

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA, HELD ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2010, IN THE COMMISSION MEETING ROOM ON THE SECOND FLOOR OF THE CHATHAM COUNTY COURTHOUSE, LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, 124 BULL STREET, SAVANNAH, GEORGIA.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Pete Liakakis called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., Friday, February 26, 2010.

=====

II. INVOCATION

Commissioner Priscilla D. Thomas gave the Invocation.

=====

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Patrick Shay led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

=====

IV. ROLL CALL

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Pete Liakakis, Chairman
 Dr. Priscilla D. Thomas, Vice Chairman, District Eight
 B. Dean Kicklighter, Chairman Pro Tem, District Seven
 James J. Holmes, District Two
 Patrick Shay, District Three
 Patrick K. Farrell, District Four
 Harris Odell, Jr., District Five
 David M. Gellatly, District Six

Absent: Helen L. Stone, District One

Also present: R. E. Abolt, County Manager
 Jonathan Hart, County Attorney
 Sybil E. Tillman, County Clerk

=====

CHATHAM COUNTY YOUTH COMMISSIONERS

Chairman Liakakis introduced the Youth Commissioners who were in attendance: Robin Laguerre, a Sophomore at Beach High School, and Jazmine Paige, a Senior at Windsor Forest High School.

=====

ANNOUNCEMENT ON ITEM REGARDING WEIGHTLIFTING CENTER

Chairman Liakakis said, I see we have some people in the audience and I want to let those know that might be here for the item of the Weightlifting Center, the Commission has given us information that they would like to continue it on the table, so if there is anybody that is here specifically for that item, it's going to be requested to stay on the table today and there will be no discussion on that item.

=====

V. PROCLAMATIONS AND SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

None.

=====

VI. CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS

None.

=====

VII. COMMISSIONERS' ITEMS

1. REQUEST FROM AWOL (ALL WALKS OF LIFE) (COMMISSIONER SHAY AND COMMISSIONER HOLMES).

Commissioner Shay said, I'll lead off. Is that alright, James [Holmes]? Commissioner Holmes said, fine. Commissioner Shay said, this is a program, All Walks of Life, that exists and its purpose is to help young people who are struggling with the law to be successful and helping them to understand their better angels, their creativity, developing work skills and helping them to decide to join in with the rest of society in pulling their own weight. I've seen the program up close. I know some of you have also seen the literature or perhaps attended some of their performances, but this is career related. It's not just a feel-good program, and we have evidence submitted by the judge — Chief Judge of the Juvenile Court that they have been successful in the past in helping that might otherwise be committed to become successful young people and move on without needing to get back into the system of incarceration later on. The reason I'm asking that we invest \$25,000 in this is beyond the humanist reasons that it's going to help young people turn around their lives, although that's very important, I think, to all of us. It's because for the taxpayers and for the people who are spending an awful lot of money in and out of juvenile detention and then later on, unfortunately, adult incarceration systems to the tune of somewhere between 45 and \$75,000 a year, depending on whether you include the mortgage on the capital improvements, this \$25,000 would be able to be a pretty handsome return on investment for the taxpayers, so I'm asking that that be linked to a program to identify a minimum of two, hopefully many more, young people who are otherwise about to be committed and working through their existing programs to help these young people stay out of the other side of the system. And this would be a kind of a pilot program. We would have the opportunity to observe how it works and monitor its success, and if it is successful, it might be something that we want to continue investing in in the future. And I'll defer to Commissioner Holmes, also an advocate.

Commissioner Holmes said, I want to first thank you. Working with youth all my years, every place I usually go, you hear people say, why don't we prevent, so I want to talk about the preventive program that AWOL is doing. You know, when you talk to most all of the judges and all of the court system, applaud this group for what it does, and I noticed this past week or so, we talked about our design for the jail and we just had a ribbon cutting on Montgomery Street, I remember when I first came on, I told St. Lawrence I was going to try to put him out of business. Well, that didn't work. But dealing with AWOL, it has proven that this is very much a preventive program and a preventive group, so the 25,000 that we are asking to invest into these young kids, it's a drop in the bucket to what we incarcerate for.

Commissioner Shay made a motion to take \$25,000 from the General Fund M&O Contingency Fund for this year and invest it in AWOL (All Walks of Life), with some kind of a contract along the lines of what has been discussed today. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion with a comment.

Commissioner Thomas said, I think it's a very fine program. It's one that deals with the so-called older kids. I just want to remind you that the Summer Bonanza Program has dealt with the preventive side with juvenile justice through Judge Beam for several years and we have been into the schools and we have prevented a lot of things and we have taken young people and put them on the right track, so I think that what you're doing now is just an extension of what we have been trying to do, and I think it's a wonderful program, so with that said, I second the motion.

Chairman Liakakis said, let's go on the board. The motion carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone and Kicklighter were not present.]

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Shay made a motion to approve the donation of \$25,000 from General Fund M&O for this year to AWOL (All Walks of Life) with some kind of a contract along the lines of what has been discussed today.

Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone and Kicklighter] were not present.

=====

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. ITEMS WERE TABLED AT THE JANUARY 29, 2010, MEETING. SEE ADDITIONAL REPORT FROM THE COUNTY ATTORNEY. ALSO INCLUDED IS INFORMATION ON THE RFP FROM ABILITIES UNLIMITED THAT DOES NOT MEET SPECS.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DEPT.</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
A. Annual contract with automatic renewal options for four (4) additional one (1) year terms to provide operation and management services for the Anderson-Cohen Weightlifting Center	Weightlifting Center	Team Savannah	\$96,000	General Fund/M&O - Weightlifting Center
B. Annual contract with automatic renewal options for four (4) additional one (1) year terms to provide janitorial services for the Anderson-Cohen Weightlifting Center	Weightlifting Center	Right Solutions Janitorial Service (MBE)	\$14,358	General Fund/M&O -Weightlifting Center

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

- a. Commissioner Odell moved to remove these items from the table for discussion by the Commissioners. Commissioner Kicklighter seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Stone was not present.]
- b. Commissioner Kicklighter moved to table Items VIII-A and VIII-B. Commissioner Odell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Stone was not present.]

AGENDA ITEM: VIII-1
AGENDA DATE: March 26, 2010

DATE: February 25, 2010
 TO: R. E. Abolt, County Manager
 FROM: R. Jonathan Hart, County Attorney
 SUBJECT: Anderson-Cohen Weightlifting Center

Russ, see the informational memo from Misty Selph, Recreation Manager, outlining staff's meeting with the Board of Education. The Board of Education, as a result of an attempt by one of the vendors to charge for services that had previously been provided for free, sent a request for proposal inquiring about alternative service providers. The request for proposal response is due March 4, 2010.

It is County's staff understanding that two of the vendors at the weightlifting center (Team Savannah and Abilities Unlimited) will submit proposals to the BOE. The County does not have, as part of its current proposed contract with these vendors, a contract provision to allow the vendors to provide the scope of services to outside third parties.

The question raised by staff is whether a County vendor may subcontract the use of the weightlifting center to a third party (Board of Education) without County consent. All County contracts prohibit vendors to subcontract without County consent. The short answer is no. However, the Board of Commissioners have the power to allow subcontracting should they choose.

County staff does not know the direction that the BOE will take as a result of the request for proposal, nor does it know the scope of contemplated services which the

BOE may request. This places the Board of Commissioners in the position of not knowing the terms necessary to permit a subcontract.

Should the Board of Commissioners continue to table this item to allow the BOE to receive its response on March 4th to its request for proposal? The tabling of this to the next meeting would allow County staff and the BOE staff to determine the direction of the BOE program. The County would have the opportunity should it desire to permit such subcontract to have provisions that are consistent with any scope of services which the BOE may contract.

RJH/jr

enclosure

TO: Jon Hart, County Attorney
 FROM: Misty Selph, Recreation Manager
 DATE: February 24, 2010
 RE: Anderson Cohen Weightlifting Center

County staff met with the Board of Education to discuss the continued use of the Anderson Cohen Weightlifting Center. Prior to this meeting, Abilities Unlimited had requested additional funding of \$25,000 from the Board to provide the Exceptional Students with a program. The Board discontinued sending those students to the Weightlifting Center approximately in November, 2009 due to the requested increase. In previous years, the County provided this program at no cost to the Board of Education. Currently, the Board of Education has an RFP out for bid that calls for a Facility and Program for their Exceptional Students. The bid opening date is March 4. County Staff proposed to the Board of Education that we continue to provide the program at no cost to the Board until the conclusion of this current school year 2009 – 2010. Beyond that, the two government entities would have to negotiate a formal written agreement.

The current proposals from Team Savannah and Abilities Unlimited does not include providing a program specific to the Board of Education. The question from staff is whether or not a contract vendor can sub-lease the Anderson Cohen Weightlifting Center to provide a program outside of the scope of their contract. Additionally, Abilities Unlimited does not own any equipment. All equipment is owned either by the County or Team Savannah. Please provide an opinion on this matter for staff.

Your advise and direction is greatly appreciated. Staff has already contacted both teams to let them know that they will have to gain permission to use the Anderson Cohen Weightlifting Center prior to submitting a bid. They are awaiting our opinion.

cc: Robert Drewry
 Al Lipsey

=====

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. TO REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING BUDGET AMENDMENTS AND TRANSFERS: (1) IN THE GENERAL FUND M&O TRANSFER \$18,000 WITHIN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT'S BUDGET FROM SALARIES TO CAPITAL OUTLAY AND CONTRACTED SERVICES.**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner KICKLIGHTER moved that the Board approve the following budget amendments and transfers: (1) In the General Fund M&O: transfer \$18,000 within the Finance Department's budget from salaries to capital outlay and contracted services. Commissioner Holmes seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Stone was absent.]

AGENDA ITEM: IX-1
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

TO: Board of Commissioners
THRU: R.E. Abolt, County Manager
FROM: Linda B. Cramer, Finance Director

ISSUE: To request approval of the following budget amendments and transfers: (1) in the General Fund M&O: transfer \$18,000 within the Finance Department’s budget from salaries to capital outlay and contracted services.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. The Finance department has identified a need to provide on-line utility bill payments. Part of the process to implement will require migrating to new servers. This is necessary for security reasons as well as development of web-based features.
2. The cost is estimated to be \$36,000 which will be divided between the ICS and Finance Departments. The Finance Director is requesting a transfer of \$18,000 from salaries to capital outlay and contracted services. Correspondence is attached.

FUNDING: Funds are available in the General Fund M&O for the transfer.

ALTERNATIVES:

- (1) That the Board approve the following:

GENERAL FUND M&O

Transfer \$18,000 within the Finance Department’s budget from salaries to capital outlay and contracted services.

- (2) Amend or deny the request.

POLICY ANALYSIS: State law grants the Board authority to amend the budget during the year as it deems necessary.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Board approve Alternative 1.

Prepared by: Read DeHaven

=====

2. REQUEST BOARD AUTHORIZE RESOLUTIONS PROVIDING INVESTMENT AUTHORITY AT VARIOUS FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT PURCHASES.

County Manager Abolt said, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Thomas, Gentlemen, there was a meeting called at the request of Commissioners Shay and Farrell to meet with the auditor and Ms [inaudible] and myself and there was some expression of interest by Commissioner Shay based on his experience at the Trade Center the way in which we commit to and use certificates of deposit. Ms. Cramer has responded to that meeting and is here to discuss how we would be doing that and extending to other lending institutions the opportunity to receive and issue certificates of deposit. Linda?

Ms. Cramer said, good morning. What we have done since the meeting, we actually were able to access the FDIC web site and pull up all the insured financial institutions between, I think, Bulloch County down to the coast in Georgia, and we’ve contacted, as far as I know, all those institutions and received quotes on CDs, so at this time, we have two – almost \$2.6 million in certificates of deposit. The interest rates on these are anywhere from 1.75 to – let’s see, we have a step-up CD, that hits about three and a half in a couple of years, so we’ve gotten a lot of differing rates. When we contacted institutions and received a rate that we thought was too low, we did not make any kind of investment.

Commissioner Shay said, thank you for the hard work that I know is involved in this. When we reviewed the comprehensive annual financial report, the CAFR, one of the things that you, in walking me through that, sort of like, you know, the education of [inaudible] here, trying to help me understand all the government finance, it seemed like the interest rate that we were earning at the present time was pretty darn low, and that was because we were investing in a very, you know, cautious way, and not an inappropriate way at all, but it was around 40

basis points. It was around .4% interest. And it seemed, to me, at least, given the fact that certificates of deposit at local community banks were able to pay a lot more than that, that it'd be a really, really great thing if we just took all that money and invested it in higher interest rates. But you helped me to understand that FDIC insurance only extends to the first \$250,000 of those CDs. Right?

Ms. Cramer said, right. Commissioner Shay said, it actually – we were hoping, Commissioner Farrell and I, that it would be something that would be not only a boon to us and to our taxpayers from a financial standpoint, but it might also help out our community banks, because, frankly, there's a banking crisis in this county, in this country. The banks are not able to make the kind of loans that they were able to in the past to successful businesses and successful developers and successful property owners, but a banking system is more complicated than I anticipated. The fact that you were able to identify \$2.5 million that we can get a better deal for our taxpayers on the money that we hold in our fund balances is a very good thing. I know it's going to be messier to administer and I appreciate the effort that goes into reaching out to dozens and dozens and dozens of banks in order to do that, but it's also going to be good for those community banks, and in times like this, we really have to be very careful to take care of our community and our community banks and our community taxpayers, to make sure that we're being cautious, as we should be, and not investing in credit default swap derivatives, that what we're doing is, we're investing in federally-insured instruments. But at the same time, we're getting a substantially better interest rate on those deposits and that will generate more flexibility for us on budgeting in the future. I'd like to thank Commissioner Farrell for being a part of this, and he probably wants to speak to it, too. I thought we were going to be able to save millions and make millions. It didn't turn out to be that robust, but I appreciate the fact that you guys worked with us to try and identify ways to do that. And I want you to know that we're going to continue to try and figure out how to be creative and make sure that our community has the benefit of our very best efforts at investment.

Commissioner Farrell said, there's nothing much I can add to that, so – but I do agree with everything that was said and appreciate everything that staff has done and hopefully, you know, some other banks will participate and help the County grow their reserve fund a little bit. Thank you.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Shay moved to authorize resolutions providing investment authority at various financial institutions related to certificate of deposit purchases. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [Commissioner Stone was absent.]

AGENDA ITEM: IX-2

AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

TO: Board of Commissioners

THRU: R.E. Abolt, County Manager

FROM: Linda Cramer, Finance Director

ISSUE: To authorize resolutions providing investment authority at various financial institutions related to Certificate of Deposit purchases.

BACKGROUND: Chatham County currently invests excess cash in the Georgia Fund 1, a liquid investment pool. The County also has Certificates of Deposit with First Chatham Bank, Darby Bank, Coastal Bank, Capitol Bank, Atlantic Bank and Sea Island Bank. In order to diversify the County's portfolio and to receive higher interest rates, more investments have been made in the purchase of Certificates of Deposit.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. Some institutions require formal resolutions to modify investment authorizations. As a result, Finance is asking for formal board approval of the resolutions.
2. In accordance with the County's adopted Investment Policy and applicable state laws and regulations, the Finance Director, under the supervision of the County Manager, is responsible for ensuring the management of the County's investments. In discharging her duties, the Finance Director or designated Finance staff may directly assist in managing the County's investments.
3. Attached is a listing of the recent Certificate of Deposit purchases. The Savannah Bank, The Heritage Bank, Bryan Bank & Trust, and Carver State Bank need formal resolutions which are also attached.

FUNDING:

N/A

POLICY ANALYSIS: The authorization is consistent with the Chatham County Investment Policy.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Approve resolutions providing investment authority at the attached financial institutions.
2. Provide staff with other direction.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Alternative 1.

The following need formal resolutions:

<u>Name of Institution</u>	<u>Date of Purchase</u>	<u>Amount of Purchase</u>
Savannah Bank	01/22/2010	\$ 240,744.95
Heritage Bank	02/11/2010	240,000.00
Carver State Bank	02/12/2010	240,000.00
Bryan Bank & Trust	02/11/2010	240,000.00

Other purchases (not needing resolutions):

Atlantic Southern Bank	02/11/2010	240,000.00
First Southern National Bank	02/11/2010	240,000.00
Workmen's Circle Credit Union	02/19/2010	240,000.00

=====

- 3. REQUEST BOARD CONVEY TO THE GEORGIA INTERNATIONAL MARITIME TRADE CENTER AUTHORITY A SECTION OF PARCEL 7 ON HUTCHINSON ISLAND FOR THE RIVERWALK EXTENSION.
[DISTRICT 3.]**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Shay said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that Item 3 be tabled for a time certain two weeks so that we can facilitate a meeting of the minds over how to best handle Parcel 7 on Hutchinson Island regarding the Trade Center and Chatham County. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [Commissioner Stone was absent.]

**AGENDA ITEM: IX-3
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010**

From: Pat Monahan
To: Pshay@GMSHay.com
CC: markmulberry@aol.com, Liakakis, Russ Abolt,
Date: 2/25/10 1:31 PM
Subject: Re: Riverwalk Conveyance

Pat, I would suggest the item remain on the agenda, and the Board approve but subject to agreement of the Trade Center Authority. The Attorney General's Office needs direction ASAP on preparing the documents. I would rather approve and rescind based on outcome of our meeting of the minds rather than delay two more weeks.

-----Original Message-----

From: "Pat Shay" <Pshay@GMSHay.com>
 Cc: Mark Smith <markmulberry@aol.com>
 To: Pat Monahan <PCMonaha@Chathamcounty.org>
 Cc: Pete Liakakis <Pete Liakakis@Chathamcounty.org>
 Cc: Russ Abolt <REAbolt@Chathamcounty.org>
 Cc: Bob Coffey <BCoffey@SavTCC.com>

Sent: 2/25/2010 12:17:15 PM
 Subject: Riverwalk Conveyance

Pat,

I spoke with chairman Mark Smith today regarding this (burning) issue. I would like to request that this item be pulled from our agenda until

we have a real meeting of the minds. I think Jon Hart should be involved in this, and later, Tom Gray, as counsel for the Trade Center.

Patrick Shay
Chatham County Commissioner

-----Original Message-----

From: Pat Shay
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2010 9:22 AM
To: 'Pat Monahan'
Subject: Re: Riverwalk Conveyance

Thanks, Pat, Chairman Mark Smith is more concerned about whether the armoring of the edge of Slip 3 becomes a "Trade Center" project to manage and administer, or is a "County" project. So far Bob Coffey seems to have been the quarterback, but I don't know who will actually be the contracting entity for improvements. Thoughts?

Pat

Patrick Shay, LEED AP, AIA
President
Pshay@GMShay.com
GUNN MEYERHOFF SHAY
architecture + urban design
www.savannaharchitects.com
p.912.232.1151
f.912.232.1992

"The earth belongs to the living, not to the dead."
-Thomas Jefferson

-----Original Message-----

From: Pat Monahan [mailto:pmonahan@Chathamcounty.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2010 8:07 AM
To: Pat Shay
Cc: Bcoffey@SavTCC.com
Subject: Riverwalk Conveyance

Patrick, on Friday's agenda, I have recommended the conveyance of the part of Parcel 7 where the riverwalk extension will be situated. As you know, the County will convey it to the Trade Center Authority, which in turn will convey it to the State of Georgia as a condition of receiving state bond funding. You and I spoke briefly some time ago about whether the County should convey all of its interest in Parcel 7 to the Trade Center Authority. I did not venture down that path with this particular item. I will leave it to your discretion on whether you want to pursue the conveyance of Parcel 7 to the Trade Center Authority. My previous reservations hinged on the Corps of Engineers' requirement for the property owner and permit holder to remain one and the same; however, for whatever reason, the Corps recognizes the Trade Center Authority as the permittee without the County's consent—although this may be because the regulatory division still associates me as the county's representative with the Slip 3 project since I attend all of the project meetings with the Corps. I also thought from protection of liability, the County under the Georgia Constitution can protect itself to a higher degree than an authority created by local act. In addition, should an issue arise with the property owner on the western side of Slip 3, the County would be in a stronger legal position (i.e. deeper pockets) to pursue. On your concern, whether the whims of a future GIMTCA Board could adversely affect Parcel 7's use and development for highest and best use (i.e. complementary to the Trade Center) remains an issue which I acknowledge as a potential point of conflict. This could be addressed as a reversion in the deed. Notwithstanding all of those points, maybe we just stick with the status quo. I have not discussed this issue with anyone but you and Bob, and I doubt anyone else considers it a burning issue. -Pat-

Patrick C. Monahan
Asst. County Manager
Chatham County
pmonahan@chathamcounty.org
Phone: (912) 652-7870
FAX: (912) 652-7874

=====

4. REQUEST BOARD CONFIRMATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE SCORECARD FOR THE DETENTION CENTER EXPANSION PROJECT.

County Manager Abolt said, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Thomas, Gentlemen, this is the next step leading us toward solicitation of bids on the detention center expansion. Mr. Kaigler and Robert James and others have participated actively in the scorecard for your critique and eventual approval of something that will be usable and get it to the point of what you want to do by way of involvement of local contractors in this overall project. Mr. Kaigler and Mr. James have brought to my attention the need to make two clarifications in the scorecard. They deal with clarification as to when the general contractor must be licensed, and we're saying the general contractor must be licensed in the State of Georgia prior to bidding, and then there's also an expression measuring experience in this type of very serious construction, namely, building jails, and the recommendation is that those that would qualify could qualify if, in the past eight years, they've constructed at least two detention/correctional facilities with a minimum of 500 beds each. Yesterday, Mr. Kaigler and I met with the Chairman and Ms. Taylor and I want to do now for your benefit that the staff may wish to have the flexibility on that 500 figure and make it slightly less. But the important thing is that when you adopt this in whatever form, this is amending the best value scorecard. What's going to happen now by the 11th of March, those that wish to compete will give us their pedigree. They will receive their grid. If they pass, then they move into that area where they can bid, and then when they bid and in the late Spring when we award the contract, it will be awarded purely on the opening of the envelope and the determination of the lowest responsible bid. Mr. Kaigler.

Mr. Kaigler said, good morning, Gentlemen. As the Manager indicated, we are recommending or making you aware of these amendments to the scorecard based on a meeting, a prequalification meeting that was held on January 27th, where all the potential contractors were present to get clarification and have questions answered concerning the scorecard. The big issue here that we need to look at in consultation with Sheriff's staff, engineering, purchasing staff, we felt that we needed a cut-off point to ensure that the contractor that we select has the adequate experience in building detention facilities. We initially said that we'd like to have a firm that within the past eight years have built a detention center – or two detention centers of at least 500 beds each. In talking with the Sheriff over the last day or two, we would like some flexibility in that 500 bed number. But other than that, we want to ensure that – and our primary goal is to ensure that we get a contractor to build this facility who has the adequate experience necessary for us to get a good project at the end.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, I'd like to ask a question. Mike, so the recommendation will still have a – are you lowering that from a 500 bed facility to two of them built within the last eight years, or –

Mr. Kaigler said, yes, sir, we're looking to lower it. Commissioner Kicklighter said to what? Mr. Kaigler said, probably 400 beds. Commissioner Kicklighter said, okay, how many 400 bed correctional facilities have been built in the United States in the last eight years? Mr. Kaigler said, there have been a number, and I don't have that handy. What we did was, after the prequalification conference, we looked at the qualifications of the firms that were represented and, based on that, we had a significant number who had built detention facilities of 4 to 500 beds or more. Commissioner Kicklighter said, so, within the last eight years, there's been at least a hundred built? Mr. Kaigler said, I wouldn't say a hundred, because these facilities aren't built that often, but I would say maybe twenty. Commissioner Kicklighter said, okay, so that part of this kinda concerns me.

Mr. Hart said, 400, to set that as a minimum, and the reason for that is, I don't want somebody to come in later and say we moved it to 350 and somebody else did it for four. I want everybody to qualify or not qualify. When you look at the number of people that we've got involved in it, 400 seemed like a number that generated a lot of competition. But you want it big enough so that it's a sophisticated contract, because, you know, you're building this while the jail's staying open. Commissioner Kicklighter said, okay, so right now, you have twenty people that would qualify at 400 and over, probably at least? Mr. Kaigler said, I'm not saying twenty. I'm saying when we looked at the individuals who represented, we probably had about ten that maybe could meet this criteria of building facilities. Now, that's not taking into consideration their bonding capacity and those kind of things, but people who actually have experience in building these types of facilities.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, just to not cut out too much competition, if a person had built two 200 bed facilities – Mr. Kaigler said, I don't know that someone – it's a big difference from a 200 bed facility and – Commissioner Kicklighter said, are we doing these in pods again, Sheriff? Sheriff St. Lawrence said, yes. It'll be precast as far as the new facility is concerned. Of course, there's a lot of renovation going on, as well. Commissioner Kicklighter said, how many beds are in each of your pods? Sheriff St. Lawrence, said, I think the beds now is up to 852 or something. This has been in the planning for 14 months. Don't eliminate no bidders over a hundred beds. Commissioner Kicklighter said, that's what I'm saying. Sheriff St. Lawrence said, what I'm saying is that whoever

that it looks like would be the low bidder, the best value, we still want to go look at what they did and know how they did it and is the people they did it for satisfied with the job they did. So, you know, there's a lot to go through. Commissioner Kicklighter said, so how many beds are in each pod in the proposed addition and the current ones, approximately? Colonel Holmes said, we have some dormitory settings and also some that are cells themselves, so it will be – some of them may have 84, 86, and some of them may have 56. Commissioner Kicklighter said, so there won't be any one pod with more than 400 or more? Mr. Holmes said, no, no, no.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, Patrick Shay, you're the expert and – Commissioner Shay said, I'm actually not. Commissioner Farrell took the initiative to go over there and get the grand tour and he's been explaining to me here this morning just by looking at this plan all the steps that are necessary in order to be able to do this. In my experience as an architect, this is pretty close to rocket science. I mean, somebody that built a 200 bed jail out in, you know, the country-side somewhere, this is like three or four quantum leaps above that in terms of complexity. I think they've got it right. I think they need to get somebody that's qualified, and you've got to remember that there are sadly hundreds and hundreds of these things that are built in the United States every day – not every day, every year, so I mean, it's not like there aren't a reservoir of qualified people who are out there. Commissioner Kicklighter said, I just didn't want to accidentally exclude some qualified – County Manager Abolt said, just get the ones to avoid and we get down and we award the contract, we're just rocking right along, and then they can't perform, and then they walk away. You think we have problems now, man, a contractor walking off the job because they can't do it. Mr. Hart said, we don't need to have that happening in the middle of the jail. Commissioner Kicklighter said, we'd have to put them in jail.

Commissioner Farrell said, I'd like to concur with staff. You know, I did spend a good amount of time out with the Sheriff's staff and our engineering staff and our folks and got a pretty in-depth immersion in this – what we're getting into. This is enormously complicated. Just moving the fence line around would make you dizzy in the schedule that's in here. This Commission does not need to get a contractor out here that is not a highly qualified professional. The fellow that built the bed in – the two or three beds in Mayberry, he can't make this quantum leap. There's just absolutely no way your construction professional skills can leap that far that fast, so I just want to concur with staff's recommendation that we really look for qualified experienced people because, otherwise, we're going to get ourselves into a mess that – as this thing progresses, if we don't have somebody that can start this job and finish it and finish it correctly. Thank you.

Mr. Hart said, for the record, you might put a minimum of 400 and competition for that, the degrees of sophistication that we feel comfortable with. Chairman Liakakis asked Sheriff St. Lawrence if he had any more comments on this, he or the Colonel? Sheriff St. Lawrence said, simply lowering it to 400 beds, I think, is a wise move. We don't want to eliminate any bidders that may have built 480 beds or 450 beds. There's a lot of expansion going on with jails, just like we're going through here, and they're expanding to 450 beds or maybe even 500, but we don't want to eliminate large companies. That will encourage more bids and probably get a better price out of it, that's all. Again, no matter who we look at that looks like the favorite in this thing, we want to know what they've done, how they did it, and is the people satisfied with what they did where they're at. You know, it's going to be a long process to go through. We've been planning for 14 months. Commissioner Kicklighter said, so are you saying reduce the number even further? Sheriff St. Lawrence said, no, no, no, I'm not saying that. I agree with the County Attorney and I agree with Mike Kaigler. I think 400 beds is a good cut line.

Commissioner Thomas said, Mr. Chairman, I believe one of our Youth Commissioners has a question. The Chairman called on Jasmine. She said, if all of these are filled, what would you do? Would you build another building or would you add more to it? Sheriff St. Lawrence said, actually, when I came on board in '92, we were opening up a 1224 bed facility and I thought that would be good for my lifetime, but it doesn't work out that way. You know, I can't control the population in the jail, and when you average 1750 over four or five, six years, you've got to expand, when you have people that don't have beds, you know. We do a lot of things that we shouldn't necessarily have to do, but between the federal courts and everybody else. we do them.

Commissioner Kicklighter moved to approve the request for confirmation of an amendment to the Scorecard for the Detention Center Expansion Project to include a minimum of 400 beds. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [Commissioner Stone was absent.]

Chairman Liakakis said, I'd like to comment on this. The County, we know, because of the overcrowding of the jail and what has happened with the federal court systems on overcrowding and all, we didn't want to place ourselves in a compromising position, but one of the things that's really concerned the County Commissioners is to prevent crime in our community. We have some programs just like with Commissioner Shay and Commissioner Holmes were talking about AWOL. That's a program to help reduce and prevent crime in our community, and that's really, really important, so at this particular point, we want to make sure that the citizens in our community fully understand that we're not just looking to load up the jails. Of course, those people that commit crimes and are serious offenders in our community, they have to be incarcerated, but hopefully, with some of the programs that we're doing, along with the City of Savannah and others, that we can prevent crime instead of filling the jails up.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Kicklighter moved to approve the request for confirmation of an amendment to the Scorecard for the Detention Center Expansion Project to include a minimum of 400 beds. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [Commissioner Stone was absent.]

AGENDA ITEM: IX-4**AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010**

TO: Board of Commissioners

THRU: R. E. Abolt, County Manager

FROM: Michael A. Kaigler, Director
Human Resources and Services

Issue: To request Board confirmation of an amendment to the scorecard for the Detention Center Expansion Project.

Background: at the December 4, 2009 Commission Meeting, Staff presented a draft scorecard to the Commission for their review and approval. Staff received comments and suggested changes from the Board with instructions to incorporate those changes into the proposed scorecard. This report provides a status of the best value contracting scorecard and requests confirmation of changes that were made to the best value scorecard.

Facts and Findings

1. A mandatory prequalification meeting was held on January 27, 2010. The purpose of this meeting was to provide information to potential bidders. There were approximately 29 firms of various size represented at the prequalification meeting. During the meeting some issues were raised by potential contractors. These issues concerned mainly the requirement that the general contractor be licensed in the State of Georgia prior to prequalification, local participation in regards to subcontractors and the type personnel the contractor is required to provide for the project.
2. In the questionnaire approved by the Board, there is a requirement that the general contractor be licensed in the State of Georgia prior to submittal of the best value scorecard questionnaire. To address the concerns raised by several of the contractors represented at the meeting, staff has recommended that the requirement be changed to reflect the requirement that the contractor must be licensed in the State of Georgia prior to bidding. This is consistent with state law and should increase the number of potential bidders on this project.
3. The original questionnaire assigned additional points to a contractor who has built correctional/detention facilities of similar size in the past. Staff is recommending that the criteria be added to the pass/fail section of the scorecard that requires that the prime contractor shall have constructed in the past 8 years at least two Detention/Correctional facilities of a minimum of 500 beds each.
4. To provide clarification on the required personnel for the project, staff has included in the addendum language that addresses this requirement in the statement of general conditions that will be a part of the bid specification.
5. The deadline for firms to submit their responses to the questionnaire is March 11, 2010. Once staff has scored the questionnaires a status report outlining the short list (firms that met the cut-off score) will be provided to the Board.

Funding: No additional funding is required at this time.

Alternatives:

1. Request Board confirmation of the changes to the Best Value Contracting scorecard for the Detention Center expansion project as listed below.
 - a. Add a requirement that the general contractor must be licensed in the State of Georgia prior to bidding.
 - b. Add to the pass/fail section a requirement that the prime contractor shall have constructed in the past 8 years at least two Detention/Correctional facilities of a minimum of 500 beds each
2. Provide Staff with other direction.

Policy Analysis: Recent changes in Georgia law provide increased flexibility in the delivery method for constructing projects. The decision about a preferred alternative depends upon the unique characteristics of each project, schedule, availability of

qualified subcontractors and suppliers, the local labor market and the public policy goals established by the Board.

Recommendation:

The Board adopt Alternative 1.

=====

5. REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO AON CONSULTING TO PROVIDE GROUP HEALTHCARE AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLAN CONSULTING SERVICES AT A COST OF \$90,000 PER YEAR.

Mr. Abolt said, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Thomas, Gentlemen, this is another [inaudible] we ask you to take to have some standing for the months and years ahead dealing with health care and the cost of health care to our employees and retirees. As you know, this past year, great success has been made through a wellness program which you initiated. The next step would be to employ the services of the consultant in this case, which would help us design, evaluate, and further implement innovations and cost-savings measures with our health plan. This is a request for proposal. This is not a low responsible bid. Mr. Kaigler and others have evaluated it and we sent you advance copy of the staff report. We're making a recommendation to employ the AON firm at a cost of \$90,000. We do point out that there's an issue on actual hours of service to be committed by the consultant, and that would vary based – if you look at the spreadsheet, on the hourly cost. In the words of Mr. Kaigler, this is the best choice for us, realizing this will be a commitment that will have budget impact this year and the year coming forward. Mike.

Mr. Kaigler said, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, as the Manager indicated, this is a project that we've been working on for some time. We issued an RFP. We received ten responses to our RFP. Staff rated the firms that submitted information and we had a short list of four firms. We brought the four firms in, interviewed, and we rated their interview. Subsequent to that, we asked for fees for a Year 1 service to provide consulting and benefit services to the County. When we got the fees in, the fees range from a low of 90,000 to almost 200,000. Because we had a wide disparity in the fees, we asked the firms to come back to us and give us anticipated number of hours they intend to spend on this project in Year 1 and give us an hourly cost, so we could have something to do an apples- to-apples comparison. As indicated in the staff report, those fees range from, there again, a low of 90,000 to a high of 170. What varied a great deal is the number of hours that each firm indicated that it would take on this project in Year 1. Based on that, we again contacted the firms and we got a commitment from each one that they could do the job for the fee that they indicated. I would note that we have one firm, local firm, that their hourly rate is \$170 an hour, which is the low hourly rate, but they felt it would take a whole lot more hours to adequately perform this service for Year 1. Based on that – and all four firms, I would add, they're national firms and they could do the work – based on that, the committee recommended AON for a cost of 90,000 for the first year.

Commissioner Farrell said, okay, I've got a few questions. Now, a couple weeks ago when this came up, you had recommended Wells Fargo and Wachovia. Is that right? A couple weeks ago, previous to what this recommendation is. Is that right? Mr. Kaigler said, well, we didn't recommend Wells Fargo. What we did was indicate the committee scored Wells Fargo – Commissioner Farrell said, the highest – Mr. Kaigler said, on the technical proposal. Commissioner Farrell said, okay. Mr. Kaigler said, when we got the fees in and we factored that in, it changed that recommendation. Commissioner Farrell said, okay, and you said a minute ago that – which concerned me a little bit – that the apparent low bidder, they gave you the hours they intend to spend. Is there any – that's pretty open-ended, because what I'm looking at is, we've got one firm that's charging \$170 an hour, but they think it's going to take a large number of hours, and we've got another firm that's \$105 an hour more, that says they can do it in a third of the time. You know, I just have to ask out loud, is there any cap on the number of hours, and are we going to get the services we need in that 327 hours? Because it's – obviously, if somebody can work three times faster than somebody else, then maybe they deserve another \$105 an hour for their service, but if we get into this low bid trap, where we give this firm, because they're the apparent low bidder, and then there's an open-ended context on the number of hours they work, so my question to you is, is where – what are the parameters of the number of hours for this apparent low bidder? Mr. Kaigler said, we would hold them to the number of hours that they anticipated, that they estimated it would take to perform the services that we specified in our Year 1 work plan.

Commissioner Farrell said, you would hold them accountable for that, and that would – the accountable would be, if it takes more hours than that to accomplish different methodology – Mr. Kaigler said, and that's one of the reasons we went back and tried to get a clarification, because the fees were just so far apart. We wanted to make sure we were getting apples-to-apples comparison. We wanted to make sure we were getting exactly what they indicated. Commissioner Farrell said, I've got some concerns. It sounds pretty open-ended. It just sets us up to come back for a change-order that says, you know, 327 hours isn't quite enough, how about, you know, we add on another 3 or 400 hours to get this job done? Now, we've got a vendor that's higher, and, you know, this is the classical bid low to get the job and then figure out how to make money on the back end. Commissioner Thomas said, right.

Commissioner Farrell said, and I'm a little concerned about that, especially if you said the other company was the local company and these other three, I'm assuming, are not local firms. Mr. Kaigler said, yes, sir, they are not local firms. Commissioner Farrell said, so we've got – you know, I'd hate to, and I'm just thinking out loud, I'd hate to

penalize the local guys for saying honestly, we think it's going to take a thousand hours, you know, we'll give you a good rate, we don't have to – you know, we don't have to travel to come here to work on your project, we're all right here. You know, is there any possibility of talking with the local firm and seeing if they could possibly do this with less hours? Because their rate is certainly much more favorable. Mr. Kaigler said, they've indicated that and there again, sir, we gave them a project and we didn't tell them how many hours you need to spend. We asked them what it's going to take, and that's what they gave us. Certainly, we could go back to the Wells Fargo. They've got the highest number of points on the technical proposal. We wanted to make sure we were – we were aware that the Board – initially when this was brought up, several of the Board members said we didn't want to spend an extravagant amount of money on this service, so we were – we took that into consideration when we were making that recommendation.

Mr. Abolt said, also, if I may, and I'll have Mr. Kaigler clarify, we're going to issue progress payments, so I mean, and the progress payments we base on work delivery. I mean, if they're not delivering the work, they're not getting paid. Mr. Kaigler said, correct. I think we've got a representative from Wells Fargo in the audience if you want to hear from them. Commissioner Farrell said, well, you know, as a Commissioner, I would hate to make a leap of faith going with the apparent low bidder, if there wasn't some assurances that, you know, that this wasn't going to go – you know, go over this amount of money. It seems like the other bidders were looking at, you know, roughly 500 hours. You know, I'm wondering if we shouldn't talk to Wachovia and say, hey, do you think you could get it done for around 500 hours or something and see what they say. Mr. Kaigler said, we could certainly go back and ask the firms to base it on the comparable hours and see what we've got from that. That's certainly something we could do. Commissioner Farrell said, thank you.

Commissioner Thomas was recognized and said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Michael, I have some of the same concerns that we've stated over and over about these change-orders. Mr. Kaigler said, yes, ma'am. Commissioner Thomas said, when we get low bids, mostly, they come back and it's almost double what they have bid the first time. Now, you know, we are for local participation. I'm a fanatic for that. Have you received in writing or this was a verbal notation that – Mr. Kaigler said, it was in writing, yes, ma'am. Commissioner Thomas said, where we can hold them, you know, to the fire as to not wanting to bring – come back before us with change-orders, you know, after change-orders. Mr. Kaigler said, yes, ma'am. Commissioner Thomas said, it would be multiple amount of money, more than that would have been done. okay? Mr. Kaigler said, yes, ma'am, I understand. We talked to them about that. But certainly, if it's the Board's desire, we can go back and try to do comparable hours, ask Wells Fargo what could they do for the hourly – estimated number of hours that was comparable to what the others estimated, approximately 500 hours. Commissioner Thomas said, I would feel better knowing that before I vote today, and I'm not prepared to vote today because of these unanswered questions. I want to make sure that they understand and that they are willing, you know, to not request change-orders after change-orders. Mr. Kaigler said, certainly, I could do that and if you want to table for two weeks, we could certainly do that and get it back to you at the next Commission meeting.

Commissioner Farrell said, yeah, I'd like to know two things. One, can they go from intentions to thou shalt not go over this amount of money, period, and also, I'd like to retalk to the local firm, because I, too, share a passion for keeping our local economy going and to see, you know, if you can work on these hours to make this a little more competitive, because I would certainly hate to punish somebody who thinks that, you know, they could take up to a thousand hours and then it only takes 800 hours or 600, and then you've got somebody else saying, well, it's only going to take me 350 hours but, really, I know I'm going to work this thing out, you know, while nobody's looking, I'm going to get it up to 7 or 800 hours and I'm going to make my lick. Mr. Kaigler said, yes, sir.

Commissioner Thomas said, and this is just a thought for in the future, because we have said it over and over and over, if you can get this finalized in your premeetings and all of that prior to bringing it to the County Commissioners, so that we won't have to have all these discussions about whether there will be change-orders and et cetera. Maybe in some cases, there will, but I mean, you know, I've seen it over and over and over, and I have questions about it. That's just my personal – Mr. Abolt said, we appreciate the feedback and for the benefit of the viewing audience, I want to make sure they understand that this is not a bid. This is a request for professional services. That's why the discussion you're having now and our ability to go back and talk to the proposers is legitimate. It is not open the envelope with more bids. Mr. Kaigler is coming this far because of the issue, yes, of local, but then have him come forward and say let's award it local, then you look at the disparity in cost and you say why. Commissioner Thomas said, okay.

Chairman Liakakis said, what is the proposed time element on this one? You know, we say – on this one, it says \$90,000 per year, but what is the proposed time element? Mr. Kaigler said, it's over a 12-month period. Chairman Liakakis said, just 12 months. Mr. Kaigler said, yes, sir. Chairman Liakakis said, so that means it gives us the ability to – you know, to stop the project if we're not getting what we're looking for. Mr. Kaigler said, yes, sir. We'd sign a 12-month agreement and after the first year, if it wasn't performing at a level that we'd like, then we could terminate the engagement. Mr. Abolt said, Mr. Chairman, because you're the one who would be asked to sign the documentation and progress payment, Mr. Kaigler always would guarantee there'd be no progress payments made unless work was complete. Chairman Liakakis said, no, we're not going to waste taxpayers' money like we did on another project that we're stuck with and cost the taxpayers in this community over \$250,000. When I brought that up, it shouldn't have been paid for in advance, because the work was not completed and I do not want to see this happen, and I know the Commissioners don't want to see it happen, either, where we pay somebody for work that hasn't been done. That's ridiculous. I don't care if we set up a schedule for payment. If they haven't, on that

schedule, completed the work, they're not going to get paid. Commissioner Thomas said, that's right. Commissioner Farrell said, do we need a motion to table this? Chairman Liakakis said, yes, we do.

Commissioner Farrell said, so moved. Commissioner Thomas said, second.

Chairman Liakakis said, let's go on the board. The motion carried unanimously. [Commissioner Stone was absent.]

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Farrell moved to table the request to award a contract to AON Consulting to provide Group Healthcare and Employee Benefit Plan Consulting Services at a cost of \$90,000 per year and bring it back at such time as the information requested is available. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [Commissioner Stone was absent.]

AGENDA ITEM: IX-5
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

TO: Board of Commissioners
 THRU: R. E. Abolt, County Manager
 FROM: Michael A. Kaigler, Director
 Human Resources and Services

ISSUE Request Board approval to award a contract to AON Consulting, to provide Group Healthcare and Employee Benefit Plan Consulting Services, at a cost of \$90,000 per year.

BACKGROUND: The County requires the services of a consultant to perform a full range of consulting services related to the evaluation, design, implementation, maintenance, communication and improvement of its benefit programs that are currently offered, or may be offered in the future to employees and retirees.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. A Request for Proposals (RFP) for Group Health and Employee Benefit Plan Consultant Services was issued, publicly advertised, and mailed to 21 firms, of which four (4) were local firms.
2. A Mandatory Pre-Proposal conference was conducted to discuss the specifications and resolve any questions or misunderstandings. There were 17 firms represented at the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference.
3. Ten firms responded to the RFP: MSI Benefits of Kennesaw, GA; Mercer, The Segal Company, and Aon Consulting of Atlanta, GA; ShawHankins of Cartersville, GA; Benalytics of Marietta, GA; Hay Group of Arlington, VA; Seacrest, Willis HR, and Wells Fargo of Savannah.
4. The technical proposals received were scored and ranked by an evaluation committee which consisted of the Human Resources and Services Director, the Finance Director, the Risk Manager, the Employee Benefits manager, the Employee Benefits Coordinator, Wellness Coordinator, and the Internal Auditor. A "shortlist" was established from the technical proposal evaluation that resulting in the following four firms: The Segal Company, Aon Consulting, Benalytics and Wells Fargo. The evaluation committee conducted interviews and scored the "shortlist" firms. Please refer to the matrix provided on page 3 for scoring details of the technical proposals and interviews.
5. As a part of the RFP document, staff provided the firms with a first year work plan that outlined items that staff wanted to be accomplished in year one of the contract, see attachment, page 4. Fee proposals were requested from all four firms. Each firm was required to state an annual total fee cost. The following represents the fees submitted to the County.

AON Consulting, Inc. Atlanta, GA	\$90,000
The Segal Company Atlanta, GA	\$91,440

Benalytics \$120,000
 Marietta, GA

Wells Fargo \$200,000
 Savannah, GA

- Due to the wide disparity in fees which range from \$90,000 to \$200,000, staff requested that each firm provide us with a estimated number of hours their firm would devote to Chatham County (based on the work plan), and cost per hour to ensure that we were evaluating the firms on the services offered to ensure that the consultants are providing us with a true cost based on the year one work plan. The following provides a chart that shows the estimated hours that each consultant proposes to devote to the year one work plan, estimated cost per hour with a total price. As noted in the chart several firms revised their pricing based on clarification and negotiation with staff.

FIRM	Wells Fargo/Wachovia	AON	Benalytics	Segal
Estimated Hours	1,000	327	514	456
Cost Per Hour	\$170	\$275	\$234	\$285
TOTAL	\$170,000	\$90,000	\$120,276	\$130,500

FUNDING: Health Insurance Fund

ALTERNATIVES:

- Board approval to award a contract to AON, to provide Group Healthcare Employee Benefit Plan Consulting Services, at a cost of \$90,000 per year.
- Provide staff other direction.

POLICY ANALYSIS: It is consistent with Board policy to award Consulting Services contracts to firms which rank the highest in a competitive sealed procurement process.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

September 22, 2009

Year 1 Work Plan

- Evaluate the County’s current Employee Health Plan and current provider(s) to identify and analyze cost drivers and potential cost savings for the County’s Plan to include the possibility of restructuring the contract with the current vendor or selecting a new vendor.
- Developing a Plan for an Employee Health Clinic
- Enhance the County’s worksite Wellness Program
- Work with County’s actuary to develop policy recommendations for managing and decreasing the County’s retiree OPEB liability e.g. increase eligibility standards, use of other insurance products, Retiree Medial Plan Management features (requires knowledge of County’s Defined Benefit Plan.)
- Develop and provide a medial plan document for Board of Commissioners approval to include, but not limited to describing plan benefits, structure, eligibility provisions, Wellness incentives.

Please note that this Year 1 Work Plan is for planning purposes only and subject to changes due to funding issues and other directions from the Board of Commissioners.

=====

6. CNT MONTHLY REPORT GIVEN VERBALLY BY DIRECTOR HARRIS.

Director Harris gave a verbal report for the month of January 2010, and said, Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Roy Harris from CNT, and I will be brief this morning. You've had a copy of the report and had an opportunity to look over it. There's just a couple things I want to mention. You may note that the number of arrests might appear a little low this month, and I have a good explanation for that. This past month and this coming month – excuse me, when I do the February report will both reflect that – due to the fact we're involved in a fairly significant investigation where I have two entire teams dedicated to that, to a fairly long-term investigation involving an organization that continues to expand as we look into it, and it's a joint multi-agency investigation, but we're carrying the bulk of the personnel work in there. We look at Page 4, significant events, Item 5, again, I just will note this was a search warrant, 1200 block of East 53rd Street, the amount of drugs, two pounds of marijuana and the Ecstasy pills, were not that significant, in fact of the guns we recovered, an AK47, a MAC 10, a handgun, and a bullet proof vest. You will note that we did call ATF to the scene. These people were convicted felons and hopefully, we can take them through the ATF process and, at that point, get them a lot more time than we can on the state system. On Page 5 are the breakdown of hours. We combined the precincts this time. That, again, is an effort not to show exactly where we're working on this major long-term investigation, so that might answer any questions you have there. If you have any other questions, I'll be glad to try to answer them.

Commissioner Farrell said, I'm glad you pointed out the major investigation. I was thinking that, you know, in the summer times we usually have a lot of problems when it gets too hot, and I was thinking maybe the cold weather the last month or two is putting a lid on crime. Director Harris said, no, sir, as you can see from the hours worked, the hours are still being worked, they're just not – one of the teams, we have a major investigation team and then the two TAC teams, which are more of the street level that does the immediate response. We have both major case and one of the TAC teams totally dedicated to this mission at this particular time.

Chairman Liakakis said, and what's so good about our CNT that was set up by the cities and the county, since March 1994 to December the 31st, 2009, the CNT have arrested over 12,600 people for drugs in our community, showing what a good job that they have done, plus confiscating over 1,000, 1200 weapons, a huge amount of drugs, and also with money, and we appreciate that, because a lot of people in the community don't really understand, you know, how complex it is and the investigations it's taken to take out those big suppliers and all, but the figures show exactly, you know, what CNT has done, and we appreciate your leadership, Commander, and also, with all of the cities that are participating in the CNT. And I had the Director of the Federal Drug Administration tell me that this drug squad in Savannah, Georgia, is the number one, that he has been all over the country, leading for the DEA, the federal drug unit, that the operation in our area is the best, where he has been all over the country and working on drug cases.

Commissioner Shay said, in a lot of your reports that I read now, there's a – it makes reference to a controlled substance that goes by the name of Ecstasy? Director Harris said, yes, sir. Commissioner Shay said, could I suggest to you that maybe we need to re-name that? Because that sounds kind of appealing, and maybe we could just start calling it really, really stupid, or something that's more of a description of what it does to people. Director Harris said, we're not the ones that named it to start with. Unfortunately, the dopers usually name the drugs or give them the nicknames. Commissioner Shay said, you know, we call stuff like methamphetamine, we give that a kind of name that doesn't sound quite so appealing. That's just a kind of off-the-wall comment. I have no firsthand experience with it, but I've seen other people that, you know, have used the drug and they strike me as being a whole lot more stupid than ecstatic.

Director Harris said, well, as we all know, and these young folks here, I hope they pay attention, we had a young man out, applied for an intern position with us today, and we polygraphed him this morning and out of five recent people we've polygraphed, we've only had two that we accepted because of drug use, and that's a very unfortunate thing that we see in our society now, where these young folks in college come in and they've experimented with a little bit of everything, and police agencies cannot take them, nor can any agency, where a secret, top-secret type clearance is required to get a job, federal government, state government, or local. And when you're very young, you don't think that far ahead, but this young man this morning had an impeccable record and he's going to go places, because he is a – he's committed himself to a lot of different things in high school and in college, you know, working on different organizations, volunteering time and all of that, and then come through the polygraph clean as that, that's an outstanding tribute to him.

Commissioner Shay said, another reason why it's really, really stupid to use stuff like that is that those drugs have a signature that stays in your body for a long, long time. Director Harris said, that's right. Commissioner Shay said, it's not just law enforcement agencies that drug test now, it's most major employers. I mean, you can't work around heavy equipment or work on an assembly line making aircraft parts or any of these kind of things if you've been tested and that drug test comes up positive. Director Harris said, very true, yes, sir. Chairman Liakakis said, are there any more questions for Director Harris? Thank you very much, we appreciate that report.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Director Roy Harris gave a report on the status of the Counter Narcotics Team for the month of January 2010.

<p>Chatham~Savannah Counter Narcotics Team Monthly Report January 2010</p>

UNDERCOVER AGENT/CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANT BUYS	
Buys	Number
Undercover (Agent) Buys	6
Confidential Information Buys	6

NARCOTICS INVESTIGATIONS*	
Investigations:	Number
Investigations Initiated During the month	54
Active Joint Investigations with other agencies (DEA, ATF, IRS, etc.)	8
Total Number of Investigations Cleared (Arrest, E.C., Unfounded)	20

DRUGS SEIZED			
Drug Type	Value	Approx. Weight	Approx. Total Value
Powder Cocaine	\$100 per gram*	615.40 Grams	\$61,540.00
Crack Cocaine	\$100 per gram*	17.40 Grams	\$1,740.00
Methamphetamine	\$100 per gram**	0 Grams	\$0.00
Marijuana	\$140 per ounce*	841 Ounces	\$117,740.00
Heroin	\$250 per gram*	0 Grams	\$0.00
Ecstasy	\$25 Dosage Unit	69 D/U	\$1,725.00
Misc. Pills	\$5 per D/U	451 D/U	\$2,255.00
Hallucinogens	\$10.00 per gram *	0	\$0

¹⁹⁹⁹Source: Office National Drug Control Policy
 **Source: Established regional average price
 ***Source: IAW GBI reporting – One marijuana plant equals 2.2 lbs of processed marijuana

DRUGS PURCHASED			
Drug Type	Value	Approx. Weight	Approx. Total Value
Powder Cocaine	\$100 per gram*	44.30 Grams	\$4,430.00
Crack Cocaine	\$100 per gram*	2.10 Grams	\$7,560.00
Methamphetamine	\$100 per gram**	N/A	N/A
Marijuana	\$140 per ounce*	54 Ounces	\$3,780.00
Heroin	\$250 per gram*	N/A	N/A
Ecstasy	\$25 Dosage Unit	N/A	N/A
Misc. Pills	\$5 per D/U	58D/U	\$290.00

¹⁹⁹⁹Source: Office National Drug Control Policy
 **Source: Established regional average price
 ***Source: IAW GBI reporting – One marijuana plant equals 2.2 lbs of processed marijuana

WEAPONS SEIZED	
Firearms (including hand guns and long guns)	5

PERSONS ARRESTED*	
Felony*	7
Sales/Trafficking	14
Misdemeanor	1
Non-Drug**	3
Total Arrests	25

*Felony includes Manufacturing Methamphetamine or Marijuana

**Non-drug related offenses include firearms violations, Obstruction, Simple Battery, etc.

ASSET FORFEITURES	
US Currency Seized (Initiated forfeiture proceedings)	\$27,400.00
US Currency Awarded	\$12,799.00
Motor Vehicles Seized (Initiated forfeiture proceedings)	1976 Chevrolet P/U 1995 Jeep Wrangler 2000 Lincoln Town Car
Motor Vehicles Awarded	N/A
Real Property Seized (Initiated forfeiture proceedings)	N/A
Real Property Awarded	N/A
Personal Property Seized (Initiated forfeiture proceedings)	N/A

ADOPTION CASES FROM OTHER AGENCIES		
DATE	AGENCY	OFFENSE
1/7/10	SCMPD	POSSESSION MARIJUANA WITH INTENT
1/7/10	SCMPD	POSSESSION MARIJUANA WITH INTENT
1/24/10	POOLER PD	POSSESSION CONTROLLED SUBST – METH
1/24/10	POOLER PD	POSSESSION CONTROLLED SUBST – METH
1/27/10	RICHMOND HILL PD	TRAFFICKING MARIJUANA
1/28/10	SCMPD	MANUFACTURING MARIJUANA

DRUG COMPLAINTS INVESTIGATED		
Drug Complaints	Received	Assigned
Project Log/Official Complaints	4	4
Hot Line / Call-In Complaints	10	9
Green Sheets/ Outside Agencies	6	6
Crime Stopper Complaints	27	25

SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

1. On 01-10-2010, a joint investigation between DEA, GSP, and CNT led to the seizure of approximately \$24,150.00 during a traffic stop on a known drug trafficker.

2. On 01-24-2010, CNT received a call for assistance from the Pooler Police Department in reference to a possible meth lab located inside a vehicle. Agents responded to the scene and observed several items located in the trunk of the vehicle. These items consisted of plastic jars, tubing, coffee filters, lye, ammonium nitrate, foil, and other glass cookware that is consistent with manufacturing meth. Also, a search of the interior of the vehicle produced numerous used/ unused syringes and several crushed up pills of Percocet. Officers on scene advised that the vehicle initially fled from them and was finally stopped at exit 109 in Port Wentworth after a pit maneuver was conducted. The vehicle was reported stolen and one of the passengers had outstanding arrest warrants for kidnapping. Agents conducted interviews on the defendants which the driver admitted to manufacturing meth and provided insight on his cooking methods. The female subject wanted for kidnapping admitted to be a long time user of meth and advised that she injected meth and the aforementioned Percocet.

3. On 01-31-2010, CNT assisted the Pooler PD in reference to a bank robbery. The suspects purportedly took several of the bank teller’s cell phones and officers were attempting to contact the cell phone providers to conduct a GPS or “Ping” request to locate them. CNT provided assistance and helped officers with this due to CNT’s familiarity with the process.

4. During the month of January, a total of seven people were arrested after a several month long undercover operation conducted by CNT. This investigation involved three separate groups believed to be involved in the illegal sales and distribution of prescription pills in Chatham and Bryan County. CNT believes the groups were not connected with one another yet together the three groups supplied 20 or more users in Chatham and Bryan County. Since the operation CNT

has seen a dramatic decrease of Roxycodone pills in the West Chatham County area.

5. On 01-19-2010, agents executed a search warrant in the 1200 block of E. 53rd Street where they seized over 2 pounds of Marijuana and a large quantity of ecstasy pills. Also seized were 3 weapons; an AK47, a MAC 10, and a 9 mm handgun. The suspect was also in possession of a military issued bullet proof vest. ATF agents responded to the scene and the case will be adjudicated in Federal Court.

DRUG INVESTIGATIONS
HOURS WORKED BY ZONE

SCMPD – All Precincts	<u>TOTAL</u> 1,191
<hr/>	
Municipalities	<u>TOTAL</u> 213
<hr/>	
Administrative Hours	800
Case Administration	998
Pharmaceutical Diversions	240
Central Intelligence	480
Out of County (Task Force Operations, etc.)	20
Assistance Rendered to Outside Agencies	72
Training	105
Court Hours	15
	<u>TOTAL</u> 2,730
<hr/>	
Total Hours Worked	<u>4,134</u>

=====

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, under Item X, the Action Calendar, we have Items 1 to 5 and under Item 5, we have Items A through J. Are there any specific items that the members would like to withdraw to speak about them?

Commissioner Thomas said, move for approval. Commissioner Farrell said, second.

Chairman Liakakis said, we have a motion and a second. Let's go on the board. The motion carried unanimously. [Commissioners Stone, Odell and Kicklighter were not present.]

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Thomas moved to approve Items 1 through 5-J, both inclusive. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone, Odell and Kicklighter were not present.]

=====

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

=====

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 12, 2010, AS MAILED.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Thomas moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of February 12, 2010. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone, Odell and Kicklighter were not present.]

=====

2. CLAIMS VS. CHATHAM COUNTY FOR THE PERIOD FEBRUARY 4, 2010, THROUGH FEBRUARY 17, 2010.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Thomas moved to authorize the Finance Director to pay the claims against the County for the period February 4, 2010, through February 17, 2010, in the amount of \$8,304,646. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone, Odell and Kicklighter were not present.]

=====

3. REQUEST FROM THE DEVELOPER, LANDMARK 24, FOR THE COUNTY TO INITIATE THE TWELVE-MONTH WARRANTY PERIOD AND REDUCED THE FINANCIAL GUARANTEE FOR FIVE OAKS SUBDIVISION. [DISTRICT 1.]

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Thomas moved to approve the request from the developer, Landmark 24, for the County to initiate the twelve-month warranty period and reduce the financial guarantee for Five Oaks Subdivision. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone, Odell and Kicklighter were not present.]

AGENDA ITEM: X-3
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

TO: Board of Commissioners
THRU: R. E. Abolt, County Manager
FROM: A. G. Bungard, P.E., County Engineer

ISSUE: To initiate the warranty period and reduce the financial guarantee for Five Oaks Subdivision.

BACKGROUND: The developer, Landmark 24, requests that the County initiate the twelve month warranty period and reduce the financial guarantee for Five Oaks Subdivision.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

- 1. Five Oaks is a new subdivision located on Old Montgomery Road and consists of 15 lots on 4.23 acres. Paving and drainage improvements will be maintained by the Five Oaks Homeowners Association. Water and sanitary sewer has been accepted by the City of Savannah.
- 2. The constructed improvements on the site are complete. They have been inspected and found to be without fault.
- 3. The developer submitted a letter of credit issued by Georgia Bank and Trust in the amount of \$155,902, which is 100% of the cost of improvements. The developer is requesting the letter of credit be reduced to \$60,553, which is 50% of the constructed improvements.
- 4. Streetlight costs and maintenance are the developer's responsibility until the warranty period is ended.

ALTERNATIVES:

- 1. To initiate the warranty period and reduce the financial guarantee for Five Oaks Subdivision.
- 2. Do not approve the request.

POLICY ANALYSIS: This action is consistent with the subdivision regulation regarding the creation of lots through plat recording.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Commissioners adopt Alternative No. 1.

District 1

PREPARED BY: Nathaniel Panther, P.E.

=====

- 4. **REQUEST BOARD APPROVE A COUNTY CONTRACT WITH THE GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (GDOT) TO IMPROVE THE INTERSECTION OF KING GEORGE BOULEVARD AND GROVE POINT ROAD AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN, COUNTY ATTORNEY, COUNTY ENGINEER AND COUNTY CLERK TO SIGN THE FORMS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THE PROJECT WHICH INCLUDES THE GDOT FORM 532, A UTILITY AGREEMENT, A LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROJECT AGREEMENT (LGPA) AND THE RIGHT-OF-WAY CERTIFICATION. [DISTRICT 6.]**

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Thomas moved to approve a County Contract with the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) to improve the intersection of King George Boulevard and Grove Point Road and authorize the Chairman, County Attorney, County Engineer and County Clerk to sign the forms necessary to implement the project which includes the GDOT Form 532, a Utility Agreement, a Local Government Project Agreement (LGPA) and the Right-of-Way Certification. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone, Odell and Kicklighter were not present.]

AGENDA ITEM: X-4
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

TO: Board of Commissioners
THRU: R. E. Abolt, County Manager
FROM: A. G. Bungard, P.E., County Engineer

ISSUE: That the Board approve a County Contract with the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) to improve the intersection of King George Boulevard and Grove Point Road and authorize the Chairman, County Attorney, County Engineer and County Clerk to sign the forms necessary to implement the project which includes the GDOT Form 532, a Utility Agreement, a Local Government Project Agreement (LGPA) and the Right-of-Way (ROW) Certification.

BACKGROUND: The purpose of the project is to improve the intersection of King George Boulevard and Grove Point Road in the unincorporated area of Chatham County.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

- 1. The GDOT has prepared a preliminary estimate and a needs assessment, indicating a commitment to participation in a County Contract for the project.
- 2. As with all County Contracts with the GDOT, the Department will reimburse the County for its participation upon satisfactory completion of the contract. The GDOT will provide contract inspection and administration for the contract.

ALTERNATIVES:

- 1. That the Board authorize a County Contract with the GDOT to improve the intersection of King George Boulevard and Grove Point Road and authorize the Chairman, County Attorney, County Engineer and County Clerk to sign the forms necessary to implement the project which includes the GDOT Form 532, the Utility Agreement, the LGPA and the ROW Certification.
- 2. That the Board not authorize the County Contract.

FUNDING: No funds are required to approve a County Contract. Approval of funds will be requested at the time of construction contract award.

POLICY ANALYSIS: That the Board must authorize intergovernmental agreements.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Board approve Alternative No. 1.

District 6

Prepared by Pamela Bernard

=====

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

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DEPT.</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
A. Annual maintenance agreement for the County portion of the 800MHz communication system	I.C.S.	Motorola Communications (Sole Source)	\$62,318	General Fund/M&O - Communications
B. Engineering services contract to provide for the design and construction phases of the fender system for the bridge at Turners Creek	Public Works and Park Services	Collins Engineers, Inc. (Sole Source)	\$14,400	CIP - Bridges
C. Change Order No. 2 to the contract to provide electrical services at the Chatham County Resource Conservation Education Center for changes in the light fixtures to LED fixtures	Public Works and Park Services	Moore and Sons Electrical	\$19,260	Solid Waste Restricted
D. Mill County roads to be resurfaced by the Georgia Department of Transportation as part of the Local Assistance Resurfacing Program (LARP)	Engineering	Carroll & Carroll, Inc.	\$13,279 (Sole Source)	SPLOST (2003-2008) - LARP
E. Annual contract with automatic renewal options for four (4) additional one (1) year terms to provide inmate healthcare services	Detention Center	Prison Health Services	\$5,399,000	General Fund/M&O - Detention Center
F. Annual contract with automatic renewal options for four (4) additional one (1) year terms to provide Workers Compensation Third Party Administrator	Finance	Underwriters Safety and Claims	\$31,500	Risk Management Fund
G. Construct a new handicapped access ramp at 107B Fahm Street	Facilities Maintenance and Operations	Alloy Industrial Contractors, Inc.	\$10,500	DSA Series 2005 Bond - SABHC
H. Replace communications tower, including foundations, installation, antenna installation and removal of old tower	Special Projects	Tower Innovations (GSA contract)	\$389,640	CIP
I. Construct self-contained communications building with UPS and generator	Special Projects	Motorola (State Contract)	\$282,326	CIP
J. Design and renovation of the District Attorney's lobby and two (2) reception areas	District Attorney	Finishing Touches Home and Business (WBE)	\$13,073	SPLOST (2008-2014) - Courthouse Construction

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Thomas moved to approve Items 5-A through 5-J, both inclusive. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM: X-5 A thru J
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

TO: BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
THRU: R.E. ABOLT, COUNTY MANAGER
FROM: MICHAEL A. KAIGLER, DIRECTOR
HUMAN RESOURCES & SERVICES
SUBJECT: AWARD OF BIDS

ITEM A

ISSUE: Request Board approval of the \$62,318 sole source annual agreement for system network maintenance with Motorola Communications for the County portion of the 800mhz Smartzone Communication System.

BACKGROUND: The system network maintenance provides for the county's 50% share of the central switching equipment data center and maintenance of the County's two 800 MHZ tower sites. The City of Savannah is separately responsible for the other 50% of the maintenance on the switching center and the other two towers of the 800 MHZ system network.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. The sole source manufacturer and service provider, Motorola Communications, provides contractual services locally through Savannah Communications, the only company technically qualified and authorized by license to maintain the communication system.
2. Over the last several years additional components have been added. Currently, the value of the entire networked communication system is more than \$15 Million.
3. This maintenance agreement represents a 2% increase over last year. Staff Believes this cost to be fair and reasonable.

FUNDING: General Fund/M&O - Communications
 (1001536 - 52.22001)

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Board approval of the \$62,318 sole source annual agreement for system network maintenance with Motorola Communications for the County portion of the 800 MHZ Smartzone communication System.
2. Provide staff other direction.

POLICY ANALYSIS: It is consistent with Board policy to provide maintenance for the County's portion of the 800 MHZ communication system, without interruption.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

I.C.S. APPROVAL _____
 LEWIS LEONARD

BUDGET APPROVAL _____
 GLORIA SAUGH

ITEM B

ISSUE: Request Board approval to award a \$14,400 sole source engineering services contract to Collins Engineers Inc. to provide engineering services for the design and construction phases of the fender system for the bridge at Turners Creek on Johnny Mercer Boulevard for Public Works and Park Services.

BACKGROUND: On 19 October 2009, Request for Quotations were received to provide an evaluation and report of the fender system for the Causton Bluff bridges and the bridge at Turners Creek on Johnny Mercer Boulevard. Collins Engineers Inc. submitted the low quote of \$8,700 to provide the requested services.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. After the evaluation of the bridges, the report recommended repair of the east fender and replacement of the west fender on the bridge at Turners Creek.
2. Staff requested a proposal from Collins Engineers to provide the design and construction phases of the repair and replacement. Collins Engineers proposed a lump sum fee of \$14,400 for the project.
3. The design phase will consist of development of a performance specification for a composite fender system, preliminary schematic drawings and preliminary cost estimate. The construction phase will include construction documents with sealed design drawings, specifications, pay item quantities, and a revised estimate.
4. Staff is recommending this be a sole source contract to Collins Engineers as they are the engineer of record since they were the firm that provided the engineering inspection, evaluation and report on the condition of the fender systems.

FUNDING: CIP - Bridges
(3504230 - 54.14002 - 35031273)

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Board approval to award a \$14,400 sole source engineering services contract to Collins Engineers to provide engineering services for the design and construction phases of the fender system for the Johnny Mercer Boulevard bridge over Turners Creek for Public Works and Park Services.
2. Provide staff other direction.

POLICY ANALYSIS: It is consistent with Board policy to approve sole source contracts when it is in the best interest of the County.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL _____
CHRIS MORRIS

ITEM C

ISSUE: Request Board approval of Change Order No. 2 in the amount of \$19,260 to the construction contract with Moore and Sons Electrical to provide and install 51 LED recessed lighting fixtures at the Chatham County Resource Conservation Education Center.

BACKGROUND: On 25 September 2009, the Board approved a construction contract with Moore and Sons Electrical Service, Inc. to provide electrical services at the Chatham County Resource Conservation Education Center. With the Board's guidance towards being the Greenest County and the hard work from the Environmental Forum the construction standards for the education center were set incredibly high.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. Initial design by the engineering firm Rosser International, prior to a contract with an architect, was standard florescent surface mounted fixtures at a cost of \$5,310. The low ceilings in the lobby and office area increases the chance of persons coming in contact with the surface mounted fixtures, plus the new recommended recessed fixtures are LED illumination and are conducive with the educational component the County is striving to accomplish. This change order will include changing the surface mounted fixture for a deduct amount of \$5,310 to LED fixtures in the amount of \$24,570 for a total change order amount of \$19,260.
2. The proposed fixture for this project is the Halo 1200 Series which exceeds the light output and distribution of a 90W halogen lamp, a 120-watt incandescent lamp, or a 32-watt compact fluorescent, while consuming less than 25 watts. LED lights are considerably less expensive to operate since each fixture has a 24 year projected life with no maintenance, however initially they are a little more expensive to purchase. LED

lighting requires only one third of the energy that an incandescent bulb will use. A single 24-watt LED light can replace a 120-watt incandescent and in the lifetime of the LED light, will save 960 kWh of energy. At a basic ten cents per kilowatt rate, that equals \$96 dollars per fixture in bill savings. We are proposing 51 fixtures for a total bill savings of \$4,896.

3. Specific Benefits of LED Light:

- Low energy consumption – retrofit bulbs range from 0.83 to 25 Watts
- LED light bulbs create 3.4 BTUs per hour, reducing the cost of air conditioning.
- LEDs do not result in heat build-up, unlike incandescent bulbs, which produce 85 BTUs per hour or 98% of consumed energy is converted into heat energy.
- Long service life – LED bulbs can last up to 50,000 hours
- No filament that will burn out
- Durable – LED bulbs are resistant to thermal and vibrational shocks and turn on instantly from -40C° to 185C°, making them ideal for applications subject to frequent on-off cycling such as the new center.
- Directional distribution of light – good for interior lighting
- No infrared or ultraviolet radiation – excellent because UV light attracts bugs
- Safety and environmentally conscious – LEDs contain no mercury and remain cool to the touch
- Fully dimmable – LEDs do not change their color tint when dimmed unlike incandescent lamps that turn yellow
- No frequency interference – no ballast to interfere with radio and television signals

4. The fixture change was requested by Dawson Architects, the contracted architect, due to the modifications to the ceiling finishes in the office areas and the requirement of energy efficiency. Staff, along with the engineer and contractor, agree to the change.

5. Contract history is as follows:

Original Contract Amount (09-25-09)	\$45,807
Change Order No. 1 (12-18-09)	\$ 0
Change Order No. 2 (Pending)	<u>\$19,260</u>
Revised Contract Amount	\$65,067

FUNDING: Solid Waste Restricted
(5404510 - 54.12009)

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Board approval of Change Order No. 2 in the amount of \$19,260 to the construction contract with Moore and Sons Electrical to provide and install 51 LED recessed lighting fixtures at the Chatham County Resource Conservation Education Center.
2. Provide staff other direction.

POLICY ANALYSIS: It is consistent with Board policy to issue Change Orders to reflect changes in the scope of work.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL _____
CHRIS MORRIS

ITEM D

ISSUE: Request Board approval of a \$13,279 sole source purchase with Carroll & Carroll, Inc. to mill County roads to be resurfaced by the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) as part of the Local Assistance Resurfacing Program (LARP).

BACKGROUND: GDOT has a LARP with local governments to resurface roads. GDOT funds the cost of resurfacing. They require that the County certify ownership of the roads to be resurfaced, prepare the roads for resurfacing (to include milling) and maintain them upon completion.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. GDOT requested a list of roads for the 2009 LARP from the County. It was submitted 11 August 2008. GDOT has a rating system by which they determine the roads that qualify

for resurfacing. They also have an allocation system that limits the amount of resurfacing granted to each county or municipality. Six of the roads were selected to be resurfaced by the GDOT.

<u>Road</u>	<u>Length (Miles)</u>
a. Barksdale Drive	0.400
b. Catalina Drive	1.206
c. Dombey Road	0.235
d. Dombey Court	0.090
e. Baker Drive	0.348
f. Manta Cove	0.112
<u>Total</u>	<u>2.391</u>

2. Barksdale Drive, Dombey Road and Dombey Court require milling to remove areas of existing asphalt before resurfacing to prevent excessive asphalt build up. Without milling, drop offs from the pavement edges into driveways cause vehicles to scrape the pavements upon entry or exit. This is considered a preparation cost.
3. The GDOT awarded a construction contract to Carroll & Carroll, Inc. GDOT held the preconstruction meeting with Carroll & Carroll, Inc. on February 9, 2010. The negotiated cost with Carroll & Carroll, Inc. for milling is \$13,279.

FUNDING: SPLOST (2003 - 2008) - LARP
(3234220 - 54.14001 - 32355657)

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Board approval of a \$13,279 sole source purchase with Carroll & Carroll, Inc. to mill County roads to be resurfaced by the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) as part of the Local Assistance Resurfacing Program (LARP)
2. Provide staff other direction.

POLICY ANALYSIS: It is consistent with Board policy to approve sole source purchases when it is in the best interest of the County.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL _____
CHRIS MORRIS

ITEM E

ISSUE: Request Board approval to award an annual contract, with automatic renewal options for four (4) additional one year terms, to Prison Health Services (PHS) of Brentwood, TN, to provide inmate health care, based on a 1,600 inmate population, at a monthly cost of \$449,916.67 for a total annual cost of \$5,399,000 with annual price increase based on current CPI. In addition to healthcare services cost, there is a separate fee for Electronic Health Record (EHR) system of \$45,200 in year one, \$16,000 annually starting year two for technical support.

BACKGROUND: The Detention Center currently processes approximately 21,000 inmates per year. Contracted Services are required to provide inmates with on site Healthcare and Dental Services.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. A Request for Proposals to provide inmate healthcare was issued, publically advertised and mailed to 11 firms. A Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference was conducted . Accompanied site visitations followed. Twelve firms were in attendance. Four (4) firms submitted proposal: Prison Health Services (PHS) of Brentwood, TN, Armor Correctional Health Services of Atlanta, GA, Wexford Health Services of Pittsburgh, PA, and Correct Health Companies of Stockbridge, GA.
2. The written proposals received were scored by a committee consisting of the Jail Administrator, the Detention Center Administrative Captain, the Detention Center Operations Captain, the Risk Manager, and a Retired Healthcare Provider. Specifications provided firms with current staffing levels and the number of hours worked by each staff member. All Proponents were required to include in their proposals, staff levels to be provided and the hours to be worked by each staff member.

3. Fee Proposals were requested from all four firms. Proponents were required to submit their fee proposals based on three pricing options: Option I- Full Catastrophic/Full Risk, Option II- Annual Aggregate Caps, and Option III- Off Site Management & Claims Payment. In addition, all firms were required to include all pharmaceuticals and a per diem charge for inmates in excess of 1600 inmates. Previous contract per diem charge was for inmate in excess of 1300 which gives the County as cost savings of approximate \$500,000 annually.
4. Staff recommends contract award to the incumbent contractor, Prison Health Services, based on the methodology for the recommendation of award as stated in the RFP. Staff believes Option I- Full Catastrophic Coverage, at PHS's monthly fee of \$449,916.67 for a total annual cost of \$5,399,000, to be reasonable and fair. The proposed per diem rate per inmate in excess of the ADP is \$4.52. The Incumbent Contractor, Prison Health Services (PHS) was the overall highest ranked firm. (See attached matrix, page 14).

FUNDING: General Fund/M&O- Detention Center
(1003326 - 52.12006)

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Board approve to award an annual contract, with automatic renewal options for four (4) additional one year terms, to Prison Health Services (PHS) of Brentwood, TN, to provide inmate health care, based on a 1,600 inmate population, at a monthly cost of \$449,916.67 for a total annual cost of \$5,399,000 with annual price increase based on current CPI. In addition to healthcare services cost, there is a separate fee for Electronic Health Record (EHR) system of \$45,200 in year one, \$16,000 annually starting year two for technical support.
2. Provide staff other direction.

POLICY ANALYSIS: It is consistent with Board policy to award contracts to the overall highest ranked firm.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL _____
RUSHEDA ADESHINA

ITEM F

ISSUE: Request Board approval to award an annual contract, with automatic renewal options for four additional one year terms, to Underwriters Safety and Claims, Inc., of Savannah, to provide Worker's Compensation Third Party Administration Services, at an annual cost of \$31,500 for the first one year term of the contract, \$31,500 for the second one year term of the contract, and \$33,500 per year for the three remaining one year terms of the contract.

BACKGROUND: The County requires the services of a Third Party Administrator (TPA) to process Worker's Compensation claims on it's behalf. The TPA is responsible for receiving, reviewing, and recording all claim and loss notices received from Chatham County and for processing all claims in accordance with applicable Georgia Law, the Georgia Insurance Commissioner's office, and the State Board of Worker's Compensation. In addition, the TPA is required to investigate claims to determine compensability, the correct amount of payment (if any), and to evaluate injuries, disabilities, and claims for settlement.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued, publically advertised, and mailed to nine (9) qualified organizations/firms, of which one was a local firm. Four (4) firms responded to the RFP: CorVel Enterprise of Duluth, GA, Underwriters Safety and Claims, Inc. of Savannah, Collins & Company of Chattanooga, TN, and Companion of Columbia, SC.
2. The technical proposals were scored and ranked by an evaluation committee which consisted of the Risk Manager, the Benefits Manager, the Senior Accountant, the Public Works Administrative Service Manager and the Administrative Assistant to the Sheriff. All four (4) firms met all technical requirements. The evaluation committee conducted interviews. The interviews were scored. Please refer to the matrix provided on page 15, for scoring details of the technical proposals and interviews.
3. Fee proposals were requested from all four (4) firms. Each firm was required to state (based on an average number of claims submitted annually by the County), the cost per claim for medical only, indemnity only, and incidents with no subsequent claim. In

addition, each firm was required to state their annual administrative fee, their annual “on line” service fee, their data conversion fee (for the first year of the contract only), and the basis for any subsequent year price increases. All fee proposals were analyzed based on the total cost of the contract for the five year term to establish the “Best Value” for the County. Proposal results are as follows:

Underwriters Safety & Claims, Inc. Savannah, GA	139.40 Points	\$31,500/Year
Companion Third Party Administrators, LLC Columbia, SC	127.70	\$31,500/Year*
CorVel Enterprise Duluth Georgia	124.35	\$51,144/Year*
Collins & Company Chattanooga, TN	106.85	\$45,724/Year*

* Includes Data Conversion Fee applicable the 1st year of the contract only.

FUNDING: Risk Management
(6259926 - 51.27004)

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Board approve award of an annual contract, with automatic renewal options for four additional one year terms, to Underwriters Safety and Claims, Inc., of Savannah, to provide Worker’s Compensation Third Party Administration Services, at an annual cost of \$31,500 for the first one year term of the contract, \$31,500 for the second one year term of the contract, and \$33,500 per year for the three remaining one year terms of the contract.
2. Provide staff other direction.

POLICY ANALYSIS: It is consistent with Board policy to provide essential services at the lowest possible cost and to award annual contracts to firms which rank the highest in a competitive sealed proposal procurement process.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL _____
ESTELLE BROWN

ITEM G

ISSUE: Request Board approval of a \$13,073 purchase to Finishing Touches Home and Business, a WBE firm, to design and renovate the District Attorney’s lobby and two (2) receptionist areas for Facilities Maintenance and Operations.

BACKGROUND: The District Attorney’s suite was last renovated in 1990. The carpet was changed in 1999. The lobby and receptionist area are the only entry to the suite and is well traveled. The flooring and furniture are in very bad condition.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. Staff did not obtain other pricing. Staff believed based on past performance, i.e. interior decoration of the Chairman’s office, Commissioners Meeting Room and the Green Room, subject vendor was asked to submit a design and price list to update the lobby and reception area entering the District Attorney’s suite. The design and price list were reviewed by the using department.
2. The vendor will completely renovate the three (3) areas to include new flooring, wall covering, furniture, and accessories.
3. The design and price list were reviewed by the using department and price is deemed to be fair and reasonable.

FUNDING: SPLOST (2008 - 2014) - Courthouse Construction
(3244980 - 54.13011 - 32460427)

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Board approval of a \$13,073 purchase to Finishing Touches Home and Business, a WBE firm, to design and renovate the District Attorney's lobby and two (2) receptionist areas for Facilities Maintenance and Operations.
2. Provide staff other direction.

POLICY ANALYSIS: It is consistent with Board policy to approve purchases to a vendor who is responsive, responsible and has provided outstanding past performance.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL _____
TOM DRANE

ITEM H

ISSUE: Request Board approval to award a \$389,640 contract, under federal GSA pricing, for a 285-foot communications tower, including foundation, tower and antenna installation and de-stacking the old tower.

BACKGROUND: The communications tower at the Sheriff's Complex will need to be replaced to increase buildable area for the Detention Center expansion as well as to provide a replacement for higher wind resistance and structural integrity. The tower provides communications for the Sheriff's Office, regional interoperable communications system and lease space for private cellular companies.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. The existing 285-foot communications tower stands within the construction footprint of the Detention Center expansion. It must be relocated to increase buildable area.
2. Chatham County followed the process required under the Communications Tower Ordinance and has received approval from the MPC as well as coordination with the Savannah Airport, Hunter Army Airfield and Mosquito Control.
3. The new communications tower will be constructed near the Sheriff's Office Gun Range, about ½ mile from its current location. Constructed of galvanized steel, it will withstand 130 mph winds. It does not require guide wires, which makes its footprint compact.
4. Tower Innovations provided pricing of \$389,640, or less than half of the original estimate, based on federal GSA pricing. George Bowen, the County's project manager, identified the group based on his prior experience in the U.S. Air Force with the design and construction of communications towers.

FUNDING: CIP - Communications Tower
(3503300 - 54.13010 - 35030513)

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Board award a \$389,640 contract to Tower Innovations for a 285-foot communications tower, including foundation, tower and antenna installation and de-stacking the old tower.
2. Board direct staff to advertise and accept proposals for this work.
3. Board not award a contract for this work.

POLICY ANALYSIS: Georgia law and *The Chatham County Purchasing Ordinance and Procedures Manual* provide authority for the Board to award contracts for good and services.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL _____
CHRIS MORRIS

ITEM I

ISSUE: Request Board approval to award a \$282,326 contract, under the State of Georgia contract pricing, for a modular concrete building to provide power and emergency support for the communications tower.

BACKGROUND: The communications tower at the Sheriff’s Complex will need to be replaced to increase buildable area for the Detention Center expansion as well as to provide a replacement for higher wind resistance and structural integrity. Because of the tower’s importance during emergencies, it will need a integrated concrete building with a generator, back up supply, HVAC, power distribution and electrical distribution.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. State of Georgia contract pricing from Motorola will meet all of the specifications for electrical distribution and emergency service in a 12 foot by 36 foot concrete building.
2. State contract pricing totals \$282,326 from Motorola.
3. The building will be constructed near the Sheriff’s Office Gun Range, on the same foundation as the new communications tower.

FUNDING: CIP - Communications Tower
(3503300 - 54.13011 - 35030513)

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Board award a \$282,326 contract to Motorola under state contract pricing for a modular concrete building to provide power and emergency support for the communications tower.
2. Board direct staff to advertise and accept proposals for this work.
3. Board not award a contract for this work.

POLICY ANALYSIS: Georgia law and *The Chatham County Purchasing Ordinance and Procedures Manual* provide authority for the Board to award contracts for professional services.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL _____
CHRIS MORRIS

ITEM J

ISSUE: Request Board approval of a \$10,500 purchase to construct a handicapped access ramp at a County facility located at 107B Fahm Street, from Alloy Industrial Contractors, Inc. for Facilities Maintenance and Operations.

BACKGROUND: The facility located at 107B Fahm Street is a Medical Treatment Facility, Chatham Care Center. The building at present can only be entered by climbing stairs and is not handicapped accessible.

FACTS AND FINDINGS:

1. This facility is a medical treatment center and there is no handicapped accessible ramp on site. The proposed handicapped ramp and landing section will be in accordance with ADA standards.
2. Barnard and King Architects developed plans and specifications designed to meet ADA compliance.
3. Staff received quotes from five (5) contractors and responses are as follows:

*	Alloy Industrial Contractors, Inc. Savannah, GA	\$10,500
	Ansley-Sheppard-Burgess Savannah, GA	\$11,000
	Keith Ray Construction, Inc. Thunderbolt, GA	\$11,876
	Marchese Commercial Construction Pooler, GA	\$12,000

* E & D Contracting Services \$16,211
Savannah, GA

*WBE Firm

- 4. Staff believes the low quote submitted by Alloy Industrial Contractors, Inc. to be fair and reasonable.

FUNDING: 2005 DSA Series Bonds - SABHC
(3705113 - 54.13011 - 37032667)

ALTERNATIVES:

- 1. Board approval of a \$10,500 purchase to construct a handicapped access ramp at a County facility located at 107B Fahm Street, from Alloy Industrial Contractors, Inc. for Facilities Maintenance and Operations.
- 2. Provide staff other direction.

POLICY ANALYSIS: It is consistent with Board policy to provide safe access to county employees and visiting disabled persons.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL _____
TOM DRANE
PREPARED BY _____
PURCHASING AGENT

=====

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.

None.

=====

XII. SECOND READINGS

- 1. TO ADOPT A FALSE ALARM ORDINANCE IN ORDER TO FACILITATE SAVANNAH-CHATHAM METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT'S ("SCMPD") ENFORCEMENT ABILITY SIMILAR TO THE CITY OF SAVANNAH'S FALSE ALARM ORDINANCE. RECOMMEND SECOND READING BE DELAYED UNTIL 12TH OF MARCH.

County Manager Abolt said, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your counsel. We met on this and it does what the Board wished. It did open the door, which I very much appreciate. As this is implemented and as we experience more [inaudible] the need to make any change, staff will come back to you with those changes. This does though accomplish your desire for compatibility with the City of Savannah. I also appreciate the fact that you listened to Ms. Cramer, the County Attorney and others and the Chairman, certainly I know [inaudible] that would be to us. If it is not working in certain areas, we will come back and make amends to it.

Chairman Liakakis said, okay. Alright, and other items, of course, are information items that all of you have been — have received. And now we —.

Commissioner Farrell said, I make a motion to approve the False Alarm Ordinance. Commissioner Gellatly said, second.

Chairman Liakakis said, alright, let's go on the board. The motion carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone, Odell and Kicklighter were not present.] Chairman Liakakis said, the motion passes.

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

Commissioner Farrell moved to adopt a False Alarm Ordinance in order to facilitate Savannah-Chatham Metropolitan Police Department's enforcement ability similar to the City of Savannah's False Alarm Ordinance. Commissioner Gellatly seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM: XII-1
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

DATE: February 23, 2010
TO: R.E. Abolt, County Manager
FROM: R. Jonathan Hart, County Attorney
SUBJECT: False Alarm Ordinance

As you know, the False Alarm Ordinance is down for second reading before the Commission. I have drafted this ordinance to meet the terms of the City of Savannah's ordinance, save and except some minor alterations due to the differences in governmental structure of the City and County.

This ordinance will become effective upon its passage. In speaking with Linda Cramer, we do not currently have the personnel, system or software to achieve collection of violations. As you know, at docket, Mrs. Cramer indicated that the City of Savannah staff had issues pertaining to collection. I do not know the extent of these issues. Nevertheless, I thought you would want to know that we will have an ordinance in place after the second reading, but with limitations in the ability to enforce collections.

RJH/jr

AGENDA ITEM: XII-1
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

DATE: February 23, 2010
TO: R.E. Abolt, County Manager
FROM: R. Jonathan Hart, County Attorney
SUBJECT: False Alarm Ordinance Provisions

The ordinance as written and submitted for the agenda on February 12, 2010 is the proposed ordinance that will be adopted and no further changes are needed.

RJH/jr

~~**AGENDA ITEM: XI-1**~~
~~**AGENDA DATE: February 12, 2010**~~

AGENDA ITEM: XII-1
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

TO: Board of Commissioners
THRU: R. E. Abolt, County Manager
FROM: R. Jonathan Hart, County Attorney
SUBJECT: False Alarm Ordinance

ISSUE:

The County Attorney's office has placed this on the agenda as a first reading as requested. It is the County Attorney's Office understanding that Chatham County would like to adopt a false Alarm Ordinance similar to that of the City of Savannah. The current false alarm provisions under the County Code are contained in the Revenue Ordinance, the Private Security Agencies Ordinance and the current False Alarm Ordinance. In order to adopt a new False Alarm Ordinance, similar to the City's, it will be necessary to amend the County's "Private Security Agencies" and Revenue Ordinance and to repeal the County's current False Alarm Ordinance.

Additionally, there are a number of policy decisions to which staff needs direction in that County government does not have certain exemptions or mechanisms to provide a rebate or waiver of an annual alarm households of senior citizens determined to be eligible for such rebate or waiver. Additionally, it is within the County's governing authority purview to make the decision of the number of "free" false alarms that will be allowed for various residents, commercial businesses, senior citizens and persons with disabilities.

Additionally, we need direction as to whether the County ordinance upon exceeding the number of false alarms should be an automatic suspension or vested within the discretion of the police chief or governing authority.

Attached is a copy of the County Attorney's memo of October 30, 2009 outlining other relevant issues. This memo has attached the revisions to the proposed ordinance. The County Attorney's Office needs further instruction as to policy issues from the Commission. In the meantime, please note that my office has drafted the proposed amendments to the ordinances referenced above, to include, to the extent possible, provisions similar to the City's ordinances. The proposed amendments are attached for your reference.

RJH/jr

enclosures

cc: R. E. Abolt, County Manager
Linda Cramer, Finance Director
Gregori S. Anderson, Director of Building Safety and Regulatory Services

DATE: October 30, 2009

TO: R.E. Abolt, County Manager

FROM: R. Jonathan Hart, County Attorney

SUBJECT: Proposed Revised - False Alarm Ordinance

As you are aware, the Board is interested in revising the County's false alarm ordinance to mirror, where possible, the City's False Alarm Ordinance in order to facilitate the SCMPD's enforcement ability. Based upon the forgoing, the requisite revisions will include the following:

- (1) Deleting/repealing the County's current False Alarm Ordinance codified in Article I, Sections 11-132 through 11-138 of Chapter 11 of the County Code;
- (2) Amending Article III, Sections 10-301 through 10-306 of Chapter 10 of the County Code; and
- (3) Amending Article Q of the County's Revenue Ordinance to add a new "Section 10" to be entitled "Alarm System Service Fees".

Attached hereto are the proposed amendments/revisions as set forth above.

As indicated in my memo of July 21, 2009 (attached), there are a number of issues to be considered by the Board for conceptual approval. Those issues are more particularly outlined below.

Senior Citizen Provisions

The City of Savannah's Revenue Ordinance provisions pertaining to false alarm fees/registration provides for a rebate to households headed by a person age 65, or where the head of household qualifies for the City's "Utility Services Senior Citizens Discount" as set forth in Article U, Section 11 of the City's Revenue Ordinance. Pursuant to this provision, a senior's eligibility for the discount is "determined under City contract with a non-profit community organization capable of screening applicants according to the established criteria and reporting eligibility to the Revenue Department."

In addition, the City's ordinance allows any such household to have four false alarms (instead of 3) during a 12-month billing cycle before assessment of any fee.

Hence, the Commission needs to consider whether the County's ordinance should contain any type of rebate or relief for households headed by low income seniors, and, if so, how eligibility will be determined.

Discretion regarding Application of Automatic Suspension

One of the provisions set forth in the City's Revenue Ordinance and the proposed amendment to the County's Revenue provides that "Upon the fourth false alarm, an alarm user will be assessed and billed a fee of \$100 for the excessive alarm and notified of suspension as a registered alarm user."

In addition, the City's Ordinance and the proposed County amendment allows broad discretion to be vested in the Police Chief to determine if a waiver of the above-referenced automatic suspension is appropriate. Specifically, the provision provides:

The Police Chief may at this discretion identify those critical or high risk locations or institutions that are not subject to automatic suspension for false alarms when such suspension would be detrimental to the safety of the public.

Apparently, the City's Ordinance contains no standards regarding the exercise of this discretion. Does the Commission wish to direct staff to include such a provision in the County's False Alarm Ordinance? Assuming the Commission wishes to include such a provision, the Commission should advise as to what, if any, standards should be applied in exercising such discretion.

Operational Issues

The proposed revisions/amendments at issue will require a number of staffing and/or computer software adjustments in order to facilitate the registration, notice, and billing components. Prior to adoption and enforcement and collection, there are number of operational issues which must be addressed.

1. Section 10-304 of the proposed amendment to Article III of the County Code now entitled "Private Security Agencies" includes provisions setting forth an application process for private detective, private security and alarm system businesses to be operated in the unincorporated County. The City's ordinance designates the Police Chief to administer such provisions. However, the County's proposed ordinance designates the County's Department of Building Safety and Regulatory Services to administer the provisions. Assuming the Commission agrees that this Department instead of the Police Chief should administer this process, Gregori Anderson will need to advise as to any operational issues that need to be addressed by his office prior to implementation.

2. During prior meetings regarding this matter, the Finance Director advised that in order to perform the requisite data collection, billing and notice functions related to this ordinance, the Finance Department would have to make some staffing adjustments and to software acquisitions.

Based upon the foregoing, the County Attorney's Office believes that the effective date of the Ordinance should coincide with Building Safety and Regulatory Services ability to implement the registration components and with the Finance Department's ability to make the requisite staffing and software adjustments.

RJH/jr

enclosures

STATE OF GEORGIA)
)
COUNTY OF CHATHAM)

FALSE ALARM ORDINANCE

BE IT ORDAINED by the Chatham County Board of Commissioners as follows:

Article I, §§ 11-132 through 11-138 of Chapter 11 of the Chatham County Code, entitled "General Offenses" is hereby deleted in its entirety.

Adopted this _____ day of February, 2010.

CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA

BY: _____
Pete Liakakis, Chairman
Board of Commissioners

ATTEST: _____
Sybil E. Tillman
Clerk of Commission

[S E A L]

STATE OF GEORGIA)
)
COUNTY OF CHATHAM)

REVENUE ORDINANCE OF CHATHAM COUNTY

AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE Q OF THE CHATHAM COUNTY REVENUE ORDINANCE

BE IT ORDAINED by the Chatham County Board of Commissioners as follows:

Add new Section 10 which is adopted and shall read as follows:
"Section 10 Alarm System Service Fees.

(A) Fees Established.

Pursuant to Chatham County Code Sections 10-301 thru 10-312, the following service fees are hereby established to discourage excessive false alarms at any single location, enhance the safety of officers of the Savannah-Chatham County Metropolitan Police protect the lives and property of the citizens of Chatham County, reduce unnecessary use of public safety resources, and produce revenues to defray a portion of the costs of responses to false alarms.

(B) Alarm users registration fee.

Each alarm system business, as defined in Section 10-302(c) of the Chatham County Code must provide the Alarm System Coordinator with a listing of locations that are using an alarm system monitored by said business. This listing must be in computerized format specified by the Alarm System Coordinator. All locations on this listing will be considered registered alarm users. Each alarm system business will be responsible for supplying the Alarm System Coordinator with any changes to its list of registered alarm users. An annual registration fee of \$12.00 per residential alarm user and \$24.00 per commercial alarm user will be collected and remitted at the time of initial registration by the alarm system business and renewed by December 31st each subsequent year. Any household headed by a person age 65 or older, will receive a rebate or waiver of the annual alarm registration fee.

(C) False alarm fees for registered alarm users.

Excessive false alarms for registered alarm users are considered to be any number in excess of three (3) false alarms during the 12-month billing cycle; except in the case of a household determined to be eligible for a rebate or waiver of the annual alarm registration fee as described above in Section B, in which case the number shall be four (4) false alarms. Upon the fourth false alarm, an alarm user will be assessed and billed a fee of \$100 for the excessive alarm and notified of suspension as a registered alarm user. Notice of the false alarm will also be sent to the alarm system company advising of the false alarm fee and advising that the alarm user has been suspended from the list of registered alarm users. Alarm users suspended from the alarm registry will be considered to be unregistered alarm users for the purpose of billing false alarms.

(D) False alarm fees for unregistered alarm users.

All false alarm responses to unregistered locations will be billed to the alarm system user. The first through third false alarms at a single location within the 12-month billing cycle will be billed at a rate of \$100 per false alarm. The fourth through tenth false alarms at a single location during the same time period will be billed at \$150 per false alarm. The eleventh and all subsequent false alarms during the same time period will be billed at \$200 per false alarm.

(E) Notices, billing and payment of Fees.

A notice will be sent to the alarm user and alarm system company advising of each occurrence of a false alarm. Statements will be mailed monthly detailing the date of each false alarm and the fees due. Payment shall be made to the County within thirty (30) days of the invoice date. In the event of non-payment by a registered user, the Alarm Systems Coordinator will provide written notification to the alarm system company and the alarm system user advising that the user has been removed from the alarm system users registry, possible loss of police response for alarm calls, all false alarm fees must be paid and a statement must be provided by the alarm system company that the alarm system has been inspected and that the user has been properly trained on the use of the system. Households determined to be eligible for a rebate or waiver of the annual alarm registration fee as described above in Section B for purposes of this ordinance are considered high-risk households and will not be subject to loss of police response unless the household is determined to have had in excess of ten false alarms in a billing cycle. All fees for excessive false alarms at unregistered locations shall be billed at least monthly to the property owner. All fees for false alarm responses caused by failure of an alarm system business to notify the police in advance of performing maintenance to an alarm system will be billed to the alarm system business. All such false alarms will be billed at a rate of \$100 per false alarm at least monthly.

Section 11 Permit Required for Private Detective Agencies, Security Services and Alarm Systems Businesses; Fee Established.

Pursuant to Chatham County Code Section 10-304, all businesses engaged in or seeking to engage in a private detective business, a private security business, or an alarm system business shall make application to the Chatham County Department of Building Safety and Regulatory Services for a permit to operate said business and shall pay a permit fee of \$100 at the time of application for a Business Tax Certificate and at the time of annual renewal of the Business Tax Certificate. The application for this permit shall be on a form provided by the Chatham County Department of Building Safety and Regulatory Services.

Adopted this _____ day of February, 2010.

CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA

BY: _____
Pete Liakakis, Chairman
Board of Commissioners

ATTEST: _____
Sybil E. Tillman
Clerk of Commission

[S E A L]

STATE OF GEORGIA)
)
COUNTY OF CHATHAM)

PRIVATE SECURITY AGENCIES ORDINANCE OF CHATHAM COUNTY

AN AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE III, SECTIONS 10-301 THROUGH 10-306 OF PRIVATE SECURITY AGENCIES ORDINANCE

BE IT ORDAINED by the Chatham County Board of Commissioners as follows:

Article III of Chapter 10 of the Chatham County Code, entitled "Private Security Agencies" shall be deleted, and in its place the following language shall be used:

ARTICLE III

"Private Detectives, Private Security Business and Alarm System Business"

10-301 Title.

The Title of the Ordinance shall be the Chatham County Private Detectives, Private Security and Alarm System Business Ordinance.

10-302 Definitions

a. Private detective business shall mean the business of obtaining or furnishing, or accepting employment to obtain or to furnish, information with reference to:

- (1) Crimes or wrongs done or threatened against the United States of America or any state or territory thereof;
- (2) The background, identity, habits, conduct, business, employment, occupation, assets, honesty, integrity, credibility, knowledge, trustworthiness, efficiency, loyalty, activity, movement, whereabouts, affiliations, associations transactions, acts, reputation, or character of any person;
- (3) The location, disposition, or recovery of lost or stolen property;
- (4) The cause or responsibility for fires, libels, accidents, damage, or injury to persons or property;
- (5) The securing of evidence in the course of private detective business to be used before any court, board, officer, or investigation committee; or
- (6) The protection of individuals from serious bodily harm or death.

b. Private security business shall mean engaging in the business of, or accepting employment to provide private patrol service, watchman service, or guard service for consideration on a private contractual basis and not as an employee.

c. Alarm system business shall mean any person, partnership or corporation engaging in the business of planning, installing, servicing, maintaining, repairing, replacing, or monitoring alarm systems within the unincorporated limits of Chatham County.

d. Alarm system shall mean an assembly of equipment and devices arranged to signal the presence of a hazard to which the Savannah/Chatham Metropolitan Police Department, Savannah Fire Department or the Southside Fire Department is expected to respond.

e. Alarm system coordinator refers to the person or entity designated to administer the provisions of this ordinance.

f. False alarm shall mean a bell, mechanical, electrical, or telephone apparatus or combination thereof which is activated for the purpose of summoning the Savannah/Chatham Metropolitan Police Department or Savannah Fire Department to respond when evidence of hazards is found and the responding

service is not needed. Exceptions will be made for alarms activated during system repair or maintenance, provided there is prior notification. Exceptions will be made for false alarms occurring during tornadoes or hurricanes and during widespread power outages exceeding three hours in duration. Such exceptions will not be counted as false alarms.

- g. Registered alarm user shall mean any person, business, or entity, including governmental agencies who own or lease an alarm system from a licensed alarm system business, or on whose premises a licensed alarm system is maintained for the protection of the premises.

10-303 Occupational Tax Certificate Required

- a. All persons engaged or seeking to engage in a private business, a private security business, or an alarm system business shall comply with the requirements of this Article. Tax certificates issued pursuant to this Article shall be valid from the date of issuance through December 31st of the year in which the tax certificate is issued. The tax certificate shall be in a conspicuous place at the business location.
- b. The fees and charges of the tax certificate required pursuant to this Article shall be as specified in the Chatham County Revenue Ordinance.
- c. The Chatham County Department of Building Safety and Regulatory Services shall be authorized to make or cause to be made inspections to determine compliance with the tax certificate posting provisions of the Article.

10-304 Application; Issuance of Tax Certificates

- a. The business owner, or in the event of a corporation, desiring to operate a business covered under this Article shall make an application on a form provided by the Chatham County Department of Building Safety and Regulatory Services for the purposes of registering said business and obtaining a tax certificate to operate said business in unincorporated area of Chatham County.
- b. The Police Chief may grant or renew a tax certificate to any business meeting the following qualifications:
 - (1) The applicant and all persons employed by the applicant must be at least 18 years of age.
 - (2) The applicant and all persons employed by the applicant must be a citizen of the United States or must have a U.S. Immigration Service work permit.
 - (3) Private detective business and private security business applicants must provide proof of a valid state license as required under O.C.G.A. § 43-38-6, and alarm system business applicants must provide proof of a valid state license as required under O.C.G.A. § 43-14-8.1. Alarm system installation businesses must provide proof that a minimum of one employee of the company has the required low voltage electrician's license issued by the State of Georgia.
 - (4) The applicant must register and provide proof that the applicant and all persons employed by the applicant have not been convicted of a felony or any crime involving the illegal use, carrying, or possession of a dangerous weapon or any crime involving moral turpitude.
 - (5) The applicant must inform the Police Chief in writing upon hiring a new unregistered employee and must provide proof that the new employee has not been convicted of a felony or any crime involving the illegal use, carrying, or possession of a dangerous weapon or any crime involving moral turpitude. The new employee must be registered with the Police Chief prior to assuming any duties regulated by this Article.
 - (6) The applicant must inform the Police Chief in writing 30 days if the applicant or an employee of the applicant is convicted of a felony or any crime involving the illegal use, carrying, or possession of a dangerous weapon or any crime involving moral turpitude.

- c. It shall be unlawful for any person to conduct any alarm system business without first paying the required fees and obtaining an alarm system business tax certificate.
- d. No tax certificate shall be issued to any private detective agency, security services business, or alarm system business until the applicant has filed with the Chatham County Department of Building Safety and Regulatory Services, a surety bond in the amount of one thousand dollars (\$1000.00), with surety from a company licensed to do business in the State of Georgia. The bond shall be taken in the name of the County of Chatham and may be called by the Chatham County Department of Building Safety and Regulatory Services for the purpose of enforcing the ordinance. Every business allowed by this ordinance shall maintain such surety bond in full force and effect. Upon failure to do so, its tax certificates shall be suspended until such bond is renewed.

10-305 Uniforms; Vehicles

It shall be unlawful for any person having a tax certificate under this ordinance to wear uniforms or to use vehicular markings which are confusingly similar to the uniform and vehicular markings of the Savannah/Chatham Metropolitan Police Department.

10-306 Alarm Systems Monitoring; Registration of Alarm Users; Police and Fire Service Response; Fees for False Alarms

- a. Each alarm system business must provide to the Alarm System Coordinator a listing of locations that are using an alarm system as defined in Section 10-302(d) of this article furnished by said business. This listing must be in a computerized format specified by the Alarm System Coordinator. All locations on the listing will be considered registered alarm users. Each alarm system business is responsible for supplying the Alarm System Coordinator with any changes to its list of registered alarm users within 72 hours. A registration fee as required by the Chatham County Revenue Ordinance, will be collected by the alarm system business and remitted to the alarm System Coordinator for each registered user at the time of registration.
- b. Only those locations registered by a licensed alarm system business will be eligible to receive police services in response to an activated alarm. Unregistered alarm users may not receive a police response to an alarm. Audible alarm from unregistered locations are subject to violation fo the Chatham County Noise Ordinance.
- c. Excessive false alarms for registered alarm users are considered to be any number in excess of three (3) false alarms during the 12-month billing cycle. All police responses to excessive false alarms will be billed to the alarm user and the alarm system business providing monitoring services to the registered alarm user. The fees for false alarms and the method of billing is as provided in the Revenue Ordinance.
- d. All police responses to false alarms at unregistered locations will be charged a fee and will be billed as provided in the Revenue Ordinance.
- e. The police department is responsible for monitoring and documenting false alarms incidents. A listing of alarm companies with excessive false alarms, locations with excessive false alarms, and the number of excessive false alarms will be maintained by the Alarm Systems Coordinator.
- f. The Police Chief may at this discretion identify those critical or high risk locations or institutions that are not subject to automatic suspension for false alarms (as provided for when such suspension would be detrimental to the safety of the public.

10-307 Audible Alarm System Cutoff Required; Self-Dialing Prohibited

- a. Every alarm system which uses an audible alarm device to attract the attention of the public shall be equipped with an automatic five (5) minute or less cutoff device or shall be silenced manually within five (5) minutes after activation.
- b. Self-dialing devices that call police directly from the alarm location are prohibited. Alarms must ring into a monitored central station which can verify the alarm prior to calling police. It is unlawful to maintain, operate, connect, or allow to be

maintained, operated, or connected, any automatic dialing device which automatically dials the police department and then relays any prerecorded message to report any robbery, burglary, fire or other emergency.

10-308 Provision for Compliance

Those alarm system businesses not in conformity with the provisions of this ordinance at the time of its adoption shall have a period of sixty (60) days from the effective date of the ordinance to conform to the requirements thereof.

10-309 Suspension or Revocation

The Police Chief may, after hearing, suspend or permanently revoke a tax certificate issued under this ordinance, if it is determined that the holder of such tax certificates has committed an act which is a violation of this ordinance or the provision of any Federal or State law, or other ordinance of Chatham County, Georgia, including provisions relating to collection and remittance of permitting, registration and false alarm fees.

10-310 Severability

If any section of this ordinance is declared unconstitutional, illegal or void, it shall not affect or impair any of the remaining sections of this ordinance.

10-311 Repealer

All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with this ordinance are hereby repealed.

10-312 Effective Date

This ordinance shall become effective on _____.

Adopted this _____ day of February, 2010.

CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA

BY: _____
Pete Liakakis, Chairman
Board of Commissioners

ATTEST: _____
Sybil E. Tillman
Clerk of Commission

[S E A L]

=====

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

ACTION OF THE BOARD:

A status report was attached as information.

=====

2. LIST OF PURCHASING ITEMS BETWEEN \$2,500 AND \$9,999 (SEE ATTACHED).**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

A status report was attached as information.

AGENDA ITEM: XIII-2

AGENDA DATE: February 12, 2010

List of Purchasing Items between \$2,500 and \$9,999
That Do Not Require Board Approval

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DEPT.</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
Three (3) Motorola mobile radios	Sheriff	Savannah Communication & Electronic	\$2,577	K-9 Grant
Provide and install six (6) microphones in the Commission Meeting Room	Commissioners	Stage Front Presentation Systems	\$3,965	General Fund/M&O - Commissioners
Bamboo plywood for cabinets at the Resource Conservation Education Center	Public Works and Park Services	Home South Architecture (Sole Source)	\$2,585	Solid Waste Restricted
Demolition/Removal of house located at 1304 Grace Drive	Engineering	Rico Strong Construction, LLC	\$3,108	SPLOST(1993-1998) - Whitefield Avenue
Two (2) 10-ton Goodman HVAC condenser units for Tag Office	Facilities Maintenance and Operations	East Coast Metal Distributors, LLC	\$6,087	General Fund/M&O - Facilities Maintenance and Operations
Labor to install two (2) 10-ton Goodman HVAC condenser units for Tag Office	Facilities Maintenance and Operations	Boaen Mechanical Contractors, Inc.	\$5,950	General Fund/M&O - Tax Commissioner
Eight (8) galvanized steel poles for scoreboard at Jim Golden Complex	Public Works and Park Services	Chatham Steel	\$6,212	General Fund/M&O - Parks and Recreation
300 tons of crush and run stone based material	Public Works and Park Services	Aggregates USA, LLC	\$6,000	SSD - Public Works
Repair of output card and processor module	Detention Center	Convertteam, Inc. (Sole Source)	\$2,664	General Fund/M&O - Detention Center
One (1) used 2006 Mercury Milan for Public Defender	Fleet Operations	Fairway Lincoln-Mercury	\$9,800	CIP - Fleet Operations
420 tons of crush and run stone based material	Engineering	B & D Clearing	\$9,660	SPLOST (2003-2008) - Jail Roads
100 tons of type III stone for renovating the Salt Creek Boat Ramp	Public Works and Park Services	Martin Marietta Aggregates	\$4,400	CIP - Parks and Recreation
110 tons of ballfield clay for Jim Golden Complex	Public Works and Park Services	Glasscock Company, Inc.	\$3,481	CIP - Parks and Recreation

=====

3. ROADS AND DRAINAGE REPORTS.**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Status reports were attached as information.

AGENDA ITEM: XIII-3 Roads
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

TO: Board of Commissioners

THRU: R. E. Abolt, County Manager

FROM: A.G. Bungard, P.E., County Engineer

ISSUE: To provide information on the status of Chatham County road projects.

BACKGROUND: The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) priorities for funding projects under the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) are changing frequently.

FACTS AND FINDING:

1. Truman Parkway, Phase 5. On January 29, 2010 the GDOT awarded a construction contract to Balfour Beatty Infrastructure for \$67,494,183. A groundbreaking ceremony is tentatively scheduled for March 19 at 1300. The project will take approximately three years to complete.

2. Diamond Causeway. The GDOT awarded a design/build contract in 2009 to LPA / United Contracting (joint venture) for \$22,500,000 to construct a two lane high level bridge over Skidaway Narrows to replace the bascule bridge. A ground breaking will be held on the same day as the Truman Parkway Phase 5 ceremony on March 19. The design consultant indicates that construction should begin June 2010.

3. Whitefield Avenue. The FHWA approved the Environmental Assessment (EA) on February 13, 2004. The Concept Report (revised to incorporate a 50 feet wide median with 6 canopy trees) was approved by the GDOT on September 24, 2007. EA and traffic studies (based on traffic projections to 2030) show the project warranted after completion of all phases of Truman Parkway. The Preliminary Field Plan Review was held on May 14, 2008. The Value Engineering Study (required on projects over \$10,000,000) was held by the GDOT on January 26-29, 2010. The Final Field Plan Review is being scheduled by the GDOT for March 2010. ROW acquisition is progressing (closed on 71 of 81). Demolition of structures continues. Expect to certify ROW in May 2010. The project will be ready for letting to construction in FY 2011.

4. Local Roads.

a. Troy Street, Catherine Street, Adeline Street, Billings Road, Elmhurst Road, Beechwood Road, Ridgewood Road. Dirt roads for paving. Billings Road has one condemnation pending. Board awarded a construction contract to pave Catherine Street and Adeline Street on October 16, 2009. Estimated completion is April 2010. Final plans have been submitted for remainder, except for Troy Street.

b. Pyeland Avenue. Board approved award of construction contract on September 25, 2009. Estimated completion is March 2010.

c. Intersection improvements on Chatham Parkway at Veterans Parkway and Garrard Avenue. Project will install signals at ramps from Veterans Pkwy to Chatham Pkwy. Board awarded a construction contract on September 11, 2009. Estimated completion is April 2010.

d. Intersection improvements at King George Blvd and Grove Point Road. Construction plans to add turn lanes and traffic signals are complete. Right of way acquisition is complete. Utility relocation is in progress.

e. Wright Avenue and Fenwick Avenue/Medford Street. Under design for paving.

RECOMMENDATION: For information.

Districts: All

AGENDA ITEM: XIII-3 Drainage
AGENDA DATE: February 26, 2010

TO: Board of Commissioners

THRU: R. E. Abolt, County Manager

FROM: A.G. Bungard, P.E., County Engineer

ISSUE: To provide information on the status of Chatham County drainage projects.

BACKGROUND: For awarded construction contracts, this report provides the latest scheduled completion dates. For projects pending environmental permits, start dates are best estimates. Project scopes include varying degrees of canal widening, bank stabilization, bridges and culverts.

FACTS AND FINDING:

1. Pipemakers Canal. The Pipemakers Canal extends from Bloomingdale to the Savannah River (over 13 miles). The project includes canal widening, bank stabilization, sluice gates and culverts. Construction of the sluice gate structure and channel improvements from SR 21 to the Savannah River (about 1.4 miles) was completed in 2005. Staff is working toward a construction contract for the next phase of the project. A separate project to improve operating efficiency and longevity of the sluice gates is also underway.

2. Hardin Canal. The Hardin Canal extends from Bloomingdale to Salt Creek near US 17 (over 12 miles). The project includes canal widening, bank stabilization, bridges and culverts. The Board awarded a construction contract on February 12, 2010 to replace golf cart bridges between I-16 and Southbridge Boulevard. Construction will begin upon execution of the contract. The SR 307/Hardin Canal Bridge Culvert project is underway. Construction of the SR 307 project is expected to take about a year with temporary closure of Dean Forest Road during the summer of 2010.

3. Conaway Branch Canal. The Conaway Canal extends from Bloomingdale at US 80 to Pipemakers Canal (about 1.6 miles). The project includes canal widening, bank stabilization and larger culverts. The Board awarded a construction contract on November 6, 2009. Construction is expected to be complete by June 2010. Temporary lane closures along Conaway Road and Hiram Road have been coordinated with local officials and emergency responders.

4. Wilmington Park Canal. The Wilmington Park Canal extends from North Cromwell Road to the Wilmington River (about 1.4 miles). The project includes canal widening, bank stabilization and culverts. Construction of new culverts with tide gates at Wilmington Island Road was completed in 2002. The project to install rip rap erosion protection at the culvert was completed in November 2009. Staff is evaluating the need for additional improvements.

5. Queensbury Drainage Improvements. The project area is south of Montgomery Cross Road and west of Ferguson Avenue and includes Tara Manor, Lakeview and the Forest City Gun Club. The project includes canal widening, culverts and access for maintenance. Current work will address inadequate drainage capacity of the system serving the Ennis Mobile Home Park and in the area between the Gun Club and the Truman Parkway. Work is expected to produce a preliminary design by May 2010.

6. Kings Way Canal. The Kings Way Canal extends from the Kingswood Subdivision to Whitefield Avenue (about 0.7 miles). The project includes canal widening, bank stabilization and culverts. Phase 1 was completed in 2005 as a part of the construction of Truman Parkway. Phase 2 is complete. Staff is discussing acquisition of drainage easements from the Gun Club that will enable construction of drainage improvements around the back side of the subdivision.

7. Louis Mills / Redgate Canal. The Louis Mills and Redgate Canals are tributaries to the South Springfield Canal. A contract to widen the channel and replace culverts between Garrard Avenue and the railroad was awarded by the Board on June 12, 2009. Construction is expected to be complete by September 2010.

8. Ogeechee Farms Area. The Ogeechee Farms project includes improvements to canals and culverts. Phase 1 was completed in July 2005 (piped in about 0.2 miles of channel south of Vidalia Road and replaced a road crossing at Waynesboro Road). A project to improve several undersized culverts along the Vidalia Canal south of Vidalia Road is under construction and is expected to be complete in May 2010. Staff started work to design improvements at Yemassee Road and Ridgeland Road.

9. Quacco Canal. The Quacco Canal extends from the Little Ogeechee River to the Regency Mobile Home Park (about 4 miles). The project includes canal widening, bank stabilization, culverts, and providing access for maintenance. A contract to construct drainage improvements including replacement of two culverts at Quacco Road and installation of a new storm sewer pipeline is underway and is expected to be complete by January 2011.

10. Norwood Drainage Outfalls. The project will improve drainage capacity and access for maintenance. Four outfalls along Norwood, between Skidaway Road and Lester Avenue, are being considered for improvements. Design work is underway for the outfall at Skidaway Road. Design work is also underway for improvements for the Norwood Place outfall. Staff is in the process of acquiring required rights-of-ways and easements for installation and maintenance of these two drainage improvement projects.

11. Henderson/Gateway. Drainage is provided by the Little Neck Canal and the Henderson Branch Canal (combined length about 2 miles). Development of the subdivisions led to increased rates and volumes of storm water runoff which the canals cannot handle. Design work is complete to replace culverts at Henderson Oaks Drive and a golf cart crossing. Staff is working with utilities to relocate facilities prior to construction.

12. Shipyard-Beaulieu Area. The project will be accomplished in phases. The first phase was to replace the storm drain pipe at Beaulieu Avenue. Construction of the first phase began in September 2009 and was completed in January 2010. The second phase will replace an undersized storm drain pipe behind the Montgomery Baptist Church. Staff is working with the church for required easements for maintenance and access.

13. Grange Road Canal. The project to relieve flooding extends from Pipemakers Canal to north of Grange Road (about 1.8 miles). The original concept identified the need for an outfall to the Savannah River within the unopened right of way of Grange Road. In 2007, the GPA requested that the right of way be abandoned for a container berth expansion. Staff is coordinating the County's needs for drainage improvements with GPA's needs to expand.

14. Skidaway Road. The project will improve roadside drainage and address vehicle safety issues along a portion of Skidaway Road near Wormsloe. Preliminary construction plans are complete and rights of way acquisitions are complete for all properties. The project was approved by the Coastal Resources Division in December 2009. Staff is currently working to secure temporary construction easements from the Department of Natural Resources.

15. LaRoche Culvert. The project includes the replacement of a drainage culvert located under LaRoche Avenue north of Lansing Avenue. The culvert replacement is in response to a deteriorating brick arch culvert with several cracks. A Professional Services Agreement contract was approved by the Commission on January 29, 2010.

16. Lehigh-Shipyard Lane Area. The project will relieve roadside drainage issues causing nuisance flooding in the Lehigh Avenue and Shipyard Lane area. Preliminary design work is complete for improvements within the existing Lehigh Avenue right-of-way from Shipyard Road to Shore Avenue. Final design plans are expected to be complete by July 2010.

17. Laberta-Cresthill Area. The project will relieve flooding within the Cresthill Subdivision. An engineering firm evaluated the storm water drainage system and the outfall to Haneys Creek. Preliminary design work is underway to improve the piping network and the outfall.

18. Quacco Canal Drainage Extension. The project will relieve drainage issues causing street and nuisance flooding in the Willow Lakes Subdivision. Preliminary design work is underway to extend the piping network from Quacco Trail to the existing lake within the subdivision.

19. Belleview Drive Drainage Improvements. The project was designed by staff to improve drainage problems involving standing water that is a primary cause of pavement degradation and public nuisance. Construction of drainage improvements including a new storm sewer and drainage inlets is underway with completion expected by April 2010.

20. Wahlstrom Road. The project will address drainage and maintenance access along the portion of Wahlstrom Road north of the railroad tracks. Drainage infrastructure in the area has received infrequent maintenance in the past due to extensive industrial activities in the area and lack of access. Current work is directed toward identifying ownership and responsibility of existing infrastructure and locating existing drainage easements and rights of way.

RECOMMENDATION: For information.

Districts: All

=====

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion being made by Commissioner Shay and seconded by Commissioner Thomas, the Board recessed at 10:25 a.m. to go into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing litigation. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone, Odell and Kicklighter were not present.]

Following adjournment of the Executive Session, the meeting of the Board of Commissioners was reconvened at 11:17 a.m.

=====

ITEMS FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 1. **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 Shay moved to approve a motion to authorize the Chairman to execute an Affidavit that the Executive Session was held in compliance with the Open Meetings Act. Commissioner Odell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone and Kicklighter were not present.]

=====

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought before the Commissioners, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 11:18 a.m.

=====

APPROVED: THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 2010

PETE LIAKAKIS, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF
COMMISSIONERS OF CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA

SYBIL E. TILLMAN, CLERK OF COMMISSION