

1 Mr. White replied that it was subject to amendment, and that there would need to be a final
2 millage and budget set at the current meeting, noting that once the tentative millage was
3 set it could decrease but not increase.

4
5 Mr. Mueller commented that there had been presentations given, and opined that 0.25 mills
6 could be permanent.

7
8 Mr. Smith remarked that it was subject to discussion, and that they could decide on zero to
9 0.25 mills.

10
11 Mr. Mueller relayed his understanding that from 2013 to the previous year, there was a 1.0
12 millage rate on the TRIM notices, and that in 2016, Lake County voted to continue the
13 NLCHD with about 57,770 votes, opining that they wanted to keep that rate. He hoped
14 that they Board would keep the 0.40 rate, and opined that some of the savings from moving
15 the rate down to 0.25 mills would not be much. He opined that even though the Board
16 wanted to fund the clinics more than the hospitals, there were many people in the
17 community who needed help, and that a business needed to reinvest in better products and
18 better services and account for higher costs. He hoped that the Board would keep the rate
19 at 0.40 mills and fund these organizations so they could do more.

20
21 There being no one else who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the
22 Chairman closed the floor for public comment.

23
24 BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR FY 2022-2023

25 Mr. White stated that there was discussion by the trustees at the previous meeting regarding
26 the purpose for the surplus and if it could be carried forward 100 percent into the FY 2023-
27 2024 budget or partially utilized to fund some of the organizations that received submittals
28 in excess of their budget.

29
30 The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

31
32 There being no one who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman
33 closed the floor for public comment.

34
35 Mr. Hurley made a motion to increase the FY 2022-2023 budget by \$109,900 in new
36 budget expenditures, covering all submittals that were incurred by the hospitals and clinics.

37
38 Mr. White clarified that this would be a reallocation of \$649,000 of already budgeted funds
39 and an additional \$109,900 above the approved FY 2022-2023 budget.

40
41 Mr. Hurley remarked that this was funding that was not dependent on raising the millage
42 and was already there, opining that it would continue to stay there if it was not spent.

43
44 Ms. White stated that there was a document in the Board's packet that showed the following
45 information: the FY 2022-2023 budget by entity; the submittals approved through the
46 quarterly agreed upon procedures performed by the independent Certified Public
47 Accountant (CPA) firm of Moore Stephens Lovelace (MSL); the amount that was funded;

1 the listing of the remaining budget for those who did not meet their budget through
2 submittals; and those that met and exceeded their budget. He mentioned that the remaining
3 budget of \$649,279 could be reallocated to another organization based on submittals, and
4 that there was an additional \$109,900 of submittals received beyond the budgeted amount.
5 He relayed his understanding that Mr. Hurley wanted to include this amount because of the
6 surplus funds.

7
8 Mr. Harper relayed his understanding that with the \$109,900 there was funding available
9 to allocate, and he questioned why it was not reallocated.

10
11 Mr. White noted that there was \$1.3 million that was not allocated, which had accumulated
12 from the carryforward amounts from the prior year and the current year by organizations
13 that were below their targeted amount and by the NLCHD overhead expenditures that were
14 below the budgeted amount.

15
16 Mr. Harper seconded the motion.

17
18 Ms. Price asked where the amount of \$109,900 came from.

19
20 Mr. White explained that \$109,900 was the difference between the \$759,000 and the
21 \$649,000, and that the 0.25 mills budget that was discussed would, with the allocation to
22 the clinics and hospitals, cover any use of the surplus funds from FY 2022-2023. He
23 pointed out that there would be a decrease in available funds for the FY 2023-2024, and
24 that there would need to be a rebalance of those expense line items for the entities in FY
25 2023-2024.

26
27 Ms. Price stated that with the \$1.3 million surplus, she would like to propose a 0.25 millage
28 rate and rollover the \$1.3 million.

29
30 Mr. Hurley asked if this rate would cover the submittals that were not met in the FY 2022-
31 2023, and questioned if it would stay in the bank.

32
33 Ms. Price indicated that it would not, and said that it would rollover to the FY 2023-2024.

34
35 Mr. White explained that the \$1.3 million currently in surplus funds could be used as
36 discussed or wholly carried forward to FY 2023-2024 to offset budgeted expenses in that
37 period, which included the clinics and entity care.

38
39 Mr. Smith inquired if the \$1.3 million would replace the \$649,000, which would go to
40 offset budgeted expenses and make less of a budget surplus going forward.

41
42 Mr. White replied that there was a \$1.3 million surplus that could be offset by reallocating
43 budget funds and/or increasing the budget to include the submittals in excess of the budget.
44 He stated that if the motion passed, it would reduce the funds available in the FY 2023-
45 2024 budget, and that the line items would need to be revisited to ensure that there was a
46 balanced budget.

47

1 Ms. Price relayed her understanding that if there was a 0.25 millage rate and the \$1.3
2 million surplus was allocated, there would be a total of over \$7 million, and that it would
3 be added to the \$5 million.

4
5 Mr. White noted that the 0.25 millage rate provided tentative income of \$4,497,000;
6 therefore, an increase of about \$1.3 million in surplus carried forward would total
7 \$5,803,965.

8
9 Ms. Price relayed her understanding that this was close to what they had already approved
10 at 0.25 mills, and Mr. White indicated that this was correct.

11
12 Mr. Smith opined that ad valorem taxes should not be used to fund hospitals, and that even
13 though clinics did a good job, they should find other ways to obtain resources. He said that
14 even though he did not want to support the funding of hospitals, he would be fine with the
15 \$1.3 million and a 0.15 millage rate, which would take care of everything being asked for
16 by the clinics and leave some for the hospitals. He expressed concerns about funding the
17 hospitals, and opined that they did very well with their operating expenses, noting that
18 without this funding, the indigent would still receive care, which was the purpose of the
19 NLCHD. He relayed his understanding that the vote in 2016 was for the continuation of
20 the NLCHD Board with the latitude to go from zero to 1.0 mill, and that it was decided on
21 a year by year basis by those who were elected to represent the people of this county.

22
23 Ms. Price inquired how much funding would be generated at 0.15 mills.

24
25 Mr. White answered that with the carryforward into the FY 2023-2024, a 0.15 millage rate
26 would support the clinics and leave about \$2.25 million for the hospitals; however, if the
27 \$1.3 million was not carried forward, it would leave about \$900,000 to split between the
28 hospitals.

29
30 Mr. Hurley commented that the Board was elected to fund the indigent care, and opined
31 that people who could not afford insurance because of various circumstances were entitled
32 to this funding. He said that he wanted to ensure it was there for them, opining that the
33 Board was not elected to lower taxes but to fund the needs of indigent people. He opined
34 that even though people without funding from the NLCHD would still receive care because
35 it was mandated by the government, the care they received may not be the best because the
36 level of care could go down without funding. He opined that it was the Board's obligation
37 to fund this, and that 60 percent of the north Lake County residents wanted to ensure that
38 people who could not afford it received care when they needed it.

39
40 Ms. Price opined that the residents were already receiving better care, and that the expertise
41 of the doctors would not be diminished if the hospitals did not receive these funds. She
42 said that she advocated for the taxpayers and the indigent.

43
44 Mr. Smith opined that when the South Lake County Hospital District had ended, their care
45 had not diminished. He also opined that the NLCHD should have been gone a long time
46 ago, and he hoped that the Legislative Delegation would end it. He opined that funding for
47 the clinics could be ended gradually, and that the hospitals would not have issues without

1 this funding. He expressed concerns about ad valorem tax, and hoped that the voters would
2 decide to end the NLCHD in 2026.

3
4 Ms. Hooper stated that she supported the clinics, and she wondered if the hospitals could
5 reallocate funding from their budgets and not depend on NLCHD funding.

6
7 The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

8
9 There being no one who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman
10 closed the floor for public comment.

11
12 Ms. Price mentioned that there was a motion on the floor.

13
14 Mr. White reiterated that the motion was to cover 100 percent of the submittals that were
15 made in excess of the budget for the entities that met their budget in submittals, and that
16 the total was \$759,179, which was inclusive of the \$109,900 that could be added to the
17 budget as opposed to just reallocated.

18
19 On a motion by Mr. Hurley, seconded by Mr. Harper which failed by a roll-call vote of 2-
20 3, the NLCHD Board did not approve to increase the FY 2022-2023 budget by \$109,900
21 in new budget expenditures, covering all submittals that were incurred by the hospitals and
22 clinics.

23
24 Ms. Hooper, Ms. Price, and Mr. Smith voted no.

25
26 Mr. White questioned if there was any other discussion about the carryforward of funds
27 versus funds being reallocated for the FY 2022-2023, opining that it was important to have
28 a finite carryforward amount for the FY 2023-2024 budget decision.

29
30 On a motion by Ms. Price, seconded by Ms. Hooper and carried unanimously by a roll-call
31 vote of 5-0, the NLCHD Board approved to move the surplus funds forward.

32
33 Mr. White remarked that the Board needed to approve line items among the entities as to
34 what was going to be expended based on their requests per the FY 2023-2024 budget, and
35 said that the requests included the following: the clinics requested \$824,700; the mental
36 health hospital and clinic requested \$1.2 million; and the hospitals requested \$3.4 million.
37 He added that any of those line items were subject to change.

38
39 Ms. Price inquired if this was covered with the 0.25 millage rate.

40
41 Mr. White said that a 0.25 millage rate would provide \$5.8 million in funds available with
42 the carryforward, and that the overhead was expected to be \$287,000, leaving about \$5.5
43 million available to split among the clinics and hospitals.

44
45 Ms. Price mentioned that Mr. Smith had suggested 0.15 mills, and she asked what the
46 allocations would be.

47

1 Mr. White replied that 0.15 mills with the \$1.3 million carryforward would provide about
2 \$4 million in funds available, and that overhead would be expected at \$237,000, leaving
3 \$3.7 million to be split among the clinics and hospitals.

4
5 RECITATION FOR THE RECORD

6 Ms. Kirste recited the following for the record: the name of the taxing authority was the
7 NLCHD; the rollback rate was currently 0.4534 mills; and the levy of 0.25 mills
8 represented a decrease in the property tax levy of -44.86 percent over the rollback rate
9 0.4534 mills.

10
11 WAIVER OF THE READING OF THE ENTIRE PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

12 On a motion by Ms. Hooper, seconded by Mr. Harper and carried unanimously by a vote
13 of 5-0, the NLCHD Board approved to read by title only Resolutions 2023-01 and 2023-
14 02.

15
16 PUBLIC COMMENT – RESOLUTION 2023-01 FOR SETTING THE MILLAGE

17 Ms. Kirste read the title of Resolution 2023-01 as follows: “RESOLUTION OF THE
18 NORTH LAKE COUNTY HOSPITAL DISTRICT PROVIDING FOR THE ADOPTION
19 OF THE MILLAGE RATE FOR THE 2023-2024 FISCAL YEAR.”

20
21 The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

22
23 There being no one who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman
24 closed the floor for public comment.

25
26 BOARD ACTION OF RESOLUTION 2023-1

27 On a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Ms. Hooper and carried by a roll-call vote of 3-2,
28 the NLCHD Board approved Resolution No. 2023-01 setting the millage rate for the FY
29 2023-2024 budget year at 0.15 mills.

30
31 Mr. Harper and Mr. Hurley voted no.

32
33 Mr. Harper questioned who would determine how the reallocation of funds would be
34 allocated to each entity.

35
36 Ms. Price answered that the Board would vote on funding the clinics and splitting the
37 difference between the hospitals.

38
39 Mr. White remarked that the trustees had the responsibility to set those line items.

40
41 Mr. Harper inquired when that would take place.

42
43 Ms. Price replied that it would take place at the current meeting.

44
45 Mr. Smith made a motion to approve to fully fund the clinics with the remainder going to
46 the hospitals.

47

1 Mr. Harper asked about fully funding the mental health hospital.

2

3 Mr. White asked if the Board wanted to expend all surplus funds, or if there should be a
4 minimum holding of funds to cover any unexpected costs.

5

6 Mr. Smith amended his motion to approve holding back \$500,000 and to fully fund the
7 clinics and LifeStream Behavioral Center, with the remainder going to the hospitals, which
8 he calculated to be about \$700,000 each.

9

10 Ms. Price questioned if \$1 million was held out or if it was a surplus from the prior year.

11

12 Mr. White replied that it was inclusive of a surplus of the prior year as well as the current
13 year under-budget items. He stated that with the \$500,000 expected fund balance at the
14 end of the year, it would fund the following: clinics at \$824,700, which was their full
15 request; the mental health facility at \$1.2 million, which was their full request; \$631,228
16 to AdventHealth Waterman; and \$631,228 to UF Health Leesburg Hospital. He
17 commented that this information could help provide a full and complete motion.

18

19 Mr. Smith amended his motion to include the numbers provided by Mr. White.

20

21 Ms. Price inquired if there had ever been an issue with not having reserves, and wondered
22 if \$500,000 was enough.

23

24 Mr. White opined that it would be plenty, and that it could create another large surplus.

25

26 Mr. Harper asked if this also included the overhead costs.

27

28 Mr. White answered that it was, and explained that this amount fluctuated based on the
29 millage rate, what they collected, and what the fees associated with collections were.

30

31 Mr. Hurley questioned why a mental health hospital was worth twice as much as a regular
32 hospital.

33

34 Ms. Price replied that she was fine with giving LifeStream Behavioral Center \$1.2 million,
35 opining that there was a great need for it.

36

37 Mr. Hurley remarked that there was also a need to care for heart attacks, cancer, and other
38 conditions that people died from.

39

40 Ms. Price expressed her concerns about funding hospitals, and opined that they already
41 provided the best care.

42

43 Mr. Hurley commented that the Board had given them \$2.7 million in the previous year,
44 and that they would only receive \$600,000 the following year, opining that some things
45 could change.

46

1 Mr. Smith opined that Lifestream Behavioral Center depended on this funding, and that
2 those who were there were largely indigent, noting that this was where law enforcement
3 personnel took people with mental issues who could not be incarcerated with the general
4 population. He also opined that Lifestream Behavioral Center was more like a clinic than
5 a hospital, and that it was more necessary and important.

6
7 Ms. Price relayed her understanding that all of these entities could go to their Lake County
8 delegations and ask for appropriations, and that if they were refused, it would go to another
9 County. She mentioned that tax revenue was also coming from the State of Florida, and
10 opined that they had many other options.

11
12 Mr. Hurley stated that he would like to see funds divided equally among the three hospitals
13 instead of \$1.2 million to one hospital and \$600,000 to two other hospitals.

14
15 Ms. Price related that LifeStream Behavioral Center still had \$354,000 left over from the
16 previous year, and she expressed concern about entities that were not able to spend their
17 allocated funding.

18
19 Mr. Harper commented that they only spent \$850,000.

20
21 Ms. Price opined that Mr. Hurley had a valid point.

22
23 The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

24
25 Mr. Andrew Wampler, Vice President of Finance for UF Health Central Florida, opined
26 that the \$2.7 million did much good for patients in north Lake County; additionally, there
27 were costs associated with processing the paperwork and qualifying people to meet the
28 regulations to receive funding. He stated that they had previously given over \$4 million in
29 care for indigent patients in north Lake County; however, they did not submit all those
30 claims because of the costs involved in submitting all that paperwork. He mentioned that
31 from \$4 million in care, they were reimbursed for \$2.7 million, and pointed out that in the
32 following year the Board wanted to reimburse them for only \$600,000. He remarked that
33 they were bound by law to give care to the indigent, and that if they were going to treat
34 Medicare and Medicaid patients, by law they had to treat indigent patients, noting that there
35 were hospitals in the state that did not treat the indigent because they were for-profit
36 hospitals. He stated that they were a not-for-profit hospital, and that they relied on
37 Medicare patients, noting that 80 to 85 percent of their patients were on Medicare. He
38 opined that businesses could not work for free, and that if they did not receive payment,
39 they would have to make changes, such as not replacing equipment and not obtaining new
40 technology.

41
42 There being no one else who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the
43 Chairman closed the floor for public comment.

44
45 Mr. Harper commented that according to the previous year's expenditure sheet, LifeStream
46 Behavioral Center only spent about \$800,000, and he wondered if the Board could
47 reallocate funds to the three hospitals equally.

1 Mr. White mentioned that NLCHD and LifeStream Behavioral Center participated in the
2 Low Income Pool (LIP) program, and that the expected LIP payment for the upcoming FY
3 was \$766,240. He explained that LIP funding allowed them to utilize funds from the State,
4 and that the LIP agreement intergovernmental transfer could not be whole if the funding
5 went below \$766,000, which had been requested as part of the LIP payment for the
6 upcoming FY.

7
8 Ms. Price opined that the Board could not reduce their funding for that reason.

9
10 Mr. White reiterated that if the funding was below that, then they would not be able to fully
11 participate.

12
13 Mr. Harper questioned if they could reduce the LifeStream Behavioral Center funding to
14 \$850,000, and opined that the Board could allocate another \$350,000 to be shared with the
15 other two hospitals.

16
17 Mr. White commented that if the clinics were fully funded at \$824,700 and the Board
18 reduced the mental health hospital funding to \$850,000, retaining \$500,000 in surplus, then
19 there would be \$806,228 for each of the other hospitals.

20
21 Mr. Harper asked how to revisit the motion.

22
23 Mr. Smith replied that he would amend the motion for the sake of unanimity to fund the
24 hospitals at \$806,000 and LifeStream Behavioral Center at \$850,000, noting that his goal
25 was to reduce the millage for the taxpayers.

26
27 Mr. White remarked that if Mr. Smith was amending the motion, then he would clarify the
28 numbers one more time in totality with a 0.15 millage rate and the surplus carried forward.
29 He stated that the funding included the following: the overhead; \$824,700 for the clinics;
30 \$850,000 for LifeStream Behavioral Center; \$806,228 for each hospital; and a surplus of
31 \$500,000.

32
33 On a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Harper and carried by a roll-call vote of 4-1,
34 the NLCHD Board approved a 0.15 millage rate with the following allocations: \$237,000
35 for overhead; \$824,700 for the clinics; \$850,000 for LifeStream Behavioral Center;
36 \$806,228 for each hospital; and a surplus opportunity of \$500,000.

37
38 Mr. Hurley voted no.

39
40 PUBLIC COMMENT – RESOLUTION 2023-02 FOR ADOPTION OF BUDGET

41 Ms. Kirste read the title of Resolution 2023-02 as follows: “RESOLUTION OF THE
42 NORTH LAKE COUNTY HOSPITAL DISTRICT PROVIDING FOR THE ADOPTION
43 OF THE PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE 2023-2024 FISCAL YEAR.”

44
45 The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

46

1 There being no one who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman
2 closed the floor for public comment.

3
4 BOARD ACTION ON RESOLUTION 2023-2

5 Mr. White relayed that the details on the resolution included the total operating budget
6 expenditures and carryforward of \$4,024,877 for FY 2023-2024 with a decrease in
7 expenditures of 70 percent from the previous year's budget and an effective date of October
8 21, 2023.

9
10 Mr. Harper commented that it was a large decrease to the budget.

11
12 On a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Ms. Hooper and carried by a roll-call vote of 3-2,
13 the NLCHD Board approved Resolution No. 2023-01 setting the millage rate for the FY
14 2023-2024 budget year at 0.15 mills.

15
16 Mr. Harper and Mr. Hurley voted no.

17
18 LETTERS OF AGREEMENT

19 Ms. Kirste stated that these were LIP letters of agreement for AdventHealth Waterman,
20 LifeStream Behavioral Health, and UF Health Leesburg Hospital. She explained that the
21 NLCHD agreed to send the funds to the State of Florida, not to exceed the amount in the
22 letters of agreement, in order for them to receive additional funding.

23
24 Mr. Harper questioned if the number on the agreement was the amount that could not be
25 exceeded, and Ms. Kirste indicated that this was correct.

26
27 On a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Ms. Hooper and carried unanimously by a vote of
28 5-0, the NLCHD Board approved the LIP letters of agreement for AdventHealth
29 Waterman, LifeStream Behavioral Center, and UF Health Leesburg Hospital.

30
31 NEW BUSINESS

32 Mr. White related that there was legislation enacted that would affect their organization
33 requiring a performance review beginning on October 1, 2023, and noted that it would have
34 to be conducted at least every five years. He commented that they had an outstanding call
35 to the Auditor General of the State of Florida to obtain a better understanding of what the
36 performance review was and to clarify that they truly were included in this Florida Statute
37 requirement. He relayed that they had been receiving solicitations for that work, and asked
38 if the Board would authorize him to discuss this requirement if necessary with the
39 organizations that could perform these services to better determine what to expect. He
40 opined that this would help provide a more productive discussion at the next trustee
41 meeting, which was scheduled for January 2024.

42
43 Mr. Harper inquired if he could also obtain the cost associated with that.

44
45 Mr. White said that he would, and that he would educate the Board on the requirements,
46 whether or not the NLCHD was required to perform them, and what the expectation of cost
47 would be.

1 Ms. Price asked if the Florida Statute was listed in the packet.
2

3 Ms. Kirste replied that it was Florida Statute 189.0695 regarding performance reviews, and
4 she offered to send copies of it to the Board.
5

6 On a motion by Ms. Price, seconded by Mr. Harper and carried unanimously by a vote of
7 5-0, the NLCHD Board approved to authorize Mr. White to discuss a performance review
8 with the organizations that could perform these services.
9

10 OTHER BUSINESS

11 Mr. Smith indicated that he did not approve of having a moment of silence, and he
12 requested that a minister or pastor come in to say a short prayer asking for God's blessings,
13 wisdom, and guidance. He noted that there was a pastor currently on the Board, and opined
14 that Mr. Hurley or others could offer the prayer.
15

16 Ms. Price agreed, and noted that there was consensus with the Board.
17

18 Ms. Kirste relayed that the next meeting was scheduled for January 18, 2024 at 5:30 p.m.
19 in Board Chambers.
20

21 ADJOURNMENT

22 The meeting adjourned at 6:37 p.m.
23
24

25 
26

27

Barbara Price, Chairman
28