

LAKE COUNTY

IMPACT FEE / CAPITAL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 6, 2011

County Commission Liaison: Commissioner Sean Parks, District 2

Members Present: Davis Talmage, Banking and Finance
Jeffrey Banker, Citizen at Large
Bill Benham, Agricultural Industry Representative
John Buxman, Chamber of Commerce
Nancy Hurlbert, Citizen At Large
Carol MacLeod, Lake County Schools
Linda Nagle, Home Builders Association of Lake County
Jim Richardson, League of Cities
Ralph Smith, Citizen At Large
Alan Winslow, Citizen at Large

Staff Present: Melanie Marsh, Assistant County Attorney
Jim Stivender, Jr., Public Works Director
Steve Koontz, Budget Director
T.J. Fish, Lake-Sumter MPO Director
Amye King, Growth Management Director
Paul Simmons, Growth Management Planner
Fred Schneider, County Engineer
Debi Tinis, Financial Coordinator
Deb Marchese, Subdivision Specialist
Cheryl Sutherland, Office Associate III

Media Present: Livi Stanford, Daily Sun

Citizen Present: Vance Jochim

Call to Order: Chairman Talmage called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

Chairman Talmage asked if there were any questions to the minutes; and made a motion to approve minutes from September 29, 2011; John Buxman so moved and seconded by Alan Winslow. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Business – Review Chairman’s Letter / Finalize Recommendations

CHAIRMAN’S LETTER

Mr. Talmage advised that Mr. Stivender is running late for meeting and suggested the committee take a few minutes to read through the Chairman’s letter and then he will open for discussion and suggestions. Nancy Hurlbert advised she had two comments – one being that the committee had talked about including in cover letter about acknowledging the school board possibly needing to go out and in no way to undermine the school board or set the committee up as competitors. Also, in paragraph two (last paragraph on first page), one sentence saying ‘critical to implement’, she believes that even though it is a true statement, it is not strong enough as the committee had said a lot more than that. Chairman Talmage requested these items be brought up at the end of the letter to discuss.

Paragraph 2: Bill Benham thought the committee’s discussions regarding ‘all’, he did not think it was stated ‘all recommendations / revenue sources must be implemented’ or was it said Ad Valorem and 6-cent local option. Chairman Talmage advised it was talked about. Mr. Benham stated as he reads it, it states ‘all ’ sources of revenue must be implemented. Nancy Hurlbert advised that is a true statement when you read to relieve the budgetary shortfall; if addressing the entire shortfall you need all of them.

Paragraph 2 (continued):

Mr. Benham advised he does not believe the committee met all of them, even if we implemented every one of the revenue sources, still did not meet the shortfall and projected revenues; did not accomplish their task by funding everything on the list of projects. Alan Winslow advised one thing that is not addressed in the letter is needs --- committee has not passed judgment on whether \$700 million is needed and Mr. Benham stated the committee has to rely on the analysis of the Public Works Department.

Linda Nagle suggested that maybe a statement to that affect needs to be in the letter --- 'based on the assumption that the \$700 million is an accurate reflection of the needs of the County. Mr. Benham asked if it is critical needs or needs and Ms. Nagle stated the committee did not pass any judgment on that and needs to be clear that they did not do that. Alan Winslow advised the committee is not putting their creditability on the line of that \$700 million. Chairman Talmage asked if the line "Lake County's projected \$700 million lack of funding" on page one, second paragraph be removed and the word "projected" be replaced with assumed or requested.

Jim Richardson stated that originally he thought the projected number was \$773 Million, and T.J. Fish advised that based on the Adopted MPO Plan they have a capacity number that was firm and adopted. Mr. Benham said from the last meeting, he remembers asking Mr. Stivender what portion of revenues he got from somewhere else and he advised 40%. Jim Richardson stated yes, but it was not included in the money he needed. Linda Nagle said she thinks that the main point is not the amount, but the committee is assuming that the amount is right, but the stated needs and projected dollar amount are correct. Jeffrey Banker suggested that he believes the paragraph needs an extra sentence. Linda Nagle suggested to remove the first sentence in paragraph two, and begin the sentence with "In the fall of 2010, the Board of County Commissioners broadened the scope of the Lake County Impact.....", and to replace 'alternative funding' with 'funding'. The committee discussed possible changes to the second paragraph amongst themselves.

Linda Nagle read the suggested changes to paragraph two – "In the fall of 2010, the Board of County Commissioners broadened the scope of the Lake County Impact Fee Committee to include all Capital Facilities for the County. The committee, retitled as the Capital Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC), was tasked with an intense six month meeting schedule to address the issues with Lake County's projected \$700 million funding requests for transportation through 2035 and to create a list of recommendations for funding". The committee, comprised of 11 appointed citizens with diverse professional backgrounds, met twice a month for six months to absorb and study the information provided by County staff. The committee based its report on the assumptions that the requested funding and transportation needs are accurate." Carol McLeod asked to add the word 'needs' after transportation in the second sentence in paragraph two. Alan Winslow stated that he had a problem with the last sentence stating 'requested funding', as the committee is recommending and the staff valued their projected funding. Linda Nagle asked if the sentence 'as provided by staff' should be added, and Mr. Winslow advised that the committee has taken two things as assumptions, 1) valuation that was given to the committee and 2) assuming needs are accurate. Mr. Winslow reported that staff came up with all valuations and projections. Bill Benham mentioned what the committee is trying to say is they are not looking at the \$700 million as a true number as it was given to them. Mr. Winslow added nor are they confident that the value that was recommended is there either. Mr. Talmage advised you cannot keep putting words into the phrase, as it is pretty clear on what is trying to be conveyed.

Alan Winslow stated he did not have the figures but the last time it was figured, only came up with \$450 Million and Jim Richardson mentioned it thought it was \$551 Million. Bill Benham asked if that was if all revenue sources were adopted and advised yes. He advised when you start projecting numbers, you will have variations that can change every month. Mr. Benham stated that when Mr. Stivender gets back, he has a question regarding revenue sources that we have now will be able to fund him for the next two years in the short term, as some of them do not take affect for some time.

Fred Schneider reported that the Public Works Department can fund their operations for the next three years, but falling behind in capital such as resurfacing, sidewalk program, and any new roads they are using money (Impact Fees) that is left over. Bill Benham mentioned until the sales tax is collected in 2017, he wondered if there would be a gap of projects that will not be completed and advised yes.

Paragraph 2 (continued):

T.J. Fish said that in the letter, he had a problem with the word 'request', as it is not a request but a reality. Linda Nagle stated that you have to request funds and Mr. Fish advised it is a deficit. Amye King asked if he is suggesting to use the word 'deficit' instead of request, and T.J. stated yes as it is more accurate. In reference to second part of paragraph two, Mr. Winslow asked if the committee evaluated the BCC's priorities, and Mr. Benham advised that the committee did not go through the project list, but just went through the revenue sources.

Chairman Talmage stated that the committee evaluated the revenue sources and that the BCC's priorities have not been focused on transportation. Mr. Benham said that it is not up to the committee to analyze the short list of projects from Mr. Stivender, but took any revenue source that could be used for transportation and tried to project numbers. Mr. Winslow mentioned that in the paragraph before the committee went to great lengths to cover them and asked if they really wanted to state that they evaluated the priorities. Carol McLeod suggested taking out that paragraph, and address the transportation needs of the County regarding future fundamental needs. Mr. Benham suggested to state that the committee concentrated on funding sources to try to accommodate the list of projects the County may need. Linda Nagle suggested to Chairman Talmage that a period be placed after the word 'County' and delete remaining of sentence.

After further discussion, the committee decided that paragraph two should read as follows:

"In the fall of 2010, the Board of County Commissioners broadened the scope of the Lake County Impact Fee Committee to include all Capital Facilities for the County. The committee, retitled as the Capital Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC), was tasked with an intense six month meeting schedule to address the issues surrounding Lake County's projected \$700 million funding request for transportation needs through 2035, and to create a list of recommendations for funding. The committee, comprised of 11 appointed citizens with diverse professional backgrounds, met twice a month for six months to absorb and study the information provided by County staff. The committee based its report on the assumptions that the evaluation of the projected funding and transportation needs provided by the staff are accurate. The recommendations listed in the attached document were thoroughly dissected and vigorously discussed. While our committee members had differing opinions in some areas, our mission remained intact: to address the transportation funding needs of the County".

Paragraph 3:

After discussion, the committee decided that paragraph three should read as follows:

"The recommendations listed in the attached document were thoroughly dissected and vigorously discussed. While our committee members had differing opinions in some areas, our mission remained intact: to address the transportation funding needs of the County."

Paragraph 4:

Jim Richardson suggested on line five to remove the word "coming' and to read ".....to meet our current and future transportation funding needs". Linda Nagle mentioned in the next sentence, to move the word 'revelation' behind the word 'This'. Ralph Smith suggested in line three to change the word 'consideration' to 'credence'. In line seven, it was also suggested to remove the word 'alternative'. Linda Nagle asked to remove the word 'previous' in line three, as this committee is not a task force, there was only one task force.

After discussion, the committee decided paragraph three should read as follows:

"In 2008, The Transportation Alternative Funding Task Force (Task Force) conducted a similar study on the deficiencies in transportation funding for Lake County. CFAC utilized that report as a guideline for its study, and gave much credence to the work of the Task Force. While the economic environment is assuredly different now, the current CFAC came to many of the same conclusions as our predecessors: we can no longer rely on a singular funding source to meet our current and future transportation funding needs. This revelation was not shocking, so we quickly turned our attention to the work at hand: to identify funding solutions that are available and to prioritize them, as well as to create certain guidelines for their use and implementation."

Paragraph 5:

Alan Winslow stated that he has a fundamental problem with what is being stated such as "recommendations have been established to function as a comprehensive solution; they must all be implemented in order to relieve the budgetary shortfall." He advised that what the committee is recommending meets only 75% of what is being asked for, and therefore not relieving the budgetary shortfall. Bill Benham said that he is uncomfortable with saying that all recommendations have to be implemented, as there was a majority to implement all of them, but some of the votes were not unanimous. He suggested saying that these are your tools to try and fund it by, as there was a majority vote on Ad Valorem and 6-cent, etc. Mr. Talmage stated that the BCC asked the committee to create a 'portfolio' and the committee has on each line item, and if you do not tell the BCC that, and they use only one and might not fund it; therefore need to tell the BCC the committee has created a portfolio to generate an amount of money. Alan Winslow advised he agrees that he does not like everything being put into the letter, which is one issue, but if you look at these recommendations as a 'third party' and take the majority's recommendations, that would be only 75% of requirements – do I ignore the other 25%?

Bill Benham mentioned that 100% have been funded if you utilize # 6 in the recommendations. T.J. Fish reported that the Task Force kept going back to the word portfolio and wondered why the County picked only one funding source for capacity, as you need to diversify. Chairman Talmage advised that the committee's job was to create funding sources, which they have done, and are tied into each other. Bill Benham asked if everyone was comfortable with the vote in recommendation #5, as he believes it was passed at 7-1 (inclusive of tying into unemployment rate), which was originally a 4-3 vote. Alan Winslow stated that he originally did not vote for Impact Fees, but if you are going to have Impact Fees, he agrees with the concept. Mr. Winslow asked if there is a need to add the votes to each recommendation, since they are already in the minutes. Mr. Benham advised stresses how much each recommendation was considered and adds 'flavor' to the committee. Commissioner Parks added that the committee could add the descending or minority opinion to the recommendation.

Mr. Winslow added that is it fair to say that there were disagreements along the way, but in the end the committee came up with the package, and would be willing to vote for the package even with disagreements. Linda Nagle agreed that they should not have in sentence "they must all be implemented in order to relieve the budgetary shortfall." Jim Stivender added that there is a capital and maintenance shortfall and not a 'budgetary shortfall'. Jeffrey Banker advised he liked saying the recommendations is not a comprehensive solution, but a 'portfolio of funding options' and others agreed.

Alan Winslow asked the committee what value have they added in the past 6-months? The committee knows what they were tasked to do – what value was added -- Is anything better today than it was before? T.J. Fish stated that the committee has adjusted things to current reality, which previous Task Force knew something bad was about to happen, but did not expect it to be this bad. Mr. Winslow asked if the committee has addressed it and Mr. Benham said the committee is sending a message to the County that these revenues are the ones that need to be utilized in order to meet the needs. Commissioner Parks stated that it is great value to him when he talks to the commission, that this committee has talked this out.

Alan Winslow added that the committee analyzed all significant options and put their blessing on all of them, and that all six options need to be used. Serious consideration must be given to some of the other alternatives, as there is still a shortfall or cut needs or a little of both. T.J. Fish advised there is no cutting back on needs – needs are the needs; as population grows, needs are there. Jim Richardson reported that if you do not have money to pave a road, you cannot pave the road. Linda Nagle and Bill Benham stated that sometimes to have to live without your needs and do without.

Ralph Smith asked if there was anyway the committee could diplomatically state that if the BCC does not implement recommendations #1 and #2 as written (without offending the commission), and make the point. Commissioner Parks added that the committee can write what they feel and need to write. The first report submitted in 2008, which is almost 4-years old, but when the current report is adopted it is his opinion that it is something that cannot be ignored, as it is new, which is a huge value. T.J. Fish stated that if Recommendations 1 & 2 is not implemented, everything else unravels. Carol McLeod advised that putting that in writing would be offensive to the commission.

Paragraph 5 (continued):

Commissioner Parks reported that if the committee wanted, they have his assurance that he will stress how important Recommendations 1 and 2 are to the commission. Bill Benham advised if the committee wants to take this serious and members could take time, he feels it would send a message to the commission to be present at the BCC meeting, which Amye King verified would be November 1st. Ralph Smith asked if there will be public comment and Commissioner Parks stated yes. Jim Stivender stated that when a committee comes to a meeting and presents in unity – it shows good government. Mr. Benham asked if they would be first on the agenda and advised no by Ms. King, as the agenda has not been set yet. If it is a presentation, it is usually after citizen comment. Alan Winslow asked if the report would be released before the BCC meeting and advised yes by Melanie Marsh, as it will be on the Intranet.

After further discussion, the committee decided paragraph five should read as follows

“Please take special care to note, the CFAC recommendations have been established not as a comprehensive solution, but as a portfolio of funding options. Recommendation number one, regarding Ad Valorem, is the first critical implementation this committee strongly suggests be enacted.”

Paragraph 6:

Linda Nagle stated that she does not see a need to put any more detail to any item in recommendation # 6, as the committee is not trying to do the role of the County Commissioners. These are ideas the committee has presented and the BCC can run with it. Alan Winslow advised it did not get past the committee that they did not come up with full funding, as they realize they were short. He believes the committee needs to recognize that this does not meet all the needs, but maybe just need one sentence that states there is a shortfall and will need to look harder at recommendation #6. Jim Stivender advised that Recommendation #6 is a nationwide issue, as this is not the only county within the State with shortfalls in it, such funding for sewer, transit, etc. The committee has 75% and does not believe congress has got anywhere near 75%.

Bill Benham mentioned adding to the first sentence in paragraph five ‘although these are the revenue sources as we see can be utilized for transportation, we still a shortfall exists.’ After further discussion between the members, the committee decided paragraph six should read as follows:

“The accompanying recommendations are listed in numerical order as to importance and implementation. Carefully note, even with implementation of the first five recommendations, the commission must consider the recommendation in number 6 in an attempt to meet the needs. Each recommendation is followed by either a benefit or our recommendation (+) or possible negative issue (-) surrounding our recommendation. Through our work with the County staff, we have created projected revenue amounts for each recommendation, thus, that projection is highlighted in each recommendation. Finally, each recommendation contains an action item illustrating the committees’ support or indifference to each item.”

Chairman Talmage advised the committee that Nancy Hurlbert has an important part to add to the letter as a closing. Ms. Hurlbert suggested adding the following:

“Concerning the recommendation to renew and reallocate the infrastructure sales tax (item #3), our committee was adamant that this was not a statement or referendum on the School Board’s needs, and quickly acknowledged our next step is to go through the same funding recommendation process for the School Board as we have for transportation.”

Amye King advised that she felt we do not need to add this paragraph, because she spoke with the County Manager’s office yesterday and because the committee has tasked themselves with transportation at this point, County staff will be go to the BCC after presentation, asking for direction to this committee regarding how education will be approached. At this point, do you just focus on impact fees for schools? Therefore, the County Manager’s office would like to take a break as the transportation aspect is done, and then request the BCC for direction on how to approach education. Commissioner Parks advised that the actual changing of the committee’s name from Impact Fee Committee to Capital Facilities Advisory Committee and his interpretation was to move forward with education next to look at alternative funding for schools. He advised if staff needed clarification from the commission that was fine.

Carol McLeod reported that the School Board has a meeting setup with Commission Parks, Chairman Stivender and Dr. Moxley to recommend what needs to be done regarding education. Chairman Talmage advised that it was mentioned in the minutes that the committee wanted to make note that the School Board would be losing 1/3 of the cent and possibly going out as a referendum, and therefore wanted to mention this in the letter. Ms. Hurlbert suggested removing the last sentence of the paragraph. T.J. Fish asked Carol McLeod how deeply the previous Impact Fee Committee got into other funding for schools and how it offsets the need to have the higher impact fee. Ms. McLeod advised they did not but when the last Impact Fee Study came back to the School Board there was a small task force that discussed other options, but did not get into a lot of the other options. She advised since the 2008 Transportation Task Force, so much has changed and the legislature has taken away several funding options the School Board use to have, so they have been going through some of the options at that time but they are not there now. T.J. Fish reported that in light of the experience this committee now has of reviewing transportation, they are empowered to address something that has not been addressed in the past.

Chairman Talmage asked the committee if they had any other comments to the letter. Linda Nagle moved to accept the Chairman's letter to the BCC with noted changes, and seconded by Bill Benham. Chairman Talmage asked if there were any comments or suggestions to the letter. Mr. Talmage asked all those in favor of accepting the Chairman's letter with amended changes and unanimously carried with an 8-0 vote.

A small break was taken at this time (approx. 10:55 a.m.)

Jim Stivender apologized for being late to the meeting as he had a doctor's appt. He asked the committee to review recommendation #5, as the 'unemployment factor' was added, and advise if formulation was ok. Bill Benham reported that at the last meeting this recommendation was voted as 4-3; however, the committee re-worded this recommendation and requested to include unemployment rate, at which time the committee voted at 7-1. Linda Nagle advised that the focus here is that the 7-1 vote does not reflect the overall position on impact fees, but on changes, and might need to show both votes. Carol McLeod stated you should show both votes separately, as the 4-3 vote was for impact fees, and the 7-1 vote was for the changes.

Jim Stivender advised the following should be noted under Action: *"Recommendation for Impact Fees was 4-3 vote by the committee." "Recommendation to include unemployment rate was 7-1 by committee vote."*

Alan Winslow suggested that the word "could" be changed to "should" in recommendation #5. T.J. Fish wanted to make a comment for the record that the only problem from an implementation standpoint (a part from BCC policy decision), is it does nothing to fix anything right now. We are at real deficit of having no impact fee program. Alan Winslow stated he believes the committee knows that, and recognize that is why there is a 25% shortfall, but this is what they voted on. Linda Nagle advised that she believes this conversation is out of order, as the committee has already voted and this is what they want, and not re-visiting it. Chairman Talmage suggested that a motion be made to accept change in language. Carol McLeod motioned to include changes to Action in Recommendation # 5 and change the word from could to should, and seconded by Ralph Smith. Chairman Talmage asked for those in favor and carried unanimously in an 8-0 vote.

Jim Stivender asked the committee if they had any questions to Recommendation #6 and Bill Benham stated that under E. - 'MSBU', that 'wherever they can be used' be included in sentence. T. J. Fish asked about specifically referencing where some projects could happen, and Mr. Stivender stated no, as this was a 'living body', so if someone picked this up in 10-years and reviewed recommendations, projects could come on or go off. Bill Benham stated that recommendations in #6 could encourage legislature to create changes or sources by which local government can utilize such as Doc Stamps, Tire Surcharge, etc. that these are done statewide by legislature.

T. J. Fish advised that currently there is a discussion going on with Lake County delegation about them supporting adding Lake County to be eligible for the Charter and Regional County Transportation Surtax. This is good example of an option that would work, voters would have to vote through and separate from sales tax, but we cannot do this as legislature has not enabled us. All Counties east of us can do it, as Seminole County is taking to their voters. There is also discussion about a Municipal Fuel Tax, but Cities do not have until State legislature gives it to them. Vehicle miles traveled continues to be discussed; all these are under the MPO Advisory Council Revenue Study work.

Indexing of local option taxes – Federal and State taxes are indexed, but not local. Mr. Fish advised the committee that he believes has done a great job, but had a question on privatization as he did not know what else could be done. Jim Stivender reported he thought it was a good point and his responsibility is to identify how much privatization is currently being done and possibilities on where it could go from here. Jim Richardson reported that the committee did talk about miles driven but did not feel comfortable with it. Linda Nagle made motion to approve the report as amended today and seconded by Bill Benham. Chairman Talmage asked if there was any discussion; those accepting report as amended carried with an 8-0 vote. Jim Stivender reminded committee members to sign the additional page to Chairman's letter before leaving meeting today.

T.J. Fish advised he wanted to notify the committee of what will be done with this report from here; he advised that this report will be available until the BCC hears the presentation on November 1st. The BCC will not act on November 1st, but there will be some discussion and direction. Through the month of November and into December, the MPO will take report to all of their committees and governing board to weigh in (since all 5 BCC members sit on MPO) allows them to have a 'sunshine discussion' before it comes back for any type of action. Mr. Fish advised that as a volunteer effort, he has been working with all chamber alliances with Lake County (along with John Buxman) on this issue, and will be a lot of entities getting involved with this report and will be making comments on behalf of the MPO of the report. Mr. Fish applauded the committee for an awesome job. He advised that when it comes to Ad Valorem, it cannot be done until there is growth in Ad Valorem, but will pointing to Pasco County and applauding the fact they are taking 30% of any growth in Ad Valorem and putting into transportation. He also advised in Recommendation #3, the only thing missing in matching funds of 50/50 there has to have a policy attached that Cities must pull from that to match County funds on regional lanes and significant County roads. On Recommendation #4 – recommend referendum, he advised only issue is that you are taking an item to the voters that raises \$4 million a year. He advised on Recommendation #5 – Impact Fees, anything that creates a zero does not help and the Commission will have to deal with that.

Alan Winslow advised that this is T.J.'s assumption and not the committee, as they are saying it is a matter of prioritization first. This committee did not say they cannot recommend Recommendation #1 until there is growth in Ad Valorem. Bill Benham asked if it was too late to get the 5-cent local gas tax on the 2012 ballot and advised no.

Jim Stivender stated to Commissioner Parks that he believes a budgetary meeting in January or February and Commissioner Parks reported that the commission will be meeting in December to discuss the budget, and had one recently on Stormwater, but meeting in December which is a few months earlier than they originally do meet. Mr. Stivender suggested that these topics from the committee be discussed at the December budget workshop.

Commissioner Parks advised that there might not be any motions passed on November 1st, but will hope there is strong discussion and he will strongly advocating the recommendations that were made, and looking for commitment and talk that is indicating they are heading that way and taking actions in December to put into budget. Alan Winslow asked Commissioner Parks if he will be referencing their recommendation on MSTU at their Stormwater workshop and Commissioner Parks advised they already had their workshop on Stormwater and the crossing over came when the MSTU was discussed. The Commission is committed to funding Stormwater needs (as there are many years of needs) and need to come up with a way to prioritize that, whether it be funding Parks out of the General Fund, or split configuration of the MSTU. Jim Stivender reported that a brain storming meeting recently on recommendations for funding Stormwater, which was directed from the BCC. Mr. Stivender advised he will provide recommendations to the BCC at the December budget workshop.

Jim Richardson asked if the committee still wanted to present their recommendations to the League of Cities, which Commissioner Parks agreed they should present to as many individuals as possible. It was advised that the presentation will be presented to the League of Cities on Friday, October 14th at the Elks. Mr. Richardson advised that the more elected officials buy into the recommendations, the better. Amye King mentioned again from the County Manager's office, the suggestion is for this committee to take a break and meet possibly November 3rd or November 10th (first or second Thursday). Commissioner Parks reported that a meeting is being setup with himself, Carol McLeod, Dr. Moxley, and Chairman Debbie Stivender to begin talking about making sure the School Board and staff are with the Commission all the way and communication lines open.

The next steps will be scheduling and details but the committee will not jump in during Thanksgiving to begin working on education – there will be a break. Bill Benham asked if it is comfortable to say that the committee would be meeting after the New Year and Commissioner Parks agreed. He advised he is aware of the 15-month moratorium (speaking as one commissioner) and understands that the committee cannot continue to meet on that aggressive schedule, but work your way through it and find out what happens at meeting first, but feels the next schedule will not be as aggressive as it has been. Bill Benham asked who would identify the need and Commissioner Parks advised the commission will clearly define what phase two is.

Amye King stated that from the staff perspective, meeting in November was to identify, based off Board direction, what the direction of this committee would be, how often it would meet, and whether or not there needs to be a recommendation from this committee on the moratorium through April, or if it needs to be extended. This will be a short meeting, organizationally, to layout the plan for 2012 and next meeting would be quarterly or whatever the BCC decides. After further discussion regarding meeting schedule, it was decided to go ahead and schedule for November 17th, which will be advertised. Commissioner Parks stated with moratoriums, he did not want to do another moratorium for 6-months, but at least keep working to try and come up with solutions and be ahead of the game.

T. J. Fish reported that a big concern with the Commission when they imposed the first moratorium and extended it, we cannot keep doing this but come up with solutions and advised the committee they have done this. Commissioner Parks agreed with T.J.'s sentiments, and advised the committee has done an awesome job and thanked them for giving of their time, as it means a lot to him and will do his best to see that it is followed through. Mr. Fish advised that he had conversations with the BCC Commission Chair Jennifer Hill, that she was there when presentation was made from the Transportation Task Force in early 2009, and remembers it could have been more wholesome in terms of engaging that task force and asking questions but did not happen, but hopes this time there is more engagement between this committee and the Commission.

Commissioner Parks advised he will push for that engagement on November 1st. Bill Benham asked what time the presentation will be on November 1st, and advised it will follow public comments and should follow (approx. 9:15am). Jim Stivender stated that the BCC changed so that presentations are moved to the beginning of agendas. Jim Richardson asked who will be present to speak to the League of Cities on this report and advised that Ralph Smith and T.J. Fish will be there. Jim Stivender advised that his staff will be preparing the agenda item package for the November 1st.BCC meeting. T.J. Fish asked if Mr. Stivender would make sure that the report is forwarded to the webmaster for posting and advised yes.

Bill Benham moved to adjourn the meeting and seconded by Nancy Hurlbert. Chairman Talmage adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:


Davis Talmage
CFAC Chairman


Cheryl Sutherland
Office Associate III