



NEW PORT RICHEY

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
COMMITTED TO SERVICE

OUR MISSION: TO PROVIDE RESPONSIVE, PROFESSIONAL, AND COURTEOUS SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC

6132 PINE HILL ROAD • PORT RICHEY, FL 34652 • 727.841.4536

Pavement Management Plan Committee Members

- Peter Altman
- Michael Beam
- Ronald Capalongo
- Heather Fiorentino
- John Gallagher
- Steve Halkias
- Anderson Hatcher
- Lois Robinson

MINUTES OF THE PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE
CITY OF NEW PORT RICHEY

NEW PORT RICHEY RECREATION & AQUATIC CENTER GAME ROOM
6630 VAN BUREN STREET, NEW PORT RICHEY, FL

February 14, 2017

10:00 AM

ORDER OF
BUSINESS

1. Call to Order – Sign In

The meeting was called to order by Robert Rivera at 10:00 am. Mr. Rivera greeted all in attendance and asked if all committee members could sign in. Mr. Gallagher asked if we were following the sunshine law and if everyone knew what it was. Mr. Rivera acknowledged that the sunshine law should be followed. Those on the committee and in attendance were, Steve Halkias, John Gallagher, Lois Robinson, Michael Beam, Peter Altman, Ronald Capalong, and Heather Fiorentino.

Also in attendance were PWD Director Robert Rivera, Finance Director Crystal Feast, PWD Acting Assistant Director Barret Doe, PWD GIS/Data Technician Samantha Hamilton, David Fleeman and Bruce Kaschyk from the Genesis Group.

Mr. Rivera began the meeting by asking the committee if a recap of everything that was already covered was necessary. The committee agreed that wouldn't be necessary. Mr. Rivera then brought up that instead of looking at the pros and cons of the old P.M.P., the committee should look at the new P.M.P and discuss what they liked, didn't like, etc. in a round table setting. Mr. Rivera then introduced Finance Director Crystal Feast.

Mr. Rivera then stated that another meeting will take place with all suggestions compiled into a new plan, and that City Manager Debbie Manns and Crystal Feast will be at the next meeting to discuss finances.

Mr. Gallagher then asked if the committee brings up any recommendations, will they even be acknowledged.

Mr. Rivera replied yes, and that it is up to the city council to make informed decisions. Mr. Rivera continued by saying that the committee is meant to represent what is best for the city, and will provide several outlooks. Mr. Rivera then introduced David Fleeman with Genesis Group.

Mr. Fleeman explained the methodology used by Genesis Group to come up with the P.M.P.

Mr. Capalong stated that he thought the plan was logical, factual, however he doesn't agree with it. He noted that he thought the city did a good job on coming up with the plan.

Mr. Beam asked if the analysis was based on 70 miles of roadways.

Mr. Rivera responded that the 70 miles excluded private and county roads.

Mr. Beam then asked if other P.M.P.'s were examined by the Genesis Group.

Mr. Fleeman responded no.

Mr. Rivera then stated that 90% of the other agencies are like the City's existing plan; assessments are done using linear feet. We are looking into examining the City of Northport's P.M.P. We have heard that it is network based.

Mr. Gallagher then brought up that the city allocate money from Penny for Pasco or gas taxes for this project.

Mr. Rivera then initiated the roundtable session portion of the meeting.

Ms. Fiorentino began by bringing up the lack of leadership from city council and the city manager, and that only having 12 roads done in 30 years is disgusting. Ms. Fiorentino then asked why we are going to charge schools and not county or state, or other government properties, and that the broken up phases of the project especially along Main St. does not make sense. Ms. Fiorentino stated that council should have added money over the years for this project, and that she is in favor of a flat tax rate. Ms. Fiorentino then asked if the city has the equipment and the man power to do our own roads. Ms. Fiorentino also had issues with the amount being evaluated annually.

Mr. Rivera responded that if the price for road repairs went down then council would evaluate the plan annually, and that the plan was designed on a 20 year criteria.

Ms. Fiorentino then added that it would be a problem if a new city council could come back, review the plan and make changes, and that the charges made to people should be locked in rate for five years at least.

Mr. Halkias then spoke about how he was misquoted in the last meeting's minutes. Corrections have been made. Mr. Halkias then asked how the paving related to traffic, and brought up how bad the intersection of Grand Blvd. and Illinois Ave. looked. Mr. Halkias brought up that there are streets not on the P.M.P. that are in horrible shape, and that our alleys have been in need of maintenance for some time now. Mr. Halkias stated that he liked the idea of main roads being paved, however doesn't think the plan is fair for his neighborhood or dead end roads.

Mr. Rivera replied that the roads in the plan are ranked and that a cycle will be done annually. This is a living document.

Mr. Gallagher then brought up how the plan being a living document makes it worse.

Mr. Rivera replied by living document, that means the rankings of the roads can change in order, but the methodology will remain the same.

Mr. Gallagher thought the technical basis was OK, however recognized that some streets in need were not in the 20 year program. Mr. Gallagher then asked how this affects where you live, stated that he thinks council will change the plan in the future, and asked about those who have paid or made partial payments.

Mr. Rivera responded that those who have paid, made partial payments, credits, etc. have been brought up and that we need to look at this more.

Mr. Gallagher then requested a copy of the city's CIP from Ms. Feast, and after review stated that it seems paving roads is not a priority compared to other CIP projects.

Ms. Feast stated that funds from other sources, such as Penny for Pasco, help assist with some of the City's CIP's.

Mr. Gallagher then brought up that the city should use bonds, Penny for Pasco, and gas taxes for paving roads. Mr. Gallagher questioned the methodology of the plan, stating it has no direct benefit to him, and asked what happens if the plan changes every five years.

Mr. Rivera explained that in the five year plan some roads can jump in front of other roads based on needs.

Mr. Altman then stated that he enjoys the collaboration of the committee, but stressed the need for a benefit to come from the P.M.P. Mr. Altman brought up that he thinks city council has interfered with the staff's work on the P.M.P., and has put pressure on staff to modify it. Mr. Altman then said that the fees need to be kept the same, he would like to eliminate modifications due to political influence, and that we need to find multiple sources of funding for paving. Mr. Altman brought up the Department of Agriculture for example, and potentially going for a loan, and stated that he thinks commercial properties

should have to contribute as well. Mr. Altman thought using Penny for Pasco and gas taxes would be a positive move.

Ms. Fiorentino then asked if council bonded money would that help with gas taxes.

Mr. Rivera replied that the city could look into that.

Mr. Altman then stated that if rates go up the residents will have to be notified, and that a new public hearing would have to happen. Mr. Altman finished with stating that it is key that we change the appearance of the city, and that the infrastructure is in poor condition.

Mr. Capalong then began by asking about sidewalks, if we have inventory, and priorities for repairing them.

Mr. Rivera replied yes and that they are ranked.

Mr. Capalong asked if the city does routine crack filling and if there is money allocated.

Mr. Rivera replied yes and the money comes out of the street division's budget.

Mr. Capalong then stated that in a sense he agrees with the priorities of the plan, and then asked about the result of delinquent payments.

Ms. Feast replied that a lean would be put on the home tied to a delinquent payment.

Mr. Capalong then asked why gas tax would go to anything else other than paving.

Mr. Altman replied that the County has one pot of gas tax money and delegates it accordingly.

Mr. Rivera agreed that there is only so much gas tax money to go around.

Mr. Capalong then asked where the gas money goes.

Mr. Altman replied that it is used for main corridors.

Mr. Capalong then brought up the question of why some properties were exempt.

Mr. River replied that the charges are made depending on location.

Mr. Capalong then brought up the Marine Parkway multi-use path, questioned what revenue it will bring to the city, and asked about new properties getting charged.

Mr. Rivera replied that the multi-use path would not increase revenue, but would add to the quality of life in the city, and that tax exempt parcels such as lift stations or R.O.W.'s would not get charged.

Mr. Capalong then brought up differences in the dollar amounts in the P.M.P. packet ("85 and change") and thinks that all numbers should be the same. Mr. Capalong then asked if manholes are taken into consideration when paving.

Mr. Rivera replied yes.

Mr. Capalong then handed out a new proposal he put together for everyone to review.

Ms. Robinson began with stating that the public is not aware of things like Penny for Pasco, and that the mayor and city council need to be more responsible. Ms. Robinson then asked how much from Penny for Pasco goes into road repairs, and where does the gas tax money go.

Ms. Feast responded that Penny for Pasco Money rolls over and other grant funds are included in CIP's, not just Penny money.

Ms. Robinson then stated that she would like a breakdown of the Penny for Pasco money, and likes Mr. Altman's idea of getting a loan from the Department of Agriculture. Ms. Robinson said she thinks the plan needs to be consistent for years and not changed, that a break off point needs to be established pertaining to leans on properties due to delinquent payments, and that representatives of shopping centers and churches need to be at the committee meetings.

Mr. Rivera replied that he tried to get representatives from shopping centers and churches to attend with no luck.

Ms. Robinson finished by stating that politics need to come out of the P.M.P., and that residents really need to attend council meetings and workshops.

Mr. Gallagher then asked when the FY 2018 budget will be available for the public to review.

Ms. Feast replied that in June or July it would be available

Ms. Robinson added that simplifying the budget forms would be in the public's best interest, and that a commitment on a project like this needs to be set in stone for years.

Mr. Beam began by agreeing with Ms. Fiorentino's thoughts that government properties should be assessed. Mr. Beam continued by stating that double assessments are an issue, that decent rates need to be locked in, and that we need to get our roads back to municipal standards. Mr. Beam finished with stating that we could add fees to tax rolls.

Mr. Rivera then asked when would be best to meet again. The committee and other in the meeting agreed to meet on Tuesday, February 28th 2017 at the rec center in the game room.

Mr. Altman added that every residential lot should be treated the same.

Mr. Gallagher added that the assessment should be based off of using front footage using a tax roll.

Ms. Feast added that she would bring budget breakdowns for all to review at the next meeting.

Mr. Beam finished with noting two errors in the minutes for the last meeting. Corrections have been made.

The meeting then adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE

CITY OF NEW PORT RICHEY

NEW PORT RICHEY RECREATION & AQUATIC CENTER GAME ROOM

6630 VAN BUREN STREET, NEW PORT RICHEY, FL

February 28, 2017

10:00 AM

ORDER OF

BUSINESS

1. Call to Order -- Sign In

The meeting was called to order by Robert Rivera at 10:03 am. Mr. Rivera greeted all in attendance and asked if all committee members could sign in. Those on the committee and in attendance were, Steve Halkias, John Gallagher, Lois Robinson, Michael Beam, Peter Altman, Ronald Capalongo, Andy Hatcher, and Heather Fiorentino.

Also in attendance were City Manager Debbie Manns, PWD Director Robert Rivera, Finance Director Crystal Feast, PWD Acting Assistant Director Barret Doe, PWD GIS/Data Technician Samantha Hamilton, and David Fleeman from the Genesis Group.

Mr. Rivera began the meeting by letting all committee members know that meeting minutes from the last meeting had been handed out and for them to please review and contact Sam by Friday (03/03/17) if any corrections needed to be made.

Mr. Rivera then introduced Andy Hatcher, let the other committee members know that he has been unable to attend the last meetings due to an illness, gave Mr. Hatcher a recap and review of the last two meetings, and gave Mr. Hatcher the floor to speak to the rest of the committee on what he thinks of the pavement management plans.

Mr. Hatcher started by saying that assessments shouldn't be based on front footage, but on live in units. Mr. Hatcher used apartments as an example, and stated that everyone living in an apartment has a vehicle. Mr. Hatcher then used his property as an example of how front footage shouldn't be assessed, and finished with the concept of assessing \$50 per year, per living unit.

Mr. River then brought up how at the last meeting the committee members wanted to discuss funding more in depth. Mr. Rivera then introduced City Manager Debbie Manns and Finance Director Crystal Feast.

Ms. Feast began by explaining that she had put together summaries of Penny for Pasco pot 1 and pot 2, local option gas taxes, and where those monies were to be spent.

Samantha Hamilton then handed out the packets prepared by Ms. Feast to all in attendance.

Ms. Feast then explained how the first page in the handout is a breakdown of Penny for Pasco pot 1, discussed where funds were going, and discussed the percentages of the categories in the handout that have been met.

Ms. Manns added that the City spends 45% of Penny pot 1 money on environmental improvements.

Mr. Capalongo asked what does that mean.

Ms. Manns explained that Penny pot 1 money is broken down into three categories for spending. 45% is used for environmental improvements, 35% is for transportation and road improvements, and 20% is for public improvements. Ms. Manns added that these percentages are set by the city council.

Mr. Gallagher mentioned that the County uses different percentages for spending.

Mr. Altman added that the police department benefitted from Penny for Pasco money as well.

Ms. Robinson asked what the city gets a year for Penny for Pasco.

Ms. Manns replied that 1.8 million is generated for Penny pot 1 and pot 2.

Ms. Feast added that Penny money has ranged from 1.6 to 2.2 million.

Ms. Manns continued by saying that city council has not yet distinguished where Penny pot 2 money will go, and that the decision will most likely be made in the next couple of months.

Mr. Capalongo asked who sets the percentages.

Ms. Manns replied that city council sets the percentages.

Mr. Beam asked if the percentage is set for 10 years.

Ms. Manns replied yes that it is set for 10 years.

Mr. Rivera added that the percentages are allocated, however an equal amount might not be spent right away, and that this is OK as long as the percentages are eventually met.

Ms. Robinson then asked about the past and future spending of the Penny monies.

Ms. Feast then explained the handout more in depth, how Penny pot 2 money (1.6 million) will roll forward, how that is money the city hasn't spent yet, how it is in reserve for FY 17 spending, and what projects it will be used on based on what has been voted on for spending. Ms. Feast then explained that there will be a total of 3.9 million of Penny money available for spending and then explained the city's fiscal year timeline and dates.

Mr. Hatcher then asked about street improvements.

Ms. Feast then gave a summary of the local option gas tax, street improvement fund, how money is rolled forward, etc. Ms. Feast also explained the handouts more in depth and that there is also special street assessment revenue money that we are still collecting over the course of 10 years. Ms. Feast then explained the planned spending and mentioned that no new assessments are planned for this year, and explained the breakdown of the local option gas tax in more detail.

Mr. Gallagher then asked what the 1.12 million in Street Improvements was for.

Mr. Rivera explained that it is for the design of collector roads, street paving, etc. and that Public Works will get a list of collector roads for the committee soon.

Ms. Robinson then asked why no money from Penny had been spent on paving.

Ms. Manns then explained the plans for the Marine Parkway overpass and the completion of the Marine Parkway multi-use path.

Mr. Gallagher asked is all items in the handout are staff recommended.

Ms. Manns replied no.

Mr. Capalongo then asked why we replaced the sidewalk on Marine Parkway.

Mr. Rivera responded by explaining the purpose of the multi-use path.

Mr. Gallagher asked if there were plans to connect it to anything.

Mr. Rivera responded yes and explained in more detail that a survey had been done, how the path improves quality of life elements, that staff and council reviewed, and eventually approved the project. Mr. Rivera then explained the plans for path tie-ins.

Mr. Halkias brought up that most people thought it would be like Dunedin.

Ms. Manns responded that is the plan, to extend the multi-use path and connect Grand Blvd. and Main St.

Ms. Fiorentino agreed with the multi-use path plan after looking at the handouts narrowly, however questioned the Oreto Industrial Park's assessment.

Mr. Rivera reiterated that we (the committee and the city) need to establish a plan and present it to council.

Ms. Fiorentino added that the whole city needs to be taken into account.

Mr. Capalongo then stated what we need to generate more revenue.

Mr. Rivera explained how quality of life projects will indirectly generate revenue, and that capital improvement projects will generate revenue in the long run.

Mr. Halkias then questioned the city's landscaping projects.

Ms. Fiorentino then mentioned how we need to work out needs vs. wants.

Mr. Gallagher then questioned the city's priorities.

Ms. Manns responded by stating that roads are a priority of the city council, that we need road improvements, improvements will have an effect on blighted neighborhoods, and that the purpose of this committee is to establish an effective plan.

Mr. Gallagher then asked where the gas tax money goes.

Ms. Manns responded that since she has been here that money has gone to roads and sidewalks.

Ms. Robinson then requested a breakdown of the percentages of street, environmental, and public improvements.

Ms. Fiorentino then explained the breakdown of Penny for Pasco funds and how funds were distributed. Ms. Fiorentino added that this committee needs to tell city council that roads and people's needs are a priority.

Mr. Hatcher asked if this assessment would sunset in five years.

Mr. Rivera answered that is not what we want to go with, and that plan has to go through a cycle of paving a network of roads.

Mr. Gallagher stated that's the plan we have now.

Mr. Rivera said that he was answering Mr. Hatcher's question, and that we need to look at the tax roll, and if the assessment was based on units then an assessment would have to be done annually. Mr. Rivera added that there would be no sunset clause, but the estimate would be reviewable.

Mr. Hatcher then brought up the stormwater tax as an example.

Mr. Altman then added that Penny for Pasco is a 10 year program, and if the monies from Penny were to go away the city would need to hunt for funds elsewhere.

Ms. Fiorentino then suggested using Penny money for improvements, then use gas tax for repairs, put money up front then switch.

Mr. Rivera added that revenue would generate from gas tax if the city did half in one cycle.

Mr. Gallagher then asked if there is a cap on the gas tax.

Mr. Altman answered that there is no cap.

Ms. Manns added that the climate of the city council is conservative.

Mr. Gallagher asked how apartments get assessed.

Mr. Hatcher expanded on that stating that there are too many rentals in the city and they should be paying as well.

Mr. Rivera used the 2011 Street Improvement plan as an example of high dollar amounts that can be adjusted due to the high amounts.

Mr. Altman then brought up Mr. Gallagher's taxes, and how the current plan lowers the tax millage. Mr. Altman added that the tax rate is too high.

Mr. Gallagher responded to Mr. Altman by telling him to let all know what his franchise fees are as well. Mr. Gallagher then advised that we put all the money together and spend, put money on a tax roll and the project would be done.

Ms. Fiorentino added that assessed properties need to be living units, that tax millage needs to be brought down, and that we need to sell that to council. Ms. Fiorentino also questioned the logic of bar and restaurant assessment.

Mr. Rivera responded that the plan needs to be network assessed evenly regardless of class, all pay the same amount, and explained his proposed "S.O.A.P." to the committee.

Mr. Gallagher agreed that Mr. Rivera's plan makes sense.

Mr. Rivera then went on to explain collector roads, peak hours, etc. to the committee and that we need to define roads.

Ms. Robinson brought up multi-family questions and concerns.

Ms. Fiorentino added that churches are paying way more than bars, and that we need equality.

Mr. Gallagher noted again that he liked Mr. Rivera's plan.

Ms. Robinson added again that she questions how bars, drive thru restaurants, and churches are assessed.

Mr. Gallagher then said that assessment should be based on trips and not lot size.

Mr. Fleeman then explained again the methodology of the assessment.

Mr. Rivera added that the plan that the city and the committee agree upon needs to be accepted by the public.

Mr. Gallagher suggested that we take a look at how much it would take to assess collector roads and get rid of land size assessment.

Mr. Altman added that we need to do something major quickly.

Ms. Fiorentino stated that the city needs to put money where it should be, and that council needs to put more money into the streets.

Mr. Gallagher noted the importance of building strong neighborhoods.

Mr. Rivera then stated that the next meeting would be in a month and the city would go over and present a proposed plan to the committee.

Ms. Fiorentino asked if the committee members could get the plan a week prior to the next meeting for review.

Mr. Rivera answered yes.

Mr. Capalongo then discussed his proposed plan that he had brought to the last meeting and handed out.

Mr. Gallagher stated that things not being locked in are worrisome.

Mr. Rivera brought up that any plan would need to defend a direct benefit.

Mr. Altman then asked why the old methodology is held onto with a "death grip."

Mr. Gallagher stated that when he was on the County Commission they stuck to the rules and that the city needs to do the same.

Mr. Altman continued that we need to come up with a plan and assess commercial properties.

Mr. Rivera then then reiterated that we need to present all proposed plans to city council.

Mr. Gallagher then stated that we should find out if Mr. Rivera's plan has merit with the city council.

Ms. Feast then wrote down three proposed plans on the yellow board.

Ms. Hamilton then passed out Mr. Rivera's Vision of Proposed Plan document.

Mr. Gallagher stated that he thinks gas taxes should be used in all plans.

Ms. Fiorentino questioned the percentage breakdowns in the plans.

Mr. Gallagher then requested that the committee vote now on a plan.

Mr. Rivera added that the original plan on the board would need to be modified.

After no votes for the 1st plan on the board, Mr. Rivera explained all plans and the dollar figures pertaining to each plan.

At this point in the meeting the committee discussed all facets of each of the three plans, and Ms. Manns, Ms. Feast, and Mr. Rivera assisted with clarifications and explanations of methodology.

Mr. Fleeman then brought up the idea of a 4th plan where every road would be done within a 20 year span.

Mr. Gallagher stated that there is no certainty to the 4th plan.

Mr. Rivera then explained the phases of the plans, and that the city would come back with summaries of plans 2 and 3 and that we would all meet again.

Mr. Beam asked if tables could be generated for each plan.

Ms. Manns and Mr. Rivera replied yes.

Ms. Feast then asked the committee if everyone was clear on plan 3.

Mr. Altman then summarized all plans for the committee again.

Ms. Fiorentino then stated that she wants to see all the plans broken down before a vote is taken.

Mr. Rivera then covered the elements of the plans again, how they would be 20 year plans, spoke of incremental stages, gas taxes, etc.

Mr. Gallagher suggested going with plan 2 and to not worry about those who have already been assessed.

Mr. Rivera then explained how we would go back 20 years to determine credits needing to be assessed.

Mr. Capalongo then brought up the CIP of having fire station 2 relocated.

Ms. Manns responded that there has been some thought on it and that a decision has not been made.

Mr. Rivera then advised that the next committee meeting would be held on Tuesday, March 28th at 10:00 a.m. at the same location.

Ms. Robinson then asked Ms. Feast about the status of the Penny 1 pot money.

Ms. Feast responded that Penny 1 pot money had been spent.

Mr. Rivera then concluded the meeting at 11:50 a.m. and asked all in the committee again to submit their changes to the last meeting's minutes to Ms. Hamilton by Friday (03/03/17)

The meeting was then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE
CITY OF NEW PORT RICHEY

NEW PORT RICHEY RECREATION & AQUATIC CENTER GAME ROOM
6630 VAN BUREN STREET, NEW PORT RICHEY, FL

April 5, 2017

10:00 AM

ORDER OF

BUSINESS

1. Call to Order – Sign In

The meeting was called to order by Robert Rivera at 10:01 am. Mr. Rivera greeted all in attendance and asked if all committee members could sign in. Those on the committee and in attendance were, Steve Halkias, John Gallagher, Lois Robinson, Michael Beam, Peter Altman, Ronald Capalong, Heather Fiorentino, and Andy Hatcher.

Also in attendance were PWD Director Robert Rivera, Finance Director Crystal Feast, PWD Acting Assistant Director Barret Doe, PWD GIS/Data Technician Samantha Hamilton, David Fleeman with the Genesis Group, Councilman Chopper Davis, and Mr. Hatcher's wife.

Mr. Rivera began the meeting by apologizing for not having the updated P.M.P. reports sent out to the committee earlier. He then suggested that this meeting be used to go over the reports. Mr. Rivera explained that all items changed were based on the committee's comments and that all changes made in the document handed out are in red. Mr. Rivera then explained some other changes in the documents that David Fleeman made, and that this plan isn't final, and that the committee needs to narrow it down. Mr. Rivera explained the engineer's comments on item four of page one, and that city council wanted include alleys in the report. Mr. Rivera added that a committee of residents

would be able to discuss the alley plan at a city council work session meeting. Mr. Rivera then went over minor changes on page two of the report pertaining to bond issuances, and discussed the possibility of bonds for the P.M.P. Mr. Rivera discussed how new language was added regarding the CIPs on page three which contains a historical payment overview based on front footage of property, ERUs based on class of property, how each ERU was assessed to each property and that there was no bearing on the size of the home. Mr. Rivera then covered that there was added historical language on page three of the report. Mr. Rivera continued on by letting the committee know that on page four there were ten additional items inserted based on the committee's recommendations. Mr. Rivera let the committee know that city council will be made aware of these new items on the report. Mr. Rivera then went over all other minor changes on the report and asked for the committee's feedback.

Mr. Hatcher asked that when the billing comes from the Pasco County Tax Collector, will everything be on the same bill.

Mr. Rivera responded by saying that it would depend on what P.M.P is decided upon.

Mr. Altman added that residents would receive a bill for the entire amount, and if it couldn't be paid in full it would be in a tax roll.

Ms. Fiorentino said that people can't afford to pay two thousand dollars extra today.

Ms. Feast responded by saying that there would be a grace period allowed if the current system remained the same.

Mr. Hatcher brought up stormdrain taxes to use as an example.

Mr. Capalonga asked how the City does streetlight taxes and if that plan can change.

Mr. Rivera replied yes.

Mr. Altman added that with these proposed changes, letters would need to go out and a public hearing would need to take place.

Mr. Hatcher then made the point that no new stormdrains have gone in recently.

Mr. Rivera then explained the differences between stormdrain taxes and this P.M.P.

Mr. Gallagher added that the plan needs to be kept simple.

Ms. Robinson then brought up the issue of credits if the plan stayed the same.

Mr. Hatcher brought up how the U.S. Congress has proposed new road improvement plans and how the City should ask for money.

Mr. Rivera assured Mr. Hatcher that city council is looking into federal monies to assist the City.

Ms. Fiorentino then asked if we could invite the County in to help aid, and that the City needs to utilize the County, Federal monies, etc.

Mr. Rivera responded that we can add that into the objectives of the report, and then covered item two pertaining to Florida statutes.

Mr. Gallagher spoke up that if council changes the plan once it is in place, everyone should get a refund.

Mr. River then covered item four.

Mr. Gallagher then raised questions about multi-family trip rates and other ERU questions.

Mr. Rivera responded by going over ERU rates and data.

Mr. Fleeman added that this would all be covered later in the report.

Mr. River then went over items five through ten and reminded the committee that these items are not set in stone and are subject to change.

Ms. Robinson brought up that there will be a lot of flak from people who already owe money.

Ms. Feast then asked if the committee is suggesting forgiving fees that haven't been paid.

Mr. River then brought up that we are talking about people who haven't already paid.

Ms. Feast then answered that foreclosure proceedings would take place if no payments were made.

Mr. Rivera added that a policy approved by city council would need to be provided pertaining to putting a lean on a property.

Mr. Gallagher then said that money owed should be put on a tax bill.

Ms. Feast responded that she wasn't sure if we could do that.

Mr. Hatcher then brought up issues with the P.M.P pertaining to the Briar Patch community.

Mr. Fleeman again stated that all items the committee continued to bring up will be brought up later and covered in the document.

Mr. Gallagher asked if we had a consensus of arterial and collector roads.

Mr. Rivera responded yes.

Mr. Feast then added that what we went over was existing.

Mr. Rivera then moved on to the proposed plan on page six where he brought up additional language that was added, covered identified funds, statutes and benefits of the

new P.M.P. Mr. River then suggested putting monies into collector roads and explained why.

Ms. Feast added that since the program is over the course of twenty years we should be conservative for the first ten years.

Robert then explained what would happen if the millage rate would change as an example.

Ms. Fiorentino agreed that the plan is better off by taking a conservative approach.

Mr. Rivera then brought up that city council would need to discuss the items on page six and explained how the money was moved around in the new plan.

Mr. Altman said to add language of "total amount going towards" to clarify the document.

Mr. Rivera then went over page seven and brought up how the City of North Port's P.M.P. compared to our proposed plan.

Then Mr. Rivera and Mr. Fleeman went over the changes on page eight, the changes in dollar amounts, and fractions.

Ms. Robinson asked where exhibit "B" was in the document.

Mr. Rivera replied that Mr. Fleeman would be updating the documents to show exhibit "B".

Mr. Rivera then went over the rest of page eight, covered more information on ERUs, and stated that we would begin only by paving collector roads. Mr. Rivera then covered page ten of the document, discussing added language, how the City Attorney preliminarily reviewed the document and how he would use the committee's comments to put together a draft of the P.M.P. to present to city council.

Mr. River then brought up different legal cases pertaining to P.M.P.s.

Mr. Beam asked for a copy of each case's documentation.

Mr. Rivera then noted that exception and appeals language, wetlands language, etc. was added to page eleven and then brought up credits. Mr. Rivera explained and called out language and credit changes and called out the discrepancies. Mr. Rivera then stated that Ms. Feast had come up with the methodology and went over the details of how people who haven't paid would be handled.

Mr. Gallagher stated that all this is creating more work.

Mr. Rivera then said that we will have the City Attorney approve whatever plan is decided upon and will make sure it legally sound.

Ms. Fiorentino then added that she likes the idea of assessing people who still haven't paid.

Ms. Robinson then asked if we could add examples using certain dollar amounts to the document.

Ms. Feast replied that she was planning on doing so.

Mr. Rivera confirmed that the final report will have examples, and then addressed how alleys were covered in the plan on page thirteen. Mr. Rivera then proposed how he thought we need to keep any alley plan separate from the plan we have been working on.

Ms. Fiorentino said she thinks that the City needs to look at alleys, tree debris, holes, alley improvements, etc.

Mr. Rivera replied to add all recommendations to the document.

Ms. Feast then gave a presentation and an example of credit application. This was followed by questions and answers with Ms. Feast and Mr. Rivera.

Mr. Flecman then covered dollar figures for different classes, single family residences, trip counts, costs, local street components, etc. This was followed by questions and answers with Mr. Fleeman and Mr. Rivera.

Mr. Fleeman then presented several examples of what different properties would pay in the City depending on their location in relation to main collector road fronts, if there were two adjacent streets to the property, etc., and used properties on U.S. Highway 19 and Main St. as examples.

A consensus of the committee was made that all math needed to be done and broken down to see all dollar amounts. The discussion included excluding U.S. Highway 19 properties.

Mr. Rivera then began to bring the meeting to an end by asking all committee members to review what we have provided and to have all comments back to us by Thursday, the 13th of April.

Mr. Capalongo asked if meeting agendas could be provided.

Mr. Gallagher stated that we need to vote up or down and move on.

Mr. Rivera then set the schedule for the next meeting to be Monday, April 24th at 1:30 p.m. at the rec center.

Mr. Rivera adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE

CITY OF NEW PORT RICHEY

NEW PORT RICHEY RECREATION & AQUATIC CENTER GAME ROOM

6630 VAN BUREN STREET, NEW PORT RICHEY, FL

April 24, 2017

1:30 PM

ORDER OF

BUSINESS

1. Call to Order – Sign In

The meeting was called to order by Robert Rivera at 1:37 pm. Mr. Rivera greeted all in attendance and asked if all committee members could sign in. Those on the committee and in attendance were, Steve Halkias, John Gallagher, Lois Robinson, Michael Beam, Peter Altman, Ronald Capalongo, and Heather Fiorentino.

Also in attendance were PWD Director Robert Rivera, PWD Acting Assistant Director Barret Doe, PWD GIS/Data Technician Samantha Hamilton, and David Fleeman with the Genesis Group

Mr. Rivera addressed the committee and let them know that this would be the final P.M.P. committee meeting. Mr. Rivera recapped the last meeting, and spoke on what things were added and removed to the proposed plans. Mr. Rivera let all know that all new comments added are in red on the documents received by the committee. Mr. Rivera then brought up the comments made about alleys and if the committee wanted alleys to be handled as streets are in the P.M.P.

Mr. Halkias brought up that alleys are the City's responsibility, and that the previous owner of his home stated that his alley hasn't been touched in years. Mr. Halkias then

brought up that City trucks have been up and down his alley, and if alleys are handled as streets are to be in the P.M.P., would he have to take care of the alleys.

Mr. Rivera responded by stating that Mr. Doe will have City crews take a look at his alley and the area in question, and how the City performs minimal maintenance in the alleys. Mr. Rivera then covered how he outlined everyone's comments, that majority rules, but how all comments must be addressed. Mr. Rivera then explained the process of how the decided upon plan will need to be reviewed, will be presented to city council, that the P.M.P. committee will be invited to a council meeting to allow the committee to voice their opinions and concerns about the chosen P.M.P. and that at that meeting would be the appropriate time to speak to council on the issue of the alleys. Mr. Rivera then went over how the plan is a starting point, is a needs assessment, and that including alleys would require a complete plan overhaul of the study performed.

Ms. Fiorentino brought up how she understands there are issues with the alleys, and how paving all alleys would affect yard debris pickup. Ms. Fiorentino then brought up how her neighbors add throw down grass or sod that creates flooding, that City crews dig holes when performing pick up, and that the alleys need to be maintained and are contaminated.

Mr. Altman then stated that we have a consensus that alleys are not part of the original plan.

Mr. Gallagher added that all should just call Public Works for as needed alley maintenance.

Mr. Rivera then assured Mr. Halkias that his voice would be heard.

Mr. Halkias then brought up how he loves the yard debris program, however illegal dumping is an issue at Illinois Ave. and Lafayette St.

Mr. Rivera assured Mr. Halkias that Mr. Doe would look into the issue. Mr. Rivera then asked the committee to turn to page three, explained how the City looked at the 2009 assessment, used it as exhibit B, that it shows three different types of assessments, and explained the three different types to the committee. Mr. Rivera covered the details Re: contributions, special roads, etc.

Mr. Altman asked what the logic was for those plans.

Mr. Rivera answered that there was no logic, but more of a sense of what the City wanted to do.

Mr. Altman responded that logic is important.

Mr. Rivera then stated that the City needed to provide backup to city council on how the plan was done.

Mr. Gallagher then stated that this is not a sustainable system.

Mr. Rivera then responded that the City will give the committee three plans to vote on.

Ms. Robinson noted that she thought it was a fair assessment.

Mr. Altman brought up again the lack of logic.

Mr. Rivera then stated that city council will ask him what was done historically, hence bringing up the 2009 assessments. Mr. Rivera then covered how option one is to stay with the original plan in place, that old dues wouldn't be able to be added to a new tax roll, and that Crystal Feast spoke on this with the City Attorney. Mr. Rivera then noted that all things were added per the committee to page five.

Ms. Fiorentino stated that once city council votes, we need to start collecting.

Mr. Rivera answered by stating that city council would create a policy for collection and follow through with it.

There was then a general discussion on the options Re: leans on foreclosures on homes.

Mr. Gallagher stated that city council needs to approve a plan, and that City staff need to follow through with the plan.

Mr. Rivera noted that the residents as well as the committee have brought up the issue of leans and foreclosures.

There was then a general discussion on new bills versus old bills, and methods of collection.

Mr. Beam then asked if the collection of outstanding bills is being done correctly.

Mr. Rivera then covered item 8 in response, and how everyone pays.

Mr. Beam then asked what the collection limits are.

Mr. Rivera then covered the collection procedures, and how item ten will be changed in the document.

Mr. Altman then brought up questions pertaining to the collection methods.

Mr. Rivera asked the committee if they are all in agreement with item eight.

Mr. Gallagher asked what a direct benefit is.

Mr. Rivera responded by stating that it is if asphalt is directly adjacent to the property. Mr. Rivera then moved on to page seven and the second option. Mr. Rivera went over the methodology, the network system, how \$200,000.00 was added from Penny for Pasco, and that assessments in red called out what the committee wanted added. Mr. Rivera added that the City would not charge themselves due to the City already paying for 50%. Mr. Rivera continued that plan two is passed on a 20 year plan, that it is based on land and trips, and has been modified. Mr. Rivera added that US Highway 19 is still in the plan, and at this point he introduce David Fleeman to speak.

Mr. Fleeman explained that we moved away from trip generation to establish a fee due to discourse of the committee.

Mr. Gallagher asked didn't the committee agree that residential properties would be assessed and charged for collector roads.

Ms. Fiorentino added that it was brought up.

Mr. Rivera then explained option two more in depth, covering collector roads, implementation process, how it would be similar to Penny for Pasco, and that staff would go to city council with their input. Mr. Rivera added that city council would have the choice if they wanted to implement phase two of that plan. Mr. Rivera finished that with stating that the bottom line is that we need to start something, and that we all agree that collector roads need to be handled, and that phase one and two of the plan would look at everything as network based.

Mr. Fleeman added to that by stating we would still treat the plan as a network, similar to the historic plan. Mr. Fleeman then explained that we created three categories of parcels, broke commercial properties into two pieces, explained collector road details, and how commercial parcels would contribute to arterial and collector roads.

Mr. Gallagher stated that this is arbitrary.

Mr. Fleeman then explained that \$225,000.00 would need to be collected by the assessment to make this plan happen. Mr. Fleeman then moved on to page nine, where he covered local roads, explained details, exclusions, contributions, and again how much would be needed to be collected with the assessment plans.

Mr. Rivera then moved on to page twelve covering exceptions and appeals, comments on the City Manager hearing the appeals, and the topic of a pavement management committee.

Mr. Gallagher said to not come up with a P.M. committee.

Mr. Rivera answered that the committee consists of the City Manager, the City Attorney, and himself.

All of the P.M.P committee members then said to remove the P.M. committee.

Mr. Rivera then asked again and for a vote and all P.M.P. committee members asked for the P.M. committee to be removed.

Mr. Rivera then went on to cover option three, how the plan is divided into two phases, is network based, that the collector roads are the priority, went over annuals costs, and assessment expectation.

Mr. Altman then asked if this will be a ten year plan.

Mr. Rivera responded that the first five years will be spent on collector roads, and at the end of the five years we would go back to city council and say that it is time for phase two just like Penny for Pasco.

Mr. Gallagher stated that he thought doing the collector roads first is backwards and that residential roads need to be done first.

Mr. Fiorentino added to that by stating that something needs to get passed, but that city council is only hearing about the residential streets. Ms. Fiorentino then said that everyone agrees that the collector roads are the City's responsibility to maintain, and that we should divide the City into five sections where we combine the collector roads and the residential roads, how this would create a better perception, and that doing residential roads first would have the best perception.

Mr. Capalonga then mentioned that he thought we were going to fix the roads collectively.

Mr. Gallagher noted that he thinks we need to pick the worst residential roads first, then asked where Crystal Feast is getting the money to do this, and then stated that the plan is unsustainable.

Mr. Rivera then told the committee it was time to vote on a plan.

Ms. Robinson then asked for an explanation of the plans.

Mr. Rivera responded by explaining the main functions, points of all phases, what phases include, timelines, etc.

Ms. Robinson then asked for a more in depth explanation of plan two.

Mr. Rivera explained the plan and the changes made.

Mr. Halkias asked if plan two and three all have to pay something.

Mr. Rivera then explained the plans again, the phases, residential roads versus collector roads, etc.

There was then a general discussion on all three plans.

Mr. Altman stated that no residential roads would get done in five years with plan three.

Ms. Robinson then asked if we went with option three, would it be changed or would it be set in stone.

Mr. Rivera answered that council can change anything.

Ms. Fiorentino then asked for a timeline for residential streets in plan two.

Mr. Rivera responded that collector roads and residential roads would be included in the start of the plan.

Ms. Fiorentino then stated that whatever plan we chooses, we cannot forget about the residential streets.

Mr. Rivera answered that is option two.

Ms. Hamilton then added that based on the current plan, residential parcels would pay \$1,700.00 on original plan with a City contribution.

Mr. Gallagher then asked why River Rd. dead ended on the map that was handed out.

Mr. Rivera explained that it should have gone all the way to Sunset Rd., and that the County owns the rest of River Rd.

Mr. Gallagher then brought the map up to Mr. Rivera and Ms. Hamilton for more questioning.

Mr. Rivera then stated that we are doing traffic counts on River Rd. per city council, and that it was now time to vote on a P.M.P.

Mr. Gallagher said he would vote for option one, but would not vote because it is unsustainable.

The rest of the committee present all voted for option two.

Mr. Capalongo then began to go over his plan he presented in a past meeting.

Mr. Rivera ended with letting the committee know what we would put together a copy of the final report prior to the work session meeting, that we would contact the committee members individually about when that work session would be, and adjourned the meeting at 2:49 p.m.