



**Lake County Transportation Alternative Task Force Committee  
Meeting Minutes - April 7, 2008**

---

- Call to Order:** Meeting called to order at 4:05 p.m. by Chairman Bennett Walling.
- Proper Noticing:** Chairman Walling asked if meeting had been properly noticed and Cheryl Sutherland stated it had been (copy of legal ad available upon request).
- Introductions:** Introductions of committee members were made. Fred Johnson and Ronald Jacobs were not present.
- Approval of Minutes:** Chairman Walling requested move to motion for approval of minutes for January 2008 and March 2008. Bud Beucher moved to approve and Virgil Clark seconded motion and was unanimously carried.

**Agenda Update and Process Discussion -  
Bennett Walling, Chairman**

**Sunshine Law (regarding emails)**

- ❖ Bennett Walling requested clarification from Sandy Minkoff, County Attorney, regarding Sunshine Law, due to emails sent out to members of committee. Mr. Minkoff advised that the Sunshine Law prohibits any two committee members talking and discussing issues, therefore, he recommended that committee members do not email each other, but to utilize County staff.

**Open Discussion -**

***Bennett Walling, Chairman; Bud Beucher, Vice-Chairman, Cindy Hall, County Chairman***

**Information Provided by County to Committee Members**

- ❖ Bud Beucher advised that in order to do the best job for staff, citizens, etc., he would like to understand information better before receiving new information at each meeting. Cindy Hall asked what staff can do to help out, since it seems too much information is provided and not enough time to discuss at meetings.

**Comments from Virgil Clark:** Advised that he had made a list of what had been discussed, goals of task force, etc. in order to make sure his concept was accurate, and then provided his opinion (noted below):

- (1) Growth does not pay for its self.
- (2) If new construction creates a need for new roads, then those who create the need should pay.
- (3) Costs should not be the responsibility of current tax payers.
- (4) School impacts fees are twice that of road impact fees (cost impact is probably more than schools).
- (5) Suggestion that Impact Fee may be levied, but his opinion for existing homes is 'past tense'.
- (6) Would like to see tasks put in place and strategies implemented for future meetings and information gathered and discussed.
- (7) Any further requests for information from County should be consensus of Task Force.

**Information Provided by County to Committee Members (continued)**

**Comments from Virgil Clark (continued):**

- o (8) Only way to accomplish goals is to break into smaller segments (i.e. **Maintenance** - repaving, resurfacing, operation; **Safety Requirements** – additional lanes, etc.; **New Construction** – someone has to pay. Virgil Clark advised we need to look at who is going to pay and possible alternative ways of payment. He would like to see that we break into three (3) segments and take one at a time and go through them. It is important to take care of what we have and put money back into maintenance of roads, etc.

**Comments from John Moore, Bennett Walling, Jim Stivender:** John Moore suggested that a sub-category should be placed under 'New Construction' and a number be assigned to new element. Bennett Walling mentioned that compared to two (2) years ago, the dollars in Impact Fees received from (1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2008 vs. 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2004) seemed higher and asked what the percentage was. Jim Stivender stated that 65% less in Impact Fees has been received compared to 2004. Mr. Walling stated that due to no building permits being currently pulled, there is a need to find alternate funding and figure a way to assist the County in allocating money to help support Public Works.

**Comments from Virgil Clark, John Moore, Bud Beucher, Bennett Walling:** Virgil Clark stated that he believes it is not the committee's duty to 'micro-manage' the County budget, but for the committee to review the budget and its needs and make a recommendation back to the County. John Moore agreed and stated that whatever number is determined to come out of County budget, leave alone, and then when needed pull necessary amount of funds and re-allocate for roads. Bud Beucher advised that is why he requested early information from Cindy Hall (population growth, number of County employees and spending - amount of money spent each year) in order to understand the process and how we got to this point. Growth has to pay for its self, but budget has shifted from years ago to today - Growth pays a larger share of its burden. He also advised there is a need to look at some historical data and understand it, as he has been researching and noticed that he cannot find numbers for "All Funds Expenditures for 1992" and mentioned that CPI grew 67% since 1992, Population grew 77% and Ad Valorum revenues grew 488%, which seems that a shifting of funds or lack of support has occurred with basics not being taken care of. Public Works' staff did not grow until period of 2002-2007 (only 104 staff members until then). Virgil Clark stated that over time County staff has doubled, whereas, Public Works' staff increased approx. 30%. Bud Beucher mentioned that according to these numbers, it seems that when revenues grew the ability to fund core projects was diluted. Bennett Walling stated that as the County grew, the Ad Valorum taxes should have gone down (due to being spread over more people), but while County spent money it did not go to Public Works. He also stated that our Country is on the verge of economic change and believes Government has run disproportionate to private business, and that we need to look inward before trying to get money from people outside.

**Comments from Virgil Clark, John Moore, Bud Beucher:** Virgil Clark stated there other factors such as: (1) taxes are lower here than when he lived in Texas and (2) employment in Lake County – over 2 to 1 against national average of construction employees (when works slows down, it cannot sustain its self). One of the biggest threats for County (from TIP) is growth. John Moore advised that with all additional money spent in County for fire departments, libraries, etc. and Impact Fees that help, but does not help with paying of salaries, maintenance of trucks, etc. Virgil Clark stated that the bigger a County gets, the more it costs. Bud Beucher asked if there is a way the committee can help County, without doing 'business as usual', and that Government cannot set back and raise taxes and do what is necessary to stretch dollars.

**Comments from TJ Fish, Bennett Walling, Bud Beucher:** TJ Fish added he was not surprised that the committee members had reached some of these conclusions. He acknowledged that some members thought they could look at the County budget and find a way to make it work. Funding for transportation is specialized when it comes to DOT, Federal, State, Gas Taxes and Impact Fees but answer was never within County budget. A burden has been placed on Impact Fees and that it is not coming from property taxes and that there is not enough gas taxes to cover all costs; even if looking at creative strategies there is not one answer. Bennett Walling mentioned that the problem he has is how it came to this level.

**Information Provided by County to Committee Members (continued)**

**Comments from TJ Fish, Bennett Walling, Bud Beucher (continued):**

His opinion is that this task force committee is not dealing with just Public Works, but an answer needs to come from all budgets within the County. He believes there are three (3) duties that the Government is responsible for: Schools, Transportation, and Safety. Currently, Schools and Transportation are underfunded and he has not heard about Sheriff's Office. He believes that every department director needs to look at their internal budget and report back to the commission as to how business is ran, and then run business similar to private business. Gross receipts of Government are known and what products are to be produced, and then what has to be provided to public. Mr. Walling's opinion is to now study needs (and not the budget and how to spend it), but see what is needed to provide and see how to distribute money coming in. Until this is done, nothing should be funded for Parks & Recreation, Libraries, etc. – this falls below the major responsibilities of Government. Government is becoming too big and now looking for more money to fund basics and it is frustrating. Bud Beucher added that his frustration is that it appears Public Works budget many years ago had a higher percentage (including maintenance and new roads) and today is a lot less. He stated it is not less because of revenues are not up – revenues are up 488% in Ad Valorem revenues since 1992, but 1997-2007 it is up 318%. County is not underfunded.

- ❖ Cindy Hall advised there are 40 or more funds within the County budget (handout provided). Of \$600 Million dollars, maybe \$100 Million is Ad Valorem tax and the other is not money that can be used for transportation (as it is earmarked for certain programs). Ad Valorem dollars are the primary funding revenue of the general fund (which is \$190 Million for this year – approx. \$100 Million of general fund is for Ad Valorem funds). General Funds can be used for anything for Governmental purposes, whereas, certain revenue funds are tied to particular areas. Cindy advised that mandated requirements from the State, has increased (such as Juvenile Justice Systems, Court Facilities, Jails, etc.) and must be funded from the General Fund. Ad Valorem funds has increased by 488% and has funded new programs put in place by the County Commissioners, such as the Library System, Parks, etc., and additional funded mandated requirements from the State. Cindy advised that she can prepare more information about what General Fund monies is spent on, if that would help in understanding where the monies go. T.J. Fish stated it is not the committee's duty to re-prioritize the County budget, but the committee can set goals to eliminate waste and restructure priorities and forward recommendations to the County Commissioners.

**Comments by Bud Beucher, Virgil Clark, Duane Booth, John Moore:** Bud Beucher added that what may be said to the County Commissioners is after looking at historical data, whatever recommendation of committee is of Ad Valorem taxes to be earmarked for roads (not swells, bicycle paths, free bus services, trees, etc.). Virgil Clark stated that he differs with this as he likes Parks and believes Lake County is beautiful and be preserved. Duane Booth advised that it should not be a part of funds for building roads, but should come out of different special taxing source. He mentioned the first priority of Government is for the health, safety and welfare of the people and not parks, buying lands for plants, animals, environmental sensitive things. There is a need to keep the health, safety and welfare of the public as the first priority. In his opinion, schools and roads are the backbone of the County and without them you cannot attract businesses and jobs (do not have income or tax base and keep loosing) - if you can better fund roads and schools, the rest will find funding sources. John Moore asked if the General Fund specifically stated what types of road issues can be addressed with funds and Cindy Hall advised General Funds can be used on anything. Duane Booth added that the maintenance side is still deficient (but committee is here to find alternative funding for new capacity). Also, a problem of not having enough funds for a while now and that new Impact Fees need to be increased, as well as, looking at any other sources that are available. In the meantime, there is still the need to fix old problems and determine where the money will come from to fund these problems.

**Comments by Bud Beucher, Virgil Clark, Duane Booth, John Moore (continued):**

Mr. Booth would like to include all these as part of the committee recommendation to the County Commissioners, to advise Commissioners that the committee is dissatisfied and the need to look at the General Fund (dissatisfied with the County budget from taking funds out of General Fund for Public Works), and see Government run more efficiently. John Moore stated that he never looked at committee being about new capacity. Bud Beucher added that by looking at the Resolution, the Commissioners had provided a narrow scope. Virgil Clark stated that he did not read that way and requested clarification of what the County Commissioners wanted. Cindy Hall stated that she would review the resolution for clarification. John Moore stated that you can make recommendations and leave maintenance alone. Bud Beucher added that he believes the resolution was about finding 'a funding source' and that is why the committee is here.

**Funding Sources (Impact Fees, Gas Taxes, etc.)**

- ❖ Cindy Hall advised she sees the resolution as providing several funding sources (ideas) that could be used for funding the transportation system (including paving, safety improvements, new construction for capacity), and funding for these different types of programs might need different ways to fund portions. She believes that the County Commissioners is not looking for one solution, but many and hoping that the committee will come up with usable ideas. Also, it is reasonable to suggest looking at prioritization of General Funds, but does not believe it is reasonable to say the committee does not like the way the County Commissioners are allocating General Funds. The County Commissioners spend many months reviewing the budget (with comments from each County department). She also added that if the committee recommends handing General Funds differently such as parks, recreation, etc., that it will be difficult.

**Comments from Bennett Walling, Virgil Clark, Bud Beucher:** Bennett Walling stated it is not that the committee does not want parks and recreation, but there is a need to look at categories (health, safety, welfare) and pull those that are not in categories and provide specific instructions for necessities in budget. Cindy Hall advised that all departments have been given instructions to review programs and comeback with consolidations and efficiencies. She also mentioned that it does not mean there could be prioritizations (for example: transportation outranking other programs), but does not believe that is the purpose of this task force. Virgil Clark added that you have to pay the bills and somebody has to pay (for example: Public Works' budget is \$15 Million in hole just for resurfacing, safety, and maintenance). Bud Beucher stated that he believes it is appropriate to include in recommendation to County Commissioners that Ad Valorem tax percentages be changed and review priorities as it does not seem they are in line (such as safety of roadways). Cindy Hall mentioned that she will bring detailed information including historical to the next meeting.

**Comments from Ray Goodgame, Council member for City of Clermont, Bud Beucher:**

Mr. Goodgame stated that, looking at Impact Fees back in 1998, had they been raised every year according to material costs and labor, this committee would not be here. He believes new construction needs to bare the impact of fees. Bud Beucher added that from 1997 to 2002, Road Impact Fees broken up by square footage went up 108% for smaller homes, up 123% for medium homes, and larger homes up 164%, therefore, Impact Fees rose from 1997 to 2002 and stopped. Ray Goodgame stated that the Road Impact Fees were never raised to a high enough level; and if raised again to cover new impact of new construction, there will not be enough fees to pay for roads, maintenance, etc. Bud Beucher added that there must be an approach that Road Impact Fees "pay 100% of burden" of growth. Ray Goodgame mentioned that the study done by MPO on what Impact Fee took into account (where we are and should be) did not take into everything into account, and he believes there is a need to look at user fees.

**Comments from Virgil Clark, John Moore, T.J. Fish, Bennett Walling:** Virgil Clark would like to know what is needed for paving and seal coating and where we are with Impact Fees and how far ahead or behind we are for current construction. T.J. Fish advised that the 2004 data states there is \$1.7 Billion dollars in needs between 2004 and 2025 and over \$3 Billion dollars from now to 2025 (and still have same revenues projected which is \$727 Million dollars and all capacity needs).

**Funding Sources (Impact Fees, Gas Taxes, etc. - continued)**

**Comments from Virgil Clark, John Moore, T.J. Fish, Bennett Walling (continued):** One issue is that some roads need to be looked as 'new growth roads' for them to get widened, but County is now stuck with backlogged roads and missed chance (with Impact Fees already collected and roads over capacity). John Moore asked if some of these 'fees' were based on that there might be more growth in some areas. T.J. Fish advised that projects have been narrowed down (widening of roads) due to fewer dollars and only looking at biggest priorities. One issue is to make sure development approvals connect with funded road improvements. There are roads within County that will not be funded through County Impact Fee program because development will have to fully fund it. Bennett Walling asked when Impact Fees were originally passed, were they passed at 100% of what Lake County needed (not including State) and advised it was not. T.J. Fish advised that when you pay for the Impact Fee you are not paying for the road in front of the property, but paying for access to the network system (such as water and electricity). Bennett Walling asked where property taxes go to and Cindy Hall advised that taxes go into the General Fund.

- ❖ Jim Stivender advised the last time Impact Fees were addressed, the question of adding value of right-of-way was asked and the Commission did not include them. The price of State road system interacting with the County road system was not included, as well as, a lot of other things not included in last Impact Fee, but were included in the study for this one. If you use General Funds for new construction of 4-lane highways, that amount is deducted from the Impact Fees. In early years, Gas Taxes were used to reduce Impact Fees. Sales taxes were used at one time but currently neither is being used for capacity therefore, the Impact Fee would go up due to nothing to offset it.

**Comments from Bud Beucher, Bennett Walling, Virgil Clark:** Bud Beucher advised that it is not right for newer homes to pay higher property taxes than those who have been in their homes for awhile. T.J. Fish reminded that there were several factors which influenced the 2001 Impact Fee that was adopted at less than the recommended amount. The question of what percentage of property taxes would go to transportation and no property taxes go to road widening. Bennett Walling suggested a need to have a comparison of surrounding Counties and Virgil Clark advised he went on online and looked at Orange and Seminole Counties and advised they were comparable. Cindy Hall stated that Seminole County has millage that goes into their transportation fund, with one being their countywide millage and some unincorporated, but their main primary source of funding for transportation is their one-cent sales tax. Seminole County voted on a one-cent sales tax just as Lake County did, but they do not share the penny, whereas Lake County Public Works receives 1/6 of penny for roads with the remaining going to Lake County cities and school district. Seminole County is funding their transportation through the one-cent sales tax. Doug Krueger advised that Volusia County is funding their transportation through Impact Fees and Gas Taxes. Volusia County had a six-cent local option and five-cent local option totaling eleven-cents, but having same problem due to Impact Fees being down, Gas Taxes down and costs being up, therefore they are doing the same as Lake County by studying how to fund road system. T.J. Fish advised that Marion County tried to pass a ½ penny tax, but voters did not pass and Marion County was forced to drop certain projects.

**Comments from Bennett Walling, Bud Beucher:** Bennett Walling stated that in his opinion, before County pulls projects there is a need to drop non-essentials. John Moore asked what used to go to transportation and advised quarter of a mil in 80s. Bud Beucher asked what the transportation budget was prior to beginning of Impact Fees and advised that prior to Gas Taxes and Impact Fees (1984), approx. \$600, 000 (which would pave 6-miles of clay roads). T.J. Fish added that in the 80's, Lake County was very rural and quickly grew from 180,000 to 300,000 people. Bud Beucher advised that something is broken and not just revenue, but how revenue is spent, the need to look at priorities and determine who bares the cost. T.J. Fish stated that transportation is important to consider and budget discussions were beginning and during budget discussions there is an option to put General Fund dollars into transportation.

**Comments by Duane Booth, Bud Beucher:** Duane Booth added that there is not one funding source that can fix problem, however, asking the County Commissioners to provide some percentage out of General Fund would help, but not help with new construction. A user fee is appropriate and long term goal, but not a short term fix. Growth from surrounding Counties is impacting our roads as well as growth within Lake County, but Lake County should not bare all costs.

**Funding Sources (Impact Fees, Gas Taxes, etc. - continued)**

**Comments by Duane Booth, Bud Beucher, T.J. Fish, Bennett Walling (continued):**

Bud Beucher advised that projects have been delayed because of growth, but without growth there is no revenue. Duane Booth advised that he would like to see what our needs are and would like to see 'shopping list' and ask for ½ cent to one-cent Sales Tax, but advised it is not available. T.J. Fish reported there is a half-cent school tax which would free-up Lake County's penny (option supported by Impact Fee Committee). Duane Booth stated also that areas to look at are: raising property taxes, tourism taxes, MSTU's, etc. – putting dollar amounts to them and label as available sources. He would like to recommend to Commissioners to tighten belts and stop wasteful Government spending and concentrate on our roads and schools. Cindy Hall advised that she can put together options for further review. Duane Booth said he would like to see a matrix of sources and T.J. Fish advised that at May's meeting this will be provided as well as comparison to surrounding Counties. Bennett Walling asked if a copy of budget from other Counties and the percentage that goes to Public Works. He believes that Impact Fees will not solve problem, but must find alternate suggestions for funding to maintain roads.

**Comments from Virgil Clark, Cindy Hall, John Moore, Bud Beucher, T.J. Fish:** Virgil Clark said that he researched the road fee for the active adult communities, (regardless of size of home), is \$1,153 and school is the same. Cindy Hall advised that 55-years and older do not pay school Impact Fee for new construction. John Moore thought it would be helpful to review at next meeting the General Funds from surrounding Counties and Bud Beucher agreed that to move forward, a matrix showing what funds are currently received, sources obtained from and where fund can be applied and still allow growth. T.J. Fish stated that millage and sales tax will bring money, but there is also DOT money, County money, and private money (concurrency).

**Presentation of Data Requested at March Meeting -**

**Cindy Hall, County Manager, Jim Stivender, Jr., Director of Public Works**

- ❖ **Population by Commissioner District -** Cindy Hall advised districts had been rearranged due to population changing. In 1991, Commission District 2 included Clermont, Groveland and Mascotte, but by 2001 the district only included Clermont. Groveland and Mascotte became Commission District 3 due to growth. In 1991, the other big shift was Commission District 4 which became smaller and Commission District 5 took over. Jim Stivender added that after adjustments, Commission District 2 doubled due to growth in South Lake area.
- ❖ **Budget Summary for 2008 by Fund** – Cindy Hall provided handout of County budget as a whole. Funds that have been discussed is the General Fund (0010), County Transportation Fund (Public Work's fund - 1120), Road Impact Fees (1151-1156), MSTU – Stormwater, Parks, & Roads (1230-1232) portion goes to roads. Renewal Sales Tax Capital Projects is currently coming in but is shared (3030), and Sales Tax Capital Projects (3010) is old sales tax that has run out (which Public Works receives only 1/3). Public Transportation - buses (1210) is not part of funding for Public Works.

**Comments by John Moore, Bud Beucher -** John Moore requested clarification on how close was County to adopted number for Road Impact Fees in 2007 at \$41,839,881. Cindy Hall advised that number is inclusive of revenues and expenditures which balance out at \$41, 839,881. This does not mean that \$41,839,881 worth of Impact Fees came in, as some of this was carried forward from previous year. Bud Beucher asked what County Transportation Trust (1120) is and Cindy Hall advised it is mainly Gas Taxes and rolls over.

- ❖ **Budget Process throughout Year** – Cindy advised County Commissioners adopt budget in September, with new Fiscal year beginning on October 1<sup>st</sup>. In November-December timeframe, a carry forward period occurs in which some projects that have not finished and funding allocated, the left over funding is then brought forward. Next item is mid-year adjustment, which is based on actual dollar values for all expenditures and revenues (recognized by annual report) which is done by external auditors and place in annual report from previous year. Left over money is carried forward to new budget.

**Comments by John Moore:** John Moore asked if left over money is put into reserves and Cindy Hall stated that most is placed in reserve, but some may have exceptions.

- ❖ **Budget Process throughout Year (continued)** – Cindy Hall advised that two (2) bond issues were adopted from 2007-2008, which one was for \$36 Million – Environmentally Sensitive Land, voter approved and paid for by property taxes which is kept separately from General Fund. \$90 Million – Courthouse, Parking Garage, Office Building is being funded by ½ cent Sales Tax from State, which previously placed in General Fund.

**Comments from Bennett Walling, Bud Beucher, Virgil Clark** - Bennett Walling asked how money is being replaced from General Fund and Cindy Hall stated it is how the General Fund is budgeted. Bud Beucher asked how much the ½ cent generates annually and Cindy Hall advised \$5 Million. He also asked if County has a savings account and Cindy Hall stated no, as County Government are requested to show every dollar shown in annual reports. Virgil Clark added that County has a reserve fund, which is like a 'savings account'. Cindy Hall advised that reserves can be used for anything, but some funds may not have reserves. County Commissioners has policy that reserves for General Fund must be 10%. Tax bills come out in November, so start up money is included in General Fund.

### **Public Works Budget -**

**Jim Stivender, Jr., Director of Public Works Department:**

- ❖ **Road Budget by Staff** – Advised that baseline is \$15 Million and must cut \$4.1 Million for Fiscal Year 2008-2009. He saw revenues declining for past three (3) years and began cutting then, with cuts of \$3-4 Million every year, mostly from Road Operations. A series of programs were setup by Road Operations mostly done by contract labor to provide better service and maintenance throughout County, therefore creating a shortfall.
- ❖ **Matrix of Budgeted Activity** – Advised that department was broke down into road related/non-road related and funding sources.
- ❖ **Annual Maintenance Needs** – Enhancement of intersections, etc. LAP (Local Agency Program) projects must be paid for first and then reimbursed from DOT.

**Comments from Bennett Walling, Virgil Clark, John Moore, Bud Beucher** – Bennett Walling asked how to obtain total budget and Jim Stivender advised approx. \$40 Million, which includes all revenues coming in, maintenance, new construction, and carry forward from previous years. Virgil Clark asked how much needed to be cut from 2008 budget and Jim Stivender advised \$4.1 Million. John Moore asked of \$40 Million, was \$10 Million for non-road related and advised yes. Bud Beucher asked what 'MSTU' was and advised – Municipal Services Taxing Unit (hospitals, etc. – who receive money if in unincorporated area in Lake County). He also asked if there is a mandated formula on how money is spent. Cindy Hall advised of the ordinance that is established and lists functions it could be used for (inclusive of parks, stormwater, and roads), however, it cannot be spent within City limits. Bud Beucher asked about Parks Capital and advised it was set aside for Park construction (from Sales Tax money) for Northwest Park in Umatilla, which is one-time money used to construct. Park Impact Fees are only \$45 per new home.

### **MPO's Role in Transportation Funding -**

**T.J. Fish, Executive Director, Lake-Sumter MPO**

- ❖ **2025 Long Range Transportation Plan** – Adopted in 2005 (based on 2004 data). Needs assessment through 2015-2025. Many needs were eliminated because not cost feasible. If adjusted now, it would exceed \$3 Billion and revenues have not changed. Current plan relies on increased impact fees – which have not been raised. If updated today, planned projects would be removed.
- ❖ **2035 Transportation Plan** – Currently underway and will take two (2) years to prepare and to be adopted in 2010. Even if funding source is not yet adopted, the plan can target reasonably anticipated revenues. Many expected projects that have been planned will not be included in without new revenues.
- ❖ **Five-Year Transportation Program (TIP)** – Lake County has a 5-year construction work program as well as FDOT. MPO annually adopts a five-year transportation improvement program (TIP). TIP includes federal, state and local transportation projects that are funded through specified phases

(planning, design, right-of-way and construction). TIP also includes committed private sector dollars. TIP has binding effect – project must be in TIP to receive state and federal dollars.

❖ **Five-Year Transportation Program (TIP) – (continued)**

State law requires consistency between City, County and MPO plans. TIP is relied upon to determine what is and is not funded. Role of MPO is to set regional transportation priorities, which is adopted by MPO annually. DOT and Lake County use the priority list to determine which projects should receive Federal, State and County funds. The list is based on need, as well as other factors.

- ❖ **List of Project Priorities** – Funding sources might force priorities to shift, making some projects eligible for certain areas of money. When Impact Fees are down, smaller projects may be funded while larger needs are unmet. Some funds have strings attached (capacity vs. maintenance). State law requires public facilities must be in place within three (3) years of development approval. Roads must be built or funded for construction within three (3) years of time of approval. Major emphasis is on five-year work programs and MPO's TIP.

- ❖ **Comments from Bud Beucher, John Moore** – Bud Beucher asked if MPO allows developers to 'pre-pay' Impact Fees and T.J. Fish advised yes, but not necessarily pre-pay but must 'reserve trips' under concurrency. Cindy Hall advised that Impact Fees can be prepaid and valid for any Impact Fee change for one-year. If not built within first year, you must pay what fee is at that time and receive credit for what is already paid. John Moore added that even if you prepaid Impact Fees earlier or now and do not meet concurrency test, you might still owe additional monies. T.J. Fish stated that prepayment of Impact Fees does mean that you will pass concurrency test.

T.J. Fish stated that MPO is first in State to manage transportation concurrency for two (2) Counties. A master tracking of traffic data is kept including traffic counts and approved trips. All local governments agreed to accept MPO reports on conditions of network. Green, Yellow and Red concept which means if green it is adequate, if yellow it is near capacity, and if red it is exceeding capacity. If capacity is adequate (green), approval may occur and developer pays Impact Fees. If nearing capacity (yellow), a plan should be implemented to solve concern. If over capacity (red), local governments have three (3) options: deny development, amend comprehensive plan to lower adopted level of service (LOS), or require proportionate fair share payment by the developer to address deficiency. If concurrency can be met through fair share agreement, development pays to correct concurrency problem and then pays Impact Fees (with limited credits). Some roads will not be included in MPO's or local government's plans due to lack of cost feasibility. Developers will not be able to meet concurrency and proportionate fair share can only be accepted if project is in the plan. Lack of sufficient Impact Fees or other funding for transportation has led to many deficiencies in Lake County road network. Development currently faces Transportation Impact Fee but may also face large fair share costs (bigger the gap between needs and funding, the more concurrency problems Lake County will face).

New Growth vs. Backlog – MPO is currently looking at needs that may arise due to new growth and what needs already exist due to approvals under an insufficient Impact Fee.

**Comments from Bud Beucher** – Bud Beucher asked if there should be an opportunity for developer to not be penalized because for several years road was not maintained at capacity or does developer need to pay current Impact Fee and pay for past? T.J. Fish stated that people are now lobbying the House and Senate over 2005 Growth Management Act (thought everyone was paying fair share, but told cannot build because they do not meet concurrency).

Connecting Purpose and Funding Source – Impact Fees intended for new road capacity due to growth. Gas taxes often considered user fees and are used for multiple purposes (maintenance, capacity, safety, etc.). Sales tax is used for infrastructure and Property Tax (Ad Valorem) is used limitedly through MSTU.

Clarifying Funding Needs – No funding plan for regional County roads and current Impact Fee program cannot handle regional needs (therefore a need for Task Force). Impact Fee program could effectively address minor County collector roads and could assist with major priority needs.

Funding Needs – Clay to pave road program requires separate funding approach, and maintenance and resurfacing need dedicated funding source. Public transportation desperately needs dedicated funding rather than General Fund, and regional trails have no dedicated funding.

**MPO's Role in Transportation Funding -**

**T.J. Fish, Executive Director, Lake-Sumter MPO**

Next Steps – Need to clarify approaches to funding needs by connecting need with appropriate funding source (capacity and maintenance). Funding approaches need to be divided between new growth and backlogged roads. Funding approaches need to be divided between clay roads, minor County roads, and major County roads. Clarify source for matching of State funds and public transportation and trails.

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was made by Vice Chairman Bud Beucher at 6:45 p.m., seconded by Bennett Walling and unanimously carried.

The next Lake County Transportation Alternative Task Force Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 5, 2008 @ 4:00 p.m. at the Lake County Administration Building – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Training Room 233.

Respectfully Submitted:



---

Cheryl Sutherland, Recording Secretary, Lake County Public Works Department