TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE FUNDING TASK FORCE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINTUES
Lake County Public Works Department
437 Ardice Avenue, Eustis, Fl.

September 15, 2008

I. Present: Bennett Walling, Bud Beucher, Duane Booth, Virgil Clark and John Moore

Absent: Fred Johnson and Ronald Jacobs

County Staff Present: Cindy Hall, County Manager, Jim Stivender, Public Works Director.

Lake-Sumter MPO Staff Present: T.J. Fish, Executive Director-Lake-Sumter MPO

Call to Order: Meeting called to order at 4:13 p.m. by Chairman Bennett Walling.

II. Confirmation of Meeting Notice: Meeting was properly noticed by legal ad.

III. Approval of Minutes: Chairman Walling motioned to postpone approval of minutes for August 4, 2008 and special meeting minutes of August 25, 2008 until later in meeting.

IV. Approaches to Accomplish Task Force Goals – Cindy Hall:

Cindy Hall provided the committee with a handout with suggested ideas:

1) *Reprioritize Transportation Projects* **-** Establish goals for transportation network and assign a point system for each goal and reprioritize all road projects based on accumulated points per project.

2) *Review Levels of Service (LOS) Standards* - Make sure service levels are not primarily accommodating rush hour traffic.

3) *Establish Timeframes for Projects* - From conception to completion, offer penalties and rewards for timeframe completion to all those involved in projects.

4) *Impact Fees*

   a) Indentify uses of Impact Fees and those not publicly desirable. Determine system of what Impact Fees can be used for.

   b) Identify targeted industries through comprehensive plan through which Impact Fees could be different. Virgil Clark asked who would make this determination and Ms. Hall stated the comprehensive plan is currently being written by a citizen's group (Land Planning Agency) and once completed it will be forwarded to the BCC for possible changes and passed on to the Department of Community Affairs. Mr. Clark asked if this plan is currently being used and Ms. Hall stated that the 1993 plan is being revised and currently being used. Mr. Moore stated that during the re-writing of the plan there would have to be someone that determined the 'targeted industry' and Ms. Hall and T.J. Fish agreed.

   Mr. Fish advised that there must be a policy first before creating the law. Mr. Clark advised he does not have a problem with the Impact Fee on homes, but does with businesses as there is a big impact on businesses. He also mentioned that without Impact Fees the burden lies upon the taxpayer and that if building industry does not pay for what they are responsible for, then the taxpayer and community will subsidize the building industry. Bud Beucher advised that the building industry and new development is paying for existing taxpayers and that there is a need for a re-alignment as residents have not been paying for roads except for what comes through gas taxes.

IV. Approaches to Accomplish Task Force Goals – Cindy Hall (continued):

Impact Fees (continued) -

Virgil Clark stated he does not believe Impact Fees are paying for new roads and Mr. Fish advised we are not keeping pace. Mr. Clark also suggested that the County is not putting enough money into maintaining roads. Bud Beucher mentioned that the availability of funds to keep up with capacity is aggravated as Impact Fee monies are used to rebuild existing roads. Mr. Clark advised that if this is true, has the existing 'Comp Plan' been violated and Ms. Hall stated that Impact Fees can be used for new capacity and the expansion of roads is 'new capacity'. Chairman Walling asked about the impact on trips from home to a business and Mr. Fish advised that methodology splits the cost to and from home. Bud Beucher requested Mr. Fish to provide the formula determining methodology and Mr. Fish advised that he had wanted Tindale-Oliver to present this but they were not able to be at this meeting. Mr. Beucher asked if they would be able to email the formula and Mr. Fish stated yes.

c) *Re-assess new Impact Fee schedule* – Implement new fee schedule in 2009 and include annual indexing to keep up with inflation (which is also used by DOT).

d) *Eliminate all Transportation Impact Fees (for all new development in 2010 calendar year)* – Transfer $3.3 million for three years from General Fund to Transportation Funds to make up for revenue loss and re-implement in 2011 with appropriate indexed schedule. This would take burden off of commercial and industrial for one year. Bud Beucher asked if the five Commissioner districts could advise if they would or would not want to be a part of the 'economic development' and Cindy Hall stated that this would have to go before the board and be voted on. Ms. Hall also mentioned that the General Fund could pickup any Impact Fees that the board chooses. Virgil Clark asked if this would be 'subsidizing' the housing industry at the taxpayers expense and Ms. Hall stated yes, but could also eliminate all Impact Fees (except for homes) and then the General Fund would pickup all Commercial and Industrial Impact Fees (but not those for homes).

Mr. Clark advised it still goes back to the taxpayer paying and why should they. Chairman Walling advised that he believed at one time that new growth and development paid for it self and does not think the entire burden should be on the construction industry. Virgil Clark stated there has been a failure to build new roads within the County, as Impact Fees have not paid for it and maintenance must be done. New growth should pay for roads and the only sources available are taxes and Impact Fees (which does not keep up with what we have). Mr. Clark advised that money needs to come out of the General Fund and Impact Fees must go up to pay for roads needed.

Chairman Walling asked when a Developer comes in, can they be approved before the road within area is approved and Jim Stivender stated they are usually deferred until they meet capacity. John Moore asked if anyone has looked at decreasing the impact on roads by individuals driving to the Orlando area and keep industries here for jobs. T.J. Fish advised the only planned area would be in the Minneola Interchange and possibly on the SR 50 corridor (but most of these areas will be in retail and not high paying jobs). Chairman Walling advised that there are currently no Impact Fees coming in and we must find alternative funding for road improvements.

5) *Fund all of Parks' budgets from Countywide General Fund sources* – Currently we have an MSTU in unincorporated areas and less than ½ Mill which is split between road maintenance, parks' budget, and stormwater. Bud Beucher asked if we have this ability and Ms. Hall stated yes.

6) *Re-write current un-incorporated MSTU* – Only allow expenditures for roads and stormwater projects and increase millage to 1 mill (around $10.5 million);

Or

Re-write Current Un-incorporated MSTU as complete Countywide – Only allow expenditures for roads and stormwater projects and levy 1 mill (around $21 million). This currently covers anything that the County does and inclusive of many things in MSTU as needed and done so the Board could have a funding source to fund it.

IV. Approaches to Accomplish Task Force Goals – Cindy Hall (continued):

Re-write current un-incorporated MSTU as complete Countywide (continued) -

Ms. Hall advised that a comment was made from the committee asking how we can be certain that anything recommended remains in affect and she stated by re-writing the MSTU to only allow roads and stormwater, the funding source is preserved for roads. If this is not done, the funding source could be used for anything. She also mentioned this is the same problem we will face if a certain amount of money is requested to be used from General Fund for transportation, as the Board cannot 'carve out' a large amount of money from General Fund and put towards transportation and eliminate other programs. Virgil Clark asked if it could be done as a percentage factor and Ms. Hall stated it is not realistic for the Board to do this as there are too many other items that need to be funded. Chairman Walling asked what the Board will do at the end of this year when the new budget comes out and they see how much money is left for next year (as it will be less than this year) and Ms. Hall stated it will go into the following year's budget and fund projects and reused.

Chairman Walling stated that by watching the news, next year the County may be looking for more money needed to be reduced from the budget and Ms. Hall stated this possibly could happen and if so, things would have to be reduced. Jim Stivender advised if this happens, there would be programs and employees that would be gone. Ms. Hall stated there would be major cuts and the County may have to do this if it comes down to it (especially if legislature tells them to they would have no choice but to do this). She mentioned that she tried to use money in a way to preserve the funding source. Duane Booth advised that what Ms. Hall is doing is taking funding source from Parks out of MSTU and putting it into the General Fund and if the Board decides to cut, then Parks would be affected and not Transportation. Ms. Hall stated yes and to re-write the MSTU allowing only for roads so that we have preserved that funding source. If something else is to be funded from that type of MSTU, it would take re-creating the ordinance through the public hearing process. A restricted MSTU, whether this is done unincorporated or countywide, restricts the funding source to roads and preserved the source. When using money from the General Fund there are no guarantees that a particular funding level will be preserved.

Bud Beucher stated that with local businesses declining there is the need to find solutions and redistribute money. Cindy Hall stated she understands and appreciates what he is saying, and hears a lot that businesses are declining, however the jail population and use of court rooms (which are large areas of the County's budget) are not declining and the County has to find a way to balance the budget (as these are areas of the County that are not declining and revenues have declined). Bud Beucher advised that there are areas that should be 'revamped' and Cindy Hall stated there are areas that could be. Jim Stivender advised that the "Site Plan Process" was revamped and each employee involved with the process had gone through training. The process went from 6-months to a 2-month process (shaving off 4-months). Staff came up with the process which took approximately 6-weeks to complete. Cindy Hall also mentioned that Growth Management (in coordination with Public Works) trimmed down the Development Review Process from 6-months to 1-year to a 30-45 day process. This doesn't mean there are fewer employees, but a benefit to the customer with developments seeing their product much quicker. Bud Beucher advised that new growth should pay for what new growth creates and those already here should pay for their own.

He stated there is a point where common sense comes into play and just because landscaping is requested, there is not a need for it. Chairman Walling stated that it is not just the Impact Fees but other things that the County is doing which is creating hardships on development industries. John Moore asked Ms. Hall about the two options for MSTU's ; $10.5 million difference is for Countywide and wanted to know how annexations would factor in. Ms. Hall stated if it were Countywide it would not matter. Mr. Moore asked if the Cities would join in and she advised that one thing Mr. Stivender has looked at is that there are several roads within the City boundaries that the County maintains (Cities annex certain areas but not the roads), and County is stuck maintaining the roads. Our MSTU does not collect any monies from those areas since they are within the Cities. Ms. Hall advised that if a Countywide MSTU was done, we would work with the City to provide some funding and re-arrange on who provides maintenance. The goal would be to work with the Cities and come up with boundaries that the Cities and County would maintain and make it more efficient.

IV. Approaches to Accomplish Task Force Goals – Cindy Hall (continued):

Re-write current un-incorporated MSTU as complete Countywide (continued) -

If there were a Countywide MSTU and if the agreement stated County would provide some type of funding, there would be more of a leverage to work with them. John Moore asked Jim Stivender if Minneola has more or less stringent requirements on road construction requirements (for example CR 561) and Mr. Stivender advised that County and DOT are setting design standards on most roads in Lake County. In some cases, due to different engineering, design standards, forms of governments and priorities, there are some subdivisions that were approved within City limits which created a problem for County. T.J. Fish mentioned that when a City chooses to annex one-side or both sides of the road and not take accountability for the road right of way it causes a problem for the County. Bud Beucher asked what the County's role is on annexation and Jim Stivender advised that State laws (since 1993) requiring that there must be a mutual agreement between County and Cities for roads and must go before our Board for annexation of right-of-way. Ms. Hall stated that Cities can annex a piece of land without annexing the road or right of way and that it would not go before the BCC. Bud Beucher advised he was under the impression that Cities/Towns were to notify the County of any annexations and that they could not annex unless a change in the comprehensive plan. T.J. Fish stated that Cities can annex and County does not have to approve it (a charter county may be different). Mr. Fish advised the City must then put the land under their comprehensive plan and assign development rights and then breakdown occurs.

7) *Implement remaining 5-cent Gas Tax (user fee)* – This would be for CIP projects ($6 Million).

8) *Requirement of City participation* – Would include all road projects (maintenance, improvements and expansion). Duane Booth asked if the City would be required to spend some of their city gas tax or sales tax to help with roads they are not helping with and Cindy Hall stated yes. These roads would include local collectors, roads that require repair of swales, etc.

9) *Assist Cities with smaller road projects through CRA's, MSBU's and CDD's.*

10) *Require Cities to cooperate with Right-of-Way Acquisitions and the donation process* – Not successful with this process but working on it.

11) *Voter Referendum* – Possibly bond specific road and transportation projects and improvements and include trails, bike paths and commuter rail. $100 Million limit on principle in series of bond issues over a 10-year period (equal to present day millage of less than .4 mill and annual payments of less than $60 for a $200,000 home. In order for voters to pass this it would need to be marketed correctly and include a mix of projects within it. Duane Booth asked if a referendum could be 'district specific' or does it have to be Countywide and Cindy Hall stated that everyone within the County would need to feel they all benefit from it if there were a menu of projects desirable to different areas within the County. Ms. Hall advised that dividing into sections might be harder to do. Bud Beucher advised that the projects would need to be listed and projects be segregated such as a referendum for roads and then another for beautification (parks, sidewalks, lights, landscaping) and give voters a choice. Mr. Beucher stated he does not want to pay for new roads (this should be paid for by new homeowners). T.J. Fish advised that the MPO is determining roads that do not need taxpayer dollars unless the development comes in and roads that will make the list are the ones back logged and those that are collector and arterial roads.

12) *Dedicate entire next 1* **cent infrastructure Sales Tax to transportation –** Possibly bring in up to $43 million in 2018. County would keep entire amount for transportation.

13) *Establish lobbying efforts towards legislation to index County and City gas taxes* – Work on lobbying but has failed in past but could help.

14) *Promote efficient Transportation systems* – Most drive outside of County, but through smart planning and mixed use communities that do not rely on vehicular transportation, we could evaluate zoning along corridors marked for expansion to promote development which may require new capacity. John Moore reported that the Lynx Bus Express Service has expanded and T.J. Fish advised it started in April when gas prices rose. Mr. Moore suggested that more promotion would help.

IV. Approaches to Accomplish Task Force Goals – T.J. Fish:

T.J. Fish provided the committee with a handout on the background of the committee and provided a suggested outline that could be used as a starting point for the recommendation to the BCC and advised the committee to feel free to make adjustments as needed.

T.J. Fish gave the background on the conception of the Transportation Alternative Task Force Committee created by the BCC which is composed of seven (7) citizens with backgrounds in business and transportation. Mr. Fish also gave a brief description on the purpose of the committee which is to examine issues involving transportation funding and provide a recommendation to the BCC on possible alternative funding sources. Mr. Fish touched on the initial concerns of the committee such as the rate of growth of the budget and available sources of transportation revenue. The committee spent a considerable amount of time on the topic of maintenance versus capacity as well as the basis for the Impact Fee. The committee viewed transportation as a link to health, safety and welfare of the community and its importance ranking as high as schools, water and sewer. The committee discussed and focused on possible funding sources such as the General Fund, MSTU's, Ad Valorem, Impact Fees, Fuel Taxes, Sales Tax, the involvement of municipalities, public-private partnerships and other possible funding sources (for example MSBU's).

Chairman Walling advised Mr. Fish he did a great job on this document and thanked him for putting it together. Bud Beucher asked T.J. Fish if the committee had any comments, could they email them to him and Mr. Fish stated they could and if there were any conflict on wording, he will bring it back to them at the next meeting. Mr. Beucher stated that the committee had also talked about changing standards, cost cutting, analysis of formula, economic diversity, earmarking commercial monies and others that could be reconsidered and included into the recommendation. John Moore also suggested to add efficiency improvements and working with local municipalities. Chairman Walling suggested adding property taxes for road improvements (retroactive for 5-years). Bud Beucher mentioned that the County should have more Interlocal Agreements between them and the Cities. Cindy Hall advised that the committee could recommend that the BCC pass a resolution that County will not maintain surrounding streets of city annexations.

IV. Approaches to Accomplish Task Force Goals – Jim Stivender:

Jim Stivender advised that this year is the first time (since 1993) that he has had a chance to sit down with anyone and discuss these issues.

MSTU Countywide at 1 mil ($21 million) - Mr. Stivender advised that each City has their maintenance areas and believes there is no reason why the County cannot work out an arrangement with the Cities to maintain their areas (such as tree limbs down, vegetation, potholes, etc.) since they already have services within these areas. He stated that a Countywide MSTU millage on MSTU could be negotiated and solution worked out. Standards would have to be set for maintenance which could be applied to City and County roads and then taxpayers would know what they are getting. Roll back MSTU for Parks and Trails to a smaller number. He believes that all special interests on property taxes (homesteads, agricultural exemptions, save your homes, etc.) should be thrown out and worked on again.

5 cent Local Option Gas Tax ($6 million) – Currently $2.3 million is used in sales tax for resurfacing. If we had a 5-cent local option gas tax we would use all $6 million of gas tax for resurfacing. Suggestion is to change the sales tax formula back to enhancement projects that do not increase capacity.

IV. Approaches to Accomplish Task Force Goals – Jim Stivender (continued):

5 cent Local Option Gas Tax – (continued) – Jim Stivender advised that indexing is critical and that we should eliminate tax on fuel and place the tax on miles driven (based on vehicle moving) as there needs to be a change. Size of vehicle and amount of mileage driven should determine how much tax you pay and not fuel efficiency or type of fuel. Bud Beucher mentioned that based on what an individual drives, when speaking about the efficiency, the mileage and weight is already built within what a person drives. Mr. Stivender advised that alternative fuels are available now and Duane Booth stated that pavement design is based on the weight of vehicle and wear and tear on road. Mr. Booth stated that making alternative fuels will not keep vehicles from placing wear and tear on roadways and that we need to get away from gas taxes. Jim Stivender advised that revenue is down on gas taxes (at 2003 levels) but is steady and has not declined anymore (and actually up $1/4 million this year).

Adopt new Impact Fees – Recommend to the BCC that the consultant review the cost estimates used in the study due to the dramatic drop in construction costs for County and State roads; currently running at 40% below 2006 costs and estimation of $9 million will be collected this year. All contracts are lower and DOT's indexing and prices are lower than what is in the Impact Fee ordinance. The $10,000 and $11,000 Impact Fee, if calculated today, would be much lower. Jim Stivender suggested asking the consultant to go back and adjust these numbers. Bud Beucher asked T.J. Fish if the committee could review the Impact Fee formula and the TRIP length formula. Mr. Stivender advised that the TRIP generation length has gone down a little as people are still traveling and going distances. In most cases, there are 'fixed' trip lengths which are those that are commuting. Chairman Walling asked T.J. Fish what the average trip length for residents within Lake County is and he stated it is 18 miles which includes commuter miles. Mr. Fish stated it is about origin and individual's destinations and advised that if the Impact Fee study is redone he believes it will come out differently. Bud Beucher asked what an update study would cost and Mr. Fish stated it would be comparable to the previous study (with framework establishing methodology already completed) most of the cost would be the changing of assumptions, which must be signed off by the BCC before it is done and released. Bud Beucher suggested that the committee might want to include in their recommendation to the BCC that a new 'snapshot' be done and Mr. Fish stated that they would need to go back to the same firm and ask for them to update with new directions.

Jim Stivender agreed that the opportunity would be a great drop, but we would need to be better prepared when indexing so if there were a problem we would not be caught off guard and in trouble again. Duane Booth stated that he feared taking the snapshot today (compared to when originally taken) that money collected may not be spent for 5-years and price may be different. Bud Beucher agreed and stated the original snapshot is close and if taken today would be close to original. Chairman Walling suggested that the Impact Fee be separated out with part going to roads and the other as beautification (landscaping, etc.) and adopt independently. Mr. Stivender stated if there is a line between enhancement, capacity and maintenance will help bring roads to a certain level. T.J. Fish stated that if the consultant looked back on the plan, the cost factor would be big and the change in population growth. Chairman Walling asked if the recent slower growth of Lake County would be a factor and Mr. Fish advised that we need to look at the plan and make adjustments where needed. Virgil Clark asked how this would tie in with the comprehensive plan and Mr. Fish stated that comp plans must be cost feasible and able to point out how you pay for needs.

Chairman Walling advised that at a previous meeting, Rick Joyce had suggested bringing a consultant into the County and also starting over with taxes. He advised that had Impact Fees been increased at last year's meeting we would still have this problem. He advised that the problem comes back to Cindy Hall and staff to come through. Mr. Walling advised that the budget must be looked at to see where alternative funding could come from within the budget, possibly eliminating certain programs. Cindy Hall stated that she does not have the authority to recommend to this committee the reduction of programs. Mr. Walling stated that he believes it will come down to Cindy Hall and her staff to build the 'County' back up on paper and then determine what programs may need to be reviewed. Cindy Hall advised that one recommendation could be to submit to the BCC to re-prioritize the County budget but she will not advise the committee as to what that should be, as it is the BCC's budget.

Chairman Walling asked what Ms. Hall's job is and she stated that her job is to take the Board direction and make it happen. She stated that everything that is in the budget is what the Board wants and if the Board states they do want the budget to be reduced, she must find ways to make it happen. Ms. Hall stated that the committee could recommend to the Board that transportation should be funded through the General Fund, but is not likely to happen. Ms. Hall stated that recently a letter was received from the City of Clermont stating they were not covering animal services anymore and the County has to pick this up these services, as well as, another letter was received from the Sheriffs office stating they needed more money for vehicles. Ms. Hall stated that at the budget public hearing, citizens spoke and advised they wanted more parks; more money for children's services and a performing arts center, but no one spoke up and stated they wanted more roads. She stated that her opinion is if the basis of the recommendation to the BCC is to cut the budget and fund roads, the committee will be disappointed with what happens. Chairman Walling stated that someone needs to speak up for the entire population. Ms. Hall stated that the Board is not putting more money towards a performing arts center, children's services or parks as there is not enough money to do so, but they are taking on animal services for Clermont with the service level being less within the County due to the added territory. She also stated that it is a balancing act and that the Board does want to fund transportation and recognizes it is a great issue, but if a recommendation is to cut the General Fund budget this will be a problem in her opinion.

John Moore stated that at a previous meeting Ms. Hall had mentioned a possibility of a percentage taken from General Fund over a three year period for funding transportation. Chairman Walling stated that this would not be enough money and will only make up for Impact Fee shortfall. Jim Stivender advised that the County took in $20 million dollars in 2005. Mr. Walling stated that basically taxes are going up and Mr. Stivender advised that is a true fact. Mr. Stivender advised that those in Tallahassee are not trying to get re-elected based on cutting taxes, because constituents back home asked what is going on as local governments have cut services – people do not want new taxes but also do not want services cut. Chairman Walling advised that all 'un-necessary' services need to be cut out and used the 5th floor of the County building as an example. Bud Beucher advised that the Board does not see a way to take 8% from the General Fund and Ms. Hall stated that will cause a significant cut in services.

Mr. Beucher stated that the committee has studied these issues and knows that it might not pass, but they must include 8% from the General Fund in the recommendation. Mr. Fish mentioned that the keyword Ms. Hall used was 'primary' and that the committee should not solely rely on the General Fund as their recommendation but should include other funding sources as well. Mr. Beucher advised that overall taxes will have to be raised and John Moore agreed and mentioned that even working with the Cities most likely taxes would be raised - just shifted. Mr. Beucher advised there is a need to change the level of services for the County and that this will require cooperation from everyone. Duane Booth asked if raises or bonuses would be given to County employees this year and Cindy Hall advised there are no bonuses but it is budgeted to give each employee $1000 across the board. Bud Beucher asked how many employees the County has employed and Ms. Hall stated approximately 800. Duane Booth stated that his business has had to cut 60% of his staff and some employees went to a 32 hour workweek (which is a 20% pay cut) in order to keep their jobs. He advised that he looks at his budget monthly for income and expenses and will not have pay raises this year or next. Mr. Booth advised that his principal owners took a 25% pay cut and also spoke one-on-one with each employee on pay cuts, etc. He advised that this is one of the reasons Amendment 1 was voted in, as citizens are tired of government spending. Chairman Walling suggested adding 'cut pay rates' to the BCC recommendation and Mr. Beucher agreed.

Mr. Booth asked Ms. Hall if there are employees within County that are not efficient and could be cut and Ms. Hall advised that the County has eliminated 60 positions which includes a hiring freeze that was initiated January of this year. Mr. Booth asked if it would be more efficient to contract work out (such as repairing potholes, etc.) than having a County employee do the work and Ms. Hall advised that she does not agree with these comments as she believes most County employees are very efficient. Jim Stivender added that he has had contractors doing work (such as potholes and mowing) in the past but was still receiving calls that the work had not been done. He added that currently some work is contracted out and some done in-house (approx. 80 individual projects are going on and 20 of them being done in-house). Mr. Stivender added that in the state of California, all professional engineers are designing roads and employed by the state. He advised that Public Works is trying to put a balance together and keep the number of staff down.

Mr. Booth advised that he was not saying that all County employees are inefficient, but was using his business as an example of when a business grows and the number of employees increase you can lose touch with them and not realize who is pulling their own weight and who is not. Ms. Hall agreed this does happen and Mr. Stivender advised there are approximately 7%-10% of employees within businesses that are inefficient. Mr. Booth stated there are efficiencies with hiring out sub-contractors and having good employees within; having a combination of both is best. Cindy Hall advised that much of what County does is population driven (for example the Sheriff's Office, Solid Waste, Libraries, etc.) and does not go up and down as economy changes. Mr. Booth asked if the 800 County employees included the Sheriffs Office and Ms. Hall stated no as the Sheriffs Office has approx. 800 employees as well.

Cindy Hall advised that the County's '5th floor' (Building, Zoning, Planning, etc.) has seen a reduction in their workflow and that several employees have been laid off. She stated that most other departments within the County are population driven services are not economic driven services. T. J. Fish asked the committee to be clear with their recommendation to the BCC that it not be just a health, safety and welfare need but directly linked to the economy as well. Cindy Hall stated that referring back to the report from T.J. Fish, it appeared that the committee would like to add the reduction of the General Fund (percentage dedicated to transportation) within their recommendation and wondered if there was anything else that should be included and Mr. Moore asked if the committee could send their thoughts and strategies to Mr. Fish and he stated that would be fine but do not send it to all committee members. Chairman Walling asked where the 25-cent from Gas Taxes went and if the millage went down and Jim Stivender stated it disappeared. Duane Booth advised he has developed a spreadsheet of where funds went and suggestions on how they should be earmarked and will send Mr. Fish this list. Mr. Fish will email his report to all committee members and will track their changes. Bud Beucher asked Mr. Fish if public-private partnerships are the same as 'Pioneer Agreements' and he stated yes. Mr. Beucher asked if these had been done and Mr. Fish stated he does not think the County has been involved with these. Chairman Walling stated that possibly when reviewing the Impact Fee Study, maybe it should only include major collector roads. Bud Beucher advised that the idea of having a 'Bond' would work if done properly. T.J. Fish agreed that these issues are so important that we may need to have the voters decide.

Virgil Clark asked the committee if they would like to address the minutes at this time and Mr. Fish advised that the minutes emailed to the committee were for August 4th and those handed out today were for the special meeting held on August 25th. The committee agreed to review the minutes and postpone acceptance of them until the next meeting on October 6th. Chairman Walling asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting and Bud Beucher so motioned and seconded by Duane Booth and adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

The next Lake County Transportation Alternative Funding Task Force Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 6, 2008 at 4:00 p.m. at the Public Works Department, 437 W. Ardice Avenue, Eustis, Florida.