FLORIDA TAXATION AND BUDGET REFORM COMMISSION

Committee Meeting IN RE:

March 7, 2008 DATE:

Commenced at 10:08 a.m. Concluded at 12:05 p.m. TIME:

LOCATION: DOT Auditorium

Tallahassee, FL

LISA D. FREEZE, RPR REPORTED BY:

Notary Public

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC 2894 REMINGTON GREEN LANE TALLAHASSEE, FL 32308 (850)878-2221

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

Hoyt "Barney" Barnett
Martha W. Barnett
Allan Bense
R. Mark Bostick
Talbot "Sandy" D'Alemberte
Daniel Gelber
Mike Haridopolos

Mike Hogan

Julia Johnson

Bruce Kyle

Carlos Lacasa

Patricia Levesque

Alan Levine

Gwen Margolis

Roberto "Bobby" Martinez

Jacintha Mathis

John M. McKay

Robert "Bob" McKee

Lesley J. "Les" Miller, Jr.

Randy Miller

Jade Thomas Moore

Nancy J. Riley

Darryl E. Rouson

Ray Sansom

James "Jim" A. Scott

Susan Story

William Gregory "Greg" Turbeville

Kenneth "Ken" Wilkinson

Brian Yablonski

		3
1	PROCEEDINGS	
2	* * *	
3	CHAIRMAN BENSE: If you'll take your seats,	
4	we'll call the meeting to order.	
5	Members, if you'll take your seats.	
6	Okay. Members, if you'll take your seats,	
7	if you'll take your seats and the secretary	
8	will call the roll.	
9	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Barney Barnett.	
10	MR. BARNETT: I'm here on the phone.	
11	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Martha Barnett.	
12	MS. BARNETT: Here.	
13	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Bostick.	
14	MR. BOSTICK: Here on the phone.	
15	MS. FRIER: Mr. D'Alemberte.	
16	MR. D'ALEMBERTE: Here.	
17	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Gelber.	
18	MR. RANDY MILLER: He's right here.	
19	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Haridopolos.	
20	(No response.)	
21	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Hogan.	
22	MR. HOGAN: Here.	
23	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Johnson.	

MS. JOHNSON: Here.

24

25

MS. FRIER: Commissioner Kyle.

		5
1	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Rouson.	
2	(No response.)	
3	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Sansom.	
4	MR. SANSOM: Here.	
5	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Story.	
6	(No response.)	
7	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Turbeville.	
8	MR. TURBEVILLE: Here.	
9	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Wilkinson.	
10	MR. WILKINSON: Here.	
11	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Yablonski.	
12	MR. YABLONSKI: Here.	
13	MS. FRIER: Vice Chair Scott.	
14	VICE CHAIR SCOTT: Here.	
15	MS. FRIER: Chair Bense.	
16	CHAIR BENSE: Here. And there is a quorum	
17	present for today's meeting. Let us reflect	
18	that I think did I see Commissioner Rouson	
19	here?	
20	MS. FRIER: Yes.	
21	CHAIR BENSE: Did I see him earlier?	
22	MS. FRIER: Yes, sir.	
23	CHAIR BENSE: So that will have us at 15	
24	voting members at today's meeting? Right. We	
25	have 16 voting members present and two on the	

two on the phone.

2.3

Okay. Just as a notation, the two members that are on the telephone cannot vote on issues that might come up today regarding constitutional proposals. So you'll recall, with respect to statutory issues, it takes a majority of a 25-member commission.

Having said that, why don't we open with reports of committees.

Commissioner Turbeville will discuss the Governmental Procedures and Structures

Committee. You are recognized.

MR. TURBEVILLE: Thank you, Chairman.

Yesterday we had a spirited debate that lasted over three hours. There were six constitutional proposals in front of the committee, and all of them passed. I'll just give a brief recap for those that are playing at home.

Constitutional Proposal No. 22 by

Commissioner Rouson that dealt with affordable housing trust fund, that passed.

Commissioner Lacasa's super exemption proposal, No. 21, passed as well.

Commissioner Lacasa also had another

proposal, Constitutional Proposal No. 33, that deals with the *Sebring* decision, as it's commonly known. It's a tax exemption for municipal property. That passed.

2.3

Commissioner Barney Barnett had

Constitutional Proposal No. 42 relating to
assessment challenges and presumption of
correctness. That passed.

And we had two proposals: One from Commissioner Hogan on unfunded mandates, which was Constitutional Proposal No. 46; and finally, Constitutional Proposal No. 51 by Commissioner Riley dealing with exempt — special districts and how they are renewed over time.

So all six proposals passed, and we had a lot of testimony and a lot of debate.

CHAIR BENSE: Any questions? Any questions? Thank you, Commissioner.

Next we'll have Commissioner Carlos Lacasa discuss the issues that occurred in Planning and Budgetary Procedures.

Okay. I didn't see you back there,

Commissioner Hogan. We'll wait for you there.

MR. HOGAN: It's just a comment.

1 CHAIRMAN BENSE: Comment, okay. Commissioner 2 Hogan, you are recognized. 3 MR. HOGAN: Just as a warning, I quess. 4 Since Comissioner Gelber has been on the 5 committee, I've noticed that he is continuing to move closer to the center. 6 7 MR. GELBER: How do you know he's not asking 8 me? CHAIR BENSE: You never know. You never 10 know. 11 VICE CHAIR SCOTT: I had a question, 12 Mr. Chairman. 13 CHAIR BENSE: Okay. Commissioner Scott. 14 VICE CHAIR SCOTT: Well, I was just -- I was 15 just going to comment that it's nice to have 16 Representative Gelber if he would just speak out a 17 little more on some of the issues. 18 CHAIR BENSE: Okay. 19 MR. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. 20 CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Wilkinson, you are 21 recognized. This meeting is rapidly getting out 22 of control. I'm getting nervous. 2.3 MR. WILKINSON: I was wondering. I can't 24 recall. The Governmental Procedures and 25 Structures Committee, is their work done now like

1 in F&T? Are we shut down? 2 CHAIR BENSE: Yes, yes. 3 MR. WILKINSON: Okay. So we don't have to 4 worry about the full commission? 5 CHAIR BENSE: Yes. We'll talk about that 6 here shortly. 7 Okay. Commissioner Lacasa, you are 8 recognized to present the results of the 9 Planning and Budgetary Procedures Committee 10 meeting yesterday. 11 MR. LACASA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 12 Yesterday the committee reported out four 13 committee -- commission proposals: 14 CP0027 by Commissioner Hogan related to 15 the timing and frequency of TBRC meetings. 16 That was reported out favorably. 17 CP0030, by Government Services Committee 18 regarding class size limitations. 19 CP0040, by the Government Procedures and 20 Structure Committee regarding the funding of 21 private and religious providers for public 22 services reported favorably. 2.3 And CP0045 by Commissioner Hogan, a 24 resolution creating the caps on spending

revenue by local government and state

25

1 government.

2.3

SR0038 by the Governmental Services

Committee was temporarily passed because the sponsor was not available yesterday.

CHAIR BENSE: Any questions of Commissioner Lacasa?

MR. D'ALEMBERTE: It might be of interest to hear the vote on some of those.

MR. LACASA: I don't have that here, unfortunately, but I can get them.

CHAIR BENSE: The staff can provide that for you, Commissioner. We can get that for you. Be happy to. Some were close; some were unanimous, I think. If I recall.

Okay. Having gone through the reports of committees, I am hoping — and Executive Director Skelton, please correct me — I think all bills, all proposals, have now cleared all their committees. Is that correct? Where the — where the sponsor is pushing them?

MS. SKELTON: There are some that are still in committee, but those were either because they were late in the process or because they have not been requested, so...

CHAIR BENSE: We really -- at this stage, I

1 am not inclined to have any more committee meetings. At some point in time, we have to get 3 on with our business here as a commission, and I would think it would be a very special exception 4 5 that there would be a proposal that would go to a 6 committee unless there's some strong objection, 7 and we can talk about that if you like. Commissioner Barnett. 8 MS. BARNETT: Are these activated all the 9 10 time? 11

CHAIR BENSE: Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MS. BARNETT: Because I've got a little machine here. I wasn't sure what that's for.

CHAIR BENSE: That's a special one for you, Commissioner Barnett.

(Laughter.)

MS. BARNETT: Well, will it make coffee if I want some?

I am aware of at least one proposal that many of the people in the public that are concerned about it, and I think they have talked with the staff about it, feel that, just inadvertently, didn't get agendaed for the Finance and Tax Committee. I don't know the background of that, but I think it's --

1 The number's 24, Susan? Is that CP0024, 2 Rob? 3 I don't know how many there are like that, 4 but I know there's a lot of concern that that 5 one did not get assigned to a committee and heard. I don't know what we do about that. 6 7 Frank said there's a committee that's 8 still meeting. Perhaps the agenda of the 9 meeting could be assigned to -- to that 10 committee even though -- that and maybe others, 11 even though it may not have initially been the 12 first committee of reference. CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Scott? 13 VICE CHAIR SCOTT: I was just curious. 14 15 is 24? MS. BARNETT: It's a -- it's one dealing with 16 17 conservation. It's -- it was the -- it was the 18 one that was kind of traveling with Commissioner 19 Yablonski's dealing with conservation. 20 Maybe Brian can speak to it. 21 MR. YABLONSKI: Yeah. 22 MS. BARNETT: He may know more about it than 2.3 T would. 24 CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Yablonski, you are

25

recognized.

MR. YABLONSKI: Yeah. Thank you. I think —
I think this was the — it was Florida Forever
reauthorization with looking at a particular
percentage of the doc stamp revenue to go to the
successor program of Florida Forever.

CHAIR BENSE: My suggestion would be that the sponsors of the proposal, obviously, like in the Legislature, some folks, when they file their bills, they have — you know, either conditions change, circumstances change, that issue is included in another bill and it just doesn't move forward through the committee process.

So I would think that from -- at this point, that the sponsors of proposals should go to the committee chair and persuade that committee chair to take up the proposal, much like you would do in the legislative process.

Is there objection to that?

MS. BARNETT: I think there's been an attempt to do that. I may not have all the information so I may not be the best person to speak to it right now, but I think there has been an attempt to call that to the attention of the staff. And certainly with — this is a public meeting. I am sure they are listening to this, or will listen to it, and

people most interested in it can advise us. But it has a lot of public interest, I believe, in that proposal.

2.3

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Barnett, how about I visit with you about — and Executive Director Skelton after the meeting to see what the status of that is? Is that okay?

Any more discussions on committee meetings?

Okay. Also, before we get into some of the statutory recommendations, the concept on our -- I've talked to Director Skelton about perhaps on March 17th, at our March 17th meeting, which will be, what, next Monday -- Monday week, that we take up a host of property tax bills. Let's take those up. Let's move them forward or not move them, one of the two.

And any discussion on that concept?

Commissioner Scott.

VICE CHAIR SCOTT: I think -- I think that's a great idea because, based on all of our public testimony, there's clearly a huge number of people interested in this issue. So I think that would be great. If that's the first -- first on our list to address, that's great.

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Miller. 2 MR. RANDY MILLER: Yes. 3 CHAIRMAN BENSE: What are they? What do we 4 have left that we will be discussing at the full 5 commission? Everything from the full commission 6 or property tax? 7 MR. RANDY MILLER: Property tax. 8 CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Skelton, you are 9 recognized -- or here I've made you a 10 Commissioner. You are recognized. 11 MS. SKELTON: Mr. Chairman, at this point the 12 proposals that have cleared committees and that 13 would be available for discussion relating to 14 property tax issues are: 15 The CS for Constitutional Proposal 2 by 16 Senators McKay -- Representative --17 Commissioner McKay; Rouson; and Miller, Les 18 Miller. 19 Constitutional Proposal 50 by Commissioner 20 Levesque. Constitution -- CS for 21 Constitutional Proposal 21 by Commissioner 22 Lacasa. 2.3 And the CS for Constitutional Proposals 6, 24 8, and 34 by Commissioners Wilkinson, Scott,

25

and Lacasa.

1 MR. RANDY MILLER: Mr. Chair. 2 CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Miller, you are 3 recognized. 4 MR. RANDY MILLER: You know, we have 5 Dr. Villamil, our economist, and I would think it 6 would be appropriate that he would give us an 7 analysis on these property tax proposals. 8 CHAIR BENSE: He will. 9 MR. RANDY MILLER: So we will have an updated 10 one, current one, when these come up. And it's 11 amended --12 CHAIR BENSE: Understood. 13 MR. RANDY MILLER: Okay. I just wanted to 14 make sure we had... Because some of them sound 15 okay until you look at the economic impact of what 16 happens, and you may not want to do that. I think 17 we have Dr. Villamil --18 CHAIR BENSE: Right. I think Dr. Villamil is 19 looking at 12 or 13 bills currently to take a look 20 at economic impact. 21 MR. RANDY MILLER: Thank you. 22 CHAIRMAN BENSE: He's working. 2.3 Comissioner Gelber, you're recognized. 24 MR. GELBER: Thanks, Chair Bense. And maybe

this has been answered before, so I apologize.

25

What is the critical path to figuring out — if there are bills that obviously do the same thing different ways, what is the — how are we going to figure out — how are you all going to figure out, especially, the voting members, how — you know, which ones actually go on the ballot and which don't? Are they going be to done the same day? Are they all going to be — have you—all talked about this?

CHAIR BENSE: Yes. Basically, the -- the status we're in now is virtually all bills have now -- all bills have cleared committees. So we now know who the hands are on deck, so to speak. We know every bill, every issue, that's out there. A couple of them, some of them, do conflict.

At some point in time, I think that the sponsor of these proposals will figure out that another one has, you know, better legs. Much like the legislative process. Or that perhaps the sponsor of a competing proposal doesn't have the number of votes as he or she begins to count votes, not by talking to the people but by serving in committee and commission meetings, where in debate the members seem to stand. And I think, as many meetings as we

1 have, a lot of members sort of have a pretty 2 good feeling philosophically where each member 3 is. 4 So -- and then once issues are passed, we 5 are going to send them to the Styling and 6 Drafting Committee, as you well know. And then 7 at sometime -- at some point, we may combine 8 issues, proposals. And that -- at that stage 9 we're looking at the end of March, early April, 10 mid April, something like that. 11 Does that help? 12 MR. GELBER: Yes. Thank you. 13 CHAIR BENSE: Senator McKay. 14 MR. McKAY: Following up on Commissioner 15 Miller's comments, I would hope that we're still retaining Dr. Fishkind --16 17 CHAIR BENSE: Absolutely. 18 MR. McKAY: -- as well --19 CHAIR BENSE: Absolutely. 20 MR. McKAY: -- in the world of dueling 21 economists. 22 MR. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. 2.3 CHAIR BENSE: Mr. Wilkinson, you are 24 recognized. 25 MR. WILKINSON: Yeah. I had -- I did not

hear, unless I missed it, from Susan. Could we have the presumption on that date as well?

> CHAIR BENSE: Yes. I think --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

MS. SKELTON: Mr. Chair, I didn't include those in that list of property tax-related issues, but they are available and can be added to that date if that's the will of the commission to take all of those issues on the same day.

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Wilkinson.

MR. WILKINSON: Well, I don't know what the scheduling -- if that would be too much for that day or what. I'd have to leave it up to staff --

CHAIR BENSE: My thoughts are that meeting will be a very long meeting, and I would be prepared, Members, to run like ten to five, ten to six, something like that. And much like a committee meeting in the Legislature, we may not get to all issues that day, and they may get carried forward to the next scheduled commission meeting. So I think that will be the process.

Director Skelton and I will try to set the agenda to get through as many as we can, and if we don't, then we will move them to the next commission meeting.

Commissioner McKay for follow-up.

VICE CHAIR SCOTT: No. I'm just going to -I know we've put out for us the schedule, or, at
least, the tentative Susan has, but I think -don't we have meetings like the 26th and the 4th
and the --

CHAIR BENSE: Why don't you call those out, Susan, if you would, please.

MS. SKELTON: Mr. Chairman, the current schedule for meetings — and they will all be held in this room at this point in time except for the last one that I will tell you — the current schedule is for March the 17th, March the 26th, April the 4th, and April the 24th and 25th.

We are hopeful that we will be able to be back in the Knott building for that meeting on April the 24th and 25th, and we anticipate that being the meeting where Style and Drafting will have completed its work, and that would be the ordering and final vote meeting set for those dates.

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Riley?

MS. RILEY: Yes. And what is the start time? 9:00 o'clock here? Is that the start time for these meetings?

MS. SKELTON: Mr. Chairman, in an attempt to

try to make it possible for people to come in that morning, the morning of, we are hopeful that we can have start times of 10:00 or 10:30 so that members can fly in in the morning.

In the event that we have extended agendas and we can't do that, we may have to push the start times back. But our goal at this point is to try to have those start times late enough so that you can get in the morning of the meeting and not have to come in and stay the night before.

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner McKay.

MR. McKAY: Mr. Chairman, I was going to —
because the scheduling issue and because our time
is coming to a close, I wonder — and because of
what you just pointed out that we may have a
lengthy as well as a complicated agenda on the
17th with regard to all the property tax issues, I
wondered if it might be wise and if the other
members of the commission might agree that we
ought to put the issue Commissioner Wilkinson just
raised on the agenda, too, and maybe even a little
bit more like the agenda, and hold over until the
Tuesday. So that if we don't finish everything on
Monday, we can carry it on to Tuesday and maybe

1 even a few more items. That might create some 2 problems with the legislative meetings. 3 CHAIR BENSE: Susan is shaking her head. 4 Susan? 5 MS. SKELTON: Mr. Chairman. The room 6 availability is for one day only. That's the 7 problem. We probably would intend to put some 8 more things on the agenda and then have it carried 9 forward to the agenda for the 26th if we don't 10 complete on the 17th. But the issue now is room 11

MR. McKAY: I understand.

availability.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

CHAIR BENSE: And again, I think we've tried to avail ourselves of free time. If we have to, in April schedule some last-minute meetings, I think we can do that and still be ahead of the May 8th deadline.

Commissioner Miller?

MR. RANDY MILLER: May 4th?

CHAIR BENSE: Oh, May 4th. May 4th.

MR. McKAY: Those members that haven't been to Tallahassee a lot during legislative session might be well advised to come up the Sunday night because getting a flight on Monday morning from Miami or Tampa will be difficult.

1 CHAIR BENSE: Book your flight now. 2 Ms. Skelton. 3 MS. SKELTON: Mr. Chair. Just as a point of reference, May 4th is actually a Sunday, and since 4 5 we don't have IRS rules, that means that our 6 ballot language has to actually be to the 7 Secretary of State by May the 2nd. 8 CHAIR BENSE: The last thing we want to do is 9 meet for four straight days the end of April. 10 think we have it spaced pretty well. We have done 11 our best to pace ourselves so that we don't run 12 into a last-minute crunch. 13 So, as we used to say, keep your debate. 14 Planes are leaving. Remember that? Planes are 15 leaving. Keep your debate. Commissioner Johnson. 16 17 MS. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, did we decide the 18 voting process for each of these stages, what will 19 be required, what kind of vote? Have we resolved 20 that yet? 21 CHAIR BENSE: I don't know what you mean. 22 MS. JOHNSON: Like whether it's going to take 2.3 majority vote to get it to the next level or a 24 supermajority vote.

CHAIR BENSE: Yes, we worked all that out

25

1 already. Were you at the meeting? 2 MS. JOHNSON: What did -- I don't remember 3 what we decided. 4 CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Scott. 5 VICE CHAIR SCOTT: The staff, they can give 6 you a copy. It was worked on several times in --7 if that's okay. 8 MS. JOHNSON: And we -- it was finalized? 9 VICE CHAIR SCOTT: Yes. 10 CHAIR BENSE: Perhaps, Commissioner, you can 11 get with Mr. Goodlette or -- because we debated 12 pretty heavy. And there was, I think, unanimity, 13 so I don't want to head back there. 14 MS. JOHNSON: No. I just wanted to -- I 15 didn't remember what the final decision was on 16 that, but I'll go over it with him. 17 CHAIR BENSE: Thank you. 18 Any more general discussion? Any more 19 general discussion? 20 Okay. Let's move on to proposals. Again, 21 we don't have -- I want to make sure members 22 know that Commissioner Barnett and Bostick were 2.3

trying to fly into Tallahassee this morning, and I think we all know the thunderstorms and so on. So we don't have 17 members, but it

24

25

up statutory recommendations since we don't have 17 votes for a constitutional proposal.

Let's take up committee substitute for Statutory Recommendation No. 0029 by the F&T

committee, a sales tax review. And presenting

that will be Commissioner Randy Miller.

Commissioner Barnett's part and Commissioner

Bostick's part. So today we will simply take

wasn't because of a lack of effort on

You are recognized.

MR. RANDY MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is a proposal on the Finance and Tax Committee dealing with review of sales tax exemptions. We have set up a procedure for the Legislature to create a committee, a joint committee, to review the exemptions and set up the procedure and some standards for them to utilize in evaluating those exemptions.

Again, this is not a mandated sunset.

This is simply a statutory structure for a review of the existing sales tax exemptions.

There are, I think, 246 of them. Some probably have outlived their usefulness and need to be taken off the books.

So this is the statutory recommendation we

would send. Now, of course, the Legislature can do it this way or review it however they want to, but I think the idea was for this commission to send something to the Legislature endorsing a review. The business community has repeatedly said we do not oppose a review. What we oppose is any kind of sunset accompanying that review.

2.3

So this is the proposal that the committee voted out. And that — the Legislature, we intend for them to take that — this up this session. So, Mr. Chairman, it's kind of critical we move it out of here today and get it on over to the Legislature for review.

I know Senator Haridopolos has said he's willing to review the sales tax exemption in the Senate. We have not heard anything from the House yet.

But, anyway, this is what this proposal is, and I would recommend that the commission accept it.

CHAIR BENSE: Okay. Commissioner Miller, having presented his statutory recommendation, before we get to the question phase, I see a couple of amendments. I'm seeing a timely-filed

1 amendment and a late-filed amendment.

2.3

Amendment No. 1 by Commissioner Mike Hogan. You are recognized to present the amendment.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If I may ask — with your permission, I am going to ask for withdrawal of this amendment but would like to explain why I introduced it and why I am withdrawing it.

CHAIR BENSE: Absolutely. You're recognized. We don't have it yet. Oh, this is late-filed.

MR. HOGAN: Mine is not listed.

CHAIRMAN BENSE: Okay. In the meantime, the staff is preparing the late-filed amendment and making sure members get a copy of the late-filed.

Commissioner Hogan.

MR. HOGAN: Amendment No. 1, and it exempts inputs to a manufacturing process, including energy, raw materials, machinery, and equipment.

The reason that I was interested in offering this amendment is manufacturing, as you all know, has taken tremendous hits nationwide. Florida is no exception.

Regulation has been a killer. Some of our trade agreements have harmed us, and

manufacturing jobs are disappearing all over the place. And certainly for us today.

Taxing inputs is a pyramiding tax, and I have a fundamental problem with pyramiding taxes, and those were the reasons that I thought that they should be exempted from this review process.

But in giving more consideration to it, I thought it would be disingenuous of us to pass through to the Legislature a requirement for review and then say we want to exempt these entities from the review. And so for those reasons, I introduced it and, for that reason, I am asking it to be withdrawn.

CHAIR BENSE: For debate on the withdrawal, Commissioner Scott, you are recognized.

VICE CHAIR SCOTT: Well, I am glad you are withdrawing it, frankly, because what we are about here is to ask them to do it. And that's their job, and if we start trying to pick one or two or any, and then what about the others. Because, you know, we — everybody would say, okay. Well, they exempted this. What about mine? What about this? What about that? And that's their job, and we are just simply sending them a resolution that they

1 should do it, which they have already, at least some of them have agreed to do. So I am glad you 3 are withdrawing it. 4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

CHAIR BENSE: Without objection, show the Amendment No. 1 withdrawn. We have a --

MS. MATHIS: Chair Bense, this is Commissioner Mathis.

CHAIR BENSE: Hey, Commissioner Mathis. morning.

MS. MATHIS: Good morning. Would it be inappropriate for some sort of transmittal or recommendation to the Legislature that they give certain consideration to manufacturing companies? Or is there a way to transmit that idea, that thought, without putting it into a formal recommendation?

CHAIR BENSE: I am going to let Commissioner Scott answer that question.

VICE CHAIR SCOTT: Commissioner, I think the concern is that for us to do one of those would mean that we, by exclusion, didn't do some other or didn't give as much consideration. And so I think we are just asking them to review all of them and not try to make a recommendation about which ones should be in a more-favored or

less-favored position.

2.3

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Mathis.

MS. MATHIS: That answered the question.

CHAIR BENSE: Okay. Any more?

Commission Barnett, you are recognized.

MS. BARNETT: I was just going to comment for Commissioner Mathis that one of the good things about this particular proposal is it does set forth criteria for the Legislature to use in evaluating the various exemptions, including things like pro-competitiveness and some of the other things that are taken — that were implied in Commissioner Hogan.

So I think that's a very positive thing about this, is it gives some input from this commission about the kinds of issues that we think are appropriate to be considered in evaluating exemptions.

MR. RANDY MILLER: Mr. Chair, if I might.

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Miller, you are recognized.

MR. RANDY MILLER: There was a lot of discussion on this proposal at the F&T Committee, and that's why it is a committee proposal. A lot of the debate went into the development of this

1 particular proposal.

2.3

It is straightforward. It does set up standards. And these that Commissioner Hogan has picked out, I know that I worked personally on putting several of these in the statute and I know that they can pass any criteria when you look at it, especially the criteria that we've established here. So there is not a big problem. Those will pass the test.

CHAIR BENSE: We were moving to Amendment No. 2. This is a late-filed amendment by Commissioner Gelber. Late-filed amendments require a two-thirds vote for introduction.

Comissioner Gelber, you are recognized to give a brief explanation of your proposed amendment.

MR. GELBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since I am going to be withdrawing it at the end of the explanation, I might make it a little less brief than I -

CHAIR BENSE: Take your time.

MR. GELBER: I agree with Commissioner Hogan so much that I actually wanted to make a point by introducing something. And, actually, it is very valid, but I think properly if there's — if it's

not going to be opened up, it ought not -- it shouldn't -- this shouldn't be there as well.

2.3

And this, obviously, is for the assisted living facilities where those folks, almost all of them are on Medicaid. We've made a very strong argument that they should be excluded just like the pyramiding.

But I think that is a very valid point and, in fact, the only reason that I agreed to do is not simply on the merits of this but also to make the point that we thought we should keep it pretty pure and let the Legislature exercise its wisdom as you-all are suggesting. But my fingers are crossed, Chairman Bense.

Anyway, so I'll ask that you don't consider this late-filed amendment at this time.

CHAIR BENSE: Without objection, show the amendment withdrawn.

Do we have any more amendments?

Okay. Let's move to the audience participation phase. We have Nancy Stephens, who is executive director of the Manufacturers Association of Florida.

1	You are recognized.
2	MS. STEPHENS: Mr. Chairman, I'll waive my
3	time in light of the discussion. We supported
4	Chairman Hogan's amendment. Thank you.
5	CHAIR BENSE: Thank you, Nancy.
6	Next is Janegale Boyd, representing the
7	Florida Association of Assisted
8	MS. BOYD: Homes and Services for the Aging.
9	CHAIR BENSE: Okay. Sorry about that.
10	MS. BOYD: We waive our time too and thank
11	you, and I appreciate Representative Gelber's
12	comments for us. Thank you.
13	CHAIR BENSE: For the record, folks, Janegale
14	Boyd is working hard for her folks, as we've heard
15	numerous conversations.
16	VICE CHAIR SCOTT: Indeed we have.
17	CHAIR BENSE: Why is everyone nodding their
18	head?
19	VICE CHAIR SCOTT: She has attended every
20	meeting, and some of us might have missed a few.
21	CHAIR BENSE: Okay. We are in the question
22	phase with the questions of the sponsor of the
23	proposal. Are there questions? Are there
24	questions of the sponsor?
25	Commissioner D'Alemberte, you are

1	recognized for questioning.
2	MR. D'ALEMBERTE: Are we now making a
3	decision about services in this proposal?
4	MR. RANDY MILLER: No, this does not in
5	the definition, it excludes services. Those are
6	outside purview of the sales tax, application for
7	sales tax today.
8	CHAIR BENSE: You are recognized for
9	follow-up, Commissioner D'Alemberte.
10	MR. D'ALEMBERTE: Yeah. Does that mean, when
11	we are asking for review, we are not reviewing
12	services?
13	MR. RANDY MILLER: That's correct.
14	MR. D'ALEMBERTE: Well, I think that's a very
15	bad bill just on that basis.
16	CHAIR BENSE: In debate, you can get your
17	licks in on debate, Commissioner D'Alemberte.
18	More questions?
19	Commissioner Riley, you are recognized.
20	MS. RILEY: I don't know if this is the right
21	time either, but and because we don't have a
22	quorum, do you
23	CHAIR BENSE: No. This will this requires
24	only 13.
25	MS. RILEY: Okay. Should we have some

discussion whether we are actually looking for a statutory recommendation or a constitutional proposal? I think we ought to have some discussion — if we decide it's going to be a statutory recommendation like this, which makes sense, and it eliminates a lot of discussion for a constitutional proposal, we can maybe take some of those things that might want to be in there.

2.3

But I would really like to have a discussion on -- I know this is a statutory recommendation. Personally, I think that's the way we should go. We should not have it in the constitution. But I don't know if it's appropriate or not to do this -- to discuss that.

CHAIR BENSE: I tell you what. Commissioner Miller, why don't you answer that question.

MR. RANDY MILLER: We --

CHAIR BENSE: Since you sponsored -- I think you are involved with both of them.

MR. RANDY MILLER: Yes. We have a constitutional provision that was being moved in tandem with this. In the event the Legislature didn't react or didn't respond to the review, we always had that option — and we still do have

that option — to move that — move it into the constitutional, constitutional provision, which I know it would just be as a hammer.

But the idea is this should be addressed statutorily. They have the authority to do it, but sometimes they need a little prodding, and a prod from the Tax and Budget Reform

Commission, I think would give it some legs in the Legislature for them to begin the process.

CHAIR BENSE: Generally speaking,

Commissioner Riley, if we had dueling proposals,

one being statutory and one being constitutional,

while we will put, if the sponsor wants, all items

on the agenda at the commission level, if a — if

a sponsor chooses not to push their proposal, then

it doesn't necessarily have to be on the agenda.

So — and I think what Commissioner Miller is saying is let's give the statutory mode a try and if the end of the day doesn't work, if there's no reaction by the Legislative session, then we, perhaps, take more drastic steps with the constitutional proposal. That's already set and ready to go.

MS. RILEY: So the fact that it's on the agenda today is -- means something different?

CHAIR BENSE: Well, Commissioner Miller, you want to address that too?

MR. RANDY MILLER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.3

What we intended to do today is basically TP it and hold it until a later meeting. The Legislature has begun. As soon as we can get this over there and see if we can get some activity on the review before we have to hit them over the head with it.

MS. RILEY: I appreciate you letting me take this time.

CHAIR BENSE: Sure.

MS. RILEY: Since we can't discuss these things ahead of time, it's the first opportunity I've had to question that's --

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Barnett, you are recognized.

MS. BARNETT: Yes. I would like to comment on this. I don't view a statutory proposal and a constitutional proposal dealing with sales tax exemptions as mutually exclusive. I think you can have both of them move forward at the same time, and that appears to be what — that's been my understanding of what we are doing.

2.3

I do think there are different philosophical discussions that you have to have with yourself in that it's a very legitimate issue to raise as to whether the sales tax exemption review should be mandated in the constitution versus a statutory decision.

There's a lot of different opinion about that. So that's a — that's a good, important discussion to have.

But to move forward on the statutory doesn't preclude --

CHAIR BENSE: No.

MS. BARNETT: — moving forward on the constitutional, and, in fact, you could have both. And if the constitutional provision passed the commission and passed the vote of the people, it would take precedence over any statutory recommendation or action by the Legislature.

CHAIR BENSE: We have moved through the committee process similar proposals, statutory as well as constitutional, to get them postured so they are ready to be placed on the agenda of the commission, so...

Commissioner McKay, you are recognized.

MR. McKAY: Mr. Chairman, if I -- if I may

2.3

expand for Commission Riley's benefit on

Commissioner Barnett's comments, there have been

more studies than any of us can probably count

without taking our socks off where there have been

recommendations to the Legislature review process

of tax exemptions, including recommendations from

the last and first Tax and Budget Reform

commission meeting we had in 1992.

But the -- despite all those recommendations from a plethora of groups, there's absolutely no substantive effort on the part of the Legislature to do that. So that's why -- that's why a constitutional requirement might -- might very well be appropriate. In fact, I think it is appropriate. And it's also consistent with a number of other provisions in the constitution requiring the Legislature to review certain programs from time to time.

CHAIR BENSE: Okay. We're in the question phase of Commissioner Miller's proposal. Are there additional questions, further questions, of Commissioner Miller?

Is there debate? I think we've done debate in question phase. That's a Senate trick. You-guys are

1 getting pretty good at that.

2.3

Commissioner D'Alemberte, would you like to debate?

MR. D'ALEMBERTE: Yes. I apologize for beginning my debate in the questioning phase. It was out of order and also ineffective.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR SCOTT: He was never in the Senate.

MR. D'ALEMBERTE: I just — I have just extreme regard for Randy Miller as a public servant person who understands the state taxation system, but don't we all know that the sales tax system in Florida is regressive? Don't we know that we tax things that the poor people have to use on a regular basis and that we leave out the taxation on — on services which are used by more wealthy people? Doesn't the exemption of services actually — actually tilt the whole sales tax on a project against — against the people who are least able to pay?

And by including services, I want to add legal services. I mean, I don't see any basis for overall exemption for legal services. We don't -- we could better balance the -- our

sales tax system.

2.3

And I generally like what Randy is doing, but I don't like the idea that we are, in this bill, making a recommendation to the Legislature that seems to present to the Legislature the idea that we have actually studied this issue and had full dollar and debate on it. I simply don't think we have. I think Commissioner Barnett and others have had some important things to say about this issue.

But -- but, as a commission, we simply have not addressed this services issue. So Mr. Chairman -- I hate to vote against Randy Miller, but this -- this particular provision is noxious to me.

CHAIR BENSE: Okay. Further debate?

MR. RANDY MILLER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BENSE: You want to -- okay.

MR. RANDY MILLER: I would like to explain to Commissioner D'Alemberte that we did have a conversation on a separate issue dealing with services taxes, which were reviewed in the F&T committee. So this is a separate proposal that we — the other debate was had in the committee.

CHAIR BENSE: Further debate? Further debate

	42
1	on Commissioner Miller's proposal.
2	Seeing none, Commissioner Miller, you are
3	recognized to close your proposal.
4	MR. RANDY MILLER: Waived.
5	CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Miller, having
6	waived his closing, the question occurs on passage
7	of
8	MR. RANDY MILLER: 49.
9	CHAIR BENSE: of CS for Statutory
10	Recommendation 00029. Call the roll.
11	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Martha Barnett?
12	MS. BARNETT: Yes.
13	MS. FRIER: Commissioner D'Alemberte?
14	MR. D'ALEMBERTE: No.
15	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Hogan?
16	MR. HOGAN: Yes.
17	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Johnson?
18	MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
19	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Lacasa?
20	MR. LACASA: Yes.
21	MS. FRIER: Commissioner McKay?
22	MR. McKAY: Yes.
23	MS. FRIER: Commissioner McKee?
24	MR. MCKEE: Yes.
25	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Randy Miller?

	43	
1	MR. RANDY MILLER: Yes.	
2	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Riley?	
3	MS. RILEY: Yes.	
4	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Rouson?	
5	MR. ROUSON: Yes.	
6	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Turbeville?	
7	MR. TURBEVILLE: No.	
8	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Wilkinson?	
9	MR. WILKINSON: Yes.	
10	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Yablonski?	
11	MR. YABLONSKI: Yes.	
12	MS. FRIER: Vice Chair Scott?	
13	VICE CHAIR SCOTT: Yes.	
14	MS. FRIER: Chair Bense?	
15	CHAIRMAN BENSE: Yes.	
16	By your vote, the statutory recommendation	
17	passes.	
18	Next, Constitutional Proposal 0007 by the	
19	F&T Committee, Commissioner James Scott.	
20	James Scott, you are recognized.	
21	VICE CHAIR SCOTT: This is this is the one	
22	that we wanted to postpone, right?	
23	In addition to not having the votes, this	
24	will be available to us at such time as the	
25	commission wants to do that. But, for now, I	

would move that we temporarily pass the constitutional proposal.

2.3

CHAIR BENSE: Without objection, show the Constitutional Proposal 0007 temporarily postponed.

Next, committee substitute for Statutory Recommendation 0049 by Commissioner Randy Miller.

Commissioner Miller, your are recognized.

MR. RANDY MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is another statutory recommendation to the Legislature to have the constitutional officers of each of the counties submit a zero-based budget to the county commission to be included in the overall county commission adoption of the countywide budget as it relates to ad valorem tax.

When we first drafted this, there was an oversight. There are two officers at the local level and the property appraiser that are supervised by the Department of Revenue. The budget is submitted to the Department of Revenue for approval. Appeals go before the Governor and Cabinet. So the rewrite of this is what we have today. This one was amended in

the committee.

2.3

So, simply put, all the constitutional officers would be — would have a budget that the public could see. When you go to the county commission budget hearing today, there's no requirement for the property appraiser to show up. There's no requirement for the sheriff or the clerk or supervisor of elections. This would have them, at least, file that zero-based budget with the county commission so that everybody knows what's in that budget.

CHAIR BENSE: Okay. Commissioner Miller, having presented his proposal, are there any amendments to the proposal?

Okay. I don't see any public debate.

Commissioner Barnett — we are in the question phase. Commissioner Barnett, you are recognized for questions.

MS. BARNETT: Question. Randy, you have mentioned in your discussion now the clerks. Does this constitutional proposal — I mean, does this statutory proposal apply to the clerks? I mean, a lot of their revenue comes from fees as opposed to ad valorem, and — but you mentioned them. Is

1 this intended to pick up the clerks and require 2 them --3 MR. RANDY MILLER: This would --CHAIR BENSE: You are recognized 4 5 Commissioner Miller. 6 MR. RANDY MILLER: This would pick up any 7 officer that uses ad valorem tax dollars. 8 MS. BARNETT: So it would not apply to the clerks? 9 10 MR. RANDY MILLER: If he's a fee officer 11 totally, I don't think it would. 12 MS. BARNETT: Could Commissioner McKee 13 comment on that? CHAIR BENSE: Can we do that? Well, why 14 15 don't you answer the question. You're right. 16 Commissioner McKee, you are recognized. 17 MR. MCKEE: At least, in nonchartered 18 counties, the clerk's budget is bifurcated. He 19 has a piece of it or she has a piece of it that 20 comes from ad valorem taxes, and it funds the 21 duties in their ex officio responsibilities to the 22 Board of County Commissioners. 2.3 Then there's the fee side of their budget 24 that comes from the activities as an officer of

the court. So a portion of the budget is

25

1 fee-driven; a portion of the budget is funded 2 with the county commission. 3 MS. BARNETT: Does the fee portion of it go through the Legislature, then? 4 5 MR. MCKEE: The fee portion of it is approved 6 by the state, correct. 7 CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Miller, you are 8 looking like that might not be the correct answer. MR. RANDY MILLER: I don't know the answer on 9 10 the clerks. I don't know who the super -- if I 11 might ask Commissioner McKee. 12 CHAIR BENSE: You are recognized. 13 MR. RANDY MILLER: Who approves the fee side 14 of that budget? 15 MR. McKEE: The state. MR. MILLER: State who? 16 17 MR. McKEE: By Article V. I don't know who on the state level. 18 19 MR. RANDY MILLER: I don't know the answer to 20 that. 21 MR. McKEE: But I know that it's -- I know 22 that it's not the county commissioners. I do know 2.3 that a portion of the budget that covers them is 24 the county comptroller, the ex officio clerk for

the county commissioners. And other

25

responsibilities that lie within the county itself, not the judicial system, are funded through ad valorem taxes.

Just so you know, I tell you that having been chief deputy clerk of courts.

CHAIR BENSE: Did that help, Commissioner

Barnett? Not totally. I can tell that you're not totally sure.

MS. BARNETT: Well, it does help me to some degree because of the distinction between the two funding sources. This amendment is limited to ad valorem funds, as opposed to it would not apply to the degree there were fees or other charges that funded a constitutional officer, clerks or otherwise. It would not apply and require a zero-based budget on that is what I'm really hearing.

So it's not comprehensive. It's only ad valorem. So you are going to miss out — I think what the answer is you are going to miss a lot of constitutional officers if their funds come from something other than ad valorem, Randy. That's, I guess, my question. I didn't think the clerks had ad valorem, which is why I was surprised to hear you say clerks in your

summary.

2.3

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Wilkinson, you are recognized for a question.

MR. WILKINSON: Yes. Just for clarification, the amendment that we approved with this is still with it. The amendment which says each of the state constitutions, county officers, boards, or other taxing authorities that obtain their revenues from ad valorem taxes, except those officers whose budgets are approved under Section — which would be the collector and the property appraiser.

So we are exempt from -- by passing this, we are not addressed.

CHAIR BENSE: This will be committee substitute. This is --

MR. RANDY MILLER: That was -- we incorporated it. It is in there.

CHAIR BENSE: Further questions?

Further questions.

I have one, Commissioner Miller. I know
Senator Dean has been interested in this issue
as well for quite some time. And apparently,
currently, there's certain offices that can
simply run about a quarter page or one-third or

a small ad and say, "This is our budget for the next year." Is that -- am I overexaggerating or is that still --

2.3

MR. RANDY MILLER: No, that's correct.

CHAIR BENSE: Provide more detail on the budget.

MR. RANDY MILLER: The attempt here is, if I might ask to --

CHAIRMAN BENSE: You are recognized.

MR. RANDY MILLER: The attempt is transparency at the government spending at the local level to make sure that the citizens of the county understand where their tax dollars are going.

Currently, there are — a big, big portion of the ad valorem budget is not controlled by the Board of County Commissioners. They have to fund the activities of other constitutional officers who are not required to come to the budget hearing and defend it. So if there is a big issue about the amount of tax increase to fund those officers, they simply don't have to show up and publish a notice. And this is to get everybody there to talk about what we're doing with your tax dollars.

1	CHAIR BENSE: Further questions? Further
2	questions? Is there debate?
3	MR. D'ALEMBERTE: I have just a question.
4	CHAIR BENSE: You are recognized,
5	Commissioner D'Alemberte.
6	MR. D'ALEMBERTE: Does this also include the
7	school superintendent?
8	CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Mills, you are
9	recognized.
10	MR. RANDY MILLER: The school superintendent,
11	if they are getting money under the school board.
12	I think that's the difference of where the school
13	funding but I don't know the answer to that.
14	MR. D'ALEMBERTE: Then how about the school
15	board?
16	MR. RANDY MILLER: The school board? I don't
17	know the answer to that.
18	But I am sure that when this thing this
19	is a recommendation going to the Legislature.
20	I am sure all these folks are going to have a
21	thousand different explanations of why they
22	shouldn't be covered.
23	CHAIR BENSE: Any further questions and any
24	debate? Is there debate?
25	MS. BARNETT: I'd like to say something.

CHAIR BENSE: Ms. Barnett, you are recognized in debate.

2.3

MS. BARNETT: I'm not opposed to this. I think transparency in spending is a very important principle that we should endorse.

I am concerned that it may not pick up all of the constitutional officers. For example,

I — I suspect it does not pick up most of the funds that clerks have. It's my understanding that the clerks' budget is not approved line item by the Legislature but more as simply as an — you know, they get a lump sum that somehow gets approved.

I don't know if that's good or bad. I'm not commenting on that. But they are a constitutional officer and — so, to some degree, this is an important issue, but I am not sure it goes far enough. I am concerned it may not go far enough. I don't know whether it picks up school boards either.

But in principle, I like it, but I'm not sure it's as comprehensive, Randy, as maybe you had intended. Or perhaps it is. But those are just my comments about it.

CHAIR BENSE: It's debate.

Commissioner Hogan, debate?

2.3

MR. HOGAN: Yes. This is — this is the bill, right?

MR. RANDY MILLER: That's it.

MR. HOGAN: Everything. Well, it says, "Each of the state's constitution county officers, school board members, or constitutional officers, board, school board, or other taxing authorities that obtain their revenue from ad valorem taxes."

And by Commissioner McKee's testimony, the clerk receives some portion of his income from ad valorem taxes. I see that it applies to everybody except the two that already have to submit a budget to the DOR.

CHAIR BENSE: Okay. Commissioner Barnett.

MS. BARNETT: I think it would apply to the clerks to the extent they have ad valorem taxes. It's the other revenues that come through fees I don't think it would apply to require that kind of transparency in budgeting, because that goes through — it doesn't go to the county commission; it would go through the Legislature.

And it's my understanding it's not appropriated funds in the classic sense. It's more — there's a different process. I can't

define it for you, but I think there's a different process. And I don't think this is the intent -- that was really my question to Randy -- I don't think it's the intent to pick up that piece of the clerk's budgets.

2.3

MR. RANDY MILLER: Mr. Chair, if I might.

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Miller, you are recognized.

MR. RANDY MILLER: You know, I don't know about the fee side, but in further reflection to Commissioner D'Alemberte, I think that the board, the wording "board" here would pick up the school board.

And the intent is — again, if we're not — if we're not picking up enough, I think Mr. Cibula reviewed this. He might want to comment on if there should be an amendment to it to make it more expansive. I am not opposed to that.

But this was our best shot at the ad valorem side. In my opinion, it would be hard, Commissioner Barnett, to pull out the ad valorem part without bringing the whole budget in because it's just the way the funding works. I mean, you use part of it to fund the

office, but you surely can't segregate out the fees and say, "That's my budget."

2.3

CHAIR BENSE: Mr. Cibula, do you want to make a comment on that? You are recognized. Just find an open mic there. That's good.

MR. CIBULA: I mean, I don't know if I have a lot to add on this one. I just prepared the language that was provided to me. But, you know, I'll just make a quick comment on, you know, school districts and the school boards. Those are both constitutional entities under Article IX, Section 4; and Article IV, Section 5. But, you know, perhaps if you want an amendment to specify exactly who this applies to by naming them, we could do that at some point.

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Scott, you are recognized.

VICE CHAIR SCOTT: Just a couple of comments. First of all, I am not sure about what this does to the school boards, and I'm sure this will get addressed when it goes to the Legislature. But one thing that it does do, and it may not be as comprehensive as it could be, is, for example, in some counties, well, like Broward, the sheriff's budget is, like, half of the whole budget, you

know. I mean, and so, for example, to say that there's some more disclosure on that sure doesn't hurt anything.

2.3

And they do go to the commission. The thing is that they can't really — if they reject it, they can appeal it, basically. But, at least, this would make them fully set out their budget instead of coming like — because I was down there on the commission for a while. They would come with, well, here it is. You know, here is this; here is that. You could ask questions and ask for more information, but by the time you ever get to doing that, it's almost time to vote on the budget. So this way they would have to submit in advance. It's a good idea, I think.

CHAIR BENSE: Further debate? Commissioner Riley, any debate?

MS. RILEY: Yes. Thank you, Chairman.

I really appreciate you bringing that up, Commissioner Barnett, because the word "fees" is now the buzz word as far as revenue goes.

So if we are going to do something to make this transparent, I personally believe we need to add that word "fees" in because your

ad valorem taxes are being reduced and — but the fees are increasing, and where they get the money and how much from fees, I think, is something that we need to address and take a look at and put in here.

CHAIR BENSE: My instincts tell me that when you submit a budget, that you have got to show your sources of revenues and show your expenses.

I mean, I could be wrong. And I don't think there are any officers of the court that are only — that live only on fees. I guess the clerks might.

I guess the clerks might.

My instincts also tell me that when this issue, if it's taken up by Florida House, I think there's some fairly conservative members of the Florida House that will probably — if the bill is filed without it, will probably amend this bill to include all fees as well.

Your call, Commissioner Miller. Do you want to TP it and amend it, or you want to get 'er done today?

MR. RANDY MILLER: Mr. Chairman, based on the schedule that we have set up for future meetings, I think we need to move it on to the Legislature and put it in their hands right now.

1	MR. CIBULA: I think they'll they'll
2	fix
3	MR. RANDY MILLER: They will fix it. And
4	there will be people coming out of the woodwork
5	saying, "Oh, did you mean this?"
6	But I think, Chairman Bense's comment, you
7	can't leave the fees out of the budget. Maybe
8	we might be able to do a quick a line item
9	zero-based budget on the entire budget, fees as
10	well as ad valorem. That's about all we can do
11	to fix that right here.
12	CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Riley
13	Mr. Cibula, why don't you work on that
14	MS. RILEY: Is there any way just to say
15	revenue from ad valorem taxes and fees?
16	MR. RANDY MILLER: That's what he just said.
17	Yes, that's what he just said.
18	MS. RILEY: That we could put that in there?
19	CHAIR BENSE: Yeah. Why don't we I tell
20	you what, Mr. Cibula, if you will work on an
21	amendment to right now a late-filed amendment,
22	I think there's general consensus that will
23	probably pass.
24	Let's temporarily postpone this bill for
25	now. We are going to take it up in this

meeting, but we can move on to a couple of other issues, some housekeeping business, while Mr. Cibula is very quickly, very quickly, handwriting a late-filed amendment.

Ms. Skelton. Let's move on to budget cuts. I think we're going to get whacked just like everyone else is, so why don't you talk about what it looks like on the budget front for us this session. You are recognized.

MS. SKELTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As everyone here is aware, the state budget has been reduced already this year, and they're having to make further reductions for the current year in order to prepare to make reductions for next year.

And at this point the House and the Senate are in conference. It's my understanding they didn't settle last night. They were close, but they didn't settle. And the — basically, both Houses took cuts to TBRC in addition to all other Legislative offices. And our cut in the House proposal was \$700,000. Our cut in the Senate proposal was \$650,000.

That sounds like a lot of money, but understanding that at the end of June, when we

1 | 2 |

were to lose our authorization for expenditure, the intent was to be able to revert in the neighborhood of \$600,000.

So, while the cuts are big, they are not as big as they sound because we did have additional funds set aside for emergency expenditures; for example, hiring of extra consultants or those types of things.

So we are taking a large hit. We don't know the final number. It will either be 700 or 650 or some version of that.

The budget then has to go to the Governor for approval. But, at this point, we are anticipating the final outcome of the conference and somewhere in the neighborhood of north of \$600,000 in cuts to the commission.

We feel like we have enough money to continue and complete our work product in early May and be able to get the final report done. And we have been working with our staff on exit plans, and we're all aware of what we're dealing with and we will continue to provide the best possible product to the staff — or to the commission and to the State of Florida.

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BENSE: Any discussion on that? 2 good news is we have been fairly frugal the last 3 year or so about spending money. You recall, even from our initial proposed budget, it was cut a 4 5 pretty good bit. So we have been -- Ms. Skelton

(Laughter.)

is very cheap.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

CHAIRMAN BENSE: Frugal, frugal, sorry. Very frugal. So sorry about that. My -- in my world, it's cheap. Any comments?

But, in all fairness, you know, Susan Skelton has been around this process, as all of you know, for a good 25 years plus, and she understands the budget process. And the good news is -- I'll wax on about her for just a moment because she understands the process, knows most of you members, and has really been valuable to me as we chat every day and e-mail about every day on the issues that are out here. So that's because of your good steward -- stewardness through the last year that we've been able to keep our expenses kind of low. That's a better way to put it.

Okay. With respect to future meetings, Members, you need to be at these meetings. I mean, we really need to be at these meetings, because this is where the rubber meets the road, especially on the 17th where we take up these property tax issues.

2.3

That is — it's a critical day. You know, all the public hearings we attended, they were virtually dominated, if you will recall, by property tax issues, so — and I know it's difficult. Sometimes it's rains like this morning. But especially make sure you do the best you can to make the meeting on the 17th of this month and the other ones as well. And if we'll be there, we can do much to get them done.

And I'll move them along as quickly as I can, yet make sure we get proper public testimony, as well as debate, during the meeting. So I hope that helps a little bit. They are still not done.

MR. RANDY MILLER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Miller, you are recognized.

MR. RANDY MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I've got a general question about the procedure. With this particular recommendation, the study on the sales

tax and the streamline, we now have — will have three proposals going to the Legislature. What is the process to get them from — with an endorsement from this commission to that body in time for them to act on it?

2.3

CHAIR BENSE: Ms. Skelton, I think you have the answer to that question in much more detail than I do.

MS. SKELTON: I don't know about detail, Mr. Chairman.

The recommendations are now in Style and Drafting. The Style and Drafting Committee will put together — the staff will draft — the Styling and Drafting Committee will approve the transmittal letter to the Legislature. And that can happen at any time because those do not have to come back for another vote.

So it's really a ministerial function at this point to make sure that they are in order and properly transmitted to the Speaker and the president and the Governor's office. And that would be ongoing. But under our rules, the next stop is to Style and Drafting, then move forward on to the Legislature. So it's a ministerial function at this point.

1 MR. RANDY MILLER: But they do --2 Mr. Chairman. 3 CHAIR BENSE: You are recognized. MR. RANDY MILLER: They do not have to come 4 5 back to this, the full commission, granting --6 MS. SKELTON: The recommendations do not have 7 to come back. 8 MR. RANDY MILLER: Okay. If I might, then I 9 will ask that we expedite those as quick as 10 possible. The session has begun and... 11 I do know that the streamline has -- the 12 House sponsor is Representative Dennis Ross 13 called and asked if he could do that, which he did. Senator Gelber has the streamline in the 14 15 Senate. So that one has -- are actually in bills. 16 17 The sales tax that we did this -- did this 18 morning has not -- had any sponsors for that. 19 MS. SKELTON: Mr. Chairman. 20 CHAIR BENSE: Ms. Skelton, you are 21 recognized. 22 MS. SKELTON: In fact, there are a couple of 2.3 vehicles for sales tax review. They are for 24 specific sales tax exemptions. But given the

conversation, they could be used as vehicles.

25

1 Mr. Chairman, I have --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

CHAIR BENSE: Commissioner Rouson, you had some -- I think a question earlier?

MR. ROUSON: No, just a comment --

CHAIR BENSE: Okay.

MR. ROUSON: — that rides on your comment about the importance of all of us trying to make March 17th.

I was a little disappointed to hear that that was the date that we have to do some of these important decisions. That's an extremely critical date in my life. I will be celebrating ten years' freedom from alcohol and cocaine on that date, and for the last six years, I've spent that day inside the jails and treatment centers encouraging others to be free from addiction. But I'm canceling that date for the first time in six years so that I can be here doing something that I think is more important to the State of Florida and to the citizens. And I really hope that we will be able to take care of some business. My wife just sent me the invitation last night to approve for our sober St. Patty's Day party.

CHAIR BENSE: I'm sorry they conflict.

MR. ROUSON: I'm sorry they conflict too.

But it is an important date for decisions that we will be making in here, and I just wanted you to know that I am going to sacrifice and do what I can to be here so I can be a part of that process.

CHAIR BENSE: Thank you, Commissioner. We appreciate those words.

Before we get back on the statutory recommendations, with respect to the Styling and Drafting Committee, we were able to bring on board as staff for the Styling and Drafting Committee Richard Hixon.

Richard, stand up.

2.3

Richard is a long-time veteran of the Florida House. He retired in 2003, and I — when I became Speaker of the House in 2004, I got him to un-retire. And he is a legend. He is respected by members of the House on both sides of the aisle. I think everyone will agree, and I think he will be absolutely invaluable in making sure that our ballot language is correct and meets any tests.

So I want to welcome Mr. Hixon now. And it took Susan Skelton and I both to talk him

67 1 into coming on board, so I think it will work 2 out good. 3 (Applause.) 4 Okay. Let's move back to Statutory 5 Recommendation No. 0049 by Commissioner Randy 6 Miller. We are back on the -- we're back on 7 the proposal. 8 And Commissioner Miller, I think you have a late-filed amendment. 9 10 MS. SKELTON: There's one copy. 11 CHAIR BENSE: Oh. I tell you what. Here's 12. what we'll do. 13 Commissioner Miller, it's going to be your 14 amendment. 15 MR. RANDY MILLER: Right. 16 CHAIR BENSE: We are going to let Ms. Skelton 17 explain the amendment, since she has it in front 18 of her, in detail what it says. 19 But, first of all, it is a late-filed 20 amendment. It requires two-thirds vote for 21 introduction. Are there any objections to 22 introducing this late-filed amendment? 2.3 Seeing none, the amendment is properly

Ms. Skelton, could you explain the

24

25

filed.

amendment.

2.3

MS. SKELTON: Yes. Mr. Chairman, this would be Amendment 1 to the CS for SR0049. It's an amendment on line 12 of the document in front of you. That line would now read: "Revenue from ad valorem taxes or fees except those officers whose budgets are approved under Sections 195.087 or 145.022 who has budgeted and appropriated to them by the board of county commissions certain ad valorem taxes or fees for the operation of their offices." And it goes from there. It adds the words "or fees" in the appropriate places.

CHAIR BENSE: Okay. The sponsor, having presented his amendment, are there questions of the sponsor of the amendment?

Is there debate on the amendment?

Are there objections to the amendment?

Seeing no objections, we are back on the proposal as amended. We are in the debate phase. Any further debate?

Seeing none, Commissioner Miller, having closed on his Statutory Recommendation, the question occurs on passage of Statutory Recommendation No. 0049 by Commissioner Miller.

The secretary will call the roll.

		69
1	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Barney I mean,	
2	I'm sorry. Commissioner Martha Barnett?	
3	MS. BARNETT: Yes.	
4	MS. FRIER: Commissioner D'Alemberte?	
5	MR. D'ALEMBERTE: Yes.	
6	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Hogan?	
7	MR. HOGAN: Yes.	
8	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Johnson?	
9	MS. JOHNSON: Yes.	
10	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Lacasa?	
11	MR. LACASA: Yes.	
12	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Levesque?	
13	MS. LEVESQUE: Yes.	
14	MS. FRIER: Commissioner McKay?	
15	MR. McKAY: Yes.	
16	MS. FRIER: Commissioner McKee?	
17	MR. McKEE: Yes.	
18	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Randy Miller?	
19	MR. RANDY MILLER: Yes.	
20	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Riley?	
21	MS. RILEY: Yes.	
22	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Rouson?	
23	MR. ROUSON: Yes.	
24	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Turbeville?	
25	MR. TURBEVILLE: Yes.	

	/0
1	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Wilkinson?
2	MR. WILKINSON: Yes.
3	MS. FRIER: Commissioner Yablonski.
4	MR. YABLONSKI: Yes.
5	MS. FRIER: Vice Chair Scott?
6	VICE CHAIR SCOTT: Yes.
7	MS. FRIER: Chair Bense?
8	CHAIR BENSE: Yes.
9	And by your vote, the Statutory
10	Recommendation passes.
11	MR. RANDY MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12	CHAIR BENSE: Okay. Any further items to be
13	brought up before the commission? Anything else?
14	Seeing none, Commissioner Hogan moves we
15	rise.
16	(The proceedings concluded at 11:44 AM)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

25