


Memorandum



Date: September 3, 2015

To: Honorable Juan C. Zapata
County Commissioner, District 11

From: Carlos A. Gimenez
Mayor 

Subject: Responses to Questions from September 2, 2015 Memorandum

This information has been prepared in response to the questions sent in your September 2, 2015 memorandum.

1. Please clarify the scope of Project No. 934740 – Lago Mar Park (Volume 2, P 230). The project description states that funds will be used for a pool renovation and expansion but a pool does not exit at this location?
The Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Project #934730 – Largo Mar Park did incorrectly identify pool renovations as part of the project description. It has since been corrected to state – “Construct local park improvements, to include restroom building, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and field improvements”.
2. Please clarify the location of Projection No. 2000000139 – Intersection Improvement at SW 127 Avenue and SW 124 Street (Volume 3, P. 118). The proposed budget indicates that the project is located within District 11 but the described intersection is District 9.
The Public Works and Waste Management Project #2000000139 – Intersection Improvement at SW 127 Avenue and SW 124 Street is in fact incorrectly identified as a District 11 project. It has since been corrected and is now reflected as a District 9 project.
3. What caused the substantial increase in interdepartmental transfers for Parks, Recreation, and Open Spaces Department in the proposed budget?
As referenced in Volume 2, page 208 and 210 of the FY 2015-16 Proposed Budget (PROS narrative), the Cooperative Extension function was transferred from the Regulatory and Economic Resources Department which resulted in a \$480,000 increase to interdepartmental transfers. In addition, increases in landscaping services provided to Miami-Dade Transit, Port of Miami, Public Works Waste Management, and Internal Services Department contributed to another \$627,000 of these transfers. I have included the link to the departmental narrative.
<http://www.miamidade.gov/budget/FY2015-16/proposed/library/parks-recreation-and-open-spaces.pdf>
4. Why has the contribution from UMSA General Fund to the Parks, Recreation, and Open Spaces Department increased by \$6 million dollars from last year?
5. What will the increased contribution from UMSA General Fund to the Parks, Recreation, and Open Spaces Department be spent on by the Department?
The FY 2015-16 Proposed Budget includes additional funding for increased grounds, roadside, and median maintenance cycles (\$2.3 million). It also includes \$3.027 million for sports programming at eleven local parks. This information is also reflected on page 213 of Volume 2.
<http://www.miamidade.gov/budget/FY2015-16/proposed/library/parks-recreation-and-open-spaces.pdf>

6. Why has the contribution from the Countywide General Fund to the Parks, Recreation, and Open Spaces Department decrease by over \$7 million in the proposed budget?
As part of the development of the Proposed Budget, projections for CDT receipts exceeded predicted levels and provided for excess revenue that may be used to fund CDT eligible activities in PROS, including Zoo Miami operations. By using these CDT funds for eligible PROS activities, it allowed the County reduce the funding needed from the Countywide General Fund for PROS and allow that funding to pay for other environment in the budget.
7. What types of expenditures are classified under "Other Operating Expenditures" and what has caused the \$3 million increase in the Parks, Recreation, and Open Spaces Department?
Other Operating Expenditures reflects the costs associated with increased maintenance cycles as described in the response to question number 4 and the operations of the new Florida Exhibit at ZooMiami.
8. Why does the proposed budget add 120 additional Metrobus drivers when Metrobus ridership has decreased?
The adding of positions was not driven by ridership but rather as a measure to reduce overtime expenditures that are a directly result of long-term absentee operators, which has caused the Department to back-fill using overtime.
9. What rate is used to calculate gasoline expenditures in the proposed budget and how does that compare to the rate used in the Fiscal Year 2014-15?
As a matter of practice each department develops its own fuel expenditure estimate when developing its budget. However, on an annual basis as part of the budget development manual the Internal Services Department (ISD) provides a table that includes prior year fuel expenses, prior year average fuel price per gallon, and prior year gallon consumption by department to assist departments when estimating fuels needs for the new budget year. Below is the link to the FY 2015-16 budget submission manual, the information referenced above is on pages 72-73.
<http://www.miamidade.gov/budget/library/fy2015-16/budget-submission-manual.pdf>
10. What caused the \$14 million dollar increase in expenditures for Charges to County Services in the proposed budget for the Internal Services Department?
The Design and Construction Division of ISD changed the way it processes pass-through charges. The division will now pay for expenditures on departments' behalf and then charge the expense to the respective department(s). This accounting treatment change is to better track design and construction work order/service ticket related projects expenses.

If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact Jennifer Moon, Budget Director at (305) 375-5143.

c: Honorable Jean Monestime, Chairman
and Members, Board of County Commissioners
Robert A. Cuevas, Jr., County Attorney
Office of the Mayor Senior Staff
Department Directors
Christopher Agrippa, Clerk of the Board
Charles Anderson, Commission Auditor