

Clearwater, Florida, April 12, 2012

The Pinellas County Business Technology Services Board met in regular session at 1:05 P.M. on this date in the County Commission Assembly Room, Pinellas County Courthouse, Clearwater, Florida, with the following members present:

Susan Latvala, County Commissioner, Chairman
Pam Dubov, Property Appraiser, Vice-Chairman
Rick Becker, representing Deborah B. Clark, Supervisor of Elections (Voting)
Bob Dillinger, Public Defender
Robert Gualtieri, Sheriff
Alan Hebdon, representing Ken Burke, Clerk of the Circuit Court (Non Voting)
Robert S. LaSala, County Administrator
Bernie McCabe, State Attorney
Diane Nelson, Tax Collector

Late Arrival

Chief Judge J. Thomas McGrady, Sixth Judicial Circuit

Not Present

Ken Burke, Clerk of the Circuit Court
Deborah B. Clark, Supervisor of Elections
Kenneth T. Welch, County Commissioner

Also Present

Paul F. Alexander, III, Director of Business Technology Services (BTS)
Dennis R. Long, Chief Assistant County Attorney
BTS Department Staff
Arlene L. Smitke, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk

AGENDA

1. Call to Order (Chair, Commissioner Latvala)
2. Designation of Voting Proxies (Chair, Commissioner Latvala)
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Chair, Commissioner Latvala)
BTS Board Meeting – January 19, 2012
4. Action Item – Approval of Strategic Business Plan (Paul Alexander)
5. Action Item – Approval of Budget Proposal FY13 (Paul Alexander)
6. Adjournment (Chair, Commissioner Latvala)

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Latvala called the meeting to order at 1:05 P.M.

DESIGNATION OF VOTING PROXIES

Responding to query by Chairman Latvala, Mr. Hebdon indicated that he is representing Clerk of the Circuit Court Ken Burke in a non-voting capacity; and Mr. Becker related that he in attendance as a voting proxy for Supervisor of Elections Deborah Clark.

MINUTES OF JANUARY 19, 2012 MEETING – APPROVED WITH UPDATE

Upon presentation by Chairman Latvala of the January 19, 2012 meeting minutes, Ms. Dubov referred to the EGIS Enterprise License Agreement item on Page 4 and provided an update, noting that negotiations with ESRI have been concluded; and that the total cost of the agreement will not exceed \$780,000 per year, in compliance with the Board's direction, although the costs are front loaded, exceeding the \$780,000 figure during the first year; whereupon, responding to query by Mr. McCabe, she related that the first year cost will be \$936,000, and the second year cost will be zero.

Thereupon, Ms. Dubov moved, seconded by Mr. Dillinger and carried, that the Board acknowledge that the total cost of the Enterprise License Agreement is less than \$780,000 annually, but that one year will exceed that amount, while other years will offset the overage.

Later in the meeting, Ms. Dubov moved, seconded by Mr. LaSala and carried, that the minutes of the January 19, 2012 meeting be approved with clarification of the ESRI agreement amount as noted above.

2012 STRATEGIC BUSINESS PLAN AND FISCAL YEAR 2013 BUDGET PROPOSAL

Mr. Alexander indicated that the Strategic Business Plan and BTS Budget would be addressed in a single presentation and recommended that the Board take action on the items by separate vote following the presentation, and no objections were noted.

Mr. Alexander conducted a PowerPoint presentation titled *Pinellas County Business Technology Services Strategic Business Plan 2012 and BTS Budget Executive Overview, Version 1.0*, which has been filed and made a part of the record. He discussed the Vision and

Mission Statements, noting that the BTS Department exists to enable the business with speed and scale.

Referring to the *Pinellas County Business Technology Services Strategic Business Plan 2012*, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, Mr. Alexander related that over the past several years, BTS has implemented a series of budget reduction strategies to address the immediate and long-term challenges that have resulted from the economic downturn; that it has collaborated and partnered with the Constitutional Officers, BCC agencies, and the Courts to enable business strategies that have enhanced the mission of Pinellas County Government at large; and that the Strategic Business Plan indicates that the coming year will be one of continued transformation and collaboration.

* * * *

Chief Judge McGrady entered the meeting at 1:11 P.M.

* * * *

Referring to the various business services provided by BTS to its customers throughout the enterprise on a day-to-day basis, BTS Deputy Director David James reviewed current metrics related to system security, network availability, telephones access, customer support, web site design and maintenance, on-line payments, and other related services.

Mr. James indicated that, as a result of the leadership of the BTS Board and governance committees, BTS has made considerable progress on major strategic initiatives over the last year; whereupon, he highlighted enterprise accomplishments with regard to the following initiatives:

- = Justice Consolidated Case Management System (Justice CCMS)
- = Oracle Project Unified Solution (OPUS)
- = Community Health & Electronic Data Application System (CHEDAS)
- = Enterprise Geographic Information Systems (EGIS)
- = Enterprise Asset Management (EAM)

Mr. James indicated that BTS continues to partner with the individual Board members and their staff on initiatives of particular importance to them; and gave an update regarding customer business services provided to the BCC Departments, the Courts, and each of the Constitutional Officers; whereupon, he described services to be provided under an agreement with the Juvenile Welfare Board (JWB), noting that a partnership between the JWB and Pinellas

County Health and Human Services will allow collaboration and data sharing using the CHEDAS platform.

Enterprise Architecture Manager Jason Malpass indicated that each year as part of its strategic planning process, BTS reaches out to the County departments and agencies through its Common Requirements Visioning/Trends questionnaire; that the purpose of the questionnaire is to provide feedback regarding needs and concerns of the businesses and the people they interact with every day; and that the responses are analyzed to provide a basis for the Strategic Plan; whereupon, he reviewed the primary strategic and recurring priorities for the coming year, as follows:

- = Enhance and Maintain the Production Environment
- = Major Projects: Justice CCMS, OPUS, CHEDAS, EGIS, EAM
- = Business Process Disciplines
 - = Strategic Planning
 - = Security Management
 - = Project Management
 - = Service Management
- = Application/Data Portfolio Management and Service Modernization
- = Investing in Talent and High Performance Organization

Mr. Malpass displayed a list of Major Business Strategies for the coming year and provided a brief explanation of each item, indicating that additional details are provided on Pages 26 through 32 of the Strategic Plan document.

Describing the timeline of major technological advances since the 1980s, Mr. Malpass indicated that a revolution is taking place today in the field of mobile technology; whereupon, he conducted a demonstration utilizing a laptop computer, an iPad mobile device, and video conferencing software to communicate with a colleague at a remote location via live streaming video. He indicated that information can be synchronized among mobile devices utilizing “Cloud” computing technology; and provided practical examples of how mobile devices could someday be used by County workers in the field to consult with in-house personnel regarding real-time conditions, noting that the Wi-Fi infrastructure is continuing to improve over time.

Discussion ensued and responding to query by Ms. Nelson pertaining to backup of information stored on the Cloud, Messrs. Malpass and Alexander related that there is a distinction between the public Cloud, which is out on the Internet, and a private Cloud, over which the

County would have more control; and that the County would not be reliant upon an outside entity for backup and recovery operations.

Responding to query by Mr. McCabe, Mr. Alexander confirmed that the cost of replacing the aging network cable infrastructure is estimated at between \$8 million and \$12 million over a five- to ten-year period; whereupon, Mr. McCabe asked whether it would make sense to plan on a totally wireless environment. Mr. Malpass related that, unlike a hard-wired connection, the quality and reliability of a wireless data transmission cannot be guaranteed at this time; that a limited number of wireless devices can be supported at any one location before the bandwidth reaches saturation; that the use of wireless technology will offset the need for replacement of the current infrastructure to some degree; and that it will be necessary to monitor the changing technology over the next several years, replacing the existing infrastructure only to the extent necessary.

Mr. Alexander indicated that the strategy will be a mixed approach, utilizing copper wire, fiber optic, wireless, and microwave technologies where appropriate; that even wireless devices must be wired back through a communication closet to a network switch; and that some wire replacement will be required to address anticipated performance issues.

APPROVAL OF FISCAL YEAR 2013 BUDGET PROPOSAL

Continuing the PowerPoint presentation Mr. Alexander displayed a chart showing a total proposed budget of \$35,015,105 comprised of a Base Operating Budget in the amount of \$16,061,550 and Cost Pools totaling \$18,953,555; whereupon, referring to the EGIS licensing agreement discussed earlier in the meeting by Ms. Dubov, he related that the Enterprise License & Maintenance Cost Pool will be reduced by \$400,000, as no payment will be due to ESRI in Fiscal Year 2013.

Thereupon, Mr. Alexander provided a brief review of the Budget Issues, noting that he had discussed the items with each of the Board members at length prior to today's meeting. He indicated that the Justice ccms project is scheduled for completion in September of Fiscal Year 2013; that an additional \$3.9 million will be required to fully fund the project; and responding to queries by the members, related that the expense was included in the approved project budget of \$11.439 million; that funding has been provided on a yearly basis coincident with the project schedule; and that delaying funding to the next fiscal year would have undesirable consequences. Referring to the OPUS project, Mr. Alexander requested funding in the amount of \$250,000 to cover recurring costs for production support positions, in accordance with the OPUS business case.

April 12, 2012

Responding to query by Sheriff Gualtieri, Mr. Alexander confirmed that the Budget Issues represent requests for additional funding on top of the “Total Budget” amount of \$35 million; and Sheriff Gualtieri inquired as to the proposed funding source, noting that he would oppose use of the Service Level Stabilization Fund for BTS Budget Issues. At the request of Mr. Dillinger, Mr. LaSala explained that the BCC has set aside approximately \$27 million over the last two years in a separate reserve, or stabilization, fund to be used to fill the gap between available revenues and projected expenditures to maintain a sustainable level of service as the budget begins to stabilize; whereupon, he noted that stabilization may not occur as soon as originally anticipated, due to new unfunded state mandates for Medicaid and the potential of further degradation of revenue as the result of proposed amendments in the upcoming November election.

Discussion ensued wherein Sheriff Gualtieri indicated that the Stabilization Fund was built by budget cuts from the Constitutional Officers and BCC Departments with the intent that it be used to assuage General Fund deficits; and that it would be unfair to those who built the fund to have it diverted for one-time BTS expenditures; whereupon, he expressed concern that a consensus by the BTS Board in support of the Budget Issues might be taken as a recommendation to the BCC to provide funding.

Mr. LaSala related that the action requested today does not speak to specific funding sources; and responding to query by Chief Judge McGrady, Chairman Latvala clarified that the BTS Board would be setting a list of its wants and priorities; and that it would be up to the BCC to decide whether or not to approve the requests; whereupon, expressing concerns regarding the effects of recent legislative action, she urged the members to continue to work together to identify opportunities for consolidation and savings.

Continuing his discussion of the Budget Issues, Mr. Alexander referred to the request for funding for the Public Safety Complex Data Center, indicating that he had spoken with Real Estate Management Director Paul Sacco yesterday; and that due to changes in the project schedule, the \$1.3 million one-time expenditure could be deferred until Fiscal Year 2014, delaying the onset of recurring maintenance costs of \$260,000 to Fiscal Year 2015. In response to query by Chairman Latvala, Mr. LaSala agreed to determine whether the \$1.3 million could be paid as part of the capital cost for the project.

Mr. Dillinger noted that the decision whether to fund the requests will be up to the County Commission, not the BTS Board, and inquired as to the purpose of the discussion; whereupon, Chairman Latvala indicated that the Base Budget, in particular, must be approved by the BTS Board before Mr. Alexander can present it to the County Commission; that the Commissioners will need to find a way to fund the department for the coming year; that they will

need to make tough decisions regarding the Budget Issues; and that approval of the Issues by the BTS Board would acknowledge that they are important and need to be addressed. Sheriff Gualtieri reiterated his concerns regarding the funding source, indicating that he would weigh the importance of each request against any possible sacrifice resulting from the diversion of funds from another purpose; whereupon, Chairman Latvala stated that the funding decision is not his to make, noting that the Commission values input from the Constitutional Officers and will have discussions with them later in the budgeting process.

Ms. Nelson suggested that the Board vote today to approve the budget and Customer Project Issues and that the Customer Requests be addressed separately, noting that she is interested in the Call Center Work Force Management item; and that she would consider funding it out of her own budget.

Chief Judge McGrady inquired whether the Board could approve the Base Budget and Cost Pools and address the Justice ccms project under a separate vote; and Attorney Long related that the County has a legal obligation to pay for services related to the Justice ccms project, unless it wishes to terminate the contract; and suggested that the item be addressed as part of the Base Budget or separately from the other Budget Issues; whereupon, Mr. Alexander requested that the Board indicate its position on all of the requests, noting that it has been his practice only to include those items supported by the BTS Board in his presentation to the BCC.

Mr. McCabe suggested that the Board vote to approve the items denominated in the Base Budget and Cost Pools (\$35,015,105), as well as the Justice ccms (\$3,910,060) and OPUS (\$250,000) projects; and that the Public Safety Complex request be excluded based on the revised timeline; and Chief Judge McGrady so moved, seconded by Mr. Dillinger; whereupon, Mr. Alexander noted that the Cost Pools amount would be reduced by \$400,000 due to elimination of the EGIS Enterprise License and Maintenance expense, as discussed earlier, and upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Dillinger pointed out that the BCC CADD Support issue (\$160,000) had not been addressed; whereupon, Mr. McCabe moved, seconded by Mr. LaSala and carried unanimously, that the item be included in the previous motion.

In response to Mr. Alexander's request for input from the Board regarding the Customer Requests Budget Issues, Mr. Dillinger indicated that the items are of much lower priority than those just voted on; and that they should be considered subject to availability of funding. Mr. McCabe concurred, expressing concern that if the Tax Collector or another entity were to fund a project on their own, it may not be compatible with the enterprise system. Mr. LaSala suggested that the Board adopt a policy that such funding be transferred to the BTS

budget; and that the project be subject to approval by the BTS Board, with the funds and programs to be managed by BTS. Ms. Nelson disagreed, indicating that she seeks collaboration where possible, but would not wish to have her hands tied by BTS, noting that as an elected official, she has the authority to act on her own; whereupon, Mr. Dillinger noted that the BTS Board members had previously signed an agreement not to do so.

Discussion ensued wherein Mr. LaSala clarified that the purpose of his suggestion was to direct the funding to BTS in order to ensure technical compatibility and alignment of software and hardware systems with the overall enterprise and network. He indicated that there are already problems in a number of areas where shadow budgets and shadow programs have been developed, expressing concern that the entities may eventually break away to function independently without the Board's guidance, prioritization, or support; that proceeding independently from the Board would be in direct conflict with the existing policy; and that existing violations, including initiatives by the Clerk of the Circuit Court, need to be addressed by the Board.

Referring to the impact of recent legislative actions, Chairman Latvala stressed the importance of the BCC and Constitutional Officers continuing to work together to reduce costs and avoid dividing resources by setting up independent systems; whereupon, Mr. LaSala suggested that the Board direct Mr. Alexander and his staff to prepare a multi-year financial forecast encompassing all Information Systems/Information Technology costs within County Government to assist the Board and the BCC in making informed decisions regarding the budget.

Discussion returned to the Customer Request Budget Issues, and in response to query by Mr. Dillinger, Mr. Alexander provided information pertaining to the Wi-Fi Connectivity (\$750,000) and Wide Area Network Redundancy (\$78,000) Issues, noting that they are the two areas that would benefit the entire County, while the remaining requests represent opportunities stemming from pockets of interest expressed by various agencies. Referring to the earlier wireless technology demonstration by Mr. Malpass, Ms. Dubov indicated that an investment in Wi-Fi Connectivity could significantly reduce the cost of replacing the aging cable infrastructure; that the County must weigh the option of spending the money now versus the cost of continuing to do things the old way; and that she believes the Board must at least make a recommendation to the BCC in support of the initiative.

Stating his assumption that the BCC puts some weight on the recommendations of the BTS Board and will take them into consideration as it wrestles with funding decisions, Sheriff Gualtieri expressed his reluctance to support the initiative for fear that the recommendation may be misread to indicate that the Board believes it should be funded from some pot of money, even if that includes the Stabilization Fund; and that depletion of the Stabilization Fund could result in

unintended consequences, such as the loss of additional deputy positions; whereupon, Chairman Latvala expressed concern that it may be necessary to use the Stabilization Fund to comply with unfunded state mandates.

Chairman Latvala indicated that the BCC will be considering all options during the upcoming budget process; and that it needs to know whether the BTS Board collectively considers one or more of the options to be important, to be pursued if and when the County can afford it; whereupon, she promised the Sheriff that she would not hold the recommendation against him; and that he will have the opportunity to work with the BCC to ensure that public safety is adequately funded to the best of its ability.

Mr. Alexander indicated that a decision not to fund the Wi-Fi, Wide Area Network Redundancy, and similar initiatives must be supported by all Board members, as it is important to maintain a standard across the enterprise; and that a decision to move forward independently could cause a contentious situation and end up costing more in the long run.

Ms. Nelson suggested that the Board recommend approval of the Customer Request for Wi-Fi Connectivity in the amount of \$750,000, provided funding is available without using the Stabilization Fund; whereupon, Mr. Dillinger moved, seconded by Chief Judge McGrady and carried unanimously, that, as a lower priority than the Base Budget and Cost Pools and subject to available funding, the BTS Board recommend approval of the Wi-Fi Connectivity and Wide Area Network Redundancy Customer Request Issues, in the amounts previously noted. Following the vote, Chairman Latvala stated that, while it is highly unlikely that the Issues will be funded this year, it is important that the BTS Board and BCC members know that the expenditures need to be made.

Mr. Alexander noted for clarification that the remaining three items, Call Center Work Force Management, Video Conferencing, and Mobile Device Management, will not be included in his presentation to the BCC; and no objections were noted.

Thereupon, Mr. LaSala moved, seconded by Mr. McCabe and carried unanimously, that the Board direct Mr. Alexander, along with BTS and Office of Management and Budget staff, to begin a financial strategic planning program to establish a multi-year forecast for the benefit of the BCC Board and the County Commission.

April 12, 2012

APPROVAL OF BTS STRATEGIC BUSINESS PLAN

Mr. Alexander requested that the Board approve the Strategic Business Plan; whereupon, Mr. Dillinger moved, seconded by Chief Judge McGrady and carried unanimously, that the Pinellas County Business Technology Services Strategic Business Plan be approved.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:27 P.M.