

MEETING: BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, BUDGET WORKSHOP

CALL TO ORDER: May 30, 2001, at 9:30 a.m., in the Palm Beach County Governmental Center, West Palm Beach, Florida.

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS AND OFFICERS PRESENT:

Chair Warren H. Newell
Vice-Chair Carol A. Roberts
Commissioner Burt Aaronson
Commissioner Addie L. Greene
Commissioner Mary McCarty
Commissioner Karen T. Marcus
Commissioner Tony Masilotti
County Administrator Robert Weisman
Chief Deputy County Attorney Gordon P. Selfridge
Condensing - Deputy Clerk Linda C. Hickman

I. OVERVIEW OF FY 2002 BUDGET. DISCUSSED 5-30-2001

County Administrator Weisman commented that:

- He had gone through an extensive process with his staff to reduce budgetary requests.
- The budget was balanced.
- The Property Appraiser's Office had submitted information today, and there was insufficient time for staff to analyze the full impact that information would have on the budget.

I.A. MAJOR BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS AND FACTORS. DISCUSSED 5-30-2001

County Administrator Weisman reviewed the major assumptions underlying the budget. During the discussion that ensued it was brought out that:

- The expected increase in property values was \$3.6 billion. An approximate increase of \$2 billion would lead to revenues of \$12 million in additional property taxes minus the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) component, which was currently unknown.
- Staff had provided \$2.5 million of debt service in the budget to pay for voting machines over time.
- Staff had estimated a 4 percent increase over the current year's estimated average revenues.
- The standard 4 percent salary budgetary impact for the 4,000 regular county employees was provided. Fire-Rescue and the Sheriff's salary figures were much higher.
- Staff had included the original targeted amount for the Sheriff in accordance with the approved Five-Year Tax Plan.

I.A. - CONTINUED

- The Sheriff's request came in more than \$10 million over the targeted amount.
- Staff had provided an extra \$1 million in the targeted amount for the additional deputies that were approved by the board last year.
- Two years ago, the first Florida Retirement System (FRS) savings benefits were incurred by former Sheriff Robert W. Neumann and the board had let him keep the \$5 million. The current Sheriff continued to keep the FRS savings.
- Last year there was \$6 million in FRS savings for the Sheriff. The Sheriff's FRS savings for the next budget year would be \$9 million. Those savings were not anticipated when the five-year projection was developed. The FRS savings were money the Sheriff did not have to spend.
- The county had incurred FRS savings but had lost state revenue sharing.
- The Supervisor of Elections had a budget increase of \$2 million. The increase consisted of \$1 million for computer equipment but not voting machines. The other \$1 million was for voter education, staff, and additional operations. The other constitutional officers did not have notable changes to their budgets.
- There had been \$21.6 million budgeted for capital expenditures. Some of the targeted areas were the South Bay Head Start Center; drainage and street improvements; general facilities that included the Governmental Center, jails, and court houses; and Information Systems Services.
- There was \$1.86 million in new funding for economic development.
- The contingency remained at \$6 million under reserves. Prior to the new figures received today, staff had proposed to increase the balance brought forward by \$7 million with an additional \$2.5 million for Worker's Compensation reserves. The county was short of Worker's Compensation funds for anticipated claims.
- There was \$18 million over what had been allocated for the budget because of the new figures that had been received from the Property Appraiser's Office. Those funds could go into reserves or be utilized for other purposes.
- Staff had provided debt service for new voting equipment and the payoff of bonds for new facilities.
- There was no increase over last year for financially assisted agencies, which was in accordance with previous board direction. The board could give different direction this year.

I.B. ROLL-BACK CALCULATION. DISCUSSED 5-30-2001

The ensuing discussion brought out that:

- The figures noted in the agenda packet had become obsolete as of this morning. They included tax rates and roll-back calculations for all of the taxes levied by the county.
- Aggregate millage represented a total of all the taxes.
- Staff proposed to maintain the countywide tax rate of 4.60 mills in accordance with the fifth year of the Five-Year Tax Plan. Staff had envisioned continuing that tax rate for one more year.
- The current roll-back rate of 4.4878 was expected to be reduced.
- When the new figures have been received, staff proposed a reduction in the library tax rate as well as a reduction in the Fire-Rescue Municipal Service Taxing Unit (MSTU) rate to below 3.10.
- Every year \$6 million was budgeted for day-to-day contingency. Approximately one-half of that amount was used last year, and it was anticipated that the same would be used this year.
- If there were a disaster and the contingency fund was insufficient, money could be used from the carryforward fund which contained approximately \$40 million.

I.C. INCREASES AND DECREASES IN REVENUES AND APPROPRIATIONS. NO DISCUSSION 5-30-2001

II. REVENUES

II.A. MAJOR COUNTYWIDE TAX EQUIVALENT REVENUE TRENDS. DISCUSSED 5-30-2001

During the discussion it was brought out that:

- These was other revenue that funded county government besides ad valorem taxes.
- The state revenue sharing program had a substantial decrease.
- If the state did not further cut shared revenue, a historic increase due to inflation and growth was anticipated.
- The tax equivalent revenue trend figures fluctuated, and staff was hesitant to be too optimistic.
- There was the complication this year of the elimination of the old telecommunications tax and the establishment of a new communications service tax.

II.A. - CONTINUED

- The state Department of Revenue (DOR) had to go through a massive process to gather revenue data from all of the communications services providers. The DOR did not tell the county what the individual numbers were.
- The DOR calculated the county's communications services tax rate based on those reported revenues in order to hold the county harmless. The rate would generate the same amounts that the county previously received under the public service tax.
- The communications services tax rate would not change on a yearly basis. If the state provided inaccurate data to the county, the county could inform the state of the situation and the rate could be adjusted.
- The communications services tax rate did not fluctuate yearly based on inflation. Inflation affected the revenues not the tax rate.
- The unusual intensity in the receipts for gasoline tax greatly exceeded the growth, population, and tourism in the county.
- It was uncertain if the increase in gas prices would reduce gasoline consumption.
- Staff had projected an additional 3 percent increase in gas tax revenue.
- It was unknown whether the federal and state governments would reduce their gas taxes, which would result in a great cut in revenue to the county.
- Commissioner Masilotti was concerned that in the last few years the proposed gasoline tax budget increases were between 7.5 and 8 percent but this year it was 3 percent.
- Staff explained that the 3 percent was on top of a 9 percent projected growth in the current year. As of a couple of months ago, the county was reaching the 9 percent projected increase. Staff would review it again before the July workshop when revenues were finalized. If the 9 percent increase was being achieved, staff would consider adjusting the percentage increase for gasoline taxes.

II.B. SOURCES OF FUNDS BY CATEGORY. NO DISCUSSION 5-30-2001

III. OPERATING BUDGET

III.A. CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS OVERVIEW. DISCUSSED 5-30-2001

During the discussion that ensued it was brought out that:

- These were the budget requests for the constitutional officers.
- There were timing allowances by the state that did not require some of the constitutional officers to submit their budget information to the county until later in the year.
- The Sheriff's figures were in accordance with the targeted figures in the Five-Year Tax Plan.
- A target figure had not been established for the Property Appraiser, Supervisor of Elections, and Tax Collector.

III.B. OPERATING BUDGET COMPARISONS. DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

Points brought out during the discussion were:

- This was a review of the individual county departmental budgets.
- There were targeted increases for those areas where there had been increased services and needed services.
- There was a comparison of gross budget, tax equivalent funding, and positions by department.
- Environmental Resources Management and Parks and Recreation had the largest increases.
- The increase for Parks and Recreation was in response to the new parks that were being opened.
- The increase for Environmental Resources Management was for the care of the environmentally sensitive lands the county was purchasing.
- Commissioner McCarty requested a concise report on the original departmental requests and those requests that were not allowed to move forward.
- Commissioner Newell requested a breakdown of the costs for the management and maintenance of the environmentally sensitive lands apart from the rest of Environmental Resources Management's budget.

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Submit a concise report on the original departmental requests and those requests that were not allowed to move forward.
- Submit a breakdown of the costs for the management and maintenance of the environmentally sensitive lands apart from the rest of Environmental Resources Management's budget.

III.C. SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUESTS. DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

The ensuing discussion revealed that:

- Commissioner Masilotti inquired about the Building Division's request for nine additional building inspectors in north county.
- County Administrator Weisman said that Planning, Zoning and Building (PZ&B) had requested 22 positions. Half of those were for the Zoning and Planning divisions and the remainder was for the Building Division.
- PZ&B Executive Director Dominic Sims explained that the positions would be used primarily to staff some of the branch offices.
- Mr. Weisman said he initially had questioned the number of positions and had been prepared to recommend a reduction. There was a private committee consisting of people in the building industry who reviewed the budget items, and he had been trying to get a response from them as to whether or not they supported 11 of the requested positions.
- Funding for the building inspectors would come from Building Division fees, not ad valorem dollars.
- Commissioner Masilotti recommended that one part-time employee for each commission district office be included in the budget because of the countywide increase in population.
- Commissioner McCarty recalled that the board had agreed that there would not be an increase in the budget for the delegate agencies nor would any new agencies be approved for funding. The board also had a discussion approximately a year and one-half ago with the United Way concerning a proposed study of the financially assisted agencies. The United Way was unable to do the study, however. She asked the board to review its decision regarding funding of the financially assisted agencies.
- Mr. Weisman said that 3 percent was allowed in the budget last year as a general cost of living for the financially assisted agencies and staff had received criticism at that time. The board was to consider whether to give it to certain agencies or make it an across-the-board increase.
- Commissioner McCarty said that she expected the transportation disadvantaged community to come before the board concerning funding.
- Mr. Weisman said that staff had provided a Palm Tran budget that adequately budgeted disabled transportation for the coming year that included the changes approved by the board a few weeks ago. The one outstanding issue was the cost of gasoline for the transportation providers.

III.C. - CONTINUED

- Commissioner Marcus requested a breakdown of the costs necessary to bring the new parks on line.
- Commissioner Newell requested staff consider combining the parks maintained by the Parks department and those maintained by the Environmental Resources department so that they were all maintained by one department.
- The positions for the new north county facility would not be filled until the facility had been completed.
- Commissioner Marcus asked for clarification regarding the positions for the new north county facility which were to be a duplication of west county staffing that had been approved last year.
- The positions for Code Enforcement officers that were approved by the board last year had been filled.
- Staff was completing the study on the effectiveness of the Code Enforcement efforts to help determine whether additional Code Enforcement officers were needed. The report was to be submitted to the board within 30 days.
- Commissioner Roberts requested an analysis of the job descriptions for the 50 Public Information Office employees.
- Commissioner Roberts said she would consider an increase in the budget for the financially assisted agencies. The board should consider reviewing an increase in the staff for each commission district every 10 years.
- Commissioner Greene recommended that one full-time employee for each district office be included in the budget instead of a part-time employee as recommended by Commissioner Marcus.
- Five positions had been provided for Animal Care and Control, which consisted of two communicators and three officers.
- Mr. Weisman informed the board that a check for \$4 million had been received from Computer Task Group (CTG), the company that failed to complete the Criminal Justice Information System.

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Consider one part-time employee or one full-time employee for each commission district office in the budget because of the countywide increase in population.

III.C. - CONTINUED

- Submit a breakdown of the costs necessary to bring the new parks on line.
- Consider combining the parks maintained by the Parks department and those maintained by the Environmental Resources Management Department so that all of the parks are maintained by one department.
- Report back with a clarification concerning the new positions for the new north county facility which were to be a duplication of staffing approved last year for the west county facility.
- Submit an analysis of the job descriptions for the 50 Public Information Office employees.

IV. CAPITAL BUDGET. DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

During the discussion, it was brought out that:

- The South Bay Head Start Facility was completely funded.
- The budget provided for a variety of drainage and street improvements in addition to the funds that had been set aside in the commission district budgets for neighborhood improvements.
- A mobile data radio system was a request from the Sheriff's Office and the Fire-Rescue Department whereby information could be received at remote terminals as well as be utilized by other agencies. The funds should have been labeled under reserves.
- The demolition of the Tishman Building located at 40 North Dixie Highway, West Palm Beach, would provide approximately 20 additional parking spaces.
- Commissioner Aaronson said that should there be a determination to conduct jury trials at the South County Courthouse, expansion costs might be greater than the requested \$1.5 million. He asked staff to report back as to whether it would be prudent to hold off on the \$1.5 million expansion until a decision had been made concerning jury trails at the South County Courthouse. County Administrator Weisman said that he would confer with Facilities Development and Operations Director Audrey Wolf concerning Mr. Aaronson's comment.
- Commissioner McCarty observed that the South County Courthouse was originally constructed for jury trials and little remodeling should be required. The proposed expansion was to remove the office space from the facility. Civil issues would be conducted at the facility which necessitated the expansion even if jury trials did not occur there.

IV. - CONTINUED

- Commissioner Roberts requested an explanation of the terms New Technology, New Technology Repair, Replacement and Improvement, Wide Area Network (WAN)/Information Highway, and WAN/Information Highway RR&I located under the Information Systems Services category.
- Mr. Weisman said that for five years there had been a problem with the audit trail concerning the missing Wide Area Network (WAN) parts. Staff would report back on the matter.
- Commissioner Roberts commented that part of the WAN should be tied into the network operations. She asked staff to develop plans this year to take the \$500,000 requested as part of the network and generate revenue to reduce costs.
- Commissioner Newell noted that the West Boynton Level 1 Sheriff's Office Facility was budgeted for next year with \$200,000 coming from ad valorem taxes and the remainder coming from impact fees. He asked staff to ensure there would not be any expansions for the Clerk's Office and Tax Collector's Office because they would get more space when the Sheriff's Office moved from the South County Complex.
- The Limestone Creek Area was in dire need of improvements, and the board had approved a 10-year plan for the completion of the improvements.
- Commissioners Masilotti and Newell expressed concern that it had been over 10 years and the Limestone Creek project had not been completed. There also was concern that work was being done in areas of Limestone Creek that was not included in the board-approved 10-year plan.
- Commissioner Masilotti stressed that the necessary funds should be supplied for completion of the Limestone Creek project and that priority should be given to the other older neighborhoods countywide that were in critical need of improvements.
- Commissioner Marcus said that construction of the Limestone Creek project took longer than anticipated but the project was expected to be completed within two years. Commissioner Newell asked staff to report back with an update on the project.
- Commissioner McCarty suggested formulating a 10-year plan for the other areas that required improvements.
- Commissioner Masilotti maintained that in order to encourage municipalities to annex adjacent unincorporated pockets, the county should devise plans for the implementation and completion of water, sewer, and street improvements for those areas.

IV. - CONTINUED

- Commissioner Newell asked staff to submit information to the board concerning the annexation of Limestone Creek into the Town of Jupiter.
- Commissioner Aaronson said that the board should establish a policy for the funding and completion of neighborhood improvement projects within a time frame that should not exceed 10 years. The projects should be prioritized, taking into consideration which areas were in the greatest need and which had been waiting the longest for improvements. He also recommended undertaking fewer projects at one time with a shorter completion time frame.
- Commissioner Roberts asked staff to consider a policy that did not require commissioners to use transportation money to fund drainage improvements.
- Commissioner Newell asked that after 10 years, staff consider the goals and objectives that had been established for the Lake Worth Corridor and Limestone Creek to see if they had been accomplished. He was concerned that when improvements had been made to a neighborhood, people who were non-minorities bought lots and developed them in order to raise the property value for their benefit. He wanted to ensure that areas remained affordable.

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Report back as to whether it would be prudent to hold off on the \$1.5 million expansion of the South County Courthouse until a decision had been made as to whether or not jury trials would be conducted there.
- Explain the terms New Technology, New Technology Repair, Replacement and Improvement, Wide Area Network (WAN)/Information Highway, and WAN/Information Highway RR&I that were located under the Information Systems Services category.
- Devise plans this year to take the \$500,000 requested as part of the Network Operations Center and use it to generate revenue.
- Ensure there would not be any expansions for the Clerk's Office and Tax Collector's Office because they would get more space when the Sheriff's Office moved from the South County Complex.
- Report back with an update on the Limestone Creek project.
- Submit information to the board concerning the annexation of Limestone Creek into the Town of Jupiter.

IV. - CONTINUED

- Consider establishing a policy for the funding and completion of neighborhood improvement projects within a time frame not to exceed 10 years. The projects should be prioritized, taking into consideration which areas were in the greatest need and which had been waiting the longest for improvements.
- Consider a policy that did not require commissioners to use transportation money to fund drainage improvements.

(CLERK'S NOTE: For a continuation of the discussion on this item, see page 31.)

V. RESERVES. NO DISCUSSION 5-30-2001

VI. OTHER BUDGET ISSUES

VI.A. SHERIFF - TIME CERTAIN - 10:30 A.M. DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

County Administrator Weisman reported that:

- Staff had previously advised the board that the Sheriff's budget exceeded the cap this year.
- Staff had a target budget of \$235,652,536 in accordance with the Five-Year Tax Plan. This was the fifth year of the plan.
- The budget submitted by the Sheriff was approximately \$10 million over the projection.
- Staff had added \$1 million to account for the addition of 16 deputies that had been agreed upon with former Sheriff Neumann.
- According to the information that staff had received, the Florida Retirement System benefits accrued to the Sheriff would be approximately \$9 million in the coming fiscal year.

Sheriff Edward W. Bieluch commented that:

- The Sheriff's Office had received notice in January of this year of a 34 percent increase in their health and dental insurance costs.
- The cost of medical care for jail inmates had far exceeded the budget.
- The Oracle Computer System still was not on track, which resulted in continuous consultant fees.
- Many of the Sheriff's Office vehicles were too old and unreliable. The fleet had been neglected within the last several years in order to cut costs.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- The court system had ordered the Sheriff's Office to add six more bailiffs.
- The School District had requested additional school crossing guards.
- When Sheriff Bieluch took office, there was a total review of the Sheriff's Office manpower allocations.
- The Detective Bureau was rebuilt particularly for robbery cases, and the personnel for the Anti-Gang Unit had been doubled.
- Last week the Sheriff had announced the creation of the Safe Roads Task Force to undertake a major offensive on traffic deaths and crashes.
- The Sheriff's budget did not stay within the cap agreed to five years ago.
- Within the last several years the adopted budgets did not reflect the actual dollars spent because of budget amendments.
- There was no way to submit a budget that met the needs of the people and remain within the cap.
- Over the last four years the Sheriff's Office had greatly expanded its services but the cap had not reflected those changes.
- The Sheriff's Office had generated more revenue every year but the cap had not risen to reflect that income.
- The Sheriff's Office administered the Alarm Program and levied and collected fines associated with the program. The cost of the Alarm Unit had to fall within the cap but the income did not.
- Several years ago, the Sheriff's Office contracted to provide patrol services for the Village of Wellington. All of those substantial costs had to be within the cap but the income did not.
- The public expected deputies to respond promptly each time they called, which was 450,000 times during 2000.
- The Sheriff's staff had been diligent in reducing administrative and operational costs.
- The Sheriff's budget was driven by one goal, which was to improve law enforcement, traffic safety, and crime solving.
- The Sheriff's budget did not reflect all that was needed by the Sheriff's Office.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- The Safe Roads Task Force would need more officers, and the Detective Bureau needed more personnel.
- The Sheriff's Office was far from solving its data issues and needed more money to be technologically up to date.
- The Sheriff's Grants Department had been reorganized and would be aggressive in the pursuit of other funding sources.
- Shortly, the Sheriff's Office would be submitting a request to enforce overweight commercial vehicle laws which would generate funds.
- The Sheriff's office was putting into effect tighter fiscal management procedures that would ensure that the use of funds was more effective.
- There was a request for 6 bailiffs, 24 school safety guards, and 22 officers for the Safe Roads Task Force. An additional 22 officers had been budgeted for the districts in response to population growth.
- The Sheriff was charged to provide for day-to-day safety of the county residents and enforcement of the laws.
- In order to build a world-class facility, the Sheriff's Office would have to expand its resources over the next few years.

Colonel Bruce Frumoff, Sheriff's Office director of administration, said that:

- A new, unprecedented, meticulous, and qualitative budget review process was undertaken this year.
- Every proposed expense was scrutinized and evaluated for necessity, relative value, and cost efficiency as well as for the accuracy and estimation of the expense.
- The proposed budget for fiscal year 2002 was 3.9 percent more than the amended budget for fiscal year 2001. It was 4.2 percent more than the target amount based on the five-year-old cost and expenditure projections which served as the budget cap.
- In spite of asking for badly needed additional personnel, the proposed budget was reduced by 17 percent in combined operating and capital expense categories.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- There was no waste in the Sheriff's budget. It was driven by legitimate necessity to best serve the county residents.
- The proposed budget exceeded the five-year budgetary cap by \$10 million because:
 - The five-year projections which former Sheriff Charles McCutcheon had agreed to use for the establishment of a budget cap were not based on any scientific methodology for projecting costs or expenditures.
 - Given that personnel costs represented approximately 80 percent of the total costs, the overall annual growth limit was approximately 5.4 percent. The average rate of increase permitted by the cap had been 4.8 percent.
 - The cumulative growth permitted over the five years of the cap was only 26.33 percent.
 - The rate of increase accommodated under the cap had never allowed for the increasing number of personnel or for the increased cost associated with personnel.
 - The failure of the Sheriff's Office to add law enforcement personnel in proportion to the increased county population had resulted in the erosion of the ratio of officers per thousand service population. The ratio went from 2.06 in 1996 when the cap was established to the current ratio of below 1.85 per thousand. The national average was 2.5 officers per thousand.
 - The less than 3 percent growth rate permitted for operating expenses had not kept pace with the increased cost of service.
 - No one could have anticipated the significant rise in the cost of food, electricity, automobiles, insurance, two-way police radios, health care, and prescription medication.
 - The growth rate of significant operations of the Sheriff's Office including the contracted services, executed permits, and burglar alarm units had been disproportionate to the arbitrary cap that was established five years ago. Their expansion had not been held in check because those operations were revenue producing.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- Those revenue producing operations had expanded at rates exceeding the cap. Those operations more than likely would have been curtailed had they not generated revenue. The expansions and increased revenue generations had also resulted in increases in the operating costs.
- The \$13.9 million expenditure for those operations currently produced about \$15.8 million in annual revenue. That represented a 10 percent increase over the preceding year and more than doubled the allotted increase. Approximately 80 percent of that increase was in the personnel services category of the budget.
- If the Sheriff's budget had a net ad valorem position, those revenue producing operations and others representing over \$13.9 million in expenditures and over \$15.8 million in revenue would have been permitted to expand at rates more than double that which was accommodated under the arbitrary cap.
- The five-year projections that had served as a basis for the annual budget cap were at their final level. Census estimates had recently demonstrated the need for an 11 percent correction of the margin of error, which had grown between the years of census and the five-year budget predictions. The Sheriff's Office budget was being measured extensively for accuracy and necessity against the five-year budget predictions.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- The Sheriff's Office had met the cap in each of the preceding four years by: (1) Not increasing the number of law enforcement personnel in proportion to population growth. That resulted in the increase in response time to calls; reduced clearance rates for investigated crimes; reduced patrols of communities; and reduced traffic enforcement. The consequences were reduced residential safety, reduced safety on the roads, and diminished quality of life for county residents; and (2) Not replacing vehicles consistent with the sensible replacement schedule caused many officers to patrol in older, less reliable vehicles. That resulted in diminished quality of service to residents as well as the financial penalty of increased repairs in parts and labor. The goal of reducing the budget by several million dollars each year to meet the cap was achieved through deferring the purchase of high price items, such as automobiles.
- Commissioner Newell asked that staff consider the inclusion of vehicles in the Sheriff's impact fee schedule.
- There were approximately 1,635 vehicles in the Sheriff's Office fleet. The new vehicle order planned for next year included 181 replacement vehicles and 45 vehicles for the new officers at a budget cost of \$4,832,000.
- In October 2000 there were 234 vacant positions within the Sheriff's Office. In January 2001, 194 positions remained vacant. That translated into millions of available dollars to mitigate all of the other budget cuts.
- An agency should not have to plan on unspent salaries from vacant positions in order to operate.
- Sheriff Bieluch intended to operate the Sheriff's Office with a full staff.
- The proposed budget for the Sheriff did not contain hidden agendas nor did it conceal expenses and unspent salaries.
- The proposed budget exceeded the rate of growth that was permissible under the five-year cap because of years of increased costs that were absorbed and concealed through reductions in essential services, reductions in the quantity of replacement vehicles purchased, and authorized positions remaining vacant so that those funds might be used to pay for the necessary expenses and unavoidable cost increases which were omitted from the budget proposals.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- The proposed budget was not the result of increased spending or irresponsible spending but the aggregate of years of accumulated cost increases being disclosed for the first time minus the real cost reductions of 17 percent in operating and capital areas.
- There had been a comparison of the rate of growth in the Sheriff's budget with that of Environmental Resources Management, Parks and Recreation, and Facilities Development and Operations, exclusive of capital improvements for year-to-year and cumulatively over the past several years. The budget cap imposed on the Sheriff's Office held the rate of growth to an average 4.8 percent annually and 26.33 percent cumulatively over the five-year period.
- The requested 45 new officers contributed to over \$3.1 million for salaries and benefits.
- The new trunk 800 megahertz countywide radio system required additional disproportionate expenditure by the Sheriff's Office, which would be the first agency to utilize the new system. The largest share of the \$1.4 million associated with the radio system was \$935,000, which was budgeted to be refunded to the county's Communications Division.
- The cost for portable and mobile radios had escalated dramatically this year resulting from the implementation of the new radio system. The need for approximately \$500,000 of additional 800 megahertz portable and mobile radios was recognized prior to and during last year's budget development. They were not included in the budget because they would have exceeded the budget cap.
- Four million dollars was budgeted for facilities maintenance charges that would be refunded to the county.
- Growth of \$1,234,118 in excess of the budget cap was attributed to contracted law enforcement services.
- The six new bailiff positions required by the court system was an additional \$273,000 obligation, that was beyond the Sheriff's Office to mitigate. It exceeded the rate of increase permissible under the budget cap.
- The contract with the Village of Wellington was amended to include four deputies and seven crossing guards. The \$280,372 for the deputies and \$39,874 for school crossing guards was paid by Wellington. That additional \$320,246 in revenue was delivered to the county. The Office of Financial Management and Budget had informed the Sheriff's Budget Office that they would not accept the budget amendment for the re-appropriation of the revenue paid by Wellington toward the cost of the new positions. The Sheriff's Office would submit the budget amendment nevertheless.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- The recent increase to the contract services operation exceeded \$1.4 million, which was an approximate 10 percent expenditure and revenue increase over the prior year and was double the permissible annual rate of growth. Although it was typical of the extensive rate of growth in the contracted services area, it was terribly damaging to the Sheriff's ability to stay within the budget cap without reducing other, more essential operations.
- Inmate health care costs had escalated beyond that which was budgeted. The budget shortfall for this year was approximately \$500,000 and predominantly resulted from cost incurred for HIV and AIDS treatment of inmates. The treatment of those diseases had been impacting the Sheriff's budget at a rate in excess of the budget cap for several years.
- The Sheriff's budget for crossing guards was necessitated by the construction of new schools and was restricted by the budget cap which was disproportionate to the school construction budget. Many school crossing guards were not compensated for the double shifts they worked.
- The current budget impact of \$105,089 was for additional crossing guards and an incentive program to attract and retain those essential personnel. This year required the addition of 24 new crossing guards.
- The five-year projections upon which the budget cap was based failed to allow for significant utility bill increases. The cost of electric and gas utilities escalated in excess of the budget cap. The current year's budget shortfall was \$184,816. An increase of \$371,719 was anticipated and was budgeted for next year.
- Group health and dental contract rates with CIGNA: Connecticut General Life Insurance Company escalated sharply beyond projections. This year's budget for group health and dental insurance included \$2,479,601 in funding for a 20 percent increase above last year's rates. During August of last year, the Sheriff's Office had been notified of a rate increase of approximately 34 percent, effective January 1, 2001. The budget shortfall this year was about \$600,000 for group health and \$30,000 for group dental.
- Every sheriff had recognized the need to maintain an attractive and affordable group health benefit in order to attract and retain employees.
- The salary for the Sheriff's deputies was not as high as the salaries for many of the local law enforcement agencies.
- The retired employees' insurance subsidy of \$400,000 was not included in the current budget. Had the item been budgeted it would have thrust the proposed budget beyond the prior year's budget cap.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- An amount of \$230,000 to pay out the executive staff personnel who separated from the agency in January was not provided for in the current budget. The payouts included compensation for vacation, sick leave, and bonuses. Some of those payments were the subject of current or potential litigation.
- An amount of \$105,000 was due to the Florida Division of Worker's Compensation for fees that were not included in the budget. The budget for the agencies Worker's Compensation managed care administration fee was short \$136,000 because of a decimal placement error during last year's budget preparation.
- The \$1.033 million that was anticipated to be spent for overtime payment for corrections deputies was omitted from this year's budget and must be funded.
- An unbudgeted \$70,000 was needed to compensate the consultant who had been employed by the Sheriff's Crime Lab since September 2000 at a rate of \$200 per hour. The consultant had been intermittently employed by the Sheriff's Office since 1998 and had received over \$160,000 in unbudgeted funds.
- An unbudgeted \$90,500 was required to be paid to the Juvenile Assessment Center. The Sheriff's Office annual funding share was \$40,500 and \$50,000 had to be made up because Court Administration had reduced its funding share.
- An unbudgeted \$96,704 was to be paid to County Facilities Development and Operations for last year's construction change orders. The change orders exceeded the contract price for renovations to the Communications Dispatch Center. The original project plan was fully funded by the county but late in the process the Sheriff's Office requested significant change orders which ran costs \$116,704 over budget. Facilities Development had absorbed the first \$20,000 of the cost overrun with the balance of \$96,704 to be paid by the Sheriff pursuant to last year's mutual agreement.
- An unbudgeted \$38,534 was due to Facilities Development and Operations for modifications to the Central Records Department which were done last year to accommodate the relocation of the Teletype Section from their former location in the Communications Dispatch Center.
- An unbudgeted \$900,850 was due to Facilities Design and Operations for last year's construction change orders for construction of an obstacle course at the firearms range in Belle Glade.
- It was projected that the safe residential treatment contract, which had been reduced two years ago, would experience a shortfall of about \$170,000 in unbudgeted funds.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- The expected proceeds of the surplus vehicle auction that was conducted earlier in the fiscal year had been overestimated, resulting in a disappointing shortfall in revenue available for the purchase of replacement vehicles. Approximately \$992,000 worth of seriously needed vehicles, which had been deleted from last year's budget, and \$181,068 for vehicle emergency lighting equipment had been ordered.
- Airport patrol deputies had filed a grievance with the Sheriff's Office last year after discovering that several officers had been under-compensated in their supplement for patrolling without a vehicle. It had been determined that \$46,500 should be distributed in settlement for the error.
- The Oracle financial and human resources computer applications had been experiencing problems for approximately two years because of deficient implementation. Approximately \$350,000 would have to be expended this year for consultants and contractors to correct the existing system problems. Required funding of \$620,000 had been included in the proposed budget to continue corrective and improvement efforts of the Oracle system for next year.
- Overtime costs of \$99,908 were incurred by the Sheriff's Office during the election's recount at the Emergency Operations Center and county courthouse. On-duty hours for personnel were an additional \$131,871.
- Facilities Development and Operations had arranged for the use of a former storefront at the Burt Reynolds Ranch for the establishment of a Sheriff's satellite office to benefit the residents of West Jupiter. Renovations costs were \$42,000.
- The Tuition Reimbursement Program was expected to experience a budget shortfall of about \$100,000 based on current utilization.
- Another budget shortfall last year was the captains' and captains-civilian rank equivalent bonus pay which required funding of \$88,925 in excess of the amount that would have been spent per policy for longevity pay for those positions.
- The actuary who had estimated the Sheriff's Office's potential for liability had included the potential for no major claims when preparing the actuary reports. Given the unpredictability of liabilities and settlements, the agency's ability to pay any large claim might not be a certainty.
- The projected Florida Retirement System pension rates were unavailable at the time that the Sheriff's budget was submitted to the county. The total retirement budget for the Sheriff's Office was currently \$23 million. The total reduction and retirement contribution from the Sheriff was expected to be approximately \$2.5 million next year.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

During the discussion that ensued, it was brought out that:

- Commissioner Masilotti asked if civilian employees were included in the Sheriff's budget, and Colonel Frumoff responded that the proposed civilian employees consisted of a risk manager and a college work study program student who would be a part-time media intern for publication purposes.
- An additional 122 officers were needed in order to be consistent with the ratio of 2.06 officers per thousand service population that was in existence at the time the budget cap had been established in 1996.
- Commissioner Masilotti asked that the Sheriff's Office submit data on the revenue generated five years ago and the current revenue that was generated from service contracts.
- The only adjustment to the target amount for the Sheriff's budget was \$1 million that had been added to former Sheriff Neumann's budget last year.
- The Florida Retirement System pension rates were not reflected in the proposed budget. Staff was of the opinion that it was a cost savings that was built into the Sheriff's functions.
- Commissioner Masilotti stated that the \$4 million revenue from contracted services that were noted in the proposed budget should be sufficient to fund the requested 44 officers, 6 bailiffs, and 24 school crossing guards.
- The county was considering self-insuring for health benefits and the Sheriff's Office should consider the same.
- Commissioner Greene questioned the equity in comparing the Sheriff's budget with the budget of a county division.
- Ms. Greene asked why the Sheriff was willing to pay \$42,000 for renovations for a satellite office to be located in a storefront at the Burt Reynolds Ranch.
- Sheriff Bieluch commented that the area of West Jupiter was located within the Sheriff's District 3. The District 3 substation headquarters was located on Jog Road in West Palm Beach. There was quite a distance from Jog Road to West Jupiter with no direct route. When officers went to the Jog Road substation for roll call it would take one-half hour or more to get to the West Jupiter area for patrol depending on traffic conditions. By having the mini substations, officers would immediately be in or near their areas of patrol upon completion of roll call. It was very important to the residents of West Jupiter that the Sheriff provide that type of service. The cost was only \$1 per year for rental after the \$42,000 for renovations to the facility.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- Money was included in the Sheriff's budget for a county parks patrol unit. There was a question as to whether the county needed to fund additional officers for the parks patrol unit.
- Commissioner Greene asked why overtime for the corrections employees and the subsidy for retirees were not budgeted. Colonel Frumoff responded that the former Sheriff's budget did not include the items and that he did not know the reason for the omission.
- Commissioner Newell asked if there were savings associated with a program whereby a long-term career officer would be replaced with a new officer having a lower salary. Colonel Frumoff explained that the proposed budget did not contain anything associated with the early retirement incentive that former Sheriff Neumann had offered many employees during the beginning of his term. The \$230,000 noted in the proposed budget was for the payments made to former employees who left the Sheriff's Office in January 2001, and litigation was involved.
- The budget shortfall consisted of items that had not been included in last year's budget for the Sheriff. As a result, there was not a line item for them in this year's budget.
- Commissioner Marcus commented that staff needed to appraise the current budget cap process for the Sheriff's Office and report back to the board on its effectiveness in order for her to make a decision regarding the Sheriff's proposed budget.
- Commissioner Marcus asked the Sheriff's Office to review the current budget cap process and discuss any changes to their budget with County Administrator Weisman.
- Commissioner Aaronson agreed that more law enforcement officers and crossing guards were needed. He questioned if bailiffs should be funded under Article 5 and whether school crossing guards should be funded by the Sheriff or the School Board.
- Mr. Aaronson stated that the board had insufficient time to comprehend the Sheriff's budget data because it was presented today.
- Commissioner Aaronson said that he was concerned with the ratio of county law enforcement officers per thousand service population compared with the national average.
- Commissioner Aaronson requested staff report back concerning data stating that Miami-Dade County Sheriff's Office had covered 1,800 square miles with 2.65 deputies and Palm Beach County covered 1,687 square miles with 1.87 deputies. Also, report back on the starting salary for officers.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- Mr. Weisman noted that information had been submitted to the board on the number of deputies per thousand service population based on the information provided last year by the former sheriff. That information was incompatible with the information submitted by the current sheriff.
- Commissioner Marcus asked staff to submit data on the various management levels within the Sheriff's Office.
- Commissioner Newell requested statewide data on the ratio of crimes that occurred per thousand service population in association with the number of deputies provided, taking into account the need for additional law enforcement officers.
- Commissioner McCarty asked if the budget cap was an arbitrary figure. Colonel Frumoff stated that the cap was a figure submitted by the former sheriff five years ago and no one currently in the Sheriff's Office could explain how the figure was derived. There was a disclaimer included in the budget document stating that the projections were for planning purposes only and did not reflect actual budget figures.
- Commissioner McCarty suggested replacing the officers that were doing administrative work with civilians in order for the officers to carry out enforcement duties.
- Commissioner McCarty recommended that the municipal law enforcement agencies review the Sheriff's data on starting salaries for deputies and give their input.
- Commissioner Newell noted that the Sheriff's Office had the same health insurance carrier as the county but there was a significant difference in rates.
- Commissioner Newell asked why the additional portable radios for the 800 megahertz countywide radio system were not included in the budget. Colonel Frumoff stated that the project had been long-term and the significant increase in personnel was not anticipated. Commissioner Newell said that planning efforts needed to be fine tuned to improve the budget process. He asked staff to review the additional costs associated with the 800 megahertz countywide radio system and compare the average salary within the Sheriff's Office with that of municipalities and sheriff offices within the state.
- Commissioner Newell said that law enforcement officers should patrol the areas that had the highest crime and accident rates.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- Commissioner Masilotti stated concern that municipalities were losing officers to the Sheriff's Office because they could not keep pace with the salaries offered by the Sheriff. Sheriff Bieluch explained that many officers from other law enforcement agencies had agreed to a reduction in salary to become employed at the Sheriff's Office because there were more diverse opportunities at the Sheriff's Office.
- The Sheriff's Office was recruiting within the law enforcement academy and the community college.
- The Sheriff's Office had agreed not to employ anyone who had a current contract with another law enforcement agency.
- Commissioner Masilotti asked the Sheriff to ensure that there was not a duplication of the services provided by the state and the U.S. Coast Guard concerning his request for marine patrol. Sheriff Bieluch stated that his office had been working on a marine task force and their legal advisor should be rendering an opinion on the matter shortly. There were 11 agencies, most of which were municipal, that patrolled the local waters. His office was working on coordinating the agencies and giving each unilateral arrest powers regarding violations that occur on the Intracoastal Waterway.
- Revenue generated by the Sheriff's Office exceeded expenditures. The county received all of the revenue generated by the Sheriff's Office. The exception was that the Sheriff received one-half of all of the revenue that was generated over the budgeted amount.
- Commissioner Roberts recommended that the board review its policy because the Sheriff was providing services that had not been anticipated five years ago. An equitable policy needed to be developed, taking into consideration revenue generated versus expenses incurred.
- Commissioner Newell asked if the total costs to provide services were included in the contracts that the Sheriff entered into. The Sheriff's Office responded that the contracts should be self-sufficient without the need to be subsidized.
- The Sheriff's Office was scheduled to conduct a services fee study by the fourth quarter of this year. The intent was to adjust the fees to bring them in line with the expenditures which had increased over time.
- The distribution of moving violations revenue was controlled by state legislation. The revenue was distributed to a variety of trust funds and agencies. The Sheriff's Office did not receive funds from the revenue, however.

VI.A. - CONTINUED

- Commissioner Newell recommended that there be improved coordination between the two entities concerning the Sheriff's Office's use of the county's Geographic Information System.

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Report back on the revenue generated by the Sheriff's Office five years ago from service contracts and on the current revenue generated.
- Report back on the Sheriff's Office's review of the current budget cap process and any changes to their budget.
- Evaluate whether bailiffs should be funded under Article 5 and whether school crossing guards should be funded by the Sheriff or the School Board.
- Report back on the statistics that Miami-Dade County covered 1,800 square miles with 2.65 deputies and Palm Beach County covered 1,687 square miles with 1.87 deputies. Also the starting salary for officers.
- Submit data regarding the various management levels within the Sheriff's Office.
- Report back on the ratio of crimes that occurred per thousand service population in association with the number of deputies provided, taking into account the need for additional law enforcement officers.
- Request input from local municipalities concerning the Sheriff's starting salaries for deputies.
- Review the additional costs associated with the 800 megahertz countywide radio system and to compare the average salary within the Sheriff's Office with that of municipalities and sheriff offices statewide.
- Consider the inclusion of vehicles in the Sheriff's impact fee schedule.

RECESS

At 12:00 m., the chair declared a recess.

RECONVENE

At 2:00 p.m., the board reconvened with Commissioners Aaronson, Greene, McCarty, Marcus, Masilotti, Newell, and Roberts present.

VI.B. COURT ADMINISTRATOR - TIME CERTAIN - 11:00 A.M.

County Administrator Weisman informed the board that Chief Judge Edward H. Fine would be present at 3:00 p.m. to discuss item VI.B. See pages 29-31 for discussion of that item.

VI.C. TRUANCY INTERDICTION PROGRAM. DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

County Administrator Weisman said the Truancy Interdiction Program was operated by the School Board and there were several countywide offices. Money had not been included in the budget for the program, and Commissioner Roberts had requested that the matter be placed on the agenda for consideration. The program's budget had been reduced from \$500,000 to \$250,000 by the state. The total budget of \$1 million had been reduced to \$750,000. Truancy Interdiction requested funding from the county or other sources.

Commissioner Roberts requested consideration of the issue because the program funding would be decreased in the upcoming year. She said that the county would save money by funding the program because children would be back in the schools instead of in the communities becoming involved in criminal activities. Ms. Roberts conveyed that if the board approved funding for the program, there might be a way next year to help the program obtain funding from another source. If the county did not assist with the funding this year, more kids would be out of school and out on the streets committing crimes in areas where the program could not afford to have counselors.

Commissioner Masilotti stated his concern that once the board started funding a program it was difficult for the funding to cease. He asked if the School Board had alternative funding sources for the program in the coming years. Mary Breland, manager of the Truancy Interdiction Program, commented that each year they sought funding. This year they were able to get money from the state legislature. They sometimes applied for grants from the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. The problem was that they did not always know if the funds would be available. The \$1 million budget was a collaboration between many of the local law enforcement agencies and the Sheriff's Office. The program received \$500,000 from the state last year. The anticipated appropriation was \$250,000, but it was uncertain if that would be received because the governor had not signed the appropriations bill. If those funds were not received, there was a chance that the program could be closed or have a decrease in the amount of funding. The Children's Services Council did not provide funding for the program, she said. Commissioner Masilotti recommended that the School Board apply for funding from a financially assisted agency.

Ms. Breland said that the program began in 1992 with one truancy center. It was initiated through the School Board and the West Palm Beach and Riviera Beach police departments. At that time, grants had been received from the Children's Services Council but later were stopped. Funding then was received from the Juvenile Justice Department. Commissioner Marcus commended the program but stated there was insufficient background information provided to make a determination at this time.

VI.C. - CONTINUED

Commissioner McCarty recalled that a juvenile assessment center had been established and children who did not go to school and were picked up by the police were taken there for processing. The processing center was a different entity than the Truancy Interdiction Program but the concept was the same. Ms. McCarty said that she did not wish the board to undertake the funding of any additional programs.

Ms. Breland stated that the School Board contributed approximately \$170,000 toward the program along with funding from the six police departments of the municipalities where the program offices were located. Mr. Weisman reported that approximately \$700,000 was budgeted for the Juvenile Court Program. He suggested that a portion of those funds could be used for the Truancy Interdiction Program.

Ms. Breland informed the board that the School Board received support from the state based on the average daily attendance of each student which was referred to as full-time equivalency funding. The truancy program was run by police officers and she was the only School Board staff member. The Truancy Interdiction Program had saved the county approximately \$8 million in juvenile court costs last year. Commissioner Aaronson emphasized that the truancy program only took the children off the streets. He suggested that the School Board seek a more rigid means to keep the children in school and not lose state and federal funding.

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Report back on the possibility of utilizing some of the juvenile court funding for the Truancy Interdiction Program.
- Report back on all of the school-related programs that were funded by the county.

VI.D. CLERK'S SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST. DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

The ensuing discussion brought out that:

- The Clerk's Office had indicated that if the Sheriff's Office hired 12 more law enforcement officers to issue citations, they currently had insufficient staff to process the increased citations. Therefore, the Clerk requested 4 additional staff positions to her budget.
- Commissioner Newell requested a breakdown of the revenue generated from citations.
- The consensus of the board was not to approve the Clerk's request for the additional positions until the Sheriff's Office increased its law enforcement officers.
- The Clerk's Office was assessing technology for the imaging of citations which would make the processing of citations more efficient.

VI.D. - CONTINUED

- The county had tried many different ways to collect the monies due for citations that were issued.
- The Clerk's Office was governed by state statute which did not allow for the collection of citation fees.
- Commissioner Aaronson stated that considerable revenue was lost because of unpaid citations.

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Submit a breakdown of the revenue generated from citations.

VI.E. CULTURAL ARTS COUNCIL. DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

County Administrator Weisman stated that the board provided \$285,000 for the Cultural Arts Council last year and \$262,500 this year. The Cultural Arts Council requested \$265,500 for next year. Staff had included \$262,500 in the proposed budget based on the discussion by the board last year.

Commissioner McCarty commented that originally the county's funding was supposed to be matched by the Cultural Arts Council. She noted that the matching funds had been received from the Tourist Development Council, however. Ms. McCarty said that she would be more favorable toward long-term funding if the Cultural Arts Council solicited matching funding from the community and not from the Tourist Development Council.

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Report on the dispersal of the Cultural Arts Council's funds.
- Report back concerning the board's previous agreement that county funding was to end as soon as other contributors were established and concerning the Cultural Arts Council's anticipated completion of its endowment campaign to supplement county grant funds.

VI.F. See pages 32-34.

VI.G. See page 34.

VI.H. See pages 34-36.

VII. See page 36.

VI.B. COURT ADMINISTRATOR. DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

(CLERK'S NOTE: For earlier discussion of this item, see page 25.)

Discussion revealed the following information:

- Five issues originally had been submitted for the board's consideration. Since that time, the issues had been reduced to three.
- The original issues were Jury Assembly, \$307,172; Domestic Relations (Dependency Court), \$369,408; Elder Justice Center, \$159,205; Pretrial Services (Drug Court), \$75,656; and Juvenile Domestic Violence Mediation, \$79,167. Jury Assembly and Pretrial Services were removed from the list.
- Court Administration had considered Domestic Relations (Dependency Court) as first priority followed by Juvenile Domestic Violence Mediation and Elder Justice Center.
- The requested funding for the Court Administration programs was approximately \$608,000.
- A year ago, the Domestic Relations general masters were identified by both the legislative Article 5 task force and the judicial Article 5 task force as being a core integral function of the court and were to be funded by the state in 2004. The caveat was that the general masters had to be in place at the time. Court Administration requested two additional general masters, two legal secretaries, one court program specialist, and one clerk.
- Juvenile Domestic Violence Mediation was a successful diversion program to keep children out of the system. The cost avoidance using this program in lieu of secured detention and related juvenile justice services was approximately \$205,000. There had been a 5 percent recidivism rate within the program as opposed to a 50 percent recidivism rate after a child was in the system.
- An Elder Justice Center was proposed for the elderly who become involved with the justice system.
- The Children's Services Council would no longer provide funding for the Domestic Relations (Dependency Court) because their focus was in prevention.
- Court Administration was currently discussing the Domestic Relations (Dependency Court) with the state. The state had a \$112,500 grant-in-aid for the foster care citizen review issue. The state had indicated that they would be willing to work with Court Administration to redraft the grant-in-aid contract.
- The Alzheimer Association and the Area Agency on Aging were involved with the proposed Elder Justice Center program.

VI.B. - CONTINUED

- It was not anticipated that the Elder Justice Center would contain a lot of staff because the center would not take on an advocacy role but rather function as an intervention facility.
- Commissioner Marcus said that she was reluctant to approve the supplemental funding for the Domestic Relations (Dependency Court) program without knowing whether the state would fund it under Article 5.
- The county was paying approximately \$17 million per year in costs that the state should be funding since Article 5 was approved in 1998. The constitutional amendment required the state to start paying in full by 2004.
- Commissioner Aaronson noted that the Children's Services Council was supported by taxes but it terminated its funding of the Domestic Relations (Dependency Court).
- Commissioner McCarty commented that the Children's Services Council was an autonomous authority that was appointed by the governor and only one commissioner was a member. She said that the council did a good job at funding the programs it felt were priority. The council's focus was on prevention which did not include the Domestic Relations (Dependency Court).
- Commissioner Aaronson stressed that if the board approved the funding for the Domestic Relations (Dependency Court), it would become a program that the board would have to continue funding and he did not wish to make a decision at this time.
- Juvenile Domestic Violence Mediation and the Elder Justice Center were not considered as Article 5 costs.
- Commissioner McCarty asserted that foster care should be made a priority.
- Commissioner Marcus encouraged the board to support established programs whereby the children exclusively benefited from the funds.
- Commissioner Greene stated that the smaller counties needed funding assistance to help with their elder and juvenile programs.
- Commissioner Masilotti suggested that he be allowed to address the Children's Services Council to urge them to reconsider funding the Domestic Relations (Dependency Court) since they had terminated their subsidy in the middle of the funding period. He suggested that the Criminal Justice and Juvenile Justice systems also contribute funds. Commissioner Aaronson conveyed that he would consider a funding partnership with the agencies.

VI.B. - CONTINUED

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Report back on foster care programs where the children would exclusively benefit from the funds.
- Report back on funding for the proposed Elder Justice Center.
- Report back on funding for the Domestic Relations (Dependency Court) after Commissioner Masilotti had addressed the Children's Services Council.

VI.C. See pages 26-27.

VI.D. See pages 27-28.

VI.E. See page 28.

VI.F. See pages 32-34.

VI.G. See page 34.

VI.H. See pages 34-36.

VII. See page 36.

IV. CAPITAL BUDGET. DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

(CLERK'S NOTE: For earlier discussion of this item, see pages 8-11.)

County Administrator Weisman asked Facilities Development and Operations Director Wolf to address some of the issues the board earlier had questions about. Ms. Wolf commented that:

- The board had questions about capital projects this morning.
- The board had entered into a contract with the City of Delray Beach and the Community Redevelopment Agency some time ago, to provide land for the South County Courthouse expansion.
- The deed for the land to expand the South County Courthouse would be conveyed tomorrow.
- Design expenses for the South County Courthouse expansion were \$1.5 million. Construction cost for the expansion of the courtroom was approximately \$14 million.
- The courthouse expansion and the cost associated with the capital budget were not affected by the jury trials versus non-jury trials issue. The infrastructure for jury trials was currently in place, and the site was being built to the maximum capacity.

IV. - CONTINUED

- A portion of the South County Courthouse expansion project was eligible for impact fee funding. The money that would have come from the Public Building Impact Fee Fund had been allocated to other facilities, however. Impact fee allocations had been assigned to the Light Industrial Office, Airport Centre, Midwestern Community Center, the new Property Appraiser's facility, and a portion of the Sheriff's substation in the west Boynton Beach area.
- The intent was to demolish the Tishman Building when the Historic Society moved out and to use the space for parking.
- The Sheriff's Office was vacating space in the South County Administration Building and was moving to the new West Boynton Beach Substation. The Tax Collector would be able to expand in the South County Administration Building, which was more cost effective than constructing a new building for him.
- The countywide mobile data communications project consisted of infrastructure and not equipment or software. The software applications were being developed and had been funded through the Sheriff; Fire-Rescue; Planning, Zoning and Building; and Palm Tran. The project basically involved towers to transmit signals countywide.

V. See page 11.

VI.A. See pages 11-25.

VI.B. See pages 25 and 29-31.

VI.C. See pages 26-27.

VI.D. See pages 27-28.

VI.E. See page 28.

VI.F. **RECREATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (RAP).** DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

During the ensuing discussion, the following information came to light:

- The program was started to provide capital dollars for county park facilities and to supplement municipal or other entities' park facilities operational costs.
- Sometime after the program had been established, former Commissioner Maude Ford Lee had a number of projects that were of a cultural and educational nature, and the board approved them. Since that time, there had been a general change in the program to where the county was giving out much smaller projects than originally anticipated and they were not capital.

VI.F. - CONTINUED

- Requests had been submitted that were not recreational. The program had become an administrative problem because each funding item required a contract and had to be audited to show that the funds had been spent appropriately. The administrative costs for some of the projects were greater than the grant funds distributed.
- The board wanted to discuss the program parameters and eligible funding recipients.
- Commissioner Newell suggested having a size limit on the grants to prohibit a lot of small grants. The grants should be matched with funds from other entities, he said.
- Commissioner Greene complimented staff on the auditing process for the RAP projects. She stated her concern that it was easier to obtain recreational funds than it was to obtain educational funds.
- Commissioner Aaronson held that the program worked. He supported using the RAP funds for cultural purposes also. The program should be strengthened, not abandoned, Mr. Aaronson declared.
- Mr. Aaronson concurred with the concept of matching funds from grant recipients. He commented that each district should be handled differently because the residents in one district might be able to afford the matching funds and the residents in another district might not.
- Without funding assistance, many of the school programs would not exist.
- A recreational or cultural component was a prerequisite for any project seeking RAP funds.
- County Administrator Weisman clarified that Commissioner Greene desired that the criteria be expanded to allow for certain educational grants without requiring a recreational component.
- Commissioner Masilotti said that RAP funds were very beneficial for many of the residents in his district who could not afford to finance their programs. He did not want to change the program unless there was the ability to broaden it.
- Commissioner McCarty proposed that the board set standards that would allow projects to be combined as a means to eliminate a lot of small contracts.
- Commissioner Marcus suggested that County Administrator Weisman or his designee be allowed to sign on the board's behalf for funding under a certain amount, as long as the project met the cultural and recreational guidelines.

VI.F. - CONTINUED

- Commissioners Newell and Roberts said that they funded capital projects under the program.
- Commissioner Roberts suggested that staff come back with recommendations on how to fund smaller projects without the process being too time consuming.
- Commissioners Aaronson and Roberts agreed that the program was not broken but staff could try to make it better.
- Commissioner Greene commended staff for helping her office to understand the Recreation Assistance Program, and she urged that it continue. Her concern was that the current program standards did not allow for the funding of a tutorial after-school program.
- Educational or social development programs were not combined with recreation or cultural arts programs.

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Report back with recommendations to streamline the process for the Recreation Assistance Program.
- Consider policy whereby the County Administrator or his designee would be authorized to sign the Recreation Assistance Program documents for funding requests under a designated amount.

VI.G. TRIM NOTICE INSERT/OPTIONS FOR FUNDING THE SHERIFF'S BUDGET. DISCUSSED 5-30-2001

County Administrator Weisman informed the board that staff was unprepared to give any substantial information on the TRIM Notice Insert/Options for Funding Sheriff's Budget item.

VI.H. COUNTY COMMISSION STAFF SALARIES AND SALARY CAP. DISCUSSED WITH DIRECTION 5-30-2001

Assistant County Administrator Brad Merriman informed the board that:

- The board had implemented a policy that froze the entry-level starting salaries for commission staff positions for three years. The county was at the conclusion of the third year, and the board had to make a decision whether to continue with the salary freeze, discontinue the salary freeze, or combine the two.
- The salary freeze did not affect future pay increases for current employees nor did it affect employees who transferred from other county departments.

During the ensuing discussion, it was brought out that:

- Commissioner Greene wanted an increase in the salaries for all of her staff but she would not know how to have that implemented based on the current salary freeze.

VI.H. - CONTINUED

- County Administrator Weisman stated that the only thing that would change the salaries of the current new employees would be to raise their salaries to the level they would have been October 1 if there had not been a freeze. If the freeze were eliminated, new employees would be allowed to start at 3 percent higher per year. In order to affect the current employees' salaries, the board would have to restore them to the level they would have been if there had not been a salary freeze.
- Commissioner Masilotti said that it had been difficult to attract qualified personnel because of the pay scale. Better salaries were offered in the private sector than in government. A change in the overall range of pay was a possible remedy.
- The commission aide salary was intended to mirror that of an administrative assistant. It was not intended to be a professional position, however.
- The pay ranges for commission aide and secretary were higher than those of similar county staff. The commission aide after eight years of service went up to the management level of the E-01 pay class. There was no comparative status for other county employees. The commission secretary was the highest-ranked secretarial position within the county. Commissioners were allowed to hire secretaries at 10 percent above the minimum starting salary.
- A person hired as a commission aide today would start with a salary that was 9 percent less than the current employees.
- Commissioner Aaronson said that he was unprepared to consider the matter today. He questioned if additional personnel should be hired based upon the countywide population increase.
- Commissioner Marcus said the salary issue was debated every two years.
- Mr. Weisman explained that if the board removed the salary freeze today, any new employee hired after today would be entitled to a 3 percent increase as of October 1 and the existing employees, if they were kept at par, would get a 3 percent increase.
- Commissioner Masilotti said he was not interested in changing the pay scale for current employees. He wanted to know what would be the impact on the budget if each commissioner hired a full-time secretary versus a secretary working part-time.

(NOTE: Mccarty said that Roberts wasn't there - in reference to commissioners present during reconvene)

VI.H. - CONTINUED

- Commissioner McCarty said that she would agree to discontinue the salary freeze because there should be a sufficient difference between the salaries of current employees and that of newly hired employees since the freeze had begun three years ago. She could not support hiring additional staff for commissioners because there were too many other projects that needed funding.
- Commissioner Newell agreed to the removal of the salary freeze but did not agree to additional staff for commissioners. He recommended that staff get a breakdown of the number of personnel that other commission districts had within the state.

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Report back on the costs associated with hiring a secretary full-time compared to the costs for a secretary part-time.
- Report back with a breakdown of the number of personnel that other commission districts had within the state.

VII. BOARD COMMENTS AND DIRECTION - None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The chair declared the meeting adjourned.

ATTESTED:

APPROVED:

Clerk

Chair