



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

Legislative Analysis

Internal Management & Fiscal Responsibility
Committee

July 12, 2011
2:00 P.M.
Commission Chamber

Charles Anderson, CPA
Commission Auditor
111 NW First Street, Suite 1030
Miami, Florida 33128
305-375-4354

**Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners
Office of the Commission Auditor**

**Legislative Notes
Internal Management & Fiscal Responsibility Committee
Meeting Agenda**

July 12, 2011

Written legislative analyses for the below listed items are attached for your consideration:

Item Number(s)

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1(E)2 Substitute | 2(J) Substitute |
| 2(K) | 3(J) |
| 3(K) | 3(L) |
| 3(M) | 3(R) |

Acknowledgements--Analyses prepared by:
Bia Marsellos, Legislative Supervisor
Michael Amador-Gil, Senior Legislative Analyst
Elizabeth N. Owens, Legislative Analyst
Mia Marin, Legislative Analyst

**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR**



Legislative Notes

Agenda Item: 1(E)2 Substitute, 2(J) Substitute and 2(K)

File Number: 111476, 111479, and 110860

Committee(s) of Reference: Internal Management and Fiscal Responsibility

Date of Analysis: July 7, 2011

Type of Item: Ordinance and Resolution

District: 2

Prime Sponsor: Commissioner Jean Monestime

Summary

These items approve the following:

- Legislative Item No. 111476 – 1(E) Substitute - Ordinance appointing the Board of Commissioners of the N.W. 79th Street Corridor Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA), designating terms of office, and delegating certain redevelopment powers;
- Legislative Item No. 111479 – 2(J) Substitute - Ordinance establishing the N.W. 79th Street Corridor CRA Community Redevelopment and Revitalization Trust Fund (Fund); and
- Legislative Item No. 110860 – 2(K)- Resolution approving the Redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the N.W. 79th Street Corridor Community Redevelopment Area.

Legislative Item No. 111476 – Item 1(E) Substitute provides for the following community redevelopment powers to be delegated to the N.W. 79th Street Corridor CRA:

- Initiate, prepare and adopt a redevelopment plan and amendments to that plan, but subject to subsequent review and approval by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC);
- CRA cannot commit itself or the County to any expenditure of funds without the specific approval of the BCC;
- Powers not specifically delegated to the agency are reserved exclusively by the BCC; and
- Names and appoints five candidates to serve as commissioners of the CRA, designates two of the five commissioners to serve as chair and vice-chair of the CRA and provides language requiring all future appointments (chairs, vice-chairs and members of CRA) will be made by resolution of the BCC.

Legislative Item No. 111476 serves as a substitute item for Legislative Item No. 111038 (Item 1E2 on this Agenda). The substitute item differs from the original in that the substitute names and appoints five candidates to serve as commissioners of the 79th Street Corridor CRA. Additionally, Legislative item No. 111304 (Item 1E2 Supplement on this Agenda) provides Trust Fund projected revenues at a contribution rate of 75% Tax Increment Financing (TIF) to total \$3,670,056 at the end of ten years. Subsequently, should the

BCC approve to extend the life of the CRA up to thirty years the total Trust Fund projected revenues at a 75% rate would be \$71,671,400.

Legislative Item No. 111479 – Item 2(J) Substitute - provides for the establishment of the Fund to include the following:

- Sets forth the County and Unincorporated Municipal Service Area (UMSA) obligation to appropriate tax increment revenue to the Fund;
- Ninety-five (95) percent of the County's tax increment to be deposited in the Fund for an initial period of ten (10) years;
- County to review and authorize CRA bond indentures and other financing instruments.

Legislative Item No. 111479 serves as a substitute item for Legislative Item No. 111078 (Item 2J on this Agenda). The substitute item differs from the original in that the substitute deletes the Manager's memorandum and the reference to the memorandum in the last whereas clause of the ordinance, and specifically identifies the resolution approving the Community Redevelopment Plan.

Legislative Item No. 110860 - Item 2(K) - approves the Community Redevelopment Plan for the N.W. 79th Street Corridor Community Redevelopment Area that addresses the needs and overall redevelopment goals of the target area. The Community Redevelopment Plan identifies six catalytic project areas along with strategies that consider the surrounding community, the preservation of historical buildings, and community heritage. The six catalytic project areas include:

- Infill and replacement housing programs to include the attraction of private developers, owner home rehabilitations, replacement of sub-standard housing, promotion of mixed use and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects;
- Economic development programs to attract large tenants to industrial area, construct new retail/office facilities, attract and assist in the creation of TODs;
- Road Improvements to address congestion along N.W. 79th Street, N.W. 27th Avenue, N.W. 22 Avenue, N.W. 17th Avenue and N.W. 12th Avenue;
- Right-of-way and streetscape improvements along all major roads;
- Infrastructure and utility improvements to support new development; and
- Community policing, crime prevention and code enforcement officers.

Legislative Item No. 111433 (2K Supplement on this Agenda) provides Trust Fund projected revenues at a contribution rate of 95% TIF to total \$4,648,738 at the end of ten years. Subsequently, should the BCC approve to extend the life of the CRA up to thirty years the total Trust Fund projected revenues at a 95% rate would be \$90,783,774. The County has incurred reimbursable expenses in the amount of \$88,950 for the cost of the Redevelopment Plan and the Finding of Necessity, which it expects to have reimbursed through the CRA Trust fund once it is established.

Legislative items 1(E) Substitute, 2(J) Substitute and 2(K), if approved by the Board of County Commissioners, would result in the creation of the N.W. 79th Street Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA).

Background

On May 5, 2009, the Board of County Commissioners approved R-566-09, which accepted the Finding of Necessity for the N.W. 79th Street Corridor Redevelopment Area.

The N.W. 79th Street Corridor Redevelopment Area consists of approximately 1,254 acres, and is generally bounded on the North by N.W. 87 Street, bounded on the East by N.W. 7th Avenue, bounded on the south by N.W. 62 Street, and bounded on the West by N.W. 37th Avenue.

Fiscal Impact

Approval of the Legislative Item No. 111479- Item 2J Substitute- will allow ninety-five (95) percent of County's TIF to be deposited in the Fund for an initial period of ten (10) years to total \$4,648,738. Subsequently, should the BCC approve to extend the life of the CRA up to thirty (30) years the total Trust Fund projected revenues would be \$90,783,774.

Legislative Item No. 111304 – Item 1E2 Supplement – provides Trust Fund projected revenues at a contribution rate of 75% TIF to total \$3,670,056 at the end of ten years. Subsequently, should the BCC approve to extend the life of the CRA up to thirty years the total Trust Fund projected revenues at a 75% rate would be \$71,671,400.

Additional Information

On April 4, 2011, the BCC approved Resolution R-223-11, which accepted the Finding of Necessity (FON) study for the expansion of the boundaries of the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor Redevelopment Area.

Currently, there are twelve (12) approved Community Redevelopment Agencies (CRA) in Miami-Dade County: 7th Avenue Corridor, Homestead, City Center, Southeast Overtown/Park West, Omni, Midtown Miami, North Miami, North Miami Beach, South Miami, Florida City, Naranja Lakes, and West Perrine.

Approval of the legislative items 1(E)2 Substitute, 2(J) Substitute and 2(K) will create the N.W. 79th Street Corridor CRA. If the above-mentioned items are approved, the only CRA pending BCC approval is the Goulds/Cutler Ridge.

Below is a list of the twelve approved CRAs and their TIF contribution rate:

| CRA | TIF Contribution Rate |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 7 th Avenue Corridor | 95% |
| Homestead | 95% |
| City Center | 95% |
| Southeast Overtown/Park West | 95% |
| Omni | 95%/County gets refund of 35% of the total TIF collected |
| Midtown Miami | 95% |
| North Miami | 95%/County gets a refund of all County TIF collected west of Biscayne Boulevard |
| North Miami Beach | 95% |
| South Miami | 50% |
| Florida City | 95% |
| Naranja Lakes | 95% |
| West Perrine | 95% |

Prepared by: Mia B. Marin

**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR**



Legislative Notes

Agenda Item: 3(J), 3(K), and 3(L)

File Number: 111353, 111357, and 111358

**Committee(s)
of Reference:** Internal Management and Fiscal Responsibility

Date of Analysis: July 7, 2011

Districts: 3 and 5

Type of Item: Resolution

Summary

Legislative Item No. 111353/Agenda Item 3J: Authorizes an execution of a retroactive *Lease Agreement* with Miami-Dade County and the City of Miami (City) for *City-owned* property located at 1009 N.W. 5 Avenue, Miami, Florida for the continued operation of a State-funded Jefferson Reeves primary care facility.

Legislative Item No. 111357/Agenda Item 3K: Authorizes an execution of a retroactive *amendment* to a Lease Agreement with the City for County-owned property located at 111 N.W. 1 Street, Miami, Florida, specifically in the 30th floor Transmitter Room and space on the roof for a radio antenna.

Legislative Item No. 111358/Agenda Item 3L: Authorizes an execution of a retroactive Lease Agreement for the *City-owned* property located at 971 N.W. 2 Street, Miami, Florida with the City. The property will continue to be used for the operation of the State-funded Dr. Rafael A. Peñalver Clinic primary care facility.

Background and Relevant Information

Items 3J and 3L will allow continued operation of the State-funded Primary Care Facilities (Dr. Rafael A. Peñalver Clinic and Jefferson Reeves) on City-owned property. On October 16, 1990, the Board of County Commissioners, authorized the leases with the City of Miami whereby the County leased from the City of Miami two (2) parcels of land located at (1) 971 N.W. 2 Street, Miami, Florida and (2) 1009 N.W. 5 Street, Miami, Florida for the development of two (2) State-funded primary care facilities.

The leases were for a period of twenty (20) years from October 1, 1990 through September 30, 2010, and the rental rate was \$1.00 per year. According to the Manager's Memo, in order to continue the operations of the two facilities, the terms for each property must be extended five years and six months and subsequent five-year renewal option period, since there are no more renewal options available.

The City of Miami advised that in order to maintain the rental rate at \$1.00 per year that it charged the County for the two parcels mentioned above, the City seeks an amendment with the County to reduce the rental rate it paid to the County for the space it leased at the 111 N.W. 1 Street, Miami (SPCC) 30th floor transmitter room and roof, from \$14,000.00 per year to \$1.00 per year.

Additional Information

In response to questions posed by the Office of the Commission Auditor, General Services Administration staff provides the following information below:

- Has the County made this type of arrangement before with other jurisdictions? *Most leases that the County has, as Landlord or Tenant, with other governmental agencies are for a nominal value (\$1.00 per year). Very rarely do governmental agencies charge each other rent.*
- If the leases ended on September 2010, why didn't the County turn over the operations to the State? *Pursuant to Chapter 154 F.S. Miami-Dade County and the State of Florida Department of Health annually enter into a contract that states the County's obligation as it relates to the operation of the Miami-Dade County Health Department. The County is required to provide facilities for the operation of the Miami-Dade County Health Department. These two clinics are included in that contract.*
- Why is the County still involved in this process? *Since the County is required to provide the facilities pursuant to the Contract mentioned above, and the land is owned by the City, the County is required to lease the land from the City.*
- Can the state and the city negotiate the new leasing terms without the County? *Pursuant to the contract the County is responsible for providing the facilities not the State.*
- Regarding the SPCC lease agreement, to date, how much revenue has the County received from the lease with the city for the usage of the 30th floor space? *The City has been leasing that space since 1985. The total revenue to date is approximately \$250,000.*
- If approved this would constitute a decrease in revenue, how would this be beneficial to the County? *The City has indicated that if the lease amendment is not approved, the County would have to start paying rent for the land, which would be more than what the County is currently receiving from the City.*
 - As mentioned above in GSA's response, government entities rarely charge each other rent, why would the City of Miami begin charging the County now if the SPCC lease agreement is not approved?
- Were other County departments, and/or municipalities notified of the opportunity to lease this space? If no, please explain why? *No, however, there are already several other agencies using the roof and 30th floor for communications equipment and only governmental agencies have been allowed to lease the space.*

Prepared by: Michael Amador-Gil

**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR**



Legislative Notes

Agenda Item: 3(M)
File Number: 111377
**Committee(s)
of Reference:** Internal Management and Fiscal Responsibility
Date of Analysis: July 7, 2011
Type of Item: Resolution

Summary

This resolution authorizes the exchanges of County-owned property located at 305 S.E. 5 Avenue, Homestead, Florida for City of Homestead-owned property located at 326 N.W. 4 Street, Homestead, Florida for the purpose of constructing *a new facility for the Homestead Fire Station No. 16*, allowing for County possession and control of the entire parcel for future County needs.

Background and Relevant Information

The existing Fire Station No. 16 located at 323 N.W. 2nd Street, Homestead, Florida, and was constructed in 1959 and consists of approximately 9,954 square feet. The new location for the entire fire station is approximately 44,964 square feet of unimproved vacant land located at 255 N.W. 4th Avenue, Homestead, Florida north of the existing Fire Station No. 16.

According to the Manager's Memo, the existing station has deteriorated resulting in an unsuitable environment for emergency personnel.

As part of the exchange of properties with the City, Miami-Dade County will retain approximately 86,967 square feet of improved City-owned land located at 326 N.W. 3 Avenue, Homestead, Florida, which contains a structure leased to Miami Bridge, Inc. Miami Bridge, Inc's purpose is to provide emergency shelter, food and counseling for at-risk youths and their families. The lease term is thirty years, beginning July 15, 1990, and terminating June 30, 2020, with an option-to-renew the lease for an additional thirty years.

The current annual rent is \$2,500.00 and the option-to-renew provides for an increase in rent to \$3,000.00 per year.

An Assignment of Lease Agreement transfers the business lease, dated July 15, 1990, between the City of Homestead and Miami Bridge, Inc. to Miami-Dade County.

Additional Information

In response to questions posed by the Office of the Commission Auditor, Miami-Dade Fire Department staff provided the following information:

- Did the BCC approve construction of the fire station? *The replacement of Homestead Fire Rescue Station 16 was on the list of Economic Stimulus Program projects approved by the Board of County Commissioners on February 2, 2010 via resolution R-133-10. The fire station was not required to go through the county governmental facilities hearing process because it is located within the municipal boundaries of the City of Homestead. Approval by the City of Homestead was granted by the Homestead City Council in January 2009 via resolution R2009-01-06.*
- Was there a solicitation? *Yes, there was a competitive solicitation for construction bids through 374240-CON ESP dated June 8, 2010.*
- Who designed the Fire Station? *The station was designed by Landera & Associate Architects located at 7500 SW 57 Ave, Suite D. South Miami, Florida.*
- Is the \$6.8 million typical operating cost for a fire station? *Why is the operating cost so high? The \$6.8 million reflects the operating costs for a triple company station that houses three units: one ladder suppression unit, one engine suppression unit and one rescue unit. These units are staffed by 11 firefighting personnel 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. This station responded to 6,394 calls in calendar year 2010*
- How has the fire dept. budgeted the \$6.8 million operating cost long term? *These funds are budgeted in the current 2010-11 fiscal year operating budget approved by the BCC in September 2010. As you are aware, the County operating budget does not contain authorization for multi-year spending, it is approved annually by the BCC, so there is no "long term" funding mechanism for operating MDR stations.*

Prepared by: Michael Amador-Gil

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR



Legislative Notes

Agenda Item: 3(R)

File Number: 111410

Committee(s) of Reference: Internal Management and Fiscal Responsibility

Date of Analysis: July 8, 2011

Type of Item: Competitive Contract Modification Package

Summary

This Competitive Contract Modification Package includes a total of nine (9) modifications to previously approved competitive contracts, requesting additional spending authority and/or time.

Budgetary Impacts

In total, this Competitive Contract Modification Package requests **\$4.074 million** in additional allocations for Miami-Dade Transit (MDT), utilizing Charter County Transportation Surtax funds, which is a component of MDT Operating funds.

Authorization to allow the use of Charter County Surtax Funds as a component of MDT Operating funds is requested in all of these items. However, the PTP 2010-11 Five Year Implementation Plan and Recommendations Memorandum dated May 26, 2011 states that, ***MDT and the County will face a critical issue as PTP funds currently used to support transit operations will be required for bond debt service; the estimated MDT operating budget shortfall in 2014 will be \$48 million annually.*** For FY 2010-11 the total PTP funding established during the budget process was \$91.969 million which is approximately 24% of MDT's total operating budget (Resolution No. 1179-10).

- ***How will these modifications affect MDT's financial situation?***

In addition, none of the items are requesting the use of federal funds. In a memo dated June 30, 2011, addressing the temporary suspension of federal funds, the Chairman of the BCC provides confirmation of the release of \$62.5 million in reimbursement to MDT. Furthermore, the memo confirms that all eight concerns originally outlined by the FTA have been addressed and that once the FY 2010 and FY2011 expenditures have been validated, FTA will allow another drawdown of an additional \$75 million in currently unobligated grant funds, bringing the total reimbursement to \$133.5 million.

Compliance and/or Performance Issues

There are no compliance or performance issues for any of the firms in this modification package.

- **Contract Modifications:** Responses provided by the Department of Procurement Management (DPM)

| Item No. | Contract Title and Modification Reason | Existing Allocation, Additional Time and Spending Authority |
|----------|---|--|
| 1 | <p>Brushes, Brooms and Mops</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Additional spending authority to allow MDT to purchase brushes, brooms and mops.</p> <p>Questions/Comments</p> <p>On July 27, 2007, this contract was initially approved under the County Manager's delegated authority and ratified under Resolution No. 29-08. Under the initial contract, MDT did not have an allocation. <i>According to DPM, MDT was added as a user department on August 2, 2007 with an allocation of \$10,000.</i></p> <p>The term under the initial contract was for 12 months with three (3) options-to-renew (OTR); therefore, this contract should have one more OTR that could be exercised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why not exercise the last OTR instead of requesting a modification? <i>This is the last OTR term. The allocation for MDT for this last renewal period had not been approved by CITT; therefore, the \$1,000 allocation for MDT could not be added to this contract. This modification requests approval is to add a \$1,000 allocation for MDT using County Surtax funds as part of MDT Operating.</i> <p>According to the DPM's Bid Tracking System (BTS), this contract is being consolidated along with seven (7) existing janitorial contracts under the new consolidated countywide janitorial services contract. <i>The seven (7) following contracts are being consolidated for janitorial supplies are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• IB6704-2/11-2 PRE-MEASURED LAUNDRY DETERGENT• IB7023-4/12-3 DISHWASHING COMPOUND• EPP4228-3/10-3 LAUNDRY SUPPLIES• 5899-3/14 GERMICIDAL DETERGENT & HAND SOAP SUPPLY• 8288-3/12-3 BRUSHES, BROOMS AND MOPS• M0692-4/11-4 JANITORIAL SUPPLIES• 8550-3/11-2 JANITORIAL SUPPLIES FOR MDPHA | <p>Existing Allocation: \$121,000</p> <p>Modified / Extended Term: No Change. Current contract expires on Nov. 30, 2011.</p> <p>Increased Allocation: \$1,000</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>On April 3, 2011, this contract was extended under the County Manager's delegated authority for an additional 4 months, from July 31, 2011 to its current expiration date of November 30, 2011.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the new consolidated countywide janitorial services contract be in place prior to the November 30, 2011 expiration date of this contract (According to the County Manager's memo, Item Nos. 2 and 3 will also be consolidated under the new countywide janitorial services contract, but these items are requesting an extension until June 30, 2012)? <p><i>There are two janitorial contracts: one is for services and the other is for janitorial supplies (used by County departments). The new janitorial supplies contract is expected to be awarded by March 30, 2012.</i></p> | |
| 2 | <p>Janitorial Services for MDT Metrorail System</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Additional time and spending authority to allow MDT to continue purchase of janitorial services for Metrorail and Metromover stations, and various MDT buildings.</p> <p>Questions/Comments</p> <p>According to the County Manager's memo, the extension will allow time to complete the procurement process for the new consolidated countywide janitorial services contract. However, on December 7, 2010, under Resolution No. 1179-10, this contract was modified for an additional 7 months extending the expiration date from March 31, 2011 to October 30, 2011, and an additional spending authority increasing this contract by \$2.478 million. The reason provided was the same as this request - to establish the new consolidated countywide janitorial services contract.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why was the successor contract not in place prior to the end of the 7 months extension? <p><i>Developing the new contracting approach has taken longer than initially estimated. The successor contract defines new performance specifications being introduced to all County departments and the vendor community. The County has developed 'cleanliness' requirements by area type (bathrooms, common areas, cubicles, conference rooms, etc). The new specifications and contract requirements meet LEED requirements (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design). Multiple meetings have taken place with user departments, Small Business Development and building managers throughout the County to solicit input from all stakeholders. The contract is expected to be advertised by August 2011. Award of the contract is estimated for March 2012.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why does this contract need additional spending authority now in | <p>Existing Allocation: \$6.554 million</p> <p>Modified / Extended Term: 8 months from October 30, 2011 to June 30, 2012.</p> <p>Increased Allocation: \$2.869 million</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | July if the last modification extended this contract to October 2011? | |
| 3 | <p>Cleaning Services for South Dade Bus Way Stations</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Additional time and spending authority to allow MDT to continue to purchase cleaning services for various bus stations and Park and Ride lots throughout the County.</p> <p>Questions/Comments According to the County Manager's memo, the extension will allow time to complete the procurement process for the new consolidated Countywide janitorial services contract. However, on December 7, 2010, under Resolution No. 1179-10, this contract was modified for an additional 6 months extending the expiration date from April 30, 2011 to October 30, 2011, and an additional spending authority increasing this contract by \$173,000. The reason provided was the same as this request - to establish the new consolidated countywide janitorial services contract.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why was the successor contract not in place prior to the end of the 7 months extension? <i>Developing the new contracting approach has taken longer than initially estimated. The successor contract defines new performance specifications being introduced to all County departments and the vendor community. The County has developed 'cleanliness' requirements by area type (bathrooms, common areas, cubicles, conference rooms, etc). The new specifications and contract requirements meet LEED requirements (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design). Multiple meetings have taken place with user departments, Small Business Development and building managers throughout the County to solicit input from all stakeholders. The contract is expected to be advertised by August 2011. Award of the contract is estimated for March 2012.</i> Why does this contract need additional spending authority now in July if the last modification extended this contract to October 2011? | <p>Existing Allocation: \$509,000</p> <p>Modified / Extended Term: 8 months from October 30, 2011 to June 30, 2012.</p> <p>Increased Allocation: \$299,000.</p> |
| 4 | <p>Asphalt Concrete</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Authorization to allow MDT to continue to purchase asphalt concrete and authorization to use Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds.</p> | <p>Existing Allocation: \$4.442 million for 60 months.</p> <p>Modified / Extended Term: No Change. Current contract expires on Oct. 31, 2011.</p> <p>Increased Allocation: \$50,000 to</p> |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | MDT from unallocated funds that have already been authorized. |
| 5 | <p>Electronic Imaging Services</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Additional spending authority to allow MDT to purchase electronic imaging services.</p> <p>Questions/Comments Did MDT have a previous allocation under this contract? What contract are they currently utilizing for these services? <i>Yes, they did. MDT previously utilized contract 6002-4/11-4 which expired on 5/31/11. MDT's allocation for the successor contract (6002-1/21) requires approval of funding source by the Board and CITT.</i></p> | <p>Existing Allocation: \$71,000 for 60 months.</p> <p>Modified / Extended Term: No Change. Current contract expires on May 31, 2016.</p> <p>Increased Allocation: \$250,000</p> |
| 6 | <p>Ice Cubes</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Additional spending authority to allow MDT to purchase ice cubes.</p> | <p>Existing Allocation: \$74,000 for 24 months.</p> <p>Modified /Extended Term: No Change. Current Contract expires on April 30, 2012.</p> <p>Increased Allocation: \$1,000</p> |
| 7 | <p>Reflective Lettering, Striping, and Application Services</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Additional time and spending authority to allow MDT to purchase reflective lettering, striping, and application services.</p> <p>The unallocated funds were awarded on September 24, 2010, under the County Manager's delegated authority for one (1) year with two (2), one-year OTR for an initial value of \$248,500 and a total cumulative value of \$745,500 (see Quarterly Report, Item No. 3N on this agenda).</p> | <p>Existing Allocation: \$74,000 for one (1) year.</p> <p>Modified / Extended Term: 8 months from Oct. 31, 2011 to June 30, 2012.</p> <p>Increased Allocation: \$132,000</p> |
| 8 | <p>Agricultural Garden & Industrial Tools</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Additional time and spending authority to allow MDT to purchase agricultural, garden and industrial tools.</p> <p>Comments / Questions According to the County Manager's memo, this contract is used by MDT's Facilities Maintenance Division to maintain facilities that are not covered by the County's landscaping contracts. No funds were previously allocated to MDT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What contract is currently utilized for these services? | <p>Existing Allocation: \$324,000 for one (1) year.</p> <p>Modified / Extended Term: No Change. Current Contract expires on May 31, 2016.</p> <p>Increased Allocation: \$6,000 to MDT from unallocated funds that have already been authorized.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p><i>MDT had an allocation under the previous renewal term (6732-4/12-3). The allocation was approved prior to the PTP unification. This modification is to add an allocation for MDT for the new renewal term, effective May 1, 2011, in order to continue purchasing these goods. Following the unification, approval must be secured from the CITT and the BCC.</i></p> | |
| 9 | <p>Route Work and Group Travel Services</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Additional time and spending authority to allow MDT to continue to purchase fixed-route services, semi fixed-route services, and group travel services within Miami-Dade, Broward, and Monroe Counties.</p> <p>Questions/Comments This is the only item that does not state that MDT confirmed that no federal funds will be utilized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will federal funds be used to fund this item? <i>MDT has confirmed that no federal funds will be utilized.</i> • Why was the successor contract not in place prior to the expiration of the current contract? <i>The scope of services for the successor contract was being revised to incorporate the results of the analysis conducted by MDT to determine the cost effectiveness of the routes. Award of the successor contract is estimated for March 2012.</i> | <p>Existing Allocation: \$12.501 million for 60 months.</p> <p>Modified / Extended Term: 6 months from Sept. 30, 2011 to May 31, 2012.</p> <p>Allocation: \$602,000</p> |

Prepared by: Elizabeth N. Owens