

In the Matter Of:

RE: ATLANTA – DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

PLANNING MEETING

February 02, 2021



ESQUIRE
DEPOSITION SOLUTIONS

800.211.DEPO (3376)
EsquireSolutions.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIPT OF
GMT20210129-190252_Developmen_gvo_1280x720

IN RE: ATLANTA – DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

DATE RECORDED: 2/2/2021

Job #: J6605926

R E C O R D I N G

1
2 TIFFANI COPE: Well, good day, everyone, and thank you
3 for joining today's call. I'm Tiffani Cope with the Business
4 Operations team with the Department of City Planning, and we
5 welcome you to today's meeting. This meeting will be recorded.
6 First, I would like to acknowledge any council members or other
7 city officials we may have with us today. Are there any?

8 MATT WESTMORELAND: Matt Westmoreland is here, and you
9 have unmuted me. I enjoyed watching your last meeting and good
10 to be back for a drama-free meeting this time.

11 TIFFANI COPE: Yes, indeed. Thank you so much for
12 joining us today.

13 MATT WESTMORELAND: Sure thing.

14 TIFFANI COPE: Okay, Madam Chair, you may proceed when
15 ready.

16 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay. Thank you, Tiffani. Matt,
17 good to see slash hear from you. Good afternoon. Today's
18 Friday, January 29, 2021. I'd like to thank you for tuning into
19 the city of Atlanta Development Impact Fee Advisory Committee
20 virtual meeting, rescheduled from January 20 , 2021. My name is
21 Malloy Peterson and I'm chair of the committee. This is a five-
22 member advisory committee appointed by the mayor and the Atlanta
23 City Council. The purpose of the Development Impact Fee
24 Advisory Committee, pursuant to the city of Atlanta Code of
25 Ordinances Part 3, Part 6, Chapter 4, and Section 6-5008 is as

1 follows:

2 First, to serve in an advisory capacity to assist and
3 advise the Atlanta City Council with regard to the adoption of
4 an amendment to the city's development impact fee ordinance, or
5 any new development impact fee ordinance. Second, to receive
6 the annual report as required by OCGA 36-71-8D2, and if
7 warranted upon review of the annual report, submit a written
8 report to the Atlanta City Council of any perceived inequities
9 in the expenditure of impact fees collected for roads, streets,
10 bridges, including rights of way, traffic signals, landscaping,
11 or any local components of state or federal highways. And
12 third, pursuant to OCGA 36-71-5C, no action of the committee, no
13 action of the committee shall be considered a necessary
14 prerequisite for action by the Atlanta City Council in regard to
15 the adoption of a development impact fee ordinance.

16 Until further note, the meetings of the City of
17 Atlanta Development Impact Fee Advisory Committee will meet
18 virtually via Zoom. We ask for your patience in the event of
19 any technical difficulties that may cause committee members to
20 experience a lost or interrupted connection. Staff is muted on
21 microphones and we ask that all participants remain muted for
22 the duration of the meeting unless you have been recognized by
23 the chair. This will minimize background noise and feedback and
24 ensure that all participants can hear comments clearly. For the
25 benefit of anyone whose called in, I will ask committee members

1 to please identify yourselves each time you speak, make or
2 second a motion, or vote. Public comment received via the
3 COAimpactfees@atlantaga.gov mailbox received up to one hour
4 before each meeting will be read by staff during the public
5 comment period and posted online via the impact fee update
6 webpage. At this point, I will take roll call to confirm a
7 quorum and to call the meeting to order. Jim Brown?

8 JIM BROWN: Yes.

9 MALLORY PETERSON: Jim Brown's present. Rod Teachey?

10 RODERICK TEACHEY: Present.

11 MALLORY PETERSON: Kevin Green?

12 G: Present.

13 MALLORY PETERSON: Stacey McCoy?

14 STACEY MCCOY: Present.

15 MALLORY PETERSON: And Malloy Peterson, present. With
16 five members present, we do have a quorum and we will proceed to
17 the meeting. A copy of the agenda for today's website meeting
18 was sent to committee members and can be found on our website.
19 Staff will type the link into the chat. At this time, I will
20 entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

21 RODERICK TEACHEY: So moved.

22 MALLORY PETERSON: Rod, when you guys say anything,
23 will you say your name first? Sorry.

24 RODERICK TEACHEY: Yeah. I'm sorry. Rod Teachey. So
25 moved.

1 STACEY MCCOY: Stacey McCoy; second.

2 MALLORY PETERSON: Thank you. Seeing as we have a
3 second, we'll take a vote on the approval of the agenda. Jim
4 Brown? Jim, do you approve the agenda?

5 JIM BROWN: I approve the agenda, yes.

6 MALLORY PETERSON: Rod Teachey?

7 RODERICK TEACHEY: Approve.

8 MALLORY PETERSON: Kevin Green?

9 G: Approve.

10 MALLORY PETERSON: And Malloy Peterson. I vote yea.

11 The motion carries with a vote of five yeas and zero nays.

12 Next, I'll entertain a motion to adopt the December 16, 2020
13 member minutes. Is there a motion?

14 G: Kevin Green. So moved.

15 STACEY MCCOY: Stacey McCoy; second.

16 MALLORY PETERSON: Seeing that we have a second we
17 will take a vote on approval of the December 16, 2020 meeting
18 minutes. Jim Brown? Jim Brown, yea or [inaudible] --

19 JIM BROWN: Yea.

20 MALLORY PETERSON: -- notes? Okay. Roger Teachey?

21 RODERICK TEACHEY: Approve.

22 MALLORY PETERSON: Kevin Green?

23 G: Approve.

24 MALLORY PETERSON: Stacey McCoy?

25 STACEY MCCOY: Approved.

1 MALLORY PETERSON: And Malloy Peterson; vote yea. The
2 motion carries with five yes, zero nays. Now staff will read
3 the public comment received via the COA Impact Fees' mailbox.

4 TIFFANI COPE: Thank you. Our first public comment
5 comes from Miss Tiffany Hogan [ph] with DR Horton and it reads
6 as follows:

7 Dear Commissioner Kean [ph] and committee members, as
8 a committed development partner in the city of Atlanta, any
9 changes to policies and ordinances that affect building and
10 development are critically important to us. We appreciate the
11 months of research via the impact fee study and the
12 opportunities made available by the committee builders,
13 developers, and community members to have input during this
14 process. As the committee intends to vote and submit final
15 recommendations to the city council for consideration, we want
16 to ensure that the below key items are defined and addressed in
17 those recommendations:

18 Implementation and fee structure. We recommend the
19 committee considered a phased-in incremental increase of 20%
20 each year over the next five years. There have been no
21 increases to impact fees in nearly 30 years. Therefore, while a
22 two-year phased-in as currently recommended is appreciated, a
23 five-year phase-in is much more practical. Additionally, with
24 the city also considering changes to the tree protection
25 ordinances, storm water fees and residential design standards,

1 builders and developers must not only consider the effect of an
2 impact fee increase, but the others previously listed as well.

3 Housing affordability. As discussed above, the city
4 of Atlanta is currently considering changes to impact fees, tree
5 protection ordinances, storm water fees, and residential design
6 standards. These all contribute to the increase cost of
7 construction and are essentially counter to the city's
8 affordable housing efforts. Therefore, serious consideration
9 should be given to provide 100% exception for all residential
10 units, rather for sale or rental.

11 Effective date. Staff should recommend a date not
12 less than six months from the adoption date of the ordinance for
13 the ordinance to take effect.

14 Grandfather clause. Consider a grandfather clause for
15 any projects already zoned or for which a re-zoning application
16 has been filed before the effective date of the impact fee
17 ordinance where the fees will be vested under the city's current
18 fee structure.

19 Again, we appreciate the committee's significant time
20 invested in research regarding an increase in impact fees, the
21 transparency in the process, and the opportunity for builder,
22 developer, and community input. We hope that consideration will
23 be given to our above recommendations. We look forward to
24 continuing to be a key partner in the development of the city of
25 Atlanta.

1 Our next public comment comes from Mr. Michael Paris
2 [ph] and Joseph Santaro [ph] with the Council for Quality
3 Growth.

4 Dear Commissioner Kean and committee members, the
5 Council for Quality Growth is a not-for-profit trade association
6 representing over 300 companies comprised of architects,
7 attorneys, contractors, developers, engineers, financial
8 executives with a vested interest in quality, growth, and
9 development in the city of Atlanta. The Council for Quality
10 Growth appreciates the opportunity to engage with the city of
11 Atlanta since the inception of the Development Impact Fee
12 Advisory Committee. We submitted our preliminary feedback from
13 our membership on the updated impact fee structure on March 11,
14 2020 and the impact it will have on quality growth within the
15 city of Atlanta. Alongside this letter, the March 2020 letter
16 has also been attached as well for your reference.

17 Since then, we have spoken informally with the city
18 administrators about our concerns with the proposed impact fee
19 study recommendations and continue to obtain feedback from our
20 membership. As DIFAC is aiming to take a vote on final
21 recommendations, we appreciate the changes the committee is
22 considering, and our organization is grateful for the
23 opportunity to formally submit our final comments for
24 consideration:

25 Implementation. Consider a phased-in approach

1 incrementally over three years with a 25% increase per year.
2 the Council for Quality Growth recommends phasing in the impact
3 fee increase incrementally over three years to match the rate of
4 inflation from 1993 to 2021, which is currently at 80.26%. That
5 would reflect a 25% increase in impact fees per year over the
6 next three years and one additional 25% increase in the fourth
7 year. We appreciate the staff's recommendation, but consider
8 this phased-in approach much more amendable after a 30-year
9 period with no increases.

10 Grace Period and Grandfather Clause. Provide a six-
11 month grace period upon adoption of the impact fee ordinance for
12 residential and commercial developers that have already invested
13 in the city but did not account for the financial burden on
14 increased impact fee expenses. Consider a grandfather clause
15 for any projects that have been zoned or have filed for a permit
16 with the Office of Planning and Zoning within the prior 12
17 months or have filed for rezoning before the adoption date of
18 the impact fees be vested under the city's current impact fee
19 structure.

20 Housing Affordability. Provide a 100% exemption for
21 affordable housing rental units to match the for-sale units and
22 economic development exemptions. The Council for Quality Growth
23 supports Atlanta's efforts to mitigate the affordable housing
24 crisis and the increased demand for housing. Local regulations,
25 such impact fees, tree protection ordinances, storm water fees,

1 residential design standards all contribute to the increased
2 cost of construction, making it financially infeasible to build
3 affordable housing developments, and consequently decrease the
4 supply of housing.

5 We continue to have concerns from our office and
6 commercial development members regarding the changes to remove
7 the tiered sliding scale-based structure. The city's current
8 impact fee structure for office and commercial has a sliding
9 scale based upon square feet. This structure has worked well in
10 the past and the sliding scale is commensurate with the
11 economics of individual projects. The Council for Quality
12 Growth applauds all efforts from the city of Atlanta and the
13 Development Impact Fee Advisory Committee to update the city of
14 Atlanta's impact fees. The Council for Quality Growth continues
15 to stand ready to serve as a resource to the city to incorporate
16 a revised impact fee structure that does not infringe on quality
17 development within the city of Atlanta.

18 And our final public comment comes from Mr. Cory Dill
19 [ph] with the Greater Atlanta Home Builders Association, and it
20 reads as follows:

21 Dear Advisory Committee, the Greater Atlanta Home
22 Builder Association has been closely monitoring the discussions
23 and recommendations from this committee regarding the city of
24 Atlanta's impact fee update. With the understanding of the need
25 for an administrative change due to COVID-19, we greatly

1 appreciate the city of Atlanta's Development Impact Fee Advisory
2 Committee council members and commissioner Tim Kean [ph] for
3 allowing builders, developers, and community members to provide
4 input on the proposed impact fee change. As such, GABA
5 recommends the following recommendations for consideration:

6 1. The fee increase should take a gradual approach
7 of phasing in over five years instead of the recommended two
8 years with a 20% increase each year.

9 2. Ensure that the single-family the housing can
10 take advantage of the opportunity for a waiver.

11 3. Ensure the term used for affordable can be used
12 with single-family housing and not based on the low-income
13 housing tax credit or other programs that is not used for
14 single-family development. The definition should be based on
15 the sale prices of the house, which the city can verify.

16 4. Consider a grandfather clause for any projects
17 already zoned or for which a rezone and application has been
18 filed for the effective date of the impact fees where the fees
19 will be vested under the city's current fee structure. And --

20 5. Staff should recommend a date no less than six
21 months from the adoption date of the ordinance for the ordinance
22 to take effect. The Greater Atlanta Home Builders Association
23 appreciates the city of Atlanta's Development Impact Fee
24 Advisory Committee's willingness to consider our recommendations
25 that impact our members and their customers and for considering

1 recommendations on effective processes and procedures that we
2 feel will move Atlanta forward as housing demand increases.

3 6. As the city continues to increase impact fees,
4 expenses associated with the tree ordinance and other fees that
5 impact our residential construction costs, we ask that they all
6 be considered as a whole rather than individually in order to gain
7 a clear picture of their combined impacts on the cost of
8 constructing a residence.

9 And, Madame Chair, that concludes all public comments.
10 Thank you.

11 MALLORY PETERSON: Thank you. So, next on our agenda,
12 I will read the comments from the Department of Community
13 Affairs DCA and the Atlanta Regional Commission ARC related to
14 the October 2020 Impact Fee Study draft, and a member of staff
15 will read the recommended responses. We will allow for comments
16 from committee members. So, the first DCA comment is a required
17 revision.

18 Please attach the schedule of improvements that was
19 submitted within the 2020 city of Atlanta annual CIE update
20 to the CIE amendment document.

21 Advisory revision. On page 9 OCGA Section 32-124,
22 highways bridges and ferries is cited to define public road.
23 Citing the Georgia code of public transportation in discussion
24 of development impact fees may be confusing since the code
25 section cited clearly states that the definition is only

1 applicable to Title 32. The Development Impact Fee Act, DIFA,
2 is found in Title 36 of OCGA 36-71-1. DIFA specifies what can
3 and cannot be funded and provides its own set of definitions.
4 As presented, this paragraph may be unintentionally misleading,
5 as it indicates impact fees can fund all improvements contained
6 in the definition cited in the text. We recommend removing this
7 paragraph of changing its focus to reference, the definition
8 provided for DIFA. And for all services except for parks and
9 recreations, we recommend affirmatively stating that the future
10 level of service is intended to maintain the current level of
11 service.

12 TIFFANI COPE: Alright. Thank you, Madam Chair.
13 Regarding DCA's comments to attach the CIE, we have complied and
14 amended our draft submission to include the CIE Schedule of
15 Improvements, as required. Concerning DCA's advisory comments
16 to remove Georgia code section 32's definition of public road
17 and to clarify future level of service, we again have complied
18 and informed DCA that we will make these recommended changes on
19 the final draft of the impact fee study update. Our responses
20 were accepted by DCA, and in turn, I am pleased to announce we
21 did receive approval from DCA to move forward towards adoption
22 with the update. Thank you.

23 MALLORY PETERSON: Thanks. Are there any comments
24 from committee members? And if so, when you have a comment,
25 please click on Participants at the bottom of the screen to use

1 the raise hand feature if you'd like to be recognized to speak.
2 Okay. Our next agenda item relates to a vote on final
3 recommendations or required changes to the draft impact fee
4 study and ordinance update. Members have received a copy of
5 these in advance and are prepared to discuss the final draft and
6 take a vote on recommendations. I will read the recommendations
7 that are up for a vote. We will open up for comments from
8 committee members and then take a vote on the recommended
9 response. Recommendation number one: the preferred timeline to
10 implement any fee changes associated with development impact
11 fees. The current recommendation is six months from the date of
12 adoption. Are there any comments from committee members? If
13 so, please click on Participants to use the raise hand feature
14 found at the bottom of your screen if you'd like to be
15 recognized to speak.

16 G: Yeah, this is Kevin. I don't see the raise hand
17 thing, but I'm not technically adept. Can I just talk?

18 MALLORY PETERSON: Sure.

19 G: Alright, thanks. Before we get into the
20 recommendations, can the staff please explain the process that
21 was gone through to develop staff recommendations, how they were
22 developed, how they were vetted within the city? You know, what
23 was the process of doing that, both within Department of
24 Planning and outside with other departments?

25 TIFFANI COPE: Thank you, Kevin. Kim, are you

1 available to speak in depth about the surveys that were
2 conducted?

3 KIM TALLON: Excuse me. Kimberly Tallon, Department
4 of City Planning. We put forth a couple of surveys that allowed
5 input from the public from various factors of the city of
6 Atlanta. We compiled those responses and put forth
7 recommendations based on the replies that we got, also
8 internally with departments that are part of managing the impact
9 fee program. Does that kind of help in regards to how we got to
10 the staff recommendations, or do you need anything further?

11 G: Yeah. I mean, I just was curious, I mean, how they
12 were developed and who did it. I'm not sure if you can give me
13 any more information on that. I know there was requests made
14 for public comment but, you know, were they shopped around with
15 Invest Atlanta and others as applicable, or did they stay within
16 Department of Planning? Or how did that work?

17 KIM TALLON: Not we definitely did include Invest
18 Atlanta, definitely the builder community, the residential
19 community, and general public as well -- and our partner
20 agencies throughout the city.

21 G: Okay.

22 MALLORY PETERSON: In terms of the schedule, we'll
23 have a recommendation. Each one we can discuss. We could just
24 take a vote if we have no discussion, but each one we can
25 discuss. But we take a vote on the recommendation if it were to

1 say "not passed", then they would note our comments that we've
2 made in the discussion period. We wouldn't take a different
3 vote, according to my understanding. Is that correct, Tiffani?
4 Okay. Alright. So, I'll read recommendation number 1 again,
5 and it's regarding the preferred timeline to implement any fee
6 changes associated with development impact fees. So, the
7 recommendation is the timeline to be six months from the date of
8 adoption. So, we'll now -- if there's no other comment, we'll
9 no vote on recommendation number 1.

10 RODERICK TEACHEY: Hold on. Sorry. I had my hand
11 raised. I'm not sure if you [inaudible] --

12 MALLORY PETERSON: Oh.

13 RODERICK TEACHEY: -- but I would like to comment on
14 this recommendation.

15 MALLORY PETERSON: Go ahead.

16 RODERICK TEACHEY: So, the challenge with this is that
17 there would be deals in the pipeline or deals in the pipeline
18 that have been previously filed for permits based on the old
19 development fees, which would therefore have those projections
20 of those development costs based on old fees. So, depending on
21 the type of transaction that it is and how tight the financial
22 are on that transaction, our raising fees could potentially deem
23 that transaction no longer financially feasible.

24 And I know we're talking about a six-month period from
25 the time of when the legislation would be passed, but a lot of

1 times these permitting processes drag out and they can go six
2 months, nine months, or even a year. So, I think we have to
3 have some protections for those developments that have filed
4 their development plans and permitting requests based on the
5 current fees and not be impacted by future changes. So, I would
6 recommend we have some type of callback grandfather clause where
7 -- I would think six months should be reasonable, but I would
8 certainly like to see if any of the other committee members have
9 any comments on that.

10 MALLORY PETERSON: Yeah, Rod. Malloy Peterson. I
11 very much noted in the comments prior -- the public comment
12 prior to our discussion and also just people who've been
13 reaching out that that continues to come up. I think the way
14 we're tackling it is, we're tackling all of it with giving six
15 months. Personally, I think it's hard to say just because
16 you've rezoned your grandfathered, but I do think if you've put
17 in for permit it may be a six-month delay or if you're in for
18 permit -- because if you're in for permit then it takes longer
19 than that.

20 So, I agree with you, Rod, that this could potentially
21 have something added onto it that says, "You're grandfathered if
22 you're in for permit." What does the rest of the group think
23 about that?

24 G: This is Kevin. I'm gonna -- I got a comment on
25 this and I guess the next one, in sort of anticipating the

1 extended phase-in. And just some thoughts on this from my
2 perspective. These are impact fees, and they're meant to offset
3 the strain on public infrastructure and services,
4 transportation, parks, police, fire. This caused by new
5 development. I think we're all aware that these fees haven't
6 been raised in almost three decades. So, the goal is to catch
7 up where developers are paying their fair share on the impact on
8 public infrastructure and services that new development is
9 causing. Meanwhile, you know, we've got city which, you know,
10 basically has got fees, in many cases, half of what a developer
11 would pay to put the exact same project in a neighboring
12 jurisdiction or a peer jurisdiction. That's through no fault of
13 their own. They're paying what the city said to pay.

14 So, I'm feeling there's a fiduciary duty to taxpayers
15 here. Either developers pay a fair share, or the city taxpayers
16 pay. But somebody's paying. Well, and then I guess the other
17 thought is, this committee has been meeting for, what, a year a
18 half just on getting as far as we've gotten. You'd kinda have
19 to be sitting under a rock somewhere to not know how the winds
20 are blowing in terms of an increased impact fees. So, I just
21 question the need for grandfathering and extended phase-in
22 beyond what is recommended in the staff recommendations, in
23 terms of the public interest in deferring and grandfathering.
24 Unless we're talking about a specific class of projects, i.e.
25 affordable projects, which is, I know, another conversation.

1 RODERICK TEACHEY: It's Rod Teachey. If I could just
2 respond to that. So, thanks, Kevin. What you're saying makes
3 sense. I certainly agree with you with respect to the
4 affordable housing developments. But I do feel that other
5 developments could be equally impacted and that may not have the
6 same or magnitude on the financial fees ability of those
7 projects. And, again, developments have been planned and
8 structured to cover a certain fee. So, we're almost kinda
9 pushing back the goalpost on these developments that are already
10 in the process, and I just think that's fair.

11 MALLORY PETERSON: Since we're talking about the two
12 together, because I think they do go together. Malloy Peterson.
13 I apologize; I'm not following my own rules. But I'm sort of
14 50/50 in terms of I do think most of these deals could figure it
15 out in the six-month period of time. So, I think we're very
16 close on that one. It does not worry me as much. But I would
17 say I've had in the order of, you know, organizations
18 representing hundreds and thousands of people who continue to
19 talk about a five-year timeframe, which I think is too long, but
20 I do think the two-year timeframe -- I would love to see that be
21 three years -- a three-year timeframe instead of two years.

22 And, really, you know, on the whole, I think all of
23 these recommendations generally are there, are just right
24 really, really close. But when you're thinking of the big
25 developers and their fees, you may think, "Well, everybody can

1 handle this", but I would argue -- and maybe Jim you could
2 comment on this -- [inaudible] Grove is certainly all over this
3 and home builders, but I personally do not see that even though
4 we're having all these meetings -- first it's been during the
5 year with COVID and every other thing that comes with that. The
6 organization, we've been very transparent, but I do think that
7 there are plenty of deals out there that are underwritten that
8 have not taken this into account. So, I just think a three-year
9 period would be more appropriate, and that is from just -- I
10 haven't really personally gotten that much pushback. I think
11 the development community says, "We get this. We are going to
12 pay more. We're not gonna go against paying more, but that is a
13 lot of increase in a two-year period", so...

14 STACEY MCCOY: I agree with Kevin that the taxpayers
15 should not have the burden, that they've had the burden for the
16 last 30 years. But I can see the three-year phase-in approach.
17 I think doing a hybrid of both of these should help the
18 developers as well as the taxpayer's recouping their fair share.

19 MALLORY PETERSON: Thanks, Stacey. Jim, do you have
20 anything on you'd like to add? Okay. Is there any more comment
21 on recommendation number 1? And then Tiffani just asked sort of
22 a point of clarification. We are only going to vote yea or nay
23 on these. And then, is it correct that any discussion we have
24 will just go along to council and any of the other committees
25 and whatnot in terms of what our general comments were?

1 TIFFANI COPE: Yes, that's correct.

2 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay. Alright. So, I'll read it
3 one last time. Recommendation one regarding the preferred
4 timeline to implement any fee changes associated with
5 development impact fees. The current recommendation is six
6 months from the date of adoption. We'll now vote on
7 recommendation number 1. Jim Brown? You there Jim? Alright.
8 Kevin Green?

9 G: Approve.

10 MALLORY PETERSON: Rod Teachey.

11 RODERICK TEACHEY: Approve.

12 MALLORY PETERSON: Stacey McCoy?

13 STACEY MCCOY: Approve.

14 MALLORY PETERSON: And I'm Malloy Peterson; vote yea.
15 So, the recommendation carries with four yeas and zero nays. On
16 recommendation two. This is regarding the preferred method to
17 implement the new fee structure. The current recommendation is
18 to phase-in over two years with three increases over the two-
19 year timeframe. Is there any comment from committee members?
20 Okay. So, we'll now vote on recommendation number 2. Kevin
21 Green?

22 G: I would vote approve of number two as written.

23 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay. Rod Teachey?

24 RODERICK TEACHEY: I don't approve.

25 MALLORY PETERSON: Jim Brown? Oh, sorry, Rod. Keep

1 going.

2 RODERICK TEACHEY: Am I allowed to give comment or I
3 just -- is it yea or nay at this point?

4 MALLORY PETERSON: Let's just say yea or nay now and
5 then --

6 RODERICK TEACHEY: Good. It's a nay.

7 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay. Jim Brown? Okay. Stacey
8 McCoy?

9 STACEY MCCOY: Approve.

10 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay. And I'm Malloy Peterson;
11 vote nay. So, the recommendation does not carry. Sorry. No,
12 we have two nays and two yes. Right? Guys, I'm sorry. I have
13 a little COVID brain still. My apologies. Jim, would you like
14 to -- are you still there to go to vote on this one? Okay. So,
15 I guess it's -- recommendation is a tie with two yeas and two
16 nays? Rod, do you want to add on your committee?

17 RODERICK TEACHEY: Yes. I agree with your comments
18 earlier that we should extend that to three years as opposed to
19 two years.

20 MALLORY PETERSON: That would be my comment as well.
21 Okay. Regarding recommendation number 3, how should we deal
22 with near term projects in progress that may be financially
23 impacted by rate changes? The current recommendation is no
24 special guidelines are needed due to the recommended six-month
25 grace period from the date of adoption. Are there any comments

1 from committee members?

2 RODERICK TEACHEY: Yes. As I stated earlier, I do
3 think there should be a grandfather clause and, at a minimum,
4 should apply to affordable housing developments because they are
5 significantly impacted by any type of increase in cost such that
6 this would cost.

7 MALLORY PETERSON: And, Rod, what would you say that
8 your suggestion is? Your --

9 RODERICK TEACHEY: My suggestion would be that any
10 development that is -- has [inaudible] actual permits for a
11 specific development within six months prior to the adoption
12 would also be exempt.

13 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay.

14 G: Madam Chair, this is Kevin. Can I just ask a quick
15 question here?

16 MALLORY PETERSON: Sure.

17 G: Well, I assume you up or down the recommendations
18 as they've been provided and then there's a separate
19 conversation around other proposed amendments that may modify
20 those? That the way we're gonna proceed?

21 MALLORY PETERSON: Yeah, that's -- Tiffani, yeah. So,
22 my understanding from my conversation with Tiffani before is
23 that our vote and our comment will be heard by people like
24 councilmember Westmoreland as they take this up in
25 consideration. So, I guess our vote will be yea or nay with

1 notes on the discussion that's with it.

2 TIFFANI COPE: Yes, that's correct.

3 MALLORY PETERSON: Alright. So, recommendation number
4 3. We'll vote on it. Noting Rod's comments we are voting only
5 on the current recommendation, no special guidelines are needed
6 due to recommended six-month grace period from date of adoption.
7 We'll now vote for recommendation number 3. Rod Teachey?

8 RODERICK TEACHEY: Nay.

9 MALLORY PETERSON: Kevin Green?

10 G: Yea.

11 MALLORY PETERSON: Jim Brown? Stacey McCoy?

12 STACEY MCCOY: Approve.

13 MALLORY PETERSON: I, Malloy Peterson, will vote yea.
14 The recommendation carries with three yes, one nay. So,
15 recommendation number 4 -- and it will be noted Rod's suggestion
16 surrounding affordable housing. Recommendation number four.
17 This is in regard to preferred single-family home SFH rate
18 structure. Rates based on square footage or single flat rate
19 for all single-family homes. The current recommendation -- this
20 is one I know we've talked about a lot -- is for a flat rate fee
21 structure. There any comments from committee members?

22 RODERICK TEACHEY: Rod Teachey. I do think it should
23 be based on square footage. I know there are discussions that,
24 you know, because the cost or the fees are based on impact on
25 the infrastructure, I mean, just common sense. If you have a

1 4,000-square foot house versus a thousand square foot house,
2 you're probably gonna have more people living in that house,
3 you're probably gonna have more cars associated with that house
4 and, therefore, you're gonna have a higher level of usage of
5 utilities. So, I think it should be based on square footage and
6 not a flat fee per house.

7 G: This is Kevin. I'm wondering if the staff can give
8 us some background on why the staff recommendation broke the way
9 it did.

10 MALLORY PETERSON: Yeah. And also, I'm gonna jump in
11 here because I remember in our last discussion of this you all -
12 - and maybe -- Tiffany and Kim, I don't know which one of you
13 wanna chime in on this -- but I know you gave an example of what
14 the spread would be, and it was something like a hundred
15 dollars. And so, if you can add that to your answer.

16 STACEY MCCOY: I'm sorry. I was actually working to
17 assist Jim back to the meeting, so I did not hear the question.

18 MALLORY PETERSON: Question on that. Jim, did you
19 lose your connection?

20 JIM BROWN: Yeah.

21 STACEY MCCOY: He's back now.

22 MALLORY PETERSON: Should we allow Jim to vote on the
23 ones that he missed due to his lost connection? What would be
24 the --

25 STACEY MCCOY: Yes. Yes, please.

1 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay, go ahead and answer that
2 question and we'll go jump back in the --

3 STACEY MCCOY: So, can you repeat the question,
4 please?

5 MALLORY PETERSON: You wanna go, Kevin?

6 G: Yeah. I was just curious. On the recommendation
7 about preferred single-family home rate structure based on
8 square footage or a single flat rate, the city recommended --
9 the staff recommended a flat rate structure. We're just curious
10 as to what the reasoning was with the staff on that
11 recommendation. And then, I'm assuming the revenue is kind of a
12 wash, but Malloy you had a question on that.

13 MALLORY PETERSON: Yeah, I remember -- and when we
14 talked about this before we went through this exact same
15 conversation and I remember you all saying that the difference
16 was somewhere in the range of, like, 100, \$150 max --

17 FEMALE SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

18 MALLORY PETERSON: -- different spread between larger
19 and smaller homes. And so, you all were saying it's so much
20 more expensive to run it in that way. So...

21 KIM TALLON: Yes, that's the correct -- so, because it
22 was not much of a difference in those two options,
23 administratively, the flat rate for single family was easier to
24 manage, especially with considerations down the line that we
25 would come back and revisit the entire program, and that way we

1 can kind of better assess what it would take to offer the multi-
2 tier.

3 MALLORY PETERSON: So, once you assess that, given
4 this committee stay along and that, obviously between the city
5 and council there could be edits to this along the way. Are you
6 all trying to assess that recommendation now at a flat fee or is
7 the recommendation to do that, and potentially, if it's cost-
8 effective to do, to do it on a square foot basis in the future?

9 KIM TALLON: Okay. Can you repeat your question? You
10 kinda lost me there.

11 MALLORY PETERSON: I was saying, um, I think you said
12 something about assessing how difficult it would be to -- if I
13 heard you correctly -- how difficult it would be to do the
14 assessments on a square foot basis?

15 KIM TALLON: Yes.

16 MALLORY PETERSON: One thing I was just throwing out
17 there was, in a year or so would you know -- would you be able
18 to tell us exactly how much more money we could correct or what
19 the differential would be, and then how much it would cost us to
20 collect that money? In case that's an edit we want to make, or
21 council wants to make to the program in a year or further out in
22 the future.

23 KIM TALLON: So, just to kind of put realistic
24 expectation on the timeline, it would be more around three to
25 five years. Because once we've gotten through this current

1 update, we would have to wait until the state does their update.
2 They're in the process of updating the impact fee program
3 overall.

4 And so, once that is complete, then we will be in the
5 position to do the major overhaul of the impact fee program, and
6 at that, we would have information that can kind of assist in
7 that decision on whether or not we need to change from the
8 single rate or the multi-tier. And so, whatever information we
9 can gather along the way to help make that decision, we would
10 definitely make a point to do so. But I don't think a one-year
11 would be a reasonable expectation.

12 MALLORY PETERSON: Yeah, I got it. I guess we'll say,
13 "at some point in the future".

14 KIM TALLON: Absolutely.

15 JIM BROWN: You can't use square footage. I can tell
16 you that. It just...

17 KIM TALLON: You wanna share more, Jim, on that one?

18 JIM BROWN: Well, it's like trying to use square
19 footage to buy a car. It just doesn't make any damn sense. I
20 mean, you know, you can have a house that's 1200 feet that costs
21 \$80 a foot, and you can have a house -- or 2,000 feet and it
22 costs \$80 a foot to buy it. Building -- and I've built a 2,000-
23 foot house that cost \$150 a foot to build. So, how you gonna --
24 it just doesn't work. It's like using zip codes to decide about
25 price point.

1 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay.

2 JIM BROWN: I mean, you can't do it. It's impossible.

3 MALLORY PETERSON: Alright. If there aren't any other
4 comments, let me know. If not, what we'll do is vote for this
5 one then we'll go back since we lost Jim on the connection and
6 we'll have Jim vote back on the three that he missed.
7 [inaudible] last. This is regarding the preferred single-family
8 rate structure discussion of whether it should be based on
9 square foot or single flat rate. The current recommendation
10 that we're voting on is that we will use a flat rate fee
11 structure. So, we'll take a vote on recommendation number 4.
12 Rod Teachey?

13 RODERICK TEACHEY: Nay.

14 MALLORY PETERSON: Jim Brown?

15 G: Jim, you're muted.

16 JIM BROWN: Mute. Nay.

17 MALLORY PETERSON: What'd you say?

18 JIM BROWN: No.

19 MALLORY PETERSON: You don't wanna do flat rate?

20 Okay. Kevin?

21 G: Approve as written. Flat rate.

22 MALLORY PETERSON: Stacey McCoy?

23 STACEY MCCOY: Approve.

24 MALLORY PETERSON: And I, Malloy Peterson, will also
25 vote yea. So, that will be the recommendation carries with

1 three yeas and two nays. Okay, Jim, we will go back very
2 quickly through the ones that you missed, starting with
3 recommendation number 1. There was the discussion over when the
4 preferred the timeline to implement any fee changes should be,
5 and the current recommendation is three months. Excuse me. The
6 current recommendation is six months from the date of adoption.
7 So, what -- you can make some comments if you'd like. We
8 discussed this one and the next one together. But do you vote
9 yea or nay on the recommendation to implement the fee changes
10 six months from the date of adoption?

11 JIM BROWN: I'd vote yea, but you -- how are you gonna
12 deal with people that are already in the system? Are they --

13 MALLORY PETERSON: So, Jim, Rod brought that up and he
14 voted nay. And so, our notification to them would be here, I
15 guess, four yeas, one nay. Our notification would be that we
16 would like to request -- Rod said for them to look into
17 affordable housing -- people who are in for permits for
18 affordable housing, and I mentioned people who are already in
19 for permit. I don't know if there's something else you wanted
20 to add in the comments on that that would be outside of just the
21 straight up six months.

22 JIM BROWN: No, I would agree with that. Anybody
23 that's already in the system has a applied, should --

24 MALLORY PETERSON: For permit.

25 JIM BROWN: Yes.

1 MALLORY PETERSON: For permit. Okay, got it.
2 Alright. Recommendation number two. This was to talk about the
3 method of implementing the fee structure. So, the current
4 recommendation is to phase-in over two years with three
5 increases over that two-year timeframe. We also discussed on
6 this one -- Rod and I both were in favor of a three-year period,
7 and Kevin commented that he thinks it's time to pay fair share
8 and we haven't done that for a long time and that it, you know,
9 doesn't need to be quite as long. So, do you have any comments?

10 JIM BROWN: I would prefer five years. It's taken
11 them 20 years to decide they wanted to raise it. What's the
12 rush?

13 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay. So, your vote is -- we're
14 gonna take your vote now on recommendation number 2, and it is
15 going to be to phase-in over two years with three increases over
16 that two-year timeframe. Yea or nay?

17 JIM BROWN: Nay.

18 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay. So, this one will be three
19 nays, two yeas with notes. And the last one is -- this also
20 kind of goes along with the other two. Recommendation number
21 three. How should we deal with near term projects in progress
22 that may be financially impacted by rate changes? So, the
23 current recommendation is there will not be any special
24 guidelines because they are putting in place the six-month grace
25 period from the date of adoption. This conversation was very

1 similar to the one on recommendation number 1. We all had a
2 similar conversation.

3 JIM BROWN: I mean, I vote -- well, the six-month
4 grace period. It takes nine months to get a permit sometimes.
5 So, you know, I don't think that's -- you gotta allow anybody
6 that's in the system not to be caught in the middle of
7 permitting a job that they budgeted and now, all of a sudden you
8 got a big increase.

9 MALLORY PETERSON: So, how would you vote on
10 recommendation number 3, no special guidelines because of the
11 six-month grace period? Would you vote yea or nay?

12 JIM BROWN: Nay.

13 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay. So, that would carry with
14 three yeas and two nays. Alright. Did we handle that okay,
15 Tiffani? Alright. So, we'll catch up here. We are on
16 recommendation number 5, and that is about what suggestions do
17 you have for annual reporting to improve transparency of the
18 program? The current recommendation is that we will provide
19 transportation impact fee distribution analysis, which shows the
20 location of where impact fees are collected, encumbered, and
21 extended, in addition to using heat maps [ph]. Are there any
22 comments from committee members?

23 JIM BROWN: I think we should do an audit of all the
24 money they've already collected.

25 MALLORY PETERSON: That was Jim. Jim, you have to say

1 your name before you speak in case people who just called in.

2 Just FYI.

3 JIM BROWN: I'm sorry.

4 MALLORY PETERSON: They can [inaudible] --

5 [Overlapping Conversation]

6 JIM BROWN: It's Jim Brown. I think we should do an
7 audit of what they've already collected. The last time I tried
8 to get involved in it, we couldn't figure out where the money
9 was.

10 MALLORY PETERSON: Alright. Are there any other
11 comments on recommendation number 5 regarding reporting? Okay.
12 I'll read it one last time. Our current -- we're gonna vote on
13 the current recommendation, which is to provide transportation
14 impact fee distribution analysis, which shows location of where
15 impact fees are collected, encumbered, and expended, in addition
16 to using heat maps. Kevin Green?

17 G: Approve.

18 MALLORY PETERSON: Jim Brown?

19 JIM BROWN: Approve.

20 MALLORY PETERSON: Rod Teachey?

21 RODERICK TEACHEY: Approve.

22 MALLORY PETERSON: Stacey McCoy?

23 STACEY MCCOY: Approve.

24 MALLORY PETERSON: Malloy Peterson votes yea. This
25 recommendation carries with five yeas and zero nays. Okay. So,

1 recommendation number 6. This is about what changes would you
2 recommend to the preliminary affordable housing exemption
3 language? The current recommendation is 20% exemption of impact
4 fees based on the following guidelines: A) for rental product in
5 developments of 10 units or more, one 10% of units at 60% AMI
6 [ph] or 15% of units at 80% AMI. And then B) on for sale
7 developments of units 10 or more, either 20% of the units at
8 120% AMI, 15% of units at 100% AMI, or 10% units at 10%--excuse
9 me -- at 80% AMI. Are there any comments from committee
10 members?

11 G: This is Kevin. I got a question. This
12 recommendation is silent on how long the rental units would stay
13 affordable. Is there some expectation there?

14 TIFFANI COPE: Yes. The standard is 20 years.

15 G: Oh, is that --

16 TIFFANI COPE: It must be affordable for 20 years.

17 G: So, we can consider that implicit within this staff
18 recommendation?

19 TIFFANI COPE: Well, it was in the full ordinance that
20 was provided to you guys.

21 G: Right.

22 TIFFANI COPE: This is just, you know, a snapshot of
23 the percentage of the exemption that you guys are voting on.

24 G: Yep.

25 MALLORY PETERSON: Alright. Any other comments?

1 RODERICK TEACHEY: Yes. It's Rod Teachey.

2 MALLORY PETERSON: Yes?

3 RODERICK TEACHEY: So, first of all, in the spirit of
4 full transparency, I do work for an affordable housing developer
5 here in the city of Atlanta. So, I just wanna make that clear.
6 But I do understand and recognize that in previous conversation
7 amongst the committee this ordinance is trying to be consistent
8 with the city's current policies for providing financial
9 subsidies and incentives for new affordable housing development
10 in the city. And I also understand that per the current state
11 law if there are any exemptions given, there has to be an
12 alternative funding source to essentially replace those
13 exemptions, and that does cause some burden on the city to come
14 up with those alternative funding sources. But as an affordable
15 housing developer, I don't think that these exemptions that are
16 proposed in this ordinance as well as the city's overall
17 incentives are gonna be enough to not only meet the growing
18 demand of affordable housing in the city, but also to achieve
19 the goals that haven't been stated by the current administration
20 to preserve existing and add a new stock of affordable housing.

21 And I think that the minimum thresholds that have been set
22 by the existing incentives as well as in this ordinance are just
23 not enough and we actually should be rewarding those affordable
24 housing developments that go above and beyond those thresholds
25 that have been set, either in the percentage of units that are

1 affordable or even as well as the level of affordability based
2 on the incomes of the residents.

3 So, in that regard, I would propose that those
4 developments that exceed the minimum requirements that are
5 currently set would actually -- well, first of all, those that
6 meet the exemptions -- I'm sorry, meet the requirements that the
7 exemption go from 20% to 100% for each affordable unit. And
8 then, I would also propose that developments that exceed the
9 minimum requirements that have been established would actually
10 get a bonus on the exemption. Again, this is all in the effort
11 to try and incentivize more affordable house development. And
12 I'll just give an example: so right now the threshold is 20%.
13 So, if a development exceeds 20% affordability, I would propose
14 that if the affordability is somewhere between 20 and 50%, then
15 the actual exemption be expanded from the 20% of the units to
16 35% of the units. If the affordability exceeds 50% but is less
17 than, say, like 75%, then the exemptions should apply to 75% of
18 the units. And then, if the affordability component is above
19 75%, then there should 100% exemption.

20 And, again, this is all in the spirit of trying to
21 incentivize developers to provide more affordability, and you'll
22 find, if you do your research that all of developments that are
23 built on the beltline or using Invest Atlanta funds that are not
24 financed with low-income housing tax credits are just meeting
25 the bare minimums, and we're never gonna make a dent and make

1 any meaningful increase in the number of affordable housing
2 units if we don't continue to provide additional incentives for
3 affordable housing. Don't continue to provide additional
4 incentives for affordable housing. Thank you.

5 MALLORY PETERSON: Thanks, Rod. Are there any other
6 comments on recommendation number 6?

7 G: I mean, this is Kevin. I appreciate Rod's
8 perspective, particularly as somebody who's on the ground trying
9 to make this happen. I guess my challenge -- and I agree. I
10 think a 20% exemption, particularly that just applies to the
11 percentage that's affordable sounds pretty paltry to me. But I
12 also understand that there's a lot of different policy levers
13 that can be pulled on affordability. And to Rod's point, I
14 mean, the city's gotta backfill this revenue with other sources,
15 to the extent they grant exemptions.

16 My challenge, I guess, is -- I'm no expert, but my
17 assumption is that the city Department of Planning vetted this
18 through Invest Atlanta and housing authority and your chief
19 housing officer, and everybody else and this is what they came
20 up with. So, I guess I'm -- I find Rod's comments to be
21 compelling, but I don't really feel equipped to opine on this
22 one given, what I have to assume, is a pretty robust scrub
23 within the city.

24 MALLORY PETERSON: Kim or Tiffani, do you wanna add
25 anything on that?

1 TIFFANI COPE: Well, I would like to open the floor
2 for Jonathan Futrell. Did you wanna make any comments regarding
3 the affordability exemption language, Jonathan?

4 JONATHAN FUTRELL: Yeah, absolutely.

5 TIFFANI COPE: Thank you.

6 JONATHAN FUTRELL: Good afternoon, commission members.
7 Jonathan Futrell here in the city attorney's office. Kevin's
8 absolutely right. We did reach out to the office of Housing and
9 Community Development to have discussions about what was
10 realistic. I think though Rod brings up some interesting points
11 -- and we would be happy to take those back to the Office of
12 Housing and see about the potential incentive structure, the per
13 unit structure as well -- but it was really a realistic
14 conversation about a uniform plan that could actually be
15 implemented, and that's where this initial proposal came from.

16 MALLORY PETERSON: Thanks, Jonathan. Are there any
17 other comments from committee members? Okay. So, as a
18 reminder, what we're voting is on the current recommendation
19 that 20% of exemption of impact fees -- that we provide a 20%
20 exemption of impact fees based on the following guidelines:
21 rental developments at 10 or more, 10% of units at 60% AMI or
22 15% of units at 80% AMI, for sale developments of units 10 or
23 more, 20% of the units at 120% AMI, 15% at 100% AMI, and 10%
24 units at 10% of units at 80% AMI. We'll now take a vote on
25 recommendation number 6. Kevin Green?

1 G: Sorry. Approve.

2 MALLORY PETERSON: Rod Teachey?

3 G: Nay.

4 MALLORY PETERSON: Jim Brown?

5 JIM BROWN: Nay.

6 MALLORY PETERSON: Stacey McCoy?

7 STACEY MCCOY: Approve.

8 MALLORY PETERSON: And Malloy Peterson vote yea. So,
9 the recommendation carries with three yeas and two nays, noting
10 the various comments we had about sliding scales and additional
11 exemptions if that can work into the city's program.

12 So recommendation number 6A is regarding should
13 affordable housing -- sorry, there's a little typo here --
14 should affordable housing exemptions apply to the entire
15 development or just the portion that's affordable? The current
16 recommendation is it applies only to the affordable portion.
17 Are there any comments from committee members?

18 RODERICK TEACHEY: It's Rod. I would just say, you
19 know, based on comments previously I do feel like there should
20 be some onus/incentive if you exceed the minimum thresholds
21 currently outlined.

22 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay. Are there any other
23 comments?

24 G: This is Kevin. I just don't understand how this
25 would work if it were not applying only to the portion that's

1 affordable. I would continue to say that it seems pretty
2 meager. But, you know, as you said it applied to the whole
3 development then you could do 10% at 60 AMI or 20% at 60% AMI
4 and it's the same exception, which doesn't make logical sense
5 and doesn't incentivize a developer to reach on affordability.

6 MALLORY PETERSON: Yeah. Malloy Peterson. I also
7 agree. I don't agree -- I mean, I don't see any way that you
8 could just have a very tiny sliver of affordable housing and
9 give an exemption for the entire development, especially if it's
10 luxury apartments. So --

11 RODERICK TEACHEY: Yeah. Just to clarify my previous
12 comments, you would have to meet, you know, much more above the
13 20% to get additional exemption. I'm not saying someone doing
14 just a minimum gets full exemption. But I would say if someone
15 has, say 75 or 80% of their units affordable, then maybe you
16 should consider 100% exemption because they've gone above and
17 beyond what's been required to a meaningful degree.

18 MALLORY PETERSON: Yeah. That's a good clarification,
19 Rod.

20 TIFFANI COPE: This is Kevin. I think this is another
21 one that could use some additional work. I can't say that I
22 know what was done to get us to this point. But maybe at least
23 a work session just to kinda look under the hood and see what's
24 possible here. You know, we're gonna drive on in terms of these
25 recommendations for now. Nothing says these can't be revisited.

1 MALLORY PETERSON: Thanks, Kevin.

2 TIFFANI COPE: As time allows.

3 MALLORY PETERSON: This isn't our only opportunity to
4 make changes to this in the course of the program. Okay. So,
5 we'll take a vote. This is about regarding should affordable
6 housing exemptions apply to the entire development or just the
7 portion that's affordable. And the current recommendation is to
8 apply the exemption only to the affordable portion. We will now
9 take our vote on recommendation 6A. Rod Teachey?

10 RODERICK TEACHEY: Nay, subject to the comments I made
11 previously.

12 MALLORY PETERSON: Kevin Green?

13 G: Yea.

14 MALLORY PETERSON: Jim Brown?

15 JIM BROWN: Yea.

16 MALLORY PETERSON: Stacey McCoy?

17 STACEY MCCOY: Yea.

18 MALLORY PETERSON: And Malloy Peterson votes yea. So,
19 the recommendation carries with four yes, one nays, noting the
20 comments -- Rod's comments and additional comments that came
21 previous. Recommendation 6B. What changes would you recommend
22 to the preliminary economic exemption language? And the current
23 recommendation is a 100% exemption for projects that meet the
24 goals and objectives of the 2020 economic development and
25 economic mobility strategy. And these are retention expansion

1 or location of a business within the city's southside or
2 westside that creates at least 50 or more middle wages, FTE --
3 full-time equivalencies -- between 38,000 and 80,000 annual
4 average salary. Or second, retention expansion or location of a
5 business outside of the city's southside or westside that
6 creates at least 200 or more middle wage FTEs between 38,000 and
7 80,000 average salary. Or third, retention, expansion, or
8 location of business anywhere in the city of Atlanta that
9 creates at least 500 jobs or at least 10 million dollars in
10 capital investment. Are there any comments from committee
11 members?

12 MALLORY PETERSON: Okay. Without any comments, we'll
13 now vote on recommendation 6B. Jim Brown?

14 JIM BROWN: Yea.

15 MALLORY PETERSON: Kevin Green?

16 G: Yes.

17 MALLORY PETERSON: Rod Teachey?

18 RODERICK TEACHEY: Yea.

19 MALLORY PETERSON: Stacey McCoy?

20 STACEY MCCOY: Yea.

21 MALLORY PETERSON: And I, Malloy Peterson, vote yea.
22 So, the recommendation carries with five yeas, zero nays. Our
23 last recommendation, number 7. Would you consider reducing the
24 size of the service areas, or using council districts as service
25 areas? The current recommendation is to maintain the current

1 three service areas. Those are the northside, the westside, and
2 the southside. Are there any comments from committee members?
3 I'll make a comment here. I will say that when I started this
4 process I just really couldn't understand how we could only have
5 three for the city. I mean, especially, it really bothered me
6 that there weren't four, because I like north, south, east, and
7 west. But through much discussion about the need to -- or to
8 improve one specific area of town, you have to improve the
9 streets around it. I know we had a lot of conversation about
10 this through our -- however long we've been doing this -- a
11 year, or a year-plus, and I now understand that we need these
12 larger service areas to accomplish projects at any significant
13 size. So, I would like to put my support behind it. Any other
14 comments? Okay. We'll know vote on recommendation number 7.
15 Kevin Green?

16 G: Support, yes.

17 MALLORY PETERSON: Rod Teachey?

18 RODERICK TEACHEY: Yes.

19 MALLORY PETERSON: Jim Brown?

20 JIM BROWN: Yes.

21 MALLORY PETERSON: Stacey McCoy?

22 STACEY MCCOY: Yea.

23 MALLORY PETERSON: And I, Malloy Peterson, vote yea.
24 Recommendation carries with five yeas and zero nays. So, thank
25 you. I know that was a lot, and it was also the culmination of

1 a lot of work. Thank you. For our next agenda item, we have
2 the City Planning Department prepared to discuss the next steps
3 to final adoption of the updated impact fee study draft.

4 TIFFANI COPE: Alright. Thank you. Our goal is to
5 finalize the ordinance and have it adopted by March with the
6 following as a tentative timeline. As previously mentioned, we
7 did receive approval from DCA on the impact fee study update.
8 So, with that, our next milestone is to conduct a council work
9 session, which is scheduled for February 11th. On February 23rd
10 we look forward to CDHS [ph] for vote to move forward to full
11 council adoption. And on March 1st is when we plan to go before
12 full council for, hopefully, favorable adoption of the new
13 ordinance.

14 MALLORY PETERSON: Thanks. Is that information posted
15 on the website, Tiffani? People are tracking.

16 TIFFANI COPE: The February 11th council work session
17 is posted. That was posted recently. The February 23rd CDHS
18 meeting and March 1 are not yet posted, as far as us getting on
19 the agenda.

20 MALLORY PETERSON: Alright, thanks. Are there any
21 other follow-ups or unfinished business from the December 16,
22 2020 meeting?

23 TIFFANI COPE: Yes. I would like to provide follow-
24 ups from our previous meeting. It was requested by you, Madam
25 Chair, mentioning -- to clarify the meaning of equivalent acres

1 in the Parks Level of Section in the impact study draft. I
2 wanted to provide an update that that information will be
3 updated on the final draft. Also, Madam Chair, you inquired if
4 we were able to create a digitally interactive heat map.
5 Unfortunately, at this time, that capability doesn't exist, but
6 we are working towards other options. So, I'll definitely keep
7 the committee posted.

8 Also, committee member Kevin Green replacing the word
9 "may" with "shall" in the economic development language. Again,
10 as an update, that language has been updated to reflect your
11 recommendation. We also received public comment from Ms. Kate
12 Little with Georgia Stand Up, advising that the estimated 2020
13 population listed in the impact fee study draft was below the
14 population listed in other city documents. I would like to note
15 that the final impact fee study draft will acknowledge the
16 current population, and we'll provide a rationale on the
17 population that's used in the study. Also, Ms. Little inquired,
18 is there a way to ensure that Atlanta citizens would receive job
19 priority consideration for jobs created on projects based on the
20 economic development exemption. Currently, there is not a
21 process in place to ensure that type of job consideration,
22 however, it is still under review. And, again, I will keep the
23 committee and the public notified. And, lastly, Ms. Little also
24 inquired how to ensure the 20-year affordable housing standard.
25 In order to ensure that standard, we will create a new land use

1 restrictive agreement to ensure that the 20-year affordability
2 standard is maintained.

3 I would also like everyone to join us on February 11th
4 at 10:00 a. m. for the impact fee study update council work
5 session. Also, committee members, please be on the lookout for
6 a future communication regarding the financial disclosure
7 process, which begins March 1st. Alright. Thank you, Madam
8 Chair. That concludes all follow-ups and announcements.

9 MALLORY PETERSON: Alright, thank you. We would like
10 to thank everybody for their work on this committee, delivering
11 the first update to the Impact Fee Study and Ordinance since
12 1993.

13 G: And, Mallory, I had a question. This is Kevin.

14 MALLORY PETERSON: Sure.

15 G: Where did we end up on number 2, the phase-in?

16 MALLORY PETERSON: On our vote, we had three nays and
17 two yeas.

18 G: Okay. So, the role of this committee is just to up
19 or down these things and not to suggest alternatives?

20 MALLORY PETERSON: Right. That's what Tiffani --
21 Tiffani, you want to say anything? I think we can only vote.

22 TIFFANI COPE: Yes. So, today we're just voting on
23 the staff recommendations that are in place. However, your
24 feedback and all of the rationales you guys gave today will be
25 considered and will be discussed to see how we move forward with

1 the ordinance.

2 G: Got it. Sorry about that. Thank you.

3 TIFFANI COPE: Oh, no worries.

4 MALLORY PETERSON: Great question. Okay. So, we've
5 come to the end of our agenda. I will entertain a motion to
6 adjourn and to complete the [inaudible].

7 MATT WESTMORELAND: Madame Chair, this is Matt
8 Westmoreland. Can I make one comment before you guys adjourn?

9 MALLORY PETERSON: Sure.

10 MATT WESTMORELAND: I just wanted to say thank you to
11 the five of you for your service and to the team here at the
12 city for your work. I have a very vivid memory as a six-year-
13 old of being very excited for these impact fees that we're gonna
14 be updated 27 years from that day.

15 MALLORY PETERSON: [Laughs]

16 MATT WESTMORELAND: So, thanks a lot for your service
17 to the city, and I'm excited to see this move forward in Feb and
18 March. So, appreciate it.

19 MALLORY PETERSON: Thank you. Your probably the only
20 six-year-old in Atlanta that may have been true about.

21 MATT WESTMORELAND: [Laughs]

22 MALLORY PETERSON: Thank you for your comments. It's
23 been a pleasure. I will speak for all five of us to say that we
24 all learned a lot during this process. It was like a PhD in
25 impact fees. So, thank you. And thanks to the staff -- has

1 been [inaudible] and incredibly responsive and very helpful
2 towards our education. So, we've come to the end of the agenda.
3 I will entertain a motion to adjourn and complete the exiting
4 roll call.

5 G: Motion to adjourn. Kevin Green.

6 JIM BROWN: Jim Brown, second.

7 MALLORY PETERSON: Seeing that we have a second, we'll
8 take a vote to adjourn. Jim Brown?

9 JIM BROWN: Adjourn.

10 MALLORY PETERSON: Rod Teachey?

11 RODERICK TEACHEY: Yea.

12 MALLORY PETERSON: Kevin Green?

13 G: Adjourn.

14 MALLORY PETERSON: And Stacey McCoy.

15 STACEY MCCOY: Adjourn.

16 MALLORY PETERSON: I vote yea to adjourn. The motion
17 carries five yeas, zero nays. We are adjourned. Thank you.

18 TIFFANI COPE: Thank you all, and thank you everyone
19 for joining us today. Hopefully, we'll see you on February 11 .
20 Thank you.

21 FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you and take care. Stay
22 safe.

23 MALLORY PETERSON: Thanks. See you [inaudible] --
24 [Overlapping Conversation]

25 JIM BROWN: Thanks, everybody.

1 MALLORY PETERSON: -- everyone. Bye.

2 FEMALE SPEAKER: Right. Bye-bye.

3 (Recording ends.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

Esquire Deposition Solutions, does hereby certify that through an independent contractor we have transcribed the audio, and that the foregoing is a true and complete transcription of the audio transcribed.

Inaudible or indiscernible passages of sound are denoted.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set my hand on this 12th day of February, 2021.

/S/



Esquire Depositions Solutions

	44:9,16	38:19,23	300	50%
\$	46:3	40:3,13	8:6	36:14,16
	48:19	20-year	32	50/50
\$150	12	45:24	13:1	19:14
26:16	9:16	46:1	32-124	500
28:23	120%	200	12:21	42:9
\$80	34:8	42:6	32's	
28:21,22	38:23	2020	13:16	6
	1200	5:12,17	35%	
1	28:20	8:14,15	36:16	6
	15%	12:14,19	36	2:25 12:3
1	34:6,8	41:24	13:2	34:1 37:6
11:6	38:22,23	44:22	36-71-1	38:25
16:4,9	16	45:12	13:2	6-5008
20:21	5:12,17	2021	36-71-5C	2:25
21:7 30:3	44:21	2:18,20	3:12	60
32:1	1993	9:4	36-71-8D2	40:3
44:11,18	9:4 46:12	23	3:6	60%
46:7		44:9,17	38,000	34:5
10		25%	42:3,6	38:21
34:5,7	2	9:1,5,6		40:3
38:21,22		26%	4	6A
42:9	2	9:4		39:12
10%	11:9	27		41:9
34:5,8	21:20	47:14	4	6B
38:21,23,	31:14	29	2:25	41:21
24 40:3	46:15	2:18	11:16	42:13
10%--excuse	2,000		24:15	
34:8	28:21	3	29:11	7
100	2,000-		4,000-	
26:16	28:22	3	square	
100%	20	2:25	25:1	7
7:9 9:20	2:20	11:11		42:23
34:8	31:11	22:21	5	43:14
36:7,19	34:14,16	24:4,7		75
38:23	36:14	32:10	5	40:15
40:16	20%	30	11:20	75%
41:23	6:19 11:8	6:21	32:16	36:17,19
10:00	34:3,7	20:16	33:11	
46:4	36:7,12,	30-year	50	
11	13,15	9:8	42:2	
8:13	37:10			

	14	administrat	12:13	agree
8	actual	ively	affect	17:20
	23:10	26:23	6:9	19:3
80	36:15	administrat	affirmative	20:14
9:4	add	ors	ly	22:17
80%	20:20	8:18	13:9	30:22
34:6,9	22:16	adopt	affordabili	37:9 40:7
38:22,24	25:15	5:12	ty	agreement
40:15	30:20	adopted	7:3 9:20	46:1
80,000	35:20	44:5	36:1,13,	ahead
42:3,7	37:24	adoption	14,16,18,	16:15
	added	3:3,15	21 37:13	26:1
	17:21	7:12	38:3 40:5	aiming
9	addition	9:11,17	46:1	8:20
	32:21	11:21	affordable	allowed
12:21	33:15	13:21	7:8 9:21,	15:4 22:2
	additional	14:12	23 10:3	allowing
	9:6 37:2,	16:8 21:6	11:11	11:3
A	3 39:10	22:25	18:25	Alongside
	40:13,21	23:11	19:4 23:4	8:15
ability	41:20	24:6	24:16	Alright
19:6	Additionall	30:6,10	30:17,18	13:12
absolutely	y	31:25	34:2,13,	14:19
28:14	6:23	44:3,11,	16 35:4,	16:4
38:4,8	addressed	12	9,14,18,	21:2,7
accepted	6:16	advance	20,23	24:3 29:3
13:20	adept	14:5	36:1,7,11	31:2
accomplish	14:17	advantage	37:1,3,4,	32:14,15
43:12	adjourn	11:10	11 39:13,	33:10
account	47:6,8	advise	14,15,16	34:25
9:13 20:8	48:3,5,8,	3:3	40:1,8,15	44:4,20
achieve	9,13,15,	advising	41:5,7,8	46:7,9
35:18	16	45:12	45:24	alternative
acknowledge	adjourned	advisory	afternoon	35:12,14
2:6 45:15	48:17	2:19,22,	2:17 38:6	alternative
acres	administrat	24 3:2,17	agencies	s
44:25	ion	8:12	15:20	46:19
Act	35:19	10:13,21	agenda	amendable
13:1	administrat	11:1,24	4:17,20	9:8
action	ive	12:21	5:3,4,5	amended
3:12,13,	10:25	13:15	12:11	13:14
		Affairs	14:2	
			44:1,19	
			47:5 48:2	

amendment 3:4 12:20	30:23 40:2	architects 8:6	19 15:6, 15,18 35:5	37:14 background 3:23 25:8
amendments 23:19	applies 37:10 39:16	area 43:8	36:23 37:18 42:8	bare 36:25
AMI 34:5,6,8, 9 38:21, 22,23,24 40:3	apply 23:4 36:17 39:14 41:6,8	areas 42:24,25 43:1,12	45:18 47:20	based 10:9 11:12,14 15:7 16:18,20 17:4 24:18,23, 24 25:5 26:7 29:8 34:4 36:1 38:20 39:19 45:19
analysis 32:19 33:14	applying 39:25	aren't 29:3	Atlanta's 9:23 10:14,24 11:1,23	
announce 13:20	appointed 2:22	argue 20:1	attach 12:18 13:13	
announcemen ts 46:8	appreciated 6:22	assess 27:1,3,6	attached 8:16	
annual 3:6,7 12:19 32:17 42:3	appreciates 8:10 11:23	assessing 27:12	attorneys 8:7	basically 18:10
anticipatin g 17:25	approach 8:25 9:8 11:6 20:16	assessments 27:14	attorney's 38:7	basis 27:8,14
apartments 40:10	approval 5:3,17 13:21 44:7	association 8:5 10:19,22 11:22	audit 32:23 33:7	begins 46:7
apologies 22:13	approve 4:20 5:4, 5,7,9,21, 23 21:9, 11,13,22, 24 22:9 24:12 29:21,23 33:17,19, 21,23 39:1,7	assume 23:17 37:22	authority 37:18	beltline 36:23
apologize 19:13		assuming 26:11	average 42:4,7	benefit 3:25
applauds 10:12		assumption 37:17	audit 32:23 33:7	begins 46:7
applicable 13:1 15:15		Atlanta 2:19,22, 24 3:3,8, 14,17 6:8 7:4,25 8:9,11,15 10:12,17, 19,21 11:22 12:2,13,	aware 18:5	beltline 36:23
application 7:15 11:17	Approved 5:25		back 2:10 19:9 25:17,21 26:2,25 29:5,6 30:1 38:11	benefit 3:25
applied	ARC 12:13		backfill	big 19:24 32:8
			B	blowing 18:20
				bonus 36:10
				bothered 43:5
				bottom 13:25 14:14

brain	15:18	3:2	2:14,21	15,17
22:13			3:23 12:9	9:13
bridges	builders	capital	13:12	10:12,13,
3:10	6:12 7:1	42:10	23:14	15,17,23
12:22	10:19	car	44:25	11:1,15,
	11:3,22	28:19	45:3 46:8	23 12:3,
brings	20:3	care	47:7	19 14:22
38:10	building	48:21	challenge	15:4,5,20
broke	6:9 28:22	carries	16:16	18:9,13,
25:8	built	5:11 6:2	37:9,16	15 26:8
brought	28:22	21:15	change	27:4
30:13	36:23	24:14	10:25	35:5,10,
	burden	29:25	11:4 28:7	13,18
Brown	9:13	33:25	changing	37:17,23
4:7,8	20:15	39:9	13:7	38:7 42:8
5:4,5,18,	35:13	41:19	Chapter	43:5 44:2
19 21:7,	business	42:22	2:25	45:14
25 22:7	2:3 42:1,	43:24		47:12,17
24:11	5,8 44:21	48:17	chat	city's
25:20	buy	carry	4:19	3:4 7:7,
28:15,18	28:19,22	22:11	chief	17 9:18
29:2,14,	Bye	32:13	37:18	10:7
16,18	49:1	cars	chime	11:19
30:11,22,	Bye-bye	25:3	25:13	35:8,16
25 31:10,	49:2	case	CIE	37:14
17 32:3,	C	27:20	12:19,20	39:11
12,23		33:1	13:13,14	42:1,5
33:3,6,		cases	cited	clarificati
18,19		18:10	12:22,25	on
39:4,5		catch	13:6	20:22
41:14,15		18:6	Citing	40:18
42:13,14		32:15	12:23	clarify
43:19,20		called	citizens	13:17
48:6,8,9,		17:6	45:18	40:11
25		caused	city	44:25
Brown's		18:4	2:4,7,19,	class
4:9		causing	23,24	18:24
budgeted		18:9	3:3,8,14,	clause
32:7		CDHS	16 6:8,	7:14
build		44:10,17	15,24	9:10,14
10:2		chair	7:3,24	11:16
28:23			8:9,10,	17:6 23:3
builder				clear
7:21				12:7 35:5
10:22				

click	22:2,20	6:8	15:18,19	11:5
13:25	23:23	committee	20:11	23:25
14:13	43:3	2:19,21,	38:9	45:19,21
close	45:11	22,24	companies	considerati
19:16,24	47:8	3:12,13,	8:6	ons
closely	commented	17,19,25	compelling	26:24
10:22	31:7	4:18 6:7,	37:21	considered
COA	comments	12,14,19	compiled	3:13 6:19
6:3	3:24 8:23	8:4,12,21	15:6	12:6
COAIMPACTFE	12:9,12,	10:13,21,	complete	46:25
ES@	15 13:13,	23 11:2	28:4 47:6	consistent
ATLANTAGA.	15,23	12:16	48:3	35:7
GOV	14:7,12	13:24	complied	constructin
4:3	16:1	14:8,12	13:13,17	g
code	17:9,11	17:8	component	12:8
2:24	20:25	18:17	36:18	constructio
12:23,24	22:17,25	21:19	components	n
13:16	24:4,21	22:16	3:11	7:7 10:2
codes	29:4	23:1	comprised	12:5
28:24	30:7,20	24:21	8:6	contained
collect	31:9	27:4	concerns	13:5
27:20	32:22	32:22	8:18 10:5	continue
collected	33:11	34:9 35:7	concludes	8:19 10:5
3:9	34:9,25	38:17	12:9 46:8	19:18
32:20,24	37:6,20	39:17	conduct	37:2,3
33:7,15	38:2,17	42:10	44:8	40:1
combined	39:10,17,	43:2	conducted	continues
12:7	19,23	45:7,8,23	15:2	10:14
commensurat	40:12	46:5,10,	confirm	12:3
e	41:10,20	18	4:6	17:13
10:10	42:10,12	committees	confusing	contractors
comment	43:2,14	20:24	12:24	8:7
4:2,5	47:22	committee's	connection	contribute
6:3,4 8:1	commercial	7:19	3:20	7:6 10:1
10:18	9:12	11:24	25:19,23	conversatio
12:16	10:6,8	common	29:5	n
13:24	commission	24:25	considerati	18:25
15:14	12:13	communicati	on	23:19,22
16:8,13	38:6	on	6:15 7:8,	26:15
17:11,24	commissione	46:6	22 8:24	
20:2,20	r	community		
21:19	6:7 8:4	6:13 7:22		
	11:2	11:3		
	committed	12:12		

31:25	12:5	9:24	16:7 21:6	define
32:2 33:5	16:20	critically	22:25	12:22
35:6	28:20,22	6:10	24:6	defined
38:14	council	culmination	30:6,10	6:16
43:9	2:6,23	43:25	31:25	definition
48:24	3:3,8,14	curious	day	11:14
Cope	6:15 8:2,	15:11	2:2 47:14	12:25
2:2,3,11,	5,9 9:2,	26:6,9	DCA	13:6,7,16
14 6:4	22 10:11,	current	12:13,16	definitions
13:12	14 11:2	7:17 9:18	13:18,20,	13:3
14:25	20:24	10:7	21 44:7	degree
21:1 24:2	27:5,21	11:19	DCA'S	40:17
34:14,16,	42:24	13:10	13:13,15	delay
19,22	44:8,11,	14:11	deal	17:17
38:1,5	12,16	17:5	22:21	delivering
40:20	46:4	21:5,17	30:12	46:10
41:2	councilmemb	22:23	31:21	demand
44:4,16,	er	24:5,19	deals	9:24 12:2
23 46:22	23:24	27:25	16:17	35:18
47:3	counter	29:9	19:14	dent
48:18	7:7	30:5,6	20:7	36:25
copy	couple	31:3,23	Dear	Department
4:17 14:4	15:4	32:18	6:7 8:4	2:4 12:12
correct	cover	33:12,13	10:21	14:23
16:3	19:8	34:3	decades	15:3,16
20:23	COVID	35:8,10,	18:6	37:17
21:1 24:2	20:5	19 38:18	December	44:2
26:21	22:13	39:15	5:12,17	departments
27:18	COVID-19	41:7,22	44:21	14:24
correctly	10:25	42:25	decide	15:8
27:13	create	45:16	28:24	depending
Cory	45:4,25	customers	31:11	16:20
10:18	created	<hr/>	decision	depth
cost	45:19	D	28:7,9	15:1
7:6 10:2	creates	<hr/>	decrease	design
12:7	42:2,6,9	damn	10:3	6:25 7:5
23:5,6	credit	28:19	deem	10:1
24:24	11:13	date	16:22	develop
27:19	credits	7:11,12,	deferring	14:21
28:23	36:24	16 9:17	18:23	developed
cost-	crisis	11:18,20,		
27:7		21 14:11		
costs				

14:22	34:5,7	43:7	due	36:10
15:12	35:24	discussions	10:25	efforts
developer	36:4,8,22	10:22	22:24	7:8 9:23
7:22	38:21,22	24:23	24:6	10:12
18:10	DIFA	38:9	25:23	encumbered
35:4,15	13:1,2,8	distributio	duration	32:20
40:5	DIFAC	n	3:22	33:15
developers	8:20	32:19	duty	end
6:13 7:1	difference	33:14	18:14	46:15
8:7 9:12	26:15,22	districts	_____	47:5 48:2
11:3	differentia	42:24	E	ends
18:7,15	l	document	_____	49:3
19:25	27:19	12:20	earlier	engage
20:18	difficult	documents	22:18	8:10
36:21	27:12,13	45:14	23:2	engineers
development	difficultie	dollars	easier	8:7
2:19,23	s	25:15	26:23	enjoyed
3:4,5,15,	3:19	42:9	east	2:9
17 6:8,10	digitally	don't	43:6	ensure
7:24 8:9,	45:4	14:16	economic	3:24 6:16
11 9:22	Dill	21:24	9:22	11:9,11
10:6,13,	10:18	28:10	41:22,24,	45:18,21,
17 11:1,	disclosure	29:19	25 45:9,	24,25
14,23	46:6	32:5	20	46:1
12:24	discuss	35:15	economics	entertain
13:1	14:5	37:2,3,21	10:11	4:20 5:12
14:10	15:23,25	39:24	edit	47:5 48:3
16:6,19,	44:2	40:7	27:20	entire
20 17:4	discussed	draft	edits	26:25
18:5,8	7:3 30:8	12:14	27:5	39:14
20:11	31:5	13:14,19	education	40:9 41:6
21:5	46:25	14:3,5	48:2	equally
23:10,11	discussion	44:3	effect	19:5
35:9	12:23	45:1,3,	7:1,13	equipped
36:11,13	15:24	13,15	11:22	37:21
38:9	16:2	drag	effective	equivalenci
39:15	17:12	17:1	7:11,16	es
40:3,9	20:23	drama-free	11:18	42:3
41:6,24	24:1	2:10	12:1 27:8	equivalent
45:9,20	25:11	drive	effort	44:25
development	29:8 30:3	40:24		
s				
10:3 17:3				
19:4,5,7,				
9 23:4				

essentially	17 37:15		11:1,4,6,	19:6,25
7:7 35:12	39:11,14	F	19,23	21:5
	41:6		12:14	24:24
established			13:1,19	32:20
36:9	exist	factors	14:3,10	33:15
	45:5	15:5	15:9 16:5	34:4
estimated		fair	19:8	38:19,20
45:12	existing	18:7,15	21:4,17	47:13,25
event	35:20,22	19:10	24:20	
3:18	exiting	20:18	25:6 27:6	feet
	48:3	31:7	28:2,5	10:9
exact			29:10	28:20,21
18:11	expanded	family	30:4,9	FEMALE
26:14	36:15	26:23	31:3	26:17
exceed	expansion	fault	32:19	48:21
36:4,8	41:25	18:12	33:14	49:2
39:20	42:4,7		44:3,7	ferries
		favor	45:13,15	12:22
exceeds	expectation	31:6	46:4,11	
36:13,16	27:24			fiduciary
	28:11	favorable		18:14
exception	34:13	44:12	feedback	
7:9 40:4			3:23	
	expended	feasible	8:12,19	figure
excited	33:15	16:23	46:24	19:14
47:13,17				33:8
	expenditure	feature	feel	filed
Excuse	3:9	14:1,13	12:2 19:4	7:16
15:3 30:5			37:21	9:15,17
executives	expenses	Feb	39:19	11:18
8:8	9:14 12:4	47:17		16:18
		February	feeling	17:3
exempt	expensive	44:9,16,	18:14	
23:12	26:20	17 46:3		final
	experience	48:19	fees	6:14
exemption	3:20		3:9 6:3,	8:20,23
9:20		federal	21,25	10:18
34:2,3,23	expert	3:11	7:4,5,17,	13:19
36:7,10,	37:16		20 9:5,	14:2,5
15,19	explain	fee	18,25	44:3
37:10	14:20	2:19,23	10:14	45:3,15
38:3,19,		3:4,5,15,	11:18	
20 40:9,	extend	17 4:5	12:3,4,24	finalize
13,14,16	22:18	6:11,18	13:5	44:5
41:8,22,	extended	7:2,16,18	14:11	
23 45:20	18:1,21	8:11,13,	16:6,19,	financed
	32:21	18 9:3,	20,22	36:24
exemptions		11,14,18	17:5	
9:22	extent	10:8,13,	18:2,5,	financial
35:11,13,	37:15	16,24	10,20	8:7 9:13
15 36:6,				

16:21	25:5 26:8	7	19:9	Green
19:6 35:8	28:15,19	future	goals	4:11 5:8,
46:6	for-sale	13:9,17	35:19	14,22
financially	9:21	17:5	41:24	21:8,21
10:2	formally	27:8,22	good	24:9
16:23	8:23	28:13	2:2,9,17	33:16
22:22	forward	46:6	22:6 38:6	38:25
31:22	7:23 12:2	FYI	40:18	41:12
find	13:21	33:2	gotta	42:15
36:22	44:10		32:5	43:15
37:20	46:25	G	37:14	45:8
fire	47:17		grace	48:5,12
18:4	found	GABA	9:10,11	ground
five-	4:18 13:2	11:4	22:25	37:8
2:21	14:14	gain	24:6	group
five-year	fourth	12:6	31:24	17:22
6:23	9:6	gather	32:4,11	Grove
19:19	Friday	28:9	gradual	20:2
flat	2:18	gave	11:6	growing
24:18,20	FTE	25:13	grandfather	35:17
25:6	42:2	46:24	7:14	growth
26:8,9,23	FTES	general	9:10,14	8:3,5,8,
27:6	42:6	15:19	11:16	10,14
29:9,10,	full	20:25	17:6 23:3	9:2,22
19,21	34:19	generally	grandfather	10:12,14
floor	35:4	19:23	ed	guess
38:1	40:14	Georgia	17:16,21	17:25
focus	44:10,12	12:23	grandfather	18:16
13:7	full-time	13:16	ing	22:15
follow-	42:3	45:12	18:21,23	23:25
44:23	fund	give	grant	28:12
follow-ups	13:5	15:12	37:15	30:15
44:21	funded	22:2 25:7	grateful	37:9,16,
46:8	13:3	36:12	8:22	20
foot	funding	40:9	Great	guidelines
25:1	35:12,14	giving	47:4	22:24
27:8,14	funds	17:14	Greater	24:5
28:21,22,	36:23	goal	10:19,21	31:24
23 29:9	Futrell	18:6 44:4	11:22	32:10
footage	38:2,4,6,	goalpost	greatly	34:4
24:18,23			10:25	38:20
				guys
				4:22

22:12	Hogan	38:8,12	44:3,7	20:2
34:20,23	6:5	39:13,14	45:1,13,	23:10
46:24	Hold	40:8 41:6	15 46:4,	29:7 33:4
47:8	16:10	45:24	11 47:13,	47:6
			25	48:1,23
	home	hundred	impacted	incentive
H	10:19,21	25:14	17:5 19:5	38:12
	11:22	hundreds	22:23	incentives
half	20:3	19:18	23:5	35:9,17,
18:10,18	24:17	hybrid	31:22	22 37:2,4
hand	26:7	20:17		
14:1,13,	homes		impacts	incentivize
16 16:10	24:19		12:7	36:11,21
	26:19		implement	40:5
handle		I	14:10	inception
20:1	hood	i.e.	16:5	8:11
32:14	40:23	18:24	21:4,17	include
happen	hope	identify	30:4,9	13:14
37:9	7:22	4:1	Implementat	15:17
happy	Horton	impact	ion	including
38:11	6:5	2:19,23	6:18 8:25	3:10
hard	hour	3:4,5,9,	implemented	incomes
17:15	4:3	15,17 4:5	38:15	36:2
hear	house	6:3,11,21	implementin	incorporate
2:17 3:24	11:15	7:2,4,16,	g	10:15
25:17	25:1,2,3,	20 8:11,	31:3	increase
heard	6 28:20,	13,14,18	implicit	6:19 7:2,
23:23	21,23	9:2,5,11,	34:17	6,20 9:1,
27:13	36:11	14,18,25	important	3,5,6
heat	housing	10:8,13,	6:10	11:6,8
32:21	7:3,8	14,16,24	impossible	12:3
33:16	9:20,21,	11:1,4,	29:2	20:13
45:4	23,24	18,23,25	improve	23:5 32:8
helpful	10:3,4	12:3,5,	32:17	37:1
48:1	11:9,12,	14,24	43:8	increased
He's	13 12:2	13:1,5,19	improvement	9:14,24
25:21	19:4 23:4	14:3,10	s	10:1
higher	24:16	15:8 16:6	12:18	18:20
25:4	30:17,18	18:2,7,20	13:5,15	increases
highways	34:2	21:5	inaudible	6:21 9:9
3:11	35:4,9,	24:24	5:18	12:2
12:22	15,18,20,	28:2,5	16:11	21:18
	24 36:24	32:19,20		31:5,15
	37:1,3,4,	33:14,15		
	18,19	34:3		
		38:19,20		

incredibly 48:1	24	31:7,10	22:7,13	just... 28:16
incremental 6:19	intended 13:10	33:6 35:1 39:18	24:11 25:17,18, 20,22	<hr/> K <hr/>
incremental ly 9:1,3	intends 6:14	40:4,9 47:22	28:15,17, 18 29:2, 5,6,14, 15,16,18 30:1,11,	Kate 45:11
individual 10:11	interactive 45:4	I'd 2:18 30:11	13,22,25 31:10,17 32:3,12, 23,25	Kean 6:7 8:4 11:2
individuall y 12:6	interest 8:8 18:23	I'll 5:12 16:4 21:2	31:10,17 32:3,12, 23,25	Kevin 4:11 5:8, 14,22 14:16,25 17:24 19:2 20:14 21:8,20 23:14 24:9 25:7 26:5 29:20 31:7 33:16 34:11 37:7 38:25 39:24 40:20 41:1,12 42:15 43:15 45:8 46:13 48:5,12
inequities 3:8	internally 15:8	33:12 36:12 43:3 45:6	33:3,6, 18,19 39:4,5 41:14,15 42:13,14 43:19,20 48:6,8,9, 25	
infeasible 10:2	interrupted 3:20	I'm 2:3,21 4:24 14:17	job 32:7 45:18,21	
inflation 9:4	Invest 15:15,17 36:23	15:12 17:24 18:14	jobs 42:9 45:19	
informally 8:17	37:18	19:13 21:14 22:10,12	join 46:3	
information 15:13 28:6,8 44:14 45:2	7:20 9:12	25:7,10, 16 26:11 33:3 36:6 37:16,20 40:13 47:17	joining 2:3,12 48:19	
informed 13:18	invested 33:8	40:13 47:17	Jonathan 38:2,3,4, 6,7,16	
infrastructure 18:3,8 24:25	isn't 41:3	I've 19:17 28:22	Joseph 8:2	Kevin's 38:7
infringe 10:16	item 14:2 44:1	<hr/> J <hr/>	jump 25:10 26:2	key 6:16 7:24
initial 38:15	items 6:16	January 2:18,20	jurisdiction 18:12	Kim 14:25 15:3,17 25:12 26:21
input 6:13 7:22 11:4 15:5	it's 16:5 17:15 19:1 20:4 22:6,15 26:19 27:7 28:18,24 29:2	Jim 4:7,8,9 5:3,4,5, 18,19 20:1,19 21:7,25		

27:9,15, 23 28:14, 17 37:24	letter 8:15	27:10 29:5	46:2	29:1,3, 14,17,19, 22,24 30:13,24
Kimberly 15:3	Let's 22:4	lot 16:25 20:13 24:20 37:12 43:9,25 44:1 47:16,24	major 28:5	31:1,13, 18 32:9, 13,25 33:4,10, 18,20,22, 24 34:25 35:2 37:5,24 38:16 39:2,4,6, 8,22 40:6,18 41:1,3, 12,14,16, 18 42:12, 15,17,19, 21 43:17, 19,21,23 44:14,20 46:9,13, 14,16,20 47:4,9, 15,19,22 48:7,10, 12,14,16, 23 49:1
kind 15:9 26:11 27:1,23 28:6 31:20	level 13:10,17 25:4 36:1 45:1	love 19:20	make 4:1 13:18 27:20,21 28:9,10, 19 30:7 35:5 36:25 37:9 38:2 40:4 41:4 43:3 47:8	
kinda 18:18 19:8 27:10 40:23	link 4:19	low-income 11:12 36:24	making 10:2	
<hr/> L <hr/>	living 25:2	luxury 40:10	Mallory 2:16 4:9, 11,13,15, 22 5:2,6, 8,10,16, 20,22,24 6:1 12:11 13:23 14:18 15:22 16:12,15 17:10 19:11 20:19 21:2,10, 12,14,23, 25 22:4, 7,10,20 23:7,13, 16,21 24:3,9, 11,13 25:10,18, 22 26:1, 5,13,18 27:3,11, 16 28:12	
land 45:25	local 3:11 9:24	<hr/> M <hr/>		
landscaping 3:10	location 32:20 33:14 42:1,4,8	Madam 2:14 13:12 23:14 44:24 45:3 46:7		
language 34:3 38:3 41:22 45:9,10	logical 40:4	Madame 12:9 47:7		
larger 26:18 43:12	long 19:19 31:8,9 34:12 43:10	made 6:12 15:13 16:2 41:10		
lastly 45:23	longer 16:23 17:18	magnitude 19:6		
Laughs 47:15,21	lookout 46:5	mailbox 4:3 6:3		
law 35:11	lose 25:19	maintain 13:10 42:25		
learned 47:24	lost 3:20 25:23	maintained		
legislation 16:25				

manage	40:2	32:22	5:13,18	46:25
26:24		34:10		47:17
managing	44:25	38:6,17	misleading	
15:8		39:17	13:4	moved
map	37:1	42:11	missed	4:21,25
45:4	40:17	43:2 46:5	25:23	5:14
		membership	29:6 30:2	multi-
maps	meant	8:13,20	mitigate	27:1
32:21	18:2		9:23	multi-tier
33:16	meet	memory	mobility	28:8
	3:17	47:12	41:25	Mute
March	35:17	mentioned	modify	29:16
8:13,15	36:6	30:18	23:19	muted
44:5,11,	40:12	44:6	money	3:20,21
18 46:7	41:23	mentioning	27:18,20	29:15
47:18		44:25	32:24	
match	meeting	method	33:8	N
9:3,21	2:5,9,10,	21:16	monitoring	
	20 3:22	31:3	10:22	nay
Matt	4:4,7,17	Michael	month	20:22
2:8,13,16	5:17	8:1	9:11	22:3,4,6,
47:7,10,	18:17	microphones	months	11 23:25
16,21	25:17	3:21	6:11 7:12	24:8,14
max	36:24	middle	9:17	29:13,16
26:16	44:18,22,	32:6	11:21	30:9,14,
	24	42:2,6	14:11	15 31:16,
mayor	meetings	milestone	16:7	17 32:11,
2:22	3:16 20:4	44:8	17:2,7,15	12 39:3,5
Mccoy	member	million	21:6	41:10
4:13,14	2:22 5:13	42:9	23:11	nays
5:1,15,	12:14	minimize	30:5,6,	5:11 6:2
24,25	45:8	3:23	10,21	21:15
20:14	members	minimum	32:4	22:12,16
21:12,13	2:6 3:19,	23:3	motion	30:1
22:8,9	25 4:16,	35:21	4:2,20	31:19
24:11,12	18 6:7,13	36:4,9	5:11,12,	32:14
25:16,21,	8:4 10:6	39:20	13 6:2	33:25
25 26:3	11:2,3,25	40:14	47:5	39:9
29:22,23	12:16	minimums	48:3,5,16	41:19
33:22,23	13:24	36:25	move	42:22
39:6,7	14:4,8,12	minutes	12:2	43:24
41:16,17	17:8		13:21	46:16
42:19,20	21:19		44:10	48:17
43:21,22	23:1			
48:14,15	24:21			
meager				

needed	31:2,14, 22:24 24:5	onus/ incentive	organizatio n	3:18 8:22 20:6 18:11,13, 15,16 20:12 31:7
neighboring	33:11 18:11	open	organizatio ns	19:17 31:7
noise	34:1 37:1,6	Operations	outlined	paying
3:23	38:25 39:12	2:4	39:21	18:7,13, 16 20:12
north	42:23 43:14 46:15	opine	overhaul	peer
northside		37:21	28:5	18:12
43:1		opportuniti es	Overlapping	people
not-for- profit	<hr/> O <hr/>	6:12	33:5 48:24	17:12 19:18 23:23 25:2 30:12,17, 18 33:1 44:15
8:5	objectives	opportunity	<hr/> P <hr/>	44:15
note	41:24	7:21 8:10,23 11:10 41:3	paltry	perceived
3:16 16:1 45:14	obtain	opposed	37:11	3:8
noted	OCGA	22:18	paragraph	percentage
17:11 24:15	3:6,12 12:21 13:2	options	13:4,7	34:23 35:25 37:11
notes	October	26:22 45:6	Paris	period
5:20 24:1 31:19	12:14	order	8:1	4:5 9:9, 10,11 16:2,24 19:15 20:9,13 22:25 24:6 31:6,25 32:4,11
notificatio n	offer	4:7 12:6 19:17 45:25	parks	part
30:14,15	27:1	ordinance	13:8 18:4 45:1	2:25 15:8
notified	office	3:4,5,15 7:12,13, 17 9:11 11:21 12:4 14:4 34:19 35:7,16, 22 44:5, 13 46:11 47:1	participat s	part
45:23	9:16 10:5,8 38:7,8,11	officer	3:21,24 13:25 14:13	partner
noting	officials	37:19	6:8 7:24 15:19	6:8 7:24 15:19
24:4 39:9 41:19	2:7	officials	passed	permit
number	offset	28:10	16:1,25	9:15 17:17,18, 22 30:19, 24 31:1 32:4
14:9 16:4,9 20:21 21:7,20, 22 22:21 24:3,7, 15,16 29:11 30:3	18:2	one-year	past	permits
	online	4:5	10:10	16:18

23:10	33:4,10,	picture	37:12	presented
30:17	18,20,22,	12:7	population	13:4
permitting	24 34:25	pipeline	45:13,14,	preserve
17:1,4	35:2	16:17	16,17	35:20
32:7	37:5,24	place	portion	pretty
personally	38:16	31:24	39:15,16,	37:11,22
17:15	39:2,4,6,	45:21	25 41:7,8	40:1
20:3,10	8,22	46:23	position	previous
perspective	40:6,18	plan	28:5	35:6
18:2 37:8	41:1,3,	38:14	posted	40:11
Peterson	12,14,16,	44:11	4:5	41:21
2:16,21	18 42:12,	planned	44:14,17,	44:24
4:9,11,	15,17,19,	19:7	18 45:7	previously
13,15,22	21 43:17,	Planning	potential	7:2 16:18
5:2,6,8,	19,21,23	2:4 9:16	38:12	39:19
10,16,20,	44:14,20	14:24	potentially	41:11
22,24 6:1	46:9,14,	15:4,16	16:22	44:6
12:11	16,20	37:17	17:20	price
13:23	47:4,9,	44:2	27:7	28:25
14:18	15,19,22	plans	practical	prices
15:22	48:7,10,	17:4	6:23	11:15
16:12,15	12,14,16,	pleased	prefer	prior
17:10	23 49:1	13:20	31:10	9:16
19:11,12	ph	pleasure	preferred	17:11,12
20:19	6:5,7 8:2	47:23	14:9 16:5	23:11
21:2,10,	10:19	plenty	21:3,16	priority
12,14,23,	11:2	20:7	24:17	45:19
25 22:4,	32:21	point	26:7 29:7	procedures
7,10,20	34:6	4:6 20:22	30:4	12:1
23:7,13,	44:10	22:3	preliminary	proceed
16,21	phase-in	28:10,13,	8:12 34:2	2:14 4:16
24:3,9,	6:23	25 37:13	41:22	23:20
11,13	18:1,21	40:22	prepared	process
25:10,18,	20:16	points	14:5 44:2	6:14 7:21
22 26:1,	21:18	38:10	prerequisit	14:20,23
5,13,18	31:4,15	police	e	19:10
27:3,11,	46:15	18:4	3:14	28:2 43:4
16 28:12	phased-in	policies	present	45:21
29:1,3,	6:19,22	6:9 35:8	4:9,10,	46:7
14,17,19,	8:25 9:8	policy	12,14,15,	47:24
22,24	phasing		16	processes
30:13,24	9:2 11:7			
31:1,13,	Phd			
18 32:9,	47:24			
13,25				

12:1 17:1	protections	27:23	rate	3:5 13:21
product	17:3	43:13	9:3 22:23	44:7
34:4	provide	putting	24:17,18,	45:18
program	7:9 9:10,	31:24	20 26:7,	received
15:9	20 11:3	_____	8,9,23	4:2,3 6:3
26:25	32:18	Q	28:8	14:4
27:21	33:13	_____	29:8,9,	45:11
28:2,5	36:21	quality	10,19,21	recently
32:18	37:2,3	8:2,5,8,	31:22	44:17
39:11	38:19	9,14 9:2,	Rates	recognize
41:4	44:23	22 10:11,	24:18	35:6
programs	45:2,16	14,16	rationale	recognized
11:13	provided	question	45:16	3:22
progress	13:8	18:21	rationales	14:1,15
22:22	23:18	23:15	46:24	recommend
31:21	34:20	25:17,18	re-zoning	6:18 7:11
project	providing	26:2,3,12	7:15	11:20
18:11	35:8	27:9	reach	13:6,9
projections	public	34:11	38:8 40:5	17:6 34:2
16:19	4:2,4	46:13	reaching	41:21
projects	6:3,4 8:1	47:4	17:13	recommenda
7:15 9:15	10:18	quick	read	tion
10:11	12:9,22,	23:14	4:4 6:2	9:7 14:9,
11:16	23 13:16	quickly	12:12,15	11 15:23,
18:24,25	15:5,14,	30:2	14:6 16:4	25 16:4,
19:7	19 17:11	quorum	21:2	7,9,14
22:22	18:3,8,23	4:7,16	33:12	20:21
31:21	45:11,23	_____	reads	21:3,5,7,
41:23	pulled	R	6:5 10:20	15,16,17,
43:12	37:13	_____	ready	20 22:11,
45:19	purpose	raise	2:15	15,21,23
proposal	2:23	14:1,13,	10:15	24:3,5,7,
38:15	pursuant	16 31:11	realistic	14,15,16,
propose	2:24 3:12	raised	27:23	19 25:8
36:3,8,13	pushback	16:11	38:10,13	26:6,11
proposed	20:10	18:6	reasonable	27:6,7
8:18 11:4	pushing	raising	17:7	29:9,11,
23:19	19:9	16:22	28:11	25 30:3,
35:16	put	range	reasoning	5,6,9
protection	15:4,6	26:16	26:10	31:2,4,
6:24 7:5	17:16	rate	receive	14,20,23
9:25	18:11			32:1,10,
				16,18
				33:11,13,

25 34:1, 3,12,18 37:6 38:18,25 39:9,12, 16 41:7, 9,19,21, 23 42:13, 22,23,25 43:14,24 45:11	recreations 13:9 reducing 42:23 reference 8:16 13:7 reflect 9:5 45:10 regard 3:3,14 24:17 36:3 Regional 12:13 regulations 9:24 related 12:13 relates 14:2 remain 3:21 remember 25:11 26:13,15 reminder 38:18 remove 10:6 13:16 removing 13:6 rental 7:10 9:21 34:4,12 38:21 repeat 26:3 27:9 replace 35:12	replacing 45:8 replies 15:7 report 3:6,7,8 reporting 32:17 33:11 representin g 8:6 19:18 request 30:16 requested 44:24 requests 15:13 17:4 required 3:6 12:16 13:15 14:3 40:17 requirements 36:4,6,9 rescheduled 2:20 research 6:11 7:20 36:22 residence 12:8 residential 6:25 7:5, 9 9:12 10:1 12:5 15:18 residents	36:2 resource 10:15 respect 19:3 respond 19:2 response 14:9 responses 12:15 13:19 15:6 responsive 48:1 rest 17:22 restrictive 46:1 retention 41:25 42:4,7 revenue 26:11 37:14 review 3:7 45:22 revised 10:16 revision 12:17,21 revisit 26:25 revisited 40:25 rewarding 35:23 rezone 11:17	rezoned 17:16 rezoning 9:17 rights 3:10 road 12:22 13:16 roads 3:9 robust 37:22 rock 18:19 Rod 4:9,22,24 5:6 17:10,20 19:1 21:10,23, 25 22:16 23:7 24:7,22 29:12 30:13,16 31:6 33:20 35:1 37:5 38:10 39:2,18 40:19 41:9 42:17 43:17 48:10 RODERICK 4:10,21, 24 5:7,21 16:10,13, 16 19:1 21:11,24 22:2,6,17
recommenda tions 6:15,17 7:23 8:19,21 10:23 11:5,24 12:1 14:3,6, 20,21 15:7,10 18:22 19:23 23:17 40:25 46:23 recommended 6:22 11:7 12:15 13:18 14:8 18:22 22:24 24:6 26:8,9 recommends 9:2 11:5 recorded 2:5 recording 49:3 recouping 20:18				

23:2,9	scale	44:9,16	18:19	sources
24:8,22	10:9,10	46:5	six-	35:14
29:13	scale-based	set	9:10	37:14
33:21	10:7	13:3	six-month	south
35:1,3	scales	35:21,25	16:24	43:6
39:18	39:10	36:5	17:17	southside
40:11	schedule	SFH	19:15	42:1,5
41:10	12:18	24:17	22:24	43:2
42:18	13:14	share	24:6	so...
43:18	15:22	18:7,15	31:24	20:13
48:11	scheduled	20:18	32:3,11	26:20
Rod's	44:9	28:17	six-year-	speak
24:4,15	screen	31:7	47:12	4:1 14:1,
37:7,13,	13:25	shopped	six-year-	15 15:1
20 41:20	14:14	15:14	old	33:1
Roger	scrub	shows	47:20	47:23
5:20	37:22	32:19	size	SPEAKER
role	section	33:14	42:24	26:17
46:18	2:25	signals	43:13	48:21
roll	12:21,25	3:10	slash	49:2
4:6 48:4	13:16	significant	2:17	special
rules	45:1	7:19	sliding	22:24
19:13	sense	43:12	10:7,8,10	24:5
run	19:3	significant	39:10	31:23
26:20	24:25	ly	sliver	32:10
rush	28:19	23:5	40:8	specific
31:12	40:4	silent	smaller	18:24
	separate	34:12	26:19	23:11
<hr/> S <hr/>	23:18	similar	snapshot	43:8
	serve	32:1,2	34:22	specifies
safe	3:2 10:15	single	somebody's	13:2
48:22	service	24:18	18:16	spirit
salary	13:10,11,	26:8,23	sort	35:3
42:4,7	17 42:24	28:8 29:9	17:25	36:20
sale	43:1,12	single-	19:13	spoken
7:10	47:11,16	family	20:21	8:17
11:15	services	11:9,12,	sounds	spread
34:6	13:8	14 24:17,	37:11	25:14
38:22	18:3,8	19 26:7	source	26:18
Santaro	session	29:7	35:12	square
8:2	40:23	sitting		10:9

24:18,23	45:12	streets	24:15	17
25:1,5	standard	3:9 43:9	suggestions	tax
26:8	34:14	structure	32:16	11:13
27:8,14	45:24,25	6:18 7:18	supply	36:24
28:15,18	46:2	8:13 9:19	10:4	taxpayers
29:9	standards	10:7,8,9,	support	18:14,15
st	6:25 7:6	16 11:19	43:13,16	20:14
44:10	10:1	21:17	supports	taxpayer's
46:6	started	24:18,21	9:23	20:18
Stacey	43:3	26:7,9	surrounding	Teachey
4:13,14	starting	29:8,11	24:16	4:9,10,
5:1,15,	30:2	31:3	surveys	21,24
24,25	state	38:12,13	15:1,4	5:6,7,20,
20:14,19	3:11 28:1	structured	system	21 16:10,
21:12,13	35:10	19:8	30:12,23	13,16
22:7,9	stated	study	32:6	19:1
24:11,12	23:2	6:11 8:19	_____	21:10,11,
25:16,21,	35:19	12:14	T	23,24
25 26:3	states	13:19	_____	22:2,6,17
29:22,23	12:25	14:4	tackling	23:2,9
33:22,23	stating	44:3,7	17:14	24:7,8,22
39:6,7	13:9	45:1,13,	takes	29:12,13
41:16,17	stay	15,17	17:18	33:20,21
42:19,20	15:15	46:4,11	32:4	35:1,3
43:21,22	27:4	subject	talk	39:2,18
48:14,15	34:12	41:10	14:17	40:11
staff	48:21	submission	19:19	41:9,10
3:20 4:4,	steps	13:14	31:2	42:17,18
19 6:2	44:2	submit	talked	43:17,18
7:11	stock	3:7 6:14	24:20	48:10,11
11:20	35:20	8:23	26:14	team
12:14	storm	submitted	talking	2:4 47:11
14:20,21	6:25 7:5	8:12	16:24	technical
15:10	9:25	12:19	18:24	3:19
18:22	straight	subsidies	19:11	technically
25:7,8	30:21	35:9	Tallon	tentative
26:9,10	strain	sudden	15:3,17	44:6
34:17	18:3	32:7	26:21	term
46:23	strategy	suggest	27:9,15,	11:11
47:25	41:25	46:19	23 28:14,	22:22
staff's		suggestion		31:21
9:7		23:8,9		
stand				
10:15				

terms	19:18	tight	8:5	39:13
15:22		16:21		
18:20, 23	three-year		traffic	
19:14	19:21	Tim	3:10	<hr/> U <hr/>
20:25	20:8, 16	11:2	transaction	
40:24	31:6	time	16:21, 22, 23	Uh-huh
text	threshold	2:10 4:1, 19 7:19		26:17
13:6	36:12	16:25	transparenc	understand
that's	thresholds	19:15	y	35:6, 10
18:12	35:21, 24	21:3	7:21	37:12
24:1	39:20	31:7, 8	32:17	39:24
27:20	throwing	33:7, 12	35:4	43:4, 11
39:25	27:16	41:2 45:5	transparent	understandi
40:18	tie	timeframe	20:6	ng
41:7	22:15	19:19, 20, 21 21:19	transportat	10:24
there's	tier	31:5, 16	ion	16:3
39:13	27:2	timeline	12:23	23:22
they've	tiered	14:9	18:4	underwritte
20:15	10:7	16:5, 7	32:19	n
23:18	Tiffani	21:4	33:13	20:7
32:24	2:2, 3, 11, 14, 16 6:4	27:24	tree	unfinished
33:7	13:12	30:4 44:6	6:24 7:4	44:21
40:16	14:25	times	9:25 12:4	uniform
thing	16:3	17:1	true	38:14
2:13	20:21	tiny	47:20	unintention
14:17	21:1	40:8	tuning	ally
20:5	23:21, 22	Title	2:18	13:4
27:16	24:2	13:1, 2	turn	unit
things	32:15	today	13:20	36:7
46:19	34:14, 16, 19, 22	2:7, 12	two-	38:13
thinking	37:24	46:22, 24	21:18	units
19:24	38:1, 5	48:19	two-year	7:10 9:21
thinks	40:20	today's	6:22	34:5, 6, 7, 8, 12
31:7	41:2	2:3, 5, 17	19:20	35:25
thought	44:4, 15, 16, 23	4:17	20:13	36:15, 16, 18 37:2
18:17	46:20, 21, 22 47:3	town	31:5, 16	38:21, 22, 23, 24
thoughts	48:18	43:8	type	40:15
18:1	Tiffany	tracking	4:19	
thousand	6:5 25:12	44:15	16:21	
25:1		trade	17:6 23:5	
thousands			45:21	unmuted
				2:9
			typo	

update	vote	42:6	10,16,21	wondering
4:5	4:2 5:3,			25:7
10:13,24	10,11,17	wages	westside	
12:19	6:1,14	42:2	42:2,5	word
13:19,22	8:20	wait	43:1	45:8
14:4 28:1	14:2,6,7,	28:1	we'll	work
44:7	8 15:24,	waiver	5:3 15:22	15:16
45:2,10	25 16:3,9	11:10	16:8	28:24
46:4,11	20:22	wanna	21:6,20	35:4
	21:6,14,	25:13	24:4,7	39:11,25
updated	20,22	26:5	26:2	40:21,23
8:13 44:3	22:11,14	28:17	28:12	44:1,8,16
45:3,10	23:23,25	29:19	29:4,5,6,	46:4,10
47:14	24:4,7,13	35:5	11 32:15	47:12
updating	25:22	37:24	38:24	
28:2	29:4,6,	38:2	41:5	worked
	11,25	wanted	42:12	10:9
ups	30:8,11	30:19	43:14	working
44:24	31:13,14	31:11	45:16	25:16
usage	32:3,9,11	45:2	48:7,19	45:6
25:4	33:12	47:10	we've	worries
utilities	38:24	warranted	16:1	47:3
25:5	39:8	3:7	18:9,18	
	41:5,9	wash	20:6	worry
	42:13,21	26:12	24:20	19:16
v	43:14,23	watching	27:25	written
	44:10	2:9	43:10	3:7 21:22
verify	46:16,21	water	47:4 48:2	29:21
11:15	48:8,16	6:25 7:5	whatnot	
versus	voted	9:25	20:25	y
25:1	30:14	webpage	What'd	
vested	votes	4:6	29:17	yea
7:17 8:8	33:24	website	what's	5:10,18,
9:18	41:18	4:17,18	31:11	19 6:1
11:19	voting	44:15	40:17,23	20:22
vetted	24:4	west	who's	21:14
14:22	29:10	43:7	37:8	22:3,4
37:17	34:23	Westmorelan	who've	23:25
virtual	38:18	d	17:12	24:10,13
2:20	46:22	2:8,13	willingness	29:25
virtually	w	23:24	11:24	30:9,11
3:18	wage	47:7,8,	winds	31:16
vivid			18:19	32:11
47:12				33:24
				39:8
				41:13,15,

17,18	18:18
42:14,18,	20:20
20,21	30:7
43:22,23	you'll
48:11,16	36:21
year	you've
6:20 9:1,	17:16
5,7 11:8	
17:2	_____
18:17	Z
20:5	_____
21:19	zip
27:17,21	28:24
43:11	
year-plus	zoned
43:11	7:15 9:15
	11:17
years	Zoning
6:20,21	9:16
9:1,3,6	
11:7,8	Zoom
19:21	3:18
20:16	
21:18	
22:18,19	
27:25	
31:4,10,	
11,15	
34:14,16	
47:14	
yeas	
5:11	
21:15	
22:15	
30:1,15	
31:19	
32:14	
33:25	
39:9	
42:22	
43:24	
46:17	
48:17	
you'd	
14:1,14	