# Coweta County Board of Commissioners

**Work Session**

**Minutes**

**22 East Broad Street**
**Newnan, GA 30263**
**www.coweta.ga.us**

**Shannon Zerangue**
**Fran Collins**
**770.254.2601**

**October 24, 2024** | **9:00 AM** | **Commission Chambers, 37 Perry Street, Newnan, GA 30263**

## Coweta County Board of Commissioners

### Call to Order/Roll Call

| Attendee Name | Title | Status |
| --- | --- | --- |
| John Reidelbach | District 4 - Chairman | Present |
| Bill McKenzie | District 2 - Vice Chairman | Present |
| Paul Poole | District 1 | Present |
| Bob Blackburn | District 3 | Present |
| Alphonso Smith | District 5 | Absent |
| Michael Fouts | County Administrator | Present |
| Kelly Mickle | Assistant County Administrator | Present |
| Sandy Wisenbaker | Assistant County Administrator | Present |
| Tod Handley | Public Works Administrator | Present |
| Nathan Lee | County Attorney | Absent |
| Fran Collins | Deputy County Clerk | Present |

The Honorable Board of Commissioners of Coweta County, Georgia met in Called Meeting/Work Session on Thursday, October 24, 2024.

Meeting Called to Order

Chairman Reidelbach called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Reidelbach led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Invocation

Invocation was given by Commissioner McKenzie.

### Regular Session

1. Discussion Regarding a Proposed Amendment to *Appendix A. Zoning and Development* Associated with *Article 6D. Solar Energy Systems and Facilities*

   Assistant Administrator Wisenbaker presented proposed changes to *Appendix A. Zoning and Development* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances* associated with *Article 6D. Solar Energy Systems and Facilities.* She explained that since the Public Hearing held on September 5, 2024, a change was recommended to building mounted Solar Energy Systems (SES), such that mechanical equipment shall not be located on a street-facing slope of a pitched roof is being proposed.

   Assistant Administrator Wisenbaker explained that in an effort to simplify and make the chart contained within the ordinance clearer, all building mounted solar energy systems are considered accessory uses and permissible within all zoning districts. Both building mounted solar energy systems and ground mounted small-scale energy systems (footprint less than 1-acre) are considered accessory uses. Ground mounted intermediate-scale (footprint 1-acre to 5-acres) and large-scale solar energy systems (footprint greater than 5-acres) are allowed in *RC (Rural Conservation)*, *LM (Light Industrial)*, and *M (Industrial)* zoning districts, and would require a *Special Use Permit (SUP)*. Solar energy facilities (solar farms) require an SES footprint greater than 10-acres and are allowed only within *LM (Light Industrial) and M (Industrial)* zoning districts, and would also require a *SUP* as proposed.

   In response to a question from Commissioner McKenzie, Ms. Wisenbaker pointed out that the footprint of the SES defines the scale, not the size of the parcel or tract.

   Chairman Reidelbach explained that the size of an SES can only be 50% of the acreage. In other words, on a two (2) acre parcel, only a one (1) acre solar farm would be allowed.

   Ms. Wisenbaker explained that as currently proposed, the ordinance does not place a cap on the size of solar energy facilities (solar farms). She noted that there have been conversations regarding a 3,000-acre parcel located within the county that is of interest to a developer. She presented an aerial map representing 2,400 acres to give the Board a visual context. The draft ordinance has a minimum parcel or tract size of no less than ten (10) acres for solar farms, but in a previous point of discussion by the Board regarding placing a cap on either parcel size or on the footprint of the SES, the number discussed was five-hundred (500) acres. She also presented an aerial map representing five-hundred (500) acres, including an area totaling two-hundred and fifty (250) acres within the five-hundred (500) representing the 50% maximum coverage. She explained that based upon feedback previously received from the Board, staff recommends that a solar energy facility (solar farm) be limited to a minimum parcel or tract size of no less than ten (10) acres and no greater than five-hundred (500) contiguous acres.

The Board briefly discussed concerns with solar farms including environmental mitigation associated with decommissioning these facilities, mitigation of weather-related incidents, chemical runoff and contaminated groundwater leaching into soils, lifespan of solar panels, clear-cutting, and erosion prevention safeguards.

In response to a question from Commissioner McKenzie, Ms. Wisenbaker explained that if a company wishes to expand a solar farm at a later date, they would have to go through the entire rezoning and special use process for the additional property.

In response to questions from Chairman Reidelbach, Assistant Administrator Wisenbaker explained that she can research language regarding mitigation of weather related issues and groundwater contamination leaching into soils for presentation to the Board at the November 5, 2024 Commission meeting.

In response to questions from Commissioner McKenzie, Assistant Administrator Wisenbaker explained that a proposed change to erosion prevention safeguards would add language to prevent land disturbing activity of more than fifty (50) contiguous acres of a project site at any one time. Further land disturbance activity would only be permitted when the other disturbed area meets State stabilization requirements.

Administrator Fouts explained that *Chapter 30. Environment* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances* spells out current land disturbing activities and applies to all developments. The County is a local issuing authority and handles the permitting and inspection of those activities.

Public Works Administrator Handley explained that there is a requirement in existing State law and the County's ordinance that approval from the Environmental Protection Division (EPD) must be obtained for land disturbance over fifty (50) acres. The County's ordinance mirrors state law and is required to adopt it. There are certain areas that the County can be more restrictive on, but there are some they cannot.

Commissioner Blackburn expressed concerns regarding the loss of prime agricultural land with large solar farms, and expressed his belief that nuclear power is much better. However, having companies that store electricity (battery storage capacity) could help change his mind.

Ms. Wisenbaker explained that any solar farm project would have to be rezoned to *LM (Light Industrial)* or *M (Industrial)* by the Board.

It was the consensus of the Board to update the proposed ordinance for solar energy facilities (solar farms) to be permitted within the *LM (Light Industrial)* or *M (Industrial)* zoning districts on a minimum-sized parcel or tract containing no less than ten (10) acres and no greater than five-hundred (500) contiguous acres. Proposed changes to the ordinance will be presented to the Board at the November 5, 2024 Commission meeting.

2. Discussion Regarding a Conceptual Plan for the Animal Adoption Center

Administrator Fouts explained that the 2025 SPLOST referendum included a $3.7 million Level 2 project for the construction of a new animal adoption center.

In response to a question from Chairman Reidelbach, Administrator Fouts explained that in regard to SPLOST, there are Level 1, Level 2, and general projects. A Level 1 project is limited to a courthouse, Level 2 projects are projects that are related to countywide services (911, EMS, Animal Services). As SPLOST collections are received, proceeds for Level 1 and Level 2 projects are taken off the top before being distributed to participating municipalities.

Administrator Fouts explained that earlier this year, a couple of the Commissioners, staff, and members of local rescue groups toured three (3) animal shelter facilities located around the state. Much was learned that could be incorporated into the new shelter. Facilities Director Mike Johnson took the feedback garnered from the tours, numerous individuals, and worked with Architect Joe Gardner to create a conceptual plan.

Facilities Director Johnson presented the animal adoption center conceptual plan, explaining that the design is more like a pet store than an animal control facility, allowing for easier view of the animals, and is more pet friendly. The plan provides for public access through the front lobby, glass walled kennels for ease of viewing, bonding sections on each side with separate adoption processing areas, staff only and utility areas, covered porches for dog viewing, and outdoor play areas. The two kennel pods are walled to help to prevent animals from seeing each other and to help reduce noise. The kennels can also be set up for a combination of large dogs and small dogs.

In response to a question from Commissioner Poole, Facilities Director Johnson explained that the cat kennel, viewing, bonding and adoption will be located at the front right corner of the adoption center.

In response to questions from Commissioner McKenzie, Facilities Director Johnson explained that as shown on the concept plan, the kennels can hold up to 12 large dogs and 12 smaller dogs on each side, or 48 total dogs, depending on the configuration. The number of cat kennels will depend on the type of enclosure and will include space for large cats and kittens. The walls in the dog kennels will help to reduce noise and the glass front on the viewing side will provide a measure of safety between dogs and children. The number of additional staff needed for the facility has not been determined yet.

In response to a question from Chairman Reidelbach, Administrator Fouts explained that the key function for the proposed facility is adoption. Once animals have been adopted, more animals can be replaced by animals ready for adoption at the intake shelter. In addition, there will be kiosks at the adoption center to view all adoptable animals. Those are operational decisions Warden Clifton and staff will need to make.

Commissioner McKenzie explained that once the adoption center opens, the animal shelter could be kept for the intake of animals only and would help prevent the spread of diseases like parvo. The animal shelter should then no longer necessarily be open to the public.

Commissioner McKenzie explained that he likes the conceptual plan and its similarity to the Douglas County facility. He expressed concerns regarding the centers' size and about future expansion, if needed.

Facilities Director Johnson explained that the adoption center was not designed with expansion in mind and perhaps an option would be to have another adoption center located in another part of the county to maximize exposure of the animals to the public.

Commissioner McKenzie explained that adding another adoption center instead of expanding this one would also drive up associated costs. He expressed concerns about staff and volunteers being able to keep the adoption center as clean as possible, and that it would probably require the use of inmate labor.

Administrator Fouts explained that the adoption center would be operated by staff and volunteers. Inmates will be utilized to move animals from the animal shelter to the adoption center and could be utilized after hours (evening or early morning) to clean the adoption center. It is an issue that staff will need to resolve before the adoption center opens.

Warden Clifton explained that it would be an easy process to bring over an inmate crew early in the morning and after closing to clean the adoption center. He expressed the importance of the adoption center to relieve overcrowding at the animal shelter and pointed out that on October 11, 2024, there were 119 dogs and today (October 24, 2024) there are 141 dogs at the animal shelter. The adoption center will provide some relief to the overcrowding and will be appreciated by the citizens.

Commissioner Poole expressed appreciation for the tremendous job the Warden, staff, and inmates do at the animal shelter to keep it clean.

Administrator Fouts briefly reviewed important steps regarding funding and the timeline. He explained that the construction estimate for the 7,872 square feet facility depends on labor and materials. If using the $400 per square feet model, and adding $800,000 for possible acquisition of property, if needed, the total estimated cost to construct the adoption center is approximately $5.5 million. $3.7 million was included in SPLOST which begins in January 2025. Collections for this project are approximately $600,000 per year.

From a cash flow perspective, there are currently no plans to advance fund the Adoption Center with bonds, and there isn't a lot of available cash in the General Fund to advance fund this project. Direction is not necessary today, but it is important to stay on path because the next step would be to take the conceptual plan, turn it over to the architect, and allow him to start actual design.

Chairman Reidelbach pointed out that before spending money on full scale drawings, the land should be acquired.

Administrator Fouts explained that discussions have been held with some of the potential landowners, and they wish to see the elevations and understand how the design will address noise. Mr. Gardner (architect) can draft elevations without developing construction plans.

In response to a question from Chairman Reidelbach, Administrator Fouts explained that staff has considered several properties, including the old firing range located off the Bypass and two properties located near the Bypass at Turkey Creek. Staff also engaged with the local rescue groups and input garnered from them is that the location of the animal adoption center is very important and should be on a road that is heavily traveled by local citizens.

Chairman Reilbach pointed out that signage is cheaper than land and with a large enough sign, people will know where the adoption center is located.

Administrator Fouts explained that civil engineering is needed on each of the sites.

Staff would like to engage with Mr. Gardner (architect) to develop draft elevations. Staff would like to hold a public open house and invite the community to see the concept plan in early 2025. In the meantime, Warden Clifton and his staff and Assistant Administrator Wisenbaker are working on plans for fostering in order to get more visibility for the animals at the shelter.

In response to a question from Commissioner McKenzie, Administrator Fouts explained that Mr. Gardner will provide front and side elevations and an overall site plan to show what the adoption center would look like based on the concept.

Administrator Fouts explained that staff believes it is also important to provide an opportunity for staff and volunteers to walk the animals and they are looking to add trails to the site plan.

3. Discussion Regarding SPLOST Funded Transportation Projects

Administrator Fouts explained that the agenda packet included a list of Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) funded projects for both road maintenance and new transportation projects from 2019 and proposed for 2025. Public Works Administrator Handley and Assistant Administrator Mickle reviewed the transportation projects list. Mr. Handley explained that the list contains all the ongoing projects and a few that have not been started yet, along with estimates from staff regarding their cost. The following list shows the annual maintenance projects and associated costs:

- 2025-2030 asphalt includes paving performed by in-house crews on County roads - $12,000,000 (generally $2 million per year)
- 2025-2030 hauling includes the cost of moving asphalt from the asphalt plant to the various roads by private companies - $3,600,000 ($600,000 per year)
- 2025-2030 pipe - includes replacement of corrugated metal pipe in streets and developments that have failed or reached the end of its useful life - $800,000 ($147,000 per year)
- 2025-2030 rock - includes various types of rock used by Public Works crews and forces - $1,650,000 ($275,000 per year)
- 2024 remaining Mill & Inlay is a resurfacing project that is ongoing - $1,268,538 (balance to complete the project)
- 2025-2030 annual roadway rehabilitation and resurfacing has been reduced in the number of road miles from previous years - $42,000,000 ($7,000,000 annually)

In response to questions from the Board during his presentation, Public Works Administrator Handley explained that sometimes the County does not have the equipment to handle a really large bore pipe because of its weight and has to rent a crane or hire a company to replace some of the larger pieces. When concrete pipe is available, it is used in certain situations, but it is easier for crews to replace metal pipe because it comes in longer lengths. For example, in a subdivision, crews can remove an old pipe and replace it with metal pipe usually within the same day, not including repaving the road. Using concrete pipe takes longer because it comes in 8-feet joints and has to be laid one joint at a time. He pointed out that as the number of roads being rehabilitated and resurfaced is reduced each year, some roads may be deteriorating and need resurfacing. He explained that an average of $10-12 million was budgeted in previous SPLOST years for annual roadway rehabilitation and resurfacing, including $10 million in 2024, $12 million in 2023, and $9 million in 2022.

Assistant Administrator Mickle explained that although there should be more revenue from the 2025 SPLOST than from the 2019 SPLOST, the reason for the proposed reductions in annual maintenance spending is because of all the road projects that have been added. For years, the transportation category of SPLOST has been used for road maintenance and only a few "newer" road type projects were able to be accomplished (ex. intersection improvements). If roadway maintenance is to be continued at the same level as before, there will not be enough funding for all the proposed road projects.

Commissioner McKenzie pointed out it would have been a great benefit to the County if the Transportation Special Purpose Local Sales Tax (TSPLOST) had been passed on the previous referendum (2019).

Public Works Administrator Handley explained that over the years, generally 1-2 intersection improvement projects per year have been accomplished. Several roadway projects will be coming up in the next few years that will occur simultaneously.

In response to questions from the Board, Public Works Administrator Handley explained that road projects are separate from maintenance, but they are all funded by SPLOST. The Tommy Lee Cook at Cedar Ridge project will cost the County $750,000 to perform the site distance improvements, and an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) that will be presented to the Board in the future is for the addition of a left turn lane. The developer has already constructed the right turn lane associated with their project.

In response to a question from Chairman Reidelbach, Public Works Administrator Handley explained that the developer is donating the right-of-way for the Shaw Connector project, but the cost for design and construction is $4.68 million.

Assistant Administrator Mickle explained that there are so many variables built into this schedule, like revenue projections, cost estimates, etc., and it is very much a moving target. For example, the total remaining cost of the Madras Connector project is $9 million and the County has been granted $1.5 million from the State Road and Tollway Authority (SRTA). An additional $5.4 million may be granted from the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), and if so, it would help offset the remaining $7.5 million. There are also possibilities of additional grant funding and funding from developers.

Public Works Administrator Handley explained that staff has applied for an additional $5.4 million of construction funding through the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) for the Madras Connector project, but have not received a response on whether it has been approved. Staff has also applied for a $5.4 million Infrastructure Grant (IG) from GDOT. Staff is doing everything they can to request federal and state funding for these projects. In the past, staff has used local funds for smaller road projects, but on projects they know the County cannot bear the cost on its own, they try to obtain federal and state funding. Lastly, he explained that if staff tries to keep all the projects as proposed on the schedule and fund them from SPLOST, then there will be a $21 million shortfall. Staff has some ideas for projects that can be delayed or postponed.

Assistant Administrator Mickle explained that staff is also working on cash flow. Staff is evaluating whether to advance fund transportation considering several large transportation projects are scheduled to occur in the next two (2) to three (3) years. The decision will need to be made to either advance fund or postpone transportation projects until SPLOST funds are collected. She explained that there is approximately $20 million remaining in the 2019 SPLOST, and the anticipated revenue specific to transportation is about $16-$17 million per year over the next six (6) years. Cash flow has to be considered carefully in terms of the timing of the projects.

In response to questions from the Board, Public Works Administrator Handley explained that the $1.2 million for the Lower Fayetteville widening project is just for design, not construction. The US 29 at Magnolia/Country Club Road project is $700,000, and that amount represents the County's commitment to assist the State with a mini-roundabout project at that location. In order to make the project feasible and with a favorable cost/benefit ratio, the State asked for a $700,000 contribution from the County. The State does have a safety program where they look at high crash-rate intersections. For example, the County changed the vertical grade of SR 54 at Gordon Road to improve the sight distance, but accidents continued to occur. The State agreed to implement a 4-way stop, and there is still a higher crash rate than they would like to see. The State is now proceeding with a roundabout project for that location. He pointed out that $7 million for the Poplar Road at SR 16 project is only 20% of the design, with right-of-way acquisition and construction costs totaling approximately $35 million to complete the project. The $5 million for the Poplar Road from Newnan Crossing Boulevard to Yeager Road project is also only 20% of the design, right-of-way, and construction cost. Currently, the only funding for this project are funds from the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) for engineering. The most qualified consultant recommended by the selection committee (appointed by the Board) for the Poplar Road from Newnan Crossing Boulevard to Yeager Road project submitted a cost proposal for $1.2 million for the concept only, which is more than the amount ARC granted. Lastly, on State route projects, GDOT sometimes asks the County to participate in order to get projects constructed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Blackburn, Public Works Administrator Handley explained that the Southwest Connector project ($7.5 million) is an important project. It provides a second access to the County Fairgrounds and the future plan is for that road to extend and cross over the CSX railroad, and tie into US 29. When that happens, it will serve essentially as a leg of another bypass extension around the city. It gives all the residents along the Corinth Road area a way to get to the interstate without having to travel to Pine Road and US 29.

Public Works Administrator Handley requested that the Board consider projects that could be postponed or delayed. He recommended postponing the two (2) Poplar Road projects since nothing has been spent yet, which would save $12 million over the next period of SPLOST. If that funding is saved and if $5.4 million is obtained through ARC or the IG for the Madras Connector, that $17 million would reduce the $21 million deficit to approximately $4 million.

In response to a question from Commissioner McKenzie, Public Works Administrator Handley explained that Amlajack Boulevard at one time had curb and gutter on the 4-lane road on both sides of the roadway and the median. The asphalt has been overlayed so many times that the curb and gutter no longer exist, and the asphalt that is there is fatigued, failing, and has potholes that need attention. Reconstruction would establish new curb and gutter for the whole road, and correct storm drainage deficiencies. Because of the location of utilities, the idea is to pull the roadway toward the median for room to add storm drainage along the outside and reconstruct the roadway. Staff has not applied for State or Federal assistance on the project because of needs to construct the project before their timeline allows and the environmental process would add to both the cost and time to perform the project. He explained that both the Mount Carmel Road at Thomas Creek and Boone Road at Thomas Creek are both bridge replacement projects and the cost of $500,000 for each is for the County to hire a company to drive the piles and use its materials and equipment to construct the bridges. If the Mount Carmel Road at Thomas Creek project were let out for design and construction, it would cost $2.5-$3 million. Both of the bridges are weight restricted, and after being rebuilt, would have steel piling, concrete caps, steel beams, and metal and asphalt decks. As bridges age, GDOT inspects and rates them, and what should be avoided is a rating by GDOT in which a school bus or fire truck cannot cross over the bridge.

In response to a question from Commissioner McKenzie, Assistant Administrator Mickle explained that the proposed schedule isn't ranked but certainly can be. The schedule is also subject to change by choice or other delays, but shows the estimated expense that would be incurred for each project. Also, the SPLOST revenue projections are at a 1.5% increase per year, which is very conservative. Hopefully, it will grow more than that per year, but staff want to be as conservative as possible at this point. Staff also expects costs to continue to increase.

In response to a question from Chairman Reidelbach, Public Works Administrator Handley explained that he feels that the County has a shot at receiving the $5.4 million from either the ARC or IG, for the Madras Connector project.

Administrator Fouts explained that all roadway maintenance has previously been funded through SPLOST. This year staff recommended placing $2 million in the FY 2025 General Fund budget for asphalt with the intention of freeing up more SPLOST funds for transportation projects. Over the next 6-years, road maintenance costs are estimated at over $60 million, or $10 million per year. In the future, it will continue to be discussed during the budget process to place some funds in the operating budget for road maintenance. Over the last 19–20 years, only one (1) new road has been constructed. The current proposed transportation projects will help with ca[acity and safety.

In response to a question from Commissioner McKenzie, Public Works Administrator Handley explained that the SR 16 at Witcher/Glover Road project ($5.4 million) is a hot spot for crashes. It is a badly skewed intersection, and there are two (2) at-grade railroad crossings on Glover Road. The project could be pushed back, but the Main Street/Arnco

Bridge is closed, and this project would provide residents in that area with a better way to get out to Hwy 16. There is also a new subdivision being constructed off Welcome to Arcno Road and a lot of that traffic will flow through this area. Staff requested contributions from those developers and the railroad that could be used for this project. Basically, this project would consolidate four (4) existing roadway intersections with Hwy 16 into one (1) location.

In closing, Administrator Fouts explained that no direction is needed from the Board at this time. Staff will return with some recommendations regarding the priority of the projects, with the two (2) Poplar Road projects being removed from the list. However, there are a lot of variations that are in play. Staff will send the Board the cash flow information with the understanding that the spreadsheet can be updated and changed.

In response to a question from Commissioner McKenzie, Public Works Administrator Handley explained that the SR 34 at Pete Davis Road project was added to the list when SPLOST collections were increasing. The intersection occurs at both a horizontal and vertical curve, and glare from the sun is bad at different times of day. Staff has discussed with GDOT the best way to handle issues and both agree that a roundabout is the best solution for this intersection ($3.5 million).

4. Discussion Regarding a Proposed Amendment to *Chapter 62. Solid Waste* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances*

Administrator Fouts explained that staff has been working on an update to *Chapter 62. Solid Waste* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances* that was originally adopted in 1985 because there are some areas that need to be enhanced. Public Works Administrator Handley and Environmental Management Director Matt Lovett worked together on the amendment. In general, staff looked at other counties that operate similar convenience locations (landfill, transfer station, etc.) and incorporate a private hauler component.

Chairman Reidelbach explained that the staff did a good job on the amendment. He also feels that the insurance limits need to be revisited for private haulers and Code Enforcement should be able to address trash on property if they witness it, instead of having to wait for a complaint to be filed.

Administrator Fouts explained that staff will look at the insurance rate for private haulers and make sure that any violations are in line with general code violations. Currently, if there is a code violation for anything, it is generally a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $1,000 per day.

In response to questions from Commissioner McKenzie, Administrator Fouts explained that currently there is no licensing component and the intent is to place that requirement in the ordinance to ensure compliance with the rules. Regarding hours of operation, those can be adjusted to align with development standards or can be completely omitted. He explained that the input received will be presented to the Board for consideration at a future meeting.

In response to a question from Chairman Reidelbach, Environmental Management Director Lovett explained that haulers pay a franchising fee of $5 annually per company.

Administrator Fouts recommended that the fee for haulers be similar to business license fees and based on the number of employees.

Commissioner McKenzie explained he supports leak-proof vehicles and that flashing lights should be required on the vehicles.

Public Works Administrator Handley explained that the verbiage in the ordinance requires flashing lights on trucks that stop on the street.

In response to a question from Commissioner McKenzie, Environmental Management Director Lovett explained that, as proposed, the hauling fee would be $500 annually.

Administrator Fouts explained that the fee could be paid at the Business License division, along with the Occupation Tax required to be reported by each company each year to obtain a Business License. That would be cleaner and more consistent.

5. Discuss Building Permit Fee Schedule

Administrator Fouts explained that during the 2024 General Assembly Session, House Bill 461 (HB 461) was approved and signed into law. This legislation changed a component of how permits can be assessed and became effective in July 2024. Staff has been working with the County's contractor (Safebuilt) regarding HB 461 and the County's permitting process. Prior to the Work Session, staff provided a summary of the bill from the Association County Commissioners of Georgia (ACCG) and a copy of HB 461 for the Board's review. At this point, staff is not ready to present any recommendations and will present any further information to the Board for consideration at a future meeting. He explained that in speaking with others around the state, there are various interpretations on how to apply the law and that there will probably be an amendment to the bill in the future.

Community Development Director Amason explained that there is a lot of data to look at and many different interpretations.

Administrator Fouts explained that if you review the International Code Council (ICC) valuation chart, residential valuation is very simple, but commercial and industrial valuations are more complex. Staff is proposing a flat fee plus the ICC valuation to remain compliant, but is studying past data and collections to ensure expenses are being covered as well.

## Adjournment

There being no further discussion, it was the consensus of the Board members present to adjourn the meeting.