



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

Board of County Commissioners Meeting

October 22, 2013
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

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
4A 131994	ORDINANCE RELATING TO ZONING REGULATIONS; AMENDING STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS; AMENDING SECTION 33-310.1 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 33-310.1 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), amending standards for certain administrative modifications relating to Zoning Regulations.</p> <p>Currently, under Section 33-310.1 of the Code, Administrative Modification or Elimination of Conditions and Restrictive Covenants, the Director is authorized to consider and approve applications to modify or eliminate a condition or part thereof, or a restrictive covenant or part thereof, where it is demonstrated that the proposed modification or elimination will result in substantial compliance with the previous zoning action regarding a site plan, as demonstrated in the Code including that the design has not materially changed, in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elevations and renderings of buildings have substantially similar architectural expressions as those shown on the approved plans. <p>The proposed ordinance provides an exception, amending Section 33-310.1 of the Code, Administrative Modification or Elimination of Conditions and Restrictive Covenants the Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elevations and renderings of buildings have substantially similar architectural expressions as those shown on the approved plans, <i>except that single use outparcel buildings fronting on section line, half-section line, or quarter-section line roads in business zoning districts shall not be subject to this requirement.</i> <p>Additional Information</p> <p>According to the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources, if the single use outparcel buildings were shown on a previously approved site plan with detailed elevations and renderings, they now have to be substantially similar in order to go through the “Substantial Compliance with Previous Approval” process (approved administratively). Currently, if they are not deemed substantially similar, they would be required to go back to CZAB for approval.</p> <p>With the proposed amendment, a single use outparcel building will be exempt from that requirement if their elevations and renderings change from the previously approved plan. Through the amendment, the applicant will not have to go back to CZAB for approval if the elevations and renderings are not deemed substantially similar to the architectural expressions shown on the previously approved plan, it can be done administratively.</p> <p>The proposed amendment is to allow changes to single use outparcel buildings that were submitted with detailed elevation and rendering plans that now may not fit the needs of an end user. This will make it easier for an applicant to change building elevations and renderings without the need for a public hearing. This will only apply to previously approved plans that detailed elevations and renderings during the public hearing process.</p> <p>Generally, substantial compliance is less expensive than a public hearing.</p>
4B 131965	ORDINANCE RELATING TO ADMINISTRATION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS; AMENDING CHAPTER 2 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, TO PERMIT THE MAYOR OR MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO CHANGE THE NATIONAL OBJECTIVE UPON DETERMINATION THAT THE PROJECT HAS MET ANOTHER NATIONAL OBJECTIVE; AND PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Chapter 2, Section 2-10.5 of the Code of Miami Dade County, Florida, to add a new subsection (g) relating to Administrative guidelines for community development block grant funds. This will permit the Mayor or Mayor’s designee to change the national objective upon determination that the project has met another national objective.</p> <p><i>(g) The Mayor or Mayor's designee may change the national objective on CDBG-funded projects and amend contracts accordingly, including revising job creation requirements, upon a determination by the Mayor or Mayor's designee that the project has met another national objective. This authorization applies retroactively to existing, executed contracts for CDBG funds and future CDBG contracts executed after the adoption date of this ordinance and is intended to expedite the appropriate spending of CDBG dollars in order to meet the 1.5 spending ratio required by the U.S. HUD and to allow the County and the agencies it funds the flexibility to meet alternative national objectives. The Mayor or Mayor's designee is directed to report to the Board on a quarterly basis all administrative changes of the CDBG national objective.</i></p>
4C 131975	ORDINANCE RELATING TO TRAFFIC INTERSECTION SAFETY AND RED LIGHT VIOLATIONS; AMENDING SECTION 30-422 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING A LOCAL HEARING PROCESS FOR RED LIGHT CAMERA VIOLATIONS; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance relating to Traffic Intersection Safety and Red Light Violations, amends Section 30-422 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), providing a local hearing process for red light camera violations.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance adds the following language to Section 30-422 of the Code, Traffic Intersection Safety and Traffic Infraction Detectors, Notice and Appeals:</p> <p><i>Pursuant to Chapter 2013-160, Laws of Florida, the Board elects to use and hereby designates its currently appointed code enforcement hearing officers under Chapter 8CC of the Code of Miami-Dade County, Florida, to serve as local hearing officers, as that term is defined in section 316.0083(91), Florida Statutes, as such may be amended from time to time, for purposes of conducting hearings by alleged violators wishing to contest a notice of violation received for a red light camera violation. A person may request such a hearing within 60 days of the notice of violation. No payment or fee shall be required in advance to receive such a hearing, but if a person is found to</i></p>

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><i>have committed the violation at the hearing, he or she shall be required to pay \$150 in hearing costs in addition to the penalty imposed by law.</i></p> <p>Currently, Florida Statutes Section 316.003(91) defines Local Hearing Officer as the person, designated by a department, county, or municipality that elects to authorize traffic infraction enforcement officers to issue traffic citations under s. 316.0083(1)(a), who is authorized to conduct hearings related to a notice of violation issued pursuant to s. 316.0083. The charter county, noncharter county, or municipality may use its currently appointed code enforcement board or special magistrate to serve as the local hearing officer. The department may enter into an interlocal agreement to use the local hearing officer of a county or municipality.</p> <p>Background and Relevant Information</p> <p>In 2003, Mark Wandall, a young husband and father tragically lost his life in an auto accident when he was broadsided by a driver who ran a red light. His widow, Melissa Wandall, spearheaded the campaign for the installation of red light cameras at intersections in Florida to curb the behavior of red light running.</p> <p>During the 2010 state legislative session, the Florida Legislature enacted Chapter 2010-80, Laws of Florida (HB 325), the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act (316.0083 F.S.), authorizing counties and municipalities to use cameras for red light enforcement.</p> <p>Florida Statute 316.0083 provides for a \$158 fine levied on violators who fail to stop at a traffic signal as required by ss. 316.074(1) or 316.075(1)(c)1., F.S. When the \$158 fine is the result of a local government's traffic infraction detector, \$75 is retained by the local government and \$83 is deposited with the Florida Department of Revenue (DOR). The DOR subsequently distributes the fines by depositing \$70 in the State General Revenue Fund, \$10 in the Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund, and \$3 in the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Trust Fund.</p> <p>If a law enforcement officer cites a motorist for the same offense, the fine is still \$158, but the revenue is distributed from the local clerk of court to DOR, where \$30 is distributed to the General Revenue Fund, \$65 is distributed to the Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund, and \$3 is distributed to the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Trust Fund. The remaining \$60 is distributed in small percentages to a number of funds pursuant to s. 318.21, F.S.</p> <p>On July 8, 2010, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) adopted Resolution No. 759-10, which authorized the installation of red light cameras at high crash, high volume intersections and directed the Mayor or designee to implement a red light camera program in Miami-Dade County. Subsequently, on January 20, 2011, under Ordinance No. 11-01, the BCC authorized the use and regulation of red light cameras in the unincorporated area of Miami-Dade County consistent with the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act. Ordinance No. 11-01 also prohibited the use of red light cameras for enforcement of right turns on red. Currently, the Administration is in the process of procuring a red light camera vendor and implementing a red light camera program, but no red light cameras have been installed as of yet by Miami-Dade County.</p> <p>During the 2013 state legislative session, HB 4011 was introduced, repealing the authority for cities and counties to have red light camera programs. Subsequently, on May 3, 2013, HB 4011 died in committee.</p> <p>During the 2013 state legislative session, the Florida Legislature enacted Chapter 2013-160, Laws of Florida (HB 7125), which amended the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Act to provide counties and municipalities the option of providing a local hearing process at the notice of violation stage related to red light camera violations. In addition, Chapter 2013-160 provides that no payment or fee is required prior to the hearing, and authorizes a county or municipality to recover hearing costs not to exceed \$250 if the person is found to have committed the red light camera violation.</p> <p>Prior to the passage of Chapter 2013-160, a person receiving a red light camera violation did not have a right to request a hearing based on the \$158 notice of violation, and instead had to wait for the violation to become a uniform traffic citation which carried a fine of \$256 or more and possible points on a person's driving record.</p> <p>Pursuant to Chapter 2013-160, the proposed ordinance establishes a local hearing process for red light camera violations so that people who receive a red light camera notice of violation can request a hearing without the added expense of the violation becoming a uniform traffic citation and risking possible points on a person's driving record.</p> <p>Additional Information</p> <p><u>Revenue Collected by the State of Florida Department of Revenue</u></p> <p>According to the Florida DOR, counties and municipalities remit the collection of funds provided in Chapter 2010-80 to the DOR weekly. There was a spike in the utilization of Red Light Cameras from 44 jurisdictions in FY 2010-11 to 71 jurisdictions in FY 2011-12; and in FY 2012-13, the number of jurisdictions utilizing Red Light Cameras increased to 77.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For FY 2010-11, the State collected a grand total of \$19,774,851; and the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Trust Fund collected \$728,276. • For FY 2011-12, the State collected a grand total of \$51,065,842; and the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Trust Fund collected \$1,851,361. • For FY 2012-13, the State collected a grand total of \$62,454,920; and the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Trust Fund collected \$2,257,262. <p><u>Collection and Disbursement of Red Light Camera Proceeds</u></p> <p>According to the Miami-Dade County Clerk of Courts, from October 2011 to September 2012 a total of \$3,495,398 was collected by the</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																		
	<p>Miami Dade County Court System for Red Light Camera violations and/or citations and distributed to municipalities with Red Light Camera Programs.</p> <p>Additionally, for the period of October 2012 to September 2013 a total of \$4,652,129 was collected by the Miami Dade County Court System for Red Light Camera violations and/or citations and distributed to municipalities with Red Light Camera Programs.</p>																		
4D 132000	<p>ORDINANCE RELATING TO FOR-HIRE LIMOUSINES; AMENDING CHAPTER 31, ARTICLE VI OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF PRE-ARRANGED LIMOUSINE TRANSPORTATION; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</p>																		
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance, relating to for-hire limousines, amends Chapter 31, Article VI of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), relating to the definition of pre-arranged limousine transportation.</p> <p><i>Provided below is a comparison of the current limousine regulations and the proposed amendments.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" style="background-color: #d9ead3; text-align: center;">Comparison of Current Limousine Regulations and Proposed Amendments <i>Miami-Dade County Code Chapter 31, Article VI.</i></th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Section of Code</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Current Code</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i></th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Notes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>Sec. 31-601(bb)</p> <p><i>Definition for Pre-arranged or Pre-arrange.</i></p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>Pre-arranged or pre-arrange means a written or telephone reservation made at least one hour in advance by the person requesting service at the place of business of the for-hire license holder for the provision of limousine service for a specified period of time.</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>Pre-arranged or pre-arrange means a written, electronic or telephone reservation made in advance by the person requesting service through the place of business of the for-hire license holder for the provision of limousine service for a specified period of time.</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p><i>Amends the definition of pre-arranged or pre-arrange to include electronic reservations.</i></p> <p><i>Specifies that the service has to be requested through the place of business of the for-hire license holder.</i></p> <p><i>Removes the requirement that the reservation be made at least one hour in advance.</i></p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>Sec. 31-602(b)</p> <p><i>For-Hire Limousine Licenses – Out of County Origin Exception.</i></p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>Nothing in this article shall be construed to prohibit discharge within Miami-Dade County of any passenger lawfully picked up in another County and lawfully transported into Miami-Dade County. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, (1) Any passenger lawfully picked up in another county, transported to, and discharged at any location within Miami-Dade County, may be picked up at the discharge location and returned to the county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged, round-trip fare pursuant to a written contract, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the passenger is picked up has adopted a similar provision; and (2) A limousine from another county may pick up a passenger at either the Miami International Airport (MIA) or the Miami-Dade Seaport (Seaport) and transport said passenger directly to the limousine's county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged one-way continuous fare pursuant to a written contract, the passenger arrived at either the MIA or the Seaport, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>Nothing in this article shall be construed to prohibit discharge within Miami-Dade County of any passenger lawfully picked up in another County and lawfully transported into Miami-Dade County. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, (1) Any passenger lawfully picked up in another county, transported to, and discharged at any location within Miami-Dade County, may be picked up at the discharge location and returned to the county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged, round-trip fare pursuant to a written contract, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the passenger is picked up has adopted a similar provision; and (2) A limousine from another county may pick up a passenger at either the Miami International Airport (MIA) or the Miami-Dade Seaport (Seaport) and transport said passenger directly to the limousine's county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged one-way continuous fare pursuant to a written contract, the passenger arrived at either the MIA or the Seaport, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the passenger is picked up has adopted a similar provision. Pre-arranged means a written, electronic or</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p><i>Amends this section of the Code to provide that pre-arranged also means electronic reservations.</i></p> <p><i>Specifies that the service has to be requested through the place of business of the for-hire license holder.</i></p> <p><i>Removes the requirement that the reservation be made at least one hour in advance.</i></p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Comparison of Current Limousine Regulations and Proposed Amendments <i>Miami-Dade County Code Chapter 31, Article VI.</i>				Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i>	Notes	<p>Sec. 31-601(bb)</p> <p><i>Definition for Pre-arranged or Pre-arrange.</i></p>	<p>Pre-arranged or pre-arrange means a written or telephone reservation made at least one hour in advance by the person requesting service at the place of business of the for-hire license holder for the provision of limousine service for a specified period of time.</p>	<p>Pre-arranged or pre-arrange means a written, electronic or telephone reservation made in advance by the person requesting service through the place of business of the for-hire license holder for the provision of limousine service for a specified period of time.</p>	<p><i>Amends the definition of pre-arranged or pre-arrange to include electronic reservations.</i></p> <p><i>Specifies that the service has to be requested through the place of business of the for-hire license holder.</i></p> <p><i>Removes the requirement that the reservation be made at least one hour in advance.</i></p>	<p>Sec. 31-602(b)</p> <p><i>For-Hire Limousine Licenses – Out of County Origin Exception.</i></p>	<p>Nothing in this article shall be construed to prohibit discharge within Miami-Dade County of any passenger lawfully picked up in another County and lawfully transported into Miami-Dade County. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, (1) Any passenger lawfully picked up in another county, transported to, and discharged at any location within Miami-Dade County, may be picked up at the discharge location and returned to the county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged, round-trip fare pursuant to a written contract, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the passenger is picked up has adopted a similar provision; and (2) A limousine from another county may pick up a passenger at either the Miami International Airport (MIA) or the Miami-Dade Seaport (Seaport) and transport said passenger directly to the limousine's county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged one-way continuous fare pursuant to a written contract, the passenger arrived at either the MIA or the Seaport, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the</p>	<p>Nothing in this article shall be construed to prohibit discharge within Miami-Dade County of any passenger lawfully picked up in another County and lawfully transported into Miami-Dade County. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, (1) Any passenger lawfully picked up in another county, transported to, and discharged at any location within Miami-Dade County, may be picked up at the discharge location and returned to the county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged, round-trip fare pursuant to a written contract, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the passenger is picked up has adopted a similar provision; and (2) A limousine from another county may pick up a passenger at either the Miami International Airport (MIA) or the Miami-Dade Seaport (Seaport) and transport said passenger directly to the limousine's county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged one-way continuous fare pursuant to a written contract, the passenger arrived at either the MIA or the Seaport, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the passenger is picked up has adopted a similar provision. Pre-arranged means a written, electronic or</p>	<p><i>Amends this section of the Code to provide that pre-arranged also means electronic reservations.</i></p> <p><i>Specifies that the service has to be requested through the place of business of the for-hire license holder.</i></p> <p><i>Removes the requirement that the reservation be made at least one hour in advance.</i></p>
Comparison of Current Limousine Regulations and Proposed Amendments <i>Miami-Dade County Code Chapter 31, Article VI.</i>																			
Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i>	Notes																
<p>Sec. 31-601(bb)</p> <p><i>Definition for Pre-arranged or Pre-arrange.</i></p>	<p>Pre-arranged or pre-arrange means a written or telephone reservation made at least one hour in advance by the person requesting service at the place of business of the for-hire license holder for the provision of limousine service for a specified period of time.</p>	<p>Pre-arranged or pre-arrange means a written, electronic or telephone reservation made in advance by the person requesting service through the place of business of the for-hire license holder for the provision of limousine service for a specified period of time.</p>	<p><i>Amends the definition of pre-arranged or pre-arrange to include electronic reservations.</i></p> <p><i>Specifies that the service has to be requested through the place of business of the for-hire license holder.</i></p> <p><i>Removes the requirement that the reservation be made at least one hour in advance.</i></p>																
<p>Sec. 31-602(b)</p> <p><i>For-Hire Limousine Licenses – Out of County Origin Exception.</i></p>	<p>Nothing in this article shall be construed to prohibit discharge within Miami-Dade County of any passenger lawfully picked up in another County and lawfully transported into Miami-Dade County. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, (1) Any passenger lawfully picked up in another county, transported to, and discharged at any location within Miami-Dade County, may be picked up at the discharge location and returned to the county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged, round-trip fare pursuant to a written contract, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the passenger is picked up has adopted a similar provision; and (2) A limousine from another county may pick up a passenger at either the Miami International Airport (MIA) or the Miami-Dade Seaport (Seaport) and transport said passenger directly to the limousine's county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged one-way continuous fare pursuant to a written contract, the passenger arrived at either the MIA or the Seaport, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the</p>	<p>Nothing in this article shall be construed to prohibit discharge within Miami-Dade County of any passenger lawfully picked up in another County and lawfully transported into Miami-Dade County. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, (1) Any passenger lawfully picked up in another county, transported to, and discharged at any location within Miami-Dade County, may be picked up at the discharge location and returned to the county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged, round-trip fare pursuant to a written contract, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the passenger is picked up has adopted a similar provision; and (2) A limousine from another county may pick up a passenger at either the Miami International Airport (MIA) or the Miami-Dade Seaport (Seaport) and transport said passenger directly to the limousine's county of origin as long as the transportation is part of a pre-arranged one-way continuous fare pursuant to a written contract, the passenger arrived at either the MIA or the Seaport, the limousine has complied with all of the regulatory requirements of the other county and the county where the passenger is picked up has adopted a similar provision. Pre-arranged means a written, electronic or</p>	<p><i>Amends this section of the Code to provide that pre-arranged also means electronic reservations.</i></p> <p><i>Specifies that the service has to be requested through the place of business of the for-hire license holder.</i></p> <p><i>Removes the requirement that the reservation be made at least one hour in advance.</i></p>																

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes			
		passenger is picked up has adopted a similar provision. Pre-arranged means a written or telephone reservation made at least one hour in advance by the person requesting service at the place of business of the for-hire license holder for the provision of limousine service for a specified period of time. Any limousine that picks up or discharges passengers at either the MIA or the Seaport shall meet the MIA and the Seaport limousine requirements. A copy of the contract shall be in the possession of the chauffeur at all times and shall be made available to enforcement personnel upon request.	telephone reservation made in advance by the person requesting service through the place of business of the for-hire license holder for the provision of limousine service for a specified period of time. Any limousine that picks up or discharges passengers at either the MIA or the Seaport shall meet the MIA and the Seaport limousine requirements. A copy of the contract shall be in the possession of the chauffeur at all times and shall be made available to enforcement personnel upon request.	
	Sec. 31-602(k) For-Hire Limousine Licenses – Rule of Operation.	For-hire license holders shall abide by all rules and regulations applicable to for-hire license holders and shall be subject to the enforcement provisions contained in this chapter and chapter 8CC of the Miami-Dade County Code. A for-hire license holder shall comply with the following regulations: * * * (22) Not allow a driver to solicit or pick up passengers other than by prearrangement through a person located at the limousine license holder's place of business;	For-hire license holders shall abide by all rules and regulations applicable to for-hire license holders and shall be subject to the enforcement provisions contained in this chapter and chapter 8CC of the Miami-Dade County Code. A for-hire license holder shall comply with the following regulations: * * * (22) Not allow a driver to solicit or pick up passengers other than by prearrangement.	<i>Removes language under subsection (22), referring to prearrangement through a person located at the limousine license holder's place of business.</i>
4E 132003	ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO FIRST SOURCE HIRING REFERRAL PROGRAM; AMENDING CHAPTER 2-2113 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA TO EXPAND THE PROGRAM TO ALL COUNTY CONTRACTS; AMENDING IMPLEMENTING ORDER NO 3-58; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE			
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Chapter 2-2113 of the Code of Miami-Dade County and Implementing Order No. 3-58, pertaining to First Source Hiring Referral Program, to expand the program to all County contracts. Currently, the program pertains to the purchase of goods and services.</p> <p>Additional Information On May 1, 2012, the BCC adopted Ordinance No. 12-32, establishing the First Source Hiring Referral Program and providing for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The South Florida Workforce Investment Board will be the "Referral Agency" and will compile and maintain a First Source Register which will be a listing of unemployed persons, including graduates funded by the Workforce Investment Act to be made available to Contractors as a first source for employment needs. • The Referral Agency will be the first source for employees to fill jobs created to satisfy the requirements of County Contracts. • Includes provisions for referral procedure, monitoring/compliance, implementation and sanctions for violations. Ensures county residents would be hired to work in County contracts. • The ordinance is to sunset in two (2) years from the effective date unless extended by the BCC. <p>South Florida Workforce Investment Board (SFWIB) First Source Hiring Referral Program According to the SFWIB website, the First Source Ordinance is a job creation and economic development model that will enable SFWIB and partner agencies to assist Miami-Dade County residents to find employment. This initiative seeks to ensure Miami-Dade County residents have the first opportunity for employment consideration from businesses, who receive a contract with Miami-Dade County (MDC).</p> <p>The ordinance outlines that prior to filling each vacancy under a County contract; the successful Bidder must first notify SFWIB of all job openings and list the vacancy via the FSHRP web portal. The listing will contain, at a minimum, a detailed description of the job responsibilities, qualifications, and wage rate. The listing must be posted during the referral period.</p> <p>Residents interested in posting an application for employment to be considered by Businesses/Contractors with job opportunities may complete a FSHRP on-line application. Applications of qualified candidates will be forwarded to business with job opportunities.</p>			
4F 132001	ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 2, ARTICLE I, SECTION 2-11.17 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY FLORIDA; ESTABLISHING RESIDENTS FIRST TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM TO EXPAND SKILLS TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR COUNTY RESIDENTS ON BUILDINGS OR PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS FUNDED COMPLETELY OR PARTIALLY BY MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, OR PRIVATELY FUNDED PROJECTS ON COUNTY OWNED LAND; REQUIRING GREATER ACCOUNTABILITY OF PUBLIC CONTRACTORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS REGARDING EFFORTS TO PROMOTE LOCAL HIRING AND TRAINING; AND PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE			
Notes	The proposed ordinance amends Section 2-11.16 of the Code of Miami-Dade County establishing Residents First Training and Employment Program to expand skills training and employment opportunities for County residents.			

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																										
	<p>The provisions of the proposed ordinance will apply to Capital Construction Contracts entered into or assisted by the County, its departments and agencies, including the Public Works and Water Departments.</p> <p>Capital Construction Contract is defined as a County contract valued in excess of \$1,000,000 for the construction, demolition, alteration and/or repair of public buildings or public works or a contract or lease valued in excess of \$1,000,000 entered into after the effective date of this ordinance which provides for privately funded construction, demolition, alteration or repair of buildings or improvements located on County-owned land.</p>																										
4G 131673	<p>ORDINANCE RELATING TO VEHICLES FOR HIRE; AMENDING CHAPTER 31, ARTICLES II AND V OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, REGULATING FOR -HIRE VEHICLES; AMENDING DEFINITIONS OF FARES OR RATES AND RATE CARD; PROVIDING FOR DEFINITION OF VIOLATION; AMENDING PROVISIONS RELATING TO RATE REGULATION; PROHIBITING THE ADDITION OF ANY SURCHARGE, FEE, CONVENIENCE FEE OR ANY OTHER COMPENSATION FOR THE USE OF A CREDIT CARD OR DEBIT CARD WITHOUT APPROVAL BY THE COUNTY COMMISSION; INCREASING PENALTIES WHERE CHAUFFEUR COLLECTS, REQUIRES, CHARGES, DEMANDS, REQUESTS OR ACCEPTS FARES OR COMPENSATION OTHER THAN ESTABLISHED FARES OR RATES; AMENDING PROVISIONS RELATING TO TAXIMETERS AND CREDIT CARD PROCESSING SYSTEMS; PROHIBITING OPERATOR OR CHAUFFEUR FROM OPERATING A CREDIT CARD PROCESSING SYSTEM THAT HAS NOT BEEN INSPECTED AND CERTIFIED; PROHIBITING OPERATOR OR CHAUFFEUR FROM OPERATING A TAXICAB WHERE THE TAXIMETER OR CREDIT CARD PROCESSING SYSTEM DOES NOT ACCURATELY DISPLAY APPROVED RATES AND FARES; AMENDING CHAPTER 8CC OF THE CODE TO PROVIDE FOR PENALTIES; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</p>																										
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance, relating to vehicles for hire, amends Chapter 31, Articles II and V of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), Regulating For-Hire Vehicles.</p> <p>Provided below is a comparison of the current taxicab regulations and the proposed amendments.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" style="background-color: #d9ead3; text-align: center;">Comparison of Current Taxicab Regulations and Proposed Amendments <i>Miami-Dade County Code Chapter 31, Article II.</i></th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Section of Code</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Current Code</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i></th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Notes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><i>Definition for Fares or Rates</i></td> <td>Sec. 31-81(o) <i>Fares or rates</i> means the charges established pursuant to this article to be paid by passengers for the transportation services provided by a for-hire passenger motor vehicle.</td> <td>Fares or rates means the charges, rates, surcharges, fees, convenience fees, fares or any other compensation established pursuant to this article to be paid by passengers for or related to the transportation services provided by a for-hire passenger motor vehicle. Fares or rates include any charge, rate, surcharge, convenience fee, fare or other compensation for the use of a credit or debit card.</td> <td><i>Expands the definition of fares or rates to include any charge, rate, surcharge, convenience fee, fare or other compensation for the use of a credit or debit card.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><i>Definition for Rate Card</i></td> <td>Sec. 31-81(II) <i>Rate card</i> means a card, issued by the CSD, which displays for-hire rates and such other data as the CSD may prescribe.</td> <td>Rate card means a card, issued by the CSD, which displays approved for-hire rates and fares and such other data as the CSD may prescribe</td> <td><i>Amends definition of rate card.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><i>Definition for Violation</i></td> <td>Sec. 31-81(zz) <i>N/A</i></td> <td>Violation means: (i) having been found guilty of a citation issued pursuant to Chapter 31 or 8CC of the Code by an administrative hearing officer or judicial officer; or (ii) failing to pay or appeal a citation issued pursuant to Chapter 31 or 8CC of the Code within the established time; or (iii) paying the fine for a citation issued pursuant to Chapter 31 or 8CC of the Code.</td> <td><i>Provides a definition of violation.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><i>Taximeters</i></td> <td>Sec. 31-86(a) Taximeters. (a) Each taxicab shall be equipped with a taximeter meeting the requirements described in this article. All customer receipts, whether handwritten or generated by a taximeter, shall contain the fare charged, the name and telephone number of the passenger service company, the operating permit number and the telephone number for filing complaints with the CSD. It shall be a violation of this article for any operator or chauffeur to</td> <td>Taximeters and Credit Card Processing Systems. (a) Each taxicab shall be equipped with a taximeter meeting the requirements described in this article. All customer receipts, whether handwritten or generated by a taximeter or a credit card processing system, shall contain the fare charged, the name and telephone number of the passenger service company, the operating permit number and the telephone number for filing complaints with the CSD. It shall be a violation of this article for any operator or chauffeur to operate any taxicab unless and until its taximeter and credit card processing</td> <td><i>Amends provisions relating to taximeters and credit card processing systems.</i> <i>Provides violation for any operator or chauffeur to operate a credit card processing system that has not been inspected and certified.</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Comparison of Current Taxicab Regulations and Proposed Amendments <i>Miami-Dade County Code Chapter 31, Article II.</i>				Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i>	Notes	<i>Definition for Fares or Rates</i>	Sec. 31-81(o) <i>Fares or rates</i> means the charges established pursuant to this article to be paid by passengers for the transportation services provided by a for-hire passenger motor vehicle.	Fares or rates means the charges, rates, surcharges, fees, convenience fees, fares or any other compensation established pursuant to this article to be paid by passengers for or related to the transportation services provided by a for-hire passenger motor vehicle. Fares or rates include any charge, rate, surcharge, convenience fee, fare or other compensation for the use of a credit or debit card.	<i>Expands the definition of fares or rates to include any charge, rate, surcharge, convenience fee, fare or other compensation for the use of a credit or debit card.</i>	<i>Definition for Rate Card</i>	Sec. 31-81(II) <i>Rate card</i> means a card, issued by the CSD, which displays for-hire rates and such other data as the CSD may prescribe.	Rate card means a card, issued by the CSD, which displays approved for-hire rates and fares and such other data as the CSD may prescribe	<i>Amends definition of rate card.</i>	<i>Definition for Violation</i>	Sec. 31-81(zz) <i>N/A</i>	Violation means: (i) having been found guilty of a citation issued pursuant to Chapter 31 or 8CC of the Code by an administrative hearing officer or judicial officer; or (ii) failing to pay or appeal a citation issued pursuant to Chapter 31 or 8CC of the Code within the established time; or (iii) paying the fine for a citation issued pursuant to Chapter 31 or 8CC of the Code.	<i>Provides a definition of violation.</i>	<i>Taximeters</i>	Sec. 31-86(a) Taximeters. (a) Each taxicab shall be equipped with a taximeter meeting the requirements described in this article. All customer receipts, whether handwritten or generated by a taximeter, shall contain the fare charged, the name and telephone number of the passenger service company, the operating permit number and the telephone number for filing complaints with the CSD. It shall be a violation of this article for any operator or chauffeur to	Taximeters and Credit Card Processing Systems. (a) Each taxicab shall be equipped with a taximeter meeting the requirements described in this article. All customer receipts, whether handwritten or generated by a taximeter or a credit card processing system , shall contain the fare charged, the name and telephone number of the passenger service company, the operating permit number and the telephone number for filing complaints with the CSD. It shall be a violation of this article for any operator or chauffeur to operate any taxicab unless and until its taximeter and credit card processing	<i>Amends provisions relating to taximeters and credit card processing systems.</i> <i>Provides violation for any operator or chauffeur to operate a credit card processing system that has not been inspected and certified.</i>
Comparison of Current Taxicab Regulations and Proposed Amendments <i>Miami-Dade County Code Chapter 31, Article II.</i>																											
Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i>	Notes																								
<i>Definition for Fares or Rates</i>	Sec. 31-81(o) <i>Fares or rates</i> means the charges established pursuant to this article to be paid by passengers for the transportation services provided by a for-hire passenger motor vehicle.	Fares or rates means the charges, rates, surcharges, fees, convenience fees, fares or any other compensation established pursuant to this article to be paid by passengers for or related to the transportation services provided by a for-hire passenger motor vehicle. Fares or rates include any charge, rate, surcharge, convenience fee, fare or other compensation for the use of a credit or debit card.	<i>Expands the definition of fares or rates to include any charge, rate, surcharge, convenience fee, fare or other compensation for the use of a credit or debit card.</i>																								
<i>Definition for Rate Card</i>	Sec. 31-81(II) <i>Rate card</i> means a card, issued by the CSD, which displays for-hire rates and such other data as the CSD may prescribe.	Rate card means a card, issued by the CSD, which displays approved for-hire rates and fares and such other data as the CSD may prescribe	<i>Amends definition of rate card.</i>																								
<i>Definition for Violation</i>	Sec. 31-81(zz) <i>N/A</i>	Violation means: (i) having been found guilty of a citation issued pursuant to Chapter 31 or 8CC of the Code by an administrative hearing officer or judicial officer; or (ii) failing to pay or appeal a citation issued pursuant to Chapter 31 or 8CC of the Code within the established time; or (iii) paying the fine for a citation issued pursuant to Chapter 31 or 8CC of the Code.	<i>Provides a definition of violation.</i>																								
<i>Taximeters</i>	Sec. 31-86(a) Taximeters. (a) Each taxicab shall be equipped with a taximeter meeting the requirements described in this article. All customer receipts, whether handwritten or generated by a taximeter, shall contain the fare charged, the name and telephone number of the passenger service company, the operating permit number and the telephone number for filing complaints with the CSD. It shall be a violation of this article for any operator or chauffeur to	Taximeters and Credit Card Processing Systems. (a) Each taxicab shall be equipped with a taximeter meeting the requirements described in this article. All customer receipts, whether handwritten or generated by a taximeter or a credit card processing system , shall contain the fare charged, the name and telephone number of the passenger service company, the operating permit number and the telephone number for filing complaints with the CSD. It shall be a violation of this article for any operator or chauffeur to operate any taxicab unless and until its taximeter and credit card processing	<i>Amends provisions relating to taximeters and credit card processing systems.</i> <i>Provides violation for any operator or chauffeur to operate a credit card processing system that has not been inspected and certified.</i>																								

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																	
		<p>permit or chauffeur's registration may be suspended for a period of up to six (6) months or revoked. Provided however, if a person commits three (3) violations of Section 31-82(j)(12) or 31-303(i)(4) or any combination thereof during any twelve-month period, such person's for-hire license, operating permit or chauffeur's registration may be suspended for a period of up to six (6) months or revoked. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, if a person commits two (2) violations of Section 31-303(i)(23), such person's chauffeur's registration may be suspended for a period of up to six (6) months or revoked.</p>		<p>period, such person's for-hire license, operating permit or chauffeur's registration may be suspended for a period of up to six (6) months or revoked. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, if a person commits two (2) violations of Section 31-303(i)(23), such person's chauffeur's registration may be suspended for a period of up to six (6) months or revoked. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary: (i) if a person commits one (1) violation of Section 31-303(i)(7), such person's chauffeur's registration shall automatically be suspended for a period of thirty (30) days; (ii) if a person commits a second violation of Section 31-303(i)(7), such person's chauffeur registration shall automatically be suspended for a period of sixty (60) days; and (iii) if a person commits a third violation of Section 31-303(i)(7), such person's chauffeur's registration shall be automatically and permanently revoked, and such person shall not be eligible for a chauffeur's registration in the future.</p>														
	<p>Sec. 31-303(i)(7)</p> <p>Chauffeur's Registration; All Types</p>	<p>No chauffeur shall collect fares or compensation for transportation services other than the established rates or charges for the type of service being provided, nor may any driver collect any additional payment for transporting any baggage which accompanies the passenger, provided, however, that this provision shall not apply to gratuities.</p>		<p>No chauffeur shall collect, require, charge, demand, request or accept fares or compensation for transportation services or related services other than the established rates or fares for the type of service being provided, nor may any driver collect, require, charge, demand, request or accept any additional payment including any surcharge, fee, convenience fee, fare or any other form of compensation for the use of a credit or debit card, unless approved by the County Commission, or for transporting any baggage which accompanies the passenger, provided, however, that this provision shall not apply to gratuities.</p>		<p><i>Prohibits the addition of any surcharge, fee, convenience fee or any other compensation for the use of a credit card or debit card without approval by the County Commission.</i></p>												
	<p>Sec. 8CC-10</p> <p>Schedule of Civil Penalties</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Code Section</u></th> <th><u>Description of Violation</u></th> <th><u>Civil Penalty</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>31-86(a)</td> <td>Failure to operate with a taximeter meeting requirements of the Code</td> <td>\$200.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Code Section</u>	<u>Description of Violation</u>	<u>Civil Penalty</u>	31-86(a)	Failure to operate with a taximeter meeting requirements of the Code	\$200.00		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Code Section</u></th> <th><u>Description of Violation</u></th> <th><u>Civil Penalty</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>31-86(a)</td> <td>Failure to operate with a taximeter or a credit card processing system meeting requirements of the Code</td> <td>\$200.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Code Section</u>	<u>Description of Violation</u>	<u>Civil Penalty</u>	31-86(a)	Failure to operate with a taximeter or a credit card processing system meeting requirements of the Code	\$200.00		<p><i>Amends Chapter 8CC of the Code to provide for penalties.</i></p>
<u>Code Section</u>	<u>Description of Violation</u>	<u>Civil Penalty</u>																
31-86(a)	Failure to operate with a taximeter meeting requirements of the Code	\$200.00																
<u>Code Section</u>	<u>Description of Violation</u>	<u>Civil Penalty</u>																
31-86(a)	Failure to operate with a taximeter or a credit card processing system meeting requirements of the Code	\$200.00																
	<p><u>Taxicab Advisory Group</u> Pursuant to the directive in Resolution No. 599-12, the Mayor provided the following information, pertaining to this item, in a memo dated September 19, 2013: <i>On September 10, 2013, a special meeting of the Taxicab Advisory Group (TAG) was convened. TAG members as well as audience participants discussed the proposed ordinance. TAG proffered a motion in support of the proposed ordinance in its entirety. The TAG vote carried 8-0. TAG's official meeting minutes will not be approved until their next scheduled quarterly meeting.</i></p>																	
4H 131945	<p>ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO ZONING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT; PROHIBITING CLOTH FENCES AND REGULATING THE APPEARANCE AND MAINTENANCE OF BOTH WIRE FENCES AND CHAIN LINK FENCES WITH CLOTH AFFIXED TO THEM IN ALL DISTRICTS; AMENDING SECTIONS 33-11 AND 8CC-10 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</p>																	
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance pertaining to Zoning and Code Enforcement, amends Sections 33-11 and 8CC-10 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), prohibiting cloth fences and regulating the appearance and maintenance of both wire fences and chain link fences with cloth affixed to them in all districts.</p> <p><i>Provided below is a comparison of the current Zoning Code and proposed amendments.</i></p>																	
	<p>Comparison of Current Zoning Code and Proposed Amendments</p>																	

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																									
	<i>Sections 33-11 and 8CC-10 of the Code</i>																									
	<u>Section of Code</u>	<u>Current Code</u>			<u>Proposed Amendments</u> <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i>		<u>Notes</u>																			
	Sec. 31-11(b) Fences, Walls, Bus Shelters and Hedges; Exterior Finish of Walls and Fences	All walls and fences shall be maintained in good, clean and finished condition. A fence with a finished and unfinished side shall be erected so that the unfinished side and supporting members face inward toward the interior of the property. Furthermore, all fences shall have the finished side facing the neighboring property or street (outward). A continuous wall or fence that is owned by multiple property owners or held in common ownership shall be of uniform construction and materials and its exterior shall also be maintained in good, clean and finished condition for the entire length of said wall or fence. Each side of a CBS wall shall be completely finished with stucco and paint. Each side of a decorative masonry wall shall be completely painted; however, walls comprised of decorative brick and natural stone may be left unpainted provided the cement and grout are finished on both sides. If a wall is to be placed on a shared property line, consent for access must be obtained from the adjoining property owner(s) prior to finishing the opposite side of the wall. If such consent cannot be obtained, the property owner erecting the wall must present proof that a request for access approval was mailed to every adjacent property owner, by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the mailing address(es) as listed in the most current Miami-Dade County tax roll, and the mailing was returned undeliverable or the adjacent property owner(s) failed to respond to the request within thirty (30) days after receipt. Upon such a showing, the property owner erecting the wall shall not be required to finish the opposite side of the wall. The use of cloth, fabric, canvass, silt screens, mesh, or other such material shall not be utilized as a fence in a RU Zone unless otherwise required by law.			<i>Wire fences, chain link fences, barbed wire and electricity charged fences.</i> Wire fences and chain link fences shall be permitted in all districts except where otherwise prohibited by this chapter. Unless otherwise required by law, wire fences and chain link fences permitted in RU Zones shall not have the application of cloth, fabric, canvass, silt screens, mesh, or other such material without first obtaining a building permit. If cloth, fabric, canvass, silt screens, mesh, or other such material is affixed to a wire fence or chain link fence the cloth, fabric, canvass, silt screens, mesh, or other such material must be properly maintained. Failure to properly maintain the material shall be a violation of this section. Barbed wire fences and fences charged with electricity shall be permitted only in the AU Zoning District, except as may be approved after public hearing and except:		<i>Prohibits the use of cloth, fabric, canvass, silt screens, mesh, or other such material to be utilized as a fence in a Residential (RU) Zoning District.</i>																			
	Sec. 33-11(g) Fences, Walls, Bus Shelters and Hedges; Wire Fences Barbed Wire and Electricity Charged Fences	<i>Wire fences, barbed wire and electricity charged fences.</i> Wire fences shall be permitted in all districts except where otherwise prohibited by this chapter. Barbed wire fences and fences charged with electricity shall be permitted only in the AU Zoning District, except as may be approved after public hearing and except:			<i>Wire fences, chain link fences, barbed wire and electricity charged fences.</i> Wire fences and chain link fences shall be permitted in all districts except where otherwise prohibited by this chapter. Unless otherwise required by law, wire fences and chain link fences permitted in RU Zones shall not have the application of cloth, fabric, canvass, silt screens, mesh, or other such material without first obtaining a building permit. If cloth, fabric, canvass, silt screens, mesh, or other such material is affixed to a wire fence or chain link fence the cloth, fabric, canvass, silt screens, mesh, or other such material must be properly maintained. Failure to properly maintain the material shall be a violation of this section. Barbed wire fences and fences charged with electricity shall be permitted only in the AU Zoning District, except as may be approved after public hearing and except:		<i>Amends title of subsection to include chain link fences.</i> <i>Provides regulations regarding the appearance and maintenance of both wire fences and chain link fences with cloth affixed to them in all Zoning districts.</i>																			
	Sec. 8CC-10 Schedule of Civil Penalties	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><u>Code Section</u></th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><u>Description of Violation</u></th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><u>Civil Penalty</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>33-11</td> <td>Over-height fence, barbed wire fence, wall or hedge</td> <td>\$200.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>33-11</td> <td>Improperly located fence, wall, or hedge</td> <td>\$200.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Code Section</u>	<u>Description of Violation</u>	<u>Civil Penalty</u>	33-11	Over-height fence, barbed wire fence, wall or hedge	\$200.00	33-11	Improperly located fence, wall, or hedge	\$200.00	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><u>Code Section</u></th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><u>Description of Violation</u></th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><u>Civil Penalty</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>33-11</td> <td>Over-height fence, barbed wire fence, wall or hedge</td> <td>\$200.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>33-11</td> <td>Improperly located fence, wall, or hedge</td> <td>\$200.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>33-11</td> <td>Improperly maintained fence, wall or hedge</td> <td>\$200.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Code Section</u>	<u>Description of Violation</u>	<u>Civil Penalty</u>	33-11	Over-height fence, barbed wire fence, wall or hedge	\$200.00	33-11	Improperly located fence, wall, or hedge	\$200.00	33-11	Improperly maintained fence, wall or hedge	\$200.00	<i>Amends Chapter 8CC of the Code to provide for penalties for improperly maintained fence, wall or hedge.</i>	
<u>Code Section</u>	<u>Description of Violation</u>	<u>Civil Penalty</u>																								
33-11	Over-height fence, barbed wire fence, wall or hedge	\$200.00																								
33-11	Improperly located fence, wall, or hedge	\$200.00																								
<u>Code Section</u>	<u>Description of Violation</u>	<u>Civil Penalty</u>																								
33-11	Over-height fence, barbed wire fence, wall or hedge	\$200.00																								
33-11	Improperly located fence, wall, or hedge	\$200.00																								
33-11	Improperly maintained fence, wall or hedge	\$200.00																								
41 131981	ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE PROPERTY OWNER AND MERCHANT ACT; MODIFYING PROVISIONS FOR MAINTENANCE OF BUILDING SURFACES, WALLS AND FENCES; AMENDING SECTIONS 19-15.10 AND 19-15.11 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE																									
Notes	The proposed ordinance relating to the Property Owner and Merchant Act, amends Sections 19-15.10 and 19-15.11 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), modifying provisions for maintenance of building surfaces, walls and fences. <i>The Responsible Property Owner and Merchant Act relates to the maintenance of the exterior of shopping centers, strip malls, restaurants,</i>																									

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																											
	<p><i>gas stations, banks and other commercial properties, requiring that property owners and tenants maintain the exterior of the building structures, parking lots and public rights-of-ways abutting the commercial property in a safe, sanitary and litter free manner to prevent neighborhood blight and deterioration.</i></p> <p>Provided below is a comparison of the current Property Owner and Merchant Act and the proposed amendments.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" style="background-color: #d9ead3; text-align: center;">Comparison of Current Property Owner and Merchant Act and the Proposed Amendments</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="4" style="background-color: #d9ead3; text-align: center;">Section 19-15 of the Code, Maintenance of Business and Commercial Premises.</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Section of Code</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Current Code</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Proposed Amendments</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Notes</th> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;"><i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i></td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Sec. 19-15.10 Exterior Building Surfaces.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><i>Exterior walls, rooftops, and other exterior features of structures shall be maintained free of peeling paint and graffiti.</i></td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">All exterior building walls, rooftops and other structural parts including fascia, soffits and balconies shall be maintained in a manner, free of chipping, rotting, pitting, cracking, graffiti, and peeling. All exterior surfaces subject to deterioration shall be properly maintained and protected from the elements by paint or other approved protective coating or treatment applied in a workmanlike fashion. All cornices, trim, windows and window frames that are damaged, sagging or otherwise deteriorated shall be repaired or replaced and all exposed materials shall be properly maintained and protected from the elements by paint, or other protective treatment or coating applied in a workmanlike fashion.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><i>Expands the provisions for the maintenance of building surfaces.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Sec. 19-15.11 Maintenance of Masonry Walls, Fences, Landscape Buffers and Entrance Features.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><i>Masonry walls, fences, landscape buffers, and entrance features shall be maintained in accordance with County Code and zoning site plans. Masonry walls, fences and entrance features shall be maintained in working order and shall be free from structural deterioration, sagging, disrepair, or other deterioration or defects. Walls and fences shall be painted and maintained free from peeling paint and graffiti.</i></td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Masonry walls, fences, landscape buffers, and entrance features shall be maintained in accordance with County Code and zoning site plans. Masonry walls, fences and entrance features shall be maintained in working order and shall be free from structural deterioration, sagging, disrepair, or other deterioration or defects. Walls and fences shall be maintained in a manner free of chipping, pitting, cracking, rotting, graffiti or peeling. Such walls and fences shall be protected from the elements by paint or other protective treatment or coating applied in a workmanlike fashion.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><i>Modifies provisions for maintenance of walls and fences.</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Comparison of Current Property Owner and Merchant Act and the Proposed Amendments				Section 19-15 of the Code, Maintenance of Business and Commercial Premises.				Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments	Notes	<i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i>				Sec. 19-15.10 Exterior Building Surfaces.	<i>Exterior walls, rooftops, and other exterior features of structures shall be maintained free of peeling paint and graffiti.</i>	All exterior building walls, rooftops and other structural parts including fascia, soffits and balconies shall be maintained in a manner, free of chipping, rotting, pitting, cracking, graffiti, and peeling. All exterior surfaces subject to deterioration shall be properly maintained and protected from the elements by paint or other approved protective coating or treatment applied in a workmanlike fashion. All cornices, trim, windows and window frames that are damaged, sagging or otherwise deteriorated shall be repaired or replaced and all exposed materials shall be properly maintained and protected from the elements by paint, or other protective treatment or coating applied in a workmanlike fashion.	<i>Expands the provisions for the maintenance of building surfaces.</i>	Sec. 19-15.11 Maintenance of Masonry Walls, Fences, Landscape Buffers and Entrance Features.	<i>Masonry walls, fences, landscape buffers, and entrance features shall be maintained in accordance with County Code and zoning site plans. Masonry walls, fences and entrance features shall be maintained in working order and shall be free from structural deterioration, sagging, disrepair, or other deterioration or defects. Walls and fences shall be painted and maintained free from peeling paint and graffiti.</i>	Masonry walls, fences, landscape buffers, and entrance features shall be maintained in accordance with County Code and zoning site plans. Masonry walls, fences and entrance features shall be maintained in working order and shall be free from structural deterioration, sagging, disrepair, or other deterioration or defects. Walls and fences shall be maintained in a manner free of chipping, pitting, cracking, rotting, graffiti or peeling. Such walls and fences shall be protected from the elements by paint or other protective treatment or coating applied in a workmanlike fashion.	<i>Modifies provisions for maintenance of walls and fences.</i>
Comparison of Current Property Owner and Merchant Act and the Proposed Amendments																												
Section 19-15 of the Code, Maintenance of Business and Commercial Premises.																												
Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments	Notes																									
<i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i>																												
Sec. 19-15.10 Exterior Building Surfaces.	<i>Exterior walls, rooftops, and other exterior features of structures shall be maintained free of peeling paint and graffiti.</i>	All exterior building walls, rooftops and other structural parts including fascia, soffits and balconies shall be maintained in a manner, free of chipping, rotting, pitting, cracking, graffiti, and peeling. All exterior surfaces subject to deterioration shall be properly maintained and protected from the elements by paint or other approved protective coating or treatment applied in a workmanlike fashion. All cornices, trim, windows and window frames that are damaged, sagging or otherwise deteriorated shall be repaired or replaced and all exposed materials shall be properly maintained and protected from the elements by paint, or other protective treatment or coating applied in a workmanlike fashion.	<i>Expands the provisions for the maintenance of building surfaces.</i>																									
Sec. 19-15.11 Maintenance of Masonry Walls, Fences, Landscape Buffers and Entrance Features.	<i>Masonry walls, fences, landscape buffers, and entrance features shall be maintained in accordance with County Code and zoning site plans. Masonry walls, fences and entrance features shall be maintained in working order and shall be free from structural deterioration, sagging, disrepair, or other deterioration or defects. Walls and fences shall be painted and maintained free from peeling paint and graffiti.</i>	Masonry walls, fences, landscape buffers, and entrance features shall be maintained in accordance with County Code and zoning site plans. Masonry walls, fences and entrance features shall be maintained in working order and shall be free from structural deterioration, sagging, disrepair, or other deterioration or defects. Walls and fences shall be maintained in a manner free of chipping, pitting, cracking, rotting, graffiti or peeling. Such walls and fences shall be protected from the elements by paint or other protective treatment or coating applied in a workmanlike fashion.	<i>Modifies provisions for maintenance of walls and fences.</i>																									
4J 131942	ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 04-117 TO PROVIDE THAT TRAFFIC SURCHARGE SECURING OUTSTANDING COURTHOUSE BONDS SHALL MEAN SURCHARGES IMPOSED BY SECTION 11-12 OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY CODE, AS AMENDED; AND PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, EXCLUSION FROM CODE AND EFFECTIVE DATE (Finance Department)																											
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Ordinance No. 04-117 to provide that the Traffic Surcharge securing outstanding courthouse bonds will mean surcharges imposed by Section 11-12 of Miami-Dade County Code (Code), as amended.</p> <p>The Traffic Surcharge is used to fund debt service for bonds issued that support the financing of the Courthouse Center located at 175 NW 1 Avenue in District 5, and the Children’s Courthouse located at 155 NW 3 Street in District 3.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance (the 2013 Ordinance) amends Ordinance No. 04-117 (the 2004 Ordinance) to provide that the definition of Traffic Surcharge means the traffic surcharge imposed by Section 11-12 of the County Code (currently \$30.00) on certain non-criminal traffic law infractions and certain criminal violations described in Chapter 318.14 and 318.17, Florida Statutes, as amended, rather than \$15.00 as stated in the 2004 Ordinance.</p> <p>Background and Relevant Legislation</p> <p>The State Legislature at its 2004 general session enacted legislation curing certain items contained in the 2003 Legislation including enacting a provision permitting counties to impose by ordinance a \$15.00 surcharge on certain non-criminal traffic law infractions and certain criminal violations described in Sections 318 and 318.17, Florida Statutes, respectively, to fund courthouse facilities, including paying debt service on the Bonds in substitution for the authority granted in the repealed legislation to pledge certain court filing fees and charges and fines and forfeitures (Prior Pledge). The \$15.00 surcharge may not be waived by the Courts.</p> <p>On June 8, 2004, under Ordinance No. 04-117 (the 2004 Ordinance), the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) authorized the substitution of the Traffic Surcharge for the Prior Pledge and further provided for a secondary pledge of a budget and appropriate in the event the Traffic Surcharge does not provide the necessary funding to pay the principal and interest on the outstanding Bonds. Ordinance No. 04-117 created a first lien on the Traffic Surcharge in favor to the holders of the Bonds.</p>																											

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>In 2004, the Traffic Surcharge was \$15.00, and was increased from \$15.00 to \$30.00 by the State legislature in 2009. The County responded when it enacted Ordinance No. 09-72 on September 1, 2009 that amended Section 11-12 of the Code to increase the traffic surcharge to \$30.00. However, the County did not amend the definition of Traffic Surcharge in the 2004 Ordinance to account for the \$15.00 increase. No additional bonds have been issued pursuant to the Master Bond Ordinance since 2009.</p> <p>The County needs to issue additional bonds to complete the Children’s Courthouse. When preparing a series resolution pursuant to the Master Bond Ordinance and Ordinance 02-172, bond counsel discovered the inconsistency in the 2004 Ordinance, which limited the Traffic Surcharge to \$15.00 and the County Code which increased it to \$30.00. The 2013 proposed Ordinance corrects this inconsistency by revising the definition of Traffic Surcharge in the 2004 Ordinance to include the \$30.00 now imposed by the County Code as well as any future increase imposed. As a result, the Senior Lien Prior Bonds, the Junior Lien Prior Bonds and the additional Bonds to be issued to complete the Children’s Courthouse will all be secured by the Traffic Surcharge imposed by Section 11-12 of the County Code.</p>
4K 131943	<p>ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE FROM TIME TO TIME OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA RICKENBACKER CAUSEWAY REVENUE BONDS FOR PURPOSES OF FINANCING AND REFINANCING IMPROVEMENTS TO RICKENBACKER CAUSEWAY; AUTHORIZING INITIAL ISSUANCE OF BONDS IN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$34,000,000.00; PROVIDING THAT PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON BONDS SHALL BE PAYABLE SOLELY FROM PLEDGED REVENUES; ESTABLISHING CERTAIN GENERAL TERMS, SECURITY, RIGHTS OF BONDHOLDERS, COVENANTS, INTEREST RATE MODES AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF BONDS; CREATING CERTAIN FUNDS AND ACCOUNTS; PROVIDING TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR ISSUANCE OF ADDITIONAL BONDS AND REFUNDING BONDS; PROVIDING THAT CERTAIN DETAILS AND BOND FORM OF EACH SERIES OF BONDS BE DETERMINED IN SUBSEQUENT SERIES RESOLUTION OR RESOLUTIONS; AND PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY AND EFFECTIVE DATE(Finance Department)</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance (the 2013 Ordinance) authorizes the issuance from time to time of Miami-Dade County, Florida Rickenbacker Causeway Revenue Bonds for purposes of financing and refinancing improvements to the Rickenbacker Causeway (Causeway).</p> <p>The 2013 Ordinance does the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes the issuance in an amount not to exceed \$34,000,000 for an initial Miami-Dade County, Florida Rickenbacker Causeway Revenue Bond, Series 2013 (Series 2013 Bonds) for the purpose of funding the cost of certain improvements; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Series 2013 Project includes the design and construction required to rehabilitate the Bear Cut and West Bridges on the Causeway. The total estimated to be funded from Series 2013 Bond Proceeds is \$30,378,000, and the total estimated to be funded from Miami-Dade Water and Sewer is \$3,000,000. • Provides that the principal, premium, if any, and interest on the bonds will be payable solely from Pledged Revenues; • Establishes the rights of the bondholders, covenants, interest rate modes and other bond provisions; • Creates certain funds and accounts; • Provides terms and conditions for issuance of additional bonds and refunding bonds; and • Provides that certain details and bond form of each series of bonds will be determined by subsequent series resolution. <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></p> <p>Until a series resolution is approved and new money bonds are subsequently issued, the enactment of the 2013 Ordinance will have no fiscal impact on the County. The Series 2013 Bonds will only be issued pursuant to a series resolution to be approved by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), which will set the parameters for establishing the terms, maturities, maximum interest rate and other details of the proposed series of bonds.</p> <p><u>Pledged Revenues</u></p> <p>When issued, the Series 2013 Bonds will be limited obligations of Miami-Dade County secured with the Pledged Revenues, which are defined in the 2013 Ordinance as the Net Revenues of the Causeway, moneys and investments held for the credit of the Funds and Accounts as provided for in the 2013 Ordinance and any other legally available revenues pledged by the Board in a subsequent ordinance. Net Revenues of the Causeway are the excess of revenues over current expenses for any particular period, usually a fiscal year. Revenues to the Causeway primarily include vehicle tolls and concession fees. Current expenses primarily consist of maintenance, repairs and operation of the Causeway, among other things. Principal and interest payments (semi-annual) resulting from the issuance of the Series 2013 Bonds will be funded with Net Revenues.</p> <p>The Series 2013 Ordinance contains a rate covenant that requires that the County maintain sufficient net revenues in order to maintain an annual debt service coverage that is at least equal to 125 percent of a given year’s annual principal and interest payment while bonds are outstanding plus 100 percent of all required deposits to the credit of sinking and other funds including a Renewal, Replacement and Improvement fund (1/12 per month of the annual requirement) as specified annually by the Consulting Engineers. Failure to meet the rate covenant will require the County to raise tolls and concession fees on the Causeway.</p> <p>Background and Relevant Legislation</p> <p>The original Bear Cut and West Bridges on the Rickenbacker Causeway were built in 1944 and consisted of a concrete substructure, steel girders, and a concrete deck superstructure. The Bridges were widened in the mid to early 1980’s with concrete substructures, pre-stressed concrete girders and a concrete deck superstructure, and have undergone various maintenance and repair actions through the years in order to extend their life expectancy. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) conducts recurring bridge inspections, with those performed in 2006, 2007, and 2010 not disclosing any critical findings.</p> <p>In March 2012, PWWM was informally notified via email by FDOT that the bridge inspection performed on January 7, 2012, found deterioration of a number of the steel beams on the West Bridge, and that PWWM was “to correct such deficiencies before they become a</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes												
	<p>critical deficiency". As a result, PWWM immediately proceeded to restrict truck traffic to the right outside lane of the West Bridge for the inbound (Eastbound) direction, and as a further precaution moved to effectuate similar restrictions on the Bear Cut Bridge. This action placed truck loads on the concrete beam segment, not on the steel beams found to be in a deteriorated condition.</p> <p>Additionally, between the months of August to September 2012, PWWM initiated detailed field inspections of the Bridge's 584 steel beams through the services of an engineering consultant. This effort also found previously undetected deterioration of the steel beams on the Bear Cut Bridge. This information was transmitted to FDOT, along with the request for a Load Rating in order to determine the load carrying capacity of the Bridges in their current condition. On October 19, 2012, based on the provided information, FDOT notified PWWM that the right outbound (westbound) lane on the Bear Cut Bridge had to be closed to traffic. PWWM immediately closed the lane upon being notified. However, in close coordination with FDOT, PWWM had its consultant re-analyze the Load Rating for the Bridges. This led to FDOT's subsequent concurrence to open the closed lane by restricting traffic to cars on the outside lane, limiting heavier vehicles to the inside lane. FDOT's formal letter of concurrence was received on November 1, 2012. PWWM implemented these restrictions through the installation of signs and pavement markings.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Relevant Legislation</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><i>Bear Cut and West Bridges on the Rickenbacker Causeway</i></th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Date and Reso.</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Legislation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">1/23/2013 R-32-13</td> <td>RESOLUTION WAIVING COMPETITIVE BIDS AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO CONTRACT FOR THE REPAIRS OF THE BEAR CUT BRIDGE AND THE WEST BRIDGE [PLEASE SEE ORIGINAL VERSION UNDER FILE NO. 130069]</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">1/23/2013 R-33-13</td> <td>RESOLUTION AMENDING IMPLEMENTING ORDER 4-57 RELATING TO THE SCHEDULE OF FEES AND TOLLS FOR THE RICKENBACKER CAUSEWAY <i>Resolution No. 33-12, amended Implementing Order 4-57 to adjust the toll structure of the Causeway in order to strengthen reserves and facilitate the sale of bonds needed to fund the necessary capital improvements to address the emergency conditions. The Board was advised that the funding source would be a combination of toll revenues and financing proceeds backed by toll revenues.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">4/16/13 R-288-13</td> <td>ESOLUTION APPROVING RATIFICATION OF THE CONTRACT AWARD TO KIEWIT INFRASTRUCTURE SOUTH CO., IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$31,000,000.00, FOR THE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES FOR THE PROJECT ENTITLED REHABILITATION OF BRIDGES NO. 874541 (WEST BRIDGE) AND 874544 (BEAR CUT BRIDGE) ON THE RICKENBACKER CAUSEWAY <i>Resolution No. 288-13 ratified a \$31,000,000 contract award to Kiewit Infrastructure South Co. (Kiewit) for the design-build services to rehabilitate the Bear Cut and West Bridges. A portion (\$3,000,000) of the Kiewit contract is funded by the Water and Sewer Department for costs related to a water main relocation and replacement. Bond proceeds from this financing will fund the remaining \$28,000,000 of the Kiewit contract plus capitalized costs that are not included in the contract but necessary to complete the construction including police traffic management during construction (\$942,000) and engineering staff time (\$686,000). In addition, \$750,000 is added to the construction fund for unforeseen conditions and remediation costs relating to asbestos abatement.</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Additional Information Pursuant to a Memo dated August 28, 2013, from the Public Works and Waste Management Department to the Mayor, the Kiewit- Bear Cut Bridge Existing Foundation Analysis Engineering Report provided the following conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Summary, the foundation of the Bridge has exhibited its integrity and safely supported the loads imposed on it for the past 67 years. The report notes that "due to the fact that the new superstructure is not increasing the axial loads on the existing foundation the factors of safety which existed prior to the rehabilitation will remain consistent upon completion of the County's specified work." • Furthermore, "If the contract prescribed substructure improvements, as specified by Miami-Dade County, is all that is required and periodic maintenance of the substructure which includes sealers, cathodic coatings, active cathodic protection and other maintenance methods is performed, this may allow this bridge to provide an additional 20-30 years of continued life, barring an extreme event such as coastal storm surges, extreme wind events (above 100 mph) and vessel collision." • Finally, the County will proceed with the planned demolition and replacement of the older portion of both Bear Cut and West bridges in order to maintain the project's schedule of substantial completion by February 2014. • Upon completion of the work, the County will begin the process of identifying funding for a Project Development and Environmental Study for the complete replacement of the Bear Cut and West bridges. <p>The report was requested by Miami-Dade County in order to evaluate the load carrying capacity of the existing piles on the portion of the Bear Cut Bridge that was built in the 1940's and that are to remain in place following the rehabilitation of the Bridge.</p>	Relevant Legislation		<i>Bear Cut and West Bridges on the Rickenbacker Causeway</i>		Date and Reso.	Legislation	1/23/2013 R-32-13	RESOLUTION WAIVING COMPETITIVE BIDS AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO CONTRACT FOR THE REPAIRS OF THE BEAR CUT BRIDGE AND THE WEST BRIDGE [PLEASE SEE ORIGINAL VERSION UNDER FILE NO. 130069]	1/23/2013 R-33-13	RESOLUTION AMENDING IMPLEMENTING ORDER 4-57 RELATING TO THE SCHEDULE OF FEES AND TOLLS FOR THE RICKENBACKER CAUSEWAY <i>Resolution No. 33-12, amended Implementing Order 4-57 to adjust the toll structure of the Causeway in order to strengthen reserves and facilitate the sale of bonds needed to fund the necessary capital improvements to address the emergency conditions. The Board was advised that the funding source would be a combination of toll revenues and financing proceeds backed by toll revenues.</i>	4/16/13 R-288-13	ESOLUTION APPROVING RATIFICATION OF THE CONTRACT AWARD TO KIEWIT INFRASTRUCTURE SOUTH CO., IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$31,000,000.00, FOR THE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES FOR THE PROJECT ENTITLED REHABILITATION OF BRIDGES NO. 874541 (WEST BRIDGE) AND 874544 (BEAR CUT BRIDGE) ON THE RICKENBACKER CAUSEWAY <i>Resolution No. 288-13 ratified a \$31,000,000 contract award to Kiewit Infrastructure South Co. (Kiewit) for the design-build services to rehabilitate the Bear Cut and West Bridges. A portion (\$3,000,000) of the Kiewit contract is funded by the Water and Sewer Department for costs related to a water main relocation and replacement. Bond proceeds from this financing will fund the remaining \$28,000,000 of the Kiewit contract plus capitalized costs that are not included in the contract but necessary to complete the construction including police traffic management during construction (\$942,000) and engineering staff time (\$686,000). In addition, \$750,000 is added to the construction fund for unforeseen conditions and remediation costs relating to asbestos abatement.</i>
Relevant Legislation													
<i>Bear Cut and West Bridges on the Rickenbacker Causeway</i>													
Date and Reso.	Legislation												
1/23/2013 R-32-13	RESOLUTION WAIVING COMPETITIVE BIDS AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO CONTRACT FOR THE REPAIRS OF THE BEAR CUT BRIDGE AND THE WEST BRIDGE [PLEASE SEE ORIGINAL VERSION UNDER FILE NO. 130069]												
1/23/2013 R-33-13	RESOLUTION AMENDING IMPLEMENTING ORDER 4-57 RELATING TO THE SCHEDULE OF FEES AND TOLLS FOR THE RICKENBACKER CAUSEWAY <i>Resolution No. 33-12, amended Implementing Order 4-57 to adjust the toll structure of the Causeway in order to strengthen reserves and facilitate the sale of bonds needed to fund the necessary capital improvements to address the emergency conditions. The Board was advised that the funding source would be a combination of toll revenues and financing proceeds backed by toll revenues.</i>												
4/16/13 R-288-13	ESOLUTION APPROVING RATIFICATION OF THE CONTRACT AWARD TO KIEWIT INFRASTRUCTURE SOUTH CO., IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$31,000,000.00, FOR THE DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES FOR THE PROJECT ENTITLED REHABILITATION OF BRIDGES NO. 874541 (WEST BRIDGE) AND 874544 (BEAR CUT BRIDGE) ON THE RICKENBACKER CAUSEWAY <i>Resolution No. 288-13 ratified a \$31,000,000 contract award to Kiewit Infrastructure South Co. (Kiewit) for the design-build services to rehabilitate the Bear Cut and West Bridges. A portion (\$3,000,000) of the Kiewit contract is funded by the Water and Sewer Department for costs related to a water main relocation and replacement. Bond proceeds from this financing will fund the remaining \$28,000,000 of the Kiewit contract plus capitalized costs that are not included in the contract but necessary to complete the construction including police traffic management during construction (\$942,000) and engineering staff time (\$686,000). In addition, \$750,000 is added to the construction fund for unforeseen conditions and remediation costs relating to asbestos abatement.</i>												
4L 131969	ORDINANCE RELATING TO ZONING; MODIFYING PROCEDURES FOR AMENDING URBAN CENTER DISTRICT REGULATING PLANS; CREATING SECTION 33-284.89.3 AND AMENDING SECTION 33-314 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA ("CODE"); PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE(Regulatory and Economic Resources)												
Notes	The proposed ordinance relating to Zoning, creates Section 33-284.89.3 and amends Section 33-314 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), modifying procedures for amending urban center district regulating plans.												
	<u>Background</u>												

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On July 7, 2005, under Ordinance No. 05-143, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) established Article XXXIII(K) of the Zoning Code, the County's Standard Urban Center District Regulations. The Standard Urban Center District provides the regulatory framework that guides the development within the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) designated urban centers and mixed-use corridors and that also constitutes the modern, form-based portion of the County's Zoning Code. • The adoption of Standard Urban Center District (SUCO) Regulations has been followed by the BCC's establishment of the area-specific urban center districts which include those addressing the following areas: Cutler Ridge, Goulds, Leisure City, Model City, Naranja, North Central, Ojus, Perrine, and Princeton. • Currently, to establish an urban center or urban area district, a two-step process is used. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First, the BCC adopts an ordinance, through its legislative process, that sets the boundaries of the urban center, the land use plan designating the uses permitted on each property, and other regulating plans and regulations applicable to that urban center district. ○ Secondly, the BCC holds a quasi-judicial zoning hearing on a district boundary change, to rezone each of the underlying properties to the urban center district. Upon the rezoning there is no formal process for an individual property owner or staff to change the land use category or other regulating plan of the urban center or urban area district. <p>The proposed ordinance will establish a one-step process that property owners and staff can utilize to initiate a change in land use category or other regulating plan for properties located in an urban center or urban area district. This new process will be quasi-judicial and require the submittal of a zoning application with the BCC having direct jurisdiction to hear such applications.</p>
4M 131959	ORDINANCE RELATING TO ZONING; CREATING SECTION 33-279.2 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA TO PROVIDE FOR AGRICULTURAL USES IN PROPERTIES OUTSIDE THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY THAT ARE DESIGNATED AGRICULTURE BY THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN BUT ARE NOT ZONED AU, AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE(Regulatory and Economic Resources)
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance relating to Zoning; creates Section 33-279.2 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), providing for agricultural uses in properties outside the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) that are designated agriculture by the Comprehensive Development Master Plan, but are not zoned AU, agricultural district.</p> <p>Background Approximately 2,231 acres located outside the UDB and designated Agriculture on the LUP map are zoned Estate (EU), Residential (RU), Business (BU) or Industrial (IU). These properties cannot establish agricultural uses based on their underlying zoning district even though their LUP map designation is Agriculture. This proposed ordinance seeks to permit agricultural uses on such properties.</p> <p>Properties establishing any agricultural use must meet the minimum lot size and setback requirements of the underlying zoning district; however, they will be exempt from the underlying zoning districts landscaping and lot coverage requirements.</p>
4N 131960	ORDINANCE RELATING TO ZONING; AUTHORIZING AGRICULTURAL USES ON LOTS LESS THAN FIVE ACRES UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES IN THE AU (AGRICULTURAL) ZONING; AMENDING SECTIONS 33-280, 28-4, AND 8CC-10 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE(Regulatory and Economic Resources)
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance relating to Zoning; amends Sections 33-280, 28-4, and 8CC-10 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), authorizing agricultural uses on lots less than five acres under certain circumstances in the AU (agricultural) zoning.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance allows non-residential agricultural uses on lots less than five (5) acres, provided that the lot is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located outside the Urban Development Boundary (UDB); • Has been created by recorded warranty deed ; and • Has a restrictive covenant recorded by the property owner that discloses that the deed and the property is solely for non-residential agricultural uses. <p>The proposed ordinance is consistent with the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) as it does not limit the size of a lot in the Agriculture land use category when the lot is to be used for non-residential agricultural uses.</p>
4O 132014	ORDINANCE APPROVING REVOLVING LINE OF CREDIT IN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$75,000,000 FROM WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. TO COUNTY FOR PURPOSES OF PROVIDING FUNDS TO PUBLIC HEALTH TRUST AND PAYING COSTS OF ISSUANCE; PROVIDING THAT SUCH LINE OF CREDIT BE SECURED BY COUNTY COVENANT TO ANNUALLY BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FROM LEGALLY AVAILABLE NON-AD VALOREM REVENUES OF THE COUNTY SUFFICIENT FUNDS TO PAY DEBT SERVICE ON LINE OF CREDIT; APPROVING TERMS OF RELATED COMMITMENT LETTER; APPROVING FORM AND EXECUTION OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN COUNTY AND PUBLIC HEALTH TRUST REGARDING PAYMENT OF LINE OF CREDIT FROM CERTAIN TRUST REVENUES; AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE AND ALL OTHER COUNTY OFFICIALS TO TAKE ALL ACTION TO SECURE LINE OF CREDIT AND TO EXTEND ITS TERM WITHIN CERTAIN PARAMETERS INCLUDING ENTERING INTO RELATED AGREEMENTS AND DOCUMENTS WITH TERMS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE SET FORTH IN THE COMMITMENT LETTER; AND PROVIDING SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE(Finance Department)
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance authorizes the issuance of a Revolving Line of Credit (Line of Credit) from Wells Fargo Bank (Wells Fargo) on behalf of the Public Health Trust (PHT) in an amount not to exceed \$75,000,000, approving the terms of the Line of Credit, and approving the related Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PHT.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed ordinance renews the Line of Credit for one year and also authorizes the County Mayor, after consultation with the Office of the County Attorney, to extend the term of the Line of Credit under the same or more favorable terms in the Commitment Letter (Commitment) to the County.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><u>Fiscal Impact</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PHT will make the payments for all draws and costs of the Line of Credit from its net operating revenues. • The County will guarantee PHT's commitment to make all payments with a County covenant to Wells Fargo to budget and appropriate annually sufficient legally available non-ad valorem revenues of the County. • Pursuant to the MOU, the County will have the right to deduct any payment made on the Line of Credit by the County from the PHT's One Half Cent Healthcare Sales Surtax or the annual Maintenance of Effort. Therefore, the County will not be incurring any additional costs. <p>Pursuant to Ordinance No. 12-110, adopted by the BCC on December 18, 2012, this item renews for one year and provides for future extensions of the Line of Credit previously entered into by the County with Wells Fargo. At that time, the Line of Credit was presented to the Trust and accepted by the County as an unsolicited proposal from Wells Fargo. The 2012 Ordinance also approved a MOU between the County and PHT providing for PHT's repayment obligation to the County. To date, all payments on the current Line of Credit have been made by the Trust from its net revenues and it is in compliance with its obligations pursuant to the existing MOU.</p> <p>The PHT has requested renewal of the Line of Credit for at least one additional year (through December 30, 2014) to enable it to continue managing these cash flow requirements. Since the previous Ordinance limited the term for the current Line of Credit to December 30, 2013, a new Ordinance is necessary to renew the Line of Credit.</p> <p><u>Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)</u></p> <p>In connection with the renewal of the Line of Credit, it is necessary for the County and the Trust to enter into a new MOU pursuant to the same PHT repayment obligations as the current MOU. The MOU provides that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PHT shall borrow and repay the Line of Credit under the terms negotiated by the County with Wells Fargo; • Subject to PHT being current on all principal and interest payments, all draw requests by PHT on the Line of Credit require the approval of the Deputy Mayor in charge of matters related to Finance or the Deputy Mayor in charge of matters related to the PHT; • In addition to the quarterly repayment requirements, the County will require of PHT that all outstanding principal and interest be repaid in full between August 1, 2014 and September 30, 2014 and any draws made after September 30, 2014, by 15 days prior to the end of the term of the Line of Credit; • If at any time PHT fails to make payments of principal and interest when due, the County has the right to withhold such amounts due from the One Half Cent Healthcare Sales Surtax or the annual Maintenance of Effort and not to permit any further draws; and • The term of the MOU will commence with the effective date of the Board approval of the Ordinance and terminate on the termination date of the Line of Credit and when all PHT's payment obligations on the Line of Credit terminate.
7A 131401 <i>Withdrawal Requested</i>	ORDINANCE RELATING TO COMMERCIAL VEHICLE IDENTIFICATION; AMENDING SECTION 8A-276 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, TO ELIMINATE REQUIREMENT THAT COMMERCIAL VEHICLE MARKINGS INCLUDE THE ADDRESS OF THE OWNER; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 8A-276 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), eliminating the requirement that commercial vehicle markings include the address of the owner.</p> <p>Pursuant to Section 8A-276 of the Code, a commercial vehicle is any vehicle whether horse-drawn, motor-driven or towed, and used, constructed, or equipped for the transportation of goods, wares, merchandise, tools, or equipment in trade, commerce, or industry.</p> <p>The Code excludes the following vehicles as commercial vehicles: Passenger automobiles including station wagons, vehicles constructed for recreational purposes or other noncommercial purposes, vehicles used by governmental agencies for official business, and other vehicles which are or may be required to be similarly identified by State or federal law.</p>
8F1 131258	RESOLUTION APPROVING TERMS OF AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE OF A LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND ADELL INVESTMENTS, INC., FOR PREMISES LOCATED AT 17601 NW 78 AVENUE, SUITES 107-111, UNINCORPORATED MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, TO BE UTILIZED BY THE MIAMI-DADE PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM FOR A PUBLIC LIBRARY, WITH A TOTAL FISCAL IMPACT TO THE COUNTY ESTIMATED TO BE \$1,602,628.00 FOR THE INITIAL FIVE-YEAR TERM OF THE LEASE AND THE ADDITIONAL FIVE-YEAR RENEWAL OPTION PERIOD; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN(Internal Services)
Supp. #1 131920	SUPPLEMENT TO RESOLUTION APPROVING LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND ADELL INVESTMENTS, INC. FOR THE PALM SPRINGS NORTH BRANCH LIBRARY LOCATED AT 17601 N.W. 78 AVENUE, SUITES 107-11, MIAMI, FL LEASE NO. 30-2010-000-0011-L01
Supp. #2 132023	SUPPLEMENT NO. 2 TO RESOLUTION APPROVING LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND ADELL INVESTMENTS, INC. FOR THE PALM SPRINGS NORTH BRANCH LIBRARY LOCATED AT 17601 N.W. 78 AVENUE, SUITES 107-11, MIAMI, FL LEASE NO. 30-2010-000-0011-L01
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the execution of a Lease Agreement between Miami-Dade County and Adell Investments, Inc. (Landlord), for the Palm Springs North Branch Library located at 17601 NW 78 Avenue, Unincorporated Miami-Dade County. More specifically, the proposed resolution does the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes the leasing of 5,336 square feet of air-conditioned commercial space; and • Authorizes a lease term of five years, plus one additional five-year renewal option period.

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Since 2004, the Palm Springs North Branch Library has been at this location. On March 16, 2004, through Resolution No. 306-04, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) approved the original lease between the Landlord and the County. The lease period was for five years, with two, two-year option to renew periods. The expiration date of the current lease is August 15, 2013, but it contains a holdover provision, which allows the County to occupy the space on a month-to-month basis. The current lease rate is \$20.76 per square foot. The property is located in District 13.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact</u> The total fiscal impact for the first year of the initial lease term will be \$140,981. The cumulative fiscal impact for the initial five-year lease term, plus the additional five-year renewal option term is estimated to be \$1,602,628. However, under Supplement No. 2 the total fiscal impact is amended. The amended total fiscal impact is \$1,654,322 over the full ten-year lease term, which is a savings of \$94,428 over the full ten-year lease term.</p> <p>The funding source is Library District funds.</p> <p><u>Supplement No. 2</u> Supplement No. 2 supersedes and replaces Supplement No. 1 which recognized additional savings. Supplement No. 2 provides for the following changes to the original item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in the annual rental rate; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1st Lease Year - From \$113,000.76 to \$79,11.53, and ○ 2nd Lease Year - From \$116,390.78 to \$90,400.61. ○ Additionally, since the annual rental amounts of the rest of the lease term is increased by the CPI capped at 3 percent, the rental amounts for the subsequent years will also be lower than originally estimated because the first CPI increase will be applied to a lower rental amount. • Addition of Article XIX which provides for the payment by the County of its proportionate share of the Common Area Maintenance (CAM) in the proposed lease agreement. The 2004 lease agreement included this clause and it is currently in effect; however, it was inadvertently left out of the proposed lease. • Change in the total fiscal impact. • The amount of the CAM charges used to calculate the total fiscal impact in the original item was incorrect. Instead of using the annual amount, the monthly amount was used in the calculation. Therefore, the total fiscal impact stated in the original item, prior to the rental reductions should have been \$1,748,750 for the full ten-year lease term. After applying the rent reduction, the new total fiscal impact is \$1,654,322 over the full ten-year lease term, which is a savings of \$94,428 over the full ten-year lease term. <p><u>Additional Information</u> As part of the Recreation and Culture strategic area, the Library System provides library services to one of the largest and most diverse populations in the United States. More than 2,000,000 residents of the Miami-Dade County Library District enjoy access to a collection of nearly 4,000,000 items in a wide variety of formats and languages and state-of-the-art computer system and public computer workstations, including laptops, with full internet access for public use. The Library System operates a Main Library, 49 neighborhood branches and two bookmobiles.</p> <p>In a memo dated August 1, 2013, titled, Library District – Budget and Programmatic Update, the Mayor states that he has directed his staff to make every effort to renegotiate lease terms.</p>
8F2 131874	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PARTIAL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, THE PERFORMING ARTS CENTER TRUST AND PAC BUILDERS JOINT VENTURE FOR REPAIRS TO THE RAIN WATER LEADER SYSTEM FOR THE ADRIENNE ARSHT CENTER AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN (SEE AGENDA ITEM NO. 8F3)(Internal Services)</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor to execute and enforce the attached Partial Settlement Agreement between Miami-Dade County, the Performing Arts Center Trust (PACT), and Performing Arts Center Builders, Joint Venture (PAC Builders). Pursuant to this Agreement, PAC Builders will install, at its own cost, additional sway bracing, pipe bracing, and riser clamps to the rain water disposal system throughout the facility. Additionally, pursuant to a determination to be made through a binding review by a neutral Arbitrator/Engineer, PAC Builders would install, at its own cost, joint restraints on that rain water disposal system.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact</u> The County and PAC Builders have agreed to share the cost of a neutral third-party Engineer/Arbitrator to provide a binding opinion on repair items that were identified by Slider in their forensic engineering report but are being disputed by PAC Builders. The Parties will mutually agree on a not-to-exceed cost for the Engineer/Arbitrator.</p> <p><u>Background- Settlement Agreement</u> In a report to the Board dated June 20, 2012, details were provided as to the considerable damage caused by the failure of a storm drain pipe at the Adrienne Arsht Center. On July 17, 2012, the Board authorized the allocation of up to \$5,000,000 for the assessment, demolition, repair, and reconstruction of the Arsht Center in response to the water damage to the facility on May 20, 2012. To date, \$4,412,000 of those funds have been expended, and \$535,000.00 has been reimbursed to the PACT by the Business Income Insurance policy with Chubb Group Insurance Companies.</p> <p>Slider was engaged by the County to provide a detailed analysis and forensic engineering report identifying the cause of the failure of the</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>rainwater drainage system at the Adrienne Arsht Center. In this report, Slider reviewed all aspects of the systems and provided recommendations as to necessary repairs throughout the facilities. A copy of the Slider report was forwarded to the Board on February 13, 2013. Slider recommended that additional pipe bracing, sway bracing, and joint restraints be installed throughout the Adrienne Arsht Center in order to strengthen the rainwater drainage system and to minimize the risk of future incidents.</p> <p>The additional recommended repairs extend to both facilities, the Ziff Ballet Opera House and the Knight Center Concert Hall. The report notes a continuing risk of similar future failure by the entire storm water drainage systems in both buildings. The most vulnerable and critical areas were identified, and bracing and shoring have been provided as a temporary measure.</p> <p>PAC Builders, serving as the Agency Construction Manager for the County during the construction of the Arsht Center, was ultimately responsible for the proper installation of the storm water drainage system.</p> <p>Slider, in conjunction with the County, Adrienne Arsht Center, and PAC Builders has completed a detailed on-site assessment identifying required repairs at both facilities. PAC Builders is not in agreement as to the extent of the overall repairs identified in the Slider report; specifically, PAC Builders does not believe that the majority of joint restraints identified by Slider are necessary for the system to function. PAC Builders additionally argues that the joint restraints Slider is recommending are not required by either the original contract or the South Florida Building Code, the building code in effect during construction.</p> <p>PAC Builders, in this Partial Settlement, has agreed, at its own cost and expense, to install sway bracing, pipe hangers, vertical support/riser clamps, and the replacement of old couplings as identified by Slider. Joint restraints will be addressed by a mutually agreeable neutral third party Engineer/Arbitrator, who will render a binding opinion as to the whether the disputed joint restraints were required by the contract, the South Florida Building Code, or other industry standards.</p> <p>To the extent the Engineer/Arbitrator determines that some or all of these joint restraints were required, PAC Builders will be responsible for installing these joint restraints at its own cost and expense. To the extent that the Engineer/Arbitrator determines that such work was not required, that determination would preclude the County from bringing an action against PAC Builders for the costs of such work, to the extent that the County, at its own cost, later had such performed.</p> <p>With respect to any work performed, PAC Builders will provide a payment and performance bond and insurance.</p> <p>This Agreement does not resolve disputes related to the costs incurred to date to repair the initial water damage. The County continues to negotiate with PAC Builders as to this amount, and intends, if a resolution of that claim is not swiftly reached, to instruct the County Attorney's Office to file an action seeking recovery of these costs. Nothing in this agreement would prevent such lawsuit, and recovery of these costs will continue to be pursued.</p> <p>Recent Events - Main Water Supply and Fire Sprinkler System</p> <p>On September 18, 2013, a two-inch water supply line failed, causing additional water damage to the Knight Concert Hall. Staff was able to limit the damage to the facility by taking immediate action to contain the leak. However, further investigation is necessary in order to determine if this is an isolated incident, or, indicative of a system-wide problem.</p> <p>Additionally, it was discovered that some of the fire sprinkler heads and caps in the audience chamber of each of the two halls may not have been installed properly, thus requiring further investigation and potential repairs.</p> <p>Additional Information</p> <p>On July 11, 2012, the BCC adopted R-635-12, authorizing the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee to expend up to \$5 million from the amount allocated to the PACT in Fiscal Year 2011-12 for operational support of the facility, excess Convention Development Tax funds and/or the Convention Development Tax Shortfall Reserve, if necessary, to reimburse the Performing Arts Center Trust, Inc. for any required assessment, demolition, repair and/or reconstruction of the Arsht Center.</p> <p>Slider Engineering Group, Inc.(the forensic engineer) provided a detailed failure analysis and forensic engineering report identifying the cause of failure of the roof rainwater drainage system. The report dated February 7, 2013, Slider also provided recommendations as to other necessary repairs throughout the facility.</p> <p>The Poole and Kent Company and Fred McGilvray, Inc. were the subcontractors hired by PAC Builders to install the roof rainwater drainage system.</p> <p>Slider's evaluation resulted in the opinion that multiple defects in the installation of the storm water drainage system caused the failure. The installation deficiencies identified were deviations from the requirements of the applicable building code, contract documents, industry standards, and manufacturer's installation instructions.</p>
8F3 131882	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AN INCREASE IN CONTRACT AMOUNT OF \$200,000 AND A TWO-YEAR EXTENSION TO CONTRACT E9668-0/13 WITH SLIDER ENGINEERING GROUP, INC. FOR COORDINATION, CONSTRUCTION OVERSIGHT, AND LITIGATION SERVICES AT THE ADRIENNE ARSHT CENTER OF THE PERFORMING ARTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN (SEE AGENDA ITEM NO. 8F2)(Internal Services)
Notes	The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor to execute a two-year time extension and approve an additional \$200,000 in expenditure authority to the County's existing Agreement (Contract No. E9668-0/13) with Slider Engineering Group, Inc. (Slider), the forensic

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>engineer for services related to damages and repairs at the Adrienne Arsht Center for the Performing Arts. The County's current contract with Slider expires on January 31, 2014, and, originally had a maximum expenditure authority of \$250,000.</p> <p>The additional time and expenditure will be used to monitor ongoing repairs, permitting coordination, construction oversight, and litigation services associated with the rain water leader system, and, to address recent incidents that have been identified associated with the main water supply and fire sprinkler system.</p> <p>Background Slider will need to remain involved in this matter beyond the initial investigation. To the extent that PAC Builders agrees to remediate the work at its expense, Slider will be needed to inspect PAC Builders work.</p> <p>To the extent that PAC Builders does not remediate this work, Slider will be needed to develop the scope of work for a third party contractor and inspect the work of such contractor. Moreover, having done the failure analysis of the incident, Slider will be needed for any subsequent legal proceedings.</p> <p>Recent Events - Main Water Supply and Fire Sprinkler System On September 18, 2013, a two-inch water supply line failed, causing additional water damage to the Knight Concert Hall. Staff was able to limit the damage to the facility by taking immediate action to contain the leak. However, further investigation is necessary in order to determine if this is an isolated incident, or, indicative of a system-wide problem.</p> <p>Additionally, it was discovered that some of the fire sprinkler heads and caps in the audience chambers of each of the two halls may not have been installed properly, thus requiring further investigation.</p> <p>As a result of these two issues, this item is requesting additional expenditure authority to add scope to the existing Slider contract to conduct a complete assessment.</p>
8G1 131345	RESOLUTION APPROVING THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012-13 FOR THE NORTH MIAMI BEACH COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY(Office of Management and Budget)
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves the North Miami Beach Community Redevelopment Agency's (Agency's) FY 2012-13 Budget for the North Miami Beach Community Redevelopment Area (Area).</p> <p>Pursuant to Section III D of the Interlocal Agreement, the Board of County Commissioner (BCC) must approve the Agency's budget prior to the Agency expending any funding in the Trust Fund.</p> <p>The Area is located within Commission Districts 2 and 4.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact</u> The Agency's revenue source is Tax Increment Financing (TIF), which is generated through the incremental growth of ad valorem revenues beyond an established base year, as defined in Section 163.387 of the Florida State Statutes. The countywide TIF payment into the Agency's Trust Fund for FY 2012-13 is \$183,310 and the City of North Miami Beach's (City's) TIF payment into the Trust Fund is \$366,833.</p> <p>The County will continue to make annual payments to the Agency based on each year's growth of ad valorem revenues over the base year through 2028, which is when the Agency will sunset.</p> <p>The Agency's FY 2012-13 budget includes revenue sources of County TIF (\$183,310), City TIF (\$366,833), carryover from prior years (\$5,517,000), and \$11,500 in interest earnings.</p> <p>Administrative expenditures total \$41,006 and represent seven percent of the total tax increment revenues from the County and City, excluding the 1.5 percent County Administrative Charge (\$2,750), satisfying the 20 percent cap in administrative expenditures required by the Interlocal Agreement.</p> <p>Operating Expenditures total \$6,028,782.</p> <p>Additional Information <i>At the July 9, 2013 Finance Committee meeting, the Board expressed concern over a \$6.078 million budget with no expenditures meeting the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) program requirements for blighted areas other than \$70,000 for landscaping and \$30,000 for façade improvements. In addition, \$5 million was being retained for possible land acquisition, multi-use retail development, and public private partnerships in a very depressed area that has languished with no proposed projects.</i></p>
8I1 131956	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE A STANDARD FORM NON-EXCLUSIVE STEVEDORING SERVICE CONTRACT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND ANY STEVEDORE COMPANY HOLDING A VALID STEVEDORING LICENSE AND A VALID STEVEDORING PERMIT, ISSUED BY THE COUNTY PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 28A OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, TO PROVIDE STEVEDORING SERVICES TO CRUISE LINES OPERATING AT THE SEAPORT (AT THE CRUISE LINES' OPTION); EXERCISE ALL RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN; AND, PURSUANT TO SECTION 5.03(D) OF THE HOME RULE CHARTER AND SECTIONS 2-8.1, 2-8.3 AND 2-8.4 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, WAIVING COMPETITIVE BIDDING REQUIREMENTS AND BID PROTEST PROCEDURES BY TWO-THIRDS (2/3) VOTE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NON-EXCLUSIVE STEVEDORING SERVICE CONTRACTS, THE MAYOR FINDING IT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE COUNTY TO DO SO(Port of Miami)

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the execution of a Standard Form Non-Exclusive Stevedoring Service Contract ("Standard Form Contract") for the benefit of cruise line customers and waives formal competitive bidding procedures in connection with the accompanying Standard Form Contract.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact This item has no fiscal impact to the County. The contracts are revenue neutral to the County since all expenses incurred as a result of contracting with the stevedoring provider will be billed to the respective cruise line. An administrative fee in the amount of three hundred fifty dollars (\$350.00) per vessel call will be assessed by the County to the respective cruise line to recover administrative/management costs incurred by the Port.</p> <p>Background For the Port to enter into a contract with a stevedoring company, as selected by a cruise line, the stevedoring company must hold a valid stevedoring permit issued by the Port Director pursuant to the requirements of Section 28A-6 of the Code of Miami-Dade County. In compliance with Section 28A-6, the Port conducts a competitive stevedoring permit application process annually in December and permits are issued mid-January of each year. As directed by Section 28A-6, the Port Director determines the number of stevedoring permits issued each year, but reserves the right to revise the number should the market change or other Port conditions arise.</p> <p>To provide consistency and continue offering this service to the Port's cruise lines, it is requested that this Contract be approved to increase the term from the Revised Contract. The new Standard Form Contract will be effective on November 1, 2013 or on the date that the Contract is executed by both the County and the stevedoring company, whichever occurs later, and will be effective for one (1) year. The new Standard Form Contract will automatically renew each year for a period of five (5) years, unless the County provides written notice sixty (60) days prior to the renewal date that it does not wish to renew the Contract. It is also important to note that the County may at any time, in its sole discretion, with or without cause, terminate the Contract.</p> <p>This Standard Form Contract will be available to all Port-permitted stevedoring companies that desire to enter into such contracts with the County.</p>
8K1 131858	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO APPROVE THE FY 2014 DOCUMENTARY STAMP SURTAX REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION TO PROJECTS THAT RECEIVE 2013 LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDITS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION; REQUIRING A MINIMUM LOCAL CONTRIBUTION OF \$160,000.00 TO QUALIFY; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO AWARD CATEGORY 1 – LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL CONTRIBUTION TO APPLICANTS UPON COMPLETION OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS AND AWARD OF TAX CREDITS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ANY NECESSARY AGREEMENTS(Public Housing and Community Development)</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve the FY 2014 Documentary Stamp Surtax (Surtax) Request for Applications (County Request for Application) for local government contribution to projects that receive low-income housing tax credits from the State. • Conditionally award funding of \$1.6 million in Surtax (funds under local match). Local Match is for applicants who will be applying for the 2013 Florida Housing Finance Corporation (Finance Corporation) Low Income Housing Tax Credits (Housing Tax Credits), and require a minimum local government contribution that is valued at a minimum \$100,000.00. The County would issue a loan of \$160,000.00, which would be valued at \$104,000.00 for the applicant to qualify. • Issuance of awards is contingent upon the completion of a subsidy layering review process that includes an update to the awardee(s) current financial viability. • Administratively provide the local government contribution commitment of funds contingent upon tax credit cycle success for FY 2013 applicants and future tax credit cycles moving forward. • Execute all conditional loan commitments, local government verification of contribution loan forms, standard shell contracts, standard shell loan documents, amendments and other agreements necessary to fulfill the purposes of this resolution. <p>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source It is anticipated that \$1.6 million in Surtax funds will be needed as part of the County's Request for Applications process for local government contributions applicants. The recommended amount sets aside enough funding for up to ten successful local match contributions, if needed. Applicants that do not receive a Housing Tax Credit award will have their minimum local contribution rescinded. The County will adopt and use the Finance Corporation ranking order for development projects as the criteria for awarding County Surtax funds. Applicants who receive Finance Corporation Housing Tax Credits will be selected to receive the County Surtax allocation. In those cases where more than ten (10) applicants are awarded Housing Tax Credits, the allocation may be increased to allocate to those successful Finance Corporation applicants.</p> <p>Background This request for approval of the local government contribution portion of the County Request for Applications is synchronized with the award of funding from the State of Florida's Finance Corporation's Request for Applications (Florida Request for Applications) process, which allows proposed affordable housing developments to compete for Housing Tax Credits. In order for applicants, identified for local government contributions, to compete in the Florida Request for Applications process, a local government contribution commitment is required.</p> <p>This County Request for Application cycle is for threshold applicants who are applying to the Florida Request for Applications for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Broward, Miami-Dade and Palm Beach Counties for Housing Tax Credits and require a minimum local</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>government contribution of \$160,000 to be considered eligible to compete for funding. Applicants will receive the minimum local government match contribution, if the application is complete and meets all threshold information requirements.</p> <p>The process utilized by the Finance Corporation is very competitive. After meeting all required regulatory, financial and threshold criteria, projects are then subject to a lottery system. Final determination of the successful lottery participants is anticipated to occur in the spring of 2014, at which time only those projects/developers that receive Housing Tax Credits will retain the local match. All applicants who received a minimum local government contribution will have their allocation rescinded automatically if they are not awarded housing tax credits.</p>
8K2 131931	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF GROUND LEASE AGREEMENTS WITH RELATED URBAN DEVELOPMENT GROUP (RUDG), THE MICHAELS DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, LLC, GORMAN & COMPANY INC., RENAISSANCE INITIATIVE JOINT VENTURE AND BISCAYNE HOUSING GROUP, LLC OR THEIR ASSIGNEES, FOR ROBERT KING HIGH, SMATHERS PLAZA, JOE MORETTI, THREE ROUND TOWERS, CULMER GARDENS, CULMER PLACE, MODELLO HOMES, NEW HAVEN, RAINBOW VILLAGE, HARRY CAIN AND WARD TOWERS PUBLIC HOUSING SITES; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE GROUND LEASE AGREEMENTS FOR AND ON BEHALF OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, AND TO MAKE ANY NECESSARY AMENDMENTS AND TO EXERCISE ANY TERMINATION, CANCELLATION AND RENEWAL PROVISIONS; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO CONSENT TO SUBLEASING OF THE SITES BY THE DEVELOPERS, WHERE APPLICABLE; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SUBMIT DEMOLITION AND/OR DISPOSITION APPLICATIONS TO THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR THESE SITES; APPROVING THE DEMOLITION AND/OR DISPOSITION OF THESE SITES, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE AMENDMENTS TO ANNUAL CONTRIBUTION CONTRACTS, AGREEMENTS, RELEASES, AND ANY OTHER DOCUMENTS THAT MAY BE REQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT(Public Housing and Community Development)</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves the execution of ground leases (Leases) with Related Urban Development Group (RUDG), The Michaels Development Company, LLC, Gorman & Company Inc., Renaissance Initiative Joint Venture, and Biscayne Housing Group, LLC or their assignees (collectively referred to as "the Developers"), in order to provide site control for the future development of the Robert King High, Smathers Plaza, Joe Moretti, Three Round Towers, Culmer Gardens, Culmer Place, Modello Homes, New Haven, Rainbow Village, Harry Cain and Ward Towers public housing sites ("Development Sites").</p> <p>The Developers require the Leases as evidence of site control, a prerequisite for their nine percent (9%) Low Income Housing Tax Credits (Housing Tax Credits) applications that they intend to submit to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation (Finance Corporation) in the 2014 Request for Applications ("2014 Applications") for development financing for the Development Sites.</p> <p>Additionally, it is recommended that the Board authorize the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee, subject to the Developers being awarded Housing Tax Credits, to submit demolition and/or disposition applications to Housing and Urban Development for the Development Sites, with the exception of Modello Homes for which the Board, pursuant to Resolution No. R-628-13, previously approved the submission of a demolition and disposition application. The Development Sites were previously approved by the Board as a result of Request for Proposals No. 794 ("the Solicitation"). The Developers and corresponding awards of Development Sites were selected pursuant to the Solicitation and approved by Resolution Nos. R-1026-11 and R-152-12.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The Solicitation was issued on July 14, 2011, to solicit offers from developers to maximize and expedite the development potential of over 100 existing public housing sites and vacant land sites administered by the Department. The Solicitation sought to establish partnerships with qualified entities to rehabilitate/upgrade existing public housing units, remove and replace obsolete public housing units, increase the number of units on underutilized sites, develop vacant land owned by the County, and also incorporate commercial and other special purpose uses, where appropriate, at particular public housing sites or vacant land sites. Additionally, the Department sought to replace its older units with new contemporary designs that resemble market-rate units (regardless of whether these are public housing, affordable or market-rate units) and incorporate creative and sustainable design solutions.</p> <p>Pursuant to Resolution No. R-1026-11, approved by the Board on November 23, 2011, site control through ground leases were awarded to six (6) developers for a total of twenty-eight (28) project sites. The ground leases were subsequently executed so that the Developers could apply for nine percent (9%) Housing Tax Credits from the Finance Corporation in the 2011 Universal Cycle. However, the Developers were not awarded Housing Tax Credits for these sites in the 2011 Universal Cycle. The Leases were for a term of 11 months and were also dependent upon receiving funding and therefore have expired. Additionally, Resolution No. R-152-12, approved by the Board on February 7, 2012, awarded four (4) sites, two of which are not part of this request to approve ground leases, but which included Harry Cain and Ward Towers.</p> <p>The Developers now seek to apply for nine percent (9%) Housing Tax Credits for the 2014 Applications for the Development Sites. However, Board approval of a ground lease is a prerequisite to apply for Housing Tax Credits as this establishes site control. The Developers will apply for the Large County (Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach) 2014 Applications (with a deadline of November 12, 2013) and/or the Preservation 2014 Applications (with a deadline of December 3, 2013).</p>
8K3 131008	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF A VACANT LAND PARCEL LOCATED AT NORTHEAST CORNER OF KENTUCKY STREET AND NW 9TH AVENUE IN FLORIDA CITY (FOLIO #16-7824-014-0204) IN THE AMOUNT OF \$18,500.00 TO THE FLORIDA CITY COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY IN ACCORDANCE WITH FLORIDA STATUTE 125.38; AUTHORIZING THE WAIVER OF ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER 8-4 AS IT PERTAINS TO REVIEW BY THE PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF COUNTY DEED FOR SUCH PURPOSE BY THE BOARD'S CHAIRPERSON; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO TAKE ALL ACTION NECESSARY TO ACCOMPLISH THE CONVEYANCE OF SAID PROPERTY(Public Housing and Community Development)</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
Supp. 132024	SUPPLEMENT TO AUTHORIZE THE SALE OF A VACANT LAND, FOLIO NO. 16-7824-014-0204, TO FLORIDA CITY COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sale of one (1) commercially-zoned vacant parcel of land located at the northeast corner of Kentucky Street and NW 9th Avenue in Florida City (Folio #16-7824-014-0204), to the Florida City Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) for the development of the Property at the appraised price of \$18,500.00; • Waive the requirements of Administrative Order 8-4 as it relates to review by the Planning Advisory Board (PAB); • The execution and recording of County deeds for such purpose; and • The County Mayor or his designee to take all actions necessary to accomplish the conveyance of said Property. <p>The conveyance of the property complies with Section 125.38 of the Florida Statutes which permits the disposition of County property to an agency established for the purposes of promoting community interest and welfare without using the competitive bidding process.</p> <p>Florida City, on behalf of the CRA, notified the County of the CRA's interest to purchase the parcel with the plan to rezone the property since it is too small for its current zoning. The CRA currently owns the parcel to the east of this parcel and plans to combine and rezone the two parcels to develop a coin laundry, small retail shop or other commercial use. The development of the parcels will allow the CRA to enhance the economic vitality of the target corridor.</p> <p><u>Background</u> In July 1998, the property located at the northeast corner of Kentucky Street and NW 9th Avenue in Florida City was purchased with Miami-Dade County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds; and is in the Miami-Dade County Public Housing and Community Development Department's inventory for development. The property is located in District 9.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact</u> The proceeds from the sale will be reimbursed to the CDBG program and used for eligible projects. Staff anticipates \$18,500.00 in revenue from the sale of the property. Since the property is being sold at fair market value, the property will no longer be subject to CDBG requirements as per the Housing and Urban Development Code of Federal Regulations, Title 24, § 570.505(d), Use of Real Property, which states that following the reimbursement to the CDBG program the property is no longer subject to any CDBG requirements.</p> <p>Furthermore, the CRA will be purchasing the parcel for the appraised price. As a condition of the land sale, there are deed restrictions and a reverter clause in the County Deed. The purchase of the vacant parcel was approved by the CRA's Board on January 22, 2013 and the planned development is within one of the target corridors of the CRA's Redevelopment Plan.</p> <p><u>Supplement</u> The Supplemental to the proposed resolution provides information regarding a revised County Deed. On September 17, 2013, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) adopted Resolution No. 761-13, which amended Resolution No. 461-13, providing an exception when property is conveyed for appraised value.</p> <p>Therefore, a revised County Deed (Exhibit B) reflects the removal of the restriction cited below: <i>In the event the Party of the Second Part, its successors or assigns, shall violate or otherwise fail to comply with any of the restrictions and covenants set forth herein, the Party of the Second Part, its successors or assigns, shall correct or cure the default/violation within (30) days of notification of the default by the Party of the First Party. If the Party of the Second Part, its successors or assigns, fails to remedy the default within thirty (30) days, the Party of the First Part shall have the right to re-enter and take possession of the Property and to terminate and revert in the Party of the First Part the estate conveyed by this Deed to the Party of the Second Part, its successors or assigns, and by such reverter to the Party of the First Part, the Party of the Second Part shall forfeit all monetary investments and improvements without any compensation or right to compensation whatsoever; provided, that any such right of re-entry shall always be subjected to and limited by, and shall not defeat, render invalid, or limit any way the lien of any valid mortgage or Deed or Trust permitted by this Deed.</i></p> <p>Additional Information According to the Property Appraiser the 2013 assessed and market value for this property is \$11,734.</p>
8N1 131968	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING REJECTION OF BIDS FOR THE METROMOVER FIBER OPTIC AND CCTV REPLACEMENT - MCC 7360 PLAN - CICC 7360-0/08 - RPQ NO: 230195-R-3(Miami-Dade Transit)
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the rejection of bids for the Metromover Fiber Optic and CCTV Replacement, Contract No. RPQ No. 230195-R3. The proposed contract was in the amount of \$3.850 million from FTA grant funds.</p> <p>The scope of work under this contract consists of installation, labor, permitting of required hardware, testing configuration, installation of network fiber optics cable, replacing existing connectors, the enclosure of cameras with mounting brackets at various Metromover stations, and integrating the entire system. The location of the project site is 75907 111 N.W. 1st Court, Miami, FL 33136 in District 5.</p> <p>Background - Reason for Rejection Request</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On July 9, 2012, this project was advertised under the Miami-Dade County, Request for Price Quotation, MCC 7360, RPQ No. 230195-R3. Six bids were received.

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes								
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On August 13, 2013, based on MDT's bid analysis and due diligence efforts, MDT issued an award recommendation to Waveguide Communications, Inc., the lowest bidder. On August 23, 2013, the awardee's insurance and performance and payment bond were approved by Miami-Dade County's Risk Management Division. On August 15, 2013, a bid protest was filed by Tri-City Electric Co., Inc., the second lowest bidder. On August 27, 2013, the bid protest hearing took place. Tri-City Electric Co., Inc. alleged that Waveguide Communications, Inc. was not eligible for this contract award for failure to possess the requisite professional license. Miami-Dade Transit asserted that Waveguide Communications, Inc., as a Certified Alarm System Contractor 1 could pull the master permit and perform low voltage electrical work, which constitutes the vast majority of the work to be performed for this scope of services. On September 4, 2013, the Hearing Examiner found Waveguide Communications, Inc.'s bid to be "non-responsive by its inability to qualify as a bonafide bidder." <p><i>In order to clarify any potential ambiguities and maximize competition to ensure the best possible prices for this scope of services, it is recommended that all bids be rejected and that this project be re-advertised expeditiously to make clear that any contractor capable of pulling the master permit be eligible for contract award.</i></p>								
11A1 131658	RESOLUTION AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. R-754-11 RELATED TO BISCAYNE RIVER VILLAGE I LOCATED AT 395 NW 1 STREET AND BISCAYNE RIVER VILLAGE II LOCATED AT 25 NW NORTH RIVER DRIVE, MIAMI, FLORIDA; CONSENTING TO CHANGE OF USE FOR THE PROJECTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE AMENDMENTS TO GROUND LEASES ON BEHALF OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY								
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution amends Resolution No. R-754-11 related to Biscayne River Village I and Biscayne River Village II in the following manner:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">R-754-11 adopted on October 4, 2011</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Proposed Amendments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>Family Building: Requires that the Family Building contain at least ninety (90) units of which at least twenty-six (26) units are to be set aside for households with incomes of no more than 28% AMI (Extremely Low Income) of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 will be one-bedroom units; <i>All 18 of the one-bedroom units will be set aside for elderly residents.</i> 6 will be two-bedroom units; and 2 will be three-bedroom units. </td> <td> <p><i>Biscayne River Village Phase I, Ltd., the Phase I Developer has requested that the County agree to amend the ground lease for the Family Building to develop the property as an eighty (80) unit workforce housing residential complex pursuant to the Miami-Dade County Workforce Housing Plan rather than housing for extremely low and low income families.</i></p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <p>Elderly Building: Requires that the Elderly Building consist of fifty-four (54) one-bedroom units, all set aside for elderly residents of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 17 will be set aside for Extremely Low Income households. </td> <td> <p><i>Biscayne River Village Phase II, Ltd., the Phase II Developer has requested that the County agree to amend the ground lease for the Elderly Building to permit the Phase II Developer to set aside seventeen (17) of the fifty-four (54) elderly units for elderly households with incomes at or below thirty-three percent (33%) rather than twenty-eight percent (28%) of Adjusted Median Income.</i></p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>The units in both the Family Building and the Elderly Building not specifically set aside for Extremely Low Income households will be set aside for low income households with incomes no greater than 60% AMI.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Additional Information On October 4, 2011, the BCC, through R-754-11, authorized the Mayor to negotiate and execute leases for the purpose of developing and operating the properties as affordable housing with certain conditions and requirements.</p> <p>The leases require that the Family Building and the Elderly Building be developed simultaneously and in the event that the Family Building is completed prior to the Elderly Building, the leases will terminate and title to any improvements will pass to the County.</p> <p>Each lease includes a provision stating that in the event of a reduction in (a) the total number of units, (b) the number of units set aside for elderly residents, or (c) the number of units set aside for households of certain AMIs, the lease will either terminate or will be brought before the BCC for amendment and approval of such changes to the fundamental terms of the lease.</p> <p>The proposed resolution states that on February 28, 2012, Biscayne River Village I and II assigned its interest in the ground leases to Biscayne River Village Phase I, Ltd. and Biscayne River Village Phase II, Ltd.</p> <p>Accordinging the Florida Department of State Division of Corporations: the following entities are listed as inactive as of September 28, 2012:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biscayne River Village I, LLC; Active; <i>Reinstatement filed on September 13, 2013</i> Biscayne River Village II, LLC; Active; <i>Reinstatement filed on September 16, 2013</i> Biscayne River Village Phase I, Ltd.; <i>Inactive as of September 28, 2012; Revoked for Annual Report</i> Biscayne River Village Phase II, Ltd.; <i>Inactive as of September 28, 2012; Revoked for Annual Report</i> 	R-754-11 adopted on October 4, 2011	Proposed Amendments	<p>Family Building: Requires that the Family Building contain at least ninety (90) units of which at least twenty-six (26) units are to be set aside for households with incomes of no more than 28% AMI (Extremely Low Income) of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 will be one-bedroom units; <i>All 18 of the one-bedroom units will be set aside for elderly residents.</i> 6 will be two-bedroom units; and 2 will be three-bedroom units. 	<p><i>Biscayne River Village Phase I, Ltd., the Phase I Developer has requested that the County agree to amend the ground lease for the Family Building to develop the property as an eighty (80) unit workforce housing residential complex pursuant to the Miami-Dade County Workforce Housing Plan rather than housing for extremely low and low income families.</i></p>	<p>Elderly Building: Requires that the Elderly Building consist of fifty-four (54) one-bedroom units, all set aside for elderly residents of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 17 will be set aside for Extremely Low Income households. 	<p><i>Biscayne River Village Phase II, Ltd., the Phase II Developer has requested that the County agree to amend the ground lease for the Elderly Building to permit the Phase II Developer to set aside seventeen (17) of the fifty-four (54) elderly units for elderly households with incomes at or below thirty-three percent (33%) rather than twenty-eight percent (28%) of Adjusted Median Income.</i></p>	<p>The units in both the Family Building and the Elderly Building not specifically set aside for Extremely Low Income households will be set aside for low income households with incomes no greater than 60% AMI.</p>	
R-754-11 adopted on October 4, 2011	Proposed Amendments								
<p>Family Building: Requires that the Family Building contain at least ninety (90) units of which at least twenty-six (26) units are to be set aside for households with incomes of no more than 28% AMI (Extremely Low Income) of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 will be one-bedroom units; <i>All 18 of the one-bedroom units will be set aside for elderly residents.</i> 6 will be two-bedroom units; and 2 will be three-bedroom units. 	<p><i>Biscayne River Village Phase I, Ltd., the Phase I Developer has requested that the County agree to amend the ground lease for the Family Building to develop the property as an eighty (80) unit workforce housing residential complex pursuant to the Miami-Dade County Workforce Housing Plan rather than housing for extremely low and low income families.</i></p>								
<p>Elderly Building: Requires that the Elderly Building consist of fifty-four (54) one-bedroom units, all set aside for elderly residents of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 17 will be set aside for Extremely Low Income households. 	<p><i>Biscayne River Village Phase II, Ltd., the Phase II Developer has requested that the County agree to amend the ground lease for the Elderly Building to permit the Phase II Developer to set aside seventeen (17) of the fifty-four (54) elderly units for elderly households with incomes at or below thirty-three percent (33%) rather than twenty-eight percent (28%) of Adjusted Median Income.</i></p>								
<p>The units in both the Family Building and the Elderly Building not specifically set aside for Extremely Low Income households will be set aside for low income households with incomes no greater than 60% AMI.</p>									
11A2 Sub.	RESOLUTION DETERMINING WHETHER TO ACCEPT OR REJECT PROPOSED VARIANCES AS TO THE DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIONS FOR BLOCK								

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
132029	36 LOCATED IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA PURSUANT TO THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF MIAMI, THE SOUTHEAST OVERTOWN/PARK WEST COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 131999]
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution determines whether to accept or reject proposed variances as to the Declaration of Restrictions for Block 36 located in Miami-Dade County, pursuant to the settlement agreement between the City of Miami, the Southeast Overtown/Park West Community Redevelopment Agency and Miami-Dade County.</p> <p>According to the Settlement Agreement between the County, the City of Miami, and the CRA, the County must approve or reject the proposed variances to the Declaration of Restrictions which has been recorded pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement mandates approval or rejection, but does not provide for revision or amendment of the proposed variances.</p> <p>On April 16, 2013, the BCC adopted Resolution 294-13, authorizing the County, the City, and the CRA to settle an existing lawsuit regarding Block 36. The Settlement Agreement was entered into by the parties, and as part of the Settlement Agreement, a Declaration of Restrictions was recorded against Block 36, which restricted the manner in how the property could be developed, and provided parameters for such development.</p> <p>The Settlement Agreement pre-approved the selection of Gatehouse Group, LLC or its affiliate as the Developer of Block 36. In the CRA's letter to the County of May 17, 2013, Gatehouse designated its affiliate, Lyric Development, LLC, as the Block 36 Developer. However, in the event that the proposed developer submits any requests for variances from the Declaration of Restrictions, the CRA must provide formal notice to the County of such variances, which must be approved or rejected by the County within 45 days of the notice, or they are deemed approved.</p> <p>On September 13, 2013, the CRA submitted Lyric's proposed variances to the Declaration of Restrictions for approval or denial by the County. The proposed variances were approved by the CRA on September 12, 2013 pursuant to Resolution CRA-R-13-0053.</p> <p><i>This substitute differs from the original because a revised letter with amended requested variances to the Declaration of Restrictions on Block 36 was sent to the County on October 15, 2013. As requested by the Southeast Overtown/Park West Community Redevelopment Agency, the revised letter replaces the original letter dated September 13, 2013. The letter of September 13, 2013 is the basis for the recommendations of denial under the original item.</i></p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact</u> Approval of the variances proposed by the developer does not create a fiscal impact to the County.</p> <p>However, as noted in the Declaration of Restrictions previously approved by the Board through Resolution 294-13, the selected developer will make separate Project Payments to the County and the CRA for Block 36. The Project Payments received by the County will be used for services that support the Overtown redevelopment project and other Overtown community development efforts. It is estimated that these payments would amount to a minimum of \$1.258 million over 25 years, or potentially more if 2.5 percent of Gross Rent exceeded the minimum payment.</p> <p>Additionally, the developer is proposing to make a contribution of \$50,000 per year for ten years, a total of \$500,000, to a community benefits program within the Southeast Overtown/Park West community redevelopment area.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval of the five variances. The variances to the Declaration of Restrictions requested by the developer and approved by the CRA, and staff's recommendation, are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The developer is requesting extension of the Zoning Approval Deadline from May 14, 2014 to November 14, 2014. <i>Staff recommends approval of this variance as it is reasonable to allow a brief six month extension in which to obtain the zoning approvals.</i> 2. The developer is requesting extension of the Commencement of Vertical Construction Deadline from May 14, 2015 to November 14, 2015. <i>Staff recommends approval of this variance given that the zoning approval deadline has been extended by the same amount of time.</i> 3. The Declaration of Restrictions provides for the development of a parking garage with a minimum of 300 spaces. The developer is requesting removal of the Parking Component from the Declaration of Restrictions. As a condition of removing the requirement of the parking garage, the developer will increase the minimum size of the Retail Component from 30,000 square feet to 55,000 square feet. It is anticipated that the additional parking spaces will be implemented in other nearby blocks. 4. The developer is requesting that the minimum square footage for the Retail Component be increased from 30,000 square feet to 55,000 square feet. <i>Staff recommends approval of this variance in lieu of the additional parking spaces on Block 36</i> 5. The developer is proposing to make a \$50,000 yearly payment for 10 years to a community benefits program within the CRA area, for a total of \$500,000.
11A3 Sub. 132030	RESOLUTION APPROVING OVERTOWN GATEWAY PARTNERS, LLC AND ALL ABOARD FLORIDA-STATIONS, LLC AS THE DEVELOPERS OF BLOCKS 45 AND 56, AND DETERMINING WHETHER TO ACCEPT OR REJECT PROPOSED VARIANCES AS TO THE DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIONS FOR SUCH BLOCKS PURSUANT TO THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF MIAMI, THE SOUTHEAST OVERTOWN/PARK WEST COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY(SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 131997)
Notes	The proposed resolution approves Overtown Gateway Partners, LLC and All Aboard Florida-Stations, LLC as the developers of Blocks 45 and 56, and determines whether to accept or reject proposed variances as to the declaration of restrictions for such blocks pursuant to the settlement agreement between the City of Miami, the Southeast Overtown/Park West Community Redevelopment Agency and Miami-Dade County.

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Based on the recommendation of the Southeast Overtown/Park West Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA), it is recommended that the Board of County Commissioners (Board) approve this item, which does the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approves of the CRA’s selection of Overtown Gateway Partners, LLC and All Aboard Florida-Stations, LLC for the development of Blocks 45 and 56 (Blocks), respectively; • Considers variances to the Declaration of Restrictive Covenants; and • Approves variance request one through five, seven, and a portion of eight (8a) and disapproves all of the other proposed variances set forth in the October 15, 2013 letter attached as Exhibit C to the resolution. Such amended request for variance letter replaces and supercedes the letters from September 17, 2013 (Exhibit A to the resolution) and September 26, 2013 (Exhibit B to the resolution). <p>According to the Settlement Agreement between the County, the City of Miami, and the CRA, the County must approve or reject the proposed developer for Blocks 45 and 56 and any variances to the Declaration of Restrictions which has been recorded pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement mandates approval or rejection, but does not provide for revision or amendment of any of the proposed variances.</p> <p><i>This substitute differs from the original because a revised letter with amended requested variances to the Declaration of Restrictions on Blocks 45 and 56 was sent to the County on October 15, 2013. As requested by the Southeast Overtown/Park West Community Redevelopment Agency, the revised letter replaces the original letters dated September 17 and 26, 2013. The letters of September 13 and 26, 2013 were the basis for the recommendations under the original item.</i></p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact</u> Selecting the developers for the two blocks in Overtown does not have an immediate fiscal impact on the County.</p> <p>However, as noted in the Declaration of Restrictions previously approved by the BCC through Resolution R-294-13, the selected developer(s) will make separate Project Payments to the County and CRA for Blocks 45 and 56 that are either: \$122,000 per year for five years and a three percent increase thereafter (minimum payment), or 2.5 percent of Gross Rent if it exceeds the minimum payment. One of the proposed variances to the Declaration of Restrictions deals with replacing the Project Payments with a one-time up-front payment. As detailed further below, the Administration recommends approval of the variance proposed by the developers.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends approval of the two proposed developers, Overtown Gateway Partners, LLC and All Aboard Florida-Stations, LLC.</i></p> <p><i>Staff does not recommend the that “failure to execute a Development Agreement with respect to one block shall only require the CRA to terminate negotiations with that Developer and issue a new Developer Opportunity for that block.”</i></p> <p><i>Staff recommends that both Development Agreements be fully executed within the required timeframes.</i></p>
11A4 131964	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING MAYORS AGAINST ILLEGAL GUNS IN URGING THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS TO EXTEND COMPREHENSIVE AND ENFORCEABLE BACKGROUND CHECKS TO COVER PRIVATE FIREARMS SALES, INCLUDING GUN SHOWS AND OVER THE INTERNET
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution supports Mayors Against Illegal Guns in urging the United States Congress to extend comprehensive and enforceable background checks to cover private firearms sales, including gun shows and over the internet.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the County's federal lobbyists to advocate for the legislation, and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2014 Federal Legislative Package when it is presented to the Board.</p> <p>Additional Information Mayors Against Illegal Guns is a national, bipartisan coalition of mayors working to make America’s communities safer by keeping illegal guns out of dangerous hands. Co-founded in 2006 by New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg and Boston Mayor Thomas Menino, the coalition has grown from a committed group of 15 members to more than 1,000 mayors from 46 states, including Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, from major cities and small towns around the country.</p> <p>On September 18, 2013, the Mayors Against Illegal Guns coalition announced the results of the first-ever national investigation into individual buyers with criminal records seeking to illegally acquire guns via online gun sales. The report concludes that thousands of people already barred by existing Federal law from purchasing guns are flocking to the Internet to evade background checks and acquire guns illegally, with no questions asked. The investigation – which examined online gun listings posted between February and May 2013 on the popular website Armslist.com – found that this single website could transfer more than 25,000 guns to individuals with criminal records just this year.</p>
11A5 131980	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING REAUTHORIZATION OF THE FLORIDA ENTERPRISE ZONE PROGRAM CURRENTLY SET TO SUNSET ON DECEMBER 31, 2015
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution supports the reauthorization of the Florida Enterprise Zone Program currently set to sunset on December 31, 2015.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2014 and 2015 State Legislative Packages when they are presented to the Board.</p> <p>Miami-Dade County's Enterprise Zone Program consists of three areas:</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Central, which encompasses a large part of Northwest Miami-Dade County, including Miami International and Opa-locka Airports, parts of east Hialeah, the Empowerment Zone and a satellite in North Dade; • South Dade, which covers part of the cities of Cutler Bay, Homestead and Florida City, as well as Perrine and Princeton; and • Miami Beach, which includes parts of South Beach, Collins Avenue and North Beach. <p><u>Additional Information- Enterprise Zone Program</u> The State of Florida established the Enterprise Zone Program to encourage business development, expansion and job creation in Florida, especially in economically distressed areas. The Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners (BCC) through Resolution No. 1305-05 joined the State of Florida (HB 1725) in sponsoring the Enterprise Zone Program to stimulate economic growth in distressed areas, and economic development through private investment to create jobs. Businesses, which locate or expand in an Enterprise Zone and hire employees who live in the zone, can reduce their State tax liability.</p> <p>Miami-Dade County's application to the State for reauthorization became effective January 1, 2006. As part of the County's reauthorization application, the BCC continued to provide a package of incentives including the economic development ad valorem tax exemption program that sunset on June 30, 2005. Ordinance No. 06-68 accomplishes this intent by making the ad valorem tax exemption program part of the new State program which started on January 1, 2006, extending the Enterprise Zone Program until December 31, 2015.</p> <p>The Economic Development Ad Valorem Tax Exemption Program is meant to encourage and attract investment to the Enterprise Zone (Zone). Miami-Dade County will abate the increase in property or tangible property taxes attributable to improvements or investment in the zone. This abatement will not reduce or eliminate existing taxes. It encourages business owners and investors to improve real property in the zone by offering reduced County tax liability for up to five years on the improvements.</p>
11A6 132008	RESOLUTION OPPOSING ANY BILL OR JOINT RESOLUTION FILED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE THAT WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT THE MIAMI-DADE COUNTY HOME RULE CHARTER OR PREEMPT LOCAL HOME RULE; IDENTIFYING THIS ISSUE AS A CRITICAL COUNTY PRIORITY FOR THE 2014 SESSION
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution opposes any bill or joint resolution filed for consideration by the Florida legislature that would adversely affect the Miami-Dade County Home Rule Charter or preempt local home rule.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the County's state lobbyists to oppose any legislation that adversely affects the Miami-Dade constitutional Home Rule Charter and preempts local Home Rule and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item as a critical County priority in the 2014 State Legislative Package when it is presented to the Board.</p> <p><u>Additional Information- The Home Rule Charter</u> In 1956, the Florida State Constitution was amended to make Miami-Dade County a home rule County. In other words, the citizens of Miami-Dade County were granted the power, within certain areas, to adopt their own rules for governing, with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) acting as the governing body. In 1957, the Miami-Dade County Home Rule Charter was adopted - essentially becoming the "constitution" for Miami-Dade County. Changes may be made to the Charter only by the affirmative vote of the electorate. Amendments may be proposed and placed on the ballot either by the BCC or by petition of the citizens.</p> <p><u>Background</u> In recent years, joint resolutions have been filed that would amend the Miami-Dade County Home Rule Amendment to the Florida Constitution authorizing revisions to the Miami Dade County Home Rule Charter by a special law passed by the Legislature. Furthermore, bills have been filed in recent years that would preempt local regulation and policy in a wide range of areas, including but not limited to construction cranes, environmental protection, living and responsible wages, local preference, pain management clinics, pit bulls and wage theft.</p>
11A7 132009	RESOLUTION URGING THE GOVERNOR, THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE, THE FLORIDA AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER APPLICABLE STATE AGENCIES TO WORK IN CLOSE COOPERATION WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CODE ENFORCEMENT, INCLUDING ENTERING INTO MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING IF APPLICABLE, TO QUICKLY IDENTIFY AND TAKE ACTION ON UNLICENSED ASSISTED LIVING FACILITIES AND OTHER COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL HOMES
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution urges the Governor, the Florida Legislature, the Florida Agency for Healthcare Administration and other applicable state agencies to work in close cooperation with local government law enforcement and code enforcement, including entering into memoranda of understanding if applicable, to quickly identify and take action related to unlicensed Assisted Living Facilities and other community residential homes.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2014 State Legislative Package when it is presented to the Board.</p> <p><u>Additional Information</u> On October 2, 2012, the BCC enacted Resolution No. 825-12, which urged the Florida Legislature to enact comprehensive Assisted Living Facility legislation during the 2013 session to protect the elderly and other vulnerable populations that reside in such facilities.</p> <p>According to an article dated May 3, 2013, a last-ditch attempt to pass legislation to reform the state's assisted living facilities measures failed on the last day of Florida's legislative session. The Senate had passed a bill (SB 646) by Sen. Eleanor Sobel, D-Hollywood, which tightened oversight of Florida's nearly 3,000 assisted living facilities, by a 38-0 vote on April 11, but a companion measure in the House never got any traction. To increase the odds of getting a bill passed, Sobel added the reforms to an omnibus healthcare bill (SB 966) sponsored by</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	Sen. Aaron Bean, Fernandina Beach, that was later weighed down with dozens of amendments. With the clock ticking, the bill was never heard Friday afternoon. http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/05/03/3379333/assisted-living-facility-reforms.html#storylink=cpy
11A8 132002	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY STATE FUNDING TO CONSTRUCT GRADE SEPARATION AT THE INTERSECTION OF S.W. 8TH STREET AND S.W. 107TH AVENUE AT THE FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS; IDENTIFYING THIS ISSUE AS A CRITICAL COUNTY PRIORITY FOR THE 2014 SESSION
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution urges the Florida Legislature to provide the necessary state funding to construct grade separation at the intersection of S.W. 8th Street and S.W. 107th Avenue at the entrances to the Florida International University main campus and identifies this as a critical County priority for the 2014 State legislative session.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the passage of legislation and funding and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item as a critical County priority in the 2014 State Legislative Package when it is presented to the Board.</p> <p>Additional Information The June 2005 Grade Separation Study prepared by the Corradino Group for the Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization examines high volume intersections throughout Miami-Dade County that could benefit from construction of what is termed a "continuous flow intersection". There are numerous concepts in the transportation community for this type of improvement. A continuous flow intersection removes the heaviest flow movement from the signal cycle, which provides more green time for all of the other movements in the intersection.</p> <p>The initial set of intersections, to be considered for grade separation, were developed by sending a letter requesting nominations to members of the Transportation Planning Committee of the MPO. Also a letter was transmitted to those municipalities with a population of 100,000 people or more requesting their participation in the study by nominating intersections that would be considered in the study.</p> <p>According to the study, historically there has been an average of 40 crashes per year with an average of 37 injuries per year at the intersection of SW 107th Avenue at SW 8th Street (Intersection). During the years 2001, 2002 and 2003 there were no fatality accidents.</p> <p>Additionally, the study found that this Intersection rates in the top five of the evaluation criteria. There are a high number of accidents, high total traffic volume through the Intersection, plenty of right-of-way to construct the grade separation and minimal impact on local businesses and local circulation. This Intersection is recommended for further analysis for a grade separation on SW 8th Street.</p>
11A9 131967	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SB 66, HB 113 OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD AUTHORIZE THE LEVY OF A DISCRETIONARY SALES SURTAX OF UP TO ONE-HALF CENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF MIAMI DADE COLLEGE AND FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY UPON APPROVAL BY A MAJORITY OF COUNTY ELECTORS VOTING IN A REFERENDUM; URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO PASS SUCH LEGISLATION
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution supports SB 66, HB 113 or similar legislation that would authorize the levy of a discretionary sales surtax of up to one half cent for the benefit of Miami Dade College and Florida International University upon approval by a majority of county electors voting in a referendum and urges the Florida Legislature to pass such legislation.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the County's state lobbyists to support the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2014 State Legislative Package when it is presented to the Board</p> <p>Additional Information On August 8, 2013, Senator Flores filed SB 66- Discretionary Sales Surtaxes for consideration during the 2014 session. SB 66 would allow the levy of a half-penny sales surtax within Miami-Dade County for the benefit of Florida International University & Miami-Dade College.</p> <p>The Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would have to approve an ordinance calling for a referendum, and further provides that the referendum would be paid for by private sources or college auxiliary funds. SB 66 provides that proceeds may be used by a state university for land acquisition for parcels that are contiguous with its existing main campus.</p> <p>On September 30, 2013, a companion bill HB 113 was filed by Representative Fresen.</p>
11A10 131988	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO COMMIT STATE FUNDING IN SUPPORT OF FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY'S (FIU) REQUEST FOR FUNDING FOR COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE RELOCATION OF THE MIAMI-DADE COUNTY FAIR AND EXPOSITION, INC. AND FIU'S DESIRED EXPANSION ONTO TAMIAMI PARK, SUBJECT TO A COUNTYWIDE REFERENDUM, AND TO IDENTIFY THIS LEGISLATIVE PRIORITY AS A CRITICAL COUNTY PRIORITY FOR THE 2014 SESSION
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution urges the Florida Legislature to commit funding to Florida International University for the relocation and the replacement costs associated with the relocation of The Fair to another site it further urges the Florida Legislature to commit funding to FIU for its desired expansion of FIU onto County park land currently leased to The Fair, subject to the voters approving such expansion in a countywide referendum.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the passage of State legislation and State funding and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item as a critical County priority in the 2014 State Legislative Package when it is presented to the Board.</p>
11A11 131998	RESOLUTION APPROVING IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-59: PROCUREMENT OF THE MIAMI-DADE COUNTY MILITARY AFFAIRS BOARD

**Board of County Commissioners
October 22, 2013 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves Implementing Order 3-59 for Procurement of the Miami-Dade County Military Affairs Board, and authorizes the County Mayor or his designee to exercise any and all rights contained therein.</p> <p>On May 17, 2012, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) created the Miami-Dade County Military Affairs Board to advance the various goals identified in Section 2-2102 of the County Code, which relate to supporting and recognizing active, reserve, retired, disabled, and deceased military personnel in Miami-Dade County.</p> <p>The BCC granted the Military Affairs Board the power to solicit and approve contracts to accomplish the public purposes set forth in Section 2-2102 of the County Code and directed the Military Affairs Board to create an implementing order establishing a framework for the Military Affairs Board's exercise of its purchasing power for BCC approval.</p> <p>The Implementing Order governs the purchase of goods and services including professional services. By exception, the Implementing Order does not govern the purchase of architecture, engineering, or those other services covered under Sec. 2-10.4 and Administrative Order 3-39.</p>
11A12 132025	<p>RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO PREVENT FLOOD INSURANCE PREMIUM RATE INCREASES ON HOMEOWNERS MANDATED BY THE BIGGERT-WATERS FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2012; URGING CONGRESS TO ENACT THE FLOOD INSURANCE IMPLEMENTATION REFORM ACT OF 2013, H.R. 2199 OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION DELAYING THE PENDING PREMIUM RATE INCREASES ON HOMEOWNERS UNDER THE BIGGERT-WATERS FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2012</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution urges Congress to enact legislation to prevent flood insurance premium rate increases on homeowners mandated by the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. The proposed resolution also urges Congress to enact the Flood Insurance Implementation Reform Act of 2013, H.R. 2199 or similar legislation delaying the pending premium rate increases under the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the County's federal lobbyists to advocate for the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2013 Federal Legislative Package and to include this item in the 2014 Federal Legislative Package when it is presented to the Board.</p> <p>Additional Information H.R. 2199: Flood Insurance Implementation Act of 2013 was introduced on May 23, 2013. The Flood Insurance Implementation Reform Act of 2013 provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays until three years after enactment of this Act the requirement of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Biggert-Waters) that any property located in an area participating in the national flood insurance program have the risk premium rate charged for flood insurance on the property adjusted to accurately reflect its current risk of flood. • Amends the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to delay until five years after enactment of Biggert-Waters the prohibition against provision to prospective insureds of flood insurance by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) at (subsidy) rates less than full actuarial estimates for property purchased after enactment of Biggert-Waters. Prohibits FEMA, when determining whether a community has made adequate progress on flood protection improvement systems, from counting federal funding or participation in such efforts. • Makes flood insurance available at certain special flood hazard area rates to riverine and coastal levees located in a community which FEMA has determined to be in the process of restoring a flood protection system previously accredited on a Flood Insurance Rate Map as providing 100-year frequency flood protection but which no longer does so. • Requires such rates to apply without regard to the level of federal funding or participation. • Amends Biggert-Waters to authorize FEMA to use other funds in addition to those specified in that Act to carry out a specified affordability study. • Requires FEMA, upon notice to certain congressional committees that it cannot submit the report on that study by the current deadline, to specify in such notice an alternative method of gathering the requisite information and subsequently to submit the information so gathered. • Directs FEMA to: (1) identify, review, update, maintain and publish National Flood Insurance rate maps pertaining to areas protected by non-structural flood mitigation features; and (2) work with states, local communities, and property owners to identify such areas and features.