

December 10, 2015, Workshop Verbatim (minus public comments)

Barfield - Thank you, we're having a little bit of a technical difficulty right now. Hold on just a second.

Infantini - Can we go ahead and just?

Barfield - Okay, thank you, we just figured out we had to turn something on to get everything started. It was really tough there. Thank you all for being here and I'd like for you all to join me in the Pledge of Allegiance, please stand. I want to thank all of you all for being here, it's a very important discussion we have, and we truly want your input and we're looking for solutions. I apologize for the movement back down here, but I think it's important, so at least we can be a little bit more comfortable and not be so crowded. I'd also like to take the opportunity to thank Commissioner Smith for bringing this up and doing the workshop. I think it's very important; there will be a lot that could come out of this, so with that we can move forward the purpose of this meeting is to review, and the legislative intent for the gas tax. We're open to various kinds of discussions, any kind of solutions, alternatives, and that's what we are really here for. We want your input and the, I want to ask that we have civility, that there is no outburst's either for pro or con, or whatever, and so we can get through this. We'll also ask that we have a lot of speakers today, probably over 50 at least so what I'd like to make sure that if someone is going to repeat exactly what you're going to say, just add to what they already said, and get a little bit more out of it. We're limited to five minutes, but at discretion we can, probably interact with you to ask question, clarifications, and recommendations. So, I really appreciate you all being here, and we are going to move forward. Yes, there are seats down here, too, if you can't get that back pew it doesn't work that way? Okay, let's start out with on the Agenda we have the legislative intent, there is a citizen's video that has been wanted to be played, it's a 12 minute video, and Commissioner Infantini put it on for herself. And my his first question is the Policy is five minutes, but my first question to Commissioner Infantini is that I want to make sure this has been vetted through the staff? Has the staff looked at all the facts of it and done a facts check to make sure everything is okay?

Infantini: I can't account for staff. Why would you ask me what staff has done? I would ask the County Manager and I haven't vetted any of the budget presentation because of unforeseen circumstances with our Budget Director.

Barfield: Okay.

Infantini: I haven't had a chance to review what's going to be presented by staff, so I.

Barfield: Okay. Okay, so it hasn't been fact checked. I'm going to leave it up to the Board if you all want to make a, it's 12 minutes to let the full 12 minutes or five minutes?

Fisher: Nope, I'm not interested.

Anderson: They cannot donate time.

Barfield: We can't do it.

Fisher: We got rules. We got 50 people who want to talk.

Infantini: The video is going to be seen in its entirety. I put it on the Agenda.

Barfield: Can I entertain a motion?

Anderson: The County Attorney says there has to be a motion to waive the rules.

Smith: I would make a motion to waive the rules.

Infantini: Second.

Barfield: I have a motion to waive the rules by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Infantini. All in favor say Aye.

Smith: Aye.

Infantini: Aye.

Barfield: All opposed? Nay

Anderson: Nay.

Fisher: Nay.

Barfield: It fails. We'll go by the rules. Excuse me. Excuse me, please keep it down. You'll have an opportunity to speak. The first speaker, we are going to go through Public Comments first, and the first speaker is Ms. Tidd. Amy Tidd, to please come forward and state your name and address for the record.

Tidd: I thought we were doing the video first?

Infantini: Oh, this is just Public Comment. If anybody coming in that doesn't want to do public comments that want to talk, sorry? Anybody who came in that doesn't want to do Public Comment but wants to talk on the video, you can explain to the Chairman when he calls your name that you want to hold off speaking until after the presentation has been made.

Barfield: Please go ahead. Thank you very much. Victoria Northrup, please name and address for the record, please. Sara Ann Conkling, how are you? Thank you. Marty Adams, how are you? Ed Priselac, I hope I said that right? I'm sorry if I didn't pronounce it correctly. Rob Cramp, could you be getting ready, too, please, you'll be next? Thank you.

Mr. Cramp. Okay. Thank you all for your services, it's a major benefit, and we really appreciate that for our community. Catherine Alexander, Roger Gangitano, I always has a hard time with your name, Sir, I'm sorry. You're on standby. Thank you. I got it now. Tim Tumulty.

Infantini: Okay, I have a comment to make. I don't know, I guess you didn't see my light on there?

Barfield: I'm sorry.

Infantini: What I'd like for anybody who would like to hold off giving their comments because people turned in their cards thinking they had to put it in Public Comment. I would suggest anybody who would like to wait until County staff has had an opportunity to do their PowerPoint presentation and we've had an opportunity to see the video, which may raise some points because once all of your points are made then many of them are going to be... I would just encourage many people to hold off giving their public comment until after the presentations are made, so when the Chairman says would like to come up, and say no I'd like to defer so you could do just as Mr. Roger Gangitano said. See I messed it up, too. You want to be able to comment on the presentation, you don't want to comment before because you can't rebut anything that's being discussed up here. It's just a thought?

Barfield: Okay. Mr. Tumulty. Thank you. Philip Weinberg and Kathryn Rudloff, if you'd get ready. Good afternoon. Thank you, I'd like to ask you a question, first. In the Blue Ribbon Report, they stated that if the gas tax came in and then a half-cent sales tax went through by referendum then the gas tax would go away, and so that's really... If this goes any further that's what I'd like to do. I'd like to make sure that's in there that way. Okay. Thank you. Kathryn Rudloff and then John Weiler. Hi. Thank you. Mr. Weiler. Okay, also can I get your name and address for the record, please? Thank you. I'd like to ask Mr. Whitten, if with the community-based funding of various charities what if we take that out, what would the impacts of that be?

Whitten: That's about \$510,000 and so, those are and a lot of those agencies are here, and they'll tell you how they leveraged the dollars. Ian is coming up and he may have those statistics in his head, but you know, the 510 that goes to those agencies, and it's through a competitive process. And so it's not the Board determining what agencies get it, but it's a competitive RFP process and Ian may have the ability to take the 510 and leverage that in the community through their services?

Infantini: I would like to comment that the charities did go through a competitive process but the \$16,000 in avoided property taxes by the historical farmhouse, they didn't go through a competitive process, and yet the Commissioners voted to say that they do not have to pay property taxes because they are a historical building. And it's nice for the community, instead of having it there, some money come from the TDC to fund those taxes. So, I wanted to let the public know that there are other places that we've been getting, that just

besides the 510.

Whitten: I think Ian, does have that information.

Golden: Commissioners, I do have some information about the leveraging for some of the agencies that you did approve funding for, for example, Aging Matters Senior Nutrition Program, that's Meals on Wheels, you allocated \$60,000. They'll draw down an additional \$540,000 in leverage funds which actually provides 1,783 meals for Unduplicated Clients. Their Senior Assistance Program \$24,000 draws down 270,000, which gives you about 1,248 Unduplicated Clients. The Alzheimer's Foundation \$60,000 they draw down 75, which allows them to do transportation for 880 clients, and we have multiple other ones. We also have the ability, if you'd like I can go into the actual numbers that those agencies plan on serving and the numbers that they had served over previous years.

Barfield: I think we are okay with that. Mr. Whitten, I have one other question on this. The \$1.1 million dollar freeze on the 150 open unfilled positions. What do you think is that?

Whitten: Yeah, Mr. Abbate and Mr. Visco are prepared to go over that. We will address that if you would like in our portion of the Workshop. Not all of those positions are generally funded; a number of those positions are Fire Medics, or Fire EMT's. A number of those positions are in enterprise funds and so as you look at the 150, not all of those are general funds. Some of those are Public Safety positions but we are prepared to actually over those in detail.

Barfield: Okay. Okay. Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

Smith: With regard to the charities, we granted \$510,000 to I made the point when we approved that, and I voted for it as well, that those charities should keep in mind that I would not be supporting them next year. I don't think it's a purpose of the government to fund charities. I'm very giving. I am a very giving person. I probably give away more than some people make, but I think it's the government's position that we should spend money for all the people and not choose a phase that is often used... winners and losers just for example. According to Dave Berman's article in the *Florida TODAY* Brevard County have 467 charities, of those 467 Brevard County chose 14 to support. Now that is not fair to the other 452 if you look at it from the standpoint that government should be helping the charities. But, I would suggest that these charities aren't going to go away if we de-fund them because 12 out of the 14 that we supported are also supported by United Way, and Aging Matters who were just mentioned, we're giving them \$60,000. I think that was for the Meals on Wheels and \$30,000 for another something but its \$90,000 altogether. I don't know where I have that number but they're receiving overall \$2, \$3, or \$4 million dollars, so my point here is that if we stop funding these folks they are still going to be out there. They are still going to be helping the community and they are still going to be receiving funds, and I would suggest that each and every one of you search your hearts and your pocketbooks, and step-up yourselves and support these folks.

Barfield: Okay, Jim Phend, please come forward, and Mary Hillberg, please get ready. Merry Christmas to you. Thank you. Mary Hillberg. Thank you. Jean Severance and Dale Young. Dale Young you're on standby. Jean Severance? Maybe I pronounced that wrong? Okay, Dale Young. There's not an Item II.

Infantini: There is. Item II., is your Legislative Intent. In other words, he wants to wait until after the presentation has been made.

Barfield: That. That's what we're doing. We are on Legislative Intent.

Infantini: No. You are on Public Comment.

Barfield: On the Legislative Intent?

Infantini: No. That Legislative Intent hasn't come up yet and.

Barfield: Yes, it has.

Infantini: We haven't done, because the video presentation would be there and Mr. Whitten would have done his PowerPoint presentation, so public comment comes after.

Barfield: No. Mr. Kaufmann, John Kaufmann. Okay, Becky Mathisen be ready, too. Thank you. Becky Mathisen. Excuse me. Excuse me, let's get some. Okay. Excuse me, they are given opportunity to speak and we are interacting, so I'm moving forward right now to Becky.

Infantini: I. I have a question.

Barfield: Excuse me, let's move forward, we'll go through the comments, and then we'll have discussion.

Infantini: How many people in this audience would like to speak after presentation?

Barfield: Wow, come on.

Anderson: We have Board rules.

Barfield: Yeah.

Infantini: Where is the Board rule that says that the Item is not heard first?

Barfield: Okay. It's.

Infantini: I've. I've not. Every single Commission meeting.

Barfield: You know what? Let's go.

Infantini: That I have attended, we have staff present the Item, they do their PowerPoint, and then people get up, and speak. These people do not want to speak before the

presentation.

Barfield: We're gonna. We're moving forward to let you speak. Becky Mathisen.

Infantini: Okay. What if they want to speak afterward? Why is there no speaking afterward? I keep hearing you saying it under your breath? I'm sorry. I've never heard this before.

Anderson: Because the County Attorney's said that in order for us to change the rules by our procedures we have to vote. So, its.

Infantini: That. That is not true. That is not true, there has never been a meeting.

Anderson: Chairman, can we move on, please?

Barfield: Okay, let's move. Let's move forward.

Anderson: There are a lot of people that want to discuss, so can you let them speak?

Barfield: Yeah, let me get through these. We are on number 19 here. Becky Mathisen. We're still on the Legislative Intent, that's the only Item, so Becky Mathisen. Public comment. On public comment we are on. Quiet. Let's take a time out. A 10 minutes time out, here.

Break 2:18 p.m. - 2:32 p.m.

Infantini: Excuse me that Agenda Item is my Agenda Item, and I am permitted to place items on the Agenda. I was permitted to place it on there. I have never seen any requirement that it could only be a five minutes for my Agenda Items. I've seen many presentations go on in this Board for 40 minutes long.

Barfield: Let me get clarified. Get that clarified. Mr. Cox... Mr. Knox. Just a minute, please. Please?

Knox: Okay. We have a rule adopted by the County Commission back in the year 2005 that's still in effect today, that says that videos are limited to five minutes. The Board can vote to waive that rule if they so choose, there was a motion made earlier that moved to waive the rule, but it was not passed. So, right now it's a five minute video.

Barfield: Quiet. Please, just let us do. Wait just a minute, please. Shh, please. Let's keep civility here. Please.

Infantini: Look who's talking.

Barfield: So, we are going to move forward, we'll address that again when it comes to it but the way it stands right now, its five minutes by the rules. Sir, please, please Sir, don't. Let's get moving through this. Please just hold off. Mr. McMillian. Well, wait a minute first, is

there anymore further public comments that does not, with this legislative intent? So, oh yes, definitely we are going through the cards. Mr. McMillian, this is regular public comment, okay? Go ahead. Thank you, sir.

Fisher: Just one second, Fred, just so you know, Jim and I had a conversation after Thanksgiving because we had several people that couldn't get to some of the places that were serving Thanksgiving meals, because we didn't have transportation, and so one of the things that we are going to try to do is a pilot program, is have limited transportation that day to get with the Daily Bread and other different places, and talk about can you serve between these certain hours? And then we try to provide some transportation during that selected hours, it wouldn't be a full-service on that day but it would be a start to trying to fix something. So, we've had that conversation already, okay. Thank you.

Barfield: Thank you. Okay, we have one last regular public comment before we get into the legislative intent. Pat Pasley.

Knox: I'm sorry to say there is a rule against that, too.

Barfield: Commissioner Infantini.

Infantini: Pat, there may be a rule, I've never seen it, and I'd like for Mr. Knox to show it to me where the rule is that you can't have three people do that. But what I would suggest is you do five minutes of the video and another person do the next five minutes, it may not be in consecutive order. Okay, because he's got the cards and he can shuffle them however he wants. So, they may not be in consecutive order but you do five minutes, have Dave do the next five, and perhaps Joyce do the next two and that way we will be able to hear the whole video.

Barfield: Okay. Let me. Now we will go to staff to get an overview of the legislative intent first. No. Just wait. Let's go through legislative intent and I'll pick up on the cards right after that.

Whitten: Mr. Chairman, this is Item II., Legislative Intent, is requested that the Board of County Commissioners approve the legislative intent to hold a public hearing to consider adoption of additional fuel and Local Option Gas Tax for road improvements in Brevard County. And so what this Item is again permission to advertise and change to the Ordinance or an amendment of the Ordinances, Code of Ordinances for six additional pennies. One of which is the ninth cent fuel tax, the second of which are five cents Local Option Gas Tax. The proposal was submitted by the Chairman is that the counties and municipalities will develop a prioritized list with estimated costs, the pennies would not be used for capacity projects, the representative jurisdictions would have to have citizen oversight committees, and the levy would only last for a 10 year collection period unless extended by the County Commission, or the respective municipalities.

Barfield: Okay. We will go with more comments Mr. William Stanziano.

Infantini: I thought we were going to have his PowerPoint? When do we get to see his presentation, so the people can comment on the presentations?

Barfield: We'll go through and finish up public comments, first.

Infantini: Oh, just the public comment. But then they can speak after the presentation.

Barfield: After we get through the comments then the presentation.

Infantini: And then they can still speak after the presentation. Is that correct?

Barfield: It's only one. One time.

Infantini: The. The whole point was. The whole point.

Barfield: Okay.

Infantini: Of having a Workshop was not to do that.

Barfield: Excuse me. I'm okay with that. Let's go with. We'll go with that.

Infantini: It was okay. Okay. No. Wait. Are you going to allow them to speak?

Barfield: Yeah.

Infantini: After.

Barfield: Yes, I will.

Infantini: Okay. You all heard it.

Barfield: Again, Mr. Stanziano. Mr. White. Come on.

Fisher: Mr. Commissioner Barfield, I know I originally voted not to do the presentation but you know what? I say let's do the. Do the video and then let Mr. Whitten do his presentation then when people want to come, come, and let'em come speak.

Barfield: Is that a motion?

Fisher: That'll be a motion.

Anderson: Second.

Barfield: We have a motion by Commissioner Fisher.

Infantini: What a great idea.

Barfield: Second by Mr. Anderson. All in favor say Aye. Aye.

Fisher: Aye.

Anderson: Aye.

Smith: Aye.

Infantini: Aye.

Barfield: Opposed?

Infantini: I wish I had thought of that.

Barfield: We are going to show the video so go with the video. SCGTV. Can you go ahead and put the video on? Mr. Whitten.

Whitten: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we're actually happy to get this opportunity to respond to the video. In largely, what we are going to talk about are the false narratives that are out in the public, and so let me give you one example. And let me start by saying that Section 1.5 of the Charter establishes the separation between legislative and executive functions of Brevard County government. The establishment and adoption of a policy shall be the responsibility of the Board and the execution of that policy is a responsibility of the County Manager, and so my job is to execute your policy. A lot of the issues that were raised in the video are Policy matters of the Board, but let me start on the... on the one issue of bond financing and the absorbent of interest rates. There are three bonds that the County has in place and those bonds begin in the year 2000 and so the video says that the County had no bond financing between the years of 2000 and 2005 is absolutely false. The County issued the Constitutional Gas Tax Bonds in the year 2000 in an amount of \$39.7 million. The interest rates on those bonds are 1.43 percent and they retire in 2020. The County issued bonds for LOGT in 2005 and refinanced those last year. Those bonds were initially \$48.5 million. The interest rates on those bonds are 2.77 percent and they are extinguished in 2026 and in 2007 the County issued bonds for \$48.4 million, and those bonds carry the highest interest rate of five percent and they're extinguishing 2037. And so, the question was asked why wouldn't the County defease the bonds? Well, as you can see, the County is already refinanced two previous bonds, and those interest rates are under well under three percent. The third bond that's at five percent has a call date of 2017 and so, if the County were to seek to refinance those bonds at this moment in time you'd actually pay more in interest earnings because you'd have to take the refinance dollars and escrow those dollars, and pay interest on those escrow dollars. And so, right now it doesn't make physical sense for the County to actually go out and refinance those bonds. The County's financial advisor monitors all the time, our ability to refinance for savings. When the County refinances, we never extend the term, we simply just take advantage of the lower interest rates. And so, again, the video was not correct in saying that the County didn't bond out between the years 2000 and 2005. The video was also incorrect in saying that those bond proceeds can't be used for repair and maintenance. They absolutely are used for repair and maintenance, and so a large part of what the County has achieved over the fifth, over the past fifteen years are as a result of issuing bonds to do. To do. To do just that, repair

and maintenance. And so, John's presentation will go into a lot more detail with regards to the success of the County with regards to those bonds, but I just wanted to highlight those things. It talks about the 150 vacant position positions and I think, 57 of those are actually in Fire, 33 of those are safer position grants, and the safer position grants are federal dollars that were utilized to train, I think Veterans and other disadvantage groups with regards to the Fire Service. And so, a large portion of those vacancies you will see are not generally funded, but are also public safety related positions. It talks about the phone system and what the County's doing with regards to the phone system. The County actually issued an RFP to switch to Voice over IP this past spring, those responses are back, and are currently under review. And so, the false narratives that are out there are presented all the time as those they are factual, it talked about zero-based budgeting, and the ability to do zero-based budgeting. Back in January I presented to Board of County Commissioners and the Citizens Budget Review a line item budget of the County, that's the first time in my recollection that anybody has ever been presented with a line item of budget for the County, and it's on the table down there and you can ask any Director whether they got one question on any line item within their budget. And so, you could simply open up that budget document, pick out a line item, call the Departments then, and ask the question. And so, we're not afraid to open up the County with regards to our line item budget, in fact, they've had that for over 10 months. It talks about the health insurance recommendations and Mr. Visco and Mr. Abbate are prepared to go in great details with regards to the savings that have been generated over time. One of the things that I want to point out is that it talks about the consultant and doing away with the current consultant, in favor of either the consultant that their recommending, or some other consultant. The County's current health insurance consultant has a listing of clients that includes Universal, Volusia County, the School Board consortium, Duvall County School Board system, the Orange County government, and the City of Orlando. And so, they're experts in the insurance business. But with regards to the turnaround in health insurance, and this is something as the Chief Administrative Officer, I'm not sure that you brag about but since 2009 the shift from Brevard County as the employer to the employees has occurred in an amount in excess of \$12 million dollars, i.e. we've reduced the cost in health insurance to the Board of County Commissioners since 2009, the 2010 Fiscal Year by \$12.3 dollars, and so to represent again as a false narrative, that we've not explored healthcare reductions is simply that, a false narrative. We're going to provide a listing of all of those initiatives, we'll go over those initiatives that you, the Board of County Commissioners approved back in January, and you can see that they're significant. And so, the turnaround on the Health Insurance Program is at the tune of \$20 plus million dollars. Last year we spent, in terms of actuals \$55 million dollars, the projection of from two years ago was \$65 million dollars I believe for the end of this Fiscal Year. And so, we're projecting that our actuals will be \$49 to \$50 million dollars, that's a \$15 million dollar savings on the Health Insurance Program. And so, there are a lot of representations in the video that are not factual, that we'll hit during our presentations, Mr. Denninghoff will go first and give you the record on Public Works in your road projects, and then Ms. Hayes will follow up with the budgetary false narratives that have been out

there. And so, that's going to take some time, but we are going to give you the detail that you've asked for. I would say to you, and I was remised in not saying before I started that Commissioner Infantini asked me well why didn't I get the PowerPoint presentation? You've seen the information before and it's just a reformatting of that information. The information is contained in the budget book. The information is contained in the annual audits. The information is contained in the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, but you didn't get that information because Mr. Rosenberg has been dealing with the death of his brother for the last week, and has only been in the office twice. And so, it took us some time to actually digest the video, to get through that video, there are a number of points that we will hit on that video, but we stand ready to actually present to the public and to remind you of what is the facts with regards to your story. Again, bonds were issued to do road projects, to do maintenance, bonds were not issued simply to pay interest on them, and so, with that I'll turn it over to Mr. Denninghoff, to go over the road portion.

Barfield: Commissioner Infantini first.

Infantini: I. Thank you. I. Unfortunately the point has been missed. The point of the video was to highlight information as best public citizens, like yourselves could gather. They have worked very very hard to gather the most accurate reliable information that they could. Nobody came out and said that they believe that absolutely without a doubt there is, it is flawless. It was an effort to accumulate information and present it to give other ideas. And just like... this is what happens to me every time I would present ideas on how we could perhaps cut spending and save some money, instead of looking at the ideas. The next meeting I was greeted with here's why this won't work. Here's why this won't work. Here's why this won't work. I mean, seriously negative Nancy. Come on. Find. What did you see in that that would work? There are a lot of good ideas. As far as the phone, we were supposed to go out to RFP in 2009 but there was a Commissioner that had an issue with one of the people that was going to bid, and so she shot it down. Now that Commissioner is no longer here and, but there has been millions that has been lost, and they've done a great job saving us on health insurance. The point is, we believe perhaps even more could be saved. It's not that you're doing a bad job, it's that we think the five of us should be directing Policy to do a better job. Every one of us can find ways to improve, instead of criticize the suggestions. And, I, it wasn't ever meant as an attack on you. I'm sure of that.

Whitten: A couple of points, Mr. Chairman, is actually the first time I've been called Nancy.

Infantini: I wasn't calling you negative Nancy, I was calling all of this this whole presentation. You're trying to come out with a negative side.

Whitten: No. No. I. I. I'm. I am. I am. I am simply saying to you that when you say that the County hasn't issue bonds and those bonds can't be used for road maintenance and repair, that that is incorrect.

Infantini: Okay.

Whitten: Here is the bond book. Right here, the bond book says 2000. And so, there again there are a number of those inaccuracies, but let me... I'm glad you reminded me that there's a particular on that I wanted to point out because, you know, as we as we work as staff, and I'll tell you that you have some of the most dedicated staff anywhere. They work in the community, they live in the community, and they are a part of this community. And so, at some point in time you have to protect your professional integrity and your ability to do your job as compromise, if you don't counter the negative because people perceive that as you not doing your job. And so, there was a slide in there that said that has management deteriorated that badly in the past two years, because the Board is unable to maintain its 55 miles per year road resurfacing? The Board has never been able to resurface 55 miles of roads. And so, to insinuate, to imply, to have somebody infer that because of my management that the Board now doesn't have the ability to do that, is a shot at me. The Board had the ability in those two Fiscal Years because there was one time savings from bond proceeds, from gas tax savings, and from other grant sources that were utilized to push us up for those moments in time but that's not recurring source. And so, the Board now goes back to the normal of not being able to resurface the 55 miles of roads per year that it needs to, and I am in my personal and humble opinion as out-of-the-box, as any manager you will find. And so, I. I am not rejecting those things that you're able to do. I am simply putting on the public record the facts with regards to your budget, your gas tax, and all of the other information that's been presented, that is again a false narrative.

Whitten: John, let me interrupt you for one second, because I forgot something. The. The. The last two years of this being an issue is... Is again very un-factual. This before me is the approved Capital Improvements Program from Fiscal Year 2005. And so, you will see in that Capital Improvement Program from 10 years ago, the listing of unmet road needs. And so, this issue has been presented to the pool, books of the Board, and to the public for a well over a decade.

Barfield: John, can you kind of summarize?

Whitten: John. Mr. Chair, there's a lot more in the presentation.

Barfield: Excuse me. Let's. Pardon me, Sir, we're. You're out of order. We'll finish here. We'll get back to the public comments, please. Just please. Just please. Please. Please.

Whitten: The. The Sheriff is here and I believe has another engagement, and I think wants to respond to some of the narratives presented in the video, in particular, I think there were two, and so to break this presentation up... Mr. Chair, you may want to ask the Sheriff to come up.

Barfield: Sheriff. Sheriff Ivey, I just want to say thank you for your article. Thank you for what you are doing for our County. We appreciate it.

Ivey: As I've told you guys before, I'm surrounded by great people, and they are doing great things to protect this community, so we appreciate that. Thank you. First of all let me.

Thank you for coming forward to let me talk about a couple things, it's only going to take me about 45 minutes to present. So, Curt, where are you going? I just want to touch a couple things just to be clear on some of the functions. One of the things that was mentioned was the CIS building and as a point of fact on that, the first of all is the building is a core function of our agency. It was a building that had to be constructed to accommodate the entire functions of our criminal investigation services, all inclusive of homicide, sex crimes, sexual offender registration, crime scene, and all of that is in that building. It had actually been prior-based over in at our east precinct and the requirements of what we do every day out grew that facility, so the facility became a necessity. We were able to pay for that building out of forfeiture money and inmate telephone money, and that's how the building was paid for and that money is very restrictive in how it can be spent and what it can be spent for, and what it can be future used for. So, in that same regard, we've also been able to use similar funds, forfeiture money, and the inmate telephone money to pay for our north precinct. The new facility. The Barbara Pill facility and also our hangar where our aviation unit is bases at, and then also our new multi-million dollar CAD System that we had to have. Our other system antiquated was completely failing and the new (RMS) Records Management System, Jail Management System, and CAD System was able to be funded through all of that as well. So, the Gus Hipp building is a priority in our agency, it's a core function of what we do. The other thing and then just real briefly, I would touch on is there was a discussion about the crime rate being down, and I am very proud to tell you that we partner with citizens, we partner with other law enforcement agencies, and in the past three years we've been able to lower the crime rate just over 18 percent in Brevard County. I think, that's... I think that's a credit to the partnership that we have with our citizens, but it's also credit to our State Attorney who does a great job at keeping people behind bars. And, the other part of it is I'm a big believer in right now we have our boot firmly planted on the throat of crime and we're not letting up. And now is not the time to let up, if you see what's going on across our country. So, we operate. We operate the most efficient law enforcement operation in Central Florida when you compare per capita, we are the most efficient law enforcement operations in all of Central Florida. We also operate with the County's blessing, the most efficient jail in all of Central Florida, and we actually compete against several privatized facilities. So, we've been able to maintain those by being innovative, by coming up with things that will lower the money we're using from taxpayers, growing vegetables and everything else that we are drastically working on, and we plan to continue that to do everything we can. And then, you know, with our budget every year we have a Budget Oversight Committee which I've seen a couple people that have sat on our Committee before in this room, and we ask our citizens from all different walks of life in our community to give up feedback on what we're doing with our budget. How we're structuring it. We ask them to give us a couple of things. One can we cut something, two are we cutting ourselves short, and three is it a budget that they can support? And each year we've had a thumbs up and we bring in different people each year, and we bring in people from all aspects of the community because we want that that position, that understanding from the community. And then of course as each of you guys know, we bring it to our

Commissioners, and meet individually with you and ask you to support which each of you have been very good about supporting public safety in this community. And we truly appreciate that. So, anything I can answer? Any questions that I can answer for any of you?

Fisher: We're good.

Ivey: Okay. Thank you everybody for letting me be here today.

Barfield: Thank you.

Whitten: Again, Mr. Chairman, we have extensive presentations both roads and budget, and so we intend on going through that unless you guys turn us around. And I don't know if you want to ask speakers if they want to come now or after the presentation. Normally, we go to presentation and then go directly to Board discussion. And so, but the pleasure of the Board? But John is a long ways from finishing up this presentation.

Barfield: What's. What's the pleasure of the Board?

Infantini: I think we've got the just of the fact that there, we need roads improved, there's been a lot of roads that had been improved, many have been widened, and I think, the question is where to get the money? And I don't see where the benefit is coming from. I think, it lies within our existing budget, not within John's control. So, I appreciate you went through the time to put together this, but I don't think your light is lit up as many times as it can be lit up. He has all five lights on yours, so he sees you want to talk. I'll be quiet. Can we get back to the people? That'd just be great.

Whitten: I'm. I'm. Mr. Chair, I consider myself a professional and a respectful person. And so, when you present again to the public false narratives, I think it is our job to give the public the facts, and so, again, we are here presenting the facts, we're not close to the end of presenting all of those facts, and addressing all of those points in detail. Again, we feel as though we need to. We understand that the narrative isn't going to change. And so, when we tell you that the County doesn't have three IT Departments and you continue to say that the County has three IT Departments, including the School Board, we understand that the narrative is to confirm the bias, but as your staff and as the County Manager, I feel compelled to allow staff to address the misinformation that's out there. The false narratives, because it reflects upon them in terms of their professional integrity. And so, we ask your indulgence to present our entire presentation just like Ms. Pasley was allowed to present her entire presentation.

Fisher: I agree with that, too, Sir.

Infantini: That. That's 11 minutes versus two hours.

Barfield: Hold. Hold on.

Infantini: That.

Barfield: I'm trying to talk.

Infantini: I. I don't. I think there's.

Fisher: Would you ask the pleasure of the Board, Sir? I would like to see staff presentation because I think, we need to get the facts out to the community, especially if we're going to move forward with this.

Infantini: If it took 11 minutes to make a presentation how can it take an hour.

Fisher: How do you feel?

Infantini: To restate the statements? I can't even see how in 10 minutes you could of had that many false statements.

Anderson: Mr. Chair.

Barfield: We're having a.

Anderson: Mr. Chair.

Barfield: Discussion here at the Commission first. Commissioner Anderson.

Anderson: The next portion that they were going into is the budget overview and revenues, and there were points that were brought up on the video that maybe these are relative to, so I'm prepared to be here all evening. I mean I had planned on being here eight hour, so let's go on.

Barfield: Okay. Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I would say that having been here for the last 13 months, I can confirm and praise Stockton, and the staff that they are very diligent, they are very efficient. I don't know that any of you need to hear more of that, personally I think that you folks have a lot of things you want to say. We have the expertise here that can answer your questions. You can. You can address. Pardon me, Sir.

Barfield: Hold on just a minute, please.

Smith: Thank you. So, my recommendation would be to let the people speak and if they have questions, they want to vent, they're frustrated, and so the best thing I thing is to let them vent. We have great people up here that can answer the questions or if there are misstatements, or misconceptions they can be corrected, and then the Board can move on.

Barfield: How does everyone else feel?

Anderson: I mean, we're here to make a decision based on information and facts, that's

what we were elected to do, so I'd, whatever, however, you guys want to proceed but the budget overview part. I mean we went through the roads. I think we all knew, no offense John, I, I zoned out on that because I know that part. But the budget part is the part I was interested in and that's that part that we were getting to now.

Fisher: You know, I think the public is confused by the video and not. And there.

Barfield: Excuse me.

Fisher: The public is confused by the video and I think there's some facts out there that need to be cleared up, and so I think, we need to give staff that opportunity.

Barfield: Okay, we will move forward with the discussion on the budget. I'm sorry, presentation on the budget. Staff presentation.

Denninghoff: You mean the... For me to continue. Correct?

Barfield: Just finish up.

Infantini: Wait, I'm sorry, on that back slide, so why did it switch from \$4.8 million going to maintenance to none going to maintenance?

Whitten: John, let's do this. Let's go to the \$50 something million dollars sitting in the bank and then let's go to the issue of how do we know that we have a road crisis. And so, let's go to again, the \$50 million dollars sitting in the bank and the work of the consultant. And that's absolutely the point, you know, that's a Policy decision of the Board, and so, when you present to the public that there is \$50 million dollars in the bank, that's absolutely true. The false narrative part of that is that those are allocated by Board Policy to projects. And so, if you want to do something different with the \$50 million that's not a decision on John and Stockton, that's a Board decision. Again, Mr. Chairman, now I will remain respectful, and professional.

Barfield: Thank you. Move forward.

Smith: Mr. Denninghoff, can I ask you a question? You're saying that we paid \$330,000. \$350,000 for these folks to assess this, in other words they basically didn't just drive around the roads, and say they look okay when they look bad. Okay. Mr. Denninghoff, can I interrupt? I've got some people out here that I keep hearing them mumble, who cares who cares. Well, I think a lot of people care, because I've had people come up to me and say, well I've driven around these roads, and I don't see anything wrong with them. Well, that's a whole lot different driving around and taking core samples, so that's why you should care. Excuse me for caring.

Barfield: Come on, please let. Let us run through here. Please. Please.

Infantini: That.

Smith: No. I didn't miss the point. The point that has been pointed out to me numerous times over the last several weeks is that these numbers are bogus, that we don't have that many roads that need to be fixed because, I, that person says or these people say, well I've driven on these roads, and I don't see all these problems. So, the point here is that we do have problems with the roads and professionals made the determinations. It wasn't anybody here. It wasn't anyone on the staff. I wanted this to be pointed out, that's the point.

Infantini: Okay, but I would like to point out that we had \$20 million dollars and rather than taking the list that's this thick, and it has all of the roads throughout the whole County, rather than prioritizing those roads based on need, we just willy-nilly allocated \$10 to one District, and \$10 million to another District. You go fix which roads you want and there's a whole community in one District that got almost all their roads resurfaced, and whole bunch of emails from other people, well why don't you do my road? And, it wasn't done based on a prioritization Countywide. This money is collected Countywide and should be allocated Countywide, and it wasn't. It wasn't done a priority schedule, which roads throughout the whole County. I don't care who's roads they are, and if all of them ended up being in one District, I wouldn't care. It wasn't done that way, so giving us more money is not going to ensure that roads will be maintained in a fair equitable manner. Roads that are most in need of improvement will be maintained, while not fixing the other, while not repaving other roads. It wasn't done in a fair equitable manor in the past. So, more money isn't the issue.

Whitten: Mr. Chair, let me. Let me. Let me. Let me summarize and so you can get to the cards, because we still have the budget presentation to go over. Bond funding can be used on repair and maintenance. You all. This Board. And I think some of the members who are still here, commissioned an engineering firm to go out, and make in-the-field assessments of our road condition. Conditions. They did that. They graded the pavement. And they graded the sub-surface, John correct me if I'm wrong of the roads. And so, you have, and it's on the table for anybody who wants to see it a comprehensive examination of the County's road system. We've done a lot more than the three projects that were listed in the video over that last 15 years. And, I think that's 208 projects that John has in the PowerPoint. And so, we stand ready to answer any questions that may come up, but the bottom line is is that your bond funds have been used to do both new roads, to do capital maintenance and repair on existing roads, we didn't make up the listing of projects, and so, it is not a wish list. And again, John is here, and I'm here to answer questions that you may have or the public may have.

Anderson: Okay. Mr. Chairman, there were some discussion about bonds. At least can we go to slide number 74? On the bond financing and kind of, it's a good chart that maybe for the public it could clear up some of the stuff that might have been indicated in the video? I don't know if you need it? I don't think you need to do? They need 74, or it is 74 on my sheet. It's the one on bond refinancing and it says numerous refinancing have occurred however.

Denninghoff: That's it. Right there. Commissioners. The. What you see here is just the two slides 73 and 74, there was two. Stockton went over these before my presentation, but basically in 2000 we had Constitutional Gas Tax bond proceeds that was the 80 percent portion of the Constitutional, it was a 20-year initial term, that term has been unchanged as a result of any refinancing efforts, the initial year that was to be retired was 2020, and it's still 2020 there's no change on that. Local Option Gas Tax one through six in bonds of 2005, is the same thing 20-years. The. And. The 20-year term there hasn't changed and in two thousand and it has been both of those have been refinanced. 2007 haven't been refinanced because we haven't got to the time period where you can do so, and any kind of economically fiscal way, again, no change on on that. So, what this slide basically is saying is the, is that the with the refinancing efforts much like a home mortgage, if you refinance your home mortgage, and you don't change the date that you are going to have it paid off and you also don't increase your debt, which is what we did here. We didn't increase the debt and we didn't change the the date of payoff. The only thing you're changing, the only thing that's ever left to consider is the interest rate. So, the refinancing efforts were we're focused on reducing the amount of interest payments that we would be making. So, what they have not done is increased the term, they've not increased the debt, and they did not increase the debt service in either the principle or the interest. The refinancing efforts did in each case reduce the debt service payments, the principle amount is unchanged but the interest has been reduced, the total interest to be paid, and also on an annual basis. So, the. And, so what that does is it provides additional funds from those sources of revenue to be used on other projects in current time, as those funds are collected, and they don't have to go to debt service. And an example of that was just a month or two ago, we refinanced the Constitutional Gas Taxes, I think for the second time, and the and we are able to save \$190,000 per year until those bonds are completely retired. That \$190,000 is now going to be available in the years going forward to be able to go towards maintenance of of roads and capacity if we so chose to do so. The. The point in one of the things that I want to restate that Stockton mentioned, you can't just refinance those bonds just any time, there's severe penalties associated with that, you can only do it a certain time, points in time, and when you get to those points if the interest rates to your advantage then we we move forward with the refinancing effort associated with that that in our, and we've got a structure of of consultants and experts that work on that all the time, and watch it pretty regularly. And so, the refinancing has not been a problem, it's been plus, it's helped us get better revenue to be used today, and for today's problems.

Whitten: Debt. Debt service schedules the debt service section of the budget book. The debt services included in the budget book under its own section. And so, you don't need a forensic audit to tell what the Board has issued, in terms of debt. If you go to the budget book it is in, it is on pages two and three of the debt section.

Fisher: Okay.

Barfield: Okay, let's take a five minutes break.

Break 4:16 p.m. to 4:29 p.m.

Barfield: Bob White. Mikes are not on? Thank you. Ronald Bartcher, I'm sorry and I know I messed that up, and could Don Hatt be ready? Thank you. Mr. Hatt. Don Hatt. Okay, Anna-May Smith. Anna-May Smith? Lynn Whelpley. Okay, Becky Funk. F-U-N-K. Funk.

David Volk. Randy Foster. Merry Christmas. Thank you. Rose McGinnis. Becky Lemstrom. Your name and address, please. Thank you. Todd Pokrywa. Thank you. Connie Smith.

Fisher: They have the right to apply. Use part of the gas tax for the Transit system, so yes, it for those people it was about that, too.

Barfield: Yeah, I mean, there has been no money given to Blue Origin, there's certain requirements over the years that they have to do. Once they finish completion of their \$200 million dollar facility, then they get a portion of that, and they have certain things they have to do which is probably a couple of years away, and that's really the the amount they are getting is just to take of the infrastructure stuff.

Infantini: Thank you.

Barfield: Thank you.

Infantini: I think the confusion about the \$8 million is the \$8 million has been pledged and that's why I've been talking about it, and so, it's been earmarked we have to have it available when and if they do whatever, which means it's not available for core function. So, if they do whatever it is they say they're going to do then we have to give it to them, so we can't use it for something that we really need. And what I've tried to encourage the Commissioners to do before they go make these promises, they figure out where they are going to get the money first so we can fund everything that we need, and then the things that we'd like to have like more jobs, engineering jobs. Okay. That's it.

Barfield: Commissioner Smith. Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Commissioner Infantini, can that, if we didn't give and didn't pledge the \$8 million dollars to Mr. Bezos, and Blue Origin, could we use it for roads?

Infantini: Yes. We. We used \$41 million. We. We bonded out \$41 million from the North Brevard Economic Zone to widen I-95 in Volusia County. And. I. I. I mean. I thought that was pretty ridiculous when we did that and.

Fisher: Its.

Infantini: Oh. Oh, but we did.

Fisher: Well. Let's.

Infantini: Well, we did borrow the money.

Fisher: Let's. Could.

Infantini: And.

Fisher: Commissioner.

Infantini: The FPL was. FPL... Florida Department of Transportation is going to pay us back but we did bond that and I've got the Agenda Item, if you want to see it to review it, to see.

Knox: That's incorrect.

Barfield: Okay. Mr. Fisher.

Knox: That's incorrect.

Anderson: That had no impact on the County funds.

Fisher: One of the things that.

TI: No, it didn't have any impact but we did have the ability to bond it out.

Fisher: One of the things that's been, you know, are you through? Because I'm going to correct something, because once again, there's just ability to mislead the public on something, and it's a shameful really because also what happened is kind of like that video, I know Commissioner Infantini had opportunity to see that early on, but allow those things to be said without contacting the people who made the video and correcting the mistakes, so that they didn't do that. Exactly what happened so we just to be clear, Commissioner Infantini, and maybe you can and so the public can understand it is the North Brevard Economic Development Zone did a partnership with the County, and created a Space Coast Infrastructure Agency? And with the Space Coast Infrastructure Agency, the contractor with FDOT built I-95 four years before it was supposed to be done, and neither the County nor the Zone had any financial obligation at all. And it was FDOT that was backing the contractor who funded the project early and their revenue was the one who backed the thing. The County had not one penny obligation, but because of the Zone and because of the County, I-95 which moves more commerce and people than anywhere got built three years early because of the creativity of it, and you didn't vote for that either, ma'am.

Infantini: You're right. I didn't, but it was widening Volusia County I-95, and it was through the North Brevard Economic Zone that we created the Space Coast Infrastructure Agency. So, why don't we use the Space Coast Infrastructure Agency? Bond out the revenue stream of the North Brevard Economic Zone and instead of giving cash giveaways to companies to get them to come here, bond out that income stream, and use it for roads.

Barfield: Mr. Knox, you have a comment?

Infantini: It was used for one.

Knox: I was going to point out that the revenue stream that was bonded by the Space Coast Infrastructure Agency, in that case was the contract payments that were due from DOT to the contractor. So, the County money was not involved at all.

Infantini: Right. But the County and the Space Coast Infrastructure was, and that is an Agency of the North Brevard Economic Zone.

Knox: And.

Infantini: We could bond out. We could bond out as the spec-building and there was a mistake in the video, it says that we're going to build a spec-building in North Brevard for \$500,000, actually its \$6 million dollars.

Fisher: That's not true.

Infantini: But it is, it is in your agenda, it's in the Capital Improvement Plan of our last budget that was approved, and it says \$6 million dollars.

Fisher: We got some people that want to speak, Sir.

Infantini: And it says that you are going to use bond proceed, so we should bond out the revenue stream of the North Brevard Economic Zone, bring it in, I think its \$54 million dollars, and use that for roads.

Barfield: Next one is, it's just one name, and it says Mackley. M-A-C-K-L-E-Y.

Smith: Can I ask a question? Mr. Whitten, have we built a \$6 million spec-building? Do we have? Have we funded? Or, or, or set aside \$6 million dollars, or do we have anything in the budget for \$6 million dollars for this spec-building?

Whitten: No. Sir, the Capital Improvement Program has both funded and unfunded items, and so, while it is in the Capital Improvement Program it is not funded at this particular time.

Smith: I just. I just wondered because I I hear the \$6 million dollar spec-building mentioned a lot and that would be some place that we could get funds for road maintenance, but it hasn't been funded so we can't use that \$6 million bucks because it doesn't exist. Is that right?

Infantini: It says that it's going to be paid.

Fisher: Correct.

Infantini: Funded with bonding.

Fisher: You know.

Infantini: Bond proceeds that's where it says in the Capital Improvement Plan which doesn't, none of those items has to come back before us if the item passes on next Tuesday. So, it says in the Capital Improvement Plan that we are building a spec-building in 2017.

Fisher: That's not true.

Infantini: That.

Barfield: The way I understand it is we haven't passed anything.

Fisher: Yeah.

Infantini: I. I. I'm just telling you what it says. It either says 2017 or 18, that's what it says.

Barfield: I haven't approved it. I haven't approved it.

Infantini: Yes, you did.

Barfield: I don't think that we.

Infantini: You approved it in the budget.

Barfield: We have not approved funding.

Infantini: In the Capital Improvement Plan.

Barfield: We have no funding for it.

Infantini: But you did approve the budget.

Fisher: It would've come back for a funding. And Sir, by the way just so the public understands that one of the things about economic development is that sometimes if you have a facility that's ready, and when you're bringing in companies the companies will actually consider your area, because they don't have to go through the two-year permitting process. So, at one point in time the Zone had some small conversation about whether or not it could make sense to build a spec-building. That conversation has not happened in the Zone in years and the reason it hasn't is because, basically the Port with Florida East Coast Railroad built a 240,000 square foot spec-building with the do it, so there's no need for the Zone to even consider it or look at it. So, you know, and Commissioner Infantini known that, but she'd throw those things out just to try to create some, you know, dislike for North Brevard.

Infantini: No, I don't try to create dislike. I try to show where you're putting it and then take it out of the budget, that's all I ask.

Barfield: Okay. Mr. Bobay. Ron Bobay. Thank you. Anthony Dutton. Trudy McCarthy. Ron Taylor. Mayor Tulley. Thank you.

Infantini: Thank you for coming up with a suggestion. That was a good suggestion.

Barfield: Suzanne Valencia. Thank you. Courtney Barker. Thank you. Mike Slotkin. Dr. Slotkin, I really thank you, and I thank you for being my appointment on the Budget Committee. Thank you.

Fisher: Dr. Slotkin, I've got a question for you, I'm sorry, Sir, I probably shouldn't have let you get away. Because I'm not sure if it's clear that you were on the Budget Review Committee. Correct? You've been. Yeah. Well, but you have a different opinion of the County finances. I mean your credentials and you're economic guru. Correct. They don't

do that.

Barfield: Come on.

Fisher: Yeah. Mr. Slotkin. Come on. Answer my question, Sir, if you don't mind, please? Go. Go ahead. Finish. No. Go ahead, Sir, please. No. No. No. You go ahead please, Sir. Yeah. I forgot where we were. It's unfortunate that you got interrupted. So, I think you were getting ready to say... I'm not sure where you were going with it but unfortunately something? Yeah. Okay. Charitable. Charitable organizations or something you were making reference to when giving. Yeah. I won't be, but yeah.

Barfield: Thank you. Joe Mayer.

Infantini: I would like to comment that I believe that the tone of the meeting is set at the top. I always heard in corporations, you set the tone at the top and I believe that the people in the audience are following the tone that has been set by this Board and their deliberations during meetings. So, I think it was only to be expected if we don't behave up here, they won't behave back there. So, I suggest that. Yeah, I wouldn't look quite so baffled.

Smith: Mr. Mayer.

Barfield: Go ahead. Thank you. Dave Pasley. Thank you. Neil Levine. Thank you. Terry Mott. Thank you. Kirk Hall. Kirk Hall. Joyce Errecart.

Infantini: Thank you.

Barfield: Thank you. Mr. Whitten, can you number one respond to the issue with the spec-building, and then number two, please explain how much cuts this County has had over the years? Put it in perspective.

Whitten: Yeah. The. The. Again, if you look at the CIP you'll see a number of projects that are that are planned, anticipated, and hoped for that may or may not happen. And so, the CIP is a is a Capital Improvement Plan. Five years and the revenue sources are listed. And so, if you anticipate, if you hope to when you get to that Fiscal Year fund the project there, you have to identify a revenue source. And so, the the planning of that spec-building was identified in this current Fiscal Year. The construction is contemplated in a in a subsequent Fiscal Year. And so, the Board would have to approve the construction of that in some Fiscal Year down the road. I'm not even sure that the the North Brevard Economic Development Zone is is a continuing to consider whether or not they are going to do a spec-building.

Fisher: They have no desire to.

Infantini: Then why is it still in the budget?

Whitten: Because.

Infantini: If they have no desire.

Whitten: Be.

Infantini: To do so then it needs to come out of the budget.

Whitten: Be. Because the budget is adopted and next year you will be talking about whether or not it should be in the budget. We're in mid-Fiscal Year and so, I can't take it out because its adopted by the Board, but you may very well see that then when we're developing the 16-17 budget delete that project from the Capital Improvement Plan.

Infantini: How is it that you're able to add things to the budget mid-year but you're not able to delete things? All the time I get budget change requests. How can that not be a budget change request?

Whitten: If. If you want that to be a CIP amendment, which we don't typically do because nothing's going to happen on it, and so, there's no urgency to to to to remove that from the budget. We do budget amendments because State law says, you have to do budget amendments, you have to do budget supplements, and so, that's not a Stockton Whitten issue. The Policy of the Board when they adopted the CIP was that they approved that a proposal to have that in their CIP. Again, the Board has an opportunity to look at that next Fiscal Year. I don't believe that the North Brevard Economic Development Zone is going to come back to you next Fiscal Year and present that as a plan, and so, I think that really is a non-issue.

Infantini: Well, I'd like to make it a motion to remove it out of the Capital Improvement Plan, do a budget change request to have it removed. If I could get a second? And then we could vote on it because if it's a moot point then then might as well just get it out, and then it won't. I tell you what... I won't put it out there on my literature any more. I will not be doing it on my Facebook and my email blast, and talking about your spec-building if you take it off. Now if you leave it on.

Post: Could I make a?

Infantini: Then clearly its. It's still on there.

Post: Could I make a comment regarding that?

Infantini: It. It's not. It's not a... Yes, you of course you can make a comment, but the point is as long as it's in our Capital Improvement Plan.

Post: I'm sorry.

Infantini: Oh, sorry. I was talking. As long as it's in the Capital Improvement Plan it's a potential problem.

Post. Yeah. I'm Troy Post, of course with the Economic Development Zone. One of the things that we did and to remember what this... How this process got started. There was a written Economic Development Plan that was crafted and put together back in 2012. Even before I arrived on the scene. And one of the things that it specifically said was to try to put together a project that would involve a spec-building. Back in 2012, especially there was a

real issue with available building stock needing certain requirements for industrial prospects, so when I came onboard in 2013 it was communicated to me to follow the Plan, and we've done that. I will tell you as Mr., as Commissioner Fisher said earlier, there's been certainly a lot of changes in the northern part of the County in the last couple of years. One of those has been the construction that's ongoing right now by Flagler Logistics to build a building essentially on the spec-basis, they do not have a tenant identified yet but they are building that project. They have the plans to do some additional buildings if they are successful, I mean getting a tenant. When we put together the current plan for the spec-building that you see listed in the CIP that was before that project was announced. It is very likely, however, because that money that \$50,000 for the current year is being used for engineering and also for environmental stuff related to the site that would be used for the spec-building, that the best thing that we may be able to come up with which is still a need, is to take and this is at the County-owned Commerce Park property that the County owns, and is designated to be used for business development. It may be that the spec-building will change into a program to provide essentially a virtual spec-building and that is to have some of the things that are going to be required. Any time a prospect comes in and tries to develop a lot, such as getting the environmental clearance, and maybe even having a set of building plans approved for a certain size. Getting all that stuff done with money that we have available to do that with. And that may be essentially what we provide is a virtual spec-building. So again, what the Zone has tried to do is follow the Plan that was approved by the County Board of Commissioners. We feel like we are doing that, there's still a need to make sure that you have the sites and the space to accommodate prospects as they come to see you, so even though \$50,000 is not a lot of money to spend on a project like this, it could still go a long way into helping us lay the groundwork to getting one of those sites at the Commerce Park developed, and that ultimately is what we're trying to do is move that County-owned property into private hands.

Infantini: So the bottom line is you're not ready to remove it out of the Capital Improvement Plan.

Post: That is correct.

Infantini: There you go.

Post: That's right.

Infantini: Okay. So, then it becomes fodder for my email blast, because it's not out, so it's in. That's all.

Fisher: Alright.

Barfield: What's the pleasure?

Whitten: Mr. Chairman, you also asked me about the cuts. I don't want to interrupt Commissioner Fisher.

Fisher: Well. What. Before you go to cuts... I want how much in your Capital Improvement budget or Plan, or whatever which we don't have funds to do probably 75-80 percent of the stuff in there. What is that? Do you have a total value number of what that Capital

Improvements dollar amount would be or do you have any idea?

Whitten: Not off the top.

Fisher: It's a pretty big number I'm assuming, right?

Whitten: Yes.

Fisher: Incoming, right? Because its replacements of roofs and building, and.

Whitten: Well. Well. Well. Well. Well, the biggest the biggest, well we won't do a whole lot in terms of roof replacements.

Fisher: Right.

Whitten: But the. The. Just simply because we don't have the dollars. But the biggest part of of the Capital Improvement Program really right now are in roads... In wastewater and water. As you'll recall that we are now replacing and rehabbing, and improving the water wastewater system that is 40-50 years old, and then in Solid Waste. I mean. Those are primary areas, in which you have Capital Improvements.

Fisher: Okay. Thank you, Sir.

Whitten: And and you you asked about the cuts over time and we've cut approximately 500 positions from the budget since approximately 2007-2008. And I. And I'll call those Full-Time Equivalents. And certainly existing positions. We've transferred again from the employer to the employee well over \$12.3 million dollars. If you go in the back to wash your hands, you will not have any hot water. If you are in your office during the daytime, you have to empty your trash to a common trash can. And so, we've reduced Library hours. We've reduced other operating hours. And so, over time, you know, it's been positions, it's been transferring cost of the insurance program to the employees. It's been little things like again, turning off the hot water, janitorial services happen during the day time because it's just cheaper that way, it's cheaper for the employees to get up and empty to a common receptacle. We've all made alterations to when and how often the grass is cut. And so, we've done a number of those things. We in fact, had a series of meetings with employees, invited them to submit through SurveyMonkey anonymous cost reduction suggestions... Some were fruitful and some were not but, you know, we've actually looked at how we we can cut the expenses, you know, one of the things that, you know, we don't say a whole lot about is that that that was a pretty unprecedented because we we wanted employees to be open with any suggestion that they had, and you went to an anonymous SurveyMonkey survey to submit those suggestions. We. We met with employees to actually talk to them about how you do that, and again, so over time we've not sat on our hands with regards to managing the revenues and expenses of County government.

Barfield: Commissioner Fisher.

Fisher: And. And I don't send out email blasts and do all the things that have all the literature that everybody, Commissioner Infantini talks about, but I want to say this for the record. Those cuts were hard cuts and those cuts were difficult cuts, and those cuts laid

500 people less. I want to say Mr. Whitten, you have to correct me on a number I think its \$30 or \$40 million dollars' worth of cuts over the years and Commissioner Infantini did not make one of those cuts in the tough difficult times, which I did.

Infantini: He means because I wouldn't approve their bloated budget, that I didn't approve the cuts which is a false narrative but that's okay.

Fisher: There's no false. There's nothing false about it all you either vote for it.

Barfield: Keith Rigler.

Fisher: Or you don't.

Barfield: Keith Rigler.

Fisher: Yeah. When you. You accuse me. Well. Hey, you get punched at so many times, you know what? I punch back sometimes, buddy. Okay. Well, you asked me. You asked. I gave you the answer. No, but let us make sure you understand something just because I'm a politician does not mean I got to take everything that comes from the public.

Barfield: Let's get back on track.

Fisher: Remember that. I'm one of those politicians that don't take everything that comes from the public. Okay? Well, whatever, and just make sure you understand that, Keith. Thank you. I'm not a punching bag. I. I won't be your punching bag, bud.

Barfield: Let's go on. Let's just go. Let's just go back and get on subject. Excuse me can you kind of wrap it up. Okay. Thank you. Skip Bollinger.

Fisher: No. You're too big.

Barfield: Skip Bollinger. Okay. Philip Stasik.

Infantini: Thank you.

Barfield: Thank you and Merry Christmas.

Infantini: For the viewing public six cents is 100 increase. I just. I just wanted to put it in perspective.

Barfield: Peter Fuscas.

Infantini: It is only six cents but its 100 percent increase. Or a three percent, it's more than a three percent cost increase to what you're currently paying for gas.

Barfield: How are you?

Smith: How about good night? Yea.

Barfield: Thank you. Spence Servoss. Stephany Ely. Thank you. Merry Christmas to you. Pam LaSalle. Okay, I have one more card, which means I've probably missed some body. If you want to speak, please get a card because I've got a ton of them here. This is the last one. Trè Holton. You can only speak once though. So.

Infantini: No. The first part of public comment and the second part is for after the presentation, so they actually gets to speak twice.

Anderson: I know what he's saying. It's true.

Barfield: Thank you. We have two cards. You've all both spoken before but I'm going to allow it. It's okay. Pat Pasley.

Smith: See we're saving money.

Barfield: No.

Infantini: I know he has done one analysis on the Beaches when they were talking about redoing the Beaches beach parking and beach renourishment in South Beaches. He did get paid for a study there. But I don't know about anything else maybe Stockton does?

Barfield: Let me let Mr. Whitten answer that.

Whitten: Yeah, I think Dr. Slotkin has a PhD in economics has done some. FIT has done some work for the County. Dr. Slotkin is not on retainer and I will tell you that Dr. Slotkin will... Is probably, you know, he and I had a conversation about that... Criticism of him and so, I would say that you will find all over this country that PhD's at Universities are used by governments to perform work. I'm not sure that that impairs his independence but I'm sure Dr. Slotkin's will be responding to that criticism.

Barfield: Okay.

Whitten: I'm not sure that Dr. Slotkin has sided with us on anything. Is that a question for me, Ms. Pasley? Well, you know what, I said again earlier, that the the the false narratives weren't going to change, and so, you you know, when you say that we've presented recommendations, and you don't give any details on the recommendation. And remember at the the the Thursday meeting with regards to the insurance recommendations, we went over those one by one. We sat and... And you all presented those and the question was asked where did you get your information from? And you all didn't know where you got your information from. And we presented. And we presented our information with all of the calculations. And yet, you continue to see that the County has done nothing with regards to health insurance. The County. The County has three IT Departments and we tell you that the School Board has nothing to do with the County. And we continue to see that and so, I don't think the recommendations were ignored. They were recommendations of individuals on the Citizens Budget Review Committee, but the Committee never came up with a voted upon recommendation. And so, we're not ignoring those. I've invited Mr. Adams into the office. We've had him in on multiple occasions. I have the same invitation to to Mr. Fusscas. We're open. We're an open book. That Committee is a six-person Committee. And so, I'm sure we will have the dialogue again, we presented a line item budget, not one

Director was called on a specific line item within their budget, and so, again, this is the protection of our professional integrity because it always seems to be that it comes back to staff, and what they really presented to you were Policy matters of the Board which staff really has no control over. And again, is just here to just implement the Policy of the Board. And so, you know, I. I would say to you that nothing was ignored. Nothing was presented as a consensus of majority vote from that Committee.

Barfield: Roger Gangitano.

Barfield: Yes. I've been taking a lot of note for different things to look at and see, so, I don't know, you know, there's things that are key to my brain of that's what I think we need to look at.

Infantini: Denninghoff.

Fisher: Denninghoff.

Smith: Denninghoff.

Barfield: It's contagious. It's contagious. Thank you. Last one. Ed. Priselac. Ed.

Whitten: The. The EDC provides an application to the companies. The companies present the application to their to their Tax Abatement Committee and that's a Committee of community members. The companies are graded on payroll, the jobs that they create, and the capital investments. The proposal on all of those three then there is a recommendation by that Committee of a what percentage and how long the tax abatement would be. Well, when you say vetting what do you mean by vetting? I don't know the extent of their analysis on the particular companies.

Barfield: I believe they pulled a Dun & Bradstreet on them, which gives a report of if they are viable, and how long they've been with us.

Infantini: I think what he's talking about is like the the whole going concern concept that CPA's do in an audit. Merry Christmas.

Smith: Merry Christmas.

Fisher: Break before discussion?

Barfield: Yeah, let's have a break before we get into discussion.

Fisher: Thanks.

Barfield: 10 minutes.

Fisher: Yeah.

Barfield: Now I'm going to open up to the Board. What's the Board's pleasure? Mr. Fisher.

Break at 6:53 p.m. to 7:07 p.m.

Fisher: Yeah. Couple. A couple of things I want to go over, you know, we spend a lot of time talking about previous Commissioners and previous decisions that have been made, and I'm one of those one's that once a decision has been made on this Board, I run with that whether I'm on the in favor side or not, because I think it's my responsibility to make that its successful. And we get into talking about core functions and what's a core function? And what I find out is is that there's a lot of things that are core functions. And. And different Commissioners set different priorities and so when you talk about a strategic plan, I can tell you that from a staffing, Mr. Whitten standpoint, you know what the plan is? Whatever you can get three votes for. And that's just the way the system works. It isn't that complicated. It's worth three and so, Commissioners should always, going to have different things that they want to get done, and they are going to have different philosophy of what, how you fund? You get a lot of comments about the North Brevard Economic Zone. Okay, that's my philosophy support CRA's and Economic Zone, but I can tell you that's the peanuts through other Commissioner philosophy. Now, let me. Let me give you an example. When we. When I became a Commissioner in 2008 I was a firm believer that we shouldn't build a new road until you can afford to pay your own. So, we went through the budget cycles and it was time to address MSTU's and I lost being able to get a MSTU passed because we couldn't get increases in the budget, that I couldn't do roads in my in my area, and it was I believe it was a 2:3 vote and I was on the wrong side of that or right side, whatever? I couldn't get that done. But, my philosophy was different priorities. Why would you build a new road if you can't pave your old ones? So the Parkway became a big issue, it was a 3:2 vote. Commissioner Nelson and myself were saying why are we spending \$37 million dollars on a Parkway if we should be paving existing roads that we got. And I know, Commissioner Infantini was in favor of spending \$37 million dollars on a new Parkway, so that's a priority thing. So, the Zone got \$3 million. The Parkway got \$37 million. Now, I'll give you another example just so we understand priorities and how people operate. We've got. We got a... And you can say roads are core services or not a core service. We. Impact Fees, there's three, I believe it's three times in the last seven years that Impact Fees have come up as a discussion in this Board. I can remember somebody calling all the realtors and saying realtors, you better come down there, and fight for Impact Fees and don't let'em happen. So what's happened? \$47 million dollars of Impact Fees could have been collected over the last seven years, that could have gone to roads, and to people that were building new homes could do it and it didn't happen. So, there goes \$90 million dollars right that could of went, that because of different philosophies or different tax structures, or whatever you want to call it it didn't happen. The other thing that popped up that kind of got me thinking about is... I remember this Board and I believe we was on all that Board and and I want you all to know something, I support the Parkway today so the fact that \$37 million went there. I'm good with it. The Board made a decision that we ought to do it and I've been supporting it, and I think Commissioner Anderson would tell you in a heartbeat that I've made some motions and negotiated some of the deals, so the Parkway can work. But I can tell you hindsight you could probably say why would you put \$37 million in a Parkway when you could've put it on maintenance today. Okay? Now, the other thing is recent that we all can relate to. And I support it today, but I'm going to just give example how things can happen up here and and you can get away from what we think is core service. I remember this Board; we all agreed that we needed to sell excess land. Remember that? And we asked staff go identify excess land, but it wouldn't have identified excess land, and when it identified it came up with a piece that we haven't used that could

come off the tax roll and we went out and got appraisal on. Appraisal came in at \$2 million dollars. Low and behold, we put it out there, and we had a buy that's willing to pay \$2 million dollars. And I can remember a bunch of people getting paraded in here, 200 people from Suntree saying you know what, don't sell that @2 million dollar land. Okay. As a Board, we made a decision not to sell it. But it was excess land that we could have sold for \$2 million dollars, but we didn't sell it. Not only did we not sell it but they were going to put 200 homes on it at about \$2,000 a year in taxes, there go \$400,000 a year in revenue that we could have bonded or used for roads, too. But we made a decision that, you know, what for those residence, for that people that was a value that we thought it had, and I'm not backing down from that value. But the truth of the matter is now we are going to make it a Park and it's going to cost us more. So. We can. We can. We can argue about what's a core service? Well core service is what three votes will get you at the end of the day and I'm saw I read somewhere someone said if you believe in CRA's and you believe in Libraries, and you believe in Parks and somebody's actually arguing against you. That's like arguing against religion, you know, Catholic or Baptist, or whatever. I'm a CRA guy. I'm a Park guy. Okay? I'm a public safety guy. I'm also the guy today when they said about keeping that property in Suntree, I saw I had a couple of Commissioners who really wanted it to happen, and I saw a bunch of residents out there. I kept. I became that buy, too, that day. But you know what? The truth of the matter is could of sold it and got \$2 million dollars, and put 200 homes on it and could have really solved the issue. But, you know, that was that's a \$400,000 over the next 30 years. That's \$12 million. The Zone is peanuts to the \$90 million dollars I just told you all about, that we could've had, so you can talk about CRA's and this and that, but at the end of the day... I'm just telling you that the quality of life and is very important to this County, and it is unfortunate that this can's been kicked down the road, kicked down the road, and kicked down the road. And I don't believe it's either or. And I don't believe you got to close a Library down to fill a pothole. And that I I personally believe that it's the time to address this, we need to approve the legislative intent, and we can have another workshop on it, if we want to. But you can approve legislative intent and still continue to talk about this issue, but don't tell me that if I stop funding CRA's and I stop funding Libraries, and I do this and that... When I gave three examples of where we could've not built a new road and we could've took it and built... Paved the ones we got. When I give you an example of you could've, we could've not, we could've sold that property but we did the right thing I think for the resident's in that thing. And I think. And I still feel good about that because that's Brevard County and that's a quality of life thing. And also, the other one would be we could've put Impact Fees back in place which we've lost \$47 million on it and we decided at that time, helping the economy was the best thing. So, I don't. I don't. And the only thing I want to say is we can go... All back up about all those decisions and whether they were right or wrong, you know, my my my mind said if once... I'm a football guy, right? The play's been called. Let's run the play and make sure we're successful, and let's support the things that previous Commissioners have put in place to make successful.

Barfield: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: My turn. I have a lot say but you know what? I'm really tired. I'm not sure if I can get all that in my brain and what's in my brain, I can't... I'm not sure I can get it out either. I'd like to thank the guys that were on the Budget Review, they put in a lot of time a lot of hours. I picked their brains a little bit. Heard from them. I want to thank the volunteers that that worked on the budget review. I want to thank all the folks that are still here and all the

folks that left already. The input was good. It gets a little too emotional for me sometimes. I'm a facts guy. I work on no emotion. When I try and make a decision, I don't think it's... I try not getting emotion involved. You know, people sometimes have asked me, well you think I should buy this car or this house? Well, is it a good deal? No. And you know, they'll say yeah, it's a good deal. And then I'll say, you know, is it a good deal because you want it to be, or because it is? Because if you want it to be, its emotion, and it probably isn't something that's a good deal it's something that you probably should walk away from. So, you know, I'm looking at what we're deciding here today and obviously we've got to fix some roads, and again, I don't like Robin said, I don't care where the problem started, I just know it's going to stop here. We're going to get these roads fixed and I think that there are a lot of things that we can do. I think we need to take the emotion out of it. We've had some passionate people here today with at the podium. They talked about how important the funding was for this good deed, or this heartwarming thing. And all those things are true but, you know, when when it comes down to it those are not the functions of government, and I think I used this story before. Davey Crockett, when he was in Congress... Congress wanted to raise some money for a dead Veteran, for his wife, and his family. He was killed and there was nobody left to take care of him and he said folks, I'll take money out of my own pocket for this lady but I don't believe it's the purpose of government to take money that we've taxed from people, and put it in the hands of someone that's down and out. He said it's the responsibility of the people to take of her. And I think by enlarge, I think our community does that. Like I said, we've got 467 charities in this County and we've only funded 14, the other ones aren't going to go away, and those 14 aren't going to go away. I mean, you know, it's too bad, and if we had all the money in the world I'd say yeah let's fund them. Let's keep funding them. I like doing good things for people. So, my point here is that I think that and the sales tax; I'm not in favor of that. I think what we need to do is... And I want to challenge the other Commissioners to scour this budget, see what you can come up with, come back in January, and give your opinions, your thoughts. We can discuss them, we can throw at each other, and if we can't come up with enough money then we have to make some hard decisions there but I think that the people deserve that we do that. Just some ideas on my part. We've got CRA's. Well, you know, I don't have a problem with the concept of CRA's, I have a problem with the fact that they never go away, and there's very little oversight. But each of the cities that has a CRA, I would suggest that one one idea would be to go to the got to the CRA, and say listen we want you to take the County monies that you get and put toward the roads that are County roads in your CRA area. I think that would only be fair because it is County money and they would be responsible for their own roads, and I think if their realistic and there and there generous and thoughtful, they would agree with that. It's their CRA, it's their County roads, and they should be responsible for them because they are getting County money. They can still perform their other CRA duties with the monies that aren't, that are City monies, that aren't County monies. And another thought if they choose not to then we could just put them on the bottom of the list. Just something to think about. Just throwing ideas out there. I've talked to Eric Garvey. He said that and we have Neil Levine up here, and he said don't take money away from the Arts and things because they are quality of life and they are importance in the community. And I would agree with that 100 percent. I love the Arts. I go to the theater and I do all that stuff, but the monies that we give them. Eric says there are funds; there is a reserve for funds they can make up the monies that they would lose by us not giving them monies. So, there's some more money, you know, they're nickels and dimes, they're nuggets, but I think it's worth our while to do that and if we get to the point in a month from now, and the other Commissioners puts their heads together. I know they

can't do it with, because of the Sunshine. Sunshine Law which is... That's another subject but they can do it with their staffs and instead of just throwing darts at this person because they don't agree with the way I think, or throwing darts at another person because you don't think like their ideas. We can come up with ideas and we bandy them about, and maybe come up with enough monies that recurring monies. The \$510,000 dollars for the charities, that's a recurring fund. It was mentioned last... Two weeks ago when we, or last week when we approved the \$510,000 dollars that. We used to give a million dollars away and that we've been trying to pare that down. Well, my staff discovered that is in fact true, except for the last five years that hasn't been pared down, it's been \$510,000 dollars for the last five years. So, if we put that \$510,000 dollars that's \$500,000 a year after year after year after year, that's recurring fund, and I think, that we can do that. I think it's worth a shot and I would like to make a motion with that in mind... That we say no to the to the local gas option tax, Local Option Gas Tax.

Infantini: I second that.

Anderson: More discussion.

Barfield: More discussion I'm hearing.

Infantini: That's fine. I just placed a second.

Barfield: Commissioner Infantini.

Infantini: When you. When you want to start. I could cry about all of the things that we've done and we stood our money on. How about the fact that we have a Stadium that was appraised at \$18 million dollars and instead of selling the Stadium, we give somebody \$10 million to renovate it. Okay, so there's a net loss of \$28 million, \$10 came from the TDC, \$18 would've gone to the County, that's two years' worth of where are we going to get the money from, okay? So. I. You know, you you you you make your comments who's buying. I don't know, but we certainly won't sell it if we don't put it out there. I know my house didn't sell in a day but I kept it out there and then I finally sold it, and boy am I as happy has could be. Next, we built a Community Center in Melbourne. They never determined there was a need and as soon as we built the Community Center in Melbourne for \$3 million dollars-ish-ish. I. I give or take like \$500,000? We then turned around and leased it to the City of Melbourne, its County-owned property. Why are we turning around, building stuff just to turn around and lease it? Oh, right, we're in real estate. I forgot all about that. When you talk about the North Brevard Economic Zone when it was created and Titusville is one of our partners, the City of Titusville said we can't give you .90 cents on the dollar that's earned in the Economic Zone, for the part of property in Titusville that's in there. I tell you what, we'll give you it's either .40 or .50 cents on the dollar because we need it for infrastructure and public safety, so but the County is giving .90 cents on the dollar for every dollar that's earned in the North Brevard Economic Zone. Why is the City of Titusville so much smarter and wiser than the County Commission? Why did we give up, if we're such great negotiators? Why did we give .90 cents on the dollar and they only gave .40 or .50 cents on the dollar? It's not fair. I. I. I just. I don't understand why we keep giving away things? And about the property we gave away, I was a big ringleader. I was probably the biggest ringleader getting those people here. I was the biggest ringleader getting those people here. The reason why I wouldn't agree to sell property is when people buy into a

community, they buy into it with the facts known as they are there. They don't. I don't make Zoning changes that are going to change people's quality of life and I'm not going to make a sale on a property like that that would change people's quality of life. That is one consistent thing I've always done and that's it. I am definitely not in favor of a gas tax.

Barfield: Commissioner Anderson.

Anderson: Thank you. I don't know. I. Recently I made some big health changes and I'm on this juice diet, and I think a lot clearer. I don't know if it's... Or a lot more realistic, lack of beer, and more vegetable. I feel great, but it also made me kind of cranky, too. So, my wife's glad I'm not home tonight. The thing. The realistic and it's made me more, you know, I, or I just for whatever reason since I've been here for seven years I've learned to be more realistic about things. And it's funny that Commissioner Fisher mentions how people identify in different groups what core functions of government are. I remember a few years ago when we were having the tax debate and there was hundreds of people here from Parks and Rec. They will tell you that is a core function of government; they outnumbered the people that showed up here 4:1. So, I went through some lists that that reminded me over the years about things that can affect the General Fund, that we can get money back from, and then the think you always got to realize is, yeah I can do any of these things but I need two other people to side with me. And I guarantee I am going to bring up this list that on any one of these its, would be impossible if not almost difficult to get three votes to de-fund or to reduce services in these areas. So I'm going to go through them real quick. So, if we want to talk about, you know, a little bit over a million dollars a year, you know, I brought this up before. I let it go. I'm kind of like Commissioner Fisher once the Commission made a decision; I roll with it but de-fund year round lifeguards. It benefits very few of my citizens, they don't care if there's a lifeguard, and if you're a Palm Bay resident when we go to the beach we go surf fishing. I go surf fishing all the time and the things I catch; I'm not going in the water so I don't need a lifeguard. I don't think it's necessary, but I let it go and that's over a million dollars a year. Commissioner Infantini will tell you that is part of public safety, I don't disagree with her, and I just don't think it's a core function of government. The Arts grants, Brevard Culture Alliance. I don't think there's three votes up here that are going to de-fund the Arts, if there are raise your hand, and we'll start there? Reduce public safety spending. Tell me where we want to reduce it; we can de-fund things that we transfer to the Sheriff Office out of General Fund. We can. They have Victims Advocate Services. Do you guys want to de-fund those? Because that could be one of the things you cut, because at the end of the day when you de-fund law enforcement they are going to go after those services first, to keep the deputies on the roads. Offender Re-entry out of our Jail. Should we de-fund and tell the Sheriff to de-fund that, and then we have repetitive people come in our Jail. Animal Services, you know, that's a big hot topic, and that's like Social Security on this level if you're the federal government. What if I said, you know what, stay dogs that haven't been retrieved only need to stay in there five days. We'll save a lot of money. That's not a core government service, keeping dogs in confined in a shelter. The. I'm not saying that, this is what constituents say to me. Law Library, you don't need the Law Library, indigent people if they can't afford a lawyer, too bad, I guess they're on their own? They don't need us, so let's de-fund the Law Library. Do I have three votes for that? I'm just telling you, I could go through this list and there's not three votes up here, by anybody because we all define, and our constituents to find core services differently. User Fees for Parks, we brought that up, you know, if you want to go to a beach Park pay for parking, and not many people use that. Do I have three votes for that? No.

Infantini: Yep. You got one. You got one. I. Right here. Beach parking?

Anderson: We tried that before Commissioner Infantini.

Infantini: There you go. That's alright. I'll. I'll. I'll do it. I'm the one who changed the Golf Fees for the volunteers.

Anderson: Increase Fees for Youth Athletics in teens at our Parks and Recreational facilities. Do I have three votes to that? If you do, we can discuss it, and there's going to be 300 people in here. Easy, if not more. Underutilized Parks and Community Centers. They. I could name a couple. One is in Commissioner Infantini's district. When I go camping down in Sebastian, the South Beach Community Center is the most underutilized Community Center, but I support that it's a need in her community. She's going to fight against that. Do I? Now if there's three votes for that. I'm just saying you know what'll happen Pat; you've been here long enough.

Infantini: No, they didn't. They.

Anderson: Lagoon. The Lagoon Program. I've been a big advocate of the Oyster Program, which I think is a cheap way to filter the water that's a hundred-plus thousand dollars, and maybe we should stop doing that. My point is I know I don't have three votes for anything on this list, not three. So now I'm being realistic. I don't mind going to legislature intent and letting these people come back and speak some more, and get more information and having a public hearing on this until until three of you tell me there's something on my list that we can get rid of, then I'm fine. Or there's three things on this list that the public will support me and say fine we'll get rid of it. You. You're not going to find three things on this list that ain't going to drop a shirt color of some color.

Smith: You know as you say that I've been telling people the last couple of days I've gotten and I'm sure you guys have got also, lots and lots of recommendation. I can get you there easy. Cut this. Cut that. Well, you know, if I was a Captain of a ship like I was when I owned my own business, I can do that, and you know I like in this County to a ship because you're steering the ship and you don't have a Captain here, you have a Captain by Committee. And the Committee is three out of the five votes here, so that's what it really all comes down to, and you can jump up and down, you can shout and you can scream, but the bottom line is you got to do the math up to three. That's the reality of the situation. But that's why I challenge the Commissioners. I think that, you know, another idea I had if and it all depends on which ox you're getting gored. I said that at the last meeting. Commissioner Infantini just talked about Parks and turning over things. Well, that's a money maker, if we turned over the Parks that we own to the cities and let them maintain them our County people still get to use them, it just doesn't cost us anything. To me that's a no-brainer, but other people would just jump up and down. And Andy, just pointed out a good example of how I just said that the TDC would fund... Would continue to fund and make up the shortfall and yet he's telling me he won't vote for that, so these are the difficult decisions we have to make folks. Just so you know.

Barfield: Commissioner Fisher.

Fisher: I was just going to say, you know, we are... One thing I found out about this job is that there there's always a lot of suggestions of what we ought to do and I think we listen to those suggestions, but at the end of the day we've got to make a decision. And I said it last time and got a motion about it, you know. I know it's a problem. I know it's an issue. I can count to three or count to four, you know, if if the if it's not there then let's move on, and stop wasting people's time. If it's there then my position is let's go to legislative intent and then have more discussion on it because that, this doesn't approve you if you pass legislative intent. All it does is it says you go to the public hearing and talk about it more, so it isn't approving anything tonight if you're doing that. But if you're not, it's not there then, you know, I got in trouble the last time what I said about it.

Infantini: And then are we going to have all of the public come back out again for another five hours? Wait. I'm sorry. Six and one-half hour session. I mean. I. I. I don't understand. You. You know what your decision is. You should know at this point in time. We've had how much time to research this and investigate? I mean, you know what it is; you want these poor folks to come back out for another six and one-half hours? They don't get paid to be up here, we do.

Barfield: I tell you. He says he wants more input, but the thing is, you know, I feel like I've been here ten years, and I've only been here... Maybe that's just tonight? But, you know, a lot of things have been said. A lot of different things but reality is, I mean for me when I came into this position, there were certain things that needed to get done. There's an issue with the roads. There is other issues that we need to address, so I just want a decision. I'm. I just want a decision. Yes, we are. No, we are not. What are we going to do? Because that's one of the biggest things I can see is things just get pushed off and pushed off, and things degrade more. So, you know, I'm fine with whatever way this thing goes but at least we'll get a full decision in what we're going to do. We have a motion on the floor right not.

Smith: Like I said before, if you can take the emotion out of it and and we can come back here in a month, and I don't know how you would do a roundtable? Like you suggested, or anybody? That's not going to happen. You got 150 people here or something.

Fisher: And who gets to speak?

Barfield: No. No. Nope.

Smith: This is our theoretical question between us.

Fisher: Yeah.

Smith: You wanted Sunshine, we're hassling all this out in Sunshine. We haven't started throwing things yet. If we were in a closed room, I think we might. But. We have a problem here and if we if we can't come back in a month. And I said this last week. I'm ready to make people on both sides unhappy. I just want a solution. And then we are going to live with the solution and you can hate me or you can love me. Whatever? And. And I'm hoping that the other Commissioner's' feel the same way? We've got to fix the problem and so, if we can come back here in 30 days or whatever date is picked, and we do this and we can't come up with enough recurring funds that's going to make a difference, then we're

going to have to make some more hard decision. So, that's the way I see it.

Fisher: Well, I think the question to me on the floor, Sir, is this... We can pass legislative intent with the understanding is, is this we're not approving the gas tax. In a month or so we'll come back, we'll have some more dialogue and conversations. Some Commissioners will make a decision on whether or not they got enough cuts and can they get three votes for those cuts? If that's not a comfort level then the legislative intent will die and doesn't never get passed in public hearing, but you your, you know, you're getting to that point one way or the other.

Infantini: I. I call the question. It's late.

Barfield: Okay. We have a motion on the floor by Commissioner Infantini. I'm sorry, by Commissioner Smith, second by Commissioner Infantini. The motion is to vote no against the gas tax.

Infantini: Correct.

AA: Against legislative intent.

Barfield: Against the legislative intent. I'm sorry. Okay? I got a motion on the floor. All in favor say Aye.

Infantini: Aye.

Smith: Aye.

Barfield: All opposed? Say Nay. Nay.

Anderson: Nay.

Fisher: Nay. All right. Okay?

Anderson: I think.

Fisher: I make a motion.

Anderson: Yeah. And I think the only way we're going to get this resolved and we have to have discussions on it, and it doesn't mean I'm going to vote for the gas tax thing yet, but we got to figure this out. This is a serious. Let me tell you one last thing. The City of Palm Bay had an. Hired an appraiser to go out and show the affects. And I may have mentioned this to you in the past? Of improved roads on home values. In some neighborhoods the improved home value, home value for fixing the roads in some neighborhoods was as much as 25 percent. So, the Return on Investment of good roads, however we get there whether it's through budget cuts, new revenue sources benefits the residents more than it harms them, and so I'll second it.

Infantini: Let.

Fisher: Okay.

Infantini: Let me tell you.

Fisher: Hold on.

Infantini: Commissioner Anderson, if you don't vote to stop funding the North Brevard Economic Zone in a big way, you're going to be hurting Palm Bay because, Palm Bay can never compete with the Titusville area, and the huge sums of money that they have to spend on economic development. Your CRA's in Brevard County because we're not going to have that revenue source coming in. You are never going to have the money to compete in your town.

Anderson: Well, I could tell you that we're not relying on a CRA, and yes, we do have revenue to use for that, and that we can compete with them. And we have plenty of it. So, in fact, I'd. I don't even want to get into my personal job, but I have \$6 million dollars I can play with, so Robin watch out.

Fisher: All right. Well, that's good. So, the motion is that we pass legislative intent. The motion will be that we pass legislative intent.

Barfield: Seconded by.

Fisher: And. And then we will come back in January and have one more, we'll have the public hearing on it.

Barfield: Okay. So, we have a motion on the floor, second by Commissioner Anderson. All in favor say Aye. Aye.

Fisher: Aye.

Anderson: Aye.

Barfield: Opposed? Say nay.

Infantini: Nay.

Smith: Nay.

Barfield: Okay, it passes 3:2.

Fisher: Okay.

Barfield: Board Reports? Anybody have any Board Reports?

Fisher: No report. I'm good.

Anderson: No.

Infantini: No report tonight.

Smith: I already said all I have to say.

Anderson: Let's go.

Fisher: Meeting adjourned, Sir?

Barfield: Yeah. Meeting adjourned. 7:37 p.m.