



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

Board of County Commissioners

March 4, 2008
9:30 AM
Commission Chamber

Charles Anderson, CPA
Commission Auditor

111 NW First Street, Suite 1030
Miami, Florida 33128
305-375-4354

**Board of County Commissioners
Agenda Notes
March 4, 2008**

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
1(D)1 1(D)2 1(D)3 1(D)4 1(D)5	Sunset Review of Sunset Boards	<p>These items detail the Sunset Review report for the Community Relations Board, Equal Opportunity Board, Black Affairs Advisory Board, Youth Crime Task Force, and Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust- Section 2-11.40 of the Code of Miami-Dade County establishes a process for the “sunset” review of County boards. According to the code, the County Manager shall provide to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) a written report of the board under review. Upon receipt of the “sunset” review, the BCC shall determine whether to abolish, continue, consolidate or modify the board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <u>Community Relations Board</u> primary mission is to intervene and contain community tensions, identify and relieve intergroup conflicts, develop support programs, foster communications, and assure resources are in place to respond to community crisis. • The <u>Equal Opportunity Board</u>’s purpose is to enforce Miami-Dade County’s anti-discrimination ordinance. The Board works with local employers and housing providers to help create harmonious and productive work environments and equal housing opportunities. • The <u>Black Affairs Advisory Board</u> advocates for diverse ethno-cultural groups that comprises Miami-Dade County’s Black World Community. It serves as a medium for identifying, understanding and facilitating solutions to challenge facing this group. • The <u>Youth Crime Task Force</u> identifies Juvenile Justice needs and allocates funding for best practices programming. The Board also cooperates with the Criminal Justice Council and the Alliance for Human Services in determining juvenile needs and creating effective programs. • The <u>Miami-Dade Homeless Trust</u> provides leadership on issues related to homelessness, such as serving as lead applicant on behalf of the County for federal funding opportunities, and developing and implementing the annual process to identify gaps and needs in the homeless continuum. The Trust has overseen the utilization of the food and beverage tax proceeds. <p>Comments:</p> <p>On June 21, 2007, the Governmental Operations and Environment Committee Sunset Review of County Boards Workshop indicated a desire for an update to the Review of Boards and Councils Report dated March 31, 2006</p>	

Office of the Commission Auditor



Item No.	Subject Matter			Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
			<p>conducted by the Office of the Commission Auditor (OCA), and our Follow-up Report dated November 30, 2006. Staff was also tasked with collecting other data. The OCA concluded an update and submitted a second follow-up report, which contains updated information on Boards' vacancies, meeting frequency, quorum attainment, and other data. The OCA's previous follow-up report, dated March 31, 2006, had already updated the data through the end of FY 2005-06. This second follow-up report provides data for the first and second quarters of FY 2006-07.</p> <p>The data in this Second follow-up report showed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) no significant changes in the percentage of Boards with high vacancy rates and/or low quorum achievement rates; and (2) An improvement in the number of Boards that had met during the period. <p>During the Follow-up Survey for FY 2006-07 Quarters 1 and 2 completed on July 13, 2007 by the OCA illustrated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Community Relations Board reported 80% quorum for 5 meetings, and had a 13% vacancy; • The Equal Opportunity board reported 38% quorum for 26 meetings, and had a 35% vacancy; • The Black Affairs Advisory Board reported 60% quorum for 5 meetings, and had a 38% vacancy; • The Youth Crime Task Force reported 100% quorum for 5 meetings, and had a 6% vacancy; and • The Miami-Dade Homeless Trust reported 100% quorum for 5 meetings, and had a 7% vacancy. 		
3(J)1(A)	Resolution Authorizing Application of Grant Funds for the Pelican Harbor Marina	<p>District 3</p> <p>This resolution authorizes the County Mayor or his designee to apply, accept, and expend up to \$1,000,000 in grant funds from the Florida Inland Navigation District (FIND), Waterway Assistance Program.</p> <p>The grant is for the construction of a Boater's Complex at the Pelican Harbor Marina. It provides for a two-story complex that will house the Dockmaster's and the Park Manager's offices. The complex will include boater's facilities, irrigation, and landscaping with connecting walkways.</p>	<p>The Waterway Assistance Program is a grant program established by the Florida Legislature and FIND for the purpose of financially cooperating with local governments to alleviate problems associated with the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and associated waterways within the District. The program is authorized by Section 374.976, F.S.</p> <p>Eligible waterway related projects</p>		

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>The project cost is estimated at \$2,000,000. The remaining \$1,000,000 in funds will come from the Miami Dade Parks and Recreation Department Capital Improvement Fund.</p> <p>Location: 1275 NE 79 Street.</p> <p>The application is due by April 1, 2008</p>	<p>include navigation channel dredging, channel markers, navigation signs or buoys, boat ramps, docking facilities, fishing & viewing piers, waterfront boardwalks, inlet management, environmental education, law enforcement equipment, boating safety programs, beach re-nourishment, dredge material management, environmental mitigation, and shoreline stabilization.</p>
3(J)1(B)	<p>Resolution Authorizing Application of Grant Funds for the Crandon Seawall</p>	<p>District 7</p> <p>This resolution authorizes the County Mayor or his designee to apply, accept, and expend up to \$1,000,000 in grant funds from the Florida Inland Navigation District (FIND), Waterway Assistance Program.</p> <p>The grant is for renovations to the Crandon seawall at the Crandon Marina.</p> <p>The project cost is estimated at \$2,000,000. The remaining funds \$1,000,000 will come from the Capital Outlay Reserve Fund.</p> <p>Location: 4000 Crandon Boulevard</p> <p>The application is due by April 1, 2008.</p>	<p>The Waterway Assistance Program is a grant program established by the Florida Legislature and FIND for the purpose of financially cooperating with local governments to alleviate problems associated with the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and associated waterways within the District. The program is authorized by Section 374.976, Florida Statutes.</p> <p>Eligible waterway related projects include navigation channel dredging, channel markers, navigation signs or buoys, boat ramps, docking facilities, fishing & viewing piers, waterfront boardwalks, inlet management, environmental education, law enforcement equipment, boating safety programs, beach re-nourishment, dredge material management, environmental mitigation, and shoreline stabilization.</p>
3(J)1(C)	<p>Resolution Authorizing Application of Grant Funds for the</p>	<p>District 4</p> <p>This resolution would authorize the County Mayor or his designee to apply, accept, and expend up to \$200,000 in grant funds from the</p>	<p>The Florida Boating Improvement Program provides funding through competitive grants for boating access projects and other boating-related</p>

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	Haulover Marina	<p>Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Florida Boating Improvement Program.</p> <p>The grant will contribute to the Boater's Complex project at the Haulover Marina.</p> <p>The Haulover Marina Boater's Complex Project award was approved at the February 19, 2008 Board of County Commissioners meeting. The project cost is approximately \$2.7 million.</p>	<p>activities on coastal and/or inland waters of Florida.</p> <p>Eligible uses of program funds include boat ramps, lifts and hoists, marine railways, and other public launching facilities for boaters.</p> <p>The application is due by April 1, 2008.</p>
3(J)1(D)	Resolution Authorizing Application of Grant Funds for the Milton E. Thompson Park	<p>District 12</p> <p>This resolution authorizes the County Mayor or his designee to apply, accept, and expend up to \$200,000 in grant funds from the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services Division of Forestry, T. Mark Schmidt Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Grant Program for FY 2008-2009.</p> <p>The grant is for the construction of a chain link access control fence at the Milton E. Thompson Park. The fence would separate the motor-cross track from the surrounding 580 acres of wetland marsh pine.</p> <p>Location: 16665 N.W. 177 Avenue</p> <p>The cost of this project is \$240,000. A grant match of \$40,000 will come from the Capital Reserve Outlay Fund.</p>	<p>The T. Mark Schmidt OHV Recreation Grant Program provides financial assistance to public agencies statewide in order to improve off-highway vehicle riding opportunities on public lands. Grant funding comes from the titling of Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs) which includes off-highway motorcycles and all-terrain vehicles only.</p> <p>The Grant Program is available to any municipal or local government, state or federal agency or entity, Native-American tribal government, or legally organized nonprofit organizations.</p> <p>The application is due on March 16, 2008.</p>
4(B)	Ordinance Amending Section 8CC of the Code of Miami-Dade County	<p>The ordinance amends Section 8CC of the Code relating to civil penalties; amends Chapter 24 of the Code providing for correction of scrivener's errors, grammatical, content, and spelling errors; updates incorrect code references; provides consistent terminology; repeals Section 24-42.6 relating to prohibition against use of hard detergents; and repeals Section 24-42.7 relating to detergents.</p> <p>On December 2, 2004, the Board of County Commissioners enacted Ordinance Number 04-214 as the first step of the reorganization of Chapter 24 of the Code.</p> <p>Comments:</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>The Office of the Commission Auditor reviewed the proposed deletion of Section 24-42.6 relating to the prohibition against the use of hard detergents and Section 24-42.7 relating to detergents. Statutory provisions addressing hard detergents were adopted by the State of Florida on December 31, 1972. The Department of Environmental Resource Management (DERM) determined these sections to be a duplication of existing state laws.</p> <p>Sections pursuant to Chapter 72-53, Laws of Florida, rules and regulations were adopted to ensure that no detergents reasonably found to have a harmful or deleterious effect on human health or on the environment are sold in Florida after December 31, 1972.</p> <p>Adopted Rules 62-603.100 of the Florida Administrative Code states in part that:</p> <p>(a) It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to sell, offer to expose for sale, give or furnish any detergent, other than powdered household laundry detergents with recommended use levels of 1/4 cup (2 oz.) or less per load, containing more than eight and seven-tenths percent (8.7%) of phosphorus by weight, expressed as elemental phosphorus, within Florida after December 31, 1972.</p> <p>(b) It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to sell, offer or expose for sale, give or furnish any household laundry detergent which requires a recommended use level of said detergent containing more than seven grams (7 gms.) of phosphorus by weight, expressed as elemental phosphorus, within Florida after December 31, 1972.</p> <p><i>Specific Authority 403.061(7),(23) FS. Law Implemented 403.061(23) FS., Chapter 72-53, Laws of Florida</i></p> <p>The process that DERM had been following is now being codified by this ordinance. There were some sections that had been amended, but were not reflected in MuniCode. For example, Section 24-48.9 was amended by Ordinance 04-163. This section deals with extending short form rockmining permits from five years to ten years.</p>	
4(D)	<p>Subpoena power of the Independent Review Panel (IRP)</p> <p>Vice-Chairwoman Barbara J. Jordan</p>	<p>This ordinance amends Article 1C, §2-11.45 of the Code, granting subpoena power to the IRP with conditions. The proposed subpoena power will not grant immunity which may interfere with prosecutorial procedures.</p> <p>The IRP, created in 1980 by Ordinance No. 80-8, was designed to operate autonomously from county government as an independent civilian "watchdog" agency. Following the McDuffie and LaFleur police shootings and subsequent riots in 1979, the BCC conceived the IRP as a means to improve community confidence in all aspects of its government (IRP 2006 Annual Report).</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>The IRP is composed of citizen volunteers who hold public hearings of cases that deserve formal investigation and special attention.</p> <p>Presently the IRP, has the following authority and powers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To hold public hearings, make factual determinations, draw conclusions, propose recommendations and prepare interim and final reports on matters relating to serious complaints or grievances made against an employee, agency, or instrumentality of Miami-Dade County. • To demand, examine and duplicate public records and documents in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 119, Florida Statute. • To enter and inspect any premises under the jurisdiction or control of Miami-Dade County or any of its agencies or instrumentalities. • To request any person, including the supervisor of the Internal Review Section of the Miami-Dade Police Department, to give sworn testimony or to produce documentary or other evidence. <i>Such requests are the only vehicle the IRP has in obtaining information and this has been a difficult task due to the lack of cooperation by witnesses.</i> • To request the County Attorney to render opinions relating to its duties, jurisdiction or power. <p>In 1996, the BCC passed Ordinance No. 96-41, granting the IRP authority to consider retaliation complaints when requested to do so by the County Manager. This amendment provided for subpoena power in the review of whistleblower cases (IRP 2006 Annual Report).</p> <p>The Ethics Commission, the Commission Auditor, and the Inspector General have the type of subpoena powers being sought in this ordinance. In addition, several boards such as the Environmental Quality Control Board and departments, such as the Department of Business Development, have been granted subpoena powers. The City of Miami, on February 14, 2002, under Ordinance No. 12188, granted the Civilian Investigative Panel (CIP), the power to issue subpoenas provided that no immunity is conferred by the CIP. The CIP has a similar mission to the IRP.</p>	
4(E)	Ordinance Regarding Port of Miami Tunnel Project Letter of Credit	<p>District 5</p> <p>This ordinance would secure repayment obligations of a \$75 million irrevocable Letter of Credit (LOC) in favor of the Florida Department of Transportation for the Seaport Tunnel. This ordinance would legally bind the County to annually budget and appropriate sufficient funds from non-ad valorem revenue to meet the repayment obligations of the LOC.</p>	<p>The Seaport Tunnel is a \$915 million project funded jointly by the State of Florida Department of Transportation, Miami-Dade County and the City of Miami.</p> <p>The Board of County Commissioners approved the Port Tunnel Master Agreement through Resolution No. 899-</p>

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>This ordinance stipulates that the terms for the LOC and LOC provider be approved by the Board in a subsequent resolution.</p> <p>The LOC will be used to fund the Geotechnical Condition and Relief Event Reserve for the Port Tunnel Project.</p> <p>Use of a Letter of Credit in the amount of \$75 million was approved as an acceptable form of financing for the Port Tunnel project by the Board through the passage of R-889-07.</p> <p><u>Geotechnical Condition and Relief Event Reserve</u></p> <p>The County has committed to a LOC to cover their commitment to fund this reserve through R-889-07. According to the Finance Department, the State will draw upon this reserve as needed and the County will pay the LOC Provider the amount of the draws and any accrued interest upon the completion of the Tunnel by issuing bonds backed by the County's pledge to budget and appropriate from legally available non-ad valorem revenues of the County, to be paid by Seaport revenues.</p> <p>Changed Geotechnical Conditions are unknown geotechnical conditions that have not been disclosed in the State's RFP for the Concessionaire building the Port Tunnel. The State and the County took borings along the allowable corridor for the tunnel and County staff considers that the probability of changed geotechnical conditions is "slight."</p> <p><u>Relief Events</u> are unforeseen events such as damage or delays caused by a hurricane, discovery of archeological, paleontological or cultural resources, changes in law, FDOT or County requested changes, or contaminated materials. County staff has stated that the likelihood of this reserve being drawn upon for Relief Events is high.</p>	<p>07, which capped the County's contribution to the project at \$402.5 million to be funded as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$100 million from the General Obligation Bond Program; • \$114 million of future FDOT District 6 revenues (SCETS) committed to the County. The County will issue bonds backed by the County's pledge to budget and appropriate from legally available non ad valorem revenues of the County; however, the revenues will be paid by the future District 6 revenues; • \$43.5 million to be bonded and secured by the County's non ad valorem revenues but payable from Port revenues • \$45 million of right-way credits from the State of Florida which are not paid back; • \$75 million for a <u>Geotechnical & Relief Contingency Reserve to be funded through a Letter of Credit to be secured by County's non ad valorem revenues and payable from Port revenues;</u> • \$25 million for an Additional Relief Event Reserve. According to the Finance Department, funding for this reserve has not been determined. It is anticipated the County would obtain another LOC, use it in a similar manner as the \$75 million LOC, and repay it in the same 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
			<p>manner.</p> <p>The Port Tunnel project consists of three main components: widening the MacArthur Causeway Bridge; a tunnel connection between Watson Island and Dodge Island; and constructing connections to the Power of Miami roadway system.</p>
4(F)	GU (Interim) Zoning District; §33-196 of the Code	<p>This ordinance, relates to the regulation of the GU (Interim) Zoning District, providing for two different trend determination processes for GU Districts inside and outside the Urban Development Boundaries (UDB).</p> <p>Uses in the GU zoning district depends on the character of the neighborhood, otherwise EU-2, 5 acre single family estate, zoning district standards apply.</p> <p>Present Zoning Code regulations allow for the Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning, when requested in writing, to make a trend of development determination. A trend of development takes into consideration the use or uses which predominates in adjoining properties within the GU District which because of their geographic proximity to the subject parcel make for a compatible use. This determination does not constitute a rezoning of the property, it only permits a limited compatible use.</p> <p>If no trend of development has been established in the GU neighborhood, minimum standards of the EU-2 District, 5 acre single family estate would apply. The EU-2 district does not allow agricultural uses as permitted in the Agricultural (AU) District.</p> <p>The purpose of the proposed ordinance is twofold: (1) to link trend determination for GU zoned properties with land use designation on the Land Use Plan (LUP) map of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP); and (2) to promote agriculture by requiring un-trended GU District properties outside the UDB to default to uses and regulation outlined in the Agricultural zoning district when they are designated Agriculture on the LUP map of the CDMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>§33-196(A) GU Designated Areas Inside the UDB</u> The current trend determination process would apply. • <u>§33-196 (B) GU Designated Areas Outside the UDB</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Properties that are designated Agricultural on the LUP map of the CDMP would default to the uses and regulations outlined in the Agricultural zoning district. 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions												
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Properties that are designated Open Land or Environmental Protection on the LUP map of the CDMP would apply the current trend determination process in order to discourage land clearing and agricultural uses in the environmentally sensitive areas. ○ Properties in the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, East Everglades Area boundaries, and the Rockmining Overlay Zoning Area are not subject to the trend determination process. <p>Agricultural Practices Study Advisory Board (APSAB) Recommendation On December 5, 2007, the APSAB passed Resolution No. AG-04-07, accepting the proposed ordinance; however, they strongly objected to the language referring to the exemption of the properties in the East Everglades Area (§33-196(B)).</p> <p>History of the GU Zoning District The Zoning Code for Miami-Dade County was created in 1938. It controls the use and development of land and building for the health, safety, and welfare of the County. Zoning districts were assigned to areas based on the existing use of the properties. The GU Zoning District was created for all properties that were not assigned a specific zoning classification. The GU zoning district was assigned to any area that was not covered by another district.</p>													
5(D)	Resolution Approving Deletion of Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond Program Project No. 131, and Approving Modification to Project No. 132	<p>The resolution authorizes the deletion of the Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond Program (BBC GOB) Project No. 131, “Portable Emergency Bridges (temporary) – Refurbish Existing Bailey Bridges” and that the Project Name, Project Description and Allocation of Project No. 132 be modified to read “Sonovoid Bridge Improvement Program”, “Structurally upgrade Sonovoid bridge decks as required.”</p> <p>Project No. 131 includes an allocation of \$100,000. The original description for this project states that funding will be used to “Refurbish Existing Bailey Bridges.” The Public Works Department (PWD) currently has two (2) World War II portable Bailey Bridges at the Road and Bridge Division yard located at 9301 NW 58 Street. These bridges have been used twice in the past 30 years, and have not been used at all in the past 20 years. PWD would like to reallocate funds from Project No. 131 to BBC Project No 132 to improve existing bridges that are currently in use and in need of repair.</p> <p>It is estimated that with the new allocation of \$100,000 from the Bailey bridges funding and the original allocation of \$10,000,000 for Sonoviod bridges would cover approximately 15 bridges to undergo structural repairs.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PWD-OCI Bridge Project No. 132 (Sonovoid Bridge Improvement Program)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 1341 1934 1446"> <thead> <tr> <th>Funding</th> <th>Type</th> <th>District</th> <th>Address</th> <th>Project Title</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>GOB</td> <td>Bridges</td> <td>12</td> <td>NW 97th Ave and Fontainebleau Blvd;</td> <td>Fontainebleau Blvd over Golf Cart Path</td> <td>Under Construction</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Funding	Type	District	Address	Project Title	Status	GOB	Bridges	12	NW 97th Ave and Fontainebleau Blvd;	Fontainebleau Blvd over Golf Cart Path	Under Construction
Funding	Type	District	Address	Project Title	Status										
GOB	Bridges	12	NW 97th Ave and Fontainebleau Blvd;	Fontainebleau Blvd over Golf Cart Path	Under Construction										

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background			Analysis / Comments / Questions	
					874637, 874638 located on Fontainebleau Blvd. 0.2 miles west of NW 97 Avenue.		
		GOB	Bridges	8	SW 248th ST and SW 123rd Ave; 874450	SW 248 ST over C-102-N	Substantially Complete
		GOB	Bridges	8	SW 187th AVE and SW 272nd ST;874265	SW 187 Ave over C-103	Bidding
		GOB	Bridges	8	SW 147th Ave and SW 216th St; 874443	SW 147 Ave over C-102	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	8	SW 182nd Ave and SW 272nd St; 874242	SW 182 Ave over C-103	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	1	NW 22nd Ave and NW 155th St; 874030	NW 22 Ave over Biscayne Canal	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	8	SW 288th St and SW 167th Ave; 874093	SW 288 St over C-103	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	8	SW 264th ST and SW 157th AVE; 874356	SW 264 St over C-103	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	9	SW 217th ave and SW 280th ST; 874352	SW 217 Ave over C-103	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	9	SW 328th ST and SW 117th Ave; 874476	SW 328 St over levee L-31-E	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	9	SW 117th Ave and SW 200th St; 874456	SW 117 Ave over C-103	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	8	SW 248th St and SW 133rd Ave; 874446	SW 248 ST over C-102	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	2	NW 22nd Ave and NW 103rd ST; 874334	NW S. River over FEC Canal	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	12	NW South River Dr. and NW 74th St; 874094	NW S. River over FEC Canal	Design Completed
		GOB	Bridges	9	SW 192 St and SW 187th Ave	SW 192 St over C-102	Design Completed
5(E)	Resolution Approving Significant	District 4					

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	Modification to Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond Program Project No. 235	<p>The resolution approves a significant modification to the Building Better Communities (BBC) Bond Program Project No. 235 listed in Resolution No. R-917-04. The resolution amends the original BBC project description for the Village of Bal Harbour Village which currently mentions “Construct City Hall/Police Building” to “City Hall/Police Building or renovate the existing facilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The change to the project description allows the Village to use the original BBC project allocation of \$963,000 to build two new holding cells and restroom facilities. The remaining balance of \$758,000 will be used at the discretion of the Village council for the construction or renovation of the existing City Hall/Police Building facilities. The initial request to address concerns about safety was derived from a residential committee petition to the Village council.</i> <p>On January 8, 2008, the Building Better Communities Citizens’ Advisory Committee approved this item.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>The Village adopted a resolution requesting the County to allow for the “significant modification” to the existing language.</p>	
5(F)	Resolution Approving Significant Modification to Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond Program Project No. 57	<p>District 4</p> <p>The resolution approves a significant modification to the Building Better Communities (BBC) Bond Program Project No. 57 listed in Resolution No. R-913-04. The significant modification would allow the City of Aventura (Aventura) to build on city-owned land rather than on County-owned land. Bond Program Project No. 57, titled “Aventura – Purchase Land for Parks/Public Facilities,” has an allocation of \$4.714 million, and authorizes the City to construct a Performing Arts Center.</p> <p>On January 8, 2008, the Building Better Communities Citizens’ Advisory Committee approved this item.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>When voters approved the eight referendum questions to fund more than 300 capital improvements projects, Bond Program Project No. 57 “Aventura-Purchase Land for Parks/Public Facilities,” did not have a set location. Aventura adopted a resolution on December 14, 2007 requesting the County to allow for a “significant modification” to the existing language by introducing a new address for the project 3375 NE 188 Street.</p> <p>This would be the third performing arts venue in Miami-Dade County, and part of a broader package of cultural</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>facilities the County is helping to build or renovate around the County.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is the Adrienne Arsht Center for the Performing Arts, and the South Miami-Dade Cultural Arts Center which is under construction, and is conceived as a multidisciplinary center for the arts. • There are two smaller venues opened: the new Lou Rawls Performing Arts Center at Florida Memorial University in Miami Gardens, and the renovated Hialeah High School auditorium, which will double as a community performing arts center for the residents of the City of Hialeah. <p>Aventura Branch Library: According to the Office of Capital Improvement (OCI), Project No. 250 allocates \$2.3 million for the renovation or construction of the Aventura Branch Library. The estimated cost to renovate the existing structure is \$9 million versus \$12 million to demolish and construct a new library at a new location. The Miami-Dade Library will use its Capital Reserve Funds to cover any remaining construction costs.</p>	
5(G)	<p>Resolution Approving Significant Modification to Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond Program Project No. 130</p>	<p>District 7</p> <p>The resolution authorizes a significant modification to the Project Description and Allocation for the Building Better Communities (BBC) General Obligation Bond Program Project No. 130, “Bear Cut Fishing Catwalk Repair.” The new description will read “Demolish the existing Bear Cut Fishing Catwalk” and the new allocation for Bear Cut will equal \$400,000. In addition, it is recommended that the BCC approve the addition of new BBC Project, No. 130(a) - “Fishing Piers at Old William Powell Bridge at Key Biscayne” and the reallocation of \$1.1 million from “Bear Cut Fishing Catwalk Repair” to new Project No. 130 (a).</p> <p>This change in description and scope of the project will result in the reallocation of \$1.1 million to new BBC Project No. 130(a) – “Fishing Piers at Old William Powell Bridge at Key Biscayne.” This new project complies with the original intent of the voters in providing fishing piers to the public in the same vicinity. The Project Description will read “Restore structural integrity of the fishing piers at Old William Powell Bridge and re-open the facility to the public.”</p> <p>Projected cost to demolish and construct: The Old William Powell Bridge was built as part of the Rickenbacker causeway in the late 1940’s. The New William Powell Bridge was built in 1985 and at this time the bascule portion of the Old William Powell Bridge was removed, leaving the rest of the bridge in place used by the public for fishing. These are now called the Fishing Piers.</p> <p>According to the Public Works Department (PWD), the preferred option would be to completely demolish (superstructure and substructure) both east and west piers and build a new fishing pier, approximately 300 feet long. The project would cost approximately \$5.5 to \$6.5 million. <u>The source for additional funds has not been identified by PWD.</u></p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions													
		<p>Comments:</p> <p>Due to the severe deterioration of the Bear Cut Fishing Catwalk, the PWD is proposing to completely demolish and remove the fishing catwalk. According to PWD, the catwalk was closed on 2003.</p>														
5(Q)	Ordinance Creating the South Kendall Community Development District	<p>District 9</p> <p>This ordinance expands the South Kendall Community Development District (CDD) from 40.32 acres to 52.98 acres, an increase of approximately 12.66 acres. The CDD currently encompasses 40.32 acres with approximately \$3.597 million in infrastructure costs. The expanded CDD will encompass a total of 581 acres. The expanded CDD includes 147 additional townhouse units, and a total infrastructure cost of approximately \$4.746 million.</p> <p><u>The total design and development cost for the expansion area is estimated to be \$1,149,050. The additional bonds necessary are expected to be repaid through non ad valorem assessments levied on all properties in the CDD.</u></p> <p>The members of the Board of Supervisors for the South Kendall Community are as follows: Miguel Avila, Beysi Orbera, Tracy Pedrouzo, and Brian Mulqueen</p> <p style="text-align: center;">South Kendall Community CDD Special Estimated District Assessments</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 870 1978 1040"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="634 870 863 1005">Type of Structure</th> <th data-bbox="863 870 1121 1005">Estimated Annual District Capital Assessments</th> <th data-bbox="1121 870 1381 1005">Estimated Annual Administrative Assessments</th> <th data-bbox="1381 870 1694 1005">Estimated Annual District Capital Assessments for the first 3 years</th> <th data-bbox="1694 870 1978 1005">Estimated Monthly District Capital Assessments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 1005 863 1040">Single Family</td> <td data-bbox="863 1005 1121 1040">\$1,200</td> <td data-bbox="1121 1005 1381 1040">\$242</td> <td data-bbox="1381 1005 1694 1040">\$1,442</td> <td data-bbox="1694 1005 1978 1040">\$100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It is unknown at this time, whether the expansion will increase the estimated assessments. The actual assessments in the expansion area will be determined following the CDD public hearing and adoption of the assessment roll. If there is an increase, the difference in assessment amounts is attributable to higher infrastructure costs, interest rates and market conditions.</p>	Type of Structure	Estimated Annual District Capital Assessments	Estimated Annual Administrative Assessments	Estimated Annual District Capital Assessments for the first 3 years	Estimated Monthly District Capital Assessments	Single Family	\$1,200	\$242	\$1,442	\$100				
Type of Structure	Estimated Annual District Capital Assessments	Estimated Annual Administrative Assessments	Estimated Annual District Capital Assessments for the first 3 years	Estimated Monthly District Capital Assessments												
Single Family	\$1,200	\$242	\$1,442	\$100												
7(A)	Ordinance Amending Rule 9.03 of Section 2-1; Relating to Rules Governing Fee Waivers Concerning Vizcaya	<p>This ordinance amends Rule 9.03 of Section 2-1 of the Code of Miami-Dade County as it relates to rules governing fee waivers for the use of Vizcaya Museum and Gardens (VMG).</p> <p>Currently, Rule 9.03 of Section 2-1 states, “all requests for fee reductions and waivers for the use of Vizcaya Museum and Gardens must be submitted to the board for review at a public hearing. Following the public hearing any such fee reductions and waivers will require a unanimous vote of the board members present.”</p>														

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>Commissioner Jose “Pepe” Diaz</p> <p>Chairman Bruno A. Barreiro</p> <p>Commissioner Carlos A. Gimenez</p>	<p>The amendment would reduce the voting requirement from a unanimous vote to two-thirds (2/3) vote for certain <u>events</u>.</p> <p>This rule only applies when any portion of the cost of the fee waiver will negatively impact the VMG budget. However, this rule would not apply when a private party is given a fee waiver and the VMG is fully reimbursed from another County fund.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p><i>What is the position of the VMG Trust regarding these changes?</i></p> <p>According to staff, the Trust supports the proposed provision stating that events for which Vizcaya will be fully reimbursed by another County source would not require a waiver vote—instead they would only require a vote on the source of funding. However, they are opposed to reducing the voting requirement from unanimous to 2/3, because the current rule provides important protection for Vizcaya. Prior to the establishment of the current rule VMG lost significant revenue and suffered excessive wear and tear from the large number of events it hosted prior to the establishment of the rule.</p> <p><i>What events are impacted?</i></p> <p>Staff states that it is difficult to establish how many events this would impact. They note that prior to the establishment of the current rule, there were nearly 200 events at Vizcaya a year, while now there are approximately 110.</p>	
7(B)	<p>Ordinance Amending Section 17-149 relating to the Community Affordable Housing Strategies Alliance (CAHSA)</p> <p>Vice-Chairwoman Barbara J. Jordan</p>	<p>This ordinance amends Section 17-149 of the Miami-Dade County Code which relates to the Community Affordable Housing Strategies Alliance (CAHSA).</p> <p>Currently, according to the Code, CAHSA shall be composed of 36 voting members. One member shall be appointed from various housing-related organizations and agencies. Appointees shall also come from the local housing development industry.</p> <p>Currently, agencies nominate a slate of no less than three candidates to represent them on the CAHSA board. Upon receipt of the candidate lists of the various organizations, the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners forwards the list to the full BCC through resolution.</p>	<p>Under the changes proposed in this item, CAHSA would be composed of 32 <i>voting</i> members as opposed to the current 36 members. Three of the four seats which are being deleted from the voting membership shall be reclassified as ex-officio members. The three ex officio members are: the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development; the Dade Legislative Representative; and the U.S. Legislative Representative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Miami-Dade Empowerment

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>From the pool of candidates for each seat, the Board of County Commissioners shall appoint one eligible person to serve as a member or alternate.</p> <p>CAHSA CAHSA was created by the Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners through Resolution-558-06, to assist in addressing the housing crisis in Miami-Dade County. CAHSA is charged with the following duties, functions and responsibilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To identify the data gathering processes and procedures necessary to evaluate the housing crisis in Miami-Dade County. • To establish methods of obtaining input on community needs and priorities, this may include public meetings, conducting focus groups and convening ad hoc panels. • To develop solutions that should include recommending additional legislation and enforcement of existing legislation. • To develop methods to inform the public about available funding and financing opportunities, rental and homeownership opportunities through an expanded public information and consumer education program. • To plan and implement the convocation of a Miami-Dade County Housing Summit with the purpose of charting the course in program and policy development for the County as it establishes a comprehensive affordable housing strategy. • To offer guidance in establishing a one-stop clearinghouse for information relating to housing in Miami-Dade County. • To serve in an advisory capacity to the Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners and the Mayor of Miami-Dade County and other public and governmental entities with respect to affordable housing issues. 	<p>Trust will no longer have a representative seat on the Alliance.</p> <p>The proposal would also delete the requirement that the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners obtain a list of three names of candidates per CAHSA seat from various organizations.</p> <p>All the names of CAHSA nominees obtained by the Chair shall be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners via resolution for final approval.</p>
7(C) & 11(A)1	<p>Florida City Boundary Change and Interlocal Agreement</p> <p>Board of County</p>	<p>The proposed annexation is for a 16.8 acre area located south of the City’s boundaries. The proposed annexation area is bounded on the north by theoretical SW 352nd Street, on the west by Florida East Coast Railway right-of-way, on the east by Krome Avenue and US1, and on the south by an area south of SW 360th Street, just south of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB).</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>Commissioners</p>	<p>Item 11A1 approves the Interlocal Agreement between Florida City and Miami-Dade County. It provides for the County to maintain jurisdiction to approve applications for all rockmining, lake excavations and related requests for the annexed area. Waste management services will also be maintained by the County and any existing interlocal agreements between the County (such as DERM, WASD, Public Safety, etc.) and Florida City will remain in full force and effect.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact Annexation of the area does not result in a net revenue loss to the Unincorporated Municipal Service Area (UMSA) budget. Based upon the revenues generated and services provided to the area as part of UMSA, a net annual budget savings of approximately \$144,000 should be realized. However, it is necessary to note that the net gain to the UMSA budget will not necessarily be \$151,200. First, many expense items will not be eliminated from the overall budget but will continue to serve UMSA. Second, the revenue and expense numbers are based on budgetary allocation formulas and not actual revenues and expenditures. In addition, the County will retain the franchise fees and utility taxes collected within the annexation area which are estimated at approximately \$1,800 and \$2,600 respectively. <u>The expected tax increase to the area if the annexation is approved would be \$26,981. The area generates an estimated \$11,800 in revenue. The County spends an estimated \$163,000, per year, providing services to the area</u> (Source: OSBM).</p> <p>December 14, 2004 – Florida City approved Resolution No. 04-47, initiating the proposed boundary change.</p> <p>May 9, 2005 – Florida City submitted an application for the annexation of an unincorporated area adjacent to the City.</p> <p>November 1, 2005 – the BCC suspended consideration of incorporations and annexations.</p> <p>May 8, 2007 – BCC allowed annexations to proceed.</p> <p>October 12, 2007 – the Governmental Operations and Environment Committee (GOEC) accepted the annexation report.</p>	
7(D)	<p>Ordinance Relating to North Terminal Development at Miami International Airport</p> <p>Commissioner Jose</p>	<p>This ordinance adds Section 2-285.1, Mayor’s authority as to contracts relating to the North Terminal Development Project at Miami International Airport, to the Code of Miami-Dade County and authorizes the County Mayor (Mayor) or the Airport Director, if authorized by the Mayor, to do the following, without prior approval of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), with respect to the contracts assigned to Miami-Dade County (County) pursuant to R-735-05, Fourth Amendment to Lease Construction and Financing Agreement between the County and American Airlines, Inc. only, and shall be within the BCC approved budget for North Terminal Development (NTD) Project at Miami International Airport (MIA):</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>“Pepe” Diaz</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advertise, Accept or Reject Bids; • Award, Amend or Modify Contracts; • Authorize Waiver of Competitive Bids (<i>Listed in the title of the ordinance</i>); • Extend contract time and waive liquidated damages for failure to comply before specified date for completion of the contract provided good cause exists and the contract provides that after the expiration of the contract time the County may extend contract time or waive liquidated damages; • Increase or reduce in any amount the scope and compensation payable under any contract; • Grant compensable and non-compensable time extensions; • Establish conditions for exercise of delegated authority; and • Any exercise of authority pursuant to this Section, shall require ratification by the BCC. <p>Additionally, if a contract expires and such contract was competitively procured and contains no minority goals or measures, the Mayor, and the Airport Director may recommend to the BCC that a contract be re-awarded to the same firm, this type of request will be heard by the BCC.</p> <p>Any amendment in excess of five million dollars (\$5,000,000) shall be subject to the prior approval of the BCC. For example, if this ordinance was currently in place Item 8(A)1(C) on today’s Agenda would not need the prior approval of the Board of County Commissioners.</p> <p>The Implementing Order (IO) shall contain guidelines for the implementation of the authority conferred in this ordinance and shall specifically provide for the application of County policies regarding, contracting, procedures for bid protests, inclusion of small business measures, community business enterprises, community small business enterprises, community workforce and responsible wages. The provision of the Code relative to such programs shall not be applicable to the contracts specified in this ordinance except as specifically provided for in the IO.</p> <p>This item was deferred at the January 17, 2008 Airport and Tourism Committee (ATC) meeting in order to bring forth the Implementing Order (IO) together with the Ordinance, however, according to staff, the IO is still not completed.</p> <p>Also, this item was substantially amended at the February 14, 2008 ATC meeting to incorporate various provisions. As well as, deleting the provision that created the “North Terminal Development Steering Committee” comprised of MDAD employees which provided for the steering committee’s approval prior to any decisions made.</p> <p>This ordinance shall become effective within ten (10) days after the date of enactment unless vetoed by the Mayor</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>and sunsets on January 1, 2011, or upon the substantial completion of the NTD Project, or if Jose Abreu is no longer the Director of the Miami-Dade County Aviation Department.</p> <p>However, the previous version heard at the February 14, 2008 ATC meeting provided that the ordinance shall become effective upon approval of the Implementing Order.</p> <p><u>Question:</u></p> <p><u>This ordinance provides a significant grant of authority to the Mayor or the Airport Director. What provisions are in place for checks and balances?</u></p>	
7(E)	Amending Chapter 10 of the Code of Miami-Dade County	<p>This ordinance amends Chapter 10 of the Miami-Dade County Code in order for the Code to be in compliance with State Statutes. Chapter 489, F.S. requires Miami-Dade County licensed contractors to register their licenses with the State of Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation Construction Industry Licensing Board (CILB) in order to obtain building permits. The State recognizes equivalent licenses if it corresponds to one of the categories of licensure contained in Chapter 489, F.S.</p> <p>This ordinance addresses the substantial differences between the scope of work for the General Building, Sub-General Building and Sub-Building contractor licenses, and to a lesser extent the General Engineering contractor category, issued by Miami-Dade County and the States corresponding scopes. The proposed amendment corrects this issue.</p> <p>The amendments include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminates the general building, sub-general building and sub-building categories; • Adds the general contractor, building contractor, and residential contractor categories, in compliance with State Statutes; and • Amends the general engineering contractor classification to maintain consistency with the general contractor category. <p>This ordinance will be implemented in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The modifications will sunset the non-corresponding local licenses and create replacement contractor classifications, which will substantially match the equivalent State license categories. • The amendment addresses those individuals qualified and certified in one of the three license categories on or before the effective date of the ordinance. These license holders will be issued the applicable General, Building or Residential Contractor license and other additional certificates authorized by the scope of their local contractor's license. • The General Engineering contractors will be issued additional certificates authorized by their scope of work, 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>necessary to remain consistent with the General contractor classification.</p> <p>According to staff, no fiscal impact is anticipated for Miami-Dade County or the municipalities.</p> <p>Question: Will this item have any impacts on the cost the contractor pays to obtain a license? According to Building Code Compliance there will be no additional cost for those license holders in these categories.</p>	
7(F) & 7(F) Supp.	Ordinance Amending Article III, Section 14, Code of Miami-Dade County, Related to Maintenance Requirements for Fire Alarm and Fire Sprinkler Systems	<p>This ordinance amends Section 14 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, related to the maintenance requirements for fire alarm and fire sprinkler systems. This amendment would require owners of commercial buildings with fire alarm and fire sprinkler systems to have maintenance agreements, and licensed technicians respond to malfunctions and alarm conditions. Currently, the Fire Watch system is used when there are system breakdowns.</p> <p><u>This ordinance will directly address the root cause of system malfunctions by requiring a contract for periodic testing and maintenance services. This ordinance lowers the dependency on the fire watch system.</u></p> <p>Exemptions: The current code exempts a number of buildings from these requirements, including one and two-family dwelling units; apartment buildings with fewer than 12 units or less than 4 stories; and other small business occupancies. <u>This proposed amendment does not modify the list of exempted buildings.</u></p> <p>False Alarm Costs: The cost associated with false alarms to a building owner is \$500.00 for the first false alarm. Subsequent false alarms are \$1,000 each. The MDRF allows for one free pass.</p> <p>Fire Watch Costs: Fire watch costs are relative to the size and type of building. A typical apartment building requires one guard per floor. Assuming there are four floors to watch, the estimated cost would be \$20/hr. X 4 X 24 hrs = \$1,920 / day for the duration of any repairs. Historically the MDRF experience fire watch costs of \$40,000.00 or more.</p> <p>Current Costs to Businesses: Businesses with fire alarm and fire sprinkler systems are already incurring some expenses for maintaining their systems. A typical service contract with a cost per hour without any necessary repairs would run \$116.25 to \$155.00. If repairs were needed, then there would be a cost of material, plus an additional \$77.50 to \$155.00 in labor.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source: All expenses will be borne by the building owners, who may pass this cost on to their tenants. Occupancies without contractual agreements for required maintenance and testing will be affected. For example, a typical contract for a typical three-story apartment building with 15 dwelling units would cost the</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>owner an average of \$200 a month to monitor the system and \$77.50 an hour for each service call. A typical inclusive full service contract would cost the owner \$406.88 per month.</p> <p>Grace Period: There will be a grace period, beginning within 545 days of notification to the building owner. The owner will have the option to appeal, based on the hardship, to the Fire Authority having jurisdiction for an extension of time up to a maximum of 1,095 days.</p> <p>Monitoring/Tracking: The fire inspector will check for the contract in the fire alarm log. In addition, responding emergency fire units will refer non-compliant systems to the Fire Prevention Division. <u>This rule would apply to new construction; new alarm and fire sprinkler systems; and apply to all existing fire alarm systems.</u></p> <p>The Miami-Dade Fire Department (MDFD) has surveyed approximately 100 alarm contractors within its jurisdiction, and has confirmed that these companies offer a variety of contracting options that will meet the proposed requirements of this ordinance.</p> <p>The contracts generally fall into two categories:</p> <p><u>Full service agreements and basic service agreements.</u> In the case of a full service agreement, a company would assess the size and type of alarm system, to determine the level of risk for the system, and enter into a scheduled service agreement for a price based on that assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a basic service agreement, the company would offer a fee schedule for the variety of services they offer and enter into a service agreement to which that pre-negotiated price list would be attached. <p>1. Full Service Agreement with no exposure risk scenario:</p> <p>For a typical three story apartment building with five apartments per floor, or for a retail business where an alarm system is required by code, approximate costs for service agreements are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a full service (turn-key system) \$4,800.00 per year • For a basic service agreement \$0.00 per year <p>2. Full Service Agreement with limited exposure risk scenario:</p> <p>With a service agreement, correcting problems with the alarm system at the same types of buildings referenced above would cost (approximately):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With a full service agreement \$0.00 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With a basic agreement, assuming two service calls due to malfunction and maintenance provided: <p>Sample Rates: Technician - 8hrs @ \$77.50/hr Parts estimate \$1,500.00</p> <p>Service Cost \$2,120.00 Potential fines for two malfunction alarms \$1,250.00</p> <p>Total Cost \$3,370.00</p> <p>3. Full Service Agreement with exposure risk scenario:</p> <p>Without a service contract, assuming two service calls due to a malfunction, without maintenance provided:</p> <p>Sample Rates: Technician – 8hrs @ \$150.00/hr Parts estimate \$1,500.00</p> <p>Service Cost \$2,700.00 Potential fines for malfunction \$1,250.00</p> <p>Total Cost \$3,950.00</p> <p>4. Firewatch for out-of-service contracts:</p> <p>If firewatch is required, costs can significantly increase. Firewatch for out-of-service alarm required by code:</p> <p>2 firewatchers at \$20.00/hr x 24hrs x 15 days \$14,400</p> <p><u>These additional costs will likely be passed on to the tenants by the building owners.</u></p> <p>Under the pay as you go scenario the majority of the companies surveyed offer basic service agreements that do not require any up-front cost. The alarm owner would be provided with a fee schedule for services and would agree to</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>use the contractor exclusively to service his/her system.</p> <p>The process that MDFR had been following is now being codified by this ordinance. Currently, the code only requires an annual alarm certificate by an alarm company that ranges approximately from \$200 to \$500 dollars. Once a landlord receives notice, which will be performed by Fire Inspectors, he or she will have 18 months to comply with this ordinance. The MDFR Fire Prevention Division has 60 Fire Inspectors.</p>	
7(G)	Approval Process for Metrorail Station Sites within the City of Miami	<p>During the February 12, 2008, Government Operations and Environment Committee and the February 13, 2008 Transit Development Committee, this item was amended to make the project more consistent with the City of Miami’s Zoning Code and to lower the requirement that residential developments have 25% workforce housing units. This item reflects the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12.5% workforce housing units required for residential uses • Setbacks for non-residential uses • Clarifies details of building heights • Revises screening requirements for parking structures • Clarifies the notice requirements for the Rapid Transit Committee • Remove a reference to Metropolitan Urban Centers (as there are none in the City of Miami) • Clarifies the number of floors for each level in the definition of building height <p>----- - - -</p> <p>Districts 3, 5, and 7</p> <p>This ordinance amends §33C of the Code of Miami-Dade County, regarding the approval process for Metrorail station sites within the City of Miami. This section of the Code applies to the development zone of the Metrorail station.</p> <p>Present Process for the Metrorail Station Development Zones within Municipalities Currently, the process for commercial, office, and/or residential development uses within the subzone areas of the Metrorail Station involve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Rapid Transit Developmental Impact Committee (RTDIC)* prepares the proposed master plan development standards for development proposals within the municipalities. • These standards are then submitted to the appropriate municipality for review and adoption as the Master Land Use Plan. • Once adopted, the Master Land Use Plan controls all public actions involving or affecting land use or development. • Finally, the developer submits an application for a special exception for site plan approval to be reviewed and 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>approved by the BCC. The RTDIC also provides a recommendation to the BCC.</p> <p>Proposed Process Amendment</p> <p>The proposed ordinance creates master development standards (§33C-8) and applies only to the development of the following Metrorail stations within the City of Miami: Coconut Grove, Douglas Road, (the portion that is not covered by standards established for the Water and Sewer property), Brickell, Culmer, and the Civic Center.</p> <p>The master development standards will not be forwarded to the City of Miami for adoption; however, the City of Miami will be consulted prior to final adoption of the standards by the Board and will have an opportunity to provide input. These standards include the following process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Request for Proposals (RFP) to be generated for each specific site. • Proposals for development will be evaluated taking into account the specific requirements within the particular RFP and the overall Master Development Standards. • Provide the basis for development before RFPs are issued and a developer is selected. • The site plan (presently approved by the BCC) will be considered for approval by the RTDIC. <p>Fiscal Impacts:</p> <p>Profit sharing lease agreements will result in direct payments to the County. The lease revenues along with the sale of transit properties will result in a positive fiscal impact to the County.</p> <p>Question/Comments:</p> <p>Why is the County proposing legislation that treats the development process for Metrorail station sites within the City of Miami differently than other municipalities?</p> <p>According to the Department of Planning and Zoning, the initial proposal was to address all Metrorail station sites located within a municipality. However, both the Municipalities and the League of Cities opposed the control of development approval standards being transferred from the Cities (currently the Code allows for the appropriate municipality to review and adopt the standards) to the RTDIC.</p> <p>The City of Miami was the only municipality that agreed to the shift. Therefore, this item addresses the City of Miami because they were the only municipality that expressed an interest to support the ordinance.</p> <p>The RTDIC* includes representation from the Cities of Miami, Coral Gables, Hialeah and South Miami.</p> <p><i>*Note: The RTDIC is composed of the County’s Developmental Impact Committee Executive Council (an Assistant County Manager, the Fire Chief, and the Department Directors from Water and Sewer, DERM, Public Works, Planning and Zoning and MPO) and 2 representatives from each of the following municipalities: Miami,</i></p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
8(A)1(A)	Clock Sponsorship Program License Agreement at Miami International Airport (MIA) to GMüller LLC	<p><i>Coral Gables, Hialeah and South Miami (§33C-3).</i></p> <p>This resolution approves the waiver of competitive bidding procedures, and awards a Clock Sponsorship Program License Agreement at Miami International Airport (MIA) to GMüller LLC. The Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD) is requesting this bid waiver because it received only one response to its Request for Information (RFI).</p> <p>MDAD requires a master clock system as a service and convenience to its passengers. The clock sponsorship opportunity was programmed and incorporated into the MIA Signage Master Plan in 2004. However, no funds were ever allocated for the Clock Program with the intention it would be provided by a sponsor.</p> <p>On February 14, 2007, MDAD advertised a Request For Information (RFI) for a Clock Sponsorship Program at MIA and received only one response from GMüller.</p> <p>The RFI advised that MDAD is requesting 182 clocks to be installed throughout the South Terminal (51 clocks), Central Terminal (64 clocks), and North Terminal (Concourse - D Extension and new North Terminal areas- 67 clocks).</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GMüller has agreed to install, maintain and operate the master clock system at its expense and they have committed to investing \$665,826 based on providing the clocks at their cost and use of a contractor to install the clocks. • GMüller will also provide a sales force through the hiring of an advertising agency to sell the advertising on the clocks whose fees are estimated to be 15 percent of gross revenue. • GMüller shall pay the County fifty (50) percent of gross revenues once the GMüller investment is recovered. The County expects revenues to commence at the <u>beginning of the third year with projected revenue for the term of the contract</u> (after GMüller’s investment) of \$1,009,524. <i>The License Agreement, on handwritten page 21 states that: “The Operator shall pay the Department the percentage fee of 50% of Gross Revenues, once the capital investment has been recouped or five (5) years from the Effective Date whichever occurs first.”</i> <p>Contract Period: Five (5) Years, with one option to renew for Five (5) Years</p> <p>Track Record: GMüller does not have any existing or previous agreements with the County.</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>Contract Measures: There is no Airport Concession Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (ACDBE) goal established for this Agreement</p> <p>GMüller LLC is a Florida company in business for one (1) year, with a parent company in Brazil in business for fifty (50) years. The company manufactures the clocks and sells advertising on the clocks' faces to third parties. The company is in most of the Brazilian Airports and in the Miami Free Zone.</p>	
8(A)1(B)	<p>Change Order No. 1 to Miami International Airport (MIA) Building Management System, MDAD Project No. I114A- \$8,271,866</p>	<p>This resolution authorizes Change Order No. 1 for the MIA Building Management System, Project I114A, between Miami-Dade County and Honeywell International, Inc. retroactively approving work previously authorized and increasing the allocation of the B3 allowance account in the amount of \$8,271,866.</p> <p>Original contract amount: \$26,609,803.64</p> <p>Adjusted contract amount: \$34,881,669.64 (including this change order)</p> <p>This is a 31.1% increase to the original contract amount.</p> <p>The justification for the change order states among other things the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An internal audit revealed that work was authorized in excess of the maximum allocation of the B3 Allowance Account. 2. MDAD has identified work required for corrective maintenance and large scale repairs and replacement to the terminal and other facilities at MIA and the GA Airports. 3. The deficiencies include design omissions that did not install all devices, systems, or interfaces required by Code. (South Terminal Remedial Work) 4. The deficiencies include design omissions that did not install all devices, systems, or interfaces required by Code. (North Terminal Remedial Work) <p><i>(The responses to the questions below were provided by MDAD staff)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Change Order on hand written page 11 of the item is dated February 18, 2005, why has it taken so long to come before the BCC? <p>According to MDAD staff, this was an oversight and the correct date of the Change Order should be, <u>January 11, 2008</u>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who authorized the excess work? 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>The work was authorized by various staff members. This contract has many PM's because of the type of work included. Each one of them had access to the B3 account and could order additional work to be performed. As far as the budget controls processes were concerned the contract had plenty of money because the costs were being tracked at the overall contract level and not on the individual allowance account level. This caused the allowance account to be overspent but the overall contract budget was never exceeded. All the work is funded however spending ability is what is being requested. In order to correct this in the future, we have assigned one single PM over the entire contract to monitor all expenditures, made some changes in the way work is ordered and encumbered and put the contractor on notice verbally and in writing that monitoring of spending is their responsibility as well as ours and that they are not to accept work without the proper paperwork. Though they acted in good faith because of the life safety nature, they fully acknowledge they should have been watching the contract closer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can there be large scale repairs and corrective maintenance if the project is not yet completed? <p>This is a contract that is set up to perform work as directed by the owner, some specifically included in the contract language as projects and the rest are repairs are needed. This is an on-going process as this contract is not one single project. The process for repairs is as follows:</p> <p><u>Deficient work determined after testing and inspections are performed</u> – Part of the requirements of this contract is to inspect, test and certify Fire Alarm and Smoke Evacuations systems throughout our 5 airports. This is required yearly by code (NFPA). Any noted deficiencies are required to be repaired prior to the systems being certified as part of the yearly certification process. Sometimes the equipment in question is so old that components are no longer available so instead of just replacing devices that may have gone bad or boards in a panel that have burned out, we are forced due to age to replace entire panels and systems in order to comply with code requirements. In some cases the occupancy of a building has changed significantly over a one year period and additional devices are required to be added to meet code which requires us to upgrade existing systems substantially. This is what is referred to large scale repairs and corrective maintenance. NOV's (Notices of Violations) also cause the department to correct these deficiencies throughout the year as inspectors go into facilities to perform ad-hoc inspections which are not related to the certification process mentioned above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who designed the project? Why were there design omissions required by Code? <p>What occurs is that the plans developed for these projects are designed by the A/E's of record to meet code requirements that they feel apply to airports. Let me advise that there is no one code written for terminal buildings and that is part of the problem we have as an airport. Unlike other occupancies, where there are codes written for specific applications like high rises, that does not apply to an airport. The only codes that are airport specific are ones that deal with fueling, storage of aircraft and maintenance hangers for aircraft, none of which are part of South</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>or North Terminal. In effect the designers are taking sections from other codes and applying them to the best of their abilities to a terminal environment. That causes a conflict with the interpretations of the code between them and the Fire and Building Depts. In order to mitigate these problems we created a Life Safety Master Plan (LSMP) for MIA. However, sometimes there are circumstances where the consultants are not aware of a requirement or it is not specifically addressed in that LSMP, so these are the circumstances where design omissions are prevalent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are there no evaluations shown in CIIS database for Honeywell International, Inc.? <p>Honeywell is a contractor and not a designer and their performance has been satisfactory for the contract period thus far, the database has not been updated. We will update the database accordingly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is only 7% of 12% of the DBE measure achieved if there is only one year left on the contract? <p>There is one year and 2 – one year extension periods left in the contract potentially. The contract has provisions for 4 construction projects that have not been issued a Notice to Proceed (NTP). These NTP's will be issued in the next 2 to 3 months. These projects make up the 5% missing goals and have been planned accordingly. These projects are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Project A2: Front Terminal Life Safety Imp. Terminal D- H: \$557,396.00 (I114 contract est.) Project A3: Back Terminal Life Safety Imp. Terminal D- H: \$439,092.00 (I114 contract est.) Project A4: MDAD Office Tower Life Safety Imp.: \$123,523.00 (I114 contract est.) Project A7: Concourse E Life Safety Imp.: \$152,178.00 (I114 contract est.) <p><u>Additional Information:</u></p> <p>According to the Small Business Development History of Violations Report dated February 22, 2008, Honeywell has one violation, dated September 15, 2004, for failing to submit payrolls, this violation has already been closed.</p> <p><u>Honeywell has no pending claims on this contract.</u></p> <p>On September 12, 2006, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) adopted R-958-06, a Global Settlement Agreement with John J. Kirlin and Honeywell, Inc. in connection with Honeywell's claims on NTD projects. The Honeywell settlement was for \$1,400,000 negotiated through the County Attorney's Office. On September 22, 2006 Check no. 3488 in the amount of \$1,400,000 was issued to Honeywell.</p> <p>On February 6, 2007, the BCC adopted R-130-07, Ratifying the County Manager's Action in settling claims under \$1 Million for the period August 1, 2006 – December 31, 2006 totaling \$2,725,276.48 pursuant to</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions										
		<p>settlements with eight contractors. Honeywell is listed as one of the eight contractors, however, detailed information regarding the settlement amount was not available at the time of printing.</p> <p>Listed below are remaining delay related claims on other projects that are still pending:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Terminal Fire and BMS \$285,000 • Concourse J \$315,000 • 763A \$124,000 • CCPE \$358,000 											
8(A)1(C)	Amended and Restated Project Specific Services Agreement for A-B Infill Shell and Interior Finish-Out	<p>This resolution authorizes an amended and restated project specific services agreement with the Leo A. Daly Company (LAD), for Contract No. MIA-747, for the A-B Infill Shell and Interior Finish-Out, for an amount of \$4,782,881.</p> <p>The A-B Infill Shell and Finishes Project consists of the construction and finish out of a new three-story concourse, the expansion of Terminal A, and the remodeling of certain areas of Terminal A and B. The project will serve (5) five gates and will include an Automated People Mover guide way.</p> <p>This agreement was assigned to Miami-Dade County as part of the Fourth Amendment to the Lease, Construction, and Financing Agreement between American Airlines and Miami-Dade County.</p> <p><u>Contract Amount:</u> \$10,799,235, First Amendment Modification \$1,247,305, and \$4,782,881(with this modification), totaling \$16,829,421.</p> <p><u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure assigned. This award was made prior to the implementation of the CBE program. The original agreement with American Airlines included voluntary participation with Black, Hispanic, and Womens Business Enterprises.</p> <p><u>LAD will have no entitlement these additional funds unless authorized by the Miami-Dade Aviation Department via task order. Any unused funds will remain with Miami-Dade County.</u></p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1501 576 1974 954"> <thead> <tr> <th>Business Enterprise</th> <th>Percentage Paid</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Black Business Enterprise</td> <td>2.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic Business Enterprise</td> <td>14.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Womens Business Enterprise</td> <td>2.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>18.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>LAD principals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leo A. Daly • Rosemary G. Daly • Jerry L. Norris • Agustin Barrera (managing principal of Miami location). <p>LAD has no history of claims with Miami-Dade County.</p>	Business Enterprise	Percentage Paid	Black Business Enterprise	2.4%	Hispanic Business Enterprise	14.2%	Womens Business Enterprise	2.3%	Total	18.9%
Business Enterprise	Percentage Paid												
Black Business Enterprise	2.4%												
Hispanic Business Enterprise	14.2%												
Womens Business Enterprise	2.3%												
Total	18.9%												

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
8(A)1(D)	<p>Agreement with Florida Turnpike Enterprise to incorporate SunPass technology at Miami International Airport</p>	<p>This resolution approves a Joint Participation Agreement between Miami-Dade County and the Florida department of transportation, Florida’s Turnpike Enterprise (FTE) to incorporate SunPass technology into the public parking facilities at the Miami International Airport (MIA) in order to allow airport customers to pay parking fees using their SunPass transponder.</p> <p>Term: Five (5) years with automatic renewals for one (1) year terms.</p> <p>Termination: After the initial term, either party may terminate this Agreement by providing at least ninety (90) days prior written notice.</p> <p>The initial cost to procure related hardware and software is estimated at approximately \$700,000 with an annual recurring operating cost of approximately \$325,333. The operating cost will be budgeted annually in MDAD’s operating budget.</p> <p><u>FTE Roles and Responsibilities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for the internal processing of MIA parking revenue transactions using Sun Pass transponders. • Wire transfer funds to the County’s MIA parking revenue account for SunPass parking transactions at MIA weekly; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>However, if during the term of this Agreement, FTE changes its Accounting processes to transfer funds at a greater frequency, FTE shall then wire transfer funds to MDAD accordingly with an “initial credit card fee” of 2% of the credit transactions deducted from the wire transfer to MDAD then reconciled the following month.</i> • On a weekly basis, FTE will deduct 0.65% (the “FTE Fee”) from the gross revenue of the wire transfer to be sent to MDAD. The transaction shall be calculated before the credit card fees are taken from the gross revenue. The FTE fee will be waived during the first 24 months of operation following the Go-Live Date. • FTE will also deduct from gross revenue, if and when these 	<p>A Report issued by the County Manager on December 4, 2007, in response to Resolution 1174-07, adopted by the BCC on October 16th, 2007 provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the program is expected to take approximately six (6) months. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is this six (6) month implementation estimate still accurate? • According to the Report, the annual operating cost is \$500,000. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Why is the operating cost less than originally anticipated in the County Manager’s report? (Current operating cost estimate approx. \$325,333; Report stated \$500,000) <p>Orlando International Airport has been offering the SunPass payment option since February 2005.</p> <p>The office of the Commission Auditor contacted the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority (GOAA) and they provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementation has been successful; • Initially they only accepted at their terminal parking but now have it at satellite facilities as well; • They have experienced daily

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>charges occur, duplicate transactions, credit card charge backs, parking fee write-offs and wire transfer fees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FTE and County will jointly promote SunPass Plus parking at MIA in accordance with a marketing plan that will be developed and agreed to by the parties. • Each Sunpass customer statement provided by FTE to its customers will include MIA parking facility transactions. • FTE will act as the primary point of contact for all SunPass related customer service issues and inquiries. <p><u>County Roles and Responsibilities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the responsibility of the County to separately contracts to purchase, install, operate and maintain the revenue collection equipment at MIA. • Will be responsible for the purchase, installation, on-going maintenance and ownership of the SunPass revenue collecting equipment at MIA. • Will be responsible for costs associated with software changes to its revenue control system that are required to implement and maintain the project. • Will indemnify and hold FTE harmless from the economic consequences of MDAD system calibration problems, loss to transactional data integrity and internal transponder data corruption that is beyond the control of FTE. • Will be responsible for any costs associated with modifying MIA parking system signage. • Will be responsible for all credit card processing fees, FTE fees and other charges related to parking transactions. • Will send each MIA SunPass parking transaction electronically as specified in the data requirements established in Exhibit A-Airport Parking Functional and Non-Functional requirements, Mobile Commerce Initiative, Version 1.10. 	<p>transactions that do require manual research and reversal of replenishments and charges (mainly due to errors from the customer not the system).</p> <p>According to the GOAA, the main issues that they have encountered daily are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Most frequent problem experienced is delays in lanes when customers do not have sufficient funds in their account to pay the parking fees.</u> <p><u>They suggest researching this issue as staff is needed to research cars that did not have a read at entry and how to determine how they will pay for the fees at exit.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A small percentage of customers choose to exit through a staffed lane rather than the dedicated SunPass lane to pay for their parking fees.</u> <p><u>When this occurs, since readers are not installed at the staffed lanes, the system does not remove their transponders from the active list and their account continues to replenish until they are removed from the system.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>They suggest researching the consequences of how MIA will handle individuals that run the gate or tailgate another vehicle. Is MIA going to handle these charges or will the turnpike?</u>

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
				<p>Although they have received an overwhelming response, the <u>importance of educating the public was stressed several times</u>. Making sure the public is aware that it does not work the same as using it for toll roads.</p>
8(A)1(D) Supp.	<p><i>The supplement attaches Exhibit A, which is referenced in the item but was inadvertently left out from the original agenda package for the February 14, 2008 Airport and Tourism Committee meeting.</i></p>			
8(A)1(E)	<p>Award Recommendation- Host International for Bookstore Café Specialty Retail Concept</p>	<p>This resolution awards a Non-Exclusive Lease and Concession Agreement (Agreement) to Host International, Inc. (Host) for the Bookstore Café Specialty Retail concept at Miami International Airport (MIA). This resolution also authorizes the Mayor or designee, to execute the Agreement and any renewal, termination or cancellation provisions.</p> <p>The Retail Concession Program RFP No. MDAD-05-05 was advertised for qualified firms to propose on eight (8) separate packages either as developers or concessionaires within the North and South Terminals and concourses at MIA. Seven of the eight packages have been awarded. However, on May 8th, 2007, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) through R-544-07 adopted the County Manager’s recommendation to reject the two (2) proposals received on Package 4 of the RFP for Retail Concession Program from Borders Group, Inc. (Borders) and AMS of South Florida, LLC (AMS) and authorized the advertisement of a new RFP for Package 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Selection Committee recommended Borders for Package 4 and the second ranked proposer, AMS filed a protest on the basis of Airport Concession Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (ACDBE) points assigned to Borders. • The RFP contained a voluntary ACDBE participation provision that allowed assignment of points during the technical review process (Borders elected to participate and AMS elected to abstain from participation). The hearing examiner supported the Manager’s award recommendation to Borders. Subsequently, Borders submitted a letter to MDAD stating that the ACDBE ownership status submitted for review was incorrect thereby making ACDBE points assigned invalid. • Consequently, the Manager recommended rejection of both proposals and to request authorization to re-advertise the RFP. <p>The four proposals received in response to the new RFP were from (listed in the order they were ranked by the Selection Committee): Host International, Inc.; Areas USA, Inc.; Faber Coe & Gregg of South Florida, Inc.; and AMS of South Florida, LLC.</p> <p>After reviewing the proposals and hearing oral presentations, the Selection Committee, based on the overall scoring</p>		

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions						
		<p>criteria, recommended Host for the award.</p> <p>Host company principals are:</p> <p>Elie W. Maalouf, Bernard N. Brown, Charles E. Powers, Mark T. Ratych, Laura A. Babin, Sadye C. Sanders</p> <p>The initial eight (8) year operational term may be extended for a maximum of one (1) two (2) year term upon mutual agreement by the County and Host.</p> <p>Host submitted a Minimum Annual Guarantee (MAG) of \$250,777.00. The County shall be paid either a monthly fee of 12% of total gross monthly revenues or the minimum monthly guarantee (\$20,898.08), whichever is greater. Also, there are additional fees, security payments and bonds that must be paid on a percentage basis.</p> <p>ACDBE participation was voluntary. Host included a Schedule of Participation by ACDBE firms and Letter of Intent committing 30% of gross revenues utilizing Joint Venture Partner, Master Concessionaire, LLC., with a sublease to operate a Café.</p> <p>Master Concessionaire, LLC, (DBA World Wide Concessions) principals are: Jose G. Alberni, Jorge Carbajal, Pedro Amaro, Jr.</p> <p>Through Resolution R-393-98, the Board awarded a food and beverage lease and concession agreement to Host. The Board granted a Three-year extension on October 2007.</p> <p>This contract came under scrutiny in 2002 when Miami-Dade Police and the Federal Bureau of Investigation looked into alleged DBE participation designed to skirt federal laws on minority hiring at airports.</p> <p>Media reports listed two of the above-mentioned principals of Master Concessionaire, LLC, as minority partners under the 1998 contract. MDAD staff asserts that to date, this investigation has not resulted in any indictments, arrests, or any other action.</p> <p>Additionally, MDAD asserts that Master Concessionaire, LLC has been a successful minority participant.</p> <p>The table below illustrates Master Concessionaire, LLC sales for FY06-07</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 1365 1341 1472"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="632 1365 1341 1401">Fiscal 2006/2007</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="632 1401 1018 1437">Concourse E</th> <th data-bbox="1018 1401 1341 1437">Sales</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 1437 1018 1472">World Wide Café</td> <td data-bbox="1018 1437 1341 1472">\$ 1,647,281</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Fiscal 2006/2007		Concourse E	Sales	World Wide Café	\$ 1,647,281	
Fiscal 2006/2007									
Concourse E	Sales								
World Wide Café	\$ 1,647,281								

Item No.	Subject Matter			Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
			Pizza Hut	\$ 550,347	
			Sam Adams	\$ 1,351,740	
			Chili's-to-Go	\$ 782,030	
			<u>Concourse F</u>		
			Bud Brewhouse	\$ 651,936	
			Pizza Hut	\$ 461,011	
			Burger King	\$ 1,335,457	
			Chili's-to-Go (2006- \$15,105)	n/a	
			<u>Concourse G</u>		
			Bud Brewhouse	\$ 534,783	
			Pizza Hut	\$ 343,941	
			Burger King	\$ 1,150,866	
			Chili's-to-Go	\$ 134,333	
			Chili's	\$ 4,277,376	
				\$ 13,221,101	
8(A)1(F)	Bid Waiver Authorizing Award & Waiving Competitive Bid Requirements	<p>This resolution awards a Non-Exclusive Lease and Concession Agreement (Agreement) to Areas USA, Inc. (Areas) for the Bookstore Café Specialty Retail location at Miami International Airport (MIA) for an initial Minimum Annual Guarantee (MAG) of \$123,500. This resolution also waives competitive bidding procedures and authorizes the Mayor or designee, to execute the Agreement and any renewal, termination or cancellation provisions.</p> <p>Areas will pay an initial MAG of \$123,500 if only two (2) gates (D24 & D25) are operational. Once five (5) gates become operational, Areas, will pay a MAG of \$158,801.61 or a monthly fee of twelve (12) percent of the total gross monthly revenues, whichever is greater.</p> <p>Additionally, Areas will pay the following on a percentage basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concession Marketing fee of one half (1/2) of one percent (1%) of gross revenues to be assessed annually and paid monthly; • Construction Permit Fee equal to one percent (1%) of the estimated construction cost of the improvements; • Initial Payment Security of twenty five percent (25%) of the MAG and non-location rent; and • Initial MAG Performance Bond equal to seventy five percent (75%) of the MAG and non-location rent amount. 			

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p><i>This item was amended at the January 17, 2008, Airport & Tourism Committee to reject the Award Recommendation to Host International, Inc. and to award to the second ranked bidder Areas USA, Inc.</i></p> <p>One of the main issues discussed during the January 17, 2008, Airport and Tourism Committee meeting was local theme. The RFP states on p. 12 under Section 1.3 Concession Goals and Objectives the following as one of the objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present a local and regional identity to the traveling public. <p>Another concern raised at the ATC meeting was the ACDBE participation, which was voluntary. Areas included a Schedule of Participation by ACDBE firms and Letter of Intent committing 6% of gross revenues for a management fee.</p> <p>This bid waiver allows for the award of a second location for a bookstore café concept that was scheduled to be included in an upcoming RFP located in the North Terminal to Areas, contingent upon Areas increasing to 30% (of gross revenue share), its local joint venture partner Books & Books' participation.</p> <p>Contract Measure: ACDBE participation was voluntary. Committed to a 30% ACDBE participation of gross revenues.</p> <p>Term: Eight (8) years; Term may be extended for a maximum of one (1) two (2) year term upon mutual agreement by the County and the Concessionaire in writing.</p> <p>Areas company principals are: Jose Gabriel Martin, Eduardo Uribe, Xavier Rabell, Gonsal Artigot</p>	
8(D)1(A)	Resolution Granting a Perpetual Access Easement	<p>Districts 8 and 9</p> <p>The resolution grants a perpetual access easement to the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) across Miami-Dade County Environmentally Endangered Lands (EEL) property located on the intersection of S.W. 112 Avenue and the Black Creek Canal.</p> <p>In preparing to make improvements on S.W. 112 Avenue, the Florida Department of Transportation discovered there was no easement on record allowing the SFWMD to cross the EEL property. <u>This easement will assure the SFWMD's access to the canal right-of-way for the purpose of maintaining the canal and performing other functions.</u></p> <p>Comments:</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>This easement is granted across an area totaling approximately 2,238 square feet. The land was purchased through Resolution R-397-93 for \$131,500. At that time, the tax assessed value for the land was \$103,125, and the appraised value was \$150,000.</p>	
8(D)1(B)	EEL Grant Award	<p>Districts 7, 8 and 9 Acceptance of a grant award from the Nature Conservancy for acquisition of saltwater or freshwater wetlands within existing EEL Project areas known as the South Dade Wetlands and the Biscayne Coastal Wetlands.</p> <p>The grant award totaling \$72,000 plus interest has been earmarked for wetland acquisition. Once received, it will be held in the EEL Trust Fund to be used for the purchase of one or more approved parcels.</p> <p>All grant-funded property will be managed consistent with EEL's standard lands management supported by the EEL Management Trust Fund.</p> <p>The grant requires the County to submit copies of all closing documents and the management plan to the Nature Conservancy.</p>	
8(D)1(C)	Environmentally Endangered Lands (EEL) Program	<p>District 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owner: Shaheed Haniff Owner purchased the property in February 2007, for \$29,000. • Total Acreage: 0.21 acres • Zoning: Agriculture (Vacant Land) • Purchase Price: \$36,000 Price is 63% of the tax assessed value of \$57,500. • The County entered into a contract for sale and purchase with the owner on December 27, 2007. Final approval needs to be given by the BCC in order for the County to close on the property. <u>The contract requires closing within 90 days (March 26, 2008).</u> • Funding Source: GOB Project 2.3 Site #73136. <p>To date, the County, in partnership with the South Florida Water Management district, the State of Florida, and other funding partners, have acquired approximately 18,155 acres of land in Miami-Dade County through the EEL Program.</p>	
8(E)1(A)	Reduce County's Interest Rate Exposure to Auction Rate Bonds	<p>This item authorizes the Mayor to do all things necessary to reduce the County's interest rate exposure to the Auction Rate Bonds and Sunshine State Governmental Financing Commission Loans.</p> <p>Since November 2007, the financial markets have been severely impacting the variable rate capital market</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions														
		<p>particularly insured loan obligations in the auction rate and short-term variable rate markets. Until the municipal insurance market stabilizes, auction rate bonds and short-term variable rate markets are no longer a viable alternative for variable rate debt.</p> <p>The following Auction Bonds (AB) and Sunshine Loans (SL) affected include:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 425 1667 688"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Original Loan Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Capital Asset Acquisition Series 2002B</td> <td>\$11,275,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Asset Acquisition Series 2007B</td> <td>\$17,450,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Asset Acquisition Series 2003B</td> <td>\$45,850,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Seaport Commercial Paper Series 2006 (various)</td> <td>\$307,060,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Seaport Commercial Paper Series 1986</td> <td>\$50,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Various Paper Sunshine Loan (Series various 1986-2006)</td> <td>\$288,200,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There is an additional auction rate bond (Aviation Series 2003E for \$139,705,000) that is affected by the market but was introduced in another resolution (R-187-08) approved by the Board on February 21, 2008.</p> <p>R-187-08 authorized the conversion of the auction rate to a fixed rate bonds.</p> <p>The County is exploring various options to reduce the risk of paying higher interest rates to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the mode from auction rate to fixed rate mode (i.e. R-187-08); • Change from auction rate to Variable Rate Demand Bonds (which require a letter of credit support at an additional cost); • Seek private placement with a bank to issue a bank loan to refund bonds; • Issue a longer term note (3-5 years); or • Refund the bond and issuing long-term fixed rate bonds. 	Description	Original Loan Amount	Capital Asset Acquisition Series 2002B	\$11,275,000	Capital Asset Acquisition Series 2007B	\$17,450,000	Capital Asset Acquisition Series 2003B	\$45,850,000	Seaport Commercial Paper Series 2006 (various)	\$307,060,000	Seaport Commercial Paper Series 1986	\$50,000,000	Various Paper Sunshine Loan (Series various 1986-2006)	\$288,200,000	
Description	Original Loan Amount																
Capital Asset Acquisition Series 2002B	\$11,275,000																
Capital Asset Acquisition Series 2007B	\$17,450,000																
Capital Asset Acquisition Series 2003B	\$45,850,000																
Seaport Commercial Paper Series 2006 (various)	\$307,060,000																
Seaport Commercial Paper Series 1986	\$50,000,000																
Various Paper Sunshine Loan (Series various 1986-2006)	\$288,200,000																
8(F)1(A)	Lease Agreement for the State of Florida Department of Health	<p>District 3</p> <p>This item will approve the execution of a lease agreement at 1313 N.W. 36th Street with Golden Sands Allapatah Corp., to be utilized by the State of Florida Department of Health and Miami Dade County Health Department.</p> <p>Lease Term: Five (5) years with no renewal option period. The rental space: 3,646 square feet of air-conditioned space.</p>															

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>Lease conditions include: landlord will be responsible for electricity, water, waste disposal services, exterior of the building, plumbing and electrical lines, air-conditioning equipment, roof and roof leaks, and maintenance of all common areas, parking lot and landscaping.</p> <p>Owner Track Record: No history of negative performance issues with Golden Sands Allapatah Corporation.</p> <p>Company Principles: Peter Fedele, President Mary Maguire, Vice-President John Fedele, Secretary Ken Fedele, Director Howard Gershuny, Director</p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p>No county funds will be utilized. The Health Department will be responsible for all charges. The total estimated first year lease is estimated to be \$138,153 (\$20 per square foot). Other properties evaluated range between \$19.00 - \$25.00 per square foot but required extensive renovations or insufficient parking.</p>	
8(F)1(B)	Florida Criminal Justice, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Reinvestment Grant Funds	<p>This resolution authorizes the County Manager to receive, and expend grant funds from the Florida Substance Abuse and Mental Health Corporation's Criminal Justice, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Reinvestment Grant Program.</p> <p>The grant funds are in the amount of \$333,000 per year for three years, totaling \$999,000 over the three year period.</p> <p>In addition, this resolution approves the Criminal Justice Reinvestment Grant County Planning Council, a grant requirement comprised of members of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit Criminal Mental Health Project Committee and the Mayor's Mental Health Task Force. The Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners is represented on the Board by Commissioner Natacha Seijas.</p> <p>The grant will implement a court-based, post booking diversion program for 200 mentally-ill individuals arrested on low-level, third degree felonies in an effort to reduce the criminalization of individuals with mental illnesses.</p>	<p>This grant requires a 100% in-kind, local match of \$333,000 per year. In-kind pledges include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miami-Dade County - \$149,000 • Eleventh Judicial Circuit Court of Florida - \$84,000 • Jackson Memorial Hospital-Jackson Health Jackson - \$100,000 <p>\$22.1 million in GOB Program funds has been earmarked for the new Mental Health Facility located at 2200 N.W. 7th Avenue. This project is to free up jail space and provide an effective and cost efficient alternative facility to house the mentally ill as they await a trial date.</p>

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
8(F)1(C)	Sale of County Owned Property	<p>District 11</p> <p>This resolution does the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declares County owned property at 15291 Southwest 23rd Lane as surplus, • Waives Administrative Order 8-4 as it relates to the review by the Planning Advisory Board (PAB), • Authorizes the County Manager to sell said property, and • Authorizes the execution of a County deed for said property. <p>Department: Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD)</p> <p>Description: The property has a lot size of 7,951 sq. ft. A two-story 3,137 sq. ft. single family home built in 2004, lies on the property. Although the home needs some repairs, the property will be sold as-is. The property is zoned modified single-family residential district.</p> <p>On April 10, 2007, the property was acquired through forfeiture action by the Public Corruption Investigation Bureau (MDPD Case No. PD06072738574). According to MDPD, the property was forfeited in a Public Corruption Investigation where the owner fled to another country. The courts have approved the forfeiture action and the County does not benefit in any way from keeping this property.</p> <p>By Court order, the County has been authorized to dispose of said property and to satisfy two encumbrances against the property. The encumbrances include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A mortgage held by JP Chase Bank NA (Chase Home Finance, Inc.) in the amount of \$258,522.17 plus a charge of \$47.65 per day until the mortgage is satisfied. By February 14, 2008, the total will be \$13,818.00; and (2) A construction lien held by Marble and Granite of Florida Corporation in the amount of \$34,290.00 including real estate sales cost. <p>Appraised Market Value: \$430,000.00</p> <p>Sale: The property will be sold via sealed bid for no less than \$387,000.00 (90% of its appraised value).</p> <p>Fiscal Impact: It is estimated that the property will generate \$7,059.00 in annual tax revenue once it is sold. According to staff, the net profit will be transferred into the Law Enforcement Trust Fund.</p> <p>Administrative Order 8-4: The authority to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of County-owned real property lies solely with the BCC. Before action is taken to sell or lease said property, a recommendation will be requested from the PAB, to indicate whether such action is in the public interest and also recommending proper land use</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>classification if applicable. Should a recommendation not be received from PAB within the time period provided, the Planning Department Director will provide a recommendation on the proposal.</p> <p>The sale of the property was not presented to the PAB for a recommendation because the property includes a single family residence; and if sold as is, the property cannot be used for any other purpose.</p>	
8(F)1(D)	Acquisition of West Miami Fire Rescue Station No. 40	<p>District 6</p> <p>This resolution authorizes a Contract for Sale and Purchase of 6,500 square feet of land containing a single family residence located at 6181 S.W. 10 Street, West Miami, for \$425,000 from Ramon V. Rasco and Emilia F. Rasco, for the purpose of expanding the adjoining West Miami Fire Rescue Station No. 40.</p> <p>Owner: Ramon V. Rasco and Emilia F. Rasco</p> <p>Location: 6181 S.W. 10 Street, West Miami</p> <p>Zoning: R-4 Zoning District (Municipal or Governmental Use). According to the City of West Miami Planning and Zoning Department, the proposed fire rescue station expansion is a permitted use under the current zoning.</p> <p>Taxes: The gross amount of real estate taxes for the year 2007 is \$1,976.15.</p> <p>Purchase Price: After extended negotiations, several offers and counter offers, the property owner agreed to sell the property for \$425,000.00.</p> <p>Appraised Value: Two State-Certified Appraisers hired by the County valued the property at: \$370,000.00 and \$463,000.00.</p> <p>Funding Source: The proposed acquisition is a funded project within the Miami-Dade Fire Rescue (MDFR) Budget and Multi-Year Capital Plan. The estimated budget allocated for the acquisition is \$500,000.00. Funding for design and construction is provided from Fire Rescue Impact Fees.</p> <p>Currently the Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Station No. 40 is located at 975 SW 62 Avenue. The County and the City of West Miami have a lease agreement set to expire on October 31, 2021. The County is paying an annual rental rate of \$12,000, and real estate taxes of \$1976.15. The MDFR wishes to terminate the lease for the west Fire Rescue Station No. 40, purchase the current station and the adjacent property located at 6181 S.W. 10 Street for \$425,000. If approved by the city commission, the County will demolish the current building and construct a 6,000 square foot facility. The design and construction is estimated to cost \$1.2 million.</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																																																																																																																														
			<p>Incidents within Station 40 Territory</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 293 1934 643"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="4">2007 Response Times</th> <th colspan="4">2006 Response Times</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Call Type</th> <th>Alarms</th> <th>Total</th> <th>MDF R</th> <th>Turnout & Travel</th> <th>Alarms</th> <th>Total</th> <th>MDF R</th> <th>Turnout & Travel</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Life Threatening Emergencies</td> <td>2,574</td> <td>8:38</td> <td>7:23</td> <td>6:50</td> <td>2,569</td> <td>9:16</td> <td>8:12</td> <td>7:35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-Life Threatening Emergencies</td> <td>1,101</td> <td>9:57</td> <td>8:20</td> <td>7:46</td> <td>1,090</td> <td>10:41</td> <td>9:18</td> <td>8:36</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Structure & Other Fires</td> <td>412</td> <td>9:59</td> <td>9:17</td> <td>7:58</td> <td>395</td> <td>11:01</td> <td>10:13</td> <td>8:53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>584</td> <td>10:07</td> <td>8:54</td> <td>7:50</td> <td>423</td> <td>10:51</td> <td>9:45</td> <td>8:43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>4,671</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4,477</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Incidents within City West of Miami</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 711 1934 1060"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="4">2007 Response Times</th> <th colspan="4">2006 Response Times</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Call Type</th> <th>Alarms</th> <th>Total</th> <th>MDFR</th> <th>Turnout & Travel</th> <th>Alarms</th> <th>Total</th> <th>MDF R</th> <th>Turnout & Travel</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Life Threatening Emergencies</td> <td>475</td> <td>6:38</td> <td>5:41</td> <td>5:09</td> <td>467</td> <td>7:45</td> <td>6:49</td> <td>6:16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-Life Threatening Emergencies</td> <td>193</td> <td>8:25</td> <td>6:47</td> <td>6:13</td> <td>187</td> <td>9:32</td> <td>8:12</td> <td>7:35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Structure & Other Fires</td> <td>44</td> <td>7:46</td> <td>7:07</td> <td>6:02</td> <td>37</td> <td>10:43</td> <td>9:49</td> <td>8:20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>83</td> <td>8:34</td> <td>7:27</td> <td>6:42</td> <td>46</td> <td>8:58</td> <td>7:34</td> <td>6:45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>795</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>737</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of West Miami, which is .72 square miles, lies within the Station 40 territory, which is approximately 5.5 square miles. <p>This item addresses the purchase price for the adjacent property. According to MDFR staff, the purchase price for the current fire station will be presented to the Board of County Commissioners separately, as negotiations with the City of West Miami are on-going.</p>		2007 Response Times				2006 Response Times				Call Type	Alarms	Total	MDF R	Turnout & Travel	Alarms	Total	MDF R	Turnout & Travel	Life Threatening Emergencies	2,574	8:38	7:23	6:50	2,569	9:16	8:12	7:35	Non-Life Threatening Emergencies	1,101	9:57	8:20	7:46	1,090	10:41	9:18	8:36	Structure & Other Fires	412	9:59	9:17	7:58	395	11:01	10:13	8:53	Other	584	10:07	8:54	7:50	423	10:51	9:45	8:43	Total	4,671				4,477					2007 Response Times				2006 Response Times				Call Type	Alarms	Total	MDFR	Turnout & Travel	Alarms	Total	MDF R	Turnout & Travel	Life Threatening Emergencies	475	6:38	5:41	5:09	467	7:45	6:49	6:16	Non-Life Threatening Emergencies	193	8:25	6:47	6:13	187	9:32	8:12	7:35	Structure & Other Fires	44	7:46	7:07	6:02	37	10:43	9:49	8:20	Other	83	8:34	7:27	6:42	46	8:58	7:34	6:45	Total	795				737				
	2007 Response Times				2006 Response Times																																																																																																																													
Call Type	Alarms	Total	MDF R	Turnout & Travel	Alarms	Total	MDF R	Turnout & Travel																																																																																																																										
Life Threatening Emergencies	2,574	8:38	7:23	6:50	2,569	9:16	8:12	7:35																																																																																																																										
Non-Life Threatening Emergencies	1,101	9:57	8:20	7:46	1,090	10:41	9:18	8:36																																																																																																																										
Structure & Other Fires	412	9:59	9:17	7:58	395	11:01	10:13	8:53																																																																																																																										
Other	584	10:07	8:54	7:50	423	10:51	9:45	8:43																																																																																																																										
Total	4,671				4,477																																																																																																																													
	2007 Response Times				2006 Response Times																																																																																																																													
Call Type	Alarms	Total	MDFR	Turnout & Travel	Alarms	Total	MDF R	Turnout & Travel																																																																																																																										
Life Threatening Emergencies	475	6:38	5:41	5:09	467	7:45	6:49	6:16																																																																																																																										
Non-Life Threatening Emergencies	193	8:25	6:47	6:13	187	9:32	8:12	7:35																																																																																																																										
Structure & Other Fires	44	7:46	7:07	6:02	37	10:43	9:49	8:20																																																																																																																										
Other	83	8:34	7:27	6:42	46	8:58	7:34	6:45																																																																																																																										
Total	795				737																																																																																																																													
8(I)1(A)	Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding Public Corruption	<p>During the February 14, 2008, Health and Public Safety Committee, this item was amended to reflect the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision added to share in the cost recovery of expenses as permitted by Florida Statutes • Removal of FDLE's obligation to provide MDPD with updates of its investigations upon request by 																																																																																																																																

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
			<p>MDPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement added that any changes to the agreement be approved by the BCC <p>-----</p> <p>This resolution retroactively executes a MOU between the County and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) to March 18, 2007.</p> <p><i>According to the Manager’s memo, several months were needed to reach a mutual agreement on provisions that established the cooperative relationship between the MDPD and the FDLE.</i></p> <p>On March 8, 2007, the BCC adopted Ordinance 07-48, amending §2-94 and establishing §2-95 of the Code, allowing the County to enter into a MOU with FDLE or another appropriate law enforcement agency regarding the investigation of public corruption matters. The MOU provided for FDLE to serve as the lead investigative law enforcement agency to investigate public corruption matters involving the County Mayor or County Commissioners, and to participate in MDPD investigations of County employees and officials.</p> <p>This MOU outlines the roles and responsibilities the County and FDLE when investigating criminal and public corruption investigations involving the Miami-Dade County Mayor, County Commissioners and public corruption investigations by non-elected County Officials and employees. It includes the following terms and conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigations involving the County Manager or County Commissioner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MDPD forwards all investigative information and evidence to FDLE; ○ FDLE assumes the lead agency roll and MDPD provides support; ○ MDPD will attend and assist in all criminal or civil court proceedings or administrative hearings arising from the investigation; ○ MDPD proceeds with all forfeiture actions for seized assets arising from the investigation; and ○ Any forfeited property, cash or proceeds from the sale of forfeited property will be shared equitably between MDPD and FDLE. • Investigations involving County employees and officials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MDPD will notify FDLE; ○ FDLE assumes a support role in the investigation; ○ MDPD will provide status updates if requested to the Special Agent in Charge of FDLE’s Miami Regional Operations Center regarding the progress of the investigation; ○ MDPD proceeds with all forfeiture actions for seized assets arising from the investigation; and ○ Any forfeited property, cash or proceeds from the sale of forfeited property will be shared equitably between MDPD and FDLE. 	
8(J)1(A)	Resolution	District 7		

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>Authorizing the Execution of a Crosseasement Agreement With GC Homes, Inc.</p>	<p>This item approves the execution of a Cross easement Agreement between Miami-Dade County and GC Homes, Inc. to develop a vehicle ingress and egress near the Douglas Metrorail Station.</p> <p>This item has no fiscal impact.</p> <p>The developer is proposing to construct, at its expense, a paved round-about driveway and water fountain between the Douglas Metrorail Station property and an adjacent parcel of land owned by the developer.</p> <p>This agreement grants the developer the easement rights necessary for this project and obligates the developer and future condo association to maintain the easement area and improvements at its sole cost and expense.</p> <p>This agreement is contingent upon the Florida Department of Transportation granting approval for the developer to construct an entrance from U.S. 1 into their property.</p>	
8(J)1(B)	<p>Grant Amendment Application with the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) for the Construction of a Park and Ride Busway Facility</p>	<p>District 8</p> <p>This item authorizes the County Mayor, his designee, or the Miami-Dade Transit Director to file a grant amendment application with USDOT for \$2,289,500 in Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program funds and Transit Enhancement funds for the land acquisition and construction of a park and ride facility at the Busway's south terminal.</p> <p>Funds will also be utilized to purchase bicycle parking racks and lockers at Metrorail and park and ride locations.</p> <p>This resolution also authorizes the County to use \$23,000 in Local Option Gas Tax (LOGT) as a match for the bicycle project.</p> <p>The park and ride lot will be located at S.W. 344th Street.</p> <p>Total cost of the park and ride project: \$7.9 million (funded primarily by future State and Federal allocations)</p> <p>Scheduled completion date: 2011</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter			
		Background		Analysis / Comments / Questions
		Project	Federal Grant	State Match
		Park and Ride Project	\$1,857,000 (CMAQ)	\$464,375 Toll Rev. Credits
		Bicycle Rack Project	\$432,000 (CMAQ)	-
		<p>The Bicycle Parking and Locker Project is defined in the “Bicycle Parking Plan for Miami-Dade Transit” (2002), which was adopted by the Metropolitan Planning Organization. The plan made recommendations for new and improved bicycle parking facilities at Miami-Dade Transit Metrorail stations, park-and-ride lots and other transit hubs.</p> <p>The plans recommends the removal of all current bike lockers, except at Dadeland North, and replace them with new, high quality lockers which allow security personnel to view the locker contents, such as perforated metal sheeting on locker doors.</p> <p>The plan recommends the removal of all “wheel bender” racks and replacing them with new “inverted U” racks, which provide two points of contact between the rack and bike. These racks allow the bike to stay stable, and also allow for greater capacity for parking bikes in a small area.</p> <p>The plan recommends that racks and lockers be placed close the station turnstiles and security stations and under cover if possible.</p> <p>Miami-Dade Transit’s bicycle parking plan will focus on putting bike racks at the following park and ride lots: Golden Glades; Hammocks Town Center; S.W. 152 Street Busway; Miami-Dade College South Campus; Coral Reek; Cutler Ridge; Harris Field; Metro Bus Downtown; S.W. 72 Street & S.W. 88th Ave; and the Sunset Strip.</p> <p>Metrorail stations where bike racks will be installed are: Brownsville; Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; Northside; Tri-Rail; Hialeah; Okeechobee; and Palmetto. Bicycle lockers will be placed at all 22 Metrorail stations.</p>		
8(M)1(A)	Resolution Accepting Safe Neighborhood Parks Discretionary Funds, Pre-Agreement Funds and Recaptured Funds	<p>This proposed resolution would authorize the execution of two grant agreements with the Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond Program (SNP) for discretionary and pre-agreement land acquisition funds and recaptured funds for specific park projects.</p> <p>Total Grant Funds: \$507,790</p> <p>A total of \$242,790 in grant funds to the Ameila Earhart and the</p>	<p>The breakdown of funds is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$65,000 in SNP Discretionary Interest Earned Funding for Amelia Earhart Park • \$200,000 in SNP Pre-Agreement Land Acquisition Funding For the Redland Fruit and Spice Park • \$242,790 in reallocated recaptured 	

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
			<p>Homestead Air Force Base Reserve Parks are for the construction of shelters. The remaining \$200,000 was used to acquire property for the expansion of the Redland Fruit and Spice Park.</p>	<p>funding for Homestead Air Reserve Park All grants will be administered by the Miami Dade Parks and Recreation Department.</p>
8(M)1(B)	<p>Retroactive Extension of CBO Grant Agreement With Trail Trap and Skeet Club, Inc.</p>	<p>District 12</p> <p>This resolution authorizes a retroactive time extension from December 31, 2006 to September 30, 2007 for the community based organization grant agreement with Trail, Trap, and Skeet Club, Inc. (Club) for improvements at the Trail Glades Range.</p> <p>Location: 17601 S.W. 8th Street (Trail Glades Range)</p> <p>The time extension would allow payment to the Trail, Trap, and Skeet Club for the amount of \$14,927.77. The \$14,927.77 was used to purchase an awning for the Range.</p> <p>All improvements and repairs to the Range were completed in November 2006. However, the Club did not submit the request for reimbursement until October 2007.</p> <p>The Club was originally awarded the grant in FY 2001-2002 for \$75,000, but due to delays the grant agreement was not executed until September 2005. These delays were the removal of the skeet house, environmental concerns with the wetlands area, and organizational problems.</p> <p><u>All grant agreements stipulate that all requests for final payment must be made within the term of the agreement. The Miami-Dade Parks and Recreation Department is responsible for monitoring this grant agreement.</u></p> <p>Why did the Club wait (11) eleven months to request reimbursement?</p> <p>The Club delayed its submittal for the awning invoice until it could determine that there were sufficient funds to cover all construction expenses associated with the skeet house. The contractor, Ness Construction, Inc. was fully paid by the time this grant agreement expired on December 31, 2006.</p>		
8(M)3(A)	<p>Contract Award Recommendation for Redland Fruit & Spice Park-Lake Development</p>	<p>District 8</p> <p>This project for the construction and excavation of a new lake, stream and waterfall basin, a new concrete waterfall structure, water pumps, and fountains at the Redland Fruit & Spice Park.</p>	<p>American Earth Movers, Inc. has one (1) violation recorded with Miami-Dade County for utilizing a non-certified CSBE in the amount of \$337,836 in 2007. The company agreed to make up a</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
			<p><u>Location:</u> 24801 S.W. 187 Avenue, Homestead, 33031</p> <p><u>Contractor:</u> American Earth Movers, Inc.</p> <p><u>Amount:</u> \$1,116,948.00</p> <p><u>Funding Source:</u> \$479,717.30 from Safe Neighborhood Park Bonds and \$637,230.70 from General Obligation Bonds (GOB).</p> <p><u>CSBE Goal:</u> 20%</p> <p><u>Contract Period:</u> 548 days</p>	<p>portion of this deficit by increasing its CSBE participation on another project by 3%.</p> <p>This contractor has had twenty-one (21) previous contracts with Miami-Dade County, totaling \$20,295,678.</p> <p>According to the Department of Small Business Development Firm History Report from September 2002 to September 2007, the contractor has had change orders totaling \$725,070 on other County projects.</p> <p>There are approximately 92 GOB projects within District 8.</p> <p>This project is one of four projects scheduled for the Redland Fruit & Spice Park. The four projects combined are budgeted at \$4,000,000.</p>
8(M)3(B)	Retroactive Change Order No. 1 for the Black Point Marina-Sewer Connection	<p>District 8</p> <p>This project is for the construction of sewage collection and transmission facilities. It includes: construction of a 2,677 linear force main, construction of 3,742 linear feet of sewage force main, removal of existing septic tank facilities, and the restoration of all surfaces.</p> <p>Location: 24775 S.W. 87th Ave, Miami, FL. 33032</p> <p>Contractor: Metro Equipment Services, Inc.</p> <p>Amount: \$1,122,220, plus an additional \$253,947.01, totaling \$1,376,167.01</p>	<p>According the Department Small Business Development, History of Violations report from January 1, 1994 to February 22, 2008 Metro Equipment Service, Inc. (MES) has (4) four violations on record.</p> <p><u>Two of these are violations are still pending for failure to meet CSBE goals. The first pending violation is in the amount of \$267,440 with the Water and Sewer Department. The second pending violation (for this project) is in the amount \$359,110.41. MES has been put</u></p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>Funding Source: General Obligation Bond (GOB) and Capital Outlay Reserve Fund</p> <p>CSBE Goal: 16%</p> <p><u>This change order is for monetary changes only.</u></p> <p>Requested changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relocation of a lift station, \$29,880; • increase the size of the sewer line; \$7,458; • modification of sewer conduit line, \$6,445; • replacement of a 4" PVC sewer line, \$39,919; • invert elevation errors, \$50,922.49; • installing of two new grease traps underneath existing asphalt driveway, \$52,055.95; • design errors associated with monitoring wells, \$12,328; • design omissions addressing the disposal of an existing septic tank, \$1,472.50; and • a design omission concerning a 2" electrical conduit, \$11,837.38. 	<p><u>on a deficit makeup plan for these two violations.</u></p> <p>This contractor has had twenty-three (23) previous contracts with Miami-Dade County, totaling \$28,425,877.</p> <p>One change was requested by the Park and Recreation Department, (1) one change was requested by the Water and Sewer Department, and (3) changes were a result of design errors and omissions.</p> <p>According to the Department of Small Business Development Firm History Report from January 2001 to November 2006, the contractor has had change orders totaling \$500,741 on other County projects.</p> <p>With this change order of \$253,947.01, the total contract amount has increased by 20% from the original amount.</p> <p>The design consultant is Consulting Engineering and Science, Inc.</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Can funds be recovered from the design consultant for the design errors and omissions?</p> <p>According to staff, the Professional Services Agreement associated with this project does not have provisions for the recovery costs associated with design</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
8(M)3(C)	Retroactive Change Order No. 2 and Final for Highland Oaks Park	<p>District 4</p> <p>This project is for the construction of a 2,086 sq. ft. recreation center with a water main extension for a fire hydrant. Additionally, there will be an expansion of the existing parking lot by 10 parking spaces.</p> <p>Location: 20459 N.E. 24th Avenue, North Miami, FL.</p> <p>Contractor: Miami Skyline Construction Corp.</p> <p>Amount: \$680,081.23, plus an additional \$43,243.15, totaling \$723,324.38</p> <p>Funding Source: Park Impact Fees and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond</p> <p>CSBE Goal: 22%. The contractor has exceeded their goal at 27.9% on this project.</p> <p><u>This change order is for both monetary changes and a time extension.</u></p> <p>Requested changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated phone lines to meet Fire Department’s alarm monitoring standards, \$787.32; • raising the compaction density for the parking lot, \$3,852.50; • FP&L and Bellsouth Phone Charges, \$5,905.82; • additional signs requested by the Fire Department, \$513.72; • modifications to the existing parking lot, \$2,808.75; • restoration costs for restoring the areas impacted to its original state, \$15,639.60; • hauling costs for concrete structures removed due conflicts with the water main, \$11,463.20; • design errors and omissions regarding the strengthening of partition walls in the restrooms, \$2,219.50, \$671.20 from the contingency allowance, increasing the contract amount by \$1,548.30; 	<p>errors and omissions.</p> <p>Miami Skyline Construction, Inc. has one (1) violation recorded with the Miami-Dade Parks and Recreation Department for underpayment of an employee in 2004. This violation has been resolved.</p> <p>This contractor has had (8) eight previous contracts with the County for a total amount of \$8,181,939.</p> <p>This Change Order was delayed due to an investigation by the Miami Dade Parks and Recreation Department and the Department of Small Business Development. The investigation concerned an employee of a sub-contractor regarding code violations on the project. Both departments stated that all allegations are invalid.</p> <p>The previous change order for this contract was in the amount of \$29,875.60. With this change order of \$43,243.15, the total contract amount has increased by 11% from the original amount.</p> <p>(3)Three changes were requested by the Miami-Dade Parks and Recreation Department, (2) two changes were requested by regulatory agencies (Fire Department and Public Works) and (4) four changes were requested by the contractor.</p>

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bonds costs omitted by the contractor, \$723.04; and • an additional (3) months to complete the work. 	<p>The design consultant was Indigo Service Corporation.</p> <p>Questions: Can funds be recovered from the design consultant for the design errors and omissions?</p> <p>According to staff, design errors and omissions costs can not be recovered because the contract threshold for recovery of errors/omissions is 3% (or 19,506.17).</p>
8(O)1(A)	<p>Rescission of Award Recommendation and Rejection of Proposals for RFQ No. 98- Homeland Security Consulting Services</p>	<p>This resolution rejects all proposals received for the Request for Qualifications No. 98 to obtain Homeland Security Consulting Services.</p> <p>This contract was for homeland security consulting services to be provided on an “as-needed” basis, using work orders. The consultant was to identify security vulnerabilities, conduct threat analyses, develop security protection options, and assist in the implementation of any recommended plans.</p> <p>Term: Three years with three (3) one-year options-to-renew.</p> <p>Department: General Services Administration (GSA)</p> <p>Contract Amount: Not to exceed to \$9.8 million for the initial 3 year term.</p> <p>Funding Source: General Fund</p> <p>Contract Measure: Small Business Enterprise selection factor</p> <p><u>Staff has determined that commencing another Request for</u></p>	<p>This contract was intended to aid GSA with their Security, Survivability, and Interoperability Master Plan (SSIMP).</p> <p>The original award recommendation was issued in March 2007 to Tetra Tech, Inc. However, an allegation was made by URS Corporation that Tetra Tech, Inc. had an unfair advantage in the selection process.</p> <p><u>Tetra Tech’s subcontractor on this proposal, A Secure America, was involved in the preparation of the SSIMP.</u></p> <p><u>Part of this proposal was to include an Integrated Command Facility (as part of the Lightspeed Building) for \$4,517,000. However, there were questions raised in the October 2007 Inspector General (OIG) report as to the actual cost of a full</u></p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																						
		<u>Qualifications process would remove any concerns or perception of unfairness.</u>	<u>functional facility as proposed in the solicitation.</u>																						
8(O)1(B)	Resolution Waiving Formal Bid Procedures	<p>SECTION 1-Sole Sources</p> <p>1.1 <u>Matrix Security Control System</u> <u>Term:</u> Two years, with one, two-year options to renew <u>Department:</u> Aviation <u>Vendor:</u> Matrix Systems, Inc. (non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$1,780,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is a non-competitive contract. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 636 1906 740"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.1</td> <td>\$1,780,000/2 years</td> <td>\$890,000</td> <td>6 months /\$480,000</td> <td>\$960,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>1.2 <u>NICE Digital Video Recording Systems (DVARs)</u> <u>Term:</u> Five years, with two options to renew(OTR), one OTR for five years and one OTR for three years <u>Department:</u> Aviation <u>Vendor:</u> Nice Systems, Inc. (non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$5,157,693 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is a non-competitive contract. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1076 1906 1180"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.2</td> <td>\$5,157,693/5 years</td> <td>\$1,031,538.60</td> <td>1 year /\$100,000</td> <td>\$100,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Nice Systems, Inc. is the sole provider of maintenance and support of the Digital Video and Audio Recording Solution (DVARs).</p> <p>SECTION 3-Emergency Purchases</p> <p>3.1 <u>Plastic Road Barricades</u> <u>Term:</u> Upon delivery</p>	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	1.1	\$1,780,000/2 years	\$890,000	6 months /\$480,000	\$960,000	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	1.2	\$5,157,693/5 years	\$1,031,538.60	1 year /\$100,000	\$100,000			
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year																					
1.1	\$1,780,000/2 years	\$890,000	6 months /\$480,000	\$960,000																					
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year																					
1.2	\$5,157,693/5 years	\$1,031,538.60	1 year /\$100,000	\$100,000																					

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p><u>Department:</u> Port of Miami <u>Vendor:</u> Protective Barrier Services, Inc. (local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$119,241 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <p><u>3.2 Transportation of Dead Bodies</u> <u>Term:</u> One year and ten days <u>Department:</u> Medical Examiner <u>Vendor:</u> Quality Removal, Inc. (local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$800,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> General Fund</p> <p>This is an emergency bridge contract until the Medical Examiner’s Office (ME) can provide this service. The ME is expected to assume these services by June 30, 2008.</p> <p><u>3.3 Laundry Services</u> <u>Term:</u> Nine months <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Corrections and Rehabilitation <u>Vendor:</u> Van-Dyne-Crotty Co. d/b/a Sprit Services Co. (non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$465,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> General Fund</p> <p>This is an emergency bridge contract due to performance issues with the awarded vendor and the inability of the two lowest bidders to provide the staff necessary to perform the work. The replacement contract will be awarded in April 2008.</p> <p><u>3.4 Heat Start Education and Childhood Development Administration</u> <u>Term:</u> Five months <u>Department:</u> Community Action Agency <u>Vendor:</u> Our Child Care, Inc. d/b/a Our Little Ones (local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$198,500 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> Federal Grant</p> <p>This is an emergency bridge contract, which allowed continued and uninterrupted services at the Little Haiti</p>		

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions											
		<p>Head Start Facility. The replacement contract was awarded this month.</p> <p><u>3.5 Janitorial Services for General Services Administration (GSA)</u> <u>Term:</u> Four months <u>Department:</u> GSA <u>Vendor:</u> Vista Building Maintenance Services, Inc. (local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$174,401 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> Internal Service Funds</p> <p>This is an emergency bridge contract until the renewal contract is awarded on February 29, 2008. According to the Department of Small Business Development, History of Violations Report from January 1, 1994 to February 22, 2008, Vista Building Maintenance Services, Inc. had two violations on record for failure to meet Hispanic Business Enterprise, Womens' Business Enterprise, and/or Black Business Enterprise subcontractor goals. Both violations have been resolved.</p> <p><u>3.6 Baggage Systems Maintenance to Conveyor Systems</u> <u>Term:</u> Six months <u>Department:</u> Aviation <u>Vendor:</u> Aircraft Service International, Inc. (non-local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$763,726 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1031 1906 1133"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3.6</td> <td>\$763,726/6 months</td> <td>\$1,527,452</td> <td>3 months /\$436,150</td> <td>\$1,744,600</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>3.7 Emphasys Computer Solution Optimization Standard Consulting Services</u> <u>Term:</u> Four months <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Housing Agency <u>Vendor:</u> Emphasys Computer Solutions, Inc. (non-local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$246,530 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> Federal Revenue</p> <p><i>Are more consulting services expected?</i></p>	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	3.6	\$763,726/6 months	\$1,527,452	3 months /\$436,150	\$1,744,600		
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year										
3.6	\$763,726/6 months	\$1,527,452	3 months /\$436,150	\$1,744,600										

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>According to staff, there are no more consulting services expected.</p> <p><u>3.8 Repair of 4th Street Force Main</u> <u>Term:</u> Six and a half months <u>Department:</u> Water and Sewer Department <u>Vendor:</u> Lanzo Construction Co. Inc (local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$844,800 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <p>According to the Department of Small Business Development, History of Violations report dated January 1, 1994 to February 22, 2008:</p> <p>Lanzo Construction Co., Inc. has (9) nine violations on record since 1998. Eight (8) of the violations are for underpayment of employees. The ninth violation is still pending for failure to meet CSBE goals in the amount of \$148,000. The contractor has been placed on a make-up deficit plan. The contractor will make up the deficit amount on another project. To date, the make-up goal is not yet complete and is not closed.</p> <p><u>3.9 Janitorial Services for Water and Sewer Department (WASD)</u> <u>Term:</u> Four months <u>Department:</u> Water and Sewer Department <u>Vendor:</u> Banks Enviro Cleaning, Inc. (local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$102,740 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <p>According to the Department of Small Business Development, History of Violations report dated January 1, 1994 to February 22, 2008:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banks Enviro Cleaning, Inc. has (5) five violations on record since 2004. All violations are the result of failure to respond to payroll audits and/or failure to pay their employees within a bi-weekly period. The fifth violation from October 2007 is closed. <p>SECTION 4-Non-Competitive Contract Modifications</p> <p><u>4.1 Juvenile Detention Services</u></p>		

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p><u>Term:</u> Twenty months <u>Department:</u> Juvenile Services Department <u>Vendor:</u> The Wackenhut Corp. (non-local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$2,800,000 Modification: an additional six months and an additional \$840,000, totaling \$3,640,000 (this is approximately \$140,000 per month) <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> General Fund</p> <p><i>Why is Wackenhut the only qualified vendor?</i></p> <p>According to staff, Wackenhut is the only qualified vendor because Wackenhut is the only company that has completed and passed the Facilities Protective Action Response training required by the State of Florida.</p> <p><u>4.2 Security Guard and Screening Services</u> <u>Term:</u> One year <u>Department:</u> GSA <u>Vendor:</u> Various (local vendors) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$58,423,988 Modification: an additional six months and an additional \$24,000,000, totaling \$82,423,988 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> Internal Service Funds</p> <p><i>How much do these security guards get paid per hour? How many employees? How many hours worked?</i></p> <p><i>When will the new contract be finalized?</i></p> <p>Staff states that there is one bid protest pending which is delaying the award process.</p> <p>According to the Department of Small Business Development, History of Violations report dated January 1, 1994 to February 22, 2008:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alanis Security has (2) violations on record for underpayment of an employee and failure to respond to a payroll audit. Both of these violations have been resolved. While the County does not maintain a comprehensive database, the Department of Small Business Development tracks all wage-related issues related to this company. 	

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delad Security, Inc. has (1) one violation on record for failure to obtain/retain their CSBE certification while performing their work designated for a CSBE. This violation has been resolved. <p><u>4.3 Security Guard and Screening Personnel Services</u> (for the courts) <u>Term:</u> Five months <u>Department:</u> GSA <u>Vendor:</u> Vanguard Security, Inc. (local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$1,731,603 Modification: an additional six months and an additional \$2,369,598, totaling \$4,101,201 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> Internal Service Charges</p> <p>The previous vendor, Empirical Protective Services, Inc. did not comply with the Bond and Living Wage requirements of their contract leading to their termination. This is an emergency bridge contract until a replacement contract is awarded.</p> <p><u>4.4 Air Conditioning Control and Equipment, Inspection, Labor, and Parts</u> <u>Term:</u> One Year <u>Department:</u> Port of Miami <u>Vendor:</u> American Standard, Inc. (non-local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$100,000 Modification: an additional \$36,000, totaling \$136,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is a non-competitive contract. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <p>American Standard has proprietary rights over Trane’s original equipment.</p> <p><u>4.5 Medical Transport Billing and Collection Services</u> <u>Term:</u> 30 months <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Fire Rescue <u>Vendor:</u> Advanced Data Processing, Inc. (local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$1,500,000 Modification: an additional six months and an additional \$300,000, totaling \$1,800,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is a non-competitive contract. <u>Funding Source:</u> Fire District Funds</p> <p>This additional time and spending authority comes from the rejection of RFP 516. The Budget and Finance</p>		

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																
		<p>Committee at its July 11, 2007 meeting recommended rejecting all bids due to issues related to price evaluations and formulas of the proposers. The replacement contract is expected to be placed at July 8, 2008 Budget and Finance Committee meeting.</p> <p>SECTION 6-Approval of the Use of People’s Transportation Plan Surtax (PTP) Funds</p> <p><u>OCA has requested that the departments provide a breakdown of PTP Surtax funds used.</u></p> <p><u>6.1 Lubricant and Diesel Fuel Analysis</u> <u>Term:</u> Eight months <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendor:</u> Ana Laboratories, Inc. (non-local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$100,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency contract. <u>Funding Source:</u> PTP Surtax and Operating Revenue</p> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 797 1621 899"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6.1</td> <td>\$76,400</td> <td>\$23,600</td> <td>\$100,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The award of the replacement contract is presented in Agenda Item 801D, Item 5.4</p> <p><u>6.2 Synthetic Transmission Fluid</u> <u>Term:</u> Eight months <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendor:</u> SSI Lubricants, LLC. <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$425,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is an emergency purchase. <u>Funding Source:</u> PTP Surtax and Operating Revenue</p> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1304 1621 1406"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6.2</td> <td>\$324,700</td> <td>\$100,300</td> <td>\$425,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The award of the replacement contract is presented in Agenda Item 801D, Item 5.2.</p>	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	6.1	\$76,400	\$23,600	\$100,000	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	6.2	\$324,700	\$100,300	\$425,000	
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																
6.1	\$76,400	\$23,600	\$100,000																
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																
6.2	\$324,700	\$100,300	\$425,000																

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
8(O)1(C)	<p>Recommendation to Reject all Proposals Responding to RFP No. 439</p> <p><i>Deferral Requested</i></p>	<p>This resolution rejects all proposals received for the Request for Proposals No. 439 for Heavy Rail Rehabilitation, and waives bid protest procedures in accordance with Section 2-8.3 and 2-8.4.</p> <p>This contract was for the rehabilitation of the County's 136 heavy rail vehicles.</p> <p>Funding Source: People's Transportation Plan (PTP) Transit Surtax</p> <p>Background:</p> <p>On October 9, 2003 the Board of County Commissioners approved a list of 24 Capital Improvement Items to be included into the PTP. The total funding associated with this list was \$397,220,000.</p> <p>One of the items on the list was the Metrorail Mid-Life Rehabilitation estimated at \$188,830,000.</p> <p>The Citizens Independent Transportation Trust approved this list of items on July 29, 2003.</p> <p>The original 136 vehicles were placed in service 24 years ago. The scheduled mid-life rehabilitation should have taken place after 15 years. However, due to lack of available funding the rehab of these vehicles had been delayed.</p> <p>On November 5, 2004, the voters of Miami-Dade approved the half-penny PTP Surtax to be used for Transit and Transportation needs in Miami-Dade County.</p> <p>Early estimates for the mid-life rehab were revised and in 2005 the estimate to complete the project was \$258.4 million (\$1.9 million per vehicle). Since the project was originally approved in 2003 the estimated costs have increased more than 27%.</p>	<p>The RFP process and a subsequent Best and Final Offer process resulted in a negotiated price of \$274,495,000 (\$2.018 million per vehicle) from Bombardier Mass Transit Corp.</p> <p>Following approval of this item, Miami-Dade Transit is expected to seek Board approval for the purchase of 198 new rail vehicles based on the results of a Life Cycle Cost Analysis; the requirements for New Starts vehicles; MDT operating vehicle requirements and the age of the existing fleet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purchase of a new fleet of vehicles would require an amendment to the PTP Miscellaneous Capital Projects List. <p>Fiscal Impact</p> <p>To date, the County has spent \$8.4 million on consultants and analyses in its effort to rehabilitate the current fleet of trains.</p> <p>The estimated cost of purchasing a new fleet of 198 vehicles is \$478.962 million (\$2.419 per train), and would be funded by the PTP.</p>
8(O)1(D)	Award of Competitive Contracts	<p>SECTION 1-Award of Competitive Bids</p> <p><u>All items that have PTP Surtax as a funding source were bifurcated at the February 12, 2008 Budget and</u></p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																												
		<p><u>Finance Committee meeting and forwarded without a recommendation.</u></p> <p><u>OCA has requested that the department provide a breakdown of PTP Surtax funds used.</u></p> <p><u>1.1 Conventional Baggage Systems Maintenance and Services</u> <u>Term:</u> one year, with four, one year options to renew <u>Department:</u> Aviation <u>Vendor:</u> Oxford Electronics (non-local vendor) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$1,097,547 <u>Contract Measure:</u> Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 626 1906 732"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.1</td> <td>\$1,097,547/1 year</td> <td>\$1,097,547</td> <td>18 months/\$4,748,700</td> <td>\$3,165,800</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>1.2 Pre-Qualification for Manufacturer's Dealer (OEM) Parts and Repair Services</u> <u>Term:</u> One year, with five, one year options to renew <u>Department:</u> Various <u>Vendor:</u> Various (all local vendors) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$4,599,500 <u>Contract Measure:</u> Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue, Fire District Funds, Internal Service Funds, PTP Surtax, General Fund</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1036 1906 1141"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.2</td> <td>\$4,599,500/1 year</td> <td>\$4,599,500</td> <td>6 years /\$13,965,625</td> <td>\$2,327,604.17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Transit PTP Breakdown</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1206 1621 1312"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.2</td> <td>\$106,960</td> <td>\$33,040</td> <td>\$140,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>1.3 A/C Chillers and Related Equipment, Maintenance and Repair Services</u> <u>Term:</u> Three years, with two, one year options to renew <u>Department:</u> Various</p>	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	1.1	\$1,097,547/1 year	\$1,097,547	18 months/\$4,748,700	\$3,165,800	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	1.2	\$4,599,500/1 year	\$4,599,500	6 years /\$13,965,625	\$2,327,604.17	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	1.2	\$106,960	\$33,040	\$140,000	
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year																											
1.1	\$1,097,547/1 year	\$1,097,547	18 months/\$4,748,700	\$3,165,800																											
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year																											
1.2	\$4,599,500/1 year	\$4,599,500	6 years /\$13,965,625	\$2,327,604.17																											
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																												
1.2	\$106,960	\$33,040	\$140,000																												

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																																		
			<p>Vendor: Various (local and non-local) Contract Amount: \$2,748,000 Contract Measure: Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference Funding Source: Operating Revenue, General Fund, Internal Service Funds, PTP Surtax</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 391 1906 496"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.3</td> <td>\$2,748,000/3 years</td> <td>\$916,000</td> <td>7 months /\$500,000</td> <td>\$857,142.86</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 565 1619 670"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.3</td> <td>\$42,020</td> <td>\$12,980</td> <td>\$55,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>1.4 Refuse Transfer Trailers Term: One year, with one six month option to renew Department: Solid Waste Management Vendor: STECO (non-local vendor) Contract Amount: \$3,722,224 Contract Measure: Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference Funding Source: Operating Revenue</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1003 1906 1109"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.4</td> <td>\$3,722,224/1 year</td> <td>\$3,722,224</td> <td>17 months /\$2,776,720</td> <td>\$1,960,037.65</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>1.5 Audio Visual Equipment and Supplies-Pre-Qualification Term: Five years with five, one-year options to renew Departments: Various Vendor: Various (local and non-local vendors) Contract Amount: \$2,991,692 Contract Measure: Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference Funding Source: General Funds, Operating Revenue, and PTP Surtax</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1409 1906 1448"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term</th> <th>Previous Contract</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> </tbody> </table>	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	1.3	\$2,748,000/3 years	\$916,000	7 months /\$500,000	\$857,142.86	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	1.3	\$42,020	\$12,980	\$55,000	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	1.4	\$3,722,224/1 year	\$3,722,224	17 months /\$2,776,720	\$1,960,037.65	Item	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term	Previous Contract		
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year																																		
1.3	\$2,748,000/3 years	\$916,000	7 months /\$500,000	\$857,142.86																																		
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																																			
1.3	\$42,020	\$12,980	\$55,000																																			
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year																																		
1.4	\$3,722,224/1 year	\$3,722,224	17 months /\$2,776,720	\$1,960,037.65																																		
Item	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term	Previous Contract																																		

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions												
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>No.</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>& Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.5</td> <td>\$2,991,692/5 years</td> <td>\$598,338.40</td> <td>6 months /\$993,630</td> <td>\$1,987,260</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No.			& Amount	Amount per year	1.5	\$2,991,692/5 years	\$598,338.40	6 months /\$993,630	\$1,987,260			
No.			& Amount	Amount per year											
1.5	\$2,991,692/5 years	\$598,338.40	6 months /\$993,630	\$1,987,260											
		<p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.5</td> <td>\$93,985</td> <td>\$29,032</td> <td>\$123,017</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	1.5	\$93,985	\$29,032	\$123,017					
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total												
1.5	\$93,985	\$29,032	\$123,017												
		<p><u>1.6 Construction Equipment Rental</u> <u>Term:</u> Five years, with one, five year option to renew <u>Departments:</u> Various <u>Vendors:</u> Various (local and non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$14,537,328 <u>Contract Measure:</u> Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue, General Funds, Internal Service Funds, and PTP Surtax</p>													
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.6</td> <td>\$14,537,328/5 years</td> <td>\$2,907,465.60</td> <td>5 years /\$31,289,000</td> <td>\$6,257,800</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	1.6	\$14,537,328/5 years	\$2,907,465.60	5 years /\$31,289,000	\$6,257,800			
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year											
1.6	\$14,537,328/5 years	\$2,907,465.60	5 years /\$31,289,000	\$6,257,800											
		<p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.6</td> <td>\$611,200</td> <td>\$188,800</td> <td>\$800,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	1.6	\$611,200	\$188,800	\$800,000					
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total												
1.6	\$611,200	\$188,800	\$800,000												
		<p>SECTION 3-Contract Modifications</p> <p><u>3.1 Elevator Maintenance Services</u> <u>Term:</u> One year <u>Department:</u> Aviation <u>Vendor:</u> ThyssenKrup Elevator Corp. (non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$ 723,000 Modification: an additional \$500,000, totaling \$1,223,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure due to insufficient availability</p>													

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions								
			<p><u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <p>The \$500,000 will go to replace one belt in the moving walkway from Skyride F to the Flamingo facility.</p> <p>According to the Department of Small Business Development, History of Violations report from January 1, 1994 to February 22, 2008, Thyssenkrupp Elevator Corporation has one violation recorded with the Department of Small Business Development for failure to submit payrolls. This violation has been resolved.</p> <p><u>3.2 Portable Generators, Purchase, Repairs and Parts</u></p> <p><u>Term:</u> Two years <u>Departments:</u> GSA and Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendors:</u> Various (local and non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$2,631,947 Modification: an additional \$1,000,000, totaling \$3,631,947 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure due to insufficient availability. <u>Funding Source:</u> Internal Service Funds, Operating Revenue and PTP Surtax</p> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 829 1621 932"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3.2</td> <td>\$38,200</td> <td>\$11,800</td> <td>\$74,240</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>3.3 Light Construction Equipment Rental</u></p> <p><u>Term:</u> Two years <u>Departments:</u> Aviation and Port of Miami <u>Vendors:</u> Various (local and non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$949,000 Modification: an additional \$392,000, totaling \$1,341,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <p><u>3.4 Medical Supplies</u></p> <p><u>Term:</u> One year <u>Departments:</u> Various <u>Vendors:</u> Various (local and non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$999,999</p>	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	3.2	\$38,200	\$11,800	\$74,240	
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total									
3.2	\$38,200	\$11,800	\$74,240									

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
			<p>Modification: and additional \$700,000, totaling \$1,699,999 <u>Contract Measure:</u> There are no contract measures. This was advertised prior to the implementation of the Small Business Enterprise Program. <u>Funding Source:</u> Fire District Funds, General Fund and State/Federal Revenue, and Operating Revenue</p> <p>SECTION 4-Purchases Made Under Competitively Awarded Contracts</p> <p><u>4.1 Symantec Computer Software and Support Services</u> <u>Term:</u> Thirty-two months <u>Department:</u> ETSD <u>Vendors:</u> Various (non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$2,085,000</p> <p>Modification an additional \$995,000, totaling \$3,080,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is a Federal General Services Administration contract. <u>Funding Source:</u> General funds, and Internal Service Funds</p> <p><i>Are more consulting services expected?</i></p> <p>According to staff, no additional modifications are expected through the term of the contract.</p> <p>Currently, the Enterprise Technology Services Department has (13) thirteen active contracts that may be used for IT consulting services, they are the following: Motorola-BW8127 - \$800,000 EAMS Pool-7890 - \$3,200,000.00 ESRI-BW8207 - \$2,500,000.00 Gartner-973-501 - \$270,000 Global 360-BW6909 - \$1,895,000.00 US Communities- RQ03-605674-16a - \$13,136,310.08 IBM-ss5851 - \$11,038,000.00 IT Consulting Services-973-561 - \$34,240,002.00 Oracle-BW7289 - \$5,500,000.00 Microsoft-255-001-01 - \$22,813,315.00 Symantec-GS-35F-0131r - \$2,085,000.00 Telecomm Support-RFQ23a - \$4,208,333.00 Accenture-RFP510 (Shared Services/ERP) - \$494,500.00</p> <p><u>4.2 Carpet and Flooring Materials</u></p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																		
			<p><u>Term:</u> Twenty-three months <u>Department:</u> Aviation <u>Vendors:</u> Various (local and non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$1,000,000 Modification: an additional \$2,500,000, totaling \$3,500,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This is a State of Florida contract. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue</p> <p>Why did the allocation deplete so fast? What terminals are associated with this contract?</p> <p>According to staff, the allocation depleted due the requirements of certain projects located at the following locations: South Terminal, Concourse J, Concourse H (3rd floor), and Concourse D. Additionally, there are pending projects at the North Terminal, Central Terminal (Concourse E, F, G), and miscellaneous Aviation department offices.</p> <p>SECTION 5-Approval of the Use of People’s Transportation Plan Surtax (PTP) Funds</p> <p><u>OCA has requested that the department provide a breakdown of PTP Surtax funds used.</u></p> <p><u>5.1 Rental of Trailers, Vans, Pickup Trucks and Utility Vehicles, Prequalification of Vendors</u></p> <p><u>Term:</u> Five years <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendors:</u> Various (local and non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$460,300 Modification: an additional \$35,700, totaling \$496,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue and PTP Surtax</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1166 1906 1268"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.1</td> <td>\$496,000/5 years</td> <td>\$99,200</td> <td>8 months /\$425,000</td> <td>\$637,500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1338 1621 1440"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.1</td> <td>\$27,275</td> <td>\$8,425</td> <td>\$35,700</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	5.1	\$496,000/5 years	\$99,200	8 months /\$425,000	\$637,500	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	5.1	\$27,275	\$8,425	\$35,700	
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year																		
5.1	\$496,000/5 years	\$99,200	8 months /\$425,000	\$637,500																		
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																			
5.1	\$27,275	\$8,425	\$35,700																			

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																										
		<p><u>5.2 Synthetic Transmission Fluid</u> <u>Term:</u> One year, with four, one year options to renew <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendor:</u> SSI Petroleum, Inc. (non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$772,975 <u>Contract Measure:</u> Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating and PTP Surtax</p> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 526 1621 631"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.2</td> <td>\$590,553</td> <td>\$182,422</td> <td>\$772,975</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The eight month emergency bridge contract that preceded this contract award is in Agenda Item 8O1B, Item 6.2.</p> <p><u>5.3 Bicycle Racks</u> <u>Term:</u> Two years, with three, one-year options to renew <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendor:</u> Midwest Bus Corp. (non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$457,780 <u>Contract Measure:</u> Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue and PTP Surtax</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1034 1906 1140"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.3</td> <td>\$457,780/2 years</td> <td>\$228,890</td> <td>6 months /\$120,000</td> <td>\$240,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1206 1621 1312"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.3</td> <td>\$349,744</td> <td>\$108,036</td> <td>\$457,780</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>5.4 Lubricant and Diesel Fuel Analysis</u> <u>Term:</u> One year, with four, one-year options to renew <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit</p>	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	5.2	\$590,553	\$182,422	\$772,975	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	5.3	\$457,780/2 years	\$228,890	6 months /\$120,000	\$240,000	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	5.3	\$349,744	\$108,036	\$457,780	
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																										
5.2	\$590,553	\$182,422	\$772,975																										
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year																									
5.3	\$457,780/2 years	\$228,890	6 months /\$120,000	\$240,000																									
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																										
5.3	\$349,744	\$108,036	\$457,780																										

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																												
		<p>Vendor: Ana Laboratories, Inc. (non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$183,657 <u>Contract Measure:</u> Small Business Enterprise 10% Bid Preference <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue, PTP Surtax</p> <p>The emergency bridge contract that preceded this contract award is in Agenda Item 801B, Item 6.1.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 461 1906 565"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Amount per year</th> <th>Previous Contract Term & Amount</th> <th>Previous Contract Amount per year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.4</td> <td>\$183,657/1 year</td> <td>\$183,657</td> <td>8 months /\$100,000</td> <td>\$150,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 631 1621 735"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.4</td> <td>\$140,314</td> <td>\$43,343</td> <td>\$183,657</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>5.5 <u>Transit Vehicle Parts and Repair Services, Pre-Qualification of Vendors</u> <u>Term:</u> Eighteen months <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendors:</u> Various (local and non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$27,704,500 Modification: an additional \$13,000,000, totaling \$40,704,500 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. The contract has a federal funding source from when it was originally awarded. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue and PTP Surtax</p> <p>According to the Department of Small Business Development, History of Violations report from January 1, 1994 to February 22, 2008, Hydraulic Technicians, Inc. has one violation recorded for underpayment of an employee on a previous County contract. This violation has been resolved and closed.</p> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1273 1621 1377"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.5</td> <td>\$9,932,000</td> <td>\$3,068,000</td> <td>\$39,750,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>5.6 <u>Track Hardware</u></p>	Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year	5.4	\$183,657/1 year	\$183,657	8 months /\$100,000	\$150,000	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	5.4	\$140,314	\$43,343	\$183,657	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	5.5	\$9,932,000	\$3,068,000	\$39,750,000			
Item No.	Contract Term & Amount	Amount per year	Previous Contract Term & Amount	Previous Contract Amount per year																											
5.4	\$183,657/1 year	\$183,657	8 months /\$100,000	\$150,000																											
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																												
5.4	\$140,314	\$43,343	\$183,657																												
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																												
5.5	\$9,932,000	\$3,068,000	\$39,750,000																												

Item No.	Background			Analysis / Comments / Questions																
	<p> <u>Term:</u> Two years <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendors:</u> Various (local and non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$1,825,000 <u>Modification:</u> an additional \$1,800,000, totaling \$3,625,000 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure. This contract has a federal funding source from when it was originally awarded. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating revenue and PTP Surtax </p> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 526 1621 631"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.6</td> <td>\$1,375,200</td> <td>\$424,800</td> <td>\$3,625,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p> <u>5.7 Hydraulic Parts, Supplies and Repairs, Pre-Qualification of Vendors</u> <u>Term:</u> One year <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendor:</u> Various (local and non-local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$1,253,534 <u>Modification:</u> an additional \$50,000, totaling \$1,303,534 <u>Contract Measure:</u> No measure due to insufficient availability. <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating revenue and PTP Surtax </p> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 1034 1621 1140"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.7</td> <td>\$38,200</td> <td>\$11,800</td> <td>\$50,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p> <u>5.8 Polygraph Services</u> <u>Term:</u> Two years <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendor:</u> Slattery Associates, Inc. (local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$823,000 <u>Modification:</u> an additional \$3,720, totaling \$826,720 <u>Contract Measure:</u> Small Business Enterprise selection factor <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue and PTP Surtax </p>			Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	5.6	\$1,375,200	\$424,800	\$3,625,000	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	5.7	\$38,200	\$11,800	\$50,000	
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																	
5.6	\$1,375,200	\$424,800	\$3,625,000																	
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																	
5.7	\$38,200	\$11,800	\$50,000																	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																
		<p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 256 1621 363"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.8</td> <td>\$2,842</td> <td>\$878</td> <td>\$3,720</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>5.9 Polygraph Services <u>Term:</u> Two years <u>Department:</u> Miami-Dade Transit <u>Vendor:</u> Journey Associates, Inc. (local) <u>Contract Amount:</u> \$395,500 Modification: an additional \$3,680, totaling \$ 399,180 <u>Contract Measure:</u> Small Business Enterprise selection factor <u>Funding Source:</u> Operating Revenue and PTP Surtax</p> <p>Transit PTP Breakdown</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 732 1621 839"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item No.</th> <th>Operating Revenue</th> <th>Surtax</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.9</td> <td>\$2,812</td> <td>\$868</td> <td>\$3,680</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	5.8	\$2,842	\$878	\$3,720	Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total	5.9	\$2,812	\$868	\$3,680	
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																
5.8	\$2,842	\$878	\$3,720																
Item No.	Operating Revenue	Surtax	Total																
5.9	\$2,812	\$868	\$3,680																
8(P)1(A)	Project Award Recommendation to CEB Construction, Inc.	<p>District 6</p> <p>This resolution approves the project award recommendation in the amount of \$48,494.80 between Miami-Dade County and CEB Construction, Inc. for Bus Bay improvements at N.W. 79th Avenue and South of N.W. 2nd Street.</p> <p><u>Using / Managing Department:</u> Public Works Department</p> <p><u>Location:</u> N.W. 79th Avenue and South of N.W. 2nd Street</p> <p><u>Project / Contract No.:</u> CICC 7040-0/07 RPQ No. 20070570</p> <p><u>Project Total:</u> \$48,494.80</p> <p><u>Funding Source:</u> Transit System Surtax – District 6 yearly allocation. Approval by the Citizens Independent Transportation Trust is required.</p> <p><u>Contract Period:</u> 45 days</p>																	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>There are 39 awarded contracts listed this company on the Capital Improvements (OCI) database, with a total performance rating of satisfactory. According to the Department of Small Business Development's History of Violations report (1/4/94 – 2/22/08), this company has four closed violations for submitting inaccurate payrolls.</p>	
8(P)1(B)	<p>Project Award Recommendation to All Quality Electrical Services, Inc.</p>	<p>Districts 7, 8, and 10</p> <p>This resolution approves the project award recommendation in the amount of \$500,000 between Miami-Dade County and All Quality Electrical Services, Inc. for the People's Transportation Plan (PTP) project for Internally Illuminated Street Name Sign Installation Contract.</p> <p><u>Using / Managing Department:</u> Public Works Department</p> <p><u>Location:</u> Various intersections to include: S.W. 72nd Avenue and S.W. 48th Street; S.W. 82nd Avenue and S.W. 16th Street; and S.W. 87th Avenue and S.W. 168th Street.</p> <p><u>Project / Contract No.:</u> CICC 7040-0/07 RPQ No. 20070784</p> <p><u>Project Total:</u> \$500,000</p> <p><u>Funding Source:</u> Transit System Surtax. Approval by the Citizens Independent Transportation Trust is required.</p> <p><u>Contract Period:</u> 100 days</p> <p>There are 12 awarded contracts listed for this company on the Capital Improvements (OCI) database, and 10 contractor performance evaluations that have an average performance rating of satisfactory. This company has no history of violations according to the Department of Small Business Development.</p>	
8(P)1(C)	<p>Project Award Recommendation to CEB Construction, Inc.</p>	<p>Districts 5 and 13</p> <p>This resolution approves the project award recommendation in the amount of \$565,000 between Miami-Dade County and CEB Construction, Inc. for the People's Transportation Plan (PTP) project to construct and install sidewalks and pedestrian ramps at various intersections within Miami-Dade County.</p> <p><u>Using / Managing Department:</u> Public Works Department</p> <p><u>Locations:</u> East 65th Street from Palm Avenue to East 2nd Avenue; N.W. 4th Street from N.W. South River Drive to N.W. 9th Avenue; and N.W. 4th Street from N.W. 9th Avenue to N.W. 10th Avenue.</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
			<p><u>Project / Contract No.:</u> CICC 7040-0/07 RPQ No. 20070791</p> <p><u>Project Total:</u> \$565,000</p> <p><u>Funding Source:</u> Transit System Surtax. Approval by the Citizens Independent Transportation Trust is required.</p> <p><u>Contract Period:</u> 270 days</p> <p>There are 39 awarded contracts listed this company on the Capital Improvements (OCI) database, with a total performance rating of satisfactory. According to the Department of Small Business Development's History of Violations report (1/4/94 – 2/22/08), this company has four closed violations for submitting inaccurate payrolls.</p>	
<p>8(P)1(D)</p> <p>8(P)1(E)</p>	<p>Retroactive Change Order No. One and Final for Contracts No. 20040507, No. 20040509</p>	<p>These resolutions approve the first and final Change Orders between H & R Paving, Inc. (H & R) and Miami-Dade County in the following amounts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract No. 20040507: \$145,837.20 (8P1D) • Contract No. 20040509: \$110,989.60 (8P1E) <p>These Change Orders ratify “Production Incentive Agreements” (PIA) between the County and the contractor that addressed the delays on resurfacing work caused by the 2005 hurricane season and the resulting scarcity of asphalt components. These Change Orders also reallocate contract funds to their respective contingency allowances to compensate the contractor for earned production incentives.</p> <p>These Change Orders require neither additional funding nor an increase in the overall contract amounts of the respective contracts.</p> <p><u>Using / Managing Department:</u> Public Works Department</p> <p><u>Project / Contract No.:</u> 20040507</p> <p><u>Project / Contract No.:</u> 20040509</p> <p><u>Change Order Funding Source:</u> Transit System Surtax. Approval by the</p>	<p>For more information and a detailed listing of H & R's previous and current violations, please see the Item 8(P)1(G) in this analysis.</p>	

Item No.	Background		Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>Citizens Independent Transportation Trust is not required.</p> <p>These Change Orders were originally deferred from the 5/16/07 Transit Committee agenda due pending the resolution of compliance issues regarding CSBE measures and Responsible Wages and Benefits requirements and a report from Small Business Development.</p> <p>According to a December 10, 2007 letter from Business Development, H&R Paving was found in violation of the CSBE program requirements and is required to makeup its CSBE deficit (valued at \$220,981.19) prior to receiving any new County contracts.</p> <p>A review into H&R's underpayment of wages on five projects is also on-going, according to the County Manager's memo dated December 24, 2007.</p> <p>The memo states that while the wages review is on-going, all previously deferred change orders and contracts may be presented to the BCC for approval.</p>	
8(P)1(F)	<p>Resolution Authorizing to Terminate for Convenience with The Redland Company, Inc.</p>	<p>District 11</p> <p>The resolution authorizes the Public Works Department (PWD) to terminate for convenience a contract with The Redland Company, Inc., titled S.W. 104 Street Roadway Improvements from SW 147 Avenue to SW 137 Avenue (PWD Project No. 20040603), and authorizes PWD to negotiate and settle any claims from the Contractor resulting from this action.</p> <p>There was an appropriation of \$6,480,170.46 for this project.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>PWD became aware of on-going litigation between The Redland Company, Inc. (Redland) and the City of Homestead (City). In an effort to make a determination on the firm's responsibility, staff contacted the City and their Counsel. Staff found that the City's allegations are associated with an agreement with Redland to dredge a rockpit within the City. Redland was issued a permit violation by the County's Department of Environmental Resources Management (DERM) for exceeding the dredging depths of the rockpit. As a result, the City terminated their agreement with Redland. Redland, aside from the on-going litigation, has since entered into a mitigation</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>agreement with DERM regarding the violation.</p> <p>Additionally, the case files obtained from the County Clerk's office by PWD staff were forwarded to the County Attorney's Office for their review and opinion regarding any legal reason that would prevent PWD from recommending award. The County Attorney found no such reason. PWD also reviewed its records and found that Redland has performed roadway construction in an acceptable manner.</p> <p>Settlement claims do not go to committee but go directly before the Board of County Commissioners. This resolution is authorizing the PWD to negotiate and settle all claims related to this project. If adopted, PWD does not have to bring back a settlement to the Board for approval.</p>	
8(P)1(G)	Resolution Approving Retroactive Change Order No. One and Final	<p>District 12</p> <p>The resolution approves Change Order No. 1 and final between H & R Paving, Inc. (H & R) and Miami-Dade County valued at \$102,277. This Change Order ratifies a "Production Incentive Agreement" (PIA) between the County and the contractor that addressed the delays on resurfacing work caused by the 2005 hurricane season and the resulting scarcity of asphalt components. This Change Order also reallocates contract funds to the contingency allowance to compensate the contractor for earned production incentives.</p> <p>Justification for Change Order: Due to the 2005 hurricane season, there were several resurfacing contracts that were delayed. During the same time, Port Everglades notified H & R that AC-30 asphaltic bituminous liquid, which is one of the main ingredients in the production of asphalt, was no longer available at said port for an indefinite period of time. The contractor was able to purchase the liquid, when available, at other facilities such as Tampa, Jacksonville and Atlanta in limited quantities, at higher prices and incurring additional transportation costs. <u>To this end, the County and H & R entered into a PIA under which H & R would receive additional compensation of \$20.00 per ton of asphalt employed on a particular month, as long as the monthly production for that month exceeded the contractual monthly production rate for at least 25%.</u></p> <p>Original Contract Expiration Date: August 14, 2006</p> <p>Using and Managing Department: Public Works Department (PWD)</p> <p>Project/Contract No.: 20040450</p> <p>Change Order Funding Source: Local Option Gas Tax</p> <p>Firm: H&R Paving, Inc.</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter																																																																																																																																																																						
	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																																																																																																																																																																				
		<p>Fiscal Impact: Approval of this Change Order will ratify the PIA and will allow the Public Works Department (PWD) to utilize \$102,277.01 from the base contract funds to cover a contingency allowance overrun caused by the payment of the production incentive. This action does not exceed the original contract amount. To date H & R has been paid \$742,098. If this item is approved, the total paid to the contractor would be \$943,465.93, which includes the original contingency amount of \$90,090 and the new amount of \$102, 277.</p> <p>Contractor Years in Business: 29 years; the firm has had fourteen contracts with the County</p> <p>History of Violations between 1/1/94 and 2/22/08 for H & R Paving:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 560 1969 1463"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date of Violation</th> <th>Project No.</th> <th>Dept</th> <th>Amount Recovered</th> <th>Amount Makeup</th> <th>Reason</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>5/13/99</td><td>647618</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to meet CSBE goals</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>7/17/98</td><td>662443</td><td>PW</td><td>\$163.19</td><td>163.19</td><td>Underpayment of employee</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>10/24/00</td><td>630214Q</td><td>PW</td><td>\$92</td><td>\$92</td><td>Underpayment of employee</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>4/12/01</td><td>671036</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failure to allow interview of employee</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>9/13/01</td><td>640336</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failure to submit monthly utilization report</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>10/16/01</td><td>630215Q</td><td>PW</td><td>\$27,500</td><td>\$27,500</td><td>Submittal of inaccurate payrolls</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>10/16/01</td><td>630013Q</td><td>PW</td><td>\$27,500</td><td>\$27,500</td><td>Submittal of inaccurate payrolls</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>11/21/02</td><td>629902Q</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>1/29/03</td><td>630158Q</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>3/26/03</td><td>629908Q</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>3/27/03</td><td>630158Q</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>1/14/04</td><td>629902Q</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>3/31/04</td><td>629902Q</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>4/13/05</td><td>20030249</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>4/21/05</td><td>20030002</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Submittal of inaccurate payrolls</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>4/21/05</td><td>CF005003 (B)</td><td>DE</td><td></td><td></td><td>Submittal of inaccurate payrolls</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>5/9/05</td><td>20030255</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>5/16/05</td><td>630023</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Submittal of inaccurate payrolls</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>5/20/05</td><td>629902Q</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to respond to payroll audit</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>8/2/05</td><td>20030255</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>9/13/05</td><td>20030254</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>12/16/05</td><td>20040506</td><td>PW</td><td></td><td></td><td>Failed to post wages at job site</td><td>Closed</td></tr> </tbody> </table>					Date of Violation	Project No.	Dept	Amount Recovered	Amount Makeup	Reason	Status	5/13/99	647618	PW			Failed to meet CSBE goals	Closed	7/17/98	662443	PW	\$163.19	163.19	Underpayment of employee	Closed	10/24/00	630214Q	PW	\$92	\$92	Underpayment of employee	Closed	4/12/01	671036	PW			Failure to allow interview of employee	Closed	9/13/01	640336	PW			Failure to submit monthly utilization report	Closed	10/16/01	630215Q	PW	\$27,500	\$27,500	Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Closed	10/16/01	630013Q	PW	\$27,500	\$27,500	Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Closed	11/21/02	629902Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed	1/29/03	630158Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed	3/26/03	629908Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed	3/27/03	630158Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed	1/14/04	629902Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed	3/31/04	629902Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed	4/13/05	20030249	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed	4/21/05	20030002	PW			Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Closed	4/21/05	CF005003 (B)	DE			Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Closed	5/9/05	20030255	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed	5/16/05	630023	PW			Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Closed	5/20/05	629902Q	PW			Failed to respond to payroll audit	Closed	8/2/05	20030255	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed	9/13/05	20030254	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed	12/16/05	20040506	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed
Date of Violation	Project No.	Dept	Amount Recovered	Amount Makeup	Reason	Status																																																																																																																																																																	
5/13/99	647618	PW			Failed to meet CSBE goals	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
7/17/98	662443	PW	\$163.19	163.19	Underpayment of employee	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
10/24/00	630214Q	PW	\$92	\$92	Underpayment of employee	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
4/12/01	671036	PW			Failure to allow interview of employee	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
9/13/01	640336	PW			Failure to submit monthly utilization report	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
10/16/01	630215Q	PW	\$27,500	\$27,500	Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
10/16/01	630013Q	PW	\$27,500	\$27,500	Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
11/21/02	629902Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
1/29/03	630158Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
3/26/03	629908Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
3/27/03	630158Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
1/14/04	629902Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
3/31/04	629902Q	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
4/13/05	20030249	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
4/21/05	20030002	PW			Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
4/21/05	CF005003 (B)	DE			Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
5/9/05	20030255	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
5/16/05	630023	PW			Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
5/20/05	629902Q	PW			Failed to respond to payroll audit	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
8/2/05	20030255	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
9/13/05	20030254	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	
12/16/05	20040506	PW			Failed to post wages at job site	Closed																																																																																																																																																																	

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background			Analysis / Comments / Questions		
			1/31/06	20040506	PW		Failed to post wages at job site	Closed
			2/2/06	20030256	PW		Failed to post wages at job site	Closed
			3/6/07	20030256	PW	\$131,487	Failed to meet CSBE goals	Open
			3/6/07	RM-6-01/03	AV	\$24,562	Failed to meet CSBE goals	Open
			3/8/07	20030249	PW	\$64,933	Failed to meet CSBE goals	Open
			5/23/07	20040508	PW		Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Open
			5/23/07	20040509	PW		Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Open
			5/23/07	20040450	PW		Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Open
			5/23/07	20040506	PW		Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Open
			5/23/07	20040507	PW		Submittal of inaccurate payrolls	Open
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• CSBE issues: On February 1 and March 6, 2007, the Department of Small Business Development (SBD) issued Notices of Violation (NOV) to H&R, pursuant to the CSBE Program for attempting to comply with CSBE participation requirements through fraud and/or misrepresentation and for failure to meet the required CSBE goal on Project Nos. 20030256, RM-6-01/03, 20030249, and 693232Q. H&R appealed the NOVs, and the appeal was reviewed by the County Manager’s Review Committee (RC) on July 18, 2007. <u>The RC recommendations indicated that while it could not find evidence to support fraud or intentional misrepresentation, H&R did not meet the required CSBE goals on three of four disputed contracts. A revised make-up amount was calculated based on the RC’s instruction to count dollars paid to all CSBEs on the four projects to calculate the deficit which is equal to \$220,981.</u></p> <p><u>The make-up of this deficit will be the condition of any new award to H&R.</u></p> <p>• Responsible Wages and benefits issues: On May 23, 2007, SBD staff issued an NOV to H&R Paving for inaccurate payrolls and underpayment of wages on five projects (20040450; 20040506; 20040507; 20040508; and 20040509). In accordance with the Responsible Wages and Benefits Ordinances, a stop payment of H&R’s final invoice for payment has been issued to protect the back wages totaling approximately \$85,000. Since then, H&R has provided additional payroll documents to SBD and has attended several meetings with SBD staff in order to clarify how the calculations for the employee’s pay were made. <u>According to SBD staff, additional payroll documents were submitted. It is expected that the amount due to the employees will be reduced to less than \$30,000.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In December 2007, H&R provided documentation that clarified how employee wages were calculated and reported on their payrolls for a three (3) week period. Based on a review of this information, and the information concerning the payment of travel time, forty employees were 							

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																		
		<p>removed from the analysis. Thirteen employees remain for a total of \$2,773.12 for three weeks. These are truck drivers or foreman that drove the trucks with crew, equipment and/or materials to job sites. The five projects under review where these employees worked took place within an 11 month period. Based on the amount due to the remaining employees for the 3 week period it is estimated that the final analysis will be around \$30,000 (\$2,773.12 x 11 months).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects being held back due to the wages and benefits issues with H & R: <p>H&R was the low bidder on each of these competitively bid contracts. The actual award recommendations were held pending the outcome of the firm's CSBE appeal hearing and the final determination of the firms actual makeup responsibility. Subsequent to these findings and the County Manager's memorandum dated December 24, 2007, the PWD began the award process. Although there has been a considerable amount of time from the bid opening; the firm has agreed to hold their prices during this process allowing the PWD to take advantage of their low prices. The following is a list of the projects (The Resurfacing and the Water and Sewer Department (WASD) Rehabilitation contracts are county wide projects that will have multiple site in various districts to be determined during the course of the contract as the need arises):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 797 1709 1297"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="632 797 989 867">PPQ and Project No.</th> <th data-bbox="989 797 1430 867">Contract Type</th> <th data-bbox="1430 797 1709 867">Amount of Contract</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 867 989 937">RPQ No. 20070564 (7360)</td> <td data-bbox="989 867 1430 937">QNIP Resurfacing Contract (Countywide)</td> <td data-bbox="1430 867 1709 937">\$999,999.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 937 989 1006">RPQ No. 20070567 (7360)</td> <td data-bbox="989 937 1430 1006">QNIP Resurfacing Contract (Countywide)</td> <td data-bbox="1430 937 1709 1006">\$999,999.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 1006 989 1076">RPQ No. 20070568 (7360)</td> <td data-bbox="989 1006 1430 1076">QNIP Resurfacing Contract (Countywide)</td> <td data-bbox="1430 1006 1709 1076">\$999,999.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 1076 989 1192">Project No. 20070593</td> <td data-bbox="989 1076 1430 1192">WASD Utility Roadway Rehabilitation Contract (Countywide)</td> <td data-bbox="1430 1076 1709 1192">\$1,068,517.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 1192 989 1297">Project No. 20070562</td> <td data-bbox="989 1192 1430 1297">PTP Roadway Improvements along NW 7 Street, from NW 72 Avenue to NW 37 Avenue</td> <td data-bbox="1430 1192 1709 1297">\$2,363,104.82</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PPQ and Project No.	Contract Type	Amount of Contract	RPQ No. 20070564 (7360)	QNIP Resurfacing Contract (Countywide)	\$999,999.00	RPQ No. 20070567 (7360)	QNIP Resurfacing Contract (Countywide)	\$999,999.00	RPQ No. 20070568 (7360)	QNIP Resurfacing Contract (Countywide)	\$999,999.00	Project No. 20070593	WASD Utility Roadway Rehabilitation Contract (Countywide)	\$1,068,517.10	Project No. 20070562	PTP Roadway Improvements along NW 7 Street, from NW 72 Avenue to NW 37 Avenue	\$2,363,104.82	
PPQ and Project No.	Contract Type	Amount of Contract																			
RPQ No. 20070564 (7360)	QNIP Resurfacing Contract (Countywide)	\$999,999.00																			
RPQ No. 20070567 (7360)	QNIP Resurfacing Contract (Countywide)	\$999,999.00																			
RPQ No. 20070568 (7360)	QNIP Resurfacing Contract (Countywide)	\$999,999.00																			
Project No. 20070593	WASD Utility Roadway Rehabilitation Contract (Countywide)	\$1,068,517.10																			
Project No. 20070562	PTP Roadway Improvements along NW 7 Street, from NW 72 Avenue to NW 37 Avenue	\$2,363,104.82																			
8(P)1(H)	Resolution Authorizing a Joint Participation Agreement with the Florida Department of	<p>District 12</p> <p>This proposed resolution would approve the execution of a Joint Participation Agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to provide \$22,519,138.49 from Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) funds for the construction of Phase 1 of the N.W. 74th Street project.</p>																			

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local match: \$22,519,138.49 from People’s Transportation Plan (PTP) Transit Surtax. <p>These funds will be used for the first phase of the 74th Street project which consists of constructing a 2.3 mile, six-lane road between N.W. 107th Avenue and N.W. 87th Avenue; and constructing a .27 mile, five-lane road between N.W. 87th Avenue and N.W. 84th Avenue.</p> <p>Total cost of the N.W. 74th Street project: \$78,547,993</p> <p>Total cost of Phase 1: \$45,038,276.98</p> <p>This project was originally included in PTP, with an estimated cost of \$15.6 million. The scope of the project expanded by the Board of County Commissioners through R-531-06, with an estimated cost of \$60 million. The expanded project was to be fully funded by the PTP, with FDOT refunding \$45 million to the County beginning in FY 2011-12. The final cost for this project is \$78,547,993, inclusive of FDOT’s increased contribution of \$56 million.</p>	
8(P)3(A)	Project Award Recommendation between APAC-Southeast, Inc. and Miami-Dade County	<p>District 12</p> <p>The resolution approves an award to APAC-Southeast, Inc. for roadway improvements along NW 72 Avenue from NW 74 Street to Okeechobee Road in the amount of \$6,093,924.19.</p> <p>This contract consists of widening the existing roadway from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with a painted median, a continuous drainage system, sidewalk, curb and gutter, signage, pavement markings, signalization, concrete barrier walls, and a new bridge over the Miami Canal connecting with Okeechobee Road.</p> <p>The annual operating and maintenance cost: The estimated annual operation for the signalized intersections (3 intersections at \$2,000) is approximately \$6,000. The estimated annual maintenance cost is approximately \$7,300. The maintenance costs take into consideration sidewalks, driving surface, bridge and the traffic signals. The life expectancy for the project is 30 years.</p> <p>Location: NW 72 Avenue from NW 74 Street to Okeechobee Road</p> <p>Managing Department: Public Works Department</p> <p>Funding Source: Road Impact Fee (RIF) and Secondary Gas Tax.</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter			Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																												
		<p>Contract Period: 540 Calendar days</p> <p>Contractor Years in Business: 27 years in business</p> <p>CSBE Goal: 13%</p> <p>Contingency Amount: \$535,341.45</p> <p>Total Dedicated Allowance: \$205,168.29</p> <p>Previous Work with the County: The contractor, Pavex Corporation DBA Ranger Construction - South a Florida Corporation formerly APAC-Southeast, Inc. has two (2) contracts listed in the Office of Capital Improvements (OCI) database and are listed as follows: one (1) the Department of Environmental Resources Management (DERM) and one (1) from PWD. During the bid analysis phase APAC-Southeast, Inc. was acquired by Pavex Corporation DBA Ranger Construction - South a Florida Corporation. The department received a request for assignment and assumption that was executed by the Clerk of the Board on November 30, 2007. Under their former company name of APAC-Southeast, Inc., PWD recently awarded one (1) capital construction contract (Project No. 20060227), but a Notice to Proceed has not been issued.</p> <p>Contractor's Performance Review: The OCI database also lists two (2) contractor performance evaluations with an overall performance rating of satisfactory (3.3).</p> <p>History of Violations between the dates of 1/1/94 and 2/22/08 for Pavex Corporation:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 1029 1913 1472"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="632 1029 842 1097">Date of Violation</th> <th data-bbox="842 1029 1052 1097">Project No.</th> <th data-bbox="1052 1029 1276 1097">Department</th> <th data-bbox="1276 1029 1451 1097">Amount Received</th> <th data-bbox="1451 1029 1677 1097">Reason</th> <th data-bbox="1677 1029 1913 1097">Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 1097 842 1166">12/11/2002</td> <td data-bbox="842 1097 1052 1166">629031</td> <td data-bbox="1052 1097 1276 1166">DE</td> <td data-bbox="1276 1097 1451 1166">\$626.49</td> <td data-bbox="1451 1097 1677 1166">Underpayment of Employee</td> <td data-bbox="1677 1097 1913 1166">Closed</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 1166 842 1234">12/11/2002</td> <td data-bbox="842 1166 1052 1234">629034</td> <td data-bbox="1052 1166 1276 1234">DE</td> <td data-bbox="1276 1166 1451 1234">\$1,395.12</td> <td data-bbox="1451 1166 1677 1234">Underpayment of Employee</td> <td data-bbox="1677 1166 1913 1234">Closed</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 1234 842 1338">2/13/2003</td> <td data-bbox="842 1234 1052 1338">629903Q</td> <td data-bbox="1052 1234 1276 1338">PW-Q</td> <td data-bbox="1276 1234 1451 1338"></td> <td data-bbox="1451 1234 1677 1338">Failed to post Wages at the Job Site</td> <td data-bbox="1677 1234 1913 1338">Closed</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 1338 842 1472">7/28/2003</td> <td data-bbox="842 1338 1052 1472">629903Q</td> <td data-bbox="1052 1338 1276 1472">PW-Q</td> <td data-bbox="1276 1338 1451 1472"></td> <td data-bbox="1451 1338 1677 1472">Failure to submit Monthly Utilization Report</td> <td data-bbox="1677 1338 1913 1472">Closed</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date of Violation	Project No.	Department	Amount Received	Reason	Status	12/11/2002	629031	DE	\$626.49	Underpayment of Employee	Closed	12/11/2002	629034	DE	\$1,395.12	Underpayment of Employee	Closed	2/13/2003	629903Q	PW-Q		Failed to post Wages at the Job Site	Closed	7/28/2003	629903Q	PW-Q		Failure to submit Monthly Utilization Report	Closed	
Date of Violation	Project No.	Department	Amount Received	Reason	Status																												
12/11/2002	629031	DE	\$626.49	Underpayment of Employee	Closed																												
12/11/2002	629034	DE	\$1,395.12	Underpayment of Employee	Closed																												
2/13/2003	629903Q	PW-Q		Failed to post Wages at the Job Site	Closed																												
7/28/2003	629903Q	PW-Q		Failure to submit Monthly Utilization Report	Closed																												

Item No.	Subject Matter																													
	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																												
	2/20/2004	CF002209	DE		Failure to submit Monthly Utilization Report	Closed																								
	6/14/2004	CF002209	DE		Failure to submit Monthly Utilization Report	Closed																								
	<p>Bid Summary: The three (3) lowest bidders were as follows: the lowest bidder, Pavex Corporation DBA Ranger Construction - South a Florida Corporation, was \$5,353,414, the second lowest bidder, Williams Paving Co., Inc., was \$5,600,000, the third lowest bidder, Horizon Contractors, Inc., was \$5,876,810.</p>																													
	<p>According to the Office of Capital Improvements, APAC-Florida, Inc. has 2 completed contracts on file, both with PWD; both have previous Change Orders (see below).</p>																													
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="634 799 810 870">Contract #</th> <th data-bbox="810 799 1024 870">Contract</th> <th data-bbox="1024 799 1239 870">Award</th> <th data-bbox="1239 799 1381 870">Status</th> <th data-bbox="1381 799 1524 870">Change Order</th> <th data-bbox="1524 799 1717 870">Approved BCC</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 870 810 938">629897</td> <td data-bbox="810 870 1024 938">Resurfacing Contract No. 1</td> <td data-bbox="1024 870 1239 938">\$2,000,000.00</td> <td data-bbox="1239 870 1381 938">100% complete</td> <td data-bbox="1381 870 1524 938">1</td> <td data-bbox="1524 870 1717 938">10/19/2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 938 810 1042">630015Q</td> <td data-bbox="810 938 1024 1042">QNIP Resurfacing Contract</td> <td data-bbox="1024 938 1239 1042">\$1,750,000.00</td> <td data-bbox="1239 938 1381 1042">100% Complete</td> <td data-bbox="1381 938 1524 1042">1</td> <td data-bbox="1524 938 1717 1042">6/6/2002</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 1042 810 1146">630015Q</td> <td data-bbox="810 1042 1024 1146">QNIP Resurfacing Contract</td> <td data-bbox="1024 1042 1239 1146">\$1,750,000.00</td> <td data-bbox="1239 1042 1381 1146">100% complete</td> <td data-bbox="1381 1042 1524 1146">2</td> <td data-bbox="1524 1042 1717 1146">10/8/2002</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Contract #	Contract	Award	Status	Change Order	Approved BCC	629897	Resurfacing Contract No. 1	\$2,000,000.00	100% complete	1	10/19/2004	630015Q	QNIP Resurfacing Contract	\$1,750,000.00	100% Complete	1	6/6/2002	630015Q	QNIP Resurfacing Contract	\$1,750,000.00	100% complete	2	10/8/2002
Contract #	Contract	Award	Status	Change Order	Approved BCC																									
629897	Resurfacing Contract No. 1	\$2,000,000.00	100% complete	1	10/19/2004																									
630015Q	QNIP Resurfacing Contract	\$1,750,000.00	100% Complete	1	6/6/2002																									
630015Q	QNIP Resurfacing Contract	\$1,750,000.00	100% complete	2	10/8/2002																									
	<p>Comments:</p>																													
	<p>PWD Bridge Maintenance: The Public Works Bridge Maintenance Unit is staff responsible for maintaining seven (7) movable bridges and the 204 fixed bridges owned by Miami-Dade County. As for maintenance and repairs to the bridge in the referenced project award, maintenance includes the approaches, superstructure, substructure, channel and navigational lighting. Public Works has increased the Secondary Gas Tax request for Bridge Repair and Painting funds from the current \$500,000 this fiscal year to \$1 Million next Fiscal Year. In addition, Public Works also requested new Secondary Gas Tax funding for emergency bridge repairs/improvements/painting for</p>																													

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>\$100,000.00 starting in Fiscal year 2009/2010 and every year thereafter.</p> <p>Based on the bids received the Bridge portion of the work is estimated at \$2,115,166.30.</p>	
8(P)3(B)	Request to Reject All Bids for the SW 157 Avenue Drainage Improvement Project	<p>District 11</p> <p>The resolution rejects all bids for the SW 157 Avenue Drainage Project. The project consisted of constructing a slab covered canal at SW 56 Street and SW 157 Avenue, and SW 42 Street and SW 157 Avenue. The work would have included excavation, drainage improvements, construction of a reinforced concrete covered canal, regarding, sodding, asphalt overlays, and pavement restoration.</p> <p>Funding Source: Building Better Community GOB Program</p> <p>Due to multiple unforeseen constraints and major changes with the project's scope of work, plan design and the pending lawsuit by the adjacent property owners, the Public Works Department (PWD) is left with no other alternative but to reject all bids. Once the aforementioned lawsuit has been settled and the full impact of the required changes is known, the department intends to re-advertise this project.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>The GOB funds for this project have been placed on hold and will be held until all pending issues can be resolved and the canal can be built.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The residents along the east side of SW 157th Ave were previously issued a permit to fence in a portion of the canal right-of-way abutting their properties. One of the permit conditions states that the County may at any time revoke the permit and subsequently the property owners would remove any obstructions they had placed in the right-of-way, including the fences. When the residents were notified that the canal was going to be built and the permit was being revoked they filed a lawsuit to retain a portion of the canal right-of-way for their use. • The County Attorney's Office filed a brief with the 3rd District Court of Appeals on January 28, 2008. The attorney representing the homeowners has until February 18, 2008 to file their brief. <p>PWD is not installing a new drainage system. The projects consist of the construction of a slab covered canal that would serve as an equalizer between the Bird Road Canal and the SW 64 Street Canal. The new canal would also serve as a groundwater interceptor reducing the groundwater level for the area east of the canal therefore reducing the possibility of flooding for that area.</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
8(Q)3(A)	Contract Award Recommendation for Project No. 2007.013; Contract no. 2007.013	<p>District 4</p> <p>This resolution approves the contract award recommendation in the amount of \$2,201,800.33 between Miami-Dade County and U.S. Bridge & Dredge, Inc. to mitigate 62.5 acres with red mangroves within the Oleta River State Park, 3400 N.E. 163rd Street, North Miami.</p> <p><u>Using / Managing Department:</u> Seaport Department</p> <p><u>Locations:</u> Oleta River State Park, 3400 N.E. 163rd Street, North Miami</p> <p><u>Project / Contract No.:</u> 2007.013</p> <p><u>Project Total:</u> \$2,201,800.33</p> <p><u>Funding Source:</u> Seaport bonds/loans</p> <p><u>Contract Period:</u> 365 days</p> <p><u>CSBE Measure:</u> None.</p> <p>This project was necessitated by damage caused by the County's dredging contractor, Dutra Construction Co., Inc., which impacted 3.5 acres of seagrass outside of the permitted dredging area. The lawsuit initiated by the County against Dutra's insurance company, Safeco Insurance, Co., resulted in a settlement of \$22.5 million</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project will only use a portion of the Safeco settlement, how will the remaining settlement funds be used? <p>This would be the first County contract awarded to U.S. Bridge & Dredge, Inc.</p>	
10(B)1(A)	FY 2007-2008 Tourist Development Council Grants-Second Quarter	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the funding of 26 grants for a total of \$240,300 for the FY 2007-08 Tourist Development Council Grants- 2nd Quarter.</p> <p>Funding is derived from the 2% Tourist Development Room Tax Revenue, the 2% Hotel/Motel Food and Beverage Surtax revenues, and \$25,000 from the Greater Miami Convention and Visitors Bureau.</p> <p>On January 22, 2008, the Tourist Development Council panel approved funding for 26 applicants for a total of \$240,300. There were 28 applicants that requested \$452,000.</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
10(I)1(A)	Resolution Approving Issuance of Educational Facilities Bond Financing for the University of Miami	<p>This resolution approves the issuance of Miami-Dade County Educational Facilities Authority (EFA) Revenue Bonds in an amount not to exceed \$385,000,000 for the purpose of making a loan to the University of Miami for the acquisition of a hospital facility (Cedar’s Medical Center), construction and equipping of medical health care facilities adjacent to the University of Miami Miller School of Medicine Campus.</p> <p>The EFA was created by Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners (Ordinance 69-72) in accordance with Florida Statutes Chapter 243, Part II., for the purpose of making loans to institutions of higher education to provide financing for qualified educational facilities.</p> <p>EFA is a separate legal entity that is allowed to enter into contracts and issue revenue bonds. The bonds and the interest on the bonds will be payable from the revenues or other moneys specifically provided by the University.</p> <p>The approval by the Commissioners is only ministerial in nature and for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (tax exempt status).</p> <p>The bonds are not deemed to constitute debt or obligation to the County.</p> <p>Previous EFA bonds approved by the Board include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R-1049-07 Pinellas County Educational Facility for a bond amount of \$11 million • R-346-07 Miami-Dade EFA for University of Miami bond amount of \$625,000 • R-439-03 Miami-Dade EFA for Florida Memorial College bond for \$14 million <p>R-982 Miami-Dade EFA for Carlos Albizu University bond for \$385 million</p>	
11(A)2	<p>Approving Designation of U.S. Highway 1/Biscayne Boulevard Between NE 135th Street and NE 151 Street as “Sigmund Zilber Memorial Highway”</p> <p>Commissioner Sally A. Heyman</p>	<p>This item approves the designation of U.S Highway 1/Biscayne Boulevard between NE 135th Street and NE 151st Street as “Sigmund Zilber Memorial Highway.”</p> <p>During the 2007 regular session, the Florida Legislature passed Senate Bill 138 that included various road designations to include designated U.S. Highway 1/Biscayne Blvd. between NE 135th Street and NE 151st Street as “Sigmund Zilber Memorial Highway.”</p> <p>Florida Statutes 334.071, requires passing resolutions from the respective cities and county commissions in support of the particular honorary designation.</p> <p>This codesignation is located in County Commission District 4 and the Cities of North Miami and North Miami Beach.</p>	
11(A)3	Student Enrollment	The proposed resolution directs the County Manager or his designee to incorporate data on student enrollment in all formulas used to project the number of students generated by residential development for the purpose of planning,	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>Commissioner Sally A. Heyman</p> <p><i>Deferral requested</i></p>	<p>zoning and land development regulations.</p> <p>The current student generation projections for residential developments utilized in the assessment of impact fees, and in applications for zoning and other land development regulations do not account for students who attend private, charter, or magnet schools.</p> <p>This resolution would revise the student generation projects to include students in private schools, charter schools, and/or magnet schools.</p>	
11(A)4	<p>Study Feasibility of Repositioning Computers and Printers in Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD) Vehicles</p> <p>Vice-Chairwoman Barbara J. Jordan</p>	<p>This resolution directs the County Manager to study the feasibility of repositioning computers and printers in MDPD vehicles so that a second police officer can sit in the front right passenger seat.</p> <p>A second law enforcement officer would be provided as an additional tool in safeguarding law enforcement officers assigned to patrol high crime areas.</p> <p>Presently, marked patrol vehicles have computers and printers located in the front right passenger seat. According to the Department, the choice to put out more single officer units has nothing to do with the configuration of computers in the vehicles. It is possible to place two man units in the field. The second officer cannot be too large in frame to sit comfortably as the passenger if a computer is installed.</p> <p>The County Manager is directed to report to the BCC the results of the study and recommendations within ninety (90) days.</p> <p>Questions/Comments</p> <p>How many in use patrol vehicles are manned with only one officer? According to MDPD, 808 one officer units are deployed daily throughout Police Services. These numbers can fluctuate daily based on events, calls or availability of staff.</p> <p>How many in use patrol vehicles have another officer in the vehicle? According to MDPD, an average of about 50 two officer units is deployed daily. These units are normally for training staffed with a Probationary officer and a Field Training officer.</p> <p>Is the single officer vehicles due to commuter and printer equipment in the passenger seat or due to another reason (such as the County does not have enough officers, financial constraints, etc...)? According to the Department, the rationale for more one officer units is for increased visibility and flexibility for call management.</p>	
11(A)5	Directing the County	This resolution directs the County Mayor or his designee to prepare a report concerning the existing policies	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>Mayor to Prepare Report Concerning Existing Policies Pertaining to County Vehicles and Uniforms</p> <p>Commissioner Dennis C. Moss</p>	<p>pertaining to maintenance and cleanliness of County vehicles and appearance of County-issued uniforms.</p> <p>This report should set recommendations as to whether current policies should be revised to improve the appearance of County vehicles and all County-issued uniforms. The report is due within ninety (90) days from approval date of the resolution.</p>	
11(A)6	<p>Directing the County Mayor to Implement Animal Care Programs at Parks</p> <p>Commissioner Dennis C. Moss</p>	<p>This proposed resolution directs the County Mayor to implement educational programs regarding animal care at pet-friendly parks providing a report on possible additional regulations.</p> <p>There are approximately (9) nine dog-friendly dog parks in Miami-Dade County. Dog-friendly parks allow pet owners to enter the park with their leashed dogs.</p> <p>Current dog park rules are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dogs must be on a leash until they are in a fenced in area; • No more than three dogs per person ; • Do not bring dogs in heat or that are sick ; • No aggressive dogs ; • Current rabies tag must be displayed ; • No puppies under 4 months old ; • Please close the gate to the dog park ; • Dogs must be monitored at all times; and • Clean up after your dog. <p>Staff indicates the <u>estimated</u> fiscal impact to implement these educational programs is \$27,000.</p>	
11(A)7 & 11(A)7 Supp.	<p>Resolution Directing the Mayor to Develop Procedure to Establish Equitable Distribution of Surplus Property to Eligible Community Based Organizations</p> <p>Commissioner</p>	<p>This resolution directs the County Manager to develop a procedure to establish a more equitable distribution of county surplus property to eligible community based organizations (CBO) to be presented before the Board within thirty (30) days.</p> <p>Currently, the County Code (Section 2-11.2.1) provides that once property is deemed surplus the County will offer the property in the following order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Park and Recreation Department at no cost; 2. Other County departments and agencies at no cost; 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																										
	Dorrin D. Rolle	<p>3. Other governmental units located within Miami-Dade County by sale or donation or to CBO's by sale or donation.</p> <p>The requests by CBO's for surplus property exceed availability and an extensive waiting list exists that can carry a wait time of two years or more.</p> <p>Over the past few years, the County has donated surplus property to CBO's located throughout the thirteen Commission districts and some Commission district receive disproportionate amounts of surplus in comparison to other districts.</p> <p>In the last six (6) years the totals for surplus property donation estimates per district are as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 626 1041 1081"> <tbody> <tr><td>District 1</td><td>\$19,215</td></tr> <tr><td>District 2</td><td>\$5,300</td></tr> <tr><td>District 3</td><td>\$37,400</td></tr> <tr><td>District 4</td><td>\$13,290</td></tr> <tr><td>District 5</td><td>\$25,700</td></tr> <tr><td>District 6</td><td>\$19,850</td></tr> <tr><td>District 7</td><td>\$21,700</td></tr> <tr><td>District 8</td><td>\$7,000</td></tr> <tr><td>District 9</td><td>\$13,300</td></tr> <tr><td>District 10</td><td>\$5,000</td></tr> <tr><td>District 11</td><td>\$28,223</td></tr> <tr><td>District 12</td><td>\$3,000</td></tr> <tr><td>District 13</td><td>\$13,200</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In order to avoid disproportionate distribution, this resolution seeks the development of a process to ensure equity throughout all the Commission districts.</p> <p>The resolution suggests the following to be implemented in the distribution process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preference for Commission districts that have not received surplus property in a long period of time; • preference to CBO's located in Commission districts that have fewer CBO's in the waiting list. 	District 1	\$19,215	District 2	\$5,300	District 3	\$37,400	District 4	\$13,290	District 5	\$25,700	District 6	\$19,850	District 7	\$21,700	District 8	\$7,000	District 9	\$13,300	District 10	\$5,000	District 11	\$28,223	District 12	\$3,000	District 13	\$13,200	
District 1	\$19,215																												
District 2	\$5,300																												
District 3	\$37,400																												
District 4	\$13,290																												
District 5	\$25,700																												
District 6	\$19,850																												
District 7	\$21,700																												
District 8	\$7,000																												
District 9	\$13,300																												
District 10	\$5,000																												
District 11	\$28,223																												
District 12	\$3,000																												
District 13	\$13,200																												
11(A)8	Urging the Florida Legislature to Pass Legislation Allowing	This resolution urges the Florida Legislature to pass legislation allowing voters with no party affiliation (NPA) to vote in any primary.																											

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions												
	<p>Voters With No Party Affiliation to Vote In Any Primary</p> <p>Commissioner Carlos A. Gimenez</p>	<p>There are various types of primaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Closed</u>- Voters may vote in a party's primary only if they are registered members of that party. Independents cannot participate. • <u>Semi-closed</u>- As in closed primaries, registered party members can vote only in their own party's primary. Semi-closed systems, however, allow unaffiliated voters to participate as well. Depending on the state, independents either make their choice of party primary privately, inside the voting booth, or publicly, by registering with any party on Election Day. • <u>Open</u>- A registered voter may vote in any <u>party primary</u> regardless of his or her own party affiliation. • <u>Semi-open</u>- All voters may vote in any single primary, but must publicly declare which primary they will vote in before entering the voting booth. Typically this declaration is accomplished by requesting a ballot. In many states with semi-open primaries, election officials record each voter's choice of party and provide the parties access to the information. • <u>Blanket</u>-This system allows voters to vote for one candidate per office, regardless of which party they were a member of. • <u>Run-off</u>- A primary in which the ballot is not restricted to one party and the top two candidates advance to the general election regardless of party affiliation. (A runoff differs from a primary in that a second round is only needed if no candidate gains a majority in the first round.) <p>Under Florida law (F.S.101.021) the primaries are closed. However, a constitutional amendment adopted in 1998 states that if all candidates for an office have the same party affiliation and the winner will have no opposition in the general election, all qualified voters, regardless of party affiliation, may vote in the primary election for that office. (Art. VI, s.5 of the Florida Constitution). Party changes must be made by the end of the 29th day before the Primary Election.</p> <p>A person registering to vote has the option of choosing party affiliation in their voters registration application as one of the following: Democratic Party, Republican Party, Minor Party of None (Non Party Affiliation).</p> <p>According to the Miami-Dade Elections Department, the number of registered NPA voters in Miami-Dade County is as follows:</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="632 1279 1224 1414"> <tr> <td>February 2004:</td> <td>NPA</td> <td>167,838</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Other</td> <td>30,605</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>February 2005:</td> <td>NPA</td> <td>198,366</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> </table>	February 2004:	NPA	167,838	18%		Other	30,605	3%	February 2005:	NPA	198,366	18%	
February 2004:	NPA	167,838	18%												
	Other	30,605	3%												
February 2005:	NPA	198,366	18%												

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions																																								
		<p>Other 43,333 4%</p> <p>February 2006: NPA 204,264 19% Other 44,520 4%</p> <p>February 2007: NPA 207,093 20% Other 43,652 4%</p> <p>February 2008: NPA 219,339 20% Other 47,006 4%</p> <p>The closed primary serves to encourage party unity and prevent members of other parties from infiltrating and voting to nominate weak candidates. However, there is a counter-argument claim that this type of primary disenfranchises independent voters and puts more moderate candidates at a disadvantage.</p> <p>According to the Florida Department of State - Division of Elections the number of registered voters NPA or other is as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="636 841 1707 1240"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Republican</th> <th>Democratic</th> <th>Other (1)</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>3,474,438</td> <td>3,853,524</td> <td>1,552,434</td> <td>8,880,396</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>3,610,992</td> <td>3,956,694</td> <td>1,756,873</td> <td>9,324,559</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>3,577,179</td> <td>3,880,342</td> <td>1,808,963</td> <td>9,266,484</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>3,954,492</td> <td>4,322,376</td> <td>2,199,569</td> <td>10,476,437</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>3,954,304</td> <td>4,276,512</td> <td>2,241,102</td> <td>10,471,918</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>3,920,201</td> <td>4,196,608</td> <td>2,268,797</td> <td>10,385,606</td> </tr> <tr> <td>December-2007</td> <td>3,826,836</td> <td>4,138,604</td> <td>2,241,161</td> <td>10,206,601</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(1) This category does not separate NPA and Minor party affiliated voters.</p>	Year	Republican	Democratic	Other (1)	Total	2000	3,474,438	3,853,524	1,552,434	8,880,396	2002	3,610,992	3,956,694	1,756,873	9,324,559	2003	3,577,179	3,880,342	1,808,963	9,266,484	2004	3,954,492	4,322,376	2,199,569	10,476,437	2005	3,954,304	4,276,512	2,241,102	10,471,918	2006	3,920,201	4,196,608	2,268,797	10,385,606	December-2007	3,826,836	4,138,604	2,241,161	10,206,601	
Year	Republican	Democratic	Other (1)	Total																																							
2000	3,474,438	3,853,524	1,552,434	8,880,396																																							
2002	3,610,992	3,956,694	1,756,873	9,324,559																																							
2003	3,577,179	3,880,342	1,808,963	9,266,484																																							
2004	3,954,492	4,322,376	2,199,569	10,476,437																																							
2005	3,954,304	4,276,512	2,241,102	10,471,918																																							
2006	3,920,201	4,196,608	2,268,797	10,385,606																																							
December-2007	3,826,836	4,138,604	2,241,161	10,206,601																																							
11(A)9	Urging Florida Legislature to Pass Legislation Increasing the Statutory Fee for Service of Process to	This resolution urges the Florida Legislature to pass legislation increasing the statutory fee for service of process.	Florida Statutes Sec. 30.231 provides the service of process fee to be \$20, this fee has not increased since 1994 and only covers two-thirds of the actual cost of executing an enforceable service of process.																																								

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>Better Reflect the Actual Cost of Service of Process</p> <p>Commissioner Sally A. Heyman</p>	<p>Annual costs to Miami-Dade County total \$700,000 to supplement the cost of service of process.</p> <p>The resolution recommends increasing the fee from \$20 to an amount that would better correlate with the actual cost of enforcing a service of process.</p> <p>In March of 2007, Revenue Estimating Conference concluded that increasing the service of process fee to \$40 would result in a recurring local government revenue increase of \$25 million for fiscal year 2007-2008.</p> <p>Similar legislation recommending process of service fee has been previously filed during the Florida 2006 and 2007 regular sessions, but these legislative items did not pass.</p> <p>The Board previously passed a resolution (R-1026-06) urging the Florida Legislature to pass similar legislation and for the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2007 State Legislative Package.</p>	
11(A)10	<p>Urging the Florida Legislature to Pass Legislation Requiring Coverage for Treatments for Autism Under Health Insurance Policies</p> <p>Commissioner Sally A. Heyman, Commissioner Jose “Pepe” Diaz, Commissioner Carlos A. Gimenez, Commissioner Joe A. Martinez, Commissioner Katy Sorenson, Commissioner Rebeca Sosa and Senator Javier D. Souto</p>	<p>This resolution urges the Florida Legislature to pass legislation requiring coverage for treatment for autism under health insurance policies.</p> <p>Currently, there are six (6) states in the U.S that have specific laws regarding insurance coverage for Autism that include: Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, New York and Tennessee.</p> <p>The State of Florida does not have any laws requiring or mandating medical insurance coverage for autism.</p> <p>There is no FDA approved treatments for Autism and without a specific treatment establishing guidelines for insurance companies is difficult.</p> <p>During its previous session, the Florida Legislature considered a bill (SB 516) sponsored by Senator Steve Geller that requires a health insurer or HMO that offers major medical coverage to include coverage for treating minor forms of Autism; authorizes an insurer or HMO to confirm diagnosis or review appropriateness of treatment plan; limits amount of annual coverage; and provides that act does not affect licensure of health care professional or impair right to reimbursement of health care provider.</p> <p>The last action taken on this bill was at the Committee on Banking and Insurance on Monday, May 07, 2007, but the bill died in committee.</p> <p>This resolution also directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2008 state legislative package.</p>	
11(A)11	Urging the Florida	This resolution urges the Florida Legislature to allow forensic employees of medical examiner offices and law	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>Legislature to Pass Legislation Allowing Forensic Employees of Medical Examiner Offices to Purchase Additional Retirement Credits</p> <p>Commissioner Joe A. Martinez and Commissioner Jose “Pepe” Diaz</p>	<p>enforcement agencies to purchase additional retirement credits to upgrade their previous service in the Florida Retirement System (FRS) to special risk service.</p> <p>In 2005, the Florida Legislature added forensic employees of medical examiner offices and law enforcement agencies to the Special Risk Class of the Florida Retirement System, but did not allow forensic employees to purchase retirement credits to upgrade previous service.</p> <p>This proposed legislation will require the contributions for upgrading previous service to Special Risk Class service to be equal to the difference in the contributions paid and the contribution rate in effect for the period being claimed, plus interest.</p> <p>This proposed legislation will also authorize but not require an employer to purchase the upgraded credit on behalf of the respective employees.</p> <p>Currently, there are two bills (HB531 and SB 800) that have been filed in the 2008 Florida Legislative Session addressing this issue.</p> <p>Similar bills have been previously filed (2006) in both the House and Senate (HB 1165 and SB 2182) that address the purchase of additional FRS credits for forensic employees, but both these bills died in committee.</p> <p>In addition, the Board approved R-1466-06 urging the Florida Legislature to pass the above-mentioned bills (HB 1165 and SB 2182) in the 2006 Legislative Session.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact:</p> <p>According to GSA Risk Management, it would be difficult to estimate the cost of the employer purchasing back time based on several unknown factors to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many employees would qualify; • What their salaries were at the time; • Amount of years each employee is eligible to purchase. <p>As stated, this legislation authorizes but does not require employers to purchase the upgraded credit on behalf of the employees.</p> <p>If the County decides to participate in the purchase upgrade it would do so for the fifty-five (55) eligible employees at the medical examiners office.</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions						
		<p>The cost estimates for the last two years include:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 293 999 396"> <tr> <td>FY2005-06</td> <td>\$445,171</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY2006-07</td> <td>\$468,564</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>\$913,735</td> </tr> </table> <p>If the County decides not to participate, employers would still be assessed 0.01% of special risk payroll to cover the additional costs.</p> <p>Based on the County's current special risk payroll, this amounts to approximately \$50,000 per year to the County.</p>	FY2005-06	\$445,171	FY2006-07	\$468,564	Total	\$913,735	
FY2005-06	\$445,171								
FY2006-07	\$468,564								
Total	\$913,735								
11(A)12	<p>Urging Related to Florida Legislature Requiring Restaurants to Post Nutrition Information</p> <p>Commissioner Joe A. Martinez</p>	<p>This resolution urges the Florida Legislature to require restaurants that have ten or more locations in Florida to post nutritional information for all standard menu items on menus and menu boards.</p> <p>On January 22, 2008, the New York City Board of Health voted unanimously to require all city chain restaurants to post calorie data on their menus. The change will affect restaurants with 15 or more outlets.</p> <p>Recently, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) adopted Resolution 456-07, which prohibits County and Public Health Trust employees from using trans fat or any product containing trans fat. Additionally, the BCC adopted Resolution 839-07, which implements a pilot trans fat-free menu item decal program. The pilot program is an informational program designed to provide education and guidance to restaurants, bakeries and the public in Miami-Dade County.</p>							
11(A)13	<p>Urging Related to Governor Crist, the Florida Legislature, and the Commissioner of the Office of Insurance Regulation To Ensure Compliance With HB 1-A</p> <p>Commissioners Dennis C. Moss, Jose "Pepe" Diaz, Carlos</p>	<p>This resolution urges Governor Charlie Crist, the Florida Legislature, and the Commissioner of the Office of Insurance Regulation to take all steps necessary to insure that all insurance comply with HB 1-A.</p> <p>HB 1-A is the insurance reform bill which revises various provisions of insurance law relating to residential property insurance insurers in the State of Florida. The reform bill offers insurance companies reinsurance coverage lower in price than private reinsurance companies. This bill also expands the Florida Hurricane Catastrophe Fund (Fund), which was created in November 1993 during a special legislative session after Hurricane Andrew. The purpose of the Fund is to protect and advance the state's interest in maintaining insurance capacity in Florida by providing reimbursements to insurers for a portion of their catastrophic hurricane losses.</p> <p>Since the passage of HB 1-A, many insurance companies have not passed the savings on to policyholders and rates continue to increase. Insurance companies do have to comply with HB 1-A.</p>							

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>A. Gimenez, Joe A. Martinez, Katy Sorenson, Rebeca Sosa, and Senator Javier D. Souto</p>		
11(A)14	<p>Urging the Legislature to pass the “Florida Restaurants Lending A Helping Hand Act”</p> <p>Commissioner Dorrin D. Rolle</p>	<p>This resolution urges the Florida Legislature to pass the “Florida Restaurants Lending A Helping Hand Act” (HH Act).</p> <p>This act will allow restaurants and hotels to donate foods to homeless shelters and other charitable non-profit organizations without the fear of a lawsuit in the event someone gets sick.</p> <p>Currently, there are two bills for consideration during the 2008 Florida Legislative Session that supports the HH Act (HB 99 and SB 276).</p> <p>This resolution also directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2008 state legislative package.</p>	
11(A)15	<p>Urging Related to the Florida Legislature Strengthening The Provision on Prohibiting Unfunded Mandates</p> <p>Commissioner Rebeca Sosa</p>	<p>The resolution urges the Florida Legislature and the Taxation and Budget Reform Commission to place on a statewide ballot a constitutional amendment strengthening the provision in the Florida Constitution prohibiting unfunded mandates.</p> <p>An unfunded mandate is a statute that requires government or private parties to carry out specific actions, but does not appropriate any funds for that purpose.</p> <p>Currently, the Florida Constitution, Article VII, Section 18 states “no county or municipality shall be bound by any general law requiring such county or municipality to spend funds or to take an action requiring the expenditure of funds unless the legislature has determined that such law fulfills an important state interest and unless: funds have been appropriated that have been estimated at the time of enactment to be sufficient to fund such expenditure, and the law requiring such expenditure is approved by two-thirds of the membership in each house of the legislature.”</p> <p>One example of a proposed unfunded mandate before the Florida Legislature is HB 273, a juvenile justice bill which increases the time juveniles spend in detention prior to a pre-disposition hearing. Presently, counties pay for juvenile predisposition detention, this proposed bill would increase this cost. This bill is currently before the Safety & Security Council.</p> <p>Presently, Constitutional Proposal 46 (CP46) has been filed by the Taxation and Budget Reform Committee that</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		would place a question on a statewide ballot strengthening the unfunded mandates provision of the Florida Constitution. CP46 would require: that unfunded mandate legislation be enacted only after a public hearing, to be provided criteria for the public hearing notice, to provide for a sunset of unfunded mandates, and to create a council to resolve disputes regarding unfunded mandates.	
11(A)16	<p>Urging related to Miami-Dade Public Schools to Reject Closing of High-Performing Schools</p> <p>Senator Javier Souto</p>	<p>This resolution urges Miami-Dade County Public Schools to reject proposals to close certain high-performing schools.</p> <p>Recently, the Miami-Dade School Board considered proposals to close ten (10) under enrolled elementary and middle schools due to imminent state budget cuts.</p> <p>The superintendent of Miami-Dade Public Schools, Rudy Crew, has stated during a budget workshop on February 7, 2008 that there are adequate resources to cover the \$ 9.2 million needed to keep these schools open.</p>	
11(A)17	<p>Retroactive In-kind for the Miami Kidney Walk 2008</p> <p>Chairman Bruno A. Barreiro</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: “Miami Kidney Walk,” February 10, 2008. • Requesting Organization: National Kidney Foundation, Inc. (non-profit) • The National Kidney Foundation, Inc., is a major voluntary health organization which seeks to prevent kidney and urinary tract diseases, improve the health and well-being of individuals and families affected by these diseases, and increase the availability of all organs for transplantation. • In-kind services amount: \$2,566 (funded by the Countywide In-kind Reserve Fund) • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Police Department and the Elections Department. 	
11(A)18	<p>Retroactive In-kind for the Winter 2008 Residence of the Cleveland Orchestra</p> <p>Chairman Bruno A. Barreiro</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: The Winter 2008 Residence of the Cleveland Orchestra, January 23 – February 3, 2008. • Requesting Organization: The Musical Arts Association of Miami, Inc. (non profit). • During the Winter 2008 Residence of the Cleveland Orchestra, the Orchestra performed subscription concerts, educational concerts for Miami-Dade County school students, and family concerts. • In-kind services amount: \$3,425 (funded from the District 5 In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Transit Agency. 	
11(A)19	<p>In-Kind Services from the Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department for Summer Games and Competition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: Summer Games and Competition, March 15, 2008. • Requesting Organization: The Special Olympics Florida, Inc. (non-profit) • The mission of Special Olympics Florida is to provide year-round sports training and competition in a variety of Olympic-type sports for people with intellectual disabilities. • In-kind services amount: \$1,466.00 (funded by the District 12 In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department. 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>Commissioner Jose “Pepe” Diaz</p>		
11(A)20	<p>Retroactive In-kind for the 2008 Parents Against Violence Event</p> <p>Commissioner Audrey M. Edmonson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: “Parents Against Violence,” January 28-February 2, 2008. • Requesting Organization: Regis House of Miami (non-profit) • The Regis House of Miami provides outpatient substance abuse for adolescents, seniors and criminal justice clients. • In-kind services amount: \$2,290 (funded by the District 3 In-kind Reserve Fund) • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Police Department and the Elections Department. 	
11(A)21	<p>Retroactive In-kind for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day of Service</p> <p>Commissioner Audrey M. Edmonson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: Martin Luther King, Jr. Day of Service, January 19, 2008. • Requesting Organization: Service For Peace, Inc. (non profit) • More than 600 volunteers participated in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day of Service event. Volunteers traveled to nine different sites to perform beautification projects intended to enhance inner city areas in Miami-Dade County. • In-kind services amount: \$8,083 (funded from the District 3 In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Transit Agency. 	
11(A)22	<p>Retroactive In-kind for the 2008 Walk Now for Autism Event</p> <p>Commissioner Carlos A. Gimenez</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: “Walk Now for Autism,” February 10, 2008. • Requesting Organization: Autism Speaks, Inc. (non profit) • Autism Speaks is dedicated to funding global biomedical research into the causes, prevention, treatments, and cure for autism; to raising public awareness about autism and its effects on individuals, families, and society; and to bringing hope to all who deal with the hardships of this disorder. • In-kind services amount: \$23,345 (funded by Countywide Reserve Fund and Non-Ad Valorem Fire Rescue District Reserve Fund) • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Police Department and the Fire Rescue Department. 	
11(A)23	<p>Retroactive In-kind for the Grand Re-opening of the Historic Virginia Key Beach Park</p> <p>Commissioner Carlos A. Gimenez</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: Grand Re-opening of Historic Virginia Key Beach Park “Paradise Renewed” event, February 23, 2008. • Requesting Organization: City of Miami, Virginia Key Beach Park Trust (non profit). • The Grand Re-opening event showcased the newly renovated Virginia Key Beach, and showcased the cultural and ecological history of the historic beach. • In-kind services amount: \$2,970 (funded from the Countywide In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Transit Agency 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
11(A)24	Retroactive In-Kind Services from the Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department for the Festival of the Poor Commissioner Carlos A. Gimenez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: Festival for the Poor, February 1-3, 2008 • Requesting Organization: Archdiocese of Miami, Inc. through St. Louis Catholic Church (non-profit). • The Festival for the Poor is an annual fundraising event benefiting various homeless programs at Camillus House, St. Anne’s Mission, Kristie’s House, Miami Rescue Project, Daily Bread, Food Bank, and Missionaries of Charity. • In-kind services amount: \$3,066.00 (funded by the Countywide In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department. 	
11(A)25	In-kind Services for 2008 Walk America Event Commissioner Sally A. Heyman, Commissioner Carlos A. Gimenez, Commissioner Joe A. Martinez, Commissioner Dennis C. Moss, Commissioner Rebeca Sosa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: “2008 Walk America,” April 26, 2008. • Requesting Organization: March of Dimes Foundation, Inc. (non-profit) • March of Dimes Foundation, Inc. mission is to improve the health of babies by preventing birth defects, premature birth, and infant mortality. This mission is carried out through research, community services, education and advocacy to save babies' lives. March of Dimes researchers, volunteers, educators, outreach workers and advocates work together to give all babies a fighting chance against the threats to their health: prematurity, birth defects, low birth weight. • In-kind services amount: \$28,223 (Countywide In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services will be provided by the Miami-Dade Police Department and the Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department. 	
11(A)26	Retroactive In-Kind Services for the National Conference of Mayors Commissioner Dennis C. Moss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: “2007 National Leadership Conference of Haitian Mayors”, September 12-16, 2007. • Requesting Organization: Galata, Inc. (non-profit) • Galata, Inc. is a community-based organization dedicated to providing health and community services to citizens in South Dade. • In kind services amount: \$5,796 (District 9 In-kind Reserve Fund) • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Transit Agency 	
11(A)27	Retroactive In-Kind Services from the Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department for “Day Out With Thomas”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: “Day Out With Thomas” event, March 2-4 and March 9-11, 2007. • Requesting Organization: The Gold Coast Railroad Museum, Inc. (non-profit) • The “Day out with Thomas” event is designed to promote and educate children about the value of the Gold Coast Railroad Museum and provide an historical overview of U.S. railroads. • In-kind services amount: \$6,223.00 (funded by the Countywide In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department. 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	Event Commissioner Dennis C. Moss		
11(A)28	Retroactive In-Kind Services From the Miami- Dade Park and Recreation Department For Mardi Gras 2008 Commissioner Dennis C. Moss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: Mardi Gras 2008, February 2, 2008. • Requesting Organization: Homestead Main Street, Inc. (non-profit) • Mardi Gras 2008 is a fund raising event to benefit Habitat for Humanity in New Orleans. The mission of Homestead Main Street, Inc. is an organization dedicated to the economic revitalization of Downtown Homestead, Florida. • In-kind services amount: \$716.00 (funded from the District 9 In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami Dade Park and Recreation Department. 	
11(A)29	Retroactive In-Kind Services For the Candlelight Walk and Stand Crime Commissioners Dennis C. Moss and Katy Sorenson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: The Candlelight Walk and Stand Against Crime, October 12, 2007 • Requesting Organization: Police Officer Assistance Trust, Inc. (non-profit) • The Police Officer Assistance Trust was founded in 1989 as a nonprofit support organization for the law enforcement community of Miami-Dade County, Florida. • In-kind services amount: \$4,414.00 (funded by the District 8 and District 9 In-kind Reserve Funds). • In-kind services provided by Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department and the Miami-Dade Transit Agency 	
11(A)30	Retroactive In-kind for the Dodge City Christmas Party Commissioner Dennis C. Moss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: Dodge City Christmas Party, December 16, 2007. • Requesting Organization: Centro Campesino-Farm Worker Center, Inc. (non profit). • The Dodge City Christmas Party brought together children from around District 9 to celebrate the holidays. • In-kind services amount: \$426 (funded from the District 9 In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Transit Agency. 	
11(A)31	Retroactive In-kind for the Dodge City Christmas Party Commissioner Dennis C. Moss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: Dodge City Christmas Party, December 16, 2007. • Requesting Organization: Naranja Optimist Club, Inc. (non profit). • The Dodge City Christmas Party brought together children from around District 9 to celebrate the holidays. • In-kind services amount: \$852 (funded from the District 9 In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Transit Agency. 	
11(A)32	Retroactive In-kind Services from the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: The Spring Garden Soiree, February 29, 2008. • Requesting Organization: Community Gardens Charitable Fund, Inc. (non-profit) 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department for Spring Garden Soiree Commissioner Katy Sorenson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Community Gardens Charitable Fund, Inc. is a grass-roots organization that was created to raise funds for green spaces such as community gardens, parks and wetland areas. Garden clubs, plant societies, individuals and corporations can contribute resources to this fund. • In-kind services amount: \$2,511.00 (funded by the District 8 In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department. 	
11(A)33	In-Kind Services from Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department for the Relay for Life East Kendall Commissioner Katy Sorenson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: Relay for Life, March 15, 2008. • Requesting Organization: The American Cancer Society, Inc. (non-profit) • The American Cancer Society, Inc. is a nationwide community-based voluntary health organization dedicated to eliminating cancer as a major health problem by preventing cancer, saving lives, and diminishing suffering from cancer, through research, education, advocacy and service. • In-kind services amount: \$866.00 (funded by the District 8 In-kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Parks and Recreation Department. 	
11(A)34	Retroactive In-kind Services from the Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department for the Walk to Talk Event Senator Javier Souto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event: Walk to Talk, November 17, 2008. • Requesting Organization: Hearing and Speech Center of Florida, Inc. (non-profit) • The Hearing and Speech Center of Florida, Inc. was established in 1936 to provide diagnosis and treatment for individuals of all ages suffering from speech, language and hearing disabilities. • In-kind services amount: \$2,150.00 (funded by the District 10 In-Kind Reserve Fund). • In-kind services provided by the Miami-Dade Parks and Recreation Department. 	
11(A)36	Resolution Approving Funding for Construction of a Comfort Home on the Grounds of the Veteran's Administration Medical Center Commissioner Jose "Pepe" Diaz	<p>This proposed resolution approves funding for purposes of construction of a comfort home on the grounds of the Veteran's Administration Medical Center in the amount of \$1,000,000 and for the Mayor and County Manager to identify proposed appropriation in the proposed budget prepared for FY 2008-09.</p> <p>Comfort homes are built on the grounds of major military and Veteran Affairs' medical centers to allow family members to be with and assist their service member or veteran that are in the medical center.</p> <p>Comfort homes were established through the Fisher House Foundation (not for profit organization).</p> <p>Miami-Dade County does not have a comfort home at the Miami VA Healthcare System (VAHS).</p> <p>Currently, there are four Comfort Homes in the State of Florida and they include:</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eglin AFB, Fl. • Tampa, Fl. • Bay Pines, Fl. • West Palm Beach, Fl. <p>Miami VAHS treats over 55,000 veterans every year with more than 6,000 in-patient admissions and 565,000 outpatient visits each year, enrolled over 3,4000 local returning veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan for medical care.</p> <p>To construct a comfort home at the Miami VAHS the federal government will provide the land located on the campus of the VAHS facility, the Fisher House Foundation will fund the remaining \$4-6 million for design, construct and furnish the Comfort Home.</p> <p>At the January 29th 2008 Budget and Finance Committee discussions on the funding alternatives included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the item to go through the normal process of approval and have administration address and incorporate the item in the budget submittal to the Board of County Commissioners; or • Include this item as one of the budget priorities set forth by the County Commissioners in their budget proposal. 	
12(B)1	<p>People's Transportation Plan 90-Day Report</p> <p>1st Quarter: FY 07-08</p>	<p>This report details the activities related to the People's Transportation Plan for the 90-day period beginning October 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007.</p> <p>This report is required to be provided to the Board of County Commissioners pursuant to Ordinance 02-117. It is prepared by the Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust (CITT).</p> <p>The report details the status of the various projects funded by the PTP including the Miami Intermodal Center/Earlington Heights Connector project, North Corridor, East-West Corridor, South Dade Link Study, Kendall Link Study, Baylink and the Northeast project.</p>	
12(B)2	<p>Status Report-Space Allocation for Participating Car Rental Companies</p>	<p>The Rental Car Facility (RCF) has been under construction and is scheduled to be completed in 2010. There are 16 car rental companies eligible to relocate their MIA operations to the RCF. These 16 companies have executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the First Amendment to the MOU and the RCF Concession Agreement for participation in the RCF.</p> <p>The Board of County Commissioners instructed MDAD to ensure that local/small car rental companies be allocated enough space to allow for growth within the RCF. Despite MDAD's efforts there was still no agreement among the</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>companies signing the MOU and the RCF Concession Agreement.</p> <p>The executed RCF Concession Agreement provides MDAD the authority to determine the size and configuration of the Assigned Areas.</p> <p>In June 2006, MDAD met with the car rental companies to propose and RCF space allocation, but has since modified that plan to increase the counter space for the small companies from 10.5 to 12 linear feet and is recommending this modified plan as its final space allocation plan. This plan was presented to the car rental companies on January 31, 2008 and at that time, they were in agreement.</p>	
12(B)3	Report- Miami International Airport Animal Relief Areas	<p>This report is in response to R-1341-07, sponsored by Commissioner Moss and adopted by the Board of County Commissioners at its December 4, 2007 meeting.</p> <p>According to the report, MIA currently has four (4) sites with bag dispensers for waste collection and trash receptacles. Two new animal relief areas were added with the opening of the South Terminal.</p> <p>The future site recommended for the North terminal includes a pet park. The cost of developing a pet park with a water source is approximately \$20,000 which is currently not in the MDAD budget.</p>	<p>Designated pet friendly areas at airports have been an “up and coming” trend at various airports throughout the country due to an increasing amount of passengers traveling with their pets.</p> <p>The pet friendly areas usually consist of areas where pets can take a restroom and water break and the owners are provided with the means to clean up after their pets.</p>
12(B)4	Report Re: SHIP and SURTAX Pro Forma	<p>This report summarizes the allocation of State Housing Initiative Partnership (SHIP) funds and Documentary Stamp Surtax (Surtax) funds towards housing activities that incorporate a range of affordable housing opportunities (rental assistance, homebuyer education, rehabilitation and development loans and mortgage assistance).</p> <p>The report recommends that 50% of the combined available SHIP and Surtax revenue (\$49.554 million), excluding administrative costs and prior funding commitments be allocated towards <u>rental housing activities</u>; and the remaining 50% will go towards <u>homeownership activities</u>.</p> <p>Rental housing activities will be funded with an allocation of \$24.777 million to be used for rental housing development, both new construction and rehabilitation. Funds allocated for this purpose will be administered by the Office of Community and Economic Development.</p> <p>Homeownership activities will be funded with \$24.777 million and allocated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$8.32 million in homebuyer mortgage assistance for approx. 104 housing units in the infill housing program. 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$8 million in homebuyer mortgage assistance for approx. 100 housing units developed with County assistance under the SHIP, Surtax, HOME and/or CDBG programs. • \$866,421 in homebuyer education and counseling support. • \$4.89 million for approx. 163 owner-occupied rehabilitation loans, with an emphasis on elderly and disabled persons in accordance with R-1036-06. • \$2.7 million towards development loans for 178 homeownership units. <p>Projections for FY2008 Surtax and SHIP revenues are high but significantly reduce over the next three years in part from the high carryover from 2007 (\$85 million) and the anticipated decline in revenues from the housing market slowdown.</p>	
13(A)1	Settlement in Connection with the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC)/Earlington Heights Connector County Attorney	<p>This resolution authorizes the County Attorney to compromise and settle on behalf of the County, Rinker Materials Corporation’s claim for attorneys’ fees and costs in the amount of \$125,000.</p> <p>This settlement is related to <i>State of Florida Department of Transportation vs. Rinker Materials Corp., and Miami-Dade County</i>, Civil Action No. 01-03486.</p> <p>Rinker Materials Corporation presently occupies property designated as Parcel 260, which will be used as part of the MIC/Earlington Heights Connector project. Rinker is currently leasing the land from the Florida Department of Transportation.</p> <p>As part of the settlement, Rinker agrees to an early termination of its lease at Parcel 260, and will not to seek any further compensation related this case.</p>	<p>Resolution R-8250-06, approved on July 6, 2006, declared the acquisition of land needed for the construction of the MIC/Earlington Heights Connector to be a public necessity and authorized the acquisition of land for this project by eminent domain.</p> <p>The MIC/Earlington Heights Connector is a 2.4 mile corridor linking the MIC to the Earlington Heights Metrorail Station at State Road 112 and N.W. 22nd Avenue.</p>
13(A)2	Settlement in Connection with the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC)/Earlington Heights Connector County Attorney	<p>This resolution authorizes the County Attorney to compromise and settle all claims against the County in eminent domain proceedings regarding Parcel 197, 3801 N.W. 25th Street.</p> <p>Property Owner: Perera Properties, Inc.</p> <p>Settlement Amount: \$2,780,250 (\$2,572,000 for the land, building, improvements and fixtures; and \$208,250 for statutory attorney’s fees).</p>	<p>Resolution R-825-06, approved on July 6, 2006, declared the acquisition of land needed for the construction of the MIC/Earlington Heights Connector to be a public necessity and authorized the acquisition of land for this project by eminent domain.</p> <p>The MIC/Earlington Heights Connector is a 2.4 mile corridor linking the MIC to</p>

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
			the Earlington Heights Metrorail Station at State Road 112 and N.W. 22 nd Avenue.
13(A)3	<p>Settlement in Connection with the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC)/Earlington Heights Connector</p> <p>County Attorney</p>	<p>This resolution authorizes the County Attorney to compromise and settle all claims of the tenants against the County in eminent domain proceedings regarding Parcel 198.</p> <p>Tenants: Leira Service, 2515 N.W. 38th Court; Beyond Details, 2517 N.W. 38th Court; and Forward Euros, 2525 N.W. 38th Court.</p> <p>Settlement Amount: \$74,509 for all trade fixtures of the tenants; \$18,808 in statutory attorney's fees; and \$5,500 in expert's fees and costs.</p> <p>This settlement also authorizes an extension of time (until April 30, 2008) for the tenants to vacate the property.</p>	<p>Resolution R-825-06, approved on July 6, 2006, declared the acquisition of land needed for the construction of the MIC/Earlington Heights Connector to be a public necessity and authorized the acquisition of land for this project by eminent domain.</p> <p>Resolution R-1267-07 authorized a settlement in County eminent domain proceedings in connection with Parcel 198.</p> <p>The MIC/Earlington Heights Connector is a 2.4 mile corridor linking the MIC to the Earlington Heights Metrorail Station at State Road 112 and N.W. 22nd Avenue.</p>