

The Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida, met in regular session on the above date at the Citrus County Courthouse in Inverness.

Commissioners: Vicki Phillips, Chairwoman; Gary Bartell, First Vice-Chairman; Jim Fowler, Second Vice-Chairman; Dennis Damato and Joyce Valentino
Attorneys: Robert B. Battista and Michele Slingerland, Assistant
Administrator: Richard Wm. Wesch
Deputy Clerks: Glenda Brown and Theresa Steelfox

The Chairwoman called the meeting to order, Commissioner Fowler gave the invocation, and Commissioner Bartell led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

3- **CONSENT AGENDA**

Upon motion by Commissioner Fowler, seconded by Commissioner Bartell, and carried unanimously, the Board pulled item 3-M (Impact Fee Update) and item 3-HH (Emergency Prevention and Readiness Outreach), approved the balance of the consent agenda items, and authorized the Chairwoman to execute all related documents:

3-A Minutes of the regular meeting held on January 11, 2005.

3-B Warrants for payroll registers dated January 19, 2005, at \$515,850.14 and January 20, 2005, at \$31,800.74. Accounts payable register dated January 21, 2005, at \$1,496,256.53. Emergency registers dated January 12, 2005, at \$18,360.35, and January 25, 2005, at \$2,579.

3-C Budget Resolutions:

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-009

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, ADOPTING THE TITLE III B GRANT BUDGET
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, on September 28, 2004, through Resolution 2004-229 the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners approved an application for financial assistance under the Older Americans Act, Title III Programs and a contract to provide services with the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2004, the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc. executed the contract providing funds to benefit elderly residents of the county; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler
BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

/s/ Vicki Phillips
VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

| EXHIBIT "A" | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| | ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| Revenues | 180F-331-691 | Title III Federal Grant | 161,942 |
| | 180F-361-200 | SBA Interest | 675 |
| | 180F-366-900 | Other Contributions and Donations | 675 |
| | 180F-381-004 | County Cash Match | 17,994 |
| | | Total Revenues | \$181,286 |
| Expenditures | 180F-5347F-51200 | Regular Salaries and Wages | 44,936 |
| | 180F-5347F-51204 | Salaries – Site Manager | 8,678 |
| | 180F-5347F-51306 | Casual Labor | 125 |
| | 180F-5347F-52100 | FICA Taxes | 4,101 |
| | 180F-5347F-52200 | Retirement Contributions | 3,962 |
| | 180F-5347F-52300 | Life and Health Insurance | 11,232 |
| | 180F-5347F-52400 | Workers Compensation | 560 |
| | 180F-5347F-53400 | Other Contractual Services | 3,800 |
| | 180F-5347F-53480 | Contract Services – Transportation | 87,495 |
| | 180F-5347F-53483 | Contract Services – Homemaker | 2,080 |
| | 180F-5347F-54000 | Travel and Per Diem | 1,276 |
| | 180F-5347F-54004 | Travel – Administration | 1,160 |
| | 180F-5347F-54100 | Communications Services | 1,575 |
| | 180F-5347F-54160 | Postage | 108 |
| | 180F-5347F-54300 | Utility Services | 2,788 |
| | 180F-5347F-54600 | Repairs and Maintenance | 360 |
| | 180F-5347F-54605 | Equipment Maintenance | 900 |
| | 180F-5347F-54676 | Copier Maintenance | 400 |
| | 180F-5347F-55100 | Office Supplies | 1,550 |
| | 180F-5347F-55107 | Program Supplies | 1,750 |
| | 180F-5347F-55200 | Operating Supplies | 125 |
| | 180F-5347F-55211 | Janitorial Supplies | 200 |
| | 180F-5347F-55400 | Dues, Books, Subscriptions | 125 |
| | 180F-5347F-55417 | Training | 2,000 |
| | | Total Expenditures | \$181,286 |

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-010

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, ADOPTING THE TITLE III C-1 GRANT BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, on September 28, 2004, through Resolution 2004-229 the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners approved an application for financial assistance under the Older Americans Act, Title III Programs and a contract to provide services with the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2004, the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc. executed the contract providing funds to benefit elderly residents of the county; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

/s/ Vicki Phillips

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

| EXHIBIT "A" | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| | ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| Revenues | 181F-331-691 | Title III Federal Grant | 161,323 |
| | 181F-361-200 | SBA Interest | 1,500 |
| | 181F-366-900 | Other Contributions and Donations | 5,900 |
| | 181F-381-004 | County Cash Match | 35,502 |
| | | Total Revenues | \$204,225 |
| Expenditures | 181F-5370F-51200 | Regular Salaries and Wages | 32,970 |
| | 181F-5370F-51204 | Salaries – Site Manager | 8,717 |
| | 181F-5370F-52100 | FICA Taxes | 3,189 |
| | 181F-5370F-52200 | Retirement Contributions | 3,081 |
| | 181F-5370F-52300 | Life and Health Insurance | 7,862 |
| | 181F-5370F-52400 | Workers Compensation | 1,950 |
| | 181F-5370F-53400 | Other Contractual Services | 6,000 |
| | 181F-5370F-54000 | Travel and Per Diem | 875 |
| | 181F-5370F-54004 | Travel – Administration | 975 |
| | 181F-5370F-54012 | Travel – Outreach | 870 |
| | 181F-5370F-54100 | Communications Services | 2,500 |
| | 181F-5370F-54160 | Postage | 200 |
| | 181F-5370F-54300 | Utility Services | 5,088 |
| | 181F-5370F-54600 | Repairs and Maintenance | 590 |
| | 181F-5370F-54605 | Equipment Maintenance | 900 |

| | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| | 181F-5370F-54676 | Copier Maintenance | 400 |
| | 181F-5370F-55100 | Office Supplies | 975 |
| | 181F-5370F-55107 | Program Supplies | 900 |
| | 181F-5370F-55211 | Janitorial Supplies | 200 |
| | 181F-5370F-55221 | Meals | 125,208 |
| | 181F-5370F-55400 | Dues, Books, Subscriptions | 275 |
| | 181F-5370F-55417 | Training | 500 |
| | | Total Expenditures | \$204,225 |

¹RESOLUTION NO. 2005-011

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, ADOPTING THE TITLE III C-2 GRANT BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, on September 28, 2004, through Resolution 2004-229 the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners approved an application for financial assistance under the Older Americans Act, Title III Programs and a contract to provide services with the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2004, the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc. executed the contract providing funds to benefit elderly residents of the county; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

/s/ Vicki Phillips

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

| EXHIBIT "A" | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| | ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| Revenues | 182F-331-691 | Title III Federal Grant | 178,647 |
| | 182F-331-693 | USDA – Title III Grants | 69,655 |
| | 182F-361-200 | SBA Interest | 1,500 |
| | 182F-366-000 | Contributions (Private) | 11,500 |
| | 182F-366-900 | Other Contributions and Donations | 16,750 |
| | 182F-381-004 | County Cash Match | 19,850 |
| | | Total Revenues | \$297,902 |
| Expenditures | 182F-5348F-51200 | Regular Salaries and Wages | 35,395 |
| | 182F-5348F-51204 | Salaries – Site Manager | 5,495 5,492 |

¹ See 04/26/05 minutes, Item 3-VV for correction

| | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| | 182F-5348F-52100 | FICA Taxes | 3,169 |
| | 182F-5348F-52200 | Retirement Contributions | 3,061 |
| | 182F-5348F-52300 | Life and Health Insurance | 8,679 |
| | 182F-5348F-52400 | Workers Compensation | 1,050 |
| | 182F-5348F-53400 | Other Contractual Services | 1,000 |
| | 182F-5348F-54000 | Travel and Per Diem | 128 |
| | 182F-5348F-54004 | Travel – Administration | 1,160 |
| | 182F-5348F-54005 | Travel – Volunteers | 26,100 |
| | 182F-5348F-54012 | Travel – Outreach | 1,740 |
| | 182F-5348F-54100 | Communications Services | 1,295 |
| | 182F-5348F-54160 | Postage | 52 |
| | 182F-5348F-54300 | Utility Services | 1,388 |
| | 182F-5348F-54600 | Repairs and Maintenance | 250 |
| | 182F-5348F-54676 | Copier Maintenance | 100 |
| | 182F-5348F-55100 | Office Supplies | 100 |
| | 182F-5348F-55107 | Program Supplies | 516 |
| | 182F-5348F-55221 | Meals | 206,227 |
| | 182F-5348F-55417 | Training | 1,000 |
| | | Total Expenditures | \$297,902 |

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-012

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, ADOPTING THE TITLE III B - LEGAL GRANT BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, on September 28, 2004, through Resolution 2004-228 the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners approved an application for financial assistance under the Older Americans Act, Title III Programs and a contract to provide services with the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2004, the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc. executed the contract providing funds to benefit elderly residents of the county; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board’s regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit “A” attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

/s/ Vicki Phillips

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

EXHIBIT "A"

| ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
|----------------|---------------------|--------|
|----------------|---------------------|--------|

| | | | |
|--------------|------------------|----------------------------|---------|
| Revenues | 186A-331-691 | Title III Federal Grant | 4,880 |
| | 186A-381-004 | County Cash Match | 543 |
| | | Total Revenues | \$5,423 |
| Expenditures | 186A-5337A-53104 | Consultant Fees – Legal | 4,880 |
| | 186A-5337A-51200 | Regular Salaries and Wages | 465 |
| | 186A-5337A-52100 | FICA Taxes | 36 |
| | 186A-5337A-52200 | Retirement Contributions | 35 |
| | 186A-5337A-52300 | Life and Health Insurance | 2 |
| | 186A-5337A-52400 | Workers Compensation | 5 |
| | | Total Expenditures | \$5,423 |

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-013

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, ADOPTING THE TITLE III E GRANT BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, on September 28, 2004, through Resolution 2004-227 the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners approved an application for financial assistance under the Older Americans Act, Title III Programs and a contract to provide services with the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, on December 30, 2004, the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc. executed the contract providing funds to benefit elderly residents of the county; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board’s regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit “A” attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

/s/ Vicki Phillips

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

| EXHIBIT "A" | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| | ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| Revenues | 184C-331-691 | Title III Federal Grant | 40,181 |
| | 184C-381-004 | County Cash Match | 4,465 |
| | | Total Revenues | \$44,646 |
| Expenditures | 184C-5326C-51200 | Regular Salaries and Wages | 3,605 |
| | 184C-5326C-52100 | FICA Taxes | 276 |
| | 184C-5326C-52200 | Retirement Contributions | 401 |
| | 184C-5326C-52300 | Life and Health Insurance | 722 |
| | 184C-5326C-52400 | Workers Compensation | 87 |
| | 184C-5326C-53485 | Contract Services – Respite | 29,602 |

| | | | |
|--|------------------|---------------------|----------|
| | 184C-5326C-54000 | Travel and Per Diem | 34 |
| | 184C-5326C-54160 | Postage | 111 |
| | 184C-5326C-55100 | Office Supplies | 57 |
| | 184C-5326C-55107 | Program Supplies | 9,751 |
| | | Total Expenditures | \$44,646 |

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-014

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE MEDICAID WAIVER PROGRAM BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, on April 13, 2004, through Resolution 2004-079 the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners approved an application for financial assistance under the Medicaid Waiver Program and a contract to provide services with the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the third quarter allocation from Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc. needs to be appropriated; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

/s/ Vicki Phillips

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

| EXHIBIT "A" | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|
| | ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| Revenues | 117E-346-900 | Fees for Services | 32,179 |
| | 117E-346-901 | Assisted Living Facility Waiver | 9,526 |
| | | Total Revenues | \$41,705 |
| Expenditures | 117E-5311E-51200 | Regular Salaries and Wages | 17,667 |
| | 117E-5311E-52100 | FICA Taxes | 1,352 |
| | 117E-5311E-52200 | Retirement Contributions | 1,305 |
| | 117E-5311E-52300 | Life and Health Insurance | 1,955 |
| | 117E-5311E-52400 | Workers' Compensation | 300 |
| | 117E-5311E-53486 | Contract Services – Meals | 6,000 |
| | 117E-5311E-53488 | Contract Services – Companionship | 2,500 |
| | 117E-5311E-54004 | Travel – Administration | 250 |
| | 117E-5311E-54005 | Travel – Volunteer | 700 |
| | 117E-5311E-54100 | Communications Services | 150 |
| | | Total Expenditures Dept. 5311E | \$32,179 |

| | | | |
|--|------------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| | 117E-5401E-51200 | Regular Salaries and Wages | 6,572 |
| | 117E-5401E-52100 | FICA Taxes | 503 |
| | 117E-5401E-52200 | Retirement Contributions | 486 |
| | 117E-5401E-52300 | Life and Health Insurance | 1,250 |
| | 117E-5401E-52400 | Workers Compensation | 115 |
| | 117E-5401E-54004 | Travel – Administration | 500 |
| | 117E-5401E-54100 | Communications Services | 100 |
| | | Total Expenditures Dept. 5401E | \$9,526 |
| | | Total Expenditures | \$41,705 |

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-015

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE COMMUNITY CARE FOR THE ELDERLY GRANT BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, Citrus County will receive funds from the Mid-Florida Area Agency on Aging, Inc. disaster relief program; and

WHEREAS, these funds will be used to aid the citizens of Citrus County that have unmet disaster needs; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

/s/ Vicki Phillips

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

| EXHIBIT "A" | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------------|---------|
| | ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| Revenues | 183E-334-999 | State Non-Grant Revenue | \$5,000 |
| Expenditures | 183E-5338E-53400 | Other Contractual Services | \$5,000 |

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-016

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE LIBRARIES BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, the Division of Library Services received a Universal Service discount on telecommunications and internet service; and

WHEREAS, these funds will be used to purchase equipment for the ACCESS Citrus 2004 LSTA Grant project as part of the Library Automation System; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

/s/ Vicki Phillips

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

| EXHIBIT "A" | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| | ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| Revenues | 131-369-900 | Other Miscellaneous Revenue | 27,848 |
| | | Total Revenues | \$27,848 |
| Expenditures | 131-6212-53100 | Professional Services | 1,800 |
| | 131-6212-54612 | Computer Maintenance | 1,200 |
| | 131-6212-54700 | Printing and Binding | 2,100 |
| | 131-6212-55120 | Office Equipment | 3,839 |
| | 131-6212-55200 | Operating Supplies | 3,865 |
| | 131-6212-55270 | Computer Accessories | 1,814 |
| | 131-6212-55275 | Computer Software | 1,030 |
| | 131-6212-56400 | Machinery and Equipment | 12,200 |
| | | Total Expenditures | \$27,848 |

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-017

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, ADOPTING THE VOTER EDUCATION BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, in accordance with the 2004 Legislature, \$2,900,000 was specifically appropriated for voter education; and

WHEREAS, Citrus County's portion has been calculated to be \$26,123 and these funds will be used to promote voter education and voter outreach programs; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.

- The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 25, 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

/s/ Vicki Phillips

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

| EXHIBIT "A" | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------|
| | ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| Revenues | 001-335-191 | Voter Education | 26,123 |
| | | Total Revenues | \$26,123 |
| Expenditures | 001-2443-54700 | Printing and Binding | 10,000 |
| | 001-2443-54921 | Advertising | 15,000 |
| | 001-2443-55417 | Training | 1,123 |
| | | Total Expenditures | \$26,123 |

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-018

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE GENERAL FUND AND WATER QUALITY BUDGETS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, on January 11, 2005, the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners approved the use of certain funds to pledge as matches for stormwater or surface restoration and wastewater projects; and

WHEREAS, these funds need to be appropriated in the proper accounts; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

- The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
- The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 25, 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

/s/ Vicki Phillips

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

| EXHIBIT "A" | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| | ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| GENERAL FUND | | | |
| Revenues | 001-271-170 | Reserve for Lake Restoration | \$260,000 |
| Expenditures | 001-9999-59100 | Cash Match for State Appropriations | \$260,000 |
| WATER QUALITY | | | |
| Revenues | 062-400-200 | Cash Carry Forward | \$400,000 |
| Expenditures | 062-5415-59100 | Cash Match for State Appropriations | \$400,000 |

3-D Budget transfers: **Office of Utility Regulation/Utility Fee Trust:** \$500 from #645-6400-55100 to #-54022. **Libraries/Article V Law Library:** \$4,249 from #096-5706-56600 to #-56400. **Library Services Division (LSD):** \$339 from #131-6212-53400 to #-54400. **Utilities Division:** \$3,000 from #450-9000-53100 to #-54615, \$2,000 from #-53100 to #-54160, and \$6,000 from #-53100 to #-54620. **Housing Services Division (HSD)/HUD:** \$4,500 from #166F-5366F-53000 to #-55275. **HSD/SHIP:** \$13,074 from #133C-5304C-54928 with \$3,074 to #-54926 and \$10,000 to #-59930. **Drug Court:** \$330 from #-040-5750-51200 to #-51306. **Systems Management and GIS (Geographic Information System):** \$7,200 from #001-2151-51200 to #-2150-51306, \$60 from #-2151-52400 to #-2150-52400, \$551 from #-2151-52100 to #-2150-52100, and \$4,000 from #-2150-51200 to #-51306. **Elections:** \$5,000 from #001-2440-54700 to #-2443-54700. **Reserves and Transfers:** \$790,000 from #001-2101-58130, \$100,000 from #-6120-53100, and \$300,000 from #-6120-56100 to #-9999-59100. **Engineering Division/Crystal River Easement:** \$1,850 from #014-7239-56100 to #-53100.

3-E Releases of Liens for special assessments that had been paid in full: **Resolution No. 2004-182:** Codie Latrelle Carr, Trustee, Alternate Key (AK) No. 2390972 (4F). **Resolution No. 2001-186:** Margaret P. Corlew, AK No. 1133271 and 1133289 (1B). **Resolution No. 2000-135:** Kay Elizabeth Stringer, AK No. 1502667 (OB). **Resolution No. 86-29, reconfirmed by Resolution No. 93-216:** David P. and Mary Boulerville, and Charles Reeves, Jr., AK No. 1941971 (H).

3-F Deletion of the following surplus items from the County's capital asset list:

| Parks and Recreation | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| Property Number | Description | Condition |
| 10734 | 9 of 26 Canoes | Non-repairable |
| 10547 | Motorola Portable Radio w/charger | Obsolete |
| Library Services | | |
| 13697 | Computer | Obsolete |
| 11278 | (72) Digital Text-Terminals | Obsolete |
| 11278 | (23) Barcode Scanner Wands | Obsolete |
| 11278 | (19) Digital Printers | Obsolete |
| 12421 | Multi CD Changer | Obsolete |
| 13311 | Uptech Computer | Obsolete |
| Systems Management | | |
| 13313 | Computer System | Obsolete |
| 13307 | Computer System | Obsolete |
| 14118 | IQ Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14173 | SBS Computer System | Obsolete |
| 14186 | SBS Computer System | Obsolete |
| 14358 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14398 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14401 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14411 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |

| | | |
|-------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 14447 | Sony G500ps Monitor | Non repairable |
| 14466 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14833 | Precision 200 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14834 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14839 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14840 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14846 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14754 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14849 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14827 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15037 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15006 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14808 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15156 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14848 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14901 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14828 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14847 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14899 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14593 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14891 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15036 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13967 | Sony 400ps Monitor | Non-repairable |
| 13950 | Millennia Micron Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13951 | Millennia Micron Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13918 | K2 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13875 | Micromania Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14055 | Micromania Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13926 | K2 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13642 | Micromania Computer | Non-repairable |
| 12838 | Uptech Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13081 | Uptech Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13371 | Uptech Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13183 | Uptech Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13182 | Uptech Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14914 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15019 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15017 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15020 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15023 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15025 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15024 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15014 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15016 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15013 | Dell GX1 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14845 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14601 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14890 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| 14896 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14898 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14829 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14826 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14900 | Dell GX110 Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13919 | IBM p2 300 computer | Non-repairable |
| 15240 | Dell Dimension L1000r | Non-repairable |
| 14820 | Dell Precision 220 | Non-repairable |
| 15222 | Dell C600 Laptop | Non-repairable |
| Supervisor of Elections | | |
| 15133 | Dell Computer | Non-repairable |
| Fleet | | |
| 14429 | Dell Computer | Non-repairable |
| 15050 | Dell Computer System | Non-repairable |
| 13467 | Micromania Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14432 | Dell Computer System | Non-repairable |
| Utilities | | |
| 14345 | Dell Computer | Non-repairable |
| 14348 | Dell Computer | Non-repairable |
| 13464 | Viewsonic Monitor | Non-repairable |
| Teen Court | | |
| 12990 | Xerox Copy Machine | Non-repairable |

3-G Satisfaction of Lien by and on behalf of the Citrus County Municipal Services Benefit Unit (MSBU) for Water and Wastewater Utility Services with Frances and William Bidwell.

3-H Satisfaction of Judgment for Timothy Allen Burke, Case No. 85-124-MM.

3-I **(1)** Citrus Springs Advisory Council's recommendation to supplement \$375,000 for the County's existing road resurfacing program in the Citrus Springs community, and **(2)** the adoption of the related Budget Resolution. **RESOLUTION NO. 2005-019**

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-019

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE CITRUS SPRINGS MSBU
BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, the Citrus Springs Advisory Council has approved supplementing the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners road resurfacing program in the Citrus Springs Community; and

WHEREAS, funds are available to complete this project and need to be appropriated in the proper account; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 25th day of January 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

/s/ Vicki Phillips

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

| EXHIBIT "A" | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| | ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT |
| Revenues | | Cash Carry Forward | \$375,000 |
| Expenditures | 730-8200-56549 | Regular Salaries and Wages | \$375,000 |

3-J Agreement for Professional Engineering Services for the Design, Permitting and Bidding of the City of Inverness WWTP (Wastewater Treatment Plant) Reclaimed Water Transmission Main with Hoyle, Tanner and Associates, Inc., for an amount not to exceed \$150,000.

3-K Staff recommendations and execution of master service agreements with the following to provide professional consulting engineering services to the Utility Division:

| Task areas defined in the Request for Qualifications: | Task areas of utility economic analysis and development of business model and rates: |
|--|---|
| C & D Engineering | PRMG |
| CH2M Hill | R. W. Beck |
| Hoyle, Tanner & Associates | |
| Jones, Edmunds & Associates | |
| Professional Engineering Consultants | |

3-L **(1)** Addendum to Water and Wastewater Developer's Agreement dated April 8, 2004, with Wayne A. Nowlan for appropriate treatment of off-site connection fees, and **(2)** the Clerk to record the agreement in the public records.

3-N A request for a six-month extension from the Department of Community Affairs for the submittal of the EAR (Evaluation and Appraisal Report) based amendments for reasons noted in the backup material.

3-O Satisfaction of Demolition Lien with Donald L. Burnham on property previously owned by Raymond Brewington, Jr., for removal of an unsafe/abandoned structure, which was deemed a nuisance and necessitated demolition and removal.

3-P Community Support Services Division's (CSSD) request to solicit and negotiate prices of vendors who were accepted by the Mid Florida Area on Aging and the Department of Elder Affairs to provide client choice for in home services in accordance with Senate Bill 1226.

3-Q (1) Modification of Agreement No. 4, Task Authorization No. 2 - Phase 2 Landfill Expansion with SCS Engineers, Inc., for \$118,000, and the extension of the project completion date by 145 days, (2) Change Order No. 7 to Purchase Order No. 46239 with SCS Engineers, Inc., and (3) staff's request to apply for reimbursement of supervision costs from FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency).

3-R Change Order No. 2 to the agreement with Advance Construction Services, Inc., for construction of Phase 2 of the Central Landfill (Bid 071-03) to extend the project completion date by 145 days at no additional cost.

3-S (1) State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection Clear Water State Revolving Fund Construction Loan Agreement WW33103S to fund the Homosassa Wastewater Collection System - Phase 3 (Halls River Road Infill) Project, and (2) adoption of a resolution relating to the State Revolving Fund Loan Agreement.

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-020

3-T (1) AIA Document B141 - 1997 Part 1 Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner and Architect with Standard Form of Architect's Services, and (2) AIA Document B141 - 1997 Part 2 Standard Form of Architect's Services: Design and Contract Administration with Schenkel Shultz, Inc., for \$214,621 for the design of a 15,000 square foot library in Homosassa and the addition and renovation of the Floral City Library.

3-U Sovereign Submerged Lands Easement with the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund (TIITF) of the State of Florida for construction of the Gospel Island Bridge.

3-V Easement No. 31388 and Temporary Easement No. 31389 with the TIITF for installation of a treated storm water pipe across the Withlacoochee State Trail as part of the modification of the Courthouse Annex storm water treatment system.

3-W Administrative Regulation No. 15.02-1, entitled Utility System Connection Fee.

3-X Amendment to the Commitment Letter to Florida Low Income Housing Associates, Inc., dated March 9, 2004, for \$150,000 to extend grant closings of State Housing Initiative Partnership (SHIP) assisted units by December 31, 2006, the HOME (Home Investment Partnership Program) Rental and other necessary funding closing dates to December 31, 2005.

3-Y Older Americans Act (OAA) Food Service Specifications/Contract 2005 Bid No. 030-03 with G.A. Food Services of Pinellas County, Inc., to provide approximately 118,606 meals to eligible residents beginning January 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2005.

3-Z Contract with Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida, Inc., for the OAA Programs to provide approximately 99 units of legal services to eligible residents beginning January 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2005.

3-AA Contract with A+ NurseTemps, Inc., for the Title III E - Family Caregiver Program 2005 Home Based Respite Care to provide in-home respite services, at \$14.25 per hour for a maximum of 601 hours, beginning January 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2005.

3-BB Contract with Brentwood Retirement Community for the Title III E - Family Caregiver Program 2005 Facility Based Respite Care to provide a maximum of 4 episodes of 24 hour in patient facility based respite not to exceed \$612, beginning January 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2005.

3-CC Contract with Interim Healthcare of North Central Florida for the Title III E - Family Caregiver Program 2005 to provide in-home respite services at \$15.50 per hour for a maximum of 1,202 hours, beginning January 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2005.

3-DD Janitorial Services Contract for Community/Senior Centers January 1, 2005, through December 31, 2006 with Coverall of North Central Florida for \$3,297 per month, under Bid No. 045-05 for janitorial services to the four senior/community center sites beginning January 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2006.

3-EE Contract with Nature Coast Lodge for the Title III E - Family Caregiver Program 2005 Facility Based Respite Care to provide 135 hours of facility based respite at \$5 per hour, not to exceed \$675, beginning January 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2005.

3-FF Title III B - OAA Program 2005 Home Based Services - Primary Contractor Bid No. 065-04 with A+ NurseTemps, Inc., to provide 135 units of homemaking services to eligible residents beginning January 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2006.

3-GG Transportation Agreement OAA Programs Fund Year 01/01/2005-12/31/2005 with Citrus County Transit to provide for 11,666 units of transportation to eligible residents.

3-II Cooperative Agreement with Humanitarians of Florida, Inc., for the provision of PetMeals to Title III homebound elderly pet owners, beginning January 1, 2005, and continuing until further notice.

3-JJ Public hearings set as follows at the Citrus County Courthouse, 110 North Apopka Avenue in Inverness to consider amendments to the Citrus County Land Development Code (LDC), Ordinance No. 90-14:

| Public Hearing | Date and Time | Application |
|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Workshop | February 8, 2005, at 2:30 P.M. | OA-04-02 (Clark Stillwell) |
| Hearing | March 8, 2005, at 2:00 P.M. | |

3-KK Homecare Options Provided for Everyone Program (H.O.P.E.) January 1, 2005, through December 31, 2005, Rate Agreement with Interim Healthcare to provide

homemaking, personal care, companionship, and respite services to County residents under the CSSD Private Pay Program.

3-LL Staff's request to develop, advertise, and solicit proposals for a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for professional services for updating the Citrus County Utility Master Plan and Rate Study.

3-MM Amendment No. 7 to the Professional Services Agreement with Hoyle, Tanner, & Associates, Inc., to perform the Inverness Airport Business Park Economic Feasibility Study in an amount not to exceed \$18,450.

3-NN Contract with Developing Options for Seniors for the Title III E - Family Caregiver Program 2005 Facility Based Respite Care to provide 28 episodes of service not to exceed \$1,120, beginning January 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2005.

3-OO Proposal from John Rife Building Contractors Corporation for \$20,380 and the corresponding Notice of Commencement for installation of fire escape stairs, a rated exterior door on the second floor for egress, relocation of the existing emergency generator, and an LP gas supply tank to be constructed on a new concrete foundation at Fire Station No. 31 located in Connell Heights, Crystal River.

3-PP Lease Agreement with the Riverhaven Village Property Owners Association, Inc., beginning January 30, 2005, and ending January 30, 2010, for a storage area at the former sewage treatment plant site.

3-QQ Settlement offers and payment of \$95,000 plus attorneys fees of \$14,916 for Parcels 112 and 739 (Jack and Bonnie Crittenden – Shipp Storage, Inc.) for the County Road (CR) 486 Project in accordance with the Mediated Settlement Agreement.

3-RR 2005 Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program on-line application and designation of Deputy Wayne King as the jurisdiction representative with authority to review, approve, transmit the completed application, and approve future payment requests.

3-SS Application for Funding Assistance Florida Department of Law Enforcement Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program for \$19,050.

3-TT Staff's request to develop, advertise, and solicit proposals for a RFQ for professional services for the Inverness Airport Environmental Assessment.

3-UU Bid Committee Report: (1) **Bid No. 047-05, Maintenance Operations Division, HVAC repairs:** awarded to The Trane Company as the lowest aggregate bid; (2) **Bid No. 049-05, HSD, housing replacement:** awarded to Donle Enterprises, Inc., at \$65,000 as the only bidder; (3) **Bid No. 053-05, HSD, home repairs:** awarded RHB 2003-026 to Heath Restoration Contractor, Inc., at the base bid total of \$17,500 and RHB 2003-027 to Donle Enterprises, Inc., at the base bid and alternate No. 1 total of \$17,910 as the lowest bidders; (4) **Bid No. 030-03, CSSD, home delivered and congregate meals:** renewed

the current bid with G.A. Food Service, Inc., under the same terms and condition listed in the bid documents; **(5) Bid Waiver Request, LSD, purchase and installation of carpet:** waived the bid procedures and allowed the Division to utilize Re:Source Florida for the purchase and installation of carpet at the Coastal Region and Lakes Region libraries at \$81,290 for purchase and installation. (1:04 P.M.)

3-M **IMPACT FEE UPDATE**

Mr. Wesch advised that a letter had been received from Clark Stillwell (filed with the Clerk's agenda), requesting that this item be pulled for Board discussion.

Mr. Stillwell, representing the Citrus County Builders Association (CCBA), explained that the Planning and Development Review Board (PDRB) hearing on this subject took six and one-half hours; therefore, he requested that the Board set their hearings with a substantial amount of time or hold a special workshop.

Commissioners concurred that if Mr. Wesch could assure the Board that there would be enough time during the regular scheduled meetings to focus primarily on the impact fee issue, they would prefer to set it as outlined in the agenda summary. Mr. Wesch stated that he would schedule the meetings appropriately.


Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Damato, and carried unanimously, the Board set a public workshop for February 22, 2005, at 2:30 P.M., and a public hearing for March 22, 2005, at 2:00 P.M. at the Citrus County Courthouse, 110 North Apopka Avenue in Inverness to consider amendments to the Impact Fee Ordinance No. 2001-A06 and fee schedule related to transportation, schools, public buildings, and libraries. (1:08 P.M.)


3-HH **EMERGENCY PREVENTION AND READINESS OUTREACH GRANT**


Mr. Wesch requested that this item be pulled due to the Barrier Free Committee, a non-profit organization, also applying for the Emergency Prevention and Readiness Outreach Grant and staff not wanting to compete for the same grant funding. He requested that the item be removed and no action be taken. (1:09 P.M.)

2 **PUBLIC HEARINGS - WORKSHOPS - PERSONS TO APPEAR**

2-A **OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

 Russ Cowper stated that he was a new resident of the County and resided on West Sophia Lane. He spoke about the 2004 Private Road Paving Program (PRPP); specifically, the paving on West Sophia Lane, North Singapore, and West Fox Hollow Court. He advised that the vote taken by the property owners in that area passed by one vote. He outlined the following issues he had with the PRPP:

 In order to get to his property he had to travel across two unpaved County roads (Cedar Hill Street and North Parkwood Avenue).

 A vote form was received in Michigan, which he completed and returned; however, it was not received by the County.

👤 He purchased his property unaware that it had been split into three parcels, and therefore he had to pay three assessments equaling approximately \$40,000 for paving a \$13,000 parcel.

👤 A lien was placed on his property for paving that had not begun and he could not close on his mortgage.

👤 Four neighbors on West Sophia Lane were excluded from the PRPP due to having access from another paved road; however, if they were included they would have voted no and the program would have ended.

👤 He owned another piece of property on the corner of Ranch Hand and Cedar Hill (County maintained roads), that had holes and was not maintained correctly.

He stated that he was not against the idea of paving the roads if everyone was included, the road assessment was calculated by frontage and not per parcel, paving the whole road and the roads leading to his road or paving nothing at all, putting the PRPP on hold until all issues were resolved, and so on.


Chairwoman Phillips stated that Mr. Cowper had brought up several different issues; however, the Board would not be able to address all of them today. She added that the PRPP Administrative Regulation (AR) had been an issue of discussion in the past, and she asked that he leave his name and phone number with Mr. Wesch so that he could be contacted later.


Tom Dick, Assistant Public Works Director, explained that at the July 27, 2004, public hearing the Board removed a portion of West Sophia Lane (between North Cheyenne Avenue and North Parkwood Avenue) from the proposed MSBU. He further explained that during that meeting the property owners to the north of West Sophia Lane (Marianne and Murray Kent) indicated they were the only responding voters and they voted no because their driveways did not face West Sophia Lane. He added that Mr. Battista advised the Board at the time that since the property owners to the south of West Sophia Lane did not respond to the voting petition, eliminating that section of the road would not affect the overall percentage vote.

Mr. Cowper stated that the Kents would have voted no, and if his vote were counted or the neighbor's votes were not eliminated, it would have changed the outcome. He also presented a letter to the Chairwoman (filed with the Clerk's agenda).

The Chairwoman stated that this subject would be discussed again at 1:35 P.M.

👤 Andrew J. Tarpey presented a letter (filed with the Clerk's agenda), a plaque, and a piece of the melted glass and debris from the World Trade Center. He said that this was a reminder of what our public service officers do.

 Thellie Simmons, Jr., read a letter into the record (filed with the Clerk's agenda) and apologized for his actions during a previous Board meeting.

 Mark Hannell expressed concern with taxes being too high, the need to increase impact fees, not wanting a municipal services taxing unit (MSTU), and so on. (1:30 P.M.)

2-B **PROCLAMATION - LIBRARY APPRECIATION MONTH**

Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Fowler, and carried unanimously, the Board approved and authorized all Commissioners to execute a proclamation declaring February 2005 "Library Appreciation Month." (1:31 P.M.)

Flossie Benton Rogers, Library Services Director, thanked the Board for their support of Library Appreciation Month and the Reading Across Citrus One Community, One Book Program. She presented each Commissioner with a book called "Ecology of a Cracker Childhood", so they could be a part of the program. (1:33 P.M.)

2-C **2004 ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Robin Eddinger expressed concerns with the 2004 PRPP, specifically West Sophia Lane, North Singapore Avenue, and West Fox Hollow Court. She explained that she resided on the corner of North Parkwood Avenue and West Sophia Lane, voted against the road being paved, and had expressed her feelings at the first public workshop last year. She requested that the road in front of her house not be paved along with the portion eliminated during the July 27, 2004, meeting. She presented a signed statement from the property owners across from her property who also did not want the road paved (filed with the Clerk's agenda). She suggested that a re-vote be taken if the paving could not be stopped in front of her property, and noted that her neighbors who signed the statement, Mr. Cowper, and she had the only houses on West Sophia Lane and were against paving the road.

Mr. Battista advised that the Board would have the ability to re-address deletions from the 2004 PRPP, and Mr. Wesch added that staff would review, coordinate a meeting with the affected parties, and report to the Board by February 8.

Mr. Battista replied to Mr. Cowper's question regarding the lien on his property by stating that staff would have to review the issue; however, he did not believe the lien could be removed until the Board made a decision on the program.

Chairwoman Phillips requested that staff list all of the ramifications of the problems with the PRPP and bring that information to the Board on February 8. She stated that the AR needed to be re-addressed to make the program better. (1:40 P.M.)

6- **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

6-A **SENIOR HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION**

Mr. Wesch stated that this item dealt with the senior homestead exemption, which was a program available under the Florida Statutes. He advised that the Board had discussed this issue on two previous occasions and had declined to move forward. He

explained that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in consultation with the Property Appraiser's Office provided the exemption worksheet and the analysis of how the program would affect the citizens of the County. He added that the numbers furnished in the backup material was based on the fullest extent of the utilization of the program. He revealed that households with ages 65 and older occupied approximately 6,900 with incomes at or below \$20,000 and owner occupied households at that same income level up to age 64 occupied approximately 4,000 households; however, would not qualify for the exemption due to the age of the occupants.

Chairwoman Phillips thanked staff for bringing forward the information, and stated that her position had not changed because to allow an exemption in one area would transfer the cost of that exemption to another area of the population.

Commissioner Valentino stated that she had told some citizens that she would support a workshop so that the pros and cons of the exemption could be explained in detail to them. Mr. Wesch explained that anyone interested in the information could contact his office and staff would set up a conference. The Chairwoman added that she would also be happy to speak to anyone regarding this issue.

Commissioner Damato stated that there were many young homeowners with an adjusted gross income of less than \$20,000, which had to pay their fair share. He added that in a County with an aging population, the expansion of this program could cause problems to the County's budget in the future. (1:47 P.M.)

2-D **PROCLAMATION - MENTORING MONTH**

Upon motion by Commissioner Fowler, seconded by Commissioner Bartell, and carried unanimously, the Board approved and authorized all Commissioners to execute a proclamation declaring January "Mentoring Month".

The proclamation was presented to Cathy Pearson, CSSD Director, and Diane Cary, Supervisor of Nature Coast Volunteer Center, who made brief comments about the mentoring program. (1:52 P.M.)

6-B **HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS FY 06 REQUEST FORMS**

Mr. Wesch advised that in December 2004, staff received a request from Congresswoman Ginny Brown-Waite to list priority projects that she could seek to acquire on the County's behalf. He stated that staff had completed the House Appropriations FY 06 Request Forms for the following projects (two project request forms were added after the printing of the agenda):

1. Davis Lake Restoration Project
2. Eastside Wastewater (WW) Collection System Project - Phase 1
3. CR 486 Road Widening Project
4. Homosassa WW Collection System Project - Phase 5
5. Tsala Apopka Littoral Shelf Restoration Project
6. Homosassa Southfork Water Quality Improvement Project - Phase 4

7. Standardize and upgrade bunker gear for existing volunteer firefighters
8. Construct a new fire station in the northwest corner of the County
9. Increase funding for National Estuary Program
10. Invasive exotic plant eradication

Mr. Wesch replied to Commissioner Bartell's question regarding criteria by stating the letter received from the congresswoman did not contain a certain criteria to follow. Commissioner Bartell requested that a Stormwater Master Plan be added to the list and the Commissioners concurred.

Upon motion by Commissioner Damato, seconded by Commissioner Valentino, and carried unanimously, the Board approved and authorized staff to transmit to Congresswoman Ginny Brown-Waite the House Appropriations FY06 Request Forms for public service projects within the Fifth Congressional District. (1:55 P.M.)

6-C **SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS**

Mr. Wesch mentioned that on January 11, 2005, the Board directed that special assessment districts be established to provide for funds to match the state grant applications for the following projects:

1. Homosassa Southfork Water Quality Improvement - Phase 4
2. Homosassa Wastewater Collection System - Phase 5 (Spring Cove and Bluewater Forest)
3. Homosassa Wastewater Collection System - Phase 6
4. Homosassa Wastewater Collection System - Phase 4/Chassahowitzka Water Distribution System - Phase 1

Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Fowler, and carried unanimously, the Board (1) approved and authorized the Chairwoman to execute the Notice of Intent to Use Uniform Method of Collecting Non-Ad Valorem Assessments, (2) set a public hearing to be held on February 22, 2005, at 1:35 P.M. at the Citrus County Courthouse, 110 North Apopka Avenue, Inverness to adopt a resolution creating the above referenced assessment districts, and (3) procure the Property Appraiser's and Tax Collector's consent to extend the time to March 1, 2005. (1:57 P.M.)

6-D **CITRUS COUNTY JUDICIAL FACILITY**

Mr. Wesch reported that this item involved the final closeout of the courthouse project. He explained that there had been some outstanding issues with the general contractor (Dooley & Mack Constructors, Inc.), regarding the finalization of the project; as well as, the County's obligation to make final payment or release retainage on the project. He added that there was also an outstanding change order related to elevator construction issues that had been resolved. He advised that an agreement had been reached on all of the outstanding issues regarding the construction of this project and requested approval of the settlement agreement, release the retainage, and Change Order No. 36.

Motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Valentino, to (1) ratify and authorize the Chairwoman to execute a Settlement Agreement to resolve outstanding litigation with Dooley & Mack Constructors, Inc., (2) approve final payment and release of retainage to Dooley & Mack Constructors, Inc., for \$408,046.79, and (3) approve and authorize the Chairwoman to execute Change Order No. 36 at \$10,021.20 for the reallocation of fees associated with the existing west elevators.

Mr. Wesch replied to Commissioner Fowler's question regarding the negotiation by stating that Mr. Dooley and he had negotiated the settlement, that both parties would pay their own legal fees, and that the County's legal fees were approximately \$7,500.

The Chairwoman called a question on the motion and the motion carried unanimously. (2:00 P.M.)

The Chairwoman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 2:16 P.M.

(Clerk's note: technical problem with the sound system was experienced at the beginning of the next item; problem was resolved during Richard Olsen's presentation)

2-E **D-05-01, THE REMINGTON COMPANY FOR BEVERLY HILLS DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT (DRI)**

Gary Maidhof, Department of Development Services (DDS) Director, stated that this application was quasi judicial, and Ms. Slingerland polled the Board for ex parte communications. Chairwoman Phillips stated that she had spoken with Harvey Gerber, representing the Boys and Girls Club, regarding the process. All other Commissioners replied that they had no previous communications.

Jenette B. Collins, AICP, Principal Planner, Community Development Division (CDD), provided the following staff report:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Application Number/Name: | D-05-01 - The Remington Company for 1981 Beverly Hills Development of Regional Impact (DRI) - Notice of Proposed Change (NOPC) |
| Property Data: | Sections 1, 2, 11-15, and 22, Township 18 South, Range 18 East; and Sections 6 and 7, Township 18 South, Range 19 East, more specifically described as the 1981 Beverly Hills DRI. 2,218.0 acres ± |
| Staff/PDRB Recommendation: | Approval, subject to two conditions listed in the backup material |
| Public Hearing: | February 8, 2005 |

She stated that the developer's request did not constitute a substantial deviation pursuant to Chapter 380.06(19), Florida Statutes, and that it involved modification of a land use change on two tracts on the master development plan designated SR8 and SR21 totaling 75.2± acres. She reported that SR8 (58.67 acres) was proposed to change from single family attached (SFA) six units per acre to single family detached (SFD) at three

units per acre, and that SR21 (16.5 acres) was proposed to change from SFA with six units per acre to multifamily low density (MF) at ten units per acre. She mentioned that there would be a decrease of 468 attached units and an increase of 191 detached and 165 multifamily units, which would result in a project wide reduction of 89 dwelling units. She also stated that the proposed changes were compatible with the surrounding existing and proposed housing types. She mentioned that a construction access was discussed during the PDRB hearing and that an interim access would be supported by staff.

She replied to Chairwoman Phillips' question regarding height restriction by stating that currently there was no language in the LDC addressing height; however, staff could address this issue in the future. Chairwoman Phillips stated that she did not want high-rise buildings in a residential area, and Mrs. Collins stated that a condition could be added and brought back at the public hearing.

Mr. Olsen, representing The Remington Company, stated that the developer would agree to a stipulation that the buildings be limited to two stories. He advised that the developer would also coordinate with the Boys and Girls Club on any access needed to go through their property. He mentioned that the developer's intent was to market the project through Forest Ridge Boulevard, and that the focus of the equipment would be behind the Golf Course Club House. He advised that the developer would be agreeable to the best solution regarding construction access.

The Chairwoman opened the public workshop for public comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor.

Mr. Stillwell, representing the Beverly Hills Development Corporation, stated that this was a down zoning and his client was in support of the application. He advised that at the PDRB hearing, Carl Bertoch on behalf of Laurel Ridge Homeowners Association raised the issue of a secondary construction access. He added that his client did not want the secondary construction access to be behind the Twisted Oaks Golf Course Club House, and indicated that there was an unimproved road off CR 491 just north of the golf course, that could be used for that purpose. He mentioned that The Remington Company agreed to using that road and that they would restore any impacts. He advised that the actual agreement would not be signed prior to the public hearing; however, this option would resolve Mr. Bertoch's concerns.

Jane Fricano, president of the Beverly Hills Civic Association, stated that after reviewing the zoning change and preliminary site plans, the association would support the project. She added that the association would help in any way they could to make this project a positive addition to Beverly Hills.

Mr. Gerber, representing the Boys and Girls Club of Citrus County, stated that he had met earlier with Chairwoman Phillips, that he had initiated the conversation when he brought to her attention that they had not received a notice about the project. He advised that they owned the 2.5-acre parcel abutting the project property. He expressed concern with Mrs. Collin's e-mail reply that notices were not sent because the project affected more

than 1,500 acres. He suggested that notices should be mailed no matter how much property was affected, because he was only made aware of the application through reading the Chronicle newspaper. He spoke of his property needing a zoning change, a roadway, a fire hydrant within 1,200 feet, and extra fill, which The Remington Company stated they could possibly assist with during the development of the project. He mentioned that he was supporting The Remington project because they were supporting his project.

Mr. Bertoch, attorney on behalf of Laurel Ridge Community Association, Inc., stated that they were speaking in support of the Beverly Hills DRI modification with one qualification (the construction access). He stated that he believed the developer was approaching in good faith; however, requested that an additional access point be created for use during construction in order to avoid impacts to the Laurel Ridge community and that this request be added as a condition of approval. He also requested that his letter be placed in the record (filed with the Clerk's agenda).

Chairwoman Phillips then asked for anyone wishing to speak in opposition. With no further public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the public workshop. (2:42 P.M.)

2-F OA-04-05, DDS

Mr. Maidhof stated that this was an ordinance amendment based on a past directive to develop standards concerning incinerators. He advised that other items had been incorporated in the ordinance amendment as well.

He reviewed the changes as follows:

- **(Section 4228)** Clear Visibility Triangle - corrected reference from Section 4350 to Section 4348
- **(Section 4229)** Functional Classification Map - deleted North and South Croft Avenue and West Cardinal Street from the Minor Collectors list. Those roadways were previously upgraded to Major Collectors and were already entered within that list
- **(Section 4322)** Types of Buffers - corrected reference from Section 4344 to Section 4350
- **(Section 4421)** Exemptions - deleted language to avoid confusion with the Florida Building Code
- **(Section 4444)** Standards - New section added regarding fences and walls. The PDRB had suggested deleting "H" from this section so that fence variances would go through the normal variance procedures
- **(Section 4698)** Incinerators, Debris Burns, and Burn Pits/Barrels - New section added to describe standards for the establishment and operation of incinerators, debris burns, and burn pits or barrels. The PDRB recommended that the section regarding burn pits/barrels be removed because it was intrusive at the residential level.
- **(Section 5332)** Setbacks - corrected reference of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) to Technical Review Team (TRT)
- Delete Appendix H

Mr. Maidhof stated that he received some suggestions from Ed McLean who represented Don Merritt & Sons, Inc., who recently received a permit from the Florida

Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) to construct an air curtain incinerator (filed with the Clerk's agenda). He advised the Board that the disposal of lot clearing debris and a restoration plan for grandfathered in sand pits would probably be discussed during the public comment section.

The Chairwoman opened the public workshop for public comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor.

Mr. McLean, spoke as a representative of J & K Consultants, and stated that he and John Barnes had reviewed the proposed amendment and agreed that the County needed the ordinance. He suggested the following changes in the text:

1. Section 4698 (5)(A)(2): "An earthen berm and/or opaque fence, either of which must be at least eight feet in height, may be substituted for the vegetative buffer. This pertains to both portable and permanent incinerator(s)." Commissioners and staff concurred.
2. Section 4698 (5)(A)(5): "All access roads to the property site up to the entrance of said property shall be paved. All roads located within the facility shall be stabilized, maintained, and dust controlled. Commissioners and staff concurred.
3. Section 4698 (6)(b)(2) "Only allow disposal of approved combustible organics such as trees and other vegetative matter. Tires, contaminated soils, and construction debris is specifically prohibited from burning. Storage more than ~~30~~ 45 days on site is prohibited." Commissioners and staff concurred.

Morris Harvey expressed concern with Section 4698 (B)(3)(b)(5): minimum setback of 1,000 feet from all residentially committed properties and Section 4698 (B)(3)(b)(6): be located and have a plan of operation that does not adversely affect residential areas as far as noise, vibration, smoke, and odor. Mr. Maidhof stated that the FDEP permit evaluated specifically for adverse effect, and the public could be involved through the conditional use process. He added that code enforcement action would be taken if the FDEP found violations on a routine basis; however, if the FDEP found the facility in compliance, but residents registered complaints, staff would investigate. Mr. Harvey complained that the FDEP inspectors were not in Citrus County often enough and the FDEP did not address noise in their permit, which was a major concern. He suggested that the earthen berm be designed to direct noise away from the neighbors. Mr. Maidhof mentioned that there were noise criteria within the LDC and that an ordinance amendment would be presented to the Board soon that would expand the noise standards and enforcement ability. He said that he would not recommend establishing specific noise standards in this amendment that would differ from the noise standards in the LDC. He addressed the earthen berm issue by stating that the design of an earthen berm to deter noise was a focused field and staff could possibly obtain guidance from the FDEP. He added that most counties were in a similar situation as Citrus County because they had no regulations and that was why staff used the construction and demolition criteria. He mentioned that there had been no discussions with the Sheriff's Office about assisting staff with complaint investigations. Ms. Slingerland added that her only discussion with the Sheriff's staff involved them assisting County staff in enforcing the noise ordinance after

Code Enforcement hours. She advised that staff was restructuring the noise ordinance to make it more enforceable.

Mr. Barnes, J & K Consultants, stated that he was pleased that something was being done with the landfill problem by filling the burrow pits and addressing the incinerator issues.

The Chairwoman then asked for anyone in opposition.

Jeff Carpino stated that currently there were no health standards for residents living near an incinerator. Chairwoman Phillips agreed with Mr. Carpino and stated that this amendment was an effort to put standards in place to protect citizens from adverse impacts. Mr. Maidhof explained that an application for an incinerator would go through the conditional use process, which meant there would be a public hearing before the PDRB, there would be public notifications to all property owners within 500 feet of the property boundary, public input would be allowed at the public hearing, conditions could be put in place to possibly mitigate impacts, and if someone still objected they could seek recourse through the court system.

With no further public input, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the public hearing.

Mr. Maidhof asked if the Commissioners would like staff to develop standards specific to lot clearing debris with burial disposal. He added that the criteria could be tied to the Extractive Land Use District so burial would occur only in the old burrow pits. He advised that if criteria were adopted, standards would be in place and those older properties could be brought back to a productive use (pasture or some other passive use). Commissioners concurred as long as the burrow pit had not breached the aquifer.(3:26 P.M.)

The Chairwoman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 3:40 P.M.

2-G **NABORS, GIBLIN & NICKERSON, P.A. - PRESENTATION**

Mr. Wesch stated that this presentation was in response to previous Board direction to contract with the law firm of Nabors, Giblin & Nickerson, P.A. (NGN), who retained Government Services Group, Inc. (GSG), to perform a funding analysis and study of the following: **(1)** services provided by the Public Safety Department, determine those services that could be funded from sources other than taxes, and develop a scope of services as to the implementation cost; and **(2)** perform a cost allocation study of law enforcement services provided by the Sheriff's Office to determine services appropriated to be funded countywide and law enforcement services appropriated to be funded by MSTU within the unincorporated areas and within municipal areas (cities) by agreement. He introduced Camille Tharpe with GSG and Robert Nabors with NGN who would provide the results of the study.

Ms. Tharpe gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Citrus County Public Safety Funding Study including the Citrus County Sheriff MSTU Program" (filed with the Clerk's

agenda). She began with the Sheriff MSTU Study and stated that a proposed methodology was developed to fund law enforcement services countywide through the General Fund and MSTU revenue, and to allocate costs commensurate with benefits to the geographic areas. She added that services were concentrated on the unincorporated area because it would be an easier MSTU to implement; however, the cities could be included by consent and ordinance.

She presented the Sheriff MSTU Report findings as follows:

- All taxpayers pay for a base level of service
- Services that benefit the entire County would be paid from the General Fund
- Services that provide benefit to unincorporated areas paid from the MSTU
- Cost allocation should be used to distribute internal and external cost
- Contract pricing should include indirect costs

She explained in detail the Sheriff MSTU allocation methodology, the base level of service factors, and the results of allocation methodology based on the 2004-2005 total budget of \$22,559,497, less other revenues. She stated that the base level allocation of \$1,165,388 should be allocated to the General Fund, \$10,522,406 should be allocated to the General Fund for direct services countywide, and that the MSTU allocation would be \$9,476,912. She also stated that the study determined that the General Fund would fund approximately 55 percent and the MSTU would fund about 45 percent of the Sheriff's budget, which would change annually based on new factors and new information.

She detailed the MSTU millage rate calculations, and specified that ten mills was the maximum amount allowed in the unincorporated area for municipal purposes. She described the MSTU implementation schedule from submittal of the Sheriff's budget by June 1, 2005, through mailing of tax bills in November 2005. She mentioned that the deadline for adoption of an MSTU ordinance would be July 1, 2005, and that the process would occur each year.

She then proceeded with the Public Safety Funding Study that was performed by profiling services by division or office, identifying current and potential future funding sources, and implementation steps. She portrayed the study results and complimented the County for utilizing user fees in all areas, but cautioned that those fees should be updated annually to make certain they were paying for the costs of services. She recommended the ability to use non ad valorem assessments (special assessments, MSBUs) to fund fire protection services. She explained that the legal requirements for a valid special assessment were that the service or facility chosen to fund through the assessment had to provide special benefit to property (fire services met that requirement), and that rates charged must be fair and reasonably apportioned among the properties. She reported that operating and capital costs could be funded with a fire services special assessment and that special assessment revenues could be pledged for debt.

She proposed that the City of Inverness (consent required by the city) and the Beverly Hills MSBU be included within the County's MSBU. She described the typical

procedures and schedule for the Public Safety MSBU, and specified the five steps involved in the MSBU process, the first being the adoption of a resolution of intent. She advised that the Board could decide after the proforma assessment rates, final assessment report, or at the final assessment hearing whether to move forward with the program. She requested that the Board authorize advertisement for a resolution of intent, and recommended implementation of an MSTU for the Sheriff's Office for unincorporated areas only, and to develop a non ad valorem assessment program for the Fire Services Division; however, not implement MSTUs for Animal Control, Code Enforcement, and Emergency Medical Services this year.

Mr. Nabors informed that the study involved an assessment of the tools available to fund public safety services other than countywide taxes. He mentioned that the user fees could be updated and increased to lessen the depletion of the General Fund; however, the two recommendations focused on the Sheriff's operations and fire rescue. He stated that the ability to perform non ad valorem assessments (MSBU) for fire rescue would set in place the capability for a user charge to pay for some of the fire rescue operations. He advised that an MSTU was a tax levied less than countywide in a geographic area, and that the study determined it would be fair to fund part of the Sheriff's services in the unincorporated area rather than countywide. He mentioned that many urban counties created Sheriff MSTUs as an equity tool and for accountability reasons. He remarked that the creation of an MSTU would not imply that the Board must use an MSTU; however, state law required that steps be taken by date certain in order to have the funding mechanism in place. He added that the study viewed the public safety function, how it was delivered in Citrus County, the legal requirements, and potential tools available to this Board for making a budget decision next year and in future years.

Chairwoman Phillips clarified that the deadline for the MSBU (Fire Services) was March 1; however, the deadline for the MSTU (Sheriff) was July 1; therefore, the Board did not have to take action today.

Mr. Nabors confirmed Commissioner Fowler's statement that the Board would still have the authority over the MSTU or MSBU process. He stated that the Sheriff would make the request, the Board would appropriate the money, and this option would give the Board the ability to decide if part of the budget would be more appropriately funded in the unincorporated areas.

Ms. Tharpe mentioned that at least 15 counties in the state, including Alachua, Pinellas, and Marion Counties used separate law enforcement MSTUs, and that every surrounding county used special assessments to fund all or part of their fire services (Sumter, Levy, Gilchrist, Marion, and Lake) to diversify revenue sources.

Discussion ensued regarding the ten mill capacity for municipal purposes in unincorporated areas, law enforcement services could not be funded by MSBUs, shifting part of the cost of law enforcement services to the unincorporated areas, and so on.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fowler to authorize advertisement of the intent to fund a municipal services taxing unit (law enforcement) and a municipal services benefit unit (fire services). Motion failed for lack of a second.

Commissioner Fowler remarked that he was mystified no one seconded his motion just to advertise that the Board might seek an additional funding method for law enforcement and fire services. He stated that the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) had needed expansion for a long time, and he thought the Board would have been more vigilant about this matter after the state suffered from three hurricanes last summer. He mentioned that his position about the Sheriff's budget had always been that his budget should not exceed the percentage of increase of taxable value in the County, and that roads, parks, libraries, and other projects also made a community; however, those things could not be enjoyed unless the community was safe. He stated that it would cost more to live in Citrus County in the future, and it would be a disservice to the people if this Board did nothing and passed the issue on to a future Board. He commended the Sheriff for the support shown him today (Sheriff's employees in the audience) and for protecting the future of law enforcement. He added that he hoped this Board would find the courage to fund the vital services.

Chairwoman Phillips stated that this Board had chosen not to use the tool reported and recommended by Mr. Nabors today, and that the Board would find the funds in the budget to fund every operation and need in the County. She agreed that the EOC building was too small and that \$325,000 was reserved for planning and designing the EOC building. She declared that this Board was not ignoring the needs of public safety or fire services, but was investigating available revenue options.

Commissioner Bartell stated that he was committed to law enforcement, and did not ever recall voting against the Sheriff's budget, but this item today was to review a funding mechanism for law enforcement and fire services. He also stated that he believed there were other funding mechanisms, and that there were other locations that had not been explored; for instance, the old Brown School (Citrus County Resource Center/VA Clinic) that might be used as an auxiliary EOC. He specified that he was not ready to spend taxpayers' dollars over the ten-mill cap for any project.

Commissioner Valentino concurred with Commissioners Phillips and Bartell and spoke against the MSTU funding method. She said that she recognized the need for additional space for the EOC, and indicated that the Board would provide funding. She mentioned that the Board would soon be reviewing and implementing impact fees, and she was disappointed that emergency services were not included in the impact fee study. She remarked that although the EOC space was inadequate, she was not sure that a new 27,000 square foot building was needed and that relocation was another option.

Commissioner Damato mentioned that he would like to examine how increased revenues and impact fees due to the tremendous growth in the County would affect the Sheriff's services funding. He emphasized that the EOC required expansion and that he was a proponent of expanding the facility on the existing site.

Commissioner Fowler elucidated that his motion was not to levy taxes or fees on anyone, only to place an advertisement in the newspaper as legally required to make the funding method possible. He mentioned that this Board was committed to providing central water and sewer in the environmentally sensitive areas, and that MSBUs would be required to make that happen. He questioned where the Board would find the courage to fund those services, law enforcement, and fire services if they would not vote just to advertise the possibility of an MSBU.

Sheriff Jeff Dawsy stated that his responsibility was to report the eminent and pressing issues of salaries, personnel, and retirement cost of \$750,000 or more that would be facing the Commissioners in the Sheriff's budget this year. He advised that he was minimizing aviation by replacing the existing obsolete helicopters with one good helicopter and a backup helicopter. He addressed the Commissioners' comments as follows: impact fees for law enforcement would not be studied and completed until 2006 (corroborated by Mr. Wesch); 27,000 square feet was the total space needed for the Sheriff's operations, and 15,000 was for the EOC; decision makers (administration) should not strategically be located away from communications, and the Brown School was not designed for a category 3 hurricane. He mentioned that funds were reserved in the budget for architect design, and requested a commitment from the Board to direct staff to begin the architect design of the EOC and to build next year.

Chairwoman Phillips responded by stating that she did not have a problem exploring the options of either expanding the EOC on the current site or another location; however, she did not want to direct staff to begin planning and designing. She specified that she was willing to direct Mr. Wesch to meet with the Sheriff, discuss his needs and explore options for location, design, architect, and building, and then present that information to the Board for a decision on moving forward with the plans.

Mr. Wesch responded to Sheriff Dawsy's request for a timeline by stating that because it would affect this year's budget, a plan would need to be in place at least by June, so the Board would be aware of the potential budget implications on the General Fund.

Discussion continued concerning working together by exploring locations and other methods of funding the space needs, such as expansion, impact fees, or borrowing money; the issue not being a debate about the Sheriff's needs, but how to fund those needs; an MSTU would create a burden to the taxpayers by extending the ad valorem taxes another ten mills; moving forward with the architect design and recommendations; making sure the Sheriff and all constitutional officers received necessary revenue and resources to fulfill their duties; living within the Board's budget, using new revenue; and so on.

Sheriff Dawsy reiterated that his responsibility was to inform the Board of public safety issues and that it was the Board's responsibility to find funding. He insisted that the Board make a commitment today.

Chairwoman Phillips replied that the Sheriff should have received a letter from the OMB asking for capital improvements and other needs for his budget for this year, which would be included in the CIP (Capital Improvement Program). She added that she would be happy to discuss the situation with the Sheriff and Mr. Wesch to determine the exact space needs, and then bring the request back to the Board.

Commissioner Fowler talked about the Board voting unanimously at either the CIP or the budget workshop to set aside money for fire services and the Sheriff's space needs, which included a notation that the money would be paid back through an MSBU or MSTU.

Chairwoman Phillips explained that Commissioner Fowler was referring to the workshop for the CIP when the Board discussed the possibilities of paying for fire services and the EOC building through an MSBU or MSTU. She stated that the notation did not obligate the Board to utilize that mechanism, and today the Board had determined not to use that tool for funding those services. She added that the problem of adopting the resolution of intent to advertise for an MSBU and MSTU today was because the Board might change their mind in September. She added that the Board could construct the EOC building by borrowing money or pledging other revenue sources.

Commissioner Fowler emphasized that the Board was not required to use the MSTU and MSBU methods for funding; however, if the Board failed to act today simply to advertise for the resolution of intent, and decided in September that there was no other way to fund those services except with an MSBU and MSTU, the opportunity would be lost.

Mr. Wesch verified Chairwoman Phillips' statement that there was \$5 million in the CIP for fiscal year 2005-06 for construction of the Sheriff's space needs, and that the Board had adequate debt capacity to borrow the funds to construct the building.

Sheriff Dawsy repeated that he wanted a timeline from the Board, requested that staff work with him within 45-60 days to explore the alternatives, and asked that a Commissioner be assigned as a direct contact through the process of developing a timeline and hiring an architect in the near future.

Chairwoman Phillips replied that she would take the lead in the process and that within one week Mr. Wesch and she would establish a timeline. She confirmed that the Sheriff would be involved in the process before alternatives were presented to the Board for a decision.

Sheriff Dawsy also requested that the architect be hired this budget year. The Commissioners concurred, and the Chairwoman assured the Sheriff that the \$325,000 set aside for hiring the architect would be done by September 30, 2005. Short discussion followed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fowler and seconded by Commissioner Damato, that the Board commit to hiring an architect for the design and planning of a building for the Sheriff's space needs by September 30, 2005.

Jim McIntosh pointed out that in June 2001, former Commissioner Batchelor mentioned that there was space for expansion at the present location in Lecanto at \$9.5 million, and that the Board denied an MSTU in 2003. He suggested that the Board could make a more objective decision on the EOC building if the EOC director was under the Board's authority rather than the Sheriff's Office.

Sheriff Dawsy explained to Commissioner Valentino that information regarding additional employees would be in the budget; however, it would be 18 months to 1 1/2 years after an architect was hired before occupancy would take place.

Mr. Wesch clarified that the CIP item Chairwoman Phillips, Sheriff Dawsy, and he would be reviewing alternatives for was the following: "*Design and construct a 25,000 square foot Sheriff's administration building and an associated 20,000 square foot Sheriff's vehicle maintenance facility to be located on Sovereign Path in Lecanto....This project to be funded by a Public Safety MSBU/MSTU*". Chairwoman Phillips confirmed that Mr. Wesch was correct.

The Chairwoman called a question on the motion and the motion carried unanimously. (4:53 P.M.)

| |
|--|
| The Chairwoman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 5:11 P.M. |
|--|

2-H **BICYCLE HELMET LAW**

Mr. Battista advised that this public hearing was authorized by the Board two weeks ago regarding repeal of the current exemption from the Bicycle Helmet Law that required those younger than 16 years of age to wear a helmet while operating a bicycle on county or state roads. He stated that Citrus County was currently exempt from the enforcement of that statute due to a provision within the County's ordinance.

The Chairwoman opened the public workshop for public comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition.

Dan Montgomery, a Citrus County physician, spoke in opposition to enforcing the Bicycle Helmet Law. Although he agreed that helmets were a good idea, he questioned if there was a health problem that required government regulation. He listed some of the reasons he thought this law was not necessary, such as bicycle riding was relatively safe, helmet laws decreased bicycle riders by 20 to 30 percent, the majority of states did not require bicycle helmet use, and the most compelling reason; freedom of choice would be denied.

Dave Conant and Mr. McIntosh also spoke in opposition.

With no further public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the public workshop.

Commissioner Fowler thanked Dr. Montgomery, Mr. Conant, and Mr. McIntosh for their comments, and stated that when this issue was first presented to the Board, he was happy that Citrus County was the first to opt out of the law. He mentioned that one person (Dr. Robert L. Brockett) recently appeared before this Board in favor of the law, and now the Board was prepared to impose it on the citizens. He expressed concern for young children who would be approached by a police officer for not wearing a helmet, and questioned the scientific evidence that proved children over the age of 16 did not need the protection of a bicycle helmet. He added that this law passed in the state legislature only because it was made optional to counties, and he hoped the Board would decline this law again today.

Commissioner Valentino stated that she appreciated the comments made by the opposition; however, she voted for the preparation of this ordinance, not due to Dr. Brockett, but because of the population growth and concern for the protection of the children.

Chairwoman Phillips commented that she thought it was the parents' responsibility to make certain their children were safe; however, she was in favor of the law because of a comment made to her by a mother, who said parents could use the reinforcement by telling their children wearing a bicycle helmet was the law.

A motion was made by Commissioner Bartell and seconded by Commissioner Damato, to adopt and authorize the Chairwoman to execute an ordinance deleting Section 98-1 of the Citrus County Code titled "Exemption from Bicycle Helmet Law"; providing for severability; providing for inclusion in the Code; and providing for an effective date.

Commissioner Bartell stated that he supported the bicycle law in order to give more support to parents; however, he questioned the enforcement and said he did not want young children arrested. Mr. Battista advised that the Board could not modify the statute, but there was always discretion on the part of law enforcement. He suggested that perhaps the Sheriff could develop an educational program, and the Board could make the ordinance effective two months from now to allow notice of an education program and time to purchase the helmets.

Discussion followed regarding the upsetting experience of a young child being arrested by a police officer while riding a bicycle, the legislature failing to make the law statewide rather than giving counties the option, changing the effective date of the ordinance, safety concerns, and so on.

The Chairwoman asked that this item be continued and scheduled for the next Board meeting in order to receive answers to the questions.

Commissioner Fowler mentioned that bicycle safety education was already included in the Sheriff's budget, and this ordinance was not needed for the deputies to educate the children about bicycle safety.

Commissioner Bartell withdrew his motion, and Commissioner Damato withdrew his second.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fowler and seconded by Commissioner Bartell, to continue this item until February 8, 2005, at 1:30 P.M.

Chairwoman Phillips assured Mr. Conant that the hearing was only being continued, and the public would be allowed to express opinions on the issue again February 8.

The Chairwoman called a question on the motion and the motion carried unanimously. (5:37 P.M.)

2-1 ***OA-05-01, DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES***

Mr. Maidhof advised that this was an ordinance amendment, specifically the "Design Standards for Small Non-Residential Development Projects". He pointed out that the public hearing was scheduled for February 22; however, the Board had previously directed staff to keep that date clear due to the workshop for impact fees. Chairwoman Phillips requested that the public hearing be scheduled for another date.

Kevin A. Smith, AICP, CDD, Assistant Director, reported that the amendment was enhanced commercial design standards for non-residential development, and a follow-up to the recently adopted big box ordinance in the LDC, setting forth appearance standards for construction of buildings, design of landscaping, and so forth. He stated that the application was for projects less than 25,000 square feet and would not apply to agricultural or industrial development, and included standards for pedestrian friendly features, guidelines for lighting and landscaping, and screening of mechanical equipment and dumpsters. He advised that staff recommended approval, and that the PDRB recommended approval with reservations, specifically stating that the proposal was premature and overreaching and should be more limited in scope.

Margaret Beake, AIA, AICP, Senior Planner, CDD, provided a slide presentation (included in the backup material) detailing the purpose, application standards, additional development standards, facades, pedestrian circulation, parking, landscaping, exterior lighting, and outdoor storage/screening.

Mr. Smith responded to Commissioner Bartell's comment about the amendment being very subjective to staff's opinion, and his question of making the criteria more specific by stating that any of the standards could be made more exact and more detailed in the requirements. He added that this draft ordinance was an effort to be less congruent with the big box standards and was similar to the same type of project standards set by Hernando County.

Commissioner Fowler agreed with Commissioner Bartell and with the PDRB who reluctantly recommended approval because the amendment was too broad and too intrusive for someone trying to develop a small project.

Commissioner Damato commented that the amendment would ensure that as the County grew; it would mirror the nature-based community, and that the Board could demand the best from the development community with enhanced building facades properly planned to mirror our native environment and lifestyle. He stated that the standards would become a playbook for future commercial growth and without them the County would become overcrowded, unsightly, and under regulated commercial sprawl. He urged the Board to approve the ordinance.

The Chairwoman opened the public workshop for public comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition.

Mr. Stillwell, representing the CCBA agreed with Commissioner Damato that development standards needed to be upgraded; however, the standards should not be detrimental to smaller businesses. He expressed concerns and offered suggestions as follows:

- Phased commercial projects built with different standards could be more aesthetically displeasing
- Add Mining District to the exemption category
- Include an option for using a landscape planning schedule to mitigate walls
- Prohibition of metal walls on facades should be modified
- Rear parking at the proposed standard encouraged higher impervious surface ratio and increased storm water drainage and drainage retention areas (DRA)
- Use a professional landscape planning standard in lieu of buffers
- Technical error in the ordinance: should read "the latter code shall prevail"
- Three foot overhang walls was more than the statewide building code standard
- Wood fences allowed flow of air and were as aesthetically pleasing as masonry walls
- How would this ordinance correspond with the statewide building permit
- Staff's discretion on the standards could be a legal problem
- Plan for new products and building techniques
- An exemption or different standards for small projects (less than 10,000 square feet)

He concluded by stating that the CCBA was not against the amendment, but thought it should be more objective and focus on better planning of the standards. Commissioner Bartell concurred and said the amendment had merit, but required more work.

Mr. Dixon explained that building permits were subject to building code regulations and site permits were subject to the LDC standards. He said that typically, an applicant would obtain a copy of the LDC and then produce a plan to meet only minimum standards; however, this ordinance would focus on projects that did not fit into the big box ordinance. He mentioned that the "gray area" was necessary to keep developments from looking the same and to create high standards. He stated that this concept would require

a change in the mindset of those working on this type of project from a design and construction standpoint. He also stated that the ordinance would allow staff to become more involved in the appearance of the community and would provide many options and alternatives to builders, developers, and commercial users. He reported two other ordinances staff would be presenting to the Board; design standards for the interchange management areas for the Suncoast Parkway and the Homosassa Redevelopment Plan and overlay zone. He added that staff could raise the proposed standards to include more landscaping if the Board desired.

Randy Clark with Clark Construction agreed that this was a step in the right direction, but that he could not design a building by this proposed ordinance because it was based on the opinions of staff. He stated that there were a few unpleasant looking buildings, but there were many nicely constructed buildings in this County that would not meet the standards as proposed in this ordinance; for example, the school board building. He specified that this ordinance did not allow for future building materials, eliminated the use of granite on the outside of buildings, and had many restrictions, such as boxing in dumpsters even if they were placed out of site. He was fearful that the Board would approve this ordinance because the PDRB had passed it on to them for a decision, and suggested that more effort was needed on this amendment with less subjectivity. He expressed frustration because those who build projects correctly were being penalized, the increased costs to builders and businesses, and that some would cross County lines to build their businesses cheaper.

Chairwoman Phillips left the room briefly, and First Vice-Chairman Bartell asked if anyone else wished to speak in opposition. There was no further public comment.

Commissioner Damato pointed out that it would be better to construct an enhanced facade rather than landscaping, which would require constant maintenance, overhangs were code regulations, and wood fences around dumpsters would deteriorate after years. He stated that when developers of national chains come to Citrus County, they build facades to the lowest level of standards because this County does not have standards in the LDC. He compared the difference in the pleasant appearance of the new Lowes in Inverness to the Home Depot in Crystal River, and stated that people moving here would demand higher standards.

Mr. Dixon responded to questions from Commissioners Damato and Bartell as follows: commercial developers inquire about County standards, but build to the minimum standards; with the recommended approach, there would be a variety of different types of projects that would meet the standards; the implementation of this ordinance would be more staff intensive and would add cost to the development; and staff was prepared to implement the standards.

Mr. Maidhof added that the CDD, not the Building Division, would oversee the implementation. He explained that paragraph three of the proposed ordinance amendment provided flexibility that would allow options and negotiation between applicants and staff providing the intent of the standard was met. He mentioned that

adopting the ordinance would give the County a higher level of standards, but that some people could not afford to build to the standards.

Discussion ensued regarding the subjectivity, the question of developers obtaining statewide building permits and not building to County standards, the costs involved, maintaining flexibility and developing more building designs, issues of negotiation, and so on.

Mr. Maidhof suggested that the Board direct staff to either **(1)** make appropriate adjustments, **(2)** give staff direction on the proposed document and staff would present a modified ordinance at the final public hearing, or **(3)** allow staff to move forward with the ordinance as written. He requested that the CCBA provide specific concerns to be addressed at the public hearing. He added that Mr. Stillwell was correct that there would be those, usually the larger retailers, who would pay the higher cost of obtaining a state building permit.

Brief discussion followed regarding problems associated with pre-applications, designing better and more attractive buildings, the need for standards, being more specific in some areas of the ordinance, and so on.

Mr. Maidhof recommended that the Board schedule another public workshop for this item on March 8, during which, the CCBA or other interested parties could provide specific comments and suggestions, which staff would include in the backup material for Board discussion and consideration. He added that staff would then schedule the public hearing in April for final adoption of the ordinance.

He replied to Commissioner Bartell's question concerning a solution to the statewide building permit by stating that essentially there was a conflict of statutes, one under the authority of the LDC and one under the building code. He advised that when a statewide building permit was submitted, if the site design work satisfied the standards of the LDC, a compromise could be negotiated between staff and the applicant. If not, he indicated the matter might evolve into litigation, and a building permit would not be issued until there was a court order.

Chairwoman Phillips stated that the Board would follow Mr. Maidhof's suggestion. Mr. Maidhof then announced that the public hearing scheduled for February 22 was cancelled and the workshop would be extended to March 8. (6:42 P.M.)

2-J **OA-05-02, DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

Mr. Smith reported that this was an amendment to the LDC to establish standards for the Coastal and Lakes Commercial (CLC), Mobile Home Park (MHP), and Recreation Vehicle Park (RVP) classifications and to eliminate the Mixed Use District (MXU). He advised that the land use categories were adopted into the Comprehensive Plan (COMP) in August 2004. He detailed the allowable uses of each land use category, and stated that staff and the PDRB recommended approval.

The Chairwoman opened the public workshop for public comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition. With no public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the public workshop.

Mr. Maidhof mentioned that appendix G was not amended in this text because staff was currently finalizing a complete revision of appendix G. He stated that the final public hearing for this item was scheduled for February 8. (6:48 P.M.)

Commissioner Fowler left the meeting.

2-K 2005 SMALL SCALE CYCLE ONE AMENDMENTS

Mr. Maidhof stated that the following applications were COMP amendments and the public hearings were scheduled for February 22 at 5:01 P.M.; however, due to the impact fee workshop scheduled for the same date, he suggested moving the public hearings for both amendments to March 8 at 5:01 P.M.

He advised that the applications were quasi judicial, and Ms. Slingerland polled the Board for ex parte communications. Commissioners Bartell, Damato, Phillips, and Valentino replied that they had no previous communications regarding the applications.

2-K.1 CPA/AA-05-03, EYSTER FOR CITRUS RECREATIONAL MARINA

Mr. Smith presented the following staff report:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Application Number/Name: | CPA/AA-05-03, James Eyster for Citrus Recreational Marina |
| Land Use: | Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM): From Industrial District (IND) and Low Intensity Coastal & Lakes (CL) to RVP LDC Atlas: From IND to RVP |
| Property Data: | 10173 North Suncoast Boulevard (US 19), or a portion of Parcel 23000 in the SW 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Sections 11 and the NW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 14, Township 17 South, Range 16 East, lying on the east side of US 19 about 1/4 mile south of the Cross Florida Barge Canal Approximately 9.1 acres of a 42.2 acre parcel |
| Staff/PDRB Recommendation: | Approval |
| Proposed Project: | Allow for expansion of the Nature Coast Landings Campground |

Mr. Smith stated that staff found the application consistent with the applicable policies of the COMP and no concurrency issues had been identified.

Mr. Eyster mentioned that this application was almost identical to two prior applications the Board had reviewed.

The Chairwoman opened the public workshop for public comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition. With no public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the public workshop.

Mr. Maidhof advised that staff would pay the cost of re-advertising the public hearings for both 2005 Small Scale Cycle One amendments. (6:50 P.M.)

2-K.2 CPA/AA-05-04, CALDWELL FOR JOHNSON

Sue Farnsworth, Environmental Planner, CDD, gave the staff report as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Application Number/Name: | CPA/AA-05-04, Randy Caldwell for Dan Johnson |
| Land Use: | GFLUM: From Low Density Residential District (LDR) to General Commercial District (GNC) LDC Atlas: From LDR to GNC with a Planned Development Overlay (PDO) |
| Property Data: | Section 15, Township 19 South, Range 17 East, a portion of Parcel B of MSP-00-11 (out of 41200), known as 2219 South Suncoast Boulevard, Homosassa Springs area Approximately 9.9 acres |
| Staff/PDRB Recommendation: | Approval with 11 conditions as listed in the staff report |
| Proposed Project: | Automobile dealership with four individual dealerships within |

Ms. Farnsworth stated that this project was similar to one submitted by the same owner last year without a PDO, which was denied by the Board; however, this application included a PDO. She mentioned that staff would correct a few errors in the staff report. She also stated that the proposed PDO had been modified several times, and the applicant had made great progress in addressing the concerns of staff and the public. She further stated that this application was close to meeting the big box standards, that the front portion was zoned GNC, and the rear portion zoned LDR would be used for drainage. She said that the PDO proposed five buildings totaling 80,400 square feet, the front four for the individual dealerships with repair shops in the rear, and sales and display in the front of the buildings. She advised that a building toward the upper rear of the property was proposed for a future body shop serving all four dealerships, and an outdoor storage yard was being proposed as an area to store cars.

She commented that neighbors were very vocal and expressed concerns of noise, lights, traffic on Longfellow Street, the view, property values, loss of natural space and wildlife, and potential crime. She reported that the applicant had addressed as many issues as possible, and there were recommended conditions addressing most of those concerns, specifically not using an outdoor PA (power amplifier) system as well as a landscape berm along the southern edge of the property that abutted residential houses.

Mr. Caldwell stated that Mr. Johnson and he had worked diligently with Ms. Farnsworth on the project, and that all concerns of citizens in the area had been addressed. He distributed additional information on the proposed floor plan and elevation (filed with the Clerk's agenda).

Commissioner Fowler returned to the meeting.

Wayne Walker with Crystal Engineering spoke regarding the design site plan, and pointed out that a number of concessions had been made and that the applicant had met the big box standards on units less than the big box projects. He stated that the applicant recognized the existing residential areas adjacent to the area, and had widened the buffers and increased plantings within, added landscape berms, positioned lighting so it would not shine off site in the evenings, and eliminated an external PA system. He further stated that this project would not be a typical car sales lot, that the owner wanted something special, and that this would be an exemplary automobile dealership when constructed. He advised that the final design of the DRA was not completed, but it would be an open pond design with a landscaping buffer in the rear. He pointed out that the project met the community standards and demands of staff, and he hoped it would be an asset to the community and accepted well by the neighbors. He added that perhaps this project could become a criterion for some of the small box standards previously discussed.

Chairwoman Phillips complimented the applicant on the impressive landscaping.

Mr. Walker answered Commissioner Bartell's questions as follows: Mr. Johnson still owned two lots on Longfellow Street; the existing earthen berm would remain; lower level directional lighting would be used in the exterior parking lot; and the east side of the property would be used for a DRA.

He clarified for Commissioner Damato that the front four buildings would accommodate separate dealerships that currently were in different locations around Crystal River; the four buildings would not be identical due to the requirements of each dealership, but architecturally they would blend together nicely; the future body shop would be conducive to all four dealerships; and the storage facility would be paved.

The Chairwoman opened the public workshop for public comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition.

Valerie Reynolds spoke in opposition because her home on West Longfellow Street was adjacent to the proposed "auto mall" with only a 30-foot buffer. She expressed concern about the construction, noise, lights, and traffic. She stated that the other six property owners on West Longfellow Street would be dramatically affected. She complimented the applicant's efforts to make an attractive place of business; however, she stated that living so close to an "auto mall" was not easy to accept.

Ms. Farnsworth confirmed for Commissioner Bartell that Ms. Reynolds property adjoined GNC zoned property, so any project designated GNC could be developed.

With no further public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the public workshop.

Mr. Maidhof announced that both of the applications would be heard on March 8 at 5:01 P.M., and stated that in view of the Board's admiration of the attractive design, staff could incorporate some of those items into car lot standards for a future ordinance amendment.

Mr. Dixon explained that because the project had a combined square footage of over 25,000 square feet, the big box standards were used; however, if it had been under 25,000, the ordinance for enhanced commercial standards would have applied. He further explained that the big box standards applied only to retail, and small commercial businesses would apply to any commercial use.

Chairwoman Phillips stated that she thought standards should be in place that required appropriate buffering between the developments of commercial property next to residential property.

Commissioner Damato remarked that this discussion reinforced his opinion that standards do work and would work on smaller projects as well, and that most people in the community would accept those standards.

Mr. Caldwell was concerned about time constraints on construction, and requested that the public hearing be held as originally scheduled on February 22.

After discussing the options, the Board decided that if the impact fee workshop scheduled for February 8 at 2:30 P.M. had not concluded by 5:00 P.M., the Board would table further discussion until after the public hearing for this application. Mr. Maidhof affirmed that he would also contact Mr. Eyster and offer him a choice of either February 8 or March 8 for the public hearing on his application (CPA/AA-05-03). (7:21 P.M.)

7- **COMMISSIONER VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN**

7-A **HISTORICAL RESOURCES ADVISORY BOARD**

The Chairwoman announced a vacancy for a Member-at-Large position on the Historical Resources Advisory Board for a term that would expire on September 30, 2005.

Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Fowler, and carried unanimously, the Board accepted with regret the resignation of Marilyn Jordan from the Historical Resources Advisory Board.

7-B **SPECIAL LIBRARY DISTRICT ADVISORY BOARD**

Commissioner Bartell nominated Ron Drinkhouse to fill a Regular Member position on the Special Library District Advisory Board for a term that would expire on September 30, 2006.

Upon motion by Commissioner Phillips, seconded by Commissioner Fowler, and carried unanimously, the Board ceased nominations. (7:23 P.M.)

13- **ANY OTHER COUNTY BUSINESS - ACCEPTED BY MOTION ONLY**

13-A **GOSPEL ISLAND BRIDGE**

Commissioner Fowler informed the Board that he had sent a letter to the DOT (Department of Transportation) requesting that they raise the Gospel Island Bridge when they replaced it so people could travel by boat from one end of the Tsala Apopka Chain of Lakes to the other. He stated that the DOT advised that they would elevate the bridge a foot and a half, which was not high enough, and that it would require the purchase of property on each end of the bridge in order to lengthen the span and raise the bridge. He requested that the Board instruct staff to investigate acquiring the property in order to make it happen.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fowler and seconded by Commissioner Damato, to instruct staff to investigate the possibility of acquiring some right of way property at the ends of the Gospel Island Bridge in order to elevate the bridge and allow travel by boat from one end of the Tsala Apopka Chain of Lakes to the other.

Commissioners Fowler and Valentino assured Chairwoman Phillips that citizens within the area wanted the bridge raised.

The Chairwoman called a question on the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

(7:25 P.M.)

13-B **CITRUS ABUSE SHELTER ASSOCIATION (CASA)**

Commissioner Fowler mentioned that he had received a letter from CASA requesting a letter of support and commitment for \$50,000 from the County to assist them in obtaining a large grant for building another facility. He pointed out that CASA was a very valuable organization that provided shelter and safety for abused women and children, and he hoped the Board would support their request.

Commissioner Valentino stated that she had also been asked to provide support for the grant, which would serve many purposes; however, the Board was already providing \$30,000 a year to CASA and the budget process was just beginning.

Chairwoman Phillips agreed that CASA was a worthy organization that provided a much-needed service, but she could not support a request for one non-profit organization when others needed funds to match grants as well.

Commissioner Fowler remarked that local government should not match grant funds for every organization; however, CASA was different from other groups because the people were unfortunate victims of spouse abuse and child molestation.

Commissioner Fowler made a motion to send a letter of support and commitment for \$50,000 to assist the Citrus Abuse Shelter Association in obtaining a grant. Motion failed for lack of second.

(7:30 P.M.)

13-C **FIRE SERVICES - PAID FIREFIGHTERS**

Commissioner Fowler questioned that since the Board did not vote earlier in the meeting to approve a special assessment for fire services, what instructions did the Board intend to give staff for funding the 27 firefighters to be hired by April 1.

Commissioner Phillips stated that the issue must be addressed and she expected staff to come back to the Board with a recommendation for funding.

Mr. Battista responded to Commissioner Bartell's question regarding requirements for an MSBU and MSTU by stating that an MSBU needed to be advertised four consecutive weeks prior to holding a public hearing for adoption of a resolution in order to meet the March 1 deadline for notification to the Property Appraiser and Tax Collector. He explained that an MSTU did not require advertisement, and the Board could still enact an MSTU this budget year, but no later than July 1.

Discussion ensued concerning the Board postponing paid firefighters last year and this year; re-evaluating paid firefighter services; using funds within the budget; firefighters, public safety, water, and sewer projects could not be funded from the General Fund; funding for water and sewer projects was a proper use of special assessments, and so on.

Mr. Wesch stated that the issue of paid firefighters was critical and unless the Board directed otherwise, staff would make funding of paid firefighters the number one priority in the budget; however, other areas, such as facility maintenance projects might be delayed due to the \$2.5 million fire services impact on the budget October 1.

Discussion continued as follows: delaying non-critical projects; using funds efficiently and evaluating other revenue sources; the Board's commitment to paid firefighters; Public Safety Department and law enforcement services (Sheriff) should have been separate issues of discussion; it was too late to establish a special assessment (MSBU); a cost allocation plan was needed in order to accomplish an MSTU; special assessment projects should be considered individually; the Board should not feel pressured into adopting an MSBU, and so on.

Commissioner Fowler declared that the Board still had the ability today to consider fire services separately and vote to advertise for an MSBU.

Mr. Wesch explained that the Board could approve the four advertisements for the special assessment, then adopt the resolution and send notice to the Property Appraiser and Tax Collector. Mr. Battista added that through the advertisements, the Board would be establishing a public hearing on the last meeting in February to consider adoption of a resolution for the intent of an MSBU; however, the Board would not be obligated to establish an MSBU.

Commissioner Valentino stated that she supported paid firefighters, but she did not understand why the County was ready to hire firefighters in April without a funding

source. Chairwoman Phillips agreed that a funding source should be established and in place before hiring people.

Commissioner Damato pointed out that an MSBU would provide the Board with another financial planning tool in addition to the tax revenues.

Mr. Wesch replied to Commissioner Valentino's question regarding postponement of hiring paid firefighters by stating that hiring paid firefighters was consistent with the Fire Services Master Plan adopted by the Board. He specified that the plan initially called for over 50 firefighters, which was reduced to 27, and the hire date was delayed from October 2004 until April 1, 2005. He explained the funding of those 27 positions from April 1 to September 30, 2005, was achieved by delaying other fire services in the CIP.

Commissioner Fowler emphasized that so much time and planning had gone into paid firefighters and now the Board had trouble making a decision for the funding. Commissioner Phillips reiterated that she would be willing to review assessments (MSBU) individually, but without an immediate time constraint.

A motion was made by Commissioner Damato and seconded by Commissioner Fowler, to advertise to adopt a resolution of intent to form an MSBU for fire services.

Mr. Battista interjected and stated that a motion should be made to reconsider the previous motion for item 2-G (B), MSBU for fire services.

Commissioner Damato withdrew his motion and Commissioner Fowler withdrew his second.

A motion was made by Commissioner Damato and seconded by Commissioner Fowler, to reconsider the previous vote concerning item 2-G (B), MSBU for fire services.

Commissioner Bartell indicated that he would support the motion merely to advertise the Board's intent to adopt a resolution because the Board was in a financial crisis concerning paid firefighters. He asked Mr. Wesch to provide other available options prior to the public hearing for adoption of the resolution.

The Chairwoman called a question on the motion. Motion carried. Voting Aye: Commissioners Bartell, Damato, Fowler, and Valentino. Voting Nay: Commissioner Phillips.

A motion was made by Commissioner Damato and seconded by Commissioner Fowler, to instruct staff to adopt a resolution of intent to advertise for the formation of an MSBU to fund fire services.

Mr. Battista specified that the advertisement would not be to establish an MSBU, but to advertise a notice of intent to set a public hearing on February 22, 2005. Mr. Wesch added that the public hearing would take place at 1:50 P.M. before the impact fee workshop.

The Chairwoman called a question on the motion. Motion carried. Voting Aye: Commissioners Bartell, Damato, Fowler, and Valentino. Voting Nay: Commissioner Phillips.

(8:01 P.M.)

14- **ANY OTHER BUSINESS OR PERSONS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE BOARD**

14-A **SENIOR HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION**

A. R. Patten spoke about the senior homestead exemption that 47 of 67 counties in the state had already adopted, which allowed up to \$25,000 additional property exemption for senior citizens. He discussed information provided in the newspaper written by Property Appraiser Ron Schultz and Mr. Wesch's data on the subject presented previously in the meeting. He stated that he felt strongly about this issue and that senior citizens deserved this extra exemption. He volunteered to perform further research on the matter, and suggested that the Board hold a public workshop to allow input from senior citizens.

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Chairwoman adjourned the meeting.

(8:11 P.M.)

ATTEST: _____, Clerk _____, Chairwoman