

SPECIAL, TOWN Council, MEETING
TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH
WORKSHOP ON PROPOSED CRA PROJECT
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1996

Present for tile Fort Myers Beach Town Council were:

Richard V.S. Roosa, Town Attorney

Ray Murphy, Councilmember

Anita Cereceda Councilmember

Ted Fitzsimmons, Councilmember

Marsha Segal-George, Interim Town Manager

Gar Reynolds, Council member

Rusty Isler, Councilmember

The meeting was called to order by councilmember Cereceda with reference to a previous presentation made by Lee County staff. There was no new material to be presented; however, Lee County staff, represented by Scott Whipple and Shay Prather, would answer questions regarding electrical hookups. Extra copies of tile "issues" paper previously provided were also available.

Scott Whipple discussed tire cost for individual property owners to hook into the electrical service. Four different companies in the electrical industry were contacted for estimates. The cost for a small business such as Dairy Queen or Westcoast Surf Shop was based on typical required amp service of 100-200 with a single-phase connection and equals about \$8.40 per fool, thus averaging less than \$1,000 for a typical small business connection. The cost would be more for larger businesses, e.g., Lani Kai or Howard Johnsons, which would require 600-800 amp service. A three-phase connection for such a larger business would cost approximately \$5,000, and it is anticipated that these larger businesses could afford the connection cost. Cost breakdowns per amp service are:

100 amp service	\$8.40/fl.
200 amp service	\$14.00/fl.
400 amp service	\$29.40/fl

Service connection is to be accomplished with top quality materials. Some questions were asked about materials, how connections are measured and phase connection. Connections are measured and made from tire transformer box to the building's meter box. One, two or three-phase connection is dependent on required electrical service. It is anticipated that a small business will require a one-phase connection. It is believed that tire information received covers everyone on Estero Island. The question was asked

what is the longest distance for hookup at Times Square? FPL has proposed four to six transformer boxes with about 30 feet distance to tile individual businesses maximum. Included is the length of the building and up tile length of Estero to tile transformer box. Drawings submitted by FPL, will be provided if specific calculation of linear distance is necessary.

Councilwoman Cereceda inquired regarding TIF revenue and expense sheet. In 1992, what was the "Matanzas Bridge Improvement" representing \$4,934? It was answered that this was for a walkway in the preserve area. 'What does NA represent in two expenses of \$25,260 and \$1,609 each?' Shay Prather responded that this was the first time an annual report had been prepared and that they were still in the process of researching these amounts. The "N/A" basically represents "monies missing in action" charged to Estero Island.

Councilwoman Cereceda inquired about the figures under "Expenses" in 1995 "Transfer to Operating" of \$125,000 and \$264,000. She was advised that this was monies transferred to CRA operating accounts to cover the cost of staff, In 1995 all areas were charged a percentage of TIF monies for CRA staff expenses.

Councilwoman Cereceda inquired regarding "Estero Boulevard Improvement." Shay Prather advised that this figure was for the WRT cost of \$136,000 as well as OD Study and TS construction, Shay Prather advised that this was for tile OD study which was an origin destination study conducted prior to this time and also part of an initial traffic study performed for the Sheriff's Department; This represents part of the cost of the study team and was a cost overlooked and not previously reimbursed or changed.

Question: Times Square Construction? Times Square construction management was a cost at \$2,643, part of which went to the Public Works Department and also for assistance from AIM Engineering for their help with consultant selection and continuing construction inspections.

The Master Plan came in at \$159,000 and it had been believed to be only at \$60-70,000 originally. The question was asked how it got so high. Shay Prather responded that she agreed it was an expensive plan. The \$137,000 was from 1993 and is all part of the Master Plan. The contract with WRT was signed in 1993. They have worked since then. They are paid in stages, and that explains amounts charged in different years, Monies represent total billing on a contract signed with WRT when first hired to do the work and includes the Core Area Master Plan. Councilman Isler asked if the plan he had was the plan in question. He also asked if the \$137,000 figure was actually paid out in 1993. He was advised that it was and in 1994 there was another \$9,200 and \$159,000 in 1995, plus the \$136,000 for another construction project, it was explained that there were two projects i.e.: a "physical improvement" project and a "planning" project, The question was asked, what is the "Estero Boulevard Improvement?" Shay Prather explained that the \$136,000 was for the construction documents, These documents are available and were presented at tile previous meeting. Construction documents were split into four separate packages inch, ding the south Estero Boulevard entrance feature; Actual blueprints were presented at the last meeting, Scott Whipple stated lie would be glad to deliver a full package of complete blueprints for the Council's use.

The question was asked, "What compiles the overlay master plan and was the represented in the blueprints" It was advised that they were separate, The overlaps represent just the zoning plan. The question was asked, "How much money was expended for just the master plan document?" Scott

Whipple stated that \$310,000 was the cost for the document including previous studies done from the inception of tile program when WRT was hired. There is no question that the overlay zoning plan as prepared was very expensive. The zoning plan and the master overlay plan was identified in the area of \$70-80,000 of the \$310,000 total package.

Scott Whipple suggested that "scope of services" could be broken out with dollar amounts provided to clarify the subject for Councilmembers. The question was asked, "What are total expenses at this point to date in the project from 1992 to 1995? The figure appears to be \$1,162,000 for operations, and is that correct for the four year span?" Shay Prather responded that this would appear to be roughly the correct sum.

No further questions were raised.

Councilwoman Cereda asked who was present from the CRA Committee and requested they sit in the front row to facilitate communication with Councilmembers, whereupon the committee members were moved to the front of the group. Interim Town Manager Marsha Segal-George asked committee members to identify themselves for the record when they spoke since the meeting was being recorded.

Councilman Isler asked Scott Whipple to label tile portions of the project map to make identification easier. The first part consists of the portion in front of Lynn Hall Park and around Times Square through the curve to down past Palermo Circle and was marked accordingly. This includes both sides of tile street on Estero Boulevard with exceptions noted, Councilman Isler indicated that overall, the feeling from the Committee and the community was that the Lynn Hall Park part of the tile project is a portion that could be cut if necessary, he asked Scott Whipple to mark that area on the map displayed.

The south end begins at Estralita Street (last street before leaving the island) on only the bay side of the island and extends to Buccaneer. Councilman Isler indicated that pieces illustrating connection to the bridge will not be connected on the recommendation of DOT. The welcome sign/entrance feature would be at the intersection after building up with considerable fill. Maps displayed represented the entirety of tile project, Initially, these plans were described in five pieces, i.e., (1) Lynn Hall Park, (2) Times Square, (3) from Times Square to the Lani Kai, (4) tile entire length between, and (5) tile entrance signage/feature. Councilman Isler asked if the cost of each piece could be illustrated. Breakdown on cost was marked as follows:

1) Lynn Hall Park	\$154,732
2) Times Square	\$1,017,333
3) Times Square to Lani Kai	\$847,681
4) South Estero Boulevard & The entrance feature	\$721,218

Buried utilities represent an additional cost. Lynn Hall represents the least costly piece. Because of anticipated useage, 8' concrete sidewalks with coconut palms were planned, Piece #3 would have 10' sidewalks on the gulf side and 7' sidewalks on tile bay side, lights and palms were included in total cost. Minimum sidewalk width is 5'. The undergrounding cost is at \$643,673.

The purpose of undergrounding on the gulf side was primarily aesthetic Scott Whipple stated that the criteria for FPL requires compliance with ADA guidelines to accommodate wheelchairs. Buried utilities were viewed as preferable, but the sidewalk project can still be built with poles in place. Shay Prather stated that moving poles completely is not practical or effective, Councilman Isler requested input from tile CRA Committee.

Roxie Smith, CRA Committee, asked "If we do not have underground utilities and construct the sidewalk around existing poles, how many poles will be in the middle of the sidewalk?" Scott Whipple stated he believes it to be around 13 out of 20 poles on tile gulf side, the bay side represents no problem. The 13 poles that would be in the middle of the sidewalk are at or near the right-of-way. Poles are fairly evenly spaced.

Roxie Smith asked if there was any possibility of undergrounding just in the area of the poles similar to the way it was done in the project on San Carlos. It was stated that undergrounding just those areas would be very difficult and is not feasible. Wheelchair access will still be possible if the poles remain in place. Vertical elements in the right-of-way would be only the concrete poles. An example was offered regarding undergrounding in specific areas and another project on the north end where utilities were partly underground resulting in stay wires.

Ran Kidder asked about the cost impact if the sidewalk were left as is on the bay side and just the gulf side redone. Scott Whipple replied that the cost had not been separated, but the number (\$847,000) could be pretty much divided in half to give a close approximation of anticipated savings. Mr. Kidder slated that he was looking for areas of savings, lie asked if the poles on the gulf side could be pushed back. It was replied that the possibility had been considered, but the problem was that some of the buildings are on the right-of-way. Moving the poles would result in utility lines on the lop of buildings anti easement agreements would need to be obtained. FPL did not consider this feasible because of buildings being so close and the easement factor, Cost is still over \$400,000 to move the poles across the street, and there would still exist poles and overhead wires.

The question was asked "To estimate total cost for hookup on total length, how many businesses would there be for hookups?" An estimate based on the Times Square area indicates that there would be approximately 40-50 businesses. The question was asked if "30" was not tire figure mentioned at tire last meeting; and was the project ever rabid.

Shay Prather responded that the County used a construction manager who obtained the subs and negotiates for the lowest cost. The only item bid out was the lights. "Doesn't this represent a conflict of interest on the part of a construction manager?' There is no motivation for cost savings." Mr. Kidder asked about "fat" built into the project costs in utilizing this process. Shay Prather stated that Lee County is confident that savings are realized using a construction manager process. Almost all of the parks and Shady Rest have been constructed this way.

The question was posed, "When tile project was bid out, how far geographically" were bids solicited?" Scott Whipple answered that a percentage of local businesses are required, and at least six companies bid on the project. He offered to bring documentation on bids and amounts submitted, There was concern expressed that there may exist excessive padding or "fat" in the project cost, large differences among bids could exist that should be explored for savings and the project should be re-bid regionally, Councilman Ted Fitzsimmons asked if the construction manager requests guaranteed bids from subs. He was advised that the only guarantee comes from WRT Construction and not tile subs.

A firm bid is not possible, and tile bid is inherently high because of unknown problems that might be encountered. WRT Construction was doing the over-ground improvements. FPL, Continental Cablevision and UTS do the underground portion and are sole providers. The digging of tile trench for undergrounding could represent an area to investigate for cost savings. A great deal of the cost of burying utilities cannot be nailed down in the early stages. A joint trench agreement is made among all of tile utilities involved, and the only cost incurred by property owners is for the FPL hookup; telephone and cable hookup is provided at no cost.

Mr. Kidder asked about reserves. Shay Prather explained that tile numbers are from an annual report prepared in November of 1995. TIF revenues were put into tile account on December 29 and are not reflected in that report. \$2.3 million is the correct figure. January's 1996 TIF deposit was \$871,000. Not included is this year's operating expense to be taken out. Additional expenses are not included as yet on the budget, but those can be provided at the next meeting.

Discussion was held and questions asked again regarding actual sidewalk construction. The sidewalk project will require a drainage pipe with fill and a concrete sidewalk on top. It was asked why concrete and not asphalt.

The response was that concrete lasts much longer and maintenance is lower; The question was asked, "Isn't asphalt cheaper? Lee County uses asphalt and not concrete" Scott Whipple responded that asphalt could be considered and is probably cheaper. He favors concrete as a much better long-term investment. The majority of the cost is for filling the swale and not for the sidewalk itself. The swale as is drains across Estero and behind Island End.

It was asked if there are restrictions for bids on this work. Scott Whipple answered that the Department of Public Works recommended the construction manager process. Alternatives can be checked. A rebid might result in much less project costs by rebidding on a regional basis with motivating factors. It was commented that FPL did not want to participate anyway. The whole project could be re-thought and rebid. It was asked if undergrounding later on would result in exorbitant cost. It was also asked if tile Town could use a private contractor to do undergrounding and could the town hire a private utility provider and not FPL. It was answered that FPL must be involved. A private contractor could only do trench work. It was commented that FPL contracts out its own undergrounding work, and it was stated that Lee County wanted to work with FPL for liability purposes but that the trench work could be re-bid.

Several questions were asked regarding a re-bid process. What is the time frame to re-bid? Is re-bidding feasible? Does tile Town have time? In theory, if Lee County is going to turn the money over to the town, the Council can re-do the project front the start. Questions asked were whether a different source of electric is a possibility; does tile Town Charter provide for selection of tile electric provider; is Lee County Electric Co-Op an Option? It was answered that this is regulated by the Public Service

Commission in a franchise arrangement and specific areas are designated to providers. It was asked again if FPL could be replaced.

Burying utilities was in the beginning largely for aesthetics and not storm safety. Service to a building requires that the property be a minimum level above sea level, but tile transformers are at ground level. The \$847,000 cost was added at a later date to make the project look nicer by undergrounding. The safety and welfare of the community was only a consideration later when FPL received an exemption. Roxie Smith explained that when undergrounding was originally discussed, it was not going to be done because of the cost, WRT wanted to underground utilities.

Commissioner Ray Judah stated that he felt underground utilities were a community "signature" for Fort Myers Beach. Improvement in perceptions and quality of life and the future depends on how well the Council uses vision in this project. Commissioner Judah stated that he believes it is much better aesthetically and functionally to bury utilities. It also allows more room for sidewalks in addition to the importance of the whole ambiance.

Commissioner Judah asked about the linear distance for tire sidewalk segment on the south end. Scott Whipple guessed it to be about one mile at a cost of \$721,218. The Lynn Hall improvements were costed at \$154,000. Commissioner Judah stated that there will exist \$900,000 of funds available in July of 1997 for sidewalk construction. Estero Boulevard is in priority and is recognized as such. The opportunity is there for ICT monies in July of next year to finish the south end of the sidewalk project. The bid submitted this year and rejected was a different fund. He was asked what the difference was and why is money not available last year now going to be available. He replied that when grant monies were applied for, two committees ranked the projects and voted. The Town of Fort Myers Beach was voted #1 by the Citizen Advisory Committee but last by the professionals on the technical advisory committee because of doubt regarding the sponsorship role in the project. When grant monies are awarded, they are not actually disbursed for about five years. Monies requested were not for any of these projects. The monies were to be used for the entire length of the island down one side of Estero Boulevard. An average grant application is about \$300,000. Commissioner Judah stated there will be \$900,000 available in 1997-98. He was asked what of this could be available to Fort Myers Beach. Scott Whipple discussed the Stringfellow project. Ms. Segal-george asked "who would apply?" It was answered that the Town of Fort Myers Beach would apply with the assistance of Lee County staff, The statement was made that when you build sidewalks over underground utilities, you should be able to determine how much the cost was per foot.

Scott Whipple replied that because of the culvert and sidewalk width, the project is more than an ordinary sidewalk. Councilman Isler commented again on concrete versus asphalt. Lee County also builds asphalt bike paths, as well as Sanibel Island. Further discussion was pursued on concrete versus asphalt and use for walk paths and/or bike paths. The observation was made that during season, you are not able to ride bikes on paths; there are too many pedestrians to accommodate bikers or rollerblading. Safety is a factor. A comment was made concerning St. Peterburg's use of blacktop sidewalks up to 10' wide. One half is designated for bikes and the other half for walkers. Whether this can be done is uncertain. Sanibel uses one path for both bikes and walkers.

Councilwoman Cereceda asked the group to disregard financial considerations for a moment and expressed her feelings on the matter. She stated that this will be the first major mark this town community can make and it should be done right. She posed the question to the Committee: do we take money from the County, put it in a bank account while we rework the plan to do it right? Having worked on this so long, what is the CRA Committee's recommendation?

The suggestion was made to rebid each part of the project to save money on each incremental piece to get what was wanted. Start from the beginning and break down the whole into individual projects and then determine how to tie them all together. They can be individually bid. Councilwoman Cereceda stated that she felt underground utilities should be included. Some discussion was held on the history of undergrounding projects and what was to be included. Working with the money currently in hand would result in a great improvement over present. The bikeway/walkway along Estero Boulevard is a priority. Undergrounding has a much bigger and broader implication. It was noted that the town is \$1 million short with the old plan. A rebid might result in being able to do the whole project.

CRA Committee member Roxie Smith stated that it would seem that rather than do five projects halfway, it would be better to do three projects all the way and do them right. Ideally, utilities would all be underground. The question is the additional money. A re-bid and re-design process after five years of committee work on the current project will be very difficult. Times Square has been an issue for 30 years and still nothing is accomplished. Either we do the project now or not do it at all.

Councilmember Fitzsimmons asked how long it would take to get new bids. Would new design and engineering work be required? Could use be made of existing drawings? Process is about two months; Shay Prather stated she felt it to be closer to three months, would Lee County permit a re-bid?

Commissioner Judah stated he did not personally believe there would be any cost savings in a re-bid and that the construction manager process is cost effective and sound. However, if the Town wants to re-bid, it should be prepared that bids may be higher and there will be time delays. He was asked about the ICT monies.

He stated that the County has a one-million-dollar sidewalk program. When can ICT monies be applied for? He stated in one year or in February of 1997.

Commissioner Judah encouraged the Council to proceed and investigate concrete versus asphalt. Mike indicated that bikes can't use sidewalks during season anyway. Also, time is at hand to start the project and these are probably competitive bids. Revisiting just adds time to the project. It is time to go ahead with the majority of the project, perhaps without doing undergrounding at this point.

Scott Whipple stated that a Department of Environmental Protection official and a lighting consultant from Sarasota were waiting for him in Times Square for a previously scheduled meeting regarding the lights.

It was stated that this project had been voted, approved and reapproved over and over again and it had been very frustrating. Let's just do it. We either do the whole project with no undergrounding or do underground and eliminate part of the project. Eliminating Lynn Hall and the undergrounding would get close to budget.

The difference could be made up with elimination of the bay side. The project has already been approved numerous times. Undergrounding was always extra. Times Square is very important as the "front door." ICT funds can be applied for later. Times Square and the sidewalks should be done. Roxie Smith questioned the re-bid process. At the time, undergrounding was feasible with the money available. A contract requiring a guarantee means a contract with an inflated bid. More discussion followed on history of undergrounding and bid process. It is believed that re-bidding will result in more funds being available. Councilwoman Cereceda asked for additional input. It was stated that given the differences between the private and public sectors, the re-bid process could save money, but a great deal of time has already gone into the process. Commissioner Judah's input was requested as regards development and building constraints and he advised that there are no real restrictions and bids are open to all. Subcontractors were sealed bids but tile construction manager selection was a committee process. ICT monies would be available in 1997 to complete sidewalks later on the gulf side. He was asked about the likelihood and he slated that this has a very strong priority.

Councilmember Isler illustrated how undergrounding and cutting smaller parts could bring project in with monies at hand. It was asked for a showing of hands. Father Gaggin suggested that the agenda and materials provided for the meeting be followed and the committee and Council vote on the options provided therein.

Scott Whipple stated again that it was necessary he leave to meet with the people waiting in Times Square. CRA Committee member Roxie Smith suggested a recess to go look at the lights. It was asked where extra monies could come from. Commissioner Judah explained again how he believed it could be accomplished and undergrounding done. The \$300,000 in community park impact fees is subject to Board approval but looks very good.

A recess was called and the meeting would resume on return. The meeting recessed at 8:00 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 9:15 p.m. On return, Roxie Smith stated that the CRA Committee would like to meet as a committee, take a vote among themselves and come to the Council with their recommendation. It was agreed to proceed.

It was confirmed that a quorum was present. Roxie Smith asked what the committee wanted to recommend to the Town Council. Options presented were:

1) Commissioner Rusty Judah:

Cut sidewalk project on the south end of the island by one-half with savings of \$350,000+/-; get a commitment from the Board of County Commissioners for \$300,000 of community park impact fees; eliminate the Lynn Hall Park sidewalk; and eliminate the sidewalk on the bay side of Estero in the area of McDonalds. The above would permit the undergrounding of utilities and the sidewalks, thereby addressing both merchants and private resident concerns on the north end of the island. The rest of the sidewalks at the south end could be completed with ICT monies next fiscal year.

2) Pat: Eliminate undergrounding and eliminate part of the Lynn Hall project.

3) Ron Kidder: Eliminate all undergrounding; eliminate the sidewalk on the bay side from Times Square to tile Lani Kai; and leave the old bayside sidewalk as is.

It was generally agreed that options 2 and 3 were basically the same. Roxie Smith requested any other suggestions or options. The bottom line is underground or don't underground. A vote was called.

Option #1 received two votes. Option #2/3 was accepted. Therefore, it was the committee's recommendation to the Council to eliminate undergrounding of utilities. The bayside sidewalk would be another area to reduce costs. The committee recommended "let's get on with it and get it done." Roxie Smith stated that the committee would like to remain in place as an oversight committee if possible.

Councilwoman Cereceda asked if it would be possible to underground utilities later. The answer at this point is "no." A question was raised regarding paver blocks and what constitutes the base material. Shay Prather replied that she believes it to be a lime rock base. The pavers can be removed and replaced. The base is to be lime rock or similar rolled hard base, not just sand. An original advantage was supposed to be that the pavers could be removed later and underground utilities installed.

Council discussion and direction was that a resolution should be prepared for the next meeting. Ms. Segal-George will list it on the March 4 agenda with inter-local agreement language as well to resolve the maintenance issue.

A discussion ensued on maintenance with a question regarding the \$31,000 figure. Shay Prather stated she believes it to be a good figure based on industry private standards. The Council is already in possession of specifics of maintenance with costs broken out.

Councilmember Gar Reynolds shared with the group some comments that had been made to him and asked why the Council would want to impose a special tax or special indebtedness for a small pocket {Times Square} when the entire island must be maintained, he asked why a special taxing district was required and proposed that the special tax on one small part be eliminated.

Commissioner Judah explained that the inter-local agreement simply states that Lee County is not responsible for maintenance. Councilmember Reynolds stated he believes the Council needs to remember that it is responsible for the entire island, not just Times Square. It was stated that at the time the special taxing district anticipated different maintenance standards or requirements for that particular area and for properties abutting that area only.

Councilmember Reynolds replied that if the property owners or business people in that area really want or need exceptional service, they should take care of it among themselves. He stated that maintenance levels and upkeep of the entire island is going to be easily improved over what the County has provided in the past anyway and asked if these businesses were willing to do anything to help maintain their own area.

Mrs. Segal-George stated that this was required as a condition for the inter-local agreement and signature of the County and Town to that agreement will resolve any questions. Language will be worked out in inter-local agreements to release Lee County from liability for maintenance. Councilwoman Cereceda asked who among the Council was in agreement with the committee's recommendations. Councilmember Reynolds stated disagreement with the recommendation because of lack of rebid effort. It was stated that in an ideal world, underground utilities would be nice. However if the will is to get it going and this is what it will take, then the Town should proceed. The Council should address the issue of undergrounding in the future if it decides to do so. There has been enough talk.

Councilwoman Cereceda reiterated that she did not like the recommendation and would prefer to wait another year or so and do it right. She stated she will make a point of talking to merchants regarding whether they are willing to hook into underground utilities. If they are not, then the project should proceed.

Councilmember Reynolds expressed doubts that the project is ready to start. It was stated that the project would start after season or approximately April 15. Shay Prather stated that all permits should be in place. All is ready except DOT. Mid-April is realistic and they will move as quickly as possible. Councilmember Reynolds asked if contracts were signed. Shay Prather stated she could not answer because there is no inter-local agreement in place.

Councilwoman Cereceda addressed Ms. Segal-George: I think we need to bring all of this back to the Council for a vote on March 4. Councilmember Reynolds asked again about signed contracts. Shay Prather responded that only bids had been received and contract negotiations were on-going. Councilmember Reynolds asked what will happen from the time the inter-local agreement is approved. She replied that contracts are in place and work will go forward when the inter-local agreement is signed.

Councilwoman Cereceda asked if \$1 million were to appear, would not the committee do the entirety of the project and do it right? She stated she feels strongly that a way must be found to do the project as originally planned.

Ms. Segal-George discussed some of the various funds and options that may be available, eg., TIF money, administrative money, park impact fee money, etc; and recommended that all of the Council meet and discuss with the Board of County Commissioners. There are some very good arguments in favor of Fort Myers Beach and it is worth discussion to determine if the project could be funded in its entirety. Councilwoman Cereceda asked Commissioner Judah about how County Administrator Stillwell participates in discussions during meetings. Would Ms. Segal-George's recommendation be worthwhile? Commissioner Judah stated that it was his opinion that it was worthwhile.

Roxie Smith asked about discussion after a joint meeting regarding the \$300,000 and some return of administrative funds. Did that discussion occur? The discussion did not happen because after the other four Commissioners stated they would not agree to give another year of TIF, County Administrator Stillwell stated that they had made their policy and there was no need to discuss further. The County Commissioners very clearly stated they would not agree to another year of TIF.

Ms. Segal-George stated that there are three different items that can be discussed on a much broader approach, taking into account the entire history and progress of this project and she believes it is fair and equitable to enter discussions. The commitment in time and energy on this project justifies additional time spent in discussion with the County Commissioners. Comments were made regarding the increasing costs over the course of the project planning. Shay Prather stated that early estimates were just that-estimates. Waiting another year will mean additional expense.

Roxie Smith clarified that if it cannot be the way it was originally planned, then this is the recommendation.

A question was asked about the chances that the County will pledge additional monies. Commissioner Judah replied that it was the opinion tht the Commissioners had already decided but that he personally

encouraged the Council to meet with the Commissioners to discuss on the basis. Ms. Segal-George had outlined. Town Attorney Roosa offered that commissioner Judah's option was an alternative to allow for the entire project with just different sequencing. Originally, the last amenity was to be undergrounding of utilities. Councilmember Reynolds stated that he liked Mr. Judah's proposal as well but that the Council really needs to meet with all Commissioners. Further discussion was held. Commissioner Judah indicated that there are two other issues necessary to get a commitment on from the Board: (1) community impact fees, and (2) commitment for a portion of ICT money in July of next year. These commitments should be made a part of the inter-local agreement. That way, the commitment would be in place for those dollars; Commissioner Judah asked if a meeting should be set up.

It was agreed that a meeting should be set as soon as possible. Ms. Segal-George will attempt to set and asked what is to be included for the March agenda. It was asked if the meeting with the commissioners could be scheduled and held before the Council meeting in March. She replied possibly but very doubtful.

Councilmember Reynolds asked if Ms. Segal-George met with Commissioners before the Council meeting, could a draft proposal for the CRA project be prepared in time after a commitment from the Commission is in hand. It was agreed that it could be done but will be held pending a meeting with the Commissioners.

Ms. Segal-George reminded councilmembers that the agendas for Friday's and next Monday's meetings had been provided this evening in the package given to each member.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Secretary