City Council of Peachtree City
Minutes of Meeting
November 15, 2007
7:00 p.m.

The City Council of Peachtree City met Thursday, November 15, 2007, in the City Hall Council Chambers. Mayor Logsdon called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Other Council Members present: Steve Boone, Mike Harman, Stuart Kourajian, and Cyndi Plunkett.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognitions
Mayor Logsdon recognized the district and state Georgia Recreation and Parks Association award recipients, including Matt McMahan and Brian Huefner, co-chairs of the Youth Council Serving Fayette County, Volunteers of the Year for the Fourth District; Bonnie Mullikin, The Gathering Place and the Recreation Department's T.E.A.M. program, State Volunteer of the Year for 2007; Jim O'Connell, athletic coordinator, Marketing and Visibility Committee Publication Award for population category 30,001– 80,000; and Carolyn Stanton, manager of leisure programs, Mike Daniel Award, the highest state honor for programmers. Mayor Logsdon recognized the McIntosh High School girl's volleyball team as state champions.

Public Comment
Richard Spain spoke regarding the PTC 101 program. He said a great job had been done and encouraged every citizen to take the class.

Agenda Changes
There were no changes.

Minutes
Plunkett moved to approve the November 1, 2007, regular meeting minute as written. Boone seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Consent Agenda
1. **Consider 2007 Budget Adjustments**
2. **Consider 2008 Budget Adjustments**
3. **Alcohol License – Change in Licensee & License Representative – Smokey Bones**

Harman moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Plunkett seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items
10-07-13 Consider Request for Abandonment of Line Creek Circle and a Portion of Line Creek Drive
City Attorney Ted Meeker clarified that the developer was requesting the City abandon Line Creek Circle and Line Creek Drive. He reminded Council that the applicant had withdrawn his request at the October 18 meeting, so the item was pulled from the agenda. The abandonment would start at the end of the Flexxon property, then move south encompassing all of Line Creek Court.

Doug McMurrain of Capital City Development addressed Council. He said his request was the same as before, but he was taking the big box off the table. He asked Council for a clean slate to work on. The substandard road, which was cracked and needed resurfacing, sat in the middle of the tract, bisecting the property and limiting how the project could be designed. The Planning Commission would not hear his application with the road in the middle of it. He was prepared to present a plan that Council and the residents would endorse. The plan had to go to the Planning Commission before it would come back to Council, so there would be numerous bites of the apple to get a plan that was right for the City.

Logsdon explained to those attending the meeting that the request was to abandon the street. If Council made a decision at this meeting, it was merely to abandon the streets. The developer would have to return to Council at a later date to buy the land, and Council would make the decision to sell the land at that time. When the land was sold, Council would then be able to put any restrictions on the property regarding big boxes or anything that was needed. He noted that Richard Spain and Tim Lydell had asked to speak.

Spain read the position paper from the Peachtree City Civic Association (PTCCA). (A copy of the position paper is included in the official meeting file.) The PCCA was opposed to the Central Park at Line Creek and the abandonment and sale of Line Creek Circle and a portion of Line Creek Drive. He asked Council to vote against the request to abandon the roads. Without the roads, there was more potential for a site plan that was consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the 54 West design guidelines. A large scale big box development would be detrimental to the City. The special use permit required the developer to prove conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. There was no overwhelming public interest in the proposed project. Approving the abandonment and sale of the roads would set a legal precedent. Ordinances based on opinion were the target of litigation. Developers would be inclined to proposed similar developments in the future and challenge the City's opinion in court, which would cost the City time and money. The 54 West overlay and design guidelines required an upscale appearance in any development in the area. There had to be a system in place to hold developers liable who did not abide by the ordinance. The parking was located between the street and store, which was contrary to the existing ordinances. The PTCCA opposed the Central Park project as it had been presented to the public and encouraged the Council to deny any action that would facilitate the development as proposed on this site. The PTCCA also asked that its position paper be included in the minutes of the meeting. The roads were needed in order to build a big box, but not the smaller scale village concept proposed by the Comprehensive Plan.

Lydell, president of the Cardiff Park Homeowners Association (HOA), noted he was also a member of the PTCCA. The residents of his subdivision had a vested interest in what happened on the property. They had worked with McMurrain on a plan that was amenable to the neighborhood, the City, and the developer. The plan was not acceptable to the majority and had been shot down. The residents were very concerned and did not want another Lexington Circle. Lydell continued the Cardiff Park residents believed the roads should be abandoned so the developer would have a clean slate to build on, provided there were restrictions that the development would not be seen, heard, or smelled by residents of Cardiff Park. The developer had made that commitment to the HOA. He asked for the same restrictions on the new plan that would be presented. He asked Council to abandon the roads, get as much money as they could for the City, and to protect the residents of Cardiff Park.

Logsdon asked for any questions or comments and if everyone understood the process.

Kourajian asked McMurrain if the roads needed to be abandoned before he could talk to anyone. He noted that one of McMurrain's earlier plans had not required the road abandonment. Kourajian did not want to sell the roads for the sake of selling them. If a project was the right thing for everyone, then he was amenable to the abandonment and sale of the roads. At this time, he did not know what would be presented. McMurrain said the City would have the second and third bites of the apple. The City had to approve the conceptual site plan, according to its ordinances. He could not even go to the Planning Commission to start the process with the roads there. They would not hear it. He owned all the property except the first 100 feet next to the Flexxon property. The roads were a liability to the City, and they generated no taxes. He would pay the City whatever the appraisers said was the fair market price for the land the roads were on. He would turn the roads into commercially rated roads, which would help the tax digest. He was committed to a project that would not be seen, smelled, or heard in Cardiff Park. McMurrain continued that everyone wanted Whole Foods. He pointed out that those particular stores exceeded 32,000 square feet, so he would have to come back to Council for a special use permit. Council would have an opportunity to say yes or no on the project. He could not talk to potential tenants about "maybes."

Kourajian asked if the roads would have to go out for bid if they were abandoned. City Manager Bernard McMullen said that, if the same property owner was on both sides of the road, the City could offer the property to that owner as long the owner paid at least fair market value. He added that the property was currently zoned GC. Any building of more than 32,000 square feet had to come before Council for approval. Anything less than 32,000 square feet required Planning Commission approval only. Council could put restrictions on the deed for the land for final site plan approval, but that was not a normal part of the process. Logsdon clarified that the deed restrictions were part of the sale of the land.

Plunkett said Council should set some criteria and only abandon the road if the criteria were met. She did not want to abandon the road looking for future criteria. She would only vote to abandon the roads if the plan made sense. Meeker said it could be done either way. McMullen had just laid out the different options. Council had to choose the option it wanted.

Logsdon said he did not disagree with Plunkett. The streets did not go anywhere and were not in the transportation plan. The City would want the restrictions set before the property was sold. He asked if the City could get an appraisal on the land without abandoning the roads. Meeker said yes. Council had to vote to abandon the roads, then the process to sell the property could begin. Harman asked what would happen if Council abandoned the roads, but decided not to sell the property. Meeker said that, under the statute, there could be a potential issue if the City abandoned the roads and did not sell the property.

Harman noted that Council had discussed this once before and most of the members had agreed to discuss abandoning the roads so a plan could be presented to the Planning Commission. He asked McMullen what the difference was. McMullen pointed out that, according to the ordinances, the developer must either own the property, or have an option to buy, prior to bringing a plan to the Planning Commission. Boone clarified that the developer could not bring a plan to Planning Commission without roads being abandoned. He said Council could do the two steps at the same time – abandon the roads, then sell the land. Plunkett said Council could do it as it had been done before, with a charette with the neighbors. There had been a plan without abandoning the roads. McMurrain said the road did not go anywhere. It was a liability, not an asset. The City still had ordinances he had to comply with. He had gone down that road once, and Council had changed its mind. He was asking for a clean slate to draw on and work with the Planning Commission on. He would bring it back to Council for final approval.

Logsdon said Council would put the restrictions giving Council the right to say what the project looked like prior to selling the land. Plunkett said the minute Council abandoned the roads it would open up the door to the next developer. Meeker verified that the process to dispose of the property should begin as soon as the roads were abandoned. Plunkett continued that McMurrain could sell the property, which would create a position the City did not want. Plunkett wondered what Council would be setting itself up for. Meeker said it could be an issue, whether it was a winning issue or not, he did not know.

Plunkett said she would not agree to abandon the roads until she knew what the restrictions would be and what was going to be done. Kourajian agreed. If McMurrain sold his property, then another developer could put in anything they wanted within the City's current restrictions. Plunkett said they had nothing to validate the promises McMurrain made. McMurrain said he had been working on this project for two years. He was trying to complete his work. He had worked with Cardiff Park and Planterra. He needed to go out to market with a plan, and he was trying to come up with a unique plan. Putting restrictions on the property was short-sighted because Council did not know what the plan was. The tenants would drive the plan in this case. Georgia law said he had first right to buy the land. He had the funding and was prepared to buy the land at fair market value. He would come up with a Peachtree City project that would be much nicer than anything in place now.

Harman asked Council what they would do if a Whole Foods or Fresh Market wanted to be a tenant, but the restrictions put on it would preclude that business from coming to the City. Plunkett said Council could change the deed restrictions to fit the plan because the roads would not have been abandoned yet. Harman asked who would look at the plan – Council or Planning Commission. The new Council could not evaluate the plan; Council Members were not planners. It would be wrong for the plan not to go through the Planning Commission. Plunkett said Council would not approve the site plan, but was willing to abandon the road based on the plan that was presented. Kourajian said he was not willing to give up City property without knowing what it was for, but he was interested in doing the right thing for the right reason. Whole Foods could go out of business. There should be restrictions as to what the building could be used for. McMurrain reiterated that a Whole Foods would exceed the big box ordinance. If Council put a restriction for no big boxes on abandoning the roads, then Council would eliminate any chance for a Whole Foods. Council had the final decision on the site plan.

Logsdon asked McMurrain if he could show Council a plan like he had for Kohl's without Council taking any action. McMurrain said he could not keep circumventing the Planning Commission. Logsdon said Council would like to see the concept before it went to the Planning Commission. If it was the right plan, Council would be willing to abandon the roads so McMurrain could go to the Planning Commission. McMurrain said he had done that already. Kourajian noted that was for the Kohl's. Now he needed to come with another plan.

Logsdon told McMurrain that the consensus was that Council would be willing to abandon the roads if the right plan were presented. He suggested McMurrain bring back a plan, and Council could abandon the roads and begin the sale process. Logsdon said the timeline he envisioned coming into the meeting was that, if the City abandoned the roads, McMurrain could proceed to the Planning Commission, which would not meet until after the Council's December meeting. Meanwhile, the City could start the appraisal process, and McMurrain could come back in January for the City to sell the roads and place restrictions on the property at the same time. Logsdon said the only change in that timeline was that he was asking McMurrain to develop a plan for the property and present it to Council first, possibly by the December 6 meeting. McMurrain said he would do it, but he had one condition. He wanted a Council Member to be part of the committee to come up with a plan, and he wanted permission to work with staff to try to come up with a plan. Logsdon and Boone said they could agree to that. McMurrain requested Council Member Plunkett serve on the committee. He said he would do what Council asked. McMurrain was ready to put the committee together and suggested Planning Commissioner Marty Mullin serve on it. Logsdon said Council would discuss who would serve and would let him know by Monday (November 19) who would serve on the committee.

Plunkett moved to continue the request for the abandonment of Line Creek Circle and a portion of Line Creek Drive until such time as the committee was prepared to make a presentation. Boone seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

<u>New Agenda Items</u>

11-07-14 Airport Authority Update

Peachtree City Airport Authority (PCAA) Chairman Jerry Cobb addressed Council. He introduced Airport Authority Member Bill Flynn, Aviation Director John Crosby, and Assistant Aviation Director Barry Griffith, who also attended the meeting. Cobb noted that Doug Fisher served as secretary/treasurer for the Authority. Greg Carroll and Rick Mendenhall also served on the board. Cobb added that Crosby was the incoming president for the Georgia Airports Association, which represented 103 airports in the state. (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is included in the official meeting file.) He continued that they were working on securing precision approaches to Falcon Field, but were having issues due to a tower that had been on the approach to Runway 31 many years ago that protruded into the airway to Falcon Field. The tower had been gone since 1992, but was still in the database.

Cobb continued that the PCAA was chartered by the state and owned the airport, which was founded by Joel Cowan in 1968. The airport received a percentage of the hotel/motel tax, but did not receive any other funds from City or Fayette County residents. Harman asked how the budget was. Cobb said they were making money. There was concern because depreciation did not show up in the budget because the airport did not pay taxes. Depreciation did show up in the annual report and made it look as though the airport was losing money, but it was not. Harman asked why the PCAA needed the hotel/motel tax if it could survive on its own. Cobb said the airport was not there yet, but that was the goal. He explained that the airport was little more than a grass strip 30 years ago. Since then, the PCAA had spent $20 million through airport improvement funding from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). On federal funding, the government paid 95% of a project; the PCAA paid 5%, and the state usually paid 50% of that, leaving 2.5% for the PCAA to pay. On state funds, the state paid 75% of a project, and the PCAA paid 25%. Harman asked when the airport would be self-sufficient. Cobb said when the 84 acres were developed and online the PCAA would be better able to do a budget. The annual budget was approximately $2 million, but there was not much spread between the income and the expenses. Without the hotel/motel tax, the Authority would be scratching the bottom all the time and would be for several years.

Cobb listed the commercial operators on the airport, which included Falcon Aviation Academy, Falcon Air Charter, Falcon Air Maintenance, Southeast Piper, Gardner Aviation Specialists, Zephyr Aviation, Silver Ace, Affordable Charters of Excellence, Rescue Air One, and Dover Avionics. On-airport non-commercial aviators included 191 based aircraft and a waiting list with weekly inquiries. Off-airport operators included Chick-fil-A, Inc., 3001, Inc., Toy Box, Commemorative Air Force, Aircraft Spruce & Specialty, and a proposed restaurant.

Cobb continued that the FY 2007 revenues were $2 million, and the FY 2008 revenues were projected to be over $2 million. The hotel/motel tax averaged $10,000 per month. Ninety percent of the revenue came from two sources – fuel sales (67%) and hangar rental/tie-down fees (23%). Capital projects from FAA and state grants totaled $1.8 million in 2007 and $4.6 million in 2008. The grants were for specific items and could not be used for overall operations.

Cobb noted that the environmental studies on Area B, the 24 acres purchased in 2003, were complete. The next step was to design the project, then bid the project and construct it. Construction should be initiated in 2008, with the first occupancy expected in 2009. The environmental studies were also completed for Area C, the 60 acres purchased in 2004. The next step was to acquire FAA and state funding for construction. Land clearing had just begun. Construction should be initiated in 2008, with the first occupancy in 2009. Both areas were purchased with FAA grants.

Cobb continued that getting precision approaches had been one of the PCAA's goals for several years. The Instrument Landing System (ILS) would be operational in mid-2008, and the Localizer Performance with Vertical Guidance (LPV) would be in operation in December 2007.

Cobb said the PCAA strived for an acceptable mix of personal pleasure aviation with facilities suitable for corporate use. The focus now was on corporate. Falcon Field was an attractive gateway to the region. The 11th Great Georgia Airshow was planned for October 2008. Approximately 20,000 attended the airshow in October 2007. The airshow was a non-profit event. More than $140,000 was given back to local non-profit organizations from the 2007 airshow, which was rated as one of the best in the country. He encouraged everyone to visit the airport, which features a playground and picnic tables.

Plunkett asked about the restaurant plans. Cobb said that it had been discussed for a few years. The site was located next to the Dixie Wing hangar, but the ground had not yet been broken.

11-07-15 Certify Election Results

Acting Administrative Services Director/City Clerk Betsy Tyler submitted the report about the municipal election held on November 6, 2007. There were 21,618 registered voters eligible to vote in the election. There were 3,141 ballots cast by the electors, including 449 absentee ballots and one provisional ballot accepted. The following votes were cast:

CITY COUNCIL POST 1

Don Haddix	1,712	56.71%
Mike Harman	748	24.78%
Thomas J. O'Toole, Jr.	555	18.38%
Write-in Votes	3	0.13%

CITY COUNCIL POST 2

Mark Hollums	510	16.98%
Michael L. King	1,027	34.19%
Doug Sturbaum	934	31.09%
Dar Thompson	524	17.44%
Write-in Votes	9	0.30%

QUESTION 1 (Baseball/Soccer Complex)

Yes	892	28.79%
No	2,206	71.21%

QUESTION 2 (Gathering Place)

Yes	1,294	41.65%
No	1,813	58.35%

Harman moved to certify the election results from the November 6 election for Council Posts 1 and 2 and the two bond questions. Plunkett seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

11-07-16 Consider Amendment to Peddlers & Solicitors Ordinance

Meeker noted that there were some operational issues that needed to be streamlined so it would be easier for staff to handle. One example was transient merchants. Due to the City's ordinances, the City did not have transient merchants who set up in parking lots. The amendments also streamlined the permitting process for the Police Department. Staff involved in the review of the amendments included Solicitor Marcia Moran, the Police Department, and Code Enforcement.

Plunkett asked about people who stood along the roads with signs advertising "going out of business" sales. Meeker noted that one of the instances was part of the court order for a bankruptcy. Plunkett referred to other businesses. Meeker said they were not allowed in the City right-of-way at all. The only exception would be the court-ordered sale. Code Enforcement should be notified when these things were seen. The practice had been prohibited since January.

Plunkett moved to approve the amendment to the Peddlers & Solicitors ordinance. Boone seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

11-07-17 Request to Address Council Regarding Allowing Segways on the Paths
Matt Dailida, director of regulatory and government affairs for Segway, addressed Council along with Paul Vereb, owner of the local Segway store. (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is included in the official meeting file.) Dailida said Segways were the first rideable self-balancing devices and could travel at a top speed of 12.5 miles per hour. An off-road model was also available. The distance that could be traveled on a single charge was approximately 24 miles. It weighed anywhere from 105 to 120 pounds. Safety was the highest priority. It met Class 3 medical standards, which meant failure was not an option. The Segway could be completely stopped in a crowded area. It could not run over or through someone. The product was U.S. made. A 30 to 60-minute training session was given after a Segway was purchased. They strongly recommended helmets. The product was extremely safe, stable, and met product safety laws. The fastest growing market was for police/security use. The average age of an owner was 50. The Segway was a green vehicle with zero emissions. Segway was committed to ensuring Segways were properly regulated. In 2003, Georgia state law defined the Segway as a personal assistance mobility device and gave users the same status as pedestrians. The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission ruled that the Segway was not a motor vehicle. Dailida referred to the motor vehicles and devices that were allowed on the path system; the Segway met those requirements. He noted that Segway users were pedestrians under state law, were not considered motor vehicles under state law, and Segways were designed to carry one person at speed of 20 miles per hour or less. The Segway footprint was equivalent to an average person. He continued that they also marketed to golf courses, and a study was conducted on the use of Segways on the turf. It was found that Segways did not impact the turf.

Vereb said his store was a perfect match for the City, and Segways were a perfect vehicle for the paths. Bicycles could go over 40 miles per hour when going downhill. A Segway stopped the moment it was level and backed itself up. It stopped immediately. It was meant to be around people on crowded sidewalks and could easily get out of the way. The Segway was a perfect vehicle for the cart path. It was a green, safe mode of transportation. More than 450 police departments used Segways.

Plunkett noted there was an all-terrain Segway. Vereb said it had wider tires. Plunkett asked why that one was not recommended for the paths. Vereb said both could be used since the Segway was built to take rugged terrain. The all-terrain Segway handled the bumps better, and people might feel more secure with it as opposed to the standard Segway. Plunkett said she preferred only the all-terrain modes be used on the paths because they should take the bumps better. Kourajian said that should be a personal decision.

Frances Meaders asked how old a person should be to use one. Logsdon said that was something Council needed to work out. State law did not stipulate an age limit for their use. Harman asked Meeker if Council had to do anything since the Segways were not excluded by the ordinance. Meeker pointed out that Segways were considered a scooter under the definition in the City's ordinance.

Al Yougel asked how the device handled steep approaches to bridges. Vereb said it depended on how far forward the user leaned. Dailida said the recommendation was 28 degrees. Users could set the speed at their personal preference. Whether going down a hill or not, the Segway would not go faster than the limit that was set.

Richard Spain noted that, under Georgia law, the devices were considered pedestrians. He asked if that meant a Segway had the right-of-way at intersections. Golf carts did not. Meeker said a Segway would have the right of way in a properly marked intersection if it had entered the roadway. Cars would have to stop. Meeker answered Harman's question regarding why the Segway was not currently allowed on the paths. Meeker said it had not been listed in vehicles that could be used, so it use was considered excluded. It was not listed as either a permitted or prohibited vehicle. Staff had always interpreted the ordinance to prohibit Segways. Council could add the Segway to the list of permitted vehicles in the ordinance.

Phil Jones asked if there was any safety data or history on accidents and the type of accidents involving Segways. Dailida said the Segway was a motorized device so injuries could occur. Training helped to minimize accidents. The company kept accident data internally to help them understand how the product was used. There were safety studies available.

Harman said he had gone by the store and ridden one. He thought they were fine for use on the paths. Harman moved to approve Segways as an official vehicle on the multi-use paths. Boone seconded.

Plunkett pointed that the agenda item had just been a request to address Council. Harman said Council only needed to state the Segway was an approved vehicle under the ordinance. Kourajian said there should be an age restrictions, and decals should be required for the devices. He added that the user should have a valid driver's license or be 18 years old. He would not want to require helmets or a specific type of Segway. Boone agreed that a decal should be required. Harman asked what criteria should be used to determine the age of a user. Kourajian said it was motorized. A seven-year old going 12.5 miles per hour was a safety issue. He did not want to legislate what parents should do, but it was the same as requiring an age restriction on driving golf carts.

Harman said he would amend his motion to comply with the golf cart rules for age restriction and registration. Kourajian said he wanted to see specific information to address Segways. Harman amended his motion to include registration as required for golf carts and age restrictions as required to operate a golf cart without parental supervision. Boone seconded.

Meeker noted that the City had a provision for low speed motor vehicles (LSMVs), which must be driven a licensed driver. The exception for golf carts was for 15-year olds with a learner's permit or 12 to 14-year olds with a parent or guardian. When he saw the agenda item, he felt that, if Council wanted to go forward, then they would direct staff to amend the ordinance and bring it back to Council for approval. It would allow staff to address some of the issues. Logsdon said he wanted to give direction to staff, then have the ordinance amendments brought back to Council.

Harman said he did not see why it should be put off if it was just adding the Segway to the list of approved vehicles. Logsdon said it would give staff time to look at the issues and come back with a well-defined ordinance. He did not want to negotiate in a meeting. Harman said they knew the request was coming for several weeks. Logsdon said staff now knew Council was willing to consider the Segways for the paths, and they would not be wasting their time on something Council did not want to consider. Harman withdrew his motion.

McMullen clarified that the ordinance should include registration similar to golf carts. He was not clear on age restrictions. Kourajian said users should be licensed drivers or 18 years old. Harman felt the age restrictions should be the same as sole operation of a golf cart. Logsdon said that was only a one-year difference. Meeker said staff could draft an ordinance and would talk to Segway about some of those issues. Council was free to change staff's recommendation. Kourajian said he was not interested in requiring helmets or certain types of Segways. Harman and Logsdon agreed. Kourajian said he saw the Segways as a multi-purpose path vehicle, not something that would be used in the sidewalks of the shopping areas. Dailida said the state's definition only applied to public property. It would be up to the owners of private property whether they would be allowed in the shopping centers.

11-07-18 Concept Approval of Intersection Improvements at Walt Banks/Peachtree Parkway and Crosstown/Peachtree Parkway

City Engineer Dave Borkowski presented the concept plans for transportation improvements at the intersections. Both projects were in the City's transportation plan and the state's Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). Walt Banks/Peachtree Parkway was also funded in the Special Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST). (A copy of the analysis is included in the official meeting file.) Borkowski said he needed Council's approval for the concept plans for the improvements. He noted that the transportation consultants were at the meeting if there were any questions on the study.

Borkowski went over the current intersection at Walt Banks/Peachtree Parkway and pointed out the multi-use path crossings in the area. The concept staff recommended was a signalized intersection with turn lanes added. The consultants agreed with the turn lanes and signalization. The level of service was acceptable with the additional turn lanes and the four-way stop; however, staff felt the best alternative was with the signalization, which would be much safer with the multi-use paths crossings at the intersections. People could push buttons to stop traffic. Logsdon and Kourajian both pointed out that Council did not want a traffic signal at the intersection.

Kourajian asked why Council was only being given one option. McMullen explained that Council had previously stated opposition to roundabouts, which did not address the cart path crossing safety concern. This was staff's alternate option to the roundabouts to address current and future traffic and path crossing safety. Kourajian said the traffic was only an issue at peak times of the day. He would not support a signal in a residential area. Boone and Plunkett agreed. McMullen said he understood. Staff had presented its recommendation, and Council did not have to accept it. There could just be turn lanes and stop signs, which was still a satisfactory level of service for vehicles. A traffic signal provided an increased level of safety for golf carts. Borkowski said the roundabout was still an option. Plunkett said that a roundabout would be fine if someone could figure out what to do with the golf carts. Boone said he liked the turn lanes and the configuration of the cart path. If traffic increased, a signal might be needed later.

Harman recalled that Boone had made a motion at an earlier meeting to put in the turn lanes, with a signal to come later if needed. The overall tone of that meeting was that there be no traffic signals on Peachtree Parkway, except for major intersections. A signal should not be installed for a problem that occurred for a couple of hours every morning and evening. It cost over $100,000 to put up a signal, and a crossing guard was $15 an hour, which was a lot of hours.

Logsdon agreed and added that he did not want to see a light at Crosstown/Peachtree Parkway either. Borkowski pointed out that Crosstown/Peachtree Parkway met the warrants for a signal now. Kourajian, who drove through the intersection every day, said he did not think the intersection was that bad, but the warrants were there. Harman agreed. Logsdon said he drove through that intersection multiple times a day, but not always at peak times. He suggested putting in the turn lanes, then re-evaluating the intersection. Kourajian agreed. Borkowski said the issue with adding more lanes to this intersection was that it would be more confusing for the drivers as to whose turn it was to go. Harman said he went through the intersection often and never had to wait for more than two or three cars. He did not see the need for six extra lanes for right and left turns. Borkowski said that, currently, there was a failure, an F rating, in one of the movements. They were also looking ahead at traffic growth through 2027. Logsdon asked if the projected amount of traffic based on the TDK Boulevard expansion had been taken out of the analysis. Borkowski said those traffic numbers had been removed from the study. The east bound movement from SR 74 was an F during the afternoon hours with 101.9 seconds of average delay. The intersection, as whole, was an E during the evening peak hours with a 61-second average delay. Harman asked how those numbers compared to the traffic at the Peachtree Parkway/SR 54 intersection. Borkowski said that comparison had not been made.

Dave Gardner told Council he drove through the Crosstown/Peachtree Parkway intersection often, and it was very bad in the afternoon, especially going eastbound on Crosstown. Everyone wanted to make a right turn going south on the Parkway. The morning was not bad. There was much more traffic at Peachtree Parkway/SR 54, which had a signal.

Phyllis Aguayo noted that traffic did back up at the Walt Banks/Peachtree Parkway intersection, but it was just a pause. Peachtree Parkway was one of the City's scenic highways and was precious to all the residents. Buffers were being lost all over the City. Peachtree Parkway would be destroyed with a light. Engineers only looked at what worked. The City had always looked at aesthetics. She drove back and forth several times a day and had never waited more than a few minutes at the intersection.

Scott Simon, owner of the property on the southeast corner of Walt Banks/Peachtree Parkway, said there was traffic during school hours and evenings. It took about 10 to 15 seconds to get out of his driveway. The back-up at the intersection was usually just a few minutes.

Harman noted that the issues at Crosstown/Peachtree Parkway could be solved with a right turn lane so the east bound traffic on Crosstown could keep moving to go south on Peachtree

Parkway. Plunkett agreed and added that moving the cart path would solve a lot of the problems at Walt Banks/Peachtree Parkway.

Borkowski said they were looking at a planning horizon through to 2027 because it took so long for transportation projects to be built. There was a two-year time frame just for the DOT studies on these projects. They were trying to get ahead of the game and take future traffic into account. Harman asked where the future traffic would come from. Borkowski said the background traffic increased every year. Plunkett and Boone noted that some of the traffic would come from the new Coweta County developments. Those drivers would come from Rockaway Road to Crosstown to get to Fayetteville. Borkowski noted that the level of service for the westbound traffic on Crosstown at the intersection was currently rated at B and C.

Logsdon asked Borkowski what he needed from Council. Borkowski said he needed Council to approve the concept so staff could move forward and work with DOT. It would 18-24 months before dirt was moved, if everything went smoothly. Logsdon said he was convinced a light would be needed at Crosstown, but not at Walt Banks Road. He asked if Council would consider tabling the decision and talk to Borkowski individually. Kourajian said there was a lot to think about. Borkowski said he would need to ask the DOT adjust their project schedule so the funds would be available. Logsdon said to put the decision on the December 6 agenda. He expected all the Council Members to talk to Borkowski before then. The consensus was that there would not be a light at Walt Banks/Peachtree Parkway.

Sherri Smith Brown, the property owner on the northeast corner of Walt Banks/Peachtree Parkway, said having a crossing guard directing traffic in the morning and afternoon kept the flow going. Most of the back up was north heading south. She had timed the wait, and it was 90 seconds.

Gardner asked where the funding for the projects would come from. Borkowski said it was a combination of SPLOST and state TIP funds.

Boone moved to postpone the approval of the concept plan for Walt Banks/Peachtree Parkway and Crosstown/Peachtree Parkway intersections until December 6. Harman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

11-07-19 Community Action Day Update

McMullen noted that Community Action Day had taken place in 2004 and 2005. Code Enforcement, primarily Tami Babb, had worked with nonprofit organizations in the City to put together a list of specific projects. The materials were acquired, and volunteers from the agencies did the projects. As a result, Code Enforcement developed a relationship with the nonprofit organizations and had worked with them when other issues had come up. Staff recommended changing the focus in the future. They suggested establishing a Keep Peachtree City Beautiful affiliation, which required minimal resources as far as office space and administrative support. The affiliation would help in applying for grants and working with other agencies. The Council consensus was for staff to proceed.

11-07-20 Consider Position Classification – Firefighter

Logsdon noted there was an additional item on the dais – a memo dated November 13, 2007, with the subject, "Consider Position Classification – Firefighter." Tyler pointed out that the request was not for new employees, but to add the classification of firefighter at a pay grade of 173F with pay starting at $30,040 to $48,374. Those hired under this classification would have to get their EMT certification within one year. Harman asked Fire Chief Ed Eiswerth if the employee would be automatically upgraded to the next classification when they received the certification. Eiswerth said they would. He added that the classification would give the City the ability to hire a firefighter immediately, especially if one of the volunteers was interested in a position. There were also applicants from out of state, and their EMT certifications might not carry over to Georgia. In most cases, the applicants were already working on their certification. This was only a temporary position. Plunkett asked what would happen if a firefighter failed to become EMT certified in that year. Eiswerth said they would be out. They had to get the certification.

Plunkett moved to create the new classification of firefighter as outlined in the staff memo. Harman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

11-07-21 Consider Endorsement of Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) Grant Application for Huddleston Road Activity Center and Commitment to Provide Matching Funds

Logsdon noted there was an additional document on the dais – a memo dated November 14, 2007, with the subject, "Endorsement of Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) grant application for Huddleston Road Activity Center and commitment to provide matching funds." City Planner David Rast noted that Huddleston Road was one of the areas identified for re-development in Council's goals and objectives. Staff was asked to look at the potential of extending sewer and to look at guidelines for redevelopment. The area was also identified in the LCI study of the 54 West corridor and the community assessment portion of the Comprehensive Plan. The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) was currently accepting applications for funding. Staff had talked to the Development Authority of Peachtree City (DAPC) about a joint application. Rast said he and Planning Assistant Tony Bernard had pulled the application together in a short time. The study area would encompass 160 acres, including all property east and west of Huddleston Road, and D-Bob Industrial and Fulton Court. They did not have a preconceived notion on what the plan would be. There would be extensive public involvement. There might be environmental issues on some sites. The application was due the next day. Council had a draft of the application, which had been modified with graphs and pictures. He asked Council to endorse the application and to match any grant funds the City might receive. The estimate for the study was $60,000. The City would be obligated to provide $12,000, or 20%, if the City received the grant.

Plunkett pointed out that Council had received the application the day prior to the meeting, which was not much time to look it over and consider it. In theory, she believed the grant would be good. She asked if the City could decline the grant if it was decided it was not what the City wanted. She wanted to her due diligence. Kourajian asked when the next deadline was. Rast said it would be another year or two. McMullen noted that Council could always decline to accept the grant. Harman clarified that the grant was just for a study to determine the viability of redevelopment in the area. McMullen said that was correct.

Plunkett moved to approve allowing Rast to apply for the LCI grant for the Huddleston Road Activity Center and a commitment to provide matching funds not to exceed $12,000. Harman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Council/Staff Topics

Update on Fayette Community Channel

Andy Macke of Comcast gave the update. (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is included in the official meeting file.) Macke noted that the Community Channel was Channel 25, and he was going to give an update on the work that had taken place over the past few months. A year ago, there were four government channels with limited capabilities, with no staff or budgets to do much more than post announcements. Comcast wanted to launch more high definition channels and was looking at how to add more channels to their offerings. Video on Demand (VOD) channels provided a competitive edge. They wanted to create a different model and enter into a cooperative partnership combining their know-how with putting out the information the City wanted to get out. Comcast wanted to reclaim the government channels and have a single branded channel and invest in local content. It would be a win for the community, the local governments, and Comcast. The distribution would be multi-platform using linear channel, VOD, and web. A local advisory board would promote the channel and steer product development. It would be a model for other zones in the region. The soft launch was in May. Comcast had developed content in partnership with the City of Peachtree City, City of Fayetteville, the Peachtree Tourism Association, Fayetteville's Mainstreet Program, and the City of Tyrone. They were working with staff to create a monthly magazine-type show for the City built around the monthly ***Update***. High school sports were important to every community, and the recent Fayette County-McIntosh football game had also been broadcast on the channel. The next step was to continue with development of the City's magazine show, produce regional content based on Metrobeat assets, explore additional content affiliations, have a big launch event in the first quarter of 2008, and explore a sponsorship model to help develop content. He also showed a draft of a planned promotional spot.

Plunkett moved to convene in executive session for threatened or pending litigation at 9:36 p.m. Harman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Plunkett moved to reconvene in regular session at 9:53 p.m. Kourajian seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

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

Betsy Tyler, Acting City Clerk

Harold K Logsdon

Harold K. Logsdon, Mayor

Pamela Dufresne

Pamela Dufresne, Recording Secretary