



# The Buckhead Council of Neighborhoods

## Board Meeting

December 10, 2009

Peachtree Presbyterian Church

6:35 – 8:20 PM

Meeting Minutes

### Meeting Attendees:

	<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Neighborhood/Organization</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
1	Graham Balch	Candidate - State Senate District 39	graham.balch@gmail.com
2	Frank Bennett	Paces	fobennett@yahoo.com
3	Laura Braddick	Northside Neighbor	lbraddick@mdjonline.com
4	Gordon Certain	North Buckhead	gcertain@comcast.net
5	Julian de Juan	Margaret Mitchell	jdejuan@rawdatainc.com
6	Sgt. Michael Harris	APD Zone 2	mharris@atlantaga.gov
7	David Haynes	Atlanta Regional Commission	DHaynes@atlantaregional.com
8	Jack Hellriegel	West Paces Northside	jehellriegel@comcast.net
9	Amy Hillman	Buckhead Forest	ahillman@tlplawfirm.com
10	Kim Kahwach	Buckhead Forest	kajensen@bellsouth.net
11	Barbara Kennedy	Collier Hills	bar2010@aol.com
12	Jim King	Chastain Park	jimking@mindspring.com
13	Walda Lavroff	North Buckhead	waldalavroff@comcast.net
14	Gary Neumark	Lindridge Martin Manor & VP-elect NPU-F	gneumark@gsu.edu
15	Kirk Oppenlander	Chastain Park	oppie@mindspring.com
16	Elizabeth Pritchard	Peachtree Battle Alliance	elizpritchard@bellsouth.net
17	Buff Quillian	Peachtree Heights West	BuffQuillian@gmail.com
18	Jane Rawlings	Lindridge Martin Manor & President-elect NPU-F	president@immna.org
19	Sue Roberts	Peachtree Heights East	Sroberts20@bellsouth.net
20	John Schaffner	Buckhead Reporter	johnschaffner@reporternewspapers.net
21	Bob Schneider	Garden Hills	bschneider@gardenhills.net
22	Bob Stasiowski	Peachtree Park	rstasiowski@yahoo.com
23	Charlotte Vicens	Margaret Mitchell	cavicens@yahoo.com
24	Marci Vincent	Mt Paran Northside	marcia_vincent@hotmail.com
25	Kerry Witt	Pine Hills	kerrywitt@mindspring.com
26	Henry Wyche	Grant Estates/South Tuxedo Park	hwyche@valleycap.com

### Representation by Neighborhood:

	<b>Neighborhood/Organization</b>	<b>Full Name</b>
1	Buckhead Forest	Kim Kahwach, Amy Hillman
2	Chastain Park	Jim King, Kirk Oppenlander
3	Collier Hills	Barbara Kennedy
4	Garden Hills	Bob Schneider
5	Grant Estates/South Tuxedo Park	Henry Wyche
6	Lindridge Martin Manor	Jane Rawlings, Gary Neumark
7	Margaret Mitchell	Julian de Juan, Charlotte Vicens
8	Mt Paran Northside	Marci Vincent
9	North Buckhead	Gordon Certain, Walda Lavroff
10	Paces	Frank Bennett
11	Peachtree Battle Alliance	Elizabeth Pritchard
12	Peachtree Heights East	Sue Roberts
13	Peachtree Heights West	Buff Quillian
14	Peachtree Park	Bob Stasiowski
15	Pine Hills	Kerry Witt
16	West Paces Northside	Jack Hellriegel

### I. Welcome

Jim King called the meeting to order at around 6:35 PM.

# BCN Board Meeting Minutes – December 10, 2009

## **II. Introductions**

The attendees introduced themselves. Kerry Witt, the new president of the Pine Hills neighborhood association, attending for the first time, introduced himself.

Collier Hills was approved by the board as a BCN member. They should have been considered for membership in the November meeting but were not because of an oversight. BNC membership now stands at 26 neighborhoods as shown in the map to the right.

THE BUCKHEAD COUNCIL OF NEIGHBORHOODS



## **III. Approval of Minutes**

Minutes for December were approved by the Board with modifications.

## **IV. Committee Reports**

### **Public Safety**

Kim Kahwach reported that her committee had its first meeting on December 7. Attendees included Lt. Cotter, Mitzie from Peachtree Battle, Charles Merrywether and Bob Schneider from Garden Hills, Jack Hellriegel from West Paces Northside, Roxanne Sullivan and Jennifer Jones from Lindridge Martin Manor, Sherry Joiner from Peachtree Battle Alliance, and Barbara Kennedy from Garden Hills.

They discussed how to get a community prosecutor funded for Zone 2. They came up with a two-step plan: (1) presidents of member neighborhoods would be requested to send a letter or e-mail to the Fulton County Commissioners, (2) the member neighborhoods would have a petition signed to be forwarded to the Fulton County Commissioners.

**Parks** - Henry Wyche reported that Kenny Rogers decorated the triangle park at Habersham and Valley Roads.

**Education** - No report.

**Communications** - No report.

**Transportation** - No report, but is the topic of one of the invited speakers.

## **V. General Business**

### **Community Prosecutor**

Jim sent a letter on behalf of the BCN Board to Commissioner Pitts, Fulton County Post 2, asking him to find money to fund that position, with a CC to DA Howard and Major Browning. Jim spoke to Pitts on the phone – Pitts said he would look into it. Jim subsequently saw DA Howard who said he would follow up with Pitts.

### **Membership Outreach**

The vote to admit Collier Hills (mentioned in II, above) was conducted at this time. Collier Hills was admitted to BCN.

Elizabeth Pritchard mentioned that Wildwood and Springlake were interested in BCN. Eric Rainy was working to help organize the Brandon neighborhood.

### **Development Task Force** (Creation of the "Development and Infrastructure Committee")

**Summary:** A motion was made and approved to create the "Development and Infrastructure Committee" with Elizabeth Prichard as the chair. Jim King asked that her committee investigate the concept of impact fee credits proposed by Amy Hillman in her comments below and whether the SPI plans could include improvements in adjacent impacted neighborhood areas. He also asked her committee to look into the three-person panel described below. There was a lot of concern expressed that the SPI-9 proposal could

## BCN Board Meeting Minutes – December 10, 2009

reduce neighborhood involvement in decisions affecting neighborhoods. It was decided that Jim Durrett and Denise Starling would be invited as main speakers to the January meeting.

**Details:** Elizabeth has previously headed this team to deal with some of the more commercial zoning, the expansion of the BCID, and the SPI zoning overlays. Jim asked Elizabeth what she wanted to call the group: development task force, CID task force, SPI task force, etc. Elizabeth said the concern is, as the CID moves down Peachtree Road, going from Pharr Road to I-85, all of those neighborhoods bordering Peachtree Road will be affected and will want to have a voice as will the neighborhoods north of Pharr.

In the last meeting Kim Kahwach had asked some of the candidates running for city-wide office if they would support appointing neighborhood representatives to the CID board. In discussion, board members commented we currently don't have direct neighborhood representation on the CID. Neighborhoods were involved in SPI 9 negotiations. Some neighborhood participants (Kim Kahwach) expressed frustration that the SPI-9 plan documents did not represent their expressed neighborhood desires but others (Bob Stasiowski) disagreed, saying the SPI, by ordinance, cannot affect the neighborhoods directly -- he said "the SPI cannot physically touch the neighborhoods", that they have to stay within the SPI boundaries.

Jim asked Bob Stasiowski to describe what he thinks SPI-9 is. Bob said, "The SPI-9 statement of intent lists about 15 items, including three or four really important items. One, is to get the density off of Peachtree and spread it more into the Buckhead Village. Two, is to get taller buildings off of Peachtree, so you have more mid-sized buildings on Peachtree and through the Buckhead Village. ... It is also trying to solve transportation, both pedestrian and vehicle traffic problems, it's trying to have more greenspace, and solve parking problems. Those are the big items."

Jim asked that we jump out of agenda sequence and ask for comments from Amy Hillman. Amy had been scheduled as the second invited speaker on the agenda, to be speaking on "Zoning". Jim asked Amy to explain her understanding of SPI-9.

Amy said that what Bob said "is the sales pitch for SPI-9. I don't agree that that is what the ultimate document accomplishes, at all. And the SPI-9, you are correct, it started out as a revision to an overlay district; it has now been changed to be a standalone zoning district. So the very first paragraph...." Bob interjected: "Those were the City's requests, right. Is that correct? [Unintelligible.]" Amy continued, "That's right. I have a real problem with that though because, it says right at the beginning that these regulations shall supplant existing districts or portions of existing districts as shown on the map. All of your commercial things that surround my neighborhood that are C1-Conditional, C3-Conditional, those are all hard-fought conditions that neighborhoods that border this SPI have accomplished over the years, whether it is buffers, or setbacks or whatever -- those are gone." Bob: "No." Amy: "That's what the document says." Bob, "Well the document is not in its final form, I don't believe, but -- that was a big discussion the other night, was it not Kim?" Kim: "Um-hum." Amy: "But it is in the document." Bob: "And the conditions they said remain, and if it was not in the document, then they made a mistake and are fixing it, because there is no intent ... [interruption: Amy: "You're more trusting than I am."] ... maybe I'm a little naive when it comes to that, but, ..."

A 10-minute discussion followed with two positions represented: Bob and Elizabeth Prichard (who had been briefed by Denise Starling) on one side and Kim and Amy on the other on whether the SPI-9 proposal superseded existing zoning conditions. Subsequent communications from Eric Boseman though Denise Starling confirmed that while provisions to preserve existing conditions were not in the draft SPI-9 document they would be added.

Questions were made about whether the density credits provided by the SPI-9 plan were needed and if there were, if a whole new zoning system was needed to accomplish them. As Amy Hillman put it, "If you are going to have an ordinance that is going to supplant the existing zoning ordinances and regulations, ... set up an amorphous body for bureaucrats or their designees to approve variations to this ordinance, ... I am just not seeing the public benefit. The public has more leverage right now because people have to negotiate with them to make the changes they want." Amy continued: "My issue is consideration of neighborhoods. They (Scotty Greene) were clearly not interested in considering concessions for neighborhoods -- but the developers are interested in getting impact fee credit for making improvements for the neighborhoods because that real estate costs less for them. It's a win-win -- they don't have to give up their \$21 million per acre land." Jim: "Is Scotty Greene still involved?" Walda: "No. Jim Durrett is now involved and he has a totally different attitude towards neighborhoods." Amy: "Well maybe I'll go see him. After that one meeting I didn't want to go back." Bob: "After the City said go redo the whole thing, I am not sure they actually had a steering committee meeting. John: "They said they did." Bob: If this is

## BCN Board Meeting Minutes – December 10, 2009

really getting ready to go to City Council for a vote, all we can do is get" the City Council's ear. Jim: "Many from the City Council have visited us and we have a new mayor..."

John Schaffner commented: "One thing, that was the final public forum basically for the development of the ordinance. Now, the only public input after that is essentially is that when it goes before the City Council, and they're hoping to give City of Atlanta approval in the first quarter of 2010." Jim, "So it will have to go through committee, and be read and then go to Council."

There was concern expressed that the SPI-9 plan provided for a three-person panel might issue special administrative permits without using the normal public process. Would the three be BCID, BATMA and NPU-B? Jim King commented: "So we need to ... take a look if there's a way make sure there's community input."

There was discussion of whether there was a lack of support for the NPU system on the part of the City. Walda Lavroff commented: "My zoning committee asked all four of the mayoral candidates what their plans were to either to enhance the NPU system or create some other organized system for citizen input, which is required by the City Charter of 1973. NONE of them answered. Not one of them. ... It is required: there has to be some organized forum for citizen participation. It does not have to be the NPU system -- that is up to the mayor and council-- but you are right, the current system needs to be either brought up to the current situation or it needs to be replaced by something."

### **VII. Invited Speakers**

#### **Amy Hillman -- Zoning lawyer, resident of Buckhead Forest**

"I was on the SPI-9 steering committee as well. I went with two goals in mind. One was to cultivate a better ability for developers to work with neighborhoods, and instead of doing tiny little pieces of greenspace in terms of parking lots trees or landscaping strips in front of buildings, or green rooftops which is something that is promoted in this SPI-9 document (I fail to see how it [green rooftops] benefits anybody except the people directly under the roof, if them), because that would provide not only an incentive for dialogue between the communities and the developers but also would be a more cost effective ability for them to put their greenspace somewhere where it matters and would have some impact. If we take my neighborhood as an example, Kim and I were able to negotiate with a developer to do two small pocket parks that are going to be built in our neighborhood. These will be great because, to be honest with you, the people who live in places like Terminus and 'Oh 5' are not walking their dogs and their kids in the parking decks -- they are coming to our neighborhoods. So why not (since we don't see any of the impact fee money) have an incentive for developers to let them have impact fee credit to build parks in neighborhoods?

"My second goal, since it has certainly happened to my neighborhood, that there be some standards for parking decks that are adjacent to residential neighborhoods. There are examples all over the country, I was a planner, I was a zoning lawyer for ten years and have a little bit of education in this area, you can make them look like a primary structure , you can do things like reducing the wattage of the lights, not having lights on the top level so they are not shining down on neighborhoods from the top parapet wall like 'Close Encounters of the Third Kind'. There are a lot of things that can be done. Parking decks are going to be necessary thing to have in the city but there are a lot of things that can be done make them more palatable."

There was audience discussion about the Carter development and legislation affecting the appearance of parking decks. John Schaffner said that a Howard Shook ordinance requires that the deck has to conform to the appearance of the main structure. Amy was concerned that the SPI-9 document took precedence over conflicting ordinances except when historic preservation was involved. She said that there is nothing that helps with the impact that the developments have on adjoining neighborhoods.

#### **David Haynes, Senior Planner, Atlanta Regional Commission**

**Summary:** ARC is strictly a planning agency. They do not design, build or operate anything. The GA400/I-85 Interchange project is in the Regional Transportation Plan for the 2014-2020 time period. Lobbying the City and our area's GDOT board member (Emory McClinton) are especially important.

**Details:** David explained that he was not an expert in the GA400/I-85 interchange and wasn't familiar with the design of the ramps, the impact on adjoining homes or the impact on local surface traffic. Those are



## BCN Board Meeting Minutes – December 10, 2009

issues that GDOT and SRTA deal with. He will talk about where the project stands in the regional planning process, what the process is and the role ARC plays in that process.

ARC is strictly a planning agency. They do not design, build or operate anything. ARC wears many hats. It deals, for instance, with transportation issues and water issues. What is ARC's planning boundary? That depends on what hat you are talking about. The ARC is one of 12 regional commissions established by state law. Every county is assigned to a regional commission, which provide basic planning services: transportation, land use, etc. Ten counties make up ARC but many ARC issues impact other areas. Air quality, for instance, impacts 20 counties related to the area's transportation system. Water issues involve a 16 county planning district. Census issues deal variously with 26 and 33 counties.

Transportation urbanized area involves all of 13 counties and parts of 5 more defined by the Metropolitan Planning Organization Boundary. It is revised in the census cycle (every ten years) and is defined by population densities of 1000 people per square mile. The 10 county ARC area board is composed of 39 members: the county commission chairs, the Mayor of the City of Atlanta, several citizen members. Tad Leithead is their first citizen chair who took over from outgoing Sam Owens. Under the ARC board is a Transportation Air Quality Committee (TAQC) with 29 members, including reps from GDOT, the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, MARTA, and a rep from the Metro Atlanta Mayors Association plus the chairs from the other 8 counties outside the 10 county area. The TAQC is the policy body. Underneath it is a technical committee with the planning staff from the TAQC's cities and counties. Collectively, those three levels are referred to as the Metropolitan Planning Organization Process. A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is required by federal law for every metropolitan area with more than 50,000 people.

How do you know who does what: ARC vs GRTA vs GDOT vs SRTA, etc. The roles are defined in the following matrix. When it comes to transportation projects there are four aspects:

- planning (funding, political, technical analysis and justification, congestion relief potential, benefit/cost, neighborhood impacts)
- implementation: engineering, design,
- implementation: right-of-way acquisition, construction, and
- operation (MARTA runs the buses and trains; SRTA collecting the tolls and maintaining GA 400)

There are three levels:

- state
- regional
- local

Q: where does the Georgia 400 interchange project fall into the matrix? A: It falls into all of them: state, regional and local for all phases of the project. It provides a huge cross-regional connectivity. The GA400/I-85 interchange is of state-wide importance as the intersection of any two interstates would be. It is close to the Buckhead and Midtown Major Activity Centers, very important to the region's economy, so it is regional. At the local level, single-family neighborhoods about the interchange. ARC is by definition a regional agency and is funded by dues from member local governments pay and the federal government.

Q: Does GRTA have a role in GA400? A: GRTA has two primary functions: they operate the express bus service and they have approval authority over the Atlanta Region's TIP. Under federal law, a region's transportation improvement program has to be approved by the governor of that state; the governor can delegate that authority to others -- that power has been invested in GRTA. They do not have authority over the long range transportation plan but they do over the TIP. Once a project is in an ARC plan, GRTA still has to sign off on it on behalf of the governor before it can be implemented. Projects like the GA400/I-85 interchange obviously fall into that category.

Q. Can GRTA insert anything into the TIP or do they just approve items that have been placed in the TIP? A. They can negotiate on behalf of the governor for changes to the TIP. They participate on the ARC's technical and policy committees, so the ARC tries to get their input throughout the process. But they can't do line item vetoes of a TIP submitted to them -- it is an up or down vote on the entire TIP.

Acronyms: RTP (Regional Transportation Plan) and TIP (Transportation Improvement Program). These are the two main documents that an MPO is responsible for producing. The RTP has to cover a planning horizon that goes out at least 20 years -- the current one was adopted in 2007 and goes out to 2030 -- the name of it is Envision 6. The RTP has to be updated at least every four years. The RTP includes:

- any project using federal funds and

## BCN Board Meeting Minutes – December 10, 2009

- any project that is deemed to be regionally significant -- any major capacity project, roadway or transit, that can alter mobility patterns in the region.

RTP plans have to meet federal ozone/air quality requirements. Once they have a set of projects, they run them through a travel demand model and then run the results through an air quality model and the emissions have to come within a budget that they are given. If they don't meet the emissions budget, they can't get approval from the federal government to spend federal money on certain types of projects.

The TIP is a subset of the RTP. The RTP can be more vague in terms of schedule, configuration, cost, funding or contractor. In the TIP (by federal law at least the first four years of the RTP), every detail must be specified: cost, year of engineering, year of right of way, year of construction, who does what, where the match amount is coming from, etc.

Currently, funding sources are a big problem. At the same time, project costs have increased, but in the last six months, costs have improved. Atlanta is the poster child for sprawl and designing transportation systems to serve such a huge area are very difficult. Overall it is a \$67 billion plan between now and 2030. About 60% of that money is simply maintenance: keeping roads paved and traffic lights operational, keeping MARTA working, and filling potholes. New projects comprise less than 40%.

Managed Lanes -- a fancy term for HOV or express lanes. Access to the lane is restricted in some way. Occupancy, type of vehicle, toll (all of GA 400 through Buckhead is a managed lane facility). The trend over the next several years is to convert HOV lanes to HOT lanes (commonly called Lexus lanes). If you carpool, they are still free. But since there is excess capacity, you can buy your way into it.

The RTP has to be updated every four years and the new plan will be called "Plan 2040", to be adopted by June/July 2011. They are well into the process. During the last 6 months, they have done a regional assessment. Starting in January, they will look at individual systems (expressways down to bicycle networks, sidewalk access around MARTA stations, etc.) There will be a reassessment of every project that's in the plan. A new draft plan should be available by December of 2010.

Q. The GA400/I-85 interchange is an "incomplete project". Does that help it move up or down the priority list? A. Promises are part of the political side of the process which, while important, is the responsibility of the board -- at the staff level, they look at technical merits and disadvantages. They are modeling at the 18 county (actually 20) level -- in their model, they will have Piedmont, Sidney Marcus, Buford Highway, Cheshire Bridge and will have a general idea of what is happening with volumes on those facilities, but there is a danger when applying the results of a regional model to a specific local situation -- it is not designed to do a great job at that. Another type of modeling would give much better result.

Q. Is your model predictive of changes that might happen with public transportation that might happen in the next ten years? A. Our model includes transit, bus routes and bus stops on streets included in the model. All of this is built on top of a land use model -- they have an entire division that does this, looking at the national level and national economy, immigration, aging patterns, boil it down to the state and region level, down to the county level even to smaller "traffic analysis zones" (ATZs). They look at how many people will be living in areas, how much commercial will be there, major generators like universities, airports, income levels -- it is a really complex model. They collect housing permits and foreclosure rates each year from the region to determine impact for each of these zones. But the model cannot look at things on a year by year basis.

Q. The TIP is being updated on the same schedule. We had Gena Evans last month and we established that there was a lot of cash on hand for 400. If there is money like that, does it have to go through the TIP? A. Yes, regardless of fund sources, a regionally significant project has to be modeled and go through the air quality measurement. If they wanted to use toll money to build a sidewalk, that wouldn't have to be in the TIP.

They are putting a lot of emphasis on city and county transportation plans as part of a program the ARC started 4 or 5 years ago. The ARC provides money for miniature versions of the RTP. The City of Atlanta is treated as its own county, since it is bigger than a lot of counties. The Connect Atlanta Plan was adopted last year. The ARC is going to put a lot of stock in what the City of Atlanta's official position is on various projects in feeding up to Plan 2040. They will also look at Concept 3, a regional transit vision and local livable center initiatives, which are ARC funded. CID projects are also taken into consideration. The state vision is also considered, including a possible regional sales tax and revising MARTA's 50%-50% funding split. Lastly, in Washington, the stimulus pumped in about \$600 million which filled a huge hole in

## BCN Board Meeting Minutes – December 10, 2009

the budget and helped keep a lot of projects on schedule. The federal transportation law needs to be reauthorized. More emphasis is expected on livability and transit, a lot less emphasis on road way capacity projects. A lot of unknowns exist now which will affect Plan 2040.

On their web site -- go to AtlantaRegion.com, click on transportation, click on public participation -- they have an overall public participation report that explains the methods they use to talk to people. For any project such as GA400, do a little reading and see how you might be most effective in making those policy revisions for the Plan 2040.

Q. Specifically, what steps can we take to make sure that the GA400/I-85 interchange project is in the next TIP? A. The current status of the project -- it is funded in the long range part of the plan -- there has been some money spent to do engineering on the project, but any right-of-way acquisition or construction is not currently within the TIP period. It is beyond the year 2013. It is in the 2014 to 2020 time frame. It is the regional plan. ARC supports that project. When you get into detail design, the issue of how it might affect particular neighborhoods must be considered. ARC knows that when and if the project moves forward, it must be designed in the best possible way to deal with those local concerns. He thinks the most effective way to advocate for/against is to work through your local officials, not only your council member, mayor's office, get to know who your GDOT board member is (he thinks it might be Emory McClinton). It is really true that the squeaky wheel gets the grease. The Northern Arc is a perfect example of a project that was taken out by a groundswell of public opposition. On the other side, if there is a lot of public support, officials will take the position that "they will only vote for the Plan if this project is included". It is about politics. Elected officials do listen to the public.

Q when you say that the ARC supports the project, is that based on having modeling data that shows that this project will actually mitigate the congestion for the long term? He can't say that they have done detailed modeling in that area. He can say that this project has been around for a long time, is one that GDOT over the years has asked us to carry forward in the plan and is obviously a missing mobility connection -- so the analysis by the ARC so far is looking at the role that project would play in the region's mobility network. As projects move from the long-range to the TIP period, a lot of other issues start bubbling up. People say, "Have you thought about X?" There are three or four projects that they are going to take a close look at and do some soul searching -- is this something we want to move forward on and if so, what is the justification for it? What are the impacts and how do we mitigate those impacts?

Q. Can you enlighten us on the suggested plan to put GA 400 in a tunnel under the city down to I-20 or I-675? A. It would be a parallel reliever to the Downtown Connector from GA 400 down to I-675 by the airport. Q. Is that in any plan yet? A. No. This project has a really interesting history to it. He says he will get up on a soapbox here. Where this came from is a free market think tank called the Reason Foundation. This is an outfit which has basically never found a road that it doesn't like. There has been a lot of change in the mindset of the region over the past decade about our transportation priorities and for whatever reason they have decided that the direction we were going is not good, so they took it upon themselves after we did our last plan update, they came up with their own plan for the Atlanta region, and that's where this tunnel came from. Q. The e-mail we got about this mentioned that it would be a public/private toll road. A. GDOT has stepped in a big pile of mess over the project. The tunnel is not in any statewide plan, it is not in any region plan, it hasn't been adopted by any agency -- it is basically just an idea. But it did show up on a list. They are backtracking -- it will be a bear to deal with it.

### **VIII. Community Concerns**

**APD Sgt. Michael Harris** - Crime is down 9% across Zone 2. Extra funds have been allocated for areas affected by burglaries. People are stealing copper and APD is trying to be innovative. Lt. Cotter's cell is 404-617-0830. Sgt. Harris 404-551-8242. Lt. Cotter is going to the Lenox substation. Their new lieutenant is T Reeves.

### **IX. Next Meeting**

- TBD (January 14)

### **X. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at around 8:20 PM.

Prepared by Gordon Certain  
BCN Secretary  
January 13, 2010

BCN Organizational Status as of 12/10/09																
		Represented?														
		2008			2009											
		Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
	Neighborhood	BCN Member?														
1	Arden															
2	Ardmore Park	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
3	Brookwood							✓							✓	
4	Brookwood Hills											✓				
5	Buckhead Forest	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
6	Buckhead Heights										✓					
7	Castlewood	✓									✓			✓		
8	Chastain Park	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
9	Collier Hills	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
10	Collier Hills North									✓						
11	Garden Hills	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
12	Grant Estates/South Tuxedo Park	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
13	Historic Brookhaven	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓	
14	Kingswood	✓	✓						✓							
15	Lindridge Martin Manor	✓	✓			✓									✓	✓
16	Margaret Mitchell	✓				✓				✓				✓		✓
17	Memorial Park	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓			✓	
18	Mount Paran Parkway														✓	
19	Mt. Paran-Northside	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓			✓
20	North Buckhead	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
21	P'tree Battle Alliance	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
22	Paces	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓	✓			✓	✓
23	Paces West	✓			✓	✓										
24	Peachtree Heights East	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓			✓			✓
25	Peachtree Heights West	✓		✓									✓		✓	✓
26	Peachtree Hills	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	
27	Peachtree Park	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
28	Pine Hills			✓												✓
29	Pleasant Hill															
30	Randall Mill															
31	Ridgedale Park	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓	
32	Springlake															
33	Tuxedo Park	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
34	Wesley Battle	✓			✓		✓									
35	West Paces Northside	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
36	Whitewater Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
37	Wildwood		✓													
Count		26	17	13	18	14	20	17	12	14	18	17	15	17	11	16