

2. – CONTINUED

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF:

Julie Burns, Deputy Clerk, Clerk & Comptroller's Office

3. APPROVE MINUTES – FEBRUARY 21, 2019

(CLERK'S NOTE: Mark Elhilow, Patrick Franklin, and Kimberly Weston joined the meeting.)

MOTION to approve the February 21, 2019 minutes. Motion by Glen Harvie, seconded by Maria Antūna, and carried 10-0. John Ahrenholtz, Debra Chandler, Mary Evans, Rex Kirby, Denise Palmatier, and Christine Thrower absent.

4. REVENUE REPORT

Sherry Brown, OFMB Director, said that:

- The infrastructure surtax revenues were averaging about 3.1% higher this year compared to the same time period last year.
- Fiscal Year (FY) 2019's budget of \$86.6 million would be met or slightly exceeded.

Chair Philip Ward asked whether the budget was based on projections or the original Infrastructure Sales Tax (IST) Project Plan (plan).

Ms. Brown responded that:

- The budget was based on the State's \$86 million estimate of how much revenue would be collected during FY 2019, and not on the original plan, which was about \$70 million.
- Revenue that was collected above the \$70 million would go into general reserves.
- The Palm Beach County School Board estimated that the 10-year plan could reach the maximum budget total of \$709 million by the 9th year.

- Staff adjusted the budget amounts to more accurately reflect the FY 2019 budget and presented the figures to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) in March 2019.

5. EXPENSE REPORT

5.a. Presentation by Jacobs Project Management Co.

Jonathan Jordan, Principal/Senior Project Manager for Jacobs Project Management Company, said that:

- Current FY 2019 expenditures on the appropriated detailed report indicated approximately \$50 million.
- Engineering expenditures totaled approximately \$24 million; FD&O, \$24 million; and Parks & Recreation (Parks), \$1.9 million.

(CLERK’S NOTE: Christine Thrower joined the meeting.)

Lee Waring asked whether some amounts in the committed costs column reflected projects that may or may not be part of FY 2019.

Mr. Jordan responded that the committed costs reflected some FY 2019 and possibly FY 2017 and FY 2018 projects.

Ms. Brown said that the amounts reflected expended dollars to date for active projects.

6. BUDGET TRANSFERS/PROJECT PRESENTATIONS BY ENGINEERING, FD&O, AND PARKS

6.a. Parks

1. **Type 1: Limestone Creek ADA Playground Surface Replacement**
2. **Type 1: Seminole Palms Parking Lot Repairs**
3. **Type 2: Haverhill Park Racquetball Court Replacement**
4. **Type 3: Playground Replacement - Countywide**

Ms. Brown stated that:

- A few Type I transfers were completed and did not require a motion because the amounts would be swept into reserves.
- The Type 2 Haverhill Park racquetball court replacement was a \$295 transfer involving a late expenditure that came in after the project was closed out.

MOTION to approve the Type 2 budget transfer of \$295 for the Haverhill Park racquetball court replacement project. Motion by Lee Waring, seconded by Mark Elhilow, and carried 11-0. John Ahrenholtz, Debra Chandler, Mary Evans, Rex Kirby, and Denise Palmatier absent.

Ms. Brown said that:

- There was a new Type 3 transfer for an additional \$1.7 million from general reserves.
- General reserves contained about \$42 million based on FY 2017, FY 2018, and FY 2019 collected revenues.

Chair Ward asked whether the funds could be used to accelerate a project.

Ms. Brown replied that the funds could be used for that purpose, but those types of plan changes had not yet been made.

Robert Hamilton, Planning Research & Development Director, said that:

- About \$400,000 was originally allocated in FY 2017 for 7 playground renovation and replacement projects, \$812,000 in FY 2018 for 13 projects, and \$421,500 in FY 2019 for 7 projects.
- The project list was based on a 2014 analysis of all Parks playgrounds.
- Inflation was not factored into the project estimates.
- The playgrounds were 15 to 25 years old, and like-for-like replacement parts no longer existed.

Mr. Hamilton said that old playground equipment was often recycled.

Maria Antūna inquired whether all the parks listed in the Parks presentation would be finished by the end of 2019.

Mr. Hamilton responded that FY 2017 projects would be finished approximately by the end of FY 2019, and all the projects for FY 2017, FY 2018, and FY 2019 would be completed by end of FY 2020, pending the funding transfer.

Mr. Waring inquired whether it was likely that staff would request more funding while the 4 FY 2018 projects were in the concept phase, and all FY 2019 projects were in the concept and development phase.

Mr. Hamilton said that:

- Staff would not be requesting more funding.
- The concept phase meant that the construction documents for the projects were not completed and available to give to a contractor.
- Staff received the equipment estimates.
- The development phase took him about 6 months to narrow down the funding numbers.

John Smith asked how staff differentiated between projects requested by the public and needed projects.

Mr. Hamilton stated that staff attended conferences and spoke to other agencies regarding new trends in recreation that could match the public's requests.

Frank Lewis asked how much of the equipment was locally sourced versus out-of-state purchases.

Mr. Hamilton responded that:

- Many of the vendors were national firms with local offices.

- Some of the playground installation vendors or contractors needed to be certified by the playground contractor.
- Staff utilized installation vendors or contractors that tended to be local.

Eric Call, Parks & Recreation Director, said that:

- When creating the initial 2014 project list, staff knew that items other than playgrounds could come in over budget, depending on when they moved forward.
- Inflation was not factored into the project estimates because reserves would cover any overages.
- County Administrator Verdenia Baker supported the budget transfers.
- Staff frontloaded all of the projects in the first 3 years of the 10-year plan so that repairs and replacement due to safety reasons could be completed.

MOTION to approve the Type 3 budget transfer for the playground replacement countywide project. Motion by Christine Thrower and seconded by Patrick Franklin.

Chair Ward inquired whether the budget transfer involved more of a scheduling process rather than a real budget change, because money was being moved from reserves to speed up the scheduling.

Ms. Brown explained that:

- The Type 3 projects were planned to begin in FY 2017, FY 2018, and FY 2019, but there was insufficient funds in the budget.
- The \$1.7 million would increase the budget so that the projects could be completed.
- The adopted 10-year plan of approximately \$709.3 million would increase to about \$711 million.

- Staff estimated that a little over \$800 million in revenues would be collected, but that amount was not adopted because over a 10-year period, low estimates would come in once bidding and construction began.

UPON CALL FOR A VOTE, the motion carried 11-0. John Ahrenholtz, Debra Chandler, Mary Evans, Rex Kirby, and Denise Palmatier absent.

6.b. Engineering

- 1. Type 1: Military Trail/South County Line to Palmetto Park Rd**
- 2. Type 1: Summit Blvd./Military to Congress**
- 3. Type 1: Congress Ave/Miner to Hypoluxo**
- 4. Type 1: Congress Avenue/Lake Ida to Summit**
- 5. Type 1: Sam Senter Road/CR 880 to Gator**
- 6. Type 1: Community Drive/Haverhill to Military**
- 7. Type 1: Randolph Siding Road/110th to Jupiter Farms**
- 8. Type 2: Jog Road/Lake Ida to Boynton Beach**
- 9. Type 2: Pinehurst Dr. from Lake Worth Rd. to Forest Hill Blvd.**

Ms. Brown said that:

- The Type 1 budget transfers would complete the projects and did not need a motion.
- The 2 Type 2 budget transfers involved some completed projects, and the funds were placed into Engineering Department reserves.
 - The Jog Road/Lake Ida budget transfer was for an additional \$400,000, and the Pinehurst Drive budget transfer was for an additional \$75,000.

Steve Carrier, Assistant County Engineer, said that:

- The Jog Road/Lake Ida project was included in the plan's FY 2019 funding at \$1.8 million.
 - The paving was completed at \$1.8 million.
 - Updating the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) curb/cut ramps would cost about \$80,000.

- Repairing and replacing the traffic loops would cost about \$160,000.
- Road restriping was completed at \$135,000.
- The total cost was slightly less than \$2.2 million.
- Cost estimates were performed 4 or 5 years ago.
- An inflation factor was included in the cost estimates, but the Engineering Department was experiencing significantly higher unit costs in annual construction contracts.
- Paving and traffic loop repair costs were underestimated.

Chair Ward asked whether the additional funds would come from reserves.

Mr. Carrier said that the funds would come from the Engineering Department's reserves.

Ms. Brown explained that remaining funds from completed Type 1 projects were placed into department reserves while collected revenue that exceeded budgeted amounts went into a general reserve.

Mr. Carrier said that most of the 20 completed engineering projects came in under budget.

MOTION to approve the Type 2 budget transfer for the Jog Road/Lake Ida project. Motion by Mark Elhilow, seconded by Lee Waring, and carried 11-0. John Ahrenholtz, Debra Chandler, Mary Evans, Rex Kirby, and Denise Palmatier absent.

Mr. Carrier said that:

- The Type 2 Pinehurst Drive budget transfer involved a resurfacing project.
 - The project was originally included in the plan's FY 2019 funding at \$500,000.
 - An additional \$75,000 was requested to complete the project.

- Paving was completed at \$415,000.
 - Upgrades to the ADA curb/cut ramps would cost about \$10,000.
 - Drainage repairs were completed at \$40,000.
 - Repairing and replacing traffic loops would cost about \$50,000.
 - Road striping was estimated at \$40,000, and the work was probably completed, but the invoice had not yet been received.
 - The total cost was slightly under \$575,000.
- Drainage repair costs were not included in estimates because those types of repairs were not anticipated in resurfacing projects.

Chair Ward said that the Jog Road/Lake Ida budget transfer would increase costs by about 15% and the Pinehurst Drive budget transfer by over 20%. He asked whether these requests for cost increases due to inflation would be regularly coming before the IST committee.

Mr. Carrier responded that there would be more budget transfer requests for cost increases.

Ms. Thrower said that construction costs were increasing at an alarming rate.

Mr. Carrier said that annual contracts were used for most of the engineering projects, and annual paving contracts were coming in 20% to 25% higher in the last 3-year period.

MOTION to approve the Type 2 budget transfer for the Pinehurst Drive project. Motion by Christine Thrower, and seconded by Maria Antūna.

Chair Ward asked whether future budgetary adjustments would be necessary due to inflation.

Ms. Brown said that budget transfers would continue to be brought forward as projects progressed.

Responding to Ms. Thrower, Ms. Brown said that there was also a corresponding increase in unanticipated revenue.

Mr. Ward said that there was a cap on total revenue as well.

Mr. Waring said that there should be consistency in the plan regarding increases in cost estimates rather than requesting them on a “piecemeal” basis.

Mr. Carrier stated that the Engineering Department’s 5-year road program and updates on cost estimates were presented to the BCC twice a year.

Glen Harvie asked whether the FY 2018 increase in revenue was \$16 million based on a \$68 million budget.

Ms. Brown responded that \$85 million was collected for FY 2018, and about \$48 million was already collected for FY 2019.

Mr. Harvie commented that the increased revenue to date was being absorbed by some of the engineering projects.

Mr. Elhilow asked how projects were prioritized because the additional money required to complete some engineering projects could compromise the future funding of other scheduled projects.

Mr. Carrier said that:

- Staff was not concerned about funding the resurfacing projects because the Engineering Department had a \$2 million reserve.
- Cost estimates for earlier projects were coming in lower because inflation was factored in.
- A detailed scope of work was not included in the calculations for bridge repairs or construction because it was more difficult to estimate those types of costs.

Mr. Franklin asked whether the IST committee could recommend prioritization of projects that may have upcoming inflation factors.

Mr. Carrier said that all engineering projects were prioritized.

Ms. Brown said that staff could review the FY 2017-FY 2019 currently funded budgets for adjustments in cost estimates, review the FY 2020 budget for any readjustments, and bring back 1 large budget transfer rather than handling adjustments on an individual basis.

Mr. Carrier said that staff could apply the suggested process to bridge projects, but not necessarily to resurfacing projects.

(CLERK'S NOTE: Vice Chair Weston left the meeting.)

Ms. Thrower asked about the frontloaded playgrounds and parks that were scheduled for the remaining 10-year plan.

Ms. Brown said that:

- Only a few new parks were scheduled, such as the Paulette Burdick Park and another City of Palm Beach Gardens park.
- There were numerous projects involving sports lighting, court replacements, athletic fields, public park buildings, pools, and restrooms.
- The budget transfer for playground replacement was moved to the front of the list because of safety issues.

Chair Ward said that the Jog Road/Lake Ida and Pinehurst Drive budget transfers were significant increases.

Mr. Harvie asked what the total estimated costs were for bridge projects.

Ms. Brown said that bridge modifications amounted to \$12.2 million and bridge replacements totaled \$31.2 million.

Mr. Carrier said that there were 27 bridge projects for a total of 300 bridges in the county.

UPON CALL FOR A VOTE, the motion carried 11-0. John Ahrenholtz, Debra Chandler, Mary Evans, Rex Kirby, and Denise Palmatier absent.

UNSCHEDULED ITEM

Mr. Carrier said that:

- The school zone system upgrade project was included in the plan for FY 2024 and funded at \$500,000.
- Staff presented a Type 2 budget transfer to the IST committee on January 18, 2018 to advance the funding to FY 2018 because a government safety grant was not awarded.
- The IST committee recommended the budget transfer to the BCC, which approved it on February 6, 2018.

Fattoush Jafar, Senior Professional Engineer, said that:

- A school zone was an area close to a school street or crosswalk where vehicular speed limits were set.
- The Engineering Department purchased a school zone clock system that remotely communicated and adjusted school zone flasher controllers.
- The old system was an antiquated one-way communication system.
- Staff chose a system that included the school beacon cabinets.
- 90% of the system was installed.
- The Department of Transportation mandated the installation of additional school zones.
 - IST funds would be used to purchase units for the upcoming school zones.
 - Remaining funding for the new school zones would be supplemented from the Engineering Department's reserves.

Ms. Thrower asked how susceptible the school beacon cabinets were to cellular disruption or power issues and what the life span and guaranty was of the new equipment.

Ms. Jafar responded that:

- Most of the cabinets used solar power.
- The communication system was based on cellular phone service.
- If cellular service was down, another cellular service could be used, or staff could drive to the locations and program the cabinets.
- The life span of the equipment with cellular service was 10 years with a 10-year guaranty.

6.c. FD&O

1. Type 1: Countywide Radio Replacement

Ms. Brown said that FD&O completed its radio replacement system, and about \$443,000 was placed into FD&O reserves.

Rich Avery, Project Manager, Capital improvements Division, said that:

- The project involved replacing the electronics and security systems for the main County courthouse, the State Attorney and Public Defender's building, and the central energy plant.
- The systems provided safety protection for judges, staff, and County property, and facilitated the movement of inmates.
- The existing integrated systems were controlled by programmable logic controllers.
- The systems were about 26 years old and included closed-circuit TV, security management, a duress system, elevator overrides, card access, intercom, and fire alarm.
- The project's scope included reviewing the emergency egress procedures for the courthouse and expansion of the 4th floor Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office command center.

- The balcony outside the existing command center would be utilized for the expansion project.
- Approximately \$16 million in IST and ad valorem funds would be available.
- In 2015, the BCC approved a contract with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. to provide consulting services for the electronics and security systems replacement projects.
- Kimley-Horn performed an existing-conditions assessment, a document review, a facilities and system functional requirements review, and a functional assessment report.
- Kimley-Horn's February 2016 report indicated that the systems needed replacement.
- In November 2016, the BCC approved a contract with TLC Engineering to provide design and architectural engineering services for the command center project and to complete a life safety study.
- In February 2017, the BCC approved a contract with Hedrick Brothers Construction, Inc. as construction manager for the project.
- In December 2018, the BCC approved a guaranteed maximum price amendment of slightly over \$13 million for construction.
- Construction of the command center was almost completed, and furniture was being installed.
- A few roadblocks existed in obtaining a certificate of occupancy from the City of West Palm Beach, but agreements were in place to move forward.
- Staff should be able to relocate to the new command center by mid-July.
- The construction manager was proceeding with product submittal and shop drawing for the electronic systems.
- The project would take about 23 months to complete.

Mr. Waring asked what the County was doing to ensure that the equipment was secure.

Ms. Brown responded that:

- The equipment, the firewalls, and the backup systems were monitored by the County's Internet Technology (IT) department on a daily basis.
- IT conducted multiple types of training.
 - Emails received from an external source contained a statement alerting the reader that it did not come from an internal internet address.
 - An IT system automatically discarded spam before it entered an email inbox.

Ms. Thrower asked whether the current system would continue to operate while the new system was being installed.

Mr. Avery stated that the current system would continue to function because the building was still occupied, and operations could not be interrupted. He added that the work on the electronic system was taking place after work hours.

Mr. Harvie inquired whether the system would contain a function to alert the presence of an active shooter.

Mr. Avery said that:

- Numerous cameras would monitor and record activity.
- The command center could remotely lockdown doors.

- Ballistic drywall would be installed in the command center.

7. OTHER COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Eric McClellan, Director, FD&O Strategic Planning, stated that staff was considering relocating future committee meetings to a complex down the street because parking was becoming challenging. He said that if the decision to relocate was made, it would be included in the meeting notice.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 11:05 a.m., the chair declared the meeting adjourned.

APPROVED:

Chair/Vice Chair