

**City Council of Peachtree City
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, February 16, 2023
6:30 p.m.**

The Mayor and Council of Peachtree City met in regular session on Thursday, February 16, 2023. Mayor Kim Learnard called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Council members attending: Frank Destadio, Clinton Holland, Mike King, and Phil Prebor.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition

Learnard reported that an online news source called Crossroads Today had named Peachtree City the Safest Town in Georgia. She asked Council and the audience to thank the Police Chief and the Fire Chief along with all the Public Safety personnel for their work.

Public Comment

Lynn Frow said she protested Council's attempt to control her voice. She told them they were elected to preserve health, safety, welfare, and morals, but it was immoral for them to silence what she had to say about her city because they did not want to hear it. Frow stated Council worked for citizens, and the time limit for public comments was ludicrous. At the December 15 meeting, she recalled, just one citizen signed up to speak and was given two minutes. She asked for and was denied an extension. She told Council she was not sure they had the best interests of Peachtree City at heart, and they could not have her voice.

Margaret Ross had signed up to speak but waived her turn.

Suzanne Brown asked Council to adopt an ordinance to allow people to keep chickens in their yards. She noted that hens would lay eggs, eat insects, and did not crow like roosters.

John Dufresne said he had researched golf cart registration revenues. Fiscal year 2015 required registration renewals only for non-resident golf carts, and it appeared the City either improperly accounted or underreported revenue from registration fees by about \$12,000.

At the October 15, 2015 meeting, two weeks after the fiscal year ended, the City Clerk reported there were 11,447 golf carts registered; 10,399 belonged to residents and 1,048 to non-residents, plus 300 Tyrone golf carts that used the path system by reciprocal agreement. The annual registration fee for non-resident carts at that time was \$72—a \$12 registration fee plus \$60. Given 1,048 golf carts at \$72 per cart, the City should have collected \$75,456 from non-resident registrations. New resident registrations and other fees would have brought in additional income. Dufresne said the total reported was \$63,430, which was \$12,026, or 16%, short of what non-resident registrations should have been.

He commented that it did not appear that the City had internal controls in place to account for golf cart registration fee revenues in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Agenda Changes

None

Minutes

February 2, 2023, Regular Meeting Minutes

King moved to approve the February 2, 2023, Regular Meeting Minutes. Destadio seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Consent Agenda

- 1. Award 130 Braelinn Court Stormwater Pipe Replacement**
- 2. Award North Peachtree Parkway Drainage Improvements**
- 3. FY23 Budget Amendment – Insurance Reimbursement – Medic 82 repairs**
- 4. FY23 Budget Amendment- Sponsorship Acceptance- Father/Daughter Dance**

Destadio moved to approve Consent Agenda items 1-4. Prebor seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Learnard expressed thanks to Mahaffey and Linkous Orthodontics for a \$1,000 donation to fund the father/daughter dance.

Old Agenda items

None

New Agenda items

02-23-04 Budget Amendment- American Rescue Plan Funds Reallocation

City Manager Robert Curnow said the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) was passed by Congress in March, 2021, and Peachtree City received approximately \$13.5 million. There were some strict guidelines at the beginning about how the money could be used, but as time went on the Federal government allowed several ways for governments to reinvest in themselves to pay for lost wages during COVID or things along those lines. In addition, money was put into the Water and Sewerage Authority (WASA), storm water, vaccine incentive, and so on.

Staff was requesting that \$3.9 million of the money originally designated for storm water be reallocated to general projects where it could be used for facilities maintenance in a plan that staff currently was working on. Taking this money would leave storm water with a proportionate amount of money with which to do business, Curnow remarked, noting they were self-funded through storm water fees and had sufficient money to finance projects for a couple of years.

Destadio said he wanted to make sure this went towards maintenance, and Curnow said it would, adding that ARPA money had a time limit on when it could be allocated and spent and moving this from storm water put them in a better spot to meet the deadline, which Destadio said he understood to be used by 2026.

Holland asked if any of the maintenance funding would be used for recreation facilities? The facilities maintenance plan staff was working on would tell them the best place to put this money, Curnow replied, and they were looking at every physical asset the City had and bring back a priority list. Would that come back to Council? Holland inquired, and Curnow said they would have conversations with Council about how it would be spent.

Destadio moved to approve New Agenda item, 02-23-04, Budget Amendment- American Rescue Plan Funds Reallocation. King seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

02-23-05 Ordinance #1206- City Council Meeting Procedures and Rules

Curnow said this ordinance regulated who could add items to City Council meeting agendas. The current ordinance allowed for anyone to place an item on the agenda, but in order to streamline the process, he proposed amending the ordinance and limit it to the City Manager, the City Attorney, Council, or the Mayor. This allowed residents to have meaningful discussions with their elected officials and possibly bring those items to the City Manager before it got to the point where they had to take a vote or do something extreme, he commented. It gave them a chance to rectify or remedy those situations in advance.

Did other cities have a similar policy? Holland asked. Curnow said he asked the City Clerks to reach out to other nearby cities and to the Georgia Municipal Association (GMA). He read a list of the entities they heard back from, saying they all were doing what this ordinance was proposing: Fayette County, Fayetteville, Newnan, Tyrone, Brooks, Brookhaven, Fairburn, South Fulton, Suwannee, Sandy Springs, Carrollton, Covington, Cochran, Jackson, and Milton. They all had language in their ordinances saying the entities that added items to Council agendas were as such: the City Manager, the City Attorney, or Council. In some regards, these cities were a little more strict; it might fall only to the Mayor or require two Council members to come to an agreement based on what citizens had brought to them.

Again, he said, their recommendation was to limit this to the City Manager, City Attorney, the Mayor, or anyone on the Council and allow them to bring forward any items that they saw fit.

King said he first saw this on Monday and reflected that when they were looking at changing an ordinance, they generally had more than three and a half days to consider it. He was concerned that they did not have a replacement for a citizen to bring redress, saying the process outlined in the ordinance was cloudy to him. Voting on something they normally took two weeks to consider did not sit well with him, he stated.

He also noted that he had been on Council for nine years and could recall just three times that a citizen had placed an item on the agenda, and one of them was tonight. He said the system was not broken, so there was no reason to adopt an ordinance to fix it.

Prebor asked how many cities that they reached out to did allow citizens to put items on the agenda? None that replied, Curnow told him. They did have opportunities for public comment, which Peachtree City had, and any item that would come forward went before one of the three entities named before it could get a place on the agenda. Prebor asked how many governments responded? and Curnow said 15. Prebor said he agreed with King that this was quick to be voting on.

Destadio said he, too, was concerned when he first read this, mentioning the First Amendment and also saying he did not think he had enough facts about what was going on. He said he understood the City Manager's explanation about giving staff time to investigate an issue if someone wanted to put it on the agenda. Staff could do some background work for the Council, including investigating the cost and the impact to the rest of the City. They would then pass this information on to Council so they could make an intelligent decision. It was helpful to learn what other cities did.

Also, Destadio continued, no one was denying a citizen their rights. They were just saying that someone else had to look at it and say "yes" to putting it on the agenda. It did not mean just the Mayor; it could be any one of them. If one out of the five Council Members did not agree, he asked, was it really

worth doing? That did not take away anyone's rights as a citizen, it just meant someone else had to agree it was worth the time to take a look.

He reminded the citizens that they still had a right to come up and speak, but they elected the Council to be their representatives. He noted that he had spent a lot of time this week trying to help an individual who had water problems in his yard. He had another meeting scheduled with another citizen about another issue. All of the Council would say they worked with citizens all the time. Citizens were able to speak their minds, and Council did listen, Destadio remarked, but that did not mean everyone should be able to add something to the agenda. However, if one member of Council thought an item should be added, then okay.

Learnard noted they were not elected from districts; each Council person was elected by and represented the entire city, and a citizen could call on any one of them. If the Council Member deemed it worthy to be on the agenda, then it would go to the City Manager. This change would bring Peachtree City in line with standard best practices. She did not know of any city that allowed a citizen to request a topic be added to the agenda. The reason was that, quite often, staff was already on it. They had the means and the manpower in the background to research these topics. Maybe it had already been researched, and they had declined to put it on the Council agenda for any number of good reasons.

Learnard said she would speak for her fellow Council Members in saying they all read their emails. They had put together a communications team this year and were reaching out in every way possible. She cited the information sessions being held regarding the Special Purposed Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST). All five of the Council Members were there to help citizens, she continued, reporting that she was constantly meeting with citizens to talk over issues.

This change, Learnard remarked, represented a more generous way to get something on an agenda than most other cities in the state in that only one Council Member could bring it to the City Manager for inclusion on the agenda. This was what the City Manager recommended as far as best practices; she thought was a reasonable policy and was 100% in favor.

Holland said Peachtree City was a special place. He asked if they should let the sleeping dog lie? Was there a real problem? Holland asked, noting that King could only remember two incidences. He preferred to think of Peachtree City as a leader, not a follower. He recalled the awards Peachtree City had received and said he believed they would continue on this path, so they should be careful about what they changed.

He expressed doubts if this was the right thing for Peachtree City at this time, but if it was passed, they needed to lengthen the amount of time between the introduction and when it hit the Council agenda in order to give them time to do the research, talk to other Council Members, and let staff do their jobs. He said again they should let the sleeping dog lie.

King said he needed more time, if he was going to vote to approve this. At the very least, he thought they should take a hard look at it to ensure there was an avenue for citizens to seek redress. He said that would come to light in the next item from some of the things he knew from investigation earlier in the week. King said he would like to table this at least until the next meeting.

Were there any time constraints? the Mayor asked, and Curnow said there were not. This was part of the process he was going through to look at policies that might be outdated. There were quite a few that staff was working on and would be coming before them later. It was just a process to put them in line with best practices.

Prebor said he had one final comment: if you could not get one of the five people on Council to at least listen, maybe your issue did not need to be on an agenda. He recalled that the former City Manager had turned down quite a few people who had requests of various types. Prebor agreed that they needed to create the best practices in everything they did, and he would be interested in learning about what was done in even more cities.

King moved to table New Agenda item 02-23-05, Ordinance #1206- City Council Meeting Procedures and Rules, until the second meeting in March. Destadio seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

02-03-06 Redistricting Voting Precincts County-wide

This was placed on the agenda by citizen Suzanne Brown, and the Mayor told her it was a vastly important issue and that she had brought a lot of important concerns to light. Learnard asked Curnow to explain what the City's research had produced.

He said staff had reached out to Fayette County Elections Superintendent Brian Hill, and he had personally talked with County Administrator Steve Rapson to express the need to stop some Peachtree City residents from having to go to a separate voting site for municipal elections. The County was aware of this issue, he said, and were working with the State Reapportionment Office. He said they would get back to the City when they had further information.

On Monday, King reported, he talked to Elections Board Chairman Darryl Hicks who explained the situation was complicated because Fayette County and Peachtree City had been divided into three State legislative districts, making it difficult to organize the precincts. There were Federal laws to look at as well as State legislative actions. Hicks told him it was their top priority to get these precincts hashed out so some voters did not have to visit two precincts on election day in order to vote in City elections. King said Hicks guaranteed him that it would be fixed this year, and King noted there was a City election coming up in the fall. The real test would be in 2024 with the National and State elections.

Brown began by explaining that when an elector registered to vote, they were assigned a County precinct number and a Municipality precinct number. Having those two different was what created this problem of some residents having to vote in two places.

She thanked Council for considering her request and noted that she had spoken several times at recent meetings about the December 6 special runoff election voting for the 2,380 Peachtree City citizens living in the Rising Starr county precinct, the 14 residents in Dogwood, and the 17 in Whitewater. Each of those 2,411 residents were assigned to a County voting site with a poll location outside the City boundary and a municipal location inside the Peachtree City city limits. If they voted on election days in November and December, they had to go to two separate poll locations.

Of the 607 voters who cast a ballot for the Senate runoff at Rising Starr Middle School, only 162 voters went to Braelinn Elementary to vote in the Peachtree City Special Municipal runoff. This was 26.7% of those who voted in the Senate race, and Brown said it was a significantly low number compared to

the rest of Peachtree City. She was glad Council agreed with her that this needed to be fixed. But how?

She and her group had created a spreadsheet that showed the three impacted precincts where voters should be shifted to line up with their municipal polling location. But, Brown continued, the Board of Elections, at their January 24 meeting, discussed re-drawing the precinct lines and boundaries for all Fayette County precincts, reducing the number of County precincts from 36 to 19, and finalizing the changes this summer. The Board of Elections said they had 2020 Census data, an old redistricting proposal from when Floyd Jones was Elections Superintendent prior to 2021, and a list of poll locations that they would like to cease using for a variety of reasons.

About one-third of all Fayette's registered voters lived in Peachtree City, Brown commented, so it seemed advisable that Peachtree City have input in the redistricting process and to request that new County precincts align with the new Peachtree City precincts and have the same polling location. She said the next Board of Elections meeting was scheduled for February 28, which put a time constraint on Peachtree City to act.

She referred to election laws, pointing out that OCGA 21-2-262 and OCGA 21-2-261 outlined the City's authority to determine municipal precincts, while the County controlled County precincts. Without input, municipalities might not get what was best for their citizens. She noted that Fayette County had had the same precincts for more than 19 years, and it was likely the people in power had never done redistricting before so they needed oversight.

Brown said she had sent Council a proposed resolution that outlined the issue and concluded with "Be it therefore resolved that the City Council of the City of Peachtree City does hereby formally request that the Fayette County Board of Elections confers with the representatives of the City of Peachtree City, ensures all residents of the City of Peachtree City are assigned to a Fayette County precinct and Municipal precinct with a polling location that is 'one and the same' for both precincts and it is inside the City of Peachtree City boundary."

She told Council this was a realistic request after what occurred in 2022, but if they chose not to send this resolution, please do not just do nothing. She asked them to make changes to the resolution or send something to assert their concerns for their citizens. Had the Fayette County Board of Elections shared Floyd Jones' proposal? Brown asked. Had they told them they planned to reduce the number of County precincts to 19 and number of Municipal precincts to six? Had they told them they had the right to draw the municipal precinct lines? She said she suspected they had not, but it had been more than three weeks since they announced their plan. Only two citizens were at that meeting, Brown went on.

Their rights to establish precinct lines and locations were outlined in State law, she continued, but the issue in 2022 was related to the Fayette County precinct. She had received the old plan the County intended to use, and she said she did not think it was good for the County or for Peachtree City. An IT expert with the Fayette County Chapter of the United States Election Integrity Project created her spreadsheets, and Brown said they could do further work if Peachtree City shared information.

Also, she said she hoped Council would vote to sign the resolution, then share it with the other municipalities in Fayette County and encourage them to submit their own resolutions.

Prebor said he was one of the voters who had to go to two locations, and it was good to hear the County was working on it.

Destadio said he talked with the City Manager and the City Clerk about Brown's spreadsheet several weeks ago and was told upon repeated inquiries that they were waiting for the attorney to look at it. However, the resolution that Brown proposed, in light of what they now knew after King's and Curnow's discussions with the County, might be a little more than what they needed. Destadio said he would like to see a letter from the City Manager to formalize Council's request involving these precincts. It could include some of the questions Brown had asked.

Holland said he had similar feelings. He would like to get this done before the fall election. He also said he liked the idea of Peachtree City having input in the drawing of new voting precincts.

They probably should get actively involved in the drawing of the City precincts, King remarked, adding that it was long overdue.

Citizens were very deep in research, Learnard remarked, and so was staff. She asked Curnow how they could assert their concerns to the Board and make sure they were getting informed on a regular basis? He again said the County was looking into this and understood it was not only a Peachtree City problem. The County Administrator stressed that there were a lot of legalities in drawing new district lines and collapsing precincts so as to not to put voters in a disenfranchisement position of taking a precinct that was close to them and making it more difficult for them to get to. There were a lot of challenges.

If Council would like staff to draw up a letter with their intent, he could send to the Elections Board. He said he agreed with King that it would be a good idea for the Mayor or a Council Member to get involved and work on it from that side while staff continued working on the other side.

Should someone attend the meeting on Tuesday? Destadio asked. King said he would go. The Mayor said she felt responsible to the citizens, and Council owed them answers. They would look to staff to keep them informed on a more regular basis.

Destadio asked if they should vote on this? Learnard said they had instructed the City Manager to prepare a letter and keep them informed.

Holland said they might have questions, and it would be good to go directly to the City Manager with them. He also said he would encourage citizens to come to Council and tell them what they should be asking.

Public Hearings

02-23-07 Ordinance #1207 - Reinstating the Planning Commission Public Hearing

Planning and Development Director Robin Cailloux said this was a text amendment initiated by City Council to reinstate the public hearing function to the Planning Commission. Historically, the Planning Commission had held public hearings for rezonings, but that function was removed in 2021 after concern that rezonings might be considered quasi-judicial proceedings. However, House Bill 1405, the Zoning Procedures Act, was passed and it clarified what were considered quasi-judicial functions and

stated that rezonings were legislative functions. The Planning Commission held a workshop on this and were unanimously in support of restoring the public hearing, Cailloux stated.

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Suzanne Brown said she was in favor of giving back the vote to the Planning Commission. Council learned a lot about the issues when the Planning Commission voted. She said when the Planning Commission was stripped of its vote, citizens were told that only one public hearing could be held. But the law said that at least one public hearing must be held, not that a second hearing could not be held. She noted that Peachtree City was the only city to take away their Planning Commission's vote.

She recalled that the Planning Commission voted unanimously against the Governor's Square rezoning, then City Council voted unanimously to approve the rezoning, which she said made them look foolish. Council then stripped the voting rights from the Planning Commission, she remarked, saying to her it looked like retribution. She wanted to see a numeric tally of how the Planning Commission voted and mused that she was often the only citizen who regularly attended their meetings. The Planning Commission was a valuable resource to Council, and Brown said she was surprised it took this long to correct this issue.

Elena Perez said she agreed with Brown. She stated she had written to Council in the past about the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI), saying most people did not move to Peachtree City for that. They wanted to get away from Atlanta and not see more apartments and loss of greenspace.

The Mayor reminded her that the topic was reinstating public hearings for the Planning Commission.

They needed to reinstate the public hearing because it was easy to get away from what they needed to be looking at and from the original plan of the city, Perez went on. It should be a collaborative effort.

Rob Hale said he agreed. It was important for citizens to have the opportunity to express their thoughts and the Planning Commission to have a vote. He thought Council would like to have more input, as well.

No one else wished to speak, either in favor or opposition, and the Mayor closed the public hearing.

Destadio said he had been a proponent of this for a long time. The Planning Commission had in the past held workshops at the end of their meetings, and he said they were beneficial for people to voice their concerns and to work out details. When workshops took the place of the public hearing, he said he found it confusing to citizens, at least at first. He also felt it was good to have two public hearings to give citizens more opportunities to have input. If you missed the Planning Commission meeting, you could go to the second public hearing before City Council.

Prebor commented on Brown's statement that they looked foolish after the Governor's Square vote. The Planning Commission did vote it down 0-5, but they also gave recommendations that the developers took into account, such as the number of entrances. That is why Council approved it 5-0. He also verified that the Planning Commission could no longer be held legally liable, which was the issue before.

Holland commented that there were some very capable people on the Planning Commission. Their comments were insightful, and they understood how important their role was. He was in favor of this.

King said the law had changed, so they needed to do this. He recommended Destadio make the motion since he served on the Planning Commission for 11 years.

Destadio moved to approve Public Hearing item, 02-23-07 Ordinance #1207 - Reinstating the Planning Commission Public Hearing. Prebor, saying he, too, had served on the Planning Commission, seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

02-23-08 Variance Request – 319 N. Peachtree Parkway – Front Yard Fence Requirements

Cailloux showed the location on a zoning map, off North Peachtree Parkway. It was one of the few houses that shared a driveway. The owners would like to put a six-foot tall brick wall in their yard, but the house and existing wall was built in 1983 and the front fence ordinance had changed since then to dictate that a front fence had to be opaque, and it had to be no more than four feet. They were asking to complete the wall across the front at six feet, adding about 60 feet to the existing 300-foot-long wall to connect to an existing side fence.

Property owner Steve Balaam noted that the wall was built when the house was constructed, but the remaining part was left as chain link and barbed wire fencing, which they did not find acceptable. He said this was actually on the side of the house. Since the cart path was put in, there was a lot more visibility to the cart traffic, he remarked, particularly at night when the lights were shining in. The wall would eliminate that and also help reduce noise from the path. The wall extension would complement what was already at the front of the property, where Balaam said, they had put a lot of effort into landscaping.

The Mayor opened the public hearing. Suzanne Brown said she normally was not in favor of approving variances, feeling they were there for a reason, but this wall had a 40-foot history, and she could not find a reason that they should disapprove this.

No one else wished to speak, and Learnard closed the public hearing.

Destadio said he lived near this area, and he took his golf cart down the new path to see what the impact was on this property at night. It was basically a perpendicular wall going up Interlochen, and the headlights went right into Balaam's yard. He said this wall would be a nice addition to what the Balaams had already done in their yard. He, too, was not always agreeable to variances, but thought this one improved the property a great deal.

Holland said he looked at variances as either needs or wants, and this was needed because of the lights from the path traffic. He suggested to Balaam that some additional shrubs and trees would also afford privacy.

Prebor thanked Balaam for his efforts to improve the property, saying he was in favor.

King moved to approve Public Hearing item 02-23-08, Variance Request – 319 N. Peachtree Parkway – Front Yard Fence Requirements. Prebor seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

02-23-09 Variance Request- Westpark Walk Shopping Center Signage

This was a sign variance, which had different review criteria than a zoning variance, Cailloux reported. The property was at the intersection of SR 54 and SR 74, and the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) would be purchasing some of this property for a new right-of-way as part of the displaced left turn (DLT) project. Some of Westpark Walk's signs were in that area, and they would like to erect new signs on their property. Cailloux noted that the GDOT project was scheduled to go out for bid in October.

Westpark wanted to replace the existing signs so they would be visible from SR 54 and SR 74. She showed a graphic that illustrated how a change in grade meant the sign would need to be higher in order to be visible from the highways. The ordinance set a maximum height of five feet for monument signs, and the applicant was requesting sign heights of 18 and 19 feet. The portion visible from the highways would then be five feet above the top of the future retaining walls.

The sign variance criteria included a statement that visibility must be impaired by a number of things, but in this case it was natural features, which would be the grade. Another criterion was that placement of the sign elsewhere would not remedy the visual obstruction. The obstruction could not be created by the owner, and the remedy could not create a safety hazard. There was a condition that if relief was granted, it must be the minimum relief necessary to overcome the hardship.

Staff had a couple of concerns which the applicant could not control. One regarded timing and the other was the possibility of field conditions changing during construction. For instance, the retaining wall could be foot taller or a foot shorter. She wanted the sign to be built after they knew the existing conditions. It should not be built before construction started because that would mean there would be a 20-foot-tall sign sticking up for a while.

Staff proposed two conditions if Council approved the variance:

- The top of each new sign should be no more than five feet above mean sea level (MSL) elevation of the nearest adjacent retaining wall.
- A sign permit be required for each sign.

Attorney Rick Lindsey represented the applicant and also introduced the civil engineer, who could answer technical questions. He said they agreed with the conditions and had no plans to build the sign until all the work was completed. They just wanted to get the base tall enough so the sign looked the same as it did today.

Learnard opened the public hearing. No one wished to speak either in favor or in opposition, and she closed the hearing.

Prebor said the request made sense, while Destadio asked Lindsey to confirm that they were not going to start construction until the project was finished. Lindsey said it would not start until the retaining walls were built and GDOT was finished because they would be afraid the signs would be damaged. Destadio said that answered his concern that this was premature.

City Attorney Ted Meeker said the motion should include the conditions.

King moved to approve Public Hearing item 02-23-09, Variance Request- Westpark Walk Shopping Center Signage with the recommended conditions. Prebor seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Council/Staff Topics

Curnow said he would be hosting the first-ever Coffee and Conversations with the City Manager on February 24. Council noted this was a good idea.

Holland said he would not be present for the next meeting; could they reschedule? The Mayor said his absence would be fine.

Holland went on to say that he had been talking about the SR 54/74 intersection and its problems since last August, and he thought it was an awful solution to a multi-faceted, complex problem that had been kicked down the road for the last two decades. He said the current project did nothing for SR 54. It did do some things for 74, and he understood it was all controlled by the State. But it was a prominent issue for citizens, and it was time the buck stopped at this City Council, he stated.

He asserted that the DLT would do nothing to help traffic on 54. There were some other complicating issues of turning right on 74 from 54 when there was a green light on northbound 74. This caused "block the box," which meant westbound traffic would not go very far from 54 because traffic was stacked up.

Holland said he recently asked the City Manager to contact GDOT to ask if there was any way they could amend, modify, or cancel this project. He said Curnow replied that as long as they had a majority on Council, they could do what they wanted with that intersection. He said he was working on an agenda topic that he would like to submit to City Council, calling for an open discussion on the project for 54/74. He pledged to have a presentation ready shortly, hopefully within the next month.

There were three engineers on Council, he pointed out: Learnard was an electrical engineer; Destadio, a civil engineer, and he was a chemical and environmental engineer. They had a lot of experience in their disciplines.

At this point, the Mayor asked him to stop. She said she and Curnow spent three hours the previous Friday at the GDOT offices and would be happy to bring him up to speed on the history, the rationale, the status, the cost, every nuance on this project.

She then told Holland he could finish his comments. He proposed that the City Council and the City Manager request the engineers and the managers of this current GDOT project to come and talk to them.

Prebor replied that Holland was "late to the party," saying it had been an issue for the 30 years he had been in Peachtree City. Holland commented that he realized that. Prebor stated that Holland moved into town, noticed a problem, and thought he had a solution.

Holland said he did not say he had a solution; they just needed GDOT to give them an update. Learnard told him she had the update; she and Curnow spent three hours in Thomaston at the GDOT offices, and she would be happy to bring him up to speed.

There being no further business, King moved to adjourn at 7:53 p.m. Prebor seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Martha Barksdale, Recording Secretary

Kim Learnard, Mayor