



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

Board of County Commissioners Meeting

September 6, 2012
9:30 A.M.
Commission Chamber

Research Division

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

**Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners
Meeting Agenda**

September 6, 2012

Item Number(s)

4A
4B
5A
7D
7E
7G
8A1
8F5
8G1
8N2

Acknowledgements:

Bia Marsellos, Senior Legislative Analyst

Michael Amador-Gil, Senior Legislative Analyst

Elizabeth Owens, Legislative Analyst

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



Research Notes

Agenda Item: 4A - Regulations on Boat Storage

File Number: 121520

Date of Analysis: August 24, 2012

Summary

The proposed ordinance pertaining to zoning modifies regulations on boat storage in certain zoning districts, requiring additional buffering; limiting number of boats; prohibiting commercial boat parking; and amending section 33-20 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code).

The proposed ordinance will only impact the Unincorporated Municipal Services Area (UMSA).

Comparison of Miami-Dade County Current Zoning Code and Proposed Amendments			
Regulations on Boat Storage			
Section of Code	Current	Proposed Amendments	Comments on Proposed Amendments
33-20(e) <i>Accessory buildings; Utility Sheds, Swimming Pools; Fallout Shelters; Boat Storages</i>	<i>Boat storage.</i> Boats of less than thirty (30) feet in length, not more than one hundred and two (102) inches in width and thirteen (13) feet six (6) inches in height, may be stored or temporarily parked in the RU, EU, AU and GU Zoning Districts subject to the following conditions:	<i>Boat storage.</i> Boats of less than thirty (30) feet in length, not more than one hundred and two (102) inches in width and thirteen (13) feet six (6) inches in height above grade , may be stored or temporarily parked in the RU, EU, AU and GU Zoning Districts on lots developed with a residential structure subject to the following conditions:	<i>Adds above grade to height requirement and specifies lots developed with a residential structure.</i> <i>The proposed amendments are in bold.</i>
33-20(e)(1) <i>Accessory buildings; Utility Sheds, Swimming Pools; Fallout Shelters; Boat Storages</i>	The place of storage shall be to the rear of the front building line. Where the boat storage area is located between the residence and a side street property line, the boat shall be visually buffered by a six-foot wood privacy fence, masonry wall, trees or shrubs maintained to a height of six feet. The front building line referred to shall be that portion furthest from the street.	Sites with less than one-half (0.5) acre of lot area shall be permitted to store up to one (1) boat. The place of storage shall be to the rear of the front building line of the residential structure . Where the boat storage area is located between the residence and a side street property line, the boat shall be visually buffered by a minimum six-foot high privacy fence, masonry wall, or trees or shrubs maintained to a minimum height of six feet. The front building line referred to shall be that portion furthest from the street.	<i>Adds the specification that this requirement is for sites with less than one-half (0.5) acre of lot area allowing for one (1) boat to be stored.</i> <i>Takes out the description of the privacy fence to be wood and provide further clarification in regards to the minimum height</i>

			<p>requirement.</p> <p><i>The proposed amendments are in bold.</i></p>
<p>33-20(e)(2)</p> <p>Accessory buildings; Utility Sheds, Swimming Pools; Fallout Shelters; Boat Storages</p>	<p>No more than one (1) boat may be stored or parked on any one (1) premise.</p>	<p>Sites containing a minimum of one-half (0.5) acre of lot area shall be permitted to store up to two (2) boats. Sites containing a minimum of five (5) acres of lot area shall be permitted to store up to three (3) boats. The place of storage shall be to the rear of the front building line of the residential structure, and such front building line shall be that portion furthest from the street. Where two or more boats are located on a site, the boat storage area shall meet the rear and side setback requirements for the principal structure and be visually buffered from the adjacent property and right-of-way by a minimum six-foot high privacy fence, masonry wall or trees or shrubs maintained to a minimum height of six feet, provided however, if a permit was approved for a five-foot high privacy fence or masonry wall prior to the effective date of this ordinance and thereafter constructed, such a fence or wall shall be acceptable in lieu of one that is six-feet high.</p>	<p><i>Provides detailed regulations for this subsection of the Code.</i></p> <p><i>Increases the amount of boats that can be stored.</i></p>
<p>33-20(e)(3)</p> <p>Accessory buildings; Utility Sheds, Swimming Pools; Fallout Shelters; Boat Storages</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Up to two (2) personal watercrafts not exceeding five (5) feet in width by twelve (12) feet in length may be stored or parked in lieu of a boat authorized by this section. Such watercraft shall be visually buffered in accordance with Section 33-20(e)(2) or (3), as applicable.</p>	<p><i>Adds new section.</i></p> <p><i>Adds regulations for personal watercrafts which are currently not part of the Code.</i></p>
<p>33-20(e)(8)</p> <p>Accessory buildings; Utility Sheds, Swimming Pools; Fallout Shelters; Boat Storages</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Commercial boat parking shall be prohibited. All boats stored on the property must be registered to the property owner or authorized residential tenant.</p>	<p><i>Creates section of the Code prohibiting Commercial Boats.</i></p>
<p>Misc.</p>	<p><i>In addition, the proposed ordinance provides for housekeeping amendments renumbering the Code to correspond to the amended subsections.</i></p>		

Prepared by: Elizabeth N. Owens

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



Research Notes

Agenda Item: 4B - Zoning Utility Sheds, Pergolas and Private Garages

File Number: 121521

Date of Analysis: August 24, 2012

Summary

The proposed ordinance related to Zoning, amends sections of the Miami-Dade County Code (Code), modifying the requirements for utility sheds, pergolas and private garages.

The following sections of the Code are amended under the proposed ordinance:

- Section 33-1, Zoning Definitions;
- Section 33-20, Accessory buildings; Utility Sheds, Swimming Pools; Fallout Shelters; Boat Storages;
- Section 33-199, Uses Permitted in the RU-1, Single-Family Residential District;
- Section 33-201, Uses Permitted in the RU-2, Two-Family Residential District;
- Section 33-224, Uses Permitted in the EU-M, Estate Modified District; and
- Section 33-225.1, Uses, Lot Area, Frontage and Depth in the EU-S, Estate Use Suburban District.

The proposed ordinance will only impact the Unincorporated Municipal Services Area (UMSA).

Comparison of Miami-Dade County Current Zoning Code and Proposed Amendments <i>Utility Sheds , Pergolas, and Private Garages</i>			
<u>Section of Code</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Proposed Amendments</u>	<u>Comments on Proposed Amendments</u>
33-1(78.3) Definitions	N/A	Pergola. A freestanding structure usually consisting of parallel colonnades supporting an open roof of girders and cross rafters. A pergola is built as an outdoor sitting area with lattice or open slat roof for partial shade.	<i>Adds the definition for Pergola to the Code.</i>
33-20(b)(1) Accessory buildings; Utility Sheds, Swimming Pools; Fallout Shelters; Boat Storages	Utility sheds, not larger than one hundred (100) square feet and incidental to an existing single-family or townhouse residential use will comply with the setback requirements contained in this subsection. Utility sheds larger than one hundred (100) square feet will comply with the accessory building setbacks contained in Section 33-50. Sheds not exceeding eight (8) feet in height will be setback as follows:	Utility sheds and pergolas larger than one hundred (100) square feet will comply with the accessory building setbacks contained in Section 33-50. Utility sheds and pergolas, not larger than one hundred (100) square feet, not exceeding ten (10) feet in height and incidental to an existing single-family or townhouse residential use shall be setback as follows:	<i>Adds requirements for pergolas.</i> <i>Allows for up to 10ft. height from 8ft. for sheds and pergolas larger than 100 sq. ft. and allows for the rear and interior side setback requirements to be reduced provided an affidavit is submitted indicating consent from the owner of the property that directly</i>

		Feet		Feet	<i>abuts the property boundary where the reduction is requested.</i> <i>Provides housekeeping amendments, i.e. removes South from the Florida Building Code and adding the language where applicable.</i> <i>The proposed amendments are in bold.</i>
	Front	55	Front	55	
	Rear	5	Rear	5; or 2⁽²⁾	
	Interior side	5	Interior side	5; or 2⁽²⁾	
	Spacing from house	10	Spacing from house	10	
	Side street	10	Side street	10	
	<p>Sheds in townhouse developments are further restricted by Section 33-202.3(2)(q). All utility sheds will be in compliance with the South Florida Building Code or be approved by the State of Florida and will be subject to easement restrictions pursuant to Sections 33-24 and 33-284.43(k).</p>		<p>(1) Utility sheds and pergolas in townhouse developments are further restricted by Section 33-202.3(2)(q). (2) Rear and interior side setbacks may be reduced to two (2) feet provided an affidavit is submitted indicating consent from the owner of the property that directly abuts the property boundary where the reduction is requested. (3) Where applicable, all utility sheds will be in compliance with the Florida Building Code or be approved by the State of Florida and will be subject to easement restrictions pursuant to Sections 33-24 and 33-284.43(k).</p>		
<p><i>Applies the modifications for the requirements for utility sheds, pergolas and private garages to the following residential districts: Section 33-199, Uses Permitted in the RU-1, Single-Family Residential District; Section 33-201, Uses Permitted in the RU-2, Two-Family Residential District; Section 33-224, Uses Permitted in the EU-M, Estate Modified District; and Section 33-225.1, Uses, Lot Area, Frontage and Depth in the EU-S, Estate Use Suburban District.</i></p>					

Prepared by: Elizabeth N. Owens

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



Research Notes

Agenda Item: 5A and 8G1 - N.W. 7th Avenue Community Redevelopment Agency

File Number: 121233 and 121232

Date of Analysis: August 3, 2012

Summary:

8G1 (File No. 121232)

This resolution approves the N.W. 7th Avenue Community Redevelopment Agency's (CRA) proposed budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 in the amount of \$2,694,064.

N.W. 7 th Avenue Corridor CRA Previous Budget Approvals				
Approval Date	Item Number	Fiscal Year	Resolution Number	Budget Amount
N/A	N/A	2010-11	N/A	N/A
May 4, 2010	101043	2009-10	R-492-10	\$2,152,036

Item 8G1, on page 9, Exhibit 1 reflects expenditures for FY 2010-11; however, there was no budget approved by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for FY 2010-11. According to the Office of Management and Budget, the NW 7th Avenue CRA did not have quorum for FY 2010-11; therefore, they could not adopt a budget. However, there were expenses associated with the CRA such as staff time, state fees, and advertising expenses.

- **Question: How will the FY 2010-11 expenditures be addressed?**

5A (File No. 121233)

This resolution adopts the amended Community Redevelopment Plan regarding certain geographic area of Miami-Dade County, known as the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor and described as a portion of Miami-Dade County generally bounded by the City of Miami Gardens on the North, the City of North Miami on the South, on the westernmost property lines of the parcels that abut the westerly right-of-way along N.W. 7th Avenue and on the East by Interstate I-95; and making certain findings with respect to such Redevelopment Plan and geographic area.

Administrative Expenditures for the N.W. 7th Avenue CRA FY2011-12 Proposed Budget

Administrative Expenditures	Total Operating Expenditures	Percentage of Administrative Expenditures from Total Operating Expenditures	Total Increment Revenue	Percentage of Administrative Expenditures from Total Increment Revenue
\$148,000	\$615,175	24%	\$340,845	43%

The administrative expenditures for the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor CRA exceed the twenty percent cap as prescribed in the Interlocal Agreement with Miami-Dade County. According to Item No. 8G1, this is due to the

\$54,000 payment to the consultant for the Amended Plan. If this expense were to be excluded, the administrative expenses would total 15 percent.

Pursuant to R-1360-09, approved by the BCC on December 1, 2009, the CRA is also reimbursing the County \$63,000 for expenses associated with the creation of the Agency, including the costs of the Finding of Necessity and the original Plan. This \$63,000 is the last payment for creation expenses which total \$94,000.

The operating expenditures for the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor CRA total \$615,175. The remaining \$1,862,778 will be held in reserve pending approval of the Amended Community Redevelopment Plan (Item No. 5A).

On April 19, 2012, the Tax Increment Financing Committee (comprised of County administrative staff to provide increment financing recommendations) reviewed the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor budget, recommending it for BCC approval.

Background and Relevant Legislation

In 1969, the Florida Legislature enacted the Community Redevelopment Act of 1969, as it is presently contained in Part III of Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, as amended (the Act). The Act authorizes counties and municipalities in the State of Florida to create community redevelopment agencies and to prepare redevelopment plans for certain defined areas within their boundaries designated as community development areas, within which community redevelopment projects may be undertaken to eliminate and prevent the development and spread of slum and blight. After a finding has been made, determining that slum and/or blight exist within a defined area, the Act authorizes the County to use and to delegate redevelopment powers at its discretion.¹

The following chart provides the Miami-Dade County legislative history for the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor CRA.

Miami-Dade County Legislative History N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor CRA	
Date and Enacting Legislation	Summary of Legislation
<i>May 6, 2003</i> <i>R-524-03</i>	<p><u>Finding of Necessity</u> Resolution No. 524-03 directed the County Manager to prepare a Finding of Necessity (FON) Study for the area along the 7th Avenue corridor between N.W. 119th Street and N.W. 79th Street (Commission Districts 2 and 3), as required by the Community Redevelopment Act of 1969.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On October 30, 2003, the Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED) issued Contract No. RFQ No. 58 to Strategic Development Initiatives, Inc. to prepare the FON.
<i>March 16, 2004</i> <i>R- 293-04</i>	<p><u>FON Report</u> Resolution No. 293-04 accepted the FON report and established the boundaries of the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor Community Redevelopment Area, approximately 112 acres, (0.4 square mile strip) generally defined as a portion of Miami-Dade County bonded on the North by NW 119 Street, on the South by NW 79th Street, on the East by I-95 and on the West by NW 7th Avenue, in unincorporated Miami-Dade County; to be a slum and blighted area and making certain findings with respect to the creation of a community redevelopment agency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition, the BCC directed the County Manager to prepare a Redevelopment Plan for the 7th Avenue Corridor. • The BCC also authorize the County Manager to waive bids and to contract with Strategic Development Initiatives (SDI), Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$75,000 in order to be able to prepare the 7th Avenue Corridor Redevelopment Plan and establish the proposed community redevelopment area by June 30, 2004.
<i>June 22, 2004</i> <i>R-774-04</i>	<p><u>Initial CRA</u> Resolution No. 774-04 appointed the BCC to serve as the initial CRA for the 7th Avenue Corridor Community Redevelopment District in order to expedite the approval of the Community Redevelopment Plan and the establishment of the 7th Avenue Corridor redevelopment trust fund prior to June 30, 2004 so the CRA would begin to receive tax increment revenues as soon as possible.</p> <p>This resolution established the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor CRA.</p>
<i>June 22, 2004</i> <i>R-780-04</i>	<p><u>Community Redevelopment Plan</u> Resolution No. 780-04 approved the Community Redevelopment Plan.</p>

¹ Section 163.335 Florida Statutes

	<p>According to the County Manager's memo dated June 22, 2004, the proposed plan for the 7th Avenue Corridor Community Redevelopment Area is to re-energize the faltering commercial district and create jobs, reduce crime, improve the appearance of the area and the quality of life for those who live in and around the area. The principal focus of the redevelopment strategy offered by the Community Redevelopment Plan was to undertake a major initiative to revitalize the area by embracing and enhancing the auto retail business sector which at the time was leading the area's decline. A well-designed, visually attractive Auto Mall located in the proximity of 79th Street and 95th Street along N.W. 7th Avenue would be the economic catalyst to provide resurgence in job creation, ad valorem revenues, and community pride.</p> <p>Subsequently, the CRA during FY2005-2006, according to the CRA Annual Report for FY2009, negotiated a development agreement that would implement the primary redevelopment project, identified in the plan as being a new car automotive retail marketing, sales and distribution center, commonly referred to as the Auto Mall. However, the FY2009 Annual Report also details that on December 7, 2005, the Developer, Potamkin Development I-95 LLC, decided to discontinue negotiations and no new Redevelopment Plan has been adopted since that date.</p>
<p>July 7, 2005 Ord. 04-124</p>	<p><u>Trust Fund</u> Ordinance 04-124 established the 7th Avenue Corridor Community Redevelopment and Revitalization Trust Fund (Fund).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This ordinance established the Fund for which increment funds are to be used in conjunction with other revenues, to finance the proposed redevelopment area and to facilitate implementation of creative tax financing strategies by the CRA. • In addition, this ordinance, based on a recommendation of the Miami-Dade County Tax Increment Financing Coordinating (TIFC) Committee, provided for a contribution of 95% of the County's tax increment to be made to the Fund.
<p>February 7, 2006 Ord. 06-18</p>	<p><u>Appointing the Board of Commissioners</u> Ordinance No. 06-18 appointed the Board of Commissioners of the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor CRA, designating their respective terms of office and certain redevelopment powers to such agency.</p>
<p>Nov. 3, 2009 R-1290-09</p>	<p><u>FON Study for Expansion Area</u> Resolution No. 1290-09 directed the County Mayor or his designee to prepare a FON study for expansion of N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor Community Redevelopment Area to include the geographical area described generally as bounded on the North by the city of Miami Gardens, bounded on the South by the City of North Miami, bounded on the West by the westernmost property lines of all those parcels of land that abut the westerly right-of-way line of N.W. 7th Avenue/State Road 441 and bounded on the East by Interstate 95, in Commission Districts 1 and 2.</p>
<p>Dec. 1, 2009 R-1360-09</p>	<p><u>Interlocal Agreement</u> Resolution No. 1360-09 approved the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Miami-Dade County and the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor CRA, establishing the terms and conditions for the implementation of the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor Community Redevelopment Area.</p> <p>This Interlocal Agreement is necessary for the CRA to proceed with the redevelopment of the project area. The Interlocal Agreement delegates all redevelopment powers with the exception of the powers that continue to vest in the BCC and cannot be delegated, pursuant to Section 163.358, Florida Statutes. Some basic terms set forth in the Interlocal Agreement are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative expenses are capped at 20 percent. • County advanced funds for expenses associated with the Finding of Necessity and Redevelopment Plan totaling \$94,500 are to be reimbursed by the CRA. • Annual reimbursement to the County for funds advanced for staff functions, legal, advertising, publication, and consulting expenses. • Prior approval by the BCC is required for amendments to the Redevelopment Plan. • Proposals for indebtedness, including bond financing, require approval of the BCC. • One or more members of the BCC or any other representative of Miami-Dade County may be appointed to serve on the CRA's Board of Commissioners. • Annual budgets and progress reports are to be submitted to the County. With the exception of the debt service payment on current bond obligations financed by tax increment revenues, no funds on deposit in the Trust Fund may be expended by the Agency until the annual budget has been approved by the BCC. • County staff will be utilized to assist in the preparation of tax increment financing plans. Small business involvement is encouraged. • Community involvement and citizen input will be obtained in the planning of redevelopment activities. • An independent audit by a Certified Public Accounting firm is required annually.
<p>May 4, 2010 R-492-10</p>	<p><u>FY 2009-10 Budget</u> Resolution No. 492-10 approved the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor CRA's FY 2009-10 budget for the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor Community Redevelopment Area. The CRA's budget includes revenues and expenditures in the amount of \$2,152,036.</p>
<p>April 4, 2011 R-223-11</p>	<p><u>FON Study for Expansion Area</u> Resolution No. 223-11 accepted the FON study of the expanded area the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor CRA to be a slum or blighted area, pursuant to Chapter 163, Part III, Florida State Statutes, updating Resolution No. 774-04.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FON Report, prepared by Keith and Schnars, P.A. for the CRA, identified conditions including high population

	<p>density, high incidence of crime, and an abundance of vacant lots and buildings in the community. Additionally, the FON identified unsanitary or unsafe conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes, and deterioration of site and other improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 12, 2010, the Board of Commissioners of the NW 7th Avenue Corridor CRA unanimously passed a motion supporting the FON. The Tax Increment Financing and Coordinating Committee reviewed the FON on July 22, 2010, and recommended it for BCC approval.
--	---

Additional Information

Currently, there are thirteen (13) approved CRAs in Miami-Dade County: 7th Avenue Corridor, Homestead, City Center, Southeast Overtown/Park West, Omni, Midtown Miami, North Miami, North Miami Beach, NW 79th Street, South Miami, Florida City, Naranja Lakes, and West Perrine. The only CRA pending BCC approval is the Goulds/Cutler Ridge.

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

CRA	TIF Contribution Rate
7 th Avenue Corridor	95%
Homestead	95%
City Center	95%
Southeast Overtown/Park West	95%
Omni	95% - County gets refund of 35% of the total TIF collected
Midtown Miami	95%
North Miami	95% - County gets a refund of all County TIF collected west of Biscayne Blvd.
North Miami Beach	95%
NW 79 th Street	95%
South Miami	50%
Florida City	95%
Naranja Lakes	95%
West Perrine	95%

Interlocal Agreements

On October 4, 2011, under Resolution No. 871-11, the BCC established policy requiring that every new or amended Interlocal Agreement related to a CRA provide for a County Commissioner to serve as a Commissioner on the CRA Board² and for County Commission approval of each CRA’s budget as a prerequisite to the CRA borrowing money, advancing funds or incurring indebtedness proposed to be repaid from or secured by the CRA’s TIF funds.

According to Administration, Resolution No. 871-11 also removed the loophole pertaining to the review of Interlocal Agreements by the County Commission prior to the CRA issuing debt or spending funds. Although some CRAs had this requirement for budget approval, the policy was inconsistently applied. Prior to the approval of Resolution No. 871-11, the Interlocal Agreements for older CRAs such as Homestead, Miami Beach City Center, Southeast Overtown / Park West and Omni were negotiated without this provision.

² According to the County Attorney’s Office, the provision under Resolution No. 871-11 that at least one County Commissioner serves as a Commissioner of the CRA is consistent with and reinforces the provisions of the policy established under Resolution No. 1382-09, directing the Mayor or designee to negotiate amendments to the interlocal agreements with each taxing authority and/or CRA to provide for the appointment of one County Commissioner to each CRA, and establishing a policy that as a condition for the creation of a new CRA that one County Commissioner will be appointed to the new CRA’s board of commissioners.

Comparison with Other CRA Budgets

Pursuant to the provisions of each CRA's Interlocal Agreement, the CRA may or may not be required to submit an annual budget to the BCC for approval. The following provides the most recent budgets approved by the BCC:

Miami-Dade County CRAs				
<i>Most Recent BCC Approved Budget</i>				
CRA	Budget Approval Date	Resolution Number	Fiscal Year	Budget Amount
Homestead	5/3/2011	Motion to adopt resulted in tie vote - File No. 110951	2010-11	\$6,146,744
Southeast Overtown/Park West	7/7/2011	R-535-11	2009-10	\$27,321,927 (FY 2009-10)
			2010-11	\$29,577,142 (FY 2010-11)
Omni	7/7/2011	R-533-11	2009-10	\$44,015,971 (FY 2009-10)
			2010-11	\$38,958,422 (FY 2010-11)
Midtown Miami	7/7/2011	R-534-11	2009-10	\$3,901,446 (FY 2009-10)
			2010-11	\$1,595,022 (FY 2010-11)
North Miami	4/3/2012	R-286-12	2010-11	\$6,988,425 (FY 2010-11)
			2011-12	\$2,437,506 (FY 2011-12)
North Miami Beach	4/3/2012	R-285-12	2010-11	\$7,268,387 (FY 2010-11)
			2011-12	\$6,148,435 (FY 2011-12)
NW 79 th Street	4/17/2012	R-336-12	2011-12	\$20,000 ³
South Miami	4/3/2012	R-284-12	2011-12	\$2,791,942
Florida City	1/24/2012	R-30-12	2011-12	\$5,728,011
Naranja Lakes	1/24/2012	R-29-12	2010-11	\$4,328,535 ⁴ (FY 2010-11)
			2011-12	\$3,628,160 (FY 2011-12)
West Perrine	4/3/2012	R-287-12	2011-12	\$1,150,887

³ At the September 20, 2011, BCC meeting, District 2 allocated \$20,000 from District office funds to the NW 79th Street CRA's FY 2011-12 Budget. Subsequently on April 17, 2012, under Resolution No. 336-12, the BCC approved the NW 79th Street CRA's FY 2011-12 Budget for the \$20,000 allocation.

⁴ Resolution No. 145-11, authorized the Naranja Lakes CRA to obtain a \$7.5 million loan to reimburse the County for the outstanding balance on two State Sunshine Loans. The CRA issued a Request for Proposals (RFP), which only produced inquiries from prospective lenders. As a result, the CRA intends to issue a second RFP during the current fiscal year.

Miami Beach City Center CRA

On June 6, 2006, under Resolution No. 705-06, the BCC approved the FY2005-06 budget for the Miami Beach City Center CRA in the amount of \$31,457,976. According to OMB, since that time, the Miami Beach City CRA has provided budgets; however, they have been incomplete. When OMB has tried to inquire to obtain information, it has never been provided; therefore, the budgets were not placed on an agenda as Administration was not comfortable with the information being provided.

Questions / Comments

In the December 19, 2006, County Manager's report titled, Report of Community Redevelopment Areas/Agencies, one of the issues resulting from the creation of CRAs is that of broadly defining redevelopment plans and interlocal agreements that do not specify the use of the revenues and the priority of spending allowing for CRAs to fund operating expenses that otherwise could be used to prepay debt. Specific redevelopment plans with clearly defined and quantifiable goals could be implemented and terminated once the goal has been attained and the debt issued, to attain goal paid. The allowable use of these funds for other than administrative expenditures and debt payment could, in effect prolong the termination of CRA that have otherwise met their goals.

- ***Are the goals for the N.W. 7th Avenue Corridor clearly defined for the expanded area?***

Prepared By: Elizabeth N. Owens

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



Research Notes

Agenda Item: 7D, 7E & 7G
 File Number: 121141, 121615 & 121045
 Date of Analysis: August 1, 2012

Summary

BCC Agenda No.	7D 121141 Underserved Taxi Service Areas	7E 121615 For-Hire Limousines Age Requirements	7G 121045 Retirement Extension for Taxicabs
Sponsor(s) & Co-Sponsors	Commissioner Jordan; and Commissioner Monestime and Vice-Chairwoman Edmonson	Chairman Martinez	Commissioner Monestime and Chairman Martinez; and Vice-Chairwoman Edmonson
Proposed Ordinance	<p>Sec. 31-93. Special Provisions</p> <p>>>(f) Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, each for-hire license holder who has been issued a for-hire taxicab license prior to September 3, 2012, which is required to be operated using a taxicab in the underserved taxicab service area pursuant to Section 31-93(c) or the South Miami taxicab service area pursuant to Section 31-93(d) may convert that for-hire license into a license which may be operated in both the designated underserved area and countywide (hereinafter "hybrid underserved taxicab license" or "hybrid underserved taxicab") as provided herein.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An underserved taxicab license may be converted into a hybrid underserved taxicab license upon payment of \$5,000. A hybrid underserved taxicab license may be operated countywide on alternating days as follows. 	<p>Sec. 31-609. Vehicle Standards</p> <p>(1) <u>Luxury limousine sedans</u>: No luxury limousine sedan initially placed into service will be older than two (2) model years of age. No luxury limousine sedan that exceeds [[five (5)]] >>seven (7)<< model years of age will be inspected or operated.</p> <p>(2) <u>Stretch limousines</u>: No stretch limousine initially placed into service will be older than two (2) model years of age. No stretch limousine that exceeds [[five (5)]] >>seven (7)<< model years of age will be inspected or operated; provided, however, that a luxury sedan vehicle that is either a fifteen (15) or greater model year Rolls Royce, Packard or Mercedes-Benz that has been stretched a minimum of forty-two (42) inches may be operated beyond [[five (5)]] >>seven (7)<< model years as long as the vehicle meets the inspection requirements of the Code.</p> <p>(3) <u>Super-stretch limousines</u>: No super-stretch limousine initially</p>	<p>Sec. 31-93. Special Provisions</p> <p>(e) Notwithstanding the vehicle age limits required by Sections 31-82(l)(4), 31-89(f) and 31-93(c)(3) of the Code, any properly permitted and inspected taxicab scheduled for retirement on December 31, [[2011]] >>2012<< will be allowed to be operated for an additional one-year period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previously approved extensions see the following ordinances: Ord. 11-102; Ord. 11-77; and Ord. 11-11

BCC Agenda No.	7D 121141 Underserved Taxi Service Areas	7E 121615 For-Hire Limousines Age Requirements	7G 121045 Retirement Extension for Taxicabs
	<p><i>All hybrid underserved taxicabs whose license number ends in an odd number (i.e., 1, 3, 5, 7, 9) are required to pick up passengers exclusively in the designated underserved taxicab service area or South Miami taxicab service area, whichever is applicable, on odd numbered days of the month.</i></p> <p><i>All hybrid underserved taxicabs whose license number ends in an even number (i.e., 0, 2, 4, 6, 8) are required to pick up passengers exclusively in the designated underserved taxicab service area or South Miami taxicab service area, whichever is applicable, on even numbered days of the month.</i></p> <p><i>To “pick up passengers exclusively in the designated underserved taxicab service area or South Miami taxicab service area” means that such taxicabs may discharge passengers at any location, but may only accept passengers in the designated underserved taxicab service area. No hybrid underserved taxicab operating pursuant to this section may provide transportation of persons and their baggage from Miami International Airport.<<</i></p>	<p><i>placed into service will be older than two (2) model years of age. No super-stretch limousine that exceeds [[seven (7)]] >>nine (9)<< model years of age will be inspected or operated; provided, however, that a luxury sedan vehicle that is either a fifteen (15) or greater model year Rolls Royce, Packard or Mercedes-Benz that has been stretched a minimum of one hundred twenty (120) inches may be operated beyond [[seven (7)]] >>nine (9)<< model years as long as the vehicle meets the inspection requirements of the Code.</i></p>	
Proposed Civil Penalty	<p>Sec. 8CC-10. Schedule of civil penalties.</p> <p><i>>>31-93 (c) Operating outside the designated area \$250.00<<</i></p> <p><i>>>31-93 (d) Operating outside the designated area \$250.00<<</i></p>	None	None

Item 7E

Research Conducted on Vehicle Age Requirements

The Office of Commission Auditor (OCA) conducted survey regarding vehicle age requirements for limousines and luxury sedan vehicles for the ten largest cities in the country and Miami-Dade County. The cities were chosen based on the United States Census Bureau's ten most populous incorporated places 2010 census briefs. **(See attached table on Vehicle Age Requirements for Limousines and Luxury Sedan Vehicles)**

OCA included the following categories for those vehicles:

- Age of vehicle to initially place in service;
- How long can it remain in service;
- Frequency of inspections; and
- Total number of vehicles permitted in the various classes.

Limousine Advisory Group Meeting Minutes Regarding Vehicle Entry Age

On April 24, 2012, the Limousine Advisory Group (LAG) convened to discuss several industry issues. The following provides excerpts from the meeting minutes:

*LAG members indicated that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would be introducing new legislation regarding **vehicle entry age** that if adopted, would be permanent. The reason for the proposed legislation was due to car manufactures not change their vehicle model/styles but every ten years; and the other reason was due to the current economic situation.*

In the absence of representation at the April 24th LAG meeting by the Greater Miami Convention & Visitors Bureau, members agreed to insert the GMCVB's position and concern on the use of older vehicles in the industry.

A citizen was concerned that after the tremendous amount of work the limousine industry has garnered over the years to establish an industry status of being world class. This amendment would reverse work involved in the creation of the 2001 Limousine Ordinance reverting this industry backwards.

Overall, there was a split between industry operators. Smaller operators were in favor of the proposed vehicle extension legislation, while the larger operators were highly opposed.

A memo, dated, August 29, 2012, from the Mayor to the Board of County Commissioners states that on July 31, 2012, the LAG held their quarterly meeting to discuss the proposed Vehicle Age Ordinance which extends the vehicle retirement age of luxury sedans and limousines an additional two (2) years.

The proposed Item 7E, includes amendments made at the July 9, 2012 Regional Transportation Committee (RTC) meeting. However, the LAG members voted 6-1 to support the item prior to the amendments, as it was on first reading (Legislative File No 120864) at the May 1, 2012 BCC meeting.

On July 9, 2012, the RTC amended the vehicle age ordinance to eliminate any references to permanent change in the age limit requirement for all "for-hire" limousines and to allow for a one (1) year extension on limousines scheduled to retire on December 31, 2012.

The memo further states that the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources supports the amendments proposed by the RTC, granting one (1) year extension on limousines scheduled to retire on December 31, 2012.

Items 7D and 7G

Background and Relevant Information

In a 2006 report titled “*Overview of Taxicab Industry for October 3, 2006 Workshop*”¹, prepared by the County Manager’s Office for the BCC stated that the taxicab industry in Miami-Dade County had faced problems on many fronts including those related to customers, services and regulations.

Since 1981, Miami-Dade County has been regulating the taxicab industry countywide. Historically, the County only regulated taxicabs in unincorporated areas, and municipalities regulated taxicabs in municipal areas. The electorate approved an amendment in 1976 to the Home Rule Charter to permit the County to regulate taxicabs throughout the County, and in 1981 an ordinance was adopted to effectuate countywide regulations.

Also, on July 9, 1998, the BCC, through Ordinance 98-105, enacted comprehensive regulatory reform changing the issuance, control, operation and regulation of taxicabs. It was at this point that the BCC sought to create a driver/owner system by restricting all transfers, assignments, sales, gifts, etc., to duly licensed chauffeurs only. Several mechanisms were implemented: (1) new taxicab medallions were to be issued by lottery only to taxicab chauffeurs who actually drive the vehicles; and (2) transfers of medallions were to be made only to taxicab chauffeurs who actually drive the vehicles, with certain gift exceptions.

According to the report, notable legislative action approved by the BCC after the 1998 ordinance included: a 1999 ordinance establishing a specially designated **Underserved Area**, bounded by N.W. 79 street, North Miami avenue, N.W. 27 Avenue, and N.W. 7 street, with a separate lottery allocation. Additionally, in May 2004 the BCC, through Ordinance 04-103 approved the continuation of the first lottery series which was about to expire through 2006.

The same ordinance created a **special South Miami-Dade Taxicab Service Area** for the area of South Miami-Dade to address service issues in that area.

The 2004 ordinance also contained a requirement for a taxicab ridership study to be conducted. One of the intended purposes of the study was to analyze the geographic distribution of taxicabs in the County. The firm selected to conduct such study was the Tennessee Transportation and Logistic Foundation, under the direction of Dr. Ray Mundy, Ph.D. (**See recommendations below**)

Industry Assessment by TTLF

On January 14, 2007, Tennessee Transportation and Logistic Foundation (TTLF) released the ***Taxicab Ridership Final Report on Miami-Dade*** to devise an equitable formula for the introduction of additional taxi licenses as the community requires them. The preliminary findings pointed to an oversupply of taxicabs in the urban core, including Miami International Airport, and an undersupply in geographic areas outside the urban core.

The following highlights the Short and Long Term Recommendations regarding underserved areas from the TTLF report:

Short Term Recommendations, as Amended via Workshop Comments 5/17/06

- Short term recommendations are those that typically address immediate problems with solutions that require little or no capital expenditure. Two broad alternatives have been advanced to deal with the current imbalance of taxi service through the Phase One and the Phase Two Reports. One was a Class “B” Taxi License to provide service to the underserved areas within the County, and the second was a systematic process to require all medallion taxis to serve the entire countywide market for taxi services.
- Through discussions with Consumer Services Department personnel, it was determined that the preference would be to concentrate on the latter as being the preferred direction which would provide improved efficiencies of the existing system and offer the best hope of improving the incomes of the

¹ See Legislative File No. 062726.

drivers. If there is no broadening of the mandate for existing Underserved medallion taxis such as expanded geographic area, and/or the creation of a Class "B" (sedan) Taxi License to serve underserved taxi areas identified in this project, the short term recommendations are as follows:

- **Permit all passenger services corporations to dispatch lottery won underserved area taxi medallions within designated underserved areas.**

According to the report, an Underserved Area medallion lottery winner may affiliate only with passenger services corporations which have an office in an underserved area. Increasing access to all passenger services corporations should improve service alternatives.

Longer Term Recommendations

- Long term recommendations are typically easier to recommend because offer direction rather than specific actions that should be taken within the next year. Longer term typically suggests actions that should occur over a three to five year period and that, in this case, moves the Miami-Dade taxi industry toward more efficient and customer oriented services for all visitors and residents irrespective of where they live in the County. Specific longer term recommendations are:
- **Phase in alternate days that taxicabs may serve the Miami International Airport as taxis have sufficient technology to serve additional market segments.**

This would force excess taxi drivers away from the airport with the intention of driving them to underserved areas. It would require no capital investment on the part of the drivers and could be implemented with odd/even airport registration numbers with all serving the airport on Sundays.

Recommendations, as amended via workshop comments 7/29/06

A second workshop on the study's recommendations was held on July 29th, 2006 as a portion of the regular Taxi Advisory Board meeting. Several excellent short term suggestions were discussed and have been incorporated into additional recommendations stemming from this year long study. These are:

- **Expand the underserved area thereby providing more opportunities for new lottery taxicabs which would then be restricted to these areas under other study recommendations.**

This recognizes that the current lack of taxi services in these areas has decreased market opportunities and it will take time to build these markets back into good radio call areas. Expanding the size of these areas would encourage more passenger Services Corporation's to market their services to individuals living within these geographic areas

Taxicab Advisory Group Meetings regarding the Underserved Taxicab Areas, Vehicle Age Extension and Chauffeur Agreements (Excerpts from the April 17, 2012 TAG meeting minutes):

*On April 17, 2012, the Taxicab Advisory Group (TAG) convened to discuss several industry issues. Among the issues discussed, a citizen advised the TAG that a citizens presentation was presented on April 4, 2012 to the BCC regarding the **Underserved Area and South Miami-Dade Area.***

According to the TAG, the County Attorney's Office in conjunction with the For-Hire Transportation Division was tasked, at the request of the Chairman of the BCC, with drafting a proposed Underserved Area ordinance.

The ordinance would provide underserved drivers the ability to operate outside their designated zones and work countywide on odd and even days with the exception of MIA. One stipulation was implemented, drivers would be required to have and utilize radio communication.

Consumer Services discussed the suggested conversion fee and operating criteria for these vehicles. Member's present insisted drivers fully understood and were aware of the perimeters prior to purchasing and operating such vehicles. Members also agreed technology installation such as GPS or GEO fencing should be factored into the agreement. Consumer Services staff suggested that members consider decreasing the conversion fee from those operating wheelchair accessible cabs (\$10,000 to \$5,000).

TAG members voted 7-1 for drivers desiring of converting these underserved area cabs into countywide cabs and driving under the odd/even day stipulation with the exception of MIA, a minimum conversion fee of \$5,000 be charged; and the conversion fee should have a loan payoff period to the County of at least 19 months similar to other payment arrangements previously offered by the department.

On May 8, 2012, the Taxicab Advisory Group (TAG) convened to discuss vehicle age extensions and chauffeur agreements. *Pursuant to the minutes, TAG members voted unanimously that instead of endorsement agreements for drivers, passenger service companies should charge drivers for the actual cost of the motor vehicle registration fee and that fee should not be charged if a driver produces a motor vehicle registration within thirty days. An additional motion was considered and adopted that passenger Service Company's receipt should remain the same.*

For additional information regarding the LAG and TAG minutes, please visit the For-Hire Transportation Advisory Groups at <http://www.miamidade.gov/business/for-hire-meetings.asp>. As of August 29, 2012, CSD staff indicated that Miami-Dade's Government Information Center personnel are in the process of updating CSD's website and that the link above is functional.

Attachment – Survey – Vehicle Age Requirements

Prepared by: Michael Amador-Gil

**Survey of the Top Ten Counties Nationwide
Vehicle Age Requirements for Limousines and Luxury Sedan Vehicles**

Cities & Population ¹	Age of Vehicle to Initially Place in Service	How Long Vehicle Can Remain in Service	Frequency of Inspections	Total Number of Vehicles Permitted in Various Classes
New York, NY ² 8,175,133	According to the New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission (TLC) the odometer reading of the vehicle cannot be 500 miles or more at the time it is initially placed in service.	As long as the for-hire vehicle is able to pass the required inspection for license renewal, there are no limitations on the length of time the vehicle can remain in service. However, the TLC Rules and Local Laws do provide a timeframe for Black Car Vehicles – 7 to 8 model years old. On and after January 1, 2014, a Black Car Vehicle is to retire after it turns six model years old. In addition, as of January 1, 2011, a Clean Air Vehicle Level I is extended for an additional 2 years or a Clean Air Vehicle Level II is extended for 1 additional year.	For-Hire Vehicles must be inspected three (3) times a year including at least once every four (4) months.	There are no caps on the number of vehicles permitted.
Los Angeles, CA ³ 3,792,621	According to the State of California Public Utilities Commission (PUC), there are no restrictions. As long as the vehicle can be insured at the time the vehicle is initially placed into service.	As long as the vehicle can be insured, there are no limitations on the length of time the vehicle can remain in service.	No specific inspections are required. However, vehicles that carry 11 passengers or more require an annual inspection by the California Highway Patrol to	There are no limitations.

¹ United States Census Bureau, *Population Distribution and Change: 2000 to 2010, 2010 Census Briefs*, Table 5. Ten Most Populous Incorporated Places: 2000 to 2010.

² In New York City, the for-hire vehicles are divided into three (3) categories: (1) Black Car – a vehicle that affiliates with a central dispatch facility and is dispatched on a pre-arranged basis, owned by franchisees of the Black Car Base or are members of a cooperative that operates the Black Car Base, and more than 90% of the Base’s business is on a payment basis other than direct cash payment by a passenger; (2) Livery Vehicles – dispatched from the Livery Base Station on a pre-arranged basis, designed to carry fewer than six (6) passengers, and passengers are charged for service on the basis of a flat rate, time, mileage, or zones; and (3) Luxury Limousine – dispatched from a Luxury Limousine Base by pre-arrangement, have a seating capacity of 20 or fewer passengers, more than 90% of its business is on a payment basis other than direct cash payment by a passenger, and passengers are charged garage to garage service on the basis of a flat rate, time or mileage. A For-Hire Vehicle is not a taxicab, a commuter van, or an authorized bus as defined by NYS law.

³ The State of California Public Utilities Commission regulates limousine licensing for all jurisdictions in the State of California. The cities of Los Angeles, San Diego and San Jose do not require additional regulations other than what is required by the State.

**Survey of the Top Ten Counties Nationwide
Vehicle Age Requirements for Limousines and Luxury Sedan Vehicles**

Cities & Population ¹	Age of Vehicle to Initially Place in Service	How Long Vehicle Can Remain in Service	Frequency of Inspections	Total Number of Vehicles Permitted in Various Classes
			determine that it is safe to be on the road.	
Chicago, IL ⁴ 2,695,598	According to the City of Chicago Department of Business Affairs and Consumer Protection (BACP), the age of the vehicle initially placed in service cannot be over 5 years, including the current year.	A livery vehicle can remain in service for six (6) years.	Annual inspections are conducted on the last two (2) model years of the vehicle. For example, for this year 2011, BACP is replacing 2005 model year vehicles and inspecting 2006/2007 model year vehicles.	Livery vehicles have medallion license numbers ranging from 7,000 to 9,999; therefore, only 2,999 vehicles are permitted under this classification.
Houston, TX 2,099,451	No restrictions on the age of vehicle initially placed in service.	Luxury Sedan Vehicles - no more than six (6) years old. Stretch Limousines – no more than ten (10) years old.	Annually.	No Limitations.
Philadelphia, PA ⁵ 1,526,006	In no event may a vehicle be first presented for service as a Philadelphia Parking Authority (Authority) certified Limousine with an odometer reading of 51,000 miles or more, except that a Limousine with a model year age of five (5) or less and less than 75,000 miles may qualify for certification by the Authority contingent upon satisfactory vehicle inspection by the Authority.	Vehicles with a capacity of 15 or less including the driver: No vehicle is allowed to be in service if it is more than eight (8) years old. Age is determined by comparing the vehicle's model year to the current model year. If this number is eight (8) or larger, the vehicle must be removed from service. Limousines must be removed from service prior to accumulating 350,000 miles, however, a Limousine then certified by the Authority with a model year age of five (5) or less may qualify to continue for only one (1) additional year upon a	A State annual inspection is required. Limousine carriers must renew the registration of each limousine annually with the Authority. In addition, the Authority does randomly selected scheduled inspections. Scheduled limousine inspections are performed on approximately 25% of the Limousines registered with the Authority. Every registered limousine must receive a scheduled inspection at least once every four (4) years.	There are no caps on the number of vehicles permitted.

⁴ According to the City of Chicago Department of Business Affairs and Consumer Protection, the City of Chicago is currently revising the rules and regulations for Taxicab Medallion License Holders in order to separate the regulations for taxis and livery vehicles.

⁵ On April 10, 2005, Act 94 of 2004 transferred oversight of limousines providing service between points within Philadelphia, and service from an airport, railroad station or hotel located in Philadelphia, from the Public Utility Commission to the Philadelphia Parking Authority.

**Survey of the Top Ten Counties Nationwide
Vehicle Age Requirements for Limousines and Luxury Sedan Vehicles**

Cities & Population ¹	Age of Vehicle to Initially Place in Service	How Long Vehicle Can Remain in Service	Frequency of Inspections	Total Number of Vehicles Permitted in Various Classes
		favorable determination of a duly filed waiver petition and satisfactory Taxicab and Limousine Division (TLD) vehicle inspection. The one (1) additional year runs from the date the vehicle reached 350,000 miles or the date the Authority granted the waiver petition, whichever occurred first.		
Phoenix, AZ ⁶ 1,445,632	According to the State of Arizona Department of Weights and Measures (DWM), there are no restrictions on the age of the vehicle at the time the vehicle is initially placed in service.	According to the DWM, as long as the vehicle carries commercial insurance and a commercial license plate, there are limitations on the length of time the vehicle can remain in service.	Annual inspections are required.	There are no limitations.
San Antonio, TX 1,327,407	According to San Antonio Ground Transportation Services, there are no restrictions on the age of the vehicle at the time the vehicle is initially placed in service.	No stretch limousine is to be older than twelve (12) years of age. No luxury vehicle is to be older than five (5) years of age. Classic vehicles must be twenty-five (25) years of age or older. Age of the vehicle is calculated from the first day of October of the model year or from the purchase date if placed into service as a new vehicle.	Annual inspections are required.	There are no limitations.
San Diego, CA 1,307,402	According PUC, there are no restrictions. As long as the vehicle can be insured at the time the vehicle is initially placed into service.	As long as the vehicle can be insured, there are no limitations on the length of time the vehicle can remain in service.	No specific inspections are required. However, vehicles that carry 11 passengers or more require an annual inspection by the California Highway Patrol to determine that it is safe to be	There are no limitations.

⁶ On April 13, 2011, the Governor of Arizona signed into law Senate Bill 1375 mandating that the regulation of taxis, limousines, and shuttles is the State's responsibility and is not subject to further regulations by a county, city and other political subdivisions. The new law became effective July 2011.

**Survey of the Top Ten Counties Nationwide
Vehicle Age Requirements for Limousines and Luxury Sedan Vehicles**

Cities & Population ¹	Age of Vehicle to Initially Place in Service	How Long Vehicle Can Remain in Service	Frequency of Inspections	Total Number of Vehicles Permitted in Various Classes
			on the road.	
Dallas, TX 1,197,816	According to the City of Dallas Public Works and Transportation Department, a luxury vehicle with an odometer reading over 150,000 miles must have been used by another company and was previously permitted with the City of Dallas. There are no restrictions for a luxury vehicle with an odometer reading less than 150,000.	No limitations on the length of time a luxury vehicle can remain in service.	Permit renew requires two (2) inspections per year – (1) a state inspection, and (2) a 20 point inspection (no emission test).	There are no limitations.
San Jose, CA 945,942	According PUC, there are no restrictions. As long as the vehicle can be insured at the time the vehicle is initially placed into service.	As long as the vehicle can be insured, there are no limitations on the length of time the vehicle can remain in service.	No specific inspections are required. However, vehicles that carry 11 passengers or more require an annual inspection by the California Highway Patrol to determine that it is safe to be on the road.	There are no limitations.

Cities & Population ⁷	Age of Vehicle to Initially Place in Service	How Long Vehicle Can Remain in Service	Frequency of Inspections	Total Number of Vehicles Permitted in Various Classes
Miami-Dade County 2,554,766	Pursuant to Section 31-609 of the Miami-Dade County Code (Code), luxury limousine sedans, stretch limousines or super-stretch limousines initially placed into service will not be older than two (2) model years of age.	Pursuant to Section 31-609 of the Code, no luxury limousine sedan or stretch limousine that exceeds five (5) model years of age will be inspected. No super-stretch limousine that exceeds seven (7) model years of age will be inspected.	The frequency of inspection is based on the age of the vehicle. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles that are current model, one (1) or two (2) model years old are inspected annually; • Vehicles three (3) and four (4) model years old are inspected semi-annually; and 	As of November 2011, there were 625 luxury sedan Vehicles and 121 stretch and super stretch vehicles registered with For Hire Transportation in Miami-Dade County. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Luxury Sedan vehicles is a closed category; therefore, the 625 vehicles is a cap number for that category.</i>

⁷ United States Census Bureau, *Population Distribution and Change: 2000 to 2010, 2010 Census Briefs*, Table 5. Ten Most Populous Incorporated Places: 2000 to 2010.

**Survey of the Top Ten Counties Nationwide
Vehicle Age Requirements for Limousines and Luxury Sedan Vehicles**

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles five (5) or more model years old are inspected quarterly. • However, ancient or antique limousines are inspected semi-annually. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Stretch and Super Stretch limousines are in an open category. They can be placed into service based on industry\company needs; therefore, the 121 Stretches and Super Stretches can fluctuate throughout the year.</i>
--	--	--	---	---

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



Research Notes

Agenda Item: 8A1
File Number: 121220
Date of Analysis: August 31, 2012

Summary

The proposed resolution provides for the following:

- Approves the First Amendment to the Lease and Concession Agreement for the Luggage Cart Concession Program at Miami International Airport (MIA) between Miami-Dade County and Smarte Carte, Inc.;
- Waives formal bid procedures pursuant to Section 5.03 (D) of the Home Rule Charter and Section 2-8.1 of the Miami-Dade County Code; and
- Authorizes the Aviation Director to impose luggage cart charges in the Federal Inspection Service (FIS) area.

Background and Relevant Information

On September 4, 2007, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) adopted R-954-07 awarding the Luggage Cart Concession Agreement at MIA, RFP 08-05, to Smarte Carte, Inc. effective November 1, 2007, for an initial term of five years and one two-year extension period. The current Agreement will terminate on October 31, 2014.

Although a *Bid Protest* was filed by the first-ranked non-local proposer Bagport America, LLC, on May 10, 2007, it was later withdrawn on May 23, 2007.

In determining the overall ranking, it was noted that the second-ranked firm (Smarte Carte, Inc.) was a local Proposer and was within 5% of the ranking obtained by the first-ranked non-local Proposer Bagport America LLC. As Smarte Carte, Inc., was eligible for local preference consideration, the local preference provisions were applied which resulted in Smarte Carte, Inc., being the first-ranked firm.

Following authorization by the County Manager, a Negotiation Committee negotiated the fee of the Agreement, which resulted in an increase in the fee paid to MDAD from 25% initially proposed by Smarte Carte, Inc., to 32%.

Smarte Carte currently provides carts in the domestic area of the Terminal, as well as the Federal Inspection Service (FIS) area for international passengers.

Discussions between the County and Smarte Carte to Redesign the Luggage Carts

At MDAD's request, Smarte Carte and MDAD met on October 7, 2011, to discuss MDAD's need for luggage carts equipped with a redesigned front wheel system, as well as the addition of a braking component to the carts. The commencement of the use of the carts on the train gave rise to the concern that if passengers failed to hold the carts securely, or if the train stopped suddenly, passengers could be injured by a runaway cart thus posing a potential liability to MDAD. This point was stressed when the train's manufacturer and warrantor sought a release from such injury liability if MDAD did not stop passengers from using the existing carts.

It was therefore urgent to secure carts with both a newly designed front wheel system that would not jam in the train doorways and a brake system that prevented the carts from rolling unintentionally. For these two reasons, MDAD requested that Smarte Carte consider providing new carts with the requested features.

Smarte Carte had concerns about moving forward with a new equipment investment of \$1.5 million while entering the last year of their initial term; an investment which historically would only be made at the commencement of a contract term.

MDAD staff agreed to propose this amendment to recommend granting Smarte Carte an additional term of five years and a one two-year extension; essentially treating the contract as if it was at its commencement.

- *Question: If BCC approval is not obtained for this amendment will Smarte Carte be reimbursed for their investment?*

Additional Information on Smarte Carte, Inc. and the Enterprise Zone Ad Valorem Tax Exemption

On April 19, 1988, the BCC enacted Ordinance No. 88-27, which authorized Enterprise Zone Ad Valorem Tax Exemption for new or expanding businesses which invested in certain zones of Miami-Dade.

At that time, to be eligible for this exemption: a new or expanded business will create a minimum of five (5) new full-time jobs. If, on a given year of the 5 year exemption, 20% or more of a business' permanent full-time employees are residents of the Enterprise Zone, such exemption, for that year, will be 100 percent of the assessed value of all improvements to real property, or 100 percent of the assessed value of all tangible personal property. In case the company can not comply with the 20% residency requirement of their employees living in the Enterprise Zone, then the exemption, for that year, will be 50% of the assessed value.

On July 24, 2001, the BCC, through Ordinance 01-126, granted an Enterprise Zone Ad Valorem Tax Exemption to Smarte Carte, Inc. This item was previously deferred by the BCC on January 25, 2000 pending the clarification of whether property tax abatement was a condition of the lease at the airport.

Property tax abatement was not a condition of the lease and consequently this item was brought back to the BCC with a recommendation for approval. The BCC also wanted to know if the business was a certified Disadvantaged Business Enterprise, which it was not at that time.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, Smarte Carte created 43 new jobs in the Enterprise Zone from 1999 through 2004.

- *Question: How many jobs has Smarte Carte Created since 2004 to date?*
- *Question: Do they still receive exemptions?*

Contract Measures

ACDBE 22.0% or \$442,772 in FY 2012

ACDBE FIRM: JA Airport Services, Inc.

The Agreement awarded through R-954-07, (current Agreement) listed the ACDBE firm- *Global Baggage Protection Systems, Inc.* with a contract measure of 23%, when did the subcontractor change?

Fiscal Impact

This item proposes to reverse a current annual expense of \$1.3 million and instead generate an estimated \$1.9 million in revenue; a net \$3.2 million annual benefit to MIA. Smarte Carte, Inc. pays the greater of a Minimum Annual Guarantee (MAG) of \$233,354 or 32% of gross revenue.

Smarte Carte currently provides carts in the domestic area of the Terminal for a fee (\$5.00 for rental of the cart) as well as the FIS area for international passengers (free of charge for international passengers). While Smarte Carte currently pays to MDAD the greater of a MAG or 32% of gross revenue based on the domestic sales, the Department pays 70 cents per cart entering the FIS area.

As a result, even though this is a Concession Agreement, the Aviation Department paid Smarte Carte \$1,481,938 in fiscal year 2011 for the use of carts in the international area.

Additional Information

Luggage Cart Fees at Fort Lauderdale and Orlando International Airports

Both the Fort Lauderdale International (FLL) and Orlando International (MCO) Airports use Smarte Carte. FLL charges \$4 for domestic passengers, but no charge for international passengers; and MCO charges \$5 for domestic and \$5 International passengers.

Prepared by: Michael Amador-Gil

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



Research Notes

Agenda Item: 8F5 - Non-Competitive Award Package

File Number: 121352

Date of Analysis: July 18, 2012

Summary

This Non-Competitive Award Package includes three (3) items – two (2) non-competitive emergency awards and a contract modification requesting additional spending authority.

Budgetary Impacts

In total, this Non-Competitive Award Package requests **\$8,475,144** in additional allocations.

Contract Modifications:

Item No.	Contract Title and Modification Reason	Existing Allocation, Additional Time and Spending Authority
1	<p>Janitorial Services for the Downtown Government Complex</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To waive formal bid procedures and ratify an emergency award for purchase of janitorial services for the Downtown Government Complex to Vista Building Management Services, Inc. (Vista).</p> <p><u>Background</u> According to the May 4, 2012, County Mayor’s memo entitled, <i>Removal of TCB Systems, Inc. from Pre-Qualification Pool for Consolidated Countywide Janitorial Services Contract No. 9562-5/22</i>, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) issued its final report with regard to the Submission of Fraudulent Bid Bonds and Performance Bonds by TCB Systems, Inc. (TCB). The OIG investigation concluded that TCB provided Miami-Dade County one (1) fraudulent bid bond and six (6) fraudulent performance bonds. The OIG recommended that the County terminate contractual relationships with TCB and initiate debarment proceedings against the vendor.</p> <p>According to the OIG Report, TCB was awarded Contract No. 8026-3/11-OTR, <i>Janitorial Services for Downtown Government Complex</i>, starting January 1, 2007. This contract replaced Contract No. EM4648-1/05, <i>Janitorial Services for Downtown Government Complex</i>, which ran from December 1, 2004 to December 31, 2006. TCB has been the sole vendor awarded these two (2) contracts, and has been paid over \$25 million for work performed under these two (2) contracts.</p> <p>Subsequently, on June 5, 2012, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) approved</p>	<p>Allocation: \$6,608,144</p> <p>Modified / Extended Term: 18 months from May 1, 2012 to October 31, 2013.</p> <p>Allocation: <i>The negotiated contract with VISTA has a net decrease from the previous contract with TCB of \$49,270 over the eighteen-month period.</i></p> <p>The following buildings and garages will be covered by this emergency purchase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Support Facility perpetrating • Don A. Hickman Building • Courthouse • Miami Arts Museum • Cultural Center Plaza

Resolution No. 456-12, establishing a Prequalification Pool for Consolidated Countywide Janitorial Services with an allocation of \$92 million for the initial five (5) year term, with five (5), one-year Options-to-Renew (OTR) periods. TCB was removed from the Prequalification Pool prior to this approval.

The Prequalification Pool is divided into three (3) separate pools based on years of experience managing facilities of various sizes. The chart below depicts the breakdown of each pool, showing the criteria, number of firms qualified and the number of certified Small Business Enterprises (SBE's) qualified for each group as of June 5, 2012:

Consolidated Countywide Janitorial Service Breakdown of Prequalification Pool ¹			
Group	Group Description	# of Recommended Vendors, per Group	# of Vendors that are Certified SBEs, per Group
1	Minimum of one year experience managing facilities of any size	21	12
2	Minimum 3 years' experience managing facilities in excess of 25,000 sq. ft.	10	2
3	Minimum 5 years' experience managing facilities in excess of 75,000 sq. ft. and/or buildings taller than 5 stories.	8	0

While 25 firms were prequalified, some vendors may serve on more than one pool. For example, Vista, serves in all three (3) groups.

Questions / Comments

The previous contract was originally awarded under Resolution No. 1430-06, Contract No. 8026-3/11, to TCB. According to Procurement's Bid Tracking System, the current value under the 3rd OTR period, including modifications and internal extensions is \$7,551,000.

- How much funding was expended to TCB under the 3rd OTR period of the previous contract?

The OIG investigation concluded that **TCB provided Miami-Dade County one (1) fraudulent bid bond and six (6) fraudulent performance bonds. This action placed the County at risk for years while TCB enjoyed a lucrative County contract earning over \$25 million.**

- In light of the OIG investigation, is the County entitled to any refunds and/or compensation for the fraudulent documents?

- Historical Museum
- Library
- Stephen P. Clark Center
- Courthouse Center
- Overtown Transit Village Building
- Overtown Transit Village South
- Courthouse Center Garage
- Garage #5 (Hickman Garage)
- Cultural Center Garage
- Overtown Transit Village Garage
- Miami-Dade West Lot Garage

Note, on July 19, 2012, the BCC recognized the procurement technician who caught the fraudulent bonds, initiating the OIG investigation.

¹ Supplemental to Resolution No. 456-12 (File No. 121130).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What safeguards has the County implemented so that the issue of fraudulent bonds will not happen again in the future? <p>The OIG recommends that the County terminate contractual relationships with TCB and initiate debarment proceedings against the vendor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the status of the debarment proceedings? <p>Additional Information</p> <p>Currently, Vista has six (6) contracts with Miami-Dade County (see bullets below). The six (6) contracts were awarded prior to the establishment of the Prequalified Pool for Consolidated Countywide Janitorial Services on June 5, 2012 (Resolution No. 456-12). The pre-qualified pool consolidates 17 existing janitorial services contracts including the seven (7) that are currently awarded to Vista. As existing contracts are set to expire, pre-qualified vendors will be invited to participate in spot market competitions, resulting in separate awards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6371-4/13-3: Janitorial Services for Medical Examiner’s Office, expiring Sept. 30, 2012; • 7898-3/10-3: Janitorial Services for Metrorail, expiring April 30, 2013; • 8584-4/13-3: Janitorial Services for GSA & PW Facilities, expiring March 19, 2013; • 8783-1/13 - Janitorial Services for MDHA, expiring April 30, 2014; • EPP-RFP8275-3(4)- Janitorial Services for the Joseph Caleb Center, expiring on Dec. 30, 2012; and • RFP551-1(5): Janitorial Services - Miami Dade Library, expiring on Sept. 30, 2012. • In addition, Vista is a pre-qualified vendor under 9562-5/22: Prequalification Pool for Consolidated Countywide Janitorial Services, expiring June 30, 2017. <p>According to the Vendor Registration Package stamped received on October 20, 2011, Vista Building Maintenance Services has been in business for more than ten (10) years, provides janitorial and custodial services, and has a total number of 69 employees.</p>	
2	<p>Elevator Maintenance Services</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Additional spending authority for Public Housing and Community Development (PHCD) and Seaport Departments to purchase elevator modernization services.</p> <p>Under the current allocation, PHCD has an allocation in the amount of \$250,000. The additional allocation of \$430,000 added to the existing allocation of \$250,000 provides PHCD with a total allocation of \$680,000.</p> <p>Under the current allocation, the Seaport Department has an allocation in the amount of \$50,000. The additional allocation of \$487,000 added to the existing allocation of \$50,000 provides the Seaport Department with a total allocation of \$537,000.</p> <p><u>Previous Modifications</u></p>	<p>Existing Allocation: \$3,325,000 for various departments including PHCD and the Seaport Departments.</p> <p>Modified / Extended Term: No Change. Current expiration is April 30, 2014.</p> <p>Increased Allocation: \$917,000.</p>
<p>Elevator Maintenance Services</p>		

Previous Modifications for Contract No. SS1243-3/24-1			
Date	Amount Approved by Procurement	Amount Approved by BCC	Resolution No.
11/23/09	\$132,000		
9/16/10	\$143,000		
12/28/10	\$125,000		
10/4/11		\$386,000	R-793-11
12/27/11	\$263,926		
3/27/12	\$ 40,000		
Total	\$703,926	\$386,000	

<p>3</p> <p>Election Department Relia-Vote Upgrade</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To waive formal bid procedures and ratify an emergency contract award for the upgrade of the existing Relia Vote System at the Miami-Dade Elections Department.</p> <p>The upgrade is required due to the existing System’s ballot limitation of five (5) pages. With the large number of federal, state, county and municipal races and issues scheduled for the November 6, 2012 General Election ballot, many of the ballot styles will exceed five (5) pages. Therefore, the upgrade will increase the System’s capacity to print, scan, and manage the increased number of ballot pages.</p> <p><u>Additional Information</u></p> <p>The Miami-Dade County Elections department is responsible for conducting all county-wide and municipal elections within Miami-Dade County. The chart below provides the total number of absentee ballots returned to the Miami-Dade Elections department in 2010, 2011 and 2012 (as of August 31,2012):</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Miami-Dade County Elections Department²</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Number of Absentee Ballots Returned</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>229,014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>294,638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012</td> <td>169,851</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Pitney Bowes Relia-Vote Absentee Ballot System is used in several Florida jurisdictions, including Broward and Pinellas Counties.</p> <p>Questions / Comments</p> <p>According to handwritten page 10, through this item, the Department is requesting a modification to Contract No. SS8541-0/12. Contract No. SS8541-0/12 was modified on November 15, 2011, under Resolution No. 961-11, to allow additional spending authority in the amount of \$400,000 for the Elections Department to purchase software license upgrades as well as maintenance and support services for the</p>	Miami-Dade County Elections Department ²		Year	Number of Absentee Ballots Returned	2010	229,014	2011	294,638	2012	169,851	<p>Contract Value: \$950,000</p> <p>Contract Term: Fifty-five months</p> <p>Non-Local Vendor: Pitney Bowes, Inc. Murray Martin, CEO 2200 Western Court, Suite 100 Lisle, Illinois 60532</p>
Miami-Dade County Elections Department ²											
Year	Number of Absentee Ballots Returned										
2010	229,014										
2011	294,638										
2012	169,851										

² Information provided by the Miami-Dade County Elections Department.

	<p>existing Relia-Vote Mail Balloting System. In addition, authorization was provided to exercise the three (3) OTR periods. The November 15, 2011 modification consolidated two (2) previously awarded contracts to support the Elections Department – (1) Contract No. BW8052-0/11, a 2006 lease to own contract for sorting and ballot assembly components in the amount of \$1,892,570; and (2) Contract No. SS8541-0/12, a 2007 lease to own contract for data management, tracking and printing components in the amount of \$692,940. The November 2011 modification also allowed for the purchase of software license upgrades to maintain compatibility with new United States Postal Service barcode technology, as well as to gain access to enhanced tracking and reporting capabilities.</p>	
--	---	--

Prepared by: Elizabeth N. Owens



Agenda Item: 8N2 – Town of Miami Lakes Trolley/Circulator Services

File Number: 121288

Date of Analysis: July 12, 2012

Summary

This resolution authorizes the County Mayor, his designee, or the Miami-Dade Transit Director to execute an Interlocal Agreement between Miami-Dade County (County) and the Town of Miami Lakes (Town) for the provision of public transportation services within the Town.

This Agreement is necessary, pursuant to Chapter 31, Article III, Section 31-113 of the Miami-Dade County Code (Code), which requires an interlocal agreement to allow the Town to provide residents and visitors with public transportation services and to be exempt from the requirements regulating passenger motor carriers.

This Agreement allows the Town to operate public transportation circulator routes within the Town to complement Miami-Dade Transit (MDT) services and provide an alternative mode of transit.

This is the first Agreement for a public circulator route between MDT and the Town. The Agreement will last for five (5) years with two (2) five-year automatic extensions. Each party has the right to terminate for cause.

Other jurisdictions with Interlocal Agreements with the County to provide circulator/trolley services include the City of Miami, City of Coral Gables, City of Doral, City of Homestead, Town of Cutler Bay, City of Miami Beach, Village of Palmetto Bay, North Bay Village, City of North Miami, Bal Harbour, City of South Miami and Sunny Isles Beach.

Background and Relevant Legislation

Town of Miami Lakes Transportation Master Plan¹

The Town of Miami Lakes Transportation Master Plan (Master Plan) consisted of five (5) primary tasks: (1) Intergovernmental Coordination/Public Involvement, (2) Data Collection and Analysis, (3) Determination of Mobility Needs, (4) Identification of Transportation Mobility Strategies, and (5) Implementation Plan. The Master Plan provided the framework to assist the Town in programming of transportation improvements and may also be used as a tool for the Town to seek funding to implement transportation improvements.

Highlighting the primary task labeled Transportation Mobility Strategies, sub-labeled Transit; this study determined that several transit deficiencies exist within the Town. While service provided by Miami-Dade Transit (MDT) is well-focused on regional travel, circulation for shorter trips within the Town is not served as well. In addition, existing Metrobus service is concentrated during morning and afternoon peak periods of travel; trip purposes that typically occur in the off-peak periods, such as shopping and lunch, are not well served by existing Metrobus

¹ *Town of Miami Lakes Transportation Master Plan - Final Report, February 2004.*

service. Furthermore, no transit route directly connects the residential neighborhoods in the western portion of the Town to the Town Center.

According to guidelines set forth in Miami-Dade County’s *Local Municipal Transit Circulator Policy Study*, the demographics of the Town are not indicative of transit dependency including the percentage of residents aged 65 and older, percentage of households with income less than \$20,000, and percentage of households with zero automobiles. However, other criteria developed in the study are met including the availability of a potential funding source for the transit circulator (the Town’s portion of the tax revenue generated by the People’s Transportation Plan sales tax), recognizable gaps where transit service is not currently provided, presence of a specific activity center in the community, and obtaining request for service from members of the community. In addition, portions of the Town are beyond a ¼ mile walking distance from an existing transit stop.

Another highlight from the Master Plan is the primary task entitled, Implementation Plan, a qualitative evaluation of projects was included, utilizing the following six (6) criteria: Improves quality of the user’s experience, promotes the use of alternative travel modes, discourages neighborhood traffic intrusion, improves safety, improves system capacity, and satisfies multiple project categories. The projects to establish the Miami Lakes Transit Circulator Service – East and West routes, were scored according to the table below:

Project Comparison Matrix							
Transit Projects	Improves Quality of User’s Experience	Promotes the Use of Alternative Travel Modes	Discourages Neighborhood Traffic Intrusion	Improves Safety	Improves System Capacity	Satisfies Multiple Project Categories	Total Score
Establish Miami Lakes Transit Circulator Service – East Route	2	2	0	0	1	1	6
Establish Miami Lakes Transit Circulator Service – West Route	2	2	0	0	1	1	6

*Note: The score recorded for each project was based on a qualitative evaluation of how well it satisfied the evaluation criteria. A point value was assigned to each criterion using the following point system:
0 = The project does not meet/has an unfavorable relationship to the criterion.
1 = The project partially meets/has a moderately favorable relationship to the criterion.
2 = The project meets/has a favorable relationship to the criterion.*

Preliminary order of magnitude cost estimates for the recommended improvements and mobility strategies were presented. These cost estimates were generally based on the costs of local projects of similar scale. The purpose of these cost estimates were to assist in the prioritization of the improvements. The first table below, depicts the cost estimates for the establishment of the Miami Lakes Transit Circulator Services – East and West routes. Immediately following is the recommended prioritization schedule for the mobility strategies. The Miami Lakes Transit Circulator Services – East and West Route, was assigned a Priority Level of 1.

Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates	
Transit Projects	Planning Level Cost Estimates
Establish Miami Lakes Transit Circulator Service – East Route	\$150,000 ⁽¹⁾ - \$250,000 ⁽²⁾
Establish Miami Lakes Transit Circulator Service – West Route	\$150,000 ⁽¹⁾ - \$250,000 ⁽²⁾
• ESTIMATED TOTAL	\$300,000 - \$500,000

Note:
(1) Cost for contracting service from a transportation provider operating two vehicles for one year.
(2) Cost including purchase of two vehicles and costs for operating two routes for one year.

Project Prioritization Schedule			
Priority Level	Project Description	Project Evaluation Score	Funding Source
1	Establish Miami Lakes Transit Circulator Service – East Route	6	Funded mostly from transit portion of People’s Transportation Plan.
1	Establish Miami Lakes Transit Circulator Service – West Route	6	Funded mostly from transit portion of People’s Transportation Plan.

Included in the Master Plan is the following recommended transit strategy for the Town:

Consider implementing a transit circulator service to provide mobility options for residents and employees within the Town. The circulator service should serve both the western and eastern portions of the Town and have the Miami Lakes Town Centers as its focal point. Segmenting the circulator service into an eastern route and a western route would be beneficial for (1) reducing trip lengths and (2) would allow utilization of the Town Center as a hub for the transit service. The Town Center would likely be the primary destination; however, the Town Center would also offer a pleasant environment for passengers transferring from one route to another. Marketing of the service should include a sense of ownership of the service by Town leaders and staff, an attractive, easily identifiable vehicle, and color brochures and schedules that explain the characteristics of the service and destinations served. A detailed feasibility assessment is recommended.

Town of Miami Lakes Commute Trip Reduction Program²

The Town Circulator routes will build off the existing MDT system in order to connect riders to the larger regional transit system.

TML Route 1, the West Route, will originate at Royal Oaks Park and travel along north 87th Avenue, east on NW 170th Street, south on 82nd Avenue, east on NW 154th Street, south on NW 79th Court, around Commerce Way and back up to NW 154th Street east to Fairway Drive to the Main Street/New Bard Road MDT Ludlum Limited bus stop.

TML Route 2, the East Route, will originate at Miami Lakes Park and travel south along Miami Lakeway North, west onto Miami Lakes Drive and south on NW 60 Avenue, east on 139th Street, north on NW 57th Avenue, to NW 142 Street, north on 60th Avenue, east on Miami Lakes Drive to Cowpen Road, along Bull Run/Eagle Nest Lane to Main and the Main Street/New Board Road MDT Ludlam Limited bus stop.

Additional Information

On May 10, 2005, under the Town of Miami Lakes Resolution No. 05-304, the Town Council waived competitive bidding and approved an agreement with Limousines of South Florida, Inc. d/b/a LSF Shuttle, for the provision of a Trolley Service to serve the residents of the Town.

LSF Shuttle³

Limousines of South Florida, Inc. dba LSF Shuttle is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Tectrans, Inc. and has been operating in the South Florida market for over 25 years.

LSF Shuttle is the largest operator of fixed-route shuttle service for municipalities in South Florida with over 300 vehicles a day in operation in Florida.

LSF has been a Florida Corporation since 1984 with corporate offices in Los Angeles and South Florida. LSF has

² Town of Miami Lakes Commute Trip Reduction Program, January 2012.

³ LSF Shuttle website: www.lsfshuttle.com/index.html

three operating facilities located in South Florida, including one facility at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport. A second facility in Broward County is just a few blocks away from the Fort Lauderdale Airport facility. A third facility in Broward County is just south of the Palm Beach/Broward County line.

LSF Shuttle has a vast amount of shuttle experience, both fixed-route and airport. The shuttle bus services have been in operation at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport for over fifteen (15) years (1987-2002), and more recently from May 2008 to present. Operations include the shuttle buses for the employee and public remote parking lots along with providing tram service inside the parking garages at the airport.

LSF Shuttle also provides fixed-route shuttles in Miami-Dade County for the City of Doral, Village of Palmetto Bay, City of Miami Springs, City of North Miami, City of Miami Lakes, City of Aventura, Town of Bay Harbor Island, Town of Bal Harbor, City of Surfside, and Miami Shores Village.

In Broward County, LSF Shuttle provides fixed-route shuttles for the City of Hallandale Beach, City of Dania Beach, Town of Davie, City of Plantation, City of Lauderhill, City of Lauderdale Lakes, City of Coral Springs, City of Pompano Beach, City of Wilton Manors, City of North Lauderdale and the City of Fort Lauderdale, under the Sun Trolley, a wave and ride system that provides community transportation in the City of Fort Lauderdale to visitors and residents. The Sun Trolleys are managed by the Downtown Fort Lauderdale Transportation Management Association (DFLTMA), a non-profit organization created in 1992 to coordinate the efforts of government and private employers, developers, and property owners in addressing common transportation concerns; improving accessibility and mobility; providing transportation services; and working cooperatively with local and state government for the continued growth and development of downtown Fort Lauderdale.

Additionally, LSF Shuttle operates all of the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) Tri-Rail feeder buses in Broward County, and operates fixed-route parking shuttles for Memorial HealthCare Systems serving three separate facilities, along with several private condominium shuttles. LSF Shuttle also operates the shuttle bus services at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport and for the employee and public remote parking lots along with providing tram service inside the parking garages at the airport.

Prepared By: Elizabeth N. Owens