

**BUDGET INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP
PLANTATION, FLORIDA**

July 10, 2012

The meeting was called to order by Councilman Levy, President Pro Tem of the City Council.

1. Roll Call by City Clerk:

Councilmember: Ron Jacobs
Robert A. Levy
Lynn Stoner
Peter S. Tingom
Sharon E. Moody
Mayor: Diane Veltri Bendekovic
City Attorney: Donald J. Lunny, Jr.

Absent:

Council President: Peter S. Tingom

* * * * *

2. The Pledge of Allegiance followed.

* * * * *

A memorandum dated July 1, 2011, to Members of City Council and Mayor Bendekovic, from Daniel W. Keefe, Chief Administrative Officer, follows:

Attached per your request is the current list of privatized services utilized by the various City departments. Also attached is the list of projects that have received Federal funding through the efforts of our Federal Lobbyist, Alcalde & Faye. The City entered into an agreement with Alcalde & Faye on February 1, 2003 and pays a \$5,000 per month retainer.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Mayor Bendekovic explained that this is an Informational Workshop, the Budget message will not come until August 23, 2012 and then the setting of the millage rate. This is the second in three series of Workshops. The June 14, 2012 Workshop presented the challenges that the City is incurring at the present time on preparing a balanced budget. The purpose of tonight's Workshop is to provide additional budgetary information prior to setting the millage rate. The more informed you are the more educated decision making will occur. She shared that Plantation is one of the few municipalities who have had a slight increase in their property tax values for two years in a row. This year we went up 2.2% and last year we went up 1%. Even with those slight increases and reductions that the City and Directors have made, that does not support our services and programs we presently enjoy in the City of Plantation. The presentation has been broken down into three different segments; the first

being a balanced budget showing recommendations put forth to generate additional revenue; the next is the budget if it stays status quo, exactly like we have it today with no additional revenue increases except for the millage which is \$468,000 that we would get with this increase; and the third will be on outsourcing and privatization. These are all possibilities. The numbers have changed since the June 14, 2012 presentation, as a budget is a fluid document. When the budget was presented on June 14, 2012 there was a 10.1 gap and tonight it is a 9.3 gap in expenditures and revenues. Remember, the numbers presented tonight or in the future are not her numbers and not the Council members numbers; those numbers are the City's numbers; they remain constant no matter who is sitting in any of these seats. These are the numbers that our Budget Manager and Finance Director have presented. What really matters about these numbers is what we do with those numbers. The bottom line is that the decisions we are going to make in the next couple of weeks during this budget process is going to determine the face of Plantation and the way we conduct business for years to come.

Mayor Bendekovic provided a brief presentation as follows:

INTRODUCTION:

- Sustain and maintain Plantation as we know it today.
- Reserves can no longer be used to balance the budget.
- Combination of revenues and reductions are needed to achieve our goals.
- Choices plus consensus equals a balanced budget.

BACKGROUND:

- Can no longer use reserves to balance the budget (\$10 million in reserves used in past four years).
- Increase in pension costs.
- Increase in fuel and (up 34% since 2007) consumable goods (up 10%).
- Ad valorem revenue has dropped 14.3% since peak in 2007.
- Stop/loss gap insurance cost increase.
- Communication service tax decrease.
- End of Code Amnesty program.
- To demonstrate financial solvency, need to build unassigned reserves to \$4.1 million over time
We wanted to go out for an approximately \$36 million General Obligation Bond. We went to our underwriters and they questioned how we would explain the gap in the budget. They want to see 5% in reserves of the General Fund, which was \$84 million at that time; therefore, we would need approximately \$4.1 million. They are looking for financial solvency. For us to go out and sell the bonds we have to show that we have some reserves to support it. They also felt like we should have some capital. We have not invested in capital for five years in the City of Plantation.
- Needed to satisfy general obligation bond underwriters.
- Need to reinvest in our City by increasing capital by \$1 million over time.

Kristi Caravella, Budget Manager, made the following presentation:

A BALANCED BUDGET

- The current budget situation shows the \$9.3 million deficit that is down from the last meeting when it was \$10.1 million. The way we got the additional reductions was the elimination of 13 vacant positions and some other minor expenditure cuts.

- There are several millage options; there are ranges from the current millage which is 4.6142 and all the other numbers are the same.
- The ad valorem revenue is 4.6142 going up to 6.1142, which is 1.5 mills. The millage would have to be raised in order to balance the budget on millage alone and that would give us a slight increase of \$445,000.
- In addition to millage revenues there are other options; a 10% Utility Franchise Pack, which would be an additional \$1.3 million; the FOP Collective Bargaining Contract, which is currently ongoing; a Public Safety Impact Fee, which would be similar to Impact Fees for Parks and Recreation. We were proposing to add Impact Fees for Police and Fire and that would be an additional \$100,000. The next option would be take home cars; there would be a commuter fee charged to employees to drive to and from work or the total elimination of take home vehicles, which would save \$240,000; this would include Police and that would be where most of the savings came from.
- During Department budget meetings fee schedules were reviewed for things the City provides such as lien searches, building permit fees, landscape fees, etc. A comparison was done with other municipalities and we looked at which departments updated their fee schedules in the recent years. Based on that information we came up with revised schedules in Planning and Zoning, Design, Landscape and Engineering, and Building Department. This would save an additional \$525,000.
- During the last meeting we discussed side parcel and after an analysis there are actually two parcels which would be viable for sale and that would bring in a one-time revenue of \$930,000.
- Charges for services, Utility Impact Fee and charge for Fire services would all require Council action and we would need that prior to October 1, 2012.

In response to Councilwoman Moody, Mayor Bendekovic advised that the two parcels that could be sold are one in the Acres and the one on 20th in the north Acres.

Ms. Caravella stated that one of the properties was purchased with CRA money and that is why we took it out and two were foreclosure type so we do not own those yet, which could be a long process.

Mayor Bendekovic indicated that would take us to Plantation Acres, the middle Acres and the north Acres properties.

In response to Councilwoman Moody, Mayor Bendekovic concurred that the property on 8th Street is five acres and the north Acres is ten acres. She believes the north Acres property might be 12 acres.

Ms. Caravella commented that we do have, from property values going up, 2.2% for this year, which is an additional \$450,000.

There is also a breakdown for the different millage increases.

In response to Councilman Levy, Ms. Caravella explained that to calculate the millage rate you take the total taxable monies of the City, which we get from the Property Appraiser's office, and the millage is sort of an imposed number that gets you to the property tax values for the previous year. You start with the previous years' millage and increase from there. One-tenth of a mill is about \$630,000 in Plantation. Then we assume a 96% collection rate so a little is taken off of that. One mill is \$1 of a \$1,000 property value. The equation of the taxable value is multiplied by the millage divided by 1,000 should be 96%.

Councilman Levy commented that if our taxable amount goes up the same millage rate increases our amount of money; if it goes down it decreases using the same millage rate.

Ms. Caravella continued with the presentation as follows:

- Different millages are shown with service taxes, building charges under permits and fees, charges of services from other departments, Impact Fees under Public Safety and other sources is where property is located.
- The 5.6142 is the millage that would get us to a surplus and with the other revenue options there would be a small surplus of \$137,000.
- It was noted that the proposed budget has capital expenses of \$1.7 million; \$1 million of that is devoted to technology infrastructure improvements, which has been put off for several years and is at a crucial break point; but the total requests from all departments including Police and Fire was \$21 million. That is the true cost of maintaining the assets of the City.
- The impact of the millage rate and how it would affect the residents depends on the value of their homes.
- We need to put the City back in a state of financial solidity; we cannot just look at this year, we have to look at future years.
- During the previous meeting the stormwater fee was discussed, which is already in progress and will show up as a non ad valorem tax in fiscal year 2014. The other two we are proposing with be a Business License Tax increase, which will bring \$36,000 in revenue and the Fire Assessment Fee, which will range from \$3.2 million to \$4 million per year. In order to collect on both of these items, Council would have to take action this year.
- There is a one-time revenue of \$930,000 for the sale of the two properties. The cost of business continues to increase and just maintaining our City assets is \$21 million.

In summary with regard to balancing this year and next year's budget, this is a plan for a sustainable future for the City, not just for today.

Councilman Jacobs commented that the bottom line in this scenario is if we raise millage by one mill to 5.6142 and do other increases that were mentioned in the presentation but not the Fire and not the Business License, those are future, this would be a balanced budget.

In response to Councilman Jacobs, Ms. Caravella concurred that in doing all of the things mentioned we still need to raise the millage one mill to balance the budget. The Pension increases are in there but there is nothing that has to do with the FOP Contract negotiations.

Mayor Bendekovic indicated that is why she has been stressing that it has to be a combination; it cannot be any one factor to balance this budget.

Gary Shimun provided the following presentation:

NON-REVENUE BUDGET:

- We currently have a loss of 13 positions in the budget presented.
- 20-35 additional is a tough figure to use because depending on the position of the City. The cost to the City for one position can range anywhere from about \$60,000 with benefits up into the range of \$150,000 to \$160,000 per year. When cutting a position it really depends on where that position is. To say it takes 20-35, if we actually had to lay off enough people to balance the budget by doing absolutely nothing else, the real figure is probably around 100 people and that would have such a huge impact on the quality and quantity of the services provided. This is something he is hoping Council will not consider.

- An option would be furlough days. We considered the possibility for closing for the entire week of Thanksgiving, which would give three unpaid leave days and two paid holidays. The burden of this will be on the General Employees and the savings would be about \$250,000. For residents, that means that no services will be provided to them from City Hall or from Parks and Recreation, etc. for that week.
- Another option was to reduce everybody's wages in the City. A 5% reduction across the board would save \$2 million. If 10% was taken only \$4.1 million would be saved. Many of the City employees are below market range in comparison with other cities within the County so you would be taking money away from people who are already paid a little less than other cities in the area.
- We provide a small bus service throughout the City, the Plantation Tram. If this were eliminated it would save about \$220,000. A portion of the funding is through gas tax so it does not have as big of an impact on the General Fund as we thought. A lot of people ride these buses and perhaps there is an alternative such as cutting out one day.
- If we do not get any revenue and nothing else changes, we will have to look at, after laying off 100 people for example, what services go along with that.
- There has been a lot of discussion about what will happen to Plantation Community Center at Kennedy Park. That facility brings in about \$100,000 per year in revenue but it costs almost \$400,000 per year to run it. If it was knocked down and a passive park was created the City would immediately save about \$272,000 per year.

Mayor Bendekovic provided a presentation as follows:

PRIVATIZATION

- This has come up several times at budget.
- Privatization success include the Plantation Preserve; PAL; Plantation Tram; Employee Health and Wellness Center; Utilities Lift Stations and Laboratory Analysis.
She applauded the employees because 51% of the employees use the Health and Wellness Center. According to recent feedback, the Health and Wellness Center has saved us \$2.5 million in the last two years.
- Privatization failures include the 2009 Summer Camp and the Gateway corridor maintenance.
- Options are strategic contracting – outside firm to help develop RFP's, including negotiations, training and compliance; managed competition – multiple vendors for one service resulting in lower costs (ongoing); and targeted outsourcing – contract out entire department.
- Privatization impact on budget includes the "Weston model", which has skeleton personnel and City facilities sold.
- Three departments were used as comparisons; a small department, a medium department and a large department. Charts were reviewed for each size department.
- Privatization considerations mean outsourcing; giving business to another organization.
- Profits.
- Contracts.
- Quality of Services.
In the past the quality that City of Plantation employees have given has been exemplary and we get more compliments than complaints regarding the quality of service. Loyalty and respectability cannot be put into numbers.
- Availability of services.
During hurricanes we need immediate service and if we call a contractor and they are busy elsewhere then we have to wait.

Councilwoman Moody mentioned numbers on the small, medium and large departments and questioned if that was just salary or whether it also included pension benefits. She commented that the figure on the large department averages \$113,000 and that seems a little high.

Mayor Bendekovic indicated that the numbers included everything. The numbers were averaged. The \$113,000 figure is not high with benefits. For someone who makes \$28,000 it actually costs the City another \$26,000.

Councilman Levy commented that Hallandale Beach privatized their lifeguards and they have done away with the contract.

In summary, the budget cannot be balanced on reserves or expenditure reductions alone. As indicated before, if we balance the budget with the \$1.2 million this year that will give us a deficit for the following year. Increased revenue is essential for Plantation's todays and tomorrows. Our budget personnel costs are approximately 73% of the budget and those costs are reduced there will also be a reduction in personnel, in services and in programs. If that happens, one thing that will have to change is the expectation and the mindsets of our residents because that will impact what the residents are so used to having in the City of Plantation. The Mayor and Council members have a fiduciary responsibility for the sustainability and maintenance of our community. The decision making process with regard to generating additional revenue for the City of Plantation is one of her main objectives to provide information for that decision making process for the Council. They have some tough choices to make. Mayor Bendekovic emphasized that they are here for clarification, for questions and opinions and are here to address any one of the Council member's questions. Ms. Caravella and Mr. Shimun are readily available to any one of them. She feels that an uninformed and uneducated decision will award irreparable damage to the City of Plantation. This decision should not just be made for today but for tomorrow as well.

Mayor Bendekovic advised that July 25, 2012 is millage rate day. A short presentation will be done. On August 3, 2012 the Council will have their budget. August 23, 2012 will be another Workshop; however, the public will not be permitted to speak at that time. All of the Directors will be presenting their budgets to the Council at that time. September 12, 2012 will be the first public hearing and the public will be allowed to speak. September 19, 2012 is the second public hearing and she thanked Ms. Caravella, Mr. Shimun and Ms. DiLaura for helping to put this presentation together.

Councilman Jacobs questioned whether there is a recommended combination and if option #2 was the option being recommended. If the maximum millage is set to the same millage then we are stuck with that and we do that before August 23, 2012. As a Council member, if you do not want the millage to go higher, then you do not set the maximum millage higher; it has been done both ways over the years. If the recommendation is to go up a mill then we need to set the maximum millage to make it possible.

Mayor Bendekovic indicated that the recommendation will be brought to Council on August 23, 2012. If the millage is set higher it can always be adjusted as we go through this process.

In response to Councilman Levy, Mayor Bendekovic advised that the recommendations are a mill; a Utilities Franchise Tax; adjust the fees and look at the commuter fee for all employees; and the sale of property. They would like the flat Fire Assessment and Business License tax for the future; we already have the stormwater. This would put us on the road to recovery.

In response to Councilman Jacobs, Mayor Bendekovic stated that Public Safety Impact Fees are Police and Fire to be paid by developers.

Mr. Lunny believed it was on the bottom of Page 5; the column that starts at the top, 5.4142.

Councilperson Stoner advised that it is on Page 4; Public Safety Impact Fees, Police and Fire, an additional \$100,000.

Councilman Jacobs commented that the proposed budget is on Page 5 in the right hand column, which is what Mr. Lunny said.

Mayor Bendekovic indicated that the 7.6% for Utility Service would include the Utility Franchise.

Mr. Lunny questioned whether the recommendation is that column.

Mayor Bendekovic clarified that would be her recommendation.

Councilman Jacobs noted that would be a 21.6% increase in the millage or a one mill increase.

Councilwoman Moody stated that if we were to go with the 1.5 millage we would not have to implement any other fees this budget year.

Mayor Bendekovic concurred. She would like to see the Fire Assessment go because that would be for the following year; that means that our Fire Department would be completely self supported with that \$3.2 million.

Councilman Jacobs noted that would be a 32.5% increase. He would support a maximum millage going up 1.5% for purposes of discussion.

In response to Councilman Levy, Mayor Bendekovic indicated that Plantation could no longer say that it does not charge a Fire fee. Plantation would not be out of sync with other cities; currently we are on the low end of the scale as far as ad valorem goes.

Councilman Levy commented that not having a Fire fee is part of what makes Plantation special. Other cities say they have not raised taxes in years but they have tripled all of their fees. The problem he sees on a generic basis is the minute we start charging fees they are no longer tax deductible on your Federal taxes. The minute you incorporate them in your ad valorem taxes they are deductible on your Federal taxes so people will get their break on the back end when they file their Federal taxes; both businesses and citizens will be able to do that. Once it is called a fee that is not allowed. If you were to incorporate Councilman Jacobs' suggestion regarding millage rate, that would mean an all inclusive tax rate with no separate fees, people will be able to deduct the total all inclusive amount from their Federal taxes rather than separating it out as fees, which cannot be deducted from Federal taxes. We need to be cognizant of that and aware when making a decision.

Mayor Bendekovic stated that our Fire Department currently saves us \$17 million per year. We are still getting a pretty good deal if we have a Fire assessment for \$3.2 million.

Councilman Levy did not want it as a fee.

Councilman Jacobs indicated that if 1 or 1.5 is approved, we are dealing with this budget. What happens next year and the years after? Are we setting up a sustainable future or are we going to have a crisis again?

Mr. Shimun advised that it depends on whether property values continue to rise in the future or whether they remain stable, in which case inflation is going to eat at us like it does in your household income. The other thing to consider is that we will still sell the other property which will give \$930,000 for the following year. That is why we are looking at the other fees so we will have a balanced budget with surplus in the coming years so we might be able to look at modest raises for some of the City employees.

In response to Councilman Jacobs, Mr. Shimun stated that is not at one mill or even at the mill and a half. It gives a balanced budget for the upcoming year but not necessarily for next year. We are very close. It depends on what fiscal changes are made in the structure of the organization over that period of time. If people leave the organization and we are able to cover the different services in other ways without filling those positions, we probably do have an ongoing balanced budget.

Councilman Jacobs commented that if we are going to make a large increase to catch up we should make it big enough so that we are caught up for a few years.

Mayor Bendekovic indicated that we can either do this very quickly or very slowly. This will get us to a better place and we will be able to start reinvesting back into capital. With the General Obligation Bond we have to ask residents if they want this and then they would see what we want. It would be up to the residents to decide. We cannot even go out for the Bond because we do not have the reserves or the capital.

Councilperson Stoner stated that all of the changes recommended are external to the taxpaying residents; there are no internal changes in the recommendations. When you say that 73% of this budget is personnel, those costs are going to continue if some adjustments are not made somewhere inside. With regard to the General Obligation Bond, she questioned how many years that would be amortized. She questioned that lawnmowers would be purchased under that Bond and depreciated.

Mr. Shimun replied that the Bond would be amortized for 20 years. There would be some Notes that would be taken out for a shorter period of time in order to purchase lawnmowers, etc. He concurred that you do not amortize something that's useful life is less than the length of the bond.

Councilperson Stoner commented that we always talk about our Volunteer Fire Department and how they save us so much money but we also have "regular" staff outside of the volunteers. When we talk about a Fire fee, would that be a dedicated revenue source. The same thing with the Police Department; completely dedicated.

Mr. Shimun advised that the Fire fee would be a dedicated source. With regard to Police, there is no public safety fee that could be dedicated; we can only dedicate what the State allows.

Councilperson Stoner noted that we would do the Fire fee versus creating a specific Fire Impact Fee that is calculated based on someone's project.

Mr. Lunny explained that one of the sources of revenue that was discussed was increasing impact fees for public safety service that would include Fire and, as he understands it, if you go with the 1.5, the Administrative effort to enact that, along with the other savings and not enacting those other fees, you could bypass for a year. If you did not do the 1.5 and you are doing the 1 mill, you would have to incur that cost and get that completed in order to come up with the \$82,685,000 so you would only be down \$2.8 million.

Councilperson Stoner referenced under our current situation that there would be some minor expenditure cuts.

Ms. Caravella indicated that to get from the \$10.1 million to \$9.3 million we went through all of the departments and anywhere that we could cut costs internally is what was done. We looked at contracts, legal fees, consultant fees, supplies in departments, and the 13 positions that were eliminated from the budget.

Councilperson Stoner commented that the 13 positions are listed as \$1 million but when we go back to privatization the number becomes \$1.171, which breaks down for 12 employees for \$97,000 and for 13 employees breaks down for \$76,000; a difference of \$21,000. A couple of hundred thousand dollars is a big swing in this budget. She questioned why we can't do your recommendation and still incorporate some of the others for the long haul. She appreciates that our residences went up 2% but that is not going to take us through the rest of this bad economy; we have another three or four years left of this. Rather than making arbitrary millage increase she is still not seeing a full package being incorporated of everything that we should do now versus later. She commented that now versus later is what got the City in this position.

Mr. Shimun stated that it depends on the department.

Mayor Bendekovic requested that Councilperson Stoner review what has been suggested as far as with revenue cuts and meet with Mr. Shimun or Ms. Caravella and tell them what you are in favor of cutting so that can be highlighted for our next Workshop. To look at each one is counter-productive and is a waste of staff time.

Councilperson Stoner advised that she is not for privatization. She has used other cities services that have privatized some of their departments and she has found it very difficult to work with them; that is not something she would like to see for this City. She believes that as a whole, the employees take pride in what they do. Sometimes privatization is "I will get to you when I get to you" and that does not help the end user have any comfort. She mentioned that FOP is not listed and this is like the exterior of the book for her; she likes the detail. To wait until August 3, 2012 to get her detailed book is tough. This is our second Workshop and we don't even get the Workshop presentation until we walk in the door and it is difficult to have some thought processes about how you want to respond to some of the presentations. She questioned whether some of the information could be received a little earlier.

Mayor Bendekovic indicated that they would be more than happy to give the Budget before August 3, 2012 but we have to set the millage rate on July 25, 2012 so we cannot give the printed form until after the millage is set. If you would like to say tonight that you want to go to 1.5 mills she will set the budget at that. She noted that she can prepare the budget but it cannot be printed until the millage is set.

Councilman Levy stated that we would have to take a consensus, we are not allowed to vote.

Councilperson Stoner commented that one thing mentioned during the last Workshop was the closing of some of the park buildings; however, she thought that was a suggestion and has since learned that is reality.

Mayor Bendekovic advised that it would be adjusting some of the hours and some of the park systems will not be open as long or on certain days. She does not think that closing an entire facility was the case.

Councilperson Stoner questioned the consequences, the impact, and the cost savings for closing facilities for a certain amount of time. As a Council member, she would rather have known than to have someone tell her they heard it.

Mayor Bendekovic reiterated to tell them what she wants; they are very transparent and will do the best they can to get it to you. They can probably get it to you prior to the next Budget Workshop.

Councilperson Stoner questioned how many dollars were transferred out of the General Fund into various reserve accounts in the last year.

Mr. Shimun was not aware of any in the last year. The \$1.2 million we keep talking about is there and there is also a Budget Stabilization Fund in the current year's budget of \$2.4 million; that may be what you are talking about, but that is prior to his employment with the City. He pointed out that this year's budget is based on Building Department receipts in excess of \$5 million, which we will not reach so that \$2.4 million for the Budget Stabilization Fund will probably be used up before the end of the fiscal year.

Mayor Bendekovic believes that a breakdown was given with the GASBY.

Councilperson Stoner commented that in the last few budgets there are always rollovers of funds that have not been used and are added to the new budget.

Mr. Shimun explained that what happens at the end of a fiscal year is if a department does not use all of its funds it goes back into the General Fund as a whole to be in the next year budget; there is not an actual rollover.

Councilperson Stoner noticed that we are still getting a lot of budgeted items and questioned whether anyone is reviewing those to see if those items are necessary? She mentioned \$36,000 for office furniture. Just because it is budgeted does not mean it has to be spent.

Mr. Shimun stated that they look at all of budgeted items. The larger items that would normally have come up under this budget would be under capital and we are bringing very little capital. The Police recently got some new cars because they have to have a regular turnover on those on a regular basis.

Councilman Levy questioned whether we could have delineated all of the reserves by the public meeting because that seems to be a constant question that the public has regarding reserves. There have been some quotes up to \$72 million.

Mayor Bendekovic indicated that she has all of the explanations. She will provide a full explanation and also have everything listed showing exactly how much is in the funds, which will show that there is \$1.2 million left with some change. With regard to the Fire assessment, Mayor Bendekovic advised that the \$3.2 million would pay for salaries, Administration and also capital, such as new fire trucks. That assessment would only be for Fire; nothing else. That does not include Fire Rescue.

In response to Councilperson Stoner, Mayor Bendekovic advised that the salary for Fire is \$1.1 million and benefits are \$.5 million.

Councilman Levy commented that there is a difference between the Fire Assessment Fee and the Fire Impact Fee.

Councilperson Stoner stated if we are only looking for an additional \$100,000 for Police and Fire, with \$50,000 going to each, \$50,000 does not remotely affect \$1.6 million and surely will not get the Fire Department a fire truck anytime soon.

Mr. Lunny believes that you are looking at the cost of underwriting Fire suppression generally every year, which Administration is looking to assign to an Impact Fee, which would not be tax deductible, as distinguished from what is the marginal cost of capital improvements necessary to serve new development only, which is the portion

of the \$180 they are proposing for the Impact Fee. The developer fee, theoretically, would only be for the equipment and capital necessary to serve that developer, and then you have to figure out how to allocate and define that. The assessment, which would be a non ad valorem assessment, could be used to cover the ongoing costs that are not associated with new development.

Councilwoman Moody mentioned the FOP and the 1.5 mills and noted that everything would be included.

Mr. Shimun stated that would keep all benefits as they currently are.

Mayor Bendekovic thanked everyone.

* * * * *

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Robert A. Levy, President Pro Tem
City Council

ATTEST:

Susan Slattery
City Clerk

RECORD ENTRY:

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the Original of the foregoing signed Minutes was received by the Office of the City Clerk and entered into the Public Record this _____ day of _____, 2012.

Susan Slattery, City Clerk