

The Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida, met in special session on the above date for the purpose of conducting preliminary budget hearings on the 2002/2003 budget. The Chairman called the meeting to order. Commissioner Wooten led in the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. Flag.

Commissioners: Jim Fowler, Chairman; Gary Bartell, First Vice-Chairman; Vicki Phillips, Second Vice-Chairman (Absent); Josh Wooten and Roger Batchelor

Administrator: Richard Wm. Wesch

Management & Budget Director: Cathy Taylor

Deputy Clerk: Glenda Brown

Clerk's Note: loss of audio at the beginning of this discussion

Mr. Wesch made opening comments, and advised that the budget did not reflect an increase in the millage rate and that it would remain at 8.5553. He added that the total tentative budget of \$133,261,414 would enable the County to effectively maintain current levels of service, provide for the operation and maintenance of new facilities coming on-line, complete capital improvement projects planned and in progress, and provide for services as directed by the Board. He reviewed the General Fund Expenditures (page IV), the Summary of Major Uses of New Dollars (page VI), and the Employees per 1,000 Citizens (page VII) of the County Administrator's Proposed Budget.

ELECTIONS (Page 154/\$564,748)

Susan Gill, Supervisor of Elections, responded to Commissioner Batchelor's question regarding the increase in expenditures from \$3,000 to \$30,000 by stating that the increase was for enhancements of equipment and personnel and to purchase a van to transfer election equipment for voter education.

Clerk's note: audio recording resumed

She mentioned that the budget was based on using one ballot; however, since the budget had been prepared, seven amendments were to be added to the November election ballot and the Capital Punishment Amendment was 579 words. She added that it might require two ballots at an additional expense of \$18,000, and that she would know by the beginning of August if an additional ballot would be required. (I-275)

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE (Page 12/\$369,203)

John Sullivan, Director of Courts, stated there was an addendum to the budget for the Courthouse furniture. Mr. Wesch advised that the anticipated cost of the furniture was included in the budget.

DRUG COURT GRANT (Page 14/\$102,778)

Raymond Cox, Drug Court Coordinator, stated that this was Drug Court's third year of operation, that the Adult Drug Court was doing well, but that Juvenile Drug Court was struggling. He added that the program was a matter of life and death at times, and that it made a difference in the lives of persons with addictions.

Judge Patricia Thomas introduced Jonathan Lin, Court Technology Officer for the Fifth Judicial Circuit, and referred to a letter (filed with the Clerk's agenda) referencing a technology position. She stated that it had been very difficult for Mr. Lin to operate throughout five counties and meet technology needs.

Mr. Lin stated that with the increased technology and volume of demand it was difficult to get technology support from all five counties or the clerk's offices. He explained that the initial request in the above referenced letter was for three jointly funded positions to serve the entire Circuit Court, that based on case filings of individual counties, Citrus County's percentage would be 12 percent of the total staffing expense. He added that Marion County had approved and would fund a position, and indicated they would continue to volunteer to be the fiscal agent for any other positions throughout the Circuit Court.

The Chairman asked if Mr. Lin thought part of his difficulty in obtaining a new position was because it was a State Court function? Mr. Lin replied that the Judiciary was glad to have had his services the last three years, but that the Judiciary's needs could not be met by one technology support staff person. He added that the five counties he traveled were approximately the size of the state of Connecticut, and that he supported 150 personal computers, and 27 to 30 were in Citrus County. He further stated that the Clerk's staff did provide support, but that it was not enough and that he needed assistance.

Commissioner Batchelor commented that according to the Article V Amendment, the State was supposed to pick up this type of funding; however, that was not happening, and although it was not the fault of the court system, it did put a burden on local government.

The Chairman asked Mr. Wesch for suggestions. Mr. Wesch replied that he did not include this request in the proposed budget due to several reasons: 1) that it was another hand down of unmet needs from the State; 2) that the County contributed resources to State Court functions; i.e., two positions in the Public Defender's Office; and 3) that the County was in the process of consolidating Information Systems (IS) services, which now also served the Supervisor of Elections. He added that should the Judiciary reach a level that the Clerk's Office could not provide support, he would be happy to extend support through the County's IS system. He remarked that given other budgetary constraints, he could not recommend the request be fulfilled.

Mr. Lin read from Article V, Chapter 27, Section 14, which stated that the counties were required to fund the cost of communication services, etc. He stated that he was disappointed that the State was not funding the services, but that according to the statute, it was a county responsibility. He mentioned that because the Judiciary was integrated with

Clerk's personnel and applications, it would be better and easier to manage if personnel was provided or funded through the Clerk's office, rather than County staff.

Mr. Wesch stated that he could not speak on behalf of the Clerk, and suggested that the issue be reserved in order to present it to the Clerk at tomorrow's meeting. He added that although the statute addressed County responsibility, it did not mandate the County to fund positions directly, and that the intent of the statute could be met through less costly means, either through the Clerk's office or the County's IS system.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the Clerk had assisted the Judiciary in computer support service for five years, but that the Clerk did not have enough staff, and the Judiciary was in a secondary position.

Discussion continued regarding the additional funds needed in the budget, discussing the matter with the Clerk, the continual grapple of Article V, State dollars that would be freed up in the future, solving the situation without new revenues, etc.

Judge Thomas expressed appreciation to the Board for the excellent working relationship, and the need for continued communication to get through difficult times. She reiterated Mr. Lin's position and stated that he was working below his ability and capacity. She mentioned Article V, and the Judiciary's concern of money going to the State and not enough coming back to the Circuit Court. She complimented Mr. Sullivan for his efforts in the Judiciary process, and stated that they were fortunate to have him.

Mr. Sullivan advised that working with the Clerk would be the best solution since she was in the same building and had worked with them in the past. (I-905)

PUBLIC DEFENDER (Page 18/\$185,614)

Mr. Wesch advised that the County now funded two positions for the Public Defender, that no new positions were requested, and that the budget reflected a 10% increase.

STATE ATTORNEY (Page 20/\$92,453)

Mr. Wesch stated that the budget request represented a 1.8-% increase.

VICTIM WITNESS PROGRAM (Page 22/\$58,833)

Mr. Wesch advised that the County funded two positions and there was 3.7% increase.

TEEN COURT - FINES (Page 24/\$51,677)

Mr. Wesch stated that the County funded one position for Teen Court.

Thomas Moore, Teen Court Coordinator, reported that this was Teen Court's seventh year of operation and that in the last six years 91% of the participants had successfully completed the program. He advised that enough funds had been generated out of the \$3 Teen Court Cost Assessment Ordinance and no more revenues were requested. He explained a new grant had been secured for Teen Court that would allow law enforcement officers to issue a Juvenile Civil Citation to first time teen offenders; therefore, saving fees in law enforcement, court processing, etc. He thanked the Board for the past years of support.

He responded to the Chairman regarding the contingency fund by stating that Teen Court had never spent more than what was in their budget, and that the contingency fund was carried forward. The Chairman replied that he thought the Teen Court Contingency Fund should be in the County's budget. Mrs. Taylor explained that this program was funded by restricted revenues in the form of fines, that the budget was balanced revenues to expenditures, and a contingency fund was provided. She added that if the contingency funds were not used, the funds accumulated and rolled back into the program for use when revenues were down.

Mr. Moore responded to Commissioner Bartell regarding the "Other Contractual Services" increase from \$0 to \$3,800 by stating that it was for a part-time computer employee position and a pilot program called "Stepping Up" for children with reading problems.

He answered Commissioner Wooten's question by stating that the Juvenile Civil Citation Program had been in effect for five years, but that it had been used at the discretion of law enforcement officers. He advised that now he was asking for re-enforcement and direction from the Sheriff so that law enforcement officers would issue a Juvenile Civil Citation whenever possible. Commissioner Wooten commented that he thought it was a good program that would save the County money.

Commissioner Batchelor questioned the increase in "Miscellaneous Supplies" from \$0 to \$3000, and Mr. Moore replied that the increase was for furniture in the new Courthouse.

Mr. Wesch clarified for Commissioner Bartell that the majority of the furniture request was collectively in one overall budget, but that there were some oversights in the budget, and Mr. Moore's furniture request was not included. Mr. Moore further explained that prior to the budget request, he submitted and expected grant money for the furniture; however, he did not receive the funds.

The Chairman and Commissioner Bartell agreed that the contingency funds should be in the County's account, rather than in individual departments or the Constitutional Officer's accounts.

Mrs. Taylor explained that legal restrictions would not allow contingencies from fines or gas tax to be mixed in with the general fund. She stated that contingencies in regular budgets could be restricted, that the only exception to that in the past was a small contingency for the Property Appraiser. She added that the Clerk, Supervisor of Elections,

State Attorney, and Sheriff had no contingency funds, and that all their money was appropriated in a line item.

Mr. Moore explained to Commissioner Batchelor that the \$3,000 for miscellaneous supplies was from donations given to the Teen Court Program. He added that in the past, he would request a budget transfer to be approved by the Board for miscellaneous supplies such as t-shirts, pizza, etc., which was time consuming and cumbersome for everyone.

(1-1565/9:55 A.M.)

COUNTY PLANNING

- ❖ Withlacoochee Regional Water Supply Authority (Page 26/\$24,094); North Central Florida Health Planning Council (\$6,177); and Withlacoochee Regional Planning Council (\$48,188)

Mr. Wesch stated that these budgets indicated various authorities and councils and the budgets were largely per capita contributions typically mandated by membership or statutory requirements.

The Chairman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 10:00 A.M.

PUBLIC WORKS

- ❖ Road Maintenance (Page 28/\$5,825,703)

Mr. Wesch stated that the budget reflected a 7.2% increase, and that the majority of the increase was in the Road Materials and Supplies line item.

- ❖ Road Maintenance Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) (Page 30/\$445,425)

Mr. Wesch advised that there was a decrease of approximately 8.2%.

- ❖ Aviation - General (Page 32/\$83,356); CIP (Page 34/\$193,000)

Mr. Wesch stated that there was a decrease of 30.1% due to re-timing of certain projects that were previously considered in order to present a balanced budget. He referenced page 35 of the Aviation budget, and stated that due to certain transfers involved there was an overall decrease of approximately 9%.

- ❖ Landfill (Page 36/\$7,392,423)

Mr. Wesch stated there was a recommended increase of one position for a heavy equipment operator with an overall budget decrease of .9%. He responded to Commissioner Batchelor's question by stating that the two positions transferred out of the litter control program within the landfill budget was reflected on page 42.

❖ Long Term Care (Page 41/\$210,131)

Mr. Wesch advised that the 8.6% increase was due largely to professional services by statute for various closure costs, studies, and calculations.

❖ Litter Program (Page 42/\$97,094)

Mr. Wesch explained the decrease in the budget was due to salaries transferred to the Road Maintenance budget.

❖ Recycling (Page 44/\$424,639)

Mr. Wesch stated there was a decrease of 6.4%, and no new positions requested.

❖ Hazardous Waste (Page 46/\$64,561)

Mr. Wesch stated there was a decrease of 14%.

❖ Citrus Springs MSBU (Page 48/\$393,770)

Mr. Wesch advised that the budget was reviewed by the Citrus Springs MSBU, and the positions would remain constant from previous years.

❖ Citrus Springs Community Center (Page 50/\$160,626)❖ Beverly Hills MSBU (Page 52/\$56,032)

Mr. Wesch stated that the Beverly Hills MSBU reviewed the budget.

❖ Aquatic Weed Control (Page 54/\$2,025,570)

Mr. Wesch advised there was a decrease of 9.6% because of a decrease in the Chemical line item, due to a greater number of chemicals added to State purchasing contracts.

❖ Lake/Fishing Improvements (Page 56/\$37,090)

Mr. Wesch stated the budget remained somewhat constant with a \$4,000 increase.

❖ Boating Improvements (Page 58/\$70,500)

Mr. Wesch stated that this budget remained constant.

❖ Public Works Administration (Page 60/\$397,952)

Mr. Wesch explained that although there was an increase in one position for an administrative secretary, it was not a new person, but rather a transfer into that division, and the overall budget reflected a 1.8-% increase.

❖ Public Utilities (Page 62/\$3,862,165)

Mr. Wesch advised that this represented a .6% increase in the Water and Wastewater line item.

❖ Water & Waste Water (Page 63/\$3,792,249)

❖ Wastewater Expansion (Page 66/\$5,210,000)

Mr. Wesch stated that due to growth in the County, this budget reflected a large increase of 33%.

❖ Utilities Renewal and Replacement (Page 68/\$1,523,700)

Mr. Wesch advised that the budget increase of 45% was for capital projects with the expansion of utility systems.

❖ WRWSA Renewal and Replacement (Page 70/\$89,997)

Mr. Wesch stated this budget represented a 29% decrease.

❖ Maintenance Operations (Page 72/\$3,834,201)

Mr. Wesch stated there were three new positions requested with a 13% increase, which was due to additional maintenance responsibilities of the new Courthouse and the Stovall Building, and to add a higher level of maintenance in park facilities.

❖ Fleet Maintenance (Page 74/\$854,105)

Mr. Wesch informed that there were no new positions and a 4-1/2% increase.

❖ Engineering (Page 76/\$1,256,223)

Mr. Wesch stated a land agent position had been added as a coordinator for various assessment rolls and projects created for private roads and limerock roads, and the overall budget increased by 5.3%.

❖ Residential/Major Road Five Year Capital Project (Page 78/\$14,593,875)

Mr. Wesch explained that this was a subject of discussion along with Road Impact Fees at the Capital Improvements Workshop May 2002.

❖ Road Impact Fees (Pages 80-91)

- | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| ❖ District 1 (\$75,000) | ❖ District 2 (\$180,000) | ❖ District 3 (\$25,000) |
| ❖ District 4 (\$0) | ❖ District 5 (\$45,000) | ❖ District 6 (\$45,000) |
| ❖ District A (\$1,035,000) | ❖ District B (\$532,500) | ❖ District C (\$90,000) |
| ❖ District D (\$983,500) | | |

❖ Water Quality (Page 98/\$554,831)

Mr. Wesch stated that there was a position decrease due to a transfer to the Administration Services budget.

Mrs. Taylor responded to Commissioner Bartell by stating that there was a General Reserve Fund of \$175,000, which was undesignated money set aside for water quality projects, and an additional \$150,000 in a transfer account for CIP. She added that any funds remaining in the General Reserve Fund would be rolled over to next fiscal year.

Commissioner Bartell commented that due to the number of water quality issues throughout the County, he would like to see additional funding go toward water quality projects.

Mr. Wesch answered Commissioner Wooten's question by stating that the \$125,000 for lake restoration was not included in this year's budget due to budget constraints and recent instant requirements; i.e., \$400,000 request for Property Appraiser's furniture. He explained that the lakes demucking operation had been discontinued and that \$125,000 was to be set aside each year in a special account to partner with the Army Corp of Engineer's (Corp) study on a lake-wide resource restoration plan. He recommended that \$250,000 be reserved in next year's budget to make up the difference.

Commissioner Wooten remarked that he was not aware that the \$125,000 set aside each year would be used exclusively for the Corp's study. He stated that he thought the funds could be used for the investigation of other water needs, such as getting water into the northern end of the lakes and refilling the aquifer. He mentioned partnering with other agencies, such as the Fish and Game Commission and Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) for solutions to the lake problems.

The Chairman recollected that the money would be stockpiled because the real need would be after the Corp's scientific study, which could result in a massive project to restore the lakes. Commissioner Wooten agreed that the Corp study should be done, but that it would be three to five years before it was accomplished, and he thought there were some limited solutions to focus on now to get water into the lakes.

Mr. Wesch advised that part of the problem was that most of the agencies were waiting for a scientific study, but if the County was approached by an agency, there was \$125,000 in the fund now that could be used. He felt that the agencies would not want to start the programs on a site-specific basis, but rather wait for a global solution.

Commissioner Bartell agreed with the Chairman regarding the need for the scientific study and with Mr. Wesch about the State agencies being reluctant to start any program until the Corp's study was done. He did support trying to find extra dollars to put into the fund, but did not want to waste dollars on projects that would not be beneficial.

Commissioner Wooten advised that he would continue to work on some of the lake issues. Mr. Wesch commented that he would commit to making the \$250,000 a budget priority next year.

The Chairman commented that he would like to see the Board's budget prior to reviewing the Constitutional Officer's budgets. He stated that the Board could then decide where to cut the County's budget in order to fund a Constitutional Officer's request. The Commissioners agreed.

Discussion continued regarding prioritizing the County's budget, major County projects suffering due to needs of Constitutional Officers, Commissioners not meeting with Constitutional Officers about their budget, good projects that never come before the Board due to extra funds needed by Constitutional Officers, the Board trying to be proactive, greater needs for the elderly, etc.

Consensus: Staff to revise the budget process and timetable for the next fiscal year and present it to the Board prior to the Preliminary Budget Hearings.

Mr. Wesch stated that he understood the Board's direction, but wanted to make the Board aware of the condensed time frame between concrete revenue projections and turn around time for the budget workshops. He explained that staff would be faced with revenue projections that changed substantially over short time frames. He added that funding sources were typically gas tax, telecommunications tax, and ad valorem tax, and those State revenue projections did not come until late in the process, and the Property Appraiser did not provide his general revenue estimates before July 1.

The Chairman stated that certain assumptions would have to be made by staff, and Commissioner Bartell replied that the Board would recognize those factors. He added that the information provided by staff would indicate what type of revenues were forth coming.

Mr. Wesch requested that the revised budget policy be ratified and adopted by the Board when presented this fall for the upcoming budget hearings. (I-3020/10:40 A.M.)

The Chairman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 1:35 P.M.

PROPERTY APPRAISER (Page 100/\$2,901,197)

Mr. Wesch stated that the Department of Revenue (DOR) tentatively approved the Property Appraiser's budget. He advised that the budget called for two new positions with an increase of 31.3%, which included \$400,000 in new furniture for the Stovall Building and \$100,000 for a jointly shared information system with the Tax Collector. He requested that 91% or approximately \$464,100 be placed into a Board contingency account for the purpose of tracking expenditures. He stated that was the amount the DOR approved for an undesignated contingency account for the Property Appraiser's use. He added that any money spent would require a budget transfer and Board review and approval. He also stated that Mr. Battista concurred that this would be a legal course of action.

Directive: Staff to place 91% of the Property Appraiser's Budget into a Board contingency account for the Property Appraiser's use.

Mr. Wesch advised that he had received a letter from Ronald Schultz, Property Appraiser, stating that the DOR was his budgetary authority, and even if invited he would not attend the meeting today. He added that Mr. Schultz was notified of the meeting.

Mr. Wesch replied to Commissioner Bartell that the \$400,000 for furniture had been discussed from the beginning, and was reasonable and inclusive of the Tax Collector's furniture needs. He also stated that in discussions with the Property Appraiser, the ratio was proportioned roughly as 40% for the Property Appraiser and 20% for the Tax Collector.

Mrs. Taylor responded to Commissioner Bartell that the reason given by the Property Appraiser for a collective request for furniture for both the Property Appraiser and Tax Collector was because his budget was submitted to the DOR first, and the Tax Collector's budget would not be submitted until August 1.

Mr. Wesch agreed with Commissioner Bartell that one lesson learned was to include furniture in the bid price, and secondly, from now on the County would be solely responsible for furniture.

Commissioner Bartell remembered during the discussion of constructing the Stovall Building, that the Property Appraiser was emphatic about the requirement by statute to return personnel from the Crystal River office to Inverness. He expressed concern that funds might be included within the 31.3% for the rental of another facility for the Crystal River staff, due to the lengthy delays in starting the construction of the Stovall Building.

Mr. Wesch replied that he could not respond to that concern since the Property Appraiser's budget was in lump sum categories. He added that he would send letters to the DOR and the Property Appraiser to ask if there were funds identified for that purpose.

Mr. Battista responded to Commissioner Batchelor by verifying that legally he could not find any reason why the contingency fund for the Property Appraiser could not be under the Board's contingency account through the budgetary amendment process.

Discussion ensued regarding the Property Appraiser declining the County's offer of assistance in purchasing furniture, the State statute written to assure that there were adequate resources to the property appraisers in order to prepare legitimate tax rolls, the County having little say in the DOR's recommended budget, the appeal and challenge process to the DOR, the Property Appraiser's 31.3% budget increase being offensive when the County was working within a 4% budget, accountability to the taxpayers from the Tax Collector and Property Appraiser, the Property Appraiser's budget increase being 8.29% with the exclusion of the contingency account, etc.

Commissioner Bartell commented that since the Stovall Building would be the people's building, he thought the \$400,000 should be in a Board's contingency fund. Commissioner Wooten suggested that all funds in each budget for furniture be consolidated into one interest bearing account.

Mr. Wesch advised that he would pursue the idea of a consolidated furniture fund under the County's control and authority. (II-490/2:00 P.M.)

MARION-CITRUS MENTAL HEALTH (Page 102/\$300,588)

Russell Rasco, Executive Director, Marion-Citrus Mental Health Center (Center), expressed appreciation to the Board for the continuing support and stated that the Center was growing and expanding at a time when needs were great. He commented that he thought the staff and director at the Citrus County Center was one of the best qualified, and he introduced the Citrus County Director, Mary Lee Cubbison.

He responded to Commission Wooten's question by stating that unless State funding could be obtained Baker Act beds would not be furnished in Citrus County.

KEY TRAINING CENTER (Page 104/\$20,000)

Mr. Wesch stated that this budget remained constant from the previous year.

COUNTY ATTORNEY (Page 106/\$322,030)

Mr. Wesch stated that there were no new positions and an overall budget decrease of 3%. He advised that senior staff would be presenting an Administrative Regulation (AR) for a car pool concept to be based out of the Lecanto Government Center. He added that there would be eight vehicles, and by converting to this type of program, the County would save money by purchasing three less vehicles, and services would also be extended to those people who would otherwise have to use their own vehicles. He further stated that the line item for Machinery and Equipment in the County Administrator's budget was for a van for the car pool concept.

Mr. Wesch responded to Commissioner Bartell by stating that there was not a formalized program for the car pool concept started a few years ago as now proposed.

The Chairman stated that he would like to point out that by keeping the Key Training Center's budget constant, it was a reduction in their budget each year. He further stated that he thought a 4% increase would keep them even with inflation and the cost of living.

Mrs. Taylor answered Commissioner Bartell's question by stating that outside council was included in the Administrative Services budget.

HUMAN RESOURCES (Page 108/246,682)

Mr. Wesch stated that two positions were transferred to the Office of Management and Budget, making a total budget decrease of 21.7%.

UTILITY FEE TRUST ACCOUNT (Page 110/\$263,000)

Mr. Wesch stated there were no new personnel.

(II-812/2:10 P.M.)

The Chairman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 2:20 P.M.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

❖ **Community Services Administration** (Page 112/\$123,252)

Mr. Wesch advised that there were no new positions, and a 1/2% budget increase. He directed the Board's attention to the Machinery and Equipment line item, and stated that due to the car pool concept, that vehicle request would not be fulfilled.

❖ **Nitrate Workgroup** (Page 114/\$18,569)

Mr. Wesch stated there was a 1/2% budget reduction.

❖ **Libraries** (Page 116/\$2,101,252)

Mr. Wesch advised of a 6.4% increase with no new personnel requested.

❖ **Library Services - Schweizer Trust** (Page 118/\$3,000)

❖ **Library Trust** (Page 120/\$10,000)

❖ **Extension Services** (Page 122/\$318,586)

Mr. Wesch stated that there were no new positions and a 4.1% increase. Mrs. Taylor answered Commissioner Bartell's question by stating that \$11,100 for machinery

and equipment was for one modular workstation at \$3,000 and that the balance was for a copier. She added that the high cost of the copier was due to the volume of literature produced and the amount of employees.

❖ Canning Center (Page 124/\$58,462)

Mr. Wesch stated the budget increase was 3.7% with no new personnel requested.

❖ Tourist Tax (Page 126/\$355,000)

Mr. Wesch advised there was a .2% increase.

❖ Parks (Page 128/\$758,182)

Mr. Wesch stated that one additional position was requested with a 5.1% increase. He replied to Commissioner Bartell's question by stating that the majority of the utility service increase was due to the increased energy and upgrade for brighter lights in the parks.

❖ Parks - CIP (Page 130/\$159,000)

❖ Parks - Special Programs (Page 132/\$85,091)

Mr. Wesch advised of a decrease in the amount of 11.4%.

❖ Chassahowitzka RV Campground (Page 134/\$225,048)

Mr. Wesch stated there were no new positions requested, and a 2% budgetary increase. Mrs. Taylor replied to the Chairman's question that the expected revenue from the campground would generate \$220,975 and that the budget was balanced with \$15,000 carried forward from prior years.

❖ Veterans Services (Page 136/\$90,801)

❖ Social Services (Page 138/\$80,765)

Mr. Wesch advised there were no new positions requested, and a 7% budgetary increase.

❖ State/County Welfare - Nursing Home Care (Page 140/\$437,580)

Mr. Wesch stated this budget represented a 4% budgetary increase.

❖ State/County Welfare, Hospital (Page 142/\$658,404)

Mr. Wesch advised that this budget also represented a 4% increase in the budget.

❖ Support Services (Page 144/\$242,475)

Mr. Wesch stated there were no new positions, and a 3.3% budget increase.

❖ Support Services Grants (Cash Match) (Page 146/\$774,033)

❖ Senior Center, Lecanto (Page 148/\$64,497)

Mr. Wesch stated that the Board directed staff to move forward with a 4,100 square foot addition to this facility. Due to budgetary constraints, he recommended the project be split over two years, the first phase being ADA bathroom upgrades and computer lab, and the balance of the project to proceed next year. He responded to the Chairman's question by stating that the Property Appraiser's budget was a competing pressure.

He answered Commissioner Wooten's question by stating that it would cost more to complete the project in two phases, but that the savings this year would be approximately \$185,000. He also advised that the Tax Collector's final budget was not due until August 1, and at that time he would know if there were any excess fees to be returned to the Board. He added that if the Board directed, he would recommend that this project be a priority on the list of projects to be restored if there were any excess fees.

Commissioner Wooten commented that he thought this project should be at the top of the priority list. He stated that the project should not suffer at the expense of other projects that were not priorities, but that the Board felt obligated to fund.

Commissioner Bartell pointed out that a lot of the pressures had been relieved at the Lecanto Senior Center since the West Side Center had opened, and that there had also been anticipation of private donations to offset the cost. Mr. Wesch stated that part of the difficulty was that the Lecanto Senior Center was to have been funded jointly, but that fund raising lagged far behind.

Mrs. Taylor responded to the Commissioners' questions by stating that the Tax Collector's excess fees would be included in the budget after September 30, 2003. She advised that by statute the Tax Collector must receive the County's revenue before she could calculate her budget, and that her budget was due to the DOR by August 1, 2002. She added that the Tax Collector received 2% from the County for collection of ad valorem taxes.

Mr. Wesch responded to the Commissioners' concerns regarding the Tax Collector's budget by stating that he would call her this afternoon and request a copy of her budget.

❖ East Side Senior Center (Page 150/\$51,679)

Mr. Wesch stated there was a request for one new position and a budget increase for the salary associated with that position, and computer accessories and software upgrades to establish a computer lab in that facility.

❖ West Side Community Center (Page 152/\$68,175)

Mr. Wesch stated there were no new positions requested, and approximately a 5 1/2% budget increase.

With no further public comment, the Chairman recessed the meeting until July 25, 2002, at 9:00 A.M. (II-1436/2:43 P.M.)