Minutes

Board of Commissioners
June 1, 2011
3:30 P.M.

Notice: A complete audio recording of this meeting can be heard by accessing Fayette County's Website at www.fayettecountyga.gov. Click on "Board of Commissioners", then "County Commission Meetings", and follow the instructions. The entire meeting or a single topic can be heard.

The Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia, met in Official Session on Wednesday, June 1, 2011, at 3:30 p.m. in the Public Meeting Room of the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue, Fayetteville, Georgia.

Commissioners Present:	Herb Frady, Chairman Robert Horgan, Vice Chairman Steve Brown Lee Hearn Allen McCarty
Staff Present:	Jack Krakeel, County Administrator Carol Chandler, Executive Assistant Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk
Staff Absent:	Scott Bennett, County Attorney

Chairman Frady called the meeting to order.

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Commissioner Horgan made a motion to accept the agenda as presented. Commissioner Hearn seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **Request from Clerk of Court Sheila Studdard that she be authorized to proceed with a grant application to the Adult Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program sponsored by the Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs and the Bureau of Justice Assistance:**

Clerk of Court Sheila Studdard had not arrived at this time. Commissioner Brown made a motion to move this item to second item on the agenda and the Board would discuss No. 2 on the agenda regarding the beekeeping ordinance at this time in order to give Ms. Studdard time to arrive. Commissioner Horgan seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

2. Further discussion of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 20. Zoning Ordinance regarding beekeeping:

Zoning Director Dennis Dutton discussed the proposed amendments to the Fayette County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 20, Zoning Ordinance regarding beekeeping. A copy of the request and backup, identified as "Attachment No. 1", follow these minutes and are made an official part hereof. He said on May 19th the Planning Commission met in a work session with three delegates of the Beekeeping Association including Mike Maxwell, Jerry Edwards and Bob Sitz. He said after a lengthy discussion, several options were discussed. He said option #1 implied that there were no restrictions for the beekeepers and this would be a permitted use in all zoning districts. He said option #2 was the Planning Commission and staff's recommendations for the beekeeping ordinance. He remarked the items that they were not able to resolve included the beehive density and on-premise sale of honey as a home occupation. He said staff was recommending that 8 hives be the limit based on information gathered and the LSU model ordinance. He stated that the Planning Commission was recommending 8 hives for a one acre lot and a maximum of 16 hives for two acres and more. He commented on the on-premise sale of honey and staff was recommending that this issue be addressed. He said staff felt that citizens would be asking for an occupational tax. He said the current home occupation requirement would be in conflict and staff would like this to be addressed.

Mr. Dutton further remarked that in the Planning Commission recommendation, staff had made some changes regarding the issue of more than five acres. He said prior to 1998 the ordinance allowed for agricultural uses in R-70. He said in that ordinance the County recognized and allowed for all agricultural uses that were existing at the five acre minimum and met all of the dimensional requirements to be able to operate as a farming operation. He said staff had incorporated that into the ordinance itself. He pointed out the reason being that the model ordinance that was used had a 200 foot distance for anything that went for any lots or acreage that was undeveloped. He said staff felt that would be hard to determine.

Mr. Dutton further remarked that screening had been an issue. He said there were a lot of questions regarding this issue such as the extent of the screening and setbacks. He said staff had used the LSU model ordinance as had been done throughout the State of Georgia. He said their intent was anything that was 25 feet or closer to a property line would have to have a fly away barrier. He said staff had proposed this originally and this was what the ordinance specifies. He said there was an agreement between staff and the Planning Commission to state this would be called a "screening tool" to meet certain criteria with either brick, wood or vegetation. He said staff could be given discretion if someone meets the vegetation screening and they could use that which was already in existence. He said the beekeepers did not have a problem and felt that was a better way to work with that although they were not in support of the ordinance. He said they felt this was a better way to do this rather than fencing in an entire yard.

Mr. Dutton further remarked on the issue of home occupation listed in letter G. He said staff was concerned in that instance that someone was going to come to staff and request an occupational tax to sell honey, and in essence staff would have to address that. He said this was basically where staff was at this point and there were some options. He said it would be at the Board's discretion if they wanted the Planning Commission to proceed with a public hearing and present these options or the Board could decide not to do use these options. He said staff needed direction as to how the Board wanted them to proceed.

Chairman Frady asked who was recommending the screening and Mr. Dutton replied that staff was recommending the screening. Chairman Frady asked what kind of screening it would be and Mr. Dutton replied that it would be a six foot high wall barrier with ten feet on each side of the hive. He said it was not to fence in the entire yard it was just any area where it comes 25 feet or closer to the property line. Chairman Frady asked what the purpose of the screening was and Mr. Dutton replied "out of sight, out of mind."

Commissioner Horgan asked if staff would specify what kind of a fence could be used and Mr. Dutton replied yes and a fence could be wooden, brick veneer, stone wall or it could be a fully vegetative screening.

Commissioner Brown suggested on Article V under permitted uses for item 3 to have it read "growing crops, gardens and beekeeping." He also suggested incorporating a ten foot setback; specify the sale of honey is permitted on premises for use of fairs or farmers markets but licensing is required if the honey producer sells to retailers within the distribution market or food manufacturers in any zoning; beehives in a front yard shall be screened with evergreen vegetation with screening from the road; a beekeeper shall provide and maintain a convenient and adequate supply of water for the bees at all times; proper storage of beekeeping equipment with hive debris complying with the International Maintenance Codes; and that the beekeeper would have 30 days from the time of a complaint to bring the beehive into compliance; no restriction on the number of hives; and in Article VI Section 6-1 add beekeeping to the permitted uses as well.

Commissioner McCarty said screening would have to be for aesthetics only because bees like clover and clover was ground level. He said bees also like vegetables and fruits. He said the bee populations would come out of the hive and they would not fly out in a straight line. He said bees will come out of the hive with a scout and fly in circles and back to the ground where clover is located. He stated unless one was trying to hide a hive, a screen would not do anything. He said bee hives and bee colonies were self-regulating in their numbers depending on the available food. He said if there was not enough food in a given area, one or more of the hives was going to leave that area. He said he did not feel the number of hives had to be regulated but was in favor of setbacks. He said he was also in favor of unrestricted sales of honey from the home.

Commissioner Horgan asked what the intent of the screening of the hives was and Mr. Dutton replied that the intent was for a screening mechanism only.

Chairman Frady said he was in favor of 8 beehives per acre and no more than 16 beehives until the zoning was A-R. He remarked that the selling of honey would be a home occupation and he felt a license would be necessary.

Commissioner McCarty expressed concern with a neighbor who would want to give another neighbor a jar of honey or sell the jar of honey. He said he would not want this to be considered a commercial sale or a business.

Commissioner Hearn felt a restriction should be put on smaller acreage lots. He said if he lived on a half acre lot, he would not want his neighbor to put 10 or 20 beehives out next door. He questioned how many pounds of honey a hive would generate in a year and Mr. Dutton said he was not sure of that amount.

Chairman Frady said from what he understood the Board was saying to staff on this issue was that the beekeepers would think it reasonable for 8 hives on one acre and 16 hives on two or more acres and then anything over 5 acres could have anything number of hives. He said he would not be in favor of unlimited hives on one acre and up but would support 8 hives on one acre and16 hives on two or more acres.

Commissioner Brown remarked that the result of this entire discussion probably would not address the issue that started the whole process and that was keeping bees away from a neighbor's swimming pool. He agreed the hives would be self-regulating but it was hard to determine the impact between three hives and eight hives and so forth. He said he would have a hard time putting a number on this since it would be hard to show the various impacts on these numbers.

Commissioner Brown questioned the issue of setbacks and Commissioner McCarty replied that setbacks should be required as for any other structure and further remarked that the setback on a piece of property would also limit the number of hives that someone is able to put on that property.

Commissioner Brown questioned the issue of screening for hives in the front or back yard. Commissioner McCarty interjected that current requirements did not allow for a building in the front yard of a house.

Mr. Dutton stated that based on the recommendation of the beekeepers their intent was for no restrictions whether it was front yard, side yard or back yard. He felt it would need to be specified for the side or rear yard if that was the consensus. Chairman Frady said he would agree with the side or rear yard but did not agree with hives in the front yard. Mr. Dutton remarked if a hive was located on Agricultural Residential there was no limitations on side or rear yard for a farm out building such as a barn. He said a property owner could have a barn located in the front yard. Mr. Dutton said the A-R zoning would be the exemption if the wording was put in that would allow for beekeeping as a permitted use in A-R. He said there would be no restriction on the side, rear or front yards.

Commissioner Brown questioned the issue of home occupation. He suggested if the property owner was selling the honey in their neighborhood, farmer's market or county fair they would not need to obtain a home occupation license. Chairman Frady pointed out that it was illegal for someone to take a jar of honey in a restaurant and give it to the owner and let him serve it to customers. Commissioner Brown remarked if someone was selling their honey to a honey company they would be required to have a license and the honey would have to be inspected. He clarified that there seemed to be a consensus of the Board not to require a home occupation license unless the person was selling the honey to commercial retail companies.

Mr. Dutton said staff would compile this information from the Board tonight and review this issue again before going to public hearing.

Mr. Krakeel clarified that there seemed to be consensus by the Board that current zoning setbacks would have to be met; no screening of the hives would be required; hives would only be located on side and rear yards except in the A-R zoning district where front yard use was permitted; and a home occupation tax certificate would not be required. He said he did not hear a consensus on the number of hives allowed.

Commissioner Brown interjected that he did not favor any restrictions on the number of hives allowed. Chairman Frady said he felt there should be some type of limit on the number of hives. Commissioner Horgan felt the restriction of the number of hives would be important for a smaller size property such as a one acre lot, but he would be in favor of unlimited hives on any lot greater than one acre. Chairman Frady said someone could have 8 hives on one acre and 16 on two or more and that would be for most of the zoning in the county. Commissioner Horgan said he would be agreeable with that.

Mr. Dutton clarified there would be 8 hives for the first acre and 16 hives maximum for two or more acres up to five acres except in A-R zoning where there shall be no limit on the number of beehives.

Mr. Krakeel questioned the issue of permitting a road side stand and Mr. Dutton said those are not currently permitted except in the A-R zoning.

Chairman Frady thanked Mr. Dutton for the presentation and the Board directed staff to take this information back to the Planning Commission and then be placed on a Commission Agenda for a public hearing .

1. Request from Clerk of Court Sheila Studdard that she be authorized to proceed with a grant application to the Adult Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program sponsored by the Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs and the Bureau of Justice Assistance:

Clerk of Courts Sheila Studdard remarked that an Adult Drug Court discretionary Grant Program sponsored by the Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs and the Bureau of Justice Assistance was posted on April 26th with an application deadline of June 9, 2011. A copy of the request, identified as "Attachment No. 2"", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof. She said this was a $200,000 twenty-four month grant and noted that this was an enhancement grant. She said this grant did have a 25% match and the funds that the County already supplies to the drug court would easily take care of the 25%. She said she did not feel any out of pocket funds would be necessary and she was just informing the Board of what she was doing. She said the drug court was in need of staff and this was a way that they could grow without being a burden to Fayette County or any other county in the circuit.

County Administrator Jack Krakeel said a vote by the Board would come at a meeting when the grant is being accepted. Ms. Studdard interjected that before her department accepted any money, the Board would have to vote to allow her to proceed.

3. Discussion of Safe Routes to School Grant for a Multi-Use Path along Redwine Road:

Director of Community Development Pete Frisina provided an update to the Board. on a grant that staff applied for in December 2008 and awarded in July 2009. A copy of his request and backup, identified as "Attachment No. 3", follow these minutes and are made an official part hereof. He remarked that this was a Federal program and the funds come through the Georgia Department of Transportation who then are in charge of the design, using consultants Kimey-Horn and Associates and construction of the project as well. He said staff had their first meeting with the consultants in May 2010, and the first draft of the plan was received in December 2010. He said there was now a deadline of letting this project by July 2011 in order to meet a Federal deadline. He discussed a map with the Board showing the proposed safe routes to school. A copy of the map, identified as "Attachment No. 4", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof. He said the main purpose of the grant was to serve the four subdivisions listed and connect those subdivisions to the Starr's Mill School property. He said staff had received word from G.D.O.T. today that there would be no reimbursement required for any utilities.

Mr. Frisina further remarked that not all of the cart paths listed on the map were City of Peachtree City paths. He said one path was owned by the Jefferson Woods Subdivision. He said had spoken with representatives of Jefferson Woods to see what could be done to reach an agreement to use their path system. He said those representatives seemed agreeable for the County to upgrade the path within the subdivision and also take the maintenance for the system as well. He said staff was in the process of determining the cost for accomplishing this.

Commissioner Brown interjected that the cart paths located in Timberlake Subdivision were also not part of the system. He felt there would need to be absolute assurances that there would be no way that they could close the path system down for any reason. Mr. Frisina said part of the negotiation discussed included the fact that until the County makes the remainder of the connection it would be a temporary use of that path and the County would upgrade the subdivision paths initially and maintain them only during the period that they were being impacted. Mr. Frisina remarked that the Timberlake Subdivision cart path system was not included in this project and was not connected to the school system.

Chairman Frady asked if the New Haven Subdivision was part of Whitewater and Mr. Frisina replied no, it was not.

Mr. Frisina said the grant was in the amount of $500,000 and almost all of those funds have been used for this project. Commissioner Brown questioned the financial impact of this project and Mr. Frisina replied that it would cost $4,500 for the floodplain mapping and also possible cost of County staff upgrading the cart path located within Jefferson Woods Subdivision and whatever maintenance might be required.

4. Staff will present an update of the County's proposed annual budget resulting from the Budget Workshops held by the Board of Commissioners:

Chief Finance Officer Mary Holland updated the Board on the County's proposed annual budget resulting from the Budget Workshops that were recently held. A copy of the request and backup, identified as "Attachment No. 5", follow these minutes and are made an official part hereof. She noted that in regard to personnel requests funding had been added for three promotions, funding for four temporary help and funding for 2.257 FTE's and all of that funding has been added to the budget for the Board's consideration. She said there were a couple of pending items under personnel with the first one being the Tax Assessor's Office request for two new positions as well as two promotions. She pointed out that Chief Tax Assessor Joel Benton would be presenting his request to the Board later in this meeting.

Ms. Holland further remarked that there was also a request from the Clerk of Courts Sheila Studdard in regard to some part time help for the Board of Equalization for which she had taken over this responsibility. She said Ms. Studdard would be providing the Board with information in regard to the number of cases that she believes will be held this year and from that she will make her request for additional hours. She said Ms. Studdard would be presenting this information to the Board at the June 23rd Board of Commissioners' meeting. She said there was also a request for court reporter fees and staff had added $3,000 for payment of indigent clients in regard to that. She commented on the issue of alcohol sales on Sunday and the Board had directed that there would be no separate election for that. She said there was a request for cleaning services for the Health Department. She noted that Commissioner Brown was going to speak with representatives of the Health Department in regard to this request. She said staff would need direction from the Board as to what it would like to do on that item. She commented on the request for the MIEX system at the Water System. She said staff would be coming to the Board with a recommendation once that process was complete and she would be working with them on some financial alternatives in regard to that. She remarked that staff had added funding for the stormwater projects that were identified as critical projects. She said the most critical projects were listed in the 2012 year and there were also some additional projects that had been added to future years of the CIP plan. She said stormwater management staff would be coming to the Board in regard to discussing the stormwater utility if that was something that the Board would want to consider.

Ms. Holland further remarked on the request for heavy equipment replacement. She said staff had added the funding for the two asphalt rollers. She said the directive from the Board regarding the paving and widening alternatives was to have Public Works staff prepare an analysis in regard to the dirt roads in the County and come back with a five year plan for the Board to consider in regard to that funding. She said staff had added additional funding for the work needed to complete the Snead Road project. Ms. Holland further commented on vehicle replacement and stated that finance staff was going to be working with the various departments that have equipment and vehicles and would be reviewing the current vehicle replacement policy to determine if there was any need for changes or updates to that. She said staff would be confirming the actual funding requirements of that as well as preparing an inventory of those items. She said that would probably take staff until the end of the calendar year to complete.

Ms. Holland further remarked on the E-911 tax district. She said the Board was considering this issue and negotiations needed to be finalized with the participants as the initiative moves forward. County Administrator Jack Krakeel interjected that the City Councils were waiting for a directive from the County with respect to this matter. He felt during the budget workshop meeting that there was a consensus of opinion of the Board with respect to the establishment of

a separate tax district for E-911. He said it was his understanding that the City of Fayetteville would place this issue on their agenda for June 16th for discussion. He said it was his recommendation if the Board approved the budget presented on June 23rd that it would also approve entering into a new intergovernmental agreement for the consolidated communications center as well as create a special tax district to fund the E-911 center.

Commissioner Brown clarified that the Board's vote was not in any way necessary for the City of Peachtree City or the Town of Tyrone to vote. Mr. Krakeel remarked that Peachtree City and Tyrone would be voting on the intergovernmental agreement specifically and the Board of Commissioners would be voting on adopting the intergovernmental agreement and as per the agreement establishing a tax district for E-911. Mr. Krakeel said this would, in effect, be on July 1st based on budgetary preparations. He said staff would need action from the Board in order to establish that tax district effective July 1, 2011. He said staff would present this to the Board for consideration at the June 23rd meeting in concert with the final budget. Mr. Krakeel stated that the Board was provided a sample resolution as well as the new intergovernmental agreement and the commitment of the municipalities for a two year funding agreement going forward on the operational side.

Ms. Holland remarked that during the Board meetings toward the end of July, staff would be coming to the Board in regard to the millage rates and at that time would ask the Board for a vote. She said this would include the E-911 tax district. She commented on fire operations. She said within that budget, staff was looking into some funding alternatives for the five year CIP plan including the breathing apparatus. She said it was staff's recommendation to adjust that millage rate so the action item for July would be asking the Board's consideration to adopt the new rate. She remarked that the recommendation for the EMS portion would be to lower the rate and staff would also be asking for the Board's consideration to vote at the time when the millage rates were set.

Ms. Holland further remarked that the Board had approved adding $160,728 for Fire and EMS and Emergency Management. She said this was in regard to technology needed to utilize the new CAD system that will be installed during the next year. She also remarked that the Board had agreed to the funding for the Strategic Technology Plan and that has been built into the five year CIP plan as well. She said each year staff would come to the Board requesting consideration for approval for projects during that year as well as approving recurring costs associated with those projects.

Ms. Holland remarked that the total difference in the budget bottom line ended up being $1,818,912 and this amount has been added to the proposal and staff would present the Board with a Resolution at the first public hearing to be held on June 9th for consideration with adoption being at the June 23rd meeting after the public hearing section of the agenda is closed. She said she would be glad to answer any questions that the Board might have.

Commissioner Brown asked if all of the components of the Strategic Technology Plan were included and Ms. Holland responded that all of the components were included. Ms. Holland said these components are included in budgets through 2016 and some of the recurring costs would actually come through in 2017. Ms. Holland said this Plan was distributed over a five year budget process.

County Administrator Jack Krakeel said there were elements of the Strategic Technology Plan that would require Board discussion and decision on an annual basis that were not included in the CIP. He noted that there were a total of five positions recommended in the Plan and the recent budget discussion was for approval of one position which was the GIS technician.

Commissioner Brown expressed concern that a lot of items had been deferred in last year's budget and now in the proposed FY2012 budget. He said the County's expenditures exceeded the revenue again and he was concerned about unsustainable budgets going into the future. He felt the worst possible scenario was starting to loom its ugly head. He said reports show home prices actually going lower than what is currently shown. He said he was very concerned that the County was pulling $3 million out of the undesignated funds and applying it to this budget. He said with the Case–Shiller Index continuing to drop and also the decrease in the manufacturing indexes, he had some real significant concerns about this budget.

Ms. Holland remarked that Fayette County had been very fortunate in the fact that this County has been able to stay within the budget over the last several years as well as increasing the undesignated unreserved fund balance currently being $7 million. She said this reserve was for the anticipation at a point in time when the County would need some additional funding in order to sustain operations. She said she believed the County was at that point. She said each year, staff would have to carefully look at the critical items and make recommendations to the Board and explain the financial impact.

Commissioner Brown questioned the $7 million being a pure $7 million number because the County had deferred a lot of things that it was ultimately going to have pay for. He also expressed concern with the things that were not on the list such as the old jail facility, the roof on the administrative complex and other items that were never put on the list. He said he would present some proposals at the June 9th meeting of things that could be done.

Chairman Frady remarked that everyone was concerned about finances. He said the County has been cutting back and already delaying some projects so those funds are not spent. He said staff also will be reviewing the budget during the mid year budget review in January 2012. He said at this point he was not willing to do much cutting other than what had already been cut. He said this is a five member Board and he was 20% of the Board.

Ms. Holland interjected that the County was in the last fiscal year of the budget. She said staff was projecting that the County would end on a positive note. She reminded the Board of the policy that the County maintain a three months worth of working capital and this was in addition to the $7 million.

Commissioner Brown remarked that there were a lot of global issues that could very well impact Fayette County. He felt the County needed to be as conservative as possible and there were some issues that the County seriously needed to take a look at in terms of injection of revenue and injection of capital into this system to close some of the gaps.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Frady thanked Ms. Holland for her presentation. Public hearings for discussion of the FY2012 budget will be held on June 9th and June 23rd during the regular Board of Commissioners meetings. The Board will consider adoption of the FY2012 budget at its June 23rd meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

5. Consideration of "Meetings Organization and Public Access of Counties: A Model Ordinance", a publication by the Association of County Commissioners of Georgia:

Chairman Frady said he had requested this item to be placed on the agenda for discussion. A copy of the request and backup, identified as "Attachment No. 6", follow these minutes and are made an official part hereof. He felt the public comment section of the agenda needed to be moved to better serve the public. He asked the Board for their comments on this issue.

Commissioner McCarty said he agreed that the public comment section of the agenda needed to be moved to a different position on the agenda. He said this would give the citizens a better chance to respond after the Board discussions on agenda items.

Chairman Frady felt the County needed to handle its business first before public comments were received. He expressed concern with the manner of the Board discussions and young people and children possibly hearing those. comments.

Commissioner McCarty said he wanted the citizens to know that this Board was not regulating their ability to speak and not going to cause undue burdens on them with what they would like to say. He felt it appropriate to allow the citizens to hear the discussions on County business and then allow citizens to comment after that was completed.

Commissioner Horgan said he agreed with Chairman Frady and Commissioner McCarty. He felt there should not be any limit to what the citizens have to say to the Board and remarked that being a Commissioner required a thick skin. He said he had looked at some other counties and the way that they handle their meetings. He said some of those counties have citizens sign up prior to the meeting and he felt that would be a good thing but he was not in favor of registering a week prior to the meeting. He said the Chairman could call out the names on the list of those wishing to speak under public comment and those citizens could make their comments at that time.

Commissioner Brown said he would prefer to keep the public comment section at the beginning of the meeting. He said a lot of people come to a meeting to make a specific comment and he did not want to hold those citizens to the end of a meeting before they could make comments. He felt this was a disservice to the citizens who attend meetings and would like to make comments. He said since there was no public comment section at the Board's workshop meetings, the Thursday evening meetings were the only times that citizens could voice a public opinion related to an issue. He said having public comment section after the agenda items would be a moot point because an item would already have been decided by the Board. He said it was his personal preference to allow citizens to speak on every agenda item which is the process in the City of Peachtree City's Council meetings. He said during his term as Mayor there, this process worked fine and would allow citizens a voice on each one of the issues. He felt the model ordinance was very vague in some parts and very restrictive in other parts. He felt it would force citizens to "jump through hoops." He said the interesting part was that the model ordinance did not force the Commissioners to "jump through any hoops." He said the model ordinance seemed to put all of the burden on the taxpayers and the citizens which he did not like. He said he was very much in favor of liberty in the public discourse and he said he was a huge proponent and advocated for the First Amendment. He remarked that the Commissioners' current agenda format was better than the model ordinance. He said he would not be in favor of forcing citizens to write down what they are going to talk about and things of that nature and then holding them to that when something else might come up during a meeting that citizens might want to voice an opinion on. He felt if a citizen takes the time to show up at a meeting, they should be allowed to talk on anything that they want to and not have to write it down on a piece of paper. He said most of the people who attend the Commission meetings are adults and they act like adults, have their opinions, pay taxes and they should be allowed to speak.

Chairman Frady said he felt the individuals on the agenda coming to the Board to do business should be heard first. He said he hoped that citizens would stay to the end of a meeting. He said if individuals did not stay then he felt they didn't have much interest in their government. He asked if there was a consensus to take this item forward.

Commissioner Brown said he would not be in favor of that.

Chairman Frady indicated there was a consensus 4-1 for staff to proceed with drafting an ordinance addressing the organization of County Commission meetings. This item will come back to the Board for further discussion and consideration at a future Commission meeting.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORTS: County Administrator Jack Krakeel stated that Chief Tax Assessor Joel Benton was attending a conference during the Board's recent budget workshops and Mr. Benton would like to ask for the Board's consideration for staffing requests for his department in the FY2012 budget.

Chief Tax Assessor Joel Benton asked for consideration for two promotions for individuals getting paid as Appraiser I and are certified as Appraiser II through the State of Georgia Department of Revenue. He said these individuals are doing Appraiser II work up to some Appraiser III level work.

Mr. Benton also remarked that since the passage of Senate Bill 346, there were a lot of changes in legislation. He said this had really affected his department in that now an assessment notice has to be sent to everyone in Fayette County and included on that notice an estimated tax amount must be listed based on the prior year's millage rate. He asked for consideration for two new positions including an Appraiser III. He noted that since the hiring freeze, two employees in Appraiser III positions had retired and those positions were never filled. He said currently he had one person trying to carry the load for all of the commercial property. He asked for consideration for an Appraiser I position to cover the front desk and an Appraiser III position to help with the commercial property and to review appeals.

Chief Finance Officer Mary Holland remarked that the impact on the County budget for these two promotions would be $8,422 and the request for two new positions would be $95,254 with the Appraiser I position being $45,536 and the Appraiser III position being $49,718.

After further discussion, there was a consensus of the Board that this request for staffing and promotions be reviewed during the mid year budget discussions.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS:
None.

ADJOURNMENT: Hearing no further business to come before the Board, Commissioner Hearn adjourned the meeting at 5:23 p.m. Commissioner McCarty seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk

Herbert E. Frady, Chairman

The foregoing minutes were duly approved at an official meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia, held on the 23rd day of June, 2011.

Karen Morley, Chief Deputy Clerk