

CLAYTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Regular Business Meeting  
7:00 P.M.

January 19, 2016

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

PRESENT: Chairman Jeffrey E. Turner, Vice-Chairman Sonna Gregory, Commissioner Gail Hambrick, Commissioner Michael Edmondson, Commissioner Shana M. Rooks, and Clerk Sandra T. Davis.

1. Chairman Turner called the meeting to order.
2. Invocation was given by Chaplain Crystal Pritchett of Association of Law Enforcement Chaplains, Georgia. The Pledge of Allegiance to the flag was led by Chairman Turner.
3. Amended the agenda by Removing Item No. 10 - To consider the recommendation of Chief Operating Officer Detrick Stanford for the position of Zoning Administrator. Vote unanimous. Removing Item No. 8 (5) – The Cancellation of Contract for Convenience of County: RFB #15-08 Lake Spivey Multi-Use Trail Construction, Phase I (International Park – Reid Stephens Park) for Clayton County, Georgia, as requested by the Chief Operating Officer. (Lewallen Construction Company, located in Marietta, Georgia). Vote unanimous. Removing Resolution 2016-16 - A Resolution authorizing Clayton County to enter into an amended master agreement with Path Foundation, Inc. providing for the terms and conditions under which services will be provided for the planning, designing, building, construction management, contract management, and maintaining of Greenway Trails in Clayton County. Vote unanimous. Motion by Commissioner Rooks, second by Chairman Turner, to adopt the agenda as amended. Vote unanimous.
4. Approved the January 5, 2016 Regular Business Meeting minutes. Vote unanimous.
5. PUBLIC COMMENT: Citizens will be given a three (3)-minute maximum time limit to speak before the Board of Commissioners about various topics, issues, and concerns. Following thirty minutes of hearing from the public, the Board of Commissioners will allow the remainder of citizens who have signed up to be heard at the next Tuesday business meeting. None.
6. PRESENTATION: “Community Development Department’s: Process Improvement Strategy”. (Presented by Mr. Patrick Ejike- Director of Community Development)

Mr. Patrick Ejike- Director of Community Development provided a presentation on the Key Development Functions by each division within his department. He stated that our business licenses will be updated and although they are not in line with some of the businesses we see around us, we are responsible for making suggestions to this board, allowing the county to better run businesses. He also

## POST SUMMARY MINUTES

noted the key accomplishments of 2014 and 2015, and how their department did many projects, including one of the most successful completions, the Castellini Construction Project on Highway 42, which will be competing on the national level for an award.

He briefly explained the “How of the Transformation”, including process improvement desired outcomes to point out the focus areas of deconstruction and reconstruction. The transformation process includes creation of automation, transparency, accountability, efficiency, productivity, excellent customer service, change in the departmental culture, and mitigate institutional knowledge. He goes on to state that there are three (3) main focus areas of the transformation process: People, which includes department culture, work skills and their educational background; Process, which includes technology, the work flow of the department and institutional knowledge; and Product, which includes access to date, the efficiencies of service and the portability of the product. Within these three (3) main focal points, there are points to keep in the back of your mind, process improvement, capacity building and economic development are all key to maintaining success.

“The How of the Magic” slide of the presentation includes the explanation of the departments deconstruction and reconstruction. In order for every function of the department to maintain, there is a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). He further states that Permit and License applications can be filled out online on the website. He states that some of the many available online services include business licenses, alcohol licenses, special event applications, business citation payments, customer satisfaction surveys and you can also schedule permit inspections. He also states a dashboard was created so that what is tracked workwise can be shown. He states that with attracting the right talent, we hire people that have a county vision to move forward. Last year, we did a review of this process and did not have any problems. Mr. Ejike goes on to say that with customer service satisfaction, we believe the feedback given to us helps the department.

The Real-Time Operational Dashboard tracks everything, including what is happening in our functions. Examples of what is being tracked include listed hotel/motel and alcohol excise tax. Supervisors get a morning email from the system that explains what happened the day before so that every supervisor is aware of what is occurring in the department.

Summary Revenue Reports allow a look into what is being done in the department, such as workload and resource allocations. He goes on to state that the next step is to establish analysis showing where last year, the peaks of the year where people are rushing to complete permit applications. He shows the rise and falls of the peaks from last year, for permit applications, planning and zoning, citations paid (over \$100,000 in 2015), code enforcement, hotel and motel tax revenues.

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

Also created is a Public Out-Reach Brochure which is made available to the public. It allows citizens to scan the barcode and get into our website. Each barcode included on the brochure that is scanned will bring you straight to the website.

Commissioner Rooks asks about the Code Enforcement section of the Summary Revenue Report included in the presentation. She asked is the report still continuing. Mr. Ejike states that the report is in fact still going on. Commissioner Rooks then asked in what year was \$100,000,000 collected in citations. Mr. Ejike states that was two (2) years ago. She then asked if the Code Enforcement was removed from Community Development and given to the Police Department and Mr. Ejike states no this is business license and inspections. She asked what was done last year in terms of enforcement. Mr. Ejike states around \$100,000 was collected in revenue last year. Commissioner Rooks then asked does he think that the businesses are more compliant since the Code Enforcement has been enforced. He states he believes so since in the past two to three years, the amount has gradually decreased. He states although there is still a lot of (street) businesses with problems, more businesses are coming in and getting their licenses overall, and they have two (2) people that come in on the weekends to help with this matter.

7. PRESENTATION: "Airport South CID Update". (Presented by Nicole Hall, CPSM)

Ms. Hall states that The Airport South CID is doing well and they are in the process of doing an expansion. One of the expansions includes a Joint Administration Agreement which is similar to the perimeter CIDs. Last Thursday on January 7, 2016, the boards (Airport South and Airport West) met as one and are now working under the Aerotropolis CID together as a unified entity to do great things around the Atlanta Airport. She then states that in result of the expansion, there will be a joint meeting on January 26, 2016 from 8:00 AM to 9:30 AM. This joint meeting will include both the Airport South CIDs and Airport West CIDs and is primarily for the expansion projects that are underway. This meeting will take place at the Georgia International Convention Center primarily for property owners but stake owners are welcome. This meeting will be 75-100 property owners in attendance in addition to stakeholders. Ms. Hall encourages the Commissioners and the Chairman to attend and reminded them an email invitation was sent out to them prior.

Ms. Hall provided a map of the vision of the entire CIDs once there is full participation, and the area that is being worked on includes; Airport West out to Camp Creek, Airport South encompassing across and down I-75 and up the Mountain View area.

Ms. Hall states that short term, there is currently in progress a clean-up project of the area of I-285 and Riverdale Road. Also, we are working on traffic signals in the surrounding area once you get off the

## POST SUMMARY MINUTES

interstate of I-285 and Riverdale Road. There was heavy traffic build-up, so we are currently working with G-DOT to get the signalization changed in that area.

Ms. Hall also states that short term with the new contracted company Valley Crest, who worked on Airport West, will now do a clean-up for the areas of the joint roads which include; Camp Creek Parkway, Sullivan Road, Best Road, Forest Parkway, Riverdale Road, and Phoenix Boulevard.

Ms. Hall also mentions Public Safety was prohibited from working within those areas under the current CID act. There is current legislation going forward for that right now. We spoke and met with the delegation and the attorney for the CID is Len Rainey, and we are working with Len Rainey to get minor tweaks fixed in addition to this change. Since the CID act is somewhat out of date, we are trying to make the alterations needed to get the act up to date. We should see this picking up soon.

Ms. Hall was pleased to say that we are working with both Clayton County Police and College Park Police and they have agreed to do additional patrols until the current patrols can expand and begin operating to Airport West and Airport South. As soon as the legislation is passed and the Governor signs the new legislation, then an increase in patrols will be seen.

Ms. Hall states that we are also working with the Department of Community Affairs on an Opportunity Zone Application which is subsequent to an Enterprise Zone Application. She states that we have been working with Courtney Pogue, Director of Economic Development to bring some economical tools to this area that we can utilize and will be beneficial. Businesses will get tax credits for new employees that they bring in for the property owners we have been working with, and this has been a success so far.

Ms. Hall states that one other future project includes working with the hotel areas and the Airport areas to become unified and complementary. She also states she will keep the board updated on the expansion progress.

Chairmen Turner states he is glad to see progress being made. He asks that with the proposed expansion at the airport has she spoken with any airport officials to see what type of impact it would have at the Sullivan Road and Riverdale Road area.

Ms. Hall states that she has not spoken to the airport directly on impacts; however, she has spoken to them about their properties because some areas have been unkempt. She has reached out to the new deputy in the area, as well as, the real estate people about their properties' appearances.

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

Chairman Turner encourages Ms. Hall to speak with both the airport and the real estate people about the impact that the expansion may have to the south side area of the airport and the hotel and restaurants around College Park.

Ms. Hall then states that she has actually spoken to them previously before the expansion began and it was advocated to make sure that the property owners would not be affected by the expansion. The sixth runway is the item that would impact the hotels and go into that hotel area but that probably would not happen for an extended amount of time.

Chairman Turner encourages a follow up with the time line, stating that it is not imminent but to still follow up.

Commissioner Hambrick asked for clarification on whether the businesses were bringing in new employees or are the businesses getting new employees from our area.

Ms. Hall states that there are two new employers coming to Phoenix Boulevard with the Opportunity Zone project. One of the two is coming because of MARTA (715 new employees) for a call center and there will also be a medical technology company coming. The Opportunity Zone is an economic development tool through the Department of Community Affairs and if established, then every time an existing property owner hires new employees or a company comes in with new employees, they would get a tax credit. This serves as an incentive for them to stay in the area. However, the Opportunity Zone is still in progress.

Commissioner Hambrick recommends putting a good word/plug in that we would like the businesses to hire local residents and to push for this idea.

Commissioner Rooks asked is the South part of the CID expansion area colored on the map, have those business owners agreed to do part of the expansion. Ms. Hall responded that we are contacting the businesses on this expansion.

Commissioner Rooks asked what is the time line for contacting the businesses and requesting that they answer on whether they want to be a part of the CID expansion or not.

Ms. Hall responded that the time line is based on the Tax Commissioner's schedule and since April 1<sup>st</sup> is the cut-off date; then, they have until February and March. She states that they have contacted the businesses either via call, email or visit. She states there is a ranking system and so far there are three (3) businesses for the expansion decision. She also states there are a lot of other property owners we are anticipating approval from and we hope to see them at the meeting.

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

8. Considered the request of Debra Brewer, Director of Central Services. (NOTE: The entire Purchasing Ordinance for Clayton County, Georgia can be viewed on the MuniCode website. Citizens can access this website via the following website address: <http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=10562>.)

1) Approved the **Recommendation for Change Order No. 2 Amendment: RFP #10-41 Construction Management at Risk Services for the Clayton County Police Precinct Sector Three and the South Clayton Recreation Center (Lovejoy Recreation Center)**. (\$7,449.00, Sector Three Police Precinct and \$1,917.00, South Clayton Recreation Center. Winter Johnson Group, located in Atlanta, Georgia. Funds will be returned to the SPLOST Undesignated Fund for reallocation). Pursuant to Section 2-136 (2) of the Clayton County Code of Ordinances, General Purchasing Methods; Clayton County utilizes the competitive sealed proposal method when the competitive sealed bid method is neither practical nor advantageous and when cost is not the primary consideration. The competitive sealed proposal method will be used when the costs of goods and services exceed \$25,000.00. All goods and services in the excess of \$25,000.00 are required to be purchased through the sealed proposal process, or negotiated by the Director of Central Services with full Board of Commissioners' approval. The Clayton County Board of Commissioners makes the final award for all non-budgeted proposals of \$35,000.00 and greater. Vote unanimous.

2) Approved the **Recommendation for Award: RFB #15-33 Remanufactured Training Ammunition for the Clayton County Police Department - Annual Contract**. (Multi-Award: Specialty Cartridge, Inc., d/b/a Atlanta Arms, located in Covington, Georgia; and Precision Delta Corporation, located in Ruleville, MS. Funding is available through the Police Department's General Fund). As requested by the Police Department. Pursuant to Section 2-136 (1) of the Clayton County Code of Ordinances, General Purchasing Methods; Clayton County utilizes the competitive sealed bid method when the costs of goods and services are in excess of \$25,000.00. The Clayton County Board of Commissioners has the final award approval for all non-budgeted bids \$35,000.00 and greater. All approved budgetary goods and services and annual contract purchases can be authorized by the Finance Director and purchased by the Director of Central Services without Board of Commissioners' approval. Vote unanimous.

3) Approved the **Recommendation to Rescind Contract Award: RFB #15-27 Demolition of Battle Creek Apartments for Clayton County, Georgia**. (C&S Construction and Consulting Inc.). Vote unanimous.

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

Vice-Chairman Gregory asked Mr. Sule Carpenter of HUD (Housing and Urban Development) if there is no other choice but to accept the lowest bid and not accept this particular vendor. Mr. Carpenter states that the guidance from the HUD Department is to take the lowest bidder.

Chairman Turner states that if we do not accept the lowest bidder than for clarification could we not receive the funds. Mr. Carpenter replied that if the lowest bidder is not accepted than the funds could be in jeopardy, because we would not be in compliance with the regulations of the HUD Department.

Commissioner Rooks asked in reference to RFB #15-27, is it not a concern that the cost is so vastly different between the original cost and the revised cost. In the one entity suggested to use, the difference between the original and revised cost is less than \$10,000. In the company selected, there is \$230,000 difference in cost. She asked is that not a concern with the disparity between the companies' costs and on whether they are being truthful on how much it will take.

Debra Brewer states we asked for details and accountability to make sure there is no error of anticipation. The current company stated in a second report that they did not see any additional work needing to be made that is not included in that minimal amount because of the detailing. We also took detail item requirements to make sure that the differences are accounted for.

Commissioner Rooks asked if we are cautioning ourselves to make sure that the companies do not come back and attempt to amend their contracts needing more funds. Debra Brewer states that they make sure to look at the possible error margin to make sure that companies do not attempt to come back and amend their contracts for more funds later on.

Commissioner Edmondson asked as a follow-up clarification that with the HUD Department, does the department not require the NESHAP testing on all the asbestos removal. Mr. Sule Carpenter states it is National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants and is required by the EPA on a National scale. Commissioner Edmondson asked why it was not included as part of the original scope. Mr. Sule Carpenter responded that we were not aware of this standard and in the revision of the contract, it was included.

Commissioner Edmondson then asked why this standard has to be included in the revision and not the original contract. He states that he thought we approved the HUD funding of asbestos removal earlier this year on a different project on a smaller scope and did it require this same survey. Mr. Sule Carpenter states no, not to his knowledge was the same survey required.

Commissioner Edmondson asked why the two projects are different. Mr. Ejike approached the rostrum to respond that they are not different but that the scope of this current project is massive, and therefore

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

when they checked with HUD after the revision, HUD confirmed that a second level EPA requirement was needed. He states this is our first time doing a project of this magnitude.

Commissioner Edmondson asked that given the fact this is the first time we have done a project of this magnitude and there are federal EPA requirements for second surveys and things of that nature, is there any other insurance or bond that is extraordinary that we are adding on to the scope of this work; so, that if it comes back with an additional \$100,000 change order as the other companies have proposed, we would have some protection. Mr. Ejike states that in reference to the assessment, we are covered and that the second assessment covers all the issues. He maintained that he could not say if there will be an increase or not in site factors but in reference to the second report, it covers all that needs to be covered.

Commissioner Edmondson asks what if a company with a low bid comes in and says something along the lines of not knowing that the project work is more than anticipated and therefore they have to charge us more. He asks would we rebid this a third time or get some bonds for the money already spent.

Mr. Ejike states that if another issue is raised in this type of circumstance; then, his recommendation would be to cancel it. He states we are actually getting a good deal with this project and if any issues arise that does not make sense to us; then, it needs to be cancelled. He states he thinks we are covered.

Commissioner Edmondson states to summarize what is being said, we do not have any type of bond coverage or protection and since this is our first time, if it does not work out we will go back to the drawing board and begin again.

In response, Mr. Ejike states that would be his recommendation because there is no bonding on non-issues. Commissioner Edmondson states he was looking for an answer with more reassurance and since there is no protection in case this does not work out; then, there is concern for him.

Commissioner Edmondson states that he has a financial question. He asked since this is HUD funding, is it coming out of CDBG allocations from a few years ago at HUD or does this require matching funds. He also asks does it reallocate back to HUD or does the government pay it. Mr. Ejike expressed that the general funding includes NSP and CDBG funds and what we have in front of us we can cover.

Commissioner Rooks asks can we restrict these funds and put limits on the money for this project. Mr. Ejike states that yes, we can amend and put restrictions on the funds if need be.

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

Commissioner Edmondson noted several concerns he has including agreeing with Commissioner Rooks in the suggestion of putting restrictions on the funds for this project. He also noted his concern for the CDBG funds running out, there being no extensions, and there being no maximums if we have to go back to the drawing board. He suggests an umbrella bonding policy.

Commissioner Rooks asked does HUD prevent us from putting a maximum limitation on the funds. Mr. Ejike states it would be irresponsible to put in the approval not to exceed a certain amount. He states the question, construction wise, is what is that offer, is it 10%, 15% and how do you establish that.

Commissioner Edmondson states that he thinks that the maximum GMP would be the \$376,000 in front of us. He states he does not want to go back to the drawing board.

Mr. Ejike provided additional information in that the county had to go to court in order to demo the property and request leniency.

Commissioner Hambrick asked how long have we been working on the project. Mr. Ejike replies that they have been working on this for years because we had to go through the courts process.

Commissioner Edmondson asked is there an estimated start date weather permitting, if this is approved because he recalls the CNS project that was approved 2-3 months ago was halted because of the HUD requirement and exempted them of the notice to proceed. Mr. Ejike said they have fourteen (14) days to get "notice to proceed".

Debra Brewer explains that they wanted a change order prior to signing the initial contract because a second survey was required.

- 4) Approved the **Recommendation for Award: RFB #15-27 Demolition of Battle Creek Apartments for Clayton County, Georgia.** (\$376,625.00 / ADS Trinity, LLC d/b/a Atlanta Demolition, located in Chamblee, Georgia. Funding is available through the Clayton County Community Development Block Grant). As requested by the Department of Community Development. Pursuant to Section 2-136 (1) of the Clayton County Code of Ordinances, General Purchasing Methods; Clayton County utilizes the competitive sealed bid method when the costs of goods and services are in excess of \$25,000.00. The Clayton County Board of Commissioners has the final award approval for all non-budgeted bids \$35,000.00 and greater. All approved budgetary goods and services and annual contract purchases can be authorized by the Finance Director and purchased by the Director of Central Services without Board of Commissioners' approval. Vote unanimous.

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

Commissioner Rooks asked are we going to include the language not to exceed the \$376, 625. Debra Brewer states that yes we can amend that and add it to the contract.

Commissioner Edmondson asked can they still exceed that amount and what does adding that language “not to exceed \$376, 625” accomplish. Debra Brewer states they cannot exceed that amount based on the scope that was provided. She also states that adding the language “not to exceed the \$376, 625” in her opinion, accomplishes if there are any additional costs; we would be required to ask if there are any increases anyways.

Commissioner Edmondson states he would like to amend his motion to include the language “not to exceed” the amount of the bid. Vote unanimous.

9. Considered the requests of Ramona Bivins, Chief Financial Officer.

1) Approved Budget Amendment #2-22/Prison/FYE 6-30-16 - To amend revenue received from the State DOT Road Maintenance Agreement for the purchase of new mowers, in the amount of \$33,200. Vote unanimous.

2) Approved Budget Amendment #2-24/Emergency Management/FYE 6-30-16 - To provide funds for the purchase of emergency supplies and equipment needed for inclement weather, in the amount of \$120,000. Vote unanimous.

Commissioner Hambrick asks for an explanation regarding what the \$120,000 is going to be spent on. Chief Merkison states that in working with Chief Financial Officer Ramona Bivins and her staff and also Central Services staff, we would not need rental space for the storage of the salt. The additional 150 tons of salt will be stored and will increase the on hand percentage by 300% of what is normally kept on hand in storage.

Chief Merksion states that in addition, the purchase of the brine maker was made, in which research was done regarding brine making business for the cost of \$34,507 which is purchasing the machine. It will allow 6,000 gallons of brine an hour which is the maximum amount that can be laid down.

Chief Merkison also states that there is a retrofit of 3 current fire department vehicles for temporary services in order to apply the brine to the areas. The retrofit of a 4, 000 gallon TND tanker will be used to treat affairs and the purchase of a used flatbed trailer with 4,000 gallon tank for the brine.

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

10. Approved the Order for Remission: State of Georgia vs. Brandon Steffon Hopper and Anytime Bail Bonds. Vote unanimous.

*Synopsis: An Order to pay Surety 50% of the bond amount under O.C.G.A § 17-6-72(e) (2) which will be \$1,250.00.*

Chief Staff Attorney Christie Barnes requested an executive session for real estate, personnel and litigation.

11. Approved the Reappointment of John Chafin to the Water Authority Board to fill the expiring term for which he is currently serving. The term is for five years expiring on February 28, 2021. (Full-Board Appointment). Vote unanimous.

12. Denied the reappointment of Sophia Haynes to the Water Authority Board to fill the expiring term for which she is currently serving. The term is for five years expiring on February 28, 2021. (Full-Board Appointment). Motion to approve Sophia Haynes for new term failed 2 – 3. Chairman Turner, and Commissioners Edmondson and Rooks opposed. Approved the appointment of Robin Malone to fill the expiring term of Sophia Haynes. Motion passed 3 – 2. Vice-Chairman Gregory and Commissioner Hambrick opposed.

13. Approved the ZONING PETITION: **LEMUEL WARD/MOD-15/09-7** (*Deferred from December 15, 2015 Meeting*). Vote unanimous.

The Applicant, Lemuel Ward, on behalf of Anvil Block Land Partners, LLC is requesting a Major Modification to the Villages of Ellenwood Planned Unit Development (PUD) Conceptual Site Plan to change an existing 189 lot single-family residential subdivision use to Light Industrial use for proposed warehouse distribution center. The subject property is located at **4503 Bouldercrest Road, Ellenwood, GA 30294** and otherwise known as 12-234B-A001. The subject property is approximately 54.98+/- acres of land and currently has a PUD zoning district classification designated as Single-Family Residential on the approved Conceptual Site Plan.

**Commissioner District 1 – Vice-Chairman Sonna Singleton Gregory**

**The Zoning Advisory Group Recommended APPROVAL**

14. Approved the ZONING PETITION: **LEMUEL WARD/RECZ-15/09-21** (*Deferred from December 15, 2015 Meeting*). Vote unanimous.

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

The Applicant, Lemuel Ward, on behalf of Anvil Block Land Partners, LLC is requesting a rezoning from Article 3, Section 3.5 Residential District Standards to Article 7, Section 7.2 Planned Unit Development Standards to allow for property to be combined with 4503 Bouldercrest Road, for a Light Industrial warehouse distribution center use. The subject property is located at **4371 Bouldercrest Road, Ellenwood, GA 30294** and otherwise known as 12-234B-A007. The subject property is approximately 2.0+/- acres of land.

**Commissioner District 1 – Vice-Chairman Sonna Singleton Gregory**

**The Zoning Advisory Group Recommended APPROVAL**

Lemuel Ward stated we are making two separate requests. The first request is 4503 Bouldercrest Road – Parcel Number 12-234B - A001, which is part of the 2003 Planned Unit Development Zoning. We are asking to change from one permitted use to another permitted use for that particular parcel. He states that we are also requesting rezoning from RS-180 to Planned Unit Development which would be in consolidation with 4503 Bouldercrest Road after rezoning.

Mr. Ward states that as currently zoned, it is very difficult to make use with a single family property. The 2003 site plan originally showed 189 single family homes, but the property has been vacant since 2003. Mr. Ward explains the decision criteria focuses going from a 55 acre single family site to an entire PUD with the rezoning.

He reassures that there is no conflict with the existing uses and this project would bring taxes, jobs, and redevelopment for years to come with a balance throughout the community. We need more mixed uses of the property and so far it is of general use.

Mr. Ward states that looking back at the PUD site plan with the original 189 single family, in there is now a low demand for single family subdivisions at this point; it would not attract a good investment and it is unlikely that a single family development of the size in the PUD site plan will be viable for the future.

He also states it is shown that in the immediate area, there is much more commercial and light industrial development rather than residential development. Only 23% of the County is zoned for commercial, office, and industrial uses, which are the prime property tax generators for the County. He stresses that more mixed commercial office uses are needed in the area.

Mr. Ward further explains the benefits of the proposed zoning in relation to the existing usability of adjacent properties. He includes that the building is several hundred feet from the rear of residential property. He includes that the large planted areas are required on the exterior from the property. The height of the building is below the maximum allowed and the size of the property reduces the sight

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

lines to the building. He also states that storm water retention will add to the buffering. Mr. Ward stated that we will not be going on Bouldercrest Road with our truck traffic. He determined that I-675 and Anvil Block Road provide excellent approach to use Lunsford Drive. He reassures that there will be no vehicular ingress or egress on Bouldercrest Road.

Mr. Ward states that the plan is to remove as small amount of trees as possible. He stated that we did request to be given a reduction of less than 15% on that site from 90' buffer yard to 75' setback with the passing of this petition. He goes on to explain that the reduction to 75' is in reference to the 90' buffer yard and setback combination is adjacent to the RS-180 properties at the northeastern corner of the site.

Mr. Ward reiterates that there is no demand for single family residences and since this is the case, we are requesting a logistics facility to be placed in the area. Mr. Ward goes on to explain that 35% of all Clayton County jobs come from the logistics industry and its related components. There is no gain by turning this petition down. He explained how the project is going to look, with approximately 795,000 square feet, 57 acres and \$31.5 million in construction costs.

The owner, Mr. Adam Richards, explained some of the economic benefits which include; future industrial development, controlled traffic flow via Anvil Block Road and Lunsford Drive, minimal site lines to interior of the property, highway access on four lane road, and adequate parking. He explained there will be job creation of approximately 180 construction jobs are expected 500 jobs upon completion and flexibility with full-time, part-time and/or daily contract jobs. With well paying, skilled job opportunities coming in, there is an estimated \$48 million in direct labor income annually.

Mr. Richards stated that another economic benefit includes property tax revenue. Currently, vacant land generates approximately \$9,800 in annual property tax revenue (scaled in a 10-year period). He states our proposed project would generate approximately \$180,000 in annual property tax revenue, which would be \$4 million over a 10-year time frame. He also states there would be a low density of employees relative to the size of the building, which means a contribution to the tax base without any additional school district expenses.

Mr. Ward then states that he believes that with the site plan, building design and transportation plan (which again does not have an outlet on Boulder Crest Road) the project will be successful. He also states that this project has been submitted to GRETA for review. The 2003 PUD was submitted to GRETA. GRETA accepted the traffic plan.

In conclusion, Mr. Ward asks that these applications set forth will be the Boards' review of the Detailed Development Plan, so that the next step in the project is to submit a Construction Site Plan Application to the Community Development Department. Based on the site plan and the Construction Site Plan Application being approved by the Technical Review Committee, and the Director and/or Zoning

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

Administrator will mark it approved for construction. The Construction Plans will be based on the approved Detailed Development Plans and will be prepared for all improvements that are required.

Mr. Ward goes on to state that this approval will in turn make an approval of the entire site being zoned PUD, and the approval of MOD will bring forth a Detailed Development Plan for the unified PUD site, which includes both properties.

Commissioner Rooks asked with the site map, what is the closest distance to the building that is intended to be built and the closest home. Mr. Ward answers that the closest proximity is that of 500 feet from building to building.

Commissioner Rooks then asked what about from property line to property line. Mr. Ward answers the closest property line is 75 feet. He states we are about 420 feet from the building to the rear of the building and 500 feet from the building to the next building.

Commissioner Rooks stated that her concern is for the residents in this area and their homes and asked for further clarification. Mr. Richards states that the closest distance to a residential home is about 140 feet and 275 feet from the property line to the building.

OPPOSITION:

Curtis Watkins of Clayton County, Georgia stated his concerns about the noise pollution and the bombardment of the tractor trailers and asks did we do a consensus of the neighborhood to see if there are residents opposing this plan or not. He stated he is here opposing this plan, because this is a 24 hour operation and no resident wants to move or live in an area where there is constant noise.

Jeffery Benoit of 5783 Rex Mill Drive stated his similar concerns for the noise pollution and also his concern for a decrease in property value. The property value relates to the citizens currently residing in this area will not be able to sell, and citizens that might want to move to this area. He stated that light pollutions are burning 24 hours daily and it is not that he has a problem with development, but the value of property needs to be maintained and the light pollution needs to be addressed.

In response to the concerns, Mr. Ward says the noise and light pollution decreases with time and residents will more than likely not come in contact with either. The lights are directed inward and the light plan will be presented to Community Development for review. In terms of property values, there is no statistical proof that residents will be impacted but there has been a substantial decrease in residential values in Clayton County and this project will not likely affect the current values of property in the area of our project. In terms of the truck traffic, he stated that the trucks will not have any outlet onto Bouldercrest Road, and the trucks are half a mile from I-675.

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

Mr. Ward also replies that we have had several neighborhood meetings, attempting to build consensus within the neighborhood. He states overall, this is good for the county and we have taken sufficient steps to avoid any type of conflicts which include the concerns stated previously. In addition, Mr. Ward states that we have one of the most comprehensive buffers required, including 40 feet of planting and over 500 feet from the nearest house.

Commissioner Rooks asks Mr. Ward will the 40 feet of planting commence immediately. Mr. Ward replied that we are required to place that buffer planting in immediately, in addition to right after the property line, with no conflicts.

Commissioner Rooks addresses Mr. Ejike with the question of how many homes are directly behind the proposed building area for this project. Mr. Ejike answers there is approximately 15-18 homes that are behind the proposed building area.

Vice-Chairman Gregory states that we have had numerous meetings and offers a motion to accept the two petitions separately.

Motion made by Chairman Turner, second by Commissioner Rooks, to go into Executive Session to discuss litigation, real estate and personnel at 8:39 p.m. Vote unanimous.

Motion made by Chairman Rooks, second by Chairman Turner, to go out of Executive Session at 9:20 p.m. Vote unanimous.

Motion made by Commissioner Rooks, second by Commissioner Edmondson, to reconvene the Regular Business Meeting at 9:22 p.m. Vote unanimous.

Attorney Jack Hancock presented four (4) documents before the Board for their consideration:

Approved the first document that is the Real Property Transfer Agreement within Clayton County Hospital Authority and Prime HealthCare Foundation with Southern Regional Health authorizing terms under which the real property coverage now owned by the County will be conveyed back to the Hospital Authority. Vote unanimous.

Approved the second document that is an Asset Purchase Agreement within the Prime HealthCare Foundation, Southern Regional Hospital and the county hospital to enforce the requirements placed upon Prime for the 5-year term and \$50,000,000 investment in the hospital. Vote unanimous.

Approved the third document is an Asset Purchase Agreement that it does not impact the obligations of the county. Vote unanimous.

POST SUMMARY MINUTES

Approved the fourth document is a Limited Warranty Deed that conveys the property that was conveyed by the hospital to the county in connection with the transaction that occurred a few years ago. Closing of this anticipated at the end of the month. Vote unanimous.

There being no further business to discuss, motion by Commissioner Edmondson, second by Chairman Turner, to adjourn the Regular Business Meeting of January 19, 2016 at 9:24 p.m. Vote unanimous.