

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**Can we synchronize closure days across Pinewood Cultural Park related sites such as Heritage Village, Florida Botanical Gardens, and County Extension, and/or Park closures?**

- All of "Pinewood" will be closed on Mondays and Tuesdays beginning October 1, 2009. Heritage Village has been closed on Mondays for a number of years. Since Heritage Village, Florida Botanical Gardens and Extension have lower visitation on Tuesdays, it made sense to keep the facilities in synch with back to back closures on Mondays and Tuesdays.

**Do we have enough park security coverage at Ft. DeSoto Park with just one deputy out at Tierra Verde? What is the cost of a park ranger to provide overnight coverage? How much coverage is necessary given crime data?**

- Pinellas County Park Rangers generally provide for the patrol of parks in the form of providing assistance to visitors, enforcing park rules, emptying trash and cleaning facilities. The same is true for Rangers during the night shift at Ft. DeSoto Park. Because Park Rangers do not have law enforcement capabilities, they rely on Law Enforcement Officers for situations beyond gaining citizens voluntary compliance with park rules. The existence of a night shift Ranger would not necessarily eliminate the dependence on the Tierra Verde deputy. It is anticipated that closure of park itself including the fishing piers would reduce the potential need for Law Enforcement assistance. Successful administration in the campground area is expected to include diligent enforcement of rules leading up to "quiet hour" and a greater reliance on campground hosts, not uncommon among other campground locations in the State. It is also anticipated that a Sheriff's Deputy will have residence within the Park.
- Should the County desire overnight coverage, we estimate the cost to be \$103,000 (includes benefits) for 2 Park Rangers annually. Two rangers are needed as Ft. DeSoto campground is a 7 day per week operation and camping will be available 365 days/year since it generates revenue.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**What are the revenues and associated one-time and recurring collection costs from proposed new Park fees at Ft. DeSoto and Howard Park?**

- Ft. DeSoto Park Admission Fee, Anticipated Revenue: \$1,977,000 (based on \$5.00 per vehicle fee) Estimated O&M Costs (recurring): \$246,500 - Includes 3 Park Rangers for collection and enforcement, 1 Accounting Support Specialist and operating supplies. Initial Capital Investment: \$328,000. Ongoing estimated annual net revenues after initial capital costs: \$1,730,500.
- Fred Howard Park Causeway and Beach Access Admission Fee, Anticipated Revenue: \$547,000 (based on \$5 per car toll to access the causeway and beach area only) Estimated O&M Costs (recurring): \$145,000 - Includes 3 FTE Parking Attendants for collection and operating supplies. Initial Capital Investment: \$50,000, Ongoing estimated annual net revenues after initial capital costs: \$402,000. A large portion of Howard Park would still be open to the public free of charge. A fee would only be incurred by those who wish to access by vehicle or park on the causeway and beach area. This was determined to be the most cost efficient way to implement a beach access parking fee.

**What is the status on efforts to implement other park revenues such as food vendors, canoe rentals, etc.?**

- Currently, the Parks and Recreation Department has three concessionaires. They are: United Park Services, Inc. at Ft. De Soto Park \$180,785, Tampa Bay Ferry at Ft. De Soto Park \$5,358 and J & M Enterprises at Sand Key Park \$23,629. Together they generate \$209,592.
- Parks and Recreation routinely looks to expand concession operations where appropriate, including present negotiations with a vendor to expand services at Sand Key Park with additional service at the recently acquired Madeira Beach Access. The Department further suggested an ability by way of the fee schedule to charge commercial operators who desire the use of parks in the conduct of their business, which might include mobile vendors, kayak outfitters, fitness camps, or other profit making endeavors that could potentially occur at park locations.
- Environmental Management has Concession Agreements at Weedon Island Preserve with Sweetwater Kayaks that generates approximately \$20,000 in revenue per year. Sweetwater offers canoe/kayak rentals and tours of the water surrounding the preserve. The Brooker Creek Preserve Environmental Education Center currently has an agreement with "Discovering Nature Store" that expires September 30, 2009. This will not be renewed. The agreement generated an average of \$2,600 per year over the last two years.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**Is the LIMA unit included in the FY10 budget at same level of service?**

- The contract for Law Enforcement Services/Environmental Lands Unit (LIMA) is with the Sheriff to provide land and marine law enforcement services to enforce state and federal criminal laws, county ordinances, and rules & regulations of the Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission. The FY10 request is to renew at the same level as this current year (4 deputies & a sergeant). It is slated to go before the Board for approval this August. The request for FY10 is an increase of 2% or \$10,730 over FY09. The Sheriff contracts now include a portion of their equipment costs and indirect costs, resulting in the increase. The total requested for FY10 is \$551,887. It is anticipated that Utilities will fund \$96,000 of it; the balance is included in the transfer to the Sheriff in the General Fund. The contract is managed by Environmental Management.

**What days are the parks and preserves open/closed? What is the rationale for the days they are closed?**

- Parks and Recreation: The recommendation was to close parks on the day after Thanksgiving and Christmas day. We estimate approximately 63,000 visitors may be impacted. To have minimal impact on park visitors and at the same time reduce department overtime costs, the months with lowest attendance were reviewed and the two specific dates were the lowest attended holidays.
- Preserves/Ed Centers: Brooker Creek & Weedon Island Education Centers: Currently they are closed Mondays & Tuesdays and all County holidays. FY10 hours will be reduced from 5 days to 3 days per week. Friday-Sunday or Saturday-Monday, although staff is reviewing attendance records to determine which days to be open. We are considering being open one day during the week in lieu of a weekend day. We may stagger the hours, but both will probably be open on Saturday.
  - Brooker Creek & Weedon Island Preserves: Currently outside access to the Preserves is 7 days. FY 10 will be reduced from 7 days to 4 days per week (will include the days Education Centers are open). Brooker Creek Preserve offers 17 miles of trails, and Weedon Island Preserve has 10 miles of trails.
  - The proposed change in hours is due to the reduction in staff for the Environmental Lands Division from 32 in FY 09 to 17 in FY 10. We will not have enough people to physically "man" both centers and provide oversight/safety/maintenance at the preserves at the current schedules.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**Can we charge different fees for residents and non-residents?**

- The County would be hard pressed to charge a fee (or a higher fee) to non-residents who use Pinellas County parks. A review of the law reveals no changes in the philosophy of the Florida courts or Attorney General's Office during the last four years. In order to justify such a differential, two tests must be met. First, the park departments must comply with the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, i.e., no discrimination against the non-residents because of race, nationality, religion, etc. Secondly, any such fee must have a reasonable relationship to the activities involved, i.e., the extra revenue must be necessary to maintain the facility.

**How much revenue is generated currently by beach access parking and how much more revenue would be generated by the proposal to increase the County's share or bring the function in-house?**

- In FY08 beach access parking generated a total of \$299,920 from Sand Key Beach Park, St. Pete Beach Access, Madeira Beach Access, Indian Rocks Beach Access, Redington Beach Access and Indian Shores Beach Access.
- If the Parks and Recreation Department operates the beach parking the estimated net increase in revenues is \$229,000. This is being explored by staff. Most agreements offer a 60% - 40% split of revenues and each one addresses oversight, maintenance, collection and enforcement.

**Have we considered an annual pass to access all of the County's parks/preserves?**

- The FY10 fee schedule includes a suggested \$110 annual pass that could be used at County boat ramps as well as Fort De Soto Park and Howard Park with the intent of minimizing the impact to frequent park users. This will require additional study.

**Have we developed a plan for communication of park/facility closures extending beyond internet-based communication?**

- A communication transition plan has been developed which will address impacts and identify strategies to inform citizens, staff and media of FY10 Budget Outcomes.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**Instead of eliminating the contribution to the Housing Trust Fund (HTF), can we extend commitment in order to meet our \$30M commitment?**

- Yes. Since FY07, the County has committed \$19.2M to the Housing Trust Fund.

**Why is the Housing Trust Fund still budgeted at \$3.1 million if we are eliminating the contribution in FY10?**

- These are funds that have been committed but not expended. Funds may be disbursed in stages particularly for large multifamily projects and the final expenditure will not occur until the project is finished.

**How much money is available for affordable housing given the proposed elimination of the contribution to the Housing Trust Fund?**

- For FY 2008-09, the BCC has under its purview almost \$20 million for affordable housing. This includes the Housing Trust Fund, the State Housing Initiatives Partnership Program (SHIP), Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership Program, and the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP).
- Due to action by the 2009 Florida Legislature, SHIP funds were reduced by \$4 million. With the proposed elimination of the HTF contribution, there still remains approximately \$14 million (including a portion of NSP carry-over funds) in the County's portfolio for affordable housing for FY 2009-10.
- Also please see document entitled "Pinellas County's Funding Resources Housing and the Homeless" distributed at the July 14<sup>th</sup> Work Session.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**How were the 3 locations selected for the Business Assistance Program (BAPs)?**

- No specific locations have been selected. The proposed model would have three Business Assistance Partnership Specialists (BAPS) possibly situated north, mid, and south county. It is intended that the remodeled Business Assistance Partnership program become more performance based, regionally focused, and with a new emphasis on the Small Business Enterprise (SBE), the networking directory, and small business finance.
- The BCC did submit a federal appropriations request for the BAP; the House Financial Services Subcommittee has recommended \$262,000 for the program.
- The cities and chambers have been informed of the impact of the budget reductions on BAP. If the proposed model is pursued staff will develop specific criteria for the new BAP program. In order to have a fair and equitable program active participation of the chambers and/or cities is not recommended.

**What is the impact from the reductions in Health & Human Services on Low-Income Pool (LIP) funding?**

- That information is not available at this time. The Agency for Health Care Administration (AHCA) has not determined the requested allocation for FY 2009-10. The influx of federal stimulus dollars has impacted the current year and next year's process.
- On June 19<sup>th</sup> the Department received an email notification from AHCA informing us of a decrease in the amount they would be requesting from the County for the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> quarter due to changes in the Federal Matching Assistance Percentage and the State Matching Assistance Percentage as a result of the federal stimulus dollars. As a result of these changes the total funding required of Pinellas County for the LIP Program decreased \$6,252,902, although the percentage of return on our investment was significantly increased. See chart below for further information.

<b>Pinellas County LIP Funding</b>	<b>Original</b>	<b>Revised</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>%</b>
Total Intergovernmental Transfer (IGT) to ACHA	\$24,165,594	\$17,912,692	\$6,252,902	-25.88
Total Return on County IGT	\$2,884,351	\$2,879,760	(\$4,592)	-.16

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**How does the reduction in contribution to hospitals in Health & Human Services affect the medical home model?**

- Hospital services are an integral component of the medical home model; while the goal is to keep people healthy and out of hospitals, the reality is that area of care is sometimes necessary. The current contract allows Bayfront Medical Center and BayCare Health Systems to receive up to \$7 million; \$6 million is for Ambulatory Surgery Center Procedures, Inpatient Care Services, Inpatient Rehabilitation, Skilled Nursing, and other related services. The remaining \$1 million is for Durable Medical Equipment, Home Health, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, etc.
- This reduction may result in an inability to negotiate viable contract agreements with local hospitals which ends September 30, 2009. It could also require further restructuring of the overall health plan resulting in potential elimination of inpatient care for County clients. Three million dollars will continue to be available to negotiate for hospital services.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**The reductions in Emergency Management seem very deep. What are the components of the \$257K in reductions?**

- Reduction details for each BCC department can be found in Exhibit C to the Budget Message. Reduction information for Emergency Management can be found on page 68.
- The \$257K reduction includes two positions (\$133K) requiring that shelter support responsibilities be spread over remaining staff resulting in an increase in the time required to process certain emergency plan reviews. Other reductions include reduced printing costs for Hurricane Guides by targeting specific populations and reduced printing costs for CEMP document using electronic files (\$112K) as well as the elimination of two vehicles (\$12K) and office supplies (\$2K).

**What are the EMS reductions (slide 91) and are the one-time funds being applied on a consistent basis?**

- For the FY10 budget, the millage rate at 0.5832 supporting the First Responders was held flat per the Board's direction. Due to reductions of 12.1% in taxable values, property tax revenues will decrease by \$2.9M compared to FY09. Negotiations with individual First Responders resulted in an overall reduction in funding of \$4.7M. Even with this reduction, \$3.2M of fund balance was utilized to cover the costs of the First Responder contracts due to the dramatic decrease in property tax revenues and meet the required reserve level in the EMS fund. Fund balance in FY09 was larger than expected because of some one time payments that include two settlements, an unexpected increase in Medicare rates and increased efficiencies in the EMS Billing Section. The use of fund balance is not sustainable over the long term as we anticipate additional property tax revenue decreases in FY11 with a relatively flat year in FY12. In order to sustainably fund the First Responder contracts in the future, a consultant will be engaged to study the EMS system during the coming year.
- Consistency has been applied to all providers during the negotiations. At this point, we have agreement with 17 of the 19 providers on financial terms and expect to reach agreement with the others within the next week.



**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**What is the status of the MSTU Road and Sidewalk Program, especially the plan for paving the remaining unpaved roads?**

Summary of MSTU Road and Sidewalk Program

- The MSTU Local Road Paving, Sidewalk and ADA Ramp Program was implemented as a county maintenance road paving and enhancement program to improve residential roadway surfaces, serving the unincorporated areas. Projects in the MSTU program were designed to rural (non-urban) design standards.
- Roads in the program were prioritized based upon the cost effectiveness of each segment. Category 1 roads were those easiest and most cost effective to implement – those with no drainage concerns. Categories 2 and 3 were defined based upon increasing levels of work and cost necessary to implement, with Category 3 requiring extensive drainage and associated permitting efforts and right-of-way acquisition.
- Approximately 121 MSTU Category 1 roads have been completed since the program's inception in 2003. This represents the paving of approximately 13 miles of local street paving.
- A total of 24 MSTU Category 2 roads have been completed, totaling about 2 ¼ miles. There are currently four MSTU Category 2 road projects ready for construction, but on hold due to funding availability, and there are six Category 2 roads in design.
- Work has not advanced on any Category 3 roadways.
- A total of 51 sidewalk projects have been completed using MSTU funds since 2004. There are currently 4 MSTU sidewalk projects in design.
- There are approximately 164 MSTU Category 2 roads remaining on the priority list and approximately 129 sidewalk projects on the MSTU sidewalk priority list.

MSTU impacts on Operations and Maintenance

- Prior to the MSTU project enhancements, the major maintenance activities performed on these roadways were asphalt patching, asphalt chip resurfacing, and roadway grading. The reduction of these activities along the 15 ¼ miles of roadways paved to date, as a part of the MSTU program, equates to an annual cost savings of approximately \$11,400 per year.
- As a result, Public Works Operations was able to reduce the pavement maintenance program by one asphalt crew, and the associated equipment. The department realized a cost avoidance of approximately \$34,000 per year in equipment costs (by not replacing eliminated assets), and reassigned affected personnel to other programs within Public Works Operations. The savings in maintenance costs achieved through the reduction of one asphalt crew and the cost avoidance from the asphalt equipment was previously applied to the FY09 budget reduction targets.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

- The 15 ¼ miles of roadways paved through the MSTU program have increased the County's Pavement Management Asset Inventory. As a result, these roadways will require future capital funds for resurfacing as the pavement deteriorates, inclusive of additional maintenance activity costs until such resurfacing is accomplished.
- A total of 49 MSTU sidewalk projects have been constructed to date, where no sidewalks existed, prior to this program. This increase in sidewalk asset inventory will add to Public Works' maintenance costs over time by increasing maintenance activities such as: sidewalk replacement, mowing / edging, and root pruning.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**Can we potentially use Return-On-Equity to offset the cost of Water & Sewer rate increases?**

- The Solid Waste fund is an independent Enterprise Fund as defined in County Code, Chapter 106 wherein it says that the operation is to be on a self-supporting, cost-recovery basis.
- It goes on to say that all revenues generated in excess of those required for operating and maintenance or expansion shall be used to reduce the schedule of rates or charges.
- If measures were taken to revise the code for the purposes of water and wastewater budget shortfalls, it should be pointed out that the Solid Waste revenues are collected from users County-wide, including all the individual municipalities that use our landfill and waste to energy plant. The Water System service boundary and the Wastewater System service boundary differ and do not include the entire County. Therefore a subsidy of rates would benefit some, while not benefitting others.

**What is the cost of the curbside recycling program (\$25M or \$8-10M)?**

- The \$8-10M amount is an estimate of the annual operating cost of the program once it has been established. The \$25M amount is for FY2010, which is a worst-case scenario wherein the County would be paying the start up costs, including the purchase of all recycling carts. An alternative plan would be to shift the cost of carts to the service provider, who could amortize those costs over the length of their contract. This approach allows year one costs to mirror the on-going annual costs, estimated between \$8-10M.

**Are we considering an increase to the Solid Waste tipping fees?**

- Each year in May, the Solid Waste Technical Management Committee, which includes representatives of Pinellas cities, evaluates revenues and expenditures and makes an informed decision relative to tipping fees for the upcoming year.
- This past May the Committee made the recommendation that tipping fees should remain at \$37.50 for FY 2010.
- At the May 22, 2009 BCC Work Session staff presented a 25 year forecast for Solid Waste revenues and expenses. The \$37.50 tipping fee was shown to support the forecast for several years into the future.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**Are the taxable values by property type (slide 21) a national number or just Pinellas County?**

- The taxable values by property type code given in the presentation were provided by the Property Appraiser and pertain only to Pinellas County. (Page A-14 in the Budget Message)

**Is the remaining \$7.8M shortfall due to the constitutionals and independents not meeting their targets?**

- Yes. The remaining \$7.8M shortfall is attributable to the remaining gap in the Constitutional Officers due to their coming in at \$11.6M over target. The difference between these numbers, \$3.8M, relates to additional property taxes over the forecasted amount.

**Are we asking the Constitutionals that did not meet their targets to make additional reductions?**

- The Board has directed the County Administrator to work with the Sheriff over the next few months to identify further potential reductions either before the adoption of the budget or in anticipation of reductions or new revenues in the FY11 budget process. The Property Appraiser and Tax Collector previously indicated to the Board that further reductions would not enable them to perform their core functions. Most of the Court-related functions are subject to other restrictions pursuant to Article V that substitute for the targets.

**What is the estimated cost of the accrued leave payout for employees that are being laid off?**

- The total cost of the accrued leave payout amount is estimated at \$704K. The General Fund impact is estimated to be \$526K. A table summarizing the leave payouts by fund can be found in the Budget Message on page A-61. The funds are available as the County is required to account for "Compensated Absences" on the balance sheet and reserve for these costs accordingly.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**Does the \$7.8M gap in the FY10 Service Level Stabilization Account turn into \$10.2M in FY11?**

- Yes, the \$7.8M gap in FY10 turns into a \$10.2M in FY11 due to inflationary increases. This information is shown in the Budget Message on page A-24.

**What budget numbers are used in the General Fund to calculate the 15% target amount for reserves?**

- The calculation for the 15% amount in the reserves is to take the reserve amount of \$94.1M and divide it by the total resources in the General Fund (page M-3 in Budget Document) which is \$611.3M. This should equal 15% (exact amount is 15.39%).

**Why do the property tax revenue numbers presented in the total budget differ from those cited in the presentation?**

- The property tax figure of \$389.3M is shown on the total budget summary on page B-6 of the Budget Document. The budget amounts in this summary are rollups across the entire County budget and all of its property tax levying funds.
- The \$389.3M includes the total property tax revenue from all of the County's millage rates including the General Fund Countywide, General Fund MSTU, EMS, Health Department, the Library Coop, Palm Harbor Recreation and Library District, Feather Sound Community Services District, and the twelve Fire Districts.
- The detail of the millage rates and revenue amounts is shown on page B-7 of the Budget Document. The General Fund property tax revenues of \$328.7M cited in the presentation is the sum of the Countywide General Fund amount of \$296.1 and the MSTU amount of \$32.5M only. These amounts also appear on page M-5 of the Budget Document which detail the components of General Fund revenue.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**Why do the proposed one-time funding allocations not appear to follow the Board's policy regarding non-recurring expenditures?**

- The proposed one-time allocations are consistent with the Board's policy. The budget policy regarding the use of One-Time revenues is shown in Exhibit A to the Budget Message on page 2.
- This policy states that one-time resources should be applied to fund one-time expenditures and should not be used to fund ongoing programs. The proposed FY10 One-Time funding allocations are shown on page A-62 of the Budget Message. Each item is listed with a short description of the project. None of the items on the list are intended to be ongoing programs.
- One-time funds are realized as additional fund balance resulting from revenue in excess of expenditures in a given fund. These funds would be over and above the target reserve amount. For example, in the General Fund, one-time funds are in addition to the 15% reserve target and the amount for the Service Level Stabilization Account. [Calculation: One-Time Funds = (Revenues – Expenditures) – Reserve Target]

**Was the \$2.7M of One-Time funding allocations for the Justice CCMS project double-counted?**

- No, the amounts are not double-counted as the \$7.65M cited on slide 97 is not inclusive of the \$2.7M noted on slide 95. The proposed FY10 one-time funding allocations include an allocation of \$2.7M for the Justice Consolidated Case Management System which will replace the current CJIS system. The \$2.7M allocation is intended to cover the first year of expenditures associated with the project.
- Also included in the one-time funding allocations is \$7.65M towards future costs for the Oracle Project Unified Solution (OPUS) and the aforementioned Justice CCMS project. This amount does not include the \$2.7M of first year expenditures for the Justice project that is listed separately.
- The full remaining total cost of the OPUS and Justice CCMS projects have not been formally determined. At this time, the best estimate is \$13M. The \$7.65M allocation would be placed in a restricted account in the Business Technology Services fund to help cover the remaining \$13M cost for these projects in FY11.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**What is the status of the Justice CCMS and OPUS projects and how much has been spent to date?**

- Justice CCMS project:
  - A Request for Proposals has been let and the bidding period will conclude on July 30<sup>th</sup>. Vendor selection is targeted for late 2009 or early 2010.
  - The current project budget in FY09 is \$290K. This entire amount is projected to be spent by the end of FY09. A one-time funding allocation of \$2.7M is included in the FY10 budget for the first year of expenditures associated with the project. It is estimated that the total cost of the project will be around \$7.5M.
  - Additional information is available on the intraweb at <http://intraweb.co.pinellas.fl.us/justice/>
- OPUS project:
  - The proposals for an implementer have been reviewed and narrowed to two vendors. The August 4<sup>th</sup> agenda will include an item seeking permission to negotiate with the highest ranked proposer.
  - The current project budget in FY09 is \$7.5M. Of this amount, only \$322K is projected to be spent by the end of FY09 and difference, \$7.2M, has been budgeted for FY10. It is estimated that the total cost of the project will be around \$15.5M.
  - Additional information is available on the intraweb at <http://intraweb.co.pinellas.fl.us/opus/>

**Did the change in reserves contribute to available one-time funds in FY10?**

- Yes. The General Fund's budgeted reserve in FY09 was \$102.8M. The FY10 amount is \$94.1M. The difference of \$8.7M contributed to available one-time funds in FY10. The application of a 15% target reserve to a smaller budget proportionately yields a smaller reserve amount.

**How can we avoid further reductions to the Constitutionals?**

- The Proposed Budget is balanced for FY10 and does not require any further reductions. The \$7.8M gap figure is necessary to meet the \$85M target to balance the budget for both FY10 and FY11. The strategy is to balance both years at once in order to provide more stability to the organization and review the necessary reductions more holistically. More detail regarding the budget target is available in the Budget Message on page A-33.
- If the \$7.8M gap is not addressed in FY10, it is estimated to increase to a \$10.2M amount in FY11 which will require further reductions, additional revenues, or a mix of both. The \$10.2M amount is referenced in the Budget Message on page A-24 as part of the General Fund Multi-Year Forecast Summary.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**What are the employee cost-saving ideas and were any included in the FY10 Budget?**

- Information regarding the Cost-Savings Ideas is included in the Budget Message on page A-37. All of the employee ideas are available on the “A Better Way” intraweb site at <http://intraweb/AdminIntranet/abetterway.html>
- Some of the cost-saving ideas that were included in the Proposed Budget are:
  - One-time funding for energy and water conservation projects with a payback of 3 years or less
  - Consolidating procurement functions from Public Works and Utilities into the Purchasing Department
  - Consolidating communication functions from Utilities to the Communications Department
  - In addition, many of the new revenue ideas in the Proposed Budget were suggested by our employees.
- Other cost-saving ideas that we plan on implementing that require more time are:
  - Implementing printer and fax policies designed to decrease the number of printers and eliminate fax machines in the organization.
  - Reviewing the utilization numbers for all of our cell phones and PDA's and re-justifying the need for those devices
  - Implementing an ordinance that would require homeowners to mow the right-of-way of the property they own instead of using County forces
  - In addition to the 109 pieces of fleet equipment that were turned in as part of the budget process, see if we can reduce even further by pooling or renting equipment more effectively
- There are many other ideas that are still being reviewed such as:
  - Consolidation of mowing functions in Public Works and Parks
  - Consolidation of GIS functions across the organization
  - Consolidation of engineering functions in Public Works, Utilities, and Real Estate Management
  - Consolidation of training across the organization



**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**What are the proposed reductions for the MSTU and how will it affect service levels?**

- The MSTU budget is addressed in the Budget Message on page A-66. Comparing the expenditure budgets for FY10 and FY09 provides some insights into the departments or programs that were reduced.
- The reductions and anticipated impacts to service levels are shown in Exhibit C to the Budget Message. A summary of MSTU reductions and the impacts to service levels includes:
  - Elimination of the MSTU Road Paving and Sidewalk Program in Public Works (\$2.7M).
    - This program was started in 2003 to target unimproved roadways. The highest priority roadways have been improved. Projects remaining on the prioritization list are generally more complex and many not be cost effective.
  - Elimination of the County Connection Centers in Community Development (\$1.1M).
    - This program was started in FY03 to improve communication and coordination in the unincorporated area and across the County. Staff have been involved in various community outreach and citizen engagement efforts including annexation information outreach in areas such as East Lake, historic preservation overlays, proposed street lighting districts, the neighborhood cleanup program, and traffic calming program. (Program funding is 80% from the MSTU and 20% from Countywide.)
  - Reduction of six Code Enforcement positions (\$404K) in Environmental Management
    - Reductions result in a complaint driven code enforcement model and response time to complaints may increase from 1 day to 10 days.
  - Significant reductions in Building Inspections, DRS, and Zoning mostly related to the decrease in development activity
    - Next day inspections may not be possible. Plan review time may increase from 5-10 days to 20-30 days. Inspectors will give 4 hour windows for inspections rather than specific appointment times.
  - The East Lake Library operating grant was reduced by 20%.
    - The 20% reduction mirrors the targets imposed on the County's departments and agencies.
  - The Sheriff's portion of the budget is 73% of the MSTU budget and it only decreased 1.9%.
    - No meaningful impact is anticipated.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**What have been the reserve amounts over the last few years and how do they compare with the FY10 amount?**

- The reserve amounts over the last few years are as follows:

Year	Budgeted Reserves	%
FY10	94,134,010	15%
FY09	102,774,000	15%
FY08	108,908,070	15%
FY07	107,089,620	14%
FY06	109,945,730	17%
FY05	59,241,470	11%
FY04	44,252,150	8%

- The numbers above are budgeted amounts. Actual amounts that were higher than the budgeted amounts were reprogrammed in the following years either to increase the reserves to the 15% target (in FY03 – FY06) or for one-time expenses.

**What is the “Committed Reserve” and how does it compare to prior years? How much of a carry forward from FY09 do we anticipate for FY10?**

- Information regarding the General Fund Reserve and its components is available in the Budget Message on page A-67. The Committed Reserve encompasses items that are restricted or have been otherwise obligated by accounting rules such as accrued leave, encumbrances, and grants. The Committed Reserve is estimated to be at approximately the same level in FY09 and FY10 as in FY08 based on historical trends. These trends do not change much over time. We will not know the exact amounts until the books close after the end of FY09.

<b>Committed Reserve</b>	<b>\$22.5 million</b>
Accrued employee leave	\$12.7 million
Encumbrances	\$9.0 million
Grants received but not spent	\$0.8 million

- The Beginning Fund Balance for FY10 is estimated at \$119.0 million (see budget page M-12, FY10 Request column). The actual amount will be determined after the close of the fiscal year in the November/December timeframe.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**What was the amount of unanticipated beginning fund balance from FY08 into FY09 and what happened to it?**

- Information on the FY09 Beginning Fund Balance was presented to the Board as part of the Preliminary FY10 General Fund Forecast on January 13, 2009.
- The budget for Beginning Fund Balance for FY09 was \$142.4M. The actual FY09 Beginning Fund Balance was \$164.9M. The difference between the two is \$22.4M. Of this amount, \$10.1M were obligations carried forward from FY08 into FY09. The carry forward obligations were appropriated by the Board as budget supplements (resolutions) into the General Fund during FY09. The difference between \$22.4M and \$10.1M in carry forwards is \$12.3M in unanticipated beginning fund balance.

<b>Beginning Fund Balance Reconciliation</b>	<b>\$</b>
Budgeted FY09 Beg. Fund Balance	\$142.4 million
Actual FY09 Beginning Fund Balance	\$164.9 million
Difference	\$22.4 million
Carry Forward Obligations from FY08	\$10.1 million
Unanticipated Beginning Fund Balance	\$12.3 million

- The \$12.3M fell to fund balance in FY09 and was used to help balance the FY10 budget.
- The \$12.3M was composed of revenue of \$6.2M composed of additional excess fees of \$5.2M and other miscellaneous pickups in revenue totaling \$1.0M. On the expenditure side, we saved an additional \$6.1M by exceeding our expenditure target of 97% as we came in closer to 96%.

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**The FY09 Budget was \$689M, and if you back out the reserves, that is \$586M. How is the target reduction 20%, when 20% of \$586M does not equal \$85M?**

- The \$85M is 20% of \$426M, the base amount of general revenue-supported recurring expenditures. The reduction base was calculated as follows:

Total FY09 General Fund Budget:	\$ 689M
Less:	
Reserves	(\$ 103M)
One-time expenditures	(\$ 14M)
Expenditures supported by department or agency non-tax revenue	(\$ 97M)
Mandates and non-discretionary expenditures	(\$ 49M)
Base Expenditures for reduction of 20%	\$ 426M

- The reserves and one-time expenditures can be found in the FY09 Budget document. The expenditures supported by non-tax revenue and the mandates and non-discretionary expenditures are items that have to be manually accounted for and as a result cannot be cross-referenced in the budget document.
- Examples of expenditures supported by agency revenue are the Sheriff's law enforcement contracts with the cities. Mandates and non-discretionary expenditures include items such as the \$6M payment to the state for Juvenile Justice. These kinds of items were backed out before applying the 20% to each department/agencies budgets.
- The \$85M target is designed to close an estimated \$85M two year gap in recurring expenditures in the General Fund. The General Fund Forecast presented in January estimated a \$70M gap in FY10 and a \$15M gap in FY11.

Forecast	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
Recurring Revenues	494.7	479.5	484.4	494.2	514.7	536.2
Recurring Expenditures	564.5	494.7	500.2	521.4	547.0	573.7
Necessary Reductions Over 2 Years	(69.8)	(15.2)				
Revenues minus Expenditures	-	-	(15.8)	(27.2)	(32.3)	(37.5)

**Follow Up From BCC Budget Work Session  
July 14, 2009**

**What is the calculation for the property tax roll up rate?**

- The FY10 Countywide millage rate is 4.8108 mills. The roll-up rate is 5.4820 mills which is a difference 0.6712 mills.
- The roll-up rate would generate about \$43.5M more than the current millage rate.
- Each tenth of a mill (0.10) is worth about \$6.5M.
- The Budget Message on page A-15 summarizes the approval levels for various millage rate levels. The roll up rate can be approved by a simple majority vote of the Board of County Commissioners.