



Public Facilities Authority

www.coweta.ga.us

Regular Session

Minutes

Shannon Zerangue
County Clerk
770.254.2601

March 31, 2026

9:00 AM

Commission Chambers - 37
Perry Street, Newnan

Public Facilities Authority

Roll Call/Call to Order

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Cynthia Bennett	Chair	Present
Don Phillips	Vice-Chair	Present
Kelvin Thompson	Treasurer	Present
David Fowler	Authority Member	Present
Steve Swope	Authority Member	Present
Michael Fouts	County Administrator	Present
Kelly Mickle	Assistant County Administrator	Present
Sandy Wisenbaker	Assistant County Administrator	Present
Tod Handley	Public Works Administrator	Present
Shannon Zerangue	County Clerk/Secretary	Present
Hans Wilson	Finance Director	Present

The Coweta County Public Facilities Authority met in Called Meeting/Regular Session on Tuesday, March 31, 2026.

Acting Authority Chair Cynthia Bennett called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

County Administrator Michael Fouts confirmed that all Authority members were in attendance.

Mr. Tommy Ratchford and Mr. Roger Murray with Murray Barnes Finister Law, LLP (bond counsel) attended the meeting remotely.

Mr. Bryan Huskey with Stifel Merchant Capital (bond underwriter) also attended the

meeting remotely.

First Order of Business

1. Request Election of Officers for the Public Facilities Authority of Coweta County

Motion to: Appoint Chair

The Authority voted to appoint member Cynthia Bennett to serve as Chair for calendar year 2026.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Don Phillips

SECONDER: David Fowler

AYES: Cynthia Bennett, Don Phillips, Kelvin Thompson, David Fowler, Steve Swope

Motion to: Appoint Vice-Chair

The Authority voted to appoint member Don Phillips to serve as Vice-Chair for calendar year 2026.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Cynthia Bennett

SECONDER: Steve Swope

AYES: Cynthia Bennett, Don Phillips, Kelvin Thompson, David Fowler, Steve Swope

Motion to: Appoint Treasurer

The Authority voted to appoint member Kelvin Thompson to serve as Treasurer for calendar year 2026.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Cynthia Bennett

SECONDER: Don Phillips

AYES: Cynthia Bennett, Don Phillips, Kelvin Thompson, David Fowler, Steve Swope

2. Request Appointment of Secretary for the Public Facilities Authority of Coweta County

Motion to: Appoint Secretary/Clerk

The Authority voted to appoint County Clerk Shannon Zerangue to serve as Secretary/Clerk to the Public Facilities Authority for calendar year 2026 (Deputy County Clerk will serve as alternate if needed).

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Cynthia Bennett

SECONDER: Don Phillips

AYES: Cynthia Bennett, Don Phillips, Kelvin Thompson, David Fowler, Steve Swope

Regular Session

Approval of Minutes

3. Request Approval of the Minutes from the Meeting Held on May 13, 2024

Motion to: Approve

The Authority voted to approve the minutes from the meeting held on Monday, May 13, 2024.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Cynthia Bennett

SECONDER: Don Phillips

AYES: Cynthia Bennett, Don Phillips, Kelvin Thompson, David Fowler, Steve Swope

New Business

4. Discuss the New Coweta County Government Center

Administrator Fouts provided a brief history of the Coweta County Administration building, explaining that the original building, located at 22 East Broad Street, Newnan, was opened in 1939 and in 1992 the annex located at 37 Perry Street, Newnan, was completed and currently houses the Assessor's office and the Commission Chambers. Since 1992, the building has undergone numerous renovations and modifications. In addition, the County has undergone several space analyses internally and with architectural firms as a means to forecast growth related to staffing and service. He also noted that in 2020, the County purchased and renovated a building that now houses the Tax Commissioner's office, Elections and Registration, I.T., and the state offices of Drivers' Services, and Veterans' Services.

Mr. Fouts explained that over time, the County has received several offers to purchase the current Administration building and subsequently the Board of Commissioners, through the Development Authority, entered into an agreement to sell the property; however, the purchaser failed to complete the closing process. Later, a second offer was received and the sale of the property successfully closed last year. As part of that transaction, the Development Authority entered into a three (3) year lease for the current location, after

which, the County offices currently located in the Administration building will no longer have occupancy at this location. This deadline underscores the urgency to advance the County's planning and decision-making process.

Mr. Fouts further explained that during the space analyses and needs assessments for County operations, the County ultimately purchased 23± acres located adjacent to the Fire Rescue Headquarters near the intersection of Turkey Creek Road and the Newnan Crossing Bypass. This site offers excellent accessibility to the community and is a highly suitable location for future development. Staff anticipates that this site will provide a location for many future County facilities to serve the community for several decades.

Mr. Fouts noted that the Authority may be aware of ongoing discussions at the State level regarding whether a County may relocate outside the city limits and the Commissioners be able to continue to conduct official business. In this instance, the property along Turkey Creek Road did not fall within the municipal boundaries of the City of Newnan (the county seat) and could not be annexed through the standard local procedures. With assistance from the City of Newnan, the Georgia General Assembly passed legislation to formally annex the property into Newnan's city limits. This will allow the Board of Commissioners to be fully compliant from a legal and procedural standpoint to meet and conduct official business at this location. He expressed appreciation to the City of Newnan for their assistance with this matter.

In response to a question from Chairperson Bennett, Mr. Fouts explained that based upon the county's population and demographics, the new location is more centrally located and will provide better accessibility. The current location is constrained by its size, encompassing less than two (2) acres, and offers no opportunity for expansion. In addition, observations from the existing building indicate that citizens, including elderly individuals, often experience difficulty finding parking when visiting the Administration building. Other alternatives within the downtown area were explored; however, those were not feasible because of insufficient land availability without substantial redevelopment. The new site provides significantly more space and flexibility for future growth, and its position near I-85 and the Bypass allows convenient access for residents traveling from various parts of the county.

In response to questions from Vice-Chair Phillips regarding the sale price of the existing property/building, Mr. Fouts and Ms. Mickle explained that the property sold for its full appraisal value. They further explained that the proceeds from the sale are being applied toward the new project with a portion of those funds being utilized to cover the three-year lease agreement that allows continued occupancy of the existing building.

Mr. Fouts continued the presentation, explaining that over the past 30± years, the County has utilized Principal Architect Joe Gardner with the firm of Gardner, Spencer, Smith, Tench and Jarbeau (GSST&J) on numerous County projects such as the Justice Center. Mr.

Gardner has consistently provided conceptual programming and planning support for the Administration building. While Mr. Gardner's contributions have been beneficial, it was determined that additional focus was needed to advance the new Government Center project. As a result, the Board of Commissioners authorized staff to enter into a contract with Jefferson Browne Architecture, based out of Peachtree City. Subsequently, Jefferson Browne Architecture partnered with Mr. Gardner to further evaluate the project. Since then, the Board of Commissioners recently authorized Jefferson Browne Architecture to proceed with the architectural component of the project, so only one (1) architectural firm will be engaged as the project proceeds. Mr. Browne and his associate, architect Paul Gresham, have worked closely with staff over the past year, meeting with department leaders, the Board of Commissioners, and other stakeholders. As a result, they have developed a 60-page program document that outlines space needs, departmental adjacencies, and operational requirements for the proposed building that includes estimated square footage based upon anticipated growth.

Mr. Fouts explained that one of the ongoing challenges in this process is forecasting anticipated growth over time. He cited the Justice Center as an example, explaining that when it was originally constructed, it was designed as a 20-year build-out. In practice, that projection proved to be very accurate because all the courtrooms have now been completed and are approaching full capacity right at the 20-year mark. Based on that experience, staff expects that the new government center will follow a similar pattern, with the projected capacity being reached within 10 to 20 years. Staff's goal is for the building to accommodate future growth without requiring a major expansion. At the same time, staff wants to be fiscally responsible in how the build-out is approached. Rather than fully outfitting all office space upfront, the plan is to incorporate a mix of completed offices and flexible areas. This includes shell space that can be converted into offices as needs evolve over time. Based upon the programming analysis prepared by Jefferson, the current projection is for a facility of approximately 70,000 to 85,000 square feet.

Mr. Fouts explained that there are two primary components to the proposed project. The first is the main administration building, which will serve general office and administrative functions. The second is a separate building for Facilities Management. Currently, warehouse operations, repairs and maintenance, and the wood shop are dispersed across four or five different buildings. The intent is to consolidate all of these operations into a single, centralized location. Because of the nature of this work, these functions do not require a traditional office environment and are better suited to an industrial-type setting. As a result, it is more practical and cost-effective to construct a standalone Facilities Management building on the property rather than incorporating these operations into the main administration building.

In response to a question from Authority member Thompson, Mr. Fouts explained that the main administration building will house the Parks and Recreation leadership team, Community Development, which includes planning, zoning, building permits, code

enforcement, business licensing, and other permitting functions, Human Resources, Finance, the Assessor's office, GIS, the Administration team, the Commission Chambers, and Environmental Health which is a State agency. In addition, he explained that the current facility has a shortage of conference rooms and meeting spaces, so there will be a strong emphasis on providing ample meeting areas in the new building.

Mr. Fouts explained that he failed to note that the IT department was temporarily relocated to the County's facility at Shenandoah because of organizational growth. They are currently occupying a previously unfinished shell space located between the Department of Veterans' Services and Elections and Voter Registration. Although this arrangement has been functional, it is not suitable for long-term growth. Therefore, IT will be incorporated back into the administration building. With over 100 employees expected to be housed in the new building, a centralized IT presence will be crucial to support daily operations and provide timely technical services.

In response to a question from Chairman Bennett, Mr. Fouts explained that the new building will incorporate dedicated meeting or event space that will be accessible to the public while still maintaining the appropriate security of the facility.

Mr. Fouts further explained that based upon discussions to date, Jefferson anticipates that the schematic design will take approximately two months to complete, followed by an additional two months to finalize construction documents, and then three months to obtain permitting. The overall construction timeline is approximately 22 months. While there is a potential for a shorter duration based upon the contractor's capability, the 22-month timeframe is being used as a realistic planning assumption to adequately complete the project. Under this schedule, the anticipated occupancy date is around September 2028. This aligns with the current lease term for the current facility and provides some flexibility for transitioning to the new building. He noted that the main point for today's discussion is funding for the project and the timing of the funding decisions.

Assistant Administrator Mickle explained that staff has developed a draft financing timeline in coordination with the bond attorney and underwriter. The schedule remains flexible because additional work is still required with the architect to refine the project scope and final cost estimates. She further explained that preparation and circulation of the Preliminary Official Statement should occur in April; completion of the credit rating package and finalization of project funding amounts is targeted for May; consideration and approval of final bond documents by the Board of Commissioners and the Public Facilities Authorities is anticipated in June; and closing of the bond transaction is estimated to occur in June. She noted that because of ongoing refinement of the project costs with the architect, the May deadline might not be achievable. As a result, the issuance timeline may extend to July. Presently, June or July remains the anticipated timeframe for bond issuance.

In response to a question from Authority member Fowler, Ms. Mickle explained that based upon the most recent information provided by the architect, the proposed facility is estimated to consist of 65,000 to 85,000 square feet. Correspondingly, the total project cost, including site work, building construction, interior fit-out, and furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E) is estimated to range from \$33 million to \$43 million. This estimate does not include security systems or audiovisual (AV) equipment. She emphasized that these figures remain preliminary and will be further refined as design development continues, and the project scope is finalized. She also noted that in addition to the new Government Center, bond issuance is also being requested to cover the shortfall to construct the new Animal Adoption Center, which will be discussed later in the meeting. The underwriter has prepared preliminary financing scenarios based upon estimated project costs. At this stage, the general funding range is approximately \$40 million to \$50 million (both building projects). She reemphasized that these estimates are preliminary and will be refined over the coming months to establish a more precise funding determination.

In response to a question from Vice-Chair Phillips, Ms. Mickle and Mr. Fouts explained that the architect prefers to proceed with a Request for Proposals (RFP) process and secure a fixed-price contract. In addition, a fixed-contract is expected to provide better overall value and cost certainty compared to alternate bid methods.

In response to a question from Chairman Bennett, Ms. Mickle explained that the security and AV systems are still being evaluated to determine if they should be included in an all-inclusive contract or procured separately through specialty subcontractors.

Administrator Fouts further explained that the AV systems will most likely be incorporated into the master contract. However, given the internal resources capable of handling portions of the work, security systems remain under consideration. If it is determined that the security scope of the project can be accomplished more cost effectively by utilizing internal resources, the County may choose to manage that work in-house rather than including it in the primary contract.

In addition, Mr. Fouts explained that initially, staff considered performing the site work in-house. However, given the number of existing projects that County forces are currently committed to, it is more practical to engage a contractor to ensure that the work is completed within the project schedule and deadlines.

Ms. Mickle added that the cost to perform the site work is approximately \$3 to \$5 million and is included in the overall estimated project cost of \$33 million to \$43 million.

Mr. Fouts noted that part of the planning efforts involve master planning the 23± acre property for future development. He noted that the existing courts are currently at capacity and that the County will need to evaluate future needs, which could include a

court annex or additional building on the property. He emphasized the importance of carefully planning the overall site layout, including access roads, to accommodate future development. He further stated that the project will likely include one-time costs for grading, as well as stormwater and road infrastructure improvements.

In response to an earlier question from Vice-Chair Phillips, Ms. Mickle explained that the current Administration building's sale price was \$3.5 million. She further explained that the rent on the current Admin building is \$27,783 per month, which is approximately \$333,000 per year. This means that over the three-year period, roughly \$1 million will be spent on rent, leaving the net proceeds from the sale of the building at roughly \$2.5 million.

Mr. Fouts pointed out that \$2.5 million was the appraisal value of the building.

Finance Director Hans Wilson explained that the funds are invested and are currently earning interest in the high three-percent (3%) range, generating approximately \$300,000 in interest income, which helps offset a portion of the rental costs.

In response to a question from Chairman Bennett regarding the use of an architectural firm that is located outside the county and whether this would be one of the few vendors engaged from outside the county, Mr. Fouts noted that while the firm is based outside the county, the majority of its employees, including the principal architect, reside in Coweta County.

Mr. Fouts further noted that the selection of the architectural firm was based on a comparative review and discussions with multiple firms. Jefferson was selected because of the quality of its prior work on other projects and overall design approach. He also noted that Jefferson served as the architect for the City of Newnan's property located across the street from the current Administration building; however, this was not a determining factor in the selection. He explained that the firm has experience working with Hitachi, and that this experience is reflected in certain design principles that will be incorporated into the final design. These factors ultimately led to the decision to engage Jefferson.

Ms. Mickle pointed out that, as referenced in Mr. Fouts' earlier presentation, one key consideration in determining the project's square footage is the extent of built-in capacity for future growth. This planning for anticipated growth contributes to the wide range of square footage options currently under consideration.

In response to a question from Chairman Bennett, Mr. Fouts explained that Coweta continues to rank highly in population growth. He further explained that public safety remains the County's highest priority, and that over the past 20-year period, the majority of staffing growth has occurred within public safety departments. Some departments have experienced more limited staffing growth over time; for example, Finance has remained at

a relatively stable staffing level for an extended period of time and has only recently seen incremental increases. He emphasized that planning for the new building is being approached in a methodical manner to ensure that the facility is suitable for long-term use, with an intended lifespan of approximately fifty (50) years, while avoiding overbuilding. The County is relying on professional guidance to benchmark typical market standards, while also considering the potential need for future expansion of the building footprint. He noted that the design approach is intended to preserve flexibility so that the County is not locked into a configuration that cannot adapt to future needs.

In response to a question from Vice-Chair Phillips regarding possible tax-related changes being discussed by the local legislature, Mr. Fouts explained that the County is currently awaiting developments anticipated during the week. Staff is concerned about the potential impacts to future funding because citizens continue to expect the same level of services, and associated costs to provide those services are not anticipated to decrease. Any changes would likely result in a shift in revenue sources rather than a reduction in overall costs.

In response to a question from Vice-Chair Phillips regarding projected interest rates, Mr. Brian Huskey from Stifel (bond underwriter), noted that rate assumptions are dependent on both the size of the project and the term of the bonds. It was stated that consideration is being given to bond terms ranging from twenty (20) to thirty (30) years, with the final structure based on what best aligns with the County's annual debt service requirements. Within that range, estimated interest rates are currently projected to be approximately 3.5% to 4.5%.

In response to a question from Authority member Swope, Mr. Fouts explained that the intent of the bond issuance is for the Public Facilities Authority to own the new building and lease it back to the County.

There were no further questions from the Authority.

5. Discuss the New Coweta County Animal Adoption Center

Administrator Fouts provided a brief history of Animal Services in Coweta, along with key milestones, future vision, and an overview of the PFA's involvement in the process. He explained that the original building on Selt Road, constructed and opened around 1999–2000, serves primarily as the intake facility. A second building, opened in approximately 2012–2013 with a combination of grant funding and County support, expanded intake capacity and added a surgical unit to support spay/neuter services and minor medical procedures. He noted that, in addition to significant human population growth, the County has also experienced substantial growth in its animal population. He recognized the Animal Services staff for their work, and stated that the Animal Services team operates as a small but highly effective unit. He explained that Animal Services staff includes one shelter coordinator, two assistants, an Animal Services supervisor, and seven Animal

Services officers responsible for field operations. In addition, the county benefits from partnership with the State prison system, through which six offenders assist with daily animal care. Veterinary services are also provided through a contracted veterinarian. Although staff is performing commendable work, continued population growth has outpaced current resources. As a result, additional physical capacity in the form of a larger shelter or adoption center, as well as increased staffing, is needed to meet service demands.

Mr. Fouts noted that the Board of Commissioners has authorized staff to begin transitioning Animal Services toward a more independent structure, as it has historically been coupled with the prison. As part of the transition, the County intends to hire an Animal Services Director, with the position to be advertised this summer. He explained that Animal Services will evolve into a standalone department over time, with reduced reliance on the partnership with the prison. In addition, an Animal Adoption Center is being planned as a separate function from the animal intake facility. During the 2025 SPLOST referendum process, Animal Services capacity was identified as a need. The County currently operates the only animal shelter in the county, as municipalities do not maintain their own shelters, though Intergovernmental Agreements are in place with those jurisdictions. The participating municipalities were supportive of allocating SPLOST funding toward the project, and early projections estimated the cost of constructing an Adoption Center at \$3.7 million. However, through the planning process, it became apparent that the specialized design and construction requirements of an Animal Adoption Center substantially increase project costs. As a result, updated estimates indicate that the project could cost nearly \$10 million. To further evaluate the project, the County engaged the architectural firm of Gardner, Spencer, Smith, Tench and Jarbeau along with Animal Arts Architecture out of Colorado, who specialize in the design of animal shelters, to refine the project scope and cost estimates. Staff believes that costs can be reduced through partnerships with the Department of Corrections (DOC), including the use of their mobile construction inmate crew, as well as County in-house resources (Public Works). Based upon these efforts, staff estimates that the project potentially could be completed in the range of \$6 million to \$7 million. He further explained that staff has evaluated several options for addressing the project's funding shortfall. After reviewing those alternatives, staff believes that the most practical approach is to incorporate the additional funding needed for the Animal Adoption Center into the proposed new Government Center bond issuance.

Mr. Fouts noted that the current location of the Animal Shelter on Selt Road does not provide sufficient room for future expansion. Therefore, staff evaluated multiple alternative sites and ultimately identified a tract consisting of 44± acres as the preferred location. The County was able to negotiate favorable terms with the property owner to acquire the site. While portions of the property are located within a floodplain and include a pond that is 5± acres in size, the proposed plan is to locate the Animal Adoption Center on the northern portion of the site near the railroad corridor behind the Fire Rescue

Headquarters. The remaining acreage will be developed as a passive park for public use. The concept would allow residents and visitors to interact with adoptable animals in a more natural setting, including opportunities to walk animals and assess compatibility with their own pets. The plan is to create a more welcoming and adoption-focused environment, which is expected to increase adoption rates and help reduce the number of animals remaining at the Shelter.

Mr. Fouts provided a proposed site plan and noted that the County received some grant funding to assist with development of the passive park. He also explained that the design has been refined through public input and consultation with Animal Arts. He noted that the original concept that consisted of 11,000 square feet was redesigned to a more efficient 9,000 square foot facility while maintaining the project's intended purpose. He emphasized that the design is intended to create a quieter, more comfortable environment for animals and visitors, improve adoption opportunities, and minimize impacts on neighboring properties. In addition, the facility will provide opportunities for volunteer and community involvement.

In response to a question from Vice-Chair Phillips regarding surgical services, Mr. Fouts explained that the proposed facility will serve as an Adoption Center only and will not replace the existing intake facility. Intake, medical treatment, and surgical procedures will continue to take place at the current Animal Services facility. Once animals are ready for adoption, they will be transferred to the new Adoption Center.

In response to a question from Authority member Swope regarding the "catio" shown on the site plan, Mr. Fouts explained that the feature is an outdoor patio area designed specifically for cats. The design was recommended by Animal Arts to provide natural sunlight and enrichment for cats. He also noted that although the County's cat population remains relatively low because of the success of the spay and neuter program, space has been incorporated into the Adoption Center to accommodate cats and support their well-being.

Mr. Fouts explained that the animal housing areas are designed with separate compartments for living and restroom purposes. The dual-compartment configuration allows animals to maintain a cleaner living environment, helping to reduce stress, improve overall comfort, and create a more positive environment for prospective adopters.

In response to a question from Chairman Bennett regarding the handling of nontraditional animals/pets, Mr. Fouts explained that Animal Services maintains temporary accommodations at the current facility, and has experience caring for animals such as chickens, goats, and horses. The staff works with Code Enforcement and community partners to identify appropriate temporary or permanent placements for such animals. In addition, County staff coordinates with other agencies, as needed, based upon the circumstances, but these incidents are relatively infrequent.

Chairman Bennett noted that Animal Services was a significant topic during the SPLOST campaign and received considerable public attention. There is strong community support for the project, and she expects many citizens will be pleased with the project.

Mr. Fouts noted that site selection was a key consideration for the project, with an emphasis placed on visibility and accessibility. Unfortunately, many residents are unaware of the current Animal Services facility and animals are often adopted from organizations other than the County Shelter. The more prominent location is intended to increase public awareness and utilization of the facility. While the project costs are higher than first estimated, it is expected to serve as a long-term asset to the county. He further noted that the initial design included a higher number of kennels; however, that number was reduced during the design process. Providing too many kennels and housing too many animals in a single facility can create operational and welfare challenges. The final design reflects a more balanced approach to capacity and animal management.

In response to a question from Authority member Swope, Mr. Fouts explained that the project timeline includes approximately three (3) months for design work with the architectural teams, followed by an extended construction and permitting period because of the specialized mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and material requirements associated with the project. These requirements, including extensive washdown systems and double interior finishes, result in a longer and more complex construction process than a typical building. Based upon the current schedule, the projected opening date is March 2028, with the understanding that this timeline may shift depending on project development and permitting. Although the issuance of the bonds will initiate the formal project timeline, he emphasized the importance of obtaining hard construction bids prior to finalizing project funding with the intent that the use of County reserves will not be needed to complete construction.

In response to a question from Vice-Chair Phillips, Mr. Fouts explained that the Government Center and the Animal Adoption Center will be bid as two separate projects, with the possibility of using the same or different contractors. He further explained that the Animal Adoption Center construction is a specialized field and may require contractors with specific experience. He noted that the design and budgeting process for the Adoption Center will follow a "good, better, best" approach to ensure alignment between the scope and available funding, with an emphasis on establishing a clear budget early in the process to guide decision-making. He noted that Animal Arts has experience managing similar projects and identifying cost-effective construction approaches. In addition, staff will continue to work closely with the Department of Corrections (DOC), which has expressed preliminary support for assisting with the project pending formal approval. He cited the Eric Minix Canine Facility, constructed for the Sheriff's Office approximately a year and a half ago, as an example of prior successful collaboration with the DOC. He noted that if that project had been bid through traditional means, costs would likely have exceeded \$2

million; however, the project was completed at approximately \$1 million or less. He emphasized that this approach demonstrated significant value and cost savings, and continued coordination between the DOC and the general contractor will be important in delivering similar efficiencies on future projects.

There were no further questions from the Authority.

6. **Request Approval/Execution of a Resolution Authorizing Issuance of Future Revenue Bonds for the Coweta County Government Center and the Coweta County Animal Adoption Center**

Administrator Fouts noted that the next item on the agenda is consideration of a resolution authorizing the process related to the issuance of the bonds. He explained that the Board of Commissioners has recently executed a related resolution, and the Public Facilities Authority's role is to adopt a similar resolution authorizing staff to continue to work with the architects, bond counsel, and underwriter to advance the project. He clarified that the resolution does not approve the actual issuance of bonds at this stage, but rather authorizes continued planning and coordination necessary to move the project forward.

In response to a question from Chairman Bennett, Mr. Fouts explained that the resolution before the Authority is an authorizing resolution to allow the project to move forward in its planning and coordination phase. No actual bond issuance is being approved at this time. It is anticipated that formal consideration and approval of the bond issuance is expected to occur in June or July.

Vice-Chair Phillips requested that the word "future" be inserted in the language in the minutes from the meeting to more clearly reflect the intent of the Authority's action. The current language could be interpreted as committing to a bond issuance at this time, and he requested that the minutes reflect that no final decision regarding issuance of the bonds is being made during this meeting.

In response to a question from Chairman Bennett, Mr. Fouts explained that there is only one (1) resolution for consideration by the Authority. The additional resolution included in the agenda packet was provided for reference only, as it reflects the action previously taken by the Board of Commissioners.

Motion to: Execute

The Authority voted to execute a Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Future Revenue Bonds associated with financing for the new Coweta County Government Center and for the new Coweta County Animal Adoption Center.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Don Phillips

SECONDER: David Fowler

AYES: Cynthia Bennett, Don Phillips, Kelvin Thompson, David Fowler, Steve Swope

7. Discuss the Next Public Facilities Authority Meeting

Administrator Fouts and Assistant Administrator Mickle advised that the meeting to consider approval of the final bond issuance is anticipated to occur in June or July. Staff will provide any supporting documentation to Authority members as it becomes available.

Because a specific meeting date was yet to be determined, it was the consensus of the Authority for staff to distribute potential dates via email once additional information is available, rather than scheduling the next meeting at this time.

In response to a question from Chairman Bennett, Mr. Fouts noted that the third-quarter update regarding the Animal Adoption Center project would be available within the same timeframe. Both the Government Center and Animal Adoption Center matters will be discussed at the Authority's next meeting, whenever that date is determined.

Chairman Bennett announced that the National Civics Bee Regional Competition would be held tonight at the Donald W. Nixon Centre through a partnership between the Coweta County School System and the Chamber of Commerce. She noted that 141 eighth-grade students submitted essays addressing community concerns, representing an increase from 117 submissions the previous year. Georgia ranked second nationally in total submissions among all 50 states. The top 25 students were recognized last week, and the top 20 students are scheduled to compete in the regional competition tonight at 6:00 p.m. She explained that the topics are very interesting and explained that when the competition is completed, she would like to send some of the essays to the County and the various municipalities.

Adjournment

Motion to: Adjourn

The Authority voted to adjourn the meeting.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Steve Swope

SECONDER: Cynthia Bennett

AYES: Cynthia Bennett, Don Phillips, Kelvin Thompson, David Fowler, Steve Swope