

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA, HELD ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 2014, 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 Albert J. Scott called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. on Friday, January 16, 2015.

Chairman Scott said, you be seated. I ask that you be seated now and when the pastor completes his remarks and indicate it's time to pray, I ask that you re-stand and remain standing as we are led in the Pledge of Allegiance by our Commission Pro Tem, Commissioner Stone.

=====

**II. INVOCATION**

Chairman Scott said, it's a great deal of pleasure today to welcome back before us one of Chatham County's premier pastors, and in fact, I refer to he and his family as Chatham's missionaries. I've known Pastor Brown for a number of years and -- and I've never known him to do anything but to travel throughout this community and to try to spread good will and unity to all and for all. He's been on the right side of most issues confronting us. He's been just a dedicated leader in this community. But for those of you who may not know that he pastor St. John Baptist, that was commonly -- and he sort of nicknamed it the Mighty Fortress. He pastored that church from 1969 until 2006, until he retired. He now serves as pastor emeritus. He's originally out of First AB here in Savannah, where he and his wife attend church prior to he becoming pastor of the Mighty Fortress, and it's with a great deal of pleasure today I invite before us to lead us in devotion the Reverend Southall Matthew Brown, pastor emeritus of St. John. Pastor Brown.

Pastor Matthew Southall Brown, Sr., said, thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, County Commission. I want to thank you for those kind words. In fact I -- I really like the way you butter your bread. You are -- you are so extravagant. I want to just very briefly talk about something this morning and I -- I want to pull a -- pull a page out of my recent book -- well my first book, which is entitled, *The Best of Pastor Matthew Southall Brown, Sr.'s 6:30 a.m. Meditative Thought*. Those of who you have followed my ministry over the 60 odd years that I have been ministering know that I had been on the -- the air, the radio, for 22 years, and when I retired from St. John, the Mighty Fortress, I decided to retire from the air, but there were so many people who came to me and who contacted me, and -- as to why we were not on the air and encouraged me to put some of these thoughts into writing, those that I had done on the air. And I'm -- I want to go to page 95 of this book and the title of this meditative thought is *Meet God in the Morning*. Meet God in the morning. It starts with Psalm 5 versus 1 through 3 which says give air or listen to my words, O Lord. Consider my meditations. Harken or listen unto the voice of my cry, my King and my God. For unto thee will I pray. My voice shall you hear in the morning, O Lord. In the morning will I direct my prayer unto you and will look up.

Pastor Brown said, I am convinced that there is no better way to start one's day than with prayer. I'm convinced of that, and I want to pause if you will allow me to to commend this Chairman for beginning this session with prayer and meditation. I cherish this invitation to open this august body with words of meditation and prayer. I remember when I was invited to open the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C. The speaker of the House of Representatives asked me if I had any advice to leave with her, and I said to her do what you did this morning. And she asked what was that, and I replied, pray. Now that may sound like a simplicity. It may sound like a trite expression, but I come today to tell this Chairman and these Commissioners and this audience that if there is anything that we need more in this city, this county, this state, this nation, and in deed this world, is prayer. And let me say that it may sound like a oversimplification, but I know it's not. Take it from an old man. I've tried it, and it works. It works, y'all.

Pastor Brown said, there are literally thousands is not millions of people in this nation who wake up, get up, and start their day without a word of prayer, without asking for God's guidance, protection and asking him to cover them as they go through another day. My people, my brethren, my sisters, if I can just say very briefly that we need prayer in this county. If it were Sunday morning at 11:00 o'clock, I would extrapolate, but I know that you have work to do. But allow me to say that there is an acute need for prayer in this town, this county, state, nation, in fact, indeed the world. There is trouble in the Kremlin in Russia; trouble in the Knesset in Israel; trouble in the Parliament in England; and yes trouble in the Senate in America. And so I have come this morning not to congratulate because it is the duty of men and women who are leaders in a community to seek God's guidance. Whomever he might be, Allah, whatever, seek your God's guidance. These are peculiar times and listen it takes a peculiar kind of people for the times we are living in. It takes people of prayer.

Pastor Brown said, if I could just close these words of meditation with the latter part of this meditative thought that is recorded in my book. One of the best times to meet God is in the morning. That is when you make your

requests for the day. The secret of a good day is meeting God early in the morning. The secret of a close relationship with God is to pray to him earnestly each and every morning. In the morning our minds are free. Free from the problems, the hustle and the bustle of the day. Free. The Psalmist made two requests of God, give ear, listen, consider, listen. One of God's attributes is hearing. He said to the children of Israel I have heard your prayers. I have heard your cries by means of your task masters. I know your sorrows. Let us pray.

Pastor Brown gave the invocation as follows:

Eternal God, our Father, as we come at the initial meeting of this great and august body of our county, we come asking my Father that we all will pray. For prayer is the soul's sincere desire. It can be uttered or unexpressed. It is the motion of a hidden fire that trembles in the breast, and so we ask that this body will become if not already a praying body. Your word told us that men, women should always pray lifting up holy hands without wrath or without doubting. We pray, O God, for he who leads this body. We pray my heavenly Father for each man, each woman who represent whatever portion or District of this county. Make them responsive to the needs of their constituents. O Lord our Lord how excellent is your name in all the earth. Your name is worthy to be praised. And so we praise you my Father for giving to us such a beautiful city, such a beautiful county. Lord, may we show our appreciation for what you have given, for thanking you through prayer. Bless us. Keep us. Hold us. Guide us. Lead us I pray. In your blessed name. In the name of him who said, if I be lifted up from the earth I will draw all men unto me. In his name do we pray. Let us say together. Amen. Amen. And Amen.

Members of the Commission and Members of the audience collectively said, Amen.

=====

### III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Stone led all in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

=====

### CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

Chairman Scott said, pastor, before go --

Pastor Brown said, thank you, Mr. Chairman for --

Chairman Scott said, I have something that I want to read here before you leave. It's a proclamation.

Chairman Scott read the proclamation as follows:



**WHEREAS**, Chatham County takes great pride in recognizing spiritual leaders that serve as beacons in the community; taking the time to share the Word and spread comfort and good cheer to their fellow-man, and in that spirit, we salute Reverend Matthew Southall Brown, Sr.; and

**WHEREAS**, a native of Savannah, Pastor Brown, as he is referred to, provides dedicated service that has benefitted not only our community but our country as well. He served with valor in World War II as one of 2,221 black soldiers who volunteered during the Battle of the Bulge; and

**WHEREAS**, following his honorable discharge, he returned to Savannah to attend college and later became the pastor of the historic St. John Baptist Church, "The Might Fortress" where he served from 1969 to 2006; and

**WHEREAS**, over the years, Pastor Brown wore many hats. In addition to being pastor of St. John Baptist Church, he served as Chief Chaplain of the former Savannah Police Department and the Savannah-Chatham Metropolitan Police Department, on the original state-wide Martin Luther King, Jr. Observance Holiday Committee, the Department of Family and Children Services for Adoption Program and the One Church, One Child National Program, to name a few; and

**NOW, THEREFORE**, I, Albert J. Scott, Chairman, on behalf of the Chatham County Board of Commissioners, do hereby applaud:

**REVEREND MATTHEW SOUTHALL BROWN, SR.**

for his willingness to unselfishly give of himself to render service, comfort, support, care and encouragement to the citizens of Chatham County.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of Chatham County, Georgia to be affixed this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of January 2015.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Albert J. Scott, Chairman  
Chatham County Commission

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gail F. Gordon, Administrative  
Assistant to the Chairman

Chairman Scott said, Pastor, I want to ask members of my Commission to come down, and we're going to present you a framed copy of this proclamation.

Pastor Brown said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you come down, just let me say that that is Senior, because there is a Junior on the planet. Right here in Savannah.

[NOTE: All Commissioners helped in presenting Pastor Brown with the Proclamation]

Pastor Brown said, I just -- I just asked the Chairman, you know -- you know I'm a Baptist preacher, right? Well just let me say that I -- I cherish this. This is another high water mark in my life, and I just said here to this young lady, some years, years ago, you're not that old, I said to you --

Commissioner Stone said, yes, I am.

Pastor Brown said, you and I served on some sort of commission. I don't remember, and you were so dynamic on that commission, and I said to you, young lady, you are on your way. I expect great things out of you, and I just said to her that I'm still -- I'm still expecting greater things out of you.

Commissioner Stone said, thank you. Thank you so much.

Pastor Brown said, and not only -- and not only out of this young lady, but out of all of us. We can come together and make this town the kind of town we want it to be.

Chairman Scott said, thank you so much Pastor Brown. I won't say how old Pastor Brown is, but I'll tell you this, that he was born in 1922. Now -- so you can do the math.

=====

**IV. ROLL CALL**

Chairman Scott said, the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present:           Albert J. Scott, Chairman  
                      Dr. Priscilla D. Thomas, Vice Chairman, District Eight  
                      Helen L. Stone, Chairman Pro Tem, District One  
                      James J. Holmes, District Two  
                      Tony Center, District Three  
                      Patrick K. Farrell, District Four  
                      Yusuf K. Shabazz, District Five  
                      Lori L. Brady, District Six  
                      Dean Kicklighter, District Seven

Also present: Lee Smith, County Manager  
R. Jonathan Hart, County Attorney  
Janice Bocook, County Clerk

=====

## **CHATHAM COUNTY YOUTH COMMISSION**

Chairman Scott said, now I will recognize our vice Chairman for the purpose of introducing the members of our Youth Commission who've joined us here today.

Commissioner Thomas said, thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen. Serving with us today from the Chatham County Youth Commission, Monica Green, who is a senior attending Johnson High School, and Jesse Green, a senior attending Beach High School. Welcome.

Commissioner Center said, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Scott said, thank you all for being here.

Commissioner Center said, I -- yeah, I just wanted to make a comment to our -- to our vice Chairman and congratulate you. I think you started the Youth Commission idea, and I read in the paper that Tybee now has a Youth Commission also. So I want to congratulate you on growing things.

Commissioner Thomas said, I didn't hear you.

Commissioner Center said, I understand you started the Youth Commission years ago.

Commissioner Thomas said, yes, and I --

Commissioner Center said, and I read in the paper that Tybee yesterday or this week swore in a Youth Commission, so they're copying you. I want to congratulate you on growing your idea.

Commissioner Thomas said, yeah. I founded the Youth -- Chatham County Youth Commission and the Summer Bonanza. They were the first two youth groups in -- and they are the official youth group of Chatham County. Okay.

Chairman Scott said, all right. Thank you so much.

=====

## **V. PROCLAMATIONS AND SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS**

### **1. PRESENTATION FROM TARA JENNINGS, DIRECTOR OF THE COASTAL GEORGIA INDICATORS COALITION, INC.**

Chairman Scott said, at this time I am going to introduce the County Manager for the purpose of presenting the next item on our agenda, which is the presentation by the Coastal Georgia Indicators Coalition.

County Manager Lee Smith said, yes, sir. Thank you. Good morning. We have with us this morning Tara Jennings, Director of the Coastal Georgia Indicators Coalition. We have begun the process officially January 1<sup>st</sup>, hit the ground running on new Chatham Community Blue Print. So I'd ask Tara to come forward and go over with you a couple things. We're going to be addressing I think the schedule of events. We've had some really good steering committee meetings. We'll be giving you some -- really the methodology behind what we'll be doing over the next couple months, the community involvement in this process. So I'll turn it over to Tara at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Tara Jennings, Director of the Coastal Georgia Indicators Coalition, said, good morning. Thank you. Just to kind of give you a brief overview of the project. I believe you have a couple of draft documents, and I'll leave with you an updated version of those. Basically, what we are doing is we are hosting a couple of different things. So we have first of all a public opinion survey that will go out in February. That will be sent out to an estimated one in four Chatham County households. So we're estimating about 26,000 surveys will be sent out. You have a draft of that survey in your packet, and I would appreciate if you have any feedback or any suggestions on the survey, if you'll send them to me electronically. I'll take those back to the committee for consideration.

Ms. Jennings said, in addition to that we are doing some community engagement opportunities. The first of those being neighborhood forums in each of the eight Districts. I believe you have a sample or a draft survey, or a draft schedule of that. I also have an updated schedule to leave with you today. I would ask that you would one, advocate for that in your area. Also, if you can plan to attend, that would be greatly appreciated. I do know

that I think the one in Pooler apparently conflicts with the City Hall, City Council meeting, and so I'm going to look at that and maybe edit that part. Likewise, if there are other community meetings that you are aware of in your District that you would like for us to attend and gather information, we would ask that you would let us know that, and I'll do my best to be in attendance or someone from the committee will be there as well.

Ms. Jennings said, we do have a steering committee. We have an indicators coalition which is made up of sponsors and partners. We are working a lot of different community groups to gather information, and especially if there's any role, in regards to the Youth Commission, we would like to be able to have youth input in this process. So if you have -- there's a way we can make that connection, just let me know, and I'll be more than happy to try to make that process work. Okay? We do have a website that has a calendar of events. It also has a newsletter, and we also have the data there as well. So there's a variety of ways people can get engaged in the process, and we'll continue to keep you abreast of our findings and our process through -- as we continue through the process. So, I have a couple of documents, I'll just pass out for you as I've mentioned and will answer any questions that you might have.

Commissioner Thomas said, do you have a contact number?

Ms. Jennings said, yes, ma'am. I'm going to put it out here for you. What's the best way to?

Commissioner Thomas said, thank you.

Chairman Scott said, carry on with your presentation if you would.

Ms. Jennings said, that -- that's all I have, sir.

Chairman Scott said, okay. Is there any questions?

County Manager Smith said, I do want, Mr. Chairman, to thank Tara and thank the steering committee. I've been in a couple of those meetings, and I want to thank all the municipalities, a lot of area groups that are participating. I know the other -- the last meeting I think we had earlier this week, I believe, out at Armstrong, they started talking about plans that we had worked on in the past, and people from the crowd start naming plans, and we finally had to stop because so many plans had happened, and, of course, I -- I assume what the activity was bringing about is we plan, we plan, we plan, we plan to plan. What did we do? I then I think light bulbs went on, and I saw people afterwards go, you know what, we've got to decide what we want, what we want the plan to be, but the implementation and carrying that forward is so important that I think the light bulb went on, and I think the Chairman used the terminology two or three meetings ago about strategic planning. He said that the -- the word was strategic, and he's right. You've got to be strategic in -- not only the planning part, but in the implementation, and we had a lot of good conversations. I want to thank Tara. She is located over at MPC. So she's really close to -- to us, so we can grab hold of her when we need her, and we appreciate what she's been doing, and we look forward to working together over the next year.

Ms. Jennings said, thank you, and like I said, just please reach out to me and let me know if there's any way or anything that I can do to make this process easier for engagement of the people. Okay.

Chairman Scott said, thank you.

Commissioner Center said, thanks.

Chairman Scott said, you know we -- we envision truly a -- a strategic plan or blue print for what is the desire, wishes of the citizenry of this county, as well as the business community, but also, what folk are willing, hopefully will be focused on, what folk are willing to spend their money on, invest in, and what are their priorities. And a good strategic plan, it's not a 20 -- 2020 focus plan. We've -- we've done a number of plans. Some of them I've participated on in the past. It dates way, way back. A good strategic plan is a living document. It's worked on every day, every year. It's incorporated into your budget, and not only that, it's updated periodically. It's not something to just let lie and doesn't take into consideration of the changing world in which we live, and so that's what I envision for the county. And so it's a process, and it's the -- we're in the very early stages of it, but I hope, if you would follow along, I think it's really going to be great for the county going forth.

County Manager Smith said, yes, sir.

=====

## **VI. CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS**

None.

=====

## VII. COMMISSIONER'S ITEMS

### 1. REQUEST BOARD ELECT A CHAIRMAN PRO TEM FOR 2015.

Chairman Scott said, the -- the next item we want to take up and it's in your packet as an executive session item, but it's the election of our Commission Pro Tem for 2015. I've had one name submitted, and that's the name of our current Pro Tem, Commissioner Helen Stone.

Commissioner Center said, and I move we elect Helen Stone Chairman Pro Tem.

Commissioner Holmes said, second.

Commissioner Shabazz said, and I'd like to --

Chairman Scott said, I recognize Commissioner Brady and then Commissioner Shabazz, in that order.

Commissioner Brady said, Commissioner Stone, how long have you been the pro tem?

Commissioner Stone said, I'm trying to remember. I think, three years? Three or four years.

Commissioner Brady said, that's it?

Commissioner Stone said, three or four years.

Commissioner Brady said, 'cause --

Commissioner Stone said, something like that.

Commissioner Brady said, -- this will be my second year -- full year, so you were only pro tem one year prior to that?

Commissioner Stone said, either one or two. I can't remember.

Chairman Scott said, two years prior to that.

Commissioner Stone said, two? Okay.

Commissioner Brady said, so four -- this will be your fourth year?

Commissioner Stone said, yes.

Commissioner Brady said, okay. My -- my only comment in reference to it, and -- and I -- I don't have any complaints about the work that you're doing, but, Mr. Chairman, and -- and I know you have your reasons for this, but originally, I think your first meeting said that we would rotate that position. While it is only a -- a position of -- of really a -- a title of -- of -- of any kind, there's no real work to be done by that person, I -- I think that it should be rotated, and I think that other people should have some form of a leadership role in, and -- and I know that -- I certainly would want the position eventually. And there's only two, actually -- well, one, two, three, four new members on this Commission that I know would probably like to have an opportunity to have some form of a leadership role. So I just want to put that out there. I'm a little disappointed that we have not rotated that position. I understand the -- the Chair -- Vice Chair's position is for a four-year term, but I just wanted to -- to stress my concerns about the continuation of -- of -- of -- of Commissioner Stone to be in a position for four years.

Chairman Scott said, okay. Commissioner Shabazz.

Commissioner Shabazz said, I'd like to make a nomination for that position if possible.

Chairman Scott said, no. We have -- we have a motion and a second on the floor that we're discussing. It's been moved and second that we elect Commissioner Pro Tem. Now if you have a substitute motion that would be in order.

Commissioner Shabazz said, okay. Well I have a substitute motion.

Chairman Scott said, then state it.

Commissioner Shabazz said, and that is that I nominate Dean Kicklighter for that position.

Chairman Scott said, is there a second?

Commissioner Shabazz said, that's -- that's in light of what my colleague just said here.

Chairman Scott said, is there a second?

Commissioner Brady said, I second it.

Commissioner Shabazz said, and -- and also what you said about rotating that position.

Chairman Scott said, yes. And there's a motion and a second that we elect Dean Kicklighter for that. Any discussion?

Commissioner Center said, now -- now I have a -- a -- a question.

Chairman Scott said, yeah.

Commissioner Center said, since it's a nomination, do we do one at a time or is it like an election, we vote between the two?

Chairman Scott said, well, if you --

Commissioner Center said, has this ever occurred before?

County Attorney R. Jonathan Hart said, no.

Chairman Scott said, no, but -- but here's -- here's the deal is that we can vote on them in the order in which they came, and if Commissioner Stone gets five votes, because what he's simply doing is placing somebody else in the -- in the running. And if Commissioner Stone gets five votes then the second motion dies because we would have elected. So at first -- first we will have a vote on Commissioner Stone as our pro tem, and all in favor of that would do so by voting yes, opposed no. Commissioner Stone has received five votes, she's elected -- six votes. She's elected pro tem.

Commissioner Center said, you got to vote.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, I don't want to vote against myself.

Commissioner Center said, well -- well, we can ex -- I -- I move that we excuse Commissioner Kicklighter from voting.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, thank you.

Commissioner Farrell said, second that.

Chairman Scott said, okay. So -- well, the -- the -- the appropriate --

Commissioner Center said, isn't that how we have to do it?

Chairman Scott said, yes. So Commissioner -- Commissioner Stone is re-elected as Commissioner Pro Tem. She received a majority of the vote, so there will be no further votes taken on it. Thank you.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, thank you. Thank you.

Chairman Scott said, next we're on -- congratulations Commissioner Stone.

Commissioner Stone said, thank you.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved to appoint Commissioner Stone as Commission Pro Tem. Commissioner Holmes seconded and the motion carried in a 6-2 vote. Chairman Scott and Commissioners Stone, Holmes, Center, Farrell, and Thomas voted yes. Commissioners Shabazz and Brady voted no. Commissioner Kicklighter was excused from the vote and abstained.

**AGENDA ITEM: VII-1**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners

**FROM:** Lee Smith, County Manager

**ISSUE:**

To elect a Chairman Pro Tem for 2015.

**BACKGROUND:**

The County's Enabling Act requires the action be taken during the first meeting of the Board in each new year.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

Concerning the election of the Chairman Pro Tem, the Enabling Act states: ***At the first regular meeting in January of each year, the Board of Commissioners shall elect from its members a Chairman pro tem. In the event of the absence of both the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, the Chairman pro tem shall preside at meetings of the Board of Commissioners. Such a Chairman pro tem shall not have or exercise any of the duties or authority of the Chairman except to preside at meetings of the Board of Commissioners.***

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Elect a Chairman Pro Tem.
2. Postpone election of a Chairman Pro Tem.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

Compliance with the Enabling Act.

**FUNDING:**

Not applicable.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Alternative 1.

=====

## **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 (\*)

None.

=====

## **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 APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING BUDGET AMENDMENTS AND TRANSFERS: 1) IN THE MULTIPLE GRANT FUND INCREASE REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES \$162,000 FOR A GRANT AWARD FROM THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL; 2) IN THE WATER AND SEWER FUND APPROPRIATE NET ASSETS AND INCREASE EXPENDITURES \$191,875; 3) IN THE GENERAL FUND M&O: A) APPROPRIATE \$5,980 FUND BALANCE COMMITTED FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT TO THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT FUND, B) TRANSFER \$13,940 FROM JUVENILE COURT CONTINGENCY TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S BUDGET, C) TRANSFER \$49,923 FROM JUVENILE COURT CONTINGENCY TO THE JUVENILE COURT'S BUDGET; AND D) TRANSFER \$92,480 FROM RESTRICTED CONTINGENCY TO THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S BUDGET; 4) IN THE CATASTROPHIC CLAIMS FUND: a) APPROPRIATE \$1,773,895 FUND BALANCE AND b) INCREASE TRANSFER OUT TO RISK MANAGEMENT FUND \$1,773,895, AND 5) IN THE RISK MANAGEMENT FUND: a) INCREASE REVENUES \$1,773,895 TRANSFER IN FROM CATASTROPHIC CLAIMS AND b) INCREASE EXPENDITURES \$1,773,895.**

Chairman Scott said, next is the Items for Individual Action, and we'll start with Item 1. This is to request approval of the following budget amendments and transfers: in the Multiple Grant Fund increase revenues and expenditures by 162,000 for a Grant Award from the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council; 2) in the Water and Sewer Fund appropriate net assets and increase expenditures by \$191,875; 3) in the General Fund M&O: appropriate \$5,980 Fund Balance committed for Emergency Management to the Emergency Management Department, Transfer \$13,940 from the Juvenile Court Contingency to the District Attorney's budget, Transfer

\$49,923 from the Juvenile Court Contingency to the Juvenile Court budget; and b) -- and d) transfer \$92,480 from Restricted Contingency to the County Attorney's budget; 4) in the Catastrophic Claims Fund: appropriate \$1,773,895 Fund Balance and increase Transfer Out to Risk Management Fund \$1,773,895, and 5) in the Risk Management Fund: increase revenues by the \$1,773,895 Transfer in from the Catastrophic Claims and b) increase expenditures by \$1,773,895.

Commissioner Center said, I move that we approve that request.

Commissioner Stone said, second.

Commissioner Shabazz said, second.

Chairman Scott said, properly moved and second. Any unreadiness? Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor indicate by voting yes, opposed no.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved for approval of the request following budget amendments and transfers: in the Multiple Grant Fund increase revenues and expenditures \$162,000 for a Grant Award from the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council; 2) in the Water and Sewer Fund appropriate net assets and increase expenditures \$191,875; 3) in the General Fund M&O appropriate: a) \$5,980 Fund Balance committed for Emergency Management to the Emergency Management Fund, b) Transfer \$13,940 from Juvenile Court Contingency to the District Attorney's budget, c) Transfer \$49,923 from Juvenile Court Contingency to the Juvenile Court's budget; and d) transfer \$92,480 from Restricted Contingency to the County Attorney's budget; 4) in the Catastrophic Claims Fund: a) appropriate \$1,773,895 Fund Balance and b) increase Transfer Out to Risk Management Fund \$1,773,895, and 5) in the Risk Management Fund: a) increase revenues \$1,773,895 Transfer in from Catastrophic Claims and b) increase expenditures \$1,773,895. Commissioners Stone and Shabazz seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEM: IX-1**

**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners

**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager

**FROM:** Amy Davis, Finance Director

**ISSUE:**

To request approval of the following budget amendments and transfers: in the Multiple Grant Fund increase revenues and expenditures \$162,000 for a Grant Award from the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council; 2) in the Water and Sewer Fund appropriate net assets and increase expenditures \$191,875; 3) in the General Fund M&O: a) appropriate \$5,980 Fund Balance committed for Emergency Management to the Emergency Management Fund, b) Transfer \$13,940 from Juvenile Court Contingency to the District Attorney's budget, c) Transfer \$49,923 from Juvenile Court Contingency to the Juvenile Court's budget; and d) transfer \$92,480 from Restricted Contingency to the County Attorney's budget; 4) in the Catastrophic Claims Fund: a) appropriate \$1,773,895 Fund Balance and b) increase Transfer Out to Risk Management Fund \$1,773,895, and 5) in the Risk Management Fund: a) increase revenues \$1,773,895 Transfer in from Catastrophic Claims and b) increase expenditures \$1,773,895.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. Chatham Savannah Veterans Court has been awarded a \$162,500 grant by the 2014 Adult Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program via the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. Correspondence and a resolution to amend the Multiple Grant Fund are attached (to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file).
2. The Public Works and Park Services Director has requested an appropriation of \$191,875 net assets to the Water and Sewer Fund operating budget for maintenance and repairs. Correspondence and a resolution to amend the Water and Sewer fund are attached (to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file).
- 3.(a) The CEMA Director has requested an appropriation of \$5,980 uncommitted fund balance for the payout of accumulated vacation leave. Correspondence and a resolution are attached (to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file).
- (b) An additional Clerical Assistant II position has been requested in the District Attorney's office. A transfer of \$13,086 from the Juvenile Court contingency will provide the necessary funding for the remainder of FY2015.

- (c) A CHINS Coordinator position and a Deputy Court Clerk I position have been requested for Juvenile Court. A transfer of \$49,923 from Juvenile Court contingency is needed to fund the position. A staff report is attached (to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file).
- (d) A transfer of \$92,480 has been requested from restricted contingency to the County Attorney's budget for a forensic audit of Probate Court.
- 4. The Finance Director has requested a transfer from the Catastrophic Claims Fund to the Risk Management Fund combining the funds. Correspondence and a resolution are attached (to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file).

**FUNDING:**

The budget amendment will establish funding in the Multiple Grant, the Water and Sewer, the General M&O, the Catastrophic Claims and the Risk Management Funds. Funds are available in the General Fund M&O for the transfers.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. That the Board approve the following:

**MULTIPLE GRANT FUND**

Increase revenues and expenditures \$162,000 for a grant award.

**WATER AND SEWER FUND**

Appropriate net assets and increase expenditures \$191,875.

**GENERAL FUND M&O**

- a) Appropriate \$5,980 fund balance committed Emergency Management and increase expenditures in the Emergency Management budget.
- b) Transfer \$13,940 from Juvenile Court contingency to the District Attorney's budget.
- c) Transfer \$49,923 from Juvenile Court contingency to the Juvenile Court budget.
- d) Transfer \$92,480 from restricted contingency to the County Attorney's budget.

**CATASTROPHIC CLAIMS FUND**

Appropriate \$1,773,895 fund balance and increase the Transfer Out to Risk Management Fund.

**RISK MANAGEMENT FUND**

Increase revenues and expenditures \$1,773,895 Transfer in from the Catastrophic Claims Fund.

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: Estelle Brown

=====

## **2. REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2015/2016 BUDGET ADOPTION AND MILLAGE LEVY CALENDAR AND SET A DATE FOR THE BUDGET GOALS SESSION/RETREAT.**

Chairman Scott said, Item 2, request Board approval of fiscal year 2015/2016 budget adoption and millage levy calendar and set a date for a budget goals session and retreat. And at this time I'll entertain a motion that we approve and staff will get with everybody and determine that date.

Commissioner Brady said, so moved.

Commissioner Center said, second.

Chairman Scott said, properly moved and second. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor indicate by voting yes, opposed no. Motion carries.

County Manager Smith said, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you right now we're looking at February 19<sup>th</sup> as a tentative date. So if you could look at your calendars, and then get with us by next week, we're going -- and I'll talk with the Chair about setting the specific date. But February 19<sup>th</sup> --

Chairman Scott said, if you -- if you would follow that up with an email.

County Manager Smith said, yes. We will today.

Chairman Scott said, or a text, Mr. Manager, we would appreciate it.

County Manager Smith said, yes, sir.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Brady moved for Board approval of the fiscal year 2015/2016 budget adoption and millage levy calendar. Commissioner Center seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Stone and Farrell did not cast a vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: IX-2**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners  
**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager  
**FROM:** Amy Davis, Finance Director

**ISSUE:**

To request Board approval of the Fiscal Year 2015/2016 Budget Adoption and Millage Levy Calendar, and set a date for the Budget Goals Session/Retreat.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Budget Adoption and Millage Levy Calendar are approved by the Board each fiscal year to facilitate timely adoption of the budget and the millage levy.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. The BY2015/2016 (July 1, 2015 thru June 30, 2016) Budget Adoption and Millage Levy calendar is shown in completion on page 3-5 herein and contains the following major target dates:
 

January 12, 2015	-	Distribution of budget packages
February 9-27, 2015	-	County Commission Board Workshop
May 8, 2015	-	Presentation of proposed budget to Board of Commissioners
May 22, 2015	-	Public hearing at regular Commission meeting
June 12, 2015	-	Year 2015 Tax Digest and 5-year history to Board as information
June 26, 2015	-	Adoption of the FY 2015/2016 Budget (including approval of fiscal year 2016 CIP budget) Adoption of Year 2015 M&O, SSD, and CAT millage rates
June 27, 2015	-	Tax Digest to Atlanta
2. The period from May 11, 2015 through May 29, 2015 is available if the Board wishes to meet with the County Manager, departments or staff to discuss the proposed budget.
3. The Board may elect to hold a Budget Goals Session/Retreat in late January or February 2015 where the Board's goals and priorities for the upcoming fiscal year can be developed. Stated goals and priorities will be utilized by the County Manager to develop the FY 2015/2016 proposed budget. The Board could also have a series of workshops on CIP needs concurrent with the goal session.
4. Approval of the calendar does not preclude the Board scheduling additional workshops prior to budget adoption or amending the target adoption date.
5. The State of Georgia may enforce penalties against counties who do not submit their digest by August 1st.

**FUNDING:**

N/A

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Approve the FY 2015/2016 Budget Adoption and Millage Levy Calendar, and set a date for the Budget Goals Session/Retreat.
2. Amend the calendar.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

State law requires that an annual budget be adopted by the Board for the General Fund and all Special Revenue and Debt Service Funds while a project-length budget should be adopted for construction-in-progress funds. The calendar also provides for levy of millage rates to allow for timely submission of the tax digest to the Department of Revenue.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That the Board approve Alternative 1 and set a date for the Budget Goals Session/Retreat.

Prepared by: Read DeHaven

**CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA BUDGET CALENDAR  
FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 2015 THRU JUNE 30, 2016**

ORIGINAL DATE	BUDGET ACTIVITY	TAX DIGEST PROCESS
September 8, 2014	FY 2016/2020 Capital budget Packages distributed	
October 17, 2014	FY 2016/2020 Capital budget Requests due from departments	
October 27, 2014- October 31, 2014	CIP Committee convenes to rate projects	
November 3, 2014 – November 15, 2014	Finalize FY 2016/2020 CIP - Identify emergency projects/finalize priorities	
November 17, 2014 – December 31, 2014	Prepare FY 2016/2020 CIP Workbook	
November 25, 2014	Begin FY2016 Budget process. Initial packets and instructions distributed.	
January 12, 2015	FY 2015/2016 Budget Request packages distributed	
January 16, 2015	Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2016 Budget Calendar to Board for approval. Five-year CIP Plan submitted to Board	Year 2015 Millage Levy Calendar to Board for approval. Once approved, notice sent to Board of Education on Millage Levy Calendar
January 12, 2015 January 31, 2015	Revenue/Expenditure Data Entry Training with Departments	
January 20, 2015 – January 31, 2015	Goal Setting: Board of County Commissioners/County Manager	
February 2, 2015	Revenue estimates due from Departments	
February 3, 2015- March 6, 2015	Complete Fiscal Year Ending 6/30/16 revenue estimates. <b>All Funds</b>	
February 6, 2015	Budget Request Packages and updated Five Year Goals due from departments	
February 9, 2015 – February 27, 2015	Analyze departmental budget requests/hold conference with Department Heads/Budget Staff (to run concurrent w/staff analysis). Board workshops.	
March 2, 2015 – March 20, 2015	Budget reviews begin – County Manager/Department Heads/Budget Staff (to run concurrent w/staff analysis)	
March 23, 2015 – April 10, 2015	Prepare budget workbooks for County Manager and Board of Commissioners – Final Internal Review by Finance Director-Budget Staff	
April 13, 2015	Advertisement to Savannah News Press for availability of proposed budget/public hearing	
April 13, 2015 – April 25, 2015	Final proposed budget goes to Printer	

May 8, 2015	Advertise availability of proposed budget and May 22, 2015 public hearing (State Law). Proposed budget document and budget message are transmitted to the Board	
May 11, 2015 – May 29, 2015	Board Workshops	
May 13, 2015	Advertise adoption FY 2015/2016 Budget	
May 22, 2015	Board conducts public hearing at regular Commission meeting	
June 1, 2015		Year 2015 Digest provided to Finance for Millage Levy calculations
June 1, 2015 – June 5, 2015	Final review/revisions of Proposed Budget by the Board	
June 4, 2015		Advertisement of 5-year history to newspaper (June 11, 2015 publication as required by State Law).
June 11, 2015		Advertise 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Public Hearing on Millage Levy to be held on June 18th at 9:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Advertise year 2015 Tax Digest and 5-year history (two weeks prior to millage levy as required by State Law - House Bill 66, Act. No. 478). Board of Education adopts 2015 millage rate.
June 12, 2015		Year 2015 Tax Digest and 5-year history to Board as information.
June 18, 2015		Hold 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Public Hearing on Millage Levy - 9:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Advertise 3 <sup>rd</sup> Public Hearing on Millage Levy to be held on June 26 <sup>th</sup> at 9:30 a.m.
June 26, 2015	Adoption of FY 2015/2016 budget by County Commissioners	(1) Hold 3 <sup>rd</sup> Public Hearing on Millage Levy at 9:30 a.m. (2) Adoption of year 2015 Chatham County M&O, SSD, and Chatham Area Transit Millage Levy by the County Commissioners
June 29, 2015 – September 11, 2015	Prepare 2015/2016 budget book and complete FY 2015/2016 budget document	
July 1, 2015	Beginning of Fiscal Year 2015/2016 - budget goes into effect	
July 6, 2015		Resolutions and forms for digest package to Chairman for signature and forwarded to Board of Assessors.
July 10, 2015		Adoption of year 2015 Board of Education Millage Levy by County Commissioners
July 27, 2015		Tax Digest to Atlanta
September 26, 2015	Deadline for submission of adopted budget document for GFOA Award	
August 1, 2015		State Penalty assessed if digest not submitted to the State

=====

- 3. REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL TO CREATE A CLERICAL ASSISTANT III POSITION IN THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE TO PERFORM ADDITIONAL DATA ENTRY DUTIES, TO CREATE A PROBATION OFFICER IV POSITION IN JUVENILE COURT TO FUNCTION AS THE CHINS COORDINATOR, AND TO**

**CREATE A DEPUTY CLERK I POSITION IN JUVENILE COURT TO PERFORM DATA ENTRY WORK AS A RESULT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT.**

Chairman Scott said, okay. Three, to request Board approval to create a Clerical Assistant III position in the District Attorney's office to perform additional data entry duties. To create a Probation Officer IV position in Juvenile Court to function as the CHINS coordinator and to create a Deputy Clerk I position in Juvenile Court to perform data entry work as a result of implementation of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act. And we have the DA with us, and we also have a representative from the Juvenile Court if anybody has any questions. If not, I'll entertain a motion.

Commissioner Center said, I move that we approve this request.

Commissioner Shabazz said, second.

Commissioner Stone said, second.

Chairman Scott said, properly moved and second. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor indicate by voting yes, opposed no.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved for Board approval to create a Clerical Assistant III position in the District Attorney's office to perform additional data entry duties, to create a Probation Officer IV position in Juvenile Court to function as the CHINS coordinator, and to create a Deputy Clerk I position in Juvenile Court to perform data entry work. Commissioners Shabazz and Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEM: IX-3**

**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners  
**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager  
**FROM:** Carolyn A. Smalls, Human Resources Director

**ISSUE:**

Board approval to create a Clerical Assistant III position in the District Attorney's Office to perform additional data entry duties, to create a Probation Officer IV position in Juvenile Court to function as the CHINS Coordinator, and to create a Deputy Court Clerk I position in Juvenile Court to perform data entry work as a result of implementation of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act.

**BACKGROUND:**

In February 2014, Chatham County retained a consulting firm to review the effects that passage of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act would have on the operations of the Juvenile Court and the District Attorney's Office. Among other findings and recommendations, the consultants recommended the addition of a data entry clerk in the District Attorney's Office to perform clerical duties related to juvenile court petitions, the addition of a CHINS Coordinator position in Juvenile Court to provide case management services to certain youth, and the addition of a data entry clerk position in Juvenile Court to handle additional clerical functions that resulted from implementation of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. The Juvenile Justice Reform Act (House Bill 242), which went into effect January 1, 2014, significantly overhauls the provision of juvenile justice services in Georgia. In general, HB 242 requires that the most serious and violent young offenders remain incarcerated, while youth with misdemeanor and more minor offenses receive specialized community-based services.
2. As a result of HB 242, Juvenile Court has transferred responsibility for the preparation of criminal petitions to the District Attorney's Office. Over 1700 juvenile court petitions are drafted and filed each year.
3. At its December 20, 2013 meeting, the Board approved the addition of an Assistant District Attorney (ADA) position to handle the increased workload associated with preparing and filing juvenile court petitions.
4. The consultants have affirmed the addition of the ADA position that was created, and recommends the addition of a data entry clerk in the DA's office to handle the clerical functions associated with juvenile court petitions.

5. The consultants also recommended the creation of a CHINS Coordinator position. HB 242 creates a new approach in Juvenile Court for intervening with children who are currently considered "unruly". The law classifies youth who are unruly or commit "status offenses" as "Children in Need of Services" (CHINS). Status offenses include habitual truancy, running away, possessing alcohol or being found in a bar, violating curfew hours, or being found ungovernable by parents or putting themselves in danger. Instead of being incarcerated, CHINS offenders are served in specialized, community-based programs involving multiple government and service agencies.
6. The Probation Officer IV (CHINS Coordinator) will provide case management services to youth who are designated as Children in Need of Service. The Probation Officer IV's duties will include screening referrals, meeting with children and families, referring children and families to community treatment and/or services. As appropriate, the Probation Officer IV will prepare cases for presentation in Court and provide case supervision to hold the youth and family accountable for court-ordered conditions.
7. The consultants recommended the addition of a data entry clerk in Juvenile Court to handle administrative and clerical functions associated with the CHINS program. The Deputy Court Clerk I position will function as the CHINS/Data Entry Clerk to handle all administrative duties and data entry/collection for CHINS cases. The responsibilities will include preparing notices and correspondence for all CHINS cases, opening and closing CHINS cases, filing CHINS petitions, preparing CHINS files for mediation and/or court, preparing records to be sealed, and keeping track of the mediation calendar.
8. Staff has reviewed the consultant's findings and recommendations, and believe that they are reasonable, appropriate, and will result in more effective and efficient provision of services in compliance with HB 242.

**FUNDING:**

The cost of the Clerical Assistant III position in the District Attorney's Office for the remainder of FY 2015 is \$13,940, with an annualized cost of \$45,302. The cost of the Probation Officer IV position in Juvenile Court for the remainder of FY 2015 is \$35,413, with an annualized cost of \$81,085. The cost of the Deputy Court Clerk I position for the remainder of FY 2015 is \$14,510, with an annualized cost of \$45,959. The total cost of the three position for the remainder of FY 2015 is \$63,863. Funding for these positions will be from the Juvenile Court Contingency Account as set forth in the FY 2015 budget.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

The Board's approval is required to create new positions. Approval of the requested positions will enable the District Attorney's Office and Juvenile Court to provide essential services related to serving youth in Chatham County.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Approve creation of a Clerical Assistant III position in the District Attorney's Office to perform additional data entry duties, creation of a Probation Officer IV position in Juvenile Court to function as the CHINS Coordinator, and creation of a Deputy Court Clerk I position in Juvenile Court to perform data entry work as a result of implementation of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act.
2. Provide staff with other direction.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve Alternative 1.

=====

**[NOTE: Item 5 was taken out of order and heard prior to Item 4].**

#### **4. POLICE MERGER AGREEMENT.**

Chairman Scott said, the next item we have is the police merger agreement. Before we get started on it, here's the format I'd like to take. I'm going to outline it, and then there -- I'm going to see if there's anybody in the audience wants to speak for or against it. If so, I will allow them five minutes each, and then once that's concluded, I will entertain a motion and a second, and I'll open it up for discussion by members of the Commission. And of course members of the Commission who wish to question whomever is making the presentation, that won't be counted as part of their five minutes, but if you want to ask a person who's speaking a question, I will recognize you to do so. Anybody have any objections for that? Hearing none, then what we have before us on Item 4 on our agenda is the Savannah-Chatham Metro -- Metro Police Merger Agreement, and what this merger agreement before you does is really it puts on paper what is a verbal and email

understanding that the County Manager have with the City Manager, and that is that the County Manager would have complete control over precincts, beats and staffing in the unincorporated Chatham County. The City Manager will have -- and all of this is in conjunction with the Chief of Police, Chief Lumpkin, the City Manager will have complete authority over beats, precincts, staffing level within the city limits of Savannah, and it pretty much is outlined in that format, and then it creates a funding formula that we would fund the first year of this agreement at the level in which the city has been billing us, which is 39 percent. We've been paying at 35.1 or whatever it is, but they've been billing us at the 39 percent level. This will provide the funding at the city's billing level for one year. After the first year of the agreement, based on the experience, staffing level, call loads, and everything else, we will recalculate the cost to the unincorporated area or the Special Service District for police services.

Chairman Scott said, now it does make changes on investigations and the reason those changes are made, the majority of the investigations in the unincorporated area, not all of them because we've had some brutal crimes in the unincorporated area, but the majority of them are property related, automobile related, theft, shoplifting, etcetera. We felt that those crimes could be better investigated at the precinct level, partly in discussion with the County Manager and staff that this would afford the officers assigned to the unincorporated area an opportunity to go out and investigate minor and petty crimes. They could do it cheaper, be a savings, and would also afford the officers an opportunity for outreach to get to know the citizens of that area and to afford them to establish a relationship that they might need in the future in the -- in the event that they have to investigate a more serious offense, and that was one of the reasons we wanted to put minor investigations back at the precinct level. And that's all this agreement will do. If you vote for it, it will send it to the City of Savannah. This will be the first vote that we've had a merger agreement. We've had a lot of discussion on it as a Commission. We have voted to terminate the current agreement. We have transmitted a letter to the city so doing. Staff has been diligently working on standing up independent police department, which was your -- which was the staff recommendation and your preference at our workshop. That's ongoing independent of the merger agreement and will not cease until such time that the city adopts your position on the merger agreement. In this proposal they are given 30 days in which to adopt this agreement. In other words, it would give them two meeting cycles in which to adopt it. So if they wanted to have a workshop, if they wanted to study it, they could do so, but what's before you would keep the two departments merged at what I would call a reasonable and just manner after the first year. And that's it in a nutshell what we will be voting on today. And at this time I want to know if there's anybody in the audience who wants to speak for it or against, and if you come up, I want you to identify yourself. I want you to tell me whether you're for it or against it, and then you have five minutes in which to tell us your position. Okay. I see one hand that's up in the audience. At this time would you come forward and identify yourself. If you are representing an organization, I certainly would appreciate it if you would tell us what organization you are representing.

Mr. Chester Dunham said, good morning to the Commissioners and everyone else.

Commissioner Thomas said, good morning.

Mr. Dunham said, my name is Chester Dunham, and I wear a few hats, so I do represent -- am speaking this morning for the A. Phillip Randolph Institute which I'm the president of the local chapter and also with the Dunham report.

Chairman Scott said, well, the other -- okay. But, the other thing, we want to know if you're speaking for it or against it.

Mr. Dunham said, well, from what you just lined out just a few minutes ago, I'm for that. That's one of the reasons I'm here this morning because we's talking about this for a long period of time. I was watching this, reading the history of it going back to, I think, the original 2003 or something when the merger first took place. Am I correct?

Chairman Scott said, actually, it went into effect January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005.

Mr. Dunham said, okay. Right now what you outlined, it make all the sense in the world because you are giving some authority to the county and unincorporated areas which I think they should have, which would make a lot of common sense, and so I'm really and -- and -- and -- and my thing is now is it's to support this. I was thinking all the time with the Commissioners and the new people who you hire, you're hiring, the city has a representative who is the City Manager, and that staff and also the -- you all have a Manager, the County Manager, and that staff, so I think the -- what you just mentioned just a few minute ago, I'm for that, what you're doing now 100 percent, and I hope that this Commission or this Board will vote in favor of that, and that's me as an individual and for some of the people I represent.

Chairman Scott said, okay.

Mr. Dunham said, thank you.

Chairman Scott said, is there any questions of Mr. Dunham? Thank you for your leadership.

Mr. Dunham said, oh, you're welcome.

Chairman Scott said, is there anybody else wish to speak on it? Okay.

Commissioner Center said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to -- I'd like to ask a couple of questions but before we vote I'd like to make comments, but I didn't -- I'd like to ask my questions first, either of staff or -- or --

Chairman Scott said, you can ask questions and -- but comments, we're going to entertain a motion, and then we'll entertain comments and --

Commissioner Center said, all right. So may I ask my questions now?

Chairman Scott said, yes.

Commissioner Center said, okay. And this is to staff or to fellow Commissioners who may have more experience. When I read the editorial in today's Savannah Morning News, it -- it claimed that -- that not having harsh jurisdictional lines is better for response time. I'd like to know from pre-merger to now has response time in the unincorporated areas improved?

County Manager Smith said, no. It has not improved.

Commissioner Center said, okay. And the other question I have, the -- the city has maintained throughout this process one of the things, that we owe them about \$900,000 under the existing agreement. Will that be handled in this proposal or that's something we'll just work out later?

County Manager Smith said, no, we're saying -- as a staff we're basically -- in this agreement, the 39 percent the first year, you go to call or experience in the second year. It does not address that issue.

Commissioner Center said, all right. So that -- that will just remain open aside from it.

Commissioner Center said, yes.

Commissioner Center said, thank you.

Chairman Scott said, that -- that would have to be discussed and decided by staff at another time, but you must also keep in mind that there is a number -- a number in -- in one of them I personally sent a letter on. There's always a number -- well, a large amount of money that's owed to the county by the city and -- and the city -- there's always just some outstanding money that's owed to the city by the county.

Commissioner Center said, yeah. I understand that.

Chairman Scott said, yeah.

Commissioner Center said, I just wanted to clarify that it's being handled differently.

Chairman Scott said, yeah. It will be handled separately.

Commissioner Center said, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Scott said, and to further answer your question, and I'd said this in the Green Room. We have a police department at Tybee. We have a police department in Thunderbolt. We have a police department in Garden City. We have a police department in Port Wentworth. We have a police department in Pooler. We have a police department in Bloomingdale. None of those police departments share precincts or beats. They don't share them with each other and they don't share them with Savannah-Chatham Metro, and there's no issue associated with response time. In fact, Pooler for a fact and to some extent Port Wentworth and Garden City often time responds to calls that come in that's within the City of Savannah because they respond to avoid further delay by Savannah-Chatham Metro, and I've stated this numerous time and for those who don't remember, when a child drowned in a pool in Pooler, that was actually what everybody believed was in Pooler was actually in the City of Savannah. Pooler police and Southside Fire Department responded to it, but it was actually in the City of Savannah because the City of Savannah has elected to go -- go out and annex pockets of the unincorporated area and it has -- and to some extent created difficulties in discerning boundaries. But that's just a fact of life, but it has nothing to do with response time, and -- and so I would say to the people who wrote that editorial, they're not very learned on that matter or on that subject. And -- and if there's a question of staff at this time, I'll entertain it. If not, I'll entertain a motion, and I recognize -- do you have a question?

Commissioner Brady said, yes, sir.

Chairman Scott said, okay. Go ahead.

Commissioner Brady said, I've been -- this probably would be directed to -- to our County Attorney. I've been told or -- or have reason to believe that there are folks who believe that in fact a -- a demerger if you will, that there's laws that -- that possibly prohibit that, and that it would have to go to a vote of the citizens of -- of the entire county. Is there any accuracy to that?

County Attorney Hart said, there is a provision in state law that says that anybody that didn't have a police department for -- before 1992 under subsection (c) of that code section that's often referred to, nobody ever cites subsection (c), says that if you didn't have a police department before 1992 and you wanted to take it out from under the sheriff, you'd have to have a referendum, okay? We've had a police department since they used horses. I don't think the ref -- a county-wide referendum would be required because we've not gotten out of the policing business. If we had, we're spending \$20 million on something I don't know what we're spending it on. We've also been in a situation where the termination provisions of the clause of the merger agreement clearly contemplated us taking back our -- our -- our police department and our assets, and as a matter of fact, all cars that are purchased under that agreement remain titled in the name of -- of the county for that very reason. In addition, we have the CNT totally funded by the county. That is the only department that does county-wide law enforcement, so, you -- you know, that's almost a logical extension of -- of what we're doing in the way of law -- way of law enforcement. We have kept the positions that we had in the former police department on our -- on our budget books as vacant because we're funding them through the city, but we have always kept that. We have always kept our GBI status open as a county police department. The Sheriff has -- has -- has never -- well, I say never's a long time in Chatham County, but in recent memory, that -- you know, we had a police department before we went into the merger, and we still provide the police services, fund the police services. We've just funded them in a different method.

County Attorney Hart said, so I would take the position that that provision we fit under subsection (c). Now that would not require a county-wide referendum, all right? Somebody could sue you for that and challenge that, and you would end up getting a -- a decision by the Court that -- that would say maybe one way or the other. If you did that, let's say you fell under it and you had a county-wide referendum, If the vote's positive on that, you form your own police department. If the vote's negative on that, after a court says you can't do that, then if everybody in the county's voting on that, even though they don't even live in unincorporated county, they're a member of Pooler, a member of Port Wentworth or whatever, the question would then become, would you take all of the function that is currently being budgeted in SSD and move it to the M&O portion of the budget, and -- and that's an option. That way everybody gets to pay for that. So, you know, there's -- there's a lot of issues there if somebody wants to raise it. I don't think it's an issue. We've known about this for some time. If you will recall at the budget workshop, I advised you that there was a provision out there about a referendum, and I said that was one of the problems with putting it under the sheriff. If we put it under the sheriff and it stayed there five or ten years and for whatever reason you decided to take it out from under the sheriff, then clearly that provision would apply. We'd have to have a county-wide referendum to take it back from the sheriff. So that's kind of where we stand on that. Now, if you want to go around town and get six curbstone opinions that -- that I think it means this, I think it means that, you can probably find somebody that disagrees with my opinion. That -- that -- that thing's been on the books, but -- but there's very little in the way, other than sheriff's who are trying to control the police function have ever brought -- brought a claim like that --

Commissioner Brady said, okay. I'm -- I still have another question.

County Attorney Hart said, -- and I don't think our sheriff's interested in doing that. I don't mean to speak for him.

Commissioner Brady said, and this would be for the County Manager. This redline copy that we have, the -- the redline -- the --

Chairman Scott said, before -- before we get on to that, though, I want to get a motion on the floor --

Commissioner Brady said, oh, before I ask my question?

Chairman Scott said, and -- and -- yeah. And -- and because it's directly on that, and then we'll have questions and answers, because if there's not a motion and second then it's a moot point anyway. So I'm going to recognize Dr. Thomas at this point for the purpose of a motion.

Commissioner Thomas said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to move that we approve the proposal as indicated through our Chair, Chairman Scott, the merger agreement as stated.

Chairman Scott asked, is there a second?

Commissioner Shabazz said, I second. Second.

Chairman Scott said, you second it?

Commissioner Shabazz said, yes.

Chairman Scott said, okay. There's a motion and second and it's time for discussion.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Scott said, now I'm going to recognize -- continue with Commissioner Brady then -- then I'm going to Commissioner Kicklighter from the 7<sup>th</sup> and Commissioner Stone from the 1<sup>st</sup>. In that order, please.

Commissioner Brady said, all right. In reference to the most recent document that -- that I received last night.

County Manager Smith said, yes.

Commissioner Brady said, last night, okay? The redline areas in here, those are changes that we made from the last document we received from the city or are those changes that we made from the last document we offered the city?

County Manager Smith said, last one from the city which we -- December 9<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Brady said, okay.

County Manager Smith said, yeah. Because they sent us one December 9<sup>th</sup>, isn't that correct? Yeah.

Commissioner Brady said, so -- so --

County Manager Smith said, so we've tried to be at least consistent in making changes so it doesn't -- it -- it got so confusing.

Commissioner Brady said, well, it is confusing --

County Manager Smith said, yeah.

Commissioner Brady said, -- because now -- because my question was going to be what changed from our original position the last time we offered it? Has anything changed in this document based on the last position we sent the City of Savannah?

County Manager Smith said, that -- that we sent in would be the October -- October 17<sup>th</sup> was our last submittal. I'm trying to go back and think what the major items were.

County Attorney Hart said, the major item I think was dealing with -- with -- with CID --

Commissioner Center said, mm-hmm.

Commissioner Brady said, uh-huh.

County Attorney Hart said, which is the criminal investigation division. This document here says we'll fund it at 39 percent for the first year.

Commissioner Brady said, uh-huh.

County Attorney Hart said, that wasn't in the old agreement. Okay?

Chairman Scott said, yeah.

Commissioner Brady said, okay.

County Attorney Hart said, so that's kind of a give me to the city. We're going to -- you know, we're going to accept your numbers. We're going to accept your budget.

Chairman Scott said, but they've been billing us at 39 percent forever.

County Attorney Hart said, yeah. They've been billing us at 39.

County Manager Smith said, yes.

County Attorney Hart said, we have a difference of an opinion about that.

Commissioner Brady said, we just don't pay it.

Chairman Scott said, yeah.

County Manager Smith said, we pay at 35.1.

County Attorney Hart said, but that takes that off the table.

Commissioner Farrell said, but they didn't renegotiate after four years, so it's all just whatever anybody wants to put out there.

County Attorney Hart said, yeah. The second thing we've -- we've done in this is that we've taken the -- we've -- we've maintained the -- the precincts, and we've maintained all the beats either being in the city or being in the

county, and that is fun -- fundamentally -- the only thing we're doing there is trying to -- to get a handle on what the costs are so we can quit arguing over whose cost it is. What you're really doing there is you're looking at a city precinct and see how many cops you got, how many staff you got, what do you got -- what are your expenses on the building, it's yours, 'cause you're the only person in it. Same -- likewise for the county, and that gives the patrol function away. Now the -- the other thing that we've done is 94 percent of all the -- all the types of various criminal matters that we have in the county, 94 percent of them deal with property. We have very little what I call the super violent crime, rapes, killings, muggings, robberies, things like that.

Commissioner Brady said, which would be under CID.

County Attorney Hart said, which would be under CID. But we've moved the property people into the -- into the precincts. Now what that's going to do, it's going to drive your precinct cost up a little bit 'cause you now got those guys in the precincts, which would be a benefit in that it drives down CID costs, okay, which benefits the city, which benefits the county. And then what we're going to do is --

Chairman Scott said, and the CID is one of the most expensive departments over there.

County Manager Smith said, yes.

County Attorney Hart said, yeah. All of your -- all of your -- you know a homicide detective makes a lot more than -- than a guy on the street because he's got experience, expertise, whatever. And then what we would do after the first year is -- is look at part one crime statistics and -- and calculate out what the call volume was on that for service, okay? And we've got that information. I believe we gave that to you in your seminar. Staff went back through and looked at every call that was made in the county and city for the last three or four years and figured out as best they could what type of response they get, and we've set a percentage in this -- this agreement saying we would pay 20 percent of CID, okay? And if the part one crime increased above 25 percent, that we would recalibrate that to reflect that there's an increase in crime in the -- in the City of Savannah. What's interesting about that as an aside is the staffing -- current staffing level at the -- at the total police department is 606 people. Okay? And there's a vacancy rate of 69 people, so if you're fully staffed, you'd have somewhere around 7 -- 675. I could be off plus, minus a few either way, and when we did our analysis on what it would cost or what kind of staffing we would have to have to have a reconstituted county police department, that was 132 people. So if you take the percentage of 132 people to 675 people, it -- it works out to 19 percent of the total population of the police department, and if you take the fully staffed police -- you -- you -- you take the police as staffed with the 69 vacancies, that works out to approximately 21 percent, which is interesting in that we're asking for 20 percent, which is right in the middle of those two numbers, which is a separate way of kind of truthing what you're trying to say here. But ultimately that number and that percentage is going to be determined by the type of service that each police department provides. If the downtown police department part of the thing gets very, very aggressive, it usually has a tendency to drive criminals out of that jurisdiction, say from downtown into the unincorporated area, so the unincorporated area might -- might have an increase there which you would then recalibrate this.

County Attorney Hart said, so that -- that's really the true difference between it is we've add the call volume into this, and we've added the precinct problem. The --the biggest problem is everybody needs to know what they're paying for, so you got two things here. You got governance, which I don't think there's a tremendous amount of argument over that anymore, but you do have with the County Manager being in charge of governance, insofar as the precinct level and an actual policing function, and then you've got how you're going to split costs, and that's a matter of money, and the only question that comes up there is what's equitable. Well it seems to me like if you're using something that says everything in your precinct is your expense, it's hard to argue about that for either side. And it's also hard to argue about oh, CID, the most expensive thing that we have in the police department, that probably costs the most to staff at 150 people, how many people would the county need if they did their own stand up department? It would be substantially less than that. We don't need eight homicide cops. We manage two murders, three murders a year in unincorporated Chatham County. So if you had eight, four or five of them would be looking for something to do. But, if you stay by the call volume of part one crimes, that's going to tell you where you're doing your serious policing, and we ought to pick up part of CID, and -- because we're getting a benefit out of that. We're -- we're suggesting 20 percent right now based on call volume. If that changes, that would change. And -- and that's --

Commissioner Brady said, and -- and --

County Attorney Hart said, -- that's primarily this proposal.

Commissioner Brady said, and we think -- and we think -- is the staff saying that the 20 percent is what -- what you feel is fair?

County Attorney Hart said, well, you could look at that a couple of different ways. You might even get down as low as 15 percent, but I think it would be very difficult to argue about a 20 percent number, and if you look at your staffing levels, depending on how you're going to take the county staffing levels for a police force compared to what it has now, you're -- you're in the 19 to 21 percent range, so, you know, I -- I think you're -- you're trying to come up with a number that -- that makes you a deal. Now whether -- whether that's satisfactory to the other side, I don't know, you know, 'cause it's going to affect costs. There's no question.

Chairman Scott said, but -- but you'll be able to determine after the first year, and that's what --

County Attorney Hart said, right now we're doing it on population, okay?

Commissioner Brady said, okay.

County Attorney Hart said, or geography. We may as well be doing it on fire hydrants.

Chairman Scott said, and that's what the 39 percent is based on, population.

County Attorney Hart said, yeah.

Commissioner Brady said, okay.

County Attorney Hart said, you may as well do fire hydrants or street lights. It's got nothing to do with police -- policing.

Commissioner Brady said, right. And -- okay. And one last question, Mr. Chairman, in reference to something you said about basically the bullet points are here, and I've -- I've looked at this document as much as I possibly can, considering when I received it, and I've read all the redline stuff, but on page six of this draft it talks about determination of precinct and best -- and beat boundaries, I'm sorry. It says all precincts shall be exclusively established and maintained within the jurisdictional limits of either the city or unincorporated area unless specifically accounted for here in this agreement. Chief shall determine the boundaries of beats within the precinct, however, at no time shall any beat be created that encourages -- or encompasses both municipal and unincorporated areas, and it shows a map here and there -- where in here does it say that specific to -- and -- and I'm -- I'm sure I've -- I've read it, I just don't -- can't find it right now -- hold on. Hold on. Here -- here -- here it is. Jurisdictional. Okay. Chief shall be answerable to County Manager for all matters occurring or arising out of the unincorporated area. City Manager shall have no decision making authority over any action or inaction arising out of or occurring in the unincorporated area of the county. That's what I was looking for.

Chairman Scott said, that's -- that's your answer.

Commissioner Brady said, that's my answer. I answered my own question.

County Manager Smith said, and Mr. -- Mr. Chairman, if -- if I --

Commissioner Brady said, please expand on it.

County Manager Smith said, well, and -- and I also want to, and I mentioned in the Green Room earlier this morning, and this is a -- a doc -- a public document, but this came -- and this was encouraging to me on December 15<sup>th</sup> from the City Manager. She sent the proposed merger agreement over, which the agreement itself, the document that we then altered because of disagreement, she stated in the email that one, the revisions are outlined below. Control of county service levels, beat locations and precincts and staffing by the County Manager and over site of all operations in the county by the County. Two, reduction of the costs which were allocated to SSD, this is accomplished by a) transferring personnel assigned to property crime investigations from CID cost to the patrol center, and Jon has just eluded to that; b) transferring costs to E911. We're pulling some of that out to go to a two-year, and she agreed to go to two years; c) allowing the county to avoid any canine patrol costs by utilizing sheriff's dogs, and we've talked about that.

County Manager Smith said, so the spirit of that email is within the document that we just handed you. Yeah. So, and -- and in the second year, you know, we clearly have said that precincts and beats can be delineated. As the Chair said, we do it every day. We can do it through ESNs which are numbers designated to an address. They're centerline data. You know where calls are coming from out in the unincorporated areas or a city. So it's very easy to delineate costs.

County Attorney Hart said, and it's been my experience in dealing with police departments and EM -- and EMS departments that when the blue light goes on or the red light goes on, they -- they don't wait around. They go do the job and if they need help, everybody else in the other communities are there to stand by and help, and -- and that's the good thing about this community as a whole.

County Manager Smith said, that's true.

Chairman Scott said, anything else?

Commissioner Brady said, yeah for right now.

Chairman Scott said, Commissioner Kicklighter was next but he had to take a break so we'll go to Commissioner Stone.

Commissioner Stone said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. On page three of the agreement that was in our notebook, not the one we were handed last night, I'm still trying to get through some of that, it -- it states that the City

Manager shall have final decision making -- making authority as to the selection and removal of the chief. Where does that leave us as far as negotiating the hiring/firing of the chief? That's the first question that I have 'cause that's -- I mean I think that's been a concern that we really haven't had enough input or authority in the hiring and firing of the chief. And if you want to respond to that, I have a couple more quick questions.

County Manager Smith said, okay. I -- I can. Jon and I, I think, both can respond to that. Part of this discussion with the City Manager and myself, and in a joint meeting of the two attorneys, City Manager, myself and staff, in the Green Room a couple months ago, that was one of the issues. These employees, if you move on a merger are city employees. So I absolutely understand that the Manager, the City Manager has to have oversight on hiring and firing and that type thing with the chief. It's got to be clear by law. Now, where it gets a little gray or we're saying we need responsibility on -- on allocation of resources. We're not saying necessarily who, but in the hiring process of the chief, the County Manager and the City Manager would work together on recruitment. Ultimately the City Manager says yes or no, but we in writing can disagree. So it's not just the -- what consult and confer, but it is in writing, so we could say we disagree because of these reasons. I'm saying we would make that public.

Commissioner Stone said, and if -- and if

County Manager Smith said, so I think it's as clear as it can be.

Commissioner Stone said, and if you disagree, would that have any weight?

County Manager Smith said, well, I think it would because if we saw that a police chief was being hired that would not do the things that we need doing in the unincorporated areas, I'm sorry to say, but that may bring about the issue of termination of the contract, to say that we feel that this cannot be carried out appropriately.

Commissioner Stone said, well, is -- is -- is there a way to guard us to make that any clearer? I mean I don't -- in looking at the writing here, shall, I mean is that as strong as we can get on that?

Chairman Scott said, yeah.

Commissioner Stone said, I mean I'm just concerned that --

County Manager Smith said, I'll let Jon get into the where's and the shall's.

Chairman Scott said, shall -- shall is about as --

County Attorney Hart said, yeah, basically -- basically it boils down to this --

Commissioner Stone said, okay. All right.

County Attorney Hart said, you -- you got a question about picking the chief, okay? Somebody's going to finally decide. The way this document is written that -- that ultimate decision is going to be in -- in the City Manager. There's no question about that.

Commissioner Center said, that's a big concession we have made.

County Attorney Hart said, and it is a huge concession concerning this Board, okay?

Commissioner Stone said, well, that's what concerns me.

County Attorney Hart said, there's no question about that.

Chairman Scott said, but we never -- we never -- we never had the authority before.

Commissioner Stone said, I understand that, but what --

County Attorney Hart said, and -- and the way it's always said is consult, and what does that mean? Open the door and yell and say I'm consulting and shut the door, okay? This language is a little bit stronger than that. If you're going to hire and fire the chief, and you're going to have the -- your chief run it, then if the police department's not working the way it should, then you're going to be answerable as the governing authority in charge of that.

Commissioner Stone said, well --

County Attorney Hart said, so, you know, yes, insofar as selecting a chief, you're -- you're going to have -- the ultimate decision is going to be somewhere else. Ultimately I hope they would find a candidate that both the City Manager and the County Manager can agree upon. Now as a policy matter as far as police procedures, as far as employment practices, as far as salary setting, that -- that's just an employment issue that you need to have some sort of uniformed set of rules. You know, we're not asking that -- that the county not be subject to the -- the standard operating procedures of -- of the police department, we're just saying, look, we want to

be able to allocate the forces we need, and we want to be able to allocate them in the precincts we need them and the beats we need them, and we're willing to pay our share, but we want to be able to calculate what our share is. If you've got merged beats, there -- there's no way to say you -- you just -- you know, you're just taking guesses at what costs are, and if you look at the beats, they can be separated out. We have a very smart police chief. Very smart police chief, and I'm sure he is up to the task of -- of doing that.

Commissioner Stone said, I -- okay. Well, I -- I understand that, and I'm all for doing what's in the best interest of the entire county. I really am, but it -- on the same token, if we are going to have a merged -- M-E-R-G-E-D police department, I want to make sure that we have input from both sides, and -- and that's what concerns me. My second question that I'll make very brief is something I brought up in the Green Room which is the -- the trajectory of the cost pre-merger and where we are now? The numbers were a little bit alarming to me, and I-- and I concur with the Chairman, part of it is inflation, but to go from 2003 to 7.8 million coming out of the Special Service District and now at 14.5 million, this is for the -- the response that I am receiving from the residents in the unincorporated area, we're paying this additional cost which is hurting that budget, which is taking monies away from things like Public Works, and we're not getting the calls for service. We're -- the -- very delayed, an hour, an hour and a half, and that's just not right, so those are the two comments that I wanted to make or questions that I had, and if we can ultimately recognize some savings by having these two precincts accountable under the counties' authority as far as numbers go, then it sounds, and correct me if I'm wrong, that there may be a possibility to recognize some cost savings.

County Manager Smith said, yes, and I think we also have to recognize that with the cost savings, if-- and I'm understanding that increased service is being requested in the unincorporated area. That being the case, we would then be able to offset that as being placed into the city for use back out into the unincorporated area to increase. So let's say, worst case, it's the -- the cost stays the same, but you have higher level of service committed to the public. Well let's say that's what it is. But I do think that we will see savings, even with the increased service. We're going to see dollar savings within 24 months. Now the other thing is I do -- I think Commissioner Brady, and -- and I apologize for not answering sooner, but on the document, the redline, was just a red line to make things clearer. There are no substantive changes from that that you received earlier. I think there was a couple typos, but no concept changes, no this is yes, this is no. Nothing like that in the last few days. There were no changes. I apologize I didn't say that.

Commissioner Brady said, thank you.

County Manager Smith said, mm-hmm.

Commissioner Stone said, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Scott said, okay. At this time I'll recognize the Commissioner from the 7<sup>th</sup> District, Commissioner Kicklighter.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to state right off the bat and make it very clear for the public to really understand what's going on here, because it's very complicated unless you've pretty much lived it and breathed it forever, it -- it's really hard to comprehend, unless you've really followed it. There was never a Chatham County police department ever, ever, ever in the history of Chatham County. Bad name. There was a unincorporated area police department. Unincorporated area Chatham County police department. Right off the bat, the name itself is misleading as far as what kind of coverage and what we're talking about merging. Not all tax payers are paying for the police department that people's talking about merging here today. For purposes of discussion, I'm going to call the unincorporated areas in Chatham County unicity. First I'm going to tell you the -- what the -- if you live in a city -- basically if you live in a city in Chatham County, you get a tax bill for the county and you get a tax bill for your city, and your city taxes pays for your police department. That's in every one of our cities in Chatham County. Whatever you pay in city taxes pays for your police department. It's no different for unicity. They pay county taxes, but they also pay their city taxes, but we call their city taxes Special Service District. Out of their city taxes, if you will, they have been paying for their very own police department, for their very own protection for the maximum benefits to keep the crime rate low.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, we as a governing body are chartered with two major jobs. One is to oversee the budget for the entire county, providing county-wide services. The other is to be the city and the city service provider for unicity. The unincorporated area residents of the county who pay their separate city tax for separate city-type services. That's what we're supposed to do. Two major goals there. So we have to try to separate them. So I just don't want right off the bat people confusing -- thinking -- I hear that often, well, I pay my -- no, it's -- it's different. This is a separate tax that these folks, the 87,000 people living in the unincorporated areas of Chatham County, this is a separate tax that they pay to fund a police department. Now prior to the merger, they were paying somewhere in the area of \$4 to \$5 million for their police services.

Chairman Scott said, Commissioner Kicklighter, could you expand, please, because I get the question all the time from City of Savannah residents that they are paying double for police services. So, you -- you're on that.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, good. Yes, sir. So, yeah, that -- that's a excellent point. So City of Savannah, you're not paying double for your police services whatsoever on that. You're -- you're paying your city taxes for your police department, just as I as a Pooler resident pay Pooler taxes for that police department. So it's not

a double tax whatsoever for -- for anyone living in the cities. As far as -- wow, that just blew my whole train of thought, but --

Chairman Scott said, I'm sorry about that.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, that was good, Chairman. Anyhow, here I'm going to just go --

Chairman Scott said, I can assure you it wasn't intentional.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, it was good though. Remember -- remember that. I know you will. What -- what we're being asked to do is -- at our workshop last month, staff recommended to us that we actually vote to hire a search firm to begin a search for a police chief to oversee the -- the unincorporated areas of the county. Today, what's happened is rather than voting on the staff's official recommendation, because it's not on the agenda. The agenda in which -- I'll leave that part out. It is not on the agenda. We have been presented with what I believe to quote staff, another option to vote on. Rather than the staff's official recommendation as to how the county should proceed towards our goal of providing safety for unincorporated area residents, unicity, the proposal that we are now being asked to approve does not fix what I believe was our as a body our largest concern nor does it achieve our biggest goal when we started actually negotiating -- negotiating here, and that was to have a truly merged police department, and by saying that, meaning, one, that the county, Chatham County, and the City of Savannah had equality with, as far as the hiring and firing of a police chief and the oversight of the police department. This latest proposal does not have that.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, up to this point, there has been in my opinion, basically since 2002 because back then it was great for the City of Savannah and their leadership. I commend them. They didn't have to then because the County Commission back then caved. There's never been a sincere attempt to come up with a fair agreement, and that has been consistent since day one, and I'm going to state this example. Excuse me one second. On September the 16<sup>th</sup> of last year, Savannah sent a counter offer back with a cost of approximately \$15 million. 10/17, the Chairman sent a counteroffer for \$13.9 million. Note, the counteroffer actually was very generous on the Chairman's part because it cost \$1 million more than the county said the cost would be to start a new Chatham County police department. It was more than fair because it actually -- that proposal would have cost the unincorporated unicity area residents \$3 million more than what the sheriff said he could cover the area for. So in a very generous offer from -- in my opinion of what the Chairman sent, on December 17<sup>th</sup>, Savannah in -- with total lack of regard for anything we've sincerely tried to achieve throughout the years, sent a counteroffer back for \$15.9 million. They not only were \$2 million higher than the Chairman's very generous offer, but they were \$900,000 higher than their very own counter in September.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, folks, we're not negotiating with people that really seem to care about equality or -- or care about people truly sharing a merged police department. We're dealing with a group of people that to this point, and by God, we've shown no reason for them to bend, they're going to take everything, step on whatever they can on the way, and at all cost to the citizens in which we're at -- on this particular topic because they're the residents that we're talking about, their money, they're going to step on them as long as we allow it to continue. I am offended by the treatment towards what I respect in your leadership, sir. You have I believe sincerely tried to negotiate with them, and their total lack of sincerity has been disgusting in my opinion. And --

Chairman Scott said, yeah. I don't -- I don't think they have any appreciation for it.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, I -- I -- I absolutely agree. And at this point, I see absolutely no reason whatsoever for us to send yet another counter. The only reason we got a 12:00 o'clock phone call -- or whatever, last night letter last minute is because the recommendation was to go for a search firm to hire a chief. They -- they -- they maybe thought just a little bit, ooh, maybe they have grown up over there and going to do something for their folks, and that's why we got that letter. I'm all for having a truly merged police department. I was from the beginning. I've never opposed a truly merged police department that benefits all parties, but I say the ball is in their court. We give them a month to present this Commission with an offer that they believe we will accept, and if they don't, we vote to get a search firm to start the search for a chief. If they send us a proposal, we'll look at it and vote it up or down. But, I think we have expressed enough good will in this, and the ball is in their court. They have shown no respect to this body. They have shown no respect to the 87,000 people that's paying more than triple the amount for their police services than they were paying for their police services prior to the merger, and it's disgusting. And I would ask the business community and the editors of the paper, try just doing the right thing on this one thing. Don't allow anybody to get screwed. As long as everybody's taken care of equally, we'll probably be all right in this community. So, you know, don't -- don't support the wrong things. Push for what's right. And right is everybody having an equal police department or these 87,000 people not overpaying and being under-served for their police services. And that's it. Thank you.

Chairman Scott said, thank you Commissioner Kicklighter.

Commissioner Holmes said, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Scott said, I next have Commissioner Shabazz and Commissioner Holmes in that order, and then Commissioner Center.

Commissioner Shabazz said, good morning. Good morning. My position is that I -- I truly believe that we need to stay together in terms of the agreement. That's why I voted -- seconded the motion that we need to do anything that we can to exhaust our efforts in staying together both city and county in terms of an agreement. I think that the -- this newly hired police chief is doing a excellent job. I think that this community's in a vulnerable state and that the crime is at a all-time high. I don't think that this is the time for us to be separating. That's my position on that and -- because when I ran I ran on the platform of public safety, and I think that that's with keeping in line with whatever I ran on and I'm standing on that, and I don't want to see this merger or this agreement discontinued. I think that we need to get together and do whatever we can to try to map out our differences. Thank you.

Chairman Scott said, Commissioner Holmes, 2<sup>nd</sup> District.

Commissioner Holmes said, thank you, sir. I want to begin from 2003 and when this merge came into agreement in 2005 and in -- in this agreement, all the work that was put into it with both parties, a lot of hours, a lot of heartaches, probably a lot of disappointment. They probably went this -- just through what we are going through right now in trying to get it together, so my hat's off to them who first put it together, but I -- I question who was the author or the dominant author of the verbiage that was put into it. Then I want to thank my colleague Dean -- Commissioner Kicklighter for disagreeing with it at that time. I honestly seen, and I -- I -- I saw it way before now what you saw then, what you speaking up against then and you're still speaking against it. Thank you for being a little bit more open in this negotiation here.

Commissioner Holmes said, then I want to thank our staff, and Mr. Smith, as a newcomer, I hate to see that you must go through this, but you'll be baptized. You're being very -- thrown into the wolves because you're a newcomer. I hate to see any chief or former chief sit through discussion like this when I know they are looking at how could they make everything better, whether it's merged agreement, city or county. I also know with what's going on in the public to what we are doing as government, it is hurting the growth of the City of Savannah and Chatham County. It is hurting the recruitment. If I was a citizen now looking for employment, and I wanted to be a policeman, I would put everything on hold. I'd have to put it on hold because there ain't nothing clear to who I would be -- hiring me.

Commissioner Holmes said, in this you talk about the benefits. You talk about the agreement. You talk about the policy. You talk about committee, and I haven't seen anything in here really to me putting number one our citizen, and when you come to talk about public safety, you're not talking about us being protected, you're -- you're -- you're talking about the citizen in unincorporated area and the City of Savannah. I'd like to say this to all of us. We're going to have to give and take and thanks for the Chairman and thanks for us negotiator who have given everything we can possibly give. But I always say give what you can give some more. Give a inch. If there's one more inch to be given, then let's consider giving that inch. If the city can give another inch, then I would ask the city to give that inch. If the city give a inch, the county give a inch, we got two inch more than what we had, and if we look at it in the very simple way because I don't think it's too complicated, you know, man and woman make things more complicated than what it really is, and the reason why that, everybody wants to be the power for it. Everybody wants to take the -- the blame for it. Everybody wants to look at it and say I had it done.

Commissioner Holmes said, well, on the agreement in which we are discussing now, the first four years of that agreement, the discussion that we had now, it should have been opened the first four years. And the other party refused to open it up and talk about it. Had they opened it up, brought it to the table, discussed it, we probably wouldn't have been here now talking about it in 2015. But they ain't only closed the door in 20 -- in -- in four years, the next opportunity they had was the seventh year, and on the seventh year you would -- you would take -- any professional person, if you close it off the first four, well, I'm going to open it up on the next seven. But it was closed again on the seventh year. The only reason why this is to the public and for us talking about it now is on the tenth year it automatically opened up. We have to. If we don't open it up now and discuss it, then we would be in violation. So the question I'm asking how many more years are we going to wait? How many more months are we going to wait? The public, ladies and gentlemen, is getting tired of city and county government.

Chairman Scott said, okay.

Commissioner Holmes said, I say we -- hold -- hold -- hold on Mr. Chairman. We are better --

Chairman Scott said, we got two more speakers here now.

Commissioner Holmes said, yes, sir. We are better than this, and I would ask you as one of your very close observant, very tentative, I use my one mouth much less than I use my -- both of my ears, and everybody that I hear want this merger to stay in tact, but then lets define it and make it stronger, and I'm asking for that inch from the city and I'm asking for that inch from the county.

Chairman Scott said, okay.

Commissioner Holmes said, and with those two that we have let's build on that. Mr. Smith, thank you for your work.

Chairman Scott said, Commissioner Center from the 3<sup>rd</sup> District.

Commissioner Holmes said, Jon Hart, thank you for your work. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Scott said, okay.

Commissioner Center said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've read the original merger agreement, every proposal, every counter proposal, every counter-counter proposal several times. I talked with a former mayor, the former County Manager, chamber executives, colleagues on City Council, colleagues on the County Commission, and the present mayor. County staff will confirm that I have spent numerous hours with them asking questions, suggesting ideas, and learning the history not only of the merger but of talks with the city.

Commissioner Center said, I have also talked with police command and officers. To a person police officers, including command staff, have told me that no matter who pays their check, no matter what their jurisdiction, it will not affect how they do their job. The police men and women I talked with are dedicated, hard working, civil servants committed to helping our community. Some officers told me if we split, they want to work for the county. Some officers told me the merger has made policing better. But all stated that protection of the community will not suffer either way.

Commissioner Center said, I heard and read the Chamber of Commerce's suggestion that the Chair, the Mayor, County and City Managers and attorneys meet in a room and come up with an agreement. That's not as simple as it sounds. Business leaders say run government like a business, but government's not a business. We can't jettison low income clients or cut non-income producing services. Citizens live here regardless of their tax paying ability, and health care, court services, streets, infrastructure, and policing have to be provided to all. Also, the Chair and the Mayor may not, by themselves, legally reach an agreement. Even if locked in a room, the best they can do is agree to a recommendation to City Council and County Commission. Then each must garner five votes to finalize that recommendation. And that process may not sit well with all their colleagues. There are Commissioners and Alderman who don't mind and even prefer that someone else work out the details, then put a proposal forward to be voted up or down. If the office holder doesn't like the proposal, then vote it down and tell the negotiators to come up with something else. There are other Commissioners and Alderman who prefer to be more active and included in the process. In that case the Chair or Mayor would meet with their respective bodies, hash out separate proposals, vote on those proposals, then meet with the other side, see what the differences are, and try to work them out. How do they go about those meetings? If they meet one on one or in groups of three, the Attorney General will come calling. If they meet as bodies, then all debates and comments must be pre-announced, advertised, and done in public. That's bulky and time consuming. I am not saying that it should not be done, but it cannot be done quickly and it cannot be done as efficiently as a businessperson would make decisions about a solely-owned business. The legislative process is just not as simple as the Chamber and Thursday's Savannah Morning News editorial proclaim, and by the way, just for reference, we are voting today on basically the fifth proposal, the County's third to the City's second. The original merger took 14 drafts and three Commission votes.

Commissioner Center said, City officials have told me that a merged department is more efficient because crime doesn't stop at jurisdictional lines, so the police department shouldn't have to. But what happens if a criminal crosses the Talmadge Bridge? Do we then merge with South Carolina. What happens if a criminal travels as the Chair pointed out to Thunderbolt, Tybee, Pooler, Pt. Wentworth, Garden City or Bloomingdale? Wouldn't we have a jurisdictional problem in those cases? Why is the City not asking to merge with those jurisdictions also? If the merger is so good, why aren't those jurisdictions clamoring to merge with us? Jurisdictional lines are not a problem They are handled every day with each of these municipalities and can be handled by inter-governmental agreements. And, if a merger is so good for policing, wouldn't it be just as good for government itself. Why stop with policing? Why not go ahead and merge the governments? Why does the City want to merge only the police and not the governments?

Commissioner Center said, I have been told that the merger is working. Yet every day it seems I read another shooting, another murder has taken place. That doesn't comfort me or support the argument that the merger is working. The one thing I have not heard in all our discussions is, how do we reduce crime? Whether we stay merged or de-merge, our focus should be on reducing crime.

Commissioner Center said, a high ranking city elected official told me the reason we merged is because the two police chiefs wanted it. The City Attorney was then quoted in the Savannah Morning News that we merged because the citizens of the unincorporated area wanted it. Let's state the truth: the primary reason the merger originally took place was to -- was to dilute the crime reporting numbers. If we de-merge the city's crime numbers will skyrocket and people are worried that businesses would not want to locate here, and that Savannah would become another Detroit. The sad point is that whether we dilute or don't dilute the numbers, those shootings and murders we read about still take place. Our focus should be on how we reduce those shootings, how we reduce these murders, how we reduce crime and keep our citizens and ourselves safe. We should never lose that focus.

Commissioner Center said, as to working with the city, I'd like to do that. One on one, City Alderman and County Commissioners have no problem meeting, speaking, arguing, and airing ideas. I've seen the Chair and Mayor work together, and just two weeks ago, while celebrating the anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, our Chair publically praised the Mayor for her work. Why there is a disconnect in this process is bewildering to us all. City leaders and city staff tell me that the county won't meet with them. The Chair, and particularly county

staff, past and present, have explained in great detail meetings they've had with the city, telling me who was there, where they met, what was said. I know they are not simply making up those details.

Commissioner Center said, until last week, no one approached me to discuss this issue. I went looking for comments. As I said a few moments ago, I approached chamber leaders, I called my city colleagues, I met one on one. I met three on three with city colleagues, I called on neighborhood associations. Now that everyone assumes that a de-merger is imminent, the full court press has been adopted. I don't mind it. I like having more information and more input. But let me tell you what doesn't work: threatening me. When a city elected official told me, "I'm watching your vote", I respond "that is why we put it on a board. You are supposed to watch my vote." When I am told "people don't know whether you are a Republican or Democrat" my reaction was "this is not a partisan vote." Just yesterday a city elected official told me, "there's a constituent in your District who wants you gone." Well, that's their right. They have that right. I didn't run for this office to be re-elected. Whatever the issue, I will not cast my vote to be re-elected. I am going to vote based on a reasoned decision and what I think is right and best for this community.

Commissioner Center said, now, as to the substance of the proposed agreement we are voting on today. From the very beginning, there have been two issues of concern to me: control and funding. As I read the existing merger and as I have talked to those involved at the time, this was to be a true merger of two departments, controlled by two political entities. The present City Administration asserts that in any disagreement on hiring or firing the chief, the City Manager has final say so. I don't read the present agreement that way, and I never will. As an example, I was told that former Chief Lovett was hired after a 3 to 1 vote. The Mayor, the Chair, and the County Manager voted for and Michael Brown, the City Manager voted against. If the City Manager had final say, why didn't Michael Brown's vote control. And he was the City Manager who negotiated this merger.

Commissioner Center said, the city has never explained to me why it wants or must have control. It can't be money, because if money were involved, people would go to jail. Why does the city insist on final say so and control? If the City truly feels a unified police department is best for this community, why has the city never offered to give up control if that would be the only way to save the merger? If merger is the paramount reason, why not, to keep the merger, offer to have the County run the police department, and the City simply pay its fair share? The City has argued that the City should control because the City represents 60 percent of the policed population. Well the County represents 100 percent of the police population. Is it a merged police force or control? Which is most important to the city?

Commissioner Center said, be that as it may, the proposal before us today concedes hiring and firing of the chief 100 percent to the City Manager. The county is giving the city exactly what it wants. And even though I live in the city and even though I have been told from the highest levels at the city that if the merger is dissolved my taxes will go up, I was elected to represent the county's interests, and I could not in good faith tax one portion of my constituents simply to make it easier for a different portion of my constituents. I cannot tell my neighbor --

Chairman Scott said, Commissioner, you are doing such a good job, but we still have other people to talk.

Commissioner Center said, I'm -- I'm almost done.

Chairman Scott said, somebody's got to leave.

Commissioner Center said, I'm fine. I'm almost done -- she has to -- I'm almost done. I cannot tell my neighbor she has to pay more so that I can pay less. I have a fiduciary obligation to every person I represent. I am totally convinced that the formula used in the present agreement is unfair to residents living in the unincorporated areas. I'm not willing to cast my vote for any agreement unless that formula is changed. Several alderman have told me that county staff have given me incorrect data. I do not ask staff to interpret data for me. I ask for raw numbers so that I can analyze them myself, and much of my analysis is based on data furnished by the city. I don't believe that residential population should be the sole criteria. While the city argues population, the county counters with usage. If the unincorporated area doesn't need as much policing, why buy it? A prudent businessman or a prudent consumer would not buy more than needed.

Commissioner Center said, so, how do you balance population against usage? And what is the correct population. During the LOST lawsuit when I came into office two years ago, the city argued that the city's population should include the 13 million annual visitors, or be increased 35,000 a day. While pushing that argument to receive funds, the city discounts it as a basis for paying funds. I have been told that the Patrol Cost Center meets my request. However the present agreement includes other cost centers. I believe that all costs, whatever the cost center, should be based on the same formula. For example if the unincorporated areas require only 25 percent of the policing, then they should pay only 25 percent of the cost.

Chairman Scott said, Commissioner, again, I've got -- I've got a member of the Commission who's got to catch a flight, and so I --

Commissioner Center said, I understand, but other Commissioners talked, and I -- I'm almost done, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Scott said, okay.

Commissioner Center said, whatever the correct or final formula should be, I am convinced a new formula is needed. I'm not totally happy with the formula stated in the proposal before us today, but I am willing to accept it. I think control should be shared. If the County is going to fund any service, the County should have a say in how that service is managed. I think funding should be equitable. The County cannot be any municipality's savior. If the city can't manage its affairs and properly police its jurisdiction, that city cannot expect the county to bail it out, at least not without giving up some control, and no portion of the county should be paid more so that another portion can pay less. The proposal before me today is not 100 percent what I want. It gives up control I don't think the county should give up. The funding formula is not exactly what I want, but it comes a lot closer to what I want than the formula we now have.

Commissioner Center said, and as President Teddy Roosevelt said if you are cast on a desert island with only a screwdriver, a hatchet, and a chisel to make a boat, you make the best one you can. It would be better if you had a saw, but you haven't. The current proposal is not exactly what I want, however, in an effort to continue the merger, I will support it. Thank you.

Chairman Scott said, thank you.

Commissioner Shabazz said, thank you.

Chairman Scott said, Commissioner Farrell.

Commissioner Farrell said, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be a little more concise and to the point, although I do appreciate the -- the many insights of my fellow Commissioners. Today we have another document in front of us, and I would suspect that if we accept the -- the -- we could keep exchanging documents from time to time possibly into infinity. This Board adopted a course of action unanimously to go into the direction of standing up a police force that would take care of the needs of the unincorporated area, and I believe in the citizen's best interest of public safety and of the wisest use of their financial resources that that is -- that was and is still the best course. Today after living and breathing this police merger situation I believe the action we took several months ago is the correct action. I will not support this particular document today. I'm not comfortable with it in several different areas. If the other partner in this merger were to present us something of substance as we're concurrent -- as we're proceeding in this other direction for the betterment of the actual citizens, although it may not benefit citizens in a particular municipality or business people in a particular segment of the economy, I think it would be in the best interest of the citizens of the unincorporated area both from the public safety point of view and as a financially responsible way to handle their tax dollars. So that's -- that's my position today that, you know, short of receiving another document that is -- from the City of Savannah that shows that they're willing to -- to see it more our way, I've been in this argue -- in this dilemma for over ten years, so -- thank you.

Chairman Scott said, I won't have any comments. All in favor of the motion indicate by voting yes, opposed no.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, no more comments? Just -- may I make a comment now?

Chairman Scott said, yeah. The motion carries. I recognize Commissioner Kicklighter for a comment.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, I just feel like somewhat of a historian here, but before I even say this, I just want to say, those who just voted for that, I wouldn't get excited because Savannah's so greedy they're probably not even going to approve that.

Commissioner Thomas said, that's okay.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, but -- just for the record, and it -- it -- it's -- it's very saddening because years ago when the -- this merger talks started, it started much like we started our talks of renegotiating, and we wanted equality, and we voted for equality over and over and over, and all those changes, and then at the back -- the very last minute, when the pressure increased, they caved, and they voted for that merger which is unfair. We're going to repeat that if -- if we go this route, and we don't achieve the goal of having equal hiring and firing ability over the chief. We can pat ourselves on the back, but we're going to wind up with the same thing, and that's it. Thank you. And I'll just keep shut. I can handle -- handle not winning a vote.

Chairman Scott said, and I -- I didn't -- I didn't make any comments because we had a Commissioner who had to leave, but I wanted to say that much of what Commissioner Kicklighter said was dead on. I -- I disagree with him that we ought to wait and let them send us another proposal, but we did send the city what I consider a very generous proposal. It was less than what we are currently paying, but it was a lot more than what we could provide police service for, and they didn't -- they didn't entertain it, and so I really think that every Commissioner here point was sincere and well taken, and to some extent, all were right in their own way. But I do believe that we are all in it together and that we cannot say that Savannah sinks and Chatham rises without Chatham sinking with it. It constitutes about 48 percent of our population, and that's just a fact. At some point it will be a lot less in terms of the percentage of our population, but that's what it is today, and so it's for those reasons that I support us staying into a merged department. I -- my preference would be to merge governments. I would dearly like to see the state legislature annex all the unincorporated area into an appropriate municipality, be it the City of Pooler, Garden City, the City of Savannah, and then we can take care of the constitutional portion of this job, and you would have all the municipal government, and we wouldn't have to worry about policing. But that's pie in the sky. We will have future opportunities to merge in more areas of government, because I

will continue to recommend them, until the entire government is merged, and I appreciate the members of this Commission and your patience through this debate.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Thomas moved for Board approval of the police merger agreement as outlined by the Chairman. Commissioner Shabazz seconded the motion and it carried in a 7-2 vote. Chairman Scott and Commissioners Stone, Holmes, Center, Shabazz, Brady and Thomas voted yes; Commissioners Farrell and Kicklighter voted no.

**AGENDA ITEM: IX-4**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners  
**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager  
**FROM:** Linda B. Cramer, Assistant County Manager

**ISSUE:**  
 SCMPD Merger

**BACKGROUND:**

Through an intergovernmental agreement which became effective on January 1, 2005, the County and City of Savannah merged police forces into the Savannah-Chatham Metropolitan Police Department (SCMPD). Officers of the SCMPD provide police services in both the unincorporated County and municipal boundaries of the City of Savannah. County staff has been working with City staff to renegotiate certain terms of the SCMPD agreement, including governance and cost sharing. During the Board's workshop on December 17, 2014, County staff presented information on the SSD's service needs as well as a series of policing alternatives (Sheriff contract, Chatham County Police Department, or contract with Savannah).

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. In 2003 the Board of Commissioners approved an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Savannah that combined police forces within the unincorporated County and Savannah city limits. The effective date of the agreement was January 1, 2005.
2. Staff has been negotiating the current SCMPD contract with its City counterparts. The history of the negotiation is:
  - ▶ July 29, 2014 -- County sends first revision of SCMPD Agreement to Savannah.
  - ▶ September 17, 2014 -- Savannah sends second proposal to County. Most of the County's July revisions were not accepted, particularly related to the Chief's hiring. The proposal includes the cost allocation process found in the 2003 agreement (costs split by population or geography.)
  - ▶ September 26, 2014 -- Unanimous vote by Board of Commissioners to end the 2003 SCMPD agreement.
  - ▶ September 30, 2014 -- Chairman notifies Mayor of termination of the 2003 SCMPD agreement within 18 months (April 1, 2016).
  - ▶ October 16, 2014 -- County sends a third proposal to Savannah that adds County control of unincorporated precincts and beats, including a revised cost formula that uses E911 calls and Part 1 crime data, as well as actual precinct costs.
  - ▶ October 28, 2014 -- City and County staff meet to discuss the October 16<sup>th</sup> proposal.
  - ▶ November 30, 2014 -- County deadline passes for City's response to revised agreements.
  - ▶ December 15, 2014 -- City Manager provides a response and send a fourth proposal to the County. New proposal removes the Policy Committee as well as the jurisdictional separation of precincts. Cost allocation process returned to methodology in the 2005 agreement.
3. County staff has revised its last proposal for one further attempt at renegotiating the agreement. The fifth proposal is attached (to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file). Key features of the new proposal include:
  - Policy Committee -- the City's proposal of December 15<sup>th</sup> had removed the Policy Committee. The County's proposal adds the Policy Committee back to the agreement.
  - Use of Unincorporated Area Precincts and Beats -- County Manager retains authority over precincts and beats in the unincorporated area. Beats will be divided into city-only beats or county-only beats. Precinct will operate for the benefit of

- either the city or unincorporated area. This is the same precinct structure as in the third proposal.
- Property investigators are placed in the precincts, not CID. City accepted this change in the fourth proposal.
  - E911 -- The City Manager and County Manager will have a two year window to discuss and address proposed changes for the operation of emergency communications or E911. In the interim, funding for E911 will be split between both jurisdictions as outlined in the cost allocation formula.
  - The effective date of the new agreement will be March 1, 2015.
  - As documented in Exhibit C of the proposed agreement, the cost formula will be:
    - i. Year 1 -- As is the current procedure, the County will pay for costs of Patrol based on its proportionate share of geography (the geographical allocation of beats and land area). The County will pay costs of other shared departments, including E911, at a 39% rate (the County now pays 35.1% of the other shared departments).. The County will pay 100% of the costs of CNT, Animal Control, and EMS from its General Fund.
    - ii. Year 2 and forward -- Except for 100% cost centers, the separated precincts and CID, all costs will be split based on the prior budget year's proportionate share of dispatched radio calls from E911. For 2013 the County's review of this data indicated a split of 74.74% City Dispatched Radio Calls and 25.26% Unincorporated Area Dispatched Radio Calls. Dispatched radio calls means the actual calls for service to the E911 Center that were responded to by Patrol officers/Police personnel within the specified time period. Dispatched radio calls do not include every phone call to the E911 center, every traffic stop, officer meal, officer visit to a station or other officer self-initiated activities. Also, by Year 2 the City and County should be able to quantify costs of separated precinct operations, and the County will then pay 100% of the costs of the unincorporated precincts and beats while the City will pay 100% of the cost of precincts and beats within its municipal boundaries. In Year 2 the County will pay 20% of the CID costs, subject to changes in unincorporated area Part 1 Crime data.
4. If the Board forwards the agreement to the City Manager, the County will need City Council's response within 30 days. If there is no response, steps related to other Policing options should be accelerated.

**FUNDING:**

The Special Service District provides funding for the SCMPD functions, except for certain activities that are paid for by the General Fund (such as CNT and Animal Control). Additional funding would be required for FY 2015 in the SSD Fund since the cost share percentage (39%) is higher than the percentage used during budget adoption (35.1%). Year 2 cost data is not available since the cost of precinct activities has not yet been identified.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

Each year the Board has reaffirmed public safety as one of its top policy goals. Police services are an integral part of the provision of public safety within any community.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval of the attached SCMPD proposed intergovernmental agreement, which will be forwarded to the City of Savannah for action by the Mayor and Aldermen within the next 30 days, or
2. Provide other direction.

=====

**[NOTE: THIS ITEM WAS TAKEN OUT OF ORDER AND HEARD PRIOR TO ITEM 4.]**

**5. CNT MONTHLY REPORT GIVEN VERBALLY BY DIRECTOR RAGAN.**

Chairman Scott said, at this time we will entertain our monthly report from our CNT Director, Director Ragan before we move on to Item 4, which is Savannah-Chatham Metro Police Department Merger Agreement. That will be next. But before we do that, let's hear from Director Ragan.

CNT Director D. Everett Ragan said, morning Mr. Chairman. Morning Honorable Commission. Always glad to be here. This week I get to come a couple of weeks early, so it's -- we're looking forward to it. Let me take you through a quick Power Point. The Power Point at first will just mirror the monthly report that you -- the regular documentation that you have, and then I have a little -- little something on the end. We hope it will mirror that.

County Manager Smith said, go to slide show and go to beginning. Move all the way over to -- see where it says from beginning? All the way over to the left. Just click on from beginning. Right there.

Director Ragan said, I should put my glasses on I guess before I come up here, but it's one of these vanity type things, so we'll see. Again, it's the outline -- the -- mirror it. So far till December, of course, the last month of the -- the year, we initiated 70 investigations. Total number that we cleared were 32. Agency assists, we had -- we assisted Savannah Metro Task Force vehicle stops. We assisted Savannah Metro homicide with a search warrant. Took us about 12 hours, and we assisted Savannah Metro precinct one with a marijuana seizure.

Director Ragan said, drugs seized for the year were totaling at a -- about -- excuse me for the month, about 161,185. Again, leading that charge would be the -- would be powder cocaine. For the year we have seized \$1,369,347 worth of drugs off the streets of Chatham County so far. Again cocaine is leading. Firearms seized, six so far, and -- and -- in -- in Dec -- in 2014 we recovered 47 firearms. Twenty-two arrests for the month and 247 for the year. Demographic outlook so far -- well in December was Chatham County at 18, in Bryan County we had 1, Clayton County 1, Fulton County 1, and Lake County, California 1. It was an individual who was importing marijuana over into the Islands precinct area off state streets. He happened to come down and check on his business, and he was present when we hit the search warrants. So we were able to arrest him too.

Director Ragan said, drug complaints you can see we average about -- we had about 432 that we assigned for the year. The -- our com stat reports, this is a weekly report that we provide at -- we -- we attend com stat meetings for -- at Savannah Metro every Wednesday. We provide this report. And you can look and it will give the Commission Districts where we have done search warrants, where we have received complaints, and where we have made arrests in your Districts. So if some of your constituents have questions, you can refer to them. If there are some of the information that is available that you would like to question then get through the -- go through the Chatham Commission -- County Manager, and we will be more than happy to follow up on any information you may have in reference to what we have done in your District or what we need to do in your District. Again, our hours expended, you can see, in the precincts area, we spent a lot of time in the Islands precincts again, and, however, most of the time is spent within the city limits of -- of Savannah.

Director Ragan said, next slide is basically a breakdown of the hours spent. A couple of significant events that we had. December the 2<sup>nd</sup>, we did the arrest over at West 36<sup>th</sup> Street. It was actually the 600 block. We received a -- a -- we intercepted a large amount of heroin. December 5<sup>th</sup>, we did a investigation we had started with the FBI. This was an individual who was actually living in Clayton County and was -- would come down and sell dope on the weekends and take refuge back in the Atlanta area. We were able to track him. We recovered six and a half ounces of cocaine here that he had in a storage shed. It was kind of unique. We arrested him and had a team that arrested him with federal probation in Atlanta. Got enough information for a search warrant on a storage locker here, and the only thing -- the only thing in the whole storage locker was one plastic bag sitting in the middle of the floor with six ounces of cocaine in it. So that's -- that's what he thought he was -- he was safe keeping it. Again, we arrested individuals with the one pot method, and this is again over off of the east side, precinct 5 area. Again, and I'll explain a little bit further what the one pot method on the little extra slides I have, and again, we got off of midtown area cocaine, marijuana and guns off of a known distributor that we had.

Director Ragan said, talk just a minute about methamphetamine. It's something that we have dealt with in -- in this area. It started and actually came from the west coast. It's progressed it's way all the way now to the mid Atlantic. It will soon be hitting real hard up in the New York areas and upper north east. Ephedra, methamphetamine, actually started as a drug in basically World War II area. It was actually started by the Japanese. Some of the kamikaze pilots when you see them taking their little sip before they got in the plane on some of the old movie reels, they were chasing down an ephedrine tablet, speed. It gives them -- gives them courage. It gives them a sense of invinc -- invincibility and a sense of strength. It was shared with the Nazis. Many tablets were given to the Nazis for their blitzkrieg. It allowed them to fight for days and days without sleep. After World War II, we'd -- they'd head over here, college -- college kids staying up for finals, studying, typically called speed back in those days, and then in the late 1980s, some Mexicans -- brothers decided to give up the importation of cocaine and since methamphetamine was easier to make, easier to transport, they devised what we call crystal meth or ice that is coming across. You can see the ice there, it's -- it looks like crystal. It gets called crystal meth. It gets called crystal ice. It comes in different colors. We're recently closing down an investigation and actually yesterday, and we'll -- I'll just talk very briefly about it, but in -- in that investigation, the dealers who were supplying between a pound and a pound and a half a week to the Chatham County area, their customers were actually requesting what color they wanted through the -- through the middle person to the Mexican importers. They like the white. The don't like the blue. The blue burns too fast. They do like the brown ice because it doesn't burn and it gives you -- as fast and it gives you a good high. So they -- they actually have a -- a request for what type of ice they want.

Director Ragan said, what we saw four years ago when I was appointed Director of CNT was the one pot method being used a lot in Chatham County, Bryan County, Effingham County. Again, I explained before, these are two gallon jug -- jugs or one gallon jugs, little Coke bottles or whatever. They throw a bunch of ingredients in there. You'll see some of the pots and the sludge that come out. They'll -- they'll strip lithium batteries, they'll throw Sudafed, lithium batteries. They'll throw Coleman camp fuel. They'll throw acid. They'll throw lye, they'll throw everything in there, get the reaction going, drain it off. When it drains off, it drains off into a hydrochloric acid, which is why you see whenever we have -- walk in on a active lab, one that is still cooking, that is why we have to have the HAZMat material. That is why we have to have the proper technique of -- of rendering it safe

before it can ever be moved. Generally it takes -- if we have to wait on DEA to come do it or GBI to come do it, or a private vendor out of Vidalia -- Valdosta, it takes us over four hours to wait on them. However, we are now trained and our agents are being trained to where we can -- we can render it safe now without having to spend that number of man hours doing it. But you see the sludge. They dump it down the drains. They dump it down into the sewer systems. They dump it into the -- into people's backyards. So it is a clean up mess whenever -- whenever it gets found. And that's the presentation for today. If you have any questions, I'll be more than happy to answer them.

Chairman Scott said, okay. Yes. You have a question from Commissioner Shabazz from the 5<sup>th</sup> District.

Director Ragan said, yes, sir.

Commissioner Shabazz said, with the disposal -- good morning.

Director Ragan said, yes, sir. Good morning.

Commissioner Shabazz said, with the disposal of this chemical and these labs, and you say it harms the ecological system?

Director Ragan said, yes, sir.

Commissioner Shabazz said, how -- what's the effects that it have on the --

Director Ragan said, when you're dealing with contamination of a -- of -- of -- of water systems, you're dealing with contamination of people's yards. You've got acids. You've got battery fuel, batteries. You've got -- you've got the -- the what do you call, the generator for the -- the stuff which is either the lye or which is either the fuel -- fuel oil or Coleman camp fuel, that kind of stuff that gets poured out there, so yes it is hazardous to breathe. It -- it -- in an open lab, it -- it expels hydrochloric acid so you breathe in a whiff of that, and you're going to be in the hospital for a while with burnt lungs and so forth. That's -- that's the impact we have. Fortunately, we have not had real large active ones in the last couple of years. Crystal ice is coming in. It's cheap. More people are getting their hands on it. They are making more money off of it. So with the one pot method, it -- it -- it takes time because you have to -- you have to smurf drug stores, which means you have to send different people in to different drug stores to sign the prescription -- to sign the Sudafed logs.

Commissioner Shabazz said, is there -- is there a certain -- certain population that it's targeted to?

Director Ragan said, no, sir. It's -- it's -- we're seeing more meth -- that the crystal meth is going into more of all of the ethnic populations in Chatham County. Some of the one pot -- most of the one pot is still staying out in West Chatham into those areas.

Commissioner Shabazz said, okay. So it's not a replacement for crack cocaine or --

Director Ragan said, it's not a replacement yet for crack cocaine, but when the more -- the -- the crystal ice comes in, it will be a replacement for crack cocaine. It is cheaper. It is -- the high is -- the high is longer, and it - it will be replaced. We're seeing less crack now. You're seeing more powder. You're seeing less crack. You're seeing more methamphetamine. So it will be a cheaper drug and a -- a higher kick for -- for the addicts.

Commissioner Shabazz said, so -- so can you draw a relationship between that and the rising levels of crime and violent crimes in our community, as well as --

Director Ragan said, the correlation between drug use and -- and crime is -- is -- is quite simple. It's that if an individual has a problem and they don't have the money to buy the drug, they're going to steal, they're going to do whatever they need to do to get the money for that. Now that shows your increase in your property crimes and -- and your larcenies and this type of stuff to get money. Violent crime wise, those individuals, those -- those crimes are stemming from one, people owing somebody money, somebody wants to take over some turf, somebody wants to do -- so if you have that impact of an increased amount of that -- of methamphetamine or either crack or whatever coming in, then the potential for that, not -- it's not always, it's -- it's not always, it's not always the -- the -- violent crimes is not always the results of drugs, but you do have the fact that the -- it's -- the opportunity for the violence increases along if a drug flow increases.

Commissioner Shabazz said, okay. Thank you.

Director Ragan said, yes, sir.

Chairman Scott said, Commissioner Stone of the 1<sup>st</sup> District.

Commissioner Stone said, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Scott said, our Pro Tem.

Commissioner Stone said, so, if this is becoming the drug of choice, this meth -- methamphetamine, and it -- from what I'm hearing from you, it will be a much greater expense to the community to clean up after this, is that correct?

Director Ragan said, fortunately, what we have is -- there are -- there are programs in place through the DEA and actually run by GBI that if it is a very large active lab, we call them, and they absorb the cost of the clean up. If it's a small lab, one pot, a couple of pots, we can -- we can manage that. We have the facilities to do that and the GBI will come, and we can render it safe, and GBI will come and pick it up and -- and take it to a landfill that is a class five landfill that they have to transport it to to get rid of it. But if it's a very large active lab, that we -- we will -- we utilize their resources to come in and do the clean up for us.

Commissioner Stone said, well, it's just frightening to think that because this would be a less expensive drug for the user that it could be more of an expense to the taxpayer ultimately.

Director Ragan said, primarily what -- what you will see is with the increase of the crystal meth that is prepared in labs in -- across the border, and it's -- it's packed over, there are -- there have been some quote unquote conversion labs in Georgia over the past couple of years. Very few, very far between that the DEA has found, but those labs you do not really have the clean up mess with the crystal ice that you do have with the one pot, with the sludge, and that kind of stuff. That crystal meth, the reason it's cheap, it's made in bulk in huge labs, generally across the border.

Commissioner Stone said, thank you.

Director Ragan said, yes.

Chairman Scott said, any further questions?

Commissioner Shabazz said, you have a Youth Commissioner right here.

Chairman Scott said, we have a question from Youth Commissioner Green.

Director Ragan said, yes, young man.

Youth Commissioner Jesse Green said, I wanted to know how much the average cost was for a one pot or small pot operation.

Director Ragan said, small pot operations are very, very, very cheap to -- to make. All that takes is a -- it takes is a -- a -- a jug, a piece of hose, a -- some Coleman fuel, some lithium batteries to -- that you shave off, make those small, a pre-cursor, like some lye, and some Sudafed, some decongestant tablets that you have -- that contain ephedrine that you have to get from behind the counter at drug stores now. You mix it all up. It's -- it's -- it's been called the one pot, the shake and bake. Once the chemicals react with the Sudafed, then it's reduced down to the powder -- the sludge in the bottom, which is your ephedrine. Once you have your hydrochloric asterisk -- acid, which is -- which is taken out by the tube, once it quits cooking, you unscrew the bottle, you take a coffee filter, and pour the liquid through the coffee filter. What's left over is methamphetamine. It's kind of sludge. It has to dry. So it's cheaper -- it's cheap to make and you don't make a whole lot. You'll get about a gram, gram and a half out of that. Most of the people with the -- with the one pots are using half of it and selling part of it, so they can get enough money to get more Sudafed to do it again. So these are the ones that you see that -- with the reactions of the chemicals, where you may have an explosion. You may have a fire. They get -- they get -- once they're strung out on this, they make the mistake sometime of flipping them -- the lighter inside where the acid and all is burning, and you have a -- you have a -- a flame. So, yeah. We have seen cases where -- and it's -- it can be cooked anywhere. It can be cooked in the car, rolling down the road. It can be cooked in somebody's attic. It could be cooked in a motel room. It could be cooked in a house trailer. It could be cooked in any small location, and we have actually worked cases where children's clothing, children's toys, the car seats, that we've had tested in some of these houses where the children have been present that have come back positive for methamphetamine on those items, and we've had DFACS remove those kids, and charge the adults with manufacturing with the -- in the kids' presence. So.

Chairman Scott said, okay. Commissioner Ragan -- you have -- you have a question now from --

Director Ragan said, yes.

Chairman Scott said, -- another Youth Commissioner by the name of Green, Monica Green.

Director Ragan said, hey Monica. Thank you.

Youth Commissioner Monica Green said, yes. My question is how many meth labs have been seized throughout the year 2014 just -- just despite the fact that this is a new year.

Director Ragan said, in 2014, we are -- we haven't received -- we haven't seized any this month so far? Oh 2015.

Youth Commissioner Monica Green said, 2014.

Director Ragan said, oh, you want 2014?

Youth Commissioner Monica Green said, mm-hmm.

Director Ragan said, off the top of my head, I don't know exactly how many we have, but I can find that out and get it for you the next time, but it would probably be, actual one pot methods, we probably recovered less than 10 that are still working. Whereas in 2010 when I started, we were probably getting 20 to 25 one pot methods, but now that crystal is so close, being shipped in, and again distributed out of Atlanta to Savannah, it is -- is what we're getting. Yesterday, just a quick, brief note that we started on a crystal meth organization again being sourced out of Atlanta responsible for about a pound and a half a week coming in of crystal ice. We effected an arrest in Atlanta. We effected search warrants in Atlanta, and we effected four arrests here just with the top hierarchy of the individuals associated with the prison gang. So I'll have that report probably within the next month.

Chairman Scott said, okay. Any further questions? If not, thank you so much.

Director Ragan said, thank you much.

#### **ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

For Information only.

[NOTE: CNT monthly Report filed in Clerk of Commission's meeting file.]

=====

### **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 Scott said, now the Action Calendar. No one indicated a need to vote on anything individually so I would entertain a motion.

Commissioner Center said, I move for approval of the action calendar.

Commissioner Stone said, second.

Chairman Scott said, been properly moved and second. Any discussion? Any unreadiness? Hearing none, all in favor of approving the Action Calendar indicate by voting yes, opposed no. The Action Calendar is approved.

#### **ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved to approve all items on the Action Calendar, Items 1 through 11 and under Item 10, Items A through Q. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

=====

**[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 DECEMBER 19, 2014, AS MAILED.**

#### **ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of December 19, 2014, as mailed. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

=====

**2. CLAIMS VS. CHATHAM COUNTY FOR THE PERIOD DECEMBER 11, 2014 THROUGH JANUARY 7, 2015.**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved to authorize the Finance Director to pay the claims against the County for the period of December 11, 2014 through January 7, 2015, in the amount of \$11,943,249. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

=====

**3. REQUEST BOARD CONFIRM THE DAYS AND TIME FOR REGULAR COMMISSION MEETINGS FOR 2015. THE BOARD TENTATIVELY ADOPTED THE CALENDAR ON DECEMBER 5, 2014.**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved the Board to confirm the days and time for regular Commission meetings for 2015. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: X-3**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners

**FROM:** Lee Smith, County Manager

**ISSUE:**

To set the days and time for regular Commission meetings for 2015. The Board will be asked to confirm adoption of the calendar at the first meeting of 2015.

**BACKGROUND:**

The County's Enabling Act requires the action be taken during the first meeting of the Board each year.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. The Enabling Act states:  
*The Board of Commissioners shall hold two regular meetings each month except as may otherwise be determined by the Board of Commissioners, as the County seat for all matters requiring action of an administrative or policy nature, and for all matters advertised or scheduled for hearing in which the public will be asked to speak for or against the items under consideration, which meetings shall be open to the public. At the first meeting of the Board of Commissioners in January of each year, the Board of Commissioners shall set the days and the time when it will hold its regular meetings. Meeting hours for the public hearings may be changed by action of the Board of Commissioners and may be held at such hour as stated in the public notice of the date and time of such hearing. Special or additional meetings may be held as necessary upon call of the Chairman or any five members of the Board of Commissioners, provided all members of the Board of Commissioners have been notified at least 24 hours in advance of such special or additional meeting, and such notice shall specify the subject matter to be considered.*
2. The Commission has met on the second and fourth Fridays of the month in the past except in January, November and December. When possible, the Board holds one meeting during the month of January. The meetings in November and December are held on the first and third Fridays to allow for the holidays. Changing to the first and third Fridays in November and December will allow at least two weeks between meetings.
3. The Chamber will hold Savannah-Chatham Day in Atlanta on January 29, 2015. This will not conflict with the second and fourth Friday schedule.
4. The ACCG District Day at the Capitol (formerly Capitol Connection Conference) will be Tuesday, February 10, 2015, in Atlanta. This will not be a conflict.
5. The NACo Legislative Conference will be February 21-25, 2015, in Washington, D.C. This will not conflict with the second and fourth Friday schedule.

6. The ACCG Annual Meeting will be April 17-21, 2015 in Chatham County. This will not be a conflict.
7. In 1998 the Board asked that in future years meetings not be scheduled on Good Friday. In 2015 Good Friday will be on April 3<sup>rd</sup>. This will not conflict with the second and fourth Friday schedule.
8. The NACo Annual Conference will be July 10 - 13, 2014, in Charlotte, North Carolina. This will conflict with the second and fourth Friday schedule. Since there are five Fridays in July, it would work to hold the July meetings on the third and fifth Fridays.
9. The ACCG Legislative Leadership Conference will be October 7-9, 2015, in Athens. This will be a conflict, but should not pose a quorum problem.
10. Currently the pre-meeting is scheduled for 9:00 a.m. to be followed immediately by the regular meeting, generally at 9:30 a.m.
11. A calendar showing County holidays for 2015 and tentative Commission meeting dates is attached to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Set meeting time to immediately follow 9:00 a.m. pre-meeting and set dates for January 16<sup>th</sup>, the second and fourth Fridays in February through June, third and fifth Fridays for July, second and fourth Fridays in August through October, and first and third Fridays in November and December, schedule to be confirmed at first meeting of the year, January 16, 2015.
2. Set meeting time and dates as designated by Commissioners, schedule to be confirmed at first meeting of the year, January 16, 2015.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

Compliance with the Enabling Act.

**FUNDING:**

Not applicable.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Alternative #1.

=====

#### **4. REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNTY FINANCIAL POLICIES.**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved for Board approval of Amendments to the County Financial Policies. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: X-4**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners  
**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager  
**FROM:** Amy Davis, Finance Director

**ISSUE:**

To request Board approval for amendments to the County Financial Policies

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

Financial policies should be reviewed periodically and updated to reflect current practices and terminology. Handling cash requires diligent and comprehensive internal controls in order to discourage fraud and/or theft. A policy has been added specifying internal control policies. Specific department procedures will be the responsibility of the individual department management.

**FUNDING:**

No funding required.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. That the Board approve changes to the County Financial Policies as recommended by staff.
2. Provide other direction.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Board approve Alternative 1.

**Policy for the Receipt and Custody of Cash****Introduction:**

This policy outlines recommended procedures for the receipt and custody of cash. The term cash includes currency, checks, money orders, charge card transactions and any other form of payment received. All checks made payable to the County or any subdivision of the County are considered County funds.

The collection and control of cash are very important functions. Ideally the collection of cash should be centralized in one location; however this is not always possible or practical due to the different locations where services are provided. As a result, the collection of money is, for the most part, decentralized.

**Policy:**

Chatham County requires department heads whose responsibilities include cash handling to develop written procedures for the collection, accounting, deposit, and safekeeping of cash. Department heads are also required to implement and monitor these procedures to ensure that they are effective and are being followed.

**Rationale:**

It is the responsibility of County personnel to safeguard all assets of the County, including cash collections.

**Recommended Procedures:**

- Ideally there must be a separation of duties between the person receiving the cash, the person preparing bank deposits, and the person responsible for maintaining the accounting records.
- All forms of cash should be physically protected in the most secure location possible. The use of vaults, locked cash drawers, cash registers, cashier's cages or any other mechanism to deter theft or mishandling is recommended. When feasible, the use of cameras to monitor customer transactions and/or the locations' security is encouraged.
- Whenever custody of cash is transferred from one person to another, or to another entity, the transfer should be documented by both the party relinquishing control and the party accepting control. Such documentation should include the date, amount transferred, time and signature of both parties. Related records should be retained by the department.
- When possible, all cash transactions will be entered and receipted in the County financial management - cash receipts systems. A daily reconciliation between the cash collected and the cash receipt system's records should be documented and retained by the department.
- Manual receipts should only be used when the cash receipts system is unavailable. The Finance Department will issue manual receipt books to requesting departments, and will maintain a log of all outstanding books. Such receipts will have the County logo on them and will be pre-numbered. Departments should reconcile the use of any manual receipts to deposited funds on a daily basis.
- Each department's written procedures should identify how frequently bank deposits are to be made. It is strongly recommended that bank deposits be made daily; however, in some cases may be little or no activity to warrant this frequency. It is strongly recommended that no currency transactions be taken in departments that do not prepare a daily bank deposit.
- Each department's written procedures should identify the dollar limit of currency that can be receipted from a single customer. Transactions that exceed this dollar limit should be paid via check, debit card or credit card. It is recommended that the per-transaction dollar limit be \$100 or less unless the department can demonstrate an average, routine transaction amount that exceeds this level. The department will also need to demonstrate effective cash handling procedures.
- No convenience fees will be charged to walk-in customers for debit or credit cards; however, a convenience fee will be charged for on-line electronic payment applications.
- Bank deposit totals should match cash receipt reports from the financial system. Discrepancies between the cash receipts system should be explained in detail by the department head and forwarded immediately to Finance.
- Department heads are responsible for complying with the policies and procedures outlined in this policy and for developing detailed written departmental operating procedures. In addition, departments are responsible for training designated employees in cash handling policies and procedures.

- Each department's written procedures should be submitted to the Internal Audit Director and the Finance Director each January. The department should prepare a risk matrix to identify internal control strengths and weaknesses.
- Internal Audit will, on occasion, conduct surprise audits to ensure policies are being adhered to. No prior notice will be given to the departments regarding the timing of such audits.

=====

**5. REQUEST APPROVAL FOR SOUTHSIDE COMMUNITY FIRE PROTECTION, INC., D/B/A SOUTHSIDE FIRE EMS TO OBTAIN TAX EXEMPT FINANCING WITH BB&T FOR AN AERIAL LADDER TRUCK.**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved for approval for Southside Fire EMS to obtain tax exempt financing with BB&T for an aerial ladder truck. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: X-5**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners  
**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager  
**FROM:** R. Jonathan Hart, County Attorney

**ISSUE:**

Request of Southside Communities Fire Protection, Inc. ("SSFD") for Board of Commissioners to pass a resolution of approval for SSFD to obtain a tax exempt financing rate through BB&T for the purchase of an aerial fire truck and ambulance to be used for public safety purposes. The approval is part of Internal Revenue Services regulations pertaining to tax exempt financing. This has no financial impact on the County, and the full faith and credit of the County is not involved.

**BACKGROUND:**

SSFD is a Georgia non-profit organization that provides fire protection and emergency medical services within the unincorporated Chatham County and through an agreement with specific municipalities. In order to provide the fire protection and emergency medical services more efficiently, SSFD desires to purchase an aerial fire truck and ambulance that will cost \$330,000. SSFD will acquire these vehicles through a loan at a lower tax exempt rate with BB&T Bank.

SSFD, being a non-profit organization and providing governmental services, qualifies for "qualified tax-exempt obligations" in accordance with Internal Revenue Service regulations. The regulations required include a consent or resolution by the governing authority. Approval of this resolution will provide a considerable financial break to SSFD.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. SSFD is a Georgia non-profit organization that provides fire protection and emergency medical services within the unincorporated Chatham County and through an agreement with specific municipalities.
2. In order to provide the fire protection and emergency medical services more efficiently, SSFD desires to purchase an aerial fire truck and ambulance that will cost \$330,000.00.
3. SSFD will acquire these vehicles through a loan with BB&T Bank at a lower tax exempt rate.
4. SSFD, being a non-profit organization and providing governmental services, qualifies for "qualified tax-exempt obligations" in accordance with the IRS Code.
5. The requirement includes a consent or resolution by the governing authority.

**FUNDING:**

Not applicable to Chatham County. The obligation for tax exempt financing will not be a debt obligation or a risk to Chatham County or its agencies.

**ALTERNATIVES**

1. Approve the request of SSFD for Board of Commissioners to pass a resolution of approval for SSFD to obtain financing with BB&T in the amount of \$330,000.00 for the purchase an aerial fire truck and ambulance.
2. Do not approve the request of SSFD for Board of Commissioners to pass a resolution of approval for SSFD to obtain financing with BB&T in the amount of \$330,000.00 for the purchase an aerial fire truck and ambulance.

**POLICY STATEMENT:**

SSFD is a Georgia nonprofit organization providing governmental services for the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Chatham County. The County should pass a resolution of approval in order for SSFD to qualify for tax exempt status pertaining to a loan with BB&T in the amount of \$330,000.00 for the purchase of an aerial fire truck and ambulance. The approval and resolution will result in tax saving which will indirectly be of benefit for lower cost of fire protection and emergency medical services for the citizens of Chatham County.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Alternative 1.



**NOW COMES** the Board of Commissioners of Chatham County, the governing authority of Chatham County, Georgia, and at their regularly scheduled meeting on January 16, 2015, upon a motion being made and properly seconded, did unanimously agree to adopt the hereinafter stated Resolution, and direct the Chatham County Board of Commissioners to deliver this Resolution to Southside Communities Fire Protection Inc., more particularly as follows:

**WITNESSETH:**

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Commissioners of Chatham County is the governing authority of said County; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Commissioners of Chatham County, did consent and approve Southside Communities Fire Protection, Inc. ("SSFD") to obtain a tax exempt loan with BB&T in the amount of \$330,000.00 for the acquisition of an aerial fire truck and ambulance; and

**WHEREAS**, this Resolution is approved and passed to meet the requirements of Section 147 of the Internal Revenue Service Code for financing to be carried out on a tax exempt basis; and

**WHEREAS**, it is directed that subsequent to passage of this Resolution, SSFD shall hold a public hearing following reasonable notice, as to the financing of said aerial fire truck and ambulance.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Board of Commissioners of Chatham County do hereby approve SSFD's request to obtain a loan in the amount of \$330,000 with BB&T for the purchase of an aerial fire truck and ambulance.

**ADOPTED AND APPROVED** this \_\_\_\_\_ day of January, 2015.

**CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Albert J. Scott, Chairman  
Board of Commissioners

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_  
Janice Bocook  
Clerk of Commission

(SEAL)

=====

**6. REQUEST BOARD APPROVE AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH TYBEE FOR DISTRIBUTION OF A PORTION OF SPLOST FUNDS FOR THE NORTH BEACH RESTROOM PROJECT.**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved for approval of an intergovernmental agreement with Tybee for distribution of a portion of SPLOST funds for the North Beach restroom project. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: X-6**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners  
**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager  
**FROM:** Leon Davenport, P.E., County Engineer

**ISSUE:**

Request Board approve an Intergovernmental Agreement with The City of Tybee Island for the distribution of a portion of SPLOST funds for the North Beach restroom project.

**BACKGROUND:**

The City of Tybee Island submitted as part of their Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) requests, improvements to their North Beach facilities and beach improvements. The State of Georgia covered funding needs for the beach improvements to the North Beach restroom and parking facilities.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. The City of Tybee Island procured the services of an architectural firm to provide design services for the new facility. Staff attended presentations by the firms and the City of Tybee Island selected the most qualified.
2. The Intergovernmental Agreement specifies that funds for the design and future construction will be provided when funds are available. The Board of Commissioners will need to approve a SPLOST budget for projects prior to disbursement of funds. Staff will present SPLOST budgets to the Board of Commissioners in February 2015.
3. The Intergovernmental Agreement specifies the amount to be conveyed to the City of Tybee Island in the amount of \$50,000 for the design services. The design and future construction is the responsibility of the City of Tybee Island.
4. The County Attorney reviewed and approved the agreement as to legal form.

**FUNDING:**

No funds for the Intergovernmental Agreement are required.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. That the Board approve an Intergovernmental Agreement with The City of Tybee Island for the distribution of SPLOST funds for the North Beach restroom project.
2. That the Board not approve the Intergovernmental Agreement.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

That the Board approve Intergovernmental Agreements.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Board approve Alternative 1.  
 District 4

**STATE OF GEORGIA**

**COUNTY OF CHATHAM**

**NORTH BEACH RESTROOM AND PARKING IMPROVEMENTS**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF SPECIAL PURPOSE LOCAL OPTION SALES TAX PROCEEDS BY THE COUNTY TO THE CITY OF TYBEE ISLAND OR THE PURPOSE OF NORTH BEACH RESTROOM AND PARKING IMPROVEMENTS**

THIS AGREEMENT made and entered into this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2015, by and between the **MAYOR AND ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF TYBEE ISLAND**, a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Georgia (hereinafter referred to as the "City"), and the **BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF CHATHAM COUNTY**, a political subdivision of the State of Georgia, (hereinafter referred to as the "County").

**WHEREAS**, the County is collecting SPLOST funds for the purpose of beach renourishment and other related capital outlay projects which would include North Beach Restrooms and Parking Facilities (hereinafter referred to as the "**Project**"); and

**WHEREAS**, the Project is entirely within the jurisdiction of the City of Tybee Island.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, in consideration of the mutual benefits to the parties, the City and County agree as follows:

1. The County agrees to convey Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) VI funds to the City when available to design improvements for the Project.
2. The City will act as the project agent and manager for the Project.
  - a. The County will convey \$50,000 from the 2014-2020 SPLOST to the City as soon as funds are available.
  - b. The City will be responsible for all financial oversight related to this Project. The City will be responsible or design, construction procurement and construction management of this project.
  - c. Once design is complete, the City will request construction funding for the project from the County. Funding will be provided by the County once an Intergovernmental Agreement is approved between the County and City and as soon as funds are available to funds this project.
  - d. The City shall not co-mingle SPLOST funds with non-SPLOST funds and shall hold all SPLOST funds in a segregated account with the funds being identified to be used only for this Project. City will be responsible for improper spending of SPLOST funds.
  - e. The City will keep records of all SPLOST expenditures and County may audit such SPLOST accounts to ensure compliance with SPLOST law.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, THE City and County have caused this Agreement to be duly executed by their proper officers and so attested with their corporate seals affixed hereto set forth in multiple originals as of the date written above:

CHATHAM COUNTY, GEORGIA

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Albert J. Scott, Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Janice E. Bocoock, Clerk of Commission

THE CITY OF TYBEE ISLAND, GEORGIA

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jason Buelterman, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jan LeViner, Clerk of Council

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Edward M. Hughes  
Attorney for the City of Tybee  
Island, Georgia

=====

- 7. REQUEST FROM THE DEVELOPER, KONTER QUALITY HOMES, FOR THE COUNTY TO RECORD THE SUBDIVISION PLAT FOR DERRICK LANDING PHASE ONE, ACCEPT THE OWNERS WARRANTY AGREEMENT AND FINANCIAL GUARANTEE, INITIATE THE TWELVE-MONTH WARRANTY PERIOD AND CREATE A NEW STREETLIGHT ASSESSMENT RATE DISTRICT. [DISTRICT 5.]**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved to approve the request from the developer, Konter Quality Homes, for the County to record the subdivision plat for Derrick Landing, phase one, accept the owners warranty agreement and financial guarantee, initiate the twelve-month warranty period and create a new streetlight assessment rate district. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: X-7**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners  
**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager  
**FROM:** Leon Davenport, P.E., County Attorney

**ISSUE:**

Request Board record the subdivision plat for Derrick Landing Phase One, accept the Owners Warranty Agreement and financial guarantee, initiate the twelve month warranty period and create a new streetlight assessment rate district.

**BACKGROUND:**

The developer, Konter Quality Homes, completed construction of Derrick Landing Phase One per the approved construction plans and requests the County record the plat, accept the Owners Warranty Agreement, initiate the twelve month warranty period and create a new streetlight assessment rate district for Derrick Landing.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. Derrick Landing is a single-family residential subdivision located on Derrick Inn Road. Phase One of Derrick Landing consists of 35 lots of 9.14 acres. Paving and street drainage will be maintained by the County. Water and sanitary sewer are owned and maintained by Consolidated Utilities.
2. Staff approved construction plans and issued a permit. The required site improvements are complete. They were inspected and found to be without fault.
3. The developer submitted a cash bond in the amount of \$98,500.00 as a Maintenance Security per the Chatham County Subdivision Regulations. The Maintenance Security allows the developer to subdivide 100% of the lots in Phase Lone before the twelve month warranty period expires.
4. Georgia Power installed four streetlights for Derrick Landing Phase One. The initial assessment per lot will be \$26.00 (Street Lighting Rate 01). The assessment is collected by Chatham County to maintain the streetlights.
5. An Environmental Site Assessment was conducted on the subdivision in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance. No environmentally unsafe conditions were found on the site.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board record the subdivision plat for Derrick Landing Phase One, accept the Owners Warranty Agreement and financial guarantee, initiate the twelve month warranty period and create a new streetlight rate district.

- 2. Do not approve the request.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

This action is consistent with the subdivision regulations regarding the creation of lots through plat recording.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Commission adopt Alternative No. 1.  
District 5

PREPARED BY: Chris Rains

=====

- 8. **REQUEST BOARD APPROVAL TO ACCEPT A \$162,000 GRANT AWARD FROM THE 2014 ADULT DRUG COURT DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAM VIA THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL (CJCC), AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN ANY DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE GRANT AWARD. THERE IS A \$62,500 MATCH REQUIREMENT THAT IS BEING MET BY CJCC IN PERSONNEL FUNDING (IN KIND).**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved for new beer, wine and liquor pouring and Sunday Sales license for 204. The Petitioner is Tracie Ramirez, d/b/a Rio Bravo Restaurant located at 444 Johnny Mercer Boulevard. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: X-8**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners

**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager

**FROM:** Jean Cottier, Interim Coordinator, Chatham-Savannah Veterans Treatment Court  
Crystal Cooper, Superior Court Administrator

**DATE:** December 23, 2014

**ISSUE:**

To accept a \$162,000 grant award from the 2014 Adult Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program via the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC), and authorize the Chairman to sign any document related to the grant award.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

- 1. Chatham Savannah Veterans Court received an award from the 2014 Adult Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program in the amount of \$162,000 that begins 1/1/15 and ends 8/30/17.
- 2. The County is named as local fiscal sponsor for the grant.
- 3. The Commission Chairman is named the Authorized Representative for the grant.
- 4. There is a \$62,500 match requirement that is being met by CJCC in personnel funding.

**FUNDING:**

The grant receipt and disbursement will be reflected in the Multiple Grant Fund.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

- 1. That the Board approve the acceptance of the grant and authorize the Chairman to sign any documents related to the grant award; or
- 2. That the Board deny approval and provide other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

CJCC requires that awards be administered by a unit of local government.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Board approve Alternative 1.

=====

9. **REQUEST FOR TRANSFER OF BEER, WINE AND LIQUOR POURING AND SUNDAY SALES LICENSE FOR 2015. PETITIONER: JUSTIN LEVI JOHNSON, D/B/A RUBY TUESDAY, LLC #4407, LOCATED AT 580 AL HENDERSON BOULEVARD, 31419. [DISTRICT 7.]**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved for transfer of beer, wine and liquor pouring and Sunday Sales license for 2015. The Petitioner is Justin Levi Johnson, d/b/a Ruby Tuesday, LLC, #4407, located at 580 Al Henderson Boulevard. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: X-9**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners  
**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager  
**FROM:** Gregori S. Anderson, Director of Building Safety and Regulatory Services  
 Joseph Lumpkin, Sr., Chief of Police

**ISSUE:**

Request for transfer of beer, wine, liquoring pouring and Sunday Sales license for 2015. Petitioner: **Justin Levi Johnson d/b/a Ruby Tuesday, LLC, #4407** located at **580 Al Henderson Boulevard, Savannah, Georgia 31419.**

**BACKGROUND:**

Mr. Johnson requests approval of a transfer of a beer, wine, liquoring pouring and Sunday Sales license in connection with an existing restaurant. The business at this location meets the requirements of the Chatham County Alcoholic Beverage Ordinance.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. The application was reviewed by the Police Department for compliance of the applicant and site distance requirements and approved.
2. The returned application was reviewed by Building Safety. The County Fire Inspector inspected the site for compliance and approved the facility.
3. The applicant and business meet the requirements of the Chatham County Alcoholic Beverage and Sunday Sales.
4. The applicant has been notified in writing of the date and time of the hearing.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Savannah-Chatham Metropolitan Police Department and Regulatory Services recommend approval.

**District 7**

We verify that the attached report and attachments (attached to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file) are complete and correct as to form.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Gregori S. Anderson, CBO

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Chief Joseph Lumpkin, Sr.

=====

10. **REQUEST FOR TRANSFER OF BEER AND WINE RETAIL LICENSE AND WINE POURING LICENSE FOR 2015. PETITIONER: TIMOTHY SCOTT HARRIS, d/b/a BILO, LLC LOCATED AT 7360 SKIDAWAY ROAD, SAVANNAH, GA 31406 [DISTRICT 3.]**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved for transfer of beer and wine retail license and wine pouring license for 2015. The Petitioner is Timothy Scott Harris d/b/a BILO, Inc., located at 7360 Skidaway Road, Savannah, Georgia 31406.

Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: X-10**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners  
**THRU:** Lee Smith, County Manager  
**FROM:** Gregori S. Anderson, Director of Building Safety and Regulatory Services  
 Joseph Lumpkin, Sr., Chief of Police

**ISSUE:**

Request for transfer of beer and wine retail license and wine pouring license for 2015. Petitioner: **Timothy Scott Harris d/b/a BILO, LLC** located at **7630 Skidaway Road, Savannah, Georgia 31406.**

**BACKGROUND:**

Mr. Harris requests approval of a transfer of a beer and wine retail license and wine pouring license in connection with an existing grocery store. The business at this location meets the requirements of the Chatham County Alcoholic Beverage Ordinance.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. The application was reviewed by the Police Department for compliance of the applicant and site distance requirements and approved.
2. The returned application was reviewed by Building Safety. The County Fire Inspector inspected the site for compliance and approved the facility.
3. The applicant and business meet the requirements of the Chatham County Alcoholic Beverage and Sunday Sales.
4. The applicant has been notified in writing of the date and time of the hearing.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Savannah-Chatham Metropolitan Police Department and Regulatory Services recommend approval.

**District 3**

We verify that the attached report and attachments (attached to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file) are complete and correct as to form.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Gregori S. Anderson, CBO

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Chief Joseph Lumpkin, Sr.

=====

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

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved for 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.) Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioner Shabazz was not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: X-11 A thru Q**  
**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO: BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**  
**THRU: LEE SMITH, COUNTY MANAGER**  
**FROM: MICHAEL A. KAIGLER, ASSISTANT COUNTY MANAGER**

**SUBJECT: AWARD OF BIDS****ITEM A**

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval to award a \$48,381 contract to Peek Pavement Marking LLC., for the restriping of various roads within the unincorporated area for Public Works and Park Services.

**BACKGROUND:** Each year streets and roads are identified for restriping. Because the department has no commercial striping equipment a solicitation was prepared based on the availability of funding.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. Staff identified approximately 247,300 linear feet of County roads that are in need of striping. Of that approximately 46,850 linear feet of roads (Montgomery Crossroads and Truman Parkway/President Street Ramp) will be striped using thermoplastic paint due the high volume of vehicular traffic. The other areas in the contract will be striped using a high build road paint. These areas are as follows: Skidaway Road, Wilmington Island Road, Sugar Mill Road, Beaulieu Road, Lehigh Avenue, Whitefield Avenue, Sullivan Street, ACL Boulevard, Liberty Parkway, Canebrake Road, and Quacco Road.
2. The project was properly advertised and three (3) bids were received and opened on December 18, 2014. The bid responses are as follows:

Peek Pavement Marking LLC. Columbus, GA	\$48,381
Road Services, Inc. Blackshear, GA	\$53,116
* Roadside North Florida, Inc. Jacksonville, FL	\$58,257

\*MBE

3. Staff believes the bid submitted by Peek Pavement Marking, LLC., to be fair and reasonable.

**FUNDING:** CIP - Public Works  
(3504100 – 52.39001 – 35031367)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval to award a contract in the amount of \$48,381 to Peek Pavement Marking LLC., for the restriping of various roads within the unincorporated area for Public Works and Park Services.
2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to award contracts to the low, responsive, responsible bidder.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_

CHRIS MORRIS

**ITEM B**

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of a \$13,249 sole source contract with National Center for State Courts (NCSC), to conduct a governance and leadership reassessment of Chatham County Juvenile Court's operation and structure.

**BACKGROUND:** Effective January 1, 2014, the Juvenile Justice Reform Act was implemented in the Juvenile Justice System in Georgia resulting in significant changes to the procedures and practices at the Chatham County Juvenile court. The extensive changes required by the Juvenile Justice Reform Act and other related issues have brought governance of the court to the forefront. Consequently, the judges of the Juvenile and Superior Courts of the Eastern Judicial Circuit determined that it was necessary to conduct a governance assessment of the Juvenile Court in early 2014 to ensure efficient implementation of the revised law to better serve children and families in Chatham County. This assessment was conducted and a final report issued in March 2014. The judges have determined that a follow up study be conducted to assess the implementation of the final report recommendations and the current governance structure of the Juvenile Court.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

- a. The NCSC is an independent, nonprofit improvement organization founded at the urging of Chief Justice of Supreme Court Warren E. Burger. Justice Burger envisioned NCSC as a clearinghouse for research information and comparative data to support improvement in judicial administration in state courts. All of the NCSC services - research, information services, education, consulting, are focus on helping courts plan, make decisions, and implement improvements that save time and money, while ensuring judicial administration that supports fair and impartial decision-making.
- b. The NCSC is the sole provider of the specific type of assessment requested. They are recognized as the lead organization that works with courts across the county for various services. NCSC staff and researchers are contracted with regularly to provide evaluation, assessments and implementation of court improvements tools and methods. Other Chatham County Courts have worked with NCSC in the past and have their assessments and evaluations to be extremely beneficial.
- c. The Judges of Superior Court have determined that it is beneficial for a reassessment of the governance and leadership review of Juvenile Court.
- d. The fee for this service is \$13,249. This fee is based upon an established fee scale that has been accepted by Courts across the Country for this type of assessment.

**FUNDING:** Juvenile Court- General Fund  
(1002600-52.39001)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval of a \$13,249 sole source contract with National Center for State Courts (NCSC), to conduct a governance and leadership reassessment of Chatham County Juvenile Court's operation and structure.
2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to provide reassessments necessary to ensure that Juvenile Court remains positioned to comply with the mandates of the revised Juvenile Code.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
RUSHEDA ADESHINA

**ITEM C**

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of a \$34,100 Summary Change Order No. 2, to the construction contract with Complete Demolition Services for the W. Bay Street Demolition Project.

**BACKGROUND:** The West Bay Street Demolition Project is part of the State Route 25 Connector/ W. Bay Street Improvement Project. The demolition project is required to certify the right of way for the road improvement project. The demolition contract was awarded to Complete Demolition Services on February 28, 2014.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. As part of the right of way negotiation process, property owners had the option to remove or reset fences, signs etc. from the acquired right of way back onto their private property. Although many property owners agreed to complete these relocations, some did not complete the removal within the agreed time. These items must be cleared prior to certification of the right of way so that the roadway improvement project can proceed. This work was not in the original contract with Complete Demolition Services.
2. Contract History:

Original Contract (2/28/14)	\$ 202,100
Change Order 1, (9/12/14)	\$ 11,330
Change Order 2, Summary (pending)	<u>\$ 34,100</u>
Pending Contract Amount	\$ 247,530

**FUNDING:** SPLOST (1998-2003) - W. Bay Street Improvement  
(3224220 - 54.14005 - 32250975)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval of a \$34,100 Summary Change Order No. 2, to the construction contract with Complete Demolition Services for the W. Bay Street Demolition Project.
2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to approve change orders necessary for the completion of construction projects.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
ESTELLE BROWN

#### ITEM D

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of a \$45,126 Summary Change Order No. 2, and an 18-day extension in the contract term for the contract with Sandhill ALS Construction Inc., on the LaRoche Avenue Culvert Drainage Improvement project.

**BACKGROUND:** The LaRoche Avenue Drainage Improvement project is part of the 2008-2014 SPLOST Drainage Program. The problem addressed by the project is the replacement of a failing brick arch culvert with a new reinforced concrete box culvert.

#### **FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. The Board awarded the project to replace the culvert on September 27, 2013. Construction began on January 21, 2014. The project was determined to be substantially complete on October 24, 2014, with punch list items completed in December.
2. The construction contract was awarded on a unit price basis. As construction progressed, some quantity totals exceeded the contract amount, while others were less than the contract amount. In addition, field conditions resulted in the addition of new items in order to fully complete the work. The summary change order results from measurement of final quantities installed at unit prices as well as adjustments to lump sum items resulting from field changes. Lump sum adjustments and unit price for items not in the contract were negotiated by staff. Staff believes these prices to be fair and reasonable for the material and labor.
3. During the completion of the project, there were periods when uncontrollable events prevented work from being done. Staff has reviewed the records and determined that a total of 18 days were lost to these events, which included the ice storms of January and February (5 days), issues with existing utility conflicts (4 days) and heavy rain (9 days). Staff recommends that 18 days be added to the contract term, increasing the total to 258 days.
4. With the extension, the contractor exceeded the contract term by 2 days. A liquidated damages deduction of \$1,000 is included in the revised contract amount.
5. Contract History:

Original Contract (9-27-13)	\$1,053,930
Change Order No. 1 (6-13-14)	6,500
Change Order No. 2 (pending)	<u>45,126</u>
Revised Contract Amount	\$1,105,556

**FUNDING:** SPLOST (2008-2014) - Drainage, LaRoche Avenue Culvert Drainage Improvement (3244250 - 54.14001 - 32456637)

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval of a \$45,126 Summary Change Order No. 2, and an 18-day extension in the contract term for the contract with Sandhill ALS Construction Inc., on the LaRoche Avenue Culvert Drainage Improvement project.
2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to approve change orders necessary for the completion of construction projects.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
MARK BUCALO

#### ITEM E

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of a \$445,314 construction contract to Carroll and Carroll, Inc., for the resurfacing of Albert Road, Cottonvale Road, Dove Lane, Goldfinch Court, Lansing Avenue, Lions Gate Entrance, Raleigh Road and Springhouse Drive.

**BACKGROUND:** The project involves milling, paving, striping and signing. The roads were selected based upon ratings provided by the Department of Public Works. Partial funding for this project comes from the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Local Maintenance and Improvement Grant (LMIG).

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. The bid was properly advertised and three (3) bids were received and opened January 6, 2015. The results are as follows:

Carroll and Carroll Inc. Savannah, GA	\$445,314
Preferred Materials, Inc. Savannah, GA	\$466,814
R.B. Baker Construction d/b/a Reeves Garden City, GA	\$681,095

2. Staff believes the bid from Carroll and Carroll Inc., is fair and reasonable.
3. The contractor will have 90 days to complete resurfacing of the roads after the notice to proceed is issued.

**FUNDING:** SPLOST (2008-2014) - Unincorporated County Roads  
(3244220 - 54.14001 - 32456767)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval of a \$445,314 construction contract to Carroll and Carroll, Inc., for the resurfacing of Albert Road, Cottonvale Road, Dove Lane, Goldfinch Court, Lansing Avenue, Lions Gate Entrance, Raleigh Road and Springhouse Drive.
2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to award construction contracts to the low, responsive, responsible bidder.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
MARK BUCALO

**ITEM F**

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of the purchase of five (5) used non-typical replacement vehicles, for CNT, from Fairway Lincoln Mazda, and authorize the disposal of five (5) vehicles to be used as trade-ins. The total purchase cost, using the trade-ins, will be \$84,800.

**BACKGROUND:** CNT has approved funding to replace vehicles through the CIP Police Merger. These vehicles are no longer suitable for departmental operations. The trade-ins will simplify the purchase of these vehicles.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. A standing request for "good" used vehicles is in place with local dealers and they are encouraged to let us know when they have a vehicle they feel we should consider.
2. Staff checked with local car dealers that normally respond to bids and came back with this proposal. This proposal provides CNT with maximum flexibility.
3. The Fleet Manager and a representative from CNT selected the following vehicles based on utility and value.
4. The vehicles selected are:

One vehicle	\$21,100
One vehicle	\$29,800
One vehicle	\$18,700
One vehicle	\$44,900
One vehicle	\$33,100
Less Trade of five (5) units -	
(Unit 1977 - 2010 Dodge Challenger - Vin #320709)	(\$ 9,800)
(Unit 1941 - 2010 Mazda 6 - Vin #M51224)	(\$ 7,700)

(Unit 1960 - 2011 Chevrolet Camaro - Vin #125275)	(\$17,000)
(Unit 1958 - 2010 Ford F150 - Vin #D60811)	(\$18,300)
(Unit 1962 - 2010 Ford Expedition Vin #B21126)	<u>(\$10,000)</u>
Total Purchase Price	\$84,800

5. Staff researched the trade-in value being offered by Fairway Lincoln Mazda and compared them to the Kelley Blue Book trade-in value. Fairway is offering a higher trade-in allowance.
6. Staff believes the total purchase price of \$84,800 to be fair and reasonable

**FUNDING:** CIP - Fleet Replacement  
(3503222 - 54.22001 - 3503065Z)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval of the purchase of five (5) used non-typical replacement vehicles, for CNT, from Fairway Lincoln Mazda, and authorize the disposal of five (5) vehicles to be used as trade-ins. The total purchase cost, using the trade-ins, will be \$84,800.
2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to approve the purchase of replacement vehicles for law enforcement activities.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
CHRIS MORRIS

**ITEM G**

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of an annual contract with renewal options for four (4) additional one (1) year terms to provide drug screening supplies for drug testing of clients at the Chatham County Juvenile Court with Medx Global Healthcare Solutions, LLC., of Conyers, GA.

**BACKGROUND:** The Juvenile Court was awarded a grant through the Georgia Administrative Office of the Courts to enhance the Chatham County Family Dependency Treatment. A portion of the grant funding is to be used for drug testing.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. The request for bids was properly advertised and eleven responses were received.

*	Phamatech Laboratories San Diego, CA	\$ 13,000	**CJ Cooper & Associates, Inc. Hiawatha, IA	\$44,000
	American Screening Shreveport, LA	\$ 30,600	*BTNX, Inc. Markham, Ontario, Canada	\$44,200
**	Medx Global Healthcare Solutions, LLC Conyers, GA	\$40,200	Fact, LLC Haddonfield, NJ	\$45,760
*	OMS Solutions, LLC Atlanta, GA	\$41,880	**Statewide Healthcare, Inc. Savannah, GA	\$41,110
*	Rapid-Exams, Inc. Poteau, OK	\$42,680	Redwood Toxicology Laboratory, Inc. Santa Rosa, CA	\$61,760
*	The Griggs Group, LLC Savannah, GA			\$180,000
*	MBE			
**	WBE			

2. The Juvenile Court is required to administer drug testing of clients based on suspicion of need or court order as part of probations terms. The Juvenile Court Family Dependency Treatment Court will test participants weekly as part of their continuing participation in this program. Tests include weekly random testing outside the court as well as weekly at the court.
3. The low bidder, Phamatech Laboratories, was unable to provide the 11 panel urine drip. The next low bidder, American Screening was not recommended for award because their references were not satisfactory due to billing problems and timely delivery.

- Local vendor, Statewide Healthcare, Inc., bid only on items 1 - 2 and was not the low bidder on those items. Since their bid was incomplete, they were not offered local preference. Another local vendor, The Griggs Group, was offered local vendor preference and they declined to match.

**FUNDING:**

- Juvenile Mental Health Court Grant  
(2502600-52.39001-25020682) \$34,200
- General Fund/M&O - Juvenile Court  
(1002600-52.12006) \$6,000

**ALTERNATIVES:**

- Board approval of an annual contract with renewal options for four (4) additional one (1) year terms to provide drug screening supplies for drug testing of clients at the Chatham County Juvenile Court with Medx Global Healthcare Solutions, LLC., of Conyers, GA.
- Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to approve purchases to provide drug screening for Juvenile Court.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
RUSHEDA ADESHINA

**ITEM H**

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of Change Order No. 1 to the annual contract with GT Distributors of Austin, TX, to provide uniform accessories for the Chatham County Sheriff's Department.

**BACKGROUND:** On February 10, 2012, the Board approved the award of an annual contract with automatic renewal's options for four (4) additional one (1) year terms, to Smyrna Police Distributors, Inc.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

- GT Distributors has recently provided a notification of price changes associated with the manufacturer price increases. As a result it has raised the price of the items listed below. GT Distributors has provided documentation to support the manufacturer's price increase.
- New price will be as follows:

Item	Description	Old Price	New Price
20.	Whistle Hooks, Premier Brand # 1007	\$ 2.20	\$ 2.31
41.	Baton-Expandable, ASP brand #52411	\$ 62.83	\$ 66.13

- Staff believes GT Distributors request for the County to contractually recognize the manufacturer price increases to be fair and reasonable.

**FUNDING:**

- General Fund/M&O - Various
- SSD - Various

**ALTERNATIVES:**

- Board approval of Change Order No. 1 to the annual contract with GT Distributors of Austin, TX, to provide uniform accessories for the Chatham County Sheriff's Department.
- Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to approve change orders for documented material price increases when they are initiated by the manufacturer.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
MARK BUCALO

**ITEM I**

**ISSUE:** Request Board confirmation of a \$191,875 emergency purchase to Savannah River Utilities Company, to replace a portion of damaged force main on Agonic Road for Public Works and Park Services.

**BACKGROUND:** The force main serves several County residential communities and replacement of the portion of the failed force main is necessary to protect public health and safety.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. When the force main initially ruptured staff made attempts to repair the broken area of the pipe. However, due to the age and condition of the pipe, repair attempts proved unsuccessful.
2. In order for repairs to proceed, staff needed to identify the exact location of the force main. Locating the force main was challenging since it runs from Agonic Road through Bacon Park to the City of Savannah lift station. After several failed attempts at locating the pipe, it was finally located by Savannah River Utilities Company, a current contractual contractor with the County.
3. On December 23, 2014, the City of Savannah reported witnessing approximately three thousand gallons of sewage spilling into Haney's Creek from the force main.
4. Due to the potential risk a sewage spill creates to public health and safety and the continued deterioration of the force main, staff solicited a quote from Savannah River Utilities Company for the replacement of a portion of the force main as specified by Engineering. Savannah River Utilities Company quoted a cost of \$191,875 for the project.
5. Staff requested emergency approval from the Chairman so work could begin immediately to replace the damaged force main and eliminate any risk a leak poses to public safety. The Chairman concurred and signed the emergency approval January 7, 2015, see attached on pages 14 and 15.

**FUNDING:** Water & Sewer Reserve (Pending Board Approval of Budget Transfer)  
(5054400 - 52.22001)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board confirmation of a \$191,875 emergency purchase to Savannah River Utilities Company, to replace a portion of damaged force main on Agonic Road for Public Works and Park Services.
2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to confirm emergency purchases.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
CHRIS MORRIS

**ITEM J**

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of a \$2,802 Change Order No. 3 to the construction contract with Pioneer Construction, Inc., to correct a previously approved change order amount for modification of the design to the Human Resources Building for ADA compliance, and include approval for mold remediation and an upgrade to the wheelchair lift.

**BACKGROUND:** On July 26, 2013, the Board approved a construction contract with Pioneer Construction, Inc. to renovate 123 Abercorn Street for the Human Resources Department. On December 20, 2013, the Board approved Change Order No.1 to the construction contract for costs associated with the design modification for ADA compliance. On September 12, 2014, the Board approved a Change Order No. 2 for additional renovation changes including wall ratings required by the Fire Marshal.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. During the renovation of the Human Resources Building, mold was discovered, which required remediation, including replacement of the carpet. The amount for mold remediation was quoted in the amount of \$6,237.
2. The quote for the upgrade to the wheelchair lift capacity is \$1,196.
3. The Board approved \$79,187 for Change Order No. 1 to the design contract to modify the design for ADA compliance. The amount for Change Order No. 1 was negotiated to a reduced amount from \$79,187 to \$74,556, leaving a savings of \$4,631. With this savings, an additional amount of \$2,802 is needed to add to the contract amount to complete the project.
4. Staff believes that the amount received from Pioneer Construction, Inc., for the construction costs associated with this Change Order are fair and reasonable.
5. Contract history:

Original contract (7/26/2013)	\$655,888
Change Order No. 1 (12/20/2013)	79,187
Change Order No. 2 (09/12/2014)	60,723
Change Order No. 3 (Pending)	\$2,802
Revised contract amount	\$798,600

**FUNDING:** SPLOST (2008-2014) - County Administration Building project  
(3244980 - 54.13001 - 32460657)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval of a \$2,802 Change Order No. 3 to the construction contract with Pioneer Construction, Inc., to correct a previously approved change order amount for modification of the design to the Human Resources Building for ADA compliance, and include approval for mold remediation and an upgrade to the wheelchair lift.
2. Provide staff with other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to approve change order to professional design/engineering contracts.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
MARK BUCALO

**ITEM K**

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of the \$101,200 purchase of four (4) 2015 Chevrolet Impalas from Dan Vaden Chevrolet for the Sheriff's Department, and declare four (4) vehicles as surplus and approval to sell at a public auction or to dispose as scrap material.

**BACKGROUND:** The purchase of these vehicles will replace ones that are older and beyond economical repair.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. A Request for Quotes was publicly advertised and opened on December 22, 2014. Responses are as follows:

Whiteside of St. Clairsville, Inc. St. Clairsville, OH	\$25,300/each
---	---------------

** Dan Vaden Chevrolet Savannah, GA	\$25,539/each
--	---------------

\*\*WBE

2. On March 27, 1998, the Board approved a local preference policy which, when a non-local firm submits the lowest bid, allows the lowest bidding Chatham County firm to match the non-local bid. If the local firm agrees to match the lowest bid, the local firm is awarded the purchase. Dan Vaden Chevrolet was offered the opportunity to match the non-local bid submitted by Whiteside of St. Clairsville, Inc., and they agreed.
3. The purchase of these vehicles will replace a vehicles that have high mileage and beyond economical repair. The vehicles to be declared surplus are:

<u>Unit #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Vin #</u>
743	2004 Ford Crown Victoria	2FAFP71W64X116074
768	2004 Ford Crown Victoria	2FAFP71W84X116075
759	2000 Ford Crown Victoria	2FAFP71W3YX144727
751	2005 Ford Crown Victoria	2FAFP71W75X162790

4. Staff believes the total cost of \$101,200, to be fair and reasonable.

**FUNDING:** SPLOST (2003 - 2008) - Vehicle Replacement  
(3234985 - 54.22001 - 32360630)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval of the \$101,200 purchase of four (4) 2015 Chevrolet Impalas from Dan Vaden Chevrolet for the Sheriff's Department, and declare four (4) vehicles as surplus and approval to sell at a public auction or to dispose as scrap material.

2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to provide vehicles for law enforcement activities.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
MARK BUCALO

#### ITEM L

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of the \$30,420 purchase of a 2015 Ford Explorer Interceptor from J.C. Lewis Ford for the Sheriff's Department, and declare one (1) vehicle as surplus and approval to sell at a public auction or to dispose as scrap material.

**BACKGROUND:** The purchase of this vehicle will replace one that is old and beyond economical repair.

#### **FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. A Request for Quotes was publicly advertised and opened on December 22, 2014. Responses are as follows:

AutoNation Ford Marietta GA	\$25,091
--------------------------------	----------

J. C. Lewis Ford Savannah, GA	\$29,279
----------------------------------	----------

2. The low offer or, AutoNation Ford, did not meet all the minimum specifications. The specifications required an eco-boost engine for fuel efficiency. AutoNation quoted a standard engine.
3. The purchase of this vehicle will replace a vehicle that is old and has high mileage. The vehicle to be declared surplus is:

<u>Unit #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Vin #</u>
K14	2004 Ford Crown Victoria	2FAFP71W54X116051

4. Staff believes the quoted price of \$29,279 plus added required options of \$1,141, for a total of \$30,420 to be fair and reasonable.

**FUNDING:** SPLOST (2003 - 2008) - Vehicle Replacement  
(3234985 - 54.22001 - 32360630)

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval of the \$30,420 purchase of a 2015 Ford Explorer Interceptor from J.C. Lewis Ford for the Sheriff's Department, and declare one (1) vehicle as surplus and approval to sell at a public auction or to dispose as scrap material.
2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to provide vehicles for law enforcement activities.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
MARK BUCALO

#### ITEM M

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of a \$15,304 Summary Change Order No. 2 to the construction contract with Pioneer Construction, Inc., for the construction of the Cloverdale Community Center.

**BACKGROUND:** The Cloverdale Community Center was developed as a free-standing, 5,300 square foot facility on the Butler Elementary School campus. The facility contains spacial allocations to accommodate programs directed by the City of Savannah, including a multi-purpose room, computer lab, office, wellness/fitness room, kitchen and restrooms.

#### **FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. On January 17, 2014, the Board approved a construction contract to Pioneer Construction, Inc., for the construction of the Cloverdale Community Center.

2. The location of the community center on the Butler Elementary School Campus and access from the Coastal Georgia Academy has stimulated additional requirements.
3. The submitted final construction contract change order represents the requirement of relocation of new piping and additional concrete around the grease trap due to interference of an existing abandoned electrical vault, upgrade of the three compartmental sink in the kitchen for the City of Savannah, upgrade of an existing gate to accommodate the new entry drive from the coastal Georgia Academy.
4. Contract history:
 

Original contract ( 1-17-14)	\$ 878,200
Change Order 1 (7-25-14)	\$ 109,532
Change Order 2 (pending)	<u>\$ 15,304</u>
Revised contract amount	\$1,003,036
5. Staff finds the fee from Pioneer Construction, Inc., for the change order to be fair and reasonable.

**FUNDING:** SPLOST (2008-2014) - Cloverdale Community Center  
(3244980 - 54.13011 - 32470360)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval to award a \$15,304 Summary Change Order No. 2 to the construction contract with Pioneer Construction, Inc., for the construction of the Cloverdale Community Center.
2. Provide staff with other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to approve change orders necessary for the completion of construction projects.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
MARK BUCALO

**ITEM N**

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of a \$135,380 purchase of four (4) 2014 Kubota tractors from Hendrix Machinery, Inc., for Public Works and Park Services, and declare four (4) tractors as surplus and approval to sell at a public auction or to dispose as scrap material.

**BACKGROUND:** The purchase of these tractors will replace four (4) tractors that are old and beyond economical repair. The new tractors will be utilized for roadside maintenance.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. An Invitation To Bid was publicly advertised and opened on December 22, 2014. Responses are as follows:

Hendrix Machinery, Inc. Pooler, GA	\$135,380
Atlantic Coastal Equipment Richmond Hill, GA	\$138,400

2. The purchase of these tractors will replace equipment with high mileage that are beyond economical repair. The equipment to be declared surplus is:

<u>Unit #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Vin #</u>
51	1997 Mowing Tractor	307667M
88	1996 Mowing Tractor	AW006090057113
47	1996 Mowing Tractor	010771B
65	1996 Mowing Tractor	10896B

3. Staff believes the total cost of \$135,380, to be fair and reasonable.

**FUNDING:** SSD - Public Works  
(2704100 - 54.22001)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Board approval of a \$135,380 purchase of four (4) 2014 Kubota tractors from Hendrix Machinery, Inc., for Public Works and Park Services, and declare four (4) tractors as surplus and approval to sell at a public auction or to dispose as scrap material.

2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to award purchases to the low responsive, responsible, bidder.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
MARK BUCALO

#### ITEM O

**ISSUE:** Request Board approval of a professional services contract with Elliot Davis Decosimo of Augusta, Georgia, for forensic audit services. The fees are estimated to be in the range of \$57,920 as a low estimate and \$92,480 as a high estimate. The services are needed to audit Probate Court accounts to determine the nature and extent of any fraudulent activity.

**BACKGROUND:** On December 18, 2014, the Probate Court Judge sent a letter to the County Manager requesting an "...outside, independent forensic audit of the Probate Court of Chatham County, Georgia". This request followed allegations of unaccounted for funds from Probate Court bank accounts.

#### **FACTS AND FINDINGS:**

1. A Request For Proposal (RFP) for Forensic Audit Services, RFP 15-0002-1 was publicly advertised and issued on December 22, 2014, with responses to be received by 5:00 P. M. on January 9, 2015.
2. Responses were received from the following firms:
  - Elliot Davis Decosimo  
Augusta, GA
  - Baker, Tilly, Virchow, Krause, LLP  
Philadelphia, PA
  - Burkett, Burkett, and Burkett  
West Columbia, SC
  - \* The Wesley Peachtree Group  
Conyers, GA
  - KPMG, LLP  
Atlanta, GA
  - \*MBE
3. The evaluation committee reviewed all proposals and ranked them in accordance with the attached evaluation matrix on page 23.
4. Elliot Davis Decosimo of Augusta, Georgia, was the highest ranked proposer. Staff believes the fees to be in the competitive range.

**FUNDING:** County Attorney (Pending Budget transfer from Restricted Contingency)  
(1001530 - 52.11001)

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Request Board approval of a professional services contract with Elliot Davis Decosimo of Augusta, Georgia for forensic audit services. The fees are estimated to be in the range of \$57,920 as a low estimate and \$92,480 as a high estimate.
2. Provide staff other direction.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:** It is consistent with Board policy to award professional services contract to the highest ranked proposer.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Staff recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BUDGET APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_  
MELVA SHARPE

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.

### **1. REQUEST BOARD ADOPT THE REVISIONS TO THE COMBINED SAVANNAH CHATHAM COUNTY SPEED ZONE ORDINANCE.**

Chairman Scott said, we have First Readers. Request the Board adoption the revisions to the combined Savannah Chatham County speeding zone ordinance. It will be ready for Second Reading and debate at our next meeting.

=====

### **2. BOARD CONSIDERATION TO AMEND THE CHATHAM COUNTY PERSONNEL ORDINANCE AND CHATHAM COUNTY PERSONNEL PROCEDURES TO AUTHORIZE EMPLOYEES ON THE COUNTY'S HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN TO ENROLL THEIR SAME SEX OR OPPOSITE SEX DOMESTIC PARTNER IN THE PLAN, AND TO AMEND OTHER PROVISIONS CONSISTENT WITH THIS CHANGE.**

Chairman Scott said, the second First Reader, is Board consideration to amend the County -- Chatham County Personnel Ordinance, the Chatham County Personnel Procedures to authorize employees on the county's health insurance plans to enroll their domestic partners in the plan and to amend other provisions consistent with this change. We will hear debate and discussion on that at the Second Reading.

=====

## **XII. SECOND READINGS**

### **1. THE PETITIONER, ADAM RAGSDALE, AGENT FOR SMACKO, INC., IS REQUESTING TO REZONE TWO EXISTING LOTS TO A B-C (COMMUNITY-BUSINESS) ZONING CLASSIFICATION. THE CURRENT ZONING OF BOTH OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES IS PD-R-SM (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT-RECLAMATION-SURFACE MINING). THE PETITIONER PROPOSES TO REZONE TO A B-C (COMMUNITY BUSINESS) CLASSIFICATION. THE MPC RECOMMENDS APPROVAL. FILE NO. Z-141022-00086-1 [DISTRICT 5.]**

Chairman Scott said, now we have Second Readers on page 11. We have a couple of zoning. The Petitioner, SMACKO, Inc., is requesting to rezone two existing lots to a B-C, or community based -- Community-Business, zoning classification. The current zoning of both the subject properties is PD-R, or Planned Development and Reclamation, Surface Mining. The Petitioner propose to rezone to a B-C, Community Business, classification. The MPC recommended approval. At this time I would recognize Marcus, our staff from MPC for comments and to answer any questions anybody may have.

Mr. Marcus Lotson said, thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. I'll be brief and give you the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding this zoning petition. The Petitioner are the property owners at 138 and 190 Red Gate Farms Trail. They're requesting to amend the current zoning from the PD-R-SM classification, which is a classification that was designated for surface mining. That property was rezoned in 2005 by this Commission as a -- for the expansion of what was at that time an existing borrow pit. Since that time, the borrow pit activities have ceased at this property, and the property for a number of years has been used for several different uses, but primarily they host private events, both at the Mackey House and at other properties within the farm, and they also do -- there's also a recreational vehicle park at -- at the property as well. The petitioners' primary business on the property is hosting weddings, and as a part of that it is their intent to serve alcohol on the site. Under the current zoning they are not able to do that. They brought forth this zoning petition today to address the existing uses on the -- that have been on the site for quite some number of years. The Planning Commission is recommending approval of the zoning change based on the fact that the -- the uses are existing. There will be no land use changes or additional structures on the property, and that the adjacent properties will not be affected by this zoning change.

Chairman Scott said, any questions?

Commissioner Kicklighter said, just wondering if there's anybody that opposed it in the audience is all I was --

Chairman Scott said, anybody oppose it in the audience? Hearing none.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, I mean I'll make a motion to approve it.

Commissioner Farrell said, second.

Chairman Scott said, properly moved and second that we approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission. All in favor indicate by voting yes, opposed no. The motion carries.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, that felt good to just win a vote, I'll tell you.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Kicklighter moved to approve the zoning reclassification request. Commissioner Farrell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Holmes, Shabazz and Brady were not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: ~~XI-1~~**

**AGENDA DATE: ~~December 19, 2014~~**

**AGENDA ITEM: XII-1**

**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**



**CHATHAM COUNTY - SAVANNAH  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

110 EAST STATE STREET PO BOX 8246 SAVANNAH GEORGIA 31412-8246 PHONE 912-651-1440 FACSIMILE 912-651-1480

**TO: BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**THRU: LEE SMITH, COUNTY MANAGER**

**FROM: THOMAS L. THOMSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

**LEGAL NOTICE/AGENDA HEADING:**

The petitioner, SMACKO, Inc., is requesting to rezone two existing lots to a B-C (Community-Business) zoning classification. The current zoning of both of the subject properties is PD-R-SM (Planned Development-Reclamation-Surface Mining). The petitioner proposes to rezone to a B-C (Community Business) classification. The MPC recommends approval. File No. Z-141022-00086-1

**BACKGROUND:**

Although there are two parcels under consideration for rezoning comprising approximately 50 acres, nearly half of which consists of ponds, Red Gate Farms includes approximately three hundred acres of a family owned former dairy farm established in the 1930s. The property in total serves a number of functions today including private residences, a recreational vehicle park, and a special event venue. The two subject parcels were rezoned for the expansion of a borrow pit in 2005. All surface mining activities have ceased and the former pits are now recreational ponds associated with the existing uses on site.

**FACTS AND FINDINGS**

1. **Public Notice:** As required, all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property were sent notices of the proposed rezoning and postings were placed on the site. There are no known neighborhood associations within the vicinity of the subject properties.
2. **Existing Land Use and Development Pattern:** The subject properties are located southwest of the intersection of Chatham Parkway and Veterans Parkway. They are bounded on the west by a rail line and the south by large tracts of undeveloped land. Recent development in the area includes The Mustard Seed Faith Center which is north of Chatham Parkway. The subject properties are totally within the greater Red Gate Farm property and do not abut any properties not associated with the farm.
3. There are no proposed land use changes or new structures associated with the subject property. The establishment of any new land uses will require that the development standards for those uses be met.

4. The land uses and zoning districts surrounding the subject property include:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Zoning</u>
North	Retail	PUD-BC
South	Undeveloped Land	PUD-M-6
East	Undeveloped Land	R-A
West	Rail Line/Undeveloped Lane	PUD-BC

5. **Existing PD-R-SM Zoning District:**

- a. **Intent of the PD-R-SM District:** According to the Zoning Ordinance, the purpose of the PD-R-SM district is "... to permit the filling and/or surface mining of land in a manner which insures that the operation of such activity does not adversely affect the ecology, or the use and enjoyment of surrounding properties, and that upon a timely conclusion of such activity, the site is permanently established as either an inert landfill or a lake and in such a matter as to render the property aesthetically compatible with surrounding uses in a safe condition."
- b. **Allowed Uses:** Only a borrow pit is allowed in the PD-R zoning district.
- c. **Development Standards:** The development standards for the PD-R-SM district appear in the attached table (Table 1).

6. **Proposed B-C District:**

- a. **Intent of the B-C District:** The purpose of this district shall be to provide community shopping facilities consisting of a wide variety of sales and service facilities at locations that will be accessible to a market area containing from 35,000 to 70,000 people.
- b. **Allowed Uses:** That uses allowed within the B-C district appear in the attached chart.
- c. **Development Standards:** The development standards for the B-C district appear in the attached table (Table 1).

7. **Land Use Element:** the Tricentennial Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates the two subject properties as Residential Suburban Single Family and the remaining portions of the farm as Planned Development. Staff believes that these properties are very stable in terms of land use and that any land use designation changes be done when and if a comprehensive redevelopment occurs in the future. While the proposed B-C zoning district is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map designation of the subject properties it is consistent with the land use designation of the farm as a whole and the properties should be seen as cohesive. Based on these findings, staff recommends that there be no change to the land use designation of the subject properties at this time.

8. **Public Services and Facilities:** The property is served by the Savannah-Chatham Metropolitan Police Department, City of Savannah fire protection and by private water and septic systems.

9. **Chatham Area Transit:** The property is also served by the Chatham Area Transit System, route number 25 West Lake. The nearest bus stop is located at the southwest corner of Ogeechee Road and Chatham Parkway.

10. **Transportation Network:** The properties are accessed from single existing curb cut on Chatham Parkway and internal access roads.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:**

1. Will the proposed zoning districts permit uses that would create traffic volumes, noise level, odor, airborne particulate matter, visual blight, reduce light or increased density of development that would adversely impact the livability or quality of life in the surrounding neighborhood?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X

2. Will the proposed zoning districts permit uses that would adversely impact adjacent and nearby properties by rendering such properties less desirable and therefore, less marketable for the type of development permitted under the current zoning?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X

3. Will the proposed zoning districts permit uses that would generate a type of mix of vehicular traffic on a street or highway that is incompatible with the type of land use development along such street or highway?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X

4. Will the proposed zoning district permit uses that would generate greater traffic volumes at vehicular access points and cross streets than is generated by uses permitted under the current zoning district to the detriment of maintaining acceptable or current volume capacity (V/C) ratio for the streets that provide vehicular access to the proposed zoning district and adjacent and nearby properties?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X

5. Will the proposed zoning district permit uses or scale of development that would require a greater level of public services such as drainage facilities, utilities, or safety services above that required for uses permitted under the current zoning district such that the provision of these services will create financial burden to the public?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X

6. Will the proposed zoning district permit uses or scale of development that would adversely impact the improvement or development of adjacent and nearby properties in accordance with existing zoning regulations and development controls deemed necessary to maintain the stability and livability of the surrounding neighborhood?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X

7. Will the proposed zoning district permit development that is inconsistent with the comprehensive land use plan?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Approve the petitioner's request to rezone the subject property from a PD-R-SM classification to a B-C classification.
2. Approve an alternate zoning classification.
3. Deny any text amendment.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

The existing zoning was established in conjunction with a surface mining operation that has been completed. The former borrow pits have been converted into recreational water features and serve to enhance the overall character of the site. The use of the property for private residences, a recreational vehicle park and special event venue is cohesive due to the acreage of the farm and the natural separation of these uses. The proposed zoning is reflective of how the property is being used now and is planned to be used going forward.

The requested zoning is an appropriate classification considering the size of the properties, their location adjacent to major thoroughfares and the distance from any incompatible uses. Further, the properties provide adequate acreage to address the development standards that would be required for any future development of the site.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Planning Commission recommends **Approval** of the request to rezone two parcels, 138 and 190 Red Gate Farm Trail, from a PD-R-SM classification to a B-C classification.

PREPARED BY:  Gary Plumbley, Director   
**Development Services**

November 18, 2014

Gregori Anderson, Director   
**BUILDING SAFETY AND REGULATORY SERVICES**

	B-C District
Minimum Lot Area	1,800 square feet per unit for residential and mixed use. Zero for non residential

Minimum Lot Width	18 feet for residential and mixed use. Zero for non residential
Front Yard Setback	50 ft. from centerline of street right-of-way; provided no residential structure within 25' of the right-of-way
Minimum Side Yard Setback	0 ft 10 ft when adjacent property is zoned residential
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	NA
Maximum Height	35 feet
Maximum Building Coverage	N/A
Maximum Density	N/A



**CHATHAM COUNTY - SAVANNAH  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

*"Planning the Future – Respecting the Past"*

-----MEMORANDUM-----

**DATE:** NOVEMBER 18, 2014  
**TO:** BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
**FROM:** METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION  
**SUBJECT:** MPC RECOMMENDATION

**PETITION REFERENCED:**  
 Petition of SMACKO Inc.  
 J. Adams Ragsdale, Agent  
 138 & 190 Red Gate Farms Trail  
**File No. Z-141022-00086-1**

**MPC ACTION:** Approval of the request to rezone two parcels, 138 and 190 Red Gate Farm Trail, from a PD-R-SM classification to a B-C Classification

**MPC STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the request to rezone two parcels, 138 and 190 Red Gate Farm Trail, from a PD-R-SM classification to a B-C Classification

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** 7 + Chairman

Shedrick Coleman, Chairman  
 James Overton, Treasurer  
 Ellis Cook  
 Susan Myers

Tanya Milton, Secretary  
 Lacy Manigault  
 Ben Farmer  
 James B. Blackburn, Jr.

**VOTING FOR MOTION**

Shedrick Coleman  
 Tanya Milton  
 James Overton  
 Lacy Manigault  
 Ellis Cook  
 Ben Farmer  
 Susan Myers  
 James B. Blackburn, Jr.

**VOTING AGAINST MOTION**

None

**\*ABSENT OR \*\*FAILING TO VOTE**

\*Adam Ragsdale  
 \*Stephanie Cutter  
 \*Lee Smith  
 \*Timothy Mackey  
 \*Murray Marshall  
 \*Joseph Welch

FOR APPROVAL: 8

FOR DENIAL: 0

ABSTAINING: 1

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Thomson  
Executive Director

The Planning Commission recommends that the following described properties, 138 AND 190 Red Gate Farms Trail, be rezoned to a B C (Community Business) classification.

**BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION**

Commencing from a point [X: 966464.188424 Y: 743669.221954], located at the approximate intersection of the centerlines of the East bound lane of Chatham Parkway and Red Gate Farms Trail/Church Under the Cross Drive.

Thence proceeding along a line in a SW direction [S 69-1-48 W] for an approximate distance of 122.052 ft. to a point [X: 966350.22089 Y: 743625.542223],

Thence proceeding along a line in a NW direction [N 70-28-49 W] for an approximate distance of 314.007 ft. to a point [X: 966053.3177092 Y: 743730.796549], said point being, THE POINT OF BEGINNING,

Thence proceeding along the approximate centerline of Red Gate Farms Trail in a SW direction [S 35-8-25 W] for an approximate distance of 1,296.095 ft. to a point [X: 965307.311606 Y: 742670.921201],

Thence proceeding along a line in a NW direction [N 54-58-25 W] for an approximate distance of 322.497 ft. to a point [X: 965043.223033 Y: 742856.01981],.

Thence proceeding along a line in a NW direction [N 66-29-4 W] for an approximate distance of 363.465 ft. to a point [X: 964709.942468 Y: 743001.041004],

Thence proceeding along a line in a SW direction [S 9-48-35 W] for an approximate distance of 670.916 ft. to a point [X: 964595.635358 Y: 742339.934285],

Thence proceeding along a line in a NW direction [N 71-26-16 W] for an approximately distance of 360.857 ft. to a point [X: 964253.550313 Y: 742454.807569],

Thence proceeding along a line in a SW direction [S 18-25-18 W] for an approximate distance of 129.506 ft. to a point [X: 964212.62529 Y: 742331.937564],

Thence proceeding along a NW direction [N 74-3-40 W] for an approximate distance of 78.973 ft. to a point [X: 964136.688306 Y: 742353.624544],

Thence proceeding along a line in a NE direction [N 19-25-45 E] for an approximate distance of 105.649 ft. to a point [X: 964171.831757 Y: 742453.257236],

Thence proceeding along a line in a SW direction [S 76-20-49 W] for an approximate distance of 269.317 ft. to a point [X: 963910.12532 Y: 742389.686562],

Thence proceeding along a line in a SW direction [S 38-16-50 W] for an approximate distance of 249.287 ft. to a point,

Thence proceeding along a line in a SW direction [S 29-45-56 W] for an approximate distance of 109.654 ft. to a point [X: 963701.250308 Y: 742098.81254],

Thence proceeding along a line in a NW direction [N 41-20-39 W] for an approximate distance of 176.738 ft. to a point [X: 963584.500308 Y: 742231.499541], a point located along the Eastern boundary of a railroad right-of-way.

Thence proceeding along the Eastern boundary of the railroad right-of-way line, in a NE direction [N 47-44-28 E] for an approximate distance of 2,557.641 ft. to a point [X: 965477.442498 Y: 743951.469359],

Thence proceeding along a line in a SE direction [S 70-41-16 E] for an approximate distance of 621.498 ft. to a point [X: 966063.969079 Y: 743745.929181],

Thence proceeding along a line in a SW direction [N 35-8-25 W] for an approximate distance of 18.505 ft. to a point [X: 966053.317792 Y: 743730.796549], said point being, THE POINT OF BEGINNING,

**The property is further identified by the Property Identification Number as follows:**

**P.I.N(S): 1-0838-01-003 & 0870-01-004**

=====

**2. THE PETITIONER, JONATHAN JEWETT, IS REQUESTING TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 453 BOURNE AVENUE FROM AN I-H (HEAVY INDUSTRIAL) CLASSIFICATION TO A B (BUSINESS) CLASSIFICATION. THE MPC RECOMMENDS APPROVAL. FILE NO. Z-101021-00085-1 [DISTRICT 8]**

Chairman Scott said, the second -- the second item under Second Readings. The Petitioner, Jonathan Jewett, is requesting to rezone property located at 453 Bourne Avenue from an I-H , Heavy Industry, classification to a B, Business, classification. The MPC recommends approval. Again, I recognize Marcus for the purpose of explanation.

Mr. Lotson said, yes, sir. Quickly, the property at 453 Bourne Avenue, which is currently zoned for heavy industrial is a vacant lot at that location. The petitioner is -- who has the property under contract, is proposing to rezone the property to the B classification which is a business zoning with the intent of developing the property as a medical office. The adjacent properties, many of which are within the City of Garden City are zoned -- or have similar zonings as proposed zoning in terms of the intensity of land uses, and the Planning Commission has recommended approval of a change from the heavy industrial classification to the B zoning classification.

Chairman Scott said, anybody in the audience oppose? I'll entertain a motion.

Commissioner Stone said, I'll move --

Commissioner Thomas said, I just -- and I just wanted to know if there's anyone in the audience --

Chairman Scott said, I just asked.

Commissioner Thomas said, oh. Okay. I'm sorry.

Commissioner Stone said, so moved.

Commissioner Kicklighter said, second.

Chairman Scott said, anyone? Okay. All right. It's been properly moved and second. Any discussion or unreadiness? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion indicate by voting yes, opposed no. The motion carries.

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Stone moved to approve the zoning change requested. Commissioner Kicklighter seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Holmes and Shabazz were not present for the vote.]

**AGENDA ITEM: ~~XI-1~~**

**AGENDA DATE: ~~December 19, 2014~~**

**AGENDA ITEM: XII-1**

**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**



**CHATHAM COUNTY - SAVANNAH  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

110 EAST STATE STREET PO BOX 8246 SAVANNAH GEORGIA 31412-8246 PHONE 912-651-1440 FACSIMILE 912-651-1480

**TO: BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**THRU: LEE SMITH, COUNTY MANAGER**

**FROM: THOMAS L. THOMSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

**LEGAL NOTICE/AGENDA HEADING:**

The petitioner, Jonathan Jewett, is requesting to rezone property located at 453 Bourne Avenue from an I-H (Heavy Industrial) classification to a B (Business) classification. The MPC recommends approval. File No. Z-141021-00085-1

**BACKGROUND:**

The subject property is located on the southside of Bourne Avenue approximately 650 feet east of Highway 21. There is a total land area of approximately .69 acres and it is undeveloped. The property is zoned I-H (Heavy Industrial) and there have been no prior zoning changes on the property. The only recent zoning change in the

vicinity occurred in 2007 for a portion of a property at the northeast corner of Highway 21 and Bourne Avenue. That property was rezoned from I-H to P-B. The petitioner has stated that he is desirous of rezoning the subject site for the purpose of developing the property to accommodate his chiropractic office and potentially a second office user within the same building.

### FACTS AND FINDINGS

1. **Public Notice:** A note of the proposed rezoning was sent to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. There is no known active neighborhood association near the subject site. The nearest residentially zoned property is approximately one third of a mile south of the subject property.
2. **Existing Development Pattern:** The land use pattern along Bourne Avenue and Highway 21 in the vicinity of the subject property includes light and heavy industrial uses as well as a motel, restaurants and retail. The land uses and zoning districts surrounding the subject property include:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Zoning</u>
North	Trucking/Outdoor Storage	P-B/I-H
South	Undeveloped	I-1 (Garden City)
East	Container Storage	I-2 (Garden City)
West	Motel	I-1 (Garden City)

*Note: I-1 and I-2 are Industrial zoning classifications as noted in the City of Garden City Zoning Ordinance.*

3. **Transportation Network:** The subject site has frontage along Bourne Avenue and an existing unnamed right of way which intersects with Bourne Avenue. There are no existing curb cuts to the property; however, there is adequate lot frontage to establish safe ingress and egress. The most recent traffic data indicates an approximate daily traffic count of 11,500 on Bourne Avenue.
4. **Public Services and Facilities:** Water and sewer services will be provided via existing nearby infrastructure or private systems. Police and Fire protection are provided by the Metropolitan Police Department and the Port Wentworth Fire Department.
5. **Chatham Area Transit (CAT):** The subject site is presently served by CAT, Route 3B Augusta Avenue/Garden City. There are bus stops located on the south side of Highway 21.
6. **Land Use Element:** The Tricentennial Plan Future Land Use Map designates the subject property as Commercial-Regional. Residential Suburban Single Family and the remaining portions of the farm as Planned Development. The Plan defines this land use category as large scale business districts supporting malls and other development at a scale and intensity capable of serving regional markets. The proposed zoning is consistent with this classification.
7. **Existing I-H Zoning District:**
  - a. **Intent of the I-H District:** According to the Zoning Ordinance, the purpose of the I-H district is to "... create and protect areas in which industries, which are not permitted in other districts, can be permitted."
  - b. **Allowed Uses:** The uses allowed within the I-H district are attached (to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file.)
  - c. **Development Standards:** The development standards for the I-H district appear in the attached table (Table 1)
8. **Proposed B Zoning District:**
  - a. **Intent of the B District:** According to the Zoning Ordinance, the purpose of the B district is to "... create and protect areas in which heavy commercial and certain industrial-like activities are permitted."
  - b. **Allowed Uses:** The uses allowed within the B district are attached (to the original staff report in the Clerk of Commission's meeting file.) This district allows a wide range of commercial, industrial and retail uses.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:**

1. Will the proposed zoning districts permit uses that would create traffic volumes, noise level, odor, airborne particulate matter, visual blight, reduce light or increased density of development that would adversely impact the livability or quality of life in the surrounding neighborhood?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X
2. Will the proposed zoning districts permit uses that would adversely impact adjacent and nearby properties by rendering such properties less desirable and therefore, less marketable for the type of development permitted under the current zoning?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X
3. Will the proposed zoning districts permit uses that would generate a type of mix of vehicular traffic on a street or highway that is incompatible with the type of land use development along such street or highway?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X
4. Will the proposed zoning district permit uses that would generate greater traffic volumes at vehicular access points and cross streets than is generated by uses permitted under the current zoning district to the detriment of maintaining acceptable or current volume capacity (V/C) ratio for the streets that provide vehicular access to the proposed zoning district and adjacent and nearby properties?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X
5. Will the proposed zoning district permit uses or scale of development that would require a greater level of public services such as drainage facilities, utilities, or safety services above that required for uses permitted under the current zoning district such that the provision of these services will create financial burden to the public?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X
6. Will the proposed zoning district permit uses or scale of development that would adversely impact the improvement or development of adjacent and nearby properties in accordance with existing zoning regulations and development controls deemed necessary to maintain the stability and livability of the surrounding neighborhood?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X
7. Will the proposed zoning district permit development that is inconsistent with the comprehensive land use plan?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  X

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Approve the B (Business) zoning classification.
2. Approve an alternate classification.
3. Deny the rezoning.

**POLICY ANALYSIS:**

Although the proposed map amendment is a down zoning in terms of intensity of allowed land uses, the uses allowed within the B district are compatible with surrounding land uses, zoning districts and the existing development plan of the area. Further, the proposed zoning district allows uses which are compatible with the Future Land Use Map designation and the likely development pattern of the area going forward.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Metropolitan Planning Commission recommends **Approval** of the petitioner's request to rezone the subject site located at 453 Bourne Avenue from an I-H (Heavy Industrial) zoning classification to a B (Business) zoning classification.

PREPARED BY:  Gary Plumbley, Director   
Development Services

November 18, 2014

Gregori Anderson, Director   
BUILDING SAFETY AND REGULATORY SERVICES

Table 1: Comparison of Development Standards for the Existing I-H and Proposed B Zoning Districts

	I-H District	B District
Minimum Lot Area	N/A	N/A
Minimum Lot Width	N/A	N/A
Front Yard Setback	85 ft. from centerline of an arterial roadway	85 ft. from centerline of an arterial roadway
Minimum Side Yard Setback	Non -- 10 ft. if abutting an "R" district	None -- 10 ft. if abutting an "R" district
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	None -- 30 ft. if adjoining an "R" district	Non -- 30 ft. if adjoining an "R" district
Maximum Height	N/A	N/A
Maximum Building Coverage	N/A	N/A
Maximum Density	N/A	N/A



**CHATHAM COUNTY - SAVANNAH  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

*"Planning the Future – Respecting the Past"*

----- **MEMORANDUM** -----

**DATE:** NOVEMBER 18, 2014  
**TO:** BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
**FROM:** METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION  
**SUBJECT:** MPC RECOMMENDATION

**PETITION REFERENCED:**  
 Jonathan Jewett, Petitioner  
 William D. Bowen, Owner  
 453 Bourne Avenue  
**File No. Z-141021-00085-1**

**MPC ACTION:** Approval of the petitioner’s request to the subject site located at 453 Bourne Avenue from an I-H (Heavy Industrial) zoning classification to a B (Business) zoning classification

**MPC STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the petitioner’s request to the subject site located at 453 Bourne Avenue from an I-H (Heavy Industrial) zoning classification to a B (Business) zoning classification

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** 8 + Chairman

- Shedrick Coleman, Chairman
- Tanya Milton, Secretary
- James Overton, Treasurer
- Lacy Manigault
- Ellis Cook
- Ben Farmer

Susan Myers  
James B. Blackburn, Jr.  
Adam Ragsdale

**VOTING FOR MOTION**

**VOTING AGAINST MOTION**

**\*ABSENT OR \*\*FAILING TO VOTE**

Shedrick Coleman  
Tanya Milton  
James Overton  
Lacy Manigault  
Ellis Cook  
Ben Farmer  
Susan Myers  
James B. Blackburn, Jr.  
Adam Ragsdale

None

\*Stephanie Cutter  
\*Timothy Mackey  
\*Murray Marshall  
\*Lee Smith  
\*Joseph Welch

FOR APPROVAL:   9  

FOR DENIAL:   0  

ABSTAINING:   0  

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Thomson  
Executive Director

The Planning Commission recommends that the following described property, 453 Bourne Avenue, be rezoned to a B (Business) classification.

**BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION**

Beginning at a point [X: 964720.004249 Y: 774961.473017], located at the approximate intersection of the centerlines of the North bound lane of State Highway 21 and Bourne Avenue,

Thence proceeding in a NE/SE direction along the centerline of Bourne Avenue for approximately 692.933 ft. to a point [X: 965410.732438 Y: 774963.589846], said point being, THE POINT OF BEGINNING,

Thence continuing a SE direction along the centerline of Bourne Avenue for approximately 228.424 ft. to a point [X: 965633.310165 Y: 774913.971144],

Thence proceeding in a SW directions [S 12-49-5 W] along a line for an approximate distance of 75.273 ft. to a point

Thence proceeding in a SE direction [S 10-26-52 E] along a line for an approximate distance of 104.027 ft. to a point [X: 965635.474686 Y: 774738.271645],

Thence proceeding in a SW direction [S 78-25-46 W] along a line for an approximate distance of 249.243 ft. to a point,

Thence proceeding in a NE direction [N 4-1-25 E] along a line for an approximate distance of 276.993 ft. to a point [X: 965410.732438 Y: 774964.589846], said point being, THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

The property is further identified by the Property Identification Number as follows:

**PIN: 1-0818-01-011**

=====

**XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

Chairman Scott said, we have a lot of informational items on your agenda. Staff is going to send you out an email with the proposed date for a budget retreat. Please be on the lookout for that.

- 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: January 16, 2015**

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

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DEPT.</b>	<b>SOURCE</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>FUNDING</b>
Commercial mower engine replacement	Detention Center	Screven Outdoors	\$3,587	General Fund/M&O - Detention Center
Excavator repair	Mosquito Control	Flint Equipment Company	\$3,400	General Fund/M&O - Mosquito Control
Mailing of renewals for month of January	Tax Commissioner	World Marketing	\$7,695	General Fund/M&O - Tax Commissioner
Out-of-state prisoner transport	Detention Center	U.S. Prisoner Transport	\$3,031	General Fund/M&O - Detention Center
Architectural services for renovation of restrooms at the J. Tom Coleman Courthouse	Facilities Maintenance and Operations	Barnard Architects	\$5,040	CIP-Facilities Maintenance
Football officials for youth playoff games 10/01-10/30	Public Works and Park Services	Coastal Football Association	\$8,580	General Fund/M&O - Parks and Recreation
Annual fire alarm inspection	Mosquito Control	Simplex Grinnell LP.	\$2,572	General Fund/M&O - Mosquito Control
Excavator repair parts	Mosquito Control	Wilco Mfr. LLC	\$6,662	General Fund/M&O - Mosquito Control
Absentee/provisional ballots	Board of Elections	Printelect	\$3,631	General Fund/M&O - Board of Elections
Football officials for youth playoff games 10/04-11/08	Public Works and Park Services	Coastal Football Association	\$3,300	General Fund/M&O - Parks and Recreation
Three (3) laptop computers for District Attorney's Office	I.C.S.	Dell Marketing, L.P.	\$5,419	General Fund/M&O - District Attorney
Sterilizing equipment	Detention Center	Nanonano US LLC.	\$7,573	General Fund/M&O - Detention Center
Purchase and installation of three (3) televisions	Weightlifting Center	Rody's Audio Warehouse, Inc.	\$2,938	General Fund/M&O - Weightlifting Center
Football officials for youth playoff games 11/04-11/24	Public Works and Park Services	Coastal Football Association	\$4,925	General Fund/M&O - Parks and Recreation
Two (2)- 24 port computer switches and power supply for I.C.S.	I.C.S.	Centrics IT LLC.	\$3,480	General Fund/M&O - I.C.S.

=====

**3. ROADS AND DRAINAGE REPORTS.**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

A status report was attached as information.

**AGENDA ITEM: XIII-4 ROADS**

**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners

**THRU:** R. E. Abolt, County Manager

**FROM:** Leon Davenport, P.E., County Engineer

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

**BACKGROUND:** Funding priorities for projects using Federal aid are established in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). For awarded construction contracts, this report provides the latest scheduled completion dates.

**FACTS AND FINDING:**

1. Whitefield Avenue. Construction complete. GDOT issued partial maintenance acceptance, except for the traffic signal at the intersection of Whitefield and Ferguson on November 14, 2014.
2. Bay Street Widening. ROW acquisition complete. Chatham County has possession and titles for all required ROW and Easements. Demolition underway to prepare parcels for ROW certification.
3. Jimmy Deloach Parkway Extension and Interchange of Jimmy Deloach Parkway at U.S. 80. Design is on-going. Notice to Proceed with ROW acquisition issued October 3, 2014 for Extension project. ROW authorization expected in 2014 for the interchange project. Property owners meeting held September 24, 2014 at Bloomingdale City Hall. Projects to be let together for construction by GDOT.
4. SR 307 Widening from US 17 to I-16. GDOT accepted for ownership and maintenance the section from I-16 southward to Hardin Canal. Notice to proceed issued for remainder on July 2, 2014 to Reeves Construction. Contract time for construction is 270 days.
5. Islands Expressway Bridge Replacement. Design is underway on a high level bridge to replace the bascule bridge over the Intercoastal Waterway on Islands Expressway. ROW authorization expected in 2015.
6. Local Roads.
  - a. Hunt Drive and Faye Road Bridge Replacements. Hunt Drive Bridge open to two way traffic. Stage 1 construction of Faye Drive construction is complete. Stage 2 construction underway with travel across the bridge reduced to one-lane and controlled by temporary traffic signals. Notice to Proceed with construction issued May 1, 2013.
  - b. Montgomery Cross Road at Sallie Mood. Construction underway. Notice to proceed with intersection and pedestrian improvement project issued to JHC Corporation on July 11, 2014. Contract time is 175 days.
  - c. Road Resurfacing. Contract let for 2.9 miles of road resurfacing to include Albert Road, Cottonvale Road, Dove Lane, Goldfinch Court, Lansing Avenue, Lions Gate Entrance, Raleigh Road and Springhouse Drive.

**RECOMMENDATION:** For information.  
Districts All

**AGENDA ITEM: XIII-4 DRAINAGE**

**AGENDA DATE: January 16, 2015**

**TO:** Board of Commissioners

**THRU:** R. E. Abolt, County Manager

**FROM:** Leon Davenport, 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 project includes canal widening, bank stabilization, sluice gates and culverts. Construction of improvements are substantially complete. Completion of punch list items is underway.
2. Pipemakers Tidegate Replacement. The project involves replacing existing sluice gates with flap gates. The Board awarded a construction contract at the September meeting. The contract has been executed and Notice to proceed given, with completion expected in May, 2015.
3. Pipemakers 24" Pipe Replacement. The project involves replacing two undersized pipes with a larger pipe near State Route 21. Design work is complete. The Board awarded a construction contract, and construction is underway.
4. Ashley Road Outfall Drainage Improvements. The project will improve a drainage system from the Ashley Road cul-de-sac. Design work is underway.
5. Gateway-Henderson Drainage Improvements. The project will improve portions of the drainage system in the northeast quadrant of I-95 and SR 204. The project includes construction of maintenance access and drainage improvements. Design work is underway.
6. Norwood Drainage Outfalls. The project will improve drainage capacity and access for maintenance for two drainage outfalls from Norwood Avenue. Construction of improvements is complete at Norwood Place. Design work, permitting, and acquisitions are underway for the outfall near Skidaway Road.
7. Louis Mills/Redgate Canal. The project will correct inadequate drainage capacity and the lack of maintenance access to the canal. Design of improvements along the Marshall Branch Canal is underway and includes construction of maintenance access and culvert replacements.
8. LaRoche Culvert. The project will replace 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. The construction contract was awarded by the Board on September 27, 2013. Work began in January 2014 and was substantially complete in October. Punch list items were completed in December.
9. Ferguson-Winterberry Outfall Drainage Improvements. The project will improve drainage and provide access for maintenance for the Remington Canal from Ferguson Road to the outfall at Moon River. The outfall passes through the Winterberry private development. Design work is underway.
10. Shipyard-Beaulieu Area. The project will improve drainage capacity and access for maintenance. A project to replace three undersized storm drain pipes and reshape the existing ditch is underway. Construction began in September and will be complete by February 2015. Design of a separate project to expand and relocate an existing outfall channel is underway.
11. Little Hurst Canal. The project will improve drainage capacity and access for maintenance along the canal. Field surveying and wetland delineation are complete. Design of improvements at the CSX railroad crossing is underway.
12. Hampton Place Drainage Improvements. The project will improve the drainage system within Hampton Place Subdivision on Quacco Road by routing a portion of the stormwater into an existing canal located on the west side of Quacco Road. Construction began in September and is scheduled to be complete in March 2015.
13. Willow Lakes Drainage Improvements. The project will relieve internal drainage issues within the Willow Lakes subdivision. The project will increase the storage capacity of the pond by lowering the existing water elevation. Design work is underway.
14. Wahlstrom Road Drainage Improvements. The project will relocate a part of a drainage system located on private property into the County right-of-way and an acquired easement. Design work and permitting are complete and the project will be out to bid soon.
15. Pipemakers Canal Cart Bridge Replacement. The project will replace a segment of the wooden golf cart bridge at Crosswinds Golf Club over the Pipemakers Canal with a concrete pad. The existing maintenance road on both sides of the bridge will be sloped to meet the pad, which will allow continuous maintenance access. The Board approved the construction contract on November 7. Construction is underway.
16. Vidalia Road Canal Drainage Improvements. The project will improve conveyance and obtain easements for access and maintenance. Design is underway.

**RECOMMENDATION:** For information.  
Districts: All

=====

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Chairman Scott said, we do have a need for an executive session.

Commissioner Center said, I move we recess to executive session for the purpose of litigation and personnel. Is there any real estate? And real estate.

Chairman Scott said, yes.

Commissioner Stone said, second.

Chairman Scott said, properly moved and second we go into executive session to discuss personnel, litigation and real estate. All in favor of the motion indicate by voting yes, opposed no. All right. We're headed to executive session.

### **ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved to recess to executive session for the purpose of litigation and personnel. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Holmes and Shabazz were not present for the vote.]

The Board recessed at approximately 12:07 p.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 Center moved to authorize the Chairman to execute an Affidavit that the Executive Session was held in compliance with the Open Meetings Act. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Holmes and Shabazz were not present for the vote.]

=====

## **2. APPOINTMENTS METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Center moved to re-appoint Ellis Cook to the Metropolitan Planning Commission with his term set to expire December 31, 2017. Commissioner Kicklighter seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Holmes and Shabazz were not present for the vote.]

=====

## **METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Brady moved to re-appoint Shedrick Coleman to the Metropolitan Planning Commission with his term set to expire December 31, 2017. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Holmes and Shabazz were not present for the vote.]

=====

**METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Brady moved to appoint Tom Woiwode to the Metropolitan Planning Commission to fill the vacancy left by Ben Farmer. His term is set to expire December 31, 2017. Commissioner Kicklighter seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Holmes and Shabazz were not present for the vote.]

=====

**DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

**ACTION OF THE BOARD:**

Commissioner Kicklighter moved to appoint Reverend Aaron James to the Chatham County Department of Family and Children's Services Board with his term set to expire June 30, 2019. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. [NOTE: Commissioners Holmes and Shabazz were not present for the vote.]

=====

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to be brought before the Commissioners, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

=====

**APPROVED: THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2015.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**ALBERT J. SCOTT, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF  
COMMISSIONERS OF CHATHAM COUNTY,  
GEORGIA**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**JANICE E. BOCOOK, CLERK OF COMMISSION**