

**PALM BEACH COUNTY  
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

## **AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY**

Meeting Date: October 16, 2012      ☐ Consent      ☒ Regular  
    ☐ Workshop      ☐ Public Hearing

**Submitted By: Engineering and Public Works**  
**Submitted For: County Engineer**

## I. EXECUTIVE BRIEF

**Motion and Title: Staff requests direction:**

- A)** on which of three roadway options (see page 3) to pursue for Fargo Avenue in the Ranchettes subdivision;
- B)** on whether to petition the Fargo property owners if it is decided to go forward with them bearing part of the costs, or whether to move directly to a public hearing. As per the MSTU ordinance, the Board can choose to consider and adopt an assessment without first petitioning the residents.

**SUMMARY:** Fargo Avenue is currently a courtesy maintained shellrock roadway. The Board has been asked many times to pave this roadway as others have been paved in the neighborhood.

District 6 (MRE)

**Background and Justification:** Palm Beach County (County) paved four roadways under the MSTU program in the Ranchettes a few years ago. Since then, the County has received a repeated request to also pave Fargo Avenue for a comparable price to the residents. While the County studied the available options, the road was accepted for courtesy maintenance and the shellrock surface was improved and has been regularly graded.

**Continued on Page 3**

**Attachments:**

- ## 1. Location Map

Recommended by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Division Director Date

Approved by: By T. Webb 10/3/12  
 County Engineer Date

## II. FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

### A. Five Year Summary of Fiscal Impact:

<b>Fiscal Years</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
<b>Capital Expenditures</b>	<u>\$ -0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
<b>Operating Costs</b>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
<b>External Revenues</b>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
<b>Program Income (County)</b>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
<b>In-Kind Match (County)</b>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
<b>NET FISCAL IMPACT</b>	<u>\$ **</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
<b># ADDITIONAL FTE</b>					
<b>POSITIONS (Cumulative)</b>					

Is Item Included in Current Budget?	Yes	No
-------------------------------------	-----	----

**Budget Acct No.: Fund\_\_ Dept.\_\_ Unit\_\_ Object**  
**Program**


**Recommended Sources of Funds/Summary of Fiscal Impact:**


\*\*Fiscal impact is indeterminable. The item requests Board direction which has multiple fiscal possibilities.

C. Departmental Fiscal Review: Shrellhite

### III. REVIEW COMMENTS

**A. OFMB Fiscal and/or Contract Dev. and Control Comments:**


 10/5/12  
 OFMB  
 10/4/12  
 10/4/12


 10/10/12  
 Contract Dev. and Control

**B. Approved as to Form  
and Legal Sufficiency:**

Marken R. Cusack 10/11/12  
(Assistant County Attorney)

**C. Other Department Review:**

**Department Director**

**This summary is not to be used as a basis for payment.**

## **Background and Justification: Continued from Page 1**

After considerable internal discussions, we offer the following options:

1. Fargo remains as a shellrock, County courtesy maintained roadway-expected annual maintenance approximately \$10,000;
2. Fargo owners (a total of 12 abutting properties) pay 50% of the costs of improving/paving the roadway via annual assessments for 20 years. We estimate the potential costs to each property owner to be approximately \$30,000, with the County's share being approximately \$360,000; or
3. Fargo owners pay \$10,000 per lot over the next 20 years and the County pays the rest of the costs of the improvement, approximately \$600,000. The \$10,000 amount is similar in magnitude to that paid by the Ranchettes residents (approximately \$7,000) during the last MSTU project.

It should be noted that option 3 will require a change to the MSTU Ordinance, as it would assess the residents less than the minimum of 50% of project costs.

Location Map

Page 77

L

See pg 67

K

TWP 44

TWP 44

TWP 44

22

23

24

