

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

MARCH 4, 2008

A meeting was held at the Murdock Administration Complex in Room 119, Port Charlotte, Florida. The following members were present: Chairman D'Aprile, Commissioner Duffy, Commissioner Moore and Commissioner Loftus. Also in attendance were Deputy County Attorney Gallagher, County Administrator Loucks, and Deputy Clerk Lansing. The following members were absent: Commissioner Cummings. The workshop was called to order at 9:00 AM followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman D'Aprile advised this workshop would provide an MSBU study update by Camille Tharpe of Government Services Group (GSG) and possible solutions to eliminate a portion of the MSBUs, reduce taxes, and meet the needs of the community.

GSG Senior Vice President Camille Tharpe said this was Phase Two of the project; thanked her associate Jason Buchholz for his work and staff for their participation and support; provided the 2007 timeline; explained the approaches and efficiencies within the MSBU program; and commented on goals of the study.

Ms. Tharpe indicated the Topics for Discussion on the slide presentation would be Project Objectives, Parameters, Challenges, Paving Information, Rates, and Next Steps. Ms. Tharpe explained the project objectives were to develop an approach to combine the 29 road and drainage MSBU programs into 3 MSBU programs using Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) standardization, consistent rates, and the same boundaries as the existing storm water districts. Ms. Tharpe mentioned strict parameters, guidelines, and methodology rules required for this special MSBU assessment; noted time frames; identified challenges; discussed the assumptions in detail; and advised only current MSBU properties were included in the study.

Chairman D'Aprile confirmed all existing MSBU units were involved and anyone not in an existing MSBU would not be included or taxed under this program. **Commissioner Moore** asked for detail on properties not presently included. Mr. Loucks and Raymond Sandrock mentioned several properties and Ms. Tharpe advised a list of the properties were in the October presentation packet.

Ms. Tharpe continued the presentation with an overview of the Minimum Level of Service Standards for Paving. **Chairman D'Aprile** asked Tom O'Kane about rejuvenation, the need for resurfacing, and questioned the life span of a paved road. Mr. O'Kane explained rejuvenation, advised roadway life varied based on primary or residential use; opined a 10 to 15-year road life in Florida without rejuvenation; and mentioned roads not used would show vegetation first. Mr. O'Kane mentioned some roads were beyond rejuvenation and explained other techniques used to preserve and extend the road life.

Mr. Loucks asked Mr. O'Kane to explain rejuvenation in detail. Mr. O'Kane described the rejuvenation sealant used to prolong the life of the pavement. **Commissioner Loftus** advised Sarasota County has used a cost effective program for at least 25 years. **Chairman D'Aprile** expressed support. Mr. O'Kane indicated the process was new to Charlotte County; suggested using it during the next five years; and agreed it had been successfully used in other areas for many years.

Commissioner Moore asked for clarification of the time frame; expressed concern for the costs involved; and wondered what would occur after completion of the rejuvenation process. Mr. O'Kane agreed roads were a tremendous investment and stated all roads would need to be re-evaluated at the end of the process.

Ms. Tharpe described the accomplishments and challenges of 1,900 miles of County roadways by category; explained only 948 miles were included in this study; advised 190 miles of road should be completed each year over the target schedule of five years; outlined three cost scenarios based on borrowing the cash, paying the loan back with interest and carrying costs over a 5, 10 or 15-year period; and provided annual paving costs by area. Mr. Loucks clarified these annual costs would be multiplied by 5

years. Ms. Tharpe outlined Methodology Components by area; discussed trip generations; explained the use of ERUs; noted Billing Units by District; and provided Preliminary Rate detail for three scenarios. (Ms. Tharpe mentioned a typo on page 15. Mr. Loucks requested the Board correct page 15 by changing 1-5 years to 1-10 years.)

Commissioner Loftus questioned how a multi-family unit could carry less units than a single-family unit. Ms. Tharpe explained trip generation determined the unit value and mentioned with local data multi-family could be changed to one unit. **Commissioner Moore** asked if commercial and condo residents living 300 feet off an arterial road currently paid MSBU assessments. Ms. Tharpe advised if they were not already in the program each situation would be handled on an individual basis and explained different scenarios when individuals would pay based upon benefits. **Commissioner Moore** asked about road and bridge roadways. Mr. Sandrock advised road and bridges were funded through gas taxes. **Commissioner Duffy** questioned if inflation was considered for the maintenance paving program. Mr. Buchholz responded a 3% per year increase was attached for maintenance costs. **Commissioner Duffy** pointed out additional maintenance costs were not mentioned for the roads not considered in this study. Ms. Tharpe agreed that would slightly increase the cost.

Ms. Tharpe mentioned developing a future crediting policy and commented on the need to be fair. **Commissioner Loftus** indicated credits would increase the projected costs and suggested not billing them rather than providing a credit. Ms. Tharpe commented on problems related to credit issues. Mr. Loucks mentioned if the program was approved, it would be extremely complex and time consuming and total equity could not be achieved. Ms. Tharpe reminded the Board that Capital projects were not included, noted no funding reserves for the next cycle, and concluded the presentation.

Chairman D'Aprile polled the Board on the direction.

Commissioner Moore asked for the number of miles generally paved in a year. Mr. O'Kane mentioned this year 100 to 110 miles would be paved, explained the schedule was based on the capacity of the contractor, and opined it might be difficult during an active

development year to complete 100 miles. **Commissioner Moore** mentioned this program indicated completing 190 miles per year for five years. Mr. O'Kane provided additional factors. **Commissioner Moore** asked about drainage issues, swales, and the cost of replacement pipes. Ms. Tharpe advised these matters were not included, explained the additional costs were significant, and opined the possibility of layering those components later. **Commissioner Moore** opined the plan would not solve funding issues and opined residents would not be able to afford it.

Commissioner Loftus expressed his concern that drainage was not included, noted MSBUs currently included road and drainage at a combined cost, and asked for an estimate of costs to the citizen. Mr. Loucks noted the numbers shown on the proposal reflected the cost for minimum levels of service and expressed reluctance to provide pricing for a different level of service. **Commissioner Loftus** opined drainage costs and additional information were needed to make an educated decision.

Chairman D'Aprile opined the drainage costs were substantial, stated the Board was not satisfied with the proposal, and would not vote today.

Commissioner Moore asked if West County neighborhood bridges were in the program or MSBU funded. Mr. O'Kane explained they were not in this program and mentioned other items covered by MSBUs.

Commissioner Duffy was surprised by the number of roads needing paving in West County; expressed her disappointment in this study; asked if a comparison was done between the preliminary and current costs; and questioned the cost effectiveness. Mr. Loucks opined this program would be cost effective in the long term instead of fixing problems as they occurred with available resources and discussed standardizing Countywide roads. **Commissioner Duffy** asked if pot holes would be eliminated. Mr. Loucks advised there would be less under the new program.

Mr. O'Kane announced achievements in Greater Port Charlotte (GPC) this last year; noted the assessment increase; opined if the assessment was maintained the County would continue to see remarkable improvements in GPC; and explained GPC was the largest MSBU.

Commissioner Loftus agreed there were many roads in Mid County that needed reconstruction, asked if the Toledo Blade area was included, and noted existing road reconstructive costs along with patching and repairs were not included in this program. Mr. O'Kane stated they could not reach all streets this year, explained this was also road maintenance, and noted all roads would eventually be done.

Mr. Loucks acknowledged the Board's frustration, agreed with **Commissioner Moore** that until new money was fused into the program it would be business as usual, and recommended Scenario 3.

Chairman D'Aprile expressed opposition for various reasons. **Commissioner Moore** indicated the study was not in a format that could be brought to the people and commented on the lack of citizen suggestions. **Commissioner Duffy** suggested distributing the research information to MSBU committees for input prior to any Board decision. **Chairman D'Aprile** appreciated the comment but opined it was the Board's responsibility. **Commissioner Duffy** reminded **Chairman D'Aprile** of the past problems related to MSBU meetings and opined a more efficient plan is needed. **Chairman D'Aprile** opined everyone should pay the same amount annually to cover the MSBU costs; explained every other state followed that procedure; and opposed the plan.

Mr. Loucks requested direction on a target number or not to pursue the plan.

Commissioner Loftus noted his desire to continue further discussions, asked for more information, agreed drainage costs would be substantial, and advised the need to consider and add the current costs for patching and drainage to this proposal. **Chairman D'Aprile** expressed his dissatisfaction and noted some of the proposal might be salvaged and used in the future.

Mr. Loucks asked for clarification. **Commissioner Moore** felt it was not fair to ask the Administrator to work around a lower target number because drainage costs were not included in the existing proposal and opined this was not the way to proceed. Mr. Loucks expressed his desire to provide options. **Chairman D'Aprile** indicated discussions should be continued with a full Board in attendance. Mr. Loucks advised no implementation should be expected for 2008/2009. **Commissioner Loftus** asked for the time frame to apply it to this year. Mr. Sandrock advised a decision would need to be made immediately. **Commissioner Moore** and Mr. Loucks agreed this issue would take a long time.

Commissioner Duffy indicated the need to meet with MSBU committees for input, to obtain citizen feedback, and asked for approximate drainage costs. Mr. Loucks advised depending on the district, assessments would be \$300 or \$400 over the current estimates. Mr. Loucks explained drainage and MSBU costs were on a case-by-case basis, clarified district locations, and opined there was no easy solution.

Adjourned: 10:18

Signature on file in Commission Minutes
Chairman

ATTEST:

BARBARA T. SCOTT, CLERK
OF THE CIRCUIT COURT AND
EX-OFFICIO TO THE BOARD
OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

By: Signature on file in Commission Minutes
Deputy Clerk

JL