

**MANATEE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, MANATEE and OSPREY ROOMS, FIFTH FLOOR
1112 Manatee Avenue West
Bradenton, Florida
June 13, 2023**


Meeting video link: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCULgjuGhS-qV966RU2Z7AtA>

Present were:

Kevin Van Ostenbridge, Chairman
Mike Rahn, First Vice-Chairman
Amanda Ballard, Second Vice-Chairman
Jason Bearden, Third Vice-Chairman
Vanessa Baugh, entered during the meeting
George Kruse
James A. Satcher, III

Also present were:

Lee Washington, Acting County Administrator
William Clague, County Attorney
Robin Toth, Deputy Clerk, Clerk of the Circuit Court

 Chairman Van Ostenbridge called the work session to order at 9:00 a.m.


INVOCATION


 The Invocation was led by Pastor Franklin Crockett, Bayside Community Church, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Bearden.


AGENDA

BC2023613DOC001


1. DISCUSSION ON HUMAN RESOURCES (HR) OUTSOURCING CONSULTATION

 Lee Washington, Acting County Administrator, stated Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc., was solicited to undertake the outsourcing of Human Resources (HR) for Manatee County.


 Jacob Erickson, stated the Board took action (April 11, 2023) to outsource Human Resources.

 Kenya Spann, Gallagher Benefit Services, Inc., stated Gallagher is a HR and Compensation practice with an experienced team of over 350 consultants in 13 offices across the United States to support clients with guidance spanning the entire HR lifecycle. She utilized a PowerPoint presentation to outline areas of expertise of Gallagher's HR and compensation consulting, structure and outsourcing, the HR function, every function that takes place, solutions and opportunities of HR needs, charting the course for HR outsourcing, what will outsourcing look like for the County, and developing a talent strategy for Manatee County.


(Depart Commissioner Satcher)

 She referred to a slide outlining Gallagher's approach to develop customized solutions by understanding the county's culture, goals and priorities.


(Enter Commissioner Satcher; Depart Chairman Van Ostenbridge and County Attorney Clague)
She continued with slides on the HR lifecycle what type of talent Manatee County is looking for, talent acquisition, how to attract them, go through the process of getting those particular employees onboard, training and development, compensation and recognition, performance management and succession planning, and health benefits and leaves of absence. In deciding on whether to outsource HR, the lifecycle must be utilized.


 She continued with slides highlighting top priorities 2022 in HR of retaining talent, attracting talent, creating a strong culture and HR priorities now.


(Enter Chairman Van Ostenbridge)


 Ms. Spann continued with slides stating the assessment of Manatee County's HR function and delivery of HR services performed by Gallagher in 2022 identified opportunities for improvements. Gallagher identified HR priority themes of the Employee Handbook, Affirmation Action Plan, Consistency with HR Actions, Hiring Practices and HR Technology.

(Enter County Attorney Clague; Commissioner Ballard absent for portion of presentation)

 Ms. Spann continued with slides to address traditional reasons why organizations may outsource HR, what does outsourcing do for organizations, HR functions generally maintained internally and HR functions generally outsourced.


 Ms. Spann specifically addressed HR outsourcing challenges. HR outsourcing can be beneficial, but it can also be a challenge to get it right. She addressed some of the biggest challenges organizations face when outsourcing some or all of their HR. It is important for organizations to know precisely what is being purchased. A best practice would be to map a prospective vendor's services to the entire scope or the County's HR functions. Having a good understanding of the organizational need will help to know what functions may be managed by the vendor versus the functions that may remain in-house, or handled by another strategic, third-party firm.


 Ms. Spann continued on what should be expected from an outsourcing HR vendor and developing a talent strategy for Manatee County. The key to successfully outsource any of the HR functions is to understand the needs, find an outsourcing provider and potentially a strategic consulting partner with the capability to work hand-in-hand with the County. An important question for the County to consider what is the timeline is to outsource some or all of the HR functions, and how long would the County outsource any of the HR functions, and what qualities the County wants. in an outstanding provider.


 Ms. Spann addressed Gallagher's role as a strategic partner to Manatee County: a current state assessment, recommendations and defining priorities, information gathering and analysis continues and deliverables and ongoing strategic support.


 Ms. Spann responded to questions by Commissioner Ballard that Gallagher has an ESG (Environmental, Social and Governance) component in their organization, ESG is new, and has a consultant on their team that can address the ESG strategy.


(Commissioner Kruse absent for portion of this dialogue)


 Ms. Spann responded to questions by Commissioner Bearden regarding compensation strategy, internal hindrances that could put a structure in place to prohibit a person from graduating into another role, incentives to encourage and foster the skill set of a person, how an outside vendor may chose a position and vet resumes, Gallagher looks at positions from the director position and above, if a company can offer a one-stop solution, Gallagher does not provide comprehensive HR compliance advice, a vendor that might experience constant staff turnover/transition, based on Manatee County and the way it is moving it is possible to hire an HR firm to align around and have an appreciation for the employee culture, goals and priorities, Manatee County must understand what their HR is doing today and all of the functions and areas, determine where the gaps are and how the County wants the HR vendor to manage those functions and areas.

 Ms. Spann stated that based on a scale of Levels A (best) through F (worst), Manatee County's level of HR last year was at Level D, which is due to lack of leadership and development.

 Upon question by Commissioner Satcher, Ms. Spann stated that last year, Gallagher received communication from former Financial Management Director, Jan Brewer, expressing concerns on the function of the Financial Management Department. Gallagher has an active contract, but has not been consulting for months. Gallagher caters to the needs of their clients by researching the HR functions.

 Ms. Spann spent a great deal of time researching the roles of a Manatee County Commissioner, and determined that Manatee County took the decision to outsource HR seriously.


 Mr. Satcher stated his background is mainly ministry and overseas mission work. As he looks at Gallagher online, he asked what allyship training is. He stated people should be judged based on their character and the things that brings everyone together.


 Chairman Van Ostenbridge stated Ms. Spann's presentation was excellent and tailored to the County Commission. His goal for employees is to create more stability, a higher level of service, quicker response times from HR, professionalism and miscommunication with the Clerk's office and paychecks, cost savings, efficiency and smaller government. He believes the Board is also in agreement with these goals. He does not support one-stop shopping. He stated Gallagher graded Manatee County's HR at a Level D last year. He is very concerned about the timeline of the procurement process and that Manatee County currently does not have an HR director or a compensation director. He would like the County Administrator to bring in someone local and outsource as a long-term solution, with the Number One priority being stability. His direction to the County Administrator is, sooner or later, looking for bold quick action and is very concerned about putting it all out to the procurement process. The timeline to get something in place is also a major concern.

 Commissioners Ballard, Kruse, and Bearden agreed with the Chairman.


RECESS/RECONVENE: 10:25 a.m. – 10:35 a.m. All Commissioners were present except Commissioner Baugh.

2. **PRESENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN – FISCAL YEARS 2024-2028**

 Sheila McLean, Chief Financial Officer, utilized a slide presentation to review and discuss the Recommended Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) FY24-28. The FY24-28 CIP is a total of \$2,110,214,932, with an FY24 investment of \$339,863,202 and by far, the largest CIP. The total CIP FY24-28 inclusive of existing and future projects is \$3,579,481,176.

 Challenges facing the CIP include the supply chain, funding capacity, logistics/timing with other projects, land acquisition/mitigation, labor shortage and growth.


Capital Improvement Plan FY24-28


 The CIP has two categories of Governmental with eight unique categories and Enterprise. The major categories of Transportation and Utilities are the main drivers of the CIP. The Infrastructure Sales Tax (IST) is carried alongside the CIP with categories of Transportation, Public Safety, and Parks. There are a total of 653 CIP projects of which there are 66 new


projects, 264 projects that need additional funding, 379 projects with no additional funding needed and 117 IST projects. It was noted that 57.5 percent of the total 653 projects are already fully funded. The County has managed to leverage and use dollars effectively.


Capital Improvement Plan FY24-28 – District


 A pie chart of the CIP FY24-28 by Commission District indicates aggressive growth occurring in east County at 40 percent for District 1 of \$1,431,628,241, with 155 projects addressing transportation and capacity increase into the utilities system.

 District 2 is the lowest growth at 7.6 percent. Countywide and Multi-Districts are projects that either cross District boundaries, or not itemized individually to a District, but benefit the County as a whole.


 Commissioner Satcher stated the pie chart is skewed, because the Port, Piney Point and Lake Manatee Dam repairs are all in District 1. More relievers are needed off I-75, which is going to impact Districts 1 and 5. These relievers will not only be a Manatee County benefit, but a regional benefit.


 Upon question, Ms. McLean stated major, Multi-District projects include 63rd Avenue, Lockwood Ridge Road shopping center, Cortez Road, Washington Park, Gateway Greenway trails, Bayshore Road, Morgan Johnson Road, 44th Avenue East Extension, watershed studies, 15th Street utility relocations, FDOT force main relocations, Tidevue Estates inflow, Ellenton-Gillette/U.S. 301 FDOT water main, and U.S. 41, from Bay Drive to Cortez Road.


 Chairman Van Ostenbridge asked if the Convention Center project was included in the District 2 total, noting this is the largest construction project in the County. He expressed frustration with lack of parity in the pie chart and comments by District 1 Commissioner Satcher that everything goes to District 3.


 Commissioner Satcher stated the big thing that would change pie chart numbers are the County-wide and Multi-District projects. East County has become the new part of the County. While the County seeks to be proactive with visionary planning, no one has championed any type of moratorium on growth. He appreciated Commissioners collaborating to get major projects done. Utility infrastructure benefits the entire County.


(Enter Commissioner Baugh)


 Chairman Van Ostenbridge stated it is the responsibility of each Commissioner to fight for the needs of their District. The Board has addressed the needs of District 3 and there are no major unmet needs, but he could not speak for the other Districts.


 Commissioner Ballard stated District 2 has consistently been overlooked. District 2 total includes the huge investment of the Convention Center construction project, which benefits the entire county. Some Multi-District initiatives benefit District 2, but also benefit District 1. Though District 2 is a centralized district, any unmaintained roads impact the entire County.


 Commissioner Kruse stated this is not about parity, but maximizing tax dollars for the overall benefit of Manatee County. Most of District 2 is municipality, and Districts 1 and 5 have the most growth, but both Districts 1 and 5 also have the most impact fees. The goal is to get the best return on tax dollars and impact fees for the County as a whole.


 Commissioner Satcher stated no one on the Board has opposed a significant project in District 2. A shared philosophy among Board members is to come up with the best projects that will make the most difference for citizens.


 Commissioner Baugh stated not much was spent for District 5 for several years, because funding was held in Reserves. Part of the reason Districts 1 and 5 have bigger portions of the pie chart now is due to impact fees, freed funding to move things forward, and population growth. One thing that stands out in District 2 is the Lincoln Pool, which is reflected in the pie chart. Traffic congestion affects the entire County and not just one area. She urged the Board to look at the County as a whole to balance traffic congestion throughout the County, and Districts 2 and 4 will play a huge role.


 Commissioner Baugh pointed out that most of the 44th Avenue East Extension project was funded by impact fees from District 5.


 Commissioner Satcher spoke about ongoing issues from 2020 and 2021 in Palmetto. The County is missing out on an opportunity for a boat ramp in District 2 that could get more people into the water without fighting Saturday traffic on S.R. 64. There is a location in District 2 worth looking into as a solution for additional parking for boat haulers.

 Commissioner Baugh stated it is rare to see the additional parking area at Fort Hamer Boat Ramp empty. She asked if TDC Funds could help build a boat ramp.


 William Clague, County Attorney, advised that boat ramps are not a legally available use of TDC proceeds per Florida Statute. There are other sources of money that can be used for boat ramps, but TDC Funds are not one of them.

 Commissioner Bearden questioned if any funds are allocated in this budget for boat ramps in Districts 1 or 2.

 It was noted that \$7 million is allocated for Peninsula Bay Boat Ramp in District 3 (located on the shore of Palma Sola Bay with access from 119th Street West in Cortez, currently a vacant parcel), that will have 88 boat parking slips. Staff is pursuing partnership funding with WCIND, as well as other details.


 Ms. McLean previously spoke to the Board (3/30/23) about execution of the main categories of Transportation, Utilities, and General Government. Before moving forward in 2022, Transportation execution rate was 59 percent of completion projects, Stormwater was 53 percent execution rate, Parks was 51 percent execution rate, Libraries was 71 percent execution rate, General Government and other projects was 43 percent execution rate, and Utilities was 45 percent execution rate, inclusive of the completion of 82 of the total 180 projects. Departments are doing what the Board instructed. Staff is approaching the FY24-28 CIP with the same concept of completing infrastructure continued from last year; thus, the reason for the 66 new projects and an influx of impact fee dollars to complete projects.


Capital Improvement Plan FY24-28 – Sources and Uses

 Ms. McLean spoke about a slide of CIP FY24-28 Sources and Uses, reflecting very diverse funding sources, and Impact Fees are one of the major and most impactful sources due to growth occurring in the County. All funding sources show increased revenues, with the highest increase of 14 percent to Impact Fees than anticipated in some Districts more than others. Staff has been able to diversify/partner with FDOT, SWFSMD and get American Rescue


Plan (ARP) Funds to move projects along. Staff is also able to use Southwest District Tax Increment Finance (SWTIF) dollars to enhance storm water projects within SWTIF boundaries.

Governmental


 She addressed the Governmental category of the CIP, stating it is very difficult to come up with a debt plan that not only meets the needs in the CIP, but does not compromise Reserves. The largest investment in Government CIP – Uses is Transportation at 75.56 percent, or \$1 billion, followed by Sports and Leisure Service at 13.67 percent, or \$194.8 million.


 Gas taxes have not decreased from last year, but a deceleration in estimates/expectations of where the proceeds should be at this point in time in 2023 have been observed. Staff is cautious to use this funding source and is monitoring legislature, going green initiatives and electric technology for better fuel efficiency.


Impact Fees – Transportation


 Transportation Impact Fees are the largest investment in the Northwest and Southeast Districts. Past trends were studied to calculate and project the future. Ending fund balance for FY24, after funding projects with Impact Fee capital is \$26,445,070. Today's revenues are not sustainable. Inasmuch as these Fees are fairly strong and FY26 revenues are unknown, staff took a very conservative approach of going back to the increase in Revenues realized prior to the COVID pandemic.


Impact Fees – Parks and Libraries


 Impact Fees for Parks and Libraries are holding on strong. Manatee County is still conservatively retaining an ending balance. Library Impact Fees can only be used for Libraries. The largest investment at this time is the East County Library, which is near completion. Other projects are coming forward, e.g. Rocky Bluff Library expansion and other projects that could potentially utilize the Reserves.


 Discussion ensued that the Northwest and Southeast Districts do not collect large amounts of impact fees, Northwest District 2 has the largest fund balance, because funds are not being spent, implication there are no pending projects to utilize impact fees in District 2, and the fees are continually accruing but not being

 Ms. Mclean stated a list of all impact fees spent in Northwest District 2 would be prepared. A full report of where and how impact fees are being spent would be presented to the Board on July 23.

 Discussion continued that there is a timeline to spend these dollars, Transportation Impact Fees collected in Northwest District 2 should be used on transportation improvements in District 2, District 2 Transportation Impact Fees for FY26 show a \$9 million balance (three years of funds) and District 2 projects are not large in number.


 Following discussion, Commissioner Kruse asked for a plan on how to use these impact fees to make sure necessary transportation infrastructure is in place in Northwest District 2.

 Upon question as to the strategy used to disburse Transportation Impact Fees, Ms. McLean stated Nicole Knapp, Impact Fee Coordinator, must follow Comprehensive Plan policy to distribute impact fees. Once the strategy is approved, the Board determines where and how the fees should be distributed. Ms. Knapp will present an Impact Fee Report to the Board on July 25, of how many projects are utilizing impact fees and the status of those projects.

 Commissioner Baugh questioned if there would be a new Impact Fee Coordinator if Ms. Knapp is to serve as Interim Director of Development Services.


Lee Washington, Acting County Administrator, stated this information would be brought back to the Board.

Impact Fees – Law Enforcement and Public Safety

 Ms. McLean state the majority of Law Enforcement Impact Fees are being used for building projects for the Sheriff's office e.g. evidence building, in conjunction with IST dollars. The other factor is that every time the Sheriff budget is approved with additional deputies and new full-time employees, there is a feature of capital that is eligible to be funded by Law Enforcement Impact Fees. This must be taken into consideration during impact fee calculations for Law Enforcement before incorporating into the CIP.


 Public Safety investment is on growth for EMS stations while retaining an ending balance.


Gas Taxes

 Gas Taxes are a steady funding source that continues to fund some maintenance and road resurfacing projects as a supplemental funding source.


Ms. McLean explained the difference in FY24 and FY25 ending fund balance totals, \$6 million the drop in Gas Tax Revenues from FY25 to FY26, and FY26 estimates go back to pre-pandemic condition and being conservative. Revenue streams on the Fund Summary for the CIP, broken down in the uses of actual Impact Fees, Gas Taxes and IST, would be discussed this afternoon.


 Ms. McLean showed a slide to give an overview of CIP FY24-28 Features Main Projects with fund totals that have major impact in the CIP for General Government, Parks, Public Safety, Law Enforcement, Road Improvements, Intersections and Sidewalks categories.


 Ms. McLean responded to question by Commissioner Ballard on the work being done on the John H. Marble Park and funding for the project.

 Chairman Van Ostenbridge noted the John H. Marble Park and Coach Eddie Shannon Park (fka Lincoln Park) are in District 2.


Enterprise Projects


 Ms. McLean addressed Enterprise Projects and CIP sources. The theme is capacity and increasing capacity in areas where it is needed. With the recently approved, revised Utility Rates (Resolution R-23-058, approved 3/28/23), Utilities has a very complete structure to fund CIP Enterprise Projects. She reviewed CIP FY24-28 Features Main Projects for Potable Water, Solid Waste, Wastewater and Stormwater. Potable Water and Wastewater are the largest categories, followed by some projects in Solid Waste and Stormwater.


 As to the new land fill site purchase of \$34.1 million and source of funding, Ms. McLean stated the \$34.1 million is an estimated cost that would be addressed in greater detail by Evan Pilachowski, Utilities Director, at the June 14 work session on the FY24 Recommended Budget for the Utilities Department.

 Commissioner Baugh noted she had a briefing with Mr. Pilachowski, who has made leeway on a location for the new landfill, and it is looking very promising.

Infrastructure Sales Tax (IST)


 Ms. McLean stated only nine years remain to collect IST dollars. Staff has observed a 16 percent increase in IST revenues, which are adjusted annually. A pie chart of FY24 Recommended Infrastructure Sales Tax Projects indicate the largest percentage of IST revenues is allocated for Transportation – Roads, at 69.71 percent. Of the Infrastructure Sales Tax Recommended Project and Equipment List of 209 projects, 117 projects are identified in the CIP Plan, and 101 projects with current appropriation are in motion.

 Ms. McLean noted that all funding sources are monitored on a monthly basis.


 The IST – Over the Life of all anticipated revenues shows a total, FY24-28 recommended CIP of \$443,578,051, with a remaining spending balance of \$231,656,200. The remaining balance is anticipated to be more due to growth. The only challenge of the IST is the percentage of categories. Staff is trying to be fair in how IST category funds are being spent. Some of the percentages in Parks would like to have access to the IST, because their percentage is so much smaller than others. Parks is reaching their max with only \$3.8 million left over for the life of 15-years.

One category under Public Safety and Law Enforcement is 911 and Public Safety Technology Upgrades with a remaining balance of \$14,594,601. Staff would like to seek opportunities to reduce or modify this fund balance to use in other categories that need funding.


Debt Structure


 Ms. McLean addressed Debt Structure, total outstanding debt, bond ratings and what the County can do to utilize debt to leverage some of the projects. Current debt structure for General Government debt is \$289,170,000, and Public Utilities debt is \$384,355,000, which is inclusive of the last two bond issuances (Governmental and Enterprise). Given the fact that the County has kept such good Reserves, the County has solvency and risk is very low, according to Bond Investors. Fitch and Moody have given Manatee County the highest bond rating of AAA.


General Government Debt

 Manatee County has over seven funding sources paying General Government Debt and the General Fund carries 65.38 percent of the load. Current, outstanding debt is going to be maturing some of the sources, and using maturity times to leverage into using and bonding for more is something that is part of the factors utilized in the debt plan. A General Government Debt slide of principal and interest was shown.


Enterprise Debt


 Enterprise Debt currently consists of four, outstanding debt in a total Enterprise debt of \$384,355,000. The County pays \$22,845,263 a year in debt service, and it is already accounted for in the increased utility rates, approved March 28.


 As to the Debt for Recommended CIP FY24-28, the plan is to bond \$1 billion. Of the \$693 million that Utilities has in the Plan, the County has already bonded \$200 million. There is much more to do to meet the capacity projects in the Plan, which also includes the Lake Manatee Dam project.


 Staff has ideas to go after other funding for transportation and they would be brought to the Board with more concise information to move them along.

 Changes from FY23 adopted to FY24 Recommended CIP slide shows all the CIP changes from 2023 to present could be found on the County's Website, www.manatee.org, Capital Improvement Booklet for FY24. The IST Changes – All Categories slide can also be found on the County's website.


 She addressed the slide of Summary of Reserves FY24 Recommended, stating the \$110,063,628 Reserve for Capital has been earmarked.


 Upon question by Commissioner Bearden as to whether Reserves funding can be shifted, it just depends upon the funding. Each one of the funds have their stabilizations. This will become clear during the presentation on the Fund Summary.


 Commissioner Ballard had proposed using some of the General funding for bookmobiles, and she questioned if the Library Impact Fees could be used for bookmobiles.


 Ms. McLean would have to refer to Nicole Knapp.


 Commissioner Ballard stated this should be funded in a different way.


 Commissioner Satcher questioned if a CIP Project could be paused in the case of a declared emergency in Manatee County.


 Mr. Clague stated this could be done, because the contracts for these CIP projects have force majeure provision for this.

 Nicole Knapp, Interim Director of Development Services, stated she believes the County could fund the book mobile and materials.

 Commissioner Satcher pointed out that, with the operations budget where it is and options if facing an emergency, he is hopeful that a way could be found to fully fund the Sheriff and still lower the millage

 Commissioner Ballard stated the Board must be willing to make tough decisions; there is a lot of growth but it is not guaranteed forever and the Board cannot act like it will.


 Commissioner Baugh stated last year's budget condition was great until Hurricane Ian came. She questioned if the Chief Financial Officer could make this work and make the decisions to make this work.


 Commissioner Satcher hopes to find a way forward; if we cannot find the \$1.5 million, \$7 million and general impact projects of \$7million in District 1, safety and backing law enforcement is paramount, he would seriously consider moving \$7 million from his district.


RECESS/RECONVENE: 12:01 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. All Commissioners were present.

TOTAL RECOMMENDED FY 24 BUDGET – PART I


Sheila Mclean, Financial Management Director, responded to Commissioner Satcher, that if going back as far as 2019 to review the budgeted dollars versus spent dollars. \$524 million; \$456 million was spent at 87 percent.

 She reviewed projects including U.S. 41 intersection/17th Street, Ellenton Gillette/U.S. 301, Moccasin Wallow Road/Gateway Boulevard, Canal Road/U.S. 41, and 51st Avenue East, Ellenton/U.S. 301, and 17th Street for \$21.9 million. In the CIP, there is an additional projecting coming in - Buckeye Road project estimated amount of \$1.1 million. All these projects have large opportunity for impact. This information would be provided to Board members.


 Ms. McLean used a slide presentation on the Total FY budget at \$1,103,239,581. She displayed a Fund Summary Sample Balanced Budget. Not all the departments are funded by the General Fund.


 She addressed a Fund Summary – CIP Funds for a total of \$460,733,798. She started with the Infrastructure Sales Tax funding source and how strong it has been coming on for the past few years. She addressed a slide of IST Tax Operating and Capital Project Funds slide showing the Revenues to be received during Fiscal Year. IST Revenues is a large revenue stream, Interest Income, Transfers from other funds, Loan proceeds. All Revenues were combined. She addressed Budgeted Expenditures by Department.

2022 Revenue Improvement Fund


 Of the \$232 million, a lot of the projects are in motion from having a bonding source. This assures the Board that the funds will be used in the timeframe of allowable use. She addressed a beginning balance/budgeted cash for FY of \$33,941,850. On July 27, a reconciliation on what has changed will show what funds have already been committed. A lot of the projects identified under this bond issuance came out of the GMP and at a much higher value.

Building Capital Projects Fund


 She stated Capital Project Funds include multi-year project budgets carried over from the previous year and are not reflected on this breakdown.

 Upon question by Commissioner Bearden as to what point does staff move the funds, Ms. McLean stated departments present the projects for funding, which are then identified to qualify for funding. Operating Funds are the last source for funding. Whatever funds are not utilized at the end of the funding year are returned back. Staff starts identifying funding for the upcoming fiscal year.


Gas Tax Capital Projects Funds

 This fund is monitored on a daily basis.

Highway Capital Project Funds


 These Funds are funded by operating sources or grants. Six Funds are included.

Parks and Recreation Capital Projects Funds


 This fund is more scarce in funding and does not fund as may CIP projects as others. Any unused funds go back into the Parks and Recreation Funds.


(Depart/Enter Chairman Van Ostenbridge)

Library Capital Project Funds

 Reserves are planned for Rocky Bluff project.

Road Impact Fee Project Funds


 The total is \$39.3 million, with an expectation of impact fees totaling \$29 million with transfers going into project funds. Total reserves equal \$44,753,242. This source has been very strong due to growth

 Commissioner Satcher referenced the Highway Capital Project Funds and asked if the Board should be looking for more projects.


This is a fund that can fund inflation for transportation-related projects.

(Depart/Enter Chairman Van Ostenbridge)

Parks Impact Fee Funds and Capital Project Funds

 In FY24, predictions are to start with \$2.3 million; during the year to receive \$6.3 million in revenues. The ending of FY24/beginning of FY25 is for the continuation of the CIP Plan.


Library Impact Fee Fund

 In FY22 and adopted FY23 cash balance does not connect, because in FY23 a budget was already done. The funds starts at \$3.6 million with \$1.7 million anticipated in revenues. One funding source is compensated with another.


Law Enforcement Impact Fee Funds

The fund starts with cash of \$2.2 million, with an expectation of revenues of \$2.4 million, with a balanced budget of \$3.4 million.

Utilities Capital Project Funds

 These funds account for the capital projects associated with the Utilities System from Potable Water and Wastewater. Capital project funds include multi-year project budgets carried over from previous years and are not reflected on the fund breakdowns.

Solid Waste Capital Project Funds

 This is a source that only has one project, starting with cash \$1.2 million e for FY24 for a full budget of \$4,090,477.

TOMORROW

Ms. Mclean stated the Utilities Department would present their budget tomorrow, June 14, followed by a presentation on Fund Summaries by Financial Management staff.

There being no public comment, Chairman Van Ostenbridge closed public comments.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Van Ostenbridge adjourned the work session at 2:13 p.m.

Minutes Approved: November 14, 2023