruct the Board of Assessors to do an Account Correction for the 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 Leasehold Improvement property tax assessment on PIN #60827-01005L of Lillie M. Oliver or approve the Tax Commissioner's Office to conduct a write-off of the same years in question.  
[District 7.]
10. For information, presentation of the 2005 tax digest to the Board.

Chairman Liakakis said, Item 10, Mr. County Attorney. An audience member asked that the Chairman read Item Number 10. Chairman Liakakis said, the County Manager is going to explain it and that's why I didn't read it. Thank you.

Mr. Abolt said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is presented at this juncture for your information. This is on schedule for your adoption of the digest come the 8th of July. As you know, Ms. Snider and her staff have done a yeoman's job in getting this all together, but this recognizes the work of the Board of Assessors and Staff, and it'll be before you for action on the 8th for adoption. It must be in Atlanta by the end of the month of July but, again, we feel that not only has the job been done, but it's done in such time that it can be provided for you in advance and then you may vote positively hopefully on the 8th of July. Chairman Liakakis said, this is just an information item,

this is not to vote. Commissioner Kicklighter said, okay, this just confirms that they've finished with their digest? Mr. Abolt said, we're just giving it to you two weeks in advance of your action.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Chairman Liakakis said, okay, there's no vote on that.

=====

11. 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. Sand and gravel with installation	Aquatic Center	Year Round Pools (Sole Source)	\$12,566	General Fund/M&O - Aquatic Center
B. Evidence Presentation System "Elmo" with installation	Juvenile Court	Remote Technologies of Savannah (Sole Source)	\$29,583	General Fund/M&O - Juvenile Court
C. Structural rehabilitation and painting of the parking garage	Facilities Maintenance	E & D Contracting Services (Sole Source)	\$224,310	Parking Garage Reserve Fund
D. Professional engineering and design services for Pipemakers Canal Improvements, Bridge Removal and Sheet Pile Wall Modification at the Georgia Ports Authority Project	SPLOST	Moffat & Nichol	\$181,400	SPLOST (1998-2003) - Pipemakers Canal Drainage Project
E. Telephone system with 52 telephones	District Attorney	Integrated Network Solutions (Sole Source)	\$11,335	General Fund/M & O - District Attorney

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DEPT.</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
F. 18 computers and eight (8) laptop computers	ICS	Dell Marketing (State Contract)	\$49,504	General Fund/M & O - Communications
G. Annual contracts for the purchase of gasoline and diesel fuel	Various	•The Sommers Company •Barrett Oil Company	Varies by item	•General Fund/M & O - Various •SSD - Various
H. Annual contract with automatic renewal options for four (4) additional one year terms to provide elevator maintenance and repair services	Facilities Maintenance and Operations	Otis Elevator Company	\$26,940	General Fund/M & O - Facilities Maintenance and Operations
I. Two (2) servers	Juvenile Court	Dell Marketing (State Contract)	\$10,903	General Fund/M & O - Juvenile Court
J. Three (3) servers	Detention Center	Dell Marketing (State Contract)	\$21,430	General Fund/M & O - Detention Center
K. Repair of the UPS system in computer room	ICS	Nationwide Power Systems	\$10,892	General Fund/M & O - Communications
L. Annual software maintenance agreement	Assessor	ESRI, Inc. (Sole Source)	\$13,100	General Fund/M & O - Assessor
M. Folder/sealer with cabinet and conveyor, this includes installation and training	Finance	Florida Micro	\$10,950	•General Fund/M & O - Finance - \$5,475 •Water & Sewer - \$5,475
N. Excavator	Solid Waste	L.B. Smith	\$156,875	Solid Waste Enterprise Fund

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DEPT.</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
O. Extend on a "month to month" basis, for annual generating lease of office space located in the Courthouse Annex	Court Administrator	First Judicial Administrative District	\$603.16 per month	Revenue Producing
P. Sports lighting at Concord Park Field	Parks and Recreation	Musco Lighting	\$45,000	CIP - Seris 1999 - Bond Fund (pending Board approval of transfer)
Q. Installation of sports lighting at Concord Park Field	Parks and Recreation	Raybey Utilities, Inc.	\$29,900	CIP - Series 1999 - Bond Fund (pending Board approval of transfer)

=====

11(h). Chairman Liakakis said, all right, on Item 11, where we request Board approval to award bids as follows and we have a request on (h) from Commissioner Shay. Would you go over that one?

Commissioner Shay said, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to request with my fellow Commissioners' forbearance, is that Item 11(h) be tabled until the next meeting. I've spoken with Mr. Kaigler, and I'd like to learn a little bit more about the elevator maintenance contract before it's awarded, and he indicated that that's not going to be a problem, for that to be delayed by two weeks.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Shay moved that 11(h) be tabled, Commissioner Kicklighter said, second. Chairman Liakakis said, okay, we have a motion on the floor and a second to hold this off until the next meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

=====

**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.

On first reading, presentation by MPC staff and discussion only by Commissioners will be heard. 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. Amendment to Article VII of the Chatham County Taxation and Revenues Ordinance to add Section 7-707 in order to change the deadline for the filing of personal and real property returns from April 1 to March 1.
2. Adopt a new Ethics Ordinance.

Chairman Liakakis said, we have some first readings, and there will be no vote. He read Item 1. Chairman Liakakis said there's no discussion and no vote on that today; when we come up for the second reading, we'll have that.

=====

**XII. SECOND READINGS**

1. The petitioner Max Cooper, Agent (for Ted Coy and Jim Klutz, Owners) is requesting to re-zone 7840 U.S. Highway 80 East from a T-B/EO (Tourist Business/Environmental Overlay) classification to a P-I-P/EO (Planned Institutional Professional/Environmental Overlay) classification and approval of a change of the Islands Future Land Use Map from Commercial Retail to Commercial Office.  
MPC File No. Z-050422-56959-1  
[District 4.]

Chairman Liakakis asked Commissioner Farrell if he had any comments and Commissioner Farrell said, no.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Motion to approve was made by Commissioner Farrell, seconded by Commissioner Shay, and the motion carried unanimously.

=====

2. The petitioner Trent Long, Agent (for Smith-Mackey Family, Owner and Petitioner) is requesting re-zoning 163 Red Gate Farms from a R-A (Residential-Agriculture) zoning classification to a PD-R-S-M (Planned Development-Reclamation-Surface Mining) zoning classification. The MPC recommended approval in conjunction with a General Development Plan in accordance with Section 4-6-8.  
MPC File No. Z-050323-36479-1  
[District 8.]

Chairman Liakakis asked if any Commissioner wanted the MPC to explain that. Commissioner Kicklighter said, no, sir, but I want to correct the record and say that's District 5, not 8. Chairman Liakakis asked Commissioner Thomas if she wanted to comment and she said no. Commissioner Odell said, this is District 5? Commissioner Kicklighter said, Red Gate, yeah, on the other side of 17, sir.

#### ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Motion to approve was made by Commissioner Stone, seconded by Commissioner Holmes, and the motion carried unanimously.

=====

### **XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

1. Progress report on General Fund Contingency Account - M & O and the Special Service District (see attached).
2. List of purchasing items between \$2,500 and \$9,999 (see attached).

=====

Chairman Liakakis said, we have items to come up in Executive Session. Mr. Abolt said, for the purpose of litigation and land acquisition.

Chairman Liakakis said, John Pierce, do you want to come up to the microphone? Commissioner Kicklighter said, Commissioner Gellatly has a point before we go. Commissioner Gellatly said, we're not going to discuss that item that I talked to you about before? Chairman Liakakis said, no. What we're going to do is invite them to discuss it. Commissioner Gellatly said, that'll be fine, thank you.

John Pierce said, thank you very much. Thank you very much. I want to tell you this is my first speech. You all work together and everything else, you know. You have a plan. Pete will have a plan. He's going to make it one day. Pete Liakakis, all the Board, because if it wasn't for you all, I wouldn't be here today. I want to say, I pray for you all and ask God to help you. And thank you, a million and one things. I always say, believe with yourself. I'm planning on going to Atlanta pretty soon. And I hate to leave you all to go to Atlanta, but whenever I leave, I'm going with people like you all. Thank you. And finally, also the courthouse staff, because the County Commissioners and all the County, all of them, they got together and Mr. Holloway, the county police, they're hard working, hard. Every day, they're working. I hate to leave Pete. May God bless you wherever I go, may God bless you. Chairman Liakakis said, well, congratulations, and may you be blessed and have a safe trip. Thank you.

=====

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Upon motion being made by Commissioner Farrell and seconded by Commissioner Thomas, the board recessed at 11:25 a.m. to go into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing litigation and land acquisition.

=====

Following adjournment of the Executive Session, the meeting of the Board of Commissioners was reconvened at 12:20 p.m.

=====

ITEMS FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION:

- XIV. Request settlement authority for Chatham County v. 0.137 Acres of Land; James W. Holland; William S. Hitch; Paula C. Denitto; John D. Weibe; Clifford J. Berger; Joseph W. Dehaven; E. S. Yeager, and Bankers First Federal Savings & Loan Association (as successor to Bank South, N.A.), Individually, Civil Action No. CV99-0258-KA in the Superior Court of Chatham County, Georgia, Project No. Stephenson Avenue Widening (Jon Hart, Charlie Barrow).

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Kicklighter moved approval of a settlement in the amount of \$18,225. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Thomas and by the motion carried unanimously.

=====

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 Kicklighter moved approval, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Farrell and the motion was carried unanimously.

=====

There being no further business, the Board Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

APPROVED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pete Liakakis, Chairman of the Board of  
Chatham County Commissioners

\_\_\_\_\_  
Barbara B. Wright, Acting Clerk, for  
Sybil E. Tillman, Clerk