City Council of Peachtree City
Minutes of Meeting
December 7, 2006
7:00 p.m.

The City Council of Peachtree City met Thursday, December 7, 2006, in the City Hall Council Chambers. Mayor Logsdon called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Other Council Members present were: Steve Boone, Stuart Kourajian, Cyndi Plunkett, and Judi Rutherford.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognitions

Mayor Logsdon recognized the graduates of the Police Department's Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) program. Mayor Logsdon recognized Chief Murray and the Police Department for earning International Reaccreditation through the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc., (CALEA). Mayor Logsdon recognized members of the Recreation Department for earning several awards from the Georgia Recreation and Parks Association, including 2006 Agency of the Year; a publication award for the fall program guide; a Presidential Citation for Recreation Administrator Sherry McHugh; Volunteer of the Year for BMX President Shayne Robinson; and an Athletic Professional Award for Jim O'Connell. Mayor Logsdon recognized Betsy Tyler for 10 years of service to the City. Bob Dalton, President of the Peachtree City Running Club, presented $1,000 checks to the Police, Fire, and Recreation Departments to go toward the CERT program, a rehab chair for firefighters, and a track/cross country course at the Baseball Soccer Complex.

Public Comment

Mr. Dennis Hammock of the International Brotherhood of Police Officers announced that they had organized a majority of the members of the department.

Minutes

Rutherford moved to approve the minutes for the September 21, 2006, Executive Session; November 2, 2006, Regular Meeting; November 7, 2006, Workshop; November 16, 2006, Regular Meeting; and the November 29, 2006, Special Called Meeting as written. Plunkett seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Monthly Reports

Rutherford asked why the number of false fire alarms had doubled, and City Manager Bernard McMullen said he would check with the Fire Chief.

Consent Agenda

1. **Consider Updates to Adopted Building Codes**
2. **Consider Adoption of Impact Fee Report**
3. **Consider Acceptance of Drainage Easement for Culvert Construction on Hip Pocket Road**
4. **Consider Extension of Parker Wrecker Service Contract**
5. **Consider Vendor for Stormwater Bill Collection Service**
6. **Consider PCTA Lease Agreement Modification**
7. **Consider Trane Performance Contract Financing**
8. **Consider Peachtree City Elementary School Funding Request**

Rutherford moved to approve the items on the Consent Agenda. Plunkett seconded. Rutherford asked Building Official Tom Carty about the proposed changes to the Building Ordinance, specifically the number of deleted provisions. Carty clarified that the changes represented the conversion to the International Codes, which incorporated many of the City's requirements that had been added to the older code.

Rutherford questioned what measures had been taken to collect the past due Stormwater Utility bills. Assistant Finance Director Janet Camburn said residents had received their original annual bills in March, with a due date of May 1. Second notices had been sent in July. Kourajian asked if the City would lose any funds by using a collection agency. Camburn said that the City would receive the total amount due, and the agency would be paid the 27% additional late fee for their services. Council asked staff to make one last effort to notify residents through the media that the bills were due and would be turned over to a collection agency before actually beginning the collection process.

Kourajian asked the City Attorney if the drainage easement for Hip Pocket would be perpetual, and Meeker confirmed this.

Rutherford asked about the financial impact of changing the Tourism Association's lease agreement, noting that the City had budgeted the $10,000 flat fee as expected revenue. Financial Services Director Paul Salvatore noted that, by changing the arrangement to reimbursement for actual staff time and services, that the City could be reimbursed more or less than the $10,000 amount, but if it were less, funds would be made up from other revenue source projections that were currently tracking slightly higher than anticipated.

Rutherford asked why bid documents had not been attached to the Trane contract. McMullen noted that the bid was originally approved in 2005 – this contract reflected additional services at the rate quoted. Following due diligence, this was a competitive cost and would not require any additional closing costs. Rutherford asked that items of this level of cost be put on the regular agenda in the future.

Kourajian asked if the City obtained pricing information from any other wrecker services. Police Chief James Murray noted that this was the only services physically located in the City, which saved the officers' time while waiting for response. Kourajian asked if it needed to be bid. Meeker said he was comfortable with continuing with Parker because they had not changed rates.

Kourajian asked about the elementary school playground funding request. McMullen noted that the original request came in May, which met the June 1 deadline and had allowed the item to be included in the 2007 budget. The schools then made the request for the actual funding closer to the first of the calendar year.

The motion carried unanimously.

New Agenda Items

12-06-01 Public Hearing – Consider Variance – 137 Senoia Road

Barry Gannon, representing the property owner and American Tower, indicated that the cell tower in question was constructed in 1995 and purchased by American Tower in 2000. Sprint, which was formerly located on the Comcast tower that had been removed, wanted to co-locate on this tower. However, the facility did not meet the setback requirements currently on the books. Gannon noted that American Tower would also have to expand the fencing at the base to allow for the additional ground equipment needed by Sprint. He indicated the expansion would occur on the side farthest from the street and should be about 15 feet by 20 feet.

City Planner David Rast noted that the original tower was approved prior to the City amending its tower ordinance in 1998. At that time, there was a widespread push in the telecommunications industry to put towers in the area, and staff had been inundated with requests. Staff approached the tower companies, requested their assistance in updating the ordinance, and asked that they work toward co-locating on towers in the City.

The applicant for the variance initially wanted to replace the tower and increase the height, but this was not possible because the site could not meet the current setback requirements. Rast said there was room on the Tower to allow Sprint to co-located, but not enough room in the current fenced area at the base of the tower for their additional equipment. Their only other option was to look for a nearby site to build another tower. Rast said staff recommended approval of the variance.

No one spoke in favor or against the variance. Logsdon closed the public hearing.

Boone asked if there would be a loss of vegetation associated with the expansion of the fenced area. Rast said there would be some vegetation lost, but there were no mature trees in the area and the vegetation was mostly scrub. Plunkett asked if the owners of the funeral home on the adjacent site had commented. Rast said that staff had received no comments from them.

Rutherford said that, when she read the ordinance, it discussed the desire to encourage co-location on towers. She felt this project was a good example of that goal. Plunkett asked what would happen if the variance were denied. Gannon said Sprint would have to build another tower or it would affect service to customers in the area.

Rutherford moved to approve a variance for the amended drawing with the conditions that the added fencing enclosure must match the existing enclosure and that any vegetation removed would be replaced. Motion carried unanimously.

12-06-02 Public Hearing – Consider Variance – 403A Dividend Drive

Applicant Tim Powers addressed Council indicating that he wanted to place a cell tower on his commercial property, a lumber yard, and the project would result in a reduction of asphalt. Powers said that, according to the Airport Authority, the tower height requested was not allowed. Powers noted that his proposal complied with all the City's zoning laws.

Powers asked where the Airport Authority's jurisdiction extended because he had gotten some conflicting distances. He said cell tower locations impacted 10 times the number of people who actually used the airport. He said higher towers were needed in the City because the community sat in a naturally low elevation.

City Planner David Rast said the tower was planned for the rear corner of the lumber yard and was a permitted use for the zoning; however, it also fell in the AI Airport Overlay District, which had been adopted to protect the air space around Falcon Field. Rast said that the site did not appear to lie within the horizontal surface of the overlay zone, but did fall within the conical surface. Rast said he worked with the Airport Authority when the request came in, and the staff finding was that the height of the tower exceeded the limits of the overlay zone. He said staff could not allow the project to move forward. The FAA agreed that the project extended 48 feet into the protected zone.

Rutherford clarified that no survey had been completed. Rast said this was correct.

John Crosby, Peachtree City-Falcon Field Airport aviation director, said that the primary surface zone was calculated by measuring 200 feet out from the primary runway and then measuring a distance of 10,000 feet from the airport. Crosby said that, when the applicant submitted the plan, the Airport staff determined that it was close to the horizontal plane, but that it was definitely within the conical surface. Crosby said both the State and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) concluded that the proposed tower penetrated the conical surface by 48 feet. The Airport Authority hired an engineer, who also concluded the proposed tower exceeded the limits of the ordinance. Crosby said that any penetration had the potential for harming the airport's operation.

Jeffrey Evans of T-Mobile addressed Council and said his firm was the original applicant for the tower in March of this year. He said they targeted this property due to the industrial zoning, and they felt confident it met the intent of the ordinance on where towers should be located. Evans reiterated that they met all the provisions of the existing zoning ordinance.

Evans said the conceptual site plan was approved by the Planning Commission pending FAA approval of the tower. He said on May 30 he received a copy of the FAA's "No Hazard" determination based on the existing conditions and operations at the airport. The Airport Authority objected because it affected their proposed instrument landing approach.

Evans concluded by saying that they had a 160-foot structure that promoted co-location per the ordinance and was determined a "No Hazard" by the FAA.

Plunkett asked how much reduced service area customers would receive if the height were reduced. Evans said significantly less because, with over 25% of the height gone, they would not build the tower.

Albert Yogel addressed Council, saying he was a pilot. He said with the flight pattern over Line Creek, the tower should not have a negative impact and might benefit by serving as a landmark.

Juan Matute said he was a retired aviation employee. He said he did not think it was within Council's power to grant a variance on air safety. He also said that all residents needed good quality cell phone coverage, and he felt the City should be proactive in identifying sites for cell towers. Matute asked what the City's liability would be if the tower were approved and then an aircraft hit the tower. He said the City should have something more definite from the FAA.

Crosby again addressed Council, saying there was a debate on the FAA letters of "No Hazard." He also stated that the flight pattern could be changed at any time.

Hearing no further comment, Mayor Logsdon closed the public hearing.

Kourajian asked how the 808-foot elevation of the airport was determined. McMullen said it was based on the point at the end of the runway that served as the primary approach, and then the horizontal surface was measured at 10,000 feet out from that point. Crosby clarified that the 10,000 feet was determined by measuring out 200 feet from the entire surface of the runway, and then the 10,000 feet extended beyond that measurement. Crosby provided a drawing that provided some information on the various surface zones (drawing is included in the official meeting file).

Plunkett asked if would help to move the tower to the northern portion of the property, which was further away from the airport. Evans said the Planning Department had indicated the entire site would not work. Boone reiterated that a survey was needed to determine the precise location of the tower within the surface zones. Rast said it would be helpful to have a drawing from the Airport Authority delineating the surface parameters and providing the different height limitations within each surface zone.

Rutherford moved to table the item to the January 18 agenda, with the Airport Authority to provide a delineation of the surface zones, following which the applicant should provide a survey of the property to pinpoint the location of the tower relative to the zones. If the tower fell outside the zones, the applicant would be reimbursed the variance fee. Plunkett seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Crosby indicated the Airport Authority would have the delineation within 30 days, and McMullen confirmed that it would be provided to the applicant upon receipt.

12-06-03 Presentation by John Pero Regarding Fence Issue

John Pero of 113 Sweetwater Oaks addressed Council, saying he was a long-time resident who wanted to leave things better than he found them. He said that his home was on a busy path, and his home had been vandalized several times. He and his wife installed a custom-built, metal security fence with security lighting to help address the problem.

Pero said in late 2005, he came to the Building Department to obtain the permit, after which the fence was inadvertently installed on City-owned property. Pero said he was looking for solutions, and had talked to several departments, including the Building Department and Public Works, as well as several elected officials. One recurring comment was the possibility of a land swap with the City.

Pero said the issue came to light after the City widened the adjacent cart path, which in turn routed water onto his lot and shorted out the security lighting. Public Works came to inspect the problem and realized the fence was in the greenbelt. The fence failed final inspection.

Pero said his understanding of a land swap indicated the City had to receive an equal or greater amount of property in the exchange. He said he hired a local surveyor and had two options, an even exchange of either 486 square feet or 535.5 square feet. Pero said he could not put the fence on his property line because then he could not turn a car around in his driveway or open the doors on a parked car.

Logsdon clarified that there was a row of trees between the driveway and the fence, and those trees were actually on the property line, so placing the fence inside the trees would actually solve the problem.

Pero said he needed security at his home, and he needed some alternatives from the Council. He was hoping for a land swap, in which he would move the fence four feet toward the property line and exchange property outside the current wooden fence on the rear side of the property.

Logsdon said one option was the removal of the trees on the property line, which would allow the fence to be located on the existing property line.

City staff projected some photographs of the fence, showing the property line pins located nine feet inside the fence along the tree line.

Logsdon said he was fearful of setting a precedent and of basically telling the public that, if someone lived on a greenbelt and wanted a wider lot, all they needed to do was fence in City property. Logsdon said he sympathized with Pero's problem, but he was uncomfortable with an exchange.

Logsdon asked for staff's opinion. McMullen said he was also uncomfortable with the precedent because it would set the City up for making a determination on whether something was done on purpose or was an accident.

Kourajian asked what would be wrong with a land swap. He noted that a similar situation had arisen with Group VI extending a building six inches into the setback, and the City suggested that they pursue a land swap with the adjacent property owner. Kourajian asked if it was an issue of residential areas versus commercial areas. Rutherford said she felt that, in this instance, the problem lay with the encroachment onto the City's property. Kourajian said what he looked at was the usage of City property, and he did not see a specific usage for either the current greenbelt property or the property that Pero proposed to exchange. He said that, while there might be opportunities for people to abuse the system, he felt Pero's proposal was fair.

McMullen said his other primary concern was the ongoing problem of homeowners around the two lakes encroaching into greenbelts. He said that, if the City started trading greenbelt property around the lake, staff would lose more control than was held at this time, and control was currently a struggle.

Kourajian asked how this differed from businesses proposing to swap land with the City for development. McMullen said that, personally, he felt that if the City had property it wanted to dispose of, it should sell it to the highest bidder.

City Attorney Ted Meeker noted that there was also a sanitary sewer easement in the greenbelt in question, which would necessitate the Water and Sewerage Authority's (WASA) blessing of any land swap or sale.

Logsdon said he felt the lakeshore enforcement problems were the more important issue. Rutherford said that it was never comfortable to sit on Council when a citizen had made a mistake, but she had a problem with approving a land swap. She said there were other situations like this existing throughout town, and she felt all those people would wind up before Council wanting to buy or swap for greenbelt. Rutherford noted that, within the last five years, they had made a resident remove a playground and retaining wall that had encroached into City-owned greenbelt.

Barbara Pero, co-owner of the property, addressed Council, saying she had a problem with the City approving the fence and then making them take it out. Rutherford clarified that the permit was granted, but the fence had not been built on their property as indicated. Mrs. Pero said she thought a precedent had been set by allowing land swaps. She said she and her husband had paid for two more surveys to come up with options. Logsdon and Rutherford reiterated that the encroachment into the greenbelt was the real issue. Rutherford said consistency was needed, and they could not say greenbelts were important, and then say this one is more important than that one and start approving random changes within them. Kourajian noted that variances existed so Council could use some discretion in the application of ordinances.

Kourajian asked what the process would be for a land swap. Meeker said that appraisals would have to be performed on both pieces of property, and then there would need to be a public hearing, followed by a vote by Council. Boone asked what restrictions the WASA easement would place on a sale of the property. Meeker said the sale would be subject to keeping the easement. Meeker added that the City would be hard-pressed to sell the property because it was a small sliver of land and therefore a non-conforming lot. He said, legally, it would be cleaner to swap the property if Council wanted to do so. Kourajian clarified that a land sale could be done, and Meeker agreed.

Pero asked Council for direction and options. Plunkett said the options she saw were tearing down the fence, moving the fence onto his own property, swapping the property, and purchasing the property. Pero asked if he could donate the fence to the City. McMullen said that would still set a precedent. Pero asked for a general sense of how Council felt about the matter.

Plunkett said this Council had been very reluctant to grant variances, and she saw this request as falling into that type of action. Plunkett felt it would set a bad precedent.

Boone said that, if he were in Pero's position, he would cut down the trees and move the fence to his property line. Boone agreed to come by the site and look at the impact on the driveway.

Rutherford said she felt it would set a precedent.

12-06-04 Request from Becky Timmis to Address Council

Becky Timmis said that a committee had been formed by Rick Davidson to recognize the contributions to the community by Beth Wortman, who died in a car crash this year. Because of Wortman's work at the Tennis Center and involvement in tennis, the committee was requesting to put a plaque at Court 1 of the Tennis Center in her memory.

Plunkett moved to approve the request. Boone seconded.

Kourajian asked about the size of the plaque. He said he was prepared to approve something, but wanted some details. Timmis said it would be similar to that provided for Tom Farr. Logsdon said the plaque and stand should be no larger than Farr's. McMullen asked that the location of the plaque and stand should be coordinated with the City Engineer to ensure that maintenance vehicles still had the necessary access.

Plunkett amended her motion to approval subject to later Council approval of location and design. Boone seconded the amendment. Motion carried unanimously.

12-06-05 Consider PCTA Reimbursement Agreement
Financial Services Director Paul Salvatore said this was a housekeeping contract to formalize the City's relationship with one of its component units. He said it covered payments the City received from the Peachtree City Tourism Association for tourism-related events such as the July 4th parade.

Rutherford moved to approve the agreement. Boone seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

(Note: Item 12-06-06 Consider Funding Additional Firefighters, was removed from the Agenda prior to the meeting date)

12-06-07 Consider Bids for Street Sweeping
City Engineer Dave Borkowski addressed Council, saying street sweeping services for parking lots, commercial streets, and arterial streets had been included in Peachtree City's Phase II Stormwater Permit. Bids had gone out for those areas plus some additional streets. The lowest responsive bid was for $63,626.88. Borkowski said this was less expensive than performing the work in-house, and that funds would be reappropriated from the Stormwater Utility to pay for the cost.

Rutherford moved to approve the agreement for 2007, with two one-year automatic renewals. Kourajian seconded.

Plunkett clarified the reason for the contract was to keep pollutants out of the water. She asked if the City did not previously perform street sweeping. McMullen said it had been performed in the past, but not on any regular schedule. Rutherford asked if similar measures would be required from other companies. Borkowski said this was a commitment made by the City only as a good-housekeeping component of the permit.

Kourajian asked how the streets were identified for inclusion. Borkowski said the permit included a commitment for City-owned parking lots, commercial streets, and arterial streets. The remainder were areas known for a high volume of trash and debris. Rutherford noted that Peachtree Parkway was included on the list, but asked, if it had not been, could it be added following a special event such as July 4th. Borkowski said yes, and that any additional requests would be charged based on the rate quoted for the contract.

Kourajian asked how staff determined that the contract was cheaper than having Public Works do the work. Borkowski said Public Works staff performed the cost analysis, based on the cost of employee hourly rates, benefits, and equipment costs. Borkowski noted that the current street sweeper was not adequate to perform the work required.

Kourajian asked if the cost would increase over the second and third year. Meeker said he did not recall any automatic increases, but noted that there was a mutual termination clause. Kourajian asked if there would be a regular schedule, so those on and near affected streets would be aware of the program. Borkowski said a specific schedule had not been identified, but the contract specified the work would be performed during the evening hours. Kourajian asked that affected residents be notified by the City web site, UPDATE newsletter, and press releases to move cars from lots to be swept.

12-06-08 Consider Bids for 11 New Police Cars

Camburn said the City had solicited bids for 11 vehicles, and that Allen Vigil Ford had submitted the lowest bid. Rutherford asked if the additional funding had been put aside for the after-market accessories to equip the cars. Camburn confirmed that adequate funds were available.

Rutherford moved to approve the purchase of 11 cars, four new and seven for replacement, from Allen Vigil for $228,690, not including after-market accessories. Plunkett seconded.

Boone asked if the replaced cars would be sold on the Internet. Camburn said some might be, but some would be recycled to other departments. Logsdon asked if seven vehicles were replacement vehicles, did that mean seven vehicles would be leaving the overall city fleet. McMullen said yes, unless there was a need for a vehicle in another department where there was currently no vehicle, but he was unaware of such a situation. Motion carried unanimously.

12-06-09 Consider Cancelling December 21 Meeting

Plunkett moved to cancel the December 21 Regular Meeting. Kourajian seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Rutherford noted that, if an agenda had to be overloaded to cancel a meeting, she preferred to hold the meeting as originally scheduled.

12-06-10 Consider Brand Name and Sole Source for E-Forms Software

System Administrator Matt Robinson addressed Council, saying that the Police Department was looking at purchasing the E-forms software from USA Software for $62,888. They were requesting Council approval under the Brand Name and Sole Source Purchase provisions of the ordinance. Robinson explained that the software would integrate the forms into the existing records management software the department already used by USA Software. While another company made similar software, the cost to integrate it into the records management system would be much greater.

Rutherford asked if the purchase met the City's sole source requirements. Camburn said yes.

Rutherford moved to approve the Brand Name/Sole Source purchase of the E-Forms Software from USA Software in the amount of $62,888. Boone seconded the motion. Plunkett asked if the item was in the budget. Camburn said yes. Kourajian asked if the cost included maintenance, support, and training. Robinson confirmed this. Motion carried unanimously.

12-06-11 Consider Membership in ICMA Consortium for Performance Measurement

McMullen said staff was requesting that Council authorize entering an agreement to partner with other cities in Metro Atlanta for the collection of data from the members in 15 areas. After collection, ICMA would analyze the best practices, noting who was doing well and why. The goal was to improve operations for all the participants. McMullen said the cost was $5,250 per year. If

10 cities participated, the $3,900 training fee would be waived. McMullen said 15 cities had expressed a strong interest, so the 10-participant requirement should be met.

Kourajian asked what the benefit to the City would be, particularly if all the other participants rated lower. McMullen said that if Peachtree City were the template, it would be good to know, but staying in the program in the future would not be of any real benefit; however, the City might not be the template in all areas, and could gain insights into improvement. Rutherford noted that participation here also gave access to results from areas outside Metro Atlanta. McMullen said participation would let the City know in a concrete way how it stacked up. Logsdon said he felt it was worth participating for a year. Plunkett said that, if it turned out not to be a benefit, then they would re-evaluate for next year.

McMullen told Council the projected timeline for the project included training in January and data collection in late winter, with results published within a couple of months after that. The three-day training would focus on city managers the first day, directors and chiefs and other department personnel on the second day, and then a third day for follow up. The estimated staff time for data collection was five percent of the work-year for the one person dedicated as central control, and one to two percent of the year for the department personnel. Rutherford asked if staff could handle the increased workload. McMullen said he felt staff could because the process worked into the performance-based evaluations and budget elements.

Rutherford moved to authorize the expenditure of $5,240 from Council Contingency with the stipulation that the City would not participate if a total of 10 cities did not participate. Boone seconded the motion.

Kourajian asked if McMullen had seen samples of the program because he was still not sold on the idea. McMullen said he had not, but noted the process might become a requirement under the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) standards. Motion carried unanimously.

Kourajian moved to extend the meeting past 11:00 p.m., if necessary. Rutherford seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

<u>Council/Staff Topics</u>

Briefing on the McIntosh Village Traffic Study

Borkowski gave a presentation to Council to provide an overview of the traffic study associated with the McIntosh Trail Village Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Traffic Study. A copy of the Power Point is included in the official meeting file.

Borkowski noted that this was a 1,600-acre site in Coweta County that was bisected by the proposed TDK/Vernon Hunter Boulevard and featured approximately 600,000 square feet of retail, approximately 119,650 square feet of office space with 164 live/work residential units, and approximately 3,000 single family homes. The site also had a proposed church and elementary school, and build-out was expected in 2016.

Borkowski said the Traffic Analysis Report featured several intersections in the City, showing current traffic levels, projected traffic levels in 2016 without the DRI, and projected traffic levels in

2016 with the DRI. The City intersections included in the study were SR 74 and Peachtree Pkwy, SR 74 and SR 54, SR 74 and TDK/Crosstown, and Crosstown and Peachtree Pkwy.

Traffic increased at all intersections by 2016, both with and without the DRI. However, the project had particular impact on traffic north and southbound at SR 74 and Peachtree Parkway (adding approximately 200 cars in each direction during the peak hour); north and southbound traffic at SR 54 and SR 74 (adding approximately 200 cars southbound and 300 cars northbound during the peak hour); and at SR 74 and TDK/Crosstown (adding approximately 600 cars turning from TDK northbound onto SR 74, approximately 50 cars going straight from TDK to Crosstown, and approximately 85 cars turning from TDK southbound onto SR 74 during the peak hour). The study also estimated greater evening and weekend traffic at Crosstown and TDK due to the anticipated travel to and from shopping in the new commercial areas. The study anticipated a less than 20-vehicle increase per direction at the Parkway and Crosstown during the peak hour due to the DRI.

There were also intersection improvements required by the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA) based on the DRI. The report indicated that a traffic signal would be needed at the Parkway and Crosstown Road (currently funded in the Regional Transportation Plan and in the City's PIP as Intersection Improvements). Additional required improvements were:

2016 Peachtree City Improvements needed without DRI:

- At the intersection of SR 74 at Peachtree Parkway, add a second westbound left turn lane to create dual left turns (Currently not programmed by DOT or City)
- At the intersection of SR 74 at SR 54, add second northbound and westbound left turn lanes to create dual left turn lanes, add a third westbound through lane, and add a receiving lane on westbound SR 54 to allow free southbound right turns (Currently only the northbound left turn lane is programmed in the ongoing 74 widening project)
- At the intersection of SR 74 at TDK Blvd/Crosstown Road, add second southbound and eastbound left turn lanes to create dual left turn lanes (Currently not programmed in ongoing 74 widening project or by the City)
- At the intersection of Peachtree Parkway at Crosstown Road, install a traffic signal [Currently funded in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP – Q23 funds) and in the City's PIP]

2016 Peachtree City Improvements needed with DRI:

- At the intersection of SR 74 at Crabapple Lane/Peachtree Parkway, add third northbound through lane (Currently not programmed by the City or DOT)
- At the intersection of SR 74 at SR 54, add third northbound and southbound through lanes and add an exclusive northbound right turn lane (Currently programmed in the ongoing 74 widening project)
- At the intersection of SR 74 at TDK Blvd/Crosstown Road, add second northbound, southbound, eastbound, and westbound through lanes; add a second northbound and westbound left turn lanes to create dual left turn lanes; and add a second southbound right turn lane and receiving lanes to create dual free right turn lanes (Currently not programmed in the ongoing 74 widening project or by the City)

Council questioned the lack of anticipated traffic increase coming in from SR 54. Borkowski noted that the study was based on a number of assumptions. In this case, the assumption was that the majority of traffic would be taking Coweta County roadways directly to the interstate. Borkowski added that, if the assumptions were wrong, the projections would be equally wrong.

Kourajian noted that, according to the study, proposed development would not increase traffic tremendously at the Braelinn Village Shopping Center. Plunkett asked what Peachtree City and the Council could do about the development and the road improvements GRTA was requiring in th City. McMullen said there was a meeting in Coweta County the previous Tuesday at which GRTA received input from the affected localities. McMullen said GRTA was looking at issuing a Notice of Decision on the DRI the following Monday.

Plunkett asked what agency had control over GRTA that monitored when they were not following their own rules, namely in placing requirements on jurisdictions that had no input into approving a project. Rutherford noted that, to date, no one had challenged GRTA's authority on these projects. McMullen said the only agency with an ability to affect the situation was Coweta County, and he indicated the project would have far more impact on their traffic than on Peachtree City's. Rutherford added that GRTA was basically saying that construction in another County required the City to make traffic improvements to accommodate that construction. Plunkett asked staff to develop a plan for January, when Council would be putting together its requests to the Legislative Delegation, on how to approach this issue. Rutherford reiterated that the real objection was being made responsible for infrastructure without being given an opportunity for input. Plunkett added that the McIntosh DRI appeared to be too large until GRTA could explain how the required road improvements would be made. Plunkett also noted that the study did not factor in the proposed West Village annexation.

XI. Executive Session

Rutherford moved to convene into executive session for threatened or pending litigation and a personnel matter. Boone seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Rutherford moved to reconvene in regular session. Kourajian seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Plunkett moved to authorize the City Attorney to file the necessary appeal and legal action against GRTA regarding the McIntosh DRI. Kourajian seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business to discuss, Rutherford moved to adjourn. Plunkett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:44 p.m.

Betsy Tyler, Deputy City Clerk

Harold K. Logsdon, Mayor