

Barfield: Okay. VI.F.3. It's a Citizen Request from Dale Young. Mr. Young, please come forward.

Smith: He's not here. I haven't seen him.

Barfield: Do you want to delay this?

Fisher: No. We got cards on this?

Barfield: Yeah. I got cards.

Fisher: Yeah. That's fine.

Barfield: Okay. VI.F.3. We have Mr. Cliff Shepard.

Shepard: Good morning. I'm Cliff Shepard.

Barfield: Good morning.

Shepard: And I am pleased to represent the Satellite Beach CRA. I am also pleased to be involved in a meeting that takes less than half of my lifetime.

Barfield: Aren't we all.

Shepard: I represent a number of cities and CRA's and they never move this fast, and so I'm grateful. I also represent the Florida Redevelopment Association, and you may have heard of it. It is the State organization under the umbrella of the League of Cities that is responsible for providing good information, which clearly is needed here about how CRA's operate, why they operate, and why they work for everybody, including the counties that set them up; but, for the specific topic in front of us, I want you to understand this, that all CRA's, as well as I believe every State government submits annually audits. Right? So, what is being requested by this citizen is that we'll have an audit on top of an audit. That's unnecessary. We kind of tend to say in government that duplication is not a good thing, that's how you end up with \$600 toilets, and other things of that nature. I want to read you from the Joint Legislative Auditing Committee website; this is what they say their responsibilities are. The Joint Legislative Auditing Committee has the authority to enforce provisions against local government entities when they fail to submit financial reports required by law. What agency in the County has failed to submit the financial reports required by law? The answer, as we know because you just made the motions accepting them is none, none, none. It simply hasn't happened. This would be duplication, it is unnecessary, its bad policy, and the audits done by CPA's for all of these agencies stand on their own. If there is a problem, that's what those audits reflect, and those audits would then be turned over to JLAC if a citizen or even a member of the County or the County Commission had said hey, this audit shows things are out of whack, we need a further in depth investigation. That's not what's going on here. It is a matter of policy, a matter of good government. Duplication is not a good thing. As a final matter, I'd like to say this...it is really apparent that this body as a group at your next Workshop, if you could spare an hour of time, the FRA would be happy to spend time educating you and citizens who don't understand the way these things work, on how they work, because to state, for example, that you're taking away taxpayer dollars from one citizen in order to benefit a specific district in a city is simply not correct. Those dollars would never get back to the city but for the CRA. They would simply save the County at the County's discretion, which I understand is a good thing for the County to

put wherever they want. But we also kind of tend to go along with the proposition that local dollars are best spent locally, by the people who understand how to spend them locally. That's why CRA's exist. They do not take one single dime from a citizen within the city that that city would get back in any other way; it simply does not work that way. Anybody who says differently doesn't understand. Thank you.

Barfield: Thank you. Courtney Barker.

Infantini: I beg to differ with his point. It does. It does take away from General Fund dollars. The city dollars would go ahead and stay in the city that are generated in the CRA but to say differently, would be just factually incorrect. It is General Fund matching that it's like. It's like a retirement plan, I put into my retirement plan and my employer matches it, to the extent that my employer matches my retirement plan, that's money they've chosen to match rather than spend elsewhere to benefit that organization. So the same thing with the General Fund, anytime we match CRA dollars we're actually taking money out of the General Fund to put in one area, as opposed to spending for the greater good of the entire County, just to make it factually accurate. I just wanted to clarify that subject.

(Audience outburst)

Barfield: Nope. No.

Infantini: It is.

Fisher: I believe you, Sir. I agree with this gentleman. You're correct. You're exactly correct.

Barfield: Go ahead, Courtney.

Barker: Okay. I'm sorry, I think, I know, do you have Carol down?

Barfield: Let's see?

Barker: She was trying to speak before the last one and didn't have, wasn't called, so, if you all know Carol, she's the person that's steamed over here.

Barfield: Okay. I've got it. Carol, go ahead and come on up.

Barker: Okay. Can she come up now?

Barfield: Yeah.

Barker: Okay. Thank you.

Barfield: Good morning.

McCormack: Good morning and here we are once again. My Town Clerk's going to pass out some information that I think is prudent, and we also have a small, short PowerPoint Presentation that I think is very informative. I picked seven different properties. Thank you. Seven different properties in the Town of Palm Shores, starting with one that is valued at \$87,000. Now if you will note the paid to Lisa Cullen, Brevard County, you will list all of the

things that are paid, not to the Town of Palm Shores as we have been continually told that we're taking from the General Fund. Lisa wrote to each and every one of you paying it, but if you look at the first one that's an \$87,000 home. They paid \$963 to Brevard County. If you look and see if there is a Palm Shores on there, it says zero. The next house is \$93,440, paid to Brevard County \$1,102.20. It goes to your General Fund; it goes to all and everything that has to do with the County, and nothing to do with the Town of Palm Shores. A \$1,803...an \$180,000 home paid \$2,420.88 to Brevard County, not to the Town of Palm Shores. The same with the \$262,000 home, they paid \$3,758.61 to the Town... to Brevard County, not to the Town of Palm Shores. A \$490,000 paid \$8,173.37 to Brevard County, not to the Town of Palm Shores; and the most expensive home I could find in our Town was \$736,000 and they paid \$10,942.52 to Brevard County. There is nowhere in this that we are taking money from the General Fund, that money all goes to Brevard County, not to us. We don't have Ad Valorem taxes as the letter from Lisa Cullen..I believe you all got one. I asked her to please send each of you an individual letter, which if it's on there, Pat.

Town Clerk: Yep, it is, each one.

McCormack: Each one of you received a personal letter from Lisa Cullen, stating that those funds as it's been stated over and over again, that we get this money. We don't get this money. It does not come to us. You know, we've, we've all been back here time and time and time again, and then this came up at your last meeting. It was pulled the day of the meeting. Then it comes out that, you know, they're questioning the legality, and the grossly apparent misuse and misunderstanding. We don't have a misunderstanding about what's in this book. I know each and every page in this book and we don't have a misunderstanding. The Admin Fees we pay are to an attorney who handles our ordinances, as far as zoning. We pay our Code Enforcement Officer who believe me, has plenty to do. We pay our Town Engineer. I mean, out of \$88,000 I don't know where y'all think that's slush fund is because it's just factually not there. We do the best...you can look at our report. \$22,000 of that came out of our General Fund, so there is no slush fund. We're not misappropriating funds and it's frustrating, as an elected official who prides herself on doing what is right, to be accused of doing something grossly...it it's just so offensive, grossly apparent that we are guilty of double taxation. Well, show me where my taxes are. When you talked about your General Fund and the sewers, if you want to donate some of those millions and millions and millions of dollars that we pay you back to us so that we can hookup people to sewer, I'd be delighted, because we can't afford to do it; but with millions of dollars that we pay you, maybe you can give us some so we can do that. But we're not doing anything wrong. We submit our report, not only to you but we submit it to the Auditor General, and then now you wanted an additional form. So, being a small town we came up with the best report we could. You know we don't have five pages of things to report, but we reported it, and if you look back at our audit report, which you received in March, we sent it certified, so I know you got it. Our numbers match what's in our audit report by our auditor. What more can we do, and how many times do we have to come back and defend what we're doing? It's just, you know, he didn't show up. Okay, so is he going to put it on next month's Agenda and are we going have to come back again? You know, it just is, it is really heartbreaking when people take off and they come here, and they try to do the right thing and, you know...is there a rule on how many times this man can put it on? He pulled it the last minute the last meeting, then today he doesn't show up. Well, we're the ones that are being punished for that and I think it's unfair that you're talking about setting rules for us. Can you set a rule on how many times we have to do this when somebody doesn't show up to defend what they want. I mean, honestly, do you not think it's unfair to us?

Barfield: Absolutely.

McCormack: I mean, we take off from our jobs and we come down and we try to give you the most current, the best information we have, and I think there should be some type of saying to okay, well, you had it on there twice, and you didn't show up either time. Are you going to make all these people come back again? And I'll be happy to answer any questions from any of you about our CRA.

Infantini: Well, I have one question.

McCormack: Sure.

Infantini: The point, and never once have I said that your Town collected property tax. I know you've gotten before the Board and said that. Never once have I said you collect property taxes, what I've said is your CRA is funded from our General Fund. Never once, so let's make sure we're clear because I know you've said it a few times in front of this Board that I've said that. Never did I say you collect property tax. I said you use our General Fund to fund your CRA. If you don't collect property taxes and I don't. Apparently you're not aware of how the CRA's are funded. What happens is...

McCormack: I'm fully aware.

Infantini: Okay, then you would know that it comes out of our General Fund. So, if we make a tax payment to you of \$84,000, it comes from, it has to come from somewhere, it's called our General Fund. So, if we are making a choice to give you \$84,000, which was a decision the Board made some years back...okay...and I didn't place this item on the Agenda, I'm just correcting because it appears that you're under the misunderstanding that I've made a statement that I've never made, because I know where the money is funded, so for the public record all of the money that the County submits to CRA's comes from our General Fund. Sometimes, if there is a city that collects property taxes, it also is contributed to by their General Fund, but whenever there's a CRA, it is coming, our contribution part, is coming from our General Fund, and when we make a decision to fund a CRA and the improvements therein, we are also making simultaneously a decision to not fund something else that may be of greater importance to the community at-large. It may not, maybe the most important thing we could do is fund CRA's and the improvements therein. I'm just completely, always posing the question to the Board because I am not a CRA believer, and I think that it is better that we should fund more responsible projects Countywide. That's only a position.

McCormack: I guess, I guess the way I wanted to explain it, and is that there is a portion of Tax Increment Financing, which the County does get a portion of that money, and it's not the whole Town. So, the only portion that you're paying us is for that small portion, the rest of all of the...and you get a portion of the TIF money, but all of the rest of the money, the millions of dollars that you are making from the Town of Palm Shores, goes right to you, that's the only point I'm trying to make, because I didn't want this audience, which they seem to have had a misunderstanding that we're not paying, but we are paying, and we're the only ones that's paying, so you're making a lot of money off of us and we're happy to give it to you. Okay? But we feel like we're doing a good job with the small portion of the millions of dollars that you get from us with our \$88,000. That's the point.

Barfield: Okay. Commissioner Smith. Do you need her still here?

Smith: No.

Barfield: Okay.

Smith: You can sit down. Thanks.

McCormack: Thank you.

Barfield: Wait, wait, Commissioner Fisher wants to speak.

Smith: Well, I do have something to say.

Barfield: Okay, go ahead.

Smith: But Ms. McCormack doesn't have to stand there, that's my point.

McCormack: That's all right. I'd be happy to. I feel like I've been here so long I might be able to (unclear).

Smith: Well. I just want to address your comment that how many times do we have to come here? I told you last week, you don't have to show up for this. This isn't a witch-hunt. And I can tell you I for one, and I can tell you for the rest of the Board, we're not conducting witch-hunts. We're not pointing our finger at you. We're not pointing our finger at Satellite Beach. We're not going to take a vote, so there's nothing to worry about. If there is going to be a vote, then you guys can mobilize the forces, and you can all come here and tell us what we've heard already 100 times. So, I just want you to understand that we have questions but we're not going to shut down CRA's. I've told you repeatedly that we have a contractual obligation to you and all the other CRA's. We can't get rid of the CRA's that are already expired so we're, so, I can't talk right. We certainly are not going to take away your CRA. So, you don't have to run down here every time you have this fear that somebody's going to take away your CRA because they some comment that was made that would be adverse to you or somebody else. So, you know, just I think that you guys need to take a step back, take a deep breath, and everything is going to be okay.

McCormack: Well, that's very reassuring and I'm going to hold you to that word. Believe me.

Barfield: Commissioner Fisher.

Fisher: Does, haven't some of your CRA's done some infrastructure projects that benefited the County?

McCormack: Absolutely.

Fisher: With that \$88,000.

McCormack: Absolutely.

Fisher: That, I mean, you're paying us a million and we're giving you 88, then you've taken that 88; and what did, do you know offhand what you've done?

McCormack: We went from \$9 million in our property values. When we started were about \$9 million for the whole Town. We're now at like \$23, \$24 million dollars of taxable value. So of that 24, I mean we've taken without the CRA we would not have the building that we have. We

wouldn't have the new businesses coming in. You know, tearing down an old building with a tarp on it and having 52 new homes going in, that are affordable home, that would have never happened; but, also, the other businesses that we've attracted that are not in the CRA, you're going to make a boatload of money off of those. I don't think you're going to turn down Wawa's money and that's not in our Community Redevelopment Fund, and that will be opened up May 19th and I'm sure you'll will get an invitation. But, you know, we have by the more successful our CRA is, the more money the County gets.

Fisher: Well. Yeah. I think. There's a couple of things that I want to point out. One is that I want you guys to be aware of that in, and I haven't heard anything different, that when we passed a Resolution back here a couple of months ago, the Resolution said that we won't be defunding or reducing funding, or dissolution of CRA's, you know, anytime in the near future unless there were three votes for it so, that Resolution still is good and is kind of law for the Board, so the Board has made that decision to do that. So, I don't think there's, but there's citizens can throw up...

McCormack: Absolutely.

Fisher: ...these types of Agenda Items. I know it. I know it. I know it questions the CRA's when they do it, so I'm not sure how do we control that? But I can assure you, we can control that, you know, defunding, which is a big part of it.

McCormack: Right.

Fisher: And, you know, of, of, or any type of getting rid of dissolution of CRA's, that's not going to happen unless you can get three votes...

McCormack: Right.

Fisher: ...and bring it on to Agenda. You'll have plenty of warning if that was to go. The, the other thing I think is in in their defense too, I think, Mr. Chairman, we got to...every time some citizen comes up and makes those statements, that's one thing, you know, and, and, and, and they've probably don't worry about those statements as much as they worry about when an elected official up here who gives them an inaccurate statement on the dais; and because people think that if we're elected officials we're telling the truth about something.

McCormack: That's right.

Fisher: I remember a couple of weeks ago when they said you were giving to General Fund money and we were paying you, and you we're getting accused of some things that kind of gotten out of hand. I think it's important because, you know, what we say up here people believe it to be the truth, and unfortunately that isn't always the truth. So...

McCormack: And I appreciate that and I think that there was the thing that was most offensive to all of us was the original statement that he made when he made his request, about things being guilty of double taxation and grossly, you know, providing information, and I, you know, I think that's when everybody feels like...well, wait a minute, there again, we're being challenged that we're not doing something legal and correct. So, I appreciate your time. Thank you for your promise Commissioner. All of you, I appreciate your support in the past, and I appreciate your support in the future.

Barfield: Thank you, Mayor. Courtney Barker.

Barker: Thank you. I wanted to talk briefly about, if I could respond to some of the comments on the CRA's, you know, the County spending money on the CRA's prevents the County from doing things for the Lagoon, and I just wanted to make sure you knew that, you know, in addition to the projects that Commissioner Anderson spoke about with Palm Bay, you know, in Titusville you have the Zone which assisted in the development of the Miracle City Mall. That Mall was a sea of asphalt. The entire Mall, and including that hundreds of acres of neighborhoods behind it, directly outfall into the Lagoon, and now that Mall is going to be redeveloped with stormwater. That stormwater comes to current standards of today and we'll be treating that, not only the Mall but some of the surrounding areas. So, I think it is, you, people need to be careful about saying that CRA's don't do anything for Lagoons. Secondly, in the City of Satellite Beach, we had four remaining private septic tanks in the City along Shell Street. That is next to the highest eroding area of our community. The CRA in the City shared the cost of putting in a sewer line to get those off, the properties off septic tank. That was a project that was reported to you in our last Annual Report that we just submitted, so, I think, and this is a sewer line for your utility. You know, so we didn't call you and yell, you know, you guys aren't putting sewer lines in. When we did it because we're partners with you and we felt it was an important thing to do, and the right thing to do, so that's what we did. So, you know when we talk about beautification, beautification in my and a lot of people's minds is landscaping. Do we want to live in a sea of asphalt? Do we not want to put landscaping in? I mean, that, that in itself it helps the Lagoon. It helps the environment. So, I'm, I hear a lot of these attacks and I just, some of them, I want the community, and I'm not really speaking to, to anti-CRA people because I know that, you know, at this point their minds aren't changed. I'm speaking to the community that's watching this and the community that's going to be reading the newspaper tomorrow, because that's why we come to these meetings. That, that's why we come to these meetings. So, so, I will never allow that that narrative to be the only narrative that the community hears, because it's not right. I also want to make sure that people know that, you know, when we talk about auditing, all of the CRA's are audited every single one of them. It's required by Statute. You get copies of them every year. So, for a resident to come up here and say that we need to be audited because of double taxation, I think in not just the report, but that need. There needs to be some expansion on why that resident thinks that, especially when they're not going to be here, because when we talk about saving taxpayer dollars. about us having to be here. The people who are really loosing are the Town of Palm Shores, because the Mayor is not at work, Vice-Mayor O'Neill, because he's not at work, City Manager Courtney Barker, because I'm not at work at City of Satellite Beach because we're always here. So it'd be nice if we didn't have to be here.

Smith: It's a wonderful place to be.

Barker: I mean, I love seeing you guys but it's over and over and over again, and it's not just because there's a disagreement of policy. This, these are political attacks. I think we all know that. So, let's just call it what it is. Thank you.

Infantini: It was not a political attack, so I do not want to call it what it is because that is not what it is. It is a prioritization of funding. Thank you.

Barfield: I'd like to say that Mr. Young's not here, but I don't think it's like him not to be here so we can't jump to any conclusions. I hope this health is okay. I hope he's okay. Dave Pasley.

Pasley: Dave Pasley, Melbourne Beach, Florida. Dale's request was for really another organization to take a look at the at the reports that are coming in. In recent months and recent weeks, we took it upon ourselves to find out what happens to these audited reports that go into the County, to the State, whomever. Okay? You talk about a self-licking ice cream cone, we've got one here. You guys get the report and you check it off yes, I received the report and you send it on to the Auditor General in Tallahassee. They check it off. They got the report. They send it off to guess who? The League of Cities, and they get the report, too, and they check it off. Does anyone actually look at what's at the report? No. Now, I can tell you you're doing a financial report. That's the audit that, that, the audit of this financial report is what's required. Financial reports are very simple. This is the simplest audit that can be devised by mankind. It says if it goes into box A and it's supposed to be spent for project A, that's how it gets spent. That's all that it is. It is not a performance audit. It is simply a goes in goes out audit, is all that it is. The issue really is back to CRA or to State Statute 163, Part 3. Again, if you read the Statute and comply with the Statute you're not going to be putting in storm sewers, that is not allowed. You're not going to be paying police forces, that's not allowed. You're not going to be building City Halls, you know, that's not allowed. What is allowed, and the folks in Rockledge have done a good job at this, they got a piece of property that was of blight, it was too small to be developed, they got it filled, moved to get properties on either side ready to put this thing on the market, or make/put it in the tax base. That's exactly what a CRA is supposed to be doing, exactly; but as far as all these roads and tulip gardening projects that we see, sorry guys, there's other ways to pay for that. You can have a bake sale and get the money to put up street lights. You don't need to be taking taxpayer money. Further, we keep talking about septic tanks. No one ever talks about the fact that there's technology out there to make our septic tanks more efficient. Mr. Smith knows all about this. Unfortunately, we can't get the State to give us permits. So, we're stuck with technology that goes back to the last century. If you're going to put a sewer line in front of my house, I would expect to pay. See an assessment for that out of my pocket, not out of the CRA money, out of my pocket. In addition to that, I got to pay to connect to that line, and you're probably going to hit me with an impact fee. Okay? That's about \$10,000 out of my pocket to, to pay for a sewer line and if my septic tank needs to be fixed, I'm going to fix it, pure and simple. I live on the river. I don't even fertilize the grass in my yard because I don't want it running off into the Lagoon. So, I think there are a lot of things that need to be looked at here. Number one is let's dust off Florida Statute 163, Part 3, and find out what these CRA's are supposed to be doing, because I'm tell you, they are doing things that are not in the books, and these audits are absolutely a joke. Then when we start paying for police protection out of there, that's not in the audit and it's not in the Statute folks. You don't do that. You don't pay for Fire Departments out of there. It's not allowed, but there's nobody enforcing it. If we're not going to enforce it why have State Statues at all? I've, I've stayed within my five minutes. There seems to be some conflict of who gets to have five minutes to speak and who doesn't have five minutes. So, my five minutes are now up. Thank you.

Infantini: Thank you.

Barfield: Commissioner Anderson.

Anderson: I don't know if I misunderstood Dave, but he said something to the effect about stormwater projects and if our CRA's are in violation the entire State of Florida's in violation, so it's buried in Brevard County and you need to go see the Governor, because let me tell you, the City of Alachua Community Redevelopment Agency roadway drainage and Park enhancement, it won an award from the State, the City of Coral Springs CRA stormwater study.

Infantini: I think his point is...

Anderson: One of the...

Infantini: The State is not being a vigilant watchdog.

Anderson: Well, there are State people at this meeting at the Lagoon House and they're fine with it. So...

Infantini: I know.

Anderson: If they are fine with then we're not doing anything wrong, we're not violating the law, and you talk about City Halls. This is pretty elaborate. Now, I wouldn't even agree with this one, but they won. If you look on page 17, the Lakeland Community Redevelopment Agency, that's their Tax Collector building. It's an old theater. Now, I wouldn't necessarily say to do that anywhere, but I mean if, if we're...this is the biggest violator according to you all's argument, but the State allows them to do it. So, I'm finished with this discussion until November 7th. So...

Barfield: What happens then?

Smith: Wait, wait, what happens on November 7th?

Fisher: Is that a Motion? That's what I was thinking, man, I don't want to talk about CRA's again. So...

Barfield: Along that line I'd like to make a comment too that we asked, requested from State to get a printout of all the reports and from, you know, if they were submitted, and if they were on time; and interestingly the columns come back as one of them is AFR received, which is the Authority Financial Report and then right next to it has audit received. Now that's not the same date as the AFR received. You look through all the Community Redevelopment Agencies in our County and each one of them has their audit receipt, too, but that's how they track it. So, okay, Pam LaSalle.

LaSalle: Pam LaSalle, Viera. Okay. I didn't look at this until last night. The JLAC looks like to be a handful of politicians that sit around and decide who to audit, and I looked through their audits online; and first of all, these audits aren't really audits, they're financial statements. The, the CPA's that prepare these reports always have boilerplate disclaimers in there and the CPA. Let's see, okay, I looked through several CRA's, found reports, and they are CPA prepared financial statements with boilerplate management letters from disclaimers about the CPA is not expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entities internal controls over their financial reporting. Now, everybody should, well, most everybody has to prepare tax return for the individual at home; this is very comparable to...it's as good as what you give the preparer and you hand them your summaries, and they run with it. And, so, the CPA's would do the same thing. They don't necessarily dig through there and they certainly don't go saying well, the State's Statute is this. Now, this JLAC group, they didn't do that many audits. I looked through their online records and from 2006 through 2016 they did 11 special district reports, audit reports, and of those only two of them are CRA's. So, I don't really think anybody has anything to worry about even if you all voted yes. Now, while they had the authority, you know, they. If you look through their verbiage of their law, it may, may, and may. So, you know, there's no guarantee with any of this, for anyone who's watching at home. Now, what is

interesting about this group is they like to use the word should 'enhance' in their summaries, you know, so it doesn't look like a lot of enforcement is what I'm getting at. Now, this group, this General Auditor, this group has a General Auditor, and the General Auditor did a report in January of 2014 on our school system. They also do the school systems; and they found the procurement issue over the software. In the summary it states controls over the enterprise resource software selection process and related payments could be enhanced. Now, we've all been reading about this \$8 million in the paper and so, you know, that just, you know, has to be the most supreme understatement I've ever read anywhere. Now, what I would like is an Inspector General, because they can get in there and they can help negotiate these contracts before they start, it's not an after-the-fact, go hunt them down, spend money on lawyers, and trying to find out where the money went, and Broward County has an Inspector General and they've got several CRA audits, and they actually get enforcement. And people get charged with criminal behavior when they find it and I just think that our County is long overdue, there's no independent oversight. These, these CPA's statements that go in, that is not oversight. The CPA's that y'all have here for internal and external, that's not independent oversight, they don't get in there and dig down, and see who's got the money and where it's gone. And our County has a billion dollar budget, a billion dollars; and, and no independent oversight. So, I would, I would rather us see moving in the direction of Inspector General. I think, as a citizen, I would be much happier and I wouldn't have to, you know, everyone complains about having to come down here. I'm not getting paid anywhere, anytime, for anything and I live in a CDD. I get to pay. I really do get to pay double taxation. Any questions?

Infantini: Yes. I'd like to ask you, you said you pay into a CDD. Could you explain how that is different from a CRA?

LaSalle: Yes. I'll be happy to.

Infantini: Oh, that's be great because I don't think the viewing public understands that many communities pay for their own community improvements while Brevard County's General Fund pays for CRA's. Could you explain the difference?

LaSalle: Right. Okay. Everybody in the County needs to get it into their head that they pay into the County. What, you know, you start at zero here, and you pay into the County; and so we're all on a level playing field then. So then you have a CDD come along and y'all approve them, and what happens is the developer then makes this little wad of money, multi-million dollars of money, and it's for the infrastructure; and then we get to pay a loan for much longer. And I was very alarmed to find out oh, no, you're going to keep paying once your loans are paid off because you get to maintain everything then, so all of our little ponds, and all of our little roads, were, and our sidewalks, oh, my goodness, we've fought over who pays for the sidewalk shoulders. Anyway, but, so individuals who live in a CDD get to pay an extra amount of money and its, it's not insignificant in in mostly in our...I know it doesn't apply to every single community, but its more in senior-restricted neighborhoods than not from my observation. I know there, it's not confined that way, but it happens a lot. So, we get to pay extra in for the infrastructure, along with everything out in the County. Now, the CRA's come along, and they manage to get money out of the County of that zero where we all start on the level playing field; and then they get money given back to them. So, I'm over here paying, you know, my. Let's say we all start with \$5, everybody in the County pays \$5. If you live in a CDD, then you pay an extra \$5, but the people over in the CRA get their \$5 back so, you know, its. I probably need a graph.

Infantini: A picture makes it easier, but the point is the people in the CDD pay for their own improvements, their own lighting, their own infrastructure improvements, their own sewer attachments to make the housing affordable. They pay in, and it's kind of like an HOA fee on steroids.

LaSalle: Yes.

Infantini: Right.

LaSalle: But there's interest.

Infantini: But you're paying for all your own and you're not getting...

LaSalle: There's interest on that, too.

Infantini: So, I just wanted to point that out as some communities have to pay for their own improvements while other communities get to use General Fund dollars, and you did a great job.

LaSalle: Thanks.

Infantini: Thanks for explaining.

LaSalle: Thanks, and it's the, it's the maintenance, you know, it's never going to go away.

Barfield: Thank you. Mr. Whitten.

Whitten: I probably should be quiet, Mr. Chairman, but CDD's have nothing to do with County government; and so, the fact that Viera East has a golf course and you chose to live in that community, and pay into that CDD to maintain the golf course, it shouldn't be construed as a double taxation. And I know this because I've been in government for 26 years. I have a Master's Degree in Political Science and I can tell you this with all certainty. So, it is my area of expertise, and so to, to, to, to have the public believe that county governments, city governments, have anything to do with CCD's, is just simply wrong.

Infantini: But that's the point, it doesn't have anything to do, and they are paying for all of their own lighting, all of their infrastructure improvements. Her extra fees are not just going to live on a golf course.

LaSalle: We don't live on a golf, we don't live on a golf course.

Barfield: Commissioner Anderson.

Infantini: So, they don't, they don't actually, just have that (unclear).

Barfield: Ms. LaSalle, please.

LaSalle: We don't live on a golf course.

Barfield: Please, please, Mr. Anderson.

Anderson: I, I...

Infantini: She needs a chance to rebut.

Anderson: I think the key word is you said Commissioner Infantini, to live in a CDD they have to pay. No, they chose to pay on a newer development. That is disclosed to them at the time of purchase that they will have to pay. Yes, it is disclosed.

LaSalle: It wasn't, no.

Anderson: Then you need to sue your realtor.

LaSalle: Well, maybe, but who has got the money to do that?

Anderson: Well, its, it, I'm a, I'm a real estate professional, you have, that is disclosed.

LaSalle: No.

Anderson: In the documents. It is disclosed in the closing documents that's...

LaSalle: Trust me we meet people all the time in our neighborhood who had no idea what they had gotten into.

Anderson: They need to pull out their closing documents, it is in there.

Infantini: Okay.

Anderson: And when I buy a house I read every document even though its 200 pages long, I read every line to understand what's in there, and I know that I would for sure know if I was choosing to pay an additional fee to live in a newer community. You don't have to pay. You chose to pay into a CDD. You chose to pay homeowners fees. You chose to pay condo fees; and to say that the citizens of Brevard should now step up and help with your improvements is very unfair.

Infantini: I'm not saying that, but the point is...the point is they moved into a community that is self-sustaining. She chose to live in the community, she may not have been aware that somewhere in the closing documents was about the CDD. I will agree with you on that one point, and only that one point; but the point is that some communities are self-sustaining while most of Brevard County is not. People that live in communities that are bound by a CDD have agreed contractually that they will maintain all of their infrastructure, their sidewalk, their curbing, their sewer lines, and the light posts, whereas Rockledge, for instance, they put up a whole bunch of lights along U.S. 1.

Barfield: Ms. LaSalle (unclear).

Infantini: That wasn't paid for out of a CDD, out of the people that live right there, part of those funds came from general tax fund, the General Fund, part of it came from a grant from the State, and what have you. Okay? That was the point.

Barfield: Mr. Fusscas. Good morning.

Fusscas: Good morning. Peter Fusscas, Malabar. I guess I've probably spoken to everybody in this room about CRA's at one time or another. So, rather than feed oats to a dead horse, I think I'll, I'd like to look at the big picture. Except for one person I might add, that I've never communicated on CRA's, but the big picture is the County's tax base, which I am particularly concerned about because it erodes; it erodes on a number of levels. One is the amount of land that is publicly owned, which I think is around 52 percent for Brevard County. The other issue is the erosion of tax base by corporate subsidies. Erosion of the tax base through CRA's and that's why I'm speaking, because what we're really doing is a CRA is funded by the County. It makes a contribution of around 40 percent. It depends upon the CRA. I mean every CRA has a different document and there are variations within that document. So, what we do in the County is we really provide a rebate or a grant for 30 years to a municipality to assist them in infrastructure. Now, they don't need to dissolve CRA's, they can operate their own CRA on their own money without County funds and they, or they are free to do it internally. They don't even need a CRA to do to accomplish any of the things that they do now with CRA money. If they want to plant a tree without a CRA, they can plant trees. It just depends upon the administration of the municipality or the County. One of the things that I am concerned about is the reporting and I, I understand that, you know, the CRA's are a creature of the legislation, enabling legislation that allows the County to enter in an agreement with the municipality or itself to create a Special District. That Special District then has a formula by which the General Fund then of the County contributes money into the trust fund of the CRA, and they use that money to do certain things; and that's the fundamental issue. Its, they don't need County money to perform their duties and responsibilities; it really is a grant that's up to you. The, I guess it's up to your agreement now. I don't know how you exit a CRA. We've had them for 30 years. There are no dissolution clauses in the Ordinances that I have seen and I may be wrong, there should be. There should be negotiations on how much the 90/10 split on on property taxes, maybe it should be 50/50, and what have you. There should be some provisions within the agreement that says that if you extend your CRA you don't automatically get another 30 years on the original CRA. I mean, it goes on and on for (unclear). On the reporting, listen I had companies in Central America, South America, Africa, and Asia that I administered, was responsible for, and we had a chart of accounts. In every single country were they had different laws and different accounting procedures, we had one uniform way to which we reported our financial results. A uniform chart of accounts, I think is absolutely essential if you're going to a template for CRA's. I mean, this is not new stuff. Okay, it's not new. I guess, to finish up, please someone take a look at the future erosion of the County's tax base, because, as your roads are a tax base you're going to have to raise the taxes on the existing people. Okay, so, that's one of my, that's the only message I've brought here is we tend to in, in the absence prioritizing our essential services and our duties, we tend to spend money on just about anything that comes up and its without rhyme or reason, it should be planned. It should be programmed and it should be executed accordingly; and anyway, I appreciate the conversation and all that you do for us. Thanks.

Infantini: Thank you.

Barfield: Thank you. Commissioner Fisher.

Fisher: Yeah, I'll say it again, it's like arguing about religion. Whether you believe in them or you don't, but you know, Mr. Pasley made some comments and, and Mr. Young, they all make reference to something's legal or not legal; and, so, I just Goggled Statute 163.370, under number three, and it says installation, construction, or reconstruction of streets, utilities, parks, playground, public areas, or major hotels are all that can be supported by CRA dollars, but that's so you know the facts when you get out there and you can go and anybody can go look at

it. 163.370. It also says support a convention centers, including meeting rooms, banquet facility, parking garage, lobby, passenger pass ways, and it goes on and on; but to make the statement that utilities, sewer lines, or roads or something like that should not be funded by this is just not true. It does meet State Statute.

Barfield: Okay, that's the last card I have on that.