City Council of Peachtree City
Agenda
October 2, 2003
7:00 p.m.

I. Prayer

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition
Remind Attendees to Turn Off Cell Phones
Presentation of 10-year Service Pin to Mark Brown

IV. Minutes
August 21, 2003, Regular Meeting Minutes
September 4, 2003, Regular Meeting Minutes
September 18, 2003, Special Called Meeting Minutes
September 18, 2003, Regular Meeting Minutes

V. Monthly Reports

VI. Consent Agenda
1. Employee Medical Insurance Renewal
2. Consider Brand Name Purchase of Play Equipment for Beaver Dam Park, Wynnmeade
3. Consider Fire Department Homeland Security Grants and Budget Amendments

VII. Old Agenda Items
04-03-03 Consider Defined Benefit Pension Plan Adoption Agreement
09-03-04 Presentation on No Smoking Resolution from Board of Health
Public Hearing – FY 2004 Millage Rate

VIII. New Agenda Items
10-03-01 Adopt FY 2004 Millage Rate
10-03-02 Public Hearing – Consider Increase in Occupational Tax

IX. Council/Staff Topics
Update on Amphitheater and Tennis Center

X. Executive Session

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

City of Peachtree City
Minutes of Meeting
August 21, 2003
7:00 p.m.

The City Council of Peachtree City met Thursday, August 21, 2003, 7:00 p.m., in the City Hall Council Chambers. Council Members attending were: Mayor Steve Brown, Annie McMenamin, Steve Rapson, and Murray Weed. Dan Tennant was out of town.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition

Mayor Brown recognized the Peachtree City Little League All-Star Teams who won the District 4 championships – Age Group 7/8, Age Group 9/10, and Age Group 11/12. Brown recognized the 87 Lazer White U-16 Girls Soccer Team as state champions. Brown recognized the 84 Lazer Elite Soccer Team as national champions. Youth Services Librarian Janice Dukes was recognized as Employee of the Month for August.

Approval of Minutes

Weed moved to approve the August 7, 2003, budget workshop minutes as written. McMenamin seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

07-03-10 Public Hearing and Consideration of Variance Request – Highway 74 South & TDK Boulevard

McMenamin asked if the attorney would be speaking for the applicant, then said she would abstain from the vote and discussion because the attorney's law firm employed her daughter. City Planner David Rast addressed Council. Rast said there had been a discrepancy on the staff position and Council asked staff and the applicant to look at things again. He continued that staff met with the owner and his development team on the site. They had a resolution to the situation that would not require a variance and put the matter back to staff for approval. Rast said the memo in Council's meeting packet outlined the plan and staff recommended Council authorize them to move forward and work with the applicant without the need for a variance.

Rick Lindsey, attorney for Hyde Investments, LLP, owner of the property, complimented staff and said they went the second and third mile to come to a resolution. Lindsey explained that there were two sets of tape on the property. One set marked what staff and the development team put together. The darker orange tape showed what would happen when the Department of Transportation (DOT) came through. He said the resolution was good from a planning perspective and it made sense to consider what would happen when the highway was widened now. The area needed to be landscaped properly and they would accept staff's recommendation, but a variance could still be needed.

Lindsey continued that all the work could become moot once the property was developed since curb cuts would be requested. Lindsey said they could live with what was recommended, but he would like for Council to discuss and consider the variance request based on what the DOT planned to do.

Brown thanked Hyde and the staff for working on the matter. Weed also thanked Lindsey and Mike Hyde for their cooperation.

Brown said he felt they should leave the matter with staff and the Planning Commission. Weed concurred. Brown said no action was necessary at this time. Lindsey noted the compromise was a testament to people working together.

New Agenda Items

08-03-06 Public Hearing – FY 2004 Budget

City Manager Bernard McMullen thanked Finance Director Paul Salvatore, his staff, and the directors and chiefs for their efforts on the budget. He noted there had been a lot of challenges this year with significant increases in health insurance costs, pension costs, and revenue challenges. McMullen said there was now a good, sound budget that met the majority of the requirements the City had to meet in terms of taking care of the City's infrastructure.

Salvatore gave a budget overview. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is included in the official meeting file. He noted that the total combined budget was now $27,890,823, including $2.3 million of estimated carryover projects from the current fiscal year. The balance of $25.5 million was for FY 2004 appropriations, which was about a 5.3% increase over FY 2003. The budget was structured to achieve the City's revised operating cash reserve policy goals by 2006. The budget also proposed a reduction in the self-insurance reserve from $800,000 to $500,000 and reduced the Council Contingency budget by $100,000. Salvatore noted that the major budgetary issues and concerns included rising health insurance and pension costs, the shortfall in the Local Option Sales Tax (LOST) revenue, the change in the LOST distribution formula, the shortfall in hotel/motel taxes, the decline in impact fees, and the state's budget cuts. Salvatore pointed out the cut in the state's Greenspace funds cost the City $250,000 allocated for the Drake Field purchase, and the City had to make up that difference.

Salvatore continued there had been a general trend of expenditures exceeding tax revenue since FY 2001. He noted the change in projections in LOST and hotel/motel taxes made last year resulted in a shortfall in revenue projections for FY 2004 of $610,000. Salvatore attributed the trend of expenditures exceeding revenues to significant events including a pay plan adjustment to the 75th percentile, the addition of 12½ staff positions, and a rollback in the millage rate. The impact of those expenditure changes in today's dollars was about $1.4 million. Salvatore said the gap was not closing, even with this budget, and the City had a further reliance on other sources of revenue.

Salvatore said the proposed millage rate for FY 2004 was 5.283, an increase of .508 mills or 12.3% over the current rate. The proposed millage rate only exceeded last year's estimate by .019 mills. Last year's projection for this year's millage rate had been an increase of .561 mills and the proposed millage rate was just over that. Salvatore said the difference equated to $27,000. To make up for the $610,000 difference in all projections, Salvatore said they cut expenditures, looked to other revenue sources, and adjusted reserves. Salvatore continued that residents who owned a home assessed at $200,000 would see an overall increase of $67 in their tax bills, including the increase in the school system's millage rate.

Rapson noted that the Board of Education had a higher millage rate than the City or the County, so it was dramatic when the dollar amount appeared. The City's 12.5% increase was about $20 to the taxpayer. The schools had a 2.75% increase equivalent to two and one-half times that amount. Rapson said a lot of people were getting bogged down with the percent increase, but the millage rate was so low that the percentages looked a lot more than the school board's percentages. Rapson said it was important from the taxpayer's perspective that they understood that relationship.

Salvatore looked at the 10-year projection and noted that the reserve target would change during the first three years. Salvatore said the reserve policy currently was 60 days of operating expense and the proposed change was to have 13% of annual revenues in reserve. In addition, Salvatore said the separate self-insurance reserve of $500,000, which had been reduced from $800,000, would be eliminated and included in the total reserves. For that reason, the cash reserves projections for FY 2004 looked high. In 2005, the projection would be at 85% of the same target. The cash reserves budget would be back on track in FY 2006.

Salvatore looked at General Fund Revenues, which were projected at $21.8 million, an increase of 7% or $1.5 million over this year's projected revenues and included the proposed property tax increase of .58 mills. He said the LOST estimate for next year was just under $6 million, or about a 1.5% increase over this year's projections. Salvatore said they had assumed an optimistic increase in sales of 3%. The sales increase was offset by the change in the LOST distribution formula. The City would get about .67% less of the County's LOST revenue and the County would get 1% more as of January 1. Salvatore said ad valorem taxes would now be the largest revenue source, rather than LOST.

Another major source of revenue was the hotel/motel tax. Salvatore said the estimate was around $849,000 for next year, which was the same as this year's level. He continued that normally there was a 2½% increase in projections. Due to this year's shortfall and the way the tax came in, Salvatore said they hoped they could get the same amount as this year and they were looking at a $50,000 shortfall this year.

Rapson pointed out that the City was not getting the normal type of increase since the renegotiation of the LOST distribution formula. He continued that LOST was the City's number one revenue source in the past, but had dropped to number two and would remain flat for the next couple of years. Rapson said those were the numbers driving the millage rate increase, as well as the economy. Salvatore agreed and noted that the City normally saw a 5% to 6% increase in LOST revenue each year.

Brown added that all monies that had traditionally come from the state had either evaporated or been reduced, such as Local Assistance Road Program (LARP) funds and Greenspace funds. LARP funds were used to resurface roads. Any funding from the state was dramatically down.

Rapson said to remember that the City would end up with about $3.6 million in cash reserves by the end of next year, which was about 20% of the operating budget. Rapson said that was phenomenal in the state. He noted other cities were laying people off and cutting services to balance the budget.

Salvatore said the hotel/motel projections had the largest impact on the overall revenue projections for next year. He added that several compliance reviews had been conducted, including one for the hotel/motel tax. The mixed drink tax and occupational tax audits were underway. The audits would ensure the City received all the revenue it should from those sources. Salvatore said they were also looking at the Court fine structure and staff was conducting a comprehensive review of all fees and charges. Staff would get back to Council regarding any recommendations.

Brown pointed out that the Development Authority had dramatically lessened its operating losses. Brown noted that when it came time to enter into the new intergovernmental agreement that he wanted to change some of the allocations. He felt they would still come out short, but wanted to factor that in and close the gap on operating losses.

Rapson noted recent newspaper articles about the increase in Court fines and said the additional revenue from the fines was not pulled out of the air. He said the fines were now more in line with neighboring jurisdictions. The City had not just doubled or tripled fines.

Brown pointed out that Council could not tell the judge how to rule on any case. The municipal judge determined whether someone paid a full fine or did community service.

McMenamin said it had also been a few years since the recreation fees had been reviewed. She did not want to drive away the customers, but she also did not want to subsidize out-of-town users of the City's recreation facilities.

Salvatore moved on to the Departmental Operating Budgets. The proposed budget totaled approximately $19.9 million, an increase of 7.67% over the FY 2003 budget. Salvatore said the proposed 32% increase in funding for the defined benefit pension plan and the 15% increase in employee health insurance were the two problem areas. He reiterated the decrease in the self-insurance fund from $800,000 to $500,000. Salvatore explained that was because staff felt there would be less reliance on the fund since the employee insurance accounts would be fully funded.

Another big item was the street and cart path repair programs. The programs were increased by $72,000, or 11.7%. Salvatore recalled the programs were cut last year and they were trying to get the funding back up to normal levels. There was an estimated 38-year paving cycle for streets and a 25-year cycle for cart paths at current funding levels. Salvatore said funding had to be increased in the future for both programs, as well as other infrastructure maintenance.

Weed said he had a good example to show that sometimes it took money to save money. He noted the purchase of some new public works equipment that would help repave cart paths. Sometimes the City had to spend the money to get the new technology that would save the City money in the long run. Brown pointed out that Weed was talking about an asphalt ripper, which took three steps out of the paving process for the cart paths. Brown said the City would not have to haul asphalt to a landfill that would accept it, or pay to have it done.

Problems encountered that were out of the ordinary included the relocation of the Canadian geese from Lake Peachtree. As a result, the landscaping budget increased. There were also a number of fence problems throughout the City and extra money was put in the budget to take care of those problems.

Brown asked Leisure Services Director Randy Gaddo about the fences that needed to be replaced. Gaddo said the wooden fences would be replaced with a vinyl-coated chain link fence, such as the fencing used at the Tennis Center. Brown noted that the vinyl fences weathered better and lasted longer.

Salvatore continued that there were courts that needed to be resurfaced. The Fire Department also had to replace older equipment and needed training mannequins and monitors. Brown added that old equipment would go on the engines and the new equipment would be on the ambulances.

Brown discussed staff requirements. He noted that in the original 2003-2007 staff plan that 28 new positions were budgeted. The number had been revised to six positions in the 2004-2008 plan. Salvatore said there had been a hiring freeze for two years and no positions had been added. Out of the six recommended positions, only one was included in the FY 2004 budget and was only budgeted for a partial year. The position was the mechanic for the new satellite auto shop facility and the increased fleet size. He pointed out that there had been significant increases to department workloads and no positions had been added to compensate for the increased workload. As the demand increased, so did the challenges for the existing staff to maintain current service levels. Salvatore said they continued to monitor benchmarks to ensure adequate service levels were maintained.

Salvatore looked at the Public Improvement Program (PIP) and major capital expenditures. He noted that $3.1 million in new appropriations were proposed, as well as $2.3 million in carryover projects. The $5.4 million total included capital projects and equipment purchases. About $2 million of the total included projects directly related to the improvements in the 54 West corridor. Salvatore noted that the satellite auto shop facility had been planned for several years due to the expansion of the fleet and was supported by a recent fleet assessment study. The shop would also alleviate issues with unsafe and overcrowded conditions at the garage. Salvatore said staff recommended a Bricks & Mortar loan for the facility.

Salvatore continued that the City lost $250,000 in Greenspace funds that were to be used for the last phase of the Drake Field purchase. Now the entire $475,000 for the final payment had to come from local funding. As for the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) plan for the 54 West Corridor, Salvatore said the road bridge would be widened and the work would start in December. There would also be a cart path bridge running parallel to the road bridge, as well as cart path culverts on either side of the track under the bridge connecting to paths and commercial areas on the south side of the highway. Cart path connections were planned at Wynnmeade and the Line Creek nature area. There would also be another cart path bridge going over the west boundary of the City. Salvatore said there would still be a great deal of state funding for the projects, roughly 80%.

Several playgrounds were due to be replaced and the old equipment would be replaced with more durable equipment for around $40,000. The City was also replacing some wooden light poles with cement poles for safety purposes. Impact fees were declining dramatically and would soon become an insignificant revenue source. Approximately $500,000 in impact fees was projected for FY 2003s. Next year, the projection dropped to $250,000. Brown pointed out that the Recreation Department was working on a maintenance master plan and those projections would be available to put in future PIP plans.

Salvatore said the City also had to start looking at a stormwater utility. Brown added that all cities were experiencing stormwater problems and that the City had some problems that would cost in the six digits to repair.

Rapson said some of the numbers in the PIP were a little misleading. He noted that, in the next few years, there were some state grants and carryover projects that would be completed. Rapson continued that there were also some material equipment purchases for the Fire Department in 2004. He noted that those purchases could be re-addressed, or expedited, after the completion of the fire study depending on the report results. Salvatore said they would normally hold off on major purchases until the tax money came in (in late December or early January). Salvatore noted that he had received a $150,000 check from the County for the Multi-purpose Rink restroom/concession area.

There were questions from the audience regarding the gateway bridge. Brown noted that the road widening and the bridge were two different projects. Brown said the Department of Transportation (DOT) took care of the state routes, but the City was responsible for the multi-use path bridge. He said they did have the dimensions for the road widening and that would not be a problem. Brown continued that the City wanted to work in conjunction with the road widening, so they were not doubling the work efforts for the abutments for the bridge.

Salvatore pointed out that, in order to get the grant commitment from the state for the bridge, the local share had to be included in the budget. Rapson explained that the state would not commit its $450,000 until the City showed its share, $112,000, was in the bank.

Questions from the audience and answers from Gaddo were inaudible regarding the sealing of the library and playground equipment.

Weed noted that the mold problem had actually happened in City Hall. Brown said they were trying to be proactive since the library was built of the same materials as City Hall. Weed asked Gaddo if the sealing of the library would be included in the bond referendum and Gaddo said that it was included.

Another resident asked what happened to the old Fire Department equipment. Brown answered it was auctioned, salvaged, or went into reserve. Rapson added that they tried to keep that revenue in public safety. He noted that the Fire Department was holding off on replacement of a fire engine and a medic unit until the City received a consultant report on the Fire Department that would tell the City what the department needed in the future. If a decision were made to hold off on those purchases, the money set aside for debt service for financing would be dropped from the fund balance for FY 2004.

A resident asked what happened if the State's contributions were cut two years from now. Rapson answered that only two projects were subsidized by the State – the gateway bridge and the bunker gear for the Fire Department. The programs were funded. He said the State would not give its funding if the City did not ante up its 20% share. If the City did not budget for its share, then the state would re-route its funding to another jurisdiction.

Salvatore and Rast pointed out that some of the LCI money was federal money that had passed through the state. Brown said the City was trying to seek more federal funds for projects such as cart paths since federal money was more dependable in the current economy.

A resident asked about the unfunded projects and how funding was determined. Salvatore explained the rating system used by staff. Rapson said none of the unfunded projects were budgeted in FY 2004. The projects were considered discretionary at one time and were moved to the unfunded list. Salvatore added that some of the projects on the list were essential, but the City could not afford them at this time. Salvatore said another possibility for funding, if the list became too extensive with essential projects, was to group some of the projects together for a bond referendum. Rapson said the City had always had a wish list. When revenues were better, a decision was made whether to take an item off the list and put it in the PIP. Brown pointed out that the unfunded list was re-prioritized all the time.

Salvatore moved to the debt service fund. The proposed fund was $2.1 million, an increase of 36%, or about $570,000, over FY 2003. Salvatore said it looked like a big increase, but the reason was because of the lease for the public safety vehicles. The lease ended this year and a new fleet was purchased. The City loaned itself the funds out of the cash reserves and did not pay a lease payment all year. The City would reimburse itself from the lease proceeds by the end of the fiscal year, then the $350,000 lease payments would come back into the budget. Salvatore said the satellite auto shop debt would come online at $33,000 a year. The balance was for essential Public Works equipment. Salvatore noted the City would save $50,000 in FY 2004 due to the refinancing of the 1993 bond this year. Salvatore reiterated that about $340,000 was saved in interest expense by delaying the submission of reimbursement requests to the finance company and using cash reserves.

Salvatore went over the major challenges in developing the FY 2004 budget – continued sharp increases in health and pension costs, a dramatic decrease in LOST and other revenue projections, and revenue loss from state grants. Salvatore said staff felt the proposed millage rate would support adequate service delivery, infrastructure, and cash reserve levels.

Brown said the costs for health insurance were not going down. Because the City was so concerned about the rate, all of the policies were re-bid and there were improvements on the dental plan. A resident asked if employees bore any of the cost of health insurance. Brown said they did and the resident asked if the employees could take on more of the cost.

Brown said they did not want to eliminate the ability of the person making $7 an hour to have insurance. Council had discussed putting more of the cost on employees and could have saved $25,000 by doing so. Brown said Council decided it would be better to take the hardship and to hold off on putting more of the cost on employees for another year. If the current economy continued, Council would ask employees to bear more of the burden of health insurance costs.

Salvatore noted that the workload was increasing for all staff members. The resident said that there was not a company in the country that had not asked its people to work more. She said everyone was going through tough times and everyone was taking on more. Brown said the workload had doubled in some departments and no new positions had been added in the last two years. Brown said staff was doing a lot more and things had to balance out. Taking benefits and increasing the workload at the same time caused morale problems. Brown continued that one reason the satellite auto facility was needed was due to the sub-human work conditions in the current auto facility. Larger vehicles had to be worked on outside no matter what time of year or what kind of weather.

Rapson said he was not in favor of balancing the budget on the backs of the employees for 2% of the money needed for the health program. Part of the level of service was directly attributed to the City's employees. The benefits attracted good employees. He continued that they had to keep that in perspective. The resident said all she needed to hear was that it would save money.

Weed commented that every budget got the same intense scrutiny every time. Salvatore said the City staff was truly lean and mean. The City had the least number of employees per thousand of any City around.

Brown continued that the City had very little trash and the grass got cut. The City had the lowest crime rate in Part 1 crimes in the U.S. for the City's population, with a lower number of officers than the average for the same size city. Brown said the City was doing a lot with fewer people, but that did not mean they might not have to ask more for health care in the future.

A resident asked about the assistant city manager position. Salvatore noted that Council approved a budget amendment to include the position in the FY 2003 budget. Rapson added that there was only a $30,000 difference in the budget when the position was included.

A resident asked if the funding was in the budget for the assistant city manager, was there also a place in the budget for police officers and firefighters. Brown said the police needed an administrative person and the fire department needed an assistant fire marshal. He felt since the gap was closing on the operating costs of the Development Authority that he had submitted a proposal that would allow the positions, but the proposal had not been included yet. McMenamin said the citizen was saying the position should be assessed. Weed said Council had assessed the position and had voted on it. Rapson added that, operationally-speaking, the decision was the City Manager's and Council had approved the recommendation. McMenamin noted that the City Manager had offered to wait on the position because of the budget problems. Weed said Council made the decision and felt adding the position was the right thing to do, but nothing was carved in stone. Brown said the City had to build efficiency in the system and the assistant city manager position was an efficiency. Brown pointed out that the new computers for Code Enforcement would allow the officers to spend an additional three hours a day on the street, as well as provide proper documentation on violations. The computers were the equivalent of another person.

The resident questioned whether the Police Department had taken into account the fact that the crime rate would go up with more big box stores coming to the City. Chief Murray said they had started to see an increase in shoplifting. With more stores, there would be more shoplifting, more bad checks, and other crimes. Murray continued that they looked at the calls for service and that told them where they needed staffing. He added that the crime rate increased as preventive patrols decreased. Murray expected crimes to go up, especially with the encroachment from the surrounding areas.

Brown closed the public hearing. Salvatore said the budget would be brought to Council for adoption on September 4.

08-03-07 Consider Resolution for Library Renovation/Expansion Bond

Library Commission Chairman Chris Clark addressed Council and noted the commission was given the task to come up with a comprehensive plan at the last Council Retreat. He introduced Tom Findley and Blaine Paxton, staff members from Leo A. Daly Company, the architects for the proposed renovation/expansion. Clark went over the programs offered by the library and the statistics regarding users. He noted the types of requests were becoming more complex and the renovation/expansion would help meet the expanding needs of an expanding population. Clark said requests for services include non-English sources, foreign language classes, internet access (there was not enough space or wiring for another computer), and cultural requests. The library was starting to meet the needs of older Americans and needed larger print books and enhanced lighting.

Clark said the library continued to serve as the community information center. There was a high demand for reference material and cultural arts. Over 2,000 participated in the summer reading program. Clark continued that they did not realize 10 years ago there would be less use of microfiche and more demand for internet access. The library was an arena for citizens to display photos, quilts, and art, and served as a home school resource center. Clark continued that the library's collection grew 2.5% to 3% each year and they were running out of room to display items on the shelves. They were out of storage space. To remain viable, the collection had to grow. Nearly 50% of the population had a library card and there were over 190,000 visits to the library last year. If residents had purchased all of the books, tapes, and other materials used last year, they would have spent over $5 million.

Clark continued that, in addition to the repairs and renovations needed, the building needed to be sealed. He said there was a serious rodent problem with squirrels getting into the cracks on the masonry. Clark asked Council to allow the voters to approve the $4.9 million bond referendum in November 2003.

Findley told Council that libraries were growing all around the nation. Collections were increasing, even with computers, which took more room. Librarians helped patrons cruise through the information. Times had changed and there was much more collaboration and discussion in the library. Findley continued that students were trained to work in groups. It was a natural evolution of how people were educated. Findley continued that people came to the library to learn to use technology. New wiring was needed and wireless technology should be available.

Findley said they had listened to what was being done at the library and that the activities were outstripping the architecture and creating more problems. Areas of concern included staff workspaces, line of sight issues, poor lighting, and acoustical problems.

Findley continued that 25 children could be jammed into the children's area, but often more than 120 wanted to attend events. He said there should be a warm and inviting entry and the bathroom area was out of the sight and control of the librarians. More security was needed. Findley added that the shelves were also too close together and did not meet the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

Findley said the plan should take advantage of the natural setting. Humidity control needed to be improved and a new roof was needed. The library should allow more natural light, while minimizing glare. Findley said they wanted to be environmentally friendly and use sustainable materials and energy-saving lights. He added that the entry should be clearly marked.

Findley said 31,230 gross square feet was needed for the next 20 years. The library currently has 20,100 square feet and the renovation would add 11,230 square feet. The space should be on the main level. Additional staff would be required for two levels.

Paxton estimated the cost at $4.9 million, which included site development, landscaping, demolition, remodeling, new construction, furniture and equipment, design fees, surveying, testing, books and materials, and bond costs. Paxton said the expansion/renovation would cost the average taxpayer $25-$26 a year for 15 years. Paxton said he felt that was an acceptable expense as a parent and resident of the City. Paxton continued that the City was a special place and asked for Council's support to put the bond referendum on the ballot. Paxton said Council should let the citizens decide whether to spend the money or not.

A resident asked if the plan would be shown to residents. She continued that $50,000 for books and materials was not even 10% of the bond. Clark answered that the Library Commission had held three different workshops on the design. He said he would love to add more money for materials, but they were living in tough times and also had to keep the library viable for the future. The resident said she would rather take out the fireplace and coffee shop and put that money into books. Clark said those ideas came from citizens and were not set in stone.

Brown said one of the things that came out of the teen study was the socialization component of libraries. The overwhelming desire of teens was to have a place to congregate and talk, like a Starbuck's©. The teens wanted to be able to sit down with books and coffee. The resident expressed concern about the replacement of books ruined by spilled coffee, as well as insurance costs for a fireplace. Clark said things were planned in the operating budget. He noted that the fireplace was an idea brought up by fellow citizens.

Library Commissioner Barbara Swafford said she was very excited about the plan. She continued that people used the library more in difficult times because it was free. Swafford felt $25 a family was a deal. She said the library would charge for refreshments and that could offset some of the costs. Swafford noted that people liked to read and wanted an environment that embraced them. She said this was an opportunity to have a great place to go.

Library Commissioner Mary Ann Browning pointed out that the library was the intellectual marketplace of the City. People read for information and recreation. The library was the great equalizer between people who made $500,000 a year and people on public assistance. She continued that the library was needed to back up the education system and was a selling point for the community, as was the education system.

Rapson noted that a library was more than just books, but provided access to all text-based information. The PINES system also allowed patrons to access books in other libraries. He said they were overlooking the technology side of the equation.

Leisure Services Director Randy Gaddo pointed out that the $50,000 was not intended to fill up the library shelves. There was room for expansion. The library's budget included $105,000 per year for books. The $50,000 was in addition to the annual amount to start the collection.

Weed said that all the Council was being asked to do was to put the question on the ballot for the voters to approve. He continued that $4.9 million was the amount in the resolution for the voters to approve. By approving the resolution, Council was only approving the amount, not the plans. Weed said he supported the $4.9 million and putting it on the ballot, but he did not like everything in the plan either. The actual details on what the money would go for would come after the fact.

Another resident asked how the plan for the renovation/construction stacked up to other communities. Findley said the plan was above the median for the collection, size, and number of seats. He explained that planning was not a black and white science. Findley said the library's growth rate was 2½%, which was on the low side, but the circulation numbers were high. There was still room to add population in the City. Findley said the plan was a middle ground to maintain the excellence at the library. He added the librarians would become more critical in weeding out materials.

The resident asked if the referendum was $4.9 million or nothing. Rapson said the money would fix a poorly-designed library, HVAC, roofing, and parking. The numbers did not look out of line, but corrected past problems. He said that would be explained to the public before the election.

McMenamin noted that Clark and the architects had spoken to a civic group earlier and that they might know the library user, but they had to target the voter. She was hearing "wants" not "needs." Weed agreed with McMenamin and said they had to be prepared. He felt that $4.9 million was an appropriate number for an appropriate library design for the City. He said they had to convince people at the beginning.

A resident asked if there was a back-up plan if the referendum was voted down. Clark said there was a plan.

Weed commented that the City spent a lot of time and money exercising people's bodies. The library exercised minds and the City needed that.

A resident asked about the children's book collection and if it would be updated. Jill Prouty, technology manager for the library, said she understood the concerns about the older books. She continued that the majority of the money had been spent on children and young adults for the last two years. The library's collection included a lot of classics that were now out of print and they were trying to keep those books in good repair, but were also buying new books at an unbelievable rate. She knew there was a huge need for multiple copies and noted that the library had 14 copies of the latest "Harry Potter" book that were gone on the first day. They also purchased multiple copies of best-selling authors. Prouty continued that the library had been part of the PINES program for the last three and one-half years. If the library had purchased all the books obtained through the PINES system, the cost would have been $9.5 million.

Rapson asked about the recurring expenses and maintenance costs. Clark said the design was maximized to keep staff at the current level. He continued that they also looked at materials that would decrease the operating costs such as materials designed to let light in, but keep heating costs down. Gaddo said the operating costs would go up around $140,000 a year. Additional space would be added and one full-time and one part-time employee would be added.

Rapson felt the building was the priority and that the road could wait until later. Clark said parking was a key concern. If there were no place to park, people would not come. He added that on Wednesday mornings, mothers walked blocks to get to the library from church parking lots.

A resident asked if there would be room to expand the library again in 20 years. Paxton said the communications tower would eventually need to be replaced because it would be outdated. If the tower were removed, there would be additional space for expansion. Clark said his idea had been to build a satellite library, but that was abandoned because of staff and operating costs.

Weed noted there had been public meetings about the renovation/expansion and the board had been diligent. They needed $4.9 million and he wished them luck. He was sure they would have lowered the costs if possible. Clark said they would have.

Rapson asked about the bond question. He noted that the question was not easy to read and understand. Meeker said the bond attorney wrote the question to meet the legal requirements. Rapson said he would like to see more information on what the money paid for in the bond question. Gaddo said the document was written exactly as required by law.

Rapson moved to approve the document before Council and to put the referendum resolution and notice of the bond question before the voters on the November 2003 ballot. Meeker clarified that the motion was to actually adopt the referendum resolution before Council and that the resolution included everything needed to go forward. Weed seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Rapson said he was available to help with promoting the referendum. Weed noted that the City could not spend money to promote the referendum. Meeker said he would look into the law and see what elected officials could and could not do. Weed said the Council Members could, individually, go out and promote the referendum. Meeker said yes, but he needed to find out how elected officials were to go about it. Clark said he intended to hold a meeting to discuss how to market the question and sell it to the voters. Brown suggested that representatives from the Youth Council be invited to the meeting.

08-03-08 Consider Easement for Fayette County Communications Building
City Engineer Troy Besseche addressed Council and said the planning and engineering staff had been contacted about installing a new communications building adjacent to the communications tower. The building would sit across the property line on Drake Field. Staff had reviewed the plan, but the City did not own the land. The City was purchasing the land in phases from the Development Authority of Peachtree City. The final installment on the property was set for November. He recommended Council seek an easement from the Development Authority. He said the building would not interfere with the library's plans.

Brown asked if the City would maintain ownership of the tower and the building. Meeker said the City would not maintain ownership of the building since it was part of the 911 system. Police Chief Jim Murray pointed out that the County's new E-911 system would be coming on line and the County was not charging the City anything to be put on the system. Brown questioned whether the City would have to get permission from the County to move the building if necessary in 30-50 years. Meeker said yes and that, under the terms of the easement, the County had the right to have the building on the property.

Rapson asked if he could vote on the matter since the Development Authority owned the land. Meeker said yes. Rapson asked if the tower ever came down, would the building come down. Meeker said there would not be a need for the building if the tower were gone. The easement would also be gone. A resident asked why that location was needed for the building. Meeker said it was adjacent to the tower. Brown noted that the Police Department was also located in the Municipal Complex at one time. He said the County was upgrading to a higher standard of 911 communications.

Weed moved that the Mayor and Council issue notice to the Development Authority that they concurred with the Development Authority giving an easement to Fayette County as required on Drake Field. Rapson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Council/Staff Topics
Brown expressed concern regarding the former city attorney's ability to try cases based upon constitutionality when he composed the ordinance. He said there was a chance the variance requested in Agenda Item 07-03-10 could come back to Council if things did not go well with the Planning Commission. Brown said any waivers issued to the former city attorney by the City did not cover him for that type of action. He asked for a legal opinion. There could be other issues and he would like the matter ironed out. Weed said even if the waiver covered this type of action, he found it difficult to believe that any attorney would want to go before the state bar, or any other higher court, and say he wrote the ordinance, but it was unconstitutional.

Brown introduced Clyde Stricklin, the new Developmental Services Director. Stricklin briefly discussed his experience.

There being no further business to discuss, Rapson moved to adjourn the meeting. Weed seconded. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

Jane Miller, City Clerk

Stephen D. Brown, Mayor

Pamela Dufresne, Recording Sescretary

City of Peachtree City
Minutes of Meeting
September 4, 2003
7:00 p.m.

The City Council of Peachtree City met Thursday, September 4, 2003, 7:00 p.m., in the City Hall Council Chambers. Council Members attending were: Mayor Steve Brown, Annie McMenamin, Steve Rapson, Dan Tennant, and Murray Weed.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition

Mayor Brown proclaimed September as National Drug and Alcohol Addiction Recovery Month.

Approval of Minutes

Tennant moved to approve the July 24, 2003, budget workshop minutes as amended. Weed seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Rapson moved to approve the August 7, 2003, regular meeting minutes as amended. Weed seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

McMenamin moved to approve the August 11, 2003, budget workshop minutes as amended. Rapson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Monthly Reports

Brown noted several upcoming events – Great Georgia Air Show, September 6-7; Election Qualifying, 8:30 a.m. on September 8 through 4:30 p.m. on September 12; Shakerag Arts & Crafts Festival, September 20-21; Alzheimer's Memory Walk, October 11; Great Chili Challenge, October 25; 4 Nights in October 2-5; Light the Night Walk, October 4.

Consent Agenda

1. **Adopt Amendment to GMEBS Retirement Plan to Comply with Changes in Federal Law**
2. **Consider Revisions to CAR 9-4, Budgetary Policies**

Weed moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Tennant seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

08-03-02 Request for Exception to Golf Cart Ordinance (Motorized Scooter)

Jim Born, the citizen who requested the exception, did not attend the meeting. City Manager Bernard McMullen reported that staff had looked at the request and he had discussed the request with Police Chief Jim Murray and City Attorney Ted Meeker. McMullen pointed out there were concerns for safety and with the mixed uses currently authorized by the ordinance. He noted the vehicle could be used on and off the paths, which presented more concerns. Staff's recommendation was that Council not approve the request.

Weed clarified that Mr. Born asked for an exception to the ordinance. He noted there was no provision in the ordinance for a variance from it. Council could not grant a variance. He said if Council were to follow staff's advice, then Council would take no action. McMullen said yes.

Brown said he had visited the business that was selling the scooters. Brown asked McMullen if staff had spoken with local businesses regarding the scooters so they could inform purchasers. McMullen said he had spoken to the store manager. Brown continued that there was also a three-wheeled version of the scooter, similar to an electric wheelchair, that might have uses for the senior and handicapped population. He said the three-wheeled version was much more sedate and might be something to consider in the future.

McMenamin noted that once Council allowed an exception for one person, then it pretty much opened it up for anybody to use a similar vehicle. She expressed concern about discrimination. Weed said they could possibly make some exceptions, but those exceptions had to be objective and would require findings for support. Brown noted that something related to Americans with Disabilities guidelines could be considered.

Rapson said Council did not want to send mixed signals. He pointed out that there was an exception in the ordinance, Section 78, 94-8, for electric and conventional wheelchairs, but electric and gas scooters were specifically prohibited in Section 78, 95-9. Until a change was made to the ordinance, the scooters would be prohibited. He said he concurred with staff's recommendation.

McMenamin said staff had made a good case. Meeker said no action by Council was appropriate.

Brown asked McMullen if scooters were considered two or three-wheeled vehicles. McMullen said two-wheeled. Brown said that three-wheels were not classified as a scooter. Rapson pointed out that scooters were not defined in the ordinance. Weed said it was appropriate to use the dictionary's definition if there was not a specific definition in the ordinance.

<u>New Agenda Items</u>

09-03-01 Consider Drainage Issue – Creekside Way

Jackie Davis, owner of the property at 501 Creekside Way, addressed Council. She said she and her husband discovered two culverts on Ebenezer Road near their back property line that were not property installed. The water from the culverts emptied onto the greenbelt, then directly onto their property. She said they had asked the City to connect the pipes properly and had not asked for damages. Davis also had photos of the area for Council.

Davis continued that Public Works Director Bobby Thompson had visited their property in February to look at the problem and told them the City would take care of it in two to three months. In June, Thompson informed the Davises the matter was out of his hands and had been turned over to City Engineer Troy Besseche. Besseche visited the property and issued a report, which the Davises received on June 13.

Davis said they disagreed with Besseche's report. Davis said Besseche wrote in the report that he supported the idea of continuing to allow the runoff across the Davis property. Besseche wrote the erosion on the property was attributed to natural erosion. Davis said they felt the pertinent facts of their property were not stated properly or were omitted. She said the report should have been neutral. Davis said if a report was needed it should have been about the culverts, which were running additional water to their property.

Davis said they contacted the City Manager and requested a meeting along with Council Member McMenamin on June 17. Temporary Interim Operations Manager Colin Halterman also attended the meeting at the Davis' home. McMenamin had recommended the problem be taken care of as soon as possible. On June 18, the Davises met with Mayor Brown, who said their problem was a bad mistake made by the City and the City would take care of it right away. She said that they received a copy of the bid for the work in July. They attended the July 24 budget workshop and discussed the matter with Council.

Davis told Council that they were now totally confused and concerned. For the first five months, they were advised this was a City problem and would be taken care of. Besseche's report appeared to have changed the position of the prior officials. Davis said they were asking Council to approve the funds for the project.

Brown addressed the City Engineer's report and said they had talked about the natural flow of the water, which went with the grade of the land. The Davis property was downhill. Brown noted that, when the water was channeled into a 20-inch to 26-inch culvert that ran under the street, the velocity changed and the water was concentrated, and he did not consider that a natural flow. He felt the Davises had a legitimate situation. Mr. Davis said they realized they lived in a drainage basin. Mrs. Davis added the water coming across Ebenezer Road was also a problem.

Chuck Pinkston addressed Council concerning the drainage/siltation problem within the Bridlepath area. Pinkston told Council he thought he had an agreement, then all of a sudden there was no money and nothing was being done.

Pinkston continued it had taken the City of Griffin five years to set up its stormwater utility and that Besseche said it would take over $5.9 million to set up the stormwater utility for the City. Pinkston said the area needed to be cleaned up and the project was unfunded through 2005. He noted the project had been funded in 2002 for $75,000 and that former City Manager Jim Basinger had said at Retreat not to take the funding away, but the money was cut.

Brown agreed there was a significant problem. He pointed out that the Griffin stormwater utility was a prototype. No one had done it before and the experts were now aware of what worked and what did not. A recent court decision from Columbia County upheld the fee structure for a stormwater utility. He said the process would be faster now.

Pinkston said he thought the Bridlepath problem was a separate issue from drainage. The problem had been there since 1959, when the area was originally plotted. The area should be maintained as the City ordinances required.

Brown said the problems had been around for decades and no one had ever said to go out and tackle the problem. There had been a band-aid approach to projects. The City was currently having a feasibility study done for the site and was applying for the appropriate permits. The $75,000 that had been cut from the budget for Bridlepath would not touch what had to be done. He said the last report put the cost at $200,000 at a minimum.

Besseche said he had several areas he could discuss and asked what Council wanted him to cover. Brown said he wanted a snapshot of where the City was today and what needed to be done in the future. Besseche said the City's stormwater management program was largely reactive. When issues came up, staff looked at them. Besseche pointed out that, unfortunately, maintenance projects were not popular projects and did not get a lot of support. Drainage complaints were routed to Public Works. Besseche said he was contacted if his support was needed for design or developing a solution. If the residents who complained did not agree with his assessment, Besseche said they could appeal to the City Manager, which the Davises had done.

As for where the City was going with stormwater, Besseche said a stormwater committee composed of staff, development people, and environmental people had met several times and worked to develop policy guidelines. They developed a water resource management ordinance, which laid the regulatory framework for the stormwater management program. Besseche said the City also responded to directives from the Atlanta Regional Commission and the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District in the way of design guidelines. Besseche said they had developed policy documents, one of which addressed the extent of service. Besseche said the City would be responsible for stormwater on public rights-of-way and easements. Problems outside of that area would be addressed and would involve acknowledgement and approval from the City Manager. Besseche said Council also had a level of service document in their meeting packet, and the City had to decide what level of service to provide and how to pay for it. Besseche said the level of service document needed to be discussed, whether during a regular meeting or at retreat. There were $9 million in stormwater projects.

Brown said staff had compiled five pages of stormwater problems at a cost of $9,269,500. The City's annual budget was only $27-$28 million. The City had to have an additional revenue source to take care of the problems and that would be through a stormwater utility. Brown said it was absolutely essential to get the utility underway as soon as possible. Besseche said they were waiting on an interim report on the stormwater utility, and that the feasibility study should be ready in December. They were looking at an 18-month implementation schedule for a utility.

Weed asked when the Bridlepath area would get relief if Council approved the $75,000. Besseche said a lot of permitting was involved and there were wetlands and jurisdictional water issues to deal with. Besseche said that was why it was taking so long for the Bridlepath project. Pinkston noted that the $75,000 approved amount was in 1999 dollars and the project had been delayed a long time. Besseche said as far as the schedule was concerned, he would have a better idea after meeting with the Pinkstons. He said it would take six to nine months for permitting if individual permits were not needed. If there were no mitigation costs, Besseche said they could probably start the work next fall. He added mitigation costs could be very expensive.

Jeanine Dunlap, a neighbor of the Pinkstons, reminded Council that when they left the Retreat in March they were told the work had been funded. The creekbed was now so filled with silt that the area was just one big island between their property and the spillway. Dunlap said they just wanted the creek to flow. She added that trees were falling. Thompson said an eight to 10-foot wide channel with an access bed on top was needed so the area could be properly maintained. Dunlap said she just wanted it dredged so the water would flow.

Brown noted that if this was a Corps of Engineers project, then the City had to go through the process. The City could get in major trouble if this turned out to be a Corps project. He said there were furious people all over the City, and there had been decades of neglect. If $75,000 would not fix it, then the City had a problem. He continued that the Corps of Engineers would dictate what the City had to do and that the City could not even access some properties or they could not get equipment in.

Weed said there were apparently two serious problems, and allegedly the City had made commitments. He asked if the $75,000 had been for all the stormwater projects or just Bridlepath. McMullen said the $75,000 had been intended just for the Bridlepath project. Pinkston said he did not know where the $75,000 figure came from.

Rapson said the two projects were getting interwoven with the stormwater utility. He recalled that in 2002 Council had raped and pillaged the capital plan for a couple of million dollars to balance the budget and the $75,000 for Bridlepath had been included. At Retreat, Council realized the money should go back into the budget and the commitment was made. Rapson continued that the $50,000 for the Davis' problem came later. Rapson agreed with Mayor Brown that they were stormwater problems, but Council made a commitment to take care of the $75,000 problem. If that amount was now $275,000, Council needed to discuss the additional funds. Rapson said he was prepared to motion to put $75,000 in the budget for Bridlepath. He said Council made the mistake and took the project out of the budget. Rapson said the $50,000 and anything over $75,000 were stormwater utility issues that Council needed to look at and decide, as a City, how to handle. Pinkston agreed and said there was no way to know what the Corps of Engineers would say was needed. Pinkston said $75,000 would not do any good if it took out a few trees.

Tennant said Council was trying to say they wanted honor to the commitment on Bridlepath. He said they were not interested in breaking promises. It might be a band-aid relatively speaking. Tennant said they wanted to do the right thing, but appreciated the residents trying to understand the big picture.

McMullen said the Bridlepath project was not being held up because of money issues. He continued that the first step was a feasibility study and that was funded and ongoing. The study should be finished by the end of the month and, until then, staff would not know the cost to correct the problem.

Weed asked what the time frame would be to complete the project once Council authorized the expenditure. McMullen said the Bridlepath project could be done this fall. McMullen continued that the $50,000 for the Davis project was an estimate to re-route the culvert, but he added that was not necessarily a complete solution. He said they did not want to fix one problem only to create another problem downstream. McMullen said they could start taking the same steps as were being taken now on the Bridlepath project.

Rapson said the best case for this meeting would be to authorize the study for the Davis' project and authorize an additional $62,000 for the Bridlepath project. Tennant said the problem would be what happened to the next 2-15 families with similar problems. Weed said there were no commitments to those people and they were responsible to do as the Davises and Pinkstons had done. Rapson pointed out that a commitment had been made to the Pinkstons and Davises, and the rest of the problems should fall under the stormwater utility. Brown said the City needed a study on the Davis' problem to make sure moving the culvert would not overload the system. He said the City wanted to correct the problem the right way.

McMullen said he also needed to point out that, for the Davis situation, the City did not necessarily have the easements or rights-of-way needed to fix the problems. The decisions Council made would significantly impact costs to fix the different problems. From an engineering perspective, there were culverts under the roads servicing stormwater now. If the City had an easement across the Davis' property, the City would be able to manage and maintain the problem, but the City did not have the easement.

Weed asked the Davises if they would grant an easement on their property so the problem could be corrected. Mrs. Davis said they would not. Rapson said the City could not maintain the system if they did not allow the City on their property. Mrs. Davis said they would be glad to write a letter giving the City permission to do what they needed to do, but they would not grant an easement.

McMullen said he was speaking in general terms and that policy needed to be set to enable staff to deal with the situations consistently.

Rapson noted that the City Manager had the authority to spend up to $10,000 on studies through PIP Contingency. He said Council could direct the City Manager to have the study done for the Davis project.

Meeker noted that the Davis topic was on the agenda for discussion, but under the ordinance requirement, the Pinkstons had to go on a future agenda. Rapson moved to put the Pinkstons' problem on the next agenda. Weed seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Brown said he was reluctant to put $75,000 into another band-aid. He would rather put the funding toward a permanent fix. Rapson said McMullen, Salvatore, and Halterman would not let Council spend $62,000 on a $200,000 problem. They would come back to Council and Council would have to react. Weed said Council lived up to the commitment, but that might not fix the problem. Weed encouraged staff and the City Attorney, if necessary, to have an open and frank discussion with the Davises regarding an easement.

Rapson told the Davises that he understood they felt their problem was unique to their house, but such problems were not unique to the City. He told the Davises he appreciated their patience. Weed added that Council was trying to meet them halfway and asked that they be willing to do the same.

09-03-02 Adopt FY 2004 Budget Resolution
Finance Director Paul Salvatore said they were at the point in the budget process where Council should take action on the FY 2004 Budget. The legally required public hearing had been held and Salvatore had received the tax digest figures from the County. There was no change in the proposed millage rate based on the information from the County. Salvatore said the digest came within ½% of the tax digest figures he had projected. The millage rate public hearings would be held on September 18 at 6:30 p.m. and on September 25 at 7:30 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. Salvatore said he needed Council to take action to adopt the resolution and that staff recommended adoption.

Brown asked if the amount allotted to the Development Authority of Peachtree City was pending whatever agreement was reached at the intergovernmental agreement negotiations. Salvatore said the amount was based on the existing agreement. McMenamin cautioned Brown that the Development Authority now received non-resident tax money, and they would hear loud and clear objections from the residents if the burden of the Tennis Center and Amphitheater was put on the residents' backs. Brown said technically all the City facilities were on the backs of the taxpayers. McMenamin said those facilities were funded by the taxpayers, and the Amphitheater and Tennis Center were not. Brown said they were funded by taxes.

Rapson asked Meeker if he would be allowed to vote on the overall budget, even though it had funding in it for the Development Authority. Meeker said that Rapson could vote on the overall budget.

Weed moved to adopt the FY 2004 budget resolution. Rapson seconded.

Tennant read the following statement regarding his position on the budget adoption:

> Several months ago, I made it clear as a campaign promise that I would not support higher taxes for Peachtree City residents, and would work toward a zero percent millage increase for the upcoming fiscal year. That was and remains a promise I take very seriously.
>
> Despite comments from one critic that this was simply an election year gimmick, I want to state emphatically that this commitment comes from the heart, and I will not waver. I do not derive my self worth from being an elected official in PTC, as I have a wonderful family, a church life, a demanding full-time job and many outside interests. I take this job on council very seriously, but I would much rather lose an election and stand up for what I believe in than to win an election by caving in on my principles.
>
> The bottom line is that Americans are overtaxed today by all levels of government. Despite the fact that staff and council have worked diligently to make the budget process as painless as possible, there is nonetheless a 12.3% tax increase proposed to balance this budget.
>
> It is one thing to sit by idly and say you're against tax increases and vote accordingly. It is quite another to make general and specific proposals that would have balanced the budget without a tax hike. That is what I have done. I offered many suggestions and three specific plans that would have offered a zero percent millage increase without affecting public safety budgets in Peachtree City during the budget workshops. However, I am but one vote out of five and a majority will always prevail in a democracy.
>
> Nonetheless, there is still such a thing as principle and that is what I stand on. In tough times, expenses and budgets can and should be cut to relieve the burden to taxpayers. This necessarily comes at a sacrifice because you simply cannot have your cake and eat it too. I believe there simply was not sufficient sacrifice in this budget, and I will never buy the argument that taxpayers don't care about how their money is managed as long as their services are provided.
>
> The buck has to stop somewhere, and for me, that is now. I will not support a tax increase and I will not vote to approve this budget.

Rapson commended Tennant on his scenarios and asking for zero percent. He continued that he could not support Tennant's proposals since they affected the level of service the citizens expected and deserved. Rapson said he was supporting the budget because he wanted to maintain the service levels the citizens expected and deserved.

Weed said Council had poured over the budget last year and they knew the millage rate would have to increase this year. Taxes would also probably have to increase next year and they already knew that. Weed said the work was not done in a vacuum. Weed did not believe the citizens wanted to see radical changes in the service level, and he believed citizens were willing to pay for the privilege. He said that had been communicated to him. If people wanted less, they would not have moved to the City. The streets were cleaner, families were safer, and their children were better educated, and that all cost money. Weed said he would vote in favor of the budget.

Tennant said he had not proposed radical changes, but legitimate, sound, conservative, and fair ideas that would have balanced the budget without a tax increase. Tennant said the Council was the City's board of directors, and there would be no tax increase if they chose that option. The bottom line in difficult times was that sacrifices had to be made, just as in the private sector and family finances. Unfortunately, there was so much emphasis on service delivery at any cost that the tax spigot was turned on.

Weed said he fundamentally disagreed with Tennant's proposals. Cutting people directly affected services and all the work that was done. He said Tennant's proposals were not absurd, but were based on flawed logic. Tennant said he spent countless hours on his proposals and that 96% service delivery was not a radical change.

The motion carried 3-2 (Tennant, McMenamin).

<u>Council/Staff Topics</u>

Comprehensive Marketing Strategy

McMullen said staff was working on a comprehensive marketing strategy for the City and would like to start working with the Development Authority and the Airport Authority to develop and coordinate an image for the City. McMullen said they also wanted to look at efficiencies in terms of dealing with different marketing avenues, such as website development. McMullen said there were four websites for the three organizations, changes could be made more economically, and the City's image could be improved.

McMenamin asked if anyone had met with the Development Authority and Airport Authority to bring the organizations up to date. McMullen said staff had met with both and they were highly supportive. McMullen continued that they were working with Debbie Britt, a marketing strategy professional who had volunteered her services. McMullen said he saw a lot of positive things coming out of the meetings. Brown added that Britt was getting them on the right track and was doing an excellent job of motivating staff. He said everyone had stellar comments about her efforts.

Meeker announced that there two matters of pending litigation for executive session.

Rapson asked McMenamin why she voted against the FY 2004 budget. McMenamin said the question was called before everyone had commented. She said she had concerns throughout the process that Council had not been strong enough on itself. She said she also could not and did not support the budget with the assistant city manager position included.

Weed moved to reconvene in executive session for two legal matters after a short break. Tennant seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Tennant moved to reconvene in regular session. Rapson seconded. The motion carried unanimously

There being no further business to discuss, Tennant moved to adjourn the meeting. Rapson seconded. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Jane Miller, City Clerk

Stephen D. Brown, Mayor

Pamela Dufresne, Recording Secretary

City Council of Peachtree City
SPECIAL CALLED MEETING
Minutes of Meeting
September 18, 2003
6:30 p.m.

The City Council of Peachtree City met in a special called meeting, Thursday, September 18, 2003, in the City Hall Council Chambers. Mayor Brown called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Other Council Members present were: Annie McMenamin, Steve Rapson, and Dan Tennant. Murray Weed was out of town.

Finance Director Paul Salvatore noted this meeting was the first of three public hearings on the FY 2004 millage rate increase as required by law. He continued that the major issues and concerns included the increase in employee health insurance costs, the increases in costs for the defined benefit pension plan, the shortfall in the LOST revenue and change in the distribution formula, the hotel/motel tax shortfall, declining impact fees, declining personal property values, state grant revenue loss, and the trend of expenditures exceeding tax revenues.

Salvatore continued that the proposed millage rate for 2004 was 5.283, an increase of .580 mills or 12.3% over the current rate of 4.703 mills. Salvatore pointed out that state law required that the millage rate be advertised with the increase from the rollback rate, which was an increase of 17% over 4.50 mills. Salvatore said Fayette County was rolling back its millage rate by .297 mills. He said there was a 1.283 net mill tax increase across all jurisdictions, including the Board of Education, and for every $200,000 worth of property, the tax bill went up $102.64.

David Chaney asked if industry and business was taxed at the same rate. Salvatore said everyone paid the same tax rate. Brown explained that some industries were offered financial enticements from the State and the County, including reduced costs on loans. Chaney said he purchased his home in 1988. Every year, the value of his home went up 18%, but his Social Security only increased 1½% at the same time, or $10 a month. His wife was a retired schoolteacher who had to take a reduction in her retirement. Chaney said he knew he could move if he did not like things, but moving was hard to do at his age. Chaney felt the City could cut back on services and said there was a lot of room for a little economy in the budget. He said expenses should be cut before taxes were raised.

Salvatore said the perception was that, because the City was a governmental entity, it was immune to economic forces. He pointed out that economic forces were the reason the City was faced with a tax increase. Health insurance costs had gone up, the stock market performance affected the portfolio plan for the defined benefit pension plan, and some industries were leaving the County. Salvatore said the industries that remained had cut costs and decreased inventory. Approximately $32 million was gone from the personal property tax digest, which was $150,000 in tax revenue. Rapson added that about 3.5% of property taxes were offset by the taxes paid by industry and commercial businesses.

Chaney, who said he had owned four businesses, told Council the budget should be reviewed, then reviewed again. He said with the current unemployment rate, there were fewer people to pay taxes and the burden got heavier. He said Council had to look at making honest cuts.

Brown asked if anyone else wanted to speak, and no one approached the podium. Brown closed the public hearing.

McMenamin moved to adjourn the meeting. Rapson seconded. The motion carried unanimously. The public hearing adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Jane Miller, City Clerk

Stephen D. Brown, Mayor

Pamela Dufresne, Recording Secretary

City of Peachtree City
Minutes of Meeting
September 18, 2003
7:00 p.m.

The City Council of Peachtree City met Thursday, September 18, 2003, 7:00 p.m., in the City Hall Council Chambers. Council Members attending were: Mayor Steve Brown, Annie McMenamin, Steve Rapson, and Dan Tennant. Murray Weed was out of town.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition

Mayor Brown read proclamations for Hispanic Heritage Month, Constitution Week, and National Public Lands Day. Brown recognized the 91 Lazer White Team U-13, 87 Girls Elite Team U-17, and 92 Lazer White Team U-12 Boys as champions in the Kohl's Atlanta Cup competition. The 90 Lazer Green Team U-14 Boys was recognized as the winner of the Aiken Cup competition held in Aiken, S.C. Code Enforcement Officer Tim Maret and Police Corporal Erik Powell were recognized as the Employees of the Month for August.

Approval of Minutes

There were no minutes for approval.

Consent Agenda

1. **Consider Budget Amendments**
2. **Consider Lease Supplement for Police Vehicles**
3. **Consider Adoption of ICMA 401 Plan**
4. **Consider Appointment of Deputy Registrars**
5. **Consider Amendment to Ordinance – Article II, Section 2-38**
6. **Alcoholic Beverage License – Change in Licensee – Aberdeen Woods**

McMenamin asked City Attorney Ted Meeker if she should abstain from the vote on Consent Agenda Item #2 since her son-in-law was a member of the Police Department. Meeker said she should not since there was no benefit to her family member that was not shared by other members of the Department so there would be no conflict. McMenamin asked the other Council Members if they felt there was an appearance of a conflict of interest. They replied that they did not.

Brown noted that Glenn Wallberg, the licensee applicant for Aberdeen Woods, was at the meeting. McMenamin noted that Aberdeen Woods had been a good corporate citizen for a long time and had given a great presence to the City, which was much appreciated. Bobby Howard, the applicant's attorney, introduced Wallberg and said he was the successor president of Sales & Service Training Center, Inc., owner of Aberdeen Woods Conference Center.

Tennant moved to approve items 1-6 on the Consent Agenda as submitted, including the additional documents on the dais. McMenamin seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

06-02-03 Consider Dog Park Location

Fred Bryant, chairman of the Dog Park Committee, addressed Council. He said the committee was basically requesting a site change from the location approved by Council in the Kedron area. He thanked Council for their leadership and Leisure Services Director Randy Gaddo and his staff, as well the Recreation Commission, members of the soccer and BMX associations, and Southern Conservation Trust.

Bryant continued that he believed there had been constructive dialogue regarding the site. He said they had agreed to disagree on some things. Bryant said he understood that the BMX association supported the location. He also understood that the Southern Conservation Trust did not oppose the dog park per se, but could not support any activity that would be inconsistent with their mission as a trust. Bryant also thanked the donors and sponsors that had contributed to this point. Bryant said the $5,000 seed money provided by Council was earmarked for the water facility. Their fundraising had already exceeded the amount provided by Council and the committee intended to return the seed money to the City in the future so the money could be used for other purposes in the City.

Bryant said the proposed new site consisted of about three acres located in the McIntosh Trail complex. The committee tried to make sure there were no topographic or erosion concerns or stormwater issues, and that access was available with minimal effort. Parking was available and a water line was located nearby. He pointed out that the new site was also a central location for most City residents. The Kedron site only had about one-half acre that was useable and had major erosion concerns, as well as mitigation factors. The Committee had looked at other sites, but none supported their criteria as well as the site behind the BMX track. Bryant said the site also met the "good neighbor" criteria. They did not want to interfere with current uses, or planned recreational uses. He asked Council to approve the relocation of the site from the Kedron area to the three acres located south and east of the BMX track at the McIntosh Trail Recreation Complex. Bryant said they would survey the site to ensure that it did not conflict with the Southern Conservation Trust nature area. The access area would be closer to the Recreation Department building and away from the BMX track. He added that with Council's approval the committee could move forward with major fundraising.

Recreation Commissioner Mike Williams told Council this site was the best location for the dog park. He added that Recreation Department staff was located nearby. The dog park would be a daylight operation and would be well-regulated. Williams said the committee had done an excellent job of resolving issues connected to the site.

Gaddo agreed with Williams. He said the committee members had been professional in their approach to issues and would do an excellent job when the park opened.

Brown noted that the concession/storage facility at the BMX track was in deplorable condition. He suggested that if the Dog Park Committee needed storage that storage space could be included if the concession stand were rebuilt. Brown said they might be able to get the materials donated since it would be a small project. Williams said they were already looking at ways to help each other's efforts.

McMenamin said she did not support Council spending the money for the dog park, but she would support Council's decision regarding the park. She said she did support the new site. McMenamin continued that she did have concerns about the original access with the multiple uses in the area. She told Bryant she appreciated the move to the left side of the Recreation Department building since it gave easier flow and access to the dog park.

Tennant moved to approve the relocation of the dog park from Kedron to the area south and east of the BMX track. Rapson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

New Agenda Items

09-03-03 Consider Bridlepath Drainage/Siltation Issue

Salvatore noted that Council had made a firm commitment of $75,000 to this project at the last meeting as discussed at this year's Retreat. He continued that $10,900 had already been appropriated for preliminary studies and an additional $64,100 was needed. Staff recommended taking the remaining $22,000 in FY 2003 Council Contingency plus $42,100 from the PIP Contingency. Salvatore continued that the money should be put aside in the PIP project account for Bridlepath Creek and carry the funds over until the money could be spent on construction or until there were additional funds to move forward with the project.

Tennant moved to authorize staff to transfer $22,000 from Council Contingency and $42,100 from PIP Contingency to provide the funding for the Bridlepath Creek sedimentation project. Rapson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

09-03-04 Presentation on No Smoking Resolution from the Board of Health

Brown asked if anyone from the Board of Health was in attendance. No one answered. The agenda item was moved to the next meeting.

Council/Staff Topics

Brown commended the Airshow Committee for their work at the Great Georgia Airshow on September 6-7, as well as the National Air Tour held at Falcon Field on September 17-18.

McMenamin agreed and said the weekend at the airshow was outstanding and the non-profit organizations had a profitable weekend. The sponsors were looking for a positive bottom line. McMenamin explained that part of the airshow budget was to house and feed the pilots, so the City benefited. The Kiwanis Club was called on very short notice to help with the Air Tour. Those monies would also go back into the community. The members of the Air Tour were housed by the Commemorative Air Force and also spent money on food, including staying for a few extra days due to the bad weather on the East Coast. McMenamin pointed out the airshows brought money into the City and were a great opportunity to showcase the City's airport. McMenamin also commended the Fire Department for their quick response to a landing incident with one of the antique aircraft.

Brown said he met with residents in the Georgian Park area concerning Phases 2 and 3 of the Kedron commercial area. He noted that the conceptual site plan for the project was on the Planning Commission's agenda on Monday, September 22. He said he would rather see the matter as a workshop item rather than conceptual site plan approval, if possible. Rapson agreed and said the homeowners wanted to discuss the project with the developer. Rapson noted that the Planning Commission workshop environment was probably an appropriate setting for that discussion. McMenamin also agreed. She said it would be a good opportunity for residents, staff, and the developer to come up with something everyone could live with. Developmental Services Director Clyde Stricklin said his department had no objection to holding a workshop.

McMenamin asked, once the invitation had been extended, if the attorneys should be contacted to make sure they agree the meeting should take place and to look at the parameters. Meeker agreed. He said Council's direction to the Planning Commission was clear.

Meeker said he had a real estate matter and pending litigation to discuss in executive session.

Tennant moved to reconvene in executive session for two legal matters after a short break. McMenamin seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Tennant moved to reconvene in regular session. Rapson seconded. The motion carried unanimously

There being no further business to discuss, Tennant moved to adjourn the meeting. Rapson seconded. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Jane Miller, City Clerk

Stephen D. Brown, Mayor

Pamela Dufresne, Recording Secretary

2003 City Event Calendar

October	November	December
10/2 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm 10/11 – Alzheimer's Memory Walk, 8 am 10/16 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm 10/18 – Peachtree City Classic Road Race 10/25 – GMA Training, Tifton	11/4 – City Election, 7 am – 7 pm 11/6 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm 11/10 – GMA Training, Macon 11/20 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm 11/27 & 28 – Thanksgiving Holiday – City Offices Closed	12/4 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm 12/18 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm 12/19 – Open House at The Gathering Place, 3-5 PM 12/24 & 25 – Christmas Holiday – City Offices Closed at noon on 24th and remain closed on 12/25

2004 City Event Calendar

January	February	March
1/1 – New Years Holiday – City Offices Closed (1/1 – Regular Council Meeting Date) 1/15 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm 1/19 – MLK Holiday, City Offices Closed	2/5 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm 2/19 - City Council Meeting, 7 pm	3/4 - City Council Meeting, 7 pm 3/18 - City Council Meeting, 7 pm
April	**May**	**June**
4/1 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm **4/15 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm**	**5/6 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm** **5/20 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm** **5/31 – Memorial Day, City Offices Closed;** **Golf Cart Rally – 7:30 am** **Celebration at Plaza**	**6/3 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm** **6/17 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm**
July	**August**	**September**
7/1 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm **7/4 – Independence Day, City Offices Closed;** **Parade – 9 am** **Concert at City Hall – 7 pm** **Fireworks – 9:30 pm** **7/15 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm**	**8/5 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm** **8/19 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm**	**9/2 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm** **9/6 – Labor Day, City Offices Closed** **9/16 – City Council Meeting, 7 pm** **9/18 & 19 – Shakerag Arts & Crafts Festival**

*Note: Items in **BOLD** are new additions*

Updated 9/23/03

BUILDING DEPARTMENT

2003 MONTHLY REPORT

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	2003 YEAR-TO-DATE	2002 YEAR-TO-DATE
DEVELOPMENT PERMITS:	12	23	20	14	28	26	15	43					181	190
BUILDING PERMITS:														
Single Family Residential	15	23	13	18	23	20	19	36					167	162
Multi-Family Residential	0	5	0	0	5	0	5	0					15	0
Misc.-Pools/fences/additions	38	55	64	57	64	60	61	62					461	520
Commercial/Industrial	2	11	0	8	8	10	10	14					63	69
TOTAL INSPECTIONS:	629	513	659	599	612	538	787	708					5,045	5,063
CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY:														
Residential	16	14	32	16	14	19	24	14					149	136
Commercial	6	3	2	5	3	1	3	5					28	25
Multi-Family Residential	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0					5	150
CODE ENFORCEMENT:														
Sign Violations	87	91	163	83	105	147	139	62					877	782
Rehab	7	18	12	25	5	22	19	26					134	112
Notice of Violations	236	275	341	783	412	311	410	351					3,119	2,483
Citations	0	1	4	2	4	5	0	2					18	41
Stop Work Orders	11	8	12	2	1	9	10	3					56	53
Complaints From Citizens	18	10	22	25	16	20	14	25					150	223
Assessments	1	6	8	10	2	14	8	40					89	347
PERMIT FEES COLLECTED:	28,004	48,240	25,706	37,930	57,370	38,357	61,091	55,875					352,573	413,635
POPULATION: Based on 2.09 of completed occupancy	34,915	34,944	35,011	35,044	35,082	35,124	35,174	35,203					35,203	34,366

Peachtree City Prisoners at Fayette County Jail

2003

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD 2003	Previous Year
*Average Misdemeanors	5.09	3.40	2.14	3.18	4.27	4.61	4.96	5.05					4.09	7.60
*Average Felonies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					0.00	1.01
*Average Totals	5.09	3.40	2.14	3.18	4.27	4.61	4.96	5.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.09	8.61

*These totals do not include weekend incarcerations.

Fayette County Jail Fund

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD 2003	Previous Year
Amount Sent to County	$6,441.79	$6,097.30	$4,550.02	$6,147.98	$5,643.86	$5,540.35	$4,003.02	$4,727.98					$43,152.30	$45,356.23
Billed from County	$5,121.00	$2,253.24	$2,116.68	$2,662.92	$2,423.94	$2,970.18	$4,165.08	$4,882.02					$26,595.06	$48,000.00
Cumulative Balance	$7,144.86	$3,844.06	$2,433.34	$3,485.06	$3,219.92	$2,570.17	-$162.06	-$154.04	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$22,381.31	-$2,643.77

*Includes carryover for 2002 of: $5,824.07

Financial Services Monthly Report

STATUS OF FUNDS AS OF AUGUST 31, 2003

Fund	Cash Balance	Total Investment	Total Cash and Investments	YTD Interest
General Fund	$152,655	$5,618,770	$5,771,425	$86,599
Library Sales Tax Fund	$0	$0	$0	$0
Public Improvement Fund	($318,409)	$1,268,044	$949,634	$20,363
Self Insurance Fund	$0	$0	$0	$0
Debt Service Fund	$81,135	$12,886	$94,021	$205
Municipal Court Fund	$29,769	$0	$29,769	$0
Develop & Impact Fees	$348,816	$220,845	$569,661	$6,680
Neighborhood Parks/Rec.	$22,357	$0	$22,357	$85
Governor's Greenspace	$5,951	$0	$5,951	$266
Federal Seizures Police	$10,615	$0	$10,615	$23
Police Tuition Account	$2,297	$0	$2,297	$21
Escrow Account	$116,468	$0	$116,468	$428
Grand Total	**$451,654**	**$7,120,544**	**$7,572,199**	**$114,671**

Purchasing Monthly Report

For Fiscal Year	2003 TOTAL YTD	2002 TOTAL YTD	MTHLY % INC/(DEC)
Purchase Requistions Processed	2,024	2,783	-27.27%
City Store Requistions Processed	101	125	-19.20%
Sealed Bids Requested >$10,000	25	19	31.58%
Requests for Proposals	5	10	-50.00%
Requests for Proposals Awarded	4	4	0.00%
Written Quotes Req $5,000-10,000	38	67	-43.28%
Verbal Quotes Requested - $500 - $5,000	410	358	14.53%
Total # Purchase Orders Issued	2,024	2,783	-27.27%
Total # of Bids Awarded	26	12	116.67%
Contracts Required >$10,000	5	7	-28.57%
# of Fixed Assets Purchased >$5000	49	29	68.97%

Collateral Analysis as of August 31, 2003

Security Location	Bank	Total Held
Bank of New York	Wachovia	$1,313,070
Bank of New York	Peachtree National	$5,333,882
Federal Res Bk of Boston	South Trust	$6,536,605
		$13,183,557

General Fund Budget Comparison
Revenues - By Major Category

Description	2003 Budget	Actual YTD	Difference	%
General Property Taxes	$6,701,035	$6,674,342	($26,693)	99.60%
Franchise Taxes	$1,869,602	$1,658,364	($211,238)	88.70%
Local Option Sales Tax	$6,242,736	$5,376,816	($865,920)	86.13%
Hotel/Motel Tax	$903,738	$809,189	($94,549)	89.54%
Other Sales & Use Taxes	$508,144	$531,010	$22,866	104.50%
Business Taxes	$1,638,015	$1,612,498	($25,517)	98.44%
Licenses & Permits	$677,451	$679,855	$2,404	100.35%
Grants	$202,591	$208,903	$6,312	103.12%
Charges for Services	$899,601	$755,472	($144,129)	83.98%
Fines & Forfeitures	$707,284	$621,186	($86,098)	87.83%
Investment Income	$79,851	$86,599	$6,748	108.45%
Surplus Carryover	$698,683	$0	($698,683)	0.00%
Other Financing Sources	$77,855	$147,635	$69,780	189.63%
Total	**$21,206,586**	**$19,161,870**	**($2,044,716)**	**90%**

General Fund Budget Comparison
Expenditures by Division YTD

Percentage into Budget Year *91.67%*

Division	2003 Budget	Actual YTD	Difference	%
Administrative	$1,368,854	$1,165,148	$203,707	85%
Developmental	$1,159,617	$833,941	$325,676	72%
Finance	$657,125	$506,647	$150,478	77%
Leisure Services	$3,852,196	$3,317,029	$535,167	86%
Public Safety	$7,703,861	$6,639,395	$1,064,466	86%
Public Works	$3,832,519	$2,988,198	$844,321	78%
Trfr to PCDA/PCAA	$385,096	$351,326	$33,770	91%
Council Contingency	$0	$0	$0	0%
Non-Profit Organizations	$25,000	$16,375	$8,625	66%
Grant Incentive Program	$50,000	$0	$50,000	0%
Council Reserve	$0	$0	$0	n/a
Transfer to PIP	$756,217	$721,427	$34,790	95%
Transfer to Debt Svc	$403,813	$403,813	$0	100%
Equity Transfer - Other	$0	$70,283	($70,283)	n/a
Liability Insurance	$64,185	$30,374	$33,811	47%
Legal Services	$167,525	$158,064	$9,461	94%
Gen'l Admin	$51,043	$0	$51,043	0%
Reserve-Insurance	$508,404	$0	$508,404	0%
Other	$221,131	$221,131	$0	100%
Total	**$21,206,586**	**$17,423,151**	**$3,783,435**	**82%**

Summary of Major Expenditures by City Manager

Description	Budget	Award	Svgs/Short	Date

PEACHTREE CITY FIRE/EMS DEPARTMENT
2003 MONTHLY REPORT

	Oct. 02	Nov. 02	Dec. 02	Jan. 03	Feb. 03	Mar. 03	Apr. 03	May. 03	Jun. 03	Jul. 03	Aug. 03	Sept. 03	Fiscal Yr. 2003 Y-T-D	Fiscal Yr. 2002 Y-T-D
Fire/Accident Calls														
Residential	4	1	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2		25	28
Business/Industrial	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	0	2		11	9
Other	186	168	175	186	173	189	168	206	159	172	186		1968	1916
Total Engine Response	190	170	178	189	175	193	173	209	163	174	190		2004	1952
Dispatched Fire Calls	56	37	41	50	34	41	37	38	43	48	41		466	527
Response Time Fire	4:44	4:14	5:31	4:37	5:14	4:56	4:18	4:13	4:49	5:02	3:57		4:53	4:19
Rescue/EMS														
Trauma	69	77	55	38	44	76	94	89	28	41	66		677	721
Medical	82	72	71	78	67	64	79	53	33	43	67		709	953
Total # Patients	151	149	126	116	111	140	173	142	61	84	133		1386	1694
Patients Transported	72	79	47	54	45	53	78	51	25	30	55		589	833
Dispatched EMS Calls	138	130	136	140	140	152	136	174	119	127	152		1544	1442
Total Medic Response	151	149	126	116	111	140	173	142	61	84	133		1386	1709
Dispatched Fire/EMS Total	194	167	177	190	174	193	173	212	162	175	193		2010	1969
Response Time EMS	4:17	4:16	4:35	4:24	4:26	4:11	4:16	4:18	3:43	4:22	4:23		4:20	4:00
EMS BILLING														
Patients Billed	63	71	74	69	78	91	49	110	61	87	65		818	855
Revenue Generated	22,355	25,170	26,105	23,360	27,410	31,385	16,695	37,620	20,870	33,027	25,216		289,213	294,861
***Total Revenue Received**	18,932	18,398	19,768	15,550	13,903	17,344	15,668	22,886	19,992	15,985	23,865		202,291	196,321

***Revenue Received on All Outstanding Accounts**

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

2003 MONTHLY REPORT

REPORT PERIOD	JAN	FEB	MAR	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	2003 YTD TOTAL	2002 YTD TOTAL
1. Authorized Permanent Positions	224	224	224	224	224	224	224	224					224	224
2. Positions Open	9	11	7	8	11	6	5	5					—	—
3. Workers Comp. Claims Filed	4	3	1	0	2	1	5	4					20	20
4. City Veh./Equip. Accidents	2	0	3	2	1	0	1	2					11	6
5. Law Suit Legal Fees	$ 30,642	$ 52,116	$2,202	$ 6,096	$ 638	$ 3,858	$ 12,202	$ 3,894					$111,647	$ 56,823

2. Assistant City Manager (1); Police Officer/Police (2); Maintenance Technician/Recreation (1); Maintenance Technician/Public Works (1).
3. Maintenance Supervisor exposed to poison ivy, causing eye irritation (1) Public Works; Maintenance Technician stung by wasps while moving soccer goal at field (1) Recreation; Building Department Employee twisted right knee while filing (1) Building; Fire Lieutenant cut right thumb while changing a broken light bulb (1) Fire.
4. Building Department Employee was backing City truck and slid into parked storage trailer, causing damage to tail light and rear quarter panel (1) Building; Fire Sergeant caused minor damage to fire engine due to running into back of another car when cars in front suddenly stopped for a changing light (1) Fire.
5. Georgian Park Car Wash $715.03; O'Keefe $2,672.52; Wright $506.00

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	UNIT	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	2003 Year to Date	2002 Year to Date
LIBRARY															
1. Books Circulated	Num.*	12,288	16,080	17,554	15,621	17,913	21,226	20,043	17,625	0	0	0	0	138,350	140,744
2. Average Daily Traffic															
a. Monday - Saturday	Num.	480	509	521	507	530	626	594	526	0	0	0	0	538	578
b. Sunday	Num.	260	367	348	261	205	271	292	261	0	0	0	0	286	330
3. Story/Baby Time Participants	Num.	286	358	103	222	245	112	227	367	0	0	0	0	1,920	1,041
4. Revenue from Overdue Books	Dls.	1,514	1,727	2,170	2,284	2,254	2,062	2,642	1,835	0	0	0	0	16,488	16,161
5. Revenue from Copy Machine	Dls.	702	982	876	851	616	590	833	838	0	0	0	0	6,288	5,656
6. Reference Assistance	Num.	327	447	670	515	536	510	442	538	0	0	0	0	3,985	3,948
7. Internet Usage	Num.	1,046	1,573	1,908	1,897	1,777	2,036	2,510	2,603	0	0	0	0	15,350	14,976
8. Renewals by Phone	Num.	289	337	618	615	515	512	52	474	0	0	0	0	3,412	4,254
9. Computer Lab Use	Num.	48	39	36	33	22	35	36	54	0	0	0	0	303	366
*Closed in Jan. - new carpet															
Leisure Programs															
1. Adult Athletics**															
a. Ongoing Programs	Num.	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	15	10
b. New Programs	Num.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
c. Participants	Num.	200	200	1,017	1,221	1,221	1,407	1,309	1,309	919	0	0	0	8,803	8,147
d. Revenues	Dls.	0	7,200	19,270	0	0	16,040	2,720	0	0	0	0	0	45,230	36,582
e. Expenses	Dls.	0	6,588	0	0	0	17,969	2,456	0	0	0	0	0	27,013	22,941
f. Refunds	Dls.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
g. Balance (+ or -)	Dls.	0	612	19,270	0	0	-1,929	264	0	0	0	0	0	$16,217	$13,641.00
**Kedron Feb. fees revised 7/03			Revised 7/03	Softball Fees											
RECREATION															
Leisure Programs															
1. Classes/Programs															
a. Classes/programs	Num.	113	113	124	125	121	116	118	104	0	0	0	0	934	905
b. Participants	Num.	3,022	3,270	3,440	3,010	3,290	3,808	2,643	3,483	0	0	0	0	25,945	22,289
c. Revenues	Num.	14,107	20,201	25,519	18,340	17,917	56,678	44,140	21,010	0	0	0	0	217,912	232,282
d. Expenses	Dls.	10,757	15,212	20,003	14,402	13,821	44,638	36,531	16,286	0	0	0	0	171,650	181,848
e. Refunds	Dls.	628	517	619	105	241	230	154	0	0	0	0	0	2,494	3,610
f. balance (+ or -)	Dls.	2,722	4,472	4,897	3,833	3,855	11,809	7,455	4,724	0	0	0	0	$43,768.19	$46,823.10
2. Special Events															
a. Events	Num.	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	11
b. Participants	Num.	0	497	0	1,000	540	0	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	22,037	13,959
c. Revenues	Dls.	0	0	0	0	500	0	0	509	0	0	0	0	1,009	2,280
d. Expenses	Dls.	0	0	0	80	250	0	0	5,077	0	0	0	0	5,407	7,074
e. Refunds	Dls.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
f. balance (+ or -)	Dls.	0	0	0	-80	250	0	0	-4,568	0	0	0	0	($4,306.90)	($4,969.00)
Sports and Facilities															
1. Playing Surface Mowing	Hrs.	0	0	0	356	370	394	409	440	0	0	0	0	1,969	1,864
2. Playing Field Preparation	Hrs.	320	700	732	525	477	340	305	420	0	0	0	0	3,819	3,697
3. Building Maintenance	Hrs.	315	359	525	500	450	470	422	450	0	0	0	0	3,491	1,210
4. Parks/Pools/tennis Courts															
a. Safety Inspections	Num.	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	0	0	0	0	400	376
b. General Repairs/Maint.	Hrs.	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	0	0	0	0	800	1,027
c. Grounds/Landscape Maint.	Hrs.	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	0	0	0	0	1,200	2,904
5. Litter Removal	Num.	286	264	320	288	256	304	373	326	0	0	0	0	2,417	1,910
6. Vandalism Repairs	Dls.	150	50	35	40	25	30	35	40	0	0	0	0	405	353
7. Complaints Answered	Num.	3	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	18	21

CRIME REPORT – AUGUST 2003

PART I CRIMES	**JAN**	**FEB**	**MAR**	**APR**	**MAY**	**JUN**	**JUL**	**AUG**	**SEPT**	**OCT**	**NOV**	**DEC**	**YTD 2003**	**YTD 2002**
MURDER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					0	0
RAPE	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2					3	2
ROBBERY	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0					4	2
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1					6	5
ARSON	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0					1	0
AUTO THEFT	3	3	4	6	12	16	10	3					57	35
THEFT	12	19	15	21	18	31	20	19					155	143
BURGLARY	1	0	1	1	0	5	4	3					15	28
TOTAL PART I CRIMES	17	23	21	30	32	53	37	28					241	215
ALCOHOL/DRUG ARRESTS **DUI – TOTAL**	19	10	15	11	19	19	20	12					125	146
DUI – ADULT	16	9	14	8	18	14	17	10					106	126
DUI – UNDERAGE	3	1	1	3	1	5	3	2					19	20
OTHER UNDERAGE ALCOHOL ARRESTS	4	3	8	4	24	18	7	7					75	81
DRUG ARRESTS	7	15	5	15	9	11	9	7					78	101
ARRESTS														
PROPERTY CRIMES	8	8	2	7	9	16	14	17					81	77
PERSON CRIMES	2	2	9	3	6	9	6	9					46	53
CITY ORDINANCES	28	27	40	35	63	70	34	35					332	343
*OTHER	98	89	98	95	73	123	86	71					733	704

ADMINISTRATIVE AVERAGE RESPONSE TIME	5.02	5.54	5.41	4.56	5.59	5.40	5.30	5.19					5.25	5.27
CALLS ANSWERED	6175	5346	5679	5683	5492	5331	5543	5202					44,451	48,756
TRAFFIC CITATIONS ISSUED	552	454	505	490	438	403	492	559					3893	4796
WARNINGS ISSUED	584	578	433	500	483	411	474	459					3922	4224
ACCIDENTS – TOTAL	85	70	99	105	124	82	91	94					750	675

TOP 5 ACCIDENT LOCATIONS – MONTH	TOTAL #
1. HWY 54 / HWY 74	9
2. HWY 54 / HUDDLESTON DR	4
3. HWY 54 / COMMERCE DR	4
4. HWY 54 / PEACHTREE PARKWAY	4
5. HWY 54 / PLANTERRA WAY	4

TOP 5 ACCIDENT LOCATIONS – YEAR	TOTAL #
1. HWY 54 / HWY 74	52
2. HWY 54 / HUDDLESTON DR.	38
3. HWY 54 / PLANTERRA WAY	29
4. HWY 74 / CROSSTOWN DR	26
5. HWY 54 / COMMERCE DR	21

Monthly Report
Public Information Department
Updated 09/23/03

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD Total
Citizen Contact (calls/letters/email)	26	39	36	38	47	46	41	29					**302**
Cable Complaints	16	8	13	10	20	18	15	10					**110**
Automated	*10*	*2*	*3*	*5*	*8*	*9*	*5*	*8*					*50*
Calls/Visits to City Hall	*6*	*6*	*11*	*5*	*12*	*9*	*10*	*2*					*61*
Open Records Requests	2	3	4	2	2	6	2	7					**28**
Press Releases	4	3	4	3	5	5	5	4					**33**
Media Contacts	**	**	12	14	6	12	16	13					**73**
Proclamations	*	*	5	5	1	1	5	2					**19**
Occupational Tax Payments	208	94	165	144	26	23	99***	41					**701**
New Businesses	*35*	*24*	*29*	*24*	*14*	*21*	*41*	*23*					*211*
Renewals	*173*	*70*	*136*	*120*	*12*	*2*	*58*	*18*					*589*
Garage Sale Registration	20	29	81	84	172	125	107	114					**732**
Solicitors Permits	8	7	14	65	11	18	35	8					**166**

* *Note: Due to a problem with the computer network, some data for January & February was lost.*

** *Media Contact Log implemented beginning in March 2003.*

*** *Increase followed Occupational Tax Audit and issuance of delinquency notices*

2003 MONTHLY REPORT
PUBLIC SERVICES DIVISION

Activity Description	Unit	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	2003 YEAR-TO-DATE	2002 YEAR-TO-DATE
CART PATHS															
1. Const./Reconst./Overlay	Ft.	0	0	0	0	35	285	580	0					900	7,192
2. Drainage Maintenance	Hrs.	173	218	330	346	237	306	199	90					1,899	1,182
3. General Maintenance	Hrs.	203	184	224	240	255	156	91	168					1,521	1,496
4. Mowing	Hrs.	0	0	0	165	68	225	210	135					803	530
5. Litter Removal	Hrs.	83	90	68	60	83	68	53	75					580	436
FLEET MANAGEMENT															
1. Equipment Maintenance	Hrs.	0	43	14	20	15	34	34	59					219	319
2. Equipment Repairs	Hrs.	192	126	159	279	241	261	261	278					1,797	1,725
3. Vehicle Maintenance	Hrs.	177	191	157	146	130	150	130	96					1,177	1,289
4. Vehicle Repairs	Hrs.	208	227	270	217	158	175	258	200					1,713	1,441
5. Fleet Down Time	Hrs.	587	593	666	670	548	622	689	629					5,004	4,823
RIGHT OF WAY															
1. Litter Removal	Hrs.	218	351	271	305	244	202	266	249					2,106	2,380
2. Right-of-Way Mowing	Hrs.	0	0	240	742	638	814	886	777					4,097	4,295
3. General Maintenance	Hrs.	693	853	797	447	477	653	446	530					4,896	3,521
LANDSCAPE															
1. Litter Removal	Hrs.	0	0	8	7	7	12	8	12					54	90
2. Mowing (Sub. Entrances)	Hrs.	0	46	454	920	844	805	698	796					4,563	4,271
3. General Maintenance	Hrs.	60	199	365	333	369	318	419	172					2,235	3,818
4. Planting	Hrs.	656	4	67	0	0	0	2	0					729	302
RECYCLING SITE															
1. City Employees Hours	Hrs.	187	70	79	74	191	71	56	78					806	787
2. City Employees Salaries	Dls.	4927	1370	1996	1556	5248	1467	1065	1785					19,414	15,214
3. Revenues	Dls.	571	341	344	559	463	373	458	367					3,476	3,281
4. Participants															
a. Recycling	Num.	292	310	428	433	623	295	301	415					3,097	3,630
b. Composting	Num.	1604	832	1696	1683	2545	1605	1614	1912					13,491	11,610
c. Mulch (Pick Up)	Num.	25	53	128	173	158	101	237	226					1,101	907
SIGN MAINTENANCE															
1. Building Maintenance	Hrs.	21	20	21	22	21	20	21	21					167	166
2. Subdivision Sign Maintenance	Hrs.	44	38	43	38	31	25	69	81					369	682
3. Traffic Sign Maintenance	Hrs.	218	193	172	179	166	60	66	136					1,190	1,083
STREETS															
1. Street Sweeping	Hrs.	15	60	30	60	14	38	12	16					245	152
2. Pavement Patching	Hrs.	0	0	20	303	208	280	113	255					1,179	1,693
3. Drainage Maintenance	Hrs.	176	130	195	83	434	241	174	175					1,608	659
4. General Maintenance	Hrs.	882	252	555	284	373	270	240	208					3,064	4,097
MISCELLANEOUS															
1. Vandalism	Dls.	144	179	241	522	215	397	411	197					2,306	2,249
2. Complaints Answered	Num.	12	24	52	49	78	39	35	35					324	173
3. Wash Police Cars	Hrs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					0	94

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: **Mayor & Council Members**

VIA: **City Manager**
Assistant City Manager

FROM: **Administrative Services Director / City Clerk**
Financial Services Director RS.

DATE: **September 26, 2003**

SUBJECT: **Employee Medical Insurance Renewal**
October 2, 2003 Council Agenda

Recommendation:
Approve an increase in the excess insurance coverage for the employee group medical insurance from $40,000 to $50,000

Discussion:
The City has received the renewal rates for the group medical insurance coverage provided by American Medical Security (AMS). They advised that the PPO access fee and the administrative fee for processing and paying claims would remain the same as last year. However, the premium for excess insurance has increased due to claims experience. We have had several high claims this year and the insurance company estimates that there will be at least five that might be expected to go into excess next year.

AMS has provided quotes for our current $40,000 excess coverage along with quotes for $45,000 and $50,000 excess coverage. The premium increase to remain at $40,000 excess would be $83,611. The premium increase for $45,000 excess coverage would be $42,197 while the premium increase for $50,000 excess coverage would be $3,385. Staff and our consultants have evaluated the quotes and determined that increasing the excess coverage to $50,000 would be advisable. The premium savings between $40,000 and $50,000 would be $80,226, enough to fund eight losses of at least $50,000. To date this year, the City has had five losses in excess of $40,000. Staff and our consultants recommend increasing the excess coverage to $50,000. Comments from staff and consultants are attached.

Budget Impact:
The annual premium would increase by $3,385 with an additional $50,000 in anticipated claims.

Attachments

Insurance Agent

J. Smith Lanier & Co.
Insuring People And Business Since 1868

September 26, 2003

Ms. Jane Miller
City of Peachtree City
151 Willowbend Road
Peachtree City, Georgia 30269

Re: Group Medical Renewal

Dear Jane,

It was certainly nice speaking with you this a.m. and I will be glad to reduce our conversation to writing.

In order to reduce the requested increase of 32% on the specific stop loss coverage, you can increase the specific amount from the current $40,000 to $50,000. This equates to an annual premium savings of $83,610.

Due to the tremendous premium savings potential, I feel you need to give serious consideration to this change.

After having reviewed the claims that surpassed the current specific stop loss of $40,000 and realizing that only five (5) was for this past year, I have to recommend that the City of Peachtree city give serious consideration to increasing the specific stop loss to $50,000 for this upcoming plan year.

If you should have any questions on any of the enclosed, please feel free to let me know.

As always, it is a pleasure to be of service to you and the employees of the City of Peachtree City.

Yours truly,

Dave

R. David Knight

1330 N. Park Street • Carrollton, Georgia 30117
P.O. Box 507 Carrollton, Georgia 30117
770.834.4476 • Fax 770.834.9403
Email: www.jsmithlanier.com

American Medical Security™

Current and Renewal Rates

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY
Affiliation Number: 24611
July 28, 2003

Group Name/Number: CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY 7771/050186

SELF FUNDED LINES

SPECIFIC ATTACHMENT: $40, 000 At Renewal
Current Policy Term: 11/01/02 though 10/31/03
Renwal Policy Term: 11/01/03 through 10/31/04

	Census		Current Admin Cost	Renewal Admin Cost	Current Specific Premium Cost	Renewal Specific Premium Cost	Current Fixed Cost	Renewal Fixed Cost
MEDICAL PHCS $10 CPY/$200/85%/$500(	74	Employee	$24.00	$24.00	$50.91	$67.27	$74.91	$91.27
	71	Family	$24.00	$24.00	$141.04	$186.37	$165.04	$210.37
	43	EE & Spouse	$24.00	$24.00	$141.04	$186.37	$165.04	$210.37
	13	EE & Child	$24.00	$24.00	$141.04	$186.37	$165.04	$210.37
		Monthly	$4,824.00	$4,824.00	$21,679.42	$28,646.97	$26,503.42	$33,470.97
TOTAL MEDICAL			**$4,824.00**	**$4,824.00**	**$21,679.42**	**$28,646.97**	**$26,503.42**	**$33,470.97**

American Medical Security™

City of Peachtree City - Alternate
Proposed Effective Date:
November 1, 2003

PLAN SUMMARY:

SPECIFIC DEDUCTIBLE:	$45,000.00
AGGREGATE ATTACHMENT POINT:	NA
CONTRACT TYPE:	36/12
MEDICAL GROUP SIZE:	203
PLAN DESCRIPTION:	99 $10/$200/85%/$5000
NETWORK :	PRIVATE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS

PRIMARY SUMMARY:

NO. MALE :	161
NO. FEMALE:	42
COBRA:	0
AVG. AGE :	40

EMPLOYEE ONLY COVERAGE:	74
FAMILY COVERAGE:	74
EMPLOYEE/SPOUSE COVERAGE:	41
EMPLOYEE/CHILD COVERAGE:	14
	203

COVERAGE TIER: EMPLOYEE COUNT:	EMPLOYEE 74	FAMILY 129	TOTAL MONTHLY	TOTAL ANNUAL
FIXED COST:				
SPECIFIC EXCESS LOSS	$59.01	$163.49	$25,456.95	$305,483.40
ADMINISTRATION FEE	$24.00	$24.00	$4,872.00	$58,464.00
PPO SERVICES	$4.55	$4.55	$923.65	$11,083.80
MONTHLY MEDICAL BILLING FEE			$25.00	$300.00
TOTAL FIXED COST	$87.56	$192.04	$31,277.60	$375,331.20

Premium Splits:
spec: 84% admin: 16% sp2: 84%

** Denote optional services

This quote was prepared based on rates for FAYETTE County, in the state of GEORGIA. Rates will vary if enrollment information differs from census information submitted, and are subject to American Medical Security home office approval. Do not cancel current coverage until written approval is received.
Note: all rates above depend on the entire census received being covered under the one plan quoted. If the census varies or more than one plan is desired, the rates may differ.
Alternate for $45,000 Specific.

QE2

American Medical Security™

City of Peachtree City - Alternate
Proposed Effective Date:
November 1, 2003

PLAN SUMMARY:	
SPECIFIC DEDUCTIBLE:	$50,000.00
AGGREGATE ATTACHMENT POINT:	125%
CONTRACT TYPE:	36/12
MEDICAL GROUP SIZE:	203
PLAN DESCRIPTION:	99 $10/$200/85%/$5000
NETWORK :	PRIVATE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS

PRIMARY SUMMARY:	
NO. MALE :	161
NO. FEMALE:	42
COBRA:	0
AVG. AGE :	40

EMPLOYEE ONLY COVERAGE:	74
FAMILY COVERAGE:	74
EMPLOYEE/SPOUSE COVERAGE:	41
EMPLOYEE/CHILD COVERAGE:	14
	203

COVERAGE TIER: EMPLOYEE COUNT:	EMPLOYEE 74	FAMILY 129	TOTAL MONTHLY	TOTAL ANNUAL
FIXED COST:				
SPECIFIC EXCESS LOSS	$50.91	$141.04	$21,961.60	$263,538.00
ADMINISTRATION FEE	$24.00	$24.00	$4,872.00	$58,464.00
PPO SERVICES	$4.55	$4.55	$923.65	$11,083.80
MONTHLY MEDICAL BILLING FEE			$25.00	$300.00
TOTAL FIXED COST	$79.46	$169.59	$27,782.15	$333,385.80

Premium Splits:
spec: 82% admin: 18% sp2: 82%

** Denote optional services

This quote was prepared based on rates for FAYETTE County, in the state of GEORGIA. Rates will vary if enrollment information differs from census information submitted, and are subject to American Medical Security home office approval. Do not cancel current coverage until written approval is received.
Note: all rates above depend on the entire census received being covered under the one plan quoted. If the census varies or more than one plan is desired, the rates may differ.
Alternate for $50,000 Specific.

QE2

Insurance Consultant

Jane Miller

From: Insurance Review & Mgmt [insrevmgmt@bellsouth.net]

Sent: Friday, September 26, 2003 11:49 AM

To: jmiller@peachtree-city.org

Subject: Medical excess insurance

Jane:

As we discussed, the option for increasing the per claim self-insured retention from $40,000 to $50,000 saves $80,228 per year in premium. In the current year, Peachtree City has had four claims exceed $50,000 and may have two more by policy year-end (the loss information I have in through June 2003). The premium savings would "fund" eight losses that exceed $40,000 up to $50,000. Based on your past experience, this guaranteed savings is a prudent trade-off of premium saving versus additional assumption of risk. I agree that the higher retention should be chosen for the renewal. Let me know if you need any additional information or if I can be of additional assistance.

Al Sherling
Insurance Review & Management, Inc.
*Please Note the new email address and update your information
Email: insrevmgmt@bellsouth.net
Phone: 770-554-9653
FAX: 770-554-9962

Jane Miller

From: Paul Salvatore
Sent: Friday, September 26, 2003 3:01 PM
To: Jane Miller
Subject: Health Ins Premium Analysis

Attached is my spreadsheet analyzing the various premium options for the excess health insurance. I concur that raising the specific to $50K is the most favorable option.

HealthInsPremAnalysis.xls

Excess Group Medical Premium Analysis
For Renewal Policy Term 11/1/03 - 10/31/04

	(Current) $40K Specific	$50K Specific	$45K Specific
Premium Increase	$83,611	$3,385	$42,197
Add'l claims paid by City (est.)*	$0	$50,000	$25,000
Net Increase for City:	**$83,611**	**$53,385**	**$67,197**

* estimate based upon 5 claims exceeding the specific ('current' situation as of 6/30/03).

Note: Fixed costs for administrative fees will remain the same

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: **Mayor & Councilmembers**

VIA: **City Manager**
Director of Financial Services
Assistant Finance Director

FROM: ***Director of Leisure Services***

DATE: **September 25, 2003**

SUBJECT: **Brand Name Purchase of Play Equipment, Beaver Dam Park, Wynnmeade**
(Oct. 2, 2003 City Council Agenda)

Recommendation:
That Council approves a request to expend $47,879 from the PIP account to purchase playground equipment for the Beaver Dam Park renovation in Wynnmeade. This will be a brand name purchase of Miracle Play Equipment from Hasley Recreation and Design Inc., the only authorized Miracle equipment dealer in Georgia. This purchase also includes a four-table size picnic shelter.

Discussion:
In order to standardize play equipment city wide for more efficient maintenance and upkeep, we have been purchasing Miracle equipment since installing it at the All Children's Playground more than two years ago. We have completed the last three upgrades (Pebblepocket Park, Braelinn Recreation Area and Glenloch Playground) using Miracle equipment. The purchase of equipment for Beaver Dam is part of an overall renovation to the park in conjunction with development of that area by Ashton Woods Homes. If approved, the equipment will be ordered for delivery after October 1 in order to complete installation in the fall.

Budget Impact:
This purchase is within the budgeted amount for this project. A total of $70,000 was budgeted. The remainder has been expended on upgrades to other aspects of the park, including repaving of the walking path around the park, and landscaping. In addition, the developer provided more than $20,000 of in-kind services such as grading and landscaping.

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Brown and Members of Council

VIA: City Manager, ATTN: Mr. Bernie McMullen
Assistant City Manager, ATTN: Mr. Colin Halterman
Director of Finance, ATTN: Paul Salvatore
Assistant Director of Finance, ATTN: Janet Camburn

FROM: Stony Lohr
Fire Chief

DATE: September 25th, 2003

SUBJECT: Fire Department Homeland Security Grants
(October 2nd, 2003 City Council Agenda)

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff requests that Council approve a FY2004 budget adjustment for the purpose of accepting and implementing Homeland Security Grants, and authorizing the Fire Chief to act as an authorized agent for the City for Homeland Security and Fire grant transactions.

DISCUSSION:

a. The Georgia Emergency Management Agency (GEMA) has notified the Fire Department that we have been approved for receipt of two Homeland Security grants totaling $162,902.71.

b. One grant provides $34,648.07 for acquisition of emergency medical supplies, equipment and instrumentation to fully equip our existing 12-foot EMS disaster/mass casualty response trailer.

c. One grant provides $128,254.64 to provide equipment, materials and instruments to equip our existing technical rescue truck and 20-foot trailer.

d. Acquisition may begin after completion of the approval documents by GEMA, and must be completed not later than June 4th, 2004. The acquisition process is that the City would purchase the various items and submit an invoice identifying those items and a copy of a cancelled check confirming payment, to GEMA, which would then reimburse us. GEMA has indicated that reimbursement can be turned around in as little as two days. We anticipate starting this process in mid October.

e. The purpose of the grants is to improve emergency preparedness of local jurisdictions, and specifically to better prepare local jurisdictions to respond as part of mutual aid teams in the event of Weapons of Mass Destruction incidents.

f. A listing of the equipment that has been approved is attached. The request was submitted through the Area 7 All Hazards Council. Council sub-committees evaluated the requests, which were then submitted to GEMA for further evaluation and submittal to the Office of Domestic Preparedness for approval.

g. The Fire Chief is already the designated action agent pertaining to fire, rescue, haz mat and EMS mutual aid actions.

BUDGET IMPACT:

This action will have no immediate budget impact because the equipment and materials provided will be funded on a reimbursable basis by the federal Office of Homeland Security through GEMA. No matching funds are required. We would be responsible for ongoing accountability and maintenance of items received.

2 Encl – As Stated

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

BUDGET AMENDMENT

NUMBER ______________________

DATE October 2, 2003

ACCOUNT	DESCRIPTION	INCREASE	DECREASE
208-00-33-1110	EMS Mass Casulty Grant	34,648	
208-00-33-1300	Technical Rescue Grant	128,255	
208-3600-53-1650	Small Tools & Equipment/Mass Casulty	24,510	
208-3600-53-1175	Operating Supplies/Mass Casulty	10,138	
208-3510-53-1650	Small Tools & Equipment/Tech. Rescue	69,393	
208-3510-53-1175	Operating Supplies/Tech. Rescue	14,202	
208-3510-54-2050	Machinery & Equipment	44,660	
	TOTAL	$ 325,806	$ -

To establish budget for Fire/EMS Federal Grants.

M.D

GEORGIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

ODP FY 03 State Domestic Preparedness Program *(SHADED AREAS ARE FOR GEMA USE ONLY)*

FISCAL YEAR / PART	FIPS NO.	BW #0089	DATE SUBMITTED	APPROVAL DATE
FY03PT2	113-59724-03			
Federal ID No. 58-	APPLICANT (Agency/ Department) Peachtree City Fire Department	COUNTY Fayette	GEMA AREA 7	GA NO. 2003-MU-T3-0010
ADDRESS		CONTACT NAME Stony R. Lohr		CONTACT Phone / ALTERNATE NO.

Category must be one of the following: Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), EOD, CBRNE Search and Rescue (SAR), Interoperable Communications (Int. Op), Physical Security (PS), Terrorism Prevention (TP), CBRNE Logistical Support (LS), Medical Supplies (MED), CBRNE Response Vehicles (VEH), CBRNE Reference Material (REF), CBRNE Detection (DET), Decon (DECON), Training (TRG), Exercise (EX)

Discipline = Fire, Law Enforcement (LE), EMS, EMA, etc

COST ESTIMATE

ITEM #	CATEGORY	ITEM	DISCIPLINE	QUANTITY	REVISED QUANTITY	COST EACH	TOTAL COST	REVISED COST
1	MED	Automatic External Defibrillator, biphasic	Fire	2		$2,999.00	$ 5,998.00	$ -
2	MED	LSI mass casualty oxygen manifold	Fire	2		$1,065.00	$ 2,130.00	$ -
3	MED	Oxygen cylinder, E cylinder	Fire	4		$89.00	$ 356.00	$ -
4	MED	Oxygen Cylinder, M Cylinder	Fire	2		$125.00	$ 250.00	$ -
5	MED	Oxygen cylinder dolly, double	Fire	1		$289.00	$ 289.00	$ -
6	MED	Oxygen Regulators	Fire	6		$175.00	$ 1,050.00	$ -
7	MED	Portable ventilators	Fire	2		$2,510.00	$ 5,020.00	$ -
8	MED	Suction Units	Fire	2		$714.00	$ 1,428.00	$ -
9	MED	Bag Valve Mask, adult	Fire	10		$25.25	$ 252.50	$ -
10	MED	Bag Valve Mask, pediatric	Fire	5		$25.25	$ 126.25	$ -
11	MED	Pulse Oximeter	Fire	2		$750.00	$ 1,500.00	$ -
12	MED	Mass Casualty Deployment System	Fire	2		$399.00	$ 798.00	$ -
13	MED	Blanket, disposable	Fire	50		$6.50	$ 325.00	$ -
14	MED	Triage Tags (pack of 50)	Fire	4		$42.95	$ 171.80	$ -
15	MED	Backboard	Fire	15		$99.00	$ 1,485.00	$ -
16	MED	Sheets	Fire	50		$3.40	$ 170.00	$ -
17	MED	IV Administration set (50 per case)	Fire	2		$247.00	$ 494.00	$ -
18	MED	IV catheters, 20 ga (50 per box)	Fire	2		$125.00	$ 250.00	$ -
19	MED	IV catheters, 18 ga (50 per box)	Fire	2		$125.00	$ 250.00	$ -
20	MED	IV catheters, 16 ga (50 per box)	Fire	1		$125.00	$ 125.00	
21	MED	Nebulizers, hand held (case of 50)	Fire	2		$227.00	$ 454.00	
22	MED	Oxygen mask, non-rebreather (case of 50)	Fire	2		$79.00	$ 158.00	
23	MED	Laryngoscope kit, disposable	Fire	2		$120.00	$ 240.00	
24	MED	Laryngoscope kit, standard	Fire	1		$312.00	$ 312.00	
25	MED	Laryngoscope blades, disposable	Fire	40		$5.95	$ 238.00	
26	MED	Endotracheal tubes (box of 10)	Fire	4		$25.00	$ 100.00	
27	MED	Albuterol (box of 25)	Fire	4		$18.00	$ 72.00	
28	MED	Sterile Water (case of 16)(500 cc)	Fire	4		$33.28	$ 133.12	
29	MED	Normal Saline (case of 12)(1,000 cc)	Fire	4		$27.60	$ 110.40	
30	MED	IV start kit (case of 50)	Fire	1		$93.50	$ 93.50	

COST ESTIMATE

ITEM #	CATEGORY	ITEM	DISCIPLINE	QUANTITY	REVISED QUANTITY	COST EACH	TOTAL COST	REVISED COST
31	MED	Kerlix (case of 100)	Fire	2		$187.00	$ 374.00	
32	MED	Sterile Burn Dressing, 8" x 8" (case of 30)	Fire	1		$268.50	$ 268.50	
33	MED	Cederoth Bloodstopper	Fire	50		$2.99	$ 149.50	
34	DECON	Personal Decon Kits (case)	Fire	4		$656.00	$ 2,624.00	
35	PPE	Tyvek coveralls, XXXL (case of 25)	Fire	2		$166.25	$ 332.50	
36	PPE	Jumpsuit (Nomex IIIA/CROSSTECH)	Fire	8		$240.00	$ 1,920.00	
37	DET	Smartcard	Fire	8		$20.00	$ 160.00	
38	DET	Radiation Detector,Ther Eberline FH40 GL,	Fire	1		$4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	
39	LS	Disaster Pouch	Fire	20		$12.00	$ 240.00	
							$ 34,648.07	$ -

PREPARED BY: TITLE:

M 13

GEORGIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

ODP FY 03 State Domestic Preparedness Program *(SHADED AREAS ARE FOR GEMA USE ONLY)*

FISCAL YEAR / PART FY03PT2	FIPS NO 113-59724-03	BW #0124	DATE SUBMITTED	APPROVAL DATE
Federal ID No. 58-1079955	APPLICANT (Agency/ Department) Peachtree City Fire Department	COUNTY Fayette	GEMA AREA 7	GAN NO 2003-MU-[illegible]
ADDRESS 105 Peachtree Parkway, North, Peachtree City, Georgia 30269		CONTACT NAME Stony R. Lohr		CONTACT Phone / ALTERNATE NO. 770-631-2540

Category must be one of the following: Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), EOD, CBRNE Search and Rescue (SAR), Interoperable Communications (Int. Op), Physical Security (PS), Terrorism Prevention (TP), CBRNE Logistical Support
Discipline = Fire, Law Enforcement (LE), EMS, EMA, etc

COST ESTIMATE

ITEM #	CATEGORY	ITEM	DISCIPLINE	QUANTITY	REVISED QUANTITY	COST EACH	TOTAL COST	REVISED COST
1	PPE	Nomex IIIA/Crosstech Coveralls	FIRE	8		$240.00	$ 1,920.00	$ -
2	PPE	Open circuit SCBA 4500psi	FIRE	6		$4,000.00	$ 24,000.00	$ -
3	PPE	4500psi spare bottle	FIRE	6		$956.00	$ 5,736.00	$ -
4	PPE	Air line system w/ 15 min. escape SCBA	FIRE	1		$15,560.00	$ 15,560.00	$ -
5	PPE	Cable air hose reel	FIRE	2		$1,650.00	$ 3,300.00	$ -
6	PPE	Rescue gloves	FIRE	8		$40.00	$ 320.00	$ -
7	PPE	Helmets for SAR	FIRE	8		$75.00	$ 600.00	$ -
8	PPE	Helmet mounted lighting system	FIRE	8		$73.00	$ 584.00	$ -
9	PPE	Hand lights	FIRE	6		$14.60	$ 87.60	$ -
10	PPE	Scott AV2000 SCBA adaptor/cartridge	FIRE	12		$41.96	$ 503.52	$ -
11	DET	Photo Ionization Detector	FIRE	1		$3,600.00	$ 3,600.00	$ -
12	DET	Chemical field test	FIRE	1		$212.00	$ 212.00	$ -
13	DET	M-8 Paper	FIRE	2		$6.00	$ 12.00	$ -
14	DET	M-9 Paper	FIRE	2		$14.00	$ 28.00	$ -
15	DET	Smart Card	FIRE	12		$20.00	$ 240.00	$ -
16	DET	Radiation Detector, FH 40 GL	FIRE	1		$4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ -
17	DET	PH paper	FIRE	2		$33.00	$ 66.00	$ -
18	DECON	Personal Decon Kit	FIRE	2		$656.00	$ 1,312.00	$ -
19	Int.Op	Hardwire Communications Link (not allowable by ODP)	FIRE	0		$8,340.00	$ -	$ -
20	Int.Op	HT 750 radio w/ shoulder mic	FIRE	6		$870.00	$ 5,220.00	$ -
21	Int.Op	Multi unit Battery charger for HT750	FIRE	1		$450.00	$ 450.00	$ -
22	Int.Op	Battery Conditioner for HT 750	FIRE	1		$1,200.00	$ 1,200.00	$ -
23	Int.Op	Spare Battery for HT 750	FIRE	6		$80.00	$ 480.00	$ -
24	SAR	Cord Reel	FIRE	1		$165.00	$ 165.00	$ -
25	SAR	Portable area illumination	FIRE	2		$445.00	$ 890.00	
26	SAR	Explosive proof exhaust fan	FIRE	1		$2,895.00	$ 2,895.00	
27	SAR	Hand lights explosive proof	FIRE	6		$38.00	$ 228.00	
28	SAR	Binoculars	FIRE	1		$200.00	$ 200.00	
29	SAR	Hydraulic power unit w/ hoses	FIRE	1		$8,600.00	$ 8,600.00	
30	SAR	Hydraulic Spreader	FIRE	1		$8,500.00	$ 8,500.00	
31	SAR	Hydraulic Cutter	FIRE	1		$4,000.00	$ 4,000.00	
32	SAR	Air bags w/ manifold and hose	FIRE	1		$6,400.00	$ 6,400.00	
33	SAR	Hydraulic Rams	FIRE	1		$5,600.00	$ 5,600.00	
34	SAR	Class III Harness	FIRE	6		$275.00	$ 1,650.00	
35	SAR	Rope Bag	FIRE	8		$25.00	$ 200.00	
36	SAR	Large Rope bag	FIRE	2		$40.00	$ 80.00	
37	SAR	Rigging Roller	FIRE	2		$185.00	$ 370.00	
38	SAR	Rope Guard	FIRE	4		$23.00	$ 92.00	
39	SAR	Wide Gate D Carabiners, steel	FIRE	12		$22.25	$ 267.00	
40	SAR	Offset D Carabiners, steel	FIRE	12		$22.25	$ 267.00	

COST ESTIMATE								
ITEM #	CATEGORY	ITEM	DISCIPLINE	QUANTITY	REVISED QUANTITY	COST EACH	TOTAL COST	REVISED COST
41	SAR	NFPA Rigger Carabiner, Large D,	FIRE	12		$18.50	$ 222.00	
42	SAR	Extra large Carabiners, steel	FIRE	8		$21.75	$ 174.00	
43	SAR	Scaffold Hooks	FIRE	4		$42.00	$ 168.00	
44	SAR	Twist Link Carabiners, steel	FIRE	8		$29.00	$ 232.00	
45	SAR	2" Pulley	FIRE	4		$38.28	$ 153.12	
46	SAR	4" Pulley	FIRE	4		$71.00	$ 284.00	
47	SAR	3" Pulley	FIRE	4		$57.00	$ 228.00	
48	SAR	Heavy Duty Rigging Pulley	FIRE	4		$56.00	$ 224.00	
49	SAR	3" Double Sheath Pulley	FIRE	4		$91.00	$ 364.00	
50	SAR	540 Degree Rescue Belay	FIRE	2		$240.00	$ 480.00	
51	SAR	P.E.D. Descenders	FIRE	4		$20.00	$ 80.00	
52	SAR	Regular 8 Descenders	FIRE	4		$34.75	$ 139.00	
53	SAR	Rappel Rack	FIRE	4		$54.00	$ 216.00	
54	SAR	Rigger Rescue rack	FIRE	4		$80.75	$ 323.00	
55	SAR	Anchor Sling	FIRE	4		$13.50	$ 54.00	
56	SAR	Anchor Loop	FIRE	4		$17.85	$ 71.40	
57	SAR	NFPA Rigging Plate, stainless streel	FIRE	6		$47.50	$ 285.00	
58	SAR	Rigging Rings	FIRE	10		$10.00	$ 100.00	
59	SAR	300' Spool Webbing	FIRE	5		$81.00	$ 405.00	
60	SAR	2" Webbing Spool	FIRE	5		$102.00	$ 510.00	
61	SAR	200' Static Kernmantle Rope	FIRE	6		$192.00	$ 1,152.00	
62	SAR	600' Static Kernmantle Rope	FIRE	2		$576.00	$ 1,152.00	
63	SAR	Prusix Cord	FIRE	4		$90.00	$ 360.00	
64	SAR	10' Sure Strong Tripod w/ Bag	FIRE	1		$1,200.00	$ 1,200.00	
65	SAR	Leg Rigging Bracket For Tripod	FIRE	6		$87.00	$ 522.00	
66	SAR	Sure Strong Winch	FIRE	1		$1,300.00	$ 1,300.00	
67	SAR	Equipment Packs	FIRE	6		$279.00	$ 1,674.00	
68	SAR	Technical Rescue Kits	FIRE	6		$575.00	$ 3,450.00	
69	SAR	Raise Lower Sets	FIRE	2		$500.00	$ 1,000.00	
70	SAR	Stokes Basket w/ Bridle	FIRE	1		$611.00	$ 611.00	
71	LS	Small Tools	FIRE	1		$1,086.00	$ 1,086.00	
							$ 128,254.64	$ -

PREPARED BY:

TITLE:

Georgia Emergency Management Agency

SONNY PERDUE
Governor

Post Office Box 18055
Atlanta, Georgia 30316-0055
Tel: (404) 635-7000
In Georgia 1-800-TRY-GEMA
Fax: (404) 635-7205
www.gema.state.ga.us

MIKE SHERBERGER
Director

September 22, 2003

RE: FIP #113-59724-03
GAN #2003-MU-T3-0010
City of Peachtree City Fire Department

Chief Stony R. Lohr
City of Peachtree City Fire Department
105 Peachtree Parkway, North
Peachtree City, Georgia 30269

Dear Chief Lohr:

Enclosed is the Grantee-Subgrantee, Office of Domestic Preparedness State Homeland Security Grant Program FY03 Part 2 Agreement. This agreement governs the procurement and use of equipment being funded by ODP, to help your agency to prepare for and react to acts of terrorism.

The amount of this agreement is $128,254.64. You may not exceed in either quantity nor total dollar amount the items expressly approved for you to purchase, as shown on the accompanying detailed budget worksheet(s).

Attached to the Grantee-Subgrantee Agreement are Exhibits A – E. Please review and return signed originals of the Grantee-Subgrantee Agreement, Exhibit B, and Exhibit C, **within 7 days of receipt of this letter**. Keep a copy of each form for your records and mail the originals of the forms to:

Georgia Emergency Management Agency
Post Office Box 18055
Atlanta, Georgia, 30316-0055
Attn: Ms. Mary Lou Salmons

If you require further information as to the grantee package, please contact Ms. Mary Lou Salmons, Grants Manager, at 404-635-7066. If you have questions about the grant program in general, please contact the GEMA Terrorism Emergency Response and Preparedness Division at 404-635-7014. It is important when requesting information regarding the grants or when sending correspondence, please reference the above information. Thank you for your work on behalf of the citizens of Georgia.

Sincerely,

Angi Whatley

Angi Whatley
Public Assistance Director

AW/mls
Enclosures

GRANTEE-SUBGRANTEE AGREEMENT

The U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Domestic Preparedness awarded funding to Georgia through the Georgia Emergency Management Agency to perform the FY03 State Homeland Security Grant Program. This award was made after Georgia Emergency Management Agency's successful application for the above mentioned awarded pursuant to PL 108-7. This document is the **Grantee – Subgrantee State Homeland Security Grant Program Agreement FY03 Part 2.** Any work performed under this agreement, including work performed by subrecipients of the subgrantee shall execute this agreement in compliance with the **U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of the Comptroller's Financial Guide** (Exhibit A). Lack of compliance with the Financial Guide will constitute breach of this agreement and allow the immediate termination of this agreement by the Grantee (GEMA). GEMA, as grantee, will maintain overall responsibility for the duration of project and accountability to the Federal government. **The amount of this agreement is for $128,254.64.**

Under this Agreement, the interests and responsibilities of the Grantee, hereinafter referred to as **GEMA**, will be executed by the **Georgia Emergency Management Agency.** The individual designated to represent the State is **Mr. Mike Sherberger, Authorized Recipient Official.** The State has designated **Mr. Ralph Reichert** as the Program Manager of this program. The Subgrantee appears on page three (3) of this agreement and, hereinafter, will be referred to as the Subgrantee in this agreement. The Subgrantee's Authorized Representative is the person whose name appears on page three (3) of this agreement and whose signature appears on page three (3) of this agreement. The Subgrantee's Authorized Representative will execute the interests and responsibilities of the Subgrantee.

1. The following exhibits are attached and made a part of this agreement or attainable via the internet.

Exhibit A.	U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of the Comptroller's Financial Guide, found on OJP's website: **www.ojp.usdoj.gov**
Exhibit B.	Assurances – OJP Assurance Form 4000/3.
Exhibit C.	Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transactions. Drug-Free Workplace Certification. Lobbying Certification OJP Form 4061/6
Exhibit D.	Approved Detailed Budget Worksheet
Exhibit E.	Payment Request Form

2. The Subgrantee agrees to perform all work in accordance with Exhibit D, the Approved Detailed Budget Worksheet. Any change to this worksheet must be

requested in writing by the Subgrantee and will be approved by the Program Manager prior to the execution of that change.

3. Federal funds provided under this program are for 100% reimbursement of all eligible expenditures.

4. If the Subgrantee violates any of the conditions of the Financial Guide, this Agreement, or applicable federal and state regulation, GEMA shall notify the Subgrantee that additional financial assistance for the project in which the violation occurred will be withheld until such violation has been corrected to the satisfaction of GEMA. In addition, GEMA may also withhold all or any portion of financial assistance which has been or is to be made available to the Subgrantee for other projects under this program, this or other agreements, and applicable federal and state regulations until adequate corrective action is taken.

5. The Subgrantee agrees that federal or state officials and auditors, or their duly authorized representatives may conduct required audits and examinations. The Subgrantee further agrees that they shall have access to any books, documents, papers and records of any recipients of this funding and of any persons or entities which perform any activity which is reimbursed to any extent with federal or state disaster assistance funds distributed under the authority of the Act and this Agreement.

6. No elected or appointed official or employee of the Subgrantee shall be admitted to any share or part of this Agreement, or to any benefit to arise thereupon; provided, however, that this provision shall not be construed to extend to any contract made with a corporation for its general benefit.

7. The Subgrantee agrees that equipment purchased under this program will be purchased within one year from the award date of June 4, 2004.

8. Progress reports are required. The first progress report will cover the period ending twelve months from the award date of June 4, 2004. Subsequent reports will cover the periods ending in three month intervals from the ending date of the period of the first progress report. Reports will be submitted to GEMA, to the attention of the Program Manager no later than 10 working days following the end of the reporting period. Each report will include an inventory of all equipment purchased, equipment not yet purchased, and justification concerning why it has not been purchased.

9. Payments to the Subgrantee will be made only upon presentation of Exhibit E – Payment Request Form. Reimbursements from invoices and applicable canceled checks (or other justifying documentation) will only be made upon approval of the Program Manager. Work not performed according to this agreement will constitute justification for non-payment of any Payment Request Form.

10. There shall be no changes to this Agreement unless mutually agreed upon by both parties to the Agreement.

11. Termination. This agreement may be terminated for the following reasons:

Cause/Default – This agreement may be terminated for cause, in whole or in part, at any time by the State for failure of the Subgrantee to perform any of the provisions herein. If the State exercises its right to terminate this agreement under the provisions of this paragraph, the termination shall be accomplished in writing and specify the reason and termination date. The Subgrantee will be required to submit the final invoice not later than 30 days after the effective date of written notice of termination. Upon termination of this agreement, the State shall not incur any new obligations after the effective date of the termination and shall cancel as many outstanding obligations as possible. The above remedies are in addition to any other remedies provided by law or the terms of this agreement.

Convenience – This agreement may be cancelled or terminated by either of the parties without cause; however, the party seeking to terminate or cancel this agreement must give written notice of its intention to do so to the other party at least 30 days prior to the effective date of cancellation or termination.

Non-availability of funding – Notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement, in the event that either of the sources of reimbursement for services under this agreement (appropriations from the General Assembly of the State of Georgia or the Congress of the United States of America) no longer exist or in the event the sum of all obligations of GEMA incurred under this and all other agreements entered into for this program exceeds the balance of such agreement sources, then this agreement shall immediately terminate without further obligation of GEMA as of that moment. The certification by the Director of GEMA of the occurrence of either of the events stated above shall be conclusive.

12. Subgrantee will follow procurement standards as stated in the Financial Guide.

13. Subgrantee's mailing address: City of Peachtree City Fire Department, 105 Peachtree Parkway, North, Peachtree City, Georgia 30269.

14. GEMA's mailing address: Georgia Emergency Management Agency, P.O. Box 18055, Atlanta, Georgia 30316-005.

Agreed:

____________________	____________________
Authorized Recipient Official	**Subgrantee's Authorized Representative**
____________________	____________________
Signature Date	**Signature Date**
	____________________
	Subgrantee's Authorized Representative (printed name)

Exhibit B

ASSURANCES

The Applicant hereby assures and certifies compliance with all Federal statutes, regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements, including OMB Circulars No. A-21, A-87, A-110, A-122, A-133; E.O. 12372 and Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements - 28 CFR, Part 66, Common rule, that govern the application, acceptance and use of Federal funds for this federally-assisted project. Also the Applicant assures and certifies that:

1. It possesses legal authority to apply for the grant; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been duly adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body, authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances containedtherein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and toprovide such additional information may be required.

2. It will comply with requirements of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal and federally - assisted programs.

3. It will comply with provisions of Federal law which limit certain political activities of employees of a State or local unit of government whose principal employment is in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by Federal grants. (5 USC 1501, et seq.)

4. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act if applicable.

5. It will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business, or other ties.

6. It will give the sponsoring agency or the Comptroller General, through any authorized representative, access toand the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant.

7. It will comply with allrequirements imposed by the Federal sponsoring agency concerning special requirements of law, program requirements, and other administrative requirements.

8. It will insure that the facilities under its ownership, lease or supervision which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are not listed on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA)list of Violating Facilities and that it will notify the Federal grantor agency of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the EPA Office of Federal Activities indicating that a facility to be used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA.

9. It will comply with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, Public Law 93-234, 87 Stat. 975, approved December 31, 1976, Section 102(a) requires, on and after March 2, 1975, the purchase of flood insurance in communities where such insurance is available as a condition for the receipt of any Federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition purposes for usein any area that has been identified by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an area having special flood hazards. The phrase "Federal financial assistance" includes any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurancepayment, rebate, subsidy, disaster assistance loan or grant, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance.

10. It will assist the Federal grantor agency in its compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 USC 470), Executive Order 11593, and the Archeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 569 a-1 et seq.) by (a) consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the conduct of investigations, as necessary, to identify properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places that are subject to adverse effects (see 36 CFR Part 800.8) by the activity, and notifying the Federal grantor agency of the existence of any such properties, and by (b) complying with all requirements established by the Federal grantor agency to avoid or mitigate adverse effects upon such properties.

11. It will comply, and assure the compliance of all its subgrantees and contractors, with the applicable provisions of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, or the Victims of Crime Act, as appropriate; the provisions of the current edition of the Office of Justice Programs Financial and Administrative Guide for Grants, M7100.1; and all other applicable Federal laws, orders, circulars, or regulations.

12. It will comply with the provisions of 28 CFR applicable to grants and cooperative agreements including Part 18, Administrative Review Procedure; Part 20, Criminal Justice Information Systems; Part 22, Confidentiality of Identifiable Research and Statistical Information; Part 23, Criminal Intelligence Systems Operating Policies; Part 30, Intergove-rnmental Review of Department of Justice Programs and Activities; Part 42, Nondiscrimination/Equal Employment Opportunity Policies and Procedures; Part 61, Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act; Part 63, Floodplain Management and Wetland Protection Procedures; and Federal laws or regulations applicable to Federal Assistance Programs.

13. It will comply, and all its contractors will comply, with the nondiscri-mination requirements of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, 42 USC 3789(d), or Victims of Crime Act (as appropriate); Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; Subtitle A, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (1990); Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975; Department of Justice Non-Discrimination Regulations, 28 CFR Part 42, Subparts C, D, E, and G; and Department of Justice regulations on disability discrimination, 28 CFR Part 35 and Part 39.

14. In the event a Federal or State court or Federal or State administrative agency makes a finding of discrimination after a due process hearing on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability against a recipient of funds, the recipient will forward a copy of the finding to the Office for Civil Rights, Office of Justice Programs.

15. It will provide an Equal Employment Opportunity Program if required to maintain one, where the application is for $500,000 or more.

16. It will comply with the provisions of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (P.L. 97-348) dated October 19, 1982 (16 USC 3501 et seq.) which prohibits the expenditure of most new Federal funds within the units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

Signature ______________________ Date ______________

Exhibit C

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 28 CFR Part 69, "New Restrictions on Lobbying" and 28 CFR Part 67, "Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonpro-curement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)." The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Justice determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 69, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over $100,000, as defined at 28 CFR Part 69, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions;

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS (DIRECT RECIPIENT)

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67, Section 67.510—

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, sentenced to a denial of Federal benefits by a State or Federal court, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67 Sections 67.615 and 67.620—

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about—

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and

(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will—

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

(2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such convic-tion. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, ATTN: Control Desk, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted—

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state, zip code)

Check ☐ if there are workplaces on file that are not indentified here.

Section 67, 630 of the regulations provides that a grantee that is a State may elect to make one certification in each Federal fiscal year. A copy of which should be included with each application for Department of Justice funding. States and State agencies may elect to use OJP Form 4061/7.

Check ☐ if the State has elected to complete OJP Form 4061/7.

DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES WHO ARE INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67; Sections 67.615 and 67.620—

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, ATTN: Control Desk, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

1. Grantee Name and Address:

2. Application Number and/or Project Name

3. Grantee IRS/Vendor Number

4. Typed Name and Title of Authorized Representative

5. Signature

6. Date

*U.S. Government Printing Office: 1996 - 405-037/40014

Exhibit D

M 13

GEORGIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

ODP FY 03 State Domestic Preparedness Program *(SHADED AREAS ARE FOR GEMA USE ONLY)*

FISCAL YEAR / PART FY03PT2	FIPS NO. 113-59724-03	BW #0124	DATE SUBMITTED	APPROVAL DATE
Federal ID No. 58-1079955	APPLICANT (Agency/ Department) Peachtree City Fire Department	COUNTY Fayette	GEMA AREA 7	[redacted]
ADDRESS 105 Peachtree Parkway, North, Peachtree City, Georgia 30269		CONTACT NAME Stony R. Lohr		CONTACT Phone / ALTERNATE NO. 770-631-2540

Category must be one of the following: Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), EOD, CBRNE Search and Rescue (SAR), Interoperable Communications (Int. Op), Physical Security (PS), Terrorism Prevention (TP), CBRNE Logistical Support
Discipline = Fire, Law Enforcement (LE), EMS, EMA, etc

COST ESTIMATE

ITEM #	CATEGORY	ITEM	DISCIPLINE	QUANTITY	REVISED QUANTITY	COST EACH	TOTAL COST	REVISED COST
1	PPE	Nomex IIIA/Crosstech Coveralls	FIRE	8		$240.00	$ 1,920.00	$ -
2	PPE	Open circuit SCBA 4500psi	FIRE	6		$4,000.00	$ 24,000.00	$ -
3	PPE	4500psi spare bottle	FIRE	6		$956.00	$ 5,736.00	$ -
4	PPE	Air line system w/ 15 min. escape SCBA	FIRE	1		$15,560.00	$ 15,560.00	$ -
5	PPE	Cable air hose reel	FIRE	2		$1,650.00	$ 3,300.00	$ -
6	PPE	Rescue gloves	FIRE	8		$40.00	$ 320.00	$ -
7	PPE	Helmets for SAR	FIRE	8		$75.00	$ 600.00	$ -
8	PPE	Helmet mounted lighting system	FIRE	8		$73.00	$ 584.00	$ -
9	PPE	Hand lights	FIRE	6		$14.60	$ 87.60	$ -
10	PPE	Scott AV2000 SCBA adaptor/cartridge	FIRE	12		$41.96	$ 503.52	$ -
11	DET	Photo Ionization Detector	FIRE	1		$3,600.00	$ 3,600.00	$ -
12	DET	Chemical field test	FIRE	1		$212.00	$ 212.00	$ -
13	DET	M-8 Paper	FIRE	2		$6.00	$ 12.00	$ -
14	DET	M-9 Paper	FIRE	2		$14.00	$ 28.00	$ -
15	DET	Smart Card	FIRE	12		$20.00	$ 240.00	$ -
16	DET	Radiation Detector, FH 40 GL	FIRE	1		$4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	$ -
17	DET	PH paper	FIRE	2		$33.00	$ 66.00	$ -
18	DECON	Personal Decon Kit	FIRE	2		$656.00	$ 1,312.00	$ -
19	Int.Op	Hardwire Communications Link (not allowable by ODP)	FIRE	0		$8,340.00	$ -	$ -
20	Int.Op	HT 750 radio w/ shoulder mic	FIRE	6		$870.00	$ 5,220.00	$ -
21	Int.Op	Multi unit Battery charger for HT750	FIRE	1		$450.00	$ 450.00	$ -
22	Int.Op	Battery Conditioner for HT 750	FIRE	1		$1,200.00	$ 1,200.00	$ -
23	Int.Op	Spare Battery for HT 750	FIRE	6		$80.00	$ 480.00	$ -
24	SAR	Cord Reel	FIRE	1		$165.00	$ 165.00	$ -
25	SAR	Portable area illumination	FIRE	2		$445.00	$ 890.00	
26	SAR	Explosive proof exhaust fan	FIRE	1		$2,895.00	$ 2,895.00	
27	SAR	Hand lights explosive proof	FIRE	6		$38.00	$ 228.00	
28	SAR	Binoculars	FIRE	1		$200.00	$ 200.00	
29	SAR	Hydraulic power unit w/ hoses	FIRE	1		$8,600.00	$ 8,600.00	
30	SAR	Hydraulic Spreader	FIRE	1		$8,500.00	$ 8,500.00	
31	SAR	Hydraulic Cutter	FIRE	1		$4,000.00	$ 4,000.00	
32	SAR	Air bags w/ manifold and hose	FIRE	1		$6,400.00	$ 6,400.00	
33	SAR	Hydraulic Rams	FIRE	1		$5,600.00	$ 5,600.00	
34	SAR	Class III Harness	FIRE	6		$275.00	$ 1,650.00	
35	SAR	Rope Bag	FIRE	8		$25.00	$ 200.00	
36	SAR	Large Rope bag	FIRE	2		$40.00	$ 80.00	
37	SAR	Rigging Roller	FIRE	2		$185.00	$ 370.00	
38	SAR	Rope Guard	FIRE	4		$23.00	$ 92.00	
39	SAR	Wide Gate D Carabiners, steel	FIRE	12		$22.25	$ 267.00	
40	SAR	Offset D Carabiners, steel	FIRE	12		$22.25	$ 267.00	

COST ESTIMATE

ITEM #	CATEGORY	ITEM	DISCIPLINE	QUANTITY	REVISED QUANTITY	COST EACH	TOTAL COST	REVISED COST
41	SAR	NFPA Rigger Carabiner, Large D,	FIRE	12		$18.50	$ 222.00	
42	SAR	Extra large Carabiners, steel	FIRE	8		$21.75	$ 174.00	
43	SAR	Scaffold Hooks	FIRE	4		$42.00	$ 168.00	
44	SAR	Twist Link Carabiners, steel	FIRE	8		$29.00	$ 232.00	
45	SAR	2" Pulley	FIRE	4		$38.28	$ 153.12	
46	SAR	4" Pulley	FIRE	4		$71.00	$ 284.00	
47	SAR	3" Pulley	FIRE	4		$57.00	$ 228.00	
48	SAR	Heavy Duty Rigging Pulley	FIRE	4		$56.00	$ 224.00	
49	SAR	3" Double Sheath Pulley	FIRE	4		$91.00	$ 364.00	
50	SAR	540 Degree Rescue Belay	FIRE	2		$240.00	$ 480.00	
51	SAR	P.E.D. Descenders	FIRE	4		$20.00	$ 80.00	
52	SAR	Regular 8 Descenders	FIRE	4		$34.75	$ 139.00	
53	SAR	Rappel Rack	FIRE	4		$54.00	$ 216.00	
54	SAR	Rigger Rescue rack	FIRE	4		$80.75	$ 323.00	
55	SAR	Anchor Sling	FIRE	4		$13.50	$ 54.00	
56	SAR	Anchor Loop	FIRE	4		$17.85	$ 71.40	
57	SAR	NFPA Rigging Plate, stainless streel	FIRE	6		$47.50	$ 285.00	
58	SAR	Rigging Rings	FIRE	10		$10.00	$ 100.00	
59	SAR	300' Spool Webbing	FIRE	5		$81.00	$ 405.00	
60	SAR	2" Webbing Spool	FIRE	5		$102.00	$ 510.00	
61	SAR	200' Static Kernmantle Rope	FIRE	6		$192.00	$ 1,152.00	
62	SAR	600' Static Kernmantle Rope	FIRE	2		$576.00	$ 1,152.00	
63	SAR	Prusix Cord	FIRE	4		$90.00	$ 360.00	
64	SAR	10' Sure Strong Tripod w/ Bag	FIRE	1		$1,200.00	$ 1,200.00	
65	SAR	Leg Rigging Bracket For Tripod	FIRE	6		$87.00	$ 522.00	
66	SAR	Sure Strong Winch	FIRE	1		$1,300.00	$ 1,300.00	
67	SAR	Equipment Packs	FIRE	6		$279.00	$ 1,674.00	
68	SAR	Technical Rescue Kits	FIRE	6		$575.00	$ 3,450.00	
69	SAR	Raise Lower Sets	FIRE	2		$500.00	$ 1,000.00	
70	SAR	Stokes Basket w/ Bridle	FIRE	1		$611.00	$ 611.00	
71	LS	Small Tools	FIRE	1		$1,086.00	$ 1,086.00	
							$ 128,254.64	$ -

PREPARED BY: TITLE:

Exhibit E

EXHIBIT E

Date: ______________

Georgia Emergency Management Agency
OJP FY03 State Domestic Preparedness Equipment Program
Payment Request Form

Instructions: All requests for payments must be supported by documentation supporting **actual** expenditures. Itemize each expenditure below to the fullest detail possible. Attach documentation that supports this payment request, such as copies of bills of sale, invoices, receipts, and canceled checks evidencing payment. Do not send originals. Attach a continuation sheet if necessary.

Budget Sheet Number: ______________ GAN Number: ______________________

Applicant/Area: __________________________ FIPs Number: ______________________

Requested Item to be Reimbursed	Requested Quantity	Previous Qty Requested	Requested Cost	[illegible]

(from continuation sheet attached) SUBTOTAL	
TOTAL	
NET AMOUNT REQUESTED	

Under penalty of perjury, I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief the data above are correct and that all outlays were made in accordance with the grant conditions or other agreements, comply with procurement regulations contained within the Financial Guide, and that payment is due and has not been previously requested. I understand that any part of this payment request that is not supported by cost documents and/or expended within the scope of the approved project will be refunded to the State of Georgia within 30 days of receiving the deobligation notice.

____

Signature of Subgrantee's Authorized Representative (and printed name)

SONNY PERDUE
Governor

Georgia Emergency Management Agency

Post Office Box 18055
Atlanta, Georgia 30316-0055
Tel: (404) 635-7000
In Georgia 1-800-TRY-GEMA
Fax: (404) 635-7205
www.gema.state.ga.us

MIKE SHERBERGER
Director

September 22, 2003

RE: FIP #113-59724-03
GAN #2003-MU-T3-0010
City of Peachtree City Fire Department

Chief Stony R. Lohr
City of Peachtree City Fire Department
105 Peachtree Parkway, North
Peachtree City, Georgia 30269

Dear Chief Lohr:

Enclosed is the Grantee-Subgrantee, Office of Domestic Preparedness State Homeland Security Grant Program FY03 Part 2 Agreement. This agreement governs the procurement and use of equipment being funded by ODP, to help your agency to prepare for and react to acts of terrorism.

The amount of this agreement is $34,648.07. You may not exceed in either quantity nor total dollar amount the items expressly approved for you to purchase, as shown on the accompanying detailed budget worksheet(s).

Attached to the Grantee-Subgrantee Agreement are Exhibits A – E. Please review and return signed originals of the Grantee-Subgrantee Agreement, Exhibit B, and Exhibit C, **within 7 days of receipt of this letter**. Keep a copy of each form for your records and mail the originals of the forms to:

Georgia Emergency Management Agency
Post Office Box 18055
Atlanta, Georgia, 30316-0055
Attn: Ms. Mary Lou Salmons

If you require further information as to the grantee package, please contact Ms. Mary Lou Salmons, Grants Manager, at 404-635-7066. If you have questions about the grant program in general, please contact the GEMA Terrorism Emergency Response and Preparedness Division at 404-635-7014. It is important when requesting information regarding the grants or when sending correspondence, please reference the above information. Thank you for your work on behalf of the citizens of Georgia.

Sincerely,

Angi Whatley

Angi Whatley
Public Assistance Director

AW/mls
Enclosures

GRANTEE-SUBGRANTEE AGREEMENT

The U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Domestic Preparedness awarded funding to Georgia through the Georgia Emergency Management Agency to perform the FY03 State Homeland Security Grant Program. This award was made after Georgia Emergency Management Agency's successful application for the above mentioned awarded pursuant to PL 108-7. This document is the **Grantee – Subgrantee State Homeland Security Grant Program Agreement FY03 Part 2.** Any work performed under this agreement, including work performed by subrecipients of the subgrantee shall execute this agreement in compliance with the **U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of the Comptroller's Financial Guide** (Exhibit A). Lack of compliance with the Financial Guide will constitute breach of this agreement and allow the immediate termination of this agreement by the Grantee (GEMA). GEMA, as grantee, will maintain overall responsibility for the duration of project and accountability to the Federal government. **The amount of this agreement is for $34,648.07.**

Under this Agreement, the interests and responsibilities of the Grantee, hereinafter referred to as **GEMA**, will be executed by the **Georgia Emergency Management Agency.** The individual designated to represent the State is **Mr. Mike Sherberger, Authorized Recipient Official.** The State has designated **Mr. Ralph Reichert** as the Program Manager of this program. The Subgrantee appears on page three (3) of this agreement and, hereinafter, will be referred to as the Subgrantee in this agreement. The Subgrantee's Authorized Representative is the person whose name appears on page three (3) of this agreement and whose signature appears on page three (3) of this agreement. The Subgrantee's Authorized Representative will execute the interests and responsibilities of the Subgrantee.

1. The following exhibits are attached and made a part of this agreement or attainable via the internet.

   Exhibit A. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of the Comptroller's Financial Guide, found on OJP's website: **www.ojp.usdoj.gov**

   Exhibit B. Assurances – OJP Assurance Form 4000/3.

   Exhibit C. Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transactions. Drug-Free Workplace Certification. Lobbying Certification OJP Form 4061/6

   Exhibit D. Approved Detailed Budget Worksheet

   Exhibit E. Payment Request Form

2. The Subgrantee agrees to perform all work in accordance with Exhibit D, the Approved Detailed Budget Worksheet. Any change to this worksheet must be

requested in writing by the Subgrantee and will be approved by the Program Manager prior to the execution of that change.

3. Federal funds provided under this program are for 100% reimbursement of all eligible expenditures.

4. If the Subgrantee violates any of the conditions of the Financial Guide, this Agreement, or applicable federal and state regulation, GEMA shall notify the Subgrantee that additional financial assistance for the project in which the violation occurred will be withheld until such violation has been corrected to the satisfaction of GEMA. In addition, GEMA may also withhold all or any portion of financial assistance which has been or is to be made available to the Subgrantee for other projects under this program, this or other agreements, and applicable federal and state regulations until adequate corrective action is taken.

5. The Subgrantee agrees that federal or state officials and auditors, or their duly authorized representatives may conduct required audits and examinations. The Subgrantee further agrees that they shall have access to any books, documents, papers and records of any recipients of this funding and of any persons or entities which perform any activity which is reimbursed to any extent with federal or state disaster assistance funds distributed under the authority of the Act and this Agreement.

6. No elected or appointed official or employee of the Subgrantee shall be admitted to any share or part of this Agreement, or to any benefit to arise thereupon; provided, however, that this provision shall not be construed to extend to any contract made with a corporation for its general benefit.

7. The Subgrantee agrees that equipment purchased under this program will be purchased within one year from the award date of June 4, 2004.

8. Progress reports are required. The first progress report will cover the period ending twelve months from the award date of June 4, 2004. Subsequent reports will cover the periods ending in three month intervals from the ending date of the period of the first progress report. Reports will be submitted to GEMA, to the attention of the Program Manager no later than 10 working days following the end of the reporting period. Each report will include an inventory of all equipment purchased, equipment not yet purchased, and justification concerning why it has not been purchased.

9. Payments to the Subgrantee will be made only upon presentation of Exhibit E – Payment Request Form. Reimbursements from invoices and applicable canceled checks (or other justifying documentation) will only be made upon approval of the Program Manager. Work not performed according to this agreement will constitute justification for non-payment of any Payment Request Form.

10. There shall be no changes to this Agreement unless mutually agreed upon by both parties to the Agreement.

11. Termination. This agreement may be terminated for the following reasons:

Cause/Default – This agreement may be terminated for cause, in whole or in part, at any time by the State for failure of the Subgrantee to perform any of the provisions herein. If the State exercises its right to terminate this agreement under the provisions of this paragraph, the termination shall be accomplished in writing and specify the reason and termination date. The Subgrantee will be required to submit the final invoice not later than 30 days after the effective date of written notice of termination. Upon termination of this agreement, the State shall not incur any new obligations after the effective date of the termination and shall cancel as many outstanding obligations as possible. The above remedies are in addition to any other remedies provided by law or the terms of this agreement.

Convenience – This agreement may be cancelled or terminated by either of the parties without cause; however, the party seeking to terminate or cancel this agreement must give written notice of its intention to do so to the other party at least 30 days prior to the effective date of cancellation or termination.

Non-availability of funding – Notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement, in the event that either of the sources of reimbursement for services under this agreement (appropriations from the General Assembly of the State of Georgia or the Congress of the United States of America) no longer exist or in the event the sum of all obligations of GEMA incurred under this and all other agreements entered into for this program exceeds the balance of such agreement sources, then this agreement shall immediately terminate without further obligation of GEMA as of that moment. The certification by the Director of GEMA of the occurrence of either of the events stated above shall be conclusive.

12. Subgrantee will follow procurement standards as stated in the Financial Guide.

13. Subgrantee's mailing address: City of Peachtree City Fire Department, 105 Peachtree Parkway, North, Peachtree City, Georgia 30269.

14. GEMA's mailing address: Georgia Emergency Management Agency, P.O. Box 18055, Atlanta, Georgia 30316-005.

Agreed:

____________________	____________________
Authorized Recipient Official	**Subgrantee's Authorized Representative**
____________________	____________________
Signature Date	**Signature Date**
	____________________
	Subgrantee's Authorized Representative (printed name)

Exhibit B

ASSURANCES

The Applicant hereby assures and certifies compliance with all Federal statutes, regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements, including OMB Circulars No. A-21, A-87, A-110, A-122, A-133; E.O. 12372 and Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements - 28 CFR, Part 66, Common rule, that govern the application, acceptance and use of Federal funds for this federally-assisted project. Also the Applicant assures and certifies that:

1. It possesses legal authority to apply for the grant; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been duly adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body, authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances containedtherein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and toprovide such additional information may be required.

2. It will comply with requirements of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal and federally - assisted programs.

3. It will comply with provisions of Federal law which limit certain political activities of employees of a State or local unit of government whose principal employment is in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by Federal grants. (5 USC 1501, et seq.)

4. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act if applicable.

5. It will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business, or other ties.

6. It will give the sponsoring agency or the Comptroller General, through any authorized representative, access toand the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant.

7. It will comply with allrequirements imposed by the Federal sponsoring agency concerning special requirements of law, program requirements, and other administrative requirements.

8. It will insure that the facilities under its ownership, lease or supervision which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are not listed on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA)list of Violating Facilities and that it will notify the Federal grantor agency of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the EPA Office of Federal Activities indicating that a facility to be used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA.

9. It will comply with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, Public Law 93-234, 87 Stat. 975, approved December 31, 1976, Section 102(a) requires, on and after March 2, 1975, the purchase of flood insurance in communities where such insurance is available as a condition for the receipt of any Federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition purposes for usein any area that has been identified by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an area having special flood hazards. The phrase "Federal financial assistance" includes any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurancepayment, rebate, subsidy, disaster assistance loan or grant, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance.

10. It will assist the Federal grantor agency in its compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 USC 470), Executive Order 11593, and the Archeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 569 a-1 et seq.) by (a) consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the conduct of investigations, as necessary, to identify properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places that are subject to adverse effects (see 36 CFR Part 800.8) by the activity, and notifying the Federal grantor agency of the existence of any such properties, and by (b) complying with all requirements established by the Federal grantor agency to avoid or mitigate adverse effects upon such properties.

11. It will comply, and assure the compliance of all its subgrantees and contractors, with the applicable provisions of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, or the Victims of Crime Act, as appropriate; the provisions of the current edition of the Office of Justice Programs Financial and Administrative Guide for Grants, M7100.1; and all other applicable Federal laws, orders, circulars, or regulations.

12. It will comply with the provisions of 28 CFR applicable to grants and cooperative agreements including Part 18, Administrative Review Procedure; Part 20, Criminal Justice Information Systems; Part 22, Confidentiality of Identifiable Research and Statistical Information; Part 23, Criminal Intelligence Systems Operating Policies; Part 30, Intergove-rnmental Review of Department of Justice Programs and Activities; Part 42, Nondiscrimination/Equal Employment Opportunity Policies and Procedures; Part 61, Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act; Part 63, Floodplain Management and Wetland Protection Procedures; and Federal laws or regulations applicable to Federal Assistance Programs.

13. It will comply, and all its contractors will comply, with the nondiscri-mination requirements of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, 42 USC 3789(d), or Victims of Crime Act (as appropriate); Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; Subtitle A, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (1990); Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975; Department of Justice Non-Discrimination Regulations, 28 CFR Part 42, Subparts C, D, E, and G; and Department of Justice regulations on disability discrimination, 28 CFR Part 35 and Part 39.

14. In the event a Federal or State court or Federal or State administrative agency makes a finding of discrimination after a due process hearing on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability against a recipient of funds, the recipient will forward a copy of the finding to the Office for Civil Rights, Office of Justice Programs.

15. It will provide an Equal Employment Opportunity Program if required to maintain one, where the application is for $500,000 or more.

16. It will comply with the provisions of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (P.L. 97-348) dated October 19, 1982 (16 USC 3501 et seq.) which prohibits the expenditure of most new Federal funds within the units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

Signature

Date

Exhibit C

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 28 CFR Part 69, "New Restrictions on Lobbying" and 28 CFR Part 67, "Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonpro-curement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)." The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Justice determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 69, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over $100,000, as defined at 28 CFR Part 69, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions;

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all sub-recipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS (DIRECT RECIPIENT)

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67, Section 67.510—

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, sentenced to a denial of Federal benefits by a State or Federal court, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67 Sections 67.615 and 67.620—

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about—

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and

(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will—

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

(2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such convic-tion. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, ATTN: Control Desk, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted—

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state, zip code)

Check ☐ if there are workplaces on file that are not indentified here.

Section 67, 630 of the regulations provides that a grantee that is a State may elect to make one certification in each Federal fiscal year. A copy of which should be included with each application for Department of Justice funding. States and State agencies may elect to use OJP Form 4061/7.

Check ☐ if the State has elected to complete OJP Form 4061/7.

DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES WHO ARE INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67; Sections 67.615 and 67.620—

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, ATTN: Control Desk, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

1. Grantee Name and Address:

2. Application Number and/or Project Name

3. Grantee IRS/Vendor Number

4. Typed Name and Title of Authorized Representative

5. Signature

6. Date

*U.S. Government Printing Office: 1996 - 405-037/40014

Exhibit D

M.D

GEORGIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

ODP FY 03 State Domestic Preparedness Program *(SHADED AREAS ARE FOR GEMA USE ONLY)*

FISCAL YEAR / PART FY03PT2	FIPS NO. 113-59724-03	BW #0089	DATE SUBMITTED	APPROVAL DATE
Federal ID No. 58-	APPLICANT (Agency/ Department) Peachtree City Fire Department	COUNTY Fayette	GEMA AREA 7	GANINO 2003MU-3-0010
ADDRESS		CONTACT NAME Stony R. Lohr		CONTACT Phone / ALTERNATE NO.

Category must be one of the following: Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), EOD, CBRNE Search and Rescue (SAR), Interoperable Communications (Int. Op), Physical Security (PS), Terrorism Prevention (TP), CBRNE Logistical Support (LS), Medical Supplies (MED), CBRNE Response Vehicles (VEH), CBRNE Reference Material (REF), CBRNE Detection (DET), Decon (DECON), Training (TRG), Exercise (EX)

Discipline = Fire, Law Enforcement (LE), EMS, EMA, etc

COST ESTIMATE

ITEM #	CATEGORY	ITEM	DISCIPLINE	QUANTITY	REVISED QUANTITY	COST EACH	TOTAL COST	REVISED COST
1	MED	Automatic External Defibrillator, biphasic	Fire	2		$2,999.00	$ 5,998.00	$ -
2	MED	LSI mass casualty oxygen manifold	Fire	2		$1,065.00	$ 2,130.00	$ -
3	MED	Oxygen cylinder, E cylinder	Fire	4		$89.00	$ 356.00	$ -
4	MED	Oxygen Cylinder, M Cylinder	Fire	2		$125.00	$ 250.00	$ -
5	MED	Oxygen cylinder dolly, double	Fire	1		$289.00	$ 289.00	$ -
6	MED	Oxygen Regulators	Fire	6		$175.00	$ 1,050.00	$ -
7	MED	Portable ventilators	Fire	2		$2,510.00	$ 5,020.00	$ -
8	MED	Suction Units	Fire	2		$714.00	$ 1,428.00	$ -
9	MED	Bag Valve Mask, adult	Fire	10		$25.25	$ 252.50	$ -
10	MED	Bag Valve Mask, pediatric	Fire	5		$25.25	$ 126.25	$ -
11	MED	Pulse Oximeter	Fire	2		$750.00	$ 1,500.00	$ -
12	MED	Mass Casualty Deployment System	Fire	2		$399.00	$ 798.00	$ -
13	MED	Blanket, disposable	Fire	50		$6.50	$ 325.00	$ -
14	MED	Triage Tags (pack of 50)	Fire	4		$42.95	$ 171.80	$ -
15	MED	Backboard	Fire	15		$99.00	$ 1,485.00	$ -
16	MED	Sheets	Fire	50		$3.40	$ 170.00	$ -
17	MED	IV Administration set (50 per case)	Fire	2		$247.00	$ 494.00	$ -
18	MED	IV catheters, 20 ga (50 per box)	Fire	2		$125.00	$ 250.00	$ -
19	MED	IV catheters, 18 ga (50 per box)	Fire	2		$125.00	$ 250.00	$ -
20	MED	IV catheters, 16 ga (50 per box)	Fire	1		$125.00	$ 125.00	
21	MED	Nebulizers, hand held (case of 50)	Fire	2		$227.00	$ 454.00	
22	MED	Oxygen mask, non-rebreather (case of 50)	Fire	2		$79.00	$ 158.00	
23	MED	Laryngoscope kit, disposable	Fire	2		$120.00	$ 240.00	
24	MED	Laryngoscope kit, standard	Fire	1		$312.00	$ 312.00	
25	MED	Laryngoscope blades, disposable	Fire	40		$5.95	$ 238.00	
26	MED	Endotracheal tubes (box of 10)	Fire	4		$25.00	$ 100.00	
27	MED	Albuterol (box of 25)	Fire	4		$18.00	$ 72.00	
28	MED	Sterile Water (case of 16)(500 cc)	Fire	4		$33.28	$ 133.12	
29	MED	Normal Saline (case of 12)(1,000 cc)	Fire	4		$27.60	$ 110.40	
30	MED	IV start kit (case of 50)	Fire	1		$93.50	$ 93.50	

COST ESTIMATE

ITEM #	CATEGORY	ITEM	DISCIPLINE	QUANTITY	REVISED QUANTITY	COST EACH	TOTAL COST	REVISED COST
31	MED	Kerlix (case of 100)	Fire	2		$187.00	$ 374.00	
32	MED	Sterile Burn Dressing, 8" x 8" (case of 30)	Fire	1		$268.50	$ 268.50	
33	MED	Cederoth Bloodstopper	Fire	50		$2.99	$ 149.50	
34	DECON	Personal Decon Kits (case)	Fire	4		$656.00	$ 2,624.00	
35	PPE	Tyvek coveralls, XXXL (case of 25)	Fire	2		$166.25	$ 332.50	
36	PPE	Jumpsuit (Nomex IIIA/CROSSTECH)	Fire	8		$240.00	$ 1,920.00	
37	DET	Smartcard	Fire	8		$20.00	$ 160.00	
38	DET	Radiation Detector,Ther Eberline FH40 GL,	Fire	1		$4,200.00	$ 4,200.00	
39	LS	Disaster Pouch	Fire	20		$12.00	$ 240.00	
							$ 34,648.07	$ -

PREPARED BY:

TITLE:

Exhibit E

EXHIBIT E

Date: ______________

Georgia Emergency Management Agency
OJP FY03 State Domestic Preparedness Equipment Program
Payment Request Form

Instructions: All requests for payments must be supported by documentation supporting **actual** expenditures. Itemize each expenditure below to the fullest detail possible. Attach documentation that supports this payment request, such as copies of bills of sale, invoices, receipts, and canceled checks evidencing payment. Do not send originals. Attach a continuation sheet if necessary.

Budget Sheet Number:______________ GAN Number:______________________

Applicant/Area: ___________________________ FIPs Number:______________________

Requested Item to be Reimbursed	Requested Quantity	Previous Qty Requested	Requested Cost	Description of Documentation Attached in Support of this Payment Request

(from continuation sheet attached) SUBTOTAL	
TOTAL	
[redacted]	
NET AMOUNT REQUESTED	

Under penalty of perjury, I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief the data above are correct and that all outlays were made in accordance with the grant conditions or other agreements, comply with procurement regulations contained within the Financial Guide, and that payment is due and has not been previously requested. I understand that any part of this payment request that is not supported by cost documents and/or expended within the scope of the approved project will be refunded to the State of Georgia within 30 days of receiving the deobligation notice.

____

Signature of Subgrantee's Authorized Representative (and printed name)

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Council

VIA: City Manager

FROM: Financial Services Director P.S.
Administrative Services Director

DATE: September 25, 2003

SUBJECT: Defined Benefit Pension Plan

Recommendation:
Staff recommends that Council take action to adopt the newly drafted defined benefit pension plan adoption agreement to replace the GMEBS plan document and adoption agreement. Council had previously taken action to authorize staff to move forward with this change.

Discussion:
At the April 3, 2003 City Council Meeting, the City's pension consultant Mr. Clark Weeks of Actech, Inc. made a presentation to Council wherein he discussed several potential changes to the City's pension plans that may result in significant financial benefit to the City. In his discussion pertaining to the City's *defined benefit* pension plan, Mr. Weeks explained why he believes the City can gain more stability in the level of contributions, gain higher overall returns and have more control over our investments by changing the plan administrator and investment manager (currently GMEBS). Council agreed with Mr. Weeks' assertions and authorized staff to move forward with working with Mr. Weeks and his firm in developing a new adoption agreement and bidding out these services. Council also agreed to adding a new 'twenty-five years and out' provision to the Police and Fire early retirement plan. A copy of the April 3 Council Meeting minutes is attached for your review.

No changes have been made to the pension benefit formulas for any employees in the new plan document. However, several other changes were made that will help clarify definitions and simplify administration. In addition, the new document eliminates the provision for disability payments, which staff believes should have been eliminated after the city adopted a separate long-term disability insurance policy for employees several years ago. This change will result in significant savings and financial benefit, as explained in the Budgetary Impact section below. The new plan document will also afford us the benefits explained in the paragraph above. Please refer to the attached list of bullet points for further explanation of these key changes. City staff, including the City Manager, Assistant City Manager, Financial Services Director, Administrative Services Director and Assistant Finance Director have reviewed the document with Mr. Weeks and made several comments and suggestions for changes that have been included.

Actech, Inc. enlisted the aid of ERISA attorney Mr. Frederick Cox, Esq. in drafting the new plan document who has also provided a letter stating that he has reviewed the document extensively and opines that the document complies with applicable state and federal pension laws. The document has also been sent to our City Attorney for his review. Both Mr. Cox and Mr. Weeks will be present at the October 2 Council Meeting to answer any questions Council may have.

Staff has already sent out requests for proposals to potential investment managers and administrators. We are seeking separate contracts for these services so that we can periodically review performance and be able to change out either of the service providers, and not have to change the other. This is currently not an option with the GMEBS arrangement. Bids are due back on Tuesday October 7, and staff's selections will be presented to Council at the October 16 Council Meeting for approval, assuming Council approves the new plan document. The goal is to have the new service providers in place on January 1, 2004, as this is the date that our actuarial computations will be calculated annually, as opposed to November 1. This is a change that was already implemented and is also expected to simplify plan administration. This schedule will allow approximately sixty days to implement the conversion to the new service providers.

Budgetary Impact:

The major, initial budgetary impact will be due to the elimination of the plan's disability benefit. According to Mr. Weeks' actuarial computation, this change will result in an immediate reduction in plan benefit obligations of approximately $230K, which will reduce the unfunded liability of the pension plan by about 5%. The budget impact the first year is a decrease in required contribution payments of $46,400 - a savings that will increase for the next 20 years.

As mentioned above, it is also expected that the revised (less volatile) investment portfolio will result in a greater level of stability in the level of contributions that the City must pay into the plan. We also expect to gain higher overall returns, and will have more control over our investments.

In addition, we expect a reduction in administrative costs due to numerous minor plan revisions that will simplify administration, as explained on the attached list. These cost reductions have not yet been determined.

Key Changes In New Plan Document For The City of Peachtree City's Defined Benefit Pension Plan

- The Pension Plan is 'stand alone' instead of being part of the GMEBS System.

- Peachtree City's own Board of Trustees will directly hire/fire both the Trust Administrator (the vendor who makes retiree payments and has custody of the assets) and the investment manager.

- Deleted the pension plan's disability benefit. The elimination of this benefit results in a $230,000 reduction in benefit obligations. In percentage terms the change produces a 5% reduction in the unfunded liability of the pension plan. The budget impact the first year is $46,400. This number will increase for the next 20 years. We now have long term disability insurance that was not in place when we instituted this pension benefit. An illustration of the need to eliminate this benefit is the fact that a long service employee when disabled could actually receive more than 100% of pay if the current plan provision remains in place.

- Numerous minor revisions to simplify administration thereby reducing administrative costs and preventing misunderstandings. These changes included: clarification of the definition of earnings, the calculation of service/eligibility for part time employees, who exactly is an eligible employee, simplification of benefit forms, and the definition of credited service.

04-04-03 Hear Pension Consultant Report

Salvatore reminded Council there had been a lot of discussion about finding ways to reduce the costs of the pension plan or gain more stability in the level of contributions. A consultant helped staff look at the options. They looked at the defined benefit contribution plan, the defined benefit plan administrator, and the public safety pension.

Clark Weeks of Actech, Inc., addressed Council regarding his analyses of the City's pension plans/benefits. Weeks discussed his analyses of the possibility of realizing a cost savings from converting the current defined benefit pension plan into a defined contribution plan, an evaluation of the City's current defined benefit pension plan administrator (Georgia Municipal Employee Benefits System – GMEBS) and other options for plan administration, and a review of the Public Safety Early Retirement benefit plan and the impact of making changes to the plan.

Weeks said the cost of the current plan was 5.8% of payroll. The actual expense this year was about 8.5% of payroll. The plan had $4 million in assets, but the plan was shorted about $600,000 on investment returns last year. Weeks looked at ways to reduce the costs of the plan and noted that the pension plan would not reach maturity for 10-15 years since the City was young. GMEBS was 60% invested in equities. Weeks noted that if the City administered the plan on its own it would be limited to 50% investment in equities. Another legal preclusion for a stand-alone plan was that real estate could not be an investment.

Weeks said changing the plan was roughly cost mutual. He continued that the big driver on whether it would be a prudent decision or not was dependent on the level of control the City wanted in its investment approach. Weeks added the City should also consider if it wanted 60% equities for the long haul. Rapson noted the rate of return would be three and one-half times better than what it was currently.

Salvatore summarized Weeks' presentation. He said no action was required to change the plan from defined benefit to defined contribution or to make changes to the current formula.

Salvatore said it was a judgment call whether to make changes to the plan administrator. He said a change could achieve more stability in the plan and that he did not realize how rich GMEBS was with equities. Salvatore said that was good in good times, but not in bad economic times. He suggested staff continue to work with Weeks and look for a different administrator. Salvatore continued that there would be some inconvenience in not working with GMEBS, but that could work out with an administrator that gave more stability.

Rapson said it was more of a change in the process and he was in favor of staff pursuing the information. McMenamin said she had to abstain from the vote since her son-in-law worked for the City. Rapson said he also had a son-in-law who worked for the City. Meeker said that it was fine for them to vote on the matter since there would be no direct benefit to the Council Members.

Salvatore noted that the benefit formula stayed the same, but a change would help the City in administering the plan. Meeker said that Council needed to provide instructions to staff at this meeting and that the changes would be discussed more when the plan came back to Council for a vote. Salvatore said staff needed action on whether or not to proceed.

Rapson moved to approve the modifications to the early retirement provision for the police and fire as outlined under agenda item 04-03-03. Weed seconded. Meeker requested the motion be amended to direct GMEBS to draft the changes and forward them to the City. Rapson and Weed accepted the amendment. The motion carried 4-0-1 (McMenamin).

ACTECH, INC.

September 24, 2003

Mr. Paul J. Salvatore
Director of Financial Services
City of Peachtree City
151 Willowbend Road
Peachtree City, Ga 30269

Dear Mr. Salvatore,

RE: Your Plan Document Effective January 1, 2004

Attached is the Peachtree City plan document that I have prepared and/or reviewed. In my opinion, the attached plan meets all the requirements under federal and state laws that pertain to your pension plan.

If you would like to have complete assurance that the IRS does not have any issues with your plan, I would recommend that you file for a determination letter with the IRS. The IRS charges a filing fee of $700.

Sincerely,

Frederick E. Cox, Jr.

Frederick E. Cox, Jr. Esquire

Eight Piedmont Center
Suite 310
3525 Piedmont Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30305
(404) 262-7185
FAX (404) 262-9413

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: **Mayor and Council**

VIA: **City Manager**

FROM: **City Clerk**

DATE: **September 26, 2003**

SUBJECT: Presentation on No Smoking Resolution from the Board of Health

---

Recommendation:
The Board of Health requested Council hear the presentation from Dr. Thomas Faulkner, Board of Health member, on a No Smoking resolution.

Discussion:
The Board of Health would like for Council to consider adopting the attached resolution that requests Council adopt an ordinance prohibiting smoking in public places and places of employment. (Attached resolution is a fax copy. Original will be available at the Council meeting)

Budgetary Impact:
There is no budgetary impact at this time.

JSM:pd

Attachments

COUNTY OF FAYETTE

STATE OF GEORGIA

RESOLUTION

NO. 2003 – ____

A RESOLUTION OF THE FAYETTE COUNTY BOARD OF HEALTH ADDRESSED TO THE CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY MAYOR AND COUNCIL TO CONSIDER THE PASSAGE OF AN ANTI-SMOKING ORDINANCE FOR THE CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY.

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council for the City of Peachtree City is the duly elected governing authority for the City of Peachtree City, Georgia; and

WHEREAS, ordinances considered and passed by the Mayor and Council for the City of Peachtree City have the force of law in the City of Peachtree City; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Health of Fayette County was organized by the State of Georgia to exercise responsibility and authority in all matters within the county pertaining to health, and to take such steps as may be necessary to prevent and suppress disease and conditions deleterious to health; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Health of Fayette County respectfully requests that the Mayor and Council for the City of Peachtree City adopt an ordinance which would prohibit the presence of secondhand smoke within businesses and public buildings in the City of Peachtree City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Health of Fayette County does hereby find that:

1.

Numerous studies have found that tobacco smoke is a major contributor to indoor air pollution, and that breathing secondhand smoke is a cause of disease, including lung cancer, in nonsmokers. No studies have been performed which conclude that breathing secondhand smoke has no effect to those persons exposed to the secondhand smoke. At special risk are children, elderly people, individuals with cardiovascular disease, and individuals with impaired respiratory function, including asthmatics and those with obstructive airway disease.

2.

Health hazards induced by breathing secondhand smoke include lung cancer, heart disease, respiratory infection, and decreased respiratory function, including bronchoconstriction and bronchospasm. Accordingly the Board of Health finds and declares that the purposes of this resolution are (1) to protect the public health and welfare by requesting that the Mayor and Council for the City of Peachtree City adopt an ordinance prohibiting smoking in public places and places of employment; and (2) to guarantee the right of everyone in our community to breathe smoke-free air, and to recognize that the need to breathe smoke-free air shall have priority over the desire to smoke. Numerous cities and counties have passed similar legislation and it is the desire of the Board of Health that similar prohibitions be put in place in the City of Peachtree City, Georgia.

3.

The Board of Health of Fayette County shall make a similar request to the governing authorities of Fayette County, Fayetteville, Tyrone, Brooks, and Woolsey, so that the citizens countywide may be protected by an ordinance which regulates secondhand smoke in Fayette County. Your consideration of this request for the passage and enforcement of an ordinance prohibiting the presence of secondhand smoke in the City of Peachtree City will benefit all citizens in the City of Peachtree City and all persons who work in the City of Peachtree City.

SO RESOLVED, this 9th day of September, 2003.

BOARD OF HEALTH OF
FAYETTE COUNTY, GEORGIA

By: [signature]
W. MICHAEL STRAIN, M.D., Chairman

ATTEST:

Merle Crowe
Clerk

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Council

VIA: City Manager Bernard McMullen

FROM: Director of Financial Services P.S.

DATE: September 26, 2003

SUBJECT: Public Hearing – Millage Rate

Recommendation:
Hold Public Hearing on millage rate.

Discussion:
This is the third and final public hearing required by law regarding the millage rate.

Budgetary Impact:
None

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: **Mayor and City Council**

VIA: **City Manager** Bernard McMullen

FROM: **Director of Financial Services** P.S.

DATE: **September 26, 2003**

SUBJECT: **Adopt Millage**

Recommendation:
Adopt millage rate of 5.283 and authorize Mayor and staff to sign all necessary documents for implementing the 2003 tax levy and homeowner tax relief grant certification.

Discussion:
Council has held the three public hearings required by law and may now take action to adopt the millage rate for FY 2004.

Budgetary Impact:
Authorize 2003 ad valorem tax levy.

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: **Mayor & Council Members**

VIA: **City Manager**
Assistant City Manager

FROM: **Administrative Services Director / City Clerk**

DATE: **September 24, 2003**

SUBJECT: **Public Hearing – Increase in Occupational Tax**
October 2, 2003 Agenda

Recommendation:
Approve Option 2 of the proposal to increase occupational tax paid by local businesses and implement an administrative fee.

Discussion:
As part of the 2004 budget process, Council directed staff to review all City fines and fees. City staff is in the process of completing a comprehensive review of all fines and fees; however, due to the timing of mailing out the 2004 occupational tax bills, immediate action is required on this particular item. Administrative Services has evaluated the tax charged to local businesses. Currently, businesses pay $15 per employee with a minimum of $100 and a maximum of $2,075. There is already an approved increase in the maximum for 2004 to $2,575. There is no administrative fee charged at this time.

A survey of other municipalities that base there occupational tax on number of employees (attachment 1) indicates that a number of municipalities charge an administrative fee in addition to a per employee tax. Staff does recommend that council consider a $20 per business administrative fee. Additionally, staff has provided information on three options for increasing the tax charged to businesses (attachment 2). Option 2 that staff recommends includes the $20 administrative fee and an increase in the per employee charge from $15 to $17.50 with a minimum of $100 and a maximum of $5,000. This will have no impact on those businesses with four or fewer employees which accounts for almost 75% of the businesses in the City.

Budget Impact:
It is estimated that these changes would generate approximately $46,650 based on current businesses.

Attachments

Occupational Tax Comparison

Population	CITY	Determination method for tax collection	Separate Admin / Location / Base Fee	Comments
5,000	**Austell**	Employee Count		1-9 employee= $95; 10-19 employees= $125; 20-49 employees= $170; 50 + employees= $310
5,000	**Barnesville**	Employee Count		1-3 emps.=$75; 4-10 emps.=$150; 11-20 emps.=$250; 21-50 emps.=$312; over 50 emps.=$312 + $1.00 each emp. Over 50
5,000	**Camilla**	Employee Count	$10	$10 Admin Fee + Graduated Scale: 0-3 employees $25 + admin fee thru 3000 employees $3,750 + admin fee. $3,760 is max fee per location
5,000	**Commerce**	Employee Count	$5	$5 Admin Fee + Graduated scale:1-2 emps.= $40; 3-6 emps.=$75; 7-10 emps.=$100; 11-20 emps.=$130; 21-50 emps.=$200 + $4 over 21emps; 51-100 emps.=$330 + $3.50 over 51emps. 101 & up =$530 + $3.00 over 101
5,000	**Dawson**	Employee Count	$100	$100 admin. fee + $30 for 0-1 employees then add $20 per emp. for 2 or more emps.
6,000	**Norcross**	Employee Count	$50	$50 Admin. Fee + 0-1 emps.=$50; 2 emps.=$60; 3-9 emps.= $60+ $15 per emp over 2; 10-99 = $165+$12.60 per emp. over 9 100-499=$1,299+$10.40 per emp over 99 over 500 emps.$5,459+ $7.40 per emp over 499emps.
7,000	**Calhoun**	Employee Count		Graduated Scale: 0-1 employees $55; thru 750 employees $3,100; $3,100 is max fee per location
7,000	**LaFayette**	Employee Count	$25	$25 Admin Fee + 0-1 emps.= $50; 2-5 emps.= $75; 6-10 emps.= $100; 11-50 emps.= $150; 51-100 emps.= $200; 101-200emps.= $300 over 200 emps.=$400; $400 is Max Tax
8,000	**Cedartown**	Employee Count		1-10 employees = $35 per employee; 11-20 employees = $20 per employee; 21-100 employees = $7.50 per employee; 101-200 employees = $2.50 per employee; 201-500 employees= $1.50 per employee; 500 + employees = $1.00 per employee
8,000	**Saint Marys**	Employee Count	$60	$60 Admin. Fee 1-10 emps. = $27.50 per emp.; 11-50 emps. = $250 + $22 over 10 emps.; 51-100 emps.=$1,155 + $11 over 50 emps.; 101-250emps. = $1,700 + $5.50 over 100 over 251emps.= $2,500 +$1over 250
9,000	**Cairo**	Employee Count	$25	$25 Admin Fee + Graduated Scale: 0-2 employees $50 thru 16 employees $175; $200 is max fee per location
9,000	**Lilburn**	Employee Count		Graduated Scale from 0 to 100 + emps. The low tax is $100 & The Max Tax is $650
9,000	**Monroe**	Employee Count		Graduated Scale from 0 to 50 + emps. The low tax is $100 & The Max Tax is $600
10,000	**Covington**	Employee Count		1-4 employees $100 then use Graduated Scale: thru 1,040 employees = $10,330
11,000	**Douglas**	Employee Count		Graduated Fee Scale where each additional employee adds a few dollars to the tax. The low tax is $100 for 1 emp. The Max Tax is $1,000 for 600 & over
16,000	**Brunswick**	Employee Count	$30	$30 Admin Fee + Graduated Scale: 0-4 = $50 thru 250 employees = $500 + admin fee. $530 is max fee per location
16,000	**Dublin**	Employee Count		Graduated Scale: 0-1 = $100; 2-10 = $200; 11-25 = $300; 26-50 = $500; 51-100 = $750; Over 100 = $1,000
17,000	**Cartersville**	Employee Count		Graduated Scale: 0-1 = $75 thru 1000 = $1,250; $1,250 is the max fee even if a business has mulitple locations
17,000	**Lawrenceville**	Employee Count		0-2 =$25; 3-9 = $25 + $5 per over 2 emps.; 10-99 = $75 + $4 per over 9 emps.; Max. Tax is $375

Occupational Tax Comparison

Population	CITY	Determination method for tax collection	Separate Admin / Location / Base Fee	Comments
21,000	**Griffin**	Employee Count	$70	1-20 = $60; 21-100 = $1,200 + $30 each over 20; 101+ = $3,600 + $10 each over 100 + $50 Flat Fee per location + $20 Admin. Fee.
22,000	**Dalton**	Employee Count		0-25 = $18 per emp. Then $16.50 per emp. for next 25 emps. Then $14.58 per emp. for next 50 emps. Then $13.12 per emp. for next 100 emps. Then $11.81 per emp. for next 300 emps. Then $10.63 per emp. for each additional over 500 emps.
22,000	**Hinesville**	Employee Count	$30	$30 Admin Fee + 0-5 emps.= $100; 6-15 emps.= $200; 16-30emps.= $300; 31-50 emps.= $400 over 51emps.=$500. $500 is max tax
25,000	**LaGrange**	Employee Count	$75	Base tax is based upon number of employees then add $75 per location fee then add $35 Admin. Fee. Max tax is $3,785 after 249 employees on a graduated scale
35,000	**East Point**	Employee Count	$50	They use 6 class groups to classify businesses then the fee varies between $100 for 1-3 emps. To $125 for 1-3 emps. Then they add between $25 to $30 for all employees over 4 depending on the classification of the business + $50 admin fee
35,000	**Peachtree City**	Employee Count		1-10 = $100; 11+ = $15 per emp.; max = $2,075
43,000	**Warner Robins**	Employee Count		Classify businesses by SIC codes into one of 6 classifications and uses an employee count for the tax rate.
47,000	**Roswell**	Employee Count	$150	$150 base fee plus $5 per employee
90,000	**Athens**	Employee Count	$25	$25 Admin Fee + Graduated Scale: 0-1 employees $25 + admin fee thru 250 employees $3,300 + admin fee. $3,325 is max fee per location
107,000	**Macon**	Employee Count	$50	$50 admin fee plus $30 for each employee. Max Rate is $5,000.00

Attachment 2

# Emps	# Biz	Current 2004 Structure ($15 per employee / $100 min / $2575 max, no Admin Fee)		OPTION 1 $20 Admin Fee / $15 per employee / $100 min / $5000 max		OPTION 2 $20 Admin Fee / $17.5 per employee / $100 min / $5000 max		OPTION 3 $20 Admin Fee / $20 per employee / $100 min / $5000 max	
		OT Amount	Projected Revenue	OT Amount	Projected Revenue	OT Amount	Projected Revenue	OT Amount	Projected Revenue
1	707	$100	$70,700	$100	$70,700	$100	$70,700	$100	$70,700
2	285	$100	$28,500	$100	$28,500	$100	$28,500	$100	$28,500
3	101	$100	$10,100	$100	$10,100	$100	$10,100	$100	$10,100
4	79	$100	$7,900	$100	$7,900	$100	$7,900	$100	$7,900
5	76	$100	$7,600	$100	$7,600	$108	$8,170	$120	$9,120
6	47	$100	$4,700	$110	$5,170	$125	$5,875	$140	$6,580
7	32	$100	$3,200	$125	$4,000	$143	$4,560	$160	$5,120
8	33	$100	$3,300	$140	$4,620	$160	$5,280	$180	$5,940
9	21	$100	$2,100	$155	$3,255	$178	$3,728	$200	$4,200
10	59	$100	$5,900	$170	$10,030	$195	$11,505	$220	$12,980
11	3	$165	$495	$185	$555	$213	$638	$240	$720
12	12	$180	$2,160	$200	$2,400	$230	$2,760	$260	$3,120
13	5	$195	$975	$215	$1,075	$248	$1,238	$280	$1,400
14	6	$210	$1,260	$230	$1,380	$265	$1,590	$300	$1,800
15	15	$225	$3,375	$245	$3,675	$283	$4,238	$320	$4,800
16	5	$240	$1,200	$260	$1,300	$300	$1,500	$340	$1,700
17	3	$255	$765	$275	$825	$318	$953	$360	$1,080
18	7	$270	$1,890	$290	$2,030	$335	$2,345	$380	$2,660
19	7	$285	$1,995	$305	$2,135	$353	$2,468	$400	$2,800
20	15	$300	$4,500	$320	$4,800	$370	$5,550	$420	$6,300
21	5	$315	$1,575	$335	$1,675	$388	$1,938	$440	$2,200
22	2	$330	$660	$350	$700	$405	$810	$460	$920
23	1	$345	$345	$365	$365	$423	$423	$480	$480
24	5	$360	$1,800	$380	$1,900	$440	$2,200	$500	$2,500
25	5	$375	$1,875	$395	$1,975	$458	$2,288	$520	$2,600
26	1	$390	$390	$410	$410	$475	$475	$540	$540
29	3	$435	$1,305	$455	$1,365	$528	$1,583	$600	$1,800
30	1	$450	$450	$470	$470	$545	$545	$620	$620
31	1	$465	$465	$485	$485	$563	$563	$640	$640
32	2	$480	$960	$500	$1,000	$580	$1,160	$660	$1,320
33	1	$495	$495	$515	$515	$598	$598	$680	$680
34	1	$510	$510	$530	$530	$615	$615	$700	$700
35	2	$525	$1,050	$545	$1,090	$633	$1,265	$720	$1,440
37	1	$555	$555	$575	$575	$668	$668	$760	$760
40	1	$600	$600	$620	$620	$720	$720	$820	$820
41	2	$615	$1,230	$635	$1,270	$738	$1,475	$840	$1,680
42	1	$630	$630	$650	$650	$755	$755	$860	$860
43	1	$645	$645	$665	$665	$773	$773	$880	$880
44	1	$660	$660	$680	$680	$790	$790	$900	$900
46	1	$690	$690	$710	$710	$825	$825	$940	$940
48	1	$720	$720	$740	$740	$860	$860	$980	$980
49	1	$735	$735	$755	$755	$878	$878	$1,000	$1,000
50	1	$750	$750	$770	$770	$895	$895	$1,020	$1,020
53	2	$795	$1,590	$815	$1,630	$948	$1,895	$1,080	$2,160
54	1	$810	$810	$830	$830	$965	$965	$1,100	$1,100
55	2	$825	$1,650	$845	$1,690	$983	$1,965	$1,120	$2,240
57	1	$855	$855	$875	$875	$1,018	$1,018	$1,160	$1,160
58	1	$870	$870	$890	$890	$1,035	$1,035	$1,180	$1,180
64	1	$960	$960	$980	$980	$1,140	$1,140	$1,300	$1,300
65	1	$975	$975	$995	$995	$1,158	$1,158	$1,320	$1,320

# Emps	# Biz	Current 2004 Structure ($15 per employee / $100 min / $2575 max, no Admin Fee)		OPTION 1 $20 Admin Fee / $15 per employee / $100 min / $5000 max		OPTION 2 $20 Admin Fee / $17.5 per employee / $100 min / $5000 max		OPTION 3 $20 Admin Fee / $20 per employee / $100 min / $5000 max	
		OT Amount	Projected Revenue	OT Amount	Projected Revenue	OT Amount	Projected Revenue	OT Amount	Projected Revenue
67	1	$1,005	$1,005	$1,025	$1,025	$1,193	$1,193	$1,360	$1,360
68	3	$1,020	$3,060	$1,040	$3,120	$1,210	$3,630	$1,380	$4,140
70	1	$1,050	$1,050	$1,070	$1,070	$1,245	$1,245	$1,420	$1,420
71	1	$1,065	$1,065	$1,085	$1,085	$1,263	$1,263	$1,440	$1,440
72	1	$1,080	$1,080	$1,100	$1,100	$1,280	$1,280	$1,460	$1,460
73	1	$1,095	$1,095	$1,115	$1,115	$1,298	$1,298	$1,480	$1,480
75	1	$1,125	$1,125	$1,145	$1,145	$1,333	$1,333	$1,520	$1,520
84	2	$1,260	$2,520	$1,280	$2,560	$1,490	$2,980	$1,700	$3,400
89	1	$1,335	$1,335	$1,355	$1,355	$1,578	$1,578	$1,800	$1,800
103	1	$1,545	$1,545	$1,565	$1,565	$1,823	$1,823	$2,080	$2,080
108	1	$1,620	$1,620	$1,640	$1,640	$1,910	$1,910	$2,180	$2,180
127	1	$1,905	$1,905	$1,925	$1,925	$2,243	$2,243	$2,560	$2,560
132	1	$1,980	$1,980	$2,000	$2,000	$2,330	$2,330	$2,660	$2,660
134	1	$2,010	$2,010	$2,030	$2,030	$2,365	$2,365	$2,700	$2,700
135	1	$2,025	$2,025	$2,045	$2,045	$2,383	$2,383	$2,720	$2,720
138	1	$2,070	$2,070	$2,090	$2,090	$2,435	$2,435	$2,780	$2,780
145	1	$2,175	$2,175	$2,195	$2,195	$2,558	$2,558	$2,920	$2,920
149	1	$2,235	$2,235	$2,255	$2,255	$2,628	$2,628	$3,000	$3,000
155	1	$2,325	$2,325	$2,345	$2,345	$2,733	$2,733	$3,120	$3,120
156	1	$2,340	$2,340	$2,360	$2,360	$2,750	$2,750	$3,140	$3,140
160	1	$2,400	$2,400	$2,420	$2,420	$2,820	$2,820	$3,220	$3,220
164	1	$2,460	$2,460	$2,480	$2,480	$2,890	$2,890	$3,300	$3,300
200	1	$2,575	$2,575	$3,020	$3,020	$3,520	$3,520	$4,020	$4,020
230	1	$2,575	$2,575	$3,470	$3,470	$4,045	$4,045	$4,620	$4,620
321	1	$2,575	$2,575	$4,835	$4,835	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
350	1	$2,575	$2,575	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
416	1	$2,575	$2,575	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
656	1	$2,575	$2,575	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
779	1	$2,575	$2,575	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
909	1	$2,575	$2,575	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
TOTALS	1601		$250,445		$277,105		$297,095		$317,300
INCREASE OVER 2004					$26,660		$46,650		$66,855