



CITY COUNCIL OF PEACHTREE CITY
REVISED AGENDA

Peachtree City
Mayor & City Council
Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor
Phil Prebor – Post 1
Mike King – Post 2
Kevin Madden – Post 3
Terry Ernst – Post 4

AUGUST 1, 2019
6:30 p.m.

I. Call to Order

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition

Presentation of Saved by the Belt Award to Daniel Handley and daughters Christina (13), Rachel (10), and Sarah (6) – Police Department
Recognize Fire Chief Joe O'Connor – Completion of National Fire Academy's Executive Fire Officer Program

IV. Public Comment

V. Agenda Changes

VI. Minutes

July 18, 2019, Regular Meeting Minutes

VII. Consent Agenda

1. Consider FY 2019 Budget Adjustment – Grinding Contract/Landscaping Supplies
2. Consider Amendment to Motorized Carts Ordinance – Sec. 78-93-Operations regulations and Sec. 78-96- Hazardous activities and special rules
3. **Consider FY 2019 Budget Adjustment – Park Enhancements**

VIII. Old Agenda Items

07-19-05 Consider Adoption of FY 2020 Operating Budget and Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
(Paul Salvatore)

IX. New Agenda Items

X. Council/Staff Topics

Millage Rate Public Hearing Schedule
Multi-use Path System Rules & Regulations

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
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 18, 2019
6:30 p.m.**

The City Council of Peachtree City met in regular session on Thursday, July 18, 2019. Mayor Vanessa Fleisch called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Others attending: Terry Ernst, Mike King, Kevin Madden, and Phil Prebor.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition

Fleisch recognized Josh Petty of the Public Works Department for 20 years of service.

The Mayor presented trophies to the winners of the July 4th parade, including 3rd Place Golf Cart – Keller Williams Realty; 2nd Place Golf Cart – LM2 Home Services; 1st Place Golf Cart – My Floral Bliss; Most Creative – Creative Learning Studios; Most Patriotic – The Joe Carbone Team; Mayor's Trophy – Piedmont Fayette Hospital; and Grand Marshal's Trophy – Peachtree City Dog Park.

Public Comment

Gary Chapman asked if any thought had been given to making golf cart drivers pass a test. He said he had lived in the City since 1987 and had seen an increase in the number of people driving dangerously on the cart paths. The regulations for golf cart operations were confusing, he remarked, and he asked if he could discuss them with someone. The Mayor told him someone would be in touch.

Minutes

King moved to approve the June 20, 2019, regular meeting minutes and the June 27, 2019, budget workshop minutes. Ernst seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Quarterly Reports – 2nd Quarter 2019

There were no comments.

Consent Agenda

- 1. Consider Approval of Sale of Surplus Vehicle – Ambulance**
- 2. Consider Intergovernmental Agreement with Fayette County for Construction & Maintenance of Multi-Use Path Projects**
- 3. Consider Elimination of Administrative Assistant Position and Replacement with Planner 1 Position in Planning and Development Department**
- 4. Consider Budget FY 2019 Budget Amendment**

Ernst moved to approved Consent Agenda items 1,2, 3, and 4. King seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

New Agenda Items

- 07-19-01 Public Hearing – Consider Variance Request to Sec. 803(a)(4) Land Development Ordinance, 139 Senoia Road (Driveway Cut)**

Fleisch opened the public hearing.

Planning and Development Director Robin Cailloux said Senoia Road was considered a collector road and served higher volumes of traffic in the City's transportation network. An ordinance prohibited direct driveway access onto these higher volume roads. She showed a map with the property in question outlined in yellow. This property was zoned Agricultural Reserve (AR), and the applicant wanted to build a home on it.

There were several criteria to be considered for approval of a variance. Cailloux explained that this property was subdivided in 1972 for four single-family residential lots. The others had been developed for homes or office, and all had direct driveway access to Senoia Road. Council had to consider whether the regulation created a hardship to this property, and Cailloux said it did. If the driveway was not allowed, the property owner would have no direct access to the road without an easement on adjoining property. That land owner submitted a letter saying they supported the request for a driveway, but would not grant an access easement.

In regard to another criterion, Cailloux stated that granting the variance would not be detrimental to public welfare, adding the distance between this and other driveways far exceeded the Land Use Ordinance standards. Another criterion looked at whether the ordinance deprived the landowner of rights that others in the same zone had. Cailloux again noted that all the other homes had been granted variances for driveways.

They also had to consider if these conditions were a result of the applicant's actions. She said the applicant had recently purchased this lot, so he did not create this situation. Granting this variance should not give the applicant special privileges, and Cailloux noted that it did not.

Cailloux said staff was of the opinion that the request met all criteria for the variance and recommended approval.

No one wished to speak either in favor or against the variance request. Fleisch closed the public hearing.

Prebor said it made sense, and King agreed.

King moved to approved New Agenda item 07-19-01, variance request to Sec. 803(a)(4) Land Development Ordinance, 139 Senoia Road. Prebor seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

07-19-02 Public Hearing – Consider Rezoning, ER to R-43, 263 Greenwood Lane

Fleisch opened the public hearing.

This property was along the City's northern boundary, adjacent to land in unincorporated Fayette County. It currently was zoned Estate Residential (ER), and the request was to rezone to Residential- 43 (R-43), which was one-acre single-family residential. Cailloux pointed out SR 74 and Peachtree Parkway on a zoning map, saying that this property must be accessed from Loring Lane. She showed the Kedron Hills development and similar zoned properties. It was not part of an existing subdivision. The City had an ordinance against subdividing lots to make them smaller than others in the subdivision of which they were a part. This property was not in Kedron Hills or the nearby Greenwood Oaks.

The applicant had provided a conceptual plan that showed how the lots would lay out. Cailloux noted that approval of this zoning district did not tie them to that particular layout, but the applicant had indicated this was the intended layout. It showed five lots. The existing home would remain for the time being. All of the side setbacks and size requirements for the R-43 district would be met for the lots.

Staff had looked to see if this proposal conformed with the six criteria proscribed by the Zoning Ordinance. The first was whether the proposal conformed with the policy and intent of the

Comprehensive Plan. The Future Land Use Map for this property called for single-family low density, which allowed for lots of one acre or larger. The request for R-43 complied with that, Cailloux said.

Staff had identified two policies that were applicable. The first was called the "step-down" policy, which encouraged less dense development towards the borders of the City. This request did that. Directly to the south were half-acre lots in Kedron Hills and there were other one-acre lots in the area. The adjacent County land was zoned for three-acre lots.

Cailloux said another policy had been brought to their attention by the City Engineering Department as being applicable to this request. The property in this area was located in an area designated by the state as a regionally significant groundwater recharge area. This part of Peachtree City was in the most southern part of this area. It was identified by its ability to significantly clean water. Most of the City's water came from an underground aquifer, and this area helped to clean the water that eventually made it into that aquifer. The applicant was proposing to install sewer, which would be much better for the drinking water supply than septic systems, which percolated into the soil and eventually entered the water supply.

They typically combined criteria 2 and 3, which looked at the compatibility with surrounding uses and development. Cailloux said the applicant was requesting single-family, which was already in the area, so it was compatible. The fourth question asked if the property had reasonable economic use as currently zoned, and Cailloux said it did. Moving on through the list of criteria, Cailloux noted that the request would not cause a burden to existing services including utilities, transportation and the school system. The developers would be providing connections to utilities at their cost. The impact of four new homes would be negligible on the transportation network and, according to the school system's formula, add only about two students.

The sixth question asked if there were changing conditions that affected the use of this property, and Cailloux said they were unaware of any.

There was a good discussion when the Planning Commission considered this rezoning at its June 10 meeting. Cailloux noted, with several members of the surrounding area attending to make comments and ask questions. The Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval with the condition that the applicants meet with the surrounding neighborhoods. She said most of the questions concerned the quality of the planned homes, and the applicant had indicated that the quality would be substantially similar to those within Greenwood and Kedron Hills. Cailloux noted that the applicant was present to respond to questions.

Staff was of the opinion that this request met the majority of the criteria and recommended approval of the rezoning, Cailloux stated.

Attorney Rick Lindsey represented the applicant, Cavalier Manor, LLC, owned by Doug Feller, who was present. After the June 10 Planning Commission meeting, Lindsey said they met with the president of Kedron Hills Homeowners Association (HOA) and a board member. They also had discussed this with two of the adjoining neighbors who were not in the HOA, who were concerned with the minimum size of the homes because R-43 allowed for homes as small as 2,300 square feet or somewhere in that range. Lindsey said none of the new homes would be less than 3,000 square feet. At least 25% of the exterior materials would be brick, stone or other type of masonry work, with the remainder being Hardie Plank or another quality material. They would reflect the nearby homes, including the new homes to the west. Lindsey said the first homes in the area were built in the 1970s, long before Kedron Hills, which was zoned with the rest of the Kedron area in the mid-1990s. Lindsey said the applicant had considered updating the single home that was on this

property, but that probably would not be practical, due to the cost. It looked like they would end up with five new homes.

Lindsey said his client would like these five lots to become part of the HOA if the HOA would allow it. The applicant had talked with the HOA about sharing the cost of traffic calming devices if the City would permit. There were issues with speeding cars on Loring Lane in the mornings and evenings. His client was willing to share the cost even if not allowed to join the HOA. He said his client wanted to be a good neighbor and intended to build his own house on the lot at the corner of Greenwood and Loring Lane and would sell the other four lots. Restrictive covenants would control the development.

Another question was whether there would be one builder or if the purchasers of the lots could pick their own builders. Lindsey said this had not been decided. Feller certainly wanted quality development around his house. The covenant would state that all construction must be finished within a year. The intent was not to "shoehorn" this into Kedron Hills, but make these homes a benefit to the area.

They were sensitive to the trees in the area, but the shared driveways that would be added meant a few would have to come down. They would install sewer in the area. There were some overhead power lines, and Coweta-Fayette EMC had committed to burying those.

For all that, Lindsey concluded, they felt this would be an asset to the area and an asset to the City, and they hoped Council would approve this rezoning.

City Attorney Ted Meeker noted the ordinance before Council did not mention that no home could be less than 3,000 square feet. Cailloux said she did not include any conditions in the draft ordinance, but it would be updated if Council added them. Lindsey said the covenant would put those in place, but it would be fine in the ordinance.

No one else wished to speak in favor of the rezoning. The Mayor asked who wished to speak against.

Stephanie Brcka said her home backed up to the planned driveway stated that she was not necessarily opposed, but had concerns. They had moved there less than a year ago. They relied on the trees for privacy, and she wondered if they would be maintained. She also asked if they would be paving the driveway and where the sewer line would be located.

Bobby Ostrander said he was the tenant at 321 Loring Lane and was there on behalf of the property owner whose biggest concern was drainage, adding those properties would increase the amount of stormwater draining onto 321 Loring Lane. Ostrander stated that he had spoken to the City's stormwater engineering department. A 10-inch drain pipe ran underneath his driveway. Any additional run-off would wash out his driveway.

Caren Russell wanted to know the difference between a flag lot and a shared driveway. She noted that this would be a gravel drive and wondered who would maintain it, asking if it be large enough to accommodate emergency vehicles. She asked if the drive would continue off the property to the north, into the County.

Gary Chapman asked if Council could require the applicant to draw up the restrictive covenants for review before Council voted on the rezoning.

No one else wished to speak. The Mayor closed the public hearing.

King asked if the driveway would be paved.

Lindsey said it would be paved and clarified that it was a driveway, not a road. It went into the last lot to the north, which he pointed out on the zoning map. He said he had spoken with that property owner, Nathan Saville. The applicant would pay for the paving the driveway since it would be shared with one of the new lots. The trees along the western boundary would stay, Lindsey stated. He said they would be back to discuss stormwater with Council and explain a plan that would confine the runoff to the individual lots.

Ernst asked Cailloux what was beyond the ER lots on the map. She said there were two more similar lots that she believed were in Tyrone. They were for sale last year, although she was unsure if they sold or what the plans were for those properties. Ernst clarified that the lot he meant was in Peachtree City and had one home on it.

Madden asked about an easement between Loring Lane and the property line. Cailloux said there was not easement, but the right-of-way was 50 feet. If 25 feet from the center of the road was measured, that would be the right-of-way. The setback line in R-43 was 40 or 50 feet; she believed it was 40 from the right-of-way. Madden asked if that would allow the preservation of the trees. She said the City did not require they keep the trees, but they could but a condition on it. Loring Lane was not a collector road, so there was not a required tree save buffer. However, trees could not be cleared for the right-of-way because it was owned by the City. Madden asked if it would be easy to tie into the Kedron Hills sewer system, and Cailloux said it should be.

Prebor wanted to know who owned the two lots to the north of the property and how they were accessed. Cailloux said the lot that had a home on it had a driveway. That driveway would also serve as the back lot's driveway. The driveway on the lot with the existing home also tied into it, but they would not be using that drive way anymore. That lot and another, which she called lots 2 and 3, would have a new driveway that connected to Loring Lane. The two front lots would have their own driveways directly onto Loring Lane.

Ernst said he was clear on that and asked Lindsey if he understood what he was asking. Lindsey pointed to the two ER lots at the northern part of this area, owned by the Savilles. He said they had no objection to the driveway, but would not be paying for paving it. Lindsey's client would.

Doug Feller introduced himself as the developer. He said the Savilles had a home on the northernmost lot on the zoning map and owned the adjacent lot. He and Lindsey had met with them, and they were happy that the driveway would be paved and that they would be getting sewer. There was a lot below them that was not zoned ER. It was zoned R-43. The property to the north was not in Peachtree City and had no access to the property they were discussing. The only lot that would be tying into the property he owned would be the top ER lot, which shared a driveway and an easement with one of his lots.

Prebor said that clarified it. Lindsey added that the lot Ernst meant was in Tyrone, and no one lived there.

City Manager Jon Rorie said he wanted to make a comment, which he tried not to do in zoning matters. Someone had a concern about traffic on Loring Lane and mentioned installing traffic

calming devices. He asked City Engineer Dave Borkowski to step to the podium. Rorie went on to say that traffic calming initiatives were driven by policy, not zoning regulations or developer's or residents' desires. He asked Borkowski if he was correct in saying that the installation of traffic calming devices first had to meet certain warrants. Borkowski said he could not recall all of them, but they would have to do a traffic study, and more than 85% of the vehicles would have to be traveling over the designated speed limit. The HOA president would have to request the devices, and more than 66% of the homeowners would have to sign a petition in support and agree to pay 50% of the installation costs. Borkowski said he believed the 50% was correct, and the City would pay the remainder.

Rorie commented that he wanted to make sure everyone understood this. It was not a matter of saying "I want to have traffic calming devices." Installing traffic calming devices could not be a condition of rezoning. That was driven from policy.

Rorie also wanted to focus on access to this property. He said this request was to go from ER to R-43. He saw it as a request to have shared access for up to five lots. Cailloux stated that the City had an ordinance that limited the number of lots that could share a driveway to two. That was why they were ensuring there were enough easements provided for the houses that would be created and the houses that currently existed.

Rorie said for those two reasons, he thought it would be best to continue this item until they had a site plan that addressed those two issues. He again stated there could not be more than two lots sharing a driveway. He said he was seeing a single sharing for five lots.

Cailloux remarked that she should do a better job of describing the plat. The plat showed two easements; one would be placed over the existing easement to serve the property that was not in this parcel. That would be one house. The second house would be the back lot on this parcel. That would be the two for that one access easement. The lot with the existing home currently had a driveway that tied into the existing drive, and they would get rid of that driveway. Cailloux noted that easements were not on the property they served; they were on the adjacent property. The two lots in the middle would be served by one easement. Each of the two lots at the front would have their own driveways from their property to the right-of-way, she noted. There would be no private roads, which were not permitted.

Rorie said he appreciated the clarification. Prebor agreed.

Cailloux again pointed out the lots with shared driveways and the ones with their own driveways. Madden said trees would have to be removed, at least for the length of the new driveways.

King said they seemed to have solved the driveway issue, but he was concerned about stormwater. He asked if they would try to retain water on the lots to the north. Cailloux pointed out that the rezoning issue was a land use issue. The Land Development Ordinance required submission of a stormwater plan when they wanted to begin development. Engineering would review it. They typically required that a subdivision have detention ponds, grouped together and fenced, that the City maintained. They had had some preliminary discussion, but had not spent a lot of time on this issue because it was not part of the zoning, it was part of the development.

King said he was concerned for the resident on the corner whose driveway was in jeopardy.

Borkowski reported that he had preliminary discussions with their engineer so they would know what was coming. They were aware that they must comply with the ordinance, which said they

could not increase runoff on the downstream people. They would have to put in controls to mitigate that. He said they were still deciding how to do that, but the traditional way in a subdivision was to put in a pond on a greenbelt and dedicate it to the City. Other smaller properties like this had come to the City for a variance to put those controls on each individual lot.

Lindsey said they would prefer to have a plan in which each lot kept its own stormwater. That should make any existing problems better. He noted they would have to come back before Council for a variance, so they could discuss it then.

Fleisch wanted to know who would pay for re-paving the driveway 20 years from now, asking if the property owners understood they would have to put money into a pool to repave. Lindsey said he told the Savilles there would be no cost for the paving, but explained that repaving costs would have to be shared. It would be addressed in the shared driveway agreement. Saville said he believed it would save money in the long run because he had already had to buy gravel due to the drive's poor condition. They knew this was coming, but had not decided how the cost would be divided.

Prebor said they wanted to include in the motion that there was a minimum house size of 3,000 square feet.

Prebor moved to approve New Agenda item 07-19-02, rezoning, ER to R-43, 263 Greenwood Lane with the condition that all homes be greater than 3,000 square feet. King seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

07-19-03 Presentation and Acceptance of CVB FY 2020 Budget

Rorie explained the Convention and Visitors Bureau (CVB) was a component unit of government and was the designated destination marketing organization for the City. The budget had already been approved by their Board of Directors, and what Council would be seeing was a highlight of what that budget entailed.

Executive Director Kym Hughes said they were projecting a 3% increase in hotel/motel tax for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 to match the line item in the proposed City budget. The CVB would continue to host the Hops & Props and Wine & Warbirds festivals this year. The ultimate goal was to partner with the City on more events. The increase in the Administration and General Operation costs was related to a vehicle lease and repairs and maintenance on that vehicle, along with a new copier lease and the addition of legal services. The CVB had a large prior year surplus budgeted to be used in the current fiscal year, but it would still leave a surplus of \$86,577.

The personnel variance from the previous year was due to variances that year, Hughes noted. The 2020 Sales and Marketing Promotions budget included an increase in marketing and advertising as well as trade shows and professional development.

Hughes noted that 75% of their revenues came from the hotel/motel tax. About 7% was from events and merchandise sales, and the total projected surplus of around \$175,000 made up 18% of the budget. The lion's share of expenditures went to marketing and advertising, Hughes pointed out. Contract labor made up 35% of expenses, while professional and technical services made up 4%. Trade shows and professional development were at about 20%. She said that, too, was part of the marketing component, but was a more specific effort. Administration and operating expenses were about 12%, with contingency funds making up 1%.

Hughes showed an overview of the entire budget, noting that it had been thoroughly examined and would help them meet their goals.

Ernst moved to approve New Agenda item 07-19-03, acceptance of CVB FY 2020 Budget. Madden seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

07-19-04 Presentation and Acceptance of KPTCB FY 2020 Budget

Keep Peachtree City Beautiful Director (KPTCB) Al Yougel said the theme of this budget was changes, such as the phenomenal increase in corrugated cardboard dropped off at the recycling center. The misuse of the gathering of plastic in the recycling dumpsters was another change they were dealing with. They were getting types of plastic that could not be recycled. Only plastic 1 and 2, such as bottles and detergent containers, were recyclable at this time, he noted. The weight of the roll-off bins was how costs were figured, and plastic amounted to about 25% of that. The plastics that could be recycled, numbers 1 and 2, could be recycled at home through curbside collection. Eliminating plastic recycling would be a big savings to KPTCB.

The third element was the burden of their activities, Yougel remarked. During the last calendar year, they had 21,011 hours of court-mandated community service. That went on six days a week, sometimes seven. Along with the burden of that and getting their jobs done, they also had the burden of activities, such as Night Markets. The Night Market occurring on the same day as the annual road race meant they were busy from 5: a.m. to 1:00 the next morning. In this budget, they had requested money for another supervisor.

They expected a 30% decline in money received from recycling, Yougel commented, and there was also a \$20,000 reduction in the amount of the City's subsidy to KPTCB. Revenues were oriented totally toward residential; they got not money from commercial. Yougel said there was no change in the litter and compost contracts. They also had another contract with the City to empty the trash cans on the cart paths, and it had not changed. There was no contract for the recycle bins located around the City; that was an independent effort of KPTCB.

There would be a drastic drop in bin pulls because they were proposing to lease a cardboard compactor for \$400 a month, including maintenance. He mentioned again the need for an additional supervisor.

Madden asked if the idea would be to compress the cardboard to get more into the bins and increase the weight of each pull and lessen bins. Yougel said one canister of the compactor could equal four or five of the roll-offs. They also did not have to tear down the cardboard. More than half of the big bins emptied each month were for cardboard, so this would be a big savings. Yougel said it would save time and was more efficient. Madden confirmed they would no longer be accepting plastic because it could be recycled through residential service. Yougel said they would have to maintain a small bin for the plastics they got from schools, The Fred, and health clubs.

Fleisch said this was still the most effective and efficient way to keep the City clean.

Madden moved to approve New Agenda item 07-19-04, acceptance of KPTCB FY 2020 Budget. Ernst seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

07-19-05 Public Hearing – Consider Proposed Budget for FY 2020 and Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

This was a public hearing, Finance Director Paul Salvatore explained; the budget would not be adopted at this meeting. He said the budget process took about five months, starting in early March with sending out forms and instructions to departments. Less than a week later, the first of the three Retreat sessions were held. At those, a number of topics relevant to the budget were discussed, such as economic development, redevelopment, facility management, and fiscal control. The Manager's proposed budget was presented June 27. They still had a few more steps before getting to adopting the final budget at the next Council meeting on August 1.

Salvatore reviewed the City's Mission Statement and Budget Policy before talking about enterprise funds, which accounted for operations of the City's business-type activities, which were the Stormwater Utility and the Amphitheater. The revenues generated by these were used to fund their operations. The point, Salvatore noted, was that these were self-supporting, not subsidized through the General Fund.

The Stormwater Utility projected revenues of about \$2.4 million. Expenditures were slightly higher because they were drawing down about \$113,000 of the reserves, called the renewal and extension fund. He pointed out the capital outlay expenses of \$450,000, which was causing the draw down. They were running out of bond construction funds, so now they would be utilizing the renewal and extension reserve fund, anticipated to be about \$2,650,000 at the end of this fiscal year. He remarked they were heading into a maintenance mode and hoped this would be the status quo for a while. If they drew down about \$100,000 a year, the \$2.6 million should last for many years before there needed to be talk of another bond.

The Amphitheater fund showed an operating increase of about \$94,000. They were not planning on any major formatting changes, keeping the six-concert series and five to seven stand-alone shows. They planned on bring back the May Play for kids, which was successful two years ago. The Amphitheater Fund's total budget was \$1,482,497. The majority of expenses were for purchased or contracted services, which included talent acquisition, sound, lights, and advertising.

Highlights of the 2020 General Fund budget included the hiring of three additional firefighters/paramedics to begin around April 1, 2020, the change in funding for Public Safety hours, and the addition of two police officers to make up for officers out on extended leave. There was funding for a 2.5% cost of living adjustment (COLA) that would not go into effect until January 1, 2020, if approved by Council after they reviewed finances at the end of FY 2019. The budget included cash funding for building maintenance expenses to avoid facilities bonds. They had budgeted for maintenance about 1% of the amount the buildings were insured for, which equaled about \$510,000. Cash would also fund major recreation facility improvements. These were mentioned as Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects, but the money would come from a transfer from the General Fund, Salvatore explained.

Unfunded items included an assistant city manager position at \$134,000. There was a request for a new police officer that was unfunded, but overtime was adjusted by \$81,000 to make up for additional patrol hours.

They were looking at lowering the millage rate. The bond millage rate would go away completely next year, Salvatore commented, resulting in a 0.176 mill reduction.

Estimated General Fund revenues were about \$38.8 million, a 1.74% increase, while appropriations, at \$39.3 million, increased by 6.57%. Salvatore said that was by design, with a

drawdown of \$490,000 in cash reserves. That conformed with the policy of one-time capital outlay expenses.

There was no change in the amount budgeted for street and path resurfacing, \$1.8 million, which would cover three to four miles of streets. Per agreement with the Atlanta Regional Airport – Falcon Field, they would decrease funding by \$7,650. As discussed at the last meeting, funding for the Fayette County Development Authority (FCDA) would be cut to \$120,000, with the remaining \$26,047 retained in the City's Economic Development fund. As discussed earlier, they were reducing the supplement to KPTCB by \$20,000.

Unresolved issues they would discuss later included a Council salary adjustment and whether they should look into a general obligation (GO) bond to fund additional recreation improvements.

Salvatore presented a high level overview of the General Fund, showing that the FY 2019 budget ended with a 38% reserve. The reserve would increase to 39% for next year, even with the drawdown of \$490,000. This was possible because revenue projections fell short in the FY 2019 budget. Without the drawdown, they would end up with reserve funds of 42% or 43%.

A pie chart showed that the Local Option Sales Tax (LOST) and ad valorem taxes were the City's two biggest sources of revenue, accounting for about 60% of the revenue. Other taxes, such as franchise taxes, contributed to the revenue stream.

What Rorie referred to as the Big Three – Fire/EMS, Police, and Public Works, made up the bulk of expenditures, Salvatore noted, about 60% of the total operating budget. Salvatore showed how much of each tax dollar on a \$341,000 home, average for the City, went to the different departments. Police got 19 cents of each dollar, for instance.

Another chart broke expenses down by account type, rather than departmental function. They were a service organization, Salvatore remarked, so most of the expenses, 58%, were for employees who provided services. Another high percentage went to contractual services, which included big contracts, such as for paving. A little less was spent on operating supplies.

CIP projects including an expenditure of \$335,000 in cash from the CIP fund, supplemented by \$175,000 from the General Fund, on improvements to City buildings for the total of \$510,000 Rorie mentioned earlier, which was around 1% of the total insured value of all City buildings, Salvatore continued. Another \$406,000 would go to Public Works and Grounds equipment purchases. A little over \$1 million would be spent on Police vehicles and equipment. The Fire/EMS Department would get \$206,000 for vehicles and equipment. About \$385,000 would go for technology and security upgrades. There would be \$775,000 in cash funding for recreation facilities upgrades. The total CIP for FY 2020 would be about \$3,271,000.

At the last workshop meeting on the Manager's proposed budget, Rorie said he was tasked with two issues to evaluate. One was to look at Council's salary. He suggested they look at the cumulative change in the Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers (CPI-U) since 2007, when the last pay increase was established. He showed how that broke down over the past 12 years. Council salaries were set at \$1,000 per month in 2007. The 12-month percentage change noted at the end of 2007 was .001, which amounted to \$1. As you went through the years, the numbers worked out to show a CPI-U change of approximately 20.1% by January 2020. If Council's pay had been adjusted through the years to reflect this, it would now be \$1,220 a month.

Rorie told Council if they chose to make a movement on the salary, the questions would be: "How much? When?" and "What would the annual impact be?" Adjusting the salary from \$1,000 to \$1,200 a month would impact the budget by \$12,600 annually.

If they chose to do that, they must follow a procedure outlined in the General Statutes of the State of Georgia. Before he explained that, Rorie said he wanted to know what Council desired.

There had been a number of discussions about the importance of attracting and retaining the best employees in the Police and Fire Departments, Madden reflected, as well as in other City departments. Council had adjusted the salaries for those people, justifiably so. Now it was time to adjust salaries for future City Council, he went on, so they could attract people who were willing to run for office and expend their time and energies to serve the City. He said he would like to see the pay raised to \$1,200 and made a part of the proposed FY 2020 budget.

Ernst agreed, saying it was time, and he did not think that amount was too much to ask for. He suggested they move forward.

Prebor noted that it was not much of a budget impact, equaling about .00033% of the total budget. Having said that, he remarked that the \$200 extra per month would not sway someone to want to run for office. He thought they should leave it as it was.

King concurred with Prebor's opinion, but noted that it was an election year, so if they voted "no," people would say that was because they wanted to get re-elected, and if they voted "yes," people would hold it against them. He said the \$200 wouldn't make much difference. It would cover gas money and a little more. They were there to serve; that was the bottom line.

Fleisch said she agreed with Madden and Ernst, and asked Rorie about the next step.

Rorie showed the statutory language detailing what would be required. The pay raise could not go into effect until after the next election. The process for raising the salary could not be taken during the period when candidates for office qualified, which Rorie said would begin August 19. The prohibition would continue until those elected took office.

They must advertise a notice of intent to take action in the County's legal organ for three consecutive weeks immediately preceding the week in which the action was taken. That would be July 31, August 7, and August 14 (correction to dates – July 24, July 31, August 7. Rorie showed a draft of the advertisement. It stated the amount of the increase and said a vote would be taken at a public meeting on August 15. Based on a CPI-U of 20%, the salary would be increased to \$1,800 a month for Mayor, and \$1,200 a month for members of Council. It would go into effect in January 2020. The process had been vetted through the City's legal counsel. Council could take action on August 15, but it must first be advertised. Rorie said no Council vote was necessary at this time. He understood he was authorized to move forward at this time.

Rorie said Salvatore had mentioned a lot of things in regards to capital improvements. There were many things the City needed to dial back on, but there were others that needed to move forward. The questions were: "What?" and "How?" They laid out a few items of interest during the June 27 budget hearing, which Rorie displayed on a list. He noted that, in his opinion, they were discretionary items. Others might see it differently. That was the dilemma.

For example, replacing the pool bubble at the Kedron Aquatics Center was projected to cost \$750,000. There was also an expense to maintain it. This enabled them to have a covered pool during the winter months. Some people would say do away with it; others would say to replace the bubble, while others would call for building a permanent structure over the pool. The bubble would need replacing in about five years. There had been debate over pickleball courts, which Rorie said he could not support building. There was always debate over spending. The question was whether they were dealing with public interest or private interest. How did those things become co-mingled in a public policy statement, Rorie asked.

Other items on the list included Tennis Center upgrade, Peachtree City Athletic Center (PAC) field expansions, and Riley Field track replacement, among others. These projects totaled about \$8 million. None of them were identified in the five-year CIP. They were horizon issues, to be executed seven or more years from now. Rorie said he had made a point regarding the Riley track replacement; the City had more than 100 miles of track – the path network. He asked Council if they were willing to invest \$150,000 in a track replacement at Riley Field.

They could create a list and put this on the November 5 ballot as a GO bond, Rorie stated. Salvatore had already stated that the millage rate was going down because of the expiration of their GO bond debt. They could use another GO bond as a debt instrument to fund these projects, offering a project list to voters to approve.

Rorie asked Council if they wanted to look at the GO bond initiative, consider cash financing, or discuss other types of debt instruments.

Prebor noted it was hard to figure out what citizens would truly see value in. Rorie agreed, saying people could understand the cost of something, but not grasp the value at all.

Rorie said Council could say they would call a special election on November 5 for a GO bond of \$10 million to purchase x, y, and z, which could be a bubble, the Riley Field track, turf fields, or whatever, and voters said "yes." Salvatore had come up with some calculations on how this would work in terms of debt service, interest, and so on. The longer the term, the greater the interest rate, but the annual debt service payments were lower with longer terms. With a \$10 million bond at a 10-year term and a 1.75% interest rate, the City would realize interest payments of \$987,000, he stated. For 15 years at 2% interest rate, interest payments would be \$1.673 million, while a 20-year term at 2.25% would push the total interest to \$2.528 million.

King wanted to know how certain they were that they could get a 1.75% interest rate. Salvatore said he had talked with the City's financial advisor that morning, and this was a conservative estimate. King went on to say they had made a concerted effort, at least during the five years he had been on Council, to keep the reserve percentage climbing, with the goal of getting to 50%. He asked what the cost in dividends would be or other interest if they took that \$10 million out of cash reserves.

Salvatore pointed out there would be a significant loss of interest earnings. On the flip side, by doing it all at once, they would avoid escalation costs of as much as 5% or more a year.

King said his point was that there was \$987,000 in interest costs over 10 years, but they would save close to that amount by going ahead with the bond. All the bond would cost would be around \$300,000.

Salvatore said that was correct, considering the offset of avoiding the cost of escalation.

A penny saved was a penny earned, Rorie opined, noting that anything they kept in the fund balance created interest revenue. King said it was just smart to let the money work for them.

Madden asked if using the cash would lower the City's bond rating, and Salvatore said it would not be looked at favorably at all. They never liked to see big draw downs of reserves. It was a red flag for bond rating agencies.

If they delayed these projects, they would know how increased costs, such as in asphalt and concrete, would impact them, Madden noted, adding it seemed smart to go ahead and do them.

Fleisch said one of the reasons they looked at facility authority bonds was because they were 10 years, and the lifetime of a lot of projects they were doing would have fallen within that. It was concerning to go out 20 years. The bubble, for instance, had a 15-year life, so a 20-year bond would outlive it. Salvatore said they could go 15 years on a facility authority bond, but they had chosen 10 years in the past.

If they put this to the voters as a GO bond, and it was defeated, Fleisch asked, If there was anything to prevent them from pulling out projects and doing them individually. They would have to pay cash, Salvatore told her, adding they would have to wait four years if they wanted to do any other type of financing. He noted there could be fallout for using cash money for something the voters had told them they did not want.

Rather than group the projects together, could they separate them and borrow money for each, Prebor asked. He said he knew they would pay a higher rate.

Rorie broke in and said he would be blunt: he did not think a GO bond initiative made any sense at this time. They had evaluated the cost escalation, the time value of money and looked at how to prioritize the projects and if they were necessary. Take the bubble, for instance. They had not decided what they wanted to do, so it made no sense to move forward with a bond with a half-baked idea.

The City was in a very good debt position, Rorie pointed out. The annual debt service would decline from \$1.3 million in 2022 to about \$676,000 in 2023. That was a \$600,000 difference. They did not have to move rapidly. For the last two or three years, they had targeted the average position in cash reserves, which fed into the revenue stream and also allowed them to spend down as a measured response for these cash purchases. Therefore, they could delay or avoid debt interest. If they entered into a GO bond with \$1 million in debt service, that would lead to \$987,000 in interest over a 10-year period. As things currently stood, in six years, their debt position would have dropped to about \$57,000 from the current budgeted proposal of \$1.4 million. It would free up \$1.450 million in cash they could be putting toward these projects and avoid interest period.

Debt was not bad, Rorie stated, but they also had to consider the millage rate and what they were trying to accomplish. If they tried to do something with a very short-term focus, they would monkey all that up, he commented. He recommended Council continue with what they had been doing over the past four or five years. There was no reason to do a GO bond at this time. They had options in the future based on the cyclical economy, and they had put money in cash reserves to deal with that cyclical economy. He recommended nothing be placed on the ballot.

Council agreed that they did not want to create a list of special projects for a GO bond in November, but Fleisch said they did want to create a prioritization list in general, so they had a long-term plan.

Ernst said he had no objections to establishing a priority list, similar to what the citizens did with the Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) projects, but he did not want to go forward with a GO bond.

The Mayor mentioned that one of the projects on the SPLOST list was a bridge from All Children's Playground to Drake Field. Now that the improvements at Drake were completed, people saw the value in that, and the bridge seemed worth doing and was on the SPLOST list. However, the initial estimates they got were outrageous. She said \$250,000 was allotted for the project, asking if they could consider an alternative. The project at Battery Way was about \$40,000. Fleisch asked if they could put out to bid something similar to that. It could facilitate people walking in the area and would be a fraction of the cost. The project had been put on the back burner when the huge estimate came in. Fleisch said maybe they could put the kayak launches on the same bid request and pay out of a different pocket.

Rorie recommended that they bid separately so there would be a better competitive environment. He said he could not recommend using SPLOST dollars for the kayak launch, and Fleisch said that was not the intent. She thought they could be bid together in order to be cohesive, then pay them separately. Rorie's way would be fine, if that was the better way. Fleisch asked Council if they agreed to put it out to bid, just to get prices. She also said they should check quality as well.

Rather than try to rush something that would not be installed until next spring, Rorie said he needed to get some other projects in their rear view mirror. That was fine, Fleisch said, but added she did want to see it moving ahead.

Not all the City's revenue came from ad valorem taxes or LOST, Rorie noted. About 40% came from other sources, such as the fee schedule. There was General Fund support for certain things, but in some cases, the user should carry the cost. The Building Department was an example. The Building Department was not an Enterprise Fund, but it did charge fees so the user carried the costs to build their property. Rorie said he did not believe the entire community should subsidize the process to build a private home. However, there was a balance between how much should be borne by the use and how much should be a subsidy from the taxpayer because when that property was developed, it would join the tax rolls and create revenue going forward.

They had looked at all the fee schedules in the City and made minor changes to some, but he wanted to look more closely at the Building Department. They were proposing changes to the fee schedule that would take effect in FY 2021. The administrative fee for permits was raised, but the permit fee for buildings up to 200 square feet was being lowered to \$75 from the previous \$150. The \$150 charge still applied to everything greater than 200 square feet, which required inspections. The smaller buildings did not.

Prebor said the \$75 was not paid to the City; it was to SAFEbuilt. Rorie said it went to the City, and then was split with SAFEbuilt. He asked what it would cost if he built a shed, and Cailloux said a shed of 200 square feet or less did not require inspection and would be \$75.

They were implementing rental fees for Drake Field Pavilion and the new splash pad at Glenloch, which also included the pool. They were changing the fees for other recreational areas, since they had been stagnant for some time, Rorie said.

Rorie did not want to bring up increasing the non-resident user fee for golf carts, but recommended it be increased from \$100 to \$150 per year, plus \$15 registration. They should recognize that there were benefits associated with developing just outside the City limits. They could take advantage of all kinds of amenities of Peachtree City's, including the cart paths. Rorie said he believed it was inappropriate to measure the success of the path system by miles. It should be measured by network. There were certain locations proposed to have access, and reminded Council that the Consent Agenda approved earlier had an inter-governmental agreement with Fayette County for the construction and maintenance of multi-use path projects. The County had a \$900,000 tunnel as one of its SPLOST projects. It would border Redwine and Robinson Roads, and the maintenance would ultimately be split 50/50 between the City and the County. The County's Federal Aid package called for a path along Redwine Road, which would enter the City limits in The Preserves, then go back into the County. That was part of the network.

Rorie said some people did not like that non-residents were charged more than City residents. Someone once complained that the only time they used the paths was to come and watch the fireworks, which, Rorie noted, cost the City about \$28,000. The fee structure was built on the premise that the user should carry their fair share of the maintenance costs. Rorie added that he was not being exclusionary, but the City spent about \$2 million to maintain the path system; someone needed to help out. He said this differential was appropriate. Rorie added that he would never have approved funding the intersection improvements at Planterra and MacDuff as a debt instrument out of the General Fund if it had not been approved as a SPLOST project. It was about increasing mobility and flow through the corridor for 36,000 vehicles a day that did not live in Peachtree City.

Rorie recalled the challenge they had in 2014 when they changed the golf cart fees before, but he thought it should be part of the budget.

The five-year financial model included some things and omitted others, such as the bubble, AstroTurf, Riley Field, lighting upgrades at the Tennis Center. They were talking in FY 2020 about revenues of \$38 million, expenses of \$39 million with a one-time cash expense of \$490,000 to fund recreational projects. This would leave the City with a reserve percentage of 39%, and an over percentage of about \$5 million. This was part of the discussion about carrying a reserve to fund cyclical economic downturns. They would not have to neglect needed projects if they maintained adequate reserves. It would allow them to look at funding projects without debt instruments.

There was a 0.176 millage rate decrease because bond debt had expired, but they would retain a millage rate of 6.232 mills. They were anticipating a tax digest increase of 5.2%, more or less, based on appeals. If there was an increase in property values that would, in effect, be a tax increase. That was the summary of the Manager's proposed budget.

No one wished to speak either for or against the proposed budget, so the Mayor closed the public hearing.

Prebor asked how much their revenues declined during the last recession, and Rorie said it was about 10%. A next time was coming, Rorie noted, pointing out that their targeted reserve policy was 25%, and they were over that by \$5,685,000. They could cover a revenue loss of \$1 million for

five years or a \$2.5 million loss for two years. The City's total ad valorem tax revenue was around \$14 million, or 38% of the total, while LOST made up 21%. They never wanted to deplete their cash reserves. They relied on interest revenue to fund projects, as well. There was no magic number, but most cities tried to keep cash reserves of about 50%. He had heard Newnan had 100%, but some cities kept it at 25%. The purpose of having the cash reserve was to avoid long-term debt and cover cyclical recessionary cycles.

Madden noted that adopting a budget was the biggest responsibility they had. He was pleased that in both the budgets he had been involved in, unlike budgets of the past, the costs of maintenance of the infrastructure had been included. He said he did not understand Rorie's reticence in raising golf cart fees, but he understood that there were about 11,000 registered golf carts in Peachtree City and about 1,100 from outside the City. Eleven thousand carts at \$15 apiece equaled \$165,000, while 1,100 carts at \$150 each was \$165,000, too. It combined to make \$330,000, just 17% of the cost of maintenance of the path network. The citizens of Peachtree City who did not own carts were also ponying up to pay for the paths. He had no problems in defending the decision to raise cart fees for people outside Peachtree City to use a path system that was not subsidized by the people of Fayette County.

Council would consider the budget for final adoption at its August 1 meeting. Salvatore said he had talked to the County Tax Commissioner, and the total tax digest was expected by the end of the month. The vote on the millage rate would be later.

07-19-06 Consider Purchase of Fire Truck

Fire Chief Joe O'Connor reminded Council that a few weeks ago they approved the purchase of an ambulance using impact fees generated from new home construction on the west side of the City to offset the growing demand for service. He was coming to them with a proposal to purchase an engine. Like the ambulance, it would not be a replacement, but an addition to their fleet. They would not only need to build the truck, but fill it with equipment.

The Chief explained they originally considered a full-size engine, like they had in their other four fire stations, but, due to the call distribution of primarily medical, and other factors, they believed the station they were planning to build in the future would require a different type of apparatus. They could not get away from the bigger engines at the four core stations, but at an outlying station, which was what they were planning, a truck built on a smaller platform with fewer "stuffings," such as a shorter hose, shorter ladders, and less water, would be sufficient. It would save eight feet in length, dramatically shortening the wheel base and lessening the weight, saving about \$250,000 over what an engine similar to the others would cost.

The recommendation was to purchase a short wheel base, short body, four-wheel drive, four-door commercial chassis produced by Ten-8 Fire & Safety Equipment of Georgia for a total vehicle price not to exceed \$412,620.89. This would require about \$80,000 to purchase air packs for about \$28,000, an extrication tool for about \$15,000, and radios. The entire purchase should amount to \$492,620.89.

Madden wanted to know about the cost of an engine upgrade. O'Connor said he took the advice of the City's maintenance people on what would be best. He explained that they had not gone out for bids on their own, but were using a purchasing cooperative, the Houston-Galveston Consortium, which did a national best price quote from vendors. That allowed them to add and subtract from the original base model. There were charges for additions and subtractions for deletions from the original proposals.

Madden noted that the upgrade to 4x4 cost \$21,000, but could lead to better utilization of the truck, such as fighting brush fires. O'Connor said the vehicle could do that. The hope was if outlying stations had that capability, future replacement vehicles would not need it.

King said the time they would have the vehicle off-road would be minimal, so he wondered if the four-wheel drive was necessary. He said it had been his experience that anything those back two wheels could get into, those front two wheels could get out of.

O'Connor stated that the challenge was to find a utilitarian vehicle that would offer an additional resource that they did not otherwise have. He said this was the package their committee put together, and he did not disagree with it. From time to time, they did need four-wheel drive, such as during ice storms. Four-wheel drive would not solve all problems, O'Connor conceded, but it was a tool in the toolbox.

King asked if the vehicle came with two-wheel drive, and the four-wheel drive was the option. O'Connor said yes.

Fleisch inquired if this part of the plan to scale back the new station in the West Village. She said she was thinking about making it fit into the community.

King said he had an issue with a vehicle that heavy having a four-wheel drive.

Rorie noted that this was an "urban assault vehicle" that could handle 98 or 99% of what it would be called on to do. Structure fires were only 1 to 1.5% of all calls. This vehicle was outfitted for an urban environment for a quick response in small streets. The question was if the increased cost of four-wheel drive worth it over a 15-year life span.

Madden moved to approve New Agenda item 07-19-06, purchase of fire truck. Prebor seconded. Motion carried 4-1 (King).

07-19-07 Consider Bid for Purchase of Real Property, Lob lolly Circle

Cailloux said this property had been in City ownership since the subdivision was platted in 1965. It was in the Hip Pocket area, in one of the City's first subdivisions. It bordered the west side of Lake Peachtree. The property was less than half an acre and was essentially an undevelopable lot due to its size, floodplains on the property and setback requirements. There was no sewer there, but the ordinance required they would have to have enough space for two septic systems. It had all kinds of issues, she concluded. The City put out a request for bid with a minimum amount, and that request had been met by the two adjacent property owners. Staff requested that Council approve this sale so they could move forward with the process of dividing the property between the lots of the two bidders.

King moved to approve New Agenda item 07-19-07, bid for purchase of real property, Loblolly Circle, for \$156,000. Ernst seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Rorie said this money would be put into a special fund account for easement acquisitions on future property purchases. It would not go into the General Fund.

Council/Staff Topics**Ordinance Preview****• Motorized Carts**

Police Chief Janet Moon said she would preview an amendment to Section 78-93 of the City's traffic ordinance. They wanted to add Senoia Road, which had a 40 mph speed zone, and Rockaway Road, which had a 45 mph speed zone, to the list of roads where motorized carts were prohibited except for crossing at authorized crossings.

The new section would read: "Sec. 78-93. - Operation regulations. (h) No motorized cart shall be permitted to operate over, along, or across Highway 74, Highway 54, Peachtree Parkway Senoia Road, Rockaway Road, or Crosstown Road between Peachtree Parkway and Highway 74 within the boundaries of the city except where authorized crossings are provided."

They also wanted to add a paragraph (m) to Section 78-96, Hazardous Activities and Rules, to read: "The driver of any vehicle on the recreation path system shall, prior to leaving the recreation path system to enter or cross a public roadway designed for automobile traffic, stop as though a stop sign were present and yield the right of way to any traffic on said public roadway that is within the intersection or so close thereto as to create a hazard." She said they wanted to make it clear that drivers of any vehicle on the path system had to stop before crossing a street.

Ernst used Hip Pocket Road as an example, saying there was a stop sign at Cedar Point, but not at the intersection before that, Loblolly Circle. He asked if this meant a cart must stop there, even though there was no sign. Moon said it did; anywhere a path intersected with a roadway, the cart must stop. An accident on Peachtree Parkway near SR 74 North prompted this, she said.

Madden said it made sense. He was taught to look both ways when crossing the street. If cart drivers came to a street, where they could be hit by a truck, they needed to stop and look both ways. This also saved City taxpayers thousands of dollars in putting up little stop signs on the paths, he pointed out.

• Commission and Authority Alternates

Rorie said there was a long-standing policy appointing alternate members to City authorities and boards. That alternate member did not have voting rights, even if they stepped up to act in their alternate role. For example, the Planning Commission had five members and one alternate. The alternate was asked to meet the same attendance requirements as the voting members. They were expected to step in when a member was absent, but could not vote. In a worst case situation, there was a time-restrictive issue to consider, but no quorum of voting members. This amendment would allow alternate members who met attendance requirements to vote at meetings which otherwise would have been canceled due to lack of a quorum. Rorie said this was a housekeeping issue that should have been done years ago. It would be on their next agenda.

Citizen Jim Savage asked if he could comment. His concern was that in the case of the Airport Authority, which was the board he was most familiar with, the charter did not provide for an alternate. He asked if allowing the alternate to vote be in conflict with the charter.

Rorie said he believed it would be, but Meeker would have to give an opinion. Meeker said he would look into it.

King moved to convene in executive session to discuss a personnel matter, pending or threatened litigation, and the acquisition or sale of real estate at 9:15 p.m. Ernst seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Ernst moved to reconvene in regular session at 9:52 p.m. King seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business to discuss, King moved to adjourn the meeting. Madden seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Martha Barksdale, Reporting Secretary

Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Mayor and City Council

VIA: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager 

FROM: Paul J. Salvatore, Financial Services Director 

DATE: July 26, 2019

SUBJECT: FY2019 Budget Amendment
August 1, 2019 *City Council Consent Agenda*

Recommendation:

It is Staff's recommendation that City Council resolve to approve the attached amendment to the Fiscal Year 2019 General Fund Operating Budget.

Discussion:

The attached proposed budget amendment 19-13 will allocate funding for the Public Works department to pay for unanticipated grinding expenses that are exceeding their budget allotment for these contractual services. Additional funds are also needed for landscaping supplies and operating supplies.

Budget Impact:

The proposed budget amendment will increase both the revenues and the expenditures in the General Fund by \$41,900 amending the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Resolution.

Attachments
Budget Amendment

DATE 08/01/2019

Approved

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor & Council Members

VIA: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager 

FROM: Pam Dufresne, Deputy City Clerk 

DATE: July 26, 2019

SUBJECT: Consider Amendments to Motorized Carts Ordinance
August 1, 2019, City Council Meeting

Recommendation:

That Council approves the amendments to Sec. 78-93-Operations regulations and Sec. 78-96-Hazardous activities and special rules in the Motorized Carts section of the City's Traffic Ordinance.

Discussion:

The Police Department has asked to amend two sections of the Traffic Ordinance. Due to increased development along Senoia and Rockaway Roads, the proposed amendment to Sec. 78-93 Operations regulations would prohibit motorized carts (golf carts) from operating over, along, or across either road except where authorized crossings are located.

The proposed amendment to Sec. 78-96 Hazardous activities requires drivers of any vehicles on the recreational path system to stop as though there was a sign present before crossing a public roadway designed. In addition, the proposed amendment requires path users to yield the right-of-way to any traffic at intersections, or close to intersections, on the public roadway.

Budget Impact:

This item should have no budgetary impact.

Ordinance Number _____

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ARTICLE III, MOTORIZED CARTS, OF THE PEACHTREE CITY TRAFFIC ORDINANCE, AS AMENDED, TO PROVIDE FOR OPERATING REGULATIONS AND HAZARDOUS ACTIVITIES, SPECIAL RULES; TO REPEAL CONFLICTING ORDINANCES; TO PROVIDE FOR SEVERABILITY; TO ESTABLISH AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY, GEORGIA, THAT:

Section 1. Article III, Motorized Carts, Section 78-93(h) of the Traffic Ordinance of the City of Peachtree City, Georgia, as amended, is hereby further amended and is to be codified as follows:

Sec. 78-93. - Operation regulations.

(h) No motorized cart shall be permitted to operate over, along, or across Highway 74, Highway 54, Peachtree Parkway Senoia Road, Rockaway Road, or Crosstown Road between Peachtree Parkway and Highway 74 within the boundaries of the city except where authorized crossings are provided.

Section 2. Article III, Motorized Carts, Section 78-96 of the Traffic Ordinance of the City of Peachtree City, Georgia, as amended, is hereby further amended and is to be codified by adding a new subparagraph (m) as follows:

Sec. 78-96. - Hazardous activities and special rules.

(m) The driver of any vehicle on the recreation path system shall, prior to leaving the recreation path system to enter or cross a public roadway designed for automobile traffic, stop as though a stop sign were present and yield the right of way to any traffic on said public roadway that is within the intersection or so close thereto as to create a hazard.

Section 3. All ordinances or parts thereof which conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are, to the extent of such conflict and except as hereinafter provided, hereby repealed.

Section 4. Should any provision of this ordinance be declared invalid by a Court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of this ordinance as a whole or any provision thereof other than the provisions specifically declared to be

invalid. The City Council declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each subsection, sentence, clause and phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases may be declared invalid.

Section 5. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption by the Peachtree City Mayor and City Council.

This _____ day of _____ 2019.

Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor

Attest: _____
Betsy Tyler, City Clerk

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Mayor and City Council

VIA: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager 

FROM: Paul J. Salvatore, Financial Services Director 
Kelly Bush, Assistant Finance Director 

DATE: July 29, 2019

SUBJECT: FY2019 Budget Amendment
August 1, 2019 *City Council Consent Agenda*

Recommendation:

It is Staff's recommendation that City Council approve the attached budget amendment to reallocate budgeted funds within the Capital Improvement Projects Fund.

Discussion:

On December 20, 2018, Council approved the buyout of lease payments of the Rockaway Road Cell Tower by American Tower, LLC. The lease proceeds of \$1,003,466 were budgeted in a generic park enhancements project in the Capital Improvement Project Fund to be used to fund city park enhancements. The attached proposed budget amendment 19-16 will reallocate \$150,000 of that funding for park improvements such as parking, ADA access, playground updates, and other needed enhancements at Battery Way (\$50,000), Meade Girls Softball (\$50,000), and Glenloch (\$50,000). The intent of this budget reallocation is to account for and track individual park projects funded through these park enhancements.

Budget Impact:

The proposed budget amendment will increase the CIP Battery Way, Meade Girl Softball, and Glenloch projects and decrease the CIP Park Enhancement Project.

Attachments
Budget Amendment

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Council

VIA: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager 

FROM: Paul J. Salvatore, Financial Services Director 

DATE: July 26, 2019

SUBJECT: Adoption of FY 2020 Budget Resolution
August 1, 2019 City Council Meeting

Recommendation:

Adopt the attached resolution for the FY 2020 Budget, along with all supporting schedules, including the revised fee schedule.

Discussion:

Council has already held several budget workshop meetings and the required public hearing on the FY 2020 Budget and may now take action to adopt the annual operating budget and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The budget resolution and all supporting documents are attached, and are consistent with the figures presented at the public hearing. The updated fee schedules previously presented by the City Manager are also attached for Council approval.

Budgetary Impact

Adoption of the resolution will authorize all appropriations for FY 2020 identified in the supporting schedules. The revised fee schedule will be implemented as of October 1, 2019, as well.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2020 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 2020 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 2020, 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 _____, 2019.

Mayor

ATTEST: _____
Betsy Tyler, City Clerk

General Fund FY 2020 Budget Summary

Sources of Funds:

Estimated Revenues

Taxes	\$31,879,563	
Licenses & Permits	\$1,694,404	
Intergovernmental (Grants)	\$683,575	
Charges for Services	\$2,542,140	
Fines & Forfeitures	\$889,610	
Investment Income	\$273,000	
Contributions & Donations	\$23,000	
Miscellaneous	\$176,222	
Total Estimated Revenues:		\$38,161,514

Other Sources	\$652,394
Surplus Carryover:	\$490,179

Total Sources of Funds:	\$39,304,087
-------------------------	--------------

Uses of Funds:

Appropriations

Departmental Operating Expenses		
Executive Services	\$479,508	
Economic Development	\$146,047	
Public Communications/CVB	\$98,300	
Administrative Services	\$1,472,034	
Financial Services/ I.T.	\$1,863,536	
Public Safety	\$16,121,370	
Public Works	\$8,983,896	
Recreation & Special Events	\$2,076,169	
Senior Services	\$227,236	
Library	\$1,108,963	
Planning & Development	\$1,968,945	
Total Departmental Appropriations:		\$34,546,004

Salary Vacancy/ Other Savings	-\$794,558
-------------------------------	------------

General Administration		
Not-for-Profit Organizations	\$25,000	
General Liability Insurance	\$113,163	
CVB Labor Expense (reimbursed)	\$362,248	
Miscellaneous Legal Fees/Claims	\$244,578	
Unemployment & Other Expenses	\$20,200	
Administrative/Technical Contingencies	\$372,162	
Total General Administration:		\$1,137,351

Transfers to Other Funds/Authorities

Transfer to CIP	\$1,234,500	
Transfer to Debt Service	\$3,100,410	
Transfer to Airport Authority	\$73,950	
Transfer to KPTCB	\$6,430	
Total Transfers:		\$4,415,290

Total Uses of Funds	\$39,304,087
---------------------	--------------

City of Peachtree City
General Fund
Sources of Funds

Account Title	Proposed FY 2020 Budget
<u>Taxes</u>	
Ad Valorem (Real) Property - Current	\$15,011,163
Ad Valorem (Real) Property - Prior Yrs.	\$31,000
Motor Vehicle	\$110,803
TAVT - Motor Vehicles	\$1,249,500
Real Estate Transfer Tax	\$90,000
Recording Intangible Tax	\$228,288
GA Power Franchise Tax	\$1,053,045
Coweta Fayette EMC	\$919,816
Atlanta Gas Franchise Tax	\$309,508
Comcast Cable	\$340,000
Bell South Cable	\$100,300
Nulink	\$16,660
Communications Franchise Tax	\$24,049
Local Option Sales Tax	\$8,408,267
Alcoholic Beverage Tax	\$728,820
Mixed Drink Tax	\$152,210
Business/Occupational Tax	\$459,521
Insurance Premium Tax	\$2,550,000
Financial Institutions	\$86,513
Property Tax Penalties - Current Year	\$6,500
Property Tax Penalties - Prior Year	\$3,600
Total Taxes:	\$31,879,563
<u>Licenses & Permits</u>	
Soil Erosion Permits	\$4,700
Land Disturbance Fees	\$72,806
Utility Registration Fee	\$0
Alcoholic Beverage Licenses	\$363,180
Golf Cart Registration	\$275,400
Alcohol Server Registration Fees	\$39,902
Burn/Blasting Permits	\$300
Miscellaneous Fire Permits	\$450
Certificates of Compliance- Fire	\$2,200
Building Permits	\$842,843
Certificates of Occupancy New	\$15,900
Certificates of Completion	\$250
Plumbing Permits	\$8,034
Electrical Permits	\$11,124
Mechanical/HVAC Permits	\$36,639
Reinspection Fee	\$5,000
Zoning & Land Use Permits	\$6,275

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

Account Title	Proposed FY 2020 Budget
Sign Permits	\$9,200
Temporary Sign/Use	\$200
Total Licenses & Permits:	\$1,694,404
 <u>Intergovernmental</u>	
Matching Grants - GDOT/LMIG	\$407,608
Federal Operating Grant - DoJ/GBI	\$8,500
FEMA/GEMA Reimbursement/Other	\$0
FCBOE Reimb.- Resource Officers	\$97,467
Fayette County Recreation Grant	\$150,000
GMA Grants	\$20,000
Total Intergovernmental:	\$683,575
 <u>Charges for Services</u>	
Tower Lease	\$165,184
Sale of Merchandise	\$1,040
False Alarm Fees - P.D.	\$7,000
Plan Review Fee - Fire New Construction	\$15,000
Fire Sprinkler Plan Review	\$4,000
Ambulance Fees	\$1,075,845
Sale of Recycled Materials	\$1,250
Program Fees - Recreation	\$139,412
Program Fees - Recreation Pools	\$6,500
Program Fees - Athletic Tournaments	\$17,500
Facilities Maint Fees - Recreation	\$75,000
Special Events/Sponsors	\$3,500
Program Fees - Kedron Fieldhouse	\$232,894
Program Fees - Kedron Pool Fees/Passes	\$94,014
Program Fees - Kedron Open Gym	\$25,224
Program Fees - Kedron Swim Lessons	\$17,929
Program Fees - Kedron Swim Teams	\$72,458
Facil Maint Fees - Kedron Athletic Assoc.	\$25,475
Building Plan Review Fees	\$117,139
Building Plan Review Resubmittal Fees	\$1,200
Development Fee Collected/Other	\$0
Plan Review Fee	\$3,500
Plan Review - Resubmittal	\$100
Plan Review - Final Site Plan	\$22,233
Conceptual Plan Fees	\$5,212
Notice of Intent - EPD	\$1,000
Plat Review Fees - Subdivision	\$11,650
Application Fees	\$8,000

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

Account Title	Proposed FY 2020 Budget
Other Charges for Services	\$30,633
CVB Reimbursements- Personnel Costs	\$362,248
Total Charges for Services:	\$2,542,140
 <u>Fines & Forfeitures</u>	
Municipal Court Fees	\$37,704
Court Administrative Fees	\$65,152
Court Restitution	\$4,596
Pre-Trial Intervention Fees	\$36,144
Municipal Court Fines	\$706,583
Security Forfeitures	\$100
Local Confiscated Funds	\$5
Library Fines	\$39,326
Total Fines & Forfeitures:	\$889,610
 <u>Investment Income</u>	
Interest Earnings	\$273,000
Total Investment Income:	\$273,000
 <u>Contributions & Donations - Private</u>	
Donations - In-Kind - Community Events	\$20,000
Donations	\$3,000
Total Contributions/Donations:	\$23,000
 <u>Miscellaneous</u>	
Facility Rental - Tennis Center	\$33,905
Facility Rental - Recreation	\$8,381
Facility Rental - Kedron	\$12,848
Other Revenues	\$60,708
Insurance Reimbursements	\$40,000
Employee Vehicle Reimbursements	\$20,380
Total Miscellaneous:	\$176,222
 Sale of Fixed Assets	 \$13,151
Total Fixed Assets:	\$13,151
 <u>Other Financing Sources</u>	
Operating transfer from CVB	\$0
Operating transfer from H/M Tax Fund	\$639,243
Operating transfer from H/M - TPD	\$0
Operating transfer from CIP Fund	\$0
Total Other Financing Sources:	\$639,243

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

Account Title	Proposed FY 2020 Budget
General Fund Revenue Totals:	\$38,813,908 \$1,105,650
Surplus Carryover/ (Reserve Increase)	\$490,179
Total Sources of Funds	\$39,304,087

Page 35 of 70
City of Peachtree City
General Fund - Uses of Funds

General Fund Expenditures	Proposed FY 2020 Budget
<u>Departmental Operating Budgets</u>	
Mayor & Council	\$150,702
Economic Development	\$146,047
Public Communications/CVB	\$98,300
City Manager	\$328,806
Total Executive Services:	\$723,855
Human Resources	\$542,810
Public Information	\$104,079
City Clerk	\$307,537
Municipal Court	\$517,608
Total Administrative Services	\$1,472,034
Finance Department	\$830,612
Purchasing Department	\$113,914
Information Technology	\$919,010
Total Financial Services/ I.T.	\$1,863,536
Police Department	\$7,620,707
Fire Department	\$8,078,718
Emergency Medical Services	\$421,945
Total Public Safety	\$16,121,370
Public Works	\$5,923,748
Grounds Maintenance	\$2,287,049
Building Maintenance	\$773,099
Total Public Works	\$8,983,896
Recreation Administration	\$1,314,118
Kedron Fieldhouse	\$762,051
Library Administration	\$1,108,963
Senior Services Facilities	\$227,236
Total Leisure Services	\$3,412,368
Planning & Zoning	\$414,665
Engineering	\$527,344
Code Enforcement	\$291,586
Building Department (Inspections)	\$735,350
Total Planning & Development	\$1,968,945
Total Departmental Budgets:	\$34,546,004
<u>General Administration Budget</u>	
Liability Insurance (GIRMA)	\$113,163
Unemployment Insurance	\$20,000
Pooled Vehicle Expenses	\$200
Not-for-Profit Organizations	\$25,000

Page 36 of 70
City of Peachtree City
General Fund - Uses of Funds

General Fund Expenditures	Proposed FY 2020 Budget
Bad Debt Expense	\$0
CVB - Shared Labor	\$362,248
Contingency - Legal Services	\$244,578
Contingency - Technology	\$55,000
Contingency - Facilities Maintenance	\$75,000
Contingency - General Administration	\$242,162
Total General Administration:	\$1,137,351
<u>Operating Transfers</u>	
Transfer to CIP Fund	\$1,234,500
Transfer to Fire/EMS Grants Fund	
Transfer to SPLOST Fund	
Transfer to Debt Service Fund	\$3,100,410
Transfer to Amphitheater Fund	
Transfer to KPTCB	\$6,430
Transfer to Airport Authority	\$73,950
Transfer to H/M Tax TPD Fund	
Total Interfund Transfers:	\$4,415,290
	\$5,190,393
General Fund Totals:	\$40,098,645
	-\$794,558
Salary Vacancy/ Other Savings:	-\$794,558
Total Uses of Funds:	\$39,304,087

**Stormwater Utility Fund
Operating & Capital Budget
Fiscal Year 2020**

Fund 521	<i>Revenues</i>		
	Description	Amount	
	Charges for Services	\$	2,381,041
	Investment Income		10,400
	Miscellaneous Revenue		26,100
	Total Stormwater Revenues:		\$ 2,417,541
Fund 521	<i>Appropriations</i>		
	Description	Amount	
	Personnel Services & Benefits	\$	742,762
	Purchased/Contracted Services		489,647
	Supplies		132,749
	Contingency		
	Capital Outlay		450,000
	Depreciation & Amortization		
	Other Costs (Bad Debt Expense)		15,000
	Debt Service		700,475
	Other Financing Uses		-
	Total Stormwater Appropriations:		\$ 2,530,633
			\$ (113,092)

**City of Peachtree City
Stormwater Utility Fund
Sources Uses of Cash for Bond Coverage
Fiscal Year 2020**

	2020 Proposed Budget
Sources of Operating Cash:	
Stormwater Billings	2,459,700
Bad Debt Expense	(15,000)
Stormwater Credits	(78,659)
Miscellaneous Revenue	26,100
Interest Earnings (1)	10,400
Sources of Cash	<u>2,402,541</u>
 Use of Operating Cash	
Salaries and Benefits	742,762
Other - Operating	622,396
Debt Service (2)	700,475
	<u>2,065,633</u>
 Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash before Capital Items	 336,908
 Capital Items (3)	 450,000
 Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash after Capital Items	 <u>\$ (113,092)</u>
(Available for Renewal & Extension)	
 Net Revenue Available for Debt Service	 \$ 1,037,383
 FY2019/2020 Debt Service Payments	 700,475
 Coverage (4)	 1.48

- (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 2020**

Revenues:

Charges For Services	\$ 1,422,497
Transfer from General Fund	-
Transfer from HM Tax Fund	60,000
Surplus Carryover (increase or use of reserves)	-

Total Revenues:	\$ 1,482,497
------------------------	---------------------

Expenses:

Personnel Services and Employee Benefits	\$ 44,628
Purchased / Contracted Services	406,199
Supplies	41,500
Program Expenses	990,170
Capital Outlay	

Total Expenses:	\$ 1,482,497
------------------------	---------------------

Debt Service Funds **FY 2020 Budget Summary**

	Fund 410 G.O Bonds	Fund 400 Other Debt	Total
Revenues:			
Ad Valorem Taxes	\$0		\$0
Other Taxes/Penalties	\$0		\$0
Surplus Carryover	\$0	\$416,040	\$416,040
Transfer from General Fund		\$3,100,410	\$3,100,410
Total Revenues	\$0	\$3,516,450	\$3,516,450

Appropriations:			
General Obligation Bond Expenses	\$0		\$0
GEFA Loans		\$306,394	\$306,394
GTIB Loans		\$109,645	\$109,645
GMA Bricks & Mortar Loans		\$230,053	\$230,053
Facilities Authority Bonds		\$1,263,846	\$1,263,846
Redevelopment Bond (\$5 MM - New)		\$0	\$0
Equipment Lease-Purchase Loans		\$1,606,511	\$1,606,511
Total Appropriations	\$0	\$3,516,450	\$3,516,450

**Debt Service Detail
FY 2020**

<u>Description/Budget Year</u>	<u>FY 2020</u>
<u>B & M Loans/Recr Bond/Facil Bond:</u>	
Police/Fire/City Hall Renovations (2009)	230,053
Facilities Authority Bond (2011)	592,700
Facilities Authority Bond (2014)	341,375
FY16 & Broadband Equip- PFA Loan	329,771
GEFA Loan Principal - Spillway	306,394
GTIB Loan Principal - MacDuff	53,408
GTIB Loan Principal - Planterra	56,237
Total B & M Loans:	1,909,939

Equipment Lease-Purchase Loans:

<u>Public Works Department</u>	
Sand Pro #5323 (replace) (2014)	1,086
Bobcat Skid Steer (replace) (2014)	2,057
4x6 Gator Utility Vehicle (2014)	1,649
F-150 P/U Truck Repl. (2014)	1,689
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)	5,150
F-250 Replacement (2017)	7,109
F-250 Diesel P/U Truck repl (2018)	7,220
F-250 Diesel P/U Truck repl (2018)	7,220
Asphalt Roller Repl. (2018)	8,421
Zero-turn Mowers-3-B&G (2018)	6,641
Komatsu Track Hoe Repl. -PW (2019)	35,466
Zero-turn Mower Repl. (5) PW- (2019)	12,192
Zero-turn Mower Repl. (3) Grnds- (2019)	7,315
F-250 P/U repl. (2019)	7,980
F-150 P/U repl. (2019)	7,093
F-250 - PW (2020)	7,980
F-350 Dump Truck Repl.-3029 PW (2020)	12,413
F-250 Repl.-3032-PW (2020)	8,424
S250 Bobcat Skid Loader -PW (2020)	14,408
LB90 Back Hoe repl. PW (2020)	24,383
F-150 P/U Truck Repl.-Grnds. (2020)	7,093
F-250 P/U Truck Repl.-Grnds (2020)	7,980
Zero-turn Mower Repl. (3) Grnds (2020)	7,315

**Debt Service Detail
FY 2020**

<u>Description/Budget Year</u>	<u>FY 2020</u>
Total Public Works:	317,235

Recreation Department

Recreation Department Totals:	0
-------------------------------	---

Police Department

Records Management System (2014)	14,630
Vehicle Replacements for FY 2014	20,563
COBAN Server Replacement FY 2015	17,873
Patrol Vehicle Replacements-4 (2017)	47,530
Motorcycle Replacement (2017)	4,595
Additional Video Storage (2017)	9,267
Coban Video Replacements-2 (2017)	6,650
Vehicle Replacements for FY 2018	104,297
Unmarked Vehicle Repl (1) (2018)	6,726
192TB Storage/Expansion (2018)	18,138
Vehicle Replacements for FY 2019	124,130
Stationary ALPRs (3) - (2019)	7,470
Ford F-250 repl. (2019)	13,521
Access Control Upgrade (2019)	4,572
Vehicle Replacements for FY 2020	132,997
192TB Storage/Expansion (2020)	18,620
Generator Replacement (2020)	25,491
Taser Replacements (2020)	53,282
 Police Department Totals:	 630,352

Fire Department

Rescue Boat (2015)	1263
Repl Exped - Asst. Ops./EMS (2014)	1,768
Repl 2 P/U w/ 1 SUV- FM (2014)	1,768
Patient Handling System (2014)	1,387
Replace Medic Unit 83 (2015)	45,441
Lucas - CPR Machines (2015)	9,638
Repl Staff Vehicle-Training (2017)	8,332
ReplStaff Vehicle (2006-1) (2018)	8,270
Cardiac Monitor Lifepak-15 Repl. (2018)	8,266
Medic Unit 85- replace (2019)	60,957
Cardiac Monitor Lifepak-15 Repl. (2019)	8,756
Sta. 82 Generator repl. (2019)	16,248
Oxygen Generator repl. (2019)	6,650
Genesis Combo Tools (2019)	6,650

**Debt Service Detail
FY 2020**

<u>Description/Budget Year</u>	<u>FY 2020</u>
Repl Staff Vehicle - 2011 (2020)	9,902
Cardiac Monitor Lifepak-15 Repl. (2020)	9,088
Combo Hydraulic Tools (2) (2020)	6,650
180 kw Generator Repl. (2020)	20,193
Fire Department Totals:	231,227
<u>General Administration</u>	
Citywide ERP System (2014)	110,179
Phase 2-3 Tech Upgrades (2014)	11,680
Additional Storage - Backups (2017)	8,826
Repl Storage - Production (2017)	9,929
Email Upgrade (MS Exchange - 2016)	9,458
MS Office 2016 Upgrade (2017)	27,323
Adobe Acrobat Upgrade (2017)	18,916
Citywide Wifi Upgrade (2017)	10,509
Backup Server (replace) (2017)	5,675
Security Cameras/Access (2017)	7,084
Online Building Permits (2019)	5,276
MS Server Software Upgrades (2019)	14,581
Tape Drive (Backups) (2019)	4,987
Public Works Physical Security (2019)	7,802
Recreation Physical Security (2019)	8,002
Add'l Storage-Facilities Video (2019)	9,975
Firewall Repl-Public Safety (2019)	9,975
Avanti Laserfiche Upgrade (2019)	13,635
PC Replacements - 146 (2019)	48,544
Firewall Replacement (2020)	11,083
Storage Repl/Additions (2020)	26,600
Data Security Upgrades (2020)	9,975
Server Replacements (2020)	11,083
SQL Server Upgrades (2020)	9,975
VMWare/Veeam Repl. (2020)	9,975
Add'l. Physical Security (2020)	6,650
Total General Administration:	427,697
Total Equipment Lease:	1,606,511
Total Debt Service Expense:	3,516,450

**Debt Service Detail
FY 2020**

<u>Description/Budget Year</u>	<u>FY 2020</u>
Less: Use of Fund Balance	
GEFA Principal Balance	\$306,394
GTIB Principal Balance-MacDuff	\$53,408
GTIB Principal Balance-Planterra	\$56,237
Total Surplus Carryover:	\$416,040
 Transfer from General Fund:	 3,100,410

**City of Peachtree City
Hotel/Motel Tax Fund Budget
FY 2020**

			FY 2019 Current Budget	FY 2019 Projected	%	FY 2020 Budget
Estimated Revenue:						
Hotel/Motel Taxes	6.5%		\$1,270,499	\$1,357,870	2.0%	\$1,385,027
H/M Tax (TPD)	1.5%		\$293,192	\$313,355	2.0%	\$319,622
			<u>\$1,563,691</u>	<u>\$1,671,224</u>		<u>\$1,704,649</u>
Operating Transfers Out:						
Convention & Visitors Bureau	3.5%		\$684,115	\$731,161		\$745,784
City General Fund: 3%			\$586,384	\$626,709		\$639,243
* City TPD Fund - 1.5%			\$233,192	\$253,355		\$259,622
* Amphitheater Fund (TPD)			\$60,000	\$60,000		\$60,000
Total:			<u>\$1,563,691</u>	<u>\$1,671,224</u>		<u>\$1,704,649</u>

* These two items total the 1.5% TPD portion

**Capital Improvement Program Fund
FY 2020 Budget Summary**

Revenues:

Transfer from General Fund	\$1,234,500
Equipment/Lease-Purchase Loans	\$2,037,142
G.O Bond Proceeds	
Facilities Authority Bond Proceeds	
State Grants	-

Total Revenues:	\$3,271,642
------------------------	--------------------

Appropriations:

Public Works	\$841,000
Recreation	\$755,000
Police	\$1,039,372
Fire/EMS	206,770
Administration	385,000
Contingency	\$44,500

Total Appropriations:	\$3,271,642
------------------------------	--------------------

2020 Capital Improvement Program

Expenditures	5 Year Plan	Debt Svce.	Term
Division: Public Services			
PW F-350 Dump - replaces F-250 - 3008	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
PW F-350 Dump Truck Replacement - 3029	\$56,000	\$12,413	5 yrs.
PW F-250 P/U Truck, Gas 7.3L - Repl. 3032	\$38,000	\$8,424	5 yrs.
PW Bobcat T650 Skid Steer repl.-3114	\$65,000	\$14,408	5 yrs.
PW LB90 Back Hoe repl. - 3803	\$110,000	\$24,383	5 yrs.
Grnds. F-150 P/U Truck Repl. - 3085	\$32,000	\$7,093	5 yrs.
Grnds. F-250 P/U Truck Repl. - 5051	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
Grnds. Zero-turn Mower Repl. (3 @ \$11,000)	\$33,000	\$7,315	5 yrs.
Eng Citywide Bridge Maintenance	\$100,000		
BM Facilities Improvements	\$335,000		
Public Services Total	\$841,000		
Division: Leisure Services			
Rec. All Children's Playground Replacement	\$320,000		
Kedr. Gym Floor Replacement	\$220,000		
Rec. Pave Meade Parking - Girls Softball	\$175,000		
Kedr. Kedron Gym Lighting Upgrades	\$40,000		
Leisure Services Total	\$755,000		
Division: Public Safety Services			
P.D. Police Vehicle Replacements (10 @ \$60,000)	\$600,000	\$132,997	5 yrs.
192TB Storage/Expansion	\$84,000	\$18,620	5 yrs.
Emergency Generator Replacement	\$115,000	\$25,491	5 yrs.
Taser Replacements 66 @ \$3,642	\$240,372	\$53,282	5 yrs.
Police Department Totals:	\$1,039,372		
F.D. Replace Staff Vehicle -2006-2 (2304)	\$44,670	\$9,902	5 yrs.
Cardiac Monitor Lifepak-15 Replacement	\$41,000	\$9,088	7 yrs.
Genisis Combo Hydraulic Tools (2 @ \$15,000)	\$30,000	\$6,650	5 yrs.
Generator Repl. -Station 81 (180 kw)	\$91,100	\$20,193	5 yrs.
Fire Department Totals:	\$206,770		
Public Safety Services Total	\$1,246,142		
Administrative/Financial/Technical Services			
Firewall Replacement - City Hall	\$50,000	\$11,083	5 yrs.
Storage Replacement & Additions	\$120,000	\$26,600	5 yrs.
Data Security Upgrades - Security Forensics	\$45,000	\$9,975	5 yrs.
Server Replacements	\$50,000	\$11,083	5 yrs.
SQL Server Upgrades	\$45,000	\$9,975	5 yrs.
Vmware/Veeam Upgrades	\$45,000	\$9,975	5 yrs.
Additional Physical Security	\$30,000	\$6,650	5 yrs.
Administrative Services Total	\$385,000		
Contingency Funds			
CIP Contingency	\$44,500		
Total Expenditures	\$3,271,642	\$451,560	
Revenue Sources			
General Fund Transfer		\$1,234,500	
Equipment Lease Loan Proceeds	\$2,037,142		
FY 2020 Facilities Bond	\$0		
State Grants			
Total Revenues		\$2,037,142	
Total Revenues & Transfers		\$3,271,642	

2021 Capital Improvement Program

Expenditures		5 Year Plan	Debt Svce.	Term
<u>Division: Public Services</u>				
PW	B95 Back Hoe	\$130,000	\$28,816	5 yrs.
PW	F-350 Dump Truck Replacement - 3020	\$56,000	\$12,413	5 yrs.
Grnds.	F-250 replacement - 5025	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
Grnds.	F-150 replacement- 5059	\$32,000	\$7,093	5 yrs.
Grnds.	F-150 replacement- 5043	\$32,000	\$7,093	5 yrs.
Grnds.	F-250 P/U Truck Replacement - 5056	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
Grnds.	Zero-turn Mower Repl. (3 @ \$11,000)	\$33,000	\$7,315	5 yrs.
Eng	Citywide Bridge Maintenance	\$100,000		
BM	Facilities Improvements	\$250,000		
Public Services Total		\$705,000		
<u>Division: Leisure Services Services</u>				
Recr.	Luther Glass Playground Upgrade	\$45,000		
Kedr.	Hockey Rink Floor Replacement	\$100,000		
Kedr.	Pool Concrete Deck Replacement	\$225,000		
Library	Replace Carpet	\$55,000		
Leisure Services Total		\$425,000		
<u>Division: Public Safety Services</u>				
P.D.	Police Vehicle Replacements (10 @ 60,000))	\$600,000	\$132,997	5 yrs.
	Taser Replacements- TBD	\$0	\$0	5 yrs.
Police Department Totals:		\$600,000		
F.D.	Replace Reserve Engine (2006)	\$725,000	\$119,261	7 yrs.
	Brush Truck - replace 2 F-350s (2221 & 2228)	\$140,000	\$31,033	5 yrs.
	Cardiac Monitor Lifepak-15 Replacement	\$40,000	\$8,867	5 yrs.
	Replace Staff Vehicle (2236)	\$45,000	\$9,975	5 yrs.
Fire Department Totals:		\$950,000		
Public Safety Services Total		\$1,550,000		
<u>Administrative/Financial/Technical Services</u>				
	Misc Software Upgrades	\$50,000	\$11,083	5 yrs.
	Storage Unit Replacements	\$200,000	\$44,332	5 yrs.
	Network Switch Replacements	\$150,000	\$33,249	5 yrs.
	MS Office Updates	\$125,000	\$27,708	5 yrs.
	MS Exchange Software Upgrade	\$75,000	\$16,625	5 yrs.
	Data Security Upgrades	\$40,000	\$8,866	5 yrs.
Administrative Services Total		\$640,000		
<u>Contingency Funds</u>				
	CIP Contingency	\$40,000		
Total Expenditures		\$3,360,000	\$522,686	
<u>Revenue Sources</u>				
	General Fund Transfer		\$955,000	
	Equipment Lease Loan Proceeds	\$2,405,000		
	FY 2020 Facilities Bond	\$0		
	State Grants			
Total Revenues			\$2,405,000	
Total Revenues & Transfers			\$3,360,000	

2022 Capital Improvement Program

Expenditures		5 Year Plan	Debt Svce.	Term
<u>Division: Public Services</u>				
PW	F-250 P/U Truck Replacement (3056)	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
PW	Ford Expedition Repl. - (3026)	\$45,000	\$9,975	5 yrs.
PW	F-250 Service Body (3092)	\$44,000	\$9,753	5 yrs.
PW	Motor Grader Repl. (3806)	\$140,000	\$31,033	5 yrs.
Grnds.	F-250 P/U Truck Replacement (5040)	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
Grnds.	F-350 Replacement - 5041	\$40,000	\$8,866	5 yrs.
Grnds.	Hustler 0-Turn Mowers (4) - 1 to repl. PW 3882	\$44,000	\$9,754	5 yrs.
Bldg	F-250 P/U Truck Replacement (5021)	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
Bldg	F-150 P/U Truck Replacement (5047)	\$32,000	\$7,093	5 yrs.
Eng	Citywide Bridge Maintenance	\$100,000		
BM	Facilities Improvements	\$250,000		
Public Services Total		\$803,000		
<u>Division: Leisure Services Services</u>				
Rec	F-250 P/U Truck Replacement (5048)	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
Rec	Recreation Registration Software	\$75,000	\$16,625	5 yrs.
Kedr.	Kedron Playground Upgrade	\$45,000		
Leisure Services Total		\$156,000		
<u>Division: Public Safety Services</u>				
P.D.	Police Vehicle Replacements (10 @ 60,000)	\$600,000	\$132,997	5 yrs.
	Motorcycle - Wolgamott	\$27,000	\$5,985	5 yrs.
	Repl. Prisoner Transport Van w/ Insert	\$45,000	\$9,975	5 yrs.
	192TB Storage/Expansion	\$84,000	\$18,620	5 yrs.
	Tasers - TBD	\$0	\$0	5 yrs.
	Flooring Upgrade	\$40,000		
Police Department Totals:		\$796,000		
F.D.	Replace Reserve Medic Unit 81 (M81)	\$280,000	\$62,065	5 yrs.
	Generator Repl. (50 kw) Station 83	\$59,300	\$13,145	5 yrs.
	Cardiac Monitor Lifepak 15 replacement	\$40,000	\$8,866	5 yrs.
Fire Department Totals:		\$379,300		
Public Safety Services Total		\$1,175,300		
<u>Administrative/Financial/Technical Services</u>				
	Storage Replacements (Production & Backup)	\$120,000	\$26,600	5 yrs.
	Microsoft Server Software Upgrades	\$70,000	\$15,516	5 yrs.
	Vmware Upgrades (Virtual Server Management)	\$35,000	\$7,758	5 yrs.
	Data Security Upgrades	\$40,000	\$8,866	5 yrs.
Administrative Services Total		\$265,000		
<u>Contingency Funds</u>				
	CIP Contingency	\$20,000		
Total Expenditures		\$2,419,300	\$435,412	
<u>Revenue Sources</u>				
	General Fund Transfer		\$455,000	
	Equipment Lease Loan Proceeds	\$1,964,300		
	FY 2020 Facilities Bond	\$0		
	State Grants			
Total Revenues			\$1,964,300	
Total Revenues & Transfers			\$2,419,300	

2023 Capital Improvement Program

Expenditures		5 Year Plan	Debt Svce.	Term
<u>Division: Public Services</u>				
PW	F-250 P/U Truck Replacement (3018)	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
PW	F-250 P/U Truck Replacement (3019)	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
Grnds.	F-150 P/U Truck Replacement (5046)	\$32,000	\$7,093	5 yrs.
Grnds.	F-150 P/U Truck Replacement (5042)	\$32,000	\$7,093	5 yrs.
Grnds.	Bobcat S185 Replacement (5330)	\$65,000	\$14,408	5 yrs.
Grnds.	Hustler Zero-Turn Mower Repl. (3 @ \$11,000)	\$33,000	\$7,315	5 yrs.
Eng	Citywide Bridge Maintenance	\$100,000		
BM	Facilities Improvements	\$250,000		
Public Services Total		\$584,000		
<u>Division: Leisure Services Services</u>				
Rec.	F-250 P/U Truck Repl. (5031) Nissan	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
Rec	Playground Upgrade	\$45,000		
Rec	Pave Glenloch Parking - New Soccer	\$150,000		
Kedr	Gym Bleacher Replacement	\$75,000		
Leisure Services Total		\$306,000		
<u>Division: Public Safety Services</u>				
P.D.	Police Vehicle Replacements (10 @ 64,000)	\$640,000	\$141,864	5 yrs.
	Motorcycle (McKinnon)	\$27,000	\$5,985	5 yrs.
	ALPR Trailer w/Cameras	\$30,000	\$6,650	5 yrs.
Police Department Totals:		\$697,000		
F.D.	Reseve Engine Replacement	\$725,000	\$119,261	7 yrs.
	Staff Vehicle Replacement (2204)	\$45,500	\$10,086	5 yrs.
Fire Department Totals:		\$770,500		
Public Safety Services Total		\$1,467,500		
<u>Administrative/Financial/Technical Services</u>				
	Server Replacements	\$75,000	\$16,625	5 yrs.
	Storage Upgrades	\$100,000	\$22,166	5 yrs.
	Firewall Replacement - PD	\$50,000	\$11,083	5 yrs.
	Tape Drive Replacement	\$30,000	\$6,650	5 yrs.
	Misc Software Upgrades	\$50,000	\$11,083	5 yrs.
Administrative Services Total		\$305,000		
<u>Contingency Funds</u>				
	CIP Contingency	\$55,000		
Total Expenditures		\$2,717,500	\$411,302	
<u>Revenue Sources</u>				
	General Fund Transfer		\$675,000	
	Equipment Lease Loan Proceeds	\$2,042,500		
	FY 2020 Facilities Bond	\$0		
	State Grants			
Total Revenues			\$2,042,500	
Total Revenues & Transfers			\$2,717,500	

2024 Capital Improvement Program

Expenditures		5 Year Plan	Debt Svce.	Term
Division: Public Services				
PW	Tandem Dump Truck Replacement (3012)	\$130,000	\$29,547	5 yrs.
PW	F-250 P/U Truck Replacement (3056)	\$36,000	\$7,980	5 yrs.
PW	Lee Boy Asphalt Spreader Replacement (3851)	\$175,000	\$39,775	5 yrs.
PW	Asphalt Roller Replacement (3833)	\$46,000	\$10,455	5 yrs.
Bldgs.	F-150 P/U Truck Repl. (3087)	\$32,000	\$7,273	5 yrs.
Grnds.	Hustler Zero-Turn Mower Repl. (3 @ \$11,000)	\$33,000	\$7,315	5 yrs.
Eng	Citywide Bridge Maintenance	\$100,000		
BM	Facilities Improvements	\$250,000		
Public Services Total		\$802,000		
Division: Leisure Services Services				
Rec.	F-150 P/U Truck Repl. (5003)	\$31,000	\$7,046	5 yrs.
Rec.	Playground Upgrade	\$45,000		
Rec.	Roof - Kedron Pool	\$750,000		
Leisure Services Total		\$826,000		
Division: Public Safety Services				
P.D.	Police Vehicle Replacements (10 @ 66,000)	\$660,000	\$150,006	5 yrs.
	Taser Replacements	\$47,520	\$10,801	5 yrs.
	Evidence Room Expansion - Tentative Price	\$40,000		
Police Department Totals:		\$747,520		
F.D.	Replace Reserve Medic 82	\$285,000	\$64,775	5 yrs.
	Replace Water Rescue 84 (2202) - Tentative Price	\$50,000	\$11,364	5 yrs.
	Replace 100 kw Generator - Station 84	\$100,000	\$22,728	5 yrs.
	Replace Squad 81- Brush Truck/QRV	\$150,000	\$34,092	5 yrs.
	Staff Vehicle Replacement (2204)	\$46,000	\$10,455	5 yrs.
Fire Department Totals:		\$631,000		
Public Safety Services Total		\$1,378,520		
Administrative/Financial/Technical Services				
	MS Server Software Upgrades	\$75,000	\$17,046	5 yrs.
	Additional Storage Replacement	\$100,000	\$22,728	5 yrs.
	Firewall Replacement - City Hall	\$55,000	\$12,501	5 yrs.
	Data Security Upgrades	\$50,000	\$11,364	5 yrs.
	Physical Security Upgrades	\$45,000	\$10,228	5 yrs.
Administrative Services Total		\$325,000		
Contingency Funds				
	CIP Contingency	\$45,000		
Total Expenditures		\$3,376,520	\$487,479	
Revenue Sources				
	General Fund Transfer		\$1,230,000	
	Equipment Lease Loan Proceeds	\$2,146,520		
	FY 2020 Facilities Bond	\$0		
	State Grants			
Total Revenues			\$2,146,520	
Total Revenues & Transfers			\$3,376,520	

City Hall

FEE TYPE	FEE AMOUNT
ELECTION - Candidate Qualifying Fee	3% previous yr salary
GOLF CART Registration/decal	\$ 15/year
GOLF CART Transfer	\$15
GOLF CART Non Resident Path User Fee	\$100/yr \$150/yr + \$15 registration
ALCOHOL LICENSE Application – New (Package, Consumption, Manufacturing)	\$200
ALCOHOL LICENSE Application – Change (Package, Consumption, Manufacturing)	\$150
ALCOHOL LICENSE Application – Wholesale Distributor (LICENSE FEE BASED ON OCC TAX)	\$200
ALCOHOL LICENSE Malt Beverage (Package, Consumption, Manufacturing)	\$775
ALCOHOL LICENSE Wine (Package, Consumption, Manufacturing)	\$575
ALCOHOL LICENSE Distilled Spirits (Package, Consumption, Manufacturing)	\$5,000
ALCOHOL LICENSE Package Store / Holidays	\$650
ALCOHOL LICENSE Sunday Sales (Consumption)	\$100
ALCOHOL LICENSE Additional Bar	20% of primary license
ALCOHOL LICENSE Qualifying Location	\$ 150 per year
ALCOHOL LICENSE Special Event Permit	\$50/day served (waived if non-profit) or 5% of annual if sold at government facilities <5 days
ALCOHOL LICENSE Wine Tasting / Growler Sampling (one-time, as long as package license remains current)	\$150 one-time
OCCUPATIONAL TAX Administrative fee (all applicants, including tax exempt)	\$20.00
OCCUPATIONAL TAX Tax rate	\$18.50 \$19.00 per employee
OCCUPATIONAL TAX Minimum Fee / Maximum	\$105/\$6,000 \$107/ \$6,176
OCCUPATIONAL TAX Late Penalty after April 30	10% of tax

FEE TYPE	FEE AMOUNT
OCCUPATIONAL TAX Insurers (separate fee schedule)	\$100
OPEN RECORDS copies (up to 11"x14") (includes staff time copying)	\$0.10/ page
OPEN RECORDS copies 11x17	\$0.25/page
OPEN RECORDS oversized copies	cost to send out
OPEN RECORDS - CD or DVD	\$1.00
Cassette Tape (copied)-	\$5.00
Staff time (search, retrieval, admin costs) – First 15 minutes FREE; hrly rate of lowest paid emp capable of work	varies
Maps	\$2.00
Yard Sale Signs/blank signs	\$0.50
Notary/Witness Fees (after 1 st page of notary/witness	\$2 per signature
TAXES	
FRANCHISE Electric	4%
FRANCHISE Cable	5%
FRANCHISE Phone	3%
FRANCHISE Natural Gas	(Formula)
FRANCHISE Hotel/Motel Tax	8%
BANK TAX (depository financial institutions)	0.25% (min \$1,000)
MIXED DRINK TAX (excludes beer and wine)	3%
Alcohol Excise Tax: distilled spirits, max allowed (O.C.G.A. § 3-4-80); wines, max allowed (O.C.G.A. § 3-6-60); malt beverages, max allowed (O.C.G.A. § 3-5-80)	
Advertisements on Water Towers—	\$25 per month
Mobile Phone Tax	Maximum \$3 per month per mobile phone bill
Southern Property Solutions/Sprint PCS Tower Lease	\$72,000.00 for first 36 months; \$24,000.00 per year for next 24 months; ncrease by 3% per year
MUNICIPAL COURT Certified Disposition	\$5.00
MUNICIPAL COURT Fines – SET BY JUDGE	See Bond Sheet
MUNICIPAL COURT Administrative Fee	\$15.00
MUNICIPAL COURT Failure to Appear Fee	\$75.00

Planning, Zoning & Engineering

FEE TYPE	FEE AMOUNT
APPLICATION FEES	
APPLICATION Administrative variance	\$25 \$30
APPLICATION Special exception variance	\$250 \$300
APPLICATION Variance (single variance)	\$250 \$300
APPLICATION Variance (multiple requests on same property)	\$250 \$300 + \$100 for each additional variance request
APPLICATION Appeal	\$250 \$300
APPLICATION Annexation - Step 1	\$250 \$300
APPLICATION Annexation - Step 2	\$750 + rezoning fee
APPLICATION Rezoning	\$750 + \$50/ acre
Zoning verification letter	\$50 \$60
Zoning / site determination letter	\$100
Street name change	\$250 \$300
Special Use Permit	\$250 \$300
TELECOMMUNICATIONS Administrative review	\$250
TELECOMMUNICATIONS Conditional Use Permit - Existing Facility	\$2,000
TELECOMMUNICATIONS Conditional Use Permit - New Facility	\$4,500
SUBDIVISION FEES - Concept plat	\$300 + \$5 per lot
SUBDIVISION FEES - Preliminary plat	\$300 + \$5 per lot
SUBDIVISION FEES - Road Construction plans	\$300 + \$5 per lot
SUBDIVISION FEES - Road Construction Plans 1st Resubmittal	\$400
SUBDIVISION FEES - Road Construction Plans 2nd Resubmittal and any subsequent resubmittals	\$400 minimum of or the amount charged by City consultant to review, whichever is greater. The actual amount charged by the City consultant, if in excess of \$400, shall have an additional sum of \$75 added for City staff time expended in such review
SUBDIVISION FEES - Final plat	\$300 + \$5 per lot
SUBDIVISION FEES - Plat amendment	\$100
SUBDIVISION FEES - General Revisions/ resubmittals	\$150 each (\$300 each starting with 3rd submittal)
SITE PLAN FEES - Conceptual site plan	\$300 + \$10 per acre or fraction thereof
SITE PLAN FEES - Final site plan	\$300 \$500 + \$10 per acre or fraction thereof

FEE TYPE	FEE AMOUNT
SITE PLAN FEES - Final site plan 1 st resubmittal	\$400
SITE PLAN FEES - Final site plan 2 nd & subsequent resubmittals	\$400 minimum of or the amount charged by City consultant to review, whichever is greater. The actual amount charged by the City consultant, if in excess of \$400, shall have an additional sum of \$75 added for City staff time expended in such review
SITE PLAN FEES - Landscape plan	\$200
SITE PLAN FEES - General Revisions/ resubmittals	\$150 each (\$300 each starting with 3rd submittal)
SITE PLAN FEES - Site lighting plan review	\$100 + \$10 per acre or fraction thereof
EROSION CONTROL - Land Disturbance Permit (LDP) Fee	\$200 + \$100 \$240 + \$120 per disturbed acre or fraction thereof
EROSION CONTROL - Notice of Intent - State	\$40 per acre of disturbed land or fraction thereof
EROSION CONTROL - Notice of Intent - City	\$40 per acre of disturbed land or fraction thereof
EROSION CONTROL - Plan review 1 st resubmittal	\$300
EROSION CONTROL - Plan review 2 nd resubmittal and any subsequent	\$400 minimum of or the amount charged by City consultant to review, whichever is greater. The actual amount charged by the City consultant, if in excess of \$400, shall have an additional sum of \$75 added for City staff time expended in such review
EROSION CONTROL - inspection	\$50 \$60
EROSION CONTROL - re-inspection (if not ready the first visit)	\$100
SIGN PERMITS - Sign	\$100 + \$50 \$120 + \$60 for each additional sign on the property
SIGN PERMITS - Sign resubmittal	\$50 each submittal
SIGN PERMITS - Temporary sign/ banner	\$30 \$35
SIGN PERMITS - Special event	\$25 \$30
SIGN PERMITS - Confiscated Sign Return Fee	\$100
SIGN PERMITS - Temporary Use for Outdoor Display	\$25 \$30
UTILITIES & ROW - Utility Registration Fee	\$500
UTILITIES & ROW - Utility ROW Permit Application Fee	\$200
UTILITIES & ROW - Utility ROW Permit Inspection Fee	\$100
UTILITIES & ROW - Utility Service Agreement / ROW Agreement / Franc	\$2,000

Building Dept.

FEE/PERMIT TYPE	SPECIFICATIONS	FEE
Calculating Building Valuation	Unless otherwise stated, the valuation for all new construction will be based on the actual contract cost of the work or calculated by using the latest construction cost data as published in the Building Safety journal by the International Code Council. For Interior Completion only, the construction cost is valued at 50% of the calculated ICC building valuation. City administrative fee of \$30 per permit.	
Fee Payment	Plan review fees are non-refundable and due at time of application.	
Plan Review Fees	Residential Plan Review	\$150 \$180
	Commercial/Industrial Plan Review	Additional 50% of permit fee (minimum \$200)
	Plan resubmittal	\$100 \$120 per resubmittal
Permit Fees (based on total valuation)	Minimum Permit Fees	Residential - \$150.00; Commercial - \$200.00
	\$1.00 to \$25,000.00	\$14.00 for each \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including
	\$25,001.00 to \$50,000.00	\$350.00 for the first \$25,000.00 plus \$10.00 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000.00
	\$50,001.00 to \$100,000.00	\$600.00 for the first \$50,000.00 plus \$7.00 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000.00
	\$100,001.00 to \$500,000.00	\$950.00 for the first \$100,000.00 plus \$6.00 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000.00
	\$500,001.00 to \$1,000,000.00	\$3,350.00 for the first \$500,000.00 plus \$5.00 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000.00
	\$1,000,001.00 and up	\$5,850.00 for the first \$1,000,000.00 plus \$3.00 for each additional \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof
Certificate of Occupancy or Completion (C/O)	New commercial building	\$100 \$120
	New single family detached, condo,	\$50 \$60
	New or renovated commercial tenant	\$25 \$30
Trade Permits (MEPs)	Minimum	\$80 plus \$5.00 for each \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, of valuation of work being done.
	Temporary Power Letter	\$50
Demolition Permit Extensions	Interior (bldg or tenant space)	\$100
	Single family residential house	\$150
	Commercial building	\$200
	First extension	\$50/ 3 months
	Subsequent extension	\$100/ 3 months

FEE/PERMIT TYPE	SPECIFICATIONS	FEE
Demolition Re-Inspections	Re-inspection fee	\$75
Other	Transfer of Permit/change of contractor	\$200
	Structure move	\$200
	Siding replacement	\$150
	Temporary Construction Trailer (not including electric permit)	\$100
	Residential Re-roof	\$100
	Commercial Re-roof	\$5.00 for each \$1,000.00, or fraction thereof, of valuation of work being done (\$200 minimum)
	Fence Permit	\$100
	Residential Swimming Pool	\$500
	Commercial Swimming Pool	\$650
	Above ground pool/ hot tub (Residential)	\$300
	Inspections outside of normal business hours	\$100 per hour (\$200 minimum)
	Replacement of permits, CO's, etc.	\$25 \$30
	Minor Plan Revision Reviews - Review on changes to architectural plans after	\$100 per hour (\$200 minimum)
	Fee for work done without a permit	Original permit fee plus 100% penalty (double permit fee)
	Accessory Buildings up to 200 SF	\$75
	Sheds Accessory Buildings greater than 200 SF or larger	\$150
	Preliminary/code compliance/safety	\$100.00
	Timbering Permit	\$100 + \$10 per acre

Fire EMS

FEE TYPE	FEE AMOUNT
EMS - Treat & Release	\$125
EMS - Ambulance - Basic Life Support (BLS)	\$750
EMS - Ambulance - Advance Life Support (ALS) Level I	\$825
EMS - Ambulance - Advance Life Support (ALS) Level II	\$900
EMS - Helicopter Assistance	\$0
EMS - Mileage	\$10/per mile
FIRE -False Alarm – 3x in 24 hours	up to \$250, up to plus \$100 for each additional
FIRE -False Alarm – 4 th in year	up to \$250 for 4 th and each additional occurrence
FIRE -Failure to provide key holders	up to \$100
FIRE -Refusal of keyholder to respond	up to \$250
FIRE MARSHAL - Building Permit Plan Review	\$.015 per gross bldg. SF (minimum \$150)
FIRE MARSHAL - Automatic Fire Extinguishment System Review	\$150.00
FIRE MARSHAL - Fire Alarm Plan Review	\$150.00
FIRE MARSHAL - Other System Plan Review	\$150
FIRE MARSHAL - Construction Site 80% Inspection	N/C
FIRE MARSHAL - Construction Site 100% Inspection	N/C
FIRE MARSHAL - Construction Site 100% Inspection (Follow-Up)	\$75
FIRE MARSHAL - Construction Site Follow Up, (#2)	\$100
FIRE MARSHAL - Construction Site Follow Up, (#3)	\$150
FIRE MARSHAL - Certificate of Compliance – Basic	\$50
FIRE MARSHAL - Sprinkler Certification without flow test	\$25
FIRE MARSHAL - Sprinkler Flow Test	\$50
FIRE MARSHAL - Alarm Certification without alarm test	\$25
FIRE MARSHAL - Alarm Test	\$50
FIRE MARSHAL - Hood System Balloon/Flamout Test	\$50
FIRE MARSHAL - Other System Test (paint booth/ clean agent system)	\$50
FIRE MARSHAL - Underground piping pressure test	\$25
FIRE MARSHAL - Above ground sprinkler plumbing pressure test	\$25
FIRE MARSHAL - Certificate of Compliance (Re-Issue)	\$50
FIRE MARSHAL - Blasting, (for a period up to 30 days)	\$100
FIRE MARSHAL - Pyrotechnics / Fireworks Event	\$500

FEE TYPE	FEE AMOUNT
FIRE MARSHAL - Annual Inspection	\$0
FIRE MARSHAL - Annual Inspection, Follow Up	\$0
FIRE MARSHAL - Annual Inspection, Follow Up #2	\$50.00
FIRE MARSHAL - Annual Inspection, Follow Up #3	\$100
Food Truck Fire Safety Inspection and Annual Permit	\$100
FIRE TRAINING GROUNDS - Live Fire Training (not assessed to Mutual Aid, services in kind may be exchanged)	\$25 per student (\$500 daily max)
FIRE TRAINING GROUNDS - Pump Test Facility (not assessed to Mutual Aid, services in kind may be exchanged)	\$50 per apparatus

Police

FEE TYPE	FEE AMOUNT
Request to Restrict Arrest Record (Expungement)	\$25
Background Check/Criminal History	\$15
Accident Reports	\$5.00 per report
Alcohol Handling Permits	\$25
Fingerprints	\$25
PAWN SHOP - Application	\$75
PAWN SHOP - Annual License	\$2,000
PAWN SHOP - Fingerprints	\$25
PAWN SHOP - Employee Permits	\$25
Solicitors Permit -	\$25/day/person first day, \$10/day/person each additional day in same week
Alarm System – Failure to Register	\$100
FALSE ALARM - 3rd – 5th instance	\$50 each
FALSE ALARM - 6th – 7th instance	\$100 each
FALSE ALARM - 8th – 9th instance	\$250 each
FALSE ALARM - 10th and above	\$500 each

Library

TYPE	FEE
Room Rental	no charge
Copies	\$0.20 b&w, \$0.50 color (per side)
Late Fees	\$0.20 per day per item
Lost Library Card Replacement	\$2.00
Test proctoring - PTC / Fayette Resident	\$10/test
Test proctoring - Non-Fayette Resident	\$20/test

Recreation Facility Rentals

FACILITY RENTALS	PTC/Fay Residents	Civic Church School	PTC/Fayette Commercial	Out of County Resident	Out of County Commercial	Deposit Required
Basketball- Outdoor	\$12 \$13/hr	\$0	\$25 \$27/hr	\$50 \$54/hr	\$50 \$54/hr	\$50
BMX Track	\$180 \$190/day	\$0	\$300 \$320/day	\$450 \$500/day	\$450 \$500/day	\$50 \$250
Skate Park	\$190/day		\$320/day	\$500/day	\$500/day	\$250
Athletic Field - Non-Tournament / NO LIGHTS	\$25/hr or \$60/day \$27/hr or \$64/day	\$25/hr or \$90/day \$27/hr or \$97/day	\$45/hr or \$150/day \$48/hr or \$161/day	\$60/hr or \$180/day \$64/hr or \$193/day	\$90/hr or \$190/day \$97/hr or \$204/day	\$150
Athletic Field - Non Tournaments / With Lights	\$35/hr or \$90/day \$37/hr or \$97/day	\$35/hr or 90/day \$37/hr or \$129/day	\$55/hr or \$180/day \$59/hr or \$193/day	\$70/hr or \$210/day \$75/hr or \$256/day	\$100/hr or \$240/day \$107/hr or \$258/day	\$150
Athletic Fields - NO LIGHTS (Tournaments/Camps/Clinics hosted by PTC Youth Sports Assn)	\$80 \$90/field/day					\$150
Athletic Fields - WITH LIGHTS (Tournaments/Camps/Clinics hosted by PTC Youth Sports Assn)	\$100 \$125/field/day					\$150 \$500

FACILITY RENTALS	PTC/Fay Residents	Civic Church School	PTC/Fayette Commercial	Out of County Resident	Out of County Commercial	Deposit Required
Athletic Fields - NO LIGHTS (Tournaments/Camps/Clinics hosted by Commercial Promoters)					\$230 \$250/field/day	\$500
Athletic Fields - WITH LIGHTS (Tournaments/Camps/Clinics hosted by Commercial Promoters)					\$260 \$300/field/day	\$500
Huddleston Pond Gazebo	\$25 \$27/hr	\$0	\$35 \$38/hr	\$80 \$86/hr	\$80 \$86/hr	\$50
Luther Glass/Three Ponds Gazebo	\$25 \$27/hr	\$0	\$35 \$38/hr	\$80 \$86/hr	\$80 \$86/hr	\$50
Beaver Dam Park (2 hr minimum)	\$30 \$32/hr	\$0	\$50 \$54/hr	\$70 \$75/hr	\$70 \$75/hr	\$50
Blue Smoke Park (2 hr minimum)	\$30 \$32/hr	\$0	\$50 \$54/hr	\$95 \$102/hr	\$95 \$102/hr	\$50
Huddleston Pond Park (2 hr minimum)	\$30 \$32/hr	\$0	\$50 \$54/hr	\$95 \$102/hr	\$95 \$102/hr	\$50
Picnic Park & Pavilion (2 hr minimum)	\$50 \$54/hr	\$0	\$95 \$102/hr	\$130/hr	\$130/hr	\$50

FACILITY RENTALS	PTC/Fay Residents	Civic Church School	PTC/Fayette Commercial	Out of County Resident	Out of County Commercial	Deposit Required
Pavilions (excluding Drake Field)	\$30 \$32/hr	\$0	\$60 \$65/hr	\$90 \$97/hr	\$90 \$97/hr	\$50
Drake Field Pavilion	\$100/hr	\$0	\$150/hr	\$200/hr	\$200/hr	\$500
Glenloch Pool & Splash Pad						
Kedron Small Pool	\$60 \$65/hr	\$30 \$32/hr	\$70 \$75/hr	\$85 \$91/hr	\$95 \$102/hr	\$75
Kedron Large Pool	\$70 \$75/hr	\$35 \$37/hr	\$85 \$91/hr	\$95 \$102/hr	\$110 \$118/hr	\$75
Kedron Both Pools	\$120 \$129/hr	\$60 \$64/hr	\$145 \$156/hr	\$170 \$183/hr	\$190 \$204/hr	\$75
Kedron Room 2	\$70 \$75/hr	\$35 \$37/hr	\$85 \$91/hr	\$95 \$102/hr	\$110 \$118/hr	\$75
Kedron Room 3	\$50 \$54/hr	\$25 \$27/hr	\$60 \$65/hr	\$70 \$75/hr	\$85 \$91/hr	\$75
Kedron Room 2 & 3	\$110 \$118/hr	\$55 \$59/hr	\$130 \$140/hr	\$155 \$167/hr	\$180 \$193/hr	\$75
Gym ½ Court	\$35 \$37/hr	\$20 \$21/hr	\$50 \$54/hr	\$60 \$65/hr	\$70 \$75/hr	\$0
Gym Full Court	\$60 \$65/hr	\$30 \$32/hr	\$70 \$75/hr	\$85 \$91/hr	\$95 \$102/hr	\$0
Full Gym- 2 Courts	\$110 \$118/hr	\$55 \$59/hr	\$130 \$140/hr	\$155 \$167/hr	\$180 \$193/hr	\$0
Building (Full Gym, Room 2 & 3)	\$200 \$215/hr	\$100 \$107/hr	\$250 \$269/hr	\$300 \$322/hr	\$350 \$376/hr	\$75
Building and Pool (Entire Facility)	\$310 \$335/hr	\$155 \$167/hr	\$385 \$414/hr	\$455 \$489/hr	\$530 \$570/hr	\$75
Kedron Multi-purpose rink	\$60 \$65/hr	\$30 \$32/hr	\$75 \$81/hr	\$85 \$91/hr	\$95 \$102/hr	\$75
Tennis Courts - WITH LIGHTS	\$30 \$32/hr	n/a	\$60 \$65/hr	\$90 \$97/hr	\$90 \$97/hr	\$50

FACILITY RENTALS	PTC/Fay Residents	Civic Church School	PTC/Fayette Commercial	Out of County Resident	Out of County Commercial	Deposit Required
Tennis Courts - UNLIGHTED	\$25 \$27/hr	n/a	\$45 \$48/hr	\$65 \$70/hr	\$65 \$70/hr	\$50
Multipurpose Court-Pebblepocket	\$30 \$32/hr	n/a	\$60 \$65/hr	\$90 \$97/hr	\$90 \$97/hr	\$50
TENNIS CENTER - Birthday Party w Staff, decorations, etc.	\$5/guest					
TENNIS CENTER - 2-hr room rental	\$30/hr					
AMPHITHEATER Rental	\$1,500 (50% non-refundable due at signing)	\$1,500 (50% non-refundable due at signing)	\$3,200 (50% non-refundable due at signing)	\$1,500 (50% non-refundable due at signing)	\$3,200 (50% non-refundable due at signing)	\$500 (1-999 attendees) \$1,000 (1,000+ attendees)
AMPHITHEATER Rental -	\$300 (due at signing)	\$300 (due at signing)	\$300 (due at signing)	\$300 (due at signing)	\$300 (due at signing)	
AMPHITHEATER Manager	\$50/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$50/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$50/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$50/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$50/hr (4-hour minimum)	
AMPHITHEATER Facility Coordinator (required)	\$25/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$25/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$25/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$25/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$25/hr (4-hour minimum)	
AMPHITHEATER Box Office Coordinator	\$30/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$30/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$30/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$30/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$30/hr (4-hour minimum)	
AMPHITHEATER Usher supervisor	\$20/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$20/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$20/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$20/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$20/hr (4-hour minimum)	
AMPHITHEATER Production Assistants	\$15/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$15/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$15/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$15/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$15/hr (4-hour minimum)	

FACILITY RENTALS	PTC/Fay Residents	Civic Church School	PTC/Fayette Commercial	Out of County Resident	Out of County Commercial	Deposit Required
AMPHITHEATER Box Office Staff	\$14/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$14/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$14/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$14/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$14/hr (4-hour minimum)	
AMPHITHEATER Event Staff – Ushers	\$14/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$14/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$14/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$14/hr (4-hour minimum)	\$14/hr (4-hour minimum)	
Cast House	\$100/day	\$100/day	\$100/day	\$100/day	\$100/day	
Round tables	\$6 each	\$6 each	\$6 each	\$6 each	\$6 each	
Banquet tables	\$10 each	\$10 each	\$10 each	\$10 each	\$10 each	
Hi Boy tables	\$10 each	\$10 each	\$10 each	\$10 each	\$10 each	
Chairs	\$1 each	\$1 each	\$1 each	\$1 each	\$1 each	

Recreation Fees

FEE TYPE	Peachtree City Resident/Business	Civic Church School	Fayette County (non PTC) Resident	Out of County Resident
SWIM TEAMS - SCAT		\$32 \$40 /per person/month		
SWIM TEAMS - Masters		\$18 \$20 /per person/month		
SWIM TEAMS - Schools		\$32 \$40 /per person/month		
POOL PASS - Per Visit - Age 0-2	\$0		\$1	
POOL PASS - Per Visit - Age 3-11	\$4 \$5 (\$36 \$45 for 10- visit punch card)		\$10 (\$90 for 10-visit punch card)	
POOL PASS - Per Visit - Age 12 – 64	\$5 \$6 (\$45 \$54 for 10- visit punch card)		\$12 (\$108 for 10-visit punch card)	
POOL PASS - Per Visit - Age 65+	\$3 \$4 (\$27 \$36 for 10- visit punch card)		\$8 (\$72 for 10-visit punch card)	
POOL PASS - Quarterly - Individual	\$75 \$80		\$150 \$160	
POOL PASS - Quarterly - Family (2)	\$135 \$145		\$270 \$290	
POOL PASS - Quarterly - Family (3)	\$185 \$200		\$370 \$400	
POOL PASS - Quarterly - Each Additional Pass	\$60 \$65		\$120 \$130	
POOL PASS - Annual - Individual	\$225 \$250		\$450 \$500	
POOL PASS - Annual - Family (2)	\$300 \$325		\$600 \$650	
POOL PASS - Annual - Family (3)	\$375 \$400		\$750 \$800	
POOL PASS - Annual - Family (4)	\$450 \$485		\$900 \$970	
POOL PASS - Annual - Family (5+)	\$525 \$565		\$1,050 \$1,130	
KEDRON Open Gym - Daily - Ages 3-11	\$1 (\$9 for 10-visit punch card)			
KEDRON Open Gym - Daily - Ages 12+	\$2 (\$18 for 10-visit punch card)			
KEDRON Open Gym - Quarterly - Ages 3-11	\$18 \$19			

FEE TYPE	Peachtree City Resident/Business	Civic Church School	Fayette County (non PTC) Resident	Out of County Resident
KEDRON Open Gym - Quarterly - Ages 12+	\$34 \$38			
KEDRON Open Gym - Annual - Ages 3-11	\$55 \$60			
KEDRON Open Gym - Annual - Ages 12+	\$110 \$120			
JULY 4th PARADE - PTC Resident/Commercial	\$0			
JULY 4th PARADE - Fayette Resident	\$25			
JULY 4th PARADE - Fayette Commercial	\$50			
SHAKERAG VENDOR Site without electricity	\$100 \$150			
SHAKERAG VENDOR Site with electricity	\$125 \$175			
SHAKERAG VENDOR Double site without electricity	\$350			
SHAKERAG VENDOR Double site with electricity	\$400			
CITY EVENT - VENDOR (Park) - per space	\$75			
CITY EVENT - VENDOR PERMIT (City Hall Plaza) - per space	\$125			
OTHER SMALL CITY EVENTS - Vendor Permit	\$25/space			
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Class I Application	\$25			
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Class II Application	\$50			

FEE TYPE	Peachtree City Resident/Business	Civic Church School	Fayette County (non PTC) Resident	Out of County Resident
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Class III Application	\$100			
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Class IV Application	\$100 \$200			
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Class 1 Deposit (50 people or less)	\$50			
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Class II Deposit (100 people or less)	\$200			
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Class III Deposit (Over 100 people)	\$200 \$250			
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Class IV Deposit (2000+ people)	\$250 \$500			
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Pedestrian Barricade	\$4 \$5	12-Jan		
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Traffic Barrels	\$1 \$2	12-Jan		
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Traffic Cones	\$.50 \$1	12-Jan		
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Tables	\$1 \$5	12-Jan		
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Chairs	\$1	12-Jan		
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Package 1: 25 tables + 50 chairs	\$100 \$125	12-Jan		
COMMUNITY SPECIAL EVENT - Package 2: 50 tables + 100 chairs	\$200 \$250	12-Jan		
YOUTH SPORT ASSN FEE (per player per season)	\$15		\$25	\$50
BMX Association Fee	\$1/rider/race			
Recreation Class Fee Share (Instructor/City) - \$16-24 class	60%/40%			

