

The Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia met in Official Session on Wednesday, December 5, 2001, at 3:30 p.m. in the public meeting room of the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue, Fayetteville, Georgia.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Greg Dunn, Chairman (entered 4:00 p.m.)  
Linda Wells, Vice Chair  
Herb Frady  
Peter Pfeifer  
A.G. VanLandingham

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris W. Cofty, County Administrator  
Carol Chandler, Executive Assistant  
William R. McNally, County Attorney  
Dennis Davenport, Asst. County Attorney  
Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk

-----

Chairman Dunn called the meeting to order, offered the Invocation and led the pledge to the Flag.

**EMPLOYEE RECOGNITIONS FOR INCENTIVE AWARDS:**

The Board recognized and presented awards to Diane Blanks and Sondra Edwards for their suggestions to the Bright Idea Program.

Commissioner Wells said it was her pleasure to make these presentations. She said this program was something that she had worked long and hard for. She said this was an incentive program for county employees to present an idea that would save time, money or make a job better. She said these were the first two awards to be given.

Diane Blanks explained that her suggestion was to alphabetize the mail slots in the county mail room. She said this would save employees time thereby saving the county money. Sondra Edwards explained that her suggestion was to dedicate one parking space for employee parking close to the main entrance of the Administrative Complex. She said employees could utilize this space for fifteen minutes of parking to unload or pick up something from any of the offices in the complex.

Commissioner Wells remarked that Diane would receive a half day off with pay and because Sondra's idea would be considered a public safety issue that might protect employees from injury, she would receive a full day off with pay.

Commissioner Wells said she would like to challenge other employees too. She said there would be time off as well as monetary awards if the county would be saved large amounts of money.

December 5, 2001

Page 2

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

Final summary report of compliance with the Regional Development Plan (ARC) including the following proposed amendments:

**ORDINANCE NO. 2001-16 - AMENDMENTS TO THE FAYETTE COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE REGARDING ARTICLE VI. DISTRICT USE REQUIREMENTS, SECTION 6-24. C-S, CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION:** The Planning Commission recommended approval (4-0). (Tabled from October 25, 2001).

Senior Planner Pete Frisina remarked that he had come before the Board on October 25, 2001. He said at that time the Board had discussed the Regional Development Plan process. He said this was the process whereby the county was trying to comply with some of the summaries of county ordinances and policies to see how they coincided with the Regional Development Policies of the Atlanta Regional Commission. He said several of the ordinance amendments had been tabled from that meeting that would help the county develop in a more responsible manner and would also comply with some of the Regional Development Policies of the A.R.C.

Mr. Frisina remarked that the first amendment regarded Article VI for conservation subdivision. He said he had taken a very conservative and benign approach to this. He said this would go through a two step process. He said a yield plan would be produced under conventional zoning regulations and that would be of a two acre zoning district. He said that would determine the number of lots. He said staff would then evaluate that yield plan to make sure that it did meet county regulations in terms of setbacks and road frontage, lot width, soil, watershed and everything else that would be included in a review of a normal preliminary plat. He said from that staff would make an evaluation as to how many lots it felt could be there based on that plan. He said this would be the number of lots that could be put into the parcel. He said the lots could be reduced down to one acre but nothing less than one acre and then could be configured on the site to preserve open space. He said by clustering the lots in one spot, this would save in terms of the infrastructure that must be put in on the front end and a savings on the infrastructure in terms of the county doing further maintenance such as street repair. He said this would also cut down on storm water runoff because there would be less impervious surfaces. He said this would be a zoning district and would go through the same public hearing that a normal zoning would. He said it would take an additional month for the staff to review the yield plan. He said the concept plan as it would be handed in with the rezoning would be similar to a preliminary plat. He said the concept plan would be a development plan. He said if staff were to make any major adjustments to the subdivision, then it would have to come back and go through the process similar to a P.U.D. He said he would be glad to answer any questions the Board might have.

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 3**

Commissioner Wells commented on the additional one month that staff would need to process these requests and asked if there would be any additional charge to somebody going through the process.

Mr. Frisina replied no. He said the additional month was basically for staff's benefit so they did not have to rush through the yield plan.

Commissioner Wells remarked that since this was a public hearing anyone in the audience could also address this item. Hearing none, she asked for the Board's comments on this matter.

Commissioner Frady said personally he could not support this. He said 40% was being asked for green space as opposed to the State's recommendation of 20%. He felt this was a little over burdensome to the landowners to ask them to do that. He said he could not support this item on that basis. He felt the 20% was something that we all needed to live with but to go to 40% was more than he could support.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked if this was a volunteer project. He said landowners would not be required to do this but they could apply for this zoning should they so desire to do it this way. He said there was still the two acre zoning in effect. He clarified that there was no demand on a developer to go to this concept. He asked if this was replacing what was currently a P.U.D.

Mr. Frisina replied no. He said this would be an additional zoning district that was based specifically to provide for development of this type of subdivision which was a conservation subdivision. He said nothing was being taken away and this would actually be an additional zoning district.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked what would set this apart from actual lot averaging on a piece of zoned property.

Mr. Frisina replied that there was no averaging. He said averaging would be taking a certain amount of land, pick a number and then divide. He said the yield plan was actually a subdivision plat. He said the number of lots would be determined by the constraints of the site as if it was developed under two acres and there was no green space. He said the yield plan was what was on the ground right now. He said the developer could only develop a certain number of lots and no more.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked if this would force a developer to do this.

Mr. Frisina replied that a developer must apply for it and if he was granted the zoning district then he would have to comply with the rules and regulations within the zoning district.

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 4**

Commissioner Frady remarked that one of his concerns regarded the open space, who would own that property and who would maintain it. He asked if there was a lake located within a plat, who would be responsible for that lake.

Mr. Frisina remarked that in the drawing he had presented to the Board anything in the green shading would be considered open space or the open space portion of the subdivision. He said there were three options for ownership by a Homeowners' Association. He said if the Homeowners' Association was to own open space then the Homeowners' Association would be mandatory and set up under Georgia Statutes. He said the other option would be for the developer or whoever to approach the county and for the Board of Commissioners to make a determination as to whether they would want to accept the ownership of the property. He said the third option would be for the ownership to go under a conservation trust organization. He said this would be a non-profit organization and their main thrust would be to conserve property and be the overseers of it. He said it was specified that any donation to the county would be for conservation areas only. He said the county would not want to get into the position where it was accepting land with improvements on it or having any kind of structure on it.

Commissioner Frady said he did not feel it was economically feasible to see 40% of the land being vacant. He said he would like to see 20% of the land for green space.

Mr. Frisina said if there were two acre lots and they were being reduced down to one acre then that would be a reduction of 50%. He said the extra 10% would be for infrastructure, right-of-way and that sort of thing. He said it was conceivable if somebody came in with a yield plan that would yield forty lots but by constraint of the site and/or the green space minimum of 40% it was conceivable that a lot or two could be lost based on certain situations. He said at this time he would rather see the county keep it the way it was, see how it works and re-evaluate it after a period of time. He said if this turned out to occur a lot, then he felt it should be reviewed and possibly reduced.

Commissioner Frady asked how large the subdivision was that Mr. Frisina had given the Board as an example.

Mr. Frisina replied that there were 148 acres with forty homes on two acre lots.

Commissioner Frady remarked that there was obviously some land in there that was not usable for anything. He said now it would be down to 40 one acre lots and have 140 acres and 100 acres with nothing on it. He said he did not see how this would work economically.

Mr. Frisina stated that when staff had done the less infrastructure analysis, it was found that it was about 2,000 less linear feet of road or \$150 per linear foot. He said this would be

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 5**

approximately \$300,000 that would not have to be put in to the development. He said the water line would cost \$20 per linear foot and this would come to \$40,000 less. He said there would also be 56,000 less square feet of impervious surface. He said he could not estimate the savings on that but estimated that there was some savings on the front end. He said he had looked at a few subdivisions just to see what the tax value was. He said this subdivision had an average assessed value of approximately \$263,000 per house and lot. He said each house was an average of 3,000 square feet heated. He said he checked out some other one acre subdivisions to see where they fell as far as price. He said he looked at Dorsett Place in Fayetteville. He said this subdivision was one acre lots, no open space and the average price of the homes were \$233,000. He said he looked at Brechin Park that was a P.U.D. with open space. He said the average price there was \$230,000. He said he also looked at Horseman's Run that did have open space. He said the average value of those homes was close to \$360,000. He said the range in the prices of these homes would vary.

Chairman Dunn entered the meeting at this time.

Commissioner Frady commented on the proposal Mr. Frisina had presented to the Board. He said two acre lots would take care of eighty areas. He said open land would certainly not collect as much taxes as would the houses that have been built on. He said the county would be reducing the digest by money and reducing the tax income.

Mr. Frisina remarked that in Horseman's Run the homes cost \$100,000 more for one acre.

Commissioner Wells stated that she did not feel there would be a lot of people coming to the county to do this. She felt it would be used in very unique situations. She said the county was committed to protecting groundwater and also being as proactive as possible as to protect the groundwater runoff. She asked if the county owned the property, would it be a problem for maintenance and supervision of the property.

Mr. Frisina replied that as with any property that the county owned there would have to be the same supervision over it as anything else. He said this was another concern. He said it would be up to the Board as to whether or not it would accept the donation.

Commissioner Frady interjected if the county owned the property then this would come off the digest.

Attorney McNally remarked that this was the reason it was set up with either of three ownerships. He said if there were a lot of amenities in it although passive, it would be one that the county would not want. He said a Homeowners' Association would take that into ownership. He said the important thing was that if either of the three, whether it be the county, the Homeowners' Association or the trust, the conservation use would be put on it so that it could never be used for anything else. He said the county would certainly have the ability to

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 6**

pick and choose which one it was going to be and the county should not take on anything that was going to be a maintenance problem for the county.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady to deny the proposed Amendment to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article VI.

Chairman Dunn asked for a second to the motion and there was none.

Chairman Dunn remarked that the motion failed for lack of a second.

Commissioner Pfeifer said he would like to make a motion.

On motion made by Commissioner Pfeifer, seconded by Commissioner Wells to approve Amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article VI. District Use Requirements, Section 6-24. C-S, Conservation Subdivision, discussion followed.

Chairman Dunn commented that he would share some of Commissioner Frady's concerns if this was something that the Board was going to make mandatory on developers. He said this would not be mandatory and would help the county in other ways. He said he did not have a feel for how much taxable digest that the county could lose if this became a popular way of developing. He said Commissioner Frady was correct that there would be some loss. He said he also felt the county had a lot to gain with less impervious surface and keeping some of the beauty in Fayette County. He said since this was not mandatory, he would support it 100%.

Commissioner Frady remarked that this was probably something that would not be used. He said he would rather see this put out there as 20% in compliance with what the State was recommending.

Commissioner VanLandingham felt it would have to be a unique piece of property that could not be developed before anyone would want to do this. He said he did not have a real problem with this. He commented on impervious surface. He said he would like to carry this issue a little bit further. He said since the number of homes was being reduced in a subdivision, he would like to look at reducing the width of a street by omitting the curbing. He said this would help with the storm water runoff in that area. He said if the flow of water was redirected then something would have to be done with it. He said if the water could run off and not channel into one area, he would like to see that also included.

Commissioner Frady said he would agree. He said the streets were not narrowed because of safety at one point because the county was requiring curb and gutter.

Chairman Dunn interjected that he recalled the evening the Board turned down the widening of the roads down. He said that decision was in conjunction with another issue that called for

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 7**

widening of the sidewalks. He said it made no sense to narrow the roads and widen the sidewalks all in the same move.

Chairman Dunn asked if there were any further comments and there were none. He called for the vote.

The motion carried 4-1 with Commissioner Frady voting in opposition. A copy of Ordinance No. 2001-16, identified as "Attachment No.1", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

**ORDINANCE NO. 2001-17 - AMENDMENTS TO THE FAYETTE COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE REGARDING ARTICLE IV. ESTABLISHMENTS OF DISTRICTS, 24. C-S, CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION:** The Planning Commission recommended approval (4-0). (Tabled from October 25, 2001).

Senior Planner Pete Frisina remarked that this article involved adding the C-S zoning district to Article IV establishment of districts. He said this was merely a housekeeping matter.

Chairman Dunn asked if anyone present would like to speak on this issue. Hearing none, he called for the Board's pleasure on this matter.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham to approve Amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article IV. Establishments of Districts, 24. C-S, Conservation Subdivision. The motion carried 5-0. A copy of Ordinance No. 2001-17, identified as "Attachment No. 2", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

**ORDINANCE NO. 2001-18 - AMENDMENTS TO THE FAYETTE COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE REGARDING ARTICLE VII. CONDITIONAL USES, EXCEPTIONS AND MODIFICATIONS, SECTION 7-2. NON-CONFORMANCES:** The Planning Commission recommended approval (4-0). (Tabled from October 25, 2001).

Senior Planner Pete Frisina remarked that item related to Section 7-2 non-conformances. He said there was already some language that dealt with restoration and reuse of non-conforming historic structures. He under "E" he was proposing a proactive approach to try and save and preserve some of the historic structures in the survey. He said this map was posted in the Planning and Zoning Office. He stated when a developer comes in, staff checks the map to determine if one of the structures exists within the property. He said staff would make the developer aware of this and ask him to evaluate the structure to determine if it was usable for the development. He said he had seen these structures used as residences and/or as community centers for the subdivision when appropriately located. He said staff was trying to set a policy where staff and the county would be willing to work with somebody if they

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 8**

wanted to try and preserve a historic structure. He said the problem might be that they would not comply with the new zoning district. He said they might not meet setbacks or meet the square footage requirements. He said the structure would also have to meet all of the health and safety codes, building codes and A.D.A. codes that are used for a community center. He said he was proposing giving this recognition and site the survey for only the interested houses in the survey and that this go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for any kind of variance that might be needed.

Chairman Dunn asked if anyone wished to comment on this matter. Hearing none, he asked for the Board's pleasure on this matter.

Commissioner Frady said one issue would be if someone had a structure of this type on his property and they came in and ask for it to be preserved. He said another issue would be if the person did not come in and ask for the structure to be preserved and the county felt it should be preserved. He asked what the procedure would be for that.

Mr. Frisina replied that the county would not mandate preservation but would only suggest it. He said staff was just prescribing a method for someone to go through to accomplish this. He said if someone did not want to preserve the structure, then that was fine.

Commissioner Frady clarified that it would be the landowner's choice and nothing would be mandated. He said if there was a real, real piece of property that was historic in nature and it was deemed historic, the county could probably condemn the property and purchase it.

Chairman Dunn said he liked bringing in the historic perspective in this and making developers and landowners aware of it. He felt it was more likely that people would want to save the structure and the county would tell them that they could not because they would not meet some newer regulatory requirements. He said none of the buildings listed were on any historical register and the buildings referred to were older homes in the county.

Mr. Frisina remarked that the structures picked up in the survey were based on the time they were built and the type of architectural style they exhibited.

Commissioner Frady said if anyone wanted to save a structure then the Board would work toward that end through the Zoning Board of Appeals to do that and not oppose it.

Chairman Dunn remarked if someone could not bring the structure in line reasonably with current standards, the Board would have to say no.

Mr. Frisina interjected that the Zoning Board of Appeals would have to make that determination.

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 9**

Chairman Dunn asked if there was anymore discussion and there was none. He asked for the Board's pleasure on this matter.

On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Commissioner Wells to approve Amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article VII. Conditional Uses, Exceptions and Modifications, Section 7-2. Non-Conformances. The motion carried 5-0. A copy of Ordinance No. 2001-18, identified as "Attachment No.3", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

**ORDINANCE NO. 2001-19 - AMENDMENTS TO THE FAYETTE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN REGARDING THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES ELEMENT:** The Planning Commission recommended approval (4-0). (Tabled from October 25, 2001).

Senior Planner Pete Frisina stated when the county entered into the Georgia Green Space Program one of the requirements they had was to acknowledge the Green Space Program in the county's Comprehensive Plan. He said a sentence would be inserted into the Capital Facilities Element under recreation that would describe the county's participation in the Program plus a full color map. He said this was a housekeeping matter.

Chairman Dunn asked if anyone wished to comment on this item. Hearing none, he asked for the Board's pleasure in this matter.

Commissioner Frady asked how the C-S zoning district related to this item. He stated that the minutes said the C-S zoning district was also one of the goals in the Green Space Program.

Mr. Frisina replied yes that was correct but it was just a reference.

Chairman Dunn remarked that the document stated that the total acreage of Fayette County was 127,333 acres. He said this would mean that the county was trying to preserve 25,466 acres relating to the 20% green space. He said it was his understanding that the Governor's program at the time was that from this point forward in the county's development that the county would try and preserve 20% of the green space. He said a substantial portion of the county had already been developed. He said if the county was going to try and preserve 20% of what was left, would that not put the county in a difficult position.

Mr. Frisina remarked that it was 20% of the total acreage of the county. He said that was the goal for developed or undeveloped. He said it was a goal and this was what the county was working toward. He said gathering this much property was going to take a lifetime or two. He said some of this property could be inside the City as well.

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 10**

Chairman Dunn said he understood that but felt to be in compliance with the Governor's program and to continue to get money the county would have to comply. He questioned if the county was setting the goal too high. He said he recalled that the program was from henceforth in the development of the county that 20% of the total acreage would have to be preserved.

Mr. Frisina agreed and stated that the calculation was based on the total area of the county.

Chairman Dunn expressed concern that the program was being overstated.

Mr. Frisina said the statute read that 20% of the total county area was the goal. He said the only thing that could be subtracted was a reservoir that was over 500 acres. He said he was able to subtract Lake Horton off the total acreage of the county.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked how Fulton County and Gwinnett County were going to comply with this.

Mr. Frisina said these counties were working toward the goal as well. He said the goal was to permanently protect 20%.

Commissioner VanLandingham said it would still fall under the Green Space Conservation Program. He said in order to attain the 20% there would have to be 25,000 acres and that percentage was already gone.

Commissioner Frady asked Attorney McNally if he interpreted this as being retroactive to the total amount in the county or just the residual from development up to this point.

Attorney McNally replied that this was a goal for the county. He said the goal was that the county would eventually reach 20% of the total county.

Commissioner Pfeifer said there was no penalty if the county did not reach this goal.

Commissioner Wells agreed and stated that the county could withdraw from this program whenever it chose to. She said there was no time limit for which the county must achieve it. She said in the meantime it was an admirable goal.

Attorney McNally interjected that if the county did not show reasonable efforts to achieve the goal then the county would probably not receive any grant money.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve Amendments to the Fayette County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan regarding the

Community Facilities Element. The motion carried 5-0. A copy of Ordinance No. 2001-19, identified as "Attachment No. 4", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

**ORDINANCE NO. 2001-20 - AMENDMENTS TO THE FAYETTE COUNTY DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS REGARDING ARTICLE XI. GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AREA PROTECTION ORDINANCE:** The Planning Commission recommended approval (4-0). (Tabled from October 25, 2001).

Senior Planner Pete Frisina said the next two amendments deal with the county's environmental regulations and that was the Watershed Protection Ordinance, Groundwater Recharge Area Protection Ordinance and the flood plain requirements as they relate to wetlands. He said by State requirement the county was required to have certain environmental laws in place and the county had these in place. He said he had sent these into the Department of Community Affairs which was the agency that determined whether or not county ordinances were in compliance with the State legislation. He said he had received comments from the Department of Community Affairs and the ordinance was amended based on their comments. He stated the Board previously commented on a paragraph that was contained in the Department of Human Resources Manual. He said Attorney McNally had reviewed that.

Attorney McNally remarked that the paragraph related to the Board of Health and lot size. He said the wording was alright for the county. He said it did not enable the Health Department to overcome or ignore the county's zoning. He said if there was not enough space for a septic tank then the individual would have an alternative. He said the individual could make the lot bigger to add what they needed or they might not be able to use the lot.

Chairman Dunn commented on the Watershed Ordinance. He said it appeared that the county had gotten a judgment from the State that the county was in compliance and that the county's watershed protection was good. He said the State had also said that the plans for the other jurisdictions did not meet the requirements. He asked who in the county did not meet these requirements.

Chairman Dunn said it stated that the other jurisdictions must comply.

Mr. Frisina remarked that it stated that for any multi-jurisdictional water supply to be complete all different plans and ordinances together must be complied with in full.

Chairman Dunn asked Mr. Frisina if he was aware where the cities were on this issue.

Mr. Frisina replied that it did not relate to only the cities but also would include Fulton County, Union City, Fairburn and other watersheds in Coweta County as well.

**December 5, 2001**  
**Page 12**

Chairman Dunn asked if this pertained to Fayette County's cities or jurisdictions outside of Fayette County boundaries.

Mr. Frisina replied both.

Chairman Dunn clarified that all the county knew from the State was that the unincorporated county was alright.

Mr. Frisina replied yes, the unincorporated county ordinances were alright. He said he thought there was a deadline by 2004. He remarked that the D.C.A. and the D.N.R. were looking to get everybody's regulations up there to evaluate. He said staff had just taken the opportunity to send them in early.

Chairman Dunn asked Mr. Frisina to determine where the cities stood on this matter.

Mr. Frisina said he recalled it was 2004 when everyone must be reviewed.

Chairman Dunn said he thought the size of the jurisdiction had something to do with the timing.

Mr. Frisina said he would call his contact at the D.C.A. and asked if they knew where the cities were with the ordinances. He said to his recollection most of them had copied the State's standards.

Chairman Dunn asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this matter. Hearing none, he asked for the Board's pleasure on this matter.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Pfeifer to approve Amendments to the Fayette County Development Regulations regarding Article XI. Groundwater Recharge Area Protection Ordinance. The motion carried 5-0. A copy of Ordinance No. 2001-20, identified as "Attachment No. 5", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

**ORDINANCE NO. 2001-21 - AMENDMENTS TO THE FAYETTE COUNTY DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS REGARDING ARTICLE IV. FLOOD PLAN REGULATIONS:** The Planning Commission recommended approval (4-0). (Tabled from October 25, 2001).

Senior Planner Pete Frisina remarked that this item was just to add some wording to the wetlands portion of the Flood Plain Regulations.

Chairman Dunn asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak in favor or against this matter. Hearing none, he asked for the Board's pleasure on this matter.

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 13**

Commissioner Frady commented on page 31 regarding the national wetlands inventory map did not relieve the owner of the property of any wetlands which were not mapped. He asked if this was part of the ordinance.

Mr. Frisina replied that it would be part of the ordinance.

Attorney McNally remarked that basically what was being said was the Army Corps of Engineers was going to keep jurisdiction over it. He said just because the Board approved it did not do away with the land owner having to get federal approval to do whatever he was going to do with it. He said the land owner would have to meet the federal guidelines for delineated wetlands. He said if the delineated wetlands were more than the map referred to, it would be the delineation that would count.

Chairman Dunn asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this matter. Hearing none, he asked for the Board's pleasure in this matter.

On motion made by Commissioner Pfeifer, seconded by Commissioner Wells to approve Amendments to the Fayette County Development Regulations regarding Article IV. Flood Plain Regulations. The motion carried 5-0. A copy of Ordinance No. 2001-21, identified as "Attachment No.6", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

**PILOT PROGRAM FOR THE PROCUREMENT CARD APPROVED:**

Director of Finance Mark Pullium said he was bringing back the issue of the Procurement Card Program to the Board for further consideration. He said it was previously stated that the objection of the proposed pilot program for the procurement card was to improve the efficiency of Fayette County's procurement process. He said this would help in making the optimum use of taxpayer resources intrusted to our care. He said one way to understand the efficiency was to view it as the process of obtaining the desired results with the least expenditure of scarce resources. He said the procurement card pilot program was designed to accomplish exactly that. He said it would shift staff's efforts away from procurement of the small dollar items and focus efforts totally on the high dollar and high volume type procurement issues from establishing contracts that could be used to procure using the p-card approach. He said it would also speed up payment to the vendor. He said this was a much more efficient system and it would save the county dollars. He said this was the main focus of the procurement card program. He quoted from a professional journal where Bill Dubose who was a Financial Administrator in the Comptroller's Office in the State of Florida. Mr. Dubose said "This program would save agencies money, allows them to redirect staff to higher dollar purchases, negotiate better deals for larger purchases and have more time to work on contracts."

Commissioner VanLandingham asked Mr. Pullium if he had checked with Sheriff Randall Johnson to determine if he was going to participate in this program.

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 14**

Mr. Pullium replied yes, that he had discussed this with the Sheriff and members of the Sheriff's Department. He said staff had assured him that they would be moving to this program as opposed to using the current cards they currently have.

Chairman Dunn asked for the Board's pleasure on this matter.

On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Commissioner Pfeifer to approve the Procurement Card Program subject to a six month review, discussion followed.

Commissioner Pfeifer remarked that he really appreciated the initiative of staff taking the time to set this up. He said he did not think it was a question of whether or not these programs worked. He said he felt that was proven. He said the pilot program would let staff know how the program would best work for the county.

Commissioner Frady remarked that he had reservations about this program but he would support the pilot program. He said he would help staff pick it apart in six months. He said if the program worked then that was fine but he said he found that things like this normally did not give the savings they were projected to give.

Chairman Dunn remarked that he would totally support it. He felt this program would enhance the overall purchasing program and make much more sense when taken in the aggregate. He said with the controls that would be put in place, he felt the program should work pretty well. He said he liked the idea of having a six month review and he said he hoped the six months review would make the county want to do it forever.

The motion carried 5-0.

**BILL BECKWITH APPOINTED TO POST 4 OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

Consideration of appointment to Post 4 of the Planning Commission. Term commences January 1, 2002 and ends December 31, 2004. Seat currently held by Bill Beckwith.

Chairman Dunn remarked that the five board appointments on the agenda tonight were for five individuals who had been serving the county for a lot of years and they had done a tremendous job. He said this involved individuals on the Planning Commission, the Library Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals. He said these individuals have done a tremendous amount of work on a daily basis for the county. He said the fact that they were willing to commit themselves to another four years and in one case five years the county could be nothing but grateful that this kind of talent wanted to continue their service. He said he appreciated each and every one of these individuals.

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 15**

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham to reappoint Bill Beckwith to Post 4 of the Planning Commission with term commencing January 1, 2002 and ending December 31, 2004. The motion carried 5-0.

**BOB HARBISON APPOINTED TO POST 3 OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

Consideration of appointment to Post 3 of the Planning Commission. Term commences January 1, 2002 and ends December 31, 2004. Seat currently held by Bob Harbison.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham to reappoint Bob Harbison to Post 3 of the Planning Commission with term commencing January 1, 2002 and ending December 31, 2004. The motion carried 5-0.

**RON MABRA APPOINTED TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS:**

Consideration of appointment to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Term commences January 1, 2002 and ends December 31, 2004. Seat currently held by Ron Mabra.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham to reappoint Ron Mabra to the Zoning Board of Appeals with term commencing January 1, 2002 and ending December 31, 2004. The motion carried 5-0.

**TOM MAHON APPOINTED TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS:**

Consideration of appointment to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Term commences January 1, 2002 and ends December 31, 2004. Seat currently held by Tom Mahon.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham to reappoint tom Mahon to the Zoning Board of Appeals with term commencing January 1, 2002 and ending December 31, 2004. The motion carried 5-0.

**SARA GOZA APPOINTED TO THE LIBRARY BOARD:**

Consideration of recommendation from the Library Board to reappoint Sara Goza to the Library Board. Term commences January 1, 2002 and ends on December 31, 2005.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner VanLandingham to reappoint Sara Goza to the Library Board with term commencing January 1, 2002 and ending December 31, 2005. The motion carried 5-0.

**CONSENT AGENDA:** On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion carried 5-0.

**PROVIDENCE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH - SIGN REQUEST:** Approval of request from Providence United Methodist Church to place a sign on the old

courthouse lawn from October 6, 2002 through October 12, 2002 to advertise the Church's Fall Festival on October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2002 from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

**OFFSHOOT PRODUCTIONS - SIGN REQUEST:** Approval of request from Offshoot Productions to place a sign on the old courthouse lawn from July 11, 2002 through July 24, 2002 to advertise a Midsummer Night's Dream theatre production at the LaFayette Educational Center from July 12 through July 28, 2002.

**FAYETTE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL CHORAL DEPARTMENT - SIGN REQUEST:** Approval of request from the Fayette County High School Choral Department to place a sign on the old courthouse lawn on March 11<sup>th</sup> through March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2002 to advertise the Select Chorus Variety Show; and also to place a sign on the old courthouse lawn from January 14<sup>th</sup> through January 27<sup>th</sup>, 2002 to advertise the Bluegrass Blast which is a fundraiser for the Chorus' Europe trip.

**SOUTHERN TURF EQUIPMENT, INC. - BID AWARD:** Approval of bid from the Director of Maintenance Jim George to award Bid #334 to Southern Turf Equipment, Inc. for two mowers at \$9,626.25 each for a total price of \$19,252.50.

**STANTEC'S PROPOSAL - INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS FOR GOZA ROAD AND S.R. 85:** Approval of recommendation from Public Works Director Lee Hearn to approve Stantec's engineering proposal for design of intersection improvements for Goza Road & S.R. 85 and Huiet Road & S.R. 54 in the amount of \$8,500.

**PARKWAY LAWN & GARDEN - BID AWARD:** Approval of recommendations from Public Works Director Lee Hearn to award Bid #338 to Parkway Lawn & Garden in the amount of \$10,400 for a commercial mower; and award bid to Fayette Tractor in the amount of \$2,750 for a flair mower attachment.

**WADE TRACTOR & EQUIPMENT - BID AWARD:** Approval of recommendation from Public Works Director Lee Hearn to award Bid #339 to Wade Tractor & Equipment for a 345D Tractor without loader in the amount of \$20,633 and the 545D x 4 Tractor with front loader in the amount of \$31,936.

**FINANCE DEPARTMENT - BUDGET AMENDMENTS APPROVED:** Approval of request from Finance Director Mark Pullium to approve budget amendments for encumbrances, budget amendments for capital items in process at year end 2001, and budget amendments to cover property and casualty insurance.

**UNIFORM CHART OF ACCOUNTS ADOPTED:** Approval of request from Finance Director Mark Pullium to approve adoption of the State of Georgia Uniform Chart of

Accounts and authorization for the Chairman to execute the Uniform Chart of Accounts Certificate of Compliance. A copy of the Certificate of Compliance, identified as "Attachment No. 7", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

**WHITEWATER MIDDLE SCHOOL BAND BOOSTERS - SIGN REQUEST:**

Approval of request from Whitewater Middle School Band Boosters to place a sign on the old courthouse lawn from February 24<sup>th</sup> through March 10<sup>th</sup> to advertise their Art Auction.

**FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES DEPARTMENT:** Approval of request from Chief Jack Krakeel to have Board approval to accept a Haz-Mat Unit from Trailers-For-Less and Coweta-Fayette EMC for the Department of Fire and Emergency Services.

**MINUTES:** Approval of minutes for Board of Commissioners' meeting held on November 8, 2001 and Called Executive Session held on November 28, 2001.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Members of the public are allowed up to three minutes each to address the Board on issues of concern other than those items which are on this evening's agenda.

There was no public comment.

**STAFF REPORTS:**

**R.F.P. FOR COUNTY TRANSFER STATION:** County Engineer Ron Salmons remarked that the ten year contract with Allied Industries for the operation of the transfer station would end on December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2002. He said a draft R.F.P. had been prepared and he asked for the Board's consideration to issue the R.F.P. in order to solicit interests from potential companies to take over the operation.

Commissioner Frady asked Mr. Salmons how many people he felt would bid on this.

Mr. Salmons replied that he felt it would have to be a company who also had a landfill operation because that was where the biggest portion of the profit in this kind of an operation was. He said he believed that there were at least three companies that would fit that bill. He said that would be Republic Services of Georgia, Allied Industries, and Waste Management.

Commissioner Frady commented that there might be other companies who would be able to bid on this because they could use Taylor County as well.

Mr. Salmons stated that Allied Industries was B.F.I., E.P.I., and Southern States. He said the industry had consolidated a great deal but the R.F.P. would go out to a number of people. He

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 18**

said Tim Jones was handling the issuing of the R.F.P. He said he was not trying to limit it to any certain companies.

Commissioner Frady asked Mr. Salmons if the R.F.P. would state that a company would have to own a landfill to do this.

Mr. Salmons replied no. He said the R.F.P. would ask the company to identify what landfill that they have. He said the county was looking for a ten year time frame for the contract.

Chairman Dunn asked Mr. Salmons to get the Board a copy of the R.F.P. when it was ready to go out.

Mr. Salmons replied that he would provide each Board member with a copy.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Wells to issue an R.F.P. to solicit interests from potential companies to take over the operation at the landfill. The motion carried 5-0.

**PIGEON CREEK FILMS CONTRACT:** Attorney McNally asked for the Board's consideration in approving the Water Committee's recommendation regarding lease of the Starr's Mill property for forty days by Pigeon Creek Films. He said Pigeon Creek Films had met the terms of the lease and he asked for the Board's approval in authorizing the Chairman to execute the lease on behalf of the county.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Pfeifer to authorize the Chairman to execute the lease with Pigeon Creek Films for use of the Starr's Mill property for forty days. The motion carried 5-0. A copy of the contract, identified as "Attachment No. 8", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:** Attorney McNally requested an executive session to discuss six legal items.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:** On motion made by Commissioner VanLandingham, seconded by Commissioner Frady to adjourn to executive session to discuss six legal items. The motion carried 5-0.

**LEGAL:** Attorney McNally reported to the Board on a legal matter.

Commissioner VanLandingham exited the meeting at this time because of a family emergency.

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 19**

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Chairman Dunn to authorize Attorney McNally to proceed in this matter. The motion carried 3-1 with Commissioner Wells voting in opposition. Commissioner VanLandingham was absent.

**LEGAL**: Attorney McNally updated the Board on a legal matter.

On motion made by Commissioner Pfeifer, seconded by Commissioner Wells to authorize Attorney McNally to proceed in this matter. The motion carried 3-1 with Commissioner Frady voting in opposition. Commissioner VanLandingham was absent.

**LEGAL**: Attorney Davenport briefed the Board on a legal matter.

The Board took no action on this matter.

**LEGAL**: Attorney Davenport briefed the Board on a legal matter.

It was the consensus of the Board that Attorney Davenport proceed in this matter.

**LEGAL**: Attorney McNally discussed a legal matter with the Board.

On motion made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Wells to authorize Attorney McNally to proceed in this matter. The motion carried 4-0. Commissioner VanLandingham was absent.

**LEGAL**: Attorney McNally updated the Board on a legal matter.

On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to authorize Attorney McNally to proceed in this matter. The motion carried 4-0. Commissioner VanLandingham was absent.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION AFFIDAVIT**: On motion made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady to authorize the Chairman to execute the Executive Session Affidavit affirming that six legal items were discussed in executive session. The motion carried 4-0. Commissioner VanLandingham was absent. A copy of the Executive Session Affidavit, identified as "Attachment No. 9", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Dunn adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

---

**December 5, 2001**

**Page 20**

Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk

Gregory M. Dunn, Chairman

The foregoing minutes were duly approved at an official meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia, held on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of January, 2002.

---

Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk