

**Meeting of the “Blue Ribbon Task Force”
to Evaluate Nevada Department of Transportation Long Range Projects
May 25, 2006**

Chairman Peckman called the meeting to order and asked Director Fontaine to take attendance. Vice Chairman Goodman, Member Russell, Member Woodbury, Member Madole, Member Cashman, Member Ralenkotter, Member Murphy, Member Skancke were present in Las Vegas. Amy Levine was sitting in for Member Capurro. Member Vilardo and Member Geeser arrived late after the vote for Item No.1. Member Ellison participated by video conference from Elko. Member Mayer, Member Landreth, Member Porter and Member List were not present. No members were participating from Carson City.

Director Fontaine stated that Daryl Capurro retired from the Nevada Motor Transport Association and Paul Enos would be replacing him. Amy Levine would attend the meeting today on his behalf.

1. Approval of April 27, 2006 Task Force Meeting Minutes – Action Item

Member Skancke made a motion for approval and **Vice Chairman Goodman** seconded the motion.

Chairman Peckman received 11 votes to the affirmative and declared the item passed.

2. Nevada Department of Transportation Director’s Report – Informational Item Only

Director Fontaine stated that at the last meeting, the Task Force had some questions that he wanted to address. Kent Cooper would be providing a brief summary of the State Citizen Advisory Committee, which convened in the mid 1980’s, which concluded with legislative approval of increases for revenues to the state highway fund in 1991. He will also provide a briefing on the Clark County question 10 ballot initiative which resulted in legislation for additional revenues for Clark County and the Washoe County ballot initiative in 2002 that was approved by the Legislature in 2003. Russ Law would address the question regarding what would be the effect of adjusting the depreciation schedule on the government services tax on motor vehicles, in terms of additional revenue. Staff will also discuss the question of whether the shortfall includes just the super/mega projects or does it also include everything that NDOT anticipates over the next eight years in terms of the maintenance program and other activities. Russ Law will also address the handout that Member Capurro distributed at the last meeting regarding fuel pipelines in Nevada and the affects of a tax on those fuels may have. He will also discuss constitutional prohibitions on certain general use revenues that might be used for transportation projects.

Kent Cooper, Assistant Director of Planning, explained that in 1989, Clark County created the master transportation plan funding committee and they were charged with the task of developing a legislative and funding package to address the needs identified in the master transportation plan. This committee looked at a number of different sources. This was very broad based and wasn't limited to local gas tax or any of those types of issues. They developed a transportation funding package that was approved by the voters before we went through the legislative process. The end result was a broad-based tax that included room tax increase, gasoline tax increase, sales and use tax increase, development tax increase, and aviation fuel tax increase. There was also a recommendation that the state and federal government kick in their fair share, although that was not tied to any increase at all.

Washoe County went through a very similar process and recommended a number of funding increases. They did index their fuel tax rate very successful in that, they took what's called the regional road impact fee, similar to the development tax and adjusted those rates, used an eighth of a percent of the transportation sales tax and then they basically had some verbiage in there to expand their ongoing programs to be efficient and productive. That was also approved by the voters of Washoe County and the Legislature.

In addition to that, the State had a committee that met from 1986 through 1991 called the Citizens Advisory Committee on Transportation. They identified a \$4.4 billion shortfall of highway revenue. The Committee stated, "the Citizens Advisory Committee recommends a broad-based tax structure to fund this program, including raising vehicle registration and motor carrier fees, the taxes on gasoline, special fuel, and increase in the privilege tax, the state sales tax, and property taxes." This did not carry through at the state level. Basically, at the state level what happened was they increased motor vehicle fuel tax special fuel tax, and then some title and registration fees and driver's license fees. So it was strictly based on our old funding mechanisms that we have used to fund transportation.

Member Cashman asked if there was a sales tax designated for transportation.

Russ Law responded that Clark and Washoe Counties both have a transportation sales tax, which is a sales dedicated to transportation.

Member Ellison asked if there was a sunset, on Question 10 and if infrastructure could be rolled over again or not?

Kent Cooper answered that it did have a sunset the rollover is what was looked at in the 2001, 2002, 2003 legislation, is do we extend those time frames for some of them, and some of them were indeed handled in that fashion.

Member Skancke wanted to know which is the most stable of the taxes or revenue sources that are being considered.

Director Fontaine responded that motor vehicle sales tax is the most stable and probably more specifically the gasoline tax. That is traditionally what we bonded against.

Member Skanke asked when gasoline tax was last increased and do we have an indexing provision that allows us to increase the tax on an inflation basis.

Director Fontaine responded that gasoline tax was increased in 1992 and that we do not have an indexing provision.

Member Skancke asked if indexing would be beneficial to the Department in terms of predictability.

Director Fontaine responded that even if we had indexed the gas tax to CPI, he believes that we would be behind because of the rate of inflation in highway construction being much higher than the CPI. However, anything that can be done to address inflation is beneficial.

Member Skancke asked how many times has the gas tax been raised in Nevada since 1955?

Russ Law estimated that there has been eight increases. There were several jumps in the late '70s or early '80s that occurred to keep up with the hyperinflation. He then went on to discuss what effects adjusting the depreciation schedule on motor vehicle registration may have using a variety of different scenarios. For instance, a \$100 is going to bring in \$240 million, 2.4 million per \$1. Currently, at the \$33 minimum rate, it brings in \$91 million.

Member Cashman wanted to verify that he had heard correctly, that the governmental services tax brings in \$9 million per year.

Russ Law responded that the current governmental services tax, which is 4% or \$4 per \$100 assessed value is generating about \$290 million per year.

Member Cashman then asked how many vehicles are registered on the road.

Russ Law responded that there almost 2 million now.

Member Russell asked how Nevada compares to what is done in other states.

Russ Law responded that is not something that he is specifically familiar with. There are other states that have a similar privilege tax and he has seen depreciation schedules, but hasn't looked at this issue for years.

Member Cashman wanted to know why Nevada's vehicle registration is so much more than other states.

Russ Law responded that the overwhelming reason is that Nevada has a high government services tax. Nevada's registration fee is pretty close to the national average.

Member Murphy stated that she believes that we are one of the few states that do not have a state income tax and is it possible that those states get revenue in other ways.

Member Vilardo asked if general growth, growth plus inflation, was considered because of the addition of vehicles now?

Russ Law responded that we did consider that vehicle growth is directly parallel to population growth. So we used demographers population on future growth in these revenues.

Director Fontaine also wanted to cover a previous question that has to do Item 4b. In the information presented to the Task Force, there is a chart that was originally distributed that showed what the projected shortfall would be. There is also a second chart that has been adjusted to show that the shortfall not only includes the super/mega projects, but also includes the preservation projects that have been discussed that are necessary to maintain the existing highway system and bridges, as well as miscellaneous project that are needed like passing lanes and ITS technology. This is just is just a different way of showing where the shortfall is.

Russ Law continued that the figures on the hand out that Daryl Capurro distributed at the last meeting looked very accurate. Also, the idea of a pipeline tax is not a new one. We found three states that have something very similar, Louisiana, Wisconsin and Alaska. In Louisiana and Wisconsin, if you pull fuel out of their pipes within their state, then you pay a tax at that point. Any fuel that runs interstate and leaves the state borders is not taxed. Both of Nevada's pipelines terminate within in the State, so we don't have any way of drawing outside the state. The most

creative one was Alaska, they actually tax via barter system. They pull natural gas out of the pipe that belongs to the State, or I should say they leave it in the pipe but then they sell it, the state markets it. But the gas is theirs. They don't get money, but they get methane gas, natural gas, if you will, and then they sell it. This would be basically the same as the way the motor vehicle fuel tax is collected. It's point of taxation issue, and the federal gas tax is collected at the refinery before it even goes into the pipes. We tax it at the supplier level, which can vary depending upon how the fuel came in the state, but for the most part in Nevada that means it's taxed as it leaves the tank farms.

Russ Law wanted to explain one change in the potential highway fund revenue from various sources based on their our work on the motor vehicle governmental services tax. He found that we had not included inflation in those figures. So those are different than the previous version. Everything else is the same.

Chairman Peckman thinks that Russ is leading the Task Force into discussion that would be more appropriate under Agenda Item 4.

Member Vilardo asked if other taxes in other states traditionally went into the Highway Fund.

Russ Law responded that most states do not have a constitutionally protected highway fund like Nevada does. The last time he looked into this, there were 19 states that had constitutionally protected highway funds. In the states that have constitutionally protected highway funds, they overwhelmingly get their money from fuel taxes and registration fees at the state level. Nevada has the most diverse collection of taxes for highways of any state that we've been able to find. In the states that do not have a constitutionally protected highway fund, they have basically a single pot of money that all the general fund and highway fund money comes from, and because all the taxes get intermingled at that point, it's impossible to say that they have just fuel tax and registration fee. And many of those states do have lower fuel tax and registration fees than those of us who have a constitutionally protected fund.

Member Cashman asked Russ, in his development of potential highway fund revenues, did he look at the other states to for additional revenue ideas or best practices that Nevada has not considered.

Russ Law responded that his staff had researched that also and Nevada has most of those things with the exception of income tax. However, every state varies based on what resources they have. In Nevada's case we have gaming revenue that exceeds any other state's. We don't have coal and we don't have oil and those are the resources that drive Alaska and Wyoming. So there's some huge differences in certain areas. But when you average it all out, we look pretty much the same.

Member Russell wanted to know how many states charge sales tax on fuel.

Russ Law responded that he believed that it was 11.

Member Vilardo added that there are only two states, California and Hawaii, listed that charge a sales tax and it is not used for the highway trust fund.

3. Discussion and Possible Recommendations Regarding Transferring Certain State Highways to Counties and Cities – *Action Item*

Director Fontaine explained that the Task Force had asked regarding the transferring of state highways back to the appropriate counties and cities. The State Transportation Board was very interested in looking at the state transportation system and seeing what types of roads that the state ought to be maintaining versus what perhaps local entities, counties and cities are maintaining, and trying to transfer those roads where appropriate. Staff has identified roughly 800 miles out of the total 5,500 centerline miles of roads that are no longer appropriate to be on the state transportation system. Most of these are low volume roads in rural counties. In some cases fewer than 50 vehicles a day and they don't really have any regional connectivity, but dead end at some point. This list also includes certain urban arterials in Las Vegas and Reno.

We had developed some initial costs for how much those roads are to maintain. Staff detailed by specific maintenance activity how much it cost us to maintain those roads on an annual basis, and we broke it down even further to include those annual costs if the road includes snow plowing. On Interstate and U.S. highways, it's costing us about \$33,000 a lane mile. This is for routine maintenance activities and annualized resurfacing of these roads. We went through the exercise for each category of road.

Vice Chairman Goodman believes that a part of this discussion needs to be what impact this would have on the local entities. He knows that NDOT has approached the counties about taking certain roads over and that NDOT would be willing to make a lump sum payment for initial maintenance or whatever. He thinks that we also have to look at the ability of counties to fund those roads, maintain them and the necessity to maintain them. We all know we have roads in this state that should not be state highways. The history of that doesn't matter anymore. They're there.

We have some roads that would be impossible for a county to take over that are well used roads, or used as a truck bypass. If we took that road off the state system and we put that truck traffic now on to the main highway again, what impact would that have on that particular community in terms of maintenance on a major road? He would hate to see some of these roads drop off that are used as bypasses even though the State maintains them. It also puts additional traffic on to an already very heavily traveled road.

Chairman Peckman asked if it is possible to make a recommendation on particular roads and time frames?

Director Fontaine responded that the those roads were already identified in 1999 by Russ Law as a result of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3. He has spent a number of years trying to transfer these roadways, but it is very difficult. Counties and cities don't want to take these roads over because of their funding constraints. He thinks that Vice Chairman Goodman makes a good point that there are some obvious roads out there that even the counties and cities would agree should not be on the state system. These are roads that don't need to be maintained because they only serve a handful of ranchers or minimal use. That is where we need to start and start the process and decide how best to deal with the road in conjunction with the local entity.

Chairman Peckman asked what the economic impact would be if NDOT transferred all of the roads that they had identified? What is the cost per year?

Director Fontaine responded that they will be prepared to do that at a future meeting. Now that we have the breakdown of those costs, we can provide a much better number, road by road.

Member Murphy agreed with Vice Chairman Good man that it is entirely different in some of the rural counties that are less financially able to take over these roads in Washoe or Clark County. In terms of permitting from the developer's standpoint, a permit often has to go through several different agencies for approval, if NDOT turns over these roads, is there a savings in not having to review all of these things or does it come out even?

Director Fontaine responded that it would definitely save resources, not only on behalf of NDOT, but also for the public business sector. Right now, it is not an efficient process. We know that we would definitely save resources in terms of our permitting and we're going to try to come up with those costs as well. But certainly the urban areas, we spend a fair amount of resources on permitting that we wouldn't have to do if we turned those roads over.

Member Murphy asked if the Department was going to consider any public impacts of these road transfers when doing this analysis.

Director Fontaine responded that staff is considering a range of options, including abandonments, and ramifications to property owners, adjacent property owners and the general public. It is a very complex issue.

Member Skancke thinks streamlining the permit process would be greatly beneficial and that the pre purchase of rights-of-way is imperative. He suggested that the Committee vote on the policy issues one at a time, like pre purchase of rights-of-way, public-private partnerships and the highway inventory, etc. Then take a look at the revenue sources and the August and September meetings. Kind of divide the separate issues. He then apologized for having to leave the meeting early.

Chairman Peckman stated to let the record show that Member Skancke has left the meeting.

Member Vilardo asked about the toll road issue on Six Mile Canyon Road. Right now it is still partially closed and it is an engineering nightmare. Storey County has spent \$150,000 - \$157,000 and only has one gas station, so they don't get any money. She wanted to know if there would be some criteria for abandonment of roads, like if there was a safety issue. It seems that we would want to think of things that could be incentives. Maybe policy decisions to the legislature. It strikes me, particularly for the rural counties, that we want the 1 cent gas tax to be a legislatively mandated tax. Maybe it's time to review the issue and allow them to use it for maintenance because right now it can only be used for new construction. Perhaps we would be able to create some partnerships that would prove more flexible. Perhaps if some of these things were placed as you discuss turning over the roads, that you might get a better reception. She also agrees with what Member Murphy was saying about the developers and the permitting process. It is a good idea when it saves money whether it is a half a million or \$200,000. Ultimately there will be some recommendations for some sort of revenue increase and if this Committee looks at this globally, it has a much better chance of being accepted by the Transportation Board and the local governments.

Member Murphy stated that she knows that NDOT has worked real hard to identify some local roads in Las Vegas that should be transferred. The counties will most likely want them in a certain condition, as well as certain funding to go with it. This has to be a consideration, too, and in regard to the permitting issue, as we stand today, everybody's hands are tied the way they are because legally NDOT has a responsibility. While this is definitely something that we need to pursue, it is a bigger issue than is initially realized. This is also something that was discussed on the Governor's Task Force for Fundamental Review and one that should be pursued.

Member Cashman wanted to verify that the information provided were the annual costs per lane mile?

Director Fontaine responded that it was the average annual costs per lane mile projected over the next 20 years that has been adjusted for inflation. Staff has identified 840 miles for transfer.

Member Cashman asked if we are talking about an average, it would be approaching the high \$20 millions to \$30 million per year?

Director Fontaine responded that most of these lane miles are lower volume or low category roads so it is probably between \$10 - \$20 million instead.

Member Cashman stated that at \$20 million, it is 7% of the total shortfall.

Vice Chairman Goodman wanted to know if the state maintained any gravel roads that are on the state system.

Russ Law was not sure, but he would check into it.

4. Discussion and Possible Recommendations on Projected Annual Revenue Shortfalls and Potential Revenue Sources – *Action Item*

Director Fontaine stated that this agenda item is to discuss and possibly develop recommendations on projected annual revenue shortfalls and potential revenue sources. The Task Force could begin by looking at the handouts that were distributed regarding this subject. There were questions at the last meeting regarding priorities and how much funding we would need to complete the program versus looking at trying to get less than total shortfall and where would that take us. Staff laid out the cash flow requirements for these super/mega projects from 2007 through 2015 to see how much money we actually need to build these projects during this time frame. Both right-of-way costs and construction costs are listed. We have also listed the costs for the preservation program in that time frame that we are assuming can be done on a pay as you go basis. Staff also looked at project priorities if we only got half of the funds needed for the projected shortfall. In southern Nevada, we would phase most of the projects. In northern Nevada, we have dropped off the Pyramid Highway project and looked at doing various phases or pieces on both the US 395 and I-80 corridors. He also explained some of the numbers for different bonding scenarios.

Robert Chisel, Assistant Director of Administration, further explained that staff had done a cash flow analysis for putting the money into a sinking fund, assuming the revenue is available July 1, 2007. The idea behind the sinking fund, the money is put into the highway fund. As you can see, the bond payments are ramping up so that if you get a certain amount of revenue, you're not spending it all at the first part of the bond. It's later on as we're fully bonded. During that analysis, staff came up with approximately \$275 million for the full bonding. That is the additional revenue that would be needed by July 1, 2007.

Director Fontaine explained that another way to look at the cash flow and available cash between now and 2015 is we've identified all of NDOT's projects, expenses, the super projects, the mega projects, the preservation program, and identified \$3.8 billion shortfall between now and 2015 to accomplish that program. If you look at what the shortfall is, the super/mega projects account for

\$4.8 billion in total expenditures. So if you take the super/mega projects away and we don't do any of them, basically what we have available for new projects, we've already factored in funding for the preservation programs. That may be one of the recommendation that you may want to consider is to do just that, fund the preservation program.

Member Russell stated that if we do that, basically what we're talking about then is we've got \$1 billion in revenue available between now and 2015 to build new projects in the State of Nevada if there is no new revenue.

Chairman Peckman asked if we did not fund the entire program, how were the project prioritized.

Director Fontaine responded that in northern Nevada, we dropped the Pyramid Highway project and basically reduced the scope of work on the two other corridors.

Chairman Peckman asked how that determination was made, was it based on need?

Director Fontaine responded that the Pyramid Highway was dropped because it was not an interstate route or U.S. highway. In southern Nevada, the difference is the phasing of work on interstate 15 as well as the other corridors.

Vice Chairman asked if Boulder City bypass would be considered to be done as a toll facility.

Director Fontaine responded that had been discussed by Boulder City. We don't know what the new study is going to change in regard to revenue generation if we did that road as a toll road. However, a toll on that road is unlikely to pay for the entire cost. There would still be additional funds needed for that project.

Chairman Peckman asked about the specifics of prioritizing projects on the reduced plan.

Director Fontaine responded that priorities were based on focusing on the existing interstate highways and U.S. highway system routes in southern Nevada. We also focused on pure traffic volume and congestion levels and wanted to address choke points, based on existing congestion as well as projected future levels of traffic.

Chairman Peckman asked if that suffice for the magnitude of the problem we're seeing right now?

Director Fontaine responded that he realizes that it is a band-aid approach. Even under the fully funded program, there are going to be segments of our freeway system that will see congestion in the next 20 – 25 years. So if we do nothing, we're going to see that congestion happen very quickly and if we do something less than full build that we're recommending, you're going to see it happen quicker than if we did the buildout.

Vice Chairman Goodman expressed concern that no matter what the Department accomplishes, there will always be criticism that more should have been done.

Director Fontaine responded that there are priority highways and I-15 is a priority highway not only in southern Nevada, but probably the entire state because of its economic importance and the sheer amount of traffic that it carries.

Chairman Goodman asked if we only had a certain amount of money, would it be possible to reprioritize based on either traffic loads or community needs? To put some project ahead of others?

Director Fontaine responded that was an important question that needs to be addressed. There are projects like that. Projects that are ready to go, but maybe not the most important project on the list. It has been the direction of the Transportation Board of Director to build projects when they are ready to go. This is something that can be changed. It could even be one of the recommendations made by this Task Force.

Member Cashman asked if it was possible to put some sort of projected average system level of service on these different scenarios. What would be the projected difference 30 years, 20 years or whatever that number is?

Director Fontaine responded that we did that for the full build out and could probably work something up for the reduced plan. It is very difficult to do an average.

Russ Law explained that level of service analyses are difficult, to say the least. But luckily the model that's in the hands of the southern Nevada RT C and they do most of the analysis work. We check it and verify their models, but they do the actual traffic analysis.

Member Cashman asked if this could be done for the two facilities in Reno and the two or three main facilities in Las Vegas and that the Committee could get a somewhat subjective opinion of what the level of service would be on those facilities.

Member Madole asked if there would be any value to looking at economic impact at the same time that they were looking at traffic service level and air quality level.

Director Fontaine responded that the economic model that you may be referring to is the REMI model we helped pay for. As far as he is aware, that model is really to look at economic impacts of highway projects on regional economics. But he doesn't know that that model necessarily can predict the type of thing the Task Force is looking at. We can have our research staff look at general trends or general studies that have been done to relate congestion levels to economics and what we are getting out of it.

Member Ralenkotter asked if staff had taken into consideration the second airport being built on I-15 and the need to transport people back and forth. This has an economic impact both on the tourism industry as well as on the entire economy of the area. We may be assuming that we can get all the money and we may only get a portion. We have to look at getting the most bang for the buck and a different system may be needed. As we go through this process, we need to look at what those recommendations would be.

Member Murphy expressed concern on the length of time that a comprehensive economic impact analysis would take and how complex the process is.

Member Madole responded that he would be satisfied if we just had something that said the relative impact of doing it the two different ways. He understands the complication, but he would just like a simple comparison without getting a terribly complicated.

Member Vilardo asked Michael Geeser about the report that had do with the cost of vehicle repairs is when you don't get your roads fixed. Is there anything that the insurance institute or the

insurance safety group does that could try to interpret that when roads are built up, you have a reduction of which should then also result in reduced insurance rates? The things may relate indirectly.

Michael Geeser explained that AAA puts out an analysis every year on what it costs to operate the car, and every year that cost has gone up. One of the factors has been annual maintenance costs on the car itself. That has nothing to do with roads in disrepair. That has simply to do with just the cost of maintaining your car, in today's day and age. When you start to factor in roads that are in disrepair, clearly that cost is going to go up even further.

Director Fontaine stated that even though we are on the last agenda item, there is clearly not enough time to start talking about taxes and revenues. He did want to get the point across regarding the priorities, the projects and the cash flow analysis that has been done. We can do amortization schedules on the cash needs, but the bottom line is to build the full program, take care of the deficit, we're talking about and increase of \$275 million a year.

Chairman Peckman asked for input from the Committee regarding the next meeting. Member Skancke had talked about some policy decisions. At some point we have to determine policy, which roads are going to get built, possible taxes and the transferring of roads.

Vice Chairman Goodman thinks those are good discussions, but the primary purpose of the Task Force is to determine what funding sources we're going to recommend to come up with \$3.8 billion and that is where the time should be spend from now until we are done with that. Then, if there is time, address the other issues.

Member Russell stated that with due respect to this group, the concept that we are actually going to identify and prioritize projects is a little silly. NDOT has the experts. We can understand globally what they're recommending to us. We have to start talking about how much and where it's going to come from. He thinks that the additional reports that were request will be the final pieces and the Committee can start seriously talking about how much and where it's going to come from.

Vice Chairman Goodman thinks that the Committee has to keep in mind where these recommendations end up ultimately and that's the Legislature. The Legislature is going to do what they feel is best or what expedient for them to move things along. We can fight as hard as we can, we can talk to the legislators, talk to the press, talk to the public, whoever, but that's where the final decision is. And some of the members of the Legislature this year, when this comes out, will be brand new. People who have never been there before. There will be several of them. All brand-new stuff for them. Nobody likes to raise taxes, we know that, but what we do here is we just have to sell them that this is the best way to go. We have to have the consensus of this group. Once the vote is made, everybody is behind it. It's that simple.

Member Geeser agreed that is would be counterproductive for this group to try to prioritize highways when NDOT has already done that and they have the knowledge.

Chairman Peckman wanted to clarify what he was hearing from the Committee. The group is looking for a tax to fund the shortfall of \$3.8 billion. We are obligated by our charter to make a recommendation to the Department of Transportation. And so one discussion would be, are we recommending that the legislature pass all these taxes? Are we recommending that there are things that we are going to recommend besides taxes and what time frame. So he disagrees with most of the group because he thinks there are some policy decisions that need to be addressed.

Because if you don't think we can raise \$3.8 billion in taxes, then you shouldn't recommend that. You should recommend something different.

Member Vilardo thinks that the policy recommendations are for later. She thinks that we need to find out if there's consensus on the funding sources and at what levels. When we see the consensus on the funding sources, and the levels, then I think there are some mechanical things we might want to address. There's definitely some policy issues. But to say you're going to tell the Highway Board they want the Legislature to do this, they're making recommendations. The Legislature is going to do it what it pleases and so is the Highway Board. It strikes me that we should look for the full amount of money and maybe we won't get there when we get through the revenue discussions and maybe we will. We have to see what we're looking at first.

Member Murphy agreed with Member Vilardo. She thinks that they have a responsibility to look for funding for the entire need, and the Legislature and the Transportation Board may cut back on that. All of these activities need to occur, but sequentially. She thinks that we should decide on a funding package

Member Russell stated that the policy points are well taken. He asked the Director if those reports would be available by the next meeting because if not, he recommends that the Task Force take a month off because we won't have the full financial picture without them.

Director Fontaine responded that staff will do the best that they can do to provide the requested information. To get into a detailed economic analysis, is a very complex activity. Staff will do everything that they can, but it is not going to be anything that is terribly detailed or complex. However, staff should be able to provide what the levels of service will be if we don't do a full build out.

Chairman Peckman stated that the Task Force needs to come prepared next time with their ideas, their thoughts, talking to people as to what's doable. What we can really expect to do on tax increases. We all have different ideas, but I think we need to do that and that's probably the only part of the discussion. The Committee probably won't be able to come to a consensus next meeting, but maybe within another meeting or two after that.

5. Public Comment

Chairman Peckman asked for any comments from the public in any of the locations. Not hearing any members of the public that wanted to comment, he asked if there was another meeting scheduled for June?

Director Fontaine responded that we currently do not have a meeting scheduled and asked if the Task Force wanted to continue to meet on the fourth Thursday of each month, which would make the next meeting June 22.

Chairman Peckman then declared the meeting adjourned.