

**CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor  
Kim Learnard – Mayor Pro-tem  
Phil Prebor – Post 1  
Mike King, Post 2  
Terry Ernst – Post 4

---

City Council of Peachtree City

**REVISED AGENDA**

August 3, 2017

7:00 p.m.

- I. Call to Order
- II. Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition
  - Recognize Employee Team – Police Department
  - Recognize Employee of the Month – Stephen Stoyell, Police Department
  - Recognize Supervisor of the Quarter – Jeff Felmet, Fire Department
  - Recognize Scott Hicks – Advanced Certificate of Public Works Management
- IV. Public Comment
- V. Agenda Changes
- VI. Minutes
  - July 11, 2017, Budget Workshop
  - July 20, 2017, Regular Meeting
- VII. Consent Agenda
  - 1. Consider Renewal of MOU with Board of Education (School Resource Officers)
  - 2. Consider FY 2017 Budget Amendment
  - 3. Consider Change Order – Paving Contract
- VIII. Old Agenda Items
  - 07-17-03 Consider FY 2018 Budget Resolution (*Paul Salvatore*)
- IX. New Agenda Items
  - 08-17-01 Consider Bids – SR 54/Planterra Way Intersection Improvements – AM Construction  
(*Dave Borkowski*)
  - 08-17-02 Consider Resolution of Support for Fayette County TIP Funding Application  
(*Dave Borkowski*)
- X. Council/Staff Topics
  - Lake Peachtree Spillway Project Update
- XI. Executive Session
- XII. Adjourn

This agenda is subject to change at any time up to 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting

# CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

## INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** Mayor & Council Members

**VIA:** Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager *JN*  
Paul Salvatore, Financial Services Director *P.S.*  
Kelly Bush, Assistant Finance Director *KB*  
Angela Egan, Purchasing Agent *AE*

**FROM:** David A. Borkowski, P.E., M. ASCE, City Engineer

**DATE:** July 31, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Change Order #1 for LMIG Paving Projects for 2017  
August 3, 2017, City Council Meeting

---

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that Council approve change order #1 for Atlanta Paving and Construction in the not to exceed amount of **\$119,746.24.**

**Discussion:**

Council recently awarded Atlanta Paving and Construction an award of \$1,352,794.88 for certain streets budgeted for resurfacing. As there were no change orders for the awarded streets increasing the original cost, funds are available to add Hilltop Drive (West) and survey of Pinemount Drive, Willow Road and Cedar Drive.

**Budget Impact:**

Adequate funding is available for this change order.



**CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor  
Kim Learnard – Mayor Pro-tem  
Phil Prebor – Post 1  
Mike King, Post 2  
Terry Ernst – Post 4

---

**City Council of Peachtree City**

**Agenda**

**August 3, 2017**

**7:00 p.m.**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Pledge of Allegiance**
- III. Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition**
  - Recognize Employee of the Month – Stephen Stoyell, Police Department**
  - Recognize Employee Team – Police Department**
- IV. Public Comment**
- V. Agenda Changes**
- VI. Minutes**
  - July 11, 2017, Budget Workshop**
  - July 20, 2017, Regular Meeting Workshop**
- VII. Consent Agenda**
  - 1. Consider Renewal of MOU with Board of Education (School Resource Officers)**
  - 2. Consider FY 2017 Budget Amendment**
- VIII. Old Agenda Items**
  - 07-17-03      Consider FY 2018 Budget Resolution *(Paul Salvatore)***
- IX. New Agenda Items**
  - 08-17-01      Consider Bids – SR 54/Planterra Way Intersection Improvements – AM Construction**  
*(Dave Borkowski)*
  - 08-17-02      Consider Resolution of Support for Fayette County TIP Funding Application**  
*(Dave Borkowski)*
- X. Council/Staff Topics**
  - Lake Peachtree Spillway Project Update**
- XI. Executive Session**
- XII. Adjourn**

This agenda is subject to change at any time up to 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting

**City Council of Peachtree City**  
**Budget Workshop Minutes**  
**July 11, 2017**  
**6:30 p.m.**

The Mayor and Council of Peachtree City met in workshop session on Tuesday, July 11, 2017, which was called to order immediately following the Special Called Meeting held prior to the workshop at City Hall. Attending: Mayor Vanessa Fleisch, Council Members Terry Ernst, Mike King, and Phil Prebor. Kim Learnard arrived at 6:37 p.m., just after the FY 2018 budget workshop began.

The purpose of the workshop was to discuss the proposed FY 2018 budget.

City Manager Jon Rorie noted this was the second workshop on the proposed budget. The last workshop was a general look at the proposed budget, and there were questions and comments afterwards that would be addressed at this workshop. There would also be additional information regarding the Stormwater Utility, Fire Department ISO and station locations, and the Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Financial Services Director Paul Salvatore said the budget workshop always began with the City's mission statement:

*The Mayor, Council Members and Employees of the City of Peachtree City recognize that our primary responsibility is to provide **high quality services** to our residents.*

*We are therefore committed to:*

- Ensuring residents a safe and healthy environment in which to live, work and enjoy leisure time*
- Providing consistency in the delivery of municipal services in a fiscally responsible manner*
- Responding in a courteous, timely, and effective manner to the expressed needs, concerns, and expectations of our residents*
- Promoting a sense of community through family oriented activities and citizen involvement.*

The budget was always designed with the City's mission statement in mind, Salvatore said. The City Manager's proposed budget was consistent with the mission statement and the City's budget policy:

*The City's primary objective is to provide a standard of budgetary performance that both staff and Council have endorsed and to provide budgetary decision making with greater continuity, reinforcing the City's core financial values and preserving them for successive staff and council.*

- Baseline and Service Level Funding*

*The City's top program priority is to maintain existing service levels in all divisions and departments. **A baseline should be set and serve as an agreed upon point of departure for subsequent budget discussions** ie: a new facility or service. Any additional services above the baseline shall be fully funded at the time of the adoption of the annual budget and ongoing funding sources shall be clearly identified. **Such ongoing funding sources must be either new or increased revenues or clearly identified expense reductions.***

#### **General Fund**

Salvatore continued that baseline funding had been maintained in the General Fund, and it would be supplemented with funds from the six-year Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) that went into effect on July 1.



The proposed General Fund revenues for FY 2018 were \$34,878,273, which was \$1,352,521 more than what was adopted for FY 2017, an increase of 4.03%. Proposed appropriations for FY 2018 were \$34,466,930, a difference of \$984,721 or 2.94%, over FY 2017. The Cash Reserve increase was estimated at \$411,343, with a 35% Fund Balance. A 0.25 mil reduction was being recommended for the Maintenance & Operation (M&O) budget for FY 2018 if the tax digest increased by 7% or more.

General Fund revenue sources included Ad Valorem Taxes (38.6%), Local Option Sales Taxes (LOST, 20.8%), Other Taxes (13.6%), Franchise Taxes (7.6%), Other Revenues (11.5%), Fund Balance (-1.2%), Fines & Forfeitures (2.9%), and Licenses & Permits (3.9%). Other Taxes included Title Ad Valorem Tax (TAVT), real estate transfer, recording intangible, alcoholic beverage taxes, occupational taxes, and financial institution taxes. The estimated revenue from Other Taxes for FY 2017 was \$843,300, and the actual revenue for FY 2015 was \$1,251,965. The TAVT was declining each year, Salvatore said.

FY 2018 General Fund expenditures included the "Big 3" – Fire/EMS (21%), Police (19%), and Public Works (16%) – followed by Buildings & Grounds (6%), Recreation & Special Events (7%), Library (3%), Administrative Services (4%), Financial Services/IT (5%), Debt Service (8%), Non-Divisional & Transfers (4%), Planning & Zoning (3%), Building Inspection (2%), and Executive Services (2%). Approximately 70% of the budget was for outright operations, another 8% was capital (debt service), and the remainder was for support services.

Salvatore gave an overview of General Fund expenses by category, reminding those at the meeting that the City's job was to provide services. Expenses included Salaries (39%), Defined Benefit Pension (4.5%), Defined Contribution Pension (0.5%), Health & Other Personnel Costs (12%), Proposed New Positions (0.3%), Contractual Services (23%), Operating Supplies (9%), Recreation Programs (1%), Capital Outlay (2%), Debt Service (8%), and Non-Departmental (1%).

Most of the General Fund expenditures fell under Police, Fire, and Public Works, Salvatore said. Governments were service driven, and the expenses were for providing services. Staff tried to keep a good mix of the in-house (salaries) and out-sourced services (contractual services), which were constantly evaluated.

Salvatore went over the summary highlights of the proposed FY 2018 General Fund operating budget:

- Estimated revenues of \$34,878,273, or 3.43% increase (\$1,353,000)
- Appropriations of \$34,466,930 or 2.94% increase (\$984,000)
- Cash Reserve increase of \$411,343, or 1%
- Street and path resurfacing – no change (\$1,800,000 @ 3-4 miles and 9 miles of paths, does not include SPLOST funds)
- \$110,000 increase in Citywide building maintenance expense
- Increase in permitting activity (~\$200,000)
- \$146,047 funding for Fayette County Development Authority (FCDA) & \$25,000 for Non-Profits (no change – Promise Place & Fayette Senior Services)
- Total (net) Personnel Expense increase of \$136,787, or 0.69%
  - \$186,000 (1.5%) for merit increases – management discretion
  - \$186,000 (2%) Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) as of January 2018, if approved by City Council based on budgeting targets
- Two new positions proposed (not included above):
  - Engineer – Full Time, \$82,511 (all inclusive, \$53,000 salary)
  - Bailiff – Part Time, \$14,187 (all inclusive, \$9,641 salary)



- Unfunded Positions – Public Services Director, Administrative Service Director, Police Captain, IT System Administrator, Code Enforcement Officer
- \$7,650 decrease in airport funding (down to \$84,150, per agreement)
- \$426,000 increase in transfer to Capital Projects Fund (CIP)
- \$254,000 decrease in transfer to Debt Service Fund (two loans paid off)
- 0.25 mil reduction in Maintenance & Operation (M&O) millage rate (assuming 7% digest growth)
- Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity solution - \$96,000

### **Personnel**

Rorie discussed the details regarding personnel expenses. Personnel expenses were tracked in a trend line. Over the last six-year period, salaries for full-time employees had increased 4%, an annual average of 0.67%. Health insurance costs had increased 22% (3.67% annually). Costs had gone up more in the private sector, and Rorie attributed that to the City's self-insurance program, which had a stop-gap measure so insurance could take over. The stop-gap kicked in when claims exceeded \$90,000. The Defined Benefit Program had an annual 1.33% reduction over the last three years in expenses, which Rorie attributed to the change in replacing some full-time positions with part-time positions, the rise and fall of the stock market, and the change requiring full-time employees to contribute to the Defined Benefit Program.

He pointed out that employees had not received a Cost of Living Allowance (COLA) since 2014. There had been some one-time adjustments since that time. The proposed budget included 2% for COLA (actual based on final Consumer Price Index) that would start on January 2018 only if budgeting targets had been met, and Council had approved it. FY 2017 ended September 30, 2017, and staff usually gave an unofficial unaudited review to Council in December.

Merit increases were also included in the proposed budget, and those would be given at the discretion of management. Rorie explained that recognizing everyone equally was not merit, and he estimated approximately 20% of the City's employees went above the minimum expectations day in and day out. This did not suggest that 80% were only doing the minimum, and all employees were trying to provide services. Merit increases were needed to recognize top performers. Employees were consistently asked to do more, and Rorie wanted them to value their jobs as a career. It was that little bit extra that made a difference. Rorie said the City had exceptional employees. While the top performers were intrinsically motivated to do their best, not because of the money, they should be recognized. The City had not given merit raises in quite some time; they needed to be in place, but managed appropriately, Rorie said.

Rorie referenced the uptick in permitting activity, discussing the request for another full-time engineer. Permits for new residences and residential alterations had increased. New commercial permits had increased a bit. Gerresheimer, Sigvaris, and Hoshizaki, all major employers in the City, had expanded. Land disturbance/engineering permitting had increased dramatically in FY 2017. A new engineer would help with review of the plans submitted and in getting the SPLOST projects ready. Getting the permits processed was not just an issue with the City's outsourced vendor, but also the internal process of running the permits through the staff members that had to sign off on them. Technology would help too, and staff was working on the digital part of the process.

### **Building Repair and Maintenance**

The total budget for FY 2017 for building repair and maintenance had totaled \$324,000 citywide. This had all been designated for systems, such as HVAC maintenance for all the units in the City (\$186,000) and \$135,000 for things like fire and security systems, generators, dumpsters, and filters, doors, speakers, and more.



Rorie continued that the City's property schedule had 60 records and was valued at \$45 million. There were 40 facilities with roofs, including City Hall, police station, fire stations, restrooms, picnic shelters, etc. Miscellaneous items totaling approximately \$1.4 million included bleachers, field lighting, safety netting, fencing, and playground equipment. Very little of the "Facilities Maintenance" funding went to the actual facilities (roofs, sealant, etc.)

As a result, the City had to borrow money to fix things, with facilities bonds taken out in 2011 and 2014 to make repairs. Projects in the 2011 Facilities bond totaled \$3,121,568. Eighteen of the projects in the 2014 Facilities bond had been completed, and several more were either in progress or slated for FY 2017. The contingency had approximately \$157,000 left.

In the future, the City had to either bring on more debt or budget in advance for the repairs/upgrades/maintenance. The 2018 budget now had an allocation, which was kept going forward into the next five years, for the Building Maintenance Department. Larger items on the list were included in the CIP. This would let the City pay for ongoing maintenance items as they were needed, rather than incurring additional debt.

#### **Infrastructure Maintenance: Bridges, Tunnels, Road Resurfacing, Cart Paths**

City Engineer Dave Borkowski reported the City's streets were an \$83 million asset, including up to 183 center line miles of roadways, and three million square yards of pavement. Those amounts would go up since the West Village roads were only about 20% complete.

Borkowski discussed the typical pavement performance curve, saying costs to resurface roads significantly increased as pavement deteriorated. Roads had a life span of approximately 15 years. There was usually a 15% quality drop in the first six years. The biggest drop in quality occurred from six to eight years of age. Conversely, the cheapest maintenance cost per mile was during the first eight years. Keeping good roads at good quality maximized maintenance dollars. The life of roads with a pavement index of 80 or better could be extended three – five years when treated with HA5/Seal Coat.

Borkowski reviewed the cost of pavement rehab per mile over time, saying that HA5/Sealcoat was \$34,203 per mile on a four-year-old road. Waiting until the road was six years old and applying a two-inch mill/overlay was \$157,203 per mile. That same two-inch mill/patch/overlay at eight years was \$241,484 per mile; and a 10-inch full depth reclamation (FDR) at nine years would be \$307,179. He added that the estimate costs were based on actual bid numbers the City had received recently.

Rorie pointed out these cost estimates were based on supply and demand of the vendors and oil prices. The ability to get the projects done was also based on the availability of the vendors, and Rorie questioned what would happen to the price if the vendors had multiple projects. Borkowski said when the demand was up, the price was up. Rorie continued that between the General Fund (\$1.8 million) and the SPLOST (\$3 - \$3.3 million) there would be \$5 million annually for road resurfacing. Staff wanted to get the bids out early, so the City would be ready start the projects in March. The good roads needed to be "good" longer, and the longer they delayed, the more it would cost.

#### **Fire Department ISO Class 1 – What does good look like?**

Rorie noted this was a big "thought" issue, and the planning horizon extended five, 10, and 15 years out. The ISO rating was important, but was only one variable, in assessing the Fire Department budget.



Assistant Fire Chief-Operations Kevin Baggett discussed the Insurance Service Office's (ISO) Public Protection Classification (PPC), which ranged from one – 10. Class 1 represented exemplary fire protection, and Class 10 indicated the area's fire-suppression program did not meet ISO's minimum criteria. The City's rating had changed to ISO Class 1 in 2015, and the department continually tried to deliver the best service possible, Baggett said.

The PPC rating was based on three categories – Fire Department (50 points) for staffing, training, geographic distribution of fire companies, apparatus and equipment etc.; Water Supply (40 points) for condition and maintenance of hydrants and a careful evaluation of the amount of available water compared with amount needed to suppress fires; and Communications (10 points) for the fire alarm and communication systems, including telephone systems, telephone lines, staffing, and dispatching systems.

Insurance companies used the ISO rating in determining rates, Rorie said. Based on an analysis of insurance premiums on the City's average \$290,000 average home value done by Fire Chief Joe O'Connor, an estimated \$332,280 had been saved on fire insurance premiums by the owners of the 13,845 housing units in the City due to the ISO 1 rating of the Fire Department. The homeowner was responsible for contacting their insurance company. Rorie added that commercial/industrial facilities usually had sprinkler systems, so the ISO rating was not a big factor in their premiums.

More Emergency Medical Services (EMS) were delivered in the City than fire services, Baggett continued, which was happening across the country. The breakdown on the types of services included EMS (72%, 2784 calls), service calls (10%, 399), false alarm/false calls (8%, 298), good intent call (5%, 178), hazardous condition/no fire (3%, 122), and actual fires (2%, 73).

The City had an aging population, as well as a lot of recreational services, which led to the increase in EMS calls, Baggett said. The average age of a patient was 60. The City had three assisted living facilities, and calls were numerous.

Strokes, heart attacks, and trauma required specialized care and were time-sensitive, Baggett pointed out. There was a time factor for fires also, and fires that continued to burn without a sprinkler system or an interface with the Fire Department continued to grow for a set period.

Baggett showed a map with the location of the four fire stations in the City that showed the response districts, noting that a large portion of the south end of the City needed better coverage. One of the assisted living facilities was located at the southern edge of the City. The community had an expectation of quick response, and rightfully so, he added.

Fifteen firefighters were needed to safely fight a fire. The City had 19 personnel on every shift, every day. Any time a medic truck was out of the City, the force was reduced by two people.

The balanced distribution of resources throughout the City allowed for the shortest possible response times, which prevented the loss of life in cardiac arrest and met the community's high expectations. The ability to quickly gather an effective fighting force of 15 firefighters allowed for the simultaneous performance of essential firefighting duties, including search and rescue, extinguishing fire, water supply, and command and safety.

Baggett referred to the 2013 Matrix Study that recommended establishment of baseline and benchmark response time objectives as published by the Commission on Fire Accreditation International for suburban communities 90% of the time. The objectives were adopted by Council on December 19, 2013. Benchmarks were those times identified as a high standard and used to plan future efforts. Baselines were the standard that the Department committed to perform at



and evaluate compliance. As baselines were achieved consistently, the standard would move upwards towards the benchmark goal.

Call handling time for processing by the Fayette County 911 Center of an emergency call and the dispatching of fire response units had a baseline of 90 seconds no less than 90% of the time. Turn-out time was the time between dispatch notification and unit response, and the baseline was 90 seconds no less than 90% of the time. Travel time was the time taken from leaving the station to the arrival of the primary company to either a fire suppression or emergency medical incident. The baseline was six and one-half minutes (390 seconds) or less 90% of the time. Baggett noted that Fire Department really only had control over the turn out time. Travel time depended on the distance that had to be covered and getting there safely.

Rorie asked if the Department with the four stations was meeting the baseline for travel time. Baggett said they were most of the time, but when a unit had to go outside of its response area because another unit was on a call, the time increased. Every second of delay meant more damage to a person or property. Rorie said the fire department classification and the water supply did not matter if they did not get the call in time. Call handling mattered, Rorie said, adding they needed to work with E911 to get the calls out faster.

Baggett continued that, in March, the second or third closest responder had been required to respond to a call because the primary unit was on another call in 15% of the calls for service. Responses to assisted living facilities accounted for nearly 20% of all calls for service. Turnaround time was the time required to return to the station after a call. A call that required transporting a patient to the Emergency Room at Piedmont Fayette Hospital took from an hour to two hours. Patients arriving via ambulance had to go through the triage system at the Emergency Room and be prioritized as walk-in patients. The process was quicker for patients in critical situations, but "wall time" (the time paramedics spent waiting to turn a patient over to hospital staff) was becoming more common. The City's paramedics had to relay all the information on treatment/procedures before they could return to the station. Trauma and stroke patients and children who had more than a routine illness had to be transported to Atlanta. Baggett noted the City's department also had mutual aid agreements with surrounding entities, and if the City was busy, that entity usually was too.

The demand for EMS would continue to grow as the population aged, Baggett reiterated. The risk of fire loss would increase as properties aged, and Baggett said the Fire Department would work on improved prevention and encourage safer construction methods and enforcement of life safety codes. They also inspected businesses to ensure all the safety measures were working and to make them safe.

Baggett said they continually monitored the key performance indicators to see when to expand services. It was an expensive process. It took one year to build a fire truck, and building a station was a two-year process.

Rorie added that it would take approximately \$2.9 million just to build a station and put in the equipment, which would be \$350,000 in debt service. Three shifts of four people (12 personnel) were needed, plus uniforms and supplies totaled \$1.08 million for a station with fire and EMS personnel. All of the City's medical units were an extension of the Emergency Room, and they operated under a doctor's supervision. They had standards of care and protocols and procedures that had to be followed.

Rorie continued that that they also were trying to allocate resources throughout the City, where the growth was occurring, and where the demand for service was, which might not mean four



people at a full fire station. The demand for service was trending nationally and locally to medical stations with ambulance personnel who could also fight fires. Instead of 12 people at one \$2 million station, there could be 12 people at two \$1 million stations. The decision should be rational and based on the need for service, in addition to the benchmarks that needed to be made.

The impact fee for fire protection for each new unit in the West Village (Wilksmoor) was \$583.88 per unit. Planning projections were based on when the new station should be built. Rorie said that, currently, the demand on the south end of the City exceeded the demand in the West Village. Staff had to look at impact fees and the increase in property taxes due to the growth to pay the operational expense of a new station.

To date, 63 building permits had been issued, with 43 certificates of occupancy (COs) for Cresswind and 18 – 19 for Everton in Wilksmoor. There was a site for a station on MacDuff Parkway, and station construction should be considered at 30% build out of the planned 1,329 units for the two subdivisions, Rorie said. The question should not be about the ISO rating, but whether the service delivery strategy adequately met the demand for 72% of the calls, which were medical.

The City was adequately funded and adequately distributed for fire stations and fire trucks, Rorie said. There was a CIP plan in place to do that. The demand was on the medical side and how those resources were distributed. The City would be better off with a temporary location for EMS on the south end of the City to see how much more growth there would be in that area. The key was the medical response moving forward.

#### **5-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)**

Salvatore discussed the effect of the proposed budget on the five-year CIP. The highlights were:

- FY 2018
  - \$341,000 cash funding for infrastructure (citywide facilities & bridges)
  - \$275,000 cash funding for technology infrastructure replacements
  - \$891,750 for vehicle & equipment replacements (5-year financing)
- FYs 2019 – 2022
  - \$350,000 per year cash funding for citywide infrastructure (facilities & bridges)
  - Additional \$250,000 cash funding for All Children's Playground in FY 2020
  - Fire Truck, Ambulance, Radios, Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) moved to SPLOST
  - New West Side Fire Station – Fully operational by FY 2021, ~\$1 million/year operating expenses
  - Reduced reliance on debt financing of infrastructure – more pay-as-you-go
  - Additional millage rate reductions in FYs 2019 & 2020 (0.1 & 0.2, respectively)

Salvatore said the CIP had a good mix of debt financing and pay-as-you-go, which was a consideration for bond rating agencies.

From FY 2020, there was an additional \$250,000 cash funding for upgrades at the All Children's Playground in conjunction with the SPLOST project to run a bridge from the park to Drake Field.

Salvatore said it was important to maintain the baseline in the budget on big items, such as paving. The new fire station in the West Village was to be fully operational by FY 2021, and the \$1.08 million in operating expenses would hit the General Fund.

Fleisch asked what the rule was for spending impact fees. Rorie said it was on a first in, first out basis, and by the sixth year, the funds should be encumbered.

Salvatore said there were additional millage rollbacks projected for FY 2019 (0.1 mil) and FY 2020 (0.2 mil). He continued that it was never good to have a big cut in the millage rate at one time. The cuts should be done in small increments and reviewed every year.

Salvatore looked at the five-year plan for the CIP budget, noting the program for FY 2018 included cash and financing. Five-year equipment lease/purchasing programs would be used to replace Public Works, Police, and Fire Department staff vehicles, as well as storage/expansion of Police videos and replacement of 15 cardiac monitor lifepaks.

Rorie noted that funding for bridge maintenance (\$100,000) and facilities improvements (\$100,000) was in addition to what was programmed in the General Fund. For the money in the CIP to be spent, special requests had to be submitted.

In FYs 2019 – 2022, the funding from citywide infrastructure increased to \$350,000 annually. Salvatore noted that there were bond funds left, so only \$100,000 was included in the CIP for FY 2018. The bond funds should be gone at the end of that year. Salvatore expected \$350,000 to be a realistic amount once the bond funds were gone.

One of the issues in the CIP was the replacement of police cars, Rorie said. The replacement cycle needed modification to balance out the purchases. He noted that FY 2018 had nine patrol vehicle replacement, FY 2019 included 12 police vehicle replacements, FY 2020 had six replacements scheduled, nine were scheduled in FY 2021, and 15 were slated in FY 2022. There should not be economic spikes in the budget year after year, Rorie said, and he recommended resetting the CIP to smooth out the spikes.

Police Chief Janet Moon discussed the current issues with vehicle replacement in the Police Department, saying the policy for mileage criteria had changed a few years previously increasing from 100,000 to 125,000 miles before a vehicle could be replaced. However, a one-size-fits-all policy did not always work. She noted a recent article in a magazine regarding rotation of police cars that stated the optimal time for replacement was when the total cost averaged over the vehicle's lifetime was at a minimum. Costs included depreciation, operating expenses, maintenance, and downtime. They also had to look at the legal consequences of keeping a vehicle too long. The City would be scrutinized more closely if an older vehicle was involved in a crash during a pursuit. The main concern was the safety of the citizens, as well as the safety of the officers driving the patrol cars.

Moon reported she recently spoke to Natalie Sellers with Local Government Risk Management Services, who recommended vehicles be replaced at 100,000 miles. The new Chevrolet Caprices were not holding up as well as the Ford Crown Victorias had.

Rorie noted the goals and objectives for FY 2018 also included the following:

- Increase Cyber Security Issues/Technology Upgrades
  - Software
  - See Click Fix It/Citizen Engagement Tool
- Evaluate EMS Stations vs. Fire Stations
  - Staffing Scenarios
  - ISO Impacts
  - Response Time Criteria and 911 Service Delivery
- Keep Peachtree City Beautiful (KPTCB) Recycling/Funding Strategies
- Reduce turnaround time in the plan review process
- Reset the CIP to restructure economic smoothing cycles



The required public hearing on the proposed FY 2018 budget was scheduled for the July 20 City Council meeting, Salvatore said. Additional hearings would be scheduled for the millage rate.

### **Stormwater Utility Fund**

Stormwater Manager Mike Madison gave an overview of the Stormwater Water Utility Fund Revenues, noting the stormwater funds were not mingled with the City's General Fund.

Stormwater revenues:

- Stormwater Fee/Charges for Service = \$2,321,968 (1.15 mil equivalent)
  - Special Fund – Funds are not commingled with General Funds and used specifically for utility
  - Residential billed twice per year to spread annual bill between two equal payments
  - Revenue demands the same regardless of billing cycle (\$150/ year or \$75 twice per year)
  - Commercial billed on a monthly basis
  - General Fund or Enterprise Fund not affected by
    - Tax Exempt Properties
    - All properties included

Expenses:

- Seven Personnel
- ~\$50 Million in identified projects
  - In-House Projects
  - Contractual Services Projects
- Bond Debt-32% of total budget, Fees set at 115% of Bond debt

Bond debt accounted for one-third of the Utility's expenses, Madison said. There was approximately \$225,000 difference between revenues and expenditures, which was put into a fund for costly pipe repairs that could not be done in-house. Rorie added the Utility would face more debt without the renewal and extension (R&E) fund.

Rorie reiterated that the public hearing on the proposed budget would be held on July 20. When the City received the tax digest from the County Tax Commissioner, they would know if the proposed budget was a good plan, and the millage rate public hearings would be set, Salvatore added.

Fleisch opened the floor for comments from the public. Larry Milligan asked if the Fire Department had considered an EMS floater that could answer calls when an EMS crew at a particular station was on another call or out of the jurisdiction. Baggett said the Department did something called "pulling zone," explaining that when the medic and fire trucks from the same station were simultaneously out, another vehicle would answer the call. If a medic truck from another station was not available, all the firefighters were emergency medical technicians (EMTs) and had a supply of equipment on the engines, but did not have all the equipment/training for all the procedures.

Fleisch asked if there had been issues with the ambulances being diverted at Piedmont Fayette. Baggett said that, legally, the hospital could only go on diversion for four hours at a time. There were two types of diversions, and Piedmont Fayette had its own policy. The state's EMS policy governed the Department's EMS services. Diversion did not mean they did not go there because they took patients to the closest, most appropriate facility. Piedmont Fayette's status ebbed and flowed.

Fleisch asked Salvatore where the City's debt stood. Salvatore said the City's debt was under \$10 million, not including stormwater debt, with about \$2.1 million in debt service. All the current debt would be paid off in 2024. Fleisch asked how much debt the City could acquire. Salvatore said the City's debt could be the equivalent of 10% of the tax digest, which was the legal debt margin, or \$200 million for General Obligation Bond debt, but that did not include lease/purchase and other types of debt. The City was at a small fraction of its allowed debt, and the debt was relatively short-term. Rorie said they were trying to keep from taking on future debt, but from a debt structure standpoint, the City was in good shape.

Ernst suggested that anyone planning to speak at the public hearing limit their speaking time. Rorie suggested something like three minutes, or between three and five minutes, adding he did not want the first person to take up all the allotted time. Rorie said staff would have a plan of action for the public hearing.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

---

Pamela Dufresne, Deputy City Clerk

---

Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor



**City Council of Peachtree City**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**July 20, 2017**  
**7:00 p.m.**

The Mayor and Council of Peachtree City met in regular session on Thursday, July 20, 2017. Mayor Vanessa Fleisch called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Others attending: Terry Ernst, Mike King, and Phil Prebor. Kim Learnard was out of town.

**Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition**

Mayor Fleisch recognized Police Sgt. Chris Hyatt for 10 years of service. Brian Glennie, Mark Williams, Stephen Stoyell, and Justin Mobley were recognized for their participation in the Supervisory Techniques Accentuate Results (STAR) program. Mayor Fleisch read a proclamation of recognition for the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Peachtree City Police Auxiliary. Police Chief Janet Moon noted the retirement of Tom and Alma MacCallum from the Auxiliary, then promoted Arline Cuebas to lieutenant and John McDonald to captain in the Auxiliary. The trophies were awarded to the July 4<sup>th</sup> parade winners, including 1<sup>st</sup> Place Golf Cart – The Czerwinski family, 2<sup>nd</sup> Place Golf Cart – My Floral Bliss, 3<sup>rd</sup> Place Golf Cart – United Pool Management, Most Creative – Narwall, Most Patriotic – Fayette Hobbies, Mayor's Trophy – Square Foot Ministries, and Grand Marshal's Trophy – Piedmont Fayette Hospital.

**Minutes**

**June 6, 2017, Retreat Workshop**

**June 15, 2017, Regular Meeting**

**June 26, 2017, Budget Workshop**

**July 11, 2017, Special Called Meeting**

King moved to approve the June 15, 2017, regular meeting minutes; June 26, 2017, budget workshop minutes; and July 11, 2017, special called meeting minutes as written. Prebor seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

King moved to approve the June 6, 2017, Retreat workshop minutes as written. Prebor seconded. Motion carried 3-0-1 (Ernst).

**Quarterly Reports – Second Quarter 2017**

Ernst noted that Council appreciated the work done to put the reports together, adding they did look over the reports.

**Consent Agenda**

**1. Consider Appointment of Alternate to Vacant Position on Airport Authority – Allen Morrison**

**2. Consider Bid for Window Replacements in City Hall & Library – Action Glass Company**

Ernst moved to approve Consent Agenda items 1 and 2. King seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**Old Agenda Items**

**06-17-01      Consider Special Use Permit in General Industrial (GI) Zoning for Dog Kennel,  
261 Tiger Way (*Request withdrawn*)**

No action required.

**New Agenda Items**

**07-17-03      Public Hearing – Consider FY 2018 Budget and CIP**

Public Information Officer/City Clerk Betsy Tyler read the public hearing protocol for this meeting, which allowed each speaker up to five minutes to present their views. She noted that there would not be a vote on the proposed budget after the public hearing ended.

City Manager Jon Rorie began the presentation by showing a photo of the landscaping at the intersection of Braelinn Road/Peachtree Parkway, saying the City had received complaints that the height of the bushes had created sight issues at the intersection. As a result, the bushes were all pruned to their base. He said the bushes were "butchered" on purpose, and the bushes were now revegetating and growing, but they would not get so high again that they were a problem.

Rorie referenced a water fountain at the intersection that had recently been painted, crediting Public Works Supervisor Scott Hicks and the STAR program for the effort. He said no one had asked that the water fountain be painted, and no work order had been submitted. An unknown employee had noticed it and had taken the initiative to maintain the fountain better.

Typically, there was a budget message in front of the budget document, Rorie said, and he had not included one for this budget. He continued that, his first year as Interim City Manager, he had inherited a budget on a Thursday and had to present it on the following Tuesday. The FY 2018 budget was different, and this was his budget message.

Everyone recognized the impact of the Great Recession at all levels of government, and many cities had to scale back services. Capital investments and purchases were deferred. Services were outsourced. They did not hire people, and as a result, they could not do certain things. Maintenance was deferred throughout the City. The recession forced the City to focus on providing services efficiently, but also restricted the effectiveness of providing those services. The restriction of effectiveness played itself out in ineffective funding for road resurfacing. The City had to incur debt for normal maintenance items. When stakeholders had low expectations regarding service delivery, it was a threat to the community. The stakeholders would quit using the public amenities, which led to a downward spiral of underfunding and service delivery. The question was whether the stakeholders believed in the provision of public services and if they were willing to pay for it.

Usually the opinions of the public were divided in thirds – 30% agreed something was the right thing to do, 30% agreed it was the wrong thing to do, and 30% were on the fence, either due to apathy or misinformation. Rorie asked everyone to keep the 70:30 ratio in mind.

In 2013, the Mayor at the time had formed a Needs Assessment Committee to determine citizens' priorities for City services and recommend a millage rate using objective methods. The committee met multiple times and sent out 1,200 invitations randomly selected from 12,000 residential addresses for a survey, receiving 209 valid responses. The results of the survey questions were mostly 70%/30%. Approximately 68% said the City's property taxes were just right. Another 2% - 3% said the taxes were too low, and 30% said taxes were too high. Answers to questions regarding cart path connectivity, stormwater, and other issues followed the 70/30 pattern. The committee recommended Council consider increasing the millage rate by 0.5 mils.

In 2016, the City received 962 responses to a Citizens Satisfaction Survey. The purpose was to measure satisfaction levels and solicit citizen input. The satisfaction with path maintenance was 50/50, Rorie said. Appearance along roadways was 75% satisfied, which was after the City started insourcing landscaping. Fifty-six percent of the respondents were satisfied with street paving and maintenance. Only 33% were satisfied with overall traffic flow. Path connectivity, alternate transportation options, and efficient road systems were cited as the top three items the City lacked. In their homes, 96% felt safe or somewhat safe, and 93% felt that way in shopping areas.



On the paths, 87% felt safe and 72% felt safe from accidents. Earlier surveys had lower percentages, and Rorie attributed that to a stronger police presence on the path system. Work continued on that. Schools, natural beauty, and the path system all contributed to quality of life, according to those who responded. Rorie said the City's number one amenity was the path system. The residents felt the biggest challenges in the next 10 years would be traffic, maintaining infrastructure, maintaining paths, aging neighborhoods, and crime. Respondents indicated the planning focus for the next 20 years should be traffic, high-paying jobs, economy, path system, and deteriorating infrastructure.

The Comprehensive Plan was updated this year, and the key features of the plan included managing congestion, providing transportation options, and ensuring adequate and modern infrastructure was in place to accommodate business and industry. Economic features included working with several public and private education organizations to provide high-quality educational facilities in the City. Transportation goals included providing a comprehensive path system connecting all the villages and multi-use activity centers.

Rorie noted all of these were worked on by citizen committees, and an infrastructure advisory group had been formed with the mission to identify projects for a proposed Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST). The group took an \$88 million project list and pared it down to \$45 million. They did not always agree, but they came together to produce the list, and the list was put on a ballot in March. The vote to invest and reinvest in the City's quality of life was approved by a two to one margin.

Economic sustainability was an important part of any community's overall plan, Rorie said. Looking over the five-year period and the work done by the citizens, Rorie asked what they were being told by 70/30 margin, and were they listening.

Rorie noted that producing was part of his budget letter, as well as listening. He noted the City's mission statement:

*The Mayor, Council Members and Employees of the City of Peachtree City recognize that our primary responsibility is to provide **high quality services** to our residents.*

*We are therefore committed to:*

- Ensuring residents a safe and healthy environment in which to live, work and enjoy leisure time*
- Providing consistency in the delivery of municipal services in a fiscally responsible manner*
- Responding in a courteous, timely, and effective manner to the expressed needs, concerns, and expectations of our residents*
- Promoting a sense of community through family oriented activities and citizen involvement.*

The budget policy was very clear, starting with a baseline budget, as stated in the Budget Policy below:

*The City's primary objective is to provide a standard of budgetary performance that both staff and Council have endorsed and to provide budgetary decision making with greater continuity, reinforcing the City's core financial values and preserving them for successive staff and council.*

- Baseline and Service Level Funding*

*The City's top program priority is to maintain existing service levels in all divisions and departments. **A baseline should be set and serve as an agreed upon point of departure for subsequent budget discussions** ie: a new facility or service. Any additional services above the baseline shall be fully funded at the time of the adoption of the annual budget and ongoing*

*funding sources shall be clearly identified. **Such ongoing funding sources must be either new or increased revenues or clearly identified expense reductions.***

By ordinance and law, the city manager was required to produce a proposed budget for the City. It took hours of staff time, as well as several workshops. The public hearing solicited input from citizens, which Rorie said he would argue was done all year long. The City had struggled and made systematic, steady progress. It was time to cross the finish line, Rorie said.

Financial Services Director Paul Salvatore then gave an overview of the various funds in the City's budget, including the General Fund (\$34.878 million), Capital Improvement Program budget (CIP) (\$1.553 million), Stormwater Operations (\$2.353 million), Amphitheater Operations (\$1.054 million), Hotel/Motel Tax (\$1.522 million), and General Obligation (GO) Bond Fund (\$629,000).

Fleisch pointed that the collections on the SPLOST had begun on July 1, and the first payment was due to the City in September. She asked Salvatore to explain the reporting. Salvatore said the money would go into a special purpose fund. They expected to take in \$6 million – \$7 million/year over six-year SPLOST. There would be some prioritization of the projects. Some temporary financing was in place for some of the bigger projects, so those projects could get off the ground.

Rorie said that SPLOST information was available in the Community Room (SPLOST War Room) downstairs at City Hall. Everything was displayed graphically. People would be able to get the information readily and easily. Signage regarding the projects would be placed around the community. Information would also be included in the Quarterly Reports. Everyone would know what's going on.

Salvatore said the highlights of the FY 2018 General Fund operating budget included the following:

- 0.25 mil reduction in Maintenance & Operation (M&O) millage rate (assuming 7% increase in property tax digest)
- Estimated revenues of \$34,878,273, or 3.43% increase (\$1,353,000)
- Appropriations of \$34,466,930 or 2.94% increase (\$984,000)
- Cash Reserve increase of \$411,343, or 1%
- Street and path resurfacing – no change (\$1,800,000 @ 3-4 miles of streets and 9 miles of paths, SPLOST funds would supplement and \$5 million would be spent)
- \$110,000 increase in Citywide building maintenance expense
- Increase in permitting activity (~\$200,000)
- \$146,047 funding for Fayette County Development Authority (FCDA) & \$25,000 for Non-Profits (no change – Promise Place & Fayette Senior Services)
- Total (net) Personnel Expense increase of \$136,787, or 0.69%
  - \$186,000 (1.5%) for merit increases – management discretion
  - \$186,000 (2%) Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) as of January 2018, if approved by City Council based on budgeting targets
- Two new positions proposed (not included above):
  - Engineer – Full Time, \$82,511 (all inclusive, \$53,000 salary)
  - Bailiff – Part Time, \$14,187 (all inclusive, \$9,641 salary)
  - Unfunded Positions – Public Services Director, Administrative Service Director, Police Captain, IT System Administrator, Code Enforcement Officer
- \$7,650 **decrease** in airport funding (down to \$84,150, per agreement)
- \$254,000 **decrease** in transfer to Debt Service Fund (two loans paid off)
- \$426K increase in transfer to Capital Projects Fund (CIP)



Salvatore explained that the baseline budget for paving would be supplemented by SPLOST funds. Rorie added that IMS Paving was currently working on an assessment of the City's roads, which included road classifications, and the City should have that information in October.

Highlights for the 5-Year CIP budget included:

- FY 2018
  - \$341,000 cash funding for infrastructure (citywide facilities & bridges)
  - \$275,000 cash funding for technology infrastructure replacements
  - \$891,750 for vehicle & equipment replacements (five-year financing)
- FYs 2019 – 2022
  - \$350,000 per year cash funding for citywide infrastructure (facilities & bridges)
  - Additional \$250,000 cash funding for All Children's Playground in FY 2020
  - Fire Truck, ambulance, radios, self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) moved to SPLOST
  - New West Side Fire Station – fully operational by FY 2021, ~\$1 million/year operating expenses
  - Reduced reliance on debt financing of infrastructure – more pay-as-you-go
  - **Additional millage rate reductions in FYs 2019 & 2020 (0.1 & 0.2, respectively)**

Stormwater Fund highlights included:

- No proposed changes in any fees
- No new debt
- No new capital equipment
- No additional employees
- Continued efforts in stormwater pipe lining and infrastructure maintenance

Salvatore looked at the five-year financial plan. No millage increases were expected. In 2021, the plan included an additional \$1 million for the new fire station on the west side. Between FY 2019 and FY 2020, the City would start using impact fees to build the station and provide the equipment. A 0.5 mil reduction (0.25 mils in FY 2018, 0.1 in FY 2019, and 0.2 in FY 2020) would take place over the next few years, Salvatore said. The millage should drop from the current 7.065 to 6.506 between FY 2017 and FY 2020, which would offset the rising property values.

Fleisch asked if there was any indication on when the final tax digest would be ready. Rorie said it was difficult to say due to the assessment appeal process. He added they always budgeted on the conservative side on revenue, and Salvatore's estimates were typically within 1% of the revenue targets.

Rorie discussed the budget as a project management tool for the City as a whole – men, money, machines, and materials (four Ms of project management), saying the key questions were what people were needed, what skill sets did they possess, and how did they all work together as a team. The machines included trucks, police cars, telephones and more, and replacement of the machines was addressed in the CIP. Materials included concrete, which was expensive, down to pens and paper. The money was the budget and where the revenue came from. These were core things that were needed to meet service demands.

Another question regarded contingencies and what would happen if the money did not come in. The City had a fiduciary responsibility to maintain assets. The focus of the 2018 budget fell into three categories – maintenance of the City's infrastructure, maintenance of the capital equipment and facilities, and maintenance of the employees. The budget was vision-based and connected the resources of men, money, machines, and materials so high level services could be

provided. What was done today would allow future generations of stakeholders to be proud of their community, Rorie said.

Fleisch opened the public hearing, reminding everyone of the five-minute time limit.

Bob Grove said he supported Rorie and his staff. This was the most understandable budget presentation he had seen over the years. He thanked everyone for their hard work.

Fleisch noted there would not be a vote on the budget at this meeting. No one else spoke. The public hearing closed.

Rorie said staff would continue to seek information on the tax digest so the millage rate hearings could be set. Salvatore said the vote on the budget was tentatively set for the August 3 Council meeting, but it would depend on when the City received the tax digest, so it could move to August 17. The budget could always be amended if necessary.

### **Council/Staff Topics**

#### **Drone Regulations**

Rorie noted that the use of drones was growing for hobbyists and commercial purposes. The City was impacted by their use in parks and over roadways. Citizens had requested regulations for drone use, but there were limitations on what the City could do. He introduced Bob Ross, who gave a presentation on the risks and responses of drone use.

Drones were part of the technological revolution, and ordinances/laws at the local/state/federal levels often lagged behind. There were opportunities and concerns. Drones were small unmanned aircraft systems (sUAS) that weighed between 0.55 and 55 pounds. They were incapable of carrying a person, and they were operated remotely or autonomously. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) recognized drones as aircraft, and until a few years ago, people who flew drones had to have the same credentials as pilots. Drone capabilities were increasing, and costs were coming down. Drone sales were forecasted to reach over four million for hobbyists and over 2.5 million for commercial users by 2020.

Police and Fire professional organizations had already developed guidelines for drone use. However, there were concerns about the use of drones by law enforcement, including whether the drones could be weaponized and used for searches with and without a warrant. Twelve drones were currently in use by the state of Georgia. According to **Rasmussen Reports**, public opinion regarding police drones was mixed. Thirty-nine percent of those surveyed opposed the use of police drones, 36% favored the use of drones, and 25% were undecided.

Commercial uses for drones included inspections of towers, pipeline surveys, photography, mapping, agriculture, package delivery, public safety, competition, sports, public safety uses, and entertainment.

Drones could not be flown over people or be flown by someone in a vehicle. Concerns about drones involved personal injury and property damage, as well as illegal activities such as weaponization, smuggling, and unlawful surveillance. Ross noted that there had been 150 accidents worldwide between 2006 – 2016, and 64% of those were due to equipment failure. Responses to those concerns included educating users, law enforcement, and the public. There were civil penalties for those who misused drones (20 convictions nationwide as of June 2016).

Drones were aircraft under federal regulation. The federal government had authority over the national airspace, not the state or local municipality, Ross stated. Current FAA rules and restrictions



included no pilot requirements for drones, drones could not weigh more than 55 pounds, and could not be flown within five miles of airports without prior notification to the airport and the air traffic controllers. In addition, drone users were required to follow community-based safety guidelines and notify air traffic control tower before flying within five miles of an airport.

Although the FAA controlled the National Air Space, it relied on help from local law enforcement, Ross said. Police had successfully charged errant drone pilots with obstructing police business when interfering with police helicopters at a crime scene, disorderly conduct when refusing to land a drone at an incident scene, trespassing, unlawful surveillance, and reckless endangerment for flying over a wildfire.

Georgia House Bill 481 went into effect on July 1, and it preempted any local ordinance, resolution, regulation, or policy for unmanned aircraft systems, with three exceptions. The local government could enforce any ordinance adopted on or before April 1, 2017; adopt an ordinance that enforced FAA restrictions; or adopt an ordinance that provided for or prohibited the launch or intentional landing of an unmanned aircraft system from or on its public property except with respect to the operation of an unmanned aircraft system for commercial purposes.

Currently, Peachtree City had one ordinance regarding drones, Sec. 54-2(e), which stated "it shall be unlawful for any person to utilize a drone or any type of remote-controlled flying device within any recreation facility during a scheduled practice, scrimmage, game, tournament or event held at a recreation facility." The City could adopt ordinances regarding use of drones on any City property.

Ross summarized the presentation, saying drones were becoming cheaper and more capable. The drone population was increasing rapidly, and there was public apprehension of new technology. Issues and responses were evolving. There was a low accident rate for drones compared to the drone population. He encouraged Council and residents to stay engaged, adding the federal legislation was working. He also encouraged educating the public and government officials.

Fleisch asked Airport Manager Hope Macaluso if they received calls from drone users. Macaluso said they did get a lot of calls, adding Ross had given an excellent presentation.

Rorie reiterated that the City had no drone regulations, with the exception of the ordinance regarding recreation facilities. There was a conflict regarding local control and whether it would stand up in court. The City had used drones to fly over the construction of MacDuff Parkway and to identify traffic movements. Staff plans were to purchase a drone and train key staff in Engineering, Police, and Fire how to use it. The policy issue would continue to evolve. He continued that Planning and Zoning had reached out to someone at the FAA whose job was to help cities look at policy decisions that could stand up to preemptive legal challenges. The City's role at this point was to note it was an evolving policy issue. They needed to take time.

#### **Bond Covenant Restrictions on Sewer Extension Outside Peachtree City Limits**

Fleisch said this topic was about the issue of bond covenants and whether sewer could be extended outside the City. She noted that Water and Sewerage Authority (WASA) members Bill Holland (chairman), John Dufresne, Frank Ward, Bob Grove (alternate), WASA attorney Mark Oldenburg, and WASA General Manager Stephen Hogan had been invited and were at the meeting. They board members were all volunteers who served five-year terms.

Rorie explained that there had been an ongoing discussion about who controlled the extension of sewer service outside the City. There had been back and forth between the attorneys. A third



party had been asked to review the documents and render an opinion. Rorie read from the third party legal opinion provided by Andrew J. Welch, III, and Warren M. Tillery with the law firm of Smith Welch, Webb & White, which asked the following question:

*Whether the Peachtree City Water and Sewerage Authority ("WASA") can extend sewer service beyond the corporate limits of Peachtree City without approval by the City Council.*

Rorie read and discussed the basic facts from the report:

The General Assembly adopted the Act that created present-day WASA in 1987. Among other things, this enabling legislation granted WASA twelve (12) enumerated powers couched in very broad terms. In particular, those enumerated powers include the ability to acquire property of any kind and to make agreements with any political subdivision of this State regarding the provision of water and sewer service. See Section 4. These powers are not limited by a geographical reference to the corporate limits of Peachtree City. WASA also has the power to issue bonds for financing "projects." Id. The term "projects" is defined very broadly to include anything "used or useful in connection with obtaining" water and sewer service. See Section 3. A copy of WASA's enabling legislation is included with this memorandum, marked Exhibit "A."

In 1996, the General Assembly amended the enabling legislation to broaden the scope of the phrase "cost of the project," and to allow for the acquisition of projects through purchasing the capital stock of a corporation. A copy of this Amendment to WASA's enabling legislation is included with this memorandum, marked Exhibit "B." Accordingly, WASA then used these powers to acquire its sewer system from Georgia Utilities Corporation ("GUC") in 1997. That acquisition was funded by the issuance of revenue bonds supported by an intergovernmental agreement between Peachtree City and WASA. In pertinent part, that intergovernmental agreement provided that WASA would operate its sewer system as a public sewer system and make its sewer facilities and services available to residents of Peachtree City. In exchange, Peachtree City agreed to pay WASA an amount sufficient to enable repayment of the outstanding bonds if the net operating revenues of the sewer system were insufficient to cover that cost of repayment. Peachtree City also pledged an annual levy of ad valorem property taxes to obtain the money necessary for Peachtree City to make such payments to WASA.

Both Peachtree City and WASA represented in the intergovernmental agreement that they had the authority to enter into the contract. Moreover, Section 6.6 of that intergovernmental agreement also provided as follows, including: "The Authority shall not extend the System or enter into any contract or commitment to extend the System outside the corporate limits of the City, unless such extension, contract, or commitment is approved by resolution of the Council of Peachtree City." A copy of that intergovernmental agreement, the 1997 Sewer System Agreement, is included with this memorandum, marked Exhibit "C."

That 1997 Sewer System Agreement was specifically referenced in the Petition and Complaint that initiated the bond validation proceedings for the Series 1997 Bonds. A copy of that Petition and Complaint is included with this memorandum, marked Exhibit "D." Neither WASA, nor Peachtree City contested the validity of the Sewer System Agreement or challenged the validation of the Series 1997 Bonds. Accordingly, the Final Order and Judgment validating the Series 1997 Bonds provided as follows, including:

*It is Further Determined, Declared, Ordered, and Adjudged, as a matter of fact and as a matter of law, that the Authority and the City are authorized to enter*



into and have properly authorized the execution and delivery of the Sewer System Agreement in substantially the form presented to this Court, and upon the execution and delivery thereof concurrently with the delivery of the Series 1997 Bonds, the Sewer System Agreement and all of the terms, covenants, and provisions thereof shall constitute a valid, binding, and legally enforceable obligations of the parties thereto for the full term thereof;

A copy of that Final Order and Judgment is included with this memorandum, marked Exhibit "E."

In 2002, WASA issued additional revenue bonds to improve and extend the Sewer System. Accordingly, WASA and Peachtree City entered into the First Amendment to the Sewer System Agreement, which reaffirmed the obligations under the Sewer System Agreement entered into between the parties with respect to the issuance of the Series 1997 Bonds. A copy of that First Amendment to the Sewer System Agreement is included with this memorandum, marked Exhibit "F." The validation proceedings for the Series 2002 Bonds incorporated all of the originating documents from the Series 1997 Bonds, including the Master Bond Resolution and the Sewer System Agreement.

In 2005, WASA issued a third series of bonds (the "Series 2005 Bonds"), primarily to refinance the outstanding balance of the Series 1997 Bonds. Accordingly, WASA and Peachtree City entered into the Second Amendment to the Sewer System Agreement, which reaffirmed the obligations under the 1997 Sewer System Agreement and 2002 First Amendment thereto. A copy of that Second Amendment to the Sewer System Agreement is included with this memorandum, marked Exhibit "I." Just like the previous bond validation proceedings in 1997 and 2002, the Sewer System Agreement, including the First and Second Amendments thereto, were incorporated by reference in the Petition and Complaint that originated the bond validation proceedings.

In 2013, WASA issued its fourth set of bonds. These were used to consolidate and refinance the outstanding balance remaining on the Series 2002 and Series 2005 Bonds. In connection with issue of the Series 2013 Bonds, WASA and Peachtree City entered into a new Sewer System Agreement as opposed to a Third Amendment to the 1997 Sewer Agreement. The 2013 Sewer System Agreement, however, contained an identical provision to the 1997 Sewer System Agreement, including the First and Second Amendments thereto. That provision provided as follows, including:

Section 6.5. Extension of System Outside Corporate Limits of City. The Authority shall not extend the System or enter into any contract or commitment to extend the System outside the corporate limits of the City, unless such extension, contract, or commitment is approved by resolution of the Council of Peachtree City.

A copy of this 2013 Sewer System Agreement is included with this memorandum, marked Exhibit "L."

This is not an impermissible delegation of WASA's legislative authority. The 2013 Sewer System Agreement does not alter the enabling legislation that created WASA. Rather, the effect of it is to impose restrictions on its unfettered exercise of these powers in exchange for Peachtree City securing WASA's bonds.



Rorie noted the attorney's answer to whether WASA could extend sewer outside the City:

*Not presently. WASA has the power to make such extensions without approval by the City Council; but, it has contractually agreed to refrain from exercising such power without first obtaining City Council approval in exchange for Peachtree City serving as a surety for WASA's revenue bonds. So, at least until those bonds are repaid, WASA is required to obtain approval from the City Council prior to extending its sewer system beyond the corporate limits of Peachtree City.*

Rorie said the next question regarded the solutions following repayment of the loans:

*One option would be to consider petitioning your local legislative delegation to amend WASA's enabling legislation to expressly require City Council approval of extra-territorial expansion. A second option may be to amend the enabling legislation to reconstitute the WASA board with a majority or all of its members constituting the membership of the City Council. A third option would be to amend the WASA enabling legislation so as to fold WASA into Peachtree City as a city department. A final and the least durable option would be to enter into an intergovernmental agreement with WASA limiting system expansion; however, intergovernmental agreements can be terminated.*

Rorie said the whole debate was about extending service outside the geographic boundaries of Peachtree City and the authority of City Council to authorize the extension. He continued that bond agreement and covenant restrictions were strong for the next eight to nine years, and Council had to consider what to do next. If the thought was to do what was in the best interest of Peachtree City residents, they had to decide how to move forward. Rorie said he had done some research regarding this.

Rorie had contacted the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD) and learned that approximately 34% of the single-family homes in the district were on septic systems. Peachtree City had some single-family homes on septic systems, which was consistent with the other counties. Fifty-three sewer providers were in the 15-county district, and 81% were enterprise funds, which had advantages, and some of those were utilities. Twenty-nine percent of the systems were local government authorities, both independent and dependent. The independent authorities worked in other communities. One of the pros of an authority and an enterprise fund was that the revenues stayed within that entity to be reinvested in the system. They could also issue revenue bonds separate from the government.

WASA's rate structure was balanced, and WASA was paying the bond, providing service, and reinvesting in the system, Rorie said. WASA responded to complaints. There was no elected follow-up that was required, which could be questioned. Rorie said he received complaints that he had to discuss with the General Manager. They could take a firmer stand on rate structures and customer service issues. Rate structures were debated in the political arena even when set up as enterprise funds. People did not want to raise rates to pay for the operation, so then it was subsidized with General Fund dollars or maintenance was deferred. The focus of the board was sewer issues, while Council had competing interests. An authority could also avoid mandated payments to the General Fund, which utilities had to make to help offset costs of human resources, finance, or other administrative services.

The cons were WASA had no taxing authority. A narrow focus on sewer issues was a con as well as a pro. There was a potential for duplication of service levels independent of services provided by the City. The City would be able to spread benefits cost over a larger pool, while the authority had a smaller pool of employees. There were also pros and cons regarding project coordination.



There were control drivers and financial drivers, Rorie noted, to consider. Sewer users complained outrageous sewer bills, but they were paying twice as much for sewer than water. The rate structure for WASA included \$24 for bond debt and \$2 for R&E for capital improvements, which meant 60% of the total sewer bill went to pay the debt, 5% went to R&E and capital improvements, and 35% went to operations. Fayette County Water System's water bill rate structure was 28% for debt, 17% to R&E, and the remaining 55% was for operations. The financial driver was the rate structure. The white elephant in the room was bond debt. Once the bonds were paid off, the rate structure could improve. Connection fees were also a financial driver. WASA was a unit of the City, but was legally separate, Rorie pointed out.

The control driver was limiting sewer to the City, and a board that was not responsible to the electorate, Rorie continued. If Council chose an option that was a control driver, the rest of the options would not matter.

Fleisch asked if rates could be lowered by bringing the system into the City. Rorie said maybe a little, but not by a massive number. He disagreed with the \$1 million figure people talked about. Fleisch recalled from discussions with other cities that ran their own systems and they had chosen between spending money on a police car or a sewer pipe many times.

Fleisch asked if anyone from WASA had a comments. Rorie said they were citizen volunteers, and this was not an "us or them" situation.

WASA Board Member John Dufresne said WASA understood they could not take the system/pipes outside the City limits, asking if the report addressed whether Tyrone or Senoia could bring their system pipes to connect to the City's system.

King said the issue was the capacity. The system's capacity belonged to the citizens, and they looked to elected representatives that were accountable to them to take care of the capacity. He asked Mayor Fleisch and Rorie to schedule a public hearing in the next month so this issue could be put to bed. He liked the options, or a hybrid. He wanted to see WASA brought under City control.

Prebor said the citizens looked at the sewer system as the City's asset, even though it was managed by a separate authority. The citizens had paid for it, and they wanted to control it.

Doug Tucker asked for a copy of the report, or at least the recap, to be posted on the website. Rorie said he had directed staff to scan the report so it would be available in electronic format. His comments would be in the minutes. He had a copy of the opinion that Tucker could have.

Cal Beverly noted he had been a resident since the system had been Georgia Utilities, owned by the developer and used to control development. Density followed sewer. Where there was no sewer, there was limited density because of the septic systems. Sewer was connected to zoning. Zoning outside the City limits would be at risk if sewer lines went out of City limits. It would put the entire zoning structure of Fayette County at risk. He agreed the City should control City sewer. He did not attribute this issue to the bad motives of the volunteer board, but they were singularly focused on sewer. He wanted to see politics involved in the operation. It allowed citizens to have accountability, and it needed to be done quickly.

Rorie said he had looked at zoning, and R-43 zoning was set up for septic systems. One of the issues was putting R-43 tracts on sewer, which could become an immediate rezoning request.

Prebor said he liked where the conversation was going. The citizens wanted to know that when the bonds were paid off the elected officials would still be in control.

King said it would take time, but Council needed act quickly on one of the options or a hybrid option. Nothing would happen until after the 2018 legislative session. Fleisch noted it would have to be introduced in January, and if it passed, it would not go into effect until July.

Fleisch said the WASA volunteers had a constraint to watch over the fiscal management of the system, and they had done so. For her, Fleisch said the driver had always been taking sewer outside the City limits. Fleisch asked to have a discussion on the August 17 agenda when Learnard would be able to attend the meeting. In the meantime, they could gather information, knowing the target dates in January, with possible signage in July.

Ernst said they should not make a rash decision, and they had to make sure they knew what they were doing. They needed time to absorb the information.

Fleisch said there would not be a huge windfall for everyone if things changed. Rorie agreed that the bond debt and the capital needs of the system would not go away. Fleisch said WASA had as many pipe issues as Stormwater. She noted Athens' sewer system had one lift station, while the City's had 37, which meant constant work. She continued that the WASA board had been good stewards of the system; it was going outside the City that drove this issue. Prebor said there were long-term issues that should be considered that Council should be responsible for.

Rorie asked if there was an expectation for staff for the August 17 meeting. Fleisch asked to see language for the enabling legislation and the boundaries of the system. Prebor said he would also like to see language for the second option, which was for Council to take over the system. Fleisch said she did not see pulling the system in as a City department. Prebor agreed staff should not work on that. They both agreed option 4 was the least durable and of no interest.

#### **Executive Session**

There were no topics for executive session.

There being no further business, King moved to adjourn. Ernst seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

---

Pamela Dufresne, Deputy City Clerk

---

Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor



# CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

## INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** City Council and Mayor  
**VIA:** Jon Rorie, City Manager   
**FROM:** Janet Moon, Chief of Police   
**DATE:** July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017  
**SUBJECT:** Memorandum of Understanding  
*City Council Consent Agenda – August 3, 2017*

---

### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the existing Memorandum of Understanding between the Peachtree City Police Department and the Fayette County Board of Education be approved.

### **Discussion:**

The appointment of a new Chief of Police (Fayetteville) and new District Attorney requires that a new Memorandum of Understanding be executed to replace the existing agreement with the Fayette County Board of Education.

### **Budget Impact:**

There is no budget impact concerning this agreement.

**SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER (SRO) PROGRAM**  
**AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION**  
**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**  
**between**  
**THE FAYETTE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**and**  
**THE FAYETTE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE**  
**THE FAYETTEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT**  
**THE PEACHTREE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT**

**INTRODUCTION**

The expectation for a prosperous future for all citizens of Fayette County depends greatly upon this County's ability to properly educate its children. Effective schooling requires a safe and peaceful environment to encourage learning. Consequently, the Fayette County Sheriff's Office, Fayetteville Police Department, Peachtree City Police Department, in collaboration with the Fayette County Board of Education, conducts the School Resource Officer Program to provide school administrators and staff with the law enforcement resources and expertise they need to maintain safety, order and discipline throughout the school environment. This program is intended to ensure that no student's right to receive an education is abridged by violence or disruption.

The program involves the assignment of a law enforcement officer to a public school as a School Resource Officer (SRO). As determined by staffing availability and the demonstrated needs of the school, the appropriate law enforcement agency will assign a full-time SRO to the school.

Because of the daily interaction between the school's administration and the SRO, it is important to establish, maintain, and update specific guidelines and procedures to be followed by the SRO and individual school administrators. This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) clarifies the roles of the SROs and school administrators and the scope of their authority as described by the United States Supreme Court. This document outlines the responsibility of the Fayette County Board of Education, the Fayette County Sheriff's Office, the Fayetteville Police Department, and the Peachtree City Police Department in this collaboration. As the success of the program relies upon effective communication between the SRO, the principal, and staffs of all law enforcement agencies, this MOU also clarifies the procedures pertaining to the exchange of information between the agencies. While refinements to this MOU may become necessary in the future, they may not be implemented without the written concurrence of all parties.

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES of the School Resource Officer**

- A. The School Resource Officer (SRO) is a sworn law enforcement officer. The Fayette County Board of Education and each specific law enforcement agency within the county employ school resource officers jointly. The SRO receives his or her authority from the law enforcement agency by which he or she is employed and is subject to the rules and regulations of that agency; the SRO is typically provided by the specific law enforcement agency in whose jurisdiction the school is located.



The SRO will be considered an active member of the administrative team of his or her assigned school. As such, administrative punishments normally imposed upon students for violations of law or school policy committed against a staff member, such as insubordination or assault, will be equally applied by school administrators to similar situations involving a student and an SRO.

- B. The SRO's assigned school buildings, grounds and surroundings will be the equivalent of the SRO's law enforcement service area, and the officer will assume primary responsibility for handling all calls for service and coordinating the response of other law enforcement resources to the school. Criminal activity that comes to the attention of the principal or school staff shall be reported to the SRO. In an emergency situation, the school shall notify the SRO, who will call 911. If the SRO is unavailable, school staff will call 911.
- C. The SRO's duty schedule will be determined by the SRO's Supervising Officer working with the school principal, but generally is arranged to provide coverage throughout the school day including peak arrival and departure times before and after school. Whenever possible, SROs will be visible patrolling the exterior and interior grounds, particularly during the opening or closing of school and during the lunch periods.
- D. The SRO shall wear the regulation law enforcement uniform and operate a marked, law enforcement patrol vehicle while on duty unless otherwise authorized by a supervisor for a specific purpose. The SRO provides a visible deterrent to crime while bringing a positive impression of the law enforcement agency to students and staff in a non-confrontational setting.
- E. The SRO shall also assist with training for the school administration on law enforcement related areas. Information about crime trends and changes to the Code of Georgia shall be disseminated to the school administrative staff to assist them in effectively providing safe school environments.
- F. SROs may become involved in the school's curriculum and provide instruction that will enhance the students' understanding of the law enforcement mission. However, responding to incidents or conducting investigations will always take precedence over instructing in the classroom.
- G. SROs shall be responsible for monitoring cultural and social influences and activities in an effort to identify emerging youth gangs. All information developed or obtained related to gang activity shall be provided to the SRO's sponsoring agency and shared on an intelligence basis between all Fayette County Law Enforcement agencies providing SROs to the Fayette County School System.
- H. When it is in the best interest of the law enforcement agency and the school, SROs may make formal presentations to, or participate in, school based community organization meetings such as those of the Parent Teacher Association or School Community Coalitions. All such participation must be approved by the SRO's Supervising Officer. Similar requests to participate in focus groups, panel discussions, camps, and mentoring programs must be approved by the Supervising Officer.

- I. A critical element of the SRO program is developing an open relationship between the principal and the SRO. Strong and open lines of communications between the two are essential for the program to succeed. Each SRO shall meet at least weekly, or more frequently if necessary, with the assigned school principal(s) for the purpose of exchanging information about current crime trends, problem areas, cultural conflicts, or other areas of concern that may cause disruption at the school(s) or within the community.
- J. Other duties and responsibilities of the SRO include
  - 1) Disposing properly of illegal substances recovered by the school but not needed for criminal prosecution.
  - 2) Maintaining familiarity with the current version of Fayette County School's Student Code of Conduct.
  - 3) Maintaining the confidentiality of student records consistent with this Memorandum of Understanding's provisions relating to the Release of Student Information.
  - 4) Attending and providing testimony at school tribunal hearings, upon request.

### **SUPERVISING OFFICER**

Personnel management, to include discipline and attendance issues, remains the responsibility of the sponsoring law enforcement agency. If an issue arises involving the SRO that is in conflict with school policies and procedures, the sponsoring agency will be responsible for resolving the conflict.

The Supervising Officer (or other person designated by the sponsoring law enforcement agency) will meet, at a minimum, annually with the school principal to review the performance of the assigned SRO. This review should include all aspects of the SRO's performance. More frequent meetings are encouraged.

In the event a pressing issue arises concerning an assigned SRO, the assigned principal shall communicate directly and immediately with the Supervising Officer.

Law enforcement agencies are also encouraged to consult with the school principal prior to the selection of a new SRO to determine any special needs or concerns for that particular school.

The Supervising Officer retains the authority to require minimum staffing levels at school events beyond an SRO to properly maintain public safety. An example of this would be a sporting event between rival schools that has a history of generating public disorder. Furthermore, the Supervising Officer will facilitate discussion of any issue between the SRO and the school principal(s).

The Supervising Officer shall also regularly communicate with the Fayette County Schools' Assistant Superintendent and provide an update on their assigned SROs and schools. Any concerns regarding the performance of the SRO by the principal or school staff shall be addressed by the Supervising Officer.



## **SCHOOL PRINCIPAL**

It is the responsibility of the principal to facilitate effective communications between the SRO and the school staff. The principal of the school shall meet at least weekly, and more often if necessary, with the assigned SRO. This meeting shall not be delegated to other administrative staff on a regular basis.

Criminal activity that comes to the attention of the principal or school staff shall be immediately reported to the SRO. In an emergency situation, the school shall notify the SRO, who will call 911. If the SRO is unavailable, school staff will call 911. In any criminal enforcement action taken by the SRO which results in the charging of a student with a crime, the principal and/or school employees will appear in court when necessary to provide testimony relevant to the case.

The principal will meet, at a minimum, annually with the assigned SRO's Supervising Officer (or other person designated by the sponsoring law enforcement agency) to review the performance of the SRO. This review should include all aspects of the SRO's performance. More frequent meetings are encouraged. This task may not be delegated to any other administrative staff.

The school shall provide a work area for the SRO that is equipped with a telephone and computer. It is recommended that the area accommodate seating for a minimum of three people in privacy for interviewing purposes.

The computer assigned to the SRO shall be capable of running software applicable to the SRO's duties, such as the student information (Infinite Campus) system. The SRO's Infinite Campus access shall be limited to Student Directory Information specific to the school to which the SRO is assigned. The SRO may have access to other student record information only when necessary to carry out his or her duties in the school environment and only as approved by the school principal.

The principal shall meet periodically with the SRO Supervisor and at other times at the request of either party when needed to facilitate communications between the school and the sponsoring law enforcement agency. Upon request, the school shall provide information to the chief executive office of the sponsoring law enforcement agency to assist in preparing the annual personnel evaluation of the assigned SRO. Principals are also encouraged to consult with the SRO Supervisor prior to the selection of new SROs to share any special needs or concerns for that particular school.

The school system shall provide in-service training, when available, to the SROs in areas that will increase their effectiveness and ability to accomplish their respective duties and responsibilities. Emphasis will be placed on increasing communication, collaboration, and cooperation between the SRO and the school administration. School officials act in "loco parentis" of students while attending school (Latin for 'in place of the parent'). Therefore, it is incumbent on administrators/SRO to communicate effectively with parents regarding their son/daughter.

## **SELECTION AND ASSIGNMENT OF THE SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER**

The selection of the SRO is the most critical aspect of the program. The sponsoring law enforcement agency shall select law enforcement officers who have demonstrated the



ability, interest, and skills necessary to work with youth, school staff, and the public. The following criteria should be considered by the sponsoring law enforcement agency when selecting officers for the program:

- Ability to work with diverse groups
- Ability to work cooperatively in a non-law enforcement environment with little supervision
- Knowledge of departmental resources
- Ability to problem solve creatively
- Skills of conflict resolution
- Knowledge of the Juvenile Code and Juvenile Court procedures
- Recommendation of supervisor

The assignment of the SRO shall be at the discretion of the sponsoring law enforcement agency. It is recommended that the full-time SRO be assigned to the school for a minimum of two years.

### **LAW ENFORCEMENT INVESTIGATION AND QUESTIONING**

The principal shall be notified as soon as possible of any significant law enforcement event problems. SROs should coordinate their activities so that action between the agencies is cooperative and in the best interests of the school and public safety.

The SRO shall provide information to the appropriate investigative sections of any crime(s) or leads that come to the attention of the SRO consistent with the Release of Student Information provisions of this MOU. SROs should be kept advised, consistent with proper law enforcement investigative techniques, of all investigations that involve students from their assigned school.

### **GUIDELINES RELATED TO INTERVIEWS WITH STUDENTS**

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), as amended July 6, 2000, prohibits the oral, written or electronically transmitted release or dissemination of student related information to anyone without the consent of the parent or legal guardian. Certain exemptions apply as they relate to judicial orders, subpoenas, and health or safety emergencies. There will be occasions (outside the scope of FERPA) when the law enforcement, courts, lawyers and other juvenile justice related agencies will seek information and/or want to talk with students at school with an administrator.

When any school employee has "reasonable suspicion" that a student (on school system property or at a school function) has committed a crime, the employee is expected to report the alleged violation to the principal(s). Certain specific offenses, such as any drug related offense, carrying a weapon, any criminal sexual offense and others are mandated to be reported by Georgia Law. The principal must conduct an appropriate inquiry pursuant to the School District's Student Code of Conduct.

*There may be occasion when a student will need to be interviewed immediately by an SRO, or other law enforcement officer working in cooperation with the SRO due to a situation or information that endangers the student and/or the school at-large. As a result, parents, legal guardians, or other custodians do not have to be notified prior to the interview.*



If it becomes necessary to interview a **student who is a victim or witness**, arrangements are to be made with the school principal and/or administration for the interview to be conducted in a proper setting so as to minimize distractions. Prior permission of the parent, guardian or other legal custodian is not required; however, it is strongly encouraged. If the parent, guardian or other legal custodian is not present, a staff member may be present during this interview.

It is important to distinguish law enforcement terminology with regard to these actions. Law enforcement officers tend to use the words interview and interrogation interchangeably; however, each has a legally distinctive application. In the law enforcement environment, interviews are typically those conversations soliciting information from victims and witnesses that are not suspected of criminal activity and thus not subject to Miranda Warnings. Interrogations are similar conversations with individuals suspected of a crime and thus the Miranda Warning does apply. Interviews frequently begin in one direction and transition into interrogations. Law enforcement officers receive extensive training on diction when this situation occurs. School administrators are expected to learn to recognize these transitional changes when they find themselves involved in interviews.

**Officers with other local and/or state jurisdictions** will, from time to time, arrive on school properties in an effort to interview a student or faculty member. The officer should be able to provide the principal or designated administrator with an "active case number" and should be able to explain to the principal's satisfaction why he or she needs to interview the student or faculty member during school.

SROs should be aware of these situations and should assist administrators in assessing the need for interviews with students.

The following guidelines are to be used to help decide what action will be taken

| <b><u>Situation</u></b>       | <b><u>Interview With</u></b> | <b><u>Type of Crime</u></b> | <b><u>Action Permitted</u></b>  |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Active case; Suspect of crime | Faculty/Staff or Student     | Felony                      | Immediate* *                    |
| Active case; Victim of crime  | Faculty/Staff or Student     | Felony                      | Immediate* *                    |
| Active case; Witness to crime | Faculty/Staff or Student     | Felony                      | Immediate* *                    |
| Active case; Suspect of crime | Faculty/Staff or Student     | Misdemeanor                 | Planning period or after school |
| Active case; Victim of crime  | Faculty/Staff or Student     | Misdemeanor                 | Planning period or after school |
| Active case; Witness to crime | Faculty/Staff or Student     | Misdemeanor                 | Planning period or after school |

**\*\*Certain types of felony crimes including but not limited to murder, robbery, sexual and child abuse offenses will require immediate follow-up by investigators to ensure that valuable information is not lost. It is vitally important that an appropriate interview setting be provided and that parents, guardians and/or other custodians be contacted prior to the interviews being conducted unless weapons, explosive devices or other**

circumstances endanger the student and/or school at large. Be mindful of the fact that the School District is acting in "loco parentis" for the student. If in doubt, contact the Fayette County Schools' Assistant Superintendent.

**IN ALL CASES, EVERY POSSIBLE ACTION WILL BE TAKEN TO MINIMIZE DISRUPTION OF THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND LOSS OF INSTRUCTIONAL TIME.**

**Legal Counsel** (lawyers) representing parents, legal guardians or other custodians may, on occasion, come to the school for the purpose of speaking to a student related to custody or other family-related issue. They must have in their possession a release or waiver signed by the custodial parent. It is recommended that arrangements be made for the attorney to speak with the student after school hours.

**Guardian Ad Litem** is a court appointed special advocate for a child/student. These individuals are generally appointed if the child has no parent or legal guardian, or if the interests of the child are in conflict with the interests of the parent or legal guardian. In some instances, an attorney, court appointed special advocate, or both may be appointed as the child's guardian ad litem. It will be rare that a guardian ad litem will come to the school to speak with the child. If this should happen, they must have in their possession a court order signed and stamped designating them as such. It is recommended that arrangements be made for the guardian ad litem to speak with the child/student after school hours.

Finally, in some instances, there will be a need to maintain confidentiality of the student providing information to principals, administrators, teachers and other school staff. This decision should be made only after discussion with the Fayette County Schools' Assistant Superintendent.

**ARREST PROCEDURES**

As mandated by state law in Georgia, students will be charged and arrested for possession of weapons, as defined in O.C.G.A. 16-11-127.1, for possession of drugs, as defined in O.C.G.A. 16-13-24 through O.C.G.A. 16-13-32, for any felony or designated felony, as described in Title 16 of the Criminal Code of Georgia Annotated, and for causing bodily injury to others, damage to public or private property, and/or causing a major school disturbance, including but not limited to making terroristic threats. Whether or not a student is arrested for fighting, disorderly conduct, and/or disrupting public school is a decision made after a joint consultation between the school principal and the SRO where practical. The final decision on whether to arrest, or not arrest, a student resides solely with the SRO. In the event that the school administrator disagrees with the SRO's decision, they must contact the Fayette County Schools' Assistant Superintendent and the Supervising Officer of the sponsoring law enforcement agency to make their concerns known immediately. In all cases involving an SRO, as in all other serious situations at the school, the parents/guardians are notified in a timely manner.

SROs are expected to be familiar with school rules and their application within the school system. Routinely, rule infractions will not be handled as violations of law, but



rather referred to the principal for action. Any questions related to the enforcement of rules versus laws within schools should be discussed with the principal. This specifically applies to general standards of conduct.

The following procedures will be adhered to where arrests of students or staff become necessary:

1. The arrest of a student or employee of the school with a warrant or petition should be coordinated through the principal and accomplished after school hours, whenever practical, with the exception of the need to make an immediate arrest.
2. Persons whose presence on school grounds has been restricted or forbidden or whose presence is in violation of the Georgia Code should be arrested for trespassing,
3. Arrest of students or staff during school hours or on school grounds shall be reported fully to the principal.

### **SEARCH AND SEIZURE**

School officials may conduct searches of student's property and person under their jurisdiction when "reasonable suspicion" exists that the search will reveal evidence that the student has violated or is violating either the law or the rules of the school. The standard for the search is "reasonable suspicion."

The SRO shall not become involved in administrative (school related) searches unless specifically requested by the school to provide security, protection or for the handling of contraband. These searches must be at the direction and control of the school official. At no time shall the SRO request that an administrative search be conducted for law enforcement purposes or have the administrator act as his or her agent. Any search initiated by an officer shall be based upon "probable cause" and, when required, a search warrant should be obtained.

### **TRIBUNAL HEARINGS**

The SRO shall attend tribunal hearings upon request of the school principal or designee. He or she shall be prepared to provide testimony on any actions that he or she took as well as any personally observed conduct witnessed. The SRO shall make available any physical evidence that is available. Unless otherwise arranged, it will be the responsibility of the SRO to transport and safeguard any physical evidence, such as a weapon, that is needed at the disciplinary hearing. The SRO shall not provide any official law enforcement document or juvenile record to the school or tribunal expulsion hearing officer. As a general rule, release of such information is prohibited unless such documents are subpoenaed by the school through the appropriate court.

### **RELEASE, OF STUDENT INFORMATION**

The release of student records is governed by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 U.S.C, §1232g. "School officials" may access and disclose student records only as authorized by FERPA.

## **SCHOOL RESOURCES OFFICERS (SROs)**

For purposes of access to student records, SROs are considered "school officials" and may be provided student information as necessary to carry out their duties related to the school environment. On a routine basis, an SRO's access to student record information shall be limited to Student Directory Information specific to the school to which the SRO is assigned. The SRO may have access to other student record information only when necessary to carry out his or her duties in the school environment and only as approved by the school principal.

SROs may only disclose student records and information contained therein to their sponsoring law enforcement agency and to other law enforcement officials as described below. SROs may disclose "law enforcement records" to their sponsoring law enforcement agency and other law enforcement officials. "Law enforcement records" are those records, files, documents, and other materials that are created and maintained by the SRO for the purpose of ensuring the physical safety and security of people and property in Fayette County Public Schools and/or the enforcement of any local, state or federal law. Because "law enforcement records" are not student records, they are not subject to the disclosure restrictions of FERPA.

## **LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES**

Law enforcement agencies who are not assigned to the schools as part of the SRO Program and other law enforcement officials may have access to student record information without parent permission and consent only if:

The Fayette County School District has designated the following student-based information as "directory information" under the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and may disclose that information upon request by appropriate institutions/agencies:

- a) Student's name, address and telephone number;
- b) Student's date and place of birth;
- c) Student's participation in official school clubs and sports;
- d) Weight and height of student if he/she is a member of an athletic team;
- e) Dates of attendance at the Fayette County School System;
- f) Awards received during the time enrolled in Fayette County School System;
- g) Grade Level;
- h) E-mail address

## **RELEASE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION**

Consistent with the basic tenants of the relationship between the School Principal and the SRO described in this understanding, open communication is essential to its effectiveness. SROs should exchange information with the principal regarding students' involvement in criminal activity in and around the school. This exchange shall be limited to that which directly relates to and contributes to a safe school environment. SROs shall not make any official document, law enforcement report, or record available to the school or its staff. The SRO shall make monthly arrest records available to the Fayette County Schools' Assistant Superintendent.



## **CONCLUSION**

This document reflects mutually agreed goals and objectives of the Fayette County Sheriff's Office, Fayetteville Police Department, Peachtree City Police Department and the Fayette County Board of Education for the School Resource Officer Program.

This endeavor is a partnership between education and law enforcement to support a collaborative, problem-solving approach to ensure a safe and secure educational environment. Quarterly meetings shall be conducted between the Law Enforcement Agency Heads, District Attorney, and Fayette County Schools' Assistant Superintendent to support this partnership.

This MOU will remain in force until such time as any party withdraws from the agreement by delivering a written notification of such rescission to the other party. It shall be reviewed annually and amended as necessary to meet the needs of the signatory agencies. This MOU shall not be construed to create or substantiate any right or claim on the part of any person or entity which is not a party hereto.

**SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER (SRO) PROGRAM**  
**AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION**

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**  
between  
**THE FAYETTE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
and  
**THE FAYETTE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE**  
**THE FAYETTEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT**  
**THE PEACHTREE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT**  
revised May 2017

\_\_\_\_\_  
FAYETTE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION  
*Superintendent – Joseph C. Barrow, Jr. Ed.D*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
FAYETTE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
*District Attorney – Ben Coker*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
FAYETTE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE  
*Sheriff – Barry Babb*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
FAYETTEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT  
*Chief of Police – Scott Gray*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
PEACHTREE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT  
*Chief of Police – Janet Moon*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY, GEORGIA  
*Mayor – Vanessa Fleisch*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY, GEORGIA  
*City Clerk – Betsy Tyler*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



# CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

## INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

---

**MEMO TO:** Mayor and City Council

**VIA:** Jonathan Rorie, City Manager *JR*

**FROM:** Paul Salvatore, Director of Financial Services *P.S.*  
Kelly Bush, Assistant Director of Financial Services *KB*

**DATE:** July 28, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Budget Amendments – Contribution from Peachtree City Water and Sewerage Authority for Hilltop Road

*August 3, 2017 City Council Consent Agenda*

---

**Recommendation:**

It is Staff's recommendation that City Council accept the contribution from Peachtree City Water and Sewerage and approve the attached budget amendment to the fiscal year 2017 budget resolution.

**Discussion:**

Through ongoing efforts to repair and replace old and compromised sewer lines, Peachtree City Water and Sewerage Authority (PTCWASA) was required to replace the gravity sewer line under Hilltop Road in Peachtree City. As part of the repair, they had to excavate, remove, and replace the gravity system which required a trench and patch of the pavement. In response to complaints from residents in the neighborhood regarding the bumpy character of the road, PTCWASA was prepared to repave that portion of the road at a cost of \$22,325. However, after learning that Hilltop Road was on the list to be repaved through full depth reclamation by the City, PTCWASA is contributing the \$22,325 toward the City's resurfacing costs.

The attached budget amendment will increase the general fund donation revenue account budget and the Public Works street resurfacing budget.

**Budget Impact:**

The attached budget amendment will increase both revenues and expenditures in the general fund by \$22,325.00.

Attachments: Budget Amendment.

kb: council reports/Budget Amendments for 2017

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

# BUDGET AMENDMENT

**NUMBER** 17-01

**DATE** 08/03/17

[illegible]

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that this Council hereby amends the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Resolution to accept additional funding from the Peachtree City Water and Sewerage Authority to go toward Hilltop Road street resurfacing.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



# CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

## INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** Mayor and City Council

**VIA:** Jonathan L. Rorie, City Manager 

**FROM:** Paul J. Salvatore, Financial Services Director *P.S.*

**DATE:** July 27, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Adoption of FY 2018 Budget Resolution  
*August 3, 2017 City Council Meeting*

---

**Recommendation:**

Adopt the attached resolution for the FY 2018 Budget, along with all supporting schedules.

**Discussion:**

Council has already held several budget workshop meetings and the required public hearing on the FY 2018 Budget and may now take action to adopt the annual operating budget. The budget resolution and all supporting documents are attached, and are consistent with the figures presented at the public hearing.

**Budgetary Impact**

Adoption of the resolution will authorize all appropriations for FY 2018 identified in the supporting schedules.

## BUDGET RESOLUTION

### **A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2018 FOR EACH FUND OF PEACHTREE CITY, APPROPRIATING THE AMOUNTS SHOWN IN EACH BUDGET AS EXPENDITURES, ADOPTING THE ITEMS OF ANTICIPATED FUNDING SOURCES, PROHIBITING EXPENDITURES TO EXCEED APPROPRIATIONS, AND PROHIBITING EXPENDITURES FROM EXCEEDING ACTUAL FUNDING SOURCES.**

WHEREAS, a proposed budget for each of the various funds of the City has been presented to the City Council and

WHEREAS, appropriate advertised public hearings have been held on the FY 2018 Proposed Budget, as required by Federal, State and Local Laws and Regulations; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed the proposed budget and has made certain amendments to funding sources and appropriations; and

WHEREAS, the budget for each fund includes appropriations for Fiscal Year 2018, incorporates certain levies, assessments, fees and charges to finance these expenditures and fits the anticipated funding sources; and

WHEREAS, each of the funds has a balanced budget, such that anticipated funding sources equal proposed expenditures; and

WHEREAS, there are adequate funds available in cash reserves to cover any unanticipated revenue shortfall;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this budget, a summary of which is hereto attached, is hereby adopted specifying the anticipated funding sources for each fund and making appropriations for proposed expenditures to the Divisions named in each fund.

**SO RESOLVED**, in open session assembled pursuant to law. This \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Betsy Tyler, City Clerk



# General Fund FY 2018 Budget Summary

## Sources of Funds:

### Estimated Revenues

|                            |              |              |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Taxes                      | \$28,434,349 |              |
| Licenses & Permits         | \$1,377,408  |              |
| Intergovernmental (Grants) | \$601,568    |              |
| Charges for Services       | \$2,332,374  |              |
| Fines & Forfeitures        | \$1,014,854  |              |
| Investment Income          | \$94,500     |              |
| Contributions & Donations  | \$4,800      |              |
| Miscellaneous              | \$218,206    |              |
|                            |              |              |
| Total Estimated Revenues:  |              | \$34,078,059 |

Other Sources \$800,214

Surplus Carryover: -\$411,343

Total Sources of Funds: \$34,466,930

## Uses of Funds:

### Appropriations

#### Departmental Operating Expenses

|                                    |              |              |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Executive Services                 | \$420,227    |              |
| Economic Development               | \$146,047    |              |
| Administrative Services            | \$1,393,591  |              |
| Financial Services/ I.T.           | \$1,690,801  |              |
| Public Safety                      | \$14,102,143 |              |
| Public Works                       | \$8,033,150  |              |
| Recreation & Special Events        | \$2,541,809  |              |
| Library                            | \$1,034,050  |              |
| Planning & Development             | \$1,829,515  |              |
|                                    |              |              |
| Total Departmental Appropriations: |              | \$31,191,333 |

Salary Vacancy/ Other Savings -\$701,805

#### General Administration

|                                        |           |           |
|----------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Not-for-Profit Organizations           | \$25,000  |           |
| General Liability Insurance            | \$114,981 |           |
| CVB Labor Expense (reimbursed)         | \$10,000  |           |
| Miscellaneous Legal Fees/Claims        | \$238,772 |           |
| Unemployment & Other Expenses          | \$20,200  |           |
| Administrative/Technical Contingencies | \$111,000 |           |
| Total General Administration:          |           | \$519,953 |

### Transfers to Other Funds/Authorities

|                               |             |             |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Transfer to CIP               | \$661,250   |             |
| Transfer to Debt Service      | \$2,712,049 |             |
| Transfer to Airport Authority | \$84,150    |             |
| Transfer to Amphitheater Fund | \$0         |             |
| Total Transfers:              |             | \$3,457,449 |

Total Uses of Funds \$34,466,930

**City of Peachtree City  
General Fund  
Sources of Funds**

| Account Title                           | Adopted<br>FY 2018<br>Budget |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b><u>Taxes</u></b>                     |                              |
| Ad Valorem (Real) Property - Current    | \$13,432,813                 |
| Ad Valorem (Real) Property - Prior Yrs. | \$32,992                     |
| Motor Vehicle                           | \$165,763                    |
| TAVT - Motor Vehicles                   | \$868,599                    |
| Real Estate Transfer Tax                | \$96,073                     |
| Recording Intangible Tax                | \$199,760                    |
| GA Power Franchise Tax                  | \$1,032,604                  |
| Coweta Fayette EMC                      | \$849,702                    |
| Atlanta Gas Franchise Tax               | \$266,843                    |
| Comcast Cable                           | \$302,240                    |
| Bell South Cable                        | \$148,998                    |
| Nulink                                  | \$11,318                     |
| Communications Franchise Tax            | \$59,334                     |
| Local Option Sales Tax                  | \$7,345,017                  |
| Alcoholic Beverage Tax                  | \$780,741                    |
| Mixed Drink Tax                         | \$134,894                    |
| Business/Occupational Tax               | \$425,177                    |
| Insurance Premium Tax                   | \$2,187,695                  |
| Financial Institutions                  | \$84,145                     |
| Property Tax Penalties - Current Year   | \$5,200                      |
| Property Tax Penalties - Prior Year     | \$4,441                      |
| Total Taxes:                            | <b>\$28,434,349</b>          |

|                                      |                    |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| <b><u>Licenses &amp; Permits</u></b> |                    |
| Soil Erosion Permits                 | \$2,700            |
| Land Disturbance Fees                | \$45,000           |
| Utility Registration Fee             | \$500              |
| Alcoholic Beverage Licenses          | \$372,300          |
| Golf Cart Registration               | \$141,755          |
| Alcohol Server Registration Fees     | \$36,320           |
| Burn/Blasting Permits                | \$600              |
| Miscellaneous Fire Permits           | \$300              |
| Certificates of Compliance- Fire     | \$350              |
| Building Permits                     | \$700,461          |
| Certificates of Occupancy New        | \$6,984            |
| Certificates of Completion           | \$550              |
| Plumbing Permits                     | \$11,138           |
| Electrical Permits                   | \$7,046            |
| Mechanical/HVAC Permits              | \$32,025           |
| Reinspection Fee                     | \$5,400            |
| Zoning & Land Use Permits            | \$6,304            |
| Sign Permits                         | \$7,675            |
| Temporary Sign/Use                   | \$0                |
| Total Licenses & Permits:            | <b>\$1,377,408</b> |



**City of Peachtree City  
General Fund  
Sources of Funds**

| Account Title                             | Adopted<br>FY 2018<br>Budget |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b><u>Intergovernmental</u></b>           |                              |
| Matching Grants - GDOT/LMIG               | \$353,957                    |
| Federal Operating Grant - DoJ/GBI         | \$16,144                     |
| FEMA/GEMA Reimbursement                   | \$0                          |
| FCBOE Reimb.- Resource Officers           | \$97,467                     |
| OCDETF Overtime Reimbursement             | \$0                          |
| Federal Operating Grant - SAFER           | \$0                          |
| Fayette County Recreation Grant           | \$114,000                    |
| GMA Grants                                | \$20,000                     |
| Total Intergovernmental:                  | <b>\$601,568</b>             |
| <br><b><u>Charges for Services</u></b>    |                              |
| Tower Lease                               | \$208,525                    |
| Sale of Merchandise                       | \$1,747                      |
| False Alarm Fees - P.D.                   | \$18,850                     |
| Alarm Registration Penalties              | \$0                          |
| Plan Review Fee - Fire New Construction   | \$20,664                     |
| Fire Sprinkler Plan Review                | \$5,450                      |
| Site Follow Up - Fire                     | \$0                          |
| Ambulance Fees                            | \$1,075,707                  |
| Sale of Recycled Materials                | \$1,500                      |
| Program Fees - Recreation                 | \$158,215                    |
| Program Fees - Recreation Pools           | \$15,342                     |
| Program Fees - Athletic Tournaments       | \$14,260                     |
| Facilities Maint Fees - Recreation        | \$117,517                    |
| TAG Program Revenues                      | \$0                          |
| Special Events/Sponsors                   | \$9,371                      |
| Program Fees - Kedron Fieldhouse          | \$245,322                    |
| Program Fees - Kedron Pool Fees/Passes    | \$106,030                    |
| Program Fees - Kedron Open Gym            | \$22,232                     |
| Program Fees - Kedron Swim Lessons        | \$8,391                      |
| Program Fees - Kedron Swim Teams          | \$54,909                     |
| Facil Maint Fees - Kedron Athletic Assoc. | \$23,557                     |
| Building Plan Review Fees                 | \$152,867                    |
| Building Plan Review Resubmittal Fees     | \$2,200                      |
| Development Fee Collected/Other           | \$200                        |
| Plan Review Fee                           | \$1,000                      |
| Plan Review - Resubmittal                 | \$1,200                      |
| Plan Review - Site Plan                   | \$11,328                     |
| Plan Review - Final Site Plan             | \$500                        |
| Conceptual Plan Fees                      | \$6,228                      |
| Notice of Intent - EPD                    | \$3,000                      |
| Plan Review Fees - Subdivision            | \$6,350                      |
| Application Fees                          | \$1,000                      |

**City of Peachtree City  
General Fund  
Sources of Funds**

| Account Title                                             | Adopted<br>FY 2018<br>Budget |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Other Charges for Services                                | \$28,912                     |
| CVB Reimbursements- Personnel Costs                       | \$10,000                     |
| <b>Total Charges for Services:</b>                        | <b>\$2,332,374</b>           |
| <br><u><b>Fines &amp; Forfeitures</b></u>                 |                              |
| Municipal Court Fees                                      | \$57,541                     |
| Court Administrative Fees                                 | \$96,189                     |
| Court Restitution                                         | \$13,942                     |
| Pre-Trial Intervention Fees                               | \$1,000                      |
| Municipal Court Fines                                     | \$803,908                    |
| Security Forfeitures                                      | \$500                        |
| Local Confiscated Funds                                   | \$0                          |
| Library Fines                                             | \$41,774                     |
| <b>Total Fines &amp; Forfeitures:</b>                     | <b>\$1,014,854</b>           |
| <br><u><b>Investment Income</b></u>                       |                              |
| Interest Earnings                                         | \$94,500                     |
| <b>Total Investment Income:</b>                           | <b>\$94,500</b>              |
| <br><u><b>Contributions &amp; Donations - Private</b></u> |                              |
| Donations - In-Kind - Community Events                    |                              |
| Donations                                                 | \$4,800                      |
| <b>Total Contributions/Donations:</b>                     | <b>\$4,800</b>               |
| <br><u><b>Miscellaneous</b></u>                           |                              |
| Facility Rental - Tennis Center                           | \$24,000                     |
| Facility Rental - Recreation                              | \$14,195                     |
| Facility Rental - Kedron                                  | \$32,195                     |
| Other Revenues                                            | \$55,000                     |
| Insurance Reimbursements                                  | \$40,000                     |
| Employee Vehicle Reimbursements                           | \$27,816                     |
| <b>Total Miscellaneous:</b>                               | <b>\$193,206</b>             |
| <br>Sale of Fixed Assets                                  | \$25,000                     |
| <b>Total Fixed Assets:</b>                                | <b>\$25,000</b>              |
| <br><u><b>Other Financing Sources</b></u>                 |                              |
| Operating transfer from CVB                               | \$0                          |
| Operating transfer from H/M Tax Fund                      | \$570,808                    |
| Operating transfer from H/M - TPD                         | \$229,406                    |
| Operating transfer from PIP Fund                          |                              |
| <b>Total Other Financing Sources:</b>                     | <b>\$800,214</b>             |
| <br><b>General Fund Revenue Totals:</b>                   | <b>\$34,878,273</b>          |



**City of Peachtree City  
General Fund  
Sources of Funds**

| <b>Account Title</b>                         | <b>Adopted<br/>FY 2018<br/>Budget</b> |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Surplus Carryover/ (Reserve Increase)</b> | <b>(\$411,343)</b>                    |
| <b>Total Sources of Funds</b>                | <b>\$34,466,930</b>                   |

**City of Peachtree City  
General Fund  
Uses of Funds**

**General Fund Expenditures**

|                                                 | <b>Adopted<br/>FY 2018<br/>Budget</b> |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u><b>Departmental Operating Budgets</b></u>    |                                       |
| Mayor & Council                                 | \$148,527                             |
| Economic Development                            | \$146,047                             |
| City Manager                                    | \$271,700                             |
| Total Executive Services:                       | <u>\$566,274</u>                      |
| <br>Human Resources                             | <br>\$445,058                         |
| Public Information                              | \$131,982                             |
| City Clerk                                      | \$374,649                             |
| Municipal Court                                 | \$441,902                             |
| Total Administrative Services                   | <u>\$1,393,591</u>                    |
| <br>Finance Department                          | <br>\$739,392                         |
| Purchasing Department                           | \$130,070                             |
| Information Technology                          | \$821,339                             |
| Total Financial Services/ I.T.                  | <u>\$1,690,801</u>                    |
| <br>Police Department                           | <br>\$6,820,053                       |
| Fire Department                                 | \$6,886,353                           |
| Emergency Medical Services                      | \$395,737                             |
| Total Public Safety                             | <u>\$14,102,143</u>                   |
| <br>Public Works                                | <br>\$5,818,578                       |
| Grounds Maintenance                             | \$1,675,641                           |
| Building Maintenance                            | \$538,931                             |
| Total Public Works                              | <u>\$8,033,150</u>                    |
| <br>Recreation Administration                   | <br>\$1,527,672                       |
| Kedron Fieldhouse                               | \$786,477                             |
| Library Administration                          | \$1,034,050                           |
| Senior Services Facilities                      | \$227,660                             |
| Total Leisure Services                          | <u>\$3,575,859</u>                    |
| <br>Planning & Zoning                           | <br>\$377,016                         |
| Engineering                                     | \$471,951                             |
| Code Enforcement                                | \$282,034                             |
| Building Department (Inspections)               | \$698,514                             |
| Total Planning & Development                    | <u>\$1,829,515</u>                    |
| <br>Total Departmental Budgets:                 | <br>\$31,191,333                      |
| <br><br>Total Departmental Budgets:             | <br><br>\$31,191,333                  |
| <br><u><b>General Administration Budget</b></u> |                                       |
| Liability Insurance (GIRMA)                     | \$114,981                             |



**City of Peachtree City  
General Fund  
Uses of Funds**

**General Fund Expenditures**

|                                      | <b>Adopted<br/>FY 2018<br/>Budget</b> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Unemployment Insurance               | \$20,000                              |
| Pooled Vehicle Expenses              | \$200                                 |
| Not-for-Profit Organizations         | \$25,000                              |
| CVB - Shared Labor                   | \$10,000                              |
| Contingency - Legal Services         | \$238,772                             |
| Contingency - Technology             | \$91,000                              |
| Contingency - General Administration | \$20,000                              |
| Total General Administration:        | <u>\$519,953</u>                      |
| <br><u>Operating Transfers</u>       |                                       |
| Transfer to CIP Fund                 | \$661,250                             |
| Transfer to Fire/EMS Grants Fund     |                                       |
| Transfer to SPLOST Fund              |                                       |
| Transfer to Debt Service Fund        | \$2,712,049                           |
| Transfer to Amphitheater Fund        |                                       |
| Transfer to Airport Authority        | \$84,150                              |
| Development Authority                |                                       |
| Total Interfund Transfers:           | <u>\$3,457,449</u>                    |
|                                      | \$3,607,920                           |
| <br>General Fund Totals:             | <br>\$35,168,735                      |
| <br>Salary Vacancy/ Other Savings:   | <br>-\$701,805                        |
| <br>Total Uses of Funds:             | <br>\$34,466,930                      |

**Stormwater Utility Fund  
Operating & Capital Budget  
Fiscal Year 2018**

***Revenues***

| <b>Fund 521</b> | <b>Description</b>                       | <b>Amount</b>       |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------|
|                 | Charges for Services                     | \$ 2,321,968        |
|                 | Investment Income                        | 8,200               |
|                 | Miscellaneous Revenue                    | 23,100              |
|                 | <b><i>Total Stormwater Revenues:</i></b> | <b>\$ 2,353,268</b> |

***Appropriations***

| <b>Fund 521</b> | <b>Description</b>                             | <b>Amount</b>       |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
|                 | Personnel Services & Benefits                  | \$ 676,970          |
|                 | Purchased/Contracted Services                  | 616,274             |
|                 | Supplies                                       | 129,299             |
|                 | Contingency                                    |                     |
|                 | Capital Outlay                                 | -                   |
|                 | Depreciation & Amortization                    |                     |
|                 | Other Costs (Bad Debt Expense)                 | 15,000              |
|                 | Debt Service                                   | 690,950             |
|                 | Other Financing Uses                           | -                   |
|                 | <b><i>Total Stormwater Appropriations:</i></b> | <b>\$ 2,128,493</b> |
|                 | <b>Available for Renewal &amp; Extension:</b>  | <b>\$ 224,775</b>   |



**City of Peachtree City  
Stormwater Utility Fund  
Sources Uses of Cash for Bond Coverage  
Fiscal Year 2018**

|                                                                         | <u>2018<br/>Adopted<br/>Budget</u>  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Sources of Operating Cash:</b>                                       |                                     |
| Stormwater Billings                                                     | 2,394,350                           |
| Bad Debt Expense                                                        | (15,000)                            |
| Stormwater Credits                                                      | (72,382)                            |
| Miscellaneous Revenue                                                   | 23,100                              |
| Interest Earnings (1)                                                   | 8,000                               |
| <b>Sources of Cash</b>                                                  | <u><b>2,338,068</b></u>             |
| <br><b>Use of Operating Cash</b>                                        |                                     |
| Salaries and Benefits                                                   | 676,970                             |
| Other - Operating                                                       | 745,573                             |
| Debt Service (2)                                                        | 690,950                             |
|                                                                         | <u><b>2,113,493</b></u>             |
| <br><b>Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash<br/>    before Capital Items</b> | <br><b>224,575</b>                  |
| <br><b>Capital Items (3)</b>                                            | <br><b>-</b>                        |
| <br><b>Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash<br/>    after Capital Items</b>  | <br><u><u><b>\$ 224,575</b></u></u> |
| <b>(Available for Renewal &amp; Extension)</b>                          |                                     |
| <br><b>Net Revenue Available for Debt Service</b>                       | <br><b>\$ 915,525</b>               |
| <br><b>FY2017/2018 Debt Service Payments</b>                            | <br><b>690,950</b>                  |
| <br><b>Coverage (4)</b>                                                 | <br><b>1.33</b>                     |

(1) Only includes interest earnings on operations, not on bond proceeds investments.

(2) Cash Basis - Operating Budget figures based on full accrual

(3) Only includes those items not reimbursed by bond proceeds or renewal and extension funds.

(4) There are no bond covenants requiring a minimum debt service coverage ratio

**Amphitheater Fund  
Operating and Capital Budget  
Fiscal Year 2018**

***Revenues:***

|                                                 |            |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Charges For Services                            | \$ 897,675 |
| Transfer from General Fund                      | -          |
| Transfer from HM Tax Fund                       | 55,000     |
| Surplus Carryover (increase or use of reserves) | 101,561    |

|                        |                     |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Total Revenues:</b> | <b>\$ 1,054,236</b> |
|------------------------|---------------------|

***Expenses:***

|                                          |            |
|------------------------------------------|------------|
| Personnel Services and Employee Benefits | \$ 142,722 |
| Purchased / Contracted Services          | 187,297    |
| Supplies                                 | 24,600     |
| Program Expenses                         | 597,010    |
| Capital Outlay                           | 102,607    |

|                        |                     |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Total Expenses:</b> | <b>\$ 1,054,236</b> |
|------------------------|---------------------|



**Capital Improvement Program Fund  
FY 2018 Budget Summary**

***Revenues:***

|                                    |           |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Transfer from General Fund         | \$661,250 |
| Equipment/Lease-Purchase Loans     | \$891,750 |
| G.O Bond Proceeds                  |           |
| Facilities Authority Bond Proceeds |           |
| State Grants                       | -         |

|                        |                    |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Total Revenues:</b> | <b>\$1,553,000</b> |
|------------------------|--------------------|

***Appropriations:***

|                |           |
|----------------|-----------|
| Public Works   | \$330,900 |
| Recreation     | \$75,000  |
| Police         | \$682,000 |
| Fire/EMS       | 144,850   |
| Administration | 275,250   |
| Contingency    | \$45,000  |

|                              |                    |
|------------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Total Appropriations:</b> | <b>\$1,553,000</b> |
|------------------------------|--------------------|

**2018 Capital Improvement Program**

| Expenditures                                              | 5 Year Plan        | Debt Svce.         | Term   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|
| <b><u>Division: Public Services</u></b>                   |                    |                    |        |
| PW F-250 Diesel Pickup Truck - repl. 3032                 | \$34,000           | \$7,536            | 5 yrs. |
| PW F-250 Diesel Pickup Truck - repl. 3091                 | \$34,000           | \$7,536            | 5 yrs. |
| PW Asphalt Roller Replacement                             | \$32,000           | \$7,093            | 5 yrs. |
| Grnds. Zero-turn Mowers (3 @ \$10,300)                    | \$30,900           | \$6,849            | 5 yrs. |
| Eng. Citywide Bridge Maintenance                          | \$100,000          |                    |        |
| BM Facilities Improvements                                | \$100,000          |                    |        |
| <b>Public Services Total</b>                              | <b>\$330,900</b>   |                    |        |
| <b><u>Division: Leisure Services Services</u></b>         |                    |                    |        |
| Kedron Boiler Replacement - Pools                         | \$75,000           |                    |        |
| <b>Leisure Services Total</b>                             | <b>\$75,000</b>    |                    |        |
| <b><u>Division: Public Safety Services</u></b>            |                    |                    |        |
| P.D. Patrol Vehicle Replacements (9 @ \$59,000)           | \$531,000          | \$117,702          | 5 yrs. |
| Unmarked Vehicle Replacement (1)                          | \$40,000           | \$8,866            | 5 yrs. |
| Motorcycle Replacement                                    | \$27,000           | \$5,985            | 5 yrs. |
| 192TB Storage/Expansion (Videos)                          | \$84,000           | \$18,620           | 5 yrs. |
| <b>Police Dept. Total:</b>                                | <b>\$682,000</b>   |                    |        |
| F.D. Replace Staff Vehicle (2006-1) -2203                 | \$39,800           | \$8,822            | 5 yrs. |
| Cardiac Monitor Lifepak-15 Repl.                          | \$39,050           | \$8,656            | 5 yrs. |
| Renovate Bay Floor & Kitchen-Sta. 81                      | \$66,000           |                    |        |
| <b>Fire Dept. Total:</b>                                  | <b>\$144,850</b>   |                    |        |
| <b>Public Safety Services Total</b>                       | <b>\$826,850</b>   |                    |        |
| <b><u>Administrative/Financial/Technical Services</u></b> |                    |                    |        |
| Access Control (Physical) Standardization                 | \$33,000           |                    |        |
| Uninterrupted Power Supply (UPS) Equipment                | \$26,500           |                    |        |
| Replacement Data Storage (Nimble-HP)                      | \$49,500           |                    |        |
| Storage for Data Backups                                  | \$50,000           |                    |        |
| Switches & WAPs (CH, Fire, PW)                            | \$25,500           |                    |        |
| Replacement Server- Domain Controller (Cisco)             | \$20,750           |                    |        |
| Facilities Security Video Storage                         | \$45,000           |                    |        |
| VMWare Software Upgrades                                  | \$25,000           |                    |        |
| <b>Administrative Services Total</b>                      | <b>\$275,250</b>   |                    |        |
| <b><u>Contingency Funds</u></b>                           |                    |                    |        |
| CIP Contingency                                           | \$45,000           |                    |        |
| <b>Total Expenditures</b>                                 | <b>\$1,553,000</b> | \$197,665          |        |
| <b><u>Revenue Sources</u></b>                             |                    |                    |        |
| General Fund Transfer                                     |                    | \$661,250          |        |
| Equipment Lease Loan Proceeds                             | \$891,750          |                    |        |
| State Grants                                              |                    |                    |        |
| <b>Total Revenues</b>                                     |                    | \$891,750          |        |
| <b>Total Revenues &amp; Transfers</b>                     |                    | <b>\$1,553,000</b> |        |

Equipment Lease/Purchase Program



**Impact Fee  
Budget  
Fiscal Year 2018**

***Revenues:***

|                              |           |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| Surplus Carryover Restricted | \$ 12,000 |
|------------------------------|-----------|

|                        |                  |
|------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Total Revenues:</b> | <b>\$ 12,000</b> |
|------------------------|------------------|

***Expenses:***

|                 |        |
|-----------------|--------|
| Library - Media | 12,000 |
|-----------------|--------|

|                        |                  |
|------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Total Expenses:</b> | <b>\$ 12,000</b> |
|------------------------|------------------|

**City of Peachtree City  
Hotel/Motel Tax Fund Budget  
FY 2018**

|                                 |      | FY 2017<br>Current<br>Budget | FY 2017<br>Projected | %    | FY 2018<br>Budget  |
|---------------------------------|------|------------------------------|----------------------|------|--------------------|
| <b>Estimated Revenue:</b>       |      |                              |                      |      |                    |
| Hotel/Motel Taxes               | 6.5% | \$1,426,473                  | \$1,212,501          | 2.0% | \$1,236,751.02     |
| H/M Tax (TPD)                   | 1.5% | \$329,186                    | \$279,807            | 2.0% | \$285,403.14       |
|                                 |      | <u>\$1,755,659</u>           | <u>\$1,492,308</u>   |      | <u>\$1,522,154</u> |
| <b>Operating Transfers Out:</b> |      |                              |                      |      |                    |
| Convention & Visitors Bureau    |      | \$768,101                    | \$652,885            |      | \$665,942          |
| City General Fund: 3%           |      | \$658,372                    | \$559,616            |      | \$570,808          |
| City General Fund: TPD 1.5%     |      | \$274,186                    | \$224,807            |      | \$230,403          |
| Amphitheater Fund               |      | \$55,000                     | \$55,000             |      | \$55,000           |
| Total:                          |      | <u>\$1,755,659</u>           | <u>\$1,492,307</u>   |      | <u>\$1,522,153</u> |



**Debt Service Funds  
FY 2018 Budget Summary**

|                            | <b>Fund 410<br/>G.O Bonds</b> | <b>Fund 400<br/>Other Debt</b> | <b>Total</b>       |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Revenues:</b>           |                               |                                |                    |
| Ad Valorem Taxes           | \$614,735                     |                                | \$614,735          |
| Other Taxes/Penalties      | \$13,231                      |                                | \$13,231           |
| Surplus Carryover          | \$1,188                       | 0                              | \$1,188            |
| Transfer from General Fund |                               | \$2,712,049                    | \$2,712,049        |
| <b>Total Revenues</b>      | <b>\$629,154</b>              | <b>\$2,712,049</b>             | <b>\$3,341,203</b> |

|                                  |                  |                    |                    |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Appropriations:</b>           |                  |                    |                    |
| General Obligation Bond Expenses | \$629,154        |                    | \$629,154          |
| GMA Bricks & Mortar Loans        |                  | \$1,475,249        | \$1,475,249        |
| Equipment Lease-Purchase Loans   |                  | \$1,236,800        | \$1,236,800        |
| <b>Total Appropriations</b>      | <b>\$629,154</b> | <b>\$2,712,049</b> | <b>\$3,341,203</b> |

**Peachtree City  
G.O. Bond Fund**

**Sources of Funds**

|                                              | <b>FY 2018<br/>Adopted</b> |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Ad Valorem Tax Projections</b>            |                            |
| Digest                                       | <b>\$2,065,457,945</b>     |
| Projected Digest Increase                    | <b>7.00%</b>               |
| One mill =                                   | <b>\$2,065,458</b>         |
| Projected millage rate                       | <b>0.294</b>               |
| <br>Millage Rate Percent Increase (Decrease) | <b>-4.85%</b>              |
| Millage Increase (Decrease)                  | <b>(0.015)</b>             |
| <br><b>Tax Revenue Generated</b>             | <b>\$607,245</b>           |
| Tax Revenue % Increase (Decrease)            | <b>1.81%</b>               |
| <br><b>Other Revenues Generated:</b>         |                            |
| Intangible Tax                               | \$9,526                    |
| Motor Vehicle Ad Valorem Tax                 | \$7,491                    |
| Real Estate Transfer Tax                     | \$1,407                    |
| Penalties                                    | \$2,297                    |
| Use of Fund Balance                          | \$1,188                    |
| <b>Total Other Fund Sources:</b>             | <b>\$21,909</b>            |
| <br><b>Total Sources of Funds:</b>           | <b>\$629,154</b>           |

**Uses of Funds**

**G.O. Bond Debt Service Detail  
Description/Budget Year**

|                                           | <b><u>FY 2018</u></b> |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>2003 Refunding (G.O. Bonds)</b>        | <b>\$198,179</b>      |
| Principal                                 | \$195,000             |
| Interest                                  | \$3,179               |
| <b>Airport G.O. Bond</b>                  | <b>\$0</b>            |
| Principal                                 |                       |
| Interest                                  |                       |
| <b>Library G.O. Bond (2011 Refunding)</b> | <b>\$427,475</b>      |
| Principal                                 | \$405,000             |
| Interest                                  | \$22,475              |
| <br>Total G.O. Bond Debt Service          | <br>\$625,654         |
| <br><b>Administrative Expense- Bonds</b>  | <br><b>\$3,500</b>    |
| <b>Total Bonds:</b>                       | <b>\$629,154</b>      |
| <br><b>Miscellaneous Expense</b>          |                       |
| <br><b>Total G.O Bond Fund Expenses</b>   | <br><b>\$629,154</b>  |



**Debt Service Detail  
FY 2018**

| <u>Description/Budget Year</u>                      | <u>FY 2018</u>   |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <b><u>B &amp; M Loans/Recr Bond/Facil Bond:</u></b> |                  |
| Police/Fire/City Hall Renovations (2009)            | 230,053          |
| Facilities Authority Bond (2011)                    | 574,050          |
| Facilities Authority Bond (2014)                    | 341,375          |
| FY16 & Broadband Equip- PFA Loan                    | 329,771          |
| <b>Total B &amp; M Loans:</b>                       | <b>1,475,249</b> |
| <b><u>Equipment Lease-Purchase Loans:</u></b>       |                  |
| <b><u>Public Works Department</u></b>               |                  |
| Dump Truck Repl (3) F-750s (2012)                   | 12,239           |
| Dump Bed Replacements (2) (2012)                    | 2,291            |
| Kubota Track Hoe (2013)                             | 13,399           |
| Mechanical Lift (2013)                              | 8,034            |
| Sand Pro #5308 (replace) (2013)                     | 1,104            |
| Sand Pro #5323 (replace) (2014)                     | 4,341            |
| Bobcat Skid Steer (replace) (2014)                  | 8,228            |
| 4x6 Gator Utility Vehicle (2014)                    | 6,593            |
| F-150 P/U Truck Repl. (2014)                        | 6,755            |
| F250 Pickup Truck repl. (2015)                      | 6,242            |
| F350 Dump Truck repl. (B&G) (2015)                  | 9,485            |
| Rubber Tire Loader repl. (2015)                     | 28,441           |
| John Deere Track Loader repl (2015)                 | 42,694           |
| Toro Groundmaster Mower (2015)                      | 11,494           |
| Server & software - GIS (2015)                      | 10,595           |
| Zero-turn Mowers-3-B&G (2017)                       | 5,453            |
| F-250 Replacement (2017)                            | 7,758            |
| F-250 Diesel P/U Truck repl (2018)                  | 7,536            |
| F-250 Diesel P/U Truck repl (2018)                  | 7,536            |
| Asphalt Roller Repl. (2018)                         | 7,093            |
| Zero-turn Mowers-3-B&G (2018)                       | 6,849            |
| <b>Total Public Works:</b>                          | <b>214,161</b>   |
| <b><u>Recreation Department</u></b>                 |                  |
| <b>Recreation Department Totals:</b>                | <b>0</b>         |
| <b><u>Police Department</u></b>                     |                  |
| Vehicle Replacements for FY 2013                    | 73,853           |
| Command Vehicle Repl (2013)                         | 7,411            |
| Police Video Repl- 5 (2013)                         | 6,184            |

**Debt Service Detail  
FY 2018**

| <u>Description/Budget Year</u>         | <u>FY 2018</u> |
|----------------------------------------|----------------|
| Police Victory Motorcycle (2013)       | 9,153          |
| Police Motorcycle- new 2nd unit (2013) | 1,731          |
| Records Management System (2014)       | 58,518         |
| Vehicle Replacements for FY 2014       | 82,249         |
| COBAN Server Replacement FY 2015       | 17,873         |
| Patrol Vehicle Replacements-4 (2017)   | 46,992         |
| Motorcycle Replacement (2017)          | 5,985          |
| Additional Video Storage (2017)        | 9,310          |
| Coban Video Replacements-2 (2017)      | 6,650          |
| Vehicle Replacements for FY 2018       | 117,702        |
| Unmarked Vehicle Repl (1) (2018)       | 8,866          |
| Motorcycle Replacement (2018)          | 5,985          |
| 192TB Storage/Expansion (2018)         | 18,620         |

Police Department Totals: 477,082

|                                         |        |
|-----------------------------------------|--------|
| <u>Fire Department</u>                  |        |
| Rescue 8 Replace/Surplus (2012)         | 10,470 |
| Rescue Boat (2015)                      | 5,050  |
| Replace Expedition-Training (2013)      | 7,233  |
| Medic Remount (2013)                    | 26,874 |
| Repl Exped - Asst. Ops./EMS (2014)      | 7,071  |
| Repl 2 P/U w/ 1 SUV- FM (2014)          | 7,071  |
| Patient Handling System (2014)          | 5,548  |
| Replace Medic Unit 83 (2015)            | 45,441 |
| Lucas - CPR Machines (2015)             | 9,638  |
| Repl Staff Vehicle-Training (2017)      | 8,822  |
| Radio Repl - Phase 1 (2017)             | 16,625 |
| ReplStaff Vehicle (2006-1) (2018)       | 8,822  |
| Cardiac Monitor Lifepak-15 Repl. (2018) | 8,656  |

Fire Department Totals: 167,321

|                                     |         |
|-------------------------------------|---------|
| <u>General Administration</u>       |         |
| Phase I Tech Upgrades (2012)        | 24,478  |
| Phase II Tech Upgrades (2013)       | 59,400  |
| Citywide Phone System Repl (2013)   | 30,444  |
| Citywide ERP System (2014)          | 110,179 |
| Phase 2-3 Tech Upgrades (2014)      | 46,718  |
| Additional Storage - Backups (2017) | 8,866   |
| Repl Storage - Production (2017)    | 9,975   |
| Email Upgrade (MS Exchange - 2016)  | 9,975   |
| MS Office 2016 Upgrade (2017)       | 28,816  |
| Adobe Acrobat Upgrade (2017)        | 19,950  |



**Debt Service Detail  
FY 2018**

| <u>Description/Budget Year</u>    | <u>FY 2018</u> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| Citywide Wifi Upgrade (2017)      | 11,083         |
| Backup Server (replace) (2017)    | 5,985          |
| Security Cameras/Access (2017)    | 7,093          |
| Online Building Permits (2017)    | 5,276          |
| <br>Total General Administration: | <br>378,238    |
| <br>Total Equipment Lease:        | <br>1,236,800  |
| <br>Total Debt Service Expense:   | <br>2,712,049  |

# CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

## INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor & Council Members

VIA: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager  
Paul Salvatore, Financial Services Director  
Kelly Bush, Assistant Finance Director  
Angela Egan, Purchasing Agent

FROM: David A. Borkowski, P.E., M. ASCE, City Engineer

DATE: July 25, 2017

SUBJECT: SR 54/Planterra Way Intersection Improvements  
August 3, 2017, City Council Meeting

### Recommendation:

Staff recommends that Council award the bid to AM Construction LLC for the amount of **\$852,628.12**, for intersection improvements at State Route 54 and Planterra Way.

### Discussion:

Staff issued an invitation to bid for the intersection improvements at SR 54 and Planterra Way. This work generally consists of traffic signal modifications, turn lane extensions, median modifications, milling, paving, signing and striping according to Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) specifications. The City received bids as follows:

| BIDDER          | LUMP SUM BASE BID |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| AM Construction | \$852,628.12      |
| McLeRoy Inc.    | \$1,377,000.00    |
| Piedmont Paving | \$868,438.00      |

The City has verified the experience of both the primary contractor and subcontractors. Staff has also reviewed AM Construction's Bid package and finds it acceptable. Therefore, Staff recommends awarding the Bid to AM Construction.

The contractor will be performing work at night and phasing the project to mitigate the impact on traffic in the corridor. Phasing will be working on Planterra Way side and the work in SR 54 first, then work on the Home Depot/Wal-Mart side will be after January 1, 2018.

### Budget Impact:

Adequate funding is available for these projects in the following line items. \$702,628.12 is budgeted in SPLOST, and \$150,000.00 is a Quick Response grant from GDOT (CIP fund 334).



# CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

## INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** Mayor & Council Members

**VIA:** Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager *JN*  
Paul Salvatore, Financial Services Director *P.S.*  
Kelly Bush, Assistant Financial Services Director *KB*

**FROM:** David Borkowski, P.E., M. ASCE *David A. Borkowski*

**DATE:** July 26, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Resolution of Support for Fayette County TIP Funding Application  
August 3, 2017, City Council Meeting

---

### Recommendation:

Staff recommends that City Council authorize the Mayor to sign the attached resolution.

### Discussion:

Staff has been working with the County to include some of our larger resurfacing projects into the Atlanta Regional Commission's (ARC) Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) for Federal funding. Part of the application process is for the local municipalities to sign a resolution committing to funding the local match for the project.

The attached resolution references approximately 9 miles of Peachtree City collector roads for resurfacing. These roads being all of Peachtree Parkway and Robinson Road from State Route 54 south to the City Limits. The financial commitment on the City would be a 20% match, or a total of \$975,445.80.

The ARC is looking to make preliminary award determinations this fall, with programming into the official TIP in the spring of 2018. The City and County would then prepare environmental documentation and bid package in mid to late 2018 with construction to most likely occur in 2019.

Staff feels that partnering with the County to bundle roads together into a large project would provide much better economy of scale than if the City were to do it alone.

### Budget Impact:

If funds are awarded from the ARC for these paving projects, the City's required local match (\$975,445.80) would come from the City's General Fund resurfacing line item.

**Resolution of Commitment to Implement Project FA-02**

WHEREAS, Peachtree City continues to support the development and enhancement of its transportation infrastructure as a means to create and sustain livable environments, efficient vehicular movement, reduced congestion, improved air quality, safer roads, and general facilitation of public mobility; and

WHEREAS, the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has issued a 2017 solicitation for Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) project funding proposals, and Fayette County desires to submit an application for consideration to fund multiple resurfacing projects within the County; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the resurfacing projects is to maintain existing corridors within Fayette County that provide essential connectivity on a local and regional level; and

WHEREAS, the grant agreement for Federal financial assistance, if awarded, will impose certain obligations upon Fayette County, including Peachtree City, to provide the local share of the project costs; and

WHEREAS, Peachtree City will provide all necessary certifications and assurances to the ARC required for the project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The City Council of Peachtree City authorizes the filing of a grant application with the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) for the resurfacing of multiple roads within the incorporated and unincorporated limits of Fayette County, in an amount of \$9,513,707;
2. Of the project total, \$4,877,229 are for roads within the incorporated limits of Peachtree City and will be the responsibility of Peachtree City. The balance of the project amount is for other local governments within the County;
3. The City Council of Peachtree City is aware that the ARC may award an amount that is less than the amount for which the City has applied (\$4,877,229);
4. The Mayor of Peachtree City is authorized to execute and file the necessary certifications, assurances and other documents required by the ARC for the grant application; and

5. Peachtree City commits to providing the required local match up to \$975,445.80 (20% of grant amount) for the roads in Peachtree City if the project is awarded.

This \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Betsy Tyler, City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_