

HARTLINE STUDY GROUP MEETING
Friday, March 10, 2006 9:00 AM
601 E. Kennedy Blvd, 26th floor, Conference Room B
Tampa, FL 33602

Members Present (6)

Brian Blair, Chair
Chelsea Bridges
Norbert Gobin
Kathy Harris
Carlton Lewis
Barbara Merritt

Staff Members Present

John Dausman, Study Group Consultant
Christine Beck, HC County Atty's Office
Sandra Sroka, HC ADA Liason
Mary Shavalier, HARTline
Ned Baier, HC Plng & Growth Mgmt
Ray Miller, HARTline
Patricia Morrison, secretarial support

Members Absent (1)

Brian Delamer

Others Present

Mark Holan
Ann Madden
Pierre Mathurin
Mike McCoy
Robert Babbitt

Gloria Mills
Sharon Streater
Konrad Smith
Marilyn Smith
Mary Ann Styles

Welcome and Introductions

Commissioner Brian Blair, Chair, called the final action meeting of the HARTline Group to order at 9:05 am. After introducing himself, Commissioner Blair asked each Study Group member and attendee to introduce themselves.

Mission Statements

Norbert Gobin read the HARTline Mission Statement and Barbara Merritt read the HARTline Study Group Mission Statement.

Approval of minutes of March 3, 2006 meeting

Brian Blair asked for comments and corrections to the draft minutes that were distributed before the meeting. John Dausman announced that the new draft included a few grammatical corrections received from Norbert Gobin and one phrase changed at the request of Christine Beck about who would have to ratify a charter change. The corrected phrase is the legislating members or bodies, which mean the three members of HARTline, (the Hillsborough County Commission, City of Tampa Council and Temple Terrace Council) would have to ratify any charter change.

Brian Blair stated I would like to add one thing to the minutes, just an answer to a question raised last week about the taxi cabs in Hillsborough County not having enough paratransit accessible vehicles. The answer that I got was the Sunshine Line and the HARTline move the people with physical challenges, take most of

the business, so it's supply and demand. If there was more of a demand for the private sector, they would have more ADA compliant vehicles.

Barbara Merritt moved that the minutes be adopted as amended. Norbert seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Kathy Harris stated that since this is the last decision meeting other than when we meet to go over the draft report, she wanted to recognize and thank the people from the public who have come to the majority of our meetings. We really appreciate your commitment and willingness to come and participate in the process and that your involvement played a significant role in our final recommendations to the board.

Brian Blair stated he would like to echo those sentiments. He said the Study Group ran a very informal meeting structure allowing the public to speak and if you want to make a strong point for your three minutes you can do that either the beginning or end of the meeting. But we don't mind if you have a question in between. He said that's been helpful in our meetings. We appreciate your dialog and input.

Kathy Harris moved to include in the final report in an appendix, all of the comments that the Study Group received from the public which are also included in the Study Group minutes. The motion was approved by consent with no objection.

Public Comment

Marilyn Smith commented that the Study Group as assembled was not the one that some powers, including some in Hillsborough County government, envisioned at the beginning. What has been opened up here has been unprecedented and really refreshing because there were certain entities that wanted to keep control and certainly didn't want any public participation. She added that while she was fighting to get the Study Group started, there were people who were deriding members that sit here. They were putting out false information saying "oh the public won't be invited to that thing." There was a great deal of resistance to where you are sitting now, and there was a gut wrenching fight. I saw the mission and I am glad you were here and I am glad you showed. I have a long history with HARTline and I am very glad we are here. I think we have done a great deal to accomplish getting transit where it needs to be.

Pierre Mathurin commented on handouts he distributed referencing January, 2006 ridership statistics showing a very healthy increase from the previous year and a handout referencing LYNX was working on a new regional funding allocation model. The model has changed and LYNX is no longer using this allocation method, they are working on a new model. He also commented that

the majority of referendums have passed since 2002. All the funding partners have put together over \$40 million funding for LYNX. This model illustrates the differences in service between HARTline and LYNX in terms of number of routes that are operated on Saturdays and Sundays and how many run past 8:00 p.m. on weekdays, Saturdays and Sundays as well as routes that run on the frequency of 30 minutes or less.

Brian Blair thanked Pierre Mathurin for his input.

Robert Babbitt introduced himself as representing McDonald Transit Associates. He said that his company had the privilege of serving 27 cities, three of which are in Florida, Daytona, Volusia County, Ocala and Collier/Naples. In the Atlanta market, we don't serve MARTA, but we serve two of the suburban systems, Gwinette and GRETA, Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, in the Dallas Fort Worth market, we don't currently serve Dallas, we do serve Fort Worth and Denton. In Riverside, the city operates the core service directly, but they contract us for what they call the "X" urban routes; the very low density suburban routes. In each of those, a common pattern emerges. The competition for the service we serve keeps everybody sharp. He commented on the handouts referencing data on the extent of contracting, share of transit agencies, system and size, service type, bus v. demand response, agency size and reason for contracting. Nationally, 11% of all bus service today is contracted out and 89% is not contracted. The competition, however, makes winners for everyone, or can, if it's structured properly. Nationally, from the National Transit Database, figures are presented herein that identify over 453 agencies' data in the US. Of 11% contracted service, the average cost per hour of service is \$67.15 compared to the in-house average of \$88.59 per hour. As you consider going forward, the issue of competition for some services, I think you will be very surprised at how much savings are possible and how much quality can be assured.

Gloria Mills commented that during the few months that we have attended these meetings, it had been very interesting and educational to listen as a member of the public and a grass roots organization. One thing that disturbed me is that we could change the way the funding is set up and what is going to happen or could happen so we may have more service in the unincorporated area, which would mean less transit for other people. I don't want to see the result to be less transit for others if more service is provided in the unincorporated county. If that is the case, there is not enough funding to run an organization such as HARTline. Asking people who live in the unincorporated area not to be taxed for transit is not good because, of course, they might not want to be. I agree that ad valorem taxes are probably not the best way to fund HARTline. But that's the way it is structured which would have to change. Treating transit differently from other agencies such as the school board, libraries, etc. and setting up this particular taxing authority differently, if voters could "opt out", it would be the end and the destruction of HARTline completely. The "Americans for Disabilities Act" requires that a county the size of Hillsborough have transit. I really enjoyed being here

and I feel like you all have done a great job and a lot of work has been done. These are my fears, I hope that what I am thinking is not the case.

John Dausman gave an answer to a question asked by Gloria Mills at the prior meeting about ad valorem per household. The Hillsborough Property Appraiser counted how many properties paid the HARTline tax and there were 388,131 properties assessed in 2005, this past year, of those 46,277 were businesses that also were assessed on their business equipment. As far as individual addresses, 388,131, divided into the ad valorem receipts for 2006 of \$29,951,000; that is \$77.17 average assessment per property both business and residential; they were not able to break those two components apart. I have a request to the tax collector, for the median number where half the people pay more than "X" and half the people pay less than "X". They said they can find that number, but I don't have it right now.

Gloria Mills stated thank you very much.

Kathy Harris commented that the Study Group struggled with how not to take anything away from what HARTline has now and how to end this process where no one loses, how do you make this a "win win" for everyone? I think we can get there. We have discussed these issues extensively to help HARTline understand how to get their message across to the unincorporated areas about the value of the system as it is now, but also to understand plans for the future. My concern has always been in the governance long term. Kathy Harris recommended the need for a different governance structure. How we can move forward long term under the current governance membership situation? I also don't support a mass transit system that is not "countywide;" it doesn't make sense. I have echoed and read many times, the comments of Sandra Sroka about the people who are the most dependent on the system and their fear about ending up with less. I believe the result will not end with less. I think as we move forward to finalize in our recommendations as one of the statements we need to make, that we don't want to do anything that will lessen the service level that exists. Our goal is to provide back to the BOCC, recommendations on essentially how we can increase the level of service particularly in the unincorporated area. I don't believe in any aspect that "to get more, you have to take something from someone else." If you have an entrepreneurial spirit, and the flexibility and an open mind, we can all benefit, if not immediately, in the long term. Whatever our recommendations are they should have that overtone.

Brian Blair expressed support for Kathy Harris' position.

Barbara Merritt expressed support for these thoughts. She agreed with Kathy Harris on the governance issue, the governance issue is something that I have been thinking about. I worked with another authority that is under a state agency. Until governance on that board was changed, which is the Florida State Fair Authority, there was nothing that went forward. Now they are under the

supervision of an elected official and they went out of the red into the black. The elected official is accountable to the public. I think with the governance structure, as a taxpayer, I should be able to talk to an elected official and say, this is what my problem is, how can we resolve it? The accountability issue has been spoken about many times. I can only relate and look back with what happened with the Florida State Fair Authority that until we get accountability, not only to the public but to the budget, it didn't go forward, it was a big change which made headlines for years. When the right combination came for the governance, it went back into place. HARTline was a different entity when established in 1980. We need to go forward with more innovative recommendations.

Carlton Lewis agreed with Kathy Harris on the need for change in governance. HARTline transportation issues are just one part of the formulation. Until such time that there is a change in governance, it is business as usual. One of the things I talked about earlier was the concept of high occupancy vehicle lanes where we "move the people" not the buses. Transportation is not only moving people, but also things like biking, our buses have bike racks on the front of them. It is a whole system of transportation which needs to be developed. What I would like to see in our recommendation is some type of cooperation between agencies and governance wherein they plan communities and HARTline is involved earlier in the design. We built many gated communities. We set ourselves up for failure because the communities are not being designed with HARTline involvement in the planning of new communities, and to bring together the full planning and needs of these communities into one entity. I would like to see HARTline in active participation for zoning and "approve" and "find in accordance with transit services." I would like to see HARTline act on design of communities wherein we can start to impact public works and have people moved. If the traffic is moving, you have a high percentage of vehicles moving throughout the city. We have increases in the bus ridership, what is causing that? I think the price of gas and the inconvenience. HARTline needs to be considered in a more active role in the planning of the whole design of building the community and I don't see that right now.

Brian Blair asked whether HART signs off on permits.

Ray Miller responded that it is not every building permit but certainly any significant development, HARTline has input, there is no sign-off, but a box you check. One of the things we are struggling with at the state level is growth management. How can we get developers to contribute to the operating costs versus capital costs? That is our big challenge in terms of meeting the needs. We are strategizing about how can we get developers to contribute to the operating side of the house versus the capital costs? We do have an opportunity to comment, it leads to shelters, connectivity, and bus pull outs, these are three examples of capital improvements.

Kathy Harris asked Ray Miller if he feels that HARTline is really a part of the planning process?

Mary Shavalier commented that HARTline often reviews plans at the end of the process rather than at the beginning. There has been great improvement in terms of bringing us opportunity to comment. At least we have an opportunity regardless of whether it is at the front or at the end. I think that if we could be involved earlier in the design, that would make good sense.

Kathy Harris asked do you want to make that policy to be one of our recommendations?

Mary Shavalier agreed with Carlton Lewis that it is the larger issue of community design model where we need to enable legislation to allow those issues to be considered. It is not just affecting HARTline, but the school board and pedestrian activity. That is what the challenge is.

Carlton Lewis responded to the call to make a motion. He said he was expressing his concerns and has not found a way to get HARTline into community development and planning. The paperwork showed 15 different agencies that signed-off. There needs to be an education and the coming together of these groups where there is no paper and rubber stamping of this process. When we design our communities, we should not design them to fail. Right now, they want gated communities on public highways, and without HARTline planning, we create traffic backed up a quarter mile as a direct result. I don't think this planning is going to happen right away; the seed might be sown as a motion.

Kathy Harris commented that these issues are something we heard a lot from the planning community, that we did not include in our first recommendations as we probably should have. So I would move, as part of our third mission to develop recommendations to improve the transit system in unincorporated county to authorize our consultant to craft language that is included in our report which addresses that issue.

Brian Blair cautioned that the cost of home ownership has gone up considerably and I don't want to do anything to put more of a burden on the people that are trying to achieve the goal of home ownership. The average cost of a house in Hillsborough County has now reached \$255,000.

Mike Peterson commented that there is a misconception of what HARTline does or doesn't do in the development process. You may see a final sheet with a check off box, that is the last step in a series of meetings. Then you will see conditions set forth by the county that require turn outs or shelters. The problem is isolating the review, project by project. Where you missed frankly, is in the community planning area. As the community plans took place, I've now been to

three or four that have been completed and two that are in the works; HARTline has not been a significant part. Whether it was HARTline or others, someone could have made transit a more integral factor in that because at the community planning level, at least we decide which major transit routes should be created and the development of that route would be expected. To plan to help that link work, there needs to be a more comprehensive proactive plan to make a system for everyone to plug in. To the extent you might want to have HARTline's involvement in community plans, or even ask the people who worked on community plans, introduce and address transit as a new topic; that's where you will get the most done. Not only will you get the developers who have to abide by the plan, you will reignite citizens who looked at community plans who may not understand what transit can do.

Marilyn Smith commented on zoning and development when the whole growth management act started. The developers didn't want EPC to have a voice in planning and development. EPC has a big voice in this issue but were kept at the end as an afterthought. Transit and EPC should be at the front if you are really going to do the job right because mass transit takes cars off the road and improves your air quality. So don't tell me you are worried about people paying \$200,000 for a house if your kid can't breathe. There are human elements to consider, not just the business end of it with the EPC kicked to the curb. Transit has got to be at the front with school children and our air quality. So let's keep that in mind when you start putting this in pecking order of what is the most important.

John Dausman suggested that the Study Group could make a finding or a conclusion that the community planning process is broken and then make a general observation of the direction to fix it. Under the section where the Study Group talked about how the transit system needs to improve, there would be an observation that HARTline is not integral to the community planning phase. Mr. Dausman commented on the handout where it addresses recommendations to the BOCC, only the BOCC can do the integration of HARTline into the community planning process in the unincorporated area so that there would be an action step. We are not recommending to the BOCC how it should be accomplished, but that if it is the Study Group's wish to include this statement, our recommendations is for the BOCC to fix the process in the unincorporated areas.

Norbert Gobin stated let's move forward with discussions of the other recommendations.

Carlton Lewis commented that the first two community plans in Hillsborough County, the Citrus Park community plan and the Town and Country community plan included components that addressed bike trails, linear parks and bus stops when these plans were approved. Right now, we are saying "well, we have looked at it." I have attended a lot of meetings for five to six years and no one

representing HARTline was there, but the transportation issues have been taken up.

Brian Blair stated we have talked about governance. He commented on the handout that Kathy Harris issued as a recommendation and asked Kathy Harris to give more details about her handout.

Kathy Harris commented that she struggled about how to address this issue but she came up with some words to discuss today. The Study Group spoke last week of doing a comprehensive study. Everyone stated we don't want to keep recommending study, so she recommended two things. 1) The Study Group recommended a study that would deal with the impact of governance on service, delivery, efficiency, equity, accountability, responsiveness and political participation. She also provided a description of the Aviation Authority and the Port Authority models which have two components that are important. The first component, they are incorporated as a countywide organization, not a county department or agency and the second, they also have a board appointed by the governor. They have ex officio elected officials that serve on that board; it is either a city council member, the mayor or a county commissioner. That is the structure. They have one thing they do and that's all they do and that's all their board members are focused on and it's from a countywide perspective that is appealing to me where HARTline should go in the long term. 2) A potential ballot question is worded in such a way that doesn't change the current system. It simply asks the question about where the system should go in the future to get an idea from the public on their thoughts. It doesn't say "should we change the system to this?" "Should we get rid of what we have and try this?" The potential question would be "should HARTline provide countywide mass transit and shift taxing authority to a single governmental body?" Meaning that it would be a countywide program which would collect some sort of equitable, countywide fee. There would be additional costs for those jurisdictions that might want expanded service or based on the number of service miles. Again, this is just some way to get to the next phase and include the public, and then it can be worded in a number of different ways.

Brian Blair asked Kathy Harris if her proposal asked people that are not receiving service now in the unincorporated to pay more tax in addition to their half mil?

Kathy Harris commented she didn't say what the fee should be based on. It is up to the Study Group to have a discussion about it, you need a starting point and move forward. And if the community cannot agree, then we will be having these committees every two years. 62% is paid by the unincorporated area with 37% of the service. There has to be a plan on moving forward and this is how we want to lay it out. This is my way of beginning the discussion that we are going to have very quickly on how to get there. I do believe if there is a ballot question, it should be related to the governance.

Gloria Mills stated she agreed with Kathy Harris. We have a lot of variables we cannot measure in the equity issue. There are many people that moved out into unincorporated areas. The people didn't necessarily want transit. People in unincorporated areas go to the city because of their work and use the transit so how do you measure that? That's my question. I don't know that there is an answer.

Bill Schnell recommended that there should be a division between the two models. This is a good model of what works in the incorporated areas of the county. In my observation, big buses don't work as well in unincorporated areas. Hillsborough County's unincorporated areas are different than the dense city; HARTline should concentrate on big buses in large, dense city areas. Bill Schnell further commented why try to blend transit when everything else is separated? The city has chosen to have their own police force and they have their own garbage collection. Why don't they have their own transit system? Wouldn't it make good sense that they do what they want with the street car and the bus system? When you apply that model into the unincorporated parts of the county like Apollo Beach, it's like mixing apples and oranges, the city is dense. Everyone drives a car in Apollo Beach, they really don't care much about transit. People in Wimauma are concerned because many can't afford a car. Those are my observations as a citizen.

Carlton Lewis commented that recently the density in some parts of unincorporated county is matching that of the city. It's generational. I would like to say "well this is yours and this is mine" but this marriage is to death-do-us-part and the city is in the county. When I moved out 15 to 20 years ago, I had three kids and now those kids are grown people, and now they have more cars than space to park in. My neighbor has cars sitting on the grass and the density is really thick out there and so he wants his child to be able to work and get a job and access those places. Before that, there were no buses within two miles his house. We have our transportation limited to those who chose to live out there, but next generation is coming and they all can't have cars and some of us are getting older and the density is still there.

Kathy Harris commented most people can't tell you "I'm in the unincorporated area; I'm in the city" unless you live way out. Most counties and jurisdictions are now talking about how to partner with the next county and provide transportation across county lines because you get more bang for your buck. We are just taking the first little baby steps hopefully to where we see ourselves in 10 years. Kathy Harris referenced the planning map where our jobs and communities are going to be in the next 25 years. She asked how do we need to be building our recommendations? The unincorporated area causes some of the political issues because it's the biggest city in the county. That creates all types of problems when you've got the BOCC that represents the entire county, including the City of Tampa. We are trying to wrestle with the governance of this service that needs to be a countywide service. At our second meeting, the HARTline administration

made it clear they have built a system based on what they view are the pressing needs. That's why the City of Tampa gets most of the money. To me, our job is if we can just in some small way, help our folks take that next step that ultimately will end in regionalization, with St. Petersburg eventually.

Brian Blair agreed with Kathy Harris, that regionalization is the future of transit. He endorsed recommendation 3 already adopted, that competition is the greatest thing that drives service, quality and keeps prices low. Within recommendation 3, we would have the opportunity for companies like McDonald Transit to look over all the recommendations. The recommendations come about through a process. Moving forward, we have 4 recommendations. Brian Blair commented on the handout referencing the Summary of Findings. I am not going to vote for anything that will raise the tax rate or fee. Some people lose sight of the fact that from 1999 to 2000 the ad valorem tax rose approximately 5%. Then Hillsborough County showed a big growth pattern from 2004 to 2005 and the ad valorem tax dollars grew 20%. We keep adding dollars to transportation. I don't want to take money away, it's a governance issue that leads to something based on equity.

Kathy Harris stated that she certainly did not envision an increased tax question.

Mike Peterson recommended it is theoretically possible that there could be a base line smaller mileage across the board. If you said we are starting with what we have paid, where are we going to start to roll back the current contribution that supports a predominantly city service or at least a big part of it. Or were you going to restructure it to where we drop back some of that overall funding so then the city picks up the pace a little bit if it wants to continue to expand its city service?

Kathy Harris commented that the main issue in this recommendation is to become a countywide service. What she envisions is an equitable fee that everyone has an opportunity to contribute. If you take the ad valorem tax, maybe you have a base, and everything over and above that can be used either for expansion, new programs or number of services miles. It is my recommendation that it needs to be a countywide service with a different governing body.

Mike Peterson stated that it's just a matter where you put your focus and fund it. He commented that the base fee may need to be lower than the current contribution from the unincorporated county so some of what they currently pay can be directed toward laying mileage in unincorporated county and then, if you don't want to raise the tax value, fund some additional money to get some additional route mileage. You might not move as quickly as you wish if you are not willing to tax yourself more, that can be in the city as well. If you change some of the dynamics, then the city may not continue to expand unless they are willing to tax themselves more. We are going to start at what we already have as

in equity and then for us to do anything else in the unincorporated county, we have to raise more money.

Kathy Harris commented she didn't believe that. If you look at the Orlando model where they use across-the-board equitable fees which make up probably 5% to 10% of the overall costs of the operating, it is a different way.

Bill Schnell commented that the city probably brings in the biggest part of farebox return and additional funding through fares. The other matter is the street car, it was my understanding that Hillsborough County took an adverse position that they never wanted to have anything to do with the street car system and county funds would not ever be used. I think everybody on the BOCC has the gold, and so they rule. Hillsborough County puts in the largest share of the money, so we should have something to say.

Brian Blair commented the street car is going to be a major discussion in the upcoming HARTline board meeting on Monday.

Bill Schnell commented if I want to get rid of my car tomorrow, I cannot use the HARTline system. If you want to put in a street car and make an amusement ride, great, all in the county said that's fine. If the city wants to take on that responsibility, that's a city deal. But now, they don't have the funding, there's a short fall and I'm in Apollo Beach and the trolley is doing nothing for me.

Kathy Harris recommended that we make it very simple in asking the public "should mass transit be a countywide service?"

Brian Blair commented that he believed that it is a countywide service now.

Kathy Harris commented that HARTline doesn't run the buses in Plant City, so it's not a countywide service. When I say countywide, I mean they run corner to corner system. If they are not running to Plant City, it's because there is a business reason, not because of a political reason.

Brian Blair commented they felt they were not getting their dollars' worth.

Kathy Harris commented transit cannot be a jurisdictional service or a membership based service. As she said last week, Temple Terrace should figure out how to get out of this.

Norbert Gobin asked should we make a motion to adopt the governance issue?

Brian Blair commented he was not clear with the motion, the Kathy Harris' recommendation. You're moving towards equitability and that's what the Study Group is about, finding a way to find equitability. Brian Blair asked Ray Miller, do you consider this a countywide system?

Ray Miller commented with the exception of Plant City, HARTline is a countywide system. Kathy Harris is getting to the Plant City issue.

Brian Blair commented so we would go into Plant City whether they wanted to or not?

Ray Miller commented yes, that's what you are talking about.

Kathy Harris commented we would not have a system based on membership. It will not be a membership system.

Brian Blair asked John Dausman to explain so that everyone understands the membership system versus a countywide system.

John Dausman commented about the current HARTline charter discussed at a couple of our meetings, was based on several referendums where individual jurisdictions representing solely their part of the population became a member of HARTline at two different dates. Through the research from the county attorney's office, we learned that because the initial referendum failed, that there were specific promises that could be clearly identified in the press made to both city residents and unincorporated residents. We have investigated; there were five of them. A couple applied to the City of Tampa and several applied to the county. There was some initial progress in fulfilling those promises, but there seems to be quite a clear record that the promises were not adhered to and abandoned a long time ago and that is not what we have today.

Ray Miller commented that he wasn't familiar with the media coverage or the promises that were stated. He did look into the ballot language and it is what the charter states. In those documents, there is no reference to any commitment. It doesn't mean that there wasn't one, but in terms of legal documents, he wasn't able to find how media coverage directed the organization.

Christine Beck commented that is correct; there isn't anything in the charter or in the ballot. I think that what John Dausman was referring to was simply media coverage and the statements by people who were pushing the referendum and lobbying for it.

Kathy Harris commented I think the way the question was put before the public made it clear that it was going to be increased or expanded service in the City of Tampa and in the unincorporated area.

Christine Beck commented the ballot language for the November referendum simply read, "the Hillsborough Transit Authority authorized beginning in the calendar year 1981 to levy an ad valorem tax at a per annum mil which would not exceed one-half mil on each dollar valuation of 50 cents per \$1,000 on taxable

real property within the City of Tampa and unincorporated Hillsborough County to provide for the operation of existing and expanded public mass transit services and facilities within the City of Tampa and unincorporated Hillsborough County.” That was the ballot question.

Brian Blair stated I think that clearly in my mind, that a voter would take the ballot question as a parity type issue that everyone is going to get what they pay for.

Ray Miller commented on the overwhelming task this group has about governance. But right or wrong, the task is enormous. You are dealing with governance issues, your dealing with policy issues, your not only dealing with service type; you are dealing with how to deliver the service. You are going from the top to where the rubber meets the road.

Brian Blair thanked everyone for being at the group meeting and stated that it's been great to have Gloria Mills. He said John Dausman has done an excellent job in providing us material and being his own secretary for so long and getting copies of everything. He further commented yes, a lot of the discussions have been citizen driven, because we wanted everyone to have a say in this process. A lot has been derived from what the citizens are saying and what they want; that's why it's expanded more than I envisioned it to expand. He believed we would have a couple little motions and that would be it. As we dug deeper it has given us a clear understanding of the mission of transit, that's why we read the mission statements, all of that revolves around the mission statements, that covers everything from where the rubber meets the road to where we are going financially at the top and there is so much in between. Ultimately, we are not going to be the ones that make the decisions about how to get those things done, it'll be HARTline or someone who works with HARTline or our regional system. Again that will be decided on the county's end when the BOCC meets and gets the recommendations condensed where it will be simple to vote on.

Kathy Harris commented I think we have a good set of findings and recommendations. As I said last week, my fear is that we submit those recommendations to the BOCC who have no authority over HARTline, that's a fact. They are left with these findings and recommendations and no authority to do anything other than put a question on the ballot. The whole process started with a discussion of putting the question on the ballot that deals with doing away essentially with the unincorporated participation. I think there is another question that needs to be asked. So my wording may need to be studied a little more, but we need to give to the BOCC a recommendation that goes beyond putting a question of the tax on the ballot, that issue is the governance problem that the HARTline Board struggles with.

John Dausman reviewed the summary of recommendations that he created from Study Group direction in the last meeting. Each recommendation is now identified under one of our mission statements; the very last page contains

governance. The current recommendation is that the BOCC and HART Board should hire a consultant to do a study to determine whether governance should change or whether the method of funding is changing. What I hear from this discussion is that the Study Group might be further along, and that the conclusion of the Study Group is that the governance should change and ultimately the funding method should change. We stop there and the recommendation to the BOCC becomes directly involved in working further to develop those issues.

Kathy Harris asked which options can be accomplished within the current HARTline governance structure and which options would require revision? The BOCC does not have the authority to say to HARTline, implement.

Brian Blair stated if there was a question of equitability within governance, I think that might be a good recommendation if you could craft some verbiage. He commented that the theme of that meeting was either we find a way to create parity or we put a question on the ballot that reads should the unincorporated area continue to participate in the funding of HARTline that is one-half mil which probably will destroy HARTline? If you go right to the heart of the matter, funding is what we are discussing. If you go to mission 1. b Federal and State grant funding, "formulas are strongly linked to population size and population growth." We know that is all taking place in unincorporated Hillsborough County. So again, all roads don't lead to downtown Tampa anymore. As Jim Hossler came and showed the maps, the dynamics and the changing of the county, eventually, there is going to be densities larger than the City of Tampa all over unincorporated Hillsborough County. If you wanted a potential ballot question under governance issues pertained to equitability with the dollars that are used and since everyone wants more bus service, I don't know how you could write that in, but I think that's what the board was looking for. HARTline only wants to improve mass transit. It has to be discussed regionally with our neighbors and I hope that is done sooner, not later. Currently, we are trying to appease the people that feel short changed when you hear all the chatter about the trolley and the street car and the dollars spent within the City of Tampa, especially the downtown area, the people that are in Brandon and other places.

Kathy Harris asked can anyone help with that?

Carlton Lewis commented on the proposed recommendation for referendum, should HARTline provide countywide mass transit, two options are not enough. If that ballot goes forward, that ballot becomes, yes or no. The issue is more complex than a yes or no response.

Kathy Harris commented if you look at the original ballot question, how they came up with the governance or the structure based on this ballot question, means that someone or group said this is how it should be crafted.

Carlton Lewis commented one option that was identified as a model was the Aviation Authority. I thought the ballot question should be geared towards something that would identify who has authority to make those decisions. Aviation is still an independent agency and has its own authority and power; the ballot doesn't answer that question. I think it should be crafted to the point where it would define and establish an independent agency as the regional authority.

Kathy Harris asked Christine Beck to recommend language that could be appropriate and we could task her with that. We do have one more meeting to speak about that being the only outstanding issue at our very last meeting. I will move forward in finalizing our other recommendations that Norbert Gobin wants us to get to. Kathy Harris moved that we give our county attorney representative the task of formulating a proposed ballot question that deals with the governance issues.

Christine Beck commented there was initial action by the Florida legislature which is what allowed the whole movement of HARTline to go forward and I believe it was what set up the structure and membership. Christine Beck shared with the group her concerns about some of these proposed ballot questions. You might find yourself in a position of having a ballot question that is in opposition to the original legislation from the state. That is something we can look at too and I can communicate with you more and try to craft something. I just wanted to alert you to that one concern.

Kathy Harris commented if we would also require the present jurisdictions to come to some sort of agreement. If that happens, a legislative change would be easier to accomplish. Again, the difficulty in doing all of this, should not stop HARTline from taking that next step.

Brian Blair asked Kathy Harris if she meant her request to the county attorney to be a motion. She said yes. Carlton Lewis seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Brian Blair commented on the handouts referencing the HARTline's Study Group's Summary of Findings asking John Dausman to comment.

John Dausman commented that the front page of the Summary of Findings was an extraction of the words the Study Group has endorsed to summarize the groupings of recommendations. The sole purpose of that was to summarize the intent of this group on one single page. So the question would be whether the group members feel that single page carried the meaning, intent or direction of this group. What the remaining pages do is take each of your recommendations, the 29 from last week and put them under the mission statements. There are 6 mission statements; there are 5 mission statements that have discussion points under them and the sixth is this entire document. The first two are a summarization of the efforts you went through in early meetings. They are not recommendations but conclusions on what are the cost and benefits, and what is

the county getting for its money? The recommendations start with mission point 3 which is that HARTline must provide a new model for providing service, the paradigm shift which this group has talked about so much. And from that point forward, you should see very familiar words, those are the recommendations from last week, resorted and placed under, as best as I could, where they belonged by the mission statement and finding. I have added on page 4 under item d. the recommendation of a military discount discussed at the last meeting and added to the list at that time. I believe that is the only brand new point that was not on last week's list. I've heard several comments, one was on the front page, Kathy Harris in particular said, I'd like to see some facts placed in a few of those sentences. For example, where it reads, "unincorporated county provides the majority of funding." We could identify the percent or amount. I am certainly willing to put more specifics in any of these sentences. I have also heard for example, on page 3 referencing specific promises made to voters that, although there is a section in the report to fully describe the 5 promises, they should be listed again there. The other general comment that I have received, is on the bottom of page 5 the part about county commissioners who sit on the HARTline board that priority should be given to those who live in unincorporated county first. The specific language that is there seems to be unclear, I haven't heard any disagreement about the intent, but I have heard from three people, that the language doesn't clearly communicate the intent to the casual reader.

Carlton Lewis asked John Dauman to explain the recommendation further.

John Dausman further commented that the current policy says county appointees, citizens, must live in unincorporated county. That's already a rule and has been for a long time. This point was an additional step that says preference should be given for the two or three commissioners who choose to serve themselves. If four hands go up in the air, it should be an adopted policy of the commission that preference goes to those who live in the unincorporated area.

Kathy Harris appreciated all of John Dausman's work in the Study Group. I am not big on the declarative statements that become headlines. The facts can always speak louder than a feeling. Our four priority recommendations are the main critical issues. If you take each one of the missions, and put them in the form of a question and ask yourself "do those findings as listed, answer those questions?" More often than not, is No. Kathy Harris recommended that the findings directly point to the answering of the questions as dictated to us by the BOCC and these statements become a part of summarizing our findings. Because this commission gave us this task of the six questions, we should answer them quickly and factually and have our four main recommendations be the imprint we leave with the BOCC.

Brian Blair agreed with Kathy Harris and recommended that this should be a part of the back up to the recommendations. It is paramount that we include

everything that this Board has come up with and John Dausman has put into words as back up. I want to caution the Study Group that during the indigent healthcare study group, that particular group was chastised by a couple of commissioners for not having enough back up in what they came up with. There were recommendations, but they wanted to see how they got to them. They wanted to see everything they could.

Kathy Harris commented I think our process has laid out a very nice picture of how we progressed and where we are today. Last night I read through all the minutes of your subcommittee and mine. I think we can very nicely lay out for the board how we came to these central four recommendations and the other recommendations that are in our material as well as answer those questions. I'm sure John Dausman would be happy to do this.

Carlton Lewis commented going back earlier, as a back up which is not here, is the public comments.

Brian Blair stated yes we have that summary.

John Dausman commented that he understood from Kath Harris the summary findings 1 through 8 are not achieving the goal. He suggested a different approach to focus on the single page of priority recommendations, followed by the remaining recommendations, numbered. They won't be 1 through 29 because they are shortened, 1 through 19 maybe. He asked if that was the intent?

Kathy Harris commented we should talk about this; it would probably be easier for the group to see the lay out of the report. There should be an executive summary in the front. Maybe in all parts of the report there is a place for them. It is just is an issue of where they are placed and how they are placed.

Brian Blair suggested bringing the lay out of the report to the next meeting.

Kathy Harris agreed. She suggested that she and Norbert Gobin have been editors along the way and will offer their continued services as well.

John Dausman commented it would be helpful to know in pages 2 through 7 if the content of all the recommendations that were under consideration, if any of you spotted one that is misstated? That would be very helpful to bring forth now.

Christine Beck commented in the mission where the HARTline model has not delivered promised benefits, we talk about the referendum of 1980. Should we not include the two referendums?

John Dausman commented the back up would thoroughly describe that, but also any summary sentence should make reference that there were two referendums.

Brian Blair asked for any comments from the public?

Barbara Merritt asked if the Study Group was going to request a response from HARTline to be included in the back that they participated and understood and they fully participated in our meetings.

Brian Blair recommended that there should be something added and mentioned to the fact that HARTline has been to every meeting and has been very cooperative. I cannot thank Mary Shavalier enough.

Mary Ann Styles commented that she read with interest, all minutes and comments. She stated that the problems you are struggling with are some of the complaints she had when this group was put together. There are comments made that there is no governance, that the board of HARTline is not responsible to anyone. Go back and read your charter, they are responsible to the three members that are the City of Tampa, City of Temple Terrace and the BOCC. It's always been my argument to have this meeting without including those other two members is where you are running into problems. There is accountability. The accountability is to the three members that are the elected officials. It's not just one person, but three bodies. When you say there should be equity, and it's like a golf club and you pay dues, I pay thousands every year for taxes, I don't have any children in school, I don't use food stamps, I don't use aid to dependent children, there are a lot of things I pay taxes for I don't need. But you know what, people do need those services. If there is ever a situation where I need those services, those services would be there for me and I know that is what my government is there for, even unemployment compensation if I should lose my job. What I am struggling with is why everyone thinks that everything should be equal across the board when you are talking about a situation where if those people that don't use the service either in the city or county, if they wanted to use the service, it is there for them, and if they wanted to use the service there would be more ridership and we could afford to provide more lanes and more buses out to certain areas. The other issue I wanted to discuss is you are on track about the issue of development and where we are going in Hillsborough County. I think there is a total lack of vision and a lack of leadership in Hillsborough County. I include the City of Tampa, the City of Temple Terrace, Plant City and unincorporated because to me it's the entire county. The county line doesn't stop at the City of Tampa. One of the concerns that I have is Mr. Miller you should have told the story about when you went out to review the plans for Bearss and Bruce B. Downs Avenue when they were widening that, you brought up the need for HOV lanes, and they said it's too late for that, we hadn't thought about that. The committees should bring in everyone upfront. But transit has been a "step child" for so many years and it hasn't gotten any attention and now we are a big county with serious needs and a lot of people who are tired of sitting in traffic. I do believe we may not correct the ills of the past, but we have got to get everyone involved in the front line before they start passing around the check off

list so maybe you do have some say, but it's not getting involved in the planning and I think there should be more of that done. Finally, your counsel is correct, there is a statute on transit that guides and governs how these entities are put together, you need to look at that for those questions of how it wasn't three people sitting around the room deciding we needed three members. Another issue is regional transit. I lobbied for HARTline for a long time in Tallahassee and I was on the board in the 1980's and transit has always been very important to me, not just the bus system, but transit. Maybe we would never be ready or nowhere near ready for heavy rail, but we are certainly ready to look at regional issues. You may not know this, that there is money available in the Comprehensive Growth Management plan, there are monies available for the region. When I tried to get it in Tallahassee, they said Mary Ann, don't you understand, that until your county steps forward and deals with the other counties around them, there is nothing we can do, you can't have any of that money. When St. Petersburg did reach out to us, we'd slap their hand and said we'll meet with you later. We need to look at regional transit, it is so important, it is where we are going in the future. I think that is all of my points. I do want to comment on the accountability though, you are right, as far as the BOCC has no power over HARTline, but it has one-third the power, you just need to get with the City of Tampa and the City of Temple Terrace, the other two members, you can make anything happen you want, but you can't do it having one-third of the group meeting to decide what you are going to do with your future and why we think of the City of Tampa versus the Hillsborough County or Hillsborough County versus the City of Tampa, that has got to stop. In a study I recently did on some other issues I'm working on, 95% of the people say they believe there is too much attention and too much animosity between the two that need to work together. I certainly believe that. I think that having meeting like this excluding the members of HARTline, creates more of that problem.

Brian Blair thanked Mary Ann Styles for her comments with a brief comment that we have included members from the City of Tampa, this has been an open meeting and everyone has been able to participate. Brian Blair commented that we are here for the citizens.

Marilyn Smith commented that right now in county policy, you have an inequity and an imbalance on your HARTline board and there is no way someone living in the city and I don't care when they move there, they need to be off that board, they are no longer representing unincorporated Hillsborough County, you must insist that this becomes a balance. If you are going to represent unincorporated Hillsborough County, you have to live in the county and vote there. You cannot take recommendations to any board of directors until you get the balance correct. We need to fix it because I'm not going away until it gets fixed.

Carlton Lewis commented he did articulate at one particular meeting, that parity does not mean equality, but a sense of "fair share". He too is a tax payer and lives here. He has never been inside a stadium and doesn't participate in sports.

He wanted to make it perfectly clear, that parity did not mean equality. He believes in equal opportunity and also believes in a sense of fair share.

Brian Blair added to what Carlton Lewis is saying is when there is a demand we want to fulfill that demand.

Kathy Harris commented she appreciated Carlton Lewis' comments. She also agreed about the regional transit situation and how to get the attention of the elected bodies to come together voluntarily, it'll never happen. So you create opportunities to move forward outside that; that is the reason we need to address the governance issues; we need to get out of that scenario. How do you get to that next step so you can then begin to look at these problems from a regional perspective? I love being a lawyer, a sort of adversarial person when the opposition makes all your points for you. I think Mary Ann Styles just did that. I think that in terms of accountability when we talked about this last week, each of the members of the HARTline board is accountable to their jurisdiction. But when you speak about who is that board, that entity, accountable to, there is a question to which they are accountable to and under the present system, how that accountability plays out. Meaning do they bring their budgets before their jurisdictions to vote, do they report like the Head Start board? There is not that type of accountability. Also, I mentioned, since I quit working for the county, I haven't been to one library or park, I don't mind paying for them because when they do something I don't like, I get to not vote for one of the members of the commission and the ones in my district. That gives me a sense that I have a say in it, there is some accountability back to me. Again, we have said that equity does not mean 50/50, equity means something else. I think that is what we have strived to lead to the commission that we are not looking for 50/50 or again you cannot turn back the hands of time. I went out on Lithia and Pinecrest waiting for the bus to come by and pick me up. There was not a bus. You have to ask yourself, what comes first, the chicken or the egg? Is my need for a bus as an individual going to be recognized by HARTline by me standing out there? Or is HARTline providing an opportunity for people like me who live out there to participate in the transit system? I think the way you deal with ridership has to be a balanced approach.

Konrad Smith commented that he rides the bus every day and has medical problems just dealing with being a pedestrian 2 years ago and getting run over. He has little insurance but is a Vet so they take care of him. He asked why isn't HARTline proactive? He believes HARTline is able to improve the service through more interaction with the bus drivers and the people in the field and the people who ride the bus. It's hard for a lot of people to come to meetings because they are working. HARTline has the people in place, they've got to perform their job description, if they don't, get someone who will and that's why you have the McDonald people sitting there. Konrad Smith called customer service asking for help, and no one responds and customer service does nothing, he doesn't see any improvements and doesn't see where they are taking care of

people. Why doesn't HARTline design comfortable centers? I wish the marketing people would market for the riders or for better bathrooms, riders sit out in the heat. Density to me equals working class people, we've got to help out the working class people because they are the ones that do the work and ride the buses. I feel that everyone has to appreciate the quality of life. Same way with homeless people, they are like the riders, if you don't take care of the homeless people, they will end up in our hospitals and our hospitals will take care of their pneumonia three or four times a year and that will equate to over \$150,000. The cost is going to be shifted from one area to another. There are going to be consequences of not providing services such as bus service to our community. If people would get back into realizing we are all helping each other, we are all going to grow together and start helping out each other. I like the way John Dausman communicates he has e-mailed me, I imagine he e-mails everyone and they interact. The relationship has to be driven with the people and with the politicians. This is a valid concern about a referendum to give people an out of their responsibility to their neighbors just because they live on the outside. I think there are benefits of living outside, benefits of living inside. If I saw there were shortcomings in my business, I would do things to improve it before I caught any objections from the public. I would do things to satisfy them and just initiate it. I just don't see things changing.

Brian Blair thanked Konrad Smith for his comments, service is extremely important and we worked on that and now your input has been very valuable and we appreciate it. Thank you Konrad that is what we are here for is to try and address those issues, HARTline has been here, they have heard everything. They've implemented a lot of our recommendations I believe already. That's what we are here for to give better service countywide. I would like to thank Mr. Babbitt for being here.

Bill Schnell commented that the Study Group has a fiduciary responsibility to voters and constituents. He would like to see something on the ballot that says we have a choice to participate and I haven't heard that today. Let us decide don't narrow the field of recommendations that we can't make that decision so people have no say or input. I think that was the initial motion that Commissioner Storms has made. I think that we should have that ability to take our money that we are paying and do what we please with it because I believe with my past experience, that we could do more with those dollars. I would at least have an opportunity for the people to speak on that. You represent us and I think you should push that issue, but let us vote on it, this is a democratic society, if we want to participate, good, if we don't want it, that should be available too.

Brian Blair commented that the report will include the history of the referendum discussion that started the Study Group.

Brian Blair adjourned the meeting at about 11:05 am.