



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

Board of County Commissioners Meeting

January 20, 2016
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
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes									
4A 153018	ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 2-10.4 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY RELATING TO ACQUISITION OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL, ENGINEERING, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL OR LAND SURVEYING AND MAPPING SERVICES TO INCLUDE A LOCALLY HEADQUARTERED PREFERENCE; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE									
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 2-10.4 of the Miami-Dade County Code, relating to acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services, to include a locally headquartered preference.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">Code Comparison Chart Section 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Section</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Current</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>Sec. 2-10.4. <i>Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services.</i></p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.</p> <p>(e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local proposers within five percent of the points assigned to those recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as local business in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.</p> <p>(e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. If two local firms, one locally headquartered and one not locally headquartered, are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the not locally headquartered firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. If two firms, one locally headquartered and one nonlocal are within ten (10) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference and locally headquartered preference shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local and locally headquartered proposers within five or ten percent of the points assigned, as set forth above, to those firms recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. This local preference and locally headquartered preference shall be applied after the ordinal ranking of the firms to determine the final ranking of selection. For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as Local Business and Locally Headquartered Business shall have the same meaning as Locally Headquartered Business as set forth in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Code Comparison Chart Section 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County			Section	Current	Proposed	<p>Sec. 2-10.4. <i>Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services.</i></p>	<p>(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.</p> <p>(e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local proposers within five percent of the points assigned to those recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as local business in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.</p>	<p>(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.</p> <p>(e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. If two local firms, one locally headquartered and one not locally headquartered, are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the not locally headquartered firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. If two firms, one locally headquartered and one nonlocal are within ten (10) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference and locally headquartered preference shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local and locally headquartered proposers within five or ten percent of the points assigned, as set forth above, to those firms recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. This local preference and locally headquartered preference shall be applied after the ordinal ranking of the firms to determine the final ranking of selection. For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as Local Business and Locally Headquartered Business shall have the same meaning as Locally Headquartered Business as set forth in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.</p>
Code Comparison Chart Section 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County										
Section	Current	Proposed								
<p>Sec. 2-10.4. <i>Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services.</i></p>	<p>(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.</p> <p>(e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local proposers within five percent of the points assigned to those recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as local business in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.</p>	<p>(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.</p> <p>(e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. If two local firms, one locally headquartered and one not locally headquartered, are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the not locally headquartered firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. If two firms, one locally headquartered and one nonlocal are within ten (10) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference and locally headquartered preference shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local and locally headquartered proposers within five or ten percent of the points assigned, as set forth above, to those firms recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. This local preference and locally headquartered preference shall be applied after the ordinal ranking of the firms to determine the final ranking of selection. For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as Local Business and Locally Headquartered Business shall have the same meaning as Locally Headquartered Business as set forth in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.</p>								
4B 160010	ORDINANCE RELATING TO VEHICLES FOR HIRE; AMENDING CHAPTER 31, ARTICLE I, SECTION 31-77 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, TO PROHIBIT THE OPERATION OF VEHICLES TRANSPORTING PASSENGERS FOR COMPENSATION WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION; CREATING CHAPTER 31, ARTICLE VII OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, REGULATING TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITIES, TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY DRIVERS AND TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY VEHICLES OPERATING IN THE INCORPORATED AND UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; PROVIDING FOR DEFINITIONS; PROHIBITING TRANSFER OF TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY LICENSES; PROVIDING THAT THERE SHALL BE NO LIMITATION ON THE NUMBER OF TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY LICENSES THAT MAY BE ISSUED; REQUIRING THAT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITIES OBTAIN A TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY LICENSE; REQUIRING THAT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITIES COMPLY WITH SPECIFIED RULES OF OPERATION; PROVIDING THAT THERE SHALL BE NO LIMIT TO THE NUMBER OF TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY VEHICLES AUTHORIZED TO OPERATE UNDER A TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY LICENSE; PROVIDING THAT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITIES MAY AUTHORIZE A PERSON TO OPERATE A TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY VEHICLE UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES; REGULATING TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY DRIVERS; MANDATING THAT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY DRIVERS COMPLY WITH SPECIFIED REQUIREMENTS; ESTABLISHING DUTIES OF THE MIAMI DADE COUNTY REGULATORY AND ECONOMIC RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OR SUCCESSOR DEPARTMENT; PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL RULES OF OPERATION; AUTHORIZING TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITIES TO ESTABLISH FARES AND RATES WITH CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS; AMENDING PROVISIONS RELATING TO VEHICLE STANDARDS; ESTABLISHING INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY COMMISSION TO ESTABLISH FEES; PROVIDING THAT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITIES MAY AUTHORIZE A									

Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	VEHICLE TO BE OPERATED AS A TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY VEHICLE UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES; PROVIDING FOR REGULATION OF TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY VEHICLES; REQUIRING THAT ADVERTISEMENTS FOR SERVICES CONTAIN CERTAIN INFORMATION; PROVIDING FOR ENFORCEMENT, PENALTIES, SUSPENSION, AND REVOCATION; AMENDING SECTION 8CC-10 OF THE CODE TO PROVIDE FOR CIVIL PENALTIES; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance, relating to vehicles for hire, provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amends Chapter 31, Article I, Section 31-77 of the Miami-Dade County Code (Code) to prohibit the operation of vehicles transporting passengers for compensation without authorization; • Creates Chapter 31, Article VII of the Code to regulate Transportation Network Entities (TNE), TNE drivers, and TNE vehicles operating in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Miami-Dade County; • Prohibits transfer of TNE licenses; • Provides that there will be no limitation on the number of TNE licenses that maybe issued; • Requires that TNE obtain a TNE license; • Requires that TNE comply with specified rules of operation; • Provides that there will be no limit to the number of TNE vehicles authorized to operate under a TNE license; • Provides that TNE may authorize a person to operate a TNE vehicle under certain circumstances; • Regulates TNE drivers and mandating that drivers comply with specified requirements; • Establishes duties of the Miami-Dade County Regulatory and Economic Resources Department (RER) or successor Department; • Provides for additional rules of operation; • Authorizes TNE to establish fares and rates with certain exceptions; • Amends provisions relating to vehicle standards; • Establishes insurance requirements; • Authorizes the BCC to establish fees; • Provides that TNE may authorize a vehicle to be operated as a TNE vehicle under certain circumstances; • Provides for regulation of TNE vehicles; • Requires that advertisements for services contain certain information; • Provides for enforcement, penalties, suspension and revocation; and • Amends Section 8CC-10 of the Miami-Dade County Code to provide for civil penalties.
4C 160015	ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 31 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, RELATING TO REGULATION OF TAXICABS; AMENDING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO LICENSING AND REGULATION OF TAXICABS; AMENDING DEFINITIONS; DELETING REQUIREMENT PROVIDING FOR CHAUFFEUR AGREEMENTS AND PASSENGER SERVICE AGREEMENTS; ELIMINATING PROVISIONS REQUIRING TRANSFERS TO TAXICAB CHAUFFEURS; ELIMINATING CHAUFFER TRAINING AND OTHER SPECIFIED REQUIREMENTS; AMENDING DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF REGULATORY AND ECONOMIC RESOURCES; AMENDING PROVISIONS RELATING TO TAXICAB RATES; ALLOWING PASSENGER SERVICE COMPANIES OR FOR-HIRE LICENSE HOLDERS TO CERTIFY THAT DRIVERS AND VEHICLES SATISFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CODE; AMENDING PROVISIONS RELATING TO VEHICLE STANDARDS INCLUDING VEHICLE AGE REQUIREMENTS AND VEHICLE INSPECTIONS; AMENDING PROVISIONS REGARDING INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS; PROVIDING THAT UNDERSERVED AREA TAXICABS AND SOUTH MIAMI DADE AREA TAXICABS MAY OPERATE COUNTYWIDE; AMENDING CHAPTER 8CC OF THE CODE PROVIDING CIVIL PENALTIES; AND PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amends Chapter 31 of the Miami-Dade County Code relating to regulation of taxicabs; • Amends requirements relating to licensing and regulation of taxicabs; • Deletes requirements providing for chauffeur agreements and passenger service agreements; • Eliminates provisions requiring transfers to taxicab chauffeurs; • Eliminates chauffeur training and other specified requirements; • Amends duties and responsibilities of the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources (RER); • Amends provisions relating to taxicab rates; • Allows passenger service companies or for-hire license holders to certify that drivers and vehicles satisfy the requirements of the Code; • Amends provisions relating to vehicle standards including vehicle age requirements and vehicle inspections; • Amends provisions regarding insurance requirements; • Provides that underserved area taxicabs and South Miami-Dade area taxicabs may operate countywide; and • Amends Chapter 8CC of the Miami-Dade County Code providing civil penalties.
4D 160016	ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 31, ARTICLE VI OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, RELATING TO REGULATION OF LIMOUSINES; AMENDING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO LICENSING AND REGULATION OF LIMOUSINES; AMENDING DEFINITIONS; AMENDING REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO INSURANCE; AMENDING PREARRANGEMENT REQUIREMENTS; DELETING REQUIREMENT FOR A LIMOUSINE SERVICE PLAN; AMENDING PROVISIONS RELATING TO LIMOUSINE RATES; ALLOWING LIMOUSINE LICENSE HOLDERS TO CERTIFY THAT DRIVERS AND VEHICLES SATISFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CODE; AMENDING PROVISIONS RELATING TO VEHICLE STANDARDS INCLUDING VEHICLE AGE AND VEHICLE INSPECTIONS; AMENDING RESPONSIBILITIES OF LIMOUSINE LICENSE HOLDERS; AMENDING DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF REGULATORY AND ECONOMIC RESOURCES; AMENDING CHAPTER 8CC OF THE CODE PROVIDING CIVIL PENALTIES; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amends Chapter 31, Article VI of the Miami-Dade County Code relating to regulation of limousines; • Amends requirements relating to licensing and regulation of limousines; • Amends requirements related to limousine rates;

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes									
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows limousine license holders to certify that drivers and vehicles satisfy the requirements of the Code; Amend provisions relating to vehicle standards including vehicle age and vehicle inspections; Amends responsibilities of limousine license holders; Amends duties and responsibilities of RER; and Amends Chapter 8CC of the Miami-Dade County Code providing civil penalties. 									
4E 153017	ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROGRAMS; AMENDING SECTIONS 2-8.1.1.1.2 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA TO ALLOW PARTICIPANTS IN THE SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE GOODS PROGRAM TO USE THE EXISTING BONDING AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AVAILABLE TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES FOR CONSTRUCTION SERVICES; AND PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN CODE AND EFFECTIVE DATE									
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance, pertaining to Small Business Enterprise Programs, amends Sections 2-8.1.1.1.2 of the Miami-Dade County Code to allow participants in the Small Business Enterprise Goods Programs to use the existing bonding and financial assistance program available to Small Business Enterprises for construction services.</p> <p>Background: The BCC previously passed and adopted Ordinance No. 97-52, codified at Section 10-33.02 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, Florida, creating a Small Business Enterprise Construction Services Program (CSBE), which included a Bonding and Financial Assistance Program and the BCC also passed and adopted Ordinance No. 15-141, which extended the Bonding and Financial Assistance Program to the County's Small Business Enterprise Services Program (SBE) and Small Business Enterprise Architecture and Engineering Program (CBE).</p> <p>The existing Bonding and Financial Assistance Program was established to provide assistance to CSBEs, SBEs, and CBEs in (i) preparing and completing bond packages, (ii) providing funding to be used for bonding purposes, and (iii) providing financial assistance such as mobilization capital, line of credit and/or working capital loans through partnering relationships with financial institutions.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Code Comparison Chart Section 2-8.1.1.1.2 of the Code of Miami-Dade County</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Section</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Current</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Sec. 2-8.1.1.1.2 <i>Small Business Enterprise Goods Program.</i></td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">(3) Program. (f) SBE Financial Assistance. SBD will develop a program to identify methods of financial assistance to SBE vendors on Miami-Dade County contracts</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">(3) Program. (f) SBE Bonding and Financial Assistance. This program will provide SBEs with assistance in obtaining bonding and/or financial assistance for goods and services contracts. Bonding assistance will include providing assistance in preparing and completing bond packages as well as providing funding to be used for bonding purposes. Financial assistance will include providing financial assistance such as mobilization capital, line of credit and/or working capital loans through partnering relationships with financial institutions.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Code Comparison Chart Section 2-8.1.1.1.2 of the Code of Miami-Dade County			Section	Current	Proposed	Sec. 2-8.1.1.1.2 <i>Small Business Enterprise Goods Program.</i>	(3) Program. (f) SBE Financial Assistance. SBD will develop a program to identify methods of financial assistance to SBE vendors on Miami-Dade County contracts	(3) Program. (f) SBE Bonding and Financial Assistance. This program will provide SBEs with assistance in obtaining bonding and/or financial assistance for goods and services contracts. Bonding assistance will include providing assistance in preparing and completing bond packages as well as providing funding to be used for bonding purposes. Financial assistance will include providing financial assistance such as mobilization capital, line of credit and/or working capital loans through partnering relationships with financial institutions.
Code Comparison Chart Section 2-8.1.1.1.2 of the Code of Miami-Dade County										
Section	Current	Proposed								
Sec. 2-8.1.1.1.2 <i>Small Business Enterprise Goods Program.</i>	(3) Program. (f) SBE Financial Assistance. SBD will develop a program to identify methods of financial assistance to SBE vendors on Miami-Dade County contracts	(3) Program. (f) SBE Bonding and Financial Assistance. This program will provide SBEs with assistance in obtaining bonding and/or financial assistance for goods and services contracts. Bonding assistance will include providing assistance in preparing and completing bond packages as well as providing funding to be used for bonding purposes. Financial assistance will include providing financial assistance such as mobilization capital, line of credit and/or working capital loans through partnering relationships with financial institutions.								
4F 160014	ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 2-10.4 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY RELATING TO ACQUISITION OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL, ENGINEERING, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL OR LAND SURVEYING AND MAPPING SERVICES TO INCLUDE PRIOR WORK AWARDED TO AFFILIATES OF A PROPOSING FIRM IN EVALUATING THE VOLUME OF WORK PREVIOUSLY AWARDED TO A FIRM; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE									
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 2-10.4 of the Miami-Dade County Code, relating to acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services, to include prior work awarded to affiliates of a proposing firm in evaluating the volume of work previously awarded to a firm.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Code Comparison Chart Section 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Section</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Current</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Sec. 2-10.4. <i>Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services.</i></td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">(1) Definitions. (5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts. (d) The County Manager shall select no less than three (3) firms, in the order of preference (provided that at least three (3) firms are identified in accordance with</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">(1) Definitions. (j) The term "Affiliates" shall mean business concerns, organizations, or individuals that directly or indirectly where: (i) one controls or has the power to control the other; or (ii) a third party controls or has the power to control both. Indicia of control include, but are not limited to, interlocking management or ownership, identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment, common use of employees, shared office space, shared local business tax receipt addresses, or a business entity organized by a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Code Comparison Chart Section 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County			Section	Current	Proposed	Sec. 2-10.4. <i>Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services.</i>	(1) Definitions. (5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts. (d) The County Manager shall select no less than three (3) firms, in the order of preference (provided that at least three (3) firms are identified in accordance with	(1) Definitions. (j) The term "Affiliates" shall mean business concerns, organizations, or individuals that directly or indirectly where: (i) one controls or has the power to control the other; or (ii) a third party controls or has the power to control both. Indicia of control include, but are not limited to, interlocking management or ownership, identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment, common use of employees, shared office space, shared local business tax receipt addresses, or a business entity organized by a
Code Comparison Chart Section 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County										
Section	Current	Proposed								
Sec. 2-10.4. <i>Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services.</i>	(1) Definitions. (5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts. (d) The County Manager shall select no less than three (3) firms, in the order of preference (provided that at least three (3) firms are identified in accordance with	(1) Definitions. (j) The term "Affiliates" shall mean business concerns, organizations, or individuals that directly or indirectly where: (i) one controls or has the power to control the other; or (ii) a third party controls or has the power to control both. Indicia of control include, but are not limited to, interlocking management or ownership, identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment, common use of employees, shared office space, shared local business tax receipt addresses, or a business entity organized by a								

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
	<p>subsection (b) above) by the competitive selection committee to be the most highly qualified to perform the required services. The competitive selection committee shall rank the firms in the order of their competence and qualification after considering such factors as the ability of professional personnel, past performance, willingness to meet time and budget requirements, locations of the firms, the recent, current, and projected workloads of the firms, and the volume of work previously awarded to the firm by the agency with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms. The competitive selection committee shall score the firms based on a qualitative evaluation of the selection criteria (the "Qualitative Score") but shall base its recommended ranking on the aggregate ranking provided by members of the selection committee (the "Ordinal Score") all as more particularly described in the Implementing Order. The competitive selection committee shall report to the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee the recommended ranking of the firms including both Qualitative Scores and Ordinal Scores. The competitive selection committee shall report no fewer than three (3) firms determined to be the most highly qualified, provided at least three (3) qualified firms have responded to the solicitation.</p> <p>Following the review of the selection committee's report, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall determine the final ranking of firms in the order of competence and qualification upon application of the criteria set forth in subsection (d) above and the local preference considerations set forth in subsection (e) below. The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall at all times abide by the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms. The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall file the names of the firms he selects together with his order of preference with the Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners. The County shall then negotiate a contract in accordance with the procedures set forth hereafter.</p>	<p>debarred entity, individual, or affiliate following the debarment of a contractor that has the same or similar management, ownership, or principal employees as the contractor that was debarred or suspended.</p> <p>(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.</p> <p>(d) The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall select no less than three (3) firms, in the order of preference (provided that at least three (3) firms are identified in accordance with subsection (b) above) by the competitive selection committee to be the most highly qualified to perform the required services. The competitive selection committee shall rank the firms in the order of their competence and qualification after considering such factors as the ability of professional personnel, past performance, willingness to meet time and budget requirements, locations of the firms, the recent, current, and projected workloads of the firms, and the volume of work previously awarded to the firm >>and its affiliates<< by the agency with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms. The competitive selection committee shall score the firms based on a qualitative evaluation of the selection criteria (the "Qualitative Score") but shall base its recommended ranking on the aggregate ranking provided by members of the selection committee (the "Ordinal Score") all as more particularly described in the Implementing Order. The competitive selection committee shall report to the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee the recommended ranking of the firms including both Qualitative Scores and Ordinal Scores. The competitive selection committee shall report no fewer than three (3) firms determined to be the most highly qualified, provided at least three (3) qualified firms have responded to the solicitation.</p> <p>Following the review of the selection committee's report, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall determine the final ranking of firms in the order of competence and qualification upon application of the criteria set forth in subsection (d) above and the local preference considerations set forth in subsection (e) below. The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall at all times abide by the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms. The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall file the names of the firms he selects together with his order of preference with the Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners. The County shall then negotiate a contract in accordance with the procedures set forth hereafter.</p>
4G 153015	ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 17, ARTICLE VIII OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY RELATED TO THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND BOARD OF TRUSTEES; REVISING MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES; CHANGING METHOD OF APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES; UPDATING TERMINOLOGY; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE	
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Chapter 17, Article VIII of the Miami-Dade County Code related to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Board of Trustees (Board of Trustees) providing for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revising membership of the Board of Trustees; • Changing method of appointment of members; and • Updating terminology. <p>Currently, the Board of Trustees is composed of nine (9) members, none of which can be employees of Miami-Dade County.</p> <p>Listed below are highlights of the proposed amendments:</p>	

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One member designated by the director of Miami-Dade Public Housing and Community Development Department, which member may be an employee of Miami-Dade County; • One (1) member nominated by Housing Opportunities Projects for Excellence, Inc.; • One (1) member nominated by the Builders Association of South Florida; • One (1) member designated by the director of Miami-Dade Economic Advocacy Trust, which member may be an employee of Miami-Dade County; • One (1) member designated by Miami-Dade Housing Finance Authority, which member may be an employee of Miami-Dade County; • One (1) member nominated by the Miami Coalition for the Homeless, Inc.; • One (1) member nominated by Fannie Mae; and • One (1) member nominated by the Latin Builders Association, Inc. • The County Mayor or the County Mayor’s designee shall contact each non-County agency or organization to obtain the name of such agency’s or organization’s representative. The County Mayor or the County Mayor’s designee shall verify that each representative nominated by their respective agency or organization meets the requirements of Section 2-11.38 of the Code of Miami-Dade County and any other applicable requirements established by the Board of County Commissioners. In the event a representative does not meet such requirements, then the agency or organization shall nominate another representative, subject to the before-mentioned requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ <i>Currently, the BCC Chair obtains the names of interested and eligible persons.</i>
4H 160047	ORDINANCE RELATING TO VEHICLES FOR HIRE; AMENDING CHAPTER 31, ARTICLE V RELATING TO CHAUFFEUR’S REGISTRATIONS; AMENDING DEFINITIONS; ELIMINATING REQUIREMENT THAT APPLICANTS FOR CHAUFFEUR’S REGISTRATION TAKE SPECIFIED COURSES AND ORAL, WRITTEN AND PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS; CREATING CHAPTER 31, ARTICLE VII OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, REGULATING TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITIES, TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY FOR HIRE CHAUFFEURS AND TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY VEHICLES OPERATING IN THE INCORPORATED AND UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; PROVIDING FOR DEFINITIONS; REQUIRING THAT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITIES OBTAIN A TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY LICENSE; PROVIDING THAT THERE SHALL BE NO LIMITATION ON THE NUMBER OF TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY LICENSES THAT MAY BE ISSUED; REQUIRING THAT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITIES COMPLY WITH SPECIFIED RULES OF OPERATION; PROHIBITING TRANSFER OF TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY LICENSES; PROVIDING THAT THERE SHALL BE NO LIMIT TO THE NUMBER OF TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY VEHICLES AUTHORIZED TO OPERATE UNDER A TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY LICENSE; REQUIRING THAT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY FOR HIRE CHAUFFEUR’S OBTAIN A CHAUFFEUR’S REGISTRATION; MANDATING THAT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY CHAUFFEURS COMPLY WITH SPECIFIED REQUIREMENTS; ESTABLISHING DUTIES OF REGULATORY AND ECONOMIC RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OR SUCCESSOR DEPARTMENT; PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL RULES OF OPERATION; AUTHORIZING TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITIES TO ESTABLISH FARES AND RATES FOR TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY SERVICES; ESTABLISHING INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS; AUTHORIZING COUNTY COMMISSION TO ESTABLISH FEES; REQUIRING THAT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK ENTITY VEHICLES COMPLY WITH VEHICLE STANDARDS AND BE ISSUED AN OPERATING PERMIT UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance, relating to vehicles for hire, provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amends Chapter 31, Article V relating to chauffeur’s registration; • Eliminates requirements that applicants for chauffeur’s registration take specified courses and oral, written and physical examinations; • Creates Chapter 21, Article VII of the Miami-Dade County Code regulating Transportation Network Entities (TNE), TNE for hire chauffeurs and TNE vehicles operating in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Miami-Dade County; • Requires that TNE obtain a TNE license; • Provides that there will be no limitation on the number of TNE licenses that may be issued; • Requires that TNE comply with specified rules of operation; • Prohibits transfer of TNE licenses; • Provides that there will be no limit to the number of TNE vehicles authorized to operate under a TNE license; • Requires that TNE for hire chauffeurs obtain a chauffeur’s registration; • Mandates that TNE chauffeurs comply with specified requirements; • Establishes duties of the Regulatory and Economic Resources Department (RER) or successor Department; • Provides for additional rules of operation; • Authorizes TNE to establish fares and rates for TNE services; • Establishes insurance requirements; • Authorizes the BCC to establish fees; and • Requires that TNE vehicles comply with vehicle standards and be issued an operating permit under certain circumstances.
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON ITEMS 4B, 4C, 4D and 4H	
<p>Ride-sharing bill advances in House Economics committee – Florida Politics, January 13, 2016¹:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A bill that would create statewide regulations for transportation network companies (TNCs) passed through the House Economics Affairs Committee on Wednesday.</i> 	

¹ <http://floridapolitics.com/archives/198578-ride-sharing-bill-advances-in-florida-house-committee>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the third year in a row that such legislation has come before Florida lawmakers. Cities and counties creating their own rules on dealing with companies such as Uber and Lyft are applying more pressure than ever on the Legislature to craft an all-encompassing statewide bill. • As was the case in 2015, Fort Walton Beach Republican is shepherding the bill in the state House. Several members of the committee applauded him for making improvements from last year's bill, such as on strengthening insurance requirements for TNC drivers. • A controversial provision that remains in the bill is how the state would pre-empt local governments from enforcing regulations. • St. Petersburg Republican says she loves Uber and supported it in the committee vote, but was unhappy that the legislation still doesn't require TNC drivers to submit to fingerprinting in background checks. • "In the state of Florida we have made the Level 2 fingerprint background the standard for safety when it comes to teachers, coaches, nurses, massage therapists and even taxi drivers," she said, calling the provisions in the bill more cumbersome and expensive than doing a Level 2 check. • Florida Taxi Association lobbyist said her organization's main objective is that there be parity between the cab industry and the TNC's. • The Taxi Association also objects to provisions that require ride-sharing companies to pay the state \$5,000 annually for enforcement, saying that should go to the local communities where Uber and Lyft operate. • There were several Uber drivers who spoke in support of the bill. • "We are optimistic that today's bipartisan vote on the passage of HB 509 by the Florida House Economic Affairs Committee is a positive indication that Florida lawmakers understand the economic, transportation access, and safety benefits that come from ridesharing services like Uber," said Uber spokesman. • A representative from the Property Casualty Insurers Association of America, waived in support of the bill during the hearing and released a statement immediately after its passage: "PCI supports HB 509 because it ensures rideshare drivers have adequate insurance coverage from the time the app is turned on until the app is turned off. Currently, there are 29 states that have enacted laws to protect not only their drivers, but their passengers and the public by closing the insurance gaps that left drivers vulnerable if an accident were to occur. Without this legislation, TNC drivers may not be covered by their insurance policy, unless they have commercial coverage." • The legislation will now advance to the floor of the House of Representatives. It has no Senate companion bill. <p>Fighting Uber, taxi owners ask to keep older cabs on the road longer – Miami Herald, January 13, 2016²:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Miami-Dade County Commission's transit committee unanimously endorsed a proposal for a two-year delay on a mandatory retirement date that kicked in at the end of 2015 for more than 100 taxis that were built before 2008. Commissioners have extended retirement dates for taxis in the past, but this move comes a week before the board is slated to once again take up the controversy over how to legalize Uber's popular cellphone-based vehicle service. • At their Jan. 20 meeting, the 13 commissioners are scheduled to face a rare instance of competing ordinances on the same topic. • One ordinance would impose restrictions Uber opposes, including a requirement that all drivers for the company submit to the same county screening that taxi drivers do. It also would require Uber and its competitors to maintain insurance on its drivers' cars 24 hours a day, rather than having company protections only kick in once a driver is heading to pick up a passenger. • The other ordinance, the pro-Uber legislation, would let Uber and other "transportation network" providers screen their own drivers for criminal history and bad driving records. The bill also would tie insurance rules to state requirements. • After launching in Miami-Dade about two years ago, Uber has rapidly dwarfed the taxi industry in terms of vehicles. A memo by the Miami-Dade Mayor this week said there are more than 10,000 vehicles being operated illegally in Miami-Dade for Uber and its much smaller competitor, Lyft. That's compared to 6,000 taxis and other for-hire vehicles licensed with the county system. Between May 2014 and the end of last year, Miami-Dade has issued about 3,500 citations to Uber and Lyft drivers.
4I 152923	<p>ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE FROM TIME TO TIME OF NOT EXCEEDING \$200,000,000.00 AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA AVIATION COMMERCIAL PAPER NOTES OUTSTANDING AT ANY ONE TIME FOR PURPOSE OF PAYING OR REIMBURSING AVIATION DEPARTMENT, TOGETHER WITH OTHER AVAILABLE FUNDS AND REVENUE, FOR COST OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS TO COUNTY'S AIRPORT FACILITIES PURSUANT TO PROVISIONS OF AMENDED AND RESTATED TRUST AGREEMENT, INCLUDING SECTION 212A THEREOF; PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT BY SUBSEQUENT RESOLUTION OF TERMS, MATURITIES, INTEREST RATES AND OTHER DETAILS OF SUCH NOTES; PROVIDING FOR SUCH NOTES TO BE PAYABLE FROM THE PROCEEDS OF AVIATION REVENUE BONDS AUTHORIZED AND UNISSUED; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY AND EFFECTIVE DATE</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes the issuance of not to exceed \$200 million at any one time in one or more series of Aviation Commercial Paper Notes (Notes), for the purpose of providing temporary financing for a portion of the cost of the Aviation Department's (Department) Capital Improvement Program (Capital Projects), which is scheduled to be initiated during fiscal year 2016. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These expenditures are needed to meet current and forecasted Department capital intensive demands at Miami International Airport and the general aviation airports. • Authorizes the Mayor or the Mayor's designee to direct First Southwest, the County's enterprise segment financial advisor, to obtain proposals through requests for proposals or any other competitive process deemed appropriate for the selection of commercial paper dealer(s), issuing and paying agent(s) and letter of credit provider(s) in connection with the Notes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The County will negotiate a letter of credit and reimbursement agreements with the commercial paper dealer(s) and paying agent(s) and present those terms to the Board for approval and adoption by a subsequent resolution. The County will also negotiate remarketing agreements with the commercial paper dealer(s) and paying agent agreement with the paying agent. <p>The implementation of a Commercial Paper Program by issuing Notes for the Aviation Department (Department) will provide a means of temporary financing to fund a portion of the Department's Capital Projects. Once the full \$200 million of the Commercial Paper Program has</p>

² <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/local/community/miami-dade/article54550595.html>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>been issued, the County anticipates to take-out the Notes with long-term, fixed rate bonds, thereby allowing additional Notes to be issued. The impact of the Commercial Paper Program is countywide.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The Ordinance authorizes the issuance of Notes to be paid from the proceeds of future Aviation revenue bonds. Interest on the Notes will be paid from bond proceeds or unencumbered funds on deposit in the Department’s Capital Improvement Fund or with proceeds from the Notes. The principal and interest from the bonds used to take out the Notes will be paid from revenues of the Department pursuant to the Department’s Amended and Restated Trust Agreement.</p> <p>The Commercial Paper Program enables the Department to have immediate access to capital funds at short-term interest rates. This program will expedite the Capital Projects, which may lead to savings by taking advantage of historically low short-term rates and favorable construction prices. The Notes will be structured as a tax-exempt commercial paper program and will be issued in anticipation of the issuance of bonds.</p> <p>To fund the Department’s Capital Improvement Program, the County, pursuant to Ordinance No. 08-121, has authorized \$1.9 billion in Airport Revenue Bonds, of which \$1.618 billion have been issued.</p> <p>Creating a Commercial Paper Program will allow the Department to respond quickly to the pace of construction and changing financial market conditions, ultimately allowing more construction to take place while prices are favorable and minimizing the cost of financing.</p>
40 160072	<p>ORDINANCE AMENDING ARTICLE LXXX, SECTION 2-1102 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA CONCERNING THE MIAMI DADE HIV/AIDS PARTNERSHIP; REVISING MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS FOR THE REPRESENTATIVE SEATS FOR MEMBER REPRESENTATIVES OF AFFECTED COMMUNITIES BY REQUIRING THIRTEEN REPRESENTATIVE SEATS FOR INDIVIDUALS LIVING WITH HIV DISEASE; WAIVING QUALIFIED ELECTOR REQUIREMENT FOR THE THIRTEEN REPRESENTATIVE SEATS FOR INDIVIDUALS LIVING WITH HIV DISEASE; PROHIBITING CRIMINAL BACKGROUND SCREENING OF APPLICANTS FOR THE THIRTEEN REPRESENTATIVE SEATS FOR INDIVIDUALS LIVING WITH HIV DISEASE AND ONE REPRESENTATIVE SEAT FOR FORMER INMATE OF A LOCAL, STATE OR FEDERAL PRISON; EXCLUDING AD HOC COMMITTEES AND WORKGROUPS FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 2-1102(G) (1) AND (2) OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA RELATED TO DEMOGRAPHICS AND PARITY; DELETING REQUIREMENT THAT PARTNERSHIP MEMBERS’ TERMS SHALL END CONCURRENTLY WITH THE LAST DAY OF THE COUNTY’S FISCAL YEAR; CORRECTING SCRIVENER’S ERRORS; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amends Article LXXX, Section 2-1102 of the Miami-Dade County Code concerning the Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership; • Revises membership requirements for the representative seats for member representatives of affected communities by requiring thirteen representative seats for individuals with HIV disease; • Waives qualified elector requirement for the thirteen representative seats for individuals living with HIV disease; • Prohibits criminal background screening of applicants for the thirteen representative seats for individuals living with HIV disease and one representative seat for former inmate of a local, state or federal prison; • Excludes ad hoc committees and workgroups from the requirements of Section 2-1102(G) (1) and (2) of the Miami-Dade County Code, relating to demographics and parity; and • Deletes the requirement that partnership members’ terms will end concurrently with the last day of the County’s fiscal year. <p><u>Background:</u> Part A of the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Extension Act of 2009 (the Act or Ryan White Part A), as amended, requires that to be eligible for federal assistance under the Act, each grantee will establish or designate an HIV health services planning council (Planning Council). The Act further requires that in fulfilling its roles and responsibilities, a planning council must include persons living with HIV/AIDS in all its activities and requires that at least 33% of the planning council will be consumers of Ryan White Part A services (Consumer Representatives) who are not officers, employees, or consultants to any entity that receives Ryan White Part A funds. The Act also requires that the Consumer Representatives must, like the planning council as a whole, reflect the demographics of the population of individuals with HIV/AIDS in the eligible metropolitan area/transitional grant area (Eligible Metropolitan Area).</p> <p>Miami-Dade County (County) is an Eligible Metropolitan Area and currently a Ryan White Part A grantee, which receives more than \$26 million from the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, HIV/AIDS Bureau (Federal Government). As required by the Act, the BCC adopted Ordinance No. 98-127, as amended and codified in Article LXXX of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), creating the Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership (Partnership). The BCC created the Partnership to determine the HIV-related needs of the community, to establish service priorities, and to allocate funding to the areas of greatest need as defined by the Federal Government.</p> <p>According to the County’s data, approximately 71,390 formerly incarcerated individuals (Formerly Incarcerated Individuals) were living in the County in 2014 and that an estimated 3,570 Formerly Incarcerated Individuals have HIV. The County’s data also shows that of the 9,655 consumers living with HIV/AIDS served by the County’s Ryan White Part A funded program in fiscal year 2014, 2,209 of these consumers have had a history of drug usage and in all likelihood some have had some dealings with the criminal justice system. Notwithstanding a person’s criminal history, the Act does not prevent such person, who meets all Ryan White Part A eligibility requirements, from receiving services under the Ryan White Part A program or serving on the planning council.</p>
5L 152620	<p>ORDINANCE APPROVING AND ADOPTING FISCAL YEAR 2015-16 MID-YEAR SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS AND AMENDMENTS FOR VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENTS AND FUNDS; RATIFYING AND APPROVING IMPLEMENTING ORDERS AND OTHER BOARD ACTIONS WHICH</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																																																														
	SET FEES, CHARGES AND ASSESSMENTS AND PROVIDING FOR THEIR AMENDMENT; AMENDING SECTION 1-4.3 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA TO CONFORM THE CODE, APPLICABLE IMPLEMENTING ORDERS, AND OTHER LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2015-16 MID-YEAR SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET AND PRIOR YEAR SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGETS AS IT RELATES TO VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS AND DELEGATIONS OF COMMISSION AUTHORITY, POWER, AND RESPONSIBILITIES ASSOCIATED THEREWITH; AND PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE																																																														
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance approves a Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Mid-Year Supplemental Budget in accordance with the Home Rule Charter and Section 129.06 of the Florida Statutes.</p> <p><u>Operating Adjustments</u> Small Business Development To address the findings in the 2015 Disparity Study submitted by Mason Tillman, Ltd. and in response to Resolution No. R-888-15, the addition of 10 positions in the Small Business Development (SBD) division of the Internal Services Department is being recommended. These positions are intended to enhance SBD's efforts to increase the number of certified small businesses, augment opportunities for small businesses and local workers on County contracts through the assignment of small business measures, enforce compliance with small business and workforce program goals, assist firms with prompt payment issues, and monitor responsible and living wage requirements. The cost of these positions for FY 2015-16 will be \$635,000 and will be funded from the reserve set aside in the Adopted Budget pending a recommendation regarding these positions, as noted in the FY 2015-16 Proposed Budget document and in the information provided at the September 17, 2015 Budget Hearing.</p> <p>Reorganization of Transportation and Public Works Functions Based on the October 9, 2015 memorandum "Reorganization of Transportation and Public Works Functions," an examination of transportation-related functions has resulted in the budget supplement. These ordinance schedules create the Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW) (\$637.32 million operating budget, 4,223 positions) and the Department of Solid Waste Management (DSWM) (\$464.14 million operating budget, 996 positions) and eliminate the former Public Works and Waste Management and Transit departments. These ordinance schedules also amend the budgets for the Regulatory and Economic Resources Department (RER) (net increase totaling \$67.024 million and net reduction of one position), and the Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department (PROS) (net increases totaling \$27.559 million and 60 position).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the memorandum, the administration would establish DTPW and it would include the functions of Miami-Dade Transit, along with the County Engineer, Traffic Operations (to include Traffic Engineering and Traffic Signals and Signs), Construction and Maintenance (to include Road, Bridge and Canal Maintenance), and Highway Planning (to include Roadway Engineering and the Right of Way Division), as well as the Passenger Transportation Regulation function from the Business Affairs Division of RER. Special Taxing District Management and Causeways would become part of PROS, and Stormwater Utility and Planning would be transferred to RER. Solid Waste Management and Mosquito Control would continue as DSWM. <p>In addition to the adjustments required to accomplish the reorganization, DTPW requires a supplement of \$550,000 in Fund CO 330 to provide federal grant match funding support for the Metropolitan Planning Organization. The additional funding will be provided by higher than anticipated Secondary Gas tax receipts.</p> <p>Reorganization of Transportation and Public Works Functions</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">FY 2015-16</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">REVENUE</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Adopted Budget</th> <th style="text-align: center;">DSWM Supplement</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">CW</td> <td>General Fund Countywide</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$13,543</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$1,584</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UMSA</td> <td>General Fund UMSA</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$12,495</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>Carryover</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$214,825</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$163,928</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>Causeway Toll Revenues</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$10,346</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>Collection Fees and Charges</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$135,988</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$135,988</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>Construction / Plat Fees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$1,158</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>Disposal Fees and Charges</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$114,994</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$114,994</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>Interest Earnings</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$409</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$409</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>Interest/ Rate Stabilization Reserve</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$58</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>Intradepartmental Transfers</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$24,534</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>Miscellaneous Revenues</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$16</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>PTP Sales Tax Revenue</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$2,939</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PROP</td> <td>Recyclable Material Sales</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$1,874</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$1,874</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					FY 2015-16		REVENUE		Adopted Budget	DSWM Supplement	CW	General Fund Countywide	\$13,543	\$1,584	UMSA	General Fund UMSA	\$12,495	\$0	PROP	Carryover	\$214,825	\$163,928	PROP	Causeway Toll Revenues	\$10,346	\$0	PROP	Collection Fees and Charges	\$135,988	\$135,988	PROP	Construction / Plat Fees	\$1,158	\$0	PROP	Disposal Fees and Charges	\$114,994	\$114,994	PROP	Interest Earnings	\$409	\$409	PROP	Interest/ Rate Stabilization Reserve	\$58	\$58	PROP	Intradepartmental Transfers	\$24,534	\$0	PROP	Miscellaneous Revenues	\$16	\$0	PROP	PTP Sales Tax Revenue	\$2,939	\$0	PROP	Recyclable Material Sales	\$1,874	\$1,874
		FY 2015-16																																																													
REVENUE		Adopted Budget	DSWM Supplement																																																												
CW	General Fund Countywide	\$13,543	\$1,584																																																												
UMSA	General Fund UMSA	\$12,495	\$0																																																												
PROP	Carryover	\$214,825	\$163,928																																																												
PROP	Causeway Toll Revenues	\$10,346	\$0																																																												
PROP	Collection Fees and Charges	\$135,988	\$135,988																																																												
PROP	Construction / Plat Fees	\$1,158	\$0																																																												
PROP	Disposal Fees and Charges	\$114,994	\$114,994																																																												
PROP	Interest Earnings	\$409	\$409																																																												
PROP	Interest/ Rate Stabilization Reserve	\$58	\$58																																																												
PROP	Intradepartmental Transfers	\$24,534	\$0																																																												
PROP	Miscellaneous Revenues	\$16	\$0																																																												
PROP	PTP Sales Tax Revenue	\$2,939	\$0																																																												
PROP	Recyclable Material Sales	\$1,874	\$1,874																																																												

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes			
	PROP	Resource Recovery Energy Sales	\$10,450	\$10,450
	PROP	Special Taxing Administration Charges	\$2,745	\$0
	PROP	Special Taxing District Revenue	\$28,128	\$0
	PROP	Stormwater Utility Fees (County)	\$24,823	\$0
	PROP	Stormwater Utility Fees (Municipalities)	\$1,591	\$0
	PROP	Transfer Fees	\$6,643	\$6,643
	PROP	Utility Service Fee	\$24,168	\$24,168
	PROP	Storm Water Utility Fees	\$3,978	\$0
	STATE	Carryover	\$55	\$55
	STATE	Mosquito State Grant	\$43	\$43
	STATE	FDOT Payment	\$2,340	\$0
	INTERTRNF	Interagency Transfers	\$3,828	\$0
	INTERTRNF	Secondary Gas Tax	\$7,998	\$0
	TOTAL REVENUE		\$649,969	\$460,194
	Supplement			\$464,140
	Variance (Intradepartmental Transfer)			(\$3,946) *
<p>* As per OMB, variance from Intradepartmental Transfer to Disposal (Fund EW 470, Subfunds 470, 471, and 475)</p>				
Capital Adjustments				
Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond Program (BBC GOB)				
<p>To properly reflect capital projects funded by the BBC GOB, the Regulatory and Economic Resources Department (RER) requires a technical adjustment to the FY 2015-16 Adopted Budget and Multi-Year Capital Plan of \$6.775 million. On September 16, 2015, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-763-15 approving a significant modification to reduce \$10 million from BBC GOB Project No. 10 "Purchase of Development Rights" and reallocating those funds to Project No. 52 "Beach Erosion Mitigation and Renourishment." Funding for this project includes \$10 million from BBC GOB proceeds as well as \$3.213 million in state and local revenue share.</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>The FY2015-16 Proposed Budget and Multi-Year Capital Plan, Volume 3, page 21, reflects an Unfunded Capital Project for Beach Erosion and Renourishment with an estimated project cost of \$20.759 million. The Office of Management and Budget stated that the GOB program transferred \$10 million of surplus funds from the Purchase of Developmental Rights Project to the Beach Renourishment Project, which had expended its appropriation. RER submitted its capital schedule to be included in the supplement indicating that \$6.775 million is needed for renourishment in FY2015-16.</i></p>				
Fire Rescue				
<p>Fire Rescue's Special Revenue Fund (Fund SF 011, Subfund 124) requires a supplemental budget of \$2.606 million to cover the costs associated with the Department's fleet replacement plan to include pumpers, rescues, platforms, battalion, and special event vehicles. This project and associated expenses were inadvertently omitted from the Department's FY 2015-16 Multi-Year Capital Plan. Funding is provided by financing proceeds pursuant to equipment leases.</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>As per the Office of Management and Budget the item is funded from \$2.6 million carryover revenue. The Fire Rescue Department stated that the \$1.8 million for 20 Battalion vehicles has not yet occurred. In addition, \$805,000 for Special Event vehicle lease proceeds was already received and it can be seen in the County's Financial System (Fund SF 011, Subfund 124).</i></p>				
Additional Information – Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee Meeting Discussion:				
<p>During the Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee meeting on January 12, 2016, the following was discussed:</p>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Committee noted that there should be more accountability in involving CBOs.</i> • <i>The Committee questioned whether or not the BCC had to approve reorganization of Transportation and Public Works functions or if the Mayor would approve reorganization, to which the CAO explained that the BCC would approve the budgetary transfers that would effectuate the reorganization. The CAO clarified that the Mayor could reorganize the administration however he wants.</i> • <i>The Committee expressed concerns with the elimination of the Public Works Department because the Department responds to the daily needs of the public and it should be isolated from transportation.</i> 			

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><u>11A4 – 151495:</u></p> <p>The proposed resolution calls a countywide Special Election to be held in Miami-Dade County, Florida in conjunction with a General Election on Tuesday, November 8, 2016, for the purpose of submitting to the qualified electors of Miami-Dade County the proposal for amendment to the Home Rule Charter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Election: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Notice of such election will be published in accordance with Section 100.342, Florida Statutes;</i> ○ <i>The result of such election will be determined by a majority of the qualified electors of Miami-Dade County voting upon the proposal;</i> ○ <i>The polls at such election will be open from 7:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. on the day of such election;</i> ○ <i>All qualified electors of Miami-Dade County, Florida will be entitled to vote at said election; and</i> ○ <i>The County registration books will remain open at the Office of the Miami-Dade County Supervisor of Elections until twenty-nine (29) days prior to the date of such election, at which time the registration books will close in accordance with the provisions of general election laws.</i> • The question will appear on the ballot in the following form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>CHARTER AMENDMENT ON CONTROL OF SPECIAL PURPOSE DISTRICTS IN MUNICIPALITIES: SHALL THE CHARTER BE AMENDED TO ALLOW THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS TO PROVIDE, BY ORDINANCE, THAT THE GOVERNING BODY OF ANY SPECIAL PURPOSE DISTRICT LOCATED ENTIRELY WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF A MUNICIPALITY BE THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE MUNICIPALITY RATHER THAN THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AS IS CURRENTLY REQUIRED BY THE CHARTER? YES/NO</i> ○ <i>The form of the ballot will be in accordance with the requirements of general election laws.</i> • Voting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Early voting will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of general election laws;</i> ○ <i>Absentee paper ballots may be used by qualified electors of Miami-Dade County for voting on this question. The form of such absentee ballot will be in accordance with the requirements prescribed by general election laws; and</i> ○ <i>A sample ballot showing the manner in which the question or proposal aforesaid will appear at this election will be published and provided in accordance with the applicable provisions of general election laws.</i> <p>This special election on the proposal will be held and conducted in accordance with applicable provisions of the general laws relating to elections and the provisions of the Miami-Dade County Home Rule Charter. The County Mayor or his or her designee, the Finance Director, and the Clerk of the County Commission are authorized and directed to take all appropriate actions necessary to carry into effect and accomplish the provisions of this resolution. This election will be a nonpartisan election. Election officials in connection with this election will be appointed in accordance with the provisions of general election laws.</p> <p>This election will be canvassed by the County Canvassing Board, in accordance with the provisions of Section 3.07 of the Home Rule Charter.</p> <p><u>Background:</u></p> <p>Section 1.01(A)(11) of the Miami-Dade County Home Rule Charter (Charter) currently provides that the BCC “shall be the governing board” of all special purpose districts (also known as special taxing districts) within Miami-Dade County and these special taxing districts are created pursuant to Chapter 18 of the Miami-Dade County Code of Ordinances to provide services including street lighting, security services, maintenance and other services which provide a special benefit to properties located within the district.</p> <p>The BCC, and County staff, are currently responsible for the management and operation of over 1,000 active Special Taxing Districts and amending the Charter would allow the BCC to authorize municipal governing boards to serve as the governing boards of Special Taxing Districts located entirely within their respective municipal limits would alleviate the administrative burden on the County while also allowing greater municipal input on the operation of these special taxing districts. This greater municipal input would include allowing the municipal governing boards to determine the appropriate annual rates to be assessed within these special taxing districts.</p> <p><u>Additional Information - Metropolitan Services Committee meeting discussion:</u></p> <p><i>During the Metropolitan Services Committee meeting on August 26, 2015, the following was discussed: It was requested, to comply with directions and Board rules that six (6) town hall meetings occur prior to BCC consideration that the hearings of the proposed resolution before the full BCC be in January to give the administration time to schedule the meetings, as the election will be held in November.</i></p> <p><u>Additional Information</u></p> <p>On June 25, 2015, the Mayor issued a memorandum regarding four ordinances approving the rate setting process for Special Taxing Districts. According to the Memorandum, Miami-Dade County’s Public Works and Waste Management Department (PWWM) is currently responsible for the management and operation of 1,068 active Special Taxing Districts, which provide lighting, security guard services, and multipurpose maintenance throughout unincorporated Miami-Dade and in several municipalities. This annual rate setting process is required pursuant to Florida Statute 197.3632 and Section 18-14(5) of the Miami-Dade County Code. In the past, this process was noticed as part of the County’s annual budget process and homeowners received their notification through the Truth In Millage (TRIM) notice. The County is now required to publicly notice the increase of any non-ad valorem assessment rolls in Special Taxing Districts separately. As required by recent case law,</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes												
	<p>whenever rates are increased property owners must be notified of proposed rate increases. In the case where there is a rate increase, the Board is required to adopt the assessment rolls at a public hearing held between January 1 and September 15.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 2, 2015, the BCC opened the public hearing for the following items which was continued to the September 1, 2015, BCC meeting: File No. 151272, which recommends flat rates for 834 out of 1,068 districts, and File Nos. 151271, 151274 and 151275, which require rate increases, on First Reading, thereby commencing the process for rate setting. On June 6, 2015, courtesy letters were mailed to all residents whose districts have a proposed rate increase. Notices of proposed rate increases were mailed to all affected Special taxing District property owners on June 8, 2015. Newspaper advertisements advising of the public hearing to be held on June 30, 2015 were published in the Miami Herald on Wednesday, June 10, 2015, and Tuesday, June 16, 2015. Notices were posted in all Special Taxing Districts with proposed rate increases. <p>The County's Audit and Management Services Department, at the request of PWWM, is currently conducting an audit of all special taxing districts. The ongoing audit process and subsequent management review have revealed issues with past management and budgeting/accounting practices that have been and continue to be addressed. Immediately upon discovering these concerns, steps were revised for consistency with County and accounting standards. The fiscal components of the Division were transferred under the purview of the PWWM Assistant Director of Administration to ensure greater accountability. Additionally, staff continues to work with the Office of Management and Budget, the Finance Department, the County Attorney's Office, and the Property Appraiser's Office to ensure compliance with proper accounting principles, ensure appropriate checks and balances, and provide for an appropriate transition to this new rate setting process.</p> <p>A historical review of past audits demonstrates a complexity of management issues that date back to 1996. The necessary immediate steps to implement corrective actions have been taken and will continue upon the conclusion and review of the audit findings. At the completion of this process, future rate setting will be limited to cost of living requirements or the cost of any improvements requested by residents.</p> <p>Additional Information - For thousands of Miami-Dade homeowners, tax increases coming after mix-up in special districts – Miami Herald, June 29, 2015 http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/1564A6AC1B5158E0?p=NewsBank</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of a widespread of what officials say was a flawed accounting system governing hundreds of special taxing districts throughout the County, about 118,000 properties face some sort of increase in 2016. Of the 1,068 special districts administered by the county, only 234 face increases in 2016 - about one in five. Most of the hikes are nominal: \$36 for the average property, but some are significant: a district in Miami's Morningside neighborhood would see its security-guard fee go from \$600 a property to \$1,640. Star Island faces an 800 percent increase to \$9,221 under the administration's proposed rates for 2016. In a Memo sent last week, the Mayor said the former Director of the taxing-district division was "removed" and the agency reorganized. An audit is under way. County Commissioners held a public hearing on the proposed increases last Tuesday, but a final vote is being delayed until Sept. 1. A spokesman from the Mayor's office said the increases will generate an extra \$4.2 million in 2016, roughly 35 percent more than the \$11.9 million that residents of the special districts would owe without the hikes. Officials describe it as a one-time fix, with about half of it going to close a deficit in the tax-district funds of about \$2 million. Public Works said the rest of the increase will cover the higher costs of providing services in the districts - amenities like security, street lights and landscaping. 												
7B 151777	ORDINANCE RELATING TO ZONING; PROVIDING FOR INCREASED HEIGHT AND LENGTH IN RECREATIONAL VEHICLE AND BOAT STORAGE; AMENDING SECTION 33-20 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE												
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance, relating to zoning, provides for increased height and length in recreational vehicle and boat storage. Specifically, the proposed ordinance will allow for larger boats not exceeding 40 feet in length, not more than 102 inches in width and 14 feet in height above grade, to be stored or temporarily parked in the RU, EU, AU and GU zoning districts on lots developed with residential structures. Additionally, it will also allow for parking of larger recreational and camping equipment permitted under applicable provisions of the motor vehicle laws of the State of Florida.</p> <p>This is an enabling legislative change allowing for larger boats to be stored and parked in RU, EU, and AU zoning districts, and for larger recreational/camping equipment to be parked in the open, on sites containing a single-family or duplex residence. As a result, it may reduce the amount of enforcement activity related to these efforts.</p> <p>The precise fiscal impact cannot be determined because the level of non-compliance for the proposed ordinance cannot be estimated at this time. However, all enforcement related expenses will not exceed revenues associated with enforcement activities. Further, enforcement activities relating to the implementation of this ordinance will be absorbed as part of the Regulatory and Economic Resource Department's ongoing enforcement activities.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">Code Comparison</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">Section 33-20 of the Miami-Dade County Code</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Section</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Current</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Sec. 33-20.</td> <td>(e) Boat storage. Boats of less than thirty (30) feet in length, not more than one hundred and two (102) inches in width and thirteen (13) feet six (6) inches in height</td> <td>(e) Boat storage. Boats not exceeding forty (40) feet in length, not more than one hundred and two (102) inches in width and fourteen (14) feet in height above</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Code Comparison			Section 33-20 of the Miami-Dade County Code			Section	Current	Proposed	Sec. 33-20.	(e) Boat storage. Boats of less than thirty (30) feet in length, not more than one hundred and two (102) inches in width and thirteen (13) feet six (6) inches in height	(e) Boat storage. Boats not exceeding forty (40) feet in length, not more than one hundred and two (102) inches in width and fourteen (14) feet in height above
Code Comparison													
Section 33-20 of the Miami-Dade County Code													
Section	Current	Proposed											
Sec. 33-20.	(e) Boat storage. Boats of less than thirty (30) feet in length, not more than one hundred and two (102) inches in width and thirteen (13) feet six (6) inches in height	(e) Boat storage. Boats not exceeding forty (40) feet in length, not more than one hundred and two (102) inches in width and fourteen (14) feet in height above											

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
	<p><i>Accessory buildings; utility sheds and pergolas; swimming pools; fallout shelters; boat storage; portable mini-storage units; cargo container storage units.</i></p>	<p>above grade, may be stored or temporarily parked in the RU, EU, AU and GU Zoning Districts on lots developed with a residential structure subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>(f) <i>Recreational and camping equipment.</i> Recreational and camping equipment in the form of travel and camping trailer, truck trailer and motor travel home, designed and used as temporary living quarters for recreation, camping or travel use may be parked in the open on sites containing a single-family or duplex residence, subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>(8) Such equipment shall not exceed the maximum length, width, height and weight permitted under applicable provisions of the motor vehicle laws of the State of Florida; provided, however, the maximum length shall not exceed thirty (30) feet and the maximum height shall not exceed ten (10) feet.</p> <p>(h) Outdoor boat and RV storage area on private residential condominium association, homeowner's association or multi-family tenant community property. The term "boat" as used in this subsection shall include every description of watercraft or airboat used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on water. The term "RV" shall mean recreational and camping equipment in the form of travel and camping trailer, swamp buggy and other off-road vehicles and motor travel home.</p> <p>(7) Boats placed in the storage area shall be restricted to the following dimensions as measured pursuant to Section 33-20(e):</p> <p>(a) thirty (30) feet in overall length (b) eight feet six inches (8'6") in width (c) thirteen (13) feet six (6) inches in height.</p> <p>(8) RV's placed in the storage area shall not exceed thirty (30) feet in length, eight feet six inches (8'6") in width nor exceed ten (10) feet in height.</p>
		<p>grade, may be stored or temporarily parked in the RU, EU, AU and GU Zoning Districts on lots developed with a residential structure subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>(f) <i>Recreational and camping equipment.</i> Recreational and camping equipment in the form of travel and camping trailer, truck trailer and motor travel home, designed and used as temporary living quarters for recreation, camping or travel use may be parked in the open on sites containing a single-family or duplex residence, subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>(8) Such equipment shall not exceed the maximum length, width, height and weight permitted under applicable provisions of the motor vehicle laws of the State of Florida; provided, however, the maximum length shall not exceed forty (40) feet and the maximum height shall not exceed thirteen (13) feet.</p> <p>(h) Outdoor boat and RV storage area on private residential condominium association, homeowner's association or multi-family tenant community property. The term "boat" as used in this subsection shall include every description of watercraft or airboat used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on water. The term "RV" shall mean recreational and camping equipment in the form of travel and camping trailer, swamp buggy and other off-road vehicles and motor travel home.</p> <p>(7) Boats placed in the storage area shall be restricted to the following dimensions as measured pursuant to Section 33-20(e):</p> <p>(a) forty (40) feet in overall length (b) eight feet six inches (8'6") in width (c) fourteen (14) feet in height.</p> <p>(8) RV's placed in the storage area shall not exceed forty (40) feet in length, eight feet six inches (8'6") in width nor exceed fourteen (14) feet in height.</p>

Additional Information – Unincorporated Municipal Service Area Committee Meeting Discussion:

During the Unincorporated Municipal Service Area Committee meeting on December 8, 2015, the following was discussed:

- *The Committee explained the rationale of the foregoing ordinance, noting that it would address Code violations and the enforcement of fines in connection with boat and RV storage.*
- *It was suggested that the Committee should defer further consideration of this legislation until workshops were held to further discuss and analyze in depth the concerns surrounding this legislation prior to taking action.*
- *The Committee explained that this legislation was about the sales of new and more efficient boats and RVs; and it addressed these newer, more efficient recreational products being currently built, which were in violation of the provisions of the Code due to their increased size. It was advised that no safety issues had been identified after reviewing the issues of concern.*
- *Following clarification from the County Attorney's Office, the Committee noted the item had already been deferred twice; and it would be laid on the table if it was deferred again.*
- *The Committee expressed concern about allowing storage of large boats in residential areas due to safety and fire related risks since these boats stored large amounts of gasoline.*
- *The Committee continued expressing concern for other safety related issues relating to homeland security, human trafficking, and terrorism and suggested that consideration of this issue be deferred.*
- *The Committee stated that the very idea an owner of a boat of any size could be associated with terrorism was the wrong message and statement to prevail, and there was human trafficking legislation in place for enforcement in the criminal justice system. It was noted that human trafficking and this legislation had no correlation, and the members of this Committee needed to proceed with its consideration and take action due to the increase in boat and RV sales during the holidays.*
- *The Committee advised that a valid concern was raised in connection with the storage of RVs and boats in residential properties due to potential fire risks, and this issue needed to be reviewed. The Committee explained that the report submitted by the Fire*

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																
	<i>Rescue Department outlining historical data on the concerns raised indicated a minuscule amount of risk. Therefore, those concerns had already been addressed.</i>																
7C 152324	ORDINANCE REQUIRING WARNING SIGNS RELATED TO SALES OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES; PROVIDING FOR SIGNS IN BUSINESS ESTABLISHMENTS SELLING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES FOR CONSUMPTION ON OR OFF THE PREMISES; PROVIDING FOR CONTENT OF SIGN TO INCLUDE PROHIBITION ON THE SALE TO MINORS; AMENDING SECTION 21-31.3 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE																
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 21-31.3 of the Miami-Dade County Code requiring warning signs related to sales of alcoholic beverages. Specifically, the proposed ordinance provides for signs in business establishments selling alcoholic beverages for consumption on or off the premises and for contents of sign to include prohibition on the sale to minors.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance will become effective ten (10) days after the date of enactment unless vetoed by the Mayor, and if vetoed, will become effective only upon an override by the BCC.</p> <p>Implementation of this ordinance will not have a fiscal impact to the County as the Miami-Dade Police Department currently enforces this section of the Code.</p>																
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Miami-Dade County Code</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Section 21-31.3</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Code Comparison Chart</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Section</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Current</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> Sec. 21-31.3. <i>Warning Signs Required for Retail Sale of Alcoholic Beverages.</i> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> (a) For the purposes of this section the following definitions shall apply: (1) Alcoholic beverages shall mean alcoholic beverages as set forth in Section 561.01(4)(a), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (2) Sale and sell shall mean "sale" and "sell" as set forth in Section 561.01(9), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (3) Retail shall mean sale to the ultimate consumer. (b) No person shall sell at retail any alcoholic beverage unless said person has posted in a conspicuous place where the sale is to occur a sign which is at least eleven (11) inches by seventeen (17) inches in size, which is plainly visible and legible to all persons entering the premises and which shall read as follows: HEALTH WARNING ALCOHOL IN BEER, WINE AND LIQUOR CAN CAUSE: * INTOXICATION * ADDICTION * BIRTH DEFECTS REDUCE YOUR RISKS: • DO NOT DRINK BEFORE DRIVING OR OPERATING MACHINERY. • DO NOT MIX ALCOHOL WITH OTHER DRUGS (IT CAN BE FATAL). • DO NOT DRINK DURING PREGNANCY. Notwithstanding any provision of the Code of Miami-Dade County, said sign shall also be translated into Spanish and posted. (c) Hotels, restaurants, lounges and other establishments which are permitted to sell alcoholic beverages for consumption on the premises are expressly exempt from the provisions of this section. </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> (a) Definitions. For the purposes of this section the following definitions shall apply: (1) Alcoholic beverages shall mean alcoholic beverages as set forth in Section 561.01(4)(a), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (2) Business Establishment includes, but is not limited to, any place of business or any club, organization, person, firm, corporation or partnership such as a golf club, country club, veteran's fraternal or benevolent organization, grocery store, drug store, nightclub, bottle club, cocktail bar, hotel bar, tavern, restaurant, restaurant bar, grill, filling station, convenience store, package store, or any other building, structure, or location or portion thereof, where in one person directly or indirectly pays another for purchase or dispensing of an alcoholic beverage. (3) Conspicuously Posted means clearly visible, easily readable and immediately apparent upon viewing. (4) Dispense means storing, handling, apportionment, preparation, gift, distribution or serving, directly or indirectly, of any amount of an alcoholic beverage to or for any person by any officer, owner, operator, lessee, or employee of a business establishment. For purpose of this definition, permitting or allowing any person to carry alcoholic beverages on the premises of any business establishment to be consumed thereon shall constitute the dispensing of such beverages. (5) Minor means any individual under the legal drinking age as set forth in Florida Statutes Section 562.11 and 562.111 as the same may be amended from time to time (6) Sale and sell shall mean "sale" and "sell" as set forth in Section 561.01(9), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (7) Retail shall mean sale to the ultimate consumer. (b) Signage required for all business establishments selling alcoholic beverages. All persons who own or operate a business establishment which sells or dispenses at retail alcoholic beverages for consumption on or off the premises shall conspicuously post a notice within said business establishment </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Miami-Dade County Code			Section 21-31.3			Code Comparison Chart			Section	Current	Proposed	Sec. 21-31.3. <i>Warning Signs Required for Retail Sale of Alcoholic Beverages.</i>	(a) For the purposes of this section the following definitions shall apply: (1) Alcoholic beverages shall mean alcoholic beverages as set forth in Section 561.01(4)(a), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (2) Sale and sell shall mean "sale" and "sell" as set forth in Section 561.01(9), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (3) Retail shall mean sale to the ultimate consumer. (b) No person shall sell at retail any alcoholic beverage unless said person has posted in a conspicuous place where the sale is to occur a sign which is at least eleven (11) inches by seventeen (17) inches in size, which is plainly visible and legible to all persons entering the premises and which shall read as follows: HEALTH WARNING ALCOHOL IN BEER, WINE AND LIQUOR CAN CAUSE: * INTOXICATION * ADDICTION * BIRTH DEFECTS REDUCE YOUR RISKS: • DO NOT DRINK BEFORE DRIVING OR OPERATING MACHINERY. • DO NOT MIX ALCOHOL WITH OTHER DRUGS (IT CAN BE FATAL). • DO NOT DRINK DURING PREGNANCY. Notwithstanding any provision of the Code of Miami-Dade County, said sign shall also be translated into Spanish and posted. (c) Hotels, restaurants, lounges and other establishments which are permitted to sell alcoholic beverages for consumption on the premises are expressly exempt from the provisions of this section.	(a) Definitions. For the purposes of this section the following definitions shall apply: (1) Alcoholic beverages shall mean alcoholic beverages as set forth in Section 561.01(4)(a), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (2) Business Establishment includes, but is not limited to, any place of business or any club, organization, person, firm, corporation or partnership such as a golf club, country club, veteran's fraternal or benevolent organization, grocery store, drug store, nightclub, bottle club, cocktail bar, hotel bar, tavern, restaurant, restaurant bar, grill, filling station, convenience store, package store, or any other building, structure, or location or portion thereof, where in one person directly or indirectly pays another for purchase or dispensing of an alcoholic beverage. (3) Conspicuously Posted means clearly visible, easily readable and immediately apparent upon viewing. (4) Dispense means storing, handling, apportionment, preparation, gift, distribution or serving, directly or indirectly, of any amount of an alcoholic beverage to or for any person by any officer, owner, operator, lessee, or employee of a business establishment. For purpose of this definition, permitting or allowing any person to carry alcoholic beverages on the premises of any business establishment to be consumed thereon shall constitute the dispensing of such beverages. (5) Minor means any individual under the legal drinking age as set forth in Florida Statutes Section 562.11 and 562.111 as the same may be amended from time to time (6) Sale and sell shall mean "sale" and "sell" as set forth in Section 561.01(9), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (7) Retail shall mean sale to the ultimate consumer. (b) Signage required for all business establishments selling alcoholic beverages. All persons who own or operate a business establishment which sells or dispenses at retail alcoholic beverages for consumption on or off the premises shall conspicuously post a notice within said business establishment
Miami-Dade County Code																	
Section 21-31.3																	
Code Comparison Chart																	
Section	Current	Proposed															
Sec. 21-31.3. <i>Warning Signs Required for Retail Sale of Alcoholic Beverages.</i>	(a) For the purposes of this section the following definitions shall apply: (1) Alcoholic beverages shall mean alcoholic beverages as set forth in Section 561.01(4)(a), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (2) Sale and sell shall mean "sale" and "sell" as set forth in Section 561.01(9), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (3) Retail shall mean sale to the ultimate consumer. (b) No person shall sell at retail any alcoholic beverage unless said person has posted in a conspicuous place where the sale is to occur a sign which is at least eleven (11) inches by seventeen (17) inches in size, which is plainly visible and legible to all persons entering the premises and which shall read as follows: HEALTH WARNING ALCOHOL IN BEER, WINE AND LIQUOR CAN CAUSE: * INTOXICATION * ADDICTION * BIRTH DEFECTS REDUCE YOUR RISKS: • DO NOT DRINK BEFORE DRIVING OR OPERATING MACHINERY. • DO NOT MIX ALCOHOL WITH OTHER DRUGS (IT CAN BE FATAL). • DO NOT DRINK DURING PREGNANCY. Notwithstanding any provision of the Code of Miami-Dade County, said sign shall also be translated into Spanish and posted. (c) Hotels, restaurants, lounges and other establishments which are permitted to sell alcoholic beverages for consumption on the premises are expressly exempt from the provisions of this section.	(a) Definitions. For the purposes of this section the following definitions shall apply: (1) Alcoholic beverages shall mean alcoholic beverages as set forth in Section 561.01(4)(a), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (2) Business Establishment includes, but is not limited to, any place of business or any club, organization, person, firm, corporation or partnership such as a golf club, country club, veteran's fraternal or benevolent organization, grocery store, drug store, nightclub, bottle club, cocktail bar, hotel bar, tavern, restaurant, restaurant bar, grill, filling station, convenience store, package store, or any other building, structure, or location or portion thereof, where in one person directly or indirectly pays another for purchase or dispensing of an alcoholic beverage. (3) Conspicuously Posted means clearly visible, easily readable and immediately apparent upon viewing. (4) Dispense means storing, handling, apportionment, preparation, gift, distribution or serving, directly or indirectly, of any amount of an alcoholic beverage to or for any person by any officer, owner, operator, lessee, or employee of a business establishment. For purpose of this definition, permitting or allowing any person to carry alcoholic beverages on the premises of any business establishment to be consumed thereon shall constitute the dispensing of such beverages. (5) Minor means any individual under the legal drinking age as set forth in Florida Statutes Section 562.11 and 562.111 as the same may be amended from time to time (6) Sale and sell shall mean "sale" and "sell" as set forth in Section 561.01(9), Florida Statutes, as same may be amended from time to time. (7) Retail shall mean sale to the ultimate consumer. (b) Signage required for all business establishments selling alcoholic beverages. All persons who own or operate a business establishment which sells or dispenses at retail alcoholic beverages for consumption on or off the premises shall conspicuously post a notice within said business establishment															

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
	<p>(d) Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction of such offense, be punished by a fine not to exceed five hundred dollars (\$500.00) or by imprisonment not to exceed sixty (60) days in the County Jail, or both, in the discretion of the court. Each day of continued violation shall be considered a separate offense.</p>	<p>in such a place where alcoholic beverages are either displayed, purchased or consumed. The required notice shall consist of one or more signs or notices, each of which is not less than ninety-three square inches (8-1/2 x 11), with at least 30-point type, which contains the following information, clearly discernable by persons to whom alcoholic beverages may be sold or dispensed.</p> <p>(1) It is unlawful to purchase alcohol if you are under 21 years of age. (2) It is unlawful to sell or dispense alcohol under 21 years of age unless exempt pursuant to section 562.11 or 562.13, Florida Statutes (3) The penalties associated with the sale or dispensing of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age include imprisonment in a County jail and a fine (4) A telephone number to report those who are in violation of the law. Such telephone numbers may include but are not limited to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. 305-470-6787 – Division of Alcoholic Beverages and Tobacco b. 1-877-MEANS 21 (877-632-6721)</p> <p>(c) Signage required for business establishments selling alcoholic beverage for consumption off the premises. No person shall sell at retail any alcoholic beverage for consumption off the premises of the business establishment unless said person has posted in a conspicuous place where the sale is to occur a sign which is at least eleven (11) inches by seventeen (17) inches in size, which is plainly visible and legible to all persons entering the premises and which shall read as follows:</p> <p>HEALTH WARNING ALCOHOL IN BEER, WINE AND LIQUOR CAN CAUSE: * INTOXICATION * ADDICTION * BIRTH DEFECTS REDUCE YOUR RISKS: • DO NOT DRINK BEFORE DRIVING OR OPERATING MACHINERY. • DO NOT MIX ALCOHOL WITH OTHER DRUGS (IT CAN BE FATAL). • DO NOT DRINK DURING PREGNANCY.</p> <p>Hotels, restaurants, lounges and other establishments which are permitted to sell alcoholic beverages for consumption on the premises are expressly exempt from the provisions of this subsection (c).</p> <p>(d) Language of signs. The owner or operator of a business establishment subject to this section shall conspicuously post translations of the required notice in Spanish and Creole.</p> <p>(e) Exemptions. The restrictions of subsections (b) and (c) shall not apply to a bona fide restaurant without a restaurant bar. However, such place of business shall conspicuously post a notice with the contents set forth in subsection (b) above within said business establishment where it will be visible to all employees of the business.</p> <p>(f) Penalties. Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction of such offense, be punished by a fine not to exceed five hundred dollars (\$500.00) or by imprisonment not to exceed sixty (60) days in the County Jail, or both, in the discretion of the court. Each day of continued violation shall be considered a separate offense.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Additional Information - Gaps in Florida Alcohol Laws According to the Tampa Alcohol Coalition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit Sales to Intoxicated Persons (SIP): 48 states have SIP laws; only 2 states in the U.S (Florida and Nevada) do not have laws prohibiting sales of alcohol to intoxicated persons. Wyoming has law but applies only to licensees with drive-in liquor area. <i>Reference- NLEEA ABC Enforcement; NHTSA Legal Report</i> • Age 21 Restriction in Bars: Florida allows 18 to 20 year olds to patronize and bartend in bars. In other states, the minimum age is 21. 21 FL cities/ counties have local "21 and up" bar ordinances. • Responsible Vendor Training: The Florida Responsible Vendor Act is voluntary and grants mitigation of penalties to participating establishments when they violate underage drinking laws, and helps protect their liquor license. Other states have mandatory responsible vendor training laws. The current FL Responsible Vendor statutes do not address "serving obviously intoxicated persons". <i>Florida Statutes 561.705 and 561.706, APIS</i> • Alcohol Advertising: There are no state statutes that restrict alcohol advertising signs in stores or alcohol ads on billboards in FL. • Mandatory Warning Signs Regarding Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS): 23 States / D.C. require FAS warning signs posted at establishments. Florida doesn't require warning signs. <i>APIS</i> <p>Alcohol Policies- From APIS (Alcohol Policy Information System) Provides tables and maps comparing state alcohol policies: http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov/</p> <p>NLEEA Alcohol Beverage Control Enforcement This research report summarizes various laws surrounding Alcohol Beverage Enforcement, particularly in relation to minors. http://www.nleea.org/reports/ABCEnforcementLegalResearch.pdf</p>
7D 152396	<p>ORDINANCE RELATED TO UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS AND COUNTY AIRPORTS; CREATING SECTION 25-11 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROHIBITING THE OPERATION OF UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS ABOVE ANY COUNTY AIRPORT OR WITHIN ONE MILE OF A COUNTY AIRPORT RUNWAY; PROVIDING DEFINITIONS, EXEMPTIONS, PENALTIES AND APPLICABILITY; AMENDING 8CC-10 OF THE CODE; AMENDING THE SCHEDULE OF CIVIL PENALTIES; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance creates Section 25-11 of the Code of Miami-Dade County prohibiting the operation of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) above any County Airport or within one mile of a County runway, and provides definitions, exemptions, and penalties once approved by the BCC.</p> <p>Implementation of this ordinance will not have a fiscal impact to the County. The Aviation Department already monitors and enforces all manner of activities around its airfield, and the Department will use existing staff to enforce the proposed ordinance.</p> <p>Social Equity Statement: The proposed ordinance will enhance the safe use and operations of the Miami-Dade County Airport System by prohibiting the operation of any Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) within one statute mile from the end of every runway at each Airport.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance has minimal social equity impact. At most, it will limit the owners of drones from operating in the prohibited areas of the proposed ordinance.</p> <p>Background: Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) are currently readily available for purchase and the use of UAS by business and the general public has been rapidly increasing. UAS can create a threat to aircraft making use of the Miami-Dade County Airport System by making intentional or accidental contact with an aircraft in flight, or by forcing such aircraft to take evasive action on approach or departure. The Federal Aviation Administration has documented 678 instances nationwide of inflight aircrafts encountering UAS.</p> <p>Additional Information: On November 3, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1017-15, urged the Federal Aviation Administration to place in the Code of Federal Regulations a provision stating that no person may operate, or cause to be operated, an Unmanned Aircraft or an Unmanned Aircraft System, or any equipment or any part thereof, within 1000 feet of the perimeter of specifically named seaports, including the Dante B. Fascell Port of Miami by name, but with exceptions for law enforcement personnel, seaport employees performing their duties, contractors at the request of a seaport, or other persons with the written permission of a seaport authority or department.</p>
7E 152611	<p>ORDINANCE AMENDING BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF THE COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP SECTION 29-124 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY TO EXPAND CITIZENS' INDEPENDENT TRANSPORTATION TRUST REVIEW TO ALL CONTRACTS PROCURED BY OR ON BEHALF OF MIAMI-DADE TRANSIT REGARDLESS OF FUNDING SOURCE; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends, by a two-thirds vote of the Commission membership, Section 29-124 of the Miami-Dade County Code to expand Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust Review to all contracts procured by or on behalf of Miami-Dade Transit regardless of funding source. Implementation of this ordinance will not have a fiscal impact to the County.</p> <p>Additional Information – Transit and Mobility Services Committee Meeting Discussion: During the Transit and Mobility Services Committee meeting on December 9, 2015, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The committee expressed concern regarding the two-thirds vote required to expand the CITT review to all contracts procured on behalf of Miami-Dade Transit.</i> • <i>The Deputy Mayor explained that this has been a long standing process and assists the administration with items under the Mayor's delegated authority and provides for a reporting mechanism.</i>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Executive Director of the CITT explained that the two-thirds vote requirement has been in the ordinance since 2001 and that there is a process in place so that if the Trust denies a contract, if the BCC does not overrule the denial, it goes back to the CITT for second consideration. He stated that an overruling of the CITT's recommendation on all items has always been a two-thirds vote.</i> • <i>The Executive Director explained that the CITT has always reviewed items with specific surtax funding, and that in 2001 surtax funds were used for a broad range of operating expenses, goods and services contracts, and a formula was created based on new services and old services, and when unification occurred, all these things came together and the CITT still reviewed the contracts. About a year or two years ago, the CITT's operating funding was shifted to wages and salaries so the CITT no longer had control of operating contracts.</i> • <i>The remedy was to have the CITT look at all contracts regardless of funding source. This ordinance creates additional oversight on items.</i> • <i>Whenever there has been an issue with a contract the CITT always works with administration so that contracts are not denied.</i> • <i>The Committee requested clarification on why the proposed ordinance was necessary, to which the Executive Director responded that in 2013 specific CITT monies were not used to fund these contracts, the CITT money was shifted to fund operator salaries, wages and benefits so inadvertently the CITT no longer formally looked at the contracts. He explained that the CITT has continued to review the contracts informally, but there has not been any formal review by the CITT. He explained that the CITT typically reviews about 50 operating contracts a year.</i> • <i>The Committee expressed concerns regarding a diversion of funds that were supposed to be used for services being used towards operations.</i> • <i>The asked what the amount of surtax funds were for this year, to which the Executive Director responded that it was \$110 million.</i> • <i>The Committee noted that \$110 million in surtax funds was even more than last year and that capital improvements should begin.</i> • <i>The CAO explained that the proposed ordinance would only extend CITT review and would codify CITT review on all transit contracts regardless of funding source.</i> • <i>The Committee requested information on the background of the initial approval process to which the CAO explained that initially the contracts would be awarded by the BCC, subject to concurrence by the CITT. The CAO explained that the BCC would vote first, then it would go to the CITT. If the CITT agreed with the award recommendation, then the Mayor would execute the contract. If the CITT disagreed with the Mayor's recommendation, it would go back to the BCC and the BCC could override the CITT decision with a two-thirds vote. The CAO explained that this process was modified to reverse the sequence to allow the CITT to offer input prior to award and review contracts involving surtax funds. If the BCC agreed they could approve the contract by majority vote. If the BCC disagreed with the CITT and rejected recommendation, it would go back to the CITT and it would then take a two-thirds vote to approve resubmitted recommendations.</i> • <i>The CAO clarified that the proposed ordinance would allow the CITT to not only review contracts involving surtax funds, but all transit contracts.</i> <p><u>Additional Information:</u> During the Transit and Mobility Services Committee meeting on February 11, 2015, File No. 142481, amending by a two-thirds thirds vote of the Commission membership Section 29-124 of the Miami-Dade County Code to expand Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust Review to all contracts procured by or on behalf of Miami-Dade Transit regardless of funding source, was deferred.</p> <p>Since it has been more than six months since File No. 142481 was deferred, the proposed ordinance, File No. 152611, has been introduced. The two items are similar.</p> <p>Previous Legislation On December 10, 2008, the Transit Committee discussed and amended File No. 083619, which amended Section 29-124 of the Miami-Dade County Code to provide that the Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) submit a recommendation to the BCC prior to the BCC awarding any contract funded in whole or in part by the Charter County Transit System Surtax Funds. This item was subsequently deferred at the March 3, 2009 BCC meeting. During the committee meeting, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Members of the Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) spoke about the current process for award of contracts funded in whole or in part by Charter County Transit System Surtax Funds. They noted that currently, the Commission reviewed contracts before the CITT reviewed them. They also noted that pursuant to this ordinance contracts would go to the CITT first, and that the Commission, whether it agreed or disagreed with the CITT, could take any action by a majority vote.</i> • <i>The CITT members suggested this ordinance be amended to provide that a 2/3 vote be required for County Commission approval instead of a majority vote.</i> • <i>The Committee expressed concern that items may be delayed if the CITT could not make recommendations due to lack of a quorum. In response, the CAO explained that this proposed ordinance could be amended to identify a timeframe in which the CITT must make a recommendation or forfeit the right to make a recommendation. He noted the timeframe would begin when the County Manager filed a recommendation.</i> • <i>The Committee suggested that the CITT meet with either the members of the Commission or members of the Transit Committee to discuss issues related to the People's Transportation Plan summit held on November 15, 2008.</i> • <i>The CAO noted that the CITT did not take a formal vote of approval or disapproval on this proposed ordinance. He added that the CITT and the CITT Nominating Committee had concerns regarding the vote required for the Commission to accept, reject, or modify the CITT's recommendation. The CAO also noted the CITT voted on contracts after the Commission approved the County Manager's recommendations on the contracts, therefore, CITT members felt they had little input when they received the contracts. The CAO further noted that currently if the Commission approved a contract the contract was submitted to the CITT; if</i>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes									
	<p><i>the CITT disagreed with the Commission, the contract was reviewed by the Commission; and the Commission could override the CITT's disapproval only by a 2/3 vote. He added that, pursuant to this proposed ordinance, the CITT would review contracts before the Commission did and the Commission, whether it agreed or disagreed with the CITT, could take any action by a majority vote.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Committee proposed that the proposed ordinance be amended to establish the following timeframe for the Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) to submit to the Transit Committee (TC) recommendations regarding contracts: 45 days after the County Manager files a recommendation. Discussion ensued regarding whether the proposed amendment would allow for contracts to be submitted in a timely manner to Commission Committees and included on Commission agendas, and regarding the CITT's meeting schedule. It was proposed that the proposed ordinance also be amended to establish quarterly meetings between members of the Transit Committee and CITT.</i> <i>The CITT members expressed support for the proposed ordinance and the amendment concerning the 45 day timeframe.</i> 									
7F 152280	ORDINANCE REVISING ZONING AND OTHER LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS; MODIFYING PROCEDURES FOR FILING ZONING APPLICATIONS; AMENDING SECTION 33-304 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE									
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance revises zoning and other land development regulations, modifies procedures for filing zoning applications and amends Section 33-304 of the Miami-Dade County Code.</p> <p>Specifically, the ordinance eliminates the restrictive filing period established in the Code so that applicants may be able to file zoning hearing applications at any time. Currently, the Code limits the filing period of zoning hearing applications to three consecutive days on the first and third Monday of each month.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The proposed ordinance bears no fiscal impact to Miami-Dade County. Ordinance implementation, if adopted, does not result in additional staffing needs or future operational costs for County administration. Activities relating to the implementation of the ordinance would be absorbed by the administering department as part of their ongoing activities.</p> <p><u>Social Equity Statement:</u> The proposed ordinance is not anticipated to have a specific social equity benefit or burden as described by Ordinance No. 15-83. As explained below, a more flexible filing period may help expedite processes and improve service and access to all customers, potentially yielding positive economic benefits to applicants who will now be able to expedite plans through the availability of an unrestricted filing process. However, a specific benefit is not quantifiable at this time.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #d9ead3; text-align: center;">Code Comparison Section 33-304 Miami-Dade County Code</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3; text-align: center;">Section</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3; text-align: center;">Current</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3; text-align: center;">Proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Sec. 33-304. <i>Applications</i></td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>(b) All zoning hearing applications in this chapter shall only be accepted during the established filing periods, which shall consist of three consecutive days beginning on the first and third Monday of each month. It is provided however that no zoning application will be accepted on a day set forth above which occurs on a legal holiday. Administrative variances may be filed at any time.</p> <p>(c) At the end of each said time period set forth in subpart (b) the Director shall promptly identify and group those applications for district boundary changes, use special exceptions, unusual and new uses and use variances which relate to or affect any particular or immediate neighborhood or area as determined by the Director, and, to the extent possible, shall notice public hearings thereon, in accordance with Section 33-310 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, so as to allow the appropriate board to consider and determine the effect of the said applications on the said neighborhood or area as a whole and their relation to and conformity with the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Upon receipt of an application, the Director shall forward the application to the appropriate Departments, as determined by the Director, for review. To allow for timely processing of applications, Department comments are to be provided to the Director within twenty-one (21) days following transmittal of the request for review, unless a greater review period is allowed by the Director.</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>(b) All zoning hearing or administrative approval applications in this chapter may be filed at any time.</p> <p>(c) Upon filing, the Director shall promptly identify and group those applications for district boundary changes, use special exceptions, unusual and new uses and use variances which relate to or affect any particular or immediate neighborhood or area as determined by the Director, and, to the extent possible, shall notice public hearings thereon, in accordance with Section 33-310 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, so as to allow the appropriate board to consider and determine the effect of the said applications on the said neighborhood or area as a whole and their relation to and conformity with the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Upon receipt of an application, the Director shall forward the application to the appropriate Departments, as determined by the Director, for review. To allow for timely processing of applications, Department comments are to be provided to the Director within twenty-one (21) days following transmittal of the request for review, unless a greater review period is allowed by the Director.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Code Comparison Section 33-304 Miami-Dade County Code			Section	Current	Proposed	Sec. 33-304. <i>Applications</i>	<p>(b) All zoning hearing applications in this chapter shall only be accepted during the established filing periods, which shall consist of three consecutive days beginning on the first and third Monday of each month. It is provided however that no zoning application will be accepted on a day set forth above which occurs on a legal holiday. Administrative variances may be filed at any time.</p> <p>(c) At the end of each said time period set forth in subpart (b) the Director shall promptly identify and group those applications for district boundary changes, use special exceptions, unusual and new uses and use variances which relate to or affect any particular or immediate neighborhood or area as determined by the Director, and, to the extent possible, shall notice public hearings thereon, in accordance with Section 33-310 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, so as to allow the appropriate board to consider and determine the effect of the said applications on the said neighborhood or area as a whole and their relation to and conformity with the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Upon receipt of an application, the Director shall forward the application to the appropriate Departments, as determined by the Director, for review. To allow for timely processing of applications, Department comments are to be provided to the Director within twenty-one (21) days following transmittal of the request for review, unless a greater review period is allowed by the Director.</p>	<p>(b) All zoning hearing or administrative approval applications in this chapter may be filed at any time.</p> <p>(c) Upon filing, the Director shall promptly identify and group those applications for district boundary changes, use special exceptions, unusual and new uses and use variances which relate to or affect any particular or immediate neighborhood or area as determined by the Director, and, to the extent possible, shall notice public hearings thereon, in accordance with Section 33-310 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, so as to allow the appropriate board to consider and determine the effect of the said applications on the said neighborhood or area as a whole and their relation to and conformity with the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Upon receipt of an application, the Director shall forward the application to the appropriate Departments, as determined by the Director, for review. To allow for timely processing of applications, Department comments are to be provided to the Director within twenty-one (21) days following transmittal of the request for review, unless a greater review period is allowed by the Director.</p>
Code Comparison Section 33-304 Miami-Dade County Code										
Section	Current	Proposed								
Sec. 33-304. <i>Applications</i>	<p>(b) All zoning hearing applications in this chapter shall only be accepted during the established filing periods, which shall consist of three consecutive days beginning on the first and third Monday of each month. It is provided however that no zoning application will be accepted on a day set forth above which occurs on a legal holiday. Administrative variances may be filed at any time.</p> <p>(c) At the end of each said time period set forth in subpart (b) the Director shall promptly identify and group those applications for district boundary changes, use special exceptions, unusual and new uses and use variances which relate to or affect any particular or immediate neighborhood or area as determined by the Director, and, to the extent possible, shall notice public hearings thereon, in accordance with Section 33-310 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, so as to allow the appropriate board to consider and determine the effect of the said applications on the said neighborhood or area as a whole and their relation to and conformity with the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Upon receipt of an application, the Director shall forward the application to the appropriate Departments, as determined by the Director, for review. To allow for timely processing of applications, Department comments are to be provided to the Director within twenty-one (21) days following transmittal of the request for review, unless a greater review period is allowed by the Director.</p>	<p>(b) All zoning hearing or administrative approval applications in this chapter may be filed at any time.</p> <p>(c) Upon filing, the Director shall promptly identify and group those applications for district boundary changes, use special exceptions, unusual and new uses and use variances which relate to or affect any particular or immediate neighborhood or area as determined by the Director, and, to the extent possible, shall notice public hearings thereon, in accordance with Section 33-310 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, so as to allow the appropriate board to consider and determine the effect of the said applications on the said neighborhood or area as a whole and their relation to and conformity with the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Upon receipt of an application, the Director shall forward the application to the appropriate Departments, as determined by the Director, for review. To allow for timely processing of applications, Department comments are to be provided to the Director within twenty-one (21) days following transmittal of the request for review, unless a greater review period is allowed by the Director.</p>								
8A1 152491	RESOLUTION APPROVING FOUR NON-EXCLUSIVE PERMITS TO PROVIDE GENERAL AERONAUTICAL SERVICES TO COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT OPERATORS AT MIAMI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, RFQ NO. MDAD-14-02, TO SWISSPORT USA, INC., AMERICAN SALES AND MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION LLC D/B/A EULEN AMERICA, G2 SECURE STAFF, LLC, AND TRIANGLE SERVICES OF FLORIDA, INC.; PROVIDING FOR PAYMENT									

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	OF 7% OF GROSS REVENUES TO THE COUNTY, AND FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS WITH TWO SEPARATE TWO YEAR EXTENSIONS; AND AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE PERMITS AND TO EXERCISE THE PROVISIONS THEREOF, INCLUDING RENEWAL AND TERMINATION PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves the award of General Aeronautical Services Permits, Project No. MDAD-14-02, to Swissport USA, Inc.; American Sales and Management Organization LLC d/b/a Eulen America; G2 Secure Staff, LLC; and Triangle Services of Florida, Inc. to provide general aeronautical services to commercial aircraft operators and airlines at Miami International Airport (MIA). The Permittees will pay the Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD) seven (7) percent of gross revenues.</p> <p>Background MDAD issued a Request for Qualifications on April 16, 2015 to solicit Qualification Statements from interested parties seeking to obtain one (1) of four (4) general aeronautical service Permits to provide those services to commercial aircraft operators and airlines operating at MIA through contractual arrangements among the entities.</p> <p>The Evaluation/Selection Committee held a Prescreening Meeting on August 13, 2015, reviewed the submitted Qualification Statements, and recommended oral presentations from all responsive firms. At a Public Hearing on August 25, 2015, the Committee heard presentations from: Swissport USA, Inc.; PrimeFlight Aviation Services, Inc.; American Sales and Management Organization LLC d/b/a Eulen America; G2 Secure Staff, LLC; Triangle Services of Florida, Inc.; and Worldwide Flight Services, Inc.</p> <p>Swissport USA, Inc. Contract Measures: LDB goal 15% Contract Measures Achieved at Award: 16.17% LDB Subcontractors: Direct Airline Services 4.5%; U.S. Lubricants 2.24%; Masdeu Five Corp. d/b/a General Patrol 0.15%; USA Special Aviation Security Services 1.95%; AWA Security 0.13%; World Ops .33%; JBD Aviation 0.64%; and Ultra Aviation Services, Inc. 6.23%.</p> <p>American Sales and Management Organization LLC d/b/a Eulen America Contract Measures: LDB goal 15% Contract Measures Achieved at Award: 15% LDB Subcontractors: Aeroservicios USA, Inc. 0.15%; Airport Medical Solutions, Inc. 0.01%; Alas International Corporation 6%; Aviation Strategies and Trade Solutions, Inc. 0.01%; Galloway Office Supplies, Inc. 0.02%; International Consulting Group, Inc. 0.05%; Sirely Uniforms, Inc. 0.46%; Per CAR, Inc. d/b/a National Sunshine Auto Parts 0.30%; Ultra Aviation Services, Inc. 3%; and Wilson, Washburn and Foster, Inc. 5%.</p> <p>G2 Secure Staff, LLC Contract Measures: LDB goal 15% Contract Measures Achieved at Award: 15% LDB Subcontractors: Ultra Aviation Services, Inc. 5%; Dade GSE, Inc. 4%; and Direct Airline Services 6%.</p> <p>Triangle Services of Florida, Inc. Contract Measures: LDB goal 15% Contract Measures Achieved at Award: 16% LDB Subcontractors: Ultra Aviation Services, Inc. 8%; Direct Airline Services 2%; Aeroservicios USA, Inc. 3%; USA Special Aviation Security Services 2%; and World Ops, Inc. 1%.</p> <p>Additional Information- Similar Legislation On December 15, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1149-15, approved the award of a permit to Ultra Aviation Services, Inc., for a period of five (5) years with two (2) two-year options to renew, to provide Limited General Aeronautical Services to commercial aircraft operators and airlines at Miami International Airport (MIA). The Permittee will pay the Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD) seven (7) percent of gross revenues.</p> <p>MDAD issued a Request for Qualifications on May 26, 2015, to solicit Qualification Statements from interested parties for a qualified Local Developing Business (LDB) to provide at least three (3) of six (6) general aeronautical services to commercial aircraft operators and airlines operating at MIA through contractual arrangements among those entities.</p> <p>On June 26, 2015, Qualification Statements were received from: Ultra Aviation Services (Ultra); ABC Aviation Business Corporation (ABC); and Management Aviation Services (MAS).</p> <p>The County Attorney's Office deemed ABC and MAS non-responsive because neither entity submitted a bid bond or other bid security with their statements. The Evaluation/Selection Committee held a Prescreening Meeting on August 13, 2015, reviewed the Qualification Statement submitted by Ultra, and on August 25, 2015 recommended award of the Non-Exclusive Permit to provide Limited General Aeronautical Services at MIA to the sole responsive and responsible firm Ultra Aviation Services, Inc.</p> <p>Contract Measures: LDB Set-Aside; Ultra Aviation Services, Inc. is a 100% certified LDB.</p> <p>Additional Information- General Aeronautical Services Permits (GASP)</p>

Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>On April 16, 2015, a discussion item was presented to the Trade and Tourism Committee regarding GASP and Certified Local Developing Businesses (LDB). The following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A representative of Ultra Aviation Services, Inc., stated he was here to provide information on this item for the Committee to consider in their discussion since this item presents a very important policy issue. He indicated the GASP was only an authorization to solicit business from airlines at Miami International Airport (MIA) and it does not guarantee a contract.</i> • <i>He stated the GASP allows you to do six core functions for airlines and one of those functions includes ramp services; which requires a capital investment of millions of dollars and significant insurance.</i> • <i>He commented that no LDB can make that type of investment without the assurance that a contract would be granted with the airlines. He also noted that no LDB can get those assurances unless it can establish direct business relationships with the airlines. He indicated this leaves the LDB's in a perpetual subservient position as a sub-contractor.</i> • <i>He advised for the upcoming solicitation, Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD) intends to issue five permits and they are requiring that a prime is qualified to provide three of the six core services, and subcontract the remaining three services.</i> • <i>He stated a way to empower the LDB is to set aside one of the five permits for a competition among the LDB companies with the same prequalification criteria, but not require that they sub-contract the three other functions since there are no LDB's that have sufficient capacity at this time to do ramp services and explained this would empower the LDB to establish direct relationships with the airlines, and help obtain future growth to provide five of the six services.</i> • <i>He advised that all three of the current permittees have communicated to MDAD they were willing to support a scenario of four plus one with the LDB permit being the fifth permit.</i> • <i>A representative on behalf of Triangle Services, which was one of the current gas permittees at the airport and is also one of the smaller LDB's commented they respected Miami-Dade County's (MDC) disadvantaged business program and have always exceeded the required goals. He recognized that MDC has been in the forefront for LDB's and minority business inclusion in airport and government contracts, and noted that MDC was one of the most progressive communities throughout this country.</i> • <i>He stated he supports the efforts that have been done and would not object to a LDB set aside. He indicated it gives those businesses an opportunity to have direct negotiations with airports to ultimately compete on a national scale. He encouraged the Committee to give consideration to the LDB set aside.</i> • <i>Responding to the Committee's questions regarding the threshold of services being met by the LDB's, the Triangle representative stated the LDB's have the capacity for services such as wheel chair, reservations and ticketing and other services that involve manpower rather than infrastructure.</i> • <i>Responding to the Committee's question pertaining to the services the LDB's have the capacity for, the Ultra representative advised the LDB's perform a range of services such as passenger, porter, ticket, meteorological, and other issues that do not require significant capital investment. He commented in terms of capacity, the last time the permits were issued, there were five permits, currently there were only three active permits at the airport. He explained that having four full permits and a fifth one that can do three of the manual six services was sufficient for capacity.</i> • <i>A representative on behalf of the Miami-Dade Aviation workers stated his role was to help the administration understand there is a correlation between safety and security issues concerning the airport workers. He noted he attended several meetings regarding the GASP and followed up by submitting a CNN video which depicts how the workers were treated as well as concerns of security and safety measures. He noted the video was available and he expressed his desire to be given the opportunity to speak with the full Board of County Commissioners regarding these issues.</i> • <i>Responding to the Committee's question of what the next step would be to move forward, Assistant County Attorney explained that the Committee could issue a directive for staff to give advice on the policy, or it could be a report back to the Committee.</i> • <i>The Deputy Director, Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD), clarified several points regarding the GASP program and its uniqueness. He stated there were two programs; one is to let the market determine who does the ground handling which was regulated by the airport to ensure the businesses were qualified and had the required insurance, while the other program caps the number of GASP's allowed, due to the amount of space that would be potentially occupied. He noted MDAD has historically capped the GASP at a certain number, and at the last procurement, it was five permits. He explained the airlines would like choose who they pick as ground handlers and he also noted they would like to have five permits that were able to handle all disciplines including the ramp. He indicated the current GASP in effect was able to handle all of the disciplines. He advised that MDAD would like to put together a procurement that requires five full GASP that can handle all aspects of the business, but was not opposed to having a LDB set aside that is only required to handle three of the six disciplines. He stated this would appease the airlines and give them more choices.</i> • <i>The Ultra representative commented he was very happy the airport had agreed to the LDB set aside and wanted to point out two issues in terms of the difference between the four plus one and the five plus one recommendation. He stated if a LDB was allowed to compete on the prime level, there would be too many competitors, and the second issue is that the permits were non-exclusive, therefore the airport retains the right to issue more permits. He felt that it was better to go with the four plus one suggestion, which gives the LDB the ability to grow and compete effectively.</i> • <i>Responding to the Committee's question regarding the sustainability of the portion of work not being completed by the LDB, MDAD stated the ramp part of the GASP requires added insurance and investment and the GASP has to make the commitment to handle the ramp but would also like to have the opportunity provide the other services as well. He noted the other disciplines do not require additional investment outside of hiring the workers and advised the five GASP were more than capable of handling all of the ramp work that would be outsourced at MIA and he also noted the LDB set asides were minority vendors that were currently doing those disciplines, just as a sub to the GASP.</i> • <i>Responding to the Committee's question whether the number of GASP currently in place was an adequate amount to service the airlines. MDAD stated the three that were currently in place were handling all of the work at MIA. He advised that the airline perspective would be to give them the opportunity to have a wider selection process to choose from and decide who they would</i>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><i>like to contract with. He explained the airlines want to go to five GASP and they do not believe that five ground handlers are too much. He indicated that it provides fair competition, brings in business to the airport and he stated the airport did have the capacity to handle the ground equipment for five GASP. MDAD advised that all GASP were certified in safety, permitted and they are required to follow all of the county rules.</i></p>
8C1 152697	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE FUNDING OF 30 GRANTS FOR A TOTAL OF \$160,000.00 FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016 COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAM – SECOND QUARTER FOR VARIOUS ENTITIES; WAIVING RESOLUTION NO. R-130-06; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE GRANT AGREEMENTS AND TO EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS, INCLUDING THE CANCELLATION PROVISIONS, CONTAINED THEREIN</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves the funding of 30 grants for a total of \$160,000.00 from the Fiscal Year 2015-16 Community Grants Program – Second Quarter. In addition, it is recommended that Resolution No. R-130-06 (requiring contracts with non-governmental entities be signed by the other parties before being submitted to the Board of County Commissioners) be waived in order to expedite the allocation of funding support for these time-sensitive tourism-oriented and community events.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> Funding for the Community Grants Program comes from Department of Cultural Affairs’ approved departmental revenues, as adopted in the Fiscal Year 2015-16 County budget ordinance. Upon adoption of the FY 2015-16 ordinance, under Grants to Programs for Artists and Non-Profit Cultural Organizations, a total of \$525,000.00 is allocated for FY 2015-16 Community Grants (CG) (\$525,000.00 from Fund SO 125, Subfund 127). To date, a sub-total of \$365,000.00 in grants has been recommended for the first two (2) quarters of the fiscal year.</p> <p><u>Background:</u> The Community Grants Panel convened on October 29, 2015 to review 33 applications requesting \$277,400.00 for the Second Quarter of the program. The panel recommended funding 30 applicants for a total of \$160,000.00. The Cultural Affairs Council approved these recommendations at their meeting on November 18, 2015.</p> <p><u>Additional Information:</u> On November 3, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-971-15, approved the funding of 28 grants for a total of \$160,000.00 from the FY 2015-16 Community Grants Program – First Quarter.</p>
8C2 152768	<p>RESOLUTION CORRECTING ERRORS IN ORDINANCE NO. 15-99, ATTACHMENT D TO THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2015 MEMORANDUM ENTITLED "INFORMATION FOR FIRST BUDGET HEARING – FY 2015-2016 PROPOSED BUDGET" SPECIFIC TO THE GRANT AWARDS THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS’ FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016 YOUTH ARTS ENRICHMENT GRANTS PROGRAM; WAIVING RESOLUTION NO. 130-06; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE GRANT AGREEMENTS WITH VARIOUS ENTITIES AND TO EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves the correction of errors in Ordinance 15-99, to the September 3, 2015, Memorandum entitled “Information for First Budget Hearing – FY 2015-2016 Proposed Budget,” concerning approval of grants to 33 non-profit cultural organizations awarded through the Department of Cultural Affairs FY 2015-2016 Youth Arts Enrichment grants program. Additionally, the proposed resolution waives Resolution No. R-130-06, requiring contracts with non-governmental entities be signed by the other parties before being submitted to the BCC, in order to expedite the allocation of funding support for these time-sensitive education events and that the Couth Mayor or Mayor’s designee be authorized to execute grant agreements with grant recipients.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> Funding for the Youth Arts Enrichment Grants program is provided to the Department of Cultural Affairs from The Children’s Trust, as adopted in the FY 2015-2016 County budget ordinance.</p>
8F1 152677 <i>Deferral Requested</i>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING TERMS AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE OF A RETROACTIVE LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND MIAMI RIVER HOUSE II ASSOCIATES, LTD AND MIAMI RIVER HOUSE III ASSOCIATES, LTD, FLORIDA LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS, FOR THE PREMISES LOCATED AT 1035 NW 11 COURT AND 1080 NW 11 STREET, MIAMI, FLORIDA, TO BE UTILIZED BY THE WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT FOR EMPLOYEE PARKING, WITH A TOTAL FISCAL IMPACT TO THE WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT ESTIMATED TO BE \$52,000 FOR THE SIX MONTH TERM OF THE LEASE AND THE 14-MONTH OPTION PERIOD; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the execution of a Retroactive Lease Agreement (Lease) between Miami-Dade County (County) and the Miami River House II Associates, LTD and the Miami River House III Associates, LTD (Landlord), for properties to be used as parking spaces for Water and Sewer Department employees. More specifically, the resolution does the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes the lease of two (2) separate parcels of land, both improved with parking spaces to be utilized by Water and Sewer Department employees; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parcel A (approximately 21,292 square feet) is owned by Miami River House II Associates, LTD and is located at 1035 NW 11 Court, Miami, Florida; and ○ Parcel B (approximately 20,064 square feet) is owned by Miami River House III Associates, LTD and is located at 1080 NW 11 Street, Miami, Florida. • Authorizes an initial lease term of six (6) months, effective retroactively on May 1, 2015, plus an optional renewal term of up to 14 months, exercised on a month-to-month basis, through December 31, 2016. <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The fiscal impact to the Water and Sewer Department for the initial term of the Lease is estimated to be \$15,600.00. This amount is comprised of \$15,000.00 in base rent, which is equal to \$2,500.00 per month and a \$600.00 lease management fee. The lease management</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes								
	<p>fee, which amounts to four (4) percent of the base rent, will be paid by the Water and Sewer Department to the Internal Services Department for the administration of the Lease. If the County elects to exercise the full optional renewal term, the total fiscal impact to the Water and Sewer Department is estimated to be \$52,000.00. All costs associated with this Lease will be funded through the Water and Sewer Department's Water Revenue Fund. The Water and Sewer Department does not anticipate any annual costs for operation and maintenance of the properties, as both properties are paved parking lots. Under the Lease, the Landlord will bear the costs to maintain the parking lot areas, including any necessary repairs and electrical services.</p> <p>Background: The Water and Sewer Department's Water Transmission and Distribution Division and Sewer Meter Installation and Maintenance Section have approximately 155 employees located at 1001 NW 11 Street, Miami, Florida. The location is comprised of office space, equipment and fleet repair bays, an equipment storage facility, and a fuel station.</p> <p>Due to parking constraints, employees working at this location were utilizing parking spaces at the Culmer Metrorail Station located at 670 NW 11 Street, as authorized by the Miami-Dade Transit Department. Following a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) field examination in February 2015, the FTA advised the Transit Department that parking at the Culmer station by Water and Sewer Department employees is not permissible and all available parking must be used by Metrorail patrons. Thus, staff from the Water and Sewer and Transit Departments implemented a corrective action plan to address this issue, identifying the two (2) properties in the Lease as the best short-term option due to pricing, proximity to the location, and availability of a combined total of 60 parking spaces. The Water and Sewer Department employees have been utilizing these properties since May 1, 2015 for parking purposes in order to meet operational needs.</p>								
8F2 152565	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN AN AMOUNT UP TO \$2,081,000.00 FOR CONTRACT NO. 8027-0/17, AIRFIELD GUIDANCE SIGNS FOR THE AVIATION DEPARTMENT								
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes increased expenditure authority of \$2,081,000 to Contract No. 8027-0/17, Airfield Guidance Signs, for the Miami-Dade Aviation Department. This contract was originally approved by the BCC in July 2012 for a six-year term through Resolution No. R-532-12 and is used by the Aviation Department to purchase airfield guidance signs, markings and lights, and associated replacement parts to comply with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airport safety requirements.</p> <p>The additional funds are needed to replace old incandescent runway guard light fixtures and signs on runways at Miami International Airport, directional signage at Miami-Opa-Locka Executive Airport, and airfield lighting systems including runway and taxiway regulators at Dade-Collier Training and Transition Airport with light-emitting diode (LED) fixtures and signs. This replacement project will ensure the Aviation Department's continued compliance with FAA regulations, particularly FAA Part 139, which governs the FAA's issuance of airport operating certificates. LED airfield signs are significantly brighter than the incandescent light fixtures currently in use and will enhance visibility for pilots. LED signs are also virtually maintenance free and consume 70 percent less energy.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source: This contract was originally approved with a \$2,240,000 allocation. That amount, pursuant to the authority granted to the County Mayor under Implementing Order 3-38, was modified administratively by \$448,000, resulting in an existing allocation of \$2,688,000 for the six-year term. The contract expires on August 31, 2018. This recommended modification will authorize additional expenditure authority of \$2,081,000, increasing the total contract value to \$4,769,000.</p> <p>Additional Information on R-532-12 and Contract No. 8027-0/17: Resolution No. R-532-12 authorized the award of a contract with Global Electrical & Lighting Supplies, Inc. (primary vendor) and Miami Breaker, Inc. (secondary vendor) for purchase of airfield guidance signs and replacement parts for the Miami-Dade Aviation Department. The contract amount is \$2.24 million over a six-year term.</p> <p>An Invitation to Bid was issued under full and open competition for purchase of airfield guidance signs and replacement parts for the Miami-Dade Aviation Department. The recommended vendors were the lowest-priced responsive and responsible bidders. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) establishes the standards for runway markings and signs to ensure safety on airfields. Guidance signs are placed on airport runways to provide additional reference points for pilots to land aircrafts. The FAA requires that these signs meet certain requirements as outlined in the solicitation. The proposed contract amount was based on anticipated usage.</p> <p>The fiscal impact for the six-year contract term is \$2,240,000 budgeted from Aviation Department Proprietary Funds. The previous contract amount was 250,000 for six months.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #c6e0b4;">Additional Information on Contract No. 8027-0/17 Modifications</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Contract No. 8027-0/17 R-532-12 8/12/2012-8/31/2018</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$2,240,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Modification 1 11/14/2014</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$448,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Current Contract Total</td> <td style="text-align: center;">\$2,688,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on Contract No. 8027-0/17 Modifications		Contract No. 8027-0/17 R-532-12 8/12/2012-8/31/2018	\$2,240,000	Modification 1 11/14/2014	\$448,000.00	Current Contract Total	\$2,688,000
Additional Information on Contract No. 8027-0/17 Modifications									
Contract No. 8027-0/17 R-532-12 8/12/2012-8/31/2018	\$2,240,000								
Modification 1 11/14/2014	\$448,000.00								
Current Contract Total	\$2,688,000								
8F3 152661	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL TIME OF FIVE YEARS AND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$1,922,000.00 FOR PREQUALIFICATION POOL NO. 6939-0/15 FOR PURCHASE OF REPAIR AND/OR REPLACEMENT AND INSTALLATION SERVICES FOR AWNINGS AND CANOPIES FOR COUNTY DEPARTMENTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SOLICIT PRICING, AWARD CONTRACTS, EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS AND ANY RESULTING CONTRACTS								

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38, AND ADD VENDORS TO THE POOL AT ANY TIME, SUBJECT TO RATIFICATION BY THE BOARD ON A BI-ANNUAL BASIS
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution extends Prequalification Pool No. 6939-0/15, Repair, Replace, Purchase and Install New Awnings and Canopies, for five (5) additional years and increases expenditure authority by \$1,922,000. This pool was established in December 2010 for a five-year term for use by multiple County departments to purchase repair, replacement and installation services for awnings and canopies. This established pool includes all responsive, responsible vendors that met the pre-qualification requirements as specified in the solicitation. The pool includes two groups: non-federally funded projects (Group A) and federally funded projects (Group B).</p> <p>Awning and canopy structures are installed countywide at various locations such as walkways, parking lots, building entrances, maintenance yards, aircraft operating areas, passenger loading bridges, cruise ship terminals, and outside exhibition areas to provide shade and shelter. During the extension period, County departments will use the pool, as needed, to purchase services. Repair and replacement work includes, but is not limited to, patching, sewing and reinforcing torn areas, shaping fabric, replacing covers, and priming and painting framework. Planned projects during the extension period include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Internal Services Department manages the new Children’s Courthouse and West Lot Building, which may require ongoing maintenance and repair, and the Richard E. Gerstein Justice Building, which requires replacement of awnings and/or canopies; • PortMiami intends to construct two (2) new ferry terminals, which will require awnings and canopies; and • The Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department will use this pool for continued maintenance of awnings and canopies at the Crandon Tennis Center and Zoo Miami. The department also anticipates covering the courtyard and walkway areas at the AD Barnes Leisure Access Center Building. <p>The requirements and terms and conditions of the pool would not change if a replacement solicitation were to be issued. It is anticipated that the same vendors would prequalify for the replacement solicitation. Additional qualified vendors may be added to the pool at any time during the term of the pool, subject to bi-annual ratification by the Board. This prequalification pool will remain advertised on the County’s Procurement Management Services website to encourage additional participation. Outreach to registered firms was conducted to increase the number of prequalified firms. It is in the County’s best interest to modify the existing pool for an additional five-year period so departments are able to continue purchasing awning and canopy services.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> This pool was established with a \$2,462,500 allocation which was modified by \$1,050,500, resulting in an existing allocation of \$3,513,000. The pool expires on December 31, 2015. The requested additional allocation of \$1,922,000 is based on anticipated usage during the five-year extension period. The yearly allocation for the extension period is lower than that of the current pool term due to a reduction in anticipated usage, based on the purchase orders issued during the current term.</p>
8F4 152693	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$2,800,000.00 FOR PREQUALIFICATION POOL NO. 5038-1/23, PUBLIC SAFETY VEHICLE ACCESSORIES, FOR COUNTY DEPARTMENTS
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes increased expenditure authority of \$2,800,000 for Prequalification Pool No. 5038-1/23, Public Safety Vehicle Accessories, for the Miami-Dade Police Department.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The pool award was originally approved with a \$3,296,000 allocation which was increased by \$660,000 administratively, resulting in an existing allocation of \$3,956,000, for the current five-year term. The pool term expires on May 31, 2018. The recommended modification will authorize additional expenditure authority of \$2,800,000 increasing the total pool value to \$6,756,000.</p> <p><u>Background:</u> In May 2013 this pool was established, through Resolution No. R-349-13, for a five-year term. The contract provides various County departments with the ability to purchase public safety vehicle accessories and related items, including installation, de-installation and repairs, as needed. The requested additional expenditure is required to support the operational needs of the Miami-Dade Police Department, i.e., ensuring adequate funding to cover vehicles slated for delivery.</p> <p>Through Resolution No. R-171-15, approved on February 18, 2015, 642 police vehicles (marked and unmarked) were authorized for purchase through access of the Florida Sheriffs Association contract (No. 14-22-0904). The additional allocation requested under this pool will be used to retro-fit these vehicles for law enforcement use. The required equipment includes lighting, bumpers, cages, sirens, trunk inserts, K-9 cages, laptop mounts, and additional associated accessories. The “Driving under the Influence” sports utility vehicles, diver vehicles, arson squad vehicles, crime scene trucks, and prisoner transport vehicles require specialty equipment and installations that are procured through this pool as well. Delivery of new vehicles is scheduled for a 10-month period which commenced May 2015 and immediate retro-fitting is required for operational use. The additional funding will be applied to equip the purchased vehicles pending delivery. The estimated values are calculated based on current pricing obtained through a competitive bidding process under the pool.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee Meeting Discussion:</u> During the Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee meeting on February 10, 2015, the following was discussed regarding R-171-15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Deputy Director of the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD), responded that 642 vehicles would be purchased; that there were a total of 3,300 vehicles; that 37 percent of the vehicles had over 100,000 miles; that 20 percent of vehicles had over 72,000 miles; that 263 vehicles were retired without replacement; and that there would be approximately 460 retired vehicles by the time</i>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes												
	<p><i>the new vehicles subject to this purchase would arrive. He noted that the new vehicles would arrive on a staggered basis and that he anticipated additional vehicle purchases over the next four fiscal years.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Committee pointed out that the vehicles continued to age as we delayed the purchase cycle, noting that plans needed to be established to prevent this from happening. The Committee questioned where the funding was coming from for this foregoing proposed resolution to which the Deputy Mayor responded that a line of credit loan was being obtained through the competitive process.</i> <i>The Committee inquired about the funding source to pay the obligation secured by the line of credit and whether it was already included in the budget, to which the Budget Director from Office of Management and Budget, responded that the payment was included in the Miami-Dade Police Department's operating budget and funded through the General Fund for Fiscal Year 2014-15.</i> <i>The Committee inquired about money acquired from criminal activities, noting these funds could be used to offset the costs associated with this purchase and other MDPD needs. The MDPD Director explained that acquired assets went through a legal process and were placed in the Law Enforcement Trust Fund (LETF), noting that these assets were included in the Department's budget.</i> <i>The Committee indicated that the County Commission was not informed about the status of the LETF and the amount of money recovered by the Department and said that efforts to accelerate the process of converting these assets to cash were needed to purchase items needed by the MDPD.</i> <i>The MDPD Director responded that the MDPD submitted resolutions to the County Commission to take money from the LETF. He said there were limitations as to how the money could be spent and that the legal process could not be accelerated just to acquire additional funding for specific needs.</i> <i>The Committee asked the Commission Auditor to provide the Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee with a report detailing the amount of money forfeited annually into the LETF by individuals committing criminal acts in Miami-Dade County; how those funds were spent; and the limitations on the use of those funds.</i> <p><u>Additional Information – Report on Miami-Dade Police Department's Law Enforcement Trust Fund Revenues and Allocations for Three Years:</u></p> <p>Pursuant to the request at the Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee meeting on February 10, 2015, the Office of the Commission Auditor provided the following information regarding the Miami-Dade Police Department's (MDPD) Law Enforcement Trust Fund: a memorandum from MDPD regarding revenues, allocations, and limitations; and a spreadsheet providing additional information on the revenues and allocations.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Revenues</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Allocations</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">FY 2011-2012</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$2,565,625.50</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$3,155,645.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">FY 2012-2013</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$1,761,481.58</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$1,580,371.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">FY 2013-2014</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$3,624,465.97</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$1,819,742.82</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Law Enforcement Trust Fund (LETF) consists of monies and proceeds from the sale of forfeited property that has been awarded to the LETF as a result of forfeiture litigation in State court and federal equitable sharing requests. According to Florida law, such proceeds and interest earned therefrom can be used for school resource officers, crime prevention, safe neighborhood, drug abuse education and prevention programs, or for other law enforcement purposes, which include defraying the cost of protracted or complex investigations, providing additional equipment or expertise, purchasing automated external defibrillators for use in law enforcement vehicles, and providing matching funds to obtain federal grants. The proceeds and interest may not be used to meet normal operating expenses of the law enforcement agency.</p> <p>In addition, Florida law requires any local law enforcement agency that acquires at least \$15,000 pursuant to the Florida Contraband Forfeiture Act within a fiscal year to expend or donate no less than 15% of such proceeds for the support or operation of any drug treatment, drug abuse education, drug prevention, crime prevention, safe neighborhood, or school resource officer program. The local law enforcement agency has the discretion to determine which program(s) will receive the designated proceeds. The Miami-Dade Police Department awards this amount to the MDPD Public Information and Education Bureau, for its crime prevention program, in order to provide educational services to the community, especially children.</p> <p>According to both the Department of Justice Equitable Sharing Program and the Department of Treasury, Guide to Equitable Sharing, shared funds must be used to increase or supplement the resources of the receiving state or local law enforcement agency. Shared resources will not be used to replace or supplant the appropriated resources of recipient.</p> <p>Equitably shared funds will be used for law enforcement purposed only and are subject to the laws, rules, and regulations, and orders of the state of local jurisdiction of which the agency is a part. Some of the specific permissible uses include: law enforcement operations and investigations, training and education, equipment, travel, awards and memorials, matching grants, drug and gang education and other awareness programs.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Relevant Legislation:</u></p> <p>On February 19, 2014, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-172-14, approved access of a competitively established Florida Sheriffs Association (FSA) contract, 13-21-0904, to purchase 211 police-rated vehicles for the Miami-Dade Police Department in the amount of \$4,331,000.</p> <p>During the BCC meeting on February 19, 2014, R-172-14 was discussed as follows:</p>	Year	Revenues	Allocations	FY 2011-2012	\$2,565,625.50	\$3,155,645.00	FY 2012-2013	\$1,761,481.58	\$1,580,371.00	FY 2013-2014	\$3,624,465.97	\$1,819,742.82
Year	Revenues	Allocations											
FY 2011-2012	\$2,565,625.50	\$3,155,645.00											
FY 2012-2013	\$1,761,481.58	\$1,580,371.00											
FY 2013-2014	\$3,624,465.97	\$1,819,742.82											

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Commission inquired whether the County leased vehicles and requested an overview of the advantages/disadvantages of leasing versus purchasing vehicles. The Director of the Internal Affairs Department, explained that private sector vendors were not willing to lease police vehicles to the County due to the excessive amount of use on those vehicles. On the other hand, he indicated that pending legislation existed for the County to lease pool vehicles.</i> • <i>The Deputy Mayor informed the Commission that he requested the Miami-Dade Police Department to conduct an analysis of alternative leasing programs to supplement current up-front purchasing efforts.</i> • <i>The Commission noted County vehicles represented the image of the County to the community and asked the Deputy Mayor to provide the BCC with a report on the process used to provide a clean, well-maintained fleet of vehicles.</i> • <i>The Commission questioned the type of vehicles being sold by Pembroke Motors, a recommended vendor.</i> • <i>The Chief Financial Officer of the Miami-Dade Police Department, indicated that two Dodge Caravans were being purchased from Pembroke Motors, to which the Commission pointed out that these were Chrysler vehicles and that firm was owned by Fiat.</i> <p><u>Additional Information – Report on Miami-Dade Police Vehicles:</u> On July 18, 2014, the Mayor issued a report regarding the maintenance and appearance of the Miami-Dade Police Department’s (MDPD) fleet, as requested during the February 19, 2014 BCC meeting.</p> <p>The report states that it is the responsibility of the assigned employee to maintain the cleanliness of their issued vehicle. As such, they are to ensure the vehicle is periodically washed and free of debris, both inside and out in order to maintain a professional appearance. According to the report, MDPD currently possesses a fleet of approximately 3,300 vehicles consisting of marked and unmarked sedans, trucks, motorcycles, all-terrain-vehicles, specialty vehicles and trailers. Of these vehicles, approximately 994 units are currently well above 100,000 odometer miles (30% of the Fleet) and approximately 786 units are between 72,000 and 100,000 odometer miles (23% of the total fleet). Additionally, the Department has retired 191 vehicles as of June 2014, without replacement, and maintains a vehicle loss of approximately 30 per month.</p> <p>Presently, there are three methods to remedying these issues dependent on the overall condition of the vehicle requiring repair: vehicle refreshment, vehicle refurbishment and vehicle replacement.</p> <p>Vehicle Refreshment The Internal Service Department (ISD) Fleet Division has developed a refreshment plan for vehicles that only suffer from cosmetic deficiencies. MDPD currently follows this plan through the harvesting and recycling of retired vehicles’ interior finishing (i.e. seats, moldings, dashboard assemblies, etc.). ISD Fleet Division has been able to successfully refresh active vehicles within a considerably reduced vehicle downtime, utilizing existing Fleet Division staff, and at a reduced cost. Since its implementation on February 13, 2013, ISD has refreshed 61 vehicles.</p> <p>Vehicle Refurbishment This option, currently practiced by MDPD, allows for the repair and refurbishment of the fleet vehicles that require paint and body work (accident, dents, missing paint, etc.). As such, these vehicles are traditionally routed through the ISD Fleet Division mechanic shops, to their centralized body shop.</p> <p>Vehicle Replacement When a vehicle’s mileage, amount of repairs to date, and cost to repair are too high, the vehicle is retired and requires replacement. In order to improve the overall appearance of the fleet, MDPD would need to gradually replace its aged vehicles. Given the Department’s high vehicle attrition rate, MDPD would require a minimum of \$6-7 million in order to match the rate of loss.</p> <p>In order to fully address the Department’s aging fleet, MDPD in concert with the ISD Procurement Management Division has conducted a study regarding an alternate funding method via Capital Lease Purchasing. Based on their findings, the Department will initiate a lease-purchase agreement to replace approximately 650 frontline vehicles (to include marked and non-marked vehicles) in FY 2014-2015. As part of this endeavor, MDPD would seek vehicles via accessing existing contracts which have been competitively bid (i.e. Florida Sheriff’s Association Contract, State of Florida, etc.) in order to seek the best vehicles unit pricing and would then in turn competitively bid the financing component amongst various private financial institutions to obtain the lowest finance interest rates and options. This is a multi-year purchase plan; future purchases will be required to replace this remaining aged fleet in order to reduce the department’s overall rising repair expenditures.</p>
8F5 151979	RESOLUTION APPROVING AWARD OF CONTRACT NO. FB-00190 FOR PURCHASE OF EXTENDED AND LIMITED USE CONTACTLESS SMARTCARDS FOR THE MIAMI-DADE TRANSIT DEPARTMENT IN A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$4,689,000.00; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO GIVE NOTICE OF THIS AWARD, ISSUE THE APPROPRIATE PURCHASE ORDER TO GIVE EFFECT TO SAME AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves an award of Contract No. FB-00190, Extended and Limited Use Contactless Smartcards to ASK-intTag, LLC for the purchase of proximity integrated circuit cards (i.e., smartcards used for public transit fare collection) that will be utilized the Miami-Dade Transit Department.</p> <p>Smartcards, which are the size of a credit card, are embedded with integrated circuits that process and store monetary and time data. This contract allows the purchase of smartcards, branded by the Transit Department as EASY Cards and EASY Tickets, to be used in conjunction with the existing automated fare collection system. The EASY Card is a durable, plastic, time-based (one-month, seven-day or one-day)</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>reloadable fare card with a 20-year lifespan. The EASY Ticket is a disposable, paper-based fare card that expires after 60 days and is designed for visitors and infrequent commuters. The EASY Cards and EASY Tickets are sold to Metrobus and Metrorail riders as a fare collection method. Metrorail patrons must use an EASY Card or EASY Ticket as the fare gates do not accept cash.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The fiscal impact for the five-year term is \$4,728,000. The current contract, 9089-3/14, is valued at \$8,625,000 for five (5) years and six (6) months and is set to expire on August 28, 2015. The difference in allocation under the replacement contract is attributed to lower pricing of EASY Cards (\$0.43 less per card) and EASY Tickets (\$0.08 less per card) due to the competitive procurement process as well as lower estimated quantities for EASY Tickets.</p> <p><u>Vendors Recommended for Award</u> An Invitation to Bid was issued under full and open competition on March 2, 2015. Ten (10) vendors responded to the solicitation. The method of award was to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder by group. Group 1 was for Easy Cards, which were parceled individually. Group 2 was for EASY Tickets parceled in rolls of 1,000 and EASY Tickets parceled individually, requiring vendors to bid on both types of parceling. ASK-intTag, LLC, was the lowest-priced responsive, responsible bidder for both groups.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Previous Legislation:</u> On February 2, 2010, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-119-10, approved an award of \$3,450,000 for contactless smart cards to the Miami-Dade Transit Department. The term of the contract was two years with three, one year options-to-renew. By exercising the three, one year options to renew, the cumulative value of the contract is \$8,625,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>According to Internal Services Department staff, the six month extension was authorized under the Mayor's delegated authority.</i> • <i>According to Miami-Dade Transit staff, the approximate amounts of EASY Cards and Easy Tickets purchased are as follows:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>EASY Cards – 1,851,000 purchased ; total cost \$2,436,000</i> ○ <i>EASY Tickets – 23,450,000 purchased; total cost \$4,197,550</i> • <i>The contract price per unit is as follows:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>EASY Card - \$1.316</i> ○ <i>EASY Ticket - \$0.179</i> <p><u>Additional Information – Purchasing of Metro Passes:</u> The EASY Card is a durable, plastic reloadable fare card. It is part of Miami-Dade Transit's automated fare collection system. It can contain both cash value and pass products (1-Month, 7-Day and 1-Day Pass) to pay your transit fare. EASY Cards issued since January 2013 have a 20 year life-span. Prior to 2013, issued EASY Cards have a 3 year life-span.</p> <p><u>Online Purchase</u> When placing an order online, an automatic email receipt will be sent shortly after an order is submitted. Purchasers must allow up to 15 days for the delivery of your EASY Card. Miami-Dade Transit is not responsible for postal service delays.</p> <p>To ensure timely mail delivery, the last day to order a parking permit (\$11.25) online with monthly pass purchase is on the 22nd of the month for the following month's permit. Parking permits ordered after the 22nd must be picked up at the Pass Sales Office at Overtown Transit Village (701 NW First Court, Suite 121—next to the Historic Lyric Theatre/Overtown Metrorail Station).</p> <p>Miami-Dade Transit does not ship outside the United States. Visitors entering Miami International Airport can purchase an EASY Card or EASY Ticket at Ticket Vending Machines located at the Miami International Airport Metrorail station. Only EASY Cards (not EASY Tickets) can be purchased or reloaded online or by telephone. There is a limit of three transactions, or \$160, per credit card, per day.</p> <p><u>In-person Purchase</u> Transit passes can be purchased at EASY Card vending machines at any Metrorail station, the Adrienne Arsht Metromover station or the Golden Glades Park & Ride lot; sales outlets throughout Miami-Dade; the Transit Service Center; 111 NW First Street, Second Level; or by calling the EASY Card Financial Center at 786-469-5151, Monday - Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., excluding County-observed holidays. TTY users should call 305-468-5402.</p>
8F6 152695	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING DESIGNATED PURCHASE PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1(B)(3) BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF THE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT; AUTHORIZING AWARD OF ADDITIONAL TIME UP TO 12 MONTHS FOR CONTRACT NOS. RFP487A AND RFP487B AND AN ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF UP TO \$20,525,000.00 FOR CONTRACT NO. RFP487A AND \$11,902,000.00 FOR CONTRACT NO. RFP487B FOR PURCHASE OF SECURITY GUARD SERVICES FOR COUNTY DEPARTMENTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes a designated purchase under Contract Nos. RFP487A and RFP487B, Security Guard and Screening Services, for multiple County departments. Approval of a designated purchase is being requested, pursuant to Section 2-8.1(b)(3) of the Miami-Dade County Code, to authorize the extension of the current term of both contracts for up to 12 months and increase expenditure authority by a total of \$32,427,000 to ensure continuity of services while the long-term replacement contract is solicited and evaluated.</p> <p>The current contract terms were previously extended administratively by six (6) months under the County Mayor's delegated authority. This procurement is presented for BCC approval as a designated purchase because the administration has exhausted its authority to further extend the contract and competition is not practicable at this time; however, the replacement solicitation has been advertised. Accordingly,</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes												
	<p>it is in the best interest of the County to authorize this designated purchase to assure the continued delivery of critical security guard and screening services to County residents.</p> <p>Background: These contracts were competitively established in June 2008 through Resolution No. R-496A-08 for three (3) years with two (2), two-year options to renew to deliver security guard and screening services at various sites and facilities countywide. Contract No. RFP487A services the Internal Services and Water and Sewer Departments. Contract No. RFP487B services the Public Housing and Community Development Department, as administered by the Internal Services Department and the Water and Sewer Department. In an effort to enhance the quality of security services and vendor performance in the delivery of these services, the scope of services for the replacement contracts is being restructured. It is anticipated that an award recommendation for the replacement contracts will be presented to the Board for approval in June 2016. As such, the last six (6) months of the requested 12-month extension will be executed on a month-to-month basis to allow for contract award and transition.</p> <p>The Office of the Commission Auditor posed the following question: Why is the replacement contract being restructured?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the Internal Services Department (ISD), the services are now being solicited under 3 separate solicitations and the structure of the service requirements are now broken into various Tiers which allows for greater participation with regard to Small Business vendors. <p>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source: Contract Nos. RFP487A and RFP487B are in their final option to renew terms, which expire on February 29, 2016. Contract No. RFP487A has an existing allocation of \$51,313,000 and Contract No. RFP487B has an existing allocation of \$29,732,000. The requested additional allocation for RFP487A is \$20,525,000, resulting in a total modified contract allocation of \$71,838,000. The requested additional allocation for RFP487B is \$11,902,000, resulting in a total modified contract allocation of \$41,634,000. The requested additional allocations under both contracts are based on anticipated usage and estimated needs.</p> <p>The Office of the Commission Auditor posed the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has it taken so long to advertise knowing that security guard and screening services were considered “critical” and that the contract was near expiration? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to ISD, the RFP was originally solicited on September 1, 2015 and thereafter went through and extensive County Attorney review. The solicitation closes on December 11, 2015. • Why was the contract extended if it did not expire until February of 2016? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to ISD, the contract was extended to allow for sufficient time for the new contract to be evaluated and approved by the Board of County Commissioners. • What was the expiration date prior to the 6 month administrative extension? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 31, 2015 <p>Additional Information – Relevant Legislation:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">On May 6, 2008, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-496-08, awarded to following contracts:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">Contract No. 487A-2A</td> <td>50 State Security Service, Inc.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract No. 487A-3A</td> <td>Barton Protective Services LLC d/b/a AlliedBarton Security Services</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract No. 487A-1E</td> <td>Feick Security Corporation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract No. 487A-2B</td> <td>McRoberts Protective Agency, Inc.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Additionally, R-496-08 deferred the award of Contract Nos. 487A-1D and 487A-3B and directed the County Mayor or his designee to place a new recommendation for award of these contracts on a subsequent agenda.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>During the BCC meeting on May 6, 2008, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Assistant County Manager explained the history and intent of the proposed resolution. She noted the County Manager’s recommendation was that five sectors in the Request for Proposal (RFP) be awarded pursuant to the competitive bid process; that bid waivers be approved for three of the sectors containing a Small Business Enterprise (SBE) category; and that bids be rejected and re-advertised for the sector that was awarded to Wackenhut, pending an audit.</i> • <i>Pertaining to concerns regarding vendors shifting names or principals, the DPM Director noted none of the firms in today’s recommendation had a history of undisclosed principals.</i> • <i>The Committee expressed concern that Security Alliance (SA) had not qualified as an SBE company for three years, but was recommended for an SBE set aside award and expressed concern with companies circumventing the process by creating subsidiaries to maintain an SBE status. The Commission asked if the current SBE ordinance provided assurances that companies were in fact, small business enterprises.</i> • <i>The DPM Director noted assertive SBE measures/set asides, participation goals and selection factors were included in the deliberations of the recommended awards for this contract. She noted SA was determined to be SBE certified at the time of the proposal submission, throughout the review/evaluation process and when the awards were recommended by the Administration.</i> • <i>The Director of the Department of Small Business Development (DSBD), noted, as part of the re-certification and application process, gross revenues of all affiliates were considered. She noted staff did an analysis of Security Alliance, and determined SA to be properly certified and eligible to participate in this bid.</i> 	On May 6, 2008, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-496-08, awarded to following contracts:		Contract No. 487A-2A	50 State Security Service, Inc.	Contract No. 487A-3A	Barton Protective Services LLC d/b/a AlliedBarton Security Services	Contract No. 487A-1E	Feick Security Corporation	Contract No. 487A-2B	McRoberts Protective Agency, Inc.	Additionally, R-496-08 deferred the award of Contract Nos. 487A-1D and 487A-3B and directed the County Mayor or his designee to place a new recommendation for award of these contracts on a subsequent agenda.	
On May 6, 2008, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-496-08, awarded to following contracts:													
Contract No. 487A-2A	50 State Security Service, Inc.												
Contract No. 487A-3A	Barton Protective Services LLC d/b/a AlliedBarton Security Services												
Contract No. 487A-1E	Feick Security Corporation												
Contract No. 487A-2B	McRoberts Protective Agency, Inc.												
Additionally, R-496-08 deferred the award of Contract Nos. 487A-1D and 487A-3B and directed the County Mayor or his designee to place a new recommendation for award of these contracts on a subsequent agenda.													

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responding to questions regarding the current revenue limit a firm could earn to remain eligible for the SBE program, and the amount of SA's gross revenues, the DSBD Director noted a firm was limited to a 3-year average of no more than \$5 million gross revenues. She noted SA was no longer SBE certified, however, it was certified at the time their proposal was submitted and during the procurement process, when SA graduated from the SBE program. • The CAO noted the provisions in the SBE ordinance in effect at that time, allowed for an exception of firms graduating from the SBE program to continue getting the benefit of a sheltered market procurement for a one-year period from the point of graduation, which permitted the firm to bid for one year as though they were an SBE firm. • The Commission questioned whether the Commission could consider that the one-year period extension (upon graduating) had expired during the process when an eligibility determination was made and when the recommendation came before the BCC. The Commission also questioned whether the BCC would have to approve a bid waiver to award the tiers as recommended by the County Manager. • The CAO explained the reason for the recommended bid waiver before the BCC was because the one-year period had expired. He noted the BCC would need to approve a bid waiver as it pertained to the awards to Security Alliance. • In response to questions regarding whether the BCC could consider substituting a recommended firm with another SBE firm, if determined ineligible as an SBE, the CAO noted the BCC could award another SBE firm. He also noted several extraordinary voting procedural requirements inherent in this item, which involved a waiver of the bid protest process requiring a 2/3s vote of the BCC before any other action could be taken on this item; and a bid waiver of the awards pertaining to SA that also required a 2/3s vote of the BCC. • In response to questions regarding a previous Invitation to Bid (ITB) that yielded better inclusion, the DPM Director noted the emergency contract now in place was issued as an ITB, but not all of the firms in the current emergency contract competed in the Request for Proposals (RFP). • In response to the Commission's questions whether the procurement process had been followed; whether all companies recommended for an award today were given due process; and if any of the recommended companies were currently under investigation, the DPM Director noted the process was properly followed; that five bid protests were dealt with appropriately, and to her knowledge, no companies recommended for an award today were currently under investigation. • Responding to the Commission's question concerning the Manager's recommendation to reject and re-advertise Sector 1C of RFP 487B, the DPM Director noted that sector was recommended for an award to Wackenhut Corporation, which was the subject of a prolonged audit. She noted staff recommended the bids be rejected and re-advertised to move forward and source that segment again. • In response to the Commission's question regarding the date the bids were first advertised and the reasons for the delays in this process, the Assistant County Manager noted the RFP was advertised in 2006, and a series of events caused the delays, including an audit, decertification and bid protests. She noted delays occurred during the process to no fault of the companies, which allowed for a graduation, and the firms went through the competitive process and were awarded. She noted the CAO and the County Manager staff devised a recommendation that would move this contract forward, since it had been ongoing for sometime. • The Commission asked that this item be bifurcated to vote separately on the Tiers in the RFP with SBE set asides and questioned when the affiliates of SA were established. The DSBD Director noted, based on the eligibility review in October 2006, SA owned several other companies, and had exceeded the size standards. She noted she could not state how far back the affiliates were established, but staff conducted an analysis of the firms' gross receipts from 2001 to 2005, including affiliate revenues, and found that SA maintained its SBE certification based on those revenues. • Responding to the Commission's question as to what the current SBE program rules were, the CAO explained that a firm graduating from the current SBE program would no longer be eligible to bid prospectively on subsequent contracts but would be allowed to finish out any existing ones. The CAO explained that bid waivers were being presented before the BCC today for awards involving SA because the one-year grace period had expired. The CAO noted that absent the bid waiver, SA would not be eligible for an award. The CAO further noted the ordinance in effect at the time of this procurement process/review, allowed for a one-year grace period upon graduation to bid on contracts, and the SBE program required the firm be SBE eligible at the time of bid. • The Commission noted a process needed to be created that allowed more participation by minority firms and pointed out that when the ITB process was utilized, more minority firms participated. • In response to the Commission's request for clarification regarding the reason the bid waivers were before the BCC, the CAO explained that under the current and prior rules, a firm had to be certified as an SBE at the time of the bid. He noted the rules in effect when the bids were opened were the prior rules, which provided for a one-year grace period from time of graduating the SBE program, but had since been amended to now require a firm be SBE certified at the time of award. He clarified that staff would apply the rules that were in effect at the time of procurement, and the bid waivers were before the Board because the one-year time period had expired. • The BCC proceeded to vote on the foregoing motion, and upon a roll call vote, the motion failed 7-4. Following an extensive discussion on how to appropriately award the RFPs, it was moved that the BCC bifurcate the foregoing resolution and vote on Contract Nos. 487A and 487B separately. This motion was seconded by and passed by a unanimous vote of those members present
Upon bifurcating Agenda Item 801B in order to vote on Contract Nos. 487A and 487B separately, R-496-08 was adopted on May 6, 2008, as amended, to exclude Contract No. 487B; waive the bid protest process; and award the following contracts:	
Contract No. 487A-1E, Tier 1	Feick Security Corp
Contract No. 487A-2A, Tier 2	50 State Security Service, Inc (Sub: Feick Security Corporation)

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																									
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Contract No. 487A-2B, Tier 2</td> <td>McRoberts Protective Agency, Inc (the sub: Security Alliance of Florida, LLC was to be replaced with another qualified SBE subcontractor)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract No. 487A-3A, Tier 3</td> <td>Barton Protect Services LLC d/b/a/Allied Barton Security Services</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract 487A-1D, Tier 1</td> <td rowspan="2">Selection processes were to be revisited with a revised recommendation for award</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract 487A-3B, Tier 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">The County Manager was instructed to revisit the selection process and come back with a revised recommendation for the award of Contract 487A-1D, Tier 1 and Contract 487A-3B, Tier 3.</td> </tr> </table> <p>The Office of the Commission Auditor posed the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have all issued with Security Alliance been resolved? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to ISD, there are no current issues Security Alliance. • What is Security Alliance's SBE status currently? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to ISD, Security Alliance is not currently a certified Small Business Enterprise. <p>On May 20, 2008, Resolution No. R-496-08, contract award to provide security guard and screening services, for and on behalf of Miami-Dade County, was reconsidered.</p> <p>During the BCC meeting on May 20, 2008, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It was moved that the proposed resolution adopted as amended at the May 6, 2008, BCC meeting be reconsidered.</i> • <i>Responding to the Commission's inquiry regarding the impact of the Commission reconsidering this proposed resolution on Small Business Enterprises (SBE), the Director of the Department of Procurement Management, noted Contract 487B, Security Guard Services, did not have SBE measures.</i> • <i>Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed by a vote of 7-0. Upon the loss of a quorum, the Commission requested the County Mayor or his designee to present the proper recommendation for Contract 487B, Security Guard Services, at the June 3, 2008, County Commission meeting.</i> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #c6e0b4;">On May 20, 2008, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-496A-08, awarded the following contracts:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Contract No. 487B-1B</td> <td>Barton Protective Services LLC d/b/a AlliedBarton Security Services</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract No. 487B-1A</td> <td>Security Alliance Of Florida, LLC</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">R-496A-08 further rejected all bids for Contract No. 487B-1C and directed the County Mayor or his designee to advertise a new solicitation for the award of Sector 1C.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #c6e0b4;">On June 3, 2008, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-656-08, awarded the following contracts:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Contract No. 487B-1B</td> <td>Barton Protective Services LLC d/b/a AlliedBarton Security Services</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract No. 487B-1C</td> <td>Security Alliance Of Florida, LLC</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">R-656-08 further rejected all bids for Contract No. 487B-1A and directed the County Mayor or his designee to advertise a new solicitation for the award of Sector 1A.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Office of the Commission Auditor posed the following question: When was Section 1A awarded?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to ISD, following a full and open competition Contract 8773-2/15 Sector 1A was award to Weiser Security Services on October 1, 2008. Weiser Security Services advised the County that at the end of the initial term of the contract (January 31, 2012) that they would no longer be able to provide the required services. The contract was extended for a one month period to allow for the evaluation on how to handle the services specifically addressed with the contract (WASD). ISD Security staff reviewed the current zones and scope of services for the existing 487A & B security contracts to determine the best fit for the services provided by Weiser. A determination was made based on pricing and scope profile for the services to add WASD security needs to Contract 487B with an effective date March 1, 2012 to be performed by Allied Barton. The contract with Weiser expired on February 29, 2012. <p>During the BCC meeting on June 3, 2008, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Commission noted the rationale for moving Security Alliance up from Sector 1A to 1C of the proposed security guard contract, in view of Security Alliance's expiration date and graduation from the Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Program, and unforeseen delays.</i> • <i>The Assistant County Manager explained that upon reviewing the numbers, Sector 1A had potentially more hours than Sector 1C, therefore, instead of rejecting and re-advertising that sector, the County Administration decided to move Security Alliance up one sector. She further explained that Allied Barton Security Services would receive the highest number of hours, Security Alliance would receive the second highest and the third sector would be rejected to be re-advertised pursuant to the proposal.</i> • <i>The Assistant County Manager clarified that the Commission proposed awarding Sector 1C to Security Alliance, and to reject and re-advertise Sector 1A.</i> 	Contract No. 487A-2B, Tier 2	McRoberts Protective Agency, Inc (the sub: Security Alliance of Florida, LLC was to be replaced with another qualified SBE subcontractor)	Contract No. 487A-3A, Tier 3	Barton Protect Services LLC d/b/a/Allied Barton Security Services	Contract 487A-1D, Tier 1	Selection processes were to be revisited with a revised recommendation for award	Contract 487A-3B, Tier 3	The County Manager was instructed to revisit the selection process and come back with a revised recommendation for the award of Contract 487A-1D, Tier 1 and Contract 487A-3B, Tier 3.		On May 20, 2008, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-496A-08, awarded the following contracts:		Contract No. 487B-1B	Barton Protective Services LLC d/b/a AlliedBarton Security Services	Contract No. 487B-1A	Security Alliance Of Florida, LLC	R-496A-08 further rejected all bids for Contract No. 487B-1C and directed the County Mayor or his designee to advertise a new solicitation for the award of Sector 1C.		On June 3, 2008, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-656-08, awarded the following contracts:		Contract No. 487B-1B	Barton Protective Services LLC d/b/a AlliedBarton Security Services	Contract No. 487B-1C	Security Alliance Of Florida, LLC	R-656-08 further rejected all bids for Contract No. 487B-1A and directed the County Mayor or his designee to advertise a new solicitation for the award of Sector 1A.	
Contract No. 487A-2B, Tier 2	McRoberts Protective Agency, Inc (the sub: Security Alliance of Florida, LLC was to be replaced with another qualified SBE subcontractor)																									
Contract No. 487A-3A, Tier 3	Barton Protect Services LLC d/b/a/Allied Barton Security Services																									
Contract 487A-1D, Tier 1	Selection processes were to be revisited with a revised recommendation for award																									
Contract 487A-3B, Tier 3																										
The County Manager was instructed to revisit the selection process and come back with a revised recommendation for the award of Contract 487A-1D, Tier 1 and Contract 487A-3B, Tier 3.																										
On May 20, 2008, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-496A-08, awarded the following contracts:																										
Contract No. 487B-1B	Barton Protective Services LLC d/b/a AlliedBarton Security Services																									
Contract No. 487B-1A	Security Alliance Of Florida, LLC																									
R-496A-08 further rejected all bids for Contract No. 487B-1C and directed the County Mayor or his designee to advertise a new solicitation for the award of Sector 1C.																										
On June 3, 2008, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-656-08, awarded the following contracts:																										
Contract No. 487B-1B	Barton Protective Services LLC d/b/a AlliedBarton Security Services																									
Contract No. 487B-1C	Security Alliance Of Florida, LLC																									
R-656-08 further rejected all bids for Contract No. 487B-1A and directed the County Mayor or his designee to advertise a new solicitation for the award of Sector 1A.																										

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responding to the Commission's inquiry regarding the projected yearly amount of Sector 1C, the Assistant County Manager noted the estimated hours had not been negotiated, however, it was estimated that Sector 1C contained more hours than Sector 1A. • Responding to the Commission's inquiry whether any legal issues existed with re-advertising Sector 1A instead of Sector 1C, the CAO stated that rejecting one sector and re-advertising another sector was legal. • The Commission pointed out that the proposal was different from the County Manager's recommendation.
8F7 152480	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL TIME OF FIVE YEARS AND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$4,548,000.00 FOR PREQUALIFICATION POOL NO. 6296-0/16 FOR PURCHASE OF VARIOUS FRESH PRODUCE FOR COUNTY DEPARTMENTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SOLICIT PRICING, AWARD CONTRACTS, EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS AND ANY RESULTING CONTRACTS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38, AND ADD VENDORS TO THE POOL AT ANY TIME, SUBJECT TO RATIFICATION BY THE BOARD ON A BI-ANNUAL BASIS</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves an extension of Prequalification Pool No. 6296-0/16, Fresh Produce, for five (5) additional years and increases expenditure authority by \$4,548,000. This pool was established on January 1, 2011 for a five-year term for use by multiple County departments to purchase various fresh produce. Vendors must be local in order to pre-qualify under this pool.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The pool was established with a \$4,895,000 allocation which was modified by \$50,000, resulting in an existing allocation of \$4,945,000. The pool expires on December 31, 2015. The requested additional allocation of \$4,548,000 is based on anticipated usage during the five-year extension period. The yearly allocation under the extension period is less than the current term due to a reduction in anticipated usage.</p> <p>In accordance with Resolution No. R-422-15, future spot market solicitations will identify locally grown produce to be set-aside for local sourcing so long as local products are available, and are of the right quality, quantity, and price. County departments will use the pool, as needed, during the extension period to purchase covered products.</p> <p>The requirements, terms and conditions of the pool would not change if a replacement solicitation were to be issued. It is anticipated that the same vendors would prequalify for a replacement solicitation. Additional qualified vendors may be added to the pool at any time during the term of the pool, subject to bi-annual ratification by the Board. This prequalification pool will remain advertised on the County's Procurement Management Services website to encourage additional participation. Outreach to registered firms was conducted to increase the number of prequalified firms. It is in the County's best interest to modify the existing pool for an additional five-year period so departments are able to continue purchasing fresh produce.</p> <p><u>Awarded Vendors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caribe Food Corp. - 7350 NW 30 Avenue Miami, FL • Excellent Fruit & Produce, Inc.(MICRO/SBE, ACDBE, DBE) - 1762 NW 21 Terrace Miami, FL • Freedom Fresh LLC - 8901 NW 33 Street, Suite 100 Miami, FL • Mac Edwards Produce & Company, Inc. - 830 NW 22 Street Miami, FL • The Produce Connection, Inc. - 2200 NW 23 Street Miami, FL • Unifresh Produce Co., Inc.(MICRO/SBE) - 1201 NW 21 Street Miami, FL <p><u>Additional Information:</u> According Prequalification Pool No. 6296-0/16, the purpose of the contract is to establish a pool of pre-qualified vendors to provide fresh fruits and vegetables, for Miami-Dade Corrections and Rehabilitation (MDCR), Miami-Dade Fire Rescue (MDFR), the Department of Human Services (DHS) and Miami-Dade County Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces (PROS). The pre-qualification contract allows qualified bidders to participate in quarterly spot market purchases. The rationale for using this method of award is due to the frequent price adjustments made by the cultivators of fresh produce throughout the year. Most fruits and vegetables grow in certain seasons and as such are available during certain times of the year, relative to where they are grown geographically. Climate change is one of the several factors that increase the vulnerability of the agricultural market. Climate change impact agriculture production and international trade causing fluctuations in price. These seasonal adjustments by fresh produce growers make it difficult for vendors to hold prices for long periods of time.</p> <p>The MDCR and PROS departments purchase produce for the inmate population, and for the animals at Zoo Miami. During quarterly spot market competitions, the estimated quantities are adjusted based on menu requirements, and budgeted costs per meal. The fluctuating number of the inmate population at MDCR also affects the volume of produce bought during each quarter. MDFR purchases fresh produce for use in this preparation of meals for the cafeteria in the MDFR Headquarters Building. DHS purchases fresh produce to supplement meals for victim's programs, shelters, and for emergencies.</p>
8F8 152680	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING DESIGNATED PURCHASE PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1(B)(3) OF THE COUNTY CODE BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF THE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT; AUTHORIZING AWARD OF ADDITIONAL TIME OF SIX MONTHS AND AN ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF UP TO \$5,788,000.00 FOR CONTRACT NO. 5380-6/14-6 FOR PURCHASE OF MOBILE EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURER REPLACEMENT PARTS AND SERVICES FOR VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes a designated purchase under Contract No. 5380-6/14-6, Mobile Equipment Manufacturer Replacement Parts and Services, for various County departments. Approval of a designated purchase is being requested, pursuant to Section 2-8.1(b)(3) of the Miami-Dade County Code, to authorize the extension of the current contract term by six (6) months and increase expenditure authority</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>by \$5,788,000 to ensure continuity of services while the competitive selection process for the replacement solicitation is finalized and a contract is awarded.</p> <p>Background: The contract, which was originally established in May 2008 through Resolution No. R-568-08, is in its final option to renew term. The contract is used by multiple County departments to purchase Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) parts and repair services for various types of automotive equipment, including passenger cars, station wagons, vans, pickup trucks, utility vehicles, suburbans, walk-in step vans and motorcycles.</p> <p>The current term was extended administratively by six (6) months under the County Mayor's delegated authority to afford the user departments sufficient time to develop the replacement solicitation in order to better meet the County's needs. Simultaneously, the Fleet Management Division of the Internal Services Department submitted requests to access competitively-awarded contracts from other entities to purchase certain equipment and parts wherein the County could obtain better pricing. These efforts led to further restructuring of the replacement solicitation as those items no longer needed to be solicited. As a result, the issuance of the replacement solicitation was delayed.</p> <p>The replacement solicitation was issued in November 2015 and covers the purchase of OEM parts for automobiles, medium and heavy trucks, marine vehicles, motorcycles, utility and construction vehicles, trailers, material handling equipment, and agricultural vehicles. Award will be made to up to three (3) responsive, responsible bidders meeting the minimum criteria required per OEM. The County reserves the right to add OEMs not awarded during the initial bid submittal by issuing a supplemental solicitation wherein authorized dealers may compete for award. This will be done where the purchase of additional equipment by a user department requires the purchase of parts from manufacturers not included in the contract.</p> <p>This item is presented for BCC approval as a designated purchase because the Administration has exhausted its authority to extend the contract and competition is currently not practicable as the replacement solicitation has been issued. It is anticipated that a contract award recommendation will be presented to the BCC for approval in early 2016. Accordingly, it is in the best interests of the County to authorize this designated purchase to support ongoing departmental demand for OEM equipment and parts while the new contract awaits award.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source: The contract expires on December 31, 2015 and has an existing allocation of \$23,729,000 for 18 months. The requested additional allocation of \$5,788,000 is based on historical usage and estimated needs and results in a total modified contract allocation of \$29,517,000.</p> <p>There are currently 70 pre-qualified vendors, of which 44 have a local office.</p>
8F9 151997	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING AWARD OF CONTRACT NO. RFP 00172 TO TETRA TECH, INC. FOR THE PROVISION OF DEBRIS REMOVAL MONITORING SERVICES FOR THE PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACES AND PUBLIC WORKS AND WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENTS IN A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$180,000,000.00 OVER THE INITIAL FIVE-YEAR TERM AND FIVE-YEAR OPTION TO RENEW PERIOD; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves the award of Request for Proposals No. 00172, Disaster Debris Removal Monitoring Services to Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra) for the delivery of such monitoring services on behalf of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Spaces and Public Works and Waste Management departments. The departments will use this contract to support the oversight and management of debris recovery contractors following disaster events.</p> <p>Tetra's responsibilities in the management of debris recovery contractors includes, but is not limited to, field monitoring of debris reduction and removal, truck certification, damage assessment, training, and emergency planning. Tetra will also be responsible for preparing and submitting public assistance applications on behalf of the County to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the State of Florida, and other relevant agencies for disaster recovery efforts.</p> <p>Under the contract, Tetra will hire and utilize a local workforce to provide the services.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source: The contract allocation will only be used if needed and is an estimate based on historical data from previous debris removal monitoring efforts. The solicitation specified that the County makes no guarantees as to the volume of work or value of any contract the awarded vendor would receive. The fiscal impact for the five-year term is estimated to be \$90,000,000. Should the County choose to exercise the single five-year option to renew, the estimated cumulative value will be \$180,000,000.</p> <p>The current contract, RFQ99, is valued at \$150,020,000 for eight (8) years. The annual allocation under the replacement contract has been reduced slightly due to lower rates for the solicited services. Costs for services are initially paid by the County and then are subsequently submitted to the State of Florida and/or FEMA for reimbursement. Therefore, the funding source is determined at the time of need.</p> <p>Vendor Recommended for Award A Request for Proposals was issued under full and open competition on December 12, 2014. Seven (7) proposals were received in response to the solicitation. This method of award was used to obtain the best value to the County by conducting a qualitative review of proposals, including qualifications, experience, and technical capability. The recommended vendor has substantial qualifications and experience and has proposed a robust electronic, automated tracking and reporting system to meet the needs of the County. Under the current contract,</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>three (3) vendors are awarded. The replacement contract is being awarded to a single vendor due to changes in technology and the industry. Paper ticketing, tracking, and reporting have been replaced by the use of an automated electronic system. By awarding to a single vendor, the County will be able to standardize the use of a single system and produce uniform reports, providing more effective and efficient management.</p> <p><u>Additional Information - Current Contract RFQ99:</u> In 2005 and 2006, the County issued Emergency Purchase Orders to access a competed Orange County contract for debris monitors to support the oversight and management of contractors engaged in debris recovery resulting from hurricanes. This monitoring service is required by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in order to be eligible for reimbursement. Historically, the County has received reimbursement for funds spent for debris removal monitoring from both FEMA and the State of Florida. FEMA, per Stafford Act, will reimburse the County a minimum of 75% of the total expenses, depending on the Declaration of Emergency issued by the Federal government. The State will pay for half of the balance not paid by the Federal government. The County will pay for the remaining costs not covered by the Federal and State governments.</p> <p>On September 18, 2007, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1029-07, approved an award to pre-qualify contractors to provide disaster debris removal monitoring services for Contract Nos. RFQ99a, RFQ99b and RFQ99c. The contract term was for three years with three, one-year options-to-renew with an estimated contract allocation up to \$75 million for the initial three year term. The County had previously received reimbursement from federal and state agencies for most of the expenses incurred for these services.</p> <p>Vendors Recommended for Award:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beck Disaster Recovery, Inc. - 800 N. Magnolia Avenue, Suite 400, Orlando, Florida 32803; • Solid Resources, Inc. - 2201 Cantu Court, Suite 119, Sarasota, Florida 34232; and • Metric Engineering, Inc. - 13940 SW 136 Street, Miami, Florida 33186 <p><i>When services were needed, the Department of Procurement Management was to utilize a competitive work order proposal process to select a pool member. However, for a declared emergency, the Department of Solid Waste Management was able to select a pool member on the basis of the ranking (i.e., highest ranked pool member recommended first). If the services of multiple contractors was required, the County could award multiple work orders for the same event to multiple Pool members. Each selection process allowed for negotiations with the recommended Pool member to ensure the services and pricing proposed meet the County's needs.</i></p> <p>Contract Measures: The Review Committee of February 14, 2007 recommended a Small Business Enterprise (SBE) selection factor for this Request for Qualifications.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Metropolitan Services Committee Meeting Discussion:</u> During the Metropolitan Services Committee meeting on November 12, 2015, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In response to questions as to whether this funding was from the federal government, the Assistant County Attorney indicated that the funding was reimbursed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), but the County paid the initial up-front fee.</i> • <i>Responding to questions regarding whether it was possible for the County to require local workforce on a contract that was federally funded, the Senior Assistant Director of Procurement Management in the Internal Services Department, noted geographic preferences were not allowable in the contract, but through negotiation the vendor offered to use a local workforce and the County accepted. She said that as long as this was not made a requirement, it would not jeopardize the contract.</i> • <i>The Committee suggested that this strategy be utilized for all future federally-funded contracts, and the Senior Assistant Director noted as long as this was not made a requirement, the Administration would welcome including local workforce through negotiations.</i> • <i>The Committee pointed out that FEMA did not always reimburse the totality of the funding to the County.</i>
8G1 152778	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FISCAL YEAR 2015-16 CONTRACT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,133,000.00 WITH THE STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EFFECTIVE RETROACTIVELY TO OCTOBER 1, 2015 FOR THE PURPOSE OF MEETING PUBLIC HEALTH NEEDS OF THE CITIZENS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME AND EXERCISE ANY PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN, AND TO EXECUTE FUTURE AGREEMENTS FOR, AND APPLY FOR, RECEIVE, AND EXPEND ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-16 SHOULD THEY BECOME AVAILABLE UNDER THIS PROGRAM FOR THIS PURPOSE</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution retroactively authorizes the execution of the agreement between Miami-Dade County and the State of Florida Department of Health (DOH) for one (1) year, from October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016. The resolution further authorizes Miami-Dade County to provide \$1,133,000 in program support to the DOH for public health services to Miami-Dade County residents.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u> The FY 2015-16 contract identifies a total program cost of \$77,974,610 including contributions by the State of Florida (\$65,823,263) and a direct local County contribution (\$1,133,000), and other local contribution (\$4,326,238) to the State's Public Health Trust Fund maintained by the State Treasurer. Additionally, the contract delineates the public health services to be provided by each unit and the corresponding staff and service measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State's cash contribution totals \$65,823,263 consisting of State and Federal revenues (\$61,915,588), State-authorized fees (\$2,357,191), and other State cash contributions (\$1,550,484).

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County's cash contribution totals \$1,133,000 from Jackson Health Systems (JHS). The DOH can elect to re-appropriate funding among the different programs with prior contract officer approval, if necessary. The JHS reimbursement methodology and monitoring requirements are detailed under separate agreements between the JHS and DOH. • The other local cash contribution totals \$10,991,347, of which \$4,374,596 is comprised of fees assessed for DOH health services, environmental health, and communicable disease services; \$2,290,513 from Medicaid; and \$4,326,238 of cash contribution. <p>Pursuant to State law, the BCC is responsible for approving the DOH revised fee schedule. However, no changes in service fees are recommended in this document. Furthermore, communicable disease and primary care fees are automatically adjusted to at least the Medicaid reimbursement rate without formal amendment to this contract in accordance with Section 154.06 of the Florida Statutes should such reimbursement be increased or decreased. Other State indirect contributions not reflected in the trust fund budget include immunization, funds for the Bureau of Public Health Laboratories, ADAP and Pharmacy Drug Program, and the Women, Infant and Children (WIC) food program totaling \$95,407,443.</p> <p>Although not mandated by State Statute, Miami-Dade County agrees to provide building space and insurance coverage for County-owned buildings, furnishings and equipment used by the DOH. The leases for these facilities will go back to the BCC as separate agreements for approval. It is the responsibility of the DOH to obtain insurance coverage for any buildings, furnishings, and equipment used by the agency but not owned by Miami-Dade County. The DOH is responsible for the construction, maintenance, repair, and improvements of all buildings, as well as providing utilities, janitorial and custodial services. In addition, the DOH must maintain facilities in compliance with all Federal, State, and local regulatory requirements, including the American with Disabilities Act.</p> <p><u>Background</u> Chapter 154 of the Florida Statutes requires that the DOH enter into a contract with each county. This contract provides for the Miami-Dade County Department of Health to promote public health, including environmental health services; to control and eradicate preventable diseases; and to provide care to special populations. This contract format is prescribed by the State and it establishes a basic legal framework for shared responsibilities between the state DOH and Miami-Dade County. This relationship has evolved over the years from a County-managed Public Health Unit to a large state agency operated entirely by the DOH.</p> <p>Either party may terminate the agreement without cause upon no less than 180 calendar days notice in writing to the other party. Either party, upon no less than 30 days notice, may terminate the agreement if the other party fails to perform an obligation under the contract. In the event that funds to finance this contract become unavailable, either party may terminate the contract upon no less than 24 hours notice in writing to the other party. Staffing and services may be reduced based on the availability of funds.</p>
8H2 152698	RESOLUTION APPROVING A JOINT USE AGREEMENT WITH THE SCHOOL BOARD OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY FOR PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN ZOO MIAMI TO BE USED BY THE SCHOOL BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL/RECREATIONAL USE AS A PART OF THE SCIENCE/ZOO MAGNET PROGRAMS AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SUCH AGREEMENT
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the Joint Use Agreement with the School Board of Miami-Dade County (District) at the site owned by Miami-Dade County (County) at Zoo Miami, and authorizes the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee to execute Joint Use Agreement.</p> <p>The site that is the subject of the Joint Use Agreement is land owned by Miami-Dade County within Zoo Miami for the operation of Middle/High School Science/Zoo Magnet Programs (Magnet Programs).</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The District will be responsible for all maintenance, repair, and upkeep of the demised area, including the school portables. In addition, the District will collect and dispose of garbage and litter within the demised area, and provide all routine custodial or janitorial services and all utilities serving the demised area. The County and the District will enter into a separate operating agreement to address operational issues relating to the Magnet Programs access to and use of Zoo Miami facilities.</p> <p><u>Background:</u> The site is owned by the County within Zoo Miami and is vacant and unimproved. The Joint Use Agreement with the District is required to facilitate joint use of the site that benefits Zoo Miami, the students of the District, and the residents of the County. Since 1988, the District has utilized four (4) portable classrooms at the Zoo Miami facility, pursuant to a Joint Operating Agreement (Former Agreement) with the County, as part of the Magnet Program at Richmond Heights Middle School. The Former Agreement expired on May 31, 2014, but uninterrupted use was facilitated through the execution of a temporary permit to allow the parties sufficient time to finalize negotiations and execute a new Joint Use Agreement.</p> <p>Prior to the expiration of the Former Agreement, the County advised the District that it would be required to relocate the four (4) portable classrooms housing the Magnet Programs from their current location to an alternate site within the Zoo Miami facility at the District's sole cost and expense. In addition, beginning with the 2015-16 school year, the District will add a high school component to the Magnet Programs, which requires the installation of new portable classrooms to accommodate both the middle and high school magnet programs. In this regard, the District's Office of School Choice and Parental Options has secured a Magnet Program Assistance Program grant to provide funds for the operation of the expanded high school program for a three-year period.</p> <p>Accordingly, it will be necessary for the parties to enter into a new Joint Use Agreement to provide for the installation of new portable classrooms and the long-term operation of the Magnet Programs at Zoo Miami. The District will be responsible, at its sole cost and expense, for all work necessary to install up to 13 portable classrooms. The portables will be installed in multiple phases as additional grade levels are</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>added within the demised area. The first phase (consisting of three (3) science labs, two (2) classrooms, and one (1) restroom building) will replace the portable classrooms currently serving the Middle School Magnet Program, as well as provide classroom space for the launching of the new High School Magnet component. Future phases will be coordinated and scheduled with the County to assure minimal impact on Zoo Miami operations.</p> <p>The District will continue to operate the Magnet Programs at the existing location through December 31, 2015 under the auspices of the Temporary Permit. This will provide sufficient time for the parties to finalize the Joint Use Agreement and for the District to install/construct the facilities at the new location. The Temporary Permit will terminate effective with the commencement of the Joint Use Agreement.</p> <p><u>Additional Information:</u> The Science Zoo Magnet Program³ affords students an opportunity to study a rigorous curriculum which explores, in depth, many branches of science related to the zoo and our technological world.</p> <p>Students will experience the fun, adventure and excitement of learning in Zoo Miami’s 290 acre “science classroom”, with more than 1200 exotic animals in cage less habitats. They will take learning safaris into unique environment ranging from Asian jungles to African plains. Participating students will work and study with a select group of enthusiastic classmates who have a keen interest in science and its applications to animals and their environment.</p> <p>Unique Program Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State of the art science laboratory and science equipment • Specialized course offerings • Seminar, cluster programs, flexible scheduling and utilization of community resources • Computer- assisted instruction • Unique field trips • Opportunity for acceleration in science and mathematics for advanced high school classes • Internships at Jungle Island and Monkey Jungle • Two-hour block science research • Study science on grounds of Zoo Miami <p>The Middle School Concept Philosophy: Child-centered; holistic knowledge is developed; thinking skills are priority goals; safety is essential; student’ developmental needs are important.</p> <p>Curriculum: Academic excellence/ social competence-academic core, exploration and development programs.</p> <p>Organization: Interdisciplinary teams; advisement program; flexible block scheduling; team planning and shared decision making; exploratory and developmental experience-elective classes, wheels and exploration credits, mini-courses, clubs, activities, interest groups; intramurals; integrated curriculum; in-service education and professional development.</p> <p>Implementation Strategies: Cooperative learning; interdisciplinary teaching styles; differentiated instruction; student services and career planning systems; home-school partnership and communications.</p>
811 152692	RESOLUTION APPROVING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE REQUEST TO EXPEND \$4,353,000.00 FROM THE MIAMI-DADE POLICE DEPARTMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT TRUST FUND; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO USE SUCH FUNDS FOR EXPENDITURES EFFECTIVE AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2015 AND DESCRIBED HEREIN
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves expenditures of \$4,353,000.00 from the Miami-Dade Police Department Law Enforcement Trust Fund in accordance with the Report of Proposed Expenditures from the Law Enforcement Trust Fund (Report).</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> Miami-Dade County will not incur any costs. The Law Enforcement Trust Fund monies are awarded to the Miami-Dade Police Department as a result of forfeiture litigation in State court and participation in federal asset sharing programs.</p> <p><u>Background:</u> On December 2, 1980, the Law Enforcement Trust Fund for Miami-Dade County was established by the BCC through Resolution No. R-1633-80. The Law Enforcement Trust Fund must be used for law enforcement purposes which are not budgeted. Allowable purposes may include: to defray costs of protracted or complex investigations; to provide additional technical equipment or expertise; to provide matching funds to obtain federal grants; or for other law enforcement purposes. The funds are administered in compliance with Miami-Dade Police Department’s policies, statutory requirements, and federal guidelines.</p> <p>The Law Enforcement Trust Fund is comprised of three (3) different funding sources: the State civil forfeitures, governed by Florida Statutes Sections 932.701 through 932.706; U.S. Department of Justice Asset Sharing Program; and U.S. Treasury Asset Sharing Program. The Law Enforcement Trust Fund monies awarded to the Miami-Dade Police Department are a result of forfeiture litigation in State court and federal asset sharing programs. Federal assets are shared among participating law enforcement agencies based on the agencies’ direct participation</p>

³ <http://zoomagnet.dadeschools.net/>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>in task force investigations that result in the forfeiture of federally seized assets. The Department's partnerships with federal agencies and the related task forces have been the subject of recent resolutions approved by the Board.</p> <p>Law Enforcement Trust Fund project requests are submitted to the Miami-Dade Police Department Law Enforcement Trust Fund Committee Chairperson. The requests are reviewed by personnel in the Fiscal Administration Bureau to ensure compliance with Law Enforcement Trust Fund requirements. The Police Legal Bureau reviews the requests for legal sufficiency and prepares the Report of Proposed Expenditures from the Law Enforcement Trust Fund. The revenues and expenditures are documented in the County budget ordinance, the federal equitable sharing and certification report, and an annual audit to the County's Finance Department.</p> <p>The package is certified by the Director of the Miami-Dade Police Department prior to the Report being presented to the BCC for approval per Florida Statutes Section 932.7055(5) (b).</p> <p>The proposed expenditures will be effective with the start of fiscal year 2015-16 through completion of the project. These expenditures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Trust Building Initiative - \$500,000; • Specialized Equipment/Ballistic Plates and Carriers - \$526,000; • Research Study - \$250,000; • Vehicle Research Investigations - \$35,000; • Violent Crimes and Special Investigations Initiative - \$1,495,000; • Targeted Crimes Initiative - \$800,000; • Illegal Dumping and other Environmental Crimes - \$50,000; • Specialized Investigations - \$210,000; • Specialized equipment/Scanning Electron Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectrometer - \$30,000; • Specialized Equipment/All-Terrain Vehicles and Trailer - \$22,000; • Boating Under the Influence Task Force - \$80,000; • Homeland Security Initiatives - \$155,000; and • Investigative Support - \$200,000. <p>These funds will support long-term, ongoing protracted or complex investigations and other allowable law enforcement expenditures in compliance with the Miami-Dade Police Department's policies, statutory requirements, and federal guidelines.</p> <p>Additional Information – Report of Proposed Expenditures from the Law Enforcement Trust Fund: On October 9, 2015, the Director of the Miami-Dade Police Department released a report regarding the proposed expenditures from the Law Enforcement Trust Fund. According to the report, the Law Enforcement Trust Fund must be used for law enforcement purposes which are not budgeted. Allowable purposes may include: to defray costs of protracted or complex investigations; to provide additional technical equipment or expertise; to provide matching funds to obtain federal grants; or for other law enforcement purposes. The funds are administered in compliance with Miami-Dade Police Department's policies, statutory requirements, and federal guidelines.</p> <p>The Law Enforcement Trust Fund is comprised of three different funding sources: the State civil forfeitures, governed by Florida Statutes Sections 932.701 through 932.706; U.S. Department of Justice Asset Sharing Program; and U.S. Treasury Asset Sharing Program. The Law Enforcement Trust Fund monies awarded to the Miami-Dade Police Department are a result of forfeiture litigation in State court and federal asset sharing programs.</p> <p>Law Enforcement Trust Fund project requests are submitted to the Miami-Dade Police Department Law Enforcement Trust Fund Committee Chairperson. The requests are reviewed by personnel in the Fiscal Administration Bureau to ensure compliance with Law Enforcement Trust Fund requirements. The Police Legal Bureau reviews the requests for legal sufficiency and prepares the Report of Proposed Expenditures from the Law Enforcement Trust Fund. The revenues and expenditures are documented in the County budget ordinance, the federal equitable sharing and certification report, and an annual audit to the County's Finance Department.</p> <p>The proposed asset sharing expenditures are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed state asset sharing expenditures - \$3,656,000; 2. Proposed justice asset sharing expenditures - \$342,000; and 3. Proposed treasury asset sharing expenditures - \$355,000. <p>Additional Information – Metropolitan Services Committee Meeting Discussion: During the Metropolitan Services Committee meeting on December 9, 2015 the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Chief from the Miami-Dade County Police Department confirmed that funds could be used for illegal dumping and explained that funds have been allocated to address the issue.</i>
8K1 160031	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 17-02 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, A LOAN NOT TO EXCEED \$2,342,208.88, OF HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM ("HOME") PROGRAM INCOME FUNDS AND DOCUMENTARY SURTAX PROGRAM ("SURTAX") PROGRAM INCOME FUNDS TO SUPERIOR MANOR APARTMENTS, LTD., OR OTHER RELATED ENTITY OF THE URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER MIAMI, INC., FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUPERIOR MANOR APARTMENTS AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SUBMIT TO THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT A SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2013-2017 CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND FY 2015 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN TO</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>ALLOCATE \$241,969.49 OF HOME PROGRAM INCOME; AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO ISSUE AN EXTENSION OF THE CONDITIONAL LOAN COMMITMENT FOR THE LOAN OF \$4,170,000.00 OF FY 2014 SURTAX FUNDS; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE CONDITIONAL LOAN COMMITMENTS, STANDARD SHELL CONTRACTS, STANDARD SHELL LOAN DOCUMENTS, AMENDMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS OR AGREEMENTS NECESSARY TO ACCOMPLISH THE PURPOSES OF THIS RESOLUTION; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SUBORDINATE THE COUNTY'S INTEREST, AND TO EXERCISE THE TERMINATION, WAIVER, ACCELERATION, CANCELLATION AND OTHER PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 152588]</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approves, pursuant to the provisions of Section 17-02 of the Code of Miami Dade County, a loan in the amount of \$241,969.49 of Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) program income funds to Superior Manor Apartments, Ltd., or other related entity of The Urban League of Greater Miami, Inc., for development of the Superior Manor Apartments affordable housing project, to be located at 5155 NW 24 Avenue, Miami, Florida, 33142 (Folio No. 30-3122-000-0111); • Approves the filing of a substantial amendment to the FY 2013-17 Consolidated Plan and the FY 2015 Annual Action Plan filed with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (U.S. HUD) to allocate \$241,969.49 of HOME program income funds to Superior Manor Apartments, Ltd., or other related entity of The Urban League of Greater Miami, Inc., for development of the Superior Manor Apartments affordable housing project; • Approves, pursuant to the provisions of Section 17-02 of the Code of Miami Dade County, a loan in the amount of \$2,100,239.39 of local Documentary Stamp Surtax (Surtax) program income funds, to Superior Manor Apartments, Ltd., or other related entity of The Urban League of Greater Miami, Inc., for development of the Superior Manor Apartments; • Authorizes the County Mayor or designee to issue an extension of the FY 2014 award of \$4,170,000.00 Surtax Funds Conditional Loan Commitment for the Superior Manor Apartments project for an additional six-month period; • Authorizes the County Mayor or designee to execute all conditional loan commitments, standard contract shells, standard loan document shells, amendments, and other agreements necessary to accomplish the purposes of this resolution; and • Authorizes the County Mayor or designee, upon a determination that such actions are in the best interest of the County, to subordinate and/or modify the terms of contracts, agreements, amendments, and loan documents so long as such modifications are approved by the County Attorney's Office and are not substantially inconsistent with this resolution and to exercise the termination, waiver, acceleration, or other provisions. <p>Superior Manor Apartments is new construction of 139 affordable housing development units for seniors with incomes not greater than 33 percent of area median income to be located at 5155 NW 24 Avenue, Miami, Florida, 33142.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>In May 2015, Central City Apartments, Ltd. pre-paid a HOME loan in the amount of \$241,969.49 and a Surtax loan in the amount of \$521,093.08, both of which had been used for the development of the Central City Apartments affordable housing project. The Village Miami Phase I, Ltd., received a County loan of Surtax funds in the amount of \$1,579,146.31 for the development of The Villages Apartments and has agreed to pre-pay its County loan in full, including any accrued interest prior to closing on the County loan to Superior Manor Apartments, Ltd., or related entity, for the Superior Manor Apartments affordable housing project. Both Central City Apartments, Ltd. and Village Miami Phase I, Ltd. are entities related to The Urban League of Greater Miami, Inc.</p> <p>These pre-paid loan funds, which upon pre-payment of \$1,579,146.31 from The Village Miami Phase I, Ltd. will total \$2,342,208.88, consist of a HOME loan in the amount of \$241,969.49 and a Surtax loan in the amount of \$2,100,239.39, which will be re-loaned to Superior Manor Apartments, Ltd., or other related entity of The Urban League of Greater Miami, Inc., for the development of the Superior Manor Apartments affordable housing project. The pre-payment and re-loan transaction is permitted by Section 17-02 of the Miami-Dade County Code, which provides that any developer that repays its County loan in full before the date on which the loan is due in full may, upon BCC approval, have the repaid funds loaned to it, or a related entity, for additional eligible affordable housing projects, without the need to compete again for those funds.</p> <p>Should the BCC approve this item, the County Mayor or designee will execute Conditional Loan Commitments. The loans for Superior Manor Apartments will be subject to a full credit underwriting analysis, including subsidy layering review, a favorable recommendation from the underwriter, and written financing commitments for the total development costs, all of which shall be completed prior to the financial closing of the loan approved herein or the release of loaned funds. The loan shall be subject to those loan terms prescribed in the Surtax and HOME FY 2015 Request for Applications except as to interest rates and payments, which are set forth in Exhibits 2 and 3, and is subject to change at the discretion of the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee based upon the credit underwriting analysis.</p> <p>Superior Manor Apartments, LLC was awarded \$4,170,000.00 of FY 2014 Surtax funds for the Superior Manor Apartments project. Superior Manor Apartments LLC was merged into Superior Manor Apartments, Ltd., which will be the borrowing entity for the \$4,170,000.00 existing loan and the new loan approved in this resolution.</p> <p>In accordance with the provisions of Resolutions No. R-165-13 and R-232-14, the Public Housing and Community Department seeks BCC approval for a third extension of the Conditional Loan Commitment for \$4,170,000.00 of FY 2014 Surtax funds for six (6) additional months to allow finalization of the underwriting process and closing on the Superior Manor Apartments project with the use of pre-paid loan funds. The developer has already received two (2) Conditional Loan Commitment extensions for the project. Following approval of this item, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee will file with U.S. HUD a substantial amendment to the FY 2013-17 Consolidated Plan and FY 2015 Annual Action Plan to authorize the allocation of HOME program income funds.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><u>Additional Information and Relevant Legislation</u> On March 4, 2014, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-232-14, restricted contract extensions for persons or entities funded with Community Development Block Grant, Home Investment Partnership, Documentary Stamp Surtax (Affordable Housing), State Housing Initiatives Program, or Emergency Solutions Grant Funds. More specifically R-232-14 provides for the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>After one (1) extension of time has been granted for up to one (1) year to an Agency to perform an activity described in the County's Annual Action Plan or to perform an activity funded with Housing and Community Development Funds awarded by the BCC – whether the extension is of a conditional loan commitment or a contract executed between the Agency and the County – the Mayor will review the project, specifically the Agency's performance and non-compliance issues, and make a determination as to whether it is in the best interest of the County to grant another extension or bring a recommendation to the Board to recapture those funds.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>If the Mayor or his designee finds it is in the best interest of the County to grant the extension, the Mayor will take that executive action and extend the agreement. After two (2) extensions for up to two (2) additional years have been granted, the Mayor will bring a recapture/reallocation item to the BCC making either (a) a recommendation to extend the contract or conditional loan commitment granting more time for the Agency to perform and explain why that is the recommendation, or (b) a recommendation to recapture and reallocate the Housing and Community Development Funds. When the item comes to committee, there will be a public hearing at which the Agency may come and explain why it needs more time to perform the activity, and the BCC will decide whether to recapture the funds or authorize another extension of the commitment or contract.</i></p>
	<p>Superior Manor Apartment Project- Legislative History</p>
<p>December 15, 1998 Report</p>	<p>This report provided the BCC with pertinent background information regarding a contract payment issue involving a County funded housing rehabilitation/renovation project and a proposed plan of action to resolve the outstanding request for the payment of the contract retainage. Pursuant to the Report:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>The County, through the Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED) allocated a total amount of \$2,706,000 for the rehabilitation of an eighty-seven (87) unit housing development consisting of forty-three (43) single story duplex apartments and one (1) single family dwelling. The allocated funding is comprised of \$1,100,000 in FY1992 HOME Disaster Relief funds and \$1,606,000 in FY1993 HOME Supplemental Disaster Relief funds.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>The ongoing rehabilitation work at the project site located at approximately N.W. 51st-52nd Streets and 24th Avenue was ordered stopped by OCED effective March 19, 1997 pursuant to an unforeseen potential environmental liability to the Urban League and the County due to the confirmation of lead and arsenic soil contamination that was found to exceed regulatory standards. In light of the federal funding involved in the project, OCED instructed the Urban League to cease and desist any work at the Superior Manor site while the project was reviewed for possible continuance.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>In conjunction with the work stoppage at the site and pending the complete assessment of the environmental hazards at the site and the development of a health and safety plan, OCED agreed to honor payment requests for all eligible costs incurred prior to April 1, 1997.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>As part of the rehabilitation effort for the Superior Manor project, the Urban League had entered into a contract with D.L. Kirby, Inc. for the construction/renovation work. The contract with D.L. Kirby, Inc. was for a total amount of \$1,525,909 which included the original contract amount of \$1,242,228 plus contract change orders totaling approximately \$283,681. Relative to the amended contract amount and the work stoppage at the project site, D.L. Kirby, Inc. had completed renovation work in the approximate amount of \$1,048,367 of which approximately \$943,531 was paid to the company and of which 10% or approximately \$104,836 represents retainage being held pending completion of the scope of work as per the payment terms in the construction contract.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>In light of the federal funding involved in this project, it has been determined that pending the resolution of the environmental problems at the site, the available federal funds cannot be further expended. As a result, the County has not been able to respond to requests by the Urban League and D.L. Kirby, Inc. for the payment of the retainage being held as per the company's contract.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Staff determined that the payment of the retainage amount due to D.L. Kirby can be made if a nonfederal funding is utilized to make the payment. In this regard, staff from OCED and the Office of Management and Budget are working to prepare a plan amendment which would in effect "swap" the approximately \$104,836 in federal funds retained for the payment due to D.L. Kirby with approximately \$104,836 in other County funds in order to make the payment due to D.L. Kirby with nonfederal funds.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Please be further advised that staff is continuing to work with the Urban League to explore funding options for the approximately \$113,000 needed to implement the environmental remediation actions required at the project</i></p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><i>site and the additional amount which is currently being determined to be needed beyond the allocated amount of \$2,706,000 for the completion of the renovation work at the project site.</i></p>
July 27, 1999 R-852-99	<p>This resolution approved the reprogramming of \$2,481 of FY 1993 HOME funds, \$54,800 of FY 1993 HOME Supplemental Disaster Relief funds, \$55,186 of FY 1995 HOME funds, \$449,475 of FY 1996 HOME funds and \$140,064 of FY 1998 HOME funds for a combined total of \$702,006 to the Urban League of Greater Miami for its Superior Manor Housing Project (\$674,000) and Tacolcy Economic Development Corporation for its Western Estates Housing Project (\$28,006).</p> <p>The Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED) has allocated a total amount of \$2,706,000 for the Superior Manor Housing Rehabilitation Project, an eighty-seven (87) unit housing development consisting of forty-three (43) single story duplex apartments and one (1) single family dwelling. The allocated funding is comprised of \$1,100,000 in FY1992 HOME Disaster Relief funds and \$1,606,000 in FY1993 HOME Supplemental Disaster Relief funds.</p> <p>The Urban League has also been able to secure a loan of \$113,000 from the Miami-Dade Housing finance Agency to pay for the remediation effort. However, the agency could not draw down on the loan until the BCC approves the \$674,000 additional funds required for Phase I. As soon as approval is obtained the remediation effort will begin. Immediately thereafter, work on Phase I will begin and is expected to be completed by January 30, 2000.</p> <p>Background The ongoing rehabilitation work at the project site located at approximately N.W. 51st-52nd Streets and 24th Avenue was ordered stopped by OCED effective March 19, 1997, pursuant to an unforeseen potential environmental liability to the Urban League and the County due to the confirmation of lead and arsenic soil contamination that was found to exceed regulatory standards. In light of the federal funding involved in the project, OCED instructed the Urban League to cease and desist any work at the Superior Manor site while the project was reviewed for possible continuance. In addition, the Urban League, as the owners of the project site, was instructed to secure the site to prohibit access. Further, a structural analysis of the buildings revealed that 57 units were beyond repair. As a result, the scope of the project was revised from the rehabilitation of 87 units to the rehabilitation of 30 units and the construction of 40 new units. The revised scope will be carried out in two phases - Phase I - Rehabilitation of 30 units; Phase II - New construction of 40 units.</p> <p>On December 15, 1998, the County Manager issued a report on this activity and advised the BCC that OCED will work with the Urban League to implement remediation actions required at the project site and to identify the additional funds needed beyond the allocated amount of \$2,706,000 for the completion of the renovation work at the project site.</p> <p>It has now been determined that because of the delays (resulting in theft, vandalism and increased construction costs) and remediation effort, an additional \$674,000 will be needed to complete Phase I. OCED is proposing that the additional funds needed for the completion of this project be taken from completed activities with unexpended balances (\$57,281), an inactive activity with an expired contract (\$291,575) and OCED's HOME Reserve funds (\$353,150).</p>
June 18, 2002 R-668-02	<p>This Resolution authorized the County Manager to allocate \$1,000,000 in Surtax funds to the Urban League of Greater Miami, Inc., for the renovation, demolition and construction of 78 affordable housing units located at NW 51st Street and NW 24th Avenue. The Urban League of Greater Miami, Inc. is a local 501(c)(3) non-profit, that owns Superior Manor, a rental property that consists of several duplex-styled units. The majority of the units were under renovation and completion was slated for October 2002. Other units were demolished because rehabilitation was cost prohibitive. The Urban League of Greater Miami, Inc., plans to construct 40 new units on the same site beginning January 2003. The renovated units consist of 18 two-bedroom units and 20 one-bedroom units. The new construction will consist of an equal number of two and three-bedroom apartments.</p>
November 9, 2002 R-1258-02	<p>This resolution amended the FY 2000, 2001 and 2002 HOME programs to reflect the recapture and reallocation of \$1,000,000 of HOME funds.</p> <p>On June 18, 2002 the BCC allocated \$1,808,065 of recaptured HOME funds to the Urban League of Greater Miami for the completion of Sugar Hill Apartments Housing Project (Resolution No. R-656-02). The Urban League, however, would not be able to begin expending these funds until December 2002/January 2003. Meanwhile, Urban League's Superior Manor Housing project received notification that the lender, First Union/Wachovia Bank, would foreclose on the property unless payment was made immediately. It was proposed that \$1,000,000 of the funds awarded to the Sugar Hill Apartments be reallocated to the Superior Manor Housing Project. Additional funds would be identified to fully fund the Sugar Hill Apartments Project.</p> <p>OCED induced the Urban League to undertake the Superior Manor project, which was stalled due to insufficient funding and other problems. Environmental issues remained unresolved for a significant period of time, which delayed the project, and then the site was vandalized. Funds have been expended for both clean up and for securing the site.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes									
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">December 2, 2014 R-1061-14</td> <td>This Resolution authorized the Housing Finance Authority of Miami-Dade County to issue Multifamily Mortgage Revenue Bonds in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$13,500,000.00 for the purpose of financing all or a portion of Superior Manor Apartments.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">November 3, 2015 R-995-15</td> <td>This Resolution rescinded Resolution No. R-1061-14, approved on December 2, 2014 and was resubmitted through this Resolution since Resolution No. R-1061-14 was approved on December 2, 2014 and would expire before the project's closing. The Bonds are expected to be issued by December 2015.</td> </tr> </table>	December 2, 2014 R-1061-14	This Resolution authorized the Housing Finance Authority of Miami-Dade County to issue Multifamily Mortgage Revenue Bonds in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$13,500,000.00 for the purpose of financing all or a portion of Superior Manor Apartments.	November 3, 2015 R-995-15	This Resolution rescinded Resolution No. R-1061-14, approved on December 2, 2014 and was resubmitted through this Resolution since Resolution No. R-1061-14 was approved on December 2, 2014 and would expire before the project's closing. The Bonds are expected to be issued by December 2015.					
December 2, 2014 R-1061-14	This Resolution authorized the Housing Finance Authority of Miami-Dade County to issue Multifamily Mortgage Revenue Bonds in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$13,500,000.00 for the purpose of financing all or a portion of Superior Manor Apartments.									
November 3, 2015 R-995-15	This Resolution rescinded Resolution No. R-1061-14, approved on December 2, 2014 and was resubmitted through this Resolution since Resolution No. R-1061-14 was approved on December 2, 2014 and would expire before the project's closing. The Bonds are expected to be issued by December 2015.									
8L1 152718	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE MAJOR ROADWAY AND NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS LISTED IN EXHIBIT 1 OF THE PEOPLE'S TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND THE FIVE YEAR IMPLEMENTATION PLAN BY EXTENDING THE LIMITS OF THE CARIBBEAN BOULEVARD PROJECT FROM CANAL C-100 TO SW 87 AVENUE TO INCLUDE THE PORTION FROM THE HOMESTEAD EXTENSION OF FLORIDA'S TURNPIKE TO CANAL C-100; AND APPROVING THE SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE JOINT PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND THE TOWN OF CUTLER BAY TO EXTEND THE LIMITS OF THE CARIBBEAN BOULEVARD PROJECT FROM CANAL C-100 TO SW 87 AVENUE TO INCLUDE THE PORTION FROM THE HOMESTEAD EXTENSION OF FLORIDA'S TURNPIKE TO CANAL C-100 AND TO PROVIDE THE TOWN OF CUTLER BAY WITH ADDITIONAL FUNDING IN AN AMOUNT UP TO \$987,937.30 FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD IMPROVEMENTS ALONG CARIBBEAN BOULEVARD FROM THE HOMESTEAD EXTENSION OF FLORIDA'S TURNPIKE TO CANAL C-100; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXERCISE THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN; AND AUTHORIZING THE USE OF CHARTER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION SURTAX FUNDS FOR SUCH PURPOSES</p>									
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An amendment to the BCC requested Major Roadway and Neighborhood Implementation Projects listed in the People's Transportation Plan (PTP) and the Five Year PTP Implementation Plan to extend the limits of the Caribbean Boulevard project (from Canal C-100 to SW 87 Avenue) to include the portion from the Homestead Extension of Florida's Turnpike to Canal C-100; and The Second Amendment to the Joint Participation Agreement (JPA) between Miami-Dade County (County) and the Town of Cutler Bay (Town) to extend the limits of the Caribbean Boulevard project (from Canal C-100 to SW 87 Avenue) to include the portion from the Homestead Extension of Florida's Turnpike to Canal C-100 and to provide the Town with additional funding in an amount up to \$987,937.30 for eligible costs incurred in the design and construction of road improvements along Caribbean Boulevard from the Homestead Extension of Florida's Turnpike to Canal C-100. <p>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source: The total cost estimated and budgeted in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16 for the Caribbean Boulevard project approved within the PTP is \$11,188,000.00, including contingencies, allowances, and Construction Engineering Inspection costs (FY 2015-16 Adopted Capital Project No. 608480).</p> <p>The design and construction of improvements to the extended limits proposed in this Amendment is estimated to cost \$1,065,330.20. The County will provide the Town with additional funding in an amount up to \$987,937.30 from the surplus funds from the Old Cutler Road JPA for eligible costs incurred in the design and construction of roadway improvements along Caribbean Boulevard from the Homestead Extension of Florida's Turnpike to Canal C-100. The Town will fund the balance of \$77,392.90.</p>									
8L2 152865	<p>RESOLUTION AMENDING THE IMPLEMENTING ORDER NO. 4-56 RELATED TO THE SCHEDULE OF FEES AND TOLLS FOR THE VENETIAN CAUSEWAY</p>									
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves amendments to Implementing Order No. 4-56, Schedule of Fees and Tolls for the Venetian Causeway (Causeway), in order to eliminate the annual plan renewal process for property owners including the administrative fee charged, to provide for pro-rated refunds or credits in the Commuter Annual Plan, and to align the Annual Plan calendar with the County's fiscal year.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source: The fiscal impact of the elimination of the Causeway Property Owner Annual Plan administrative fee is an annual reduction of approximately \$40,000.00 in revenue to the proprietary Causeway fund. The fiscal impact of pro-rated revenues for the Causeway Commuter Annual Plan under the current bridge construction project is estimated to be \$34,000.00 based on the nine (9) months of planned construction. The fiscal impact on refunds or credits is unknown since it will be based on the length of time the Causeway may be closed by future construction projects. The alignment of annual plans with the County fiscal year will have no fiscal impact.</p> <p>Background: Modifications to the Implementing Order will result in changes to the annual plans as reflected in the table below, and will become effective on January 1, 2016:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Annual Plan</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Current Rate</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Proposed Rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Venetian Causeway Property Owner</td> <td>\$24.00 annually</td> <td>\$0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Venetian Causeway Commuter</td> <td>\$90.00 annually</td> <td>No change</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Elimination of Venetian Causeway Property Owner Fee and Renewal Process In 1951, the developer that built the Venetian Causeway transferred ownership to the County. As part of that transfer, the County agreed to exempt Causeway property owners and their successors from paying a toll. In recent years, property owners were charged a \$24.00 administrative fee for an annual pass allowing free toll passage. This fee was charged to offset costs of administering the Annual Plan.</p>	Annual Plan	Current Rate	Proposed Rate	Venetian Causeway Property Owner	\$24.00 annually	\$0.00	Venetian Causeway Commuter	\$90.00 annually	No change
Annual Plan	Current Rate	Proposed Rate								
Venetian Causeway Property Owner	\$24.00 annually	\$0.00								
Venetian Causeway Commuter	\$90.00 annually	No change								

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Recently, as a result of the conversion to SunPass and the associated reduction in administrative costs, it is recommended that the administrative fee no longer be collected annually from the 1,700 Causeway property owners.</p> <p>Credit or Refunds for Interruption of Venetian Causeway Commuter Annual Plan The County began bridge construction in June 2015 resulting in the full closure of the West Venetian Bascule Bridge for a period of nine (9) months. Additionally, there are plans to replace or significantly rehabilitate all 12 bridges along the Causeway in the upcoming years, which will require further closures of the Causeway. The annual plans at the Causeway are valid from May 1 of any given year to April 30 of the subsequent year. Therefore, Commuter Plan customers who pay for the full year but are unable to use it should be granted a corresponding credit in the year after reopening the Causeway to properly reimburse them for the time in which they could not fully traverse the Causeway.</p> <p>Adjustment of Annual Plan Year To assist with the annual budget process, the annual plans will be adjusted to coincide with the County's fiscal year.</p>
8M1 152773	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE RELEASE OF UNNEEDED CANAL RESERVATION LYING WITHIN THE WEST ½ OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 52 SOUTH AND RANGE 40 EAST IN THE CITY OF HIALEAH IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR TO EXECUTE DISCLAIMER OF INTEREST FOR RELEASE OF RESERVATION
8M2 152563	RESOLUTION ACCEPTING "ASSIGNMENT OF OPTION TO PURCHASE" APPROXIMATELY 17.73 ACRES OF SOUTH DADE WETLANDS PROJECT WITHIN THE ENVIRONMENTALLY ENDANGERED LANDS PROGRAM ACQUISITION SITE WITH THE NATURE CONSERVANCY AS ASSIGNOR, MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AS ASSIGNEE, AND MARCIA PAGUAGA CHOISEUL AND FELICIA MONDINO AS SELLERS FOR A PURCHASE PRICE OF \$75,000.00 USING BUILDING BETTER COMMUNITIES GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROGRAM FUNDS; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE ASSIGNMENT OF OPTION TO PURCHASE AND TO EXERCISE THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN; AND DIRECTING THE MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO RECORD IN THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY THE INSTRUMENT OF CONVEYANCE AS REQUIRED BY RESOLUTION NO. R-974-09
Notes	<p><u>8M1 – 152773:</u> The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee to accept the Assignment of Option to Purchase as negotiated by The Nature Conservancy for the Environmentally Endangered Lands (EEL) Program.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The appraised value of the subject property is \$106,380.00 and the negotiated purchase price is \$75,000.00. Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond (BBC-GOB) Program funding under Project No. 2.4, Site #70230 will be used for this purchase.</p> <p>In the unlikely event that BBC-GOB Program funds are not available, the EEL Acquisition Trust Fund may be used to close on the property. As of July 31, 2015, the balance of the EEL Trust Fund (GF 080) is \$41,886,142.33, of which \$21,233,266.80 is reserved for acquisition and \$20,652,875.53 is reserved for management.</p> <p><u>8M2 – 152563:</u> The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee to accept the Assignment of Option to Purchase as negotiated by The Nature Conservancy for the Environmentally Endangered Lands (EEL) Program and to execute the assignment of option to purchase.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The appraised value of the subject property is \$106,380.00 and the negotiated purchase price is \$75,000.00. Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond (BBC-GOB) Program funding under Project No. 2.4, Site #70230 will be used for this purchase.</p> <p>In the unlikely event that BBC-GOB Program funds are not available, the EEL Acquisition Trust Fund may be used to close on the property. As of July 31, 2015, the balance of the EEL Trust Fund (GF 080) is \$41,886,142.33, of which \$21,233,266.80 is reserved for acquisition and \$20,652,875.53 is reserved for management.</p> <p><u>Background:</u> The historic loss, fragmentation and degradation of native wetland and forest communities in Miami-Dade County are well recognized. In May of 1990, with the knowledge that remaining wetland and forest communities were endangered, the electorate of Miami-Dade County authorized the County to levy an ad valorem tax for two (2) years to create the EEL Program and Trust Fund. The purpose of the EEL Program is to acquire, preserve, enhance, restore, conserve and maintain environmentally-endangered lands for the benefit of present and future generations.</p> <p>The BCC first placed the South Dade Wetlands on the EEL Priority A Acquisition List in 1993. The County, in partnership with the South Florida Water Management District, the State of Florida, and other funding partners, has acquired approximately 21,676 acres of land throughout Miami-Dade County since inception of the EEL Program.</p> <p>The parcel proposed for acquisition is located within the South Dade Wetlands EEL Project, an important wetland system in the southern part of the County. Land in this area is targeted for acquisition because of its strategic location between two (2) national parks (Everglades National Park and Biscayne National Park) and within the watersheds of Florida Bay, Biscayne Bay, and Card and Barnes Sounds. Preserving and maintaining these wetlands is important for protecting against salt water intrusion of the Biscayne Aquifer and because of the</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	importance of the region to endangered and threatened species. Acquiring these parcels is also consistent with the Sea Level Rise Task Force Recommendations for the continued strategic implementation of the EEL Program.
8N1 152703	RESOLUTION APPROVING TERMS OF AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR, COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE OR MIAMI-DADE TRANSIT DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE AND FILE A GRANT APPLICATION FOR \$5,570,526.00 WITH THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5307 URBANIZED FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM AND PROVIDE ALL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR THE NEW STATE ROAD 836 EXPRESS BUS SERVICE PANTHER AND TAMIAMI STATIONS; AUTHORIZING RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS PURSUANT TO SUCH APPLICATIONS AND AGREEMENTS; AND AUTHORIZING RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE OF ANY ADDITIONAL FUNDS AS SPECIFIED IN THE AGREEMENTS SHOULD THEY BECOME AVAILABLE
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves the execution and filing of a grant application on behalf of Miami-Dade County (County) with the United States Department of Transportation's Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 Urbanized Formula grant program funding in the amount of \$5,570,526.00. The funding will be used for costs related to infrastructure improvements to support the planned Miami-Dade Transit (MDT) State Road (SR) 836 Express Bus Service project. The improvements will include a new transit bus terminal facility within the Florida International University (FIU) Modesto A. Maidique Campus (Panther Station) and a park-and-ride lot/bus terminal at SW 8 Street and SW 147 Avenue (Tamiami Station).</p> <p>It is further recommended that the BCC authorize this grant application pursuant to the agreement, as well as the receipt and expenditure of funds as specified in the agreement. A public hearing is required in accordance with Federal regulations.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> This item represents a positive fiscal impact to the County because it provides funding to MDT for the SR 836 Express Bus Service Project. The required local match of \$1,392,631.00 will be provided in full by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) through the use of State Transportation Development Credits as a "soft match" for this grant.</p> <p>The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), Public Law 112-141, Section 1512, authorizes State transportation departments to make available to public transit agencies the use of transportation development credits on selected federally assisted public transit capital projects. By using the credits to substitute for the required non-federal share on a new Federal-aid project, the Federal share can effectively be increased to 100 percent.</p> <p>The estimated annual operating and maintenance costs for the SR 836 Express Panther and Tamiami stations is \$150,000.00 and will be funded through MDT's future operating budgets.</p> <p>The total estimated cost of the SR 836 Express Bus Panther and Tamiami Stations project is \$13,402,407.00 and will be funded with local, state and federal funds. This grant will provide \$5,570,526.00 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 Surface Transportation and CMAQ program flexible funding transferred from the FHWA to the FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Formula Grant program.</p> <p>Additional federal funding for the Panther Station is programmed in the FDOT's Five-Year Work Program for FY 2017 (\$1,570,384.00) and FY 2018 (\$1,570,194.00).</p> <p>This additional funding will be applied for in the year of availability through an amendment of the original grant. The \$785,144.00 required local match will be satisfied using FDOT Transportation Development Credits as a "soft match." Therefore, the total FTA funding provided for this project, inclusive of this grant, is \$8,711,104.00.</p> <p>Additionally, FDOT has also programmed state funding in FY 2017 (\$897,640.00) for the Tamiami Station, which will be provided to MDT in a future agreement with FDOT. The agreement will require an equal local match for a total amount of \$1,795,280.00. Therefore, the total federal and state funding programmed for this project is \$9,608,744.00. Local funding in the amount of approximately \$3,793,663.00 will be used to complete the cost of the SR 836 Express Bus Panther and Tamiami Stations project.</p> <p>The Panther and Tamiami Stations are currently scheduled for completion in August 2019. The Dolphin Station, which will be constructed by MDX, is slated for completion late 2017.</p> <p><u>Background:</u> Jointly administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the FTA, Surface Transportation and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Programs were reauthorized under MAP-21, allowing States to continue the ability to transfer (flex) these funds to FTA for award as grants. The Federal share of funding for eligible projects under these programs is 80 percent. Some specific activities include capital costs for transit projects for assistance under Chapter 53 of title 49, including vehicles and facilities used to provide intercity passenger bus service, projects that improve traffic flow, and transportation systems management and operations that mitigate congestion and improve air quality.</p> <p>The new SR 836 Express Bus Service project is part of an incremental approach to implement rapid transit services in the East-West Corridor, which was studied in the mid 1990's and then incorporated into the People's Transportation Plan in 2002. Infrastructure improvements to support the SR 836 Express Bus Service project include the proposed Panther, Tamiami, and Dolphin Stations. The Dolphin Station, which is fully funded under a separate grant agreement, will be constructed by the Miami-Dade Expressway Authority (MDX).</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	On August 3, 2015, FTA approved a Categorical Exclusion (CE) for the SR 836 Express Bus Service Panther and Tamiami Stations and roadway access improvements. Currently, the project is in the design consultant selection process. The Notice-to-Proceed (NTP) to the design consultant is anticipated in May 2016.
801 152775	RESOLUTION APPROVING AUTOMATIC METER READING ANTENNA INSTALLATION AND ACCESS AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND THE CITY OF NORTH MIAMI BEACH WITH AN INITIAL CONTRACT TERM OF FIVE YEARS AND THREE FIVE-YEAR RENEWAL OPTION PERIODS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME AND TO EXERCISE THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to execute an Automated Meter Reading Antenna Installation and Access Agreement (Agreement) between the County and the City of North Miami Beach with a contract term of five (5) years, and three (3) five-year renewal option periods.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The approval of this resolution will have a positive fiscal impact to the County. The City of North Miami Beach will pay a rental rate to the County of \$540.00 per year, payable in 12 equal monthly installments of \$45.00.</p> <p><u>Background:</u> The Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department's (WASD) provides wholesale sewage disposal services to the City of North Miami Beach and operates and maintains the sewer collection and disposal system. The City of North Miami Beach owns and operates a water treatment plant and subsequently provides water service to its customers in the City's water service area.</p> <p>The City of North Miami Beach is looking to replace outdated water meters installed throughout the City's water service area with a new, state-of-the-art wireless system to collect, store and transmit water consumption data to the City. In that regard, the City of North Miami Beach has requested that the County allow the City to install and maintain an Automated Meter Reading Collector/Repeater Antennas System at 11 WASD pump station sites installed throughout the City to enable the City to collect meter reading data and transmit that data over a low-frequency radio signal. The City will be responsible for all costs and expenses related to the operation, maintenance, repair, connection/disconnection, replacement and/or removal of the equipment. The County will not incur any expenses.</p> <p>The terms and conditions of the Agreement gives the County the right to enter and inspect the premises where the City of North Miami Beach installs their equipment at any time to ensure compliance with WASD standards, and the right for either party to cancel the Agreement with or without cause with 30 days written notice.</p>
9A1 152418	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY THROUGH ITS COMMUNITY ACTION AND HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT AND COMMUNITY ACTION HUMAN SERVICE FOUNDATION NON-PROFIT, INC., DBA COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY FOUNDATION, INC., FOR THE COUNTY TO LEASE ONE WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBLE MINI BUS FOR \$1.00 PER YEAR FOR A PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE AMENDMENTS AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS THEREIN INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE TERMINATION PROVISION
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes the County Mayor or designee to execute the standard Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Miami-Dade County, through its Community Action and Human Services Department and the Community Human Service Foundation Non-Profit, Inc., a not for profit Florida Corporation doing business as Community Action Agency Foundation (CAA Foundation), for the lease of one (1) new specially equipped and wheelchair accessible mini-bus; and • Authorizes the County Mayor or designee to exercise all provisions in the MOA, including, but not limited to the termination provision. <p>The leasing of this vehicle will expand the Community Action and Human Services Department's ability to provide transportation services to eligible disadvantaged individuals with disabilities.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact</u> There is no fiscal impact to Miami-Dade County for the provision of these services. There are no administrative costs associated with the lease and no local match required by Miami-Dade County. The CAA Foundation desires to transfer the aforementioned mini-bus to the Community Action and Human Services Department for transporting disadvantaged individuals with disabilities at the cost of \$1.00 per year for a period of five (5) years with an option to extend the lease through the vehicle's productive life. At the end of the leasing period, contingent on the Florida Department of Transportation's authorization, ownership of the vehicle will be transferred to the County at no additional cost to the County.</p> <p><u>Background</u> The CAA Foundation is a not-for-profit Florida corporation composed of members from the Community Action Agency Board (CAA Board) and private entities. The CAA Foundation uses its resources (e.g. grants, donations, contributions, etc.) to assist the Community Action and Human Services Department's clients with needs that cannot be met through its programs or traditional public assistance programs, including, but not limited to, the purchase of food, clothing, medicine, rental assistance and transportation.</p> <p>On November 4, 2014, the CAA Foundation was awarded a grant to purchase one (1) specially equipped and wheelchair accessible mini bus under the Florida Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Agency (FTA) Program. The FDOT precludes governmental entities from applying for this type funding, therefore, the Community Action and Human Services Department was not eligible to apply directly. FDOT</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	authorized the CAA Foundation's purchase of a new, specially equipped and wheelchair accessible mini bus; the CAA Foundation subsequently took ownership of the vehicle on August 27, 2015 from the manufacturer. Pursuant to the FTA Transit Vehicle Inventory Management Vehicle Useful Life Standards, FDOT has classified this new mini bus as a Type D Transit Bus and mandated that the unit has a useful life of at least 150,000 miles.
10A1 152753	RESOLUTION APPROVING THE 2015 UPDATE OF THE FIVE YEAR PEOPLE'S TRANSPORTATION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves the 2015 Update of the Five Year People's Transportation Plan Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Background: The Five Year Implementation Plan was established pursuant to the ordinance governing the activities of the CITT (Ordinance 02-116), as amended by the BCC on September 21, 2010. The CITT (Trust), in consultation with the Mayor, will recommend to the BCC a Five Year Implementation Plan (Plan) that includes a detailed scope of work, schedule and budget for each project included in the People's Transportation Plan (PTP), as amended, anticipated to be implemented in whole or in part during the five year period.</p> <p>The Plan will be consistent with the federal requirements for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and Long Range Transportation Plan. The Plan will be updated annually. The Ordinance further provides the County Commission will not delete, materially change or add any project to the Plan except in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Ordinance. The procedures include that such proposals will be initially reviewed by the Trust, which will forward a recommendation to the BCC.</p> <p>Additional Information – Transit and Mobility Services Committee Meeting Discussion: During the Transit and Mobility Services Committee meeting on December 9, 2015, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Continuing diversion of money that was supposed to be used for capital projects, specifically extension of rail, continuing to be used in operations.</i> • <i>The Committee asked the CITT Executive Director about the amount of surtax funds to be used this year, to which the Executive Director responded that it was \$110 million. The Committee noted that \$110 million is more than last year's amount.</i>
11A1 160062	RESOLUTION APPROVING TERMS OF AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION BY THE COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE LEASE BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND NKMIA, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF A FACILITY TO HOUSE THE HEADQUARTERS OF NAEEM KHAN LIMITED OR A SUCCESSOR ENTITY TO DESIGN, CREATE, AND MARKET PRODUCTS UNDER THE NAEEM KHAN BRAND AND RELATED CREATIVE INDUSTRIES AND PROVIDING FOR AN EIGHT MONTH EXTENSION OF CERTAIN DEADLINES SET FORTH THEREIN FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1175 NW SOUTH RIVER DRIVE LOCATED IN MIAMI, FLORIDA; AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE EXERCISE ANY AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN AND TO PERFORM ALL ACTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE SAME [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 152688]
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves the terms of and authorizes an Amendment to the Lease between Miami-Dade County and NKMIA, LLC, providing an eight month extension of the date that NKMIA is required to issue a Notice to Proceed for the construction of the Project from June 12, 2016 to February 12, 2017, and an eight month extension for NKMIA to provide the County with the plans, specifications, and permits for the Project from April 12, 2016 to December 12, 2016. All other unrelated timeframes set forth in the Lease, including completion of construction, will not be impacted by this extension.</p> <p>The proposed resolution further authorizes, the County Mayor or designee, after approval by the County Attorney's Office, with respect to the customary documentation as may be reasonably required in connection with the leasehold financing referenced in Section 17.2 of the Lease, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve terms requiring the County to provide the leasehold lender with notice of any Tenant default; • Provide a reasonable curative period for the lender in the event that the Tenant fails to remedy the default; and • Review and approve of the reasonable and customary documentation and terms which are not otherwise inconsistent with the Amended Lease or authorizing resolution. <p>Additional Information On November 3, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-997-15, waived the requirement in the Administrative Rules that each Project 124 allocation be a minimum of \$10,000,000.00 for NKMIA LLC with regard to the Naeem Khan Project and approved, an allocation, subject to the availability of Recaptured Funds, of up to \$1,500,000.00 from Project 124 to NKMIA LLC for the Naeem Khan Project.</p> <p><i>The County will reallocate Recaptured Funds to projects in the order in which projects are allocated Project 124 Funds (i.e. the oldest allocation will receive Recaptured Funds first). Recaptured Funds will be allocated to the Naeem Khan Project as such Recaptured Funds become available until such project is fully funded in the amount of the allocation approved by the BCC.</i></p> <p>During consideration of Resolution No. R-997-15, at the October 15, 2015 Economic Prosperity Committee meeting, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Committee noted that the lease agreement entered into by NKMIA LLC and the County (R-1071-14); stated that Mr. Naeem Kahn would assume financial responsibility for all repairs to the property and inquired what had since changed; stated the new criteria used to determine allocation of recaptured funds and questioned whether the foregoing proposed resolution satisfied them.</i>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Regulatory and Economic Resources Department (RER,) clarified that the lease did include a condition that Mr. Kahn repair the seawall and Riverwalk because of the deteriorated state of the property, but did not specifically address whether County funds could be used to facilitate the repairs. He noted that Mr. Kahn was informed about the availability of County funds that could be used to pay for the repairs.</i> • <i>The Committee asked whether the repairs were deemed necessary to the development of the site and inquired if the application for funds were evaluated using the new criteria.</i> • <i>RER reported that a general review of the application seemed to indicate that the project would qualify for funding and informed the Committee members that a full report regarding projects applying for recaptured funds would be submitted to the BCC for review.</i> • <i>The Committee inquired about the process used to determine allocation and distribution of Economic Development Fund (EDF.) RER explained that staff was attempting to contact applicants and spoke about the lack of response.</i> <p>On October 30, 2015, the Mayor issued a report with respect to the eligibility requirements for projects which stated, that monies from Project No. 124, Economic development Fund will be used to support the reconstruction or repair of the sea wall. The sea wall and river walk components certainly add to the public benefit of the area allowing for both added pedestrian enjoyment and secure passage of boat traffic on the Miami River.</p> <p><u>Additional Information- Lease Agreement Resolution No. R-1071-14</u> On December 2, 2014, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1071-14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declared the Property surplus; • Waived Administrative Order 8-4 as it pertains to review by the Planning Advisory Board; and • Pursuant to Section 125.045, Florida Statutes, authorized the lease, and if the option to purchase is exercised, the conveyance, of the Property to NKMIA, LLC. <p>Naeem Khan is the principal designer and owner of a privately owned fashion company that is currently located in New York City and which operates under the Naeem Khan fashion label, and NKMIA, LLC. (NKMIA), is a Delaware limited liability company which is affiliated with Mr. Khan. NKMIA has expressed the desire to lease, and potentially purchase, the County-owned property located at 1175 NW South River Drive (Property), with the purpose of using that location as its headquarters and principal place of business for both itself, and Naeem Khan Ltd., or a successor entity that is the primary entity designing, creating, fabricating and marketing products under the Naeem Khan luxury lifestyle, fashion and design brand.</p> <p>NKMIA indicated in exchange for the right to lease the Property, for a term of thirty (30) years, with the option to renew for two additional terms of thirty (30) years each, along with the option to purchase the Property during the initial term, that it is willing to make certain economic investments in Miami-Dade County, including: construction on the Property of a new 30,000 square foot facility with a minimum construction budget of \$6 million; repair and reconstruction of the seawall portion of the Property; development of the Riverwalk along the waterfront portion of the Property providing public access along the Miami River, in accordance with the City of Miami, Miami River Greenway Action Plan; and hiring fifty (50) new skilled full-time (or full-time equivalent) employees, who reside in Miami-Dade County, with an average salary of \$50,000.00, among other terms and conditions</p> <p>The Agreement to Lease provided that in the event NKMIA exercises its right to purchase the Property, the purchase price would be a below market rate amount, which would be calculated by taking the base amount of \$1,241,696.00 (which is equal to the Miami-Dade County Property Appraiser's 2014 assessed value of the land), and would be increased annually from the date of lease execution until the time of purchase, by the National Consumer Price Index for all Wage Earners & Clerical Workers, provided, such increases will not exceed three percent (3.0%) in any one year.</p> <p>The Agreement to Lease further provided that in order for NKMIA to exercise the purchase option, it must have satisfied all of the Minimum Development conditions, and have expanded its workforce to no less than 70 full time (or full time-equivalent) employees with an average salary of \$50,000.00, for at least twelve (12) months prior to such exercise, and must maintain satisfaction of such conditions for at least ten (10) years following the closing of such purchase.</p>
11A2 152776	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PREPARE A REPORT TO THE BOARD MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDING THE COUNTY'S ROAD IMPACT FEE PROGRAM FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENCOURAGING TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTY'S RAPID TRANSIT ZONE, URBAN CENTERS, AND OTHER APPROPRIATE AREAS AND OF FUNDING TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS TO SERVE THOSE AREAS, INCLUDING THE USE OF TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS WITHIN THOSE AREAS, AND PROPOSING FURTHER LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or Mayor's designee to prepare a report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making recommendations as to whether modifications to existing impact fee ordinances and creation of new impact fee programs would be appropriate to address the unique impacts of transit-oriented developments and fund transit capital improvements; • Making recommendations as to whether the creation of a transferable development right program is appropriate to facilitate transit-oriented developments; and • Proposing legislation or other actions that may be necessary to implement the recommendations. <p>The County Mayor or Mayor's designee will provide the report to the BCC within 180 days of the effective date of this resolution and will place the completed report on an agenda of the BCC pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Background: It is an Objective of the Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan to emphasize concentration and intensification of development around urban centers. Policies of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan provide that the County will facilitate high-intensity urban centers at locations having high countywide multimodal accessibility. Policies of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan provide that new development and redevelopment in existing and planned transit corridors and urban centers be planned and designed to promote transit-oriented development and transit use. The Comprehensive Development Master Plan permits the use of Impact Fees and Transferable Development Rights to promote its Objectives and Policies.</p>
11A3 152684	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE AMENDMENT EXTENDING BY ONE YEAR THE TERM OF INTERLOCAL AFFILIATION AGREEMENT ("AGREEMENT") FOR COUNTY TO PARTNER WITH THE SCHOOL BOARD OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY TO HOLD MOVIE NIGHTS AT SCHOOL BOARD SITES LOCATED WITHIN COUNTY COMMISSION DISTRICTS UPON THE REQUEST OF COUNTY COMMISSIONER FOR SUCH DISTRICT; DIRECTING COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO FILE COPY OF FULLY EXECUTED AMENDMENT WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO RENEW THE AGREEMENT FOR AN ADDITIONAL FOUR, CONSECUTIVE ONE-YEAR PERIODS</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or Mayor's designee to execute an amendment (Amendment) that will extend the Interlocal Affiliation Agreement with the School Board of Miami-Dade County (Agreement) until December 31, 2016 and provide the possibility by mutual agreement for an additional four consecutive one-year extension periods.</p> <p>Background: Pursuant to Resolution No. R-1014-14, the BCC authorized the County Mayor or Mayor's designee to execute an interlocal affiliation agreement (Agreement) for the County to partner with the School Board to provide Movie Nights at School Board sites located within County Commission Districts upon request of the County Commissioner for such district, subject to identification of funding source and receipt of any necessary approvals for County costs that may be associated with such event. The Agreement expires on December 31, 2015.</p>
11A4 151495	<p>RESOLUTION CALLING A COUNTYWIDE SPECIAL ELECTION IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, TO BE HELD IN CONJUNCTION WITH A GENERAL ELECTION ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2016, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE ELECTORS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY THE QUESTION OF WHETHER TO AMEND THE CHARTER TO ALLOW THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS TO PROVIDE, BY ORDINANCE, THAT THE GOVERNING BODY OF A SPECIAL PURPOSE DISTRICT LOCATED ENTIRELY WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF A MUNICIPALITY BE THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE MUNICIPALITY RATHER THAN THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AS IS CURRENTLY REQUIRED BY THE CHARTER (SEE AGENDA ITEM NO. 7A)</p>
Notes	<p>See Item 7A</p>
11A5 152554	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MUNICIPAL CIRCULATORS TO OPERATE ON THE SOUTH MIAMI-DADE BUSWAY AS PART OF A NEW ROUTE OR ROUTE CHANGE APPROVED BY THE COUNTY</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes municipal circulators to operate on the South Miami-Dade Busway as part of a new route or route change approved by the County.</p> <p>Background: The South Miami-Dade Busway (Busway) is a dedicated lane for bus transit service from Dadeland South Metrorail Station to S.W. 344 Street. Various circulators operated by or on behalf of municipalities have routes that are near, adjacent to or surrounding the Busway and use of the Busway by municipal circulators as part of an approved route would be in line with the express purpose of the Busway to provide an enhancement to transit services, specifically bus service, by allowing such buses to provide more efficient service, bypass potential traffic congestion on U.S. 1, and connect directly to Miami-Dade Transit bus routes operating on the Busway. The Busway is intended to operate as a bus rapid transit system, emulating high volume service like Metrorail as municipal circulators currently connect directly to Metrorail transit stations. Such municipal circulator routes are intended to provide direct connection to the Miami-Dade Transit system as they do along the Metrorail corridor. Municipal circulator routes are approved by the County and any new circulator route or change to an existing circulator route in order to utilize or operate on the Busway would have to be approved.</p>
11A6 160066	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO STUDY THE ISSUE OF ALLOWING FLEXTIME FOR COUNTY EMPLOYEES, AND DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PROVIDE A REPORT TO THE BOARD ON THE COST AND FEASIBILITY OF ADOPTING A FLEXTIME POLICY FOR COUNTY EMPLOYEES WITH FIXED DAILY SCHEDULES, AND WHETHER THE COUNTY MAYOR RECOMMENDS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SUCH A POLICY (SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 152694)</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution directs the Mayor or Mayor's designee to study the issue of flextime for County employees, and to submit a report to the BCC. The report will, at a minimum, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost and feasibility of adopting a flextime policy for employees of Miami-Dade County with fixed daily schedules, including an explanation of issues which could impact the implementation of such a policy, such as collective bargaining; • Information about other jurisdictions which have adopted flextime policies; and • Whether, based on the foregoing, the administration recommends the implementation of a flex-time policy for any and/or all employees of Miami-Dade County with fixed daily schedules. <p>The Mayor or Mayor's designee is further directed to submit this report to the BCC within 90 days of the effective date of this resolution and to place the completed report on a BCC agenda pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65.</p> <p>Background: Flexible or alternative work schedules, also known as "flextime," are generally defined as work schedules that permit flexible starting and quitting times while maintaining the traditional total number of hours per work week without generating any overtime hours, and without affecting employee salary, benefits, job responsibilities, or eligibility for overtime compensation. Permitting certain County employees with</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>traditional fixed daily schedules to alter their daily schedules can help reduce rush-hour traffic congestion within Miami-Dade County while simultaneously improving employee morale and work attendance. Personal reasons such as spouses' work schedules, children's school schedules, child-care commitments, doctor's appointments, and mass transit schedules are among the factors affecting employees' needs for flexible work hours. Flexible schedules are especially feasible in work areas with relatively little contact with the public in order to maintain appropriate levels of public service.</p> <p>The Miami-Dade Aviation Department has already instituted a flextime policy detailed in DSOP No. 01-09, which creates guidelines for establishing flextime schedules when and where appropriate for employees who work fixed schedules. Pursuant to Aviation DSOP NO. 01-09, flexible work schedules are assigned to employees at the sole discretion of the Department, there are no requirements to accommodate individual employee requests to deviate from normal schedules beyond those imposed by law, and the Department reserves the ability to revoke or change employees' flextime authorizations. Aviation DSOP No. 01-09 also requires that work plan schedules deviating from the standard must: (1) be in the best interests of the Department; (2) promote cost effective and efficient use of resources, and, where applicable, contribute to enhance customer service; (3) guarantee the necessary coverage during the standard work hours of the affected work function; (4) provide for adequate supervision; (5) not result in any overtime; (6) be uniformly and fairly offered to all employees within the same classification and work function; (7) be for a specific period of time; and (8) requests for extensions must be submitted in writing and through the proper chain-of-command.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Flexible Work Schedules:</u></p> <p>According to the Department of Labor⁴, a flexible work schedule is an alternative to the traditional 9 to 5, 40-hour work week. It allows employees to vary their arrival and/or departure times. Under some policies, employees must work a prescribed number of hours a pay period and be present during a daily "core time." The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) does not address flexible work schedules. Alternative work arrangements such as flexible work schedules are a matter of agreement between the employer and the employee (or the employee's representative). The Department of Labor has conducted numerous surveys and published articles and reports on the subject.</p> <p>The U.S. Office of Personnel Management⁵ provides that federal agencies may implement for its employees an alternative work schedule (AWS) instead of traditional fixed work schedules (e.g., 8 hours per day, 40 hours per week). Within rules established by the agency, AWS can enable employees to have work schedules that help the employee balance work and family or personal responsibilities.</p> <p>There are two categories of AWS: flexible work schedules (FWS) and compressed work schedules (CWS).</p> <p>FWS consist of workdays with (1) core hours and (2) flexible hours. Core hours are the designated period of the day when all employees must be at work. Flexible hours are the part of the workday when employees may (within limits or "bands") choose their time of arrival and departure. Within limits set by their agencies, FWS can enable employees to select and alter their work schedules to better fit personal needs and help balance work, personal, and family responsibilities.</p> <p>Employee Coverage</p> <p>A Federal employee, as defined in section 2105(a) or (c) of title 5, United States Code, who is employed by an agency, as defined in 5 U.S.C. 6121(1), may be covered by a flexible work schedule. Flexible work schedules are voluntary work schedules that are approved by supervisors or managers.</p> <p>Credit Hours</p> <p>Credit hours are any hours within an FWS that are in excess of an employee's basic work requirement (e.g., 40 hours a week) which the employee elects to work to vary the length of a workweek or a workday. Agencies may limit or restrict the earning and use of credit hours. OPM regulations prohibit Senior Executive Service (SES) members from accumulating credit hours under AWS programs (5 CFR 610.408). The law prohibits carrying over more than 24 credit hours from one pay period to the next (5 U.S.C. 6126).</p> <p>Types of FWS</p> <p>There are various types of FWS arrangements that provide different degrees of flexibility. These include flexitour, gliding, variable day, variable week, and maxiflex schedules.</p> <p><u>Additional Information - U of M study finds increased employee flexibility, supervisor support offer wide-ranging benefits:</u></p> <p>Work-family conflict is increasingly common among U.S. workers, with about 70 percent reporting struggles balancing work and non-work obligations. A new study by University of Minnesota sociologists Erin L. Kelly, Phyllis Moen, Wen Fan, and interdisciplinary collaborators from across the country, shows that workplaces can change to increase flexibility, provide more support from supervisors and reduce work-family conflict.</p> <p>The study, titled, "Changing Work and Work-Family Conflict: Evidence from the Work, Family, and Health Network," was published by the American Sociological Review online today and is scheduled to appear in the June print edition of the journal. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) funded the research.</p>

⁴ <http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/workhours/flexibleschedules.htm>

⁵ <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/work-schedules/fact-sheets/alternative-flexible-work-schedules/>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Using a sample of nearly 700 employees from an information technology department of a large Fortune 500 corporation, the research team gave half of the group greater control over when and where they worked, as well as increased supervisor support for their personal lives and family lives. The other group worked under their normal conditions.</p> <p>The researchers found that employees whose work environments were modified experienced significant improvements over the six-month study period. Not only did they have a decrease in work-family conflict, but they also experienced an improvement in perceived time adequacy (a feeling that they had enough time to be with their families) and in their sense of schedule control.</p> <p>Results also suggest the modified work environment brought greater benefits to employees more vulnerable to work-family conflict, in particular parents and those whose supervisors were less supportive before the workplace initiative. There was no evidence that this intervention increased work hours or perceived job demands.</p> <p>NIH and CDC support for this randomized field trial, the most rigorous research method available, was through the Work, Family & Health Network, a collaboration of eight research organizations studying changes in the work environment that can improve the health of workers, and their families, while benefiting organizations.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee Meeting Discussion:</u> During the Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee meeting on December 8, 2015, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Committee indicated that County departments were under the jurisdiction of the Mayor, noting concern that employee scheduling issues were not under the purview of the County Commission. The Committee stated that some departments that were not delivering direct services to the community already adopted flexible time schedules and mentioned there could be friction amongst employees who were not allowed this benefit while others were.</i> • <i>The Committee further mentioned concern about liability issues, productivity measurement, employee monitoring, traffic, and system abuse and noted that employees were paid by taxpayers and needed to be available to respond to emergency situations.</i> • <i>The Committee clarified that the proposed resolution related to flexible hour scheduling at the employees normal place of employment and was not considering employees working from home. She indicated that flexible scheduling would need to be amenable with department operations and would assist with commute times and traffic congestion issues. The Committee reported that the resolution requested the Mayor to explore the feasibility of the proposal; that it was not designed for the entire workforce; and that implementation would be determined by individual departments.</i> • <i>The Committee noted that her research revealed that there was not much impact on travel time when implemented by the private sector; however, larger employers such as government entities had better results.</i> • <i>The Committee questioned whether flexible time was a component of employee collective bargaining agreements to which the Human Resources Department (HR) Director reported that some collective bargaining contracts already included language allowing ten-hour shifts. She indicated that schedule changes required proper employee notification.</i> • <i>The Committee inquired about the need to take so long to conduct a study when data should already be available and whether an implementation agreement already existed between administration and the collective bargaining units to which the HR Director clarified that many departments already used flexible scheduling. She advised that a pilot program was implemented in 2009 in five departments, noting many other departments including Public Works and Waste Management now used ten-hour shifts.</i> • <i>The HR Director mentioned the time required to complete the report was necessary to conduct surveys and evaluate other municipalities.</i> • <i>The Committee expressed the desire that the study be done more expeditiously and stated that it did not believe the County Commission should tell administration to implement something because it was inserting itself in the collective bargaining process.</i> • <i>The Committee asked the Deputy Mayor and HR Director to provide the Committee with a report on flextime usage by various County departments; including, the results of previous implementation efforts and whether flextime was currently being used by those departments.</i> • <i>The Assistant County Attorney clarified that the proposed resolution was only requesting a study be conducted and the implementation would be a separate item.</i> • <i>The Committee stated that the County operated 24/7 and required flexible work hours and cautioned it was not prudent for an entire department to be on the same flexible schedule.</i> • <i>The Committee mentioned the need for flexible scheduling in the 3-1-1 Answer Center and other County services to meet the demands of community residents who were also working flexible schedules.</i> • <i>The Deputy Mayor commented that the proposal required the Mayor to make a policy recommendation. He acknowledged that flexible time already existed in certain departments; however, cautioned that administration would want to retain as much flexibility in scheduling employees, depending upon funding, departmental needs and changing circumstances. He said that administration would prepare the requested report, although indicated that an overall policy directing administration to do things a certain way could be problematic.</i> • <i>The proposed resolution was amended to change the time to submit this report to the BCC from “60 days” of the effective date of this resolution to “90 days”.</i>
11A7 152831	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE MAYOR OR MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE MIAMI-DADE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, CONDUCT A STUDY TO DETERMINE WHAT STEPS MUST BE TAKEN TO ENSURE THAT THE UNDERLINE IS ELIGIBLE FOR STATE FUNDING AS PART OF THE SUNTRAIL PROGRAM
Notes	The proposed resolution:

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the Mayor or Mayor’s designee to collaborate with the Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization in conducting a study to determine what steps must be taken to ensure that the Underline is eligible for state funding as part of the SunTrail program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At a minimum, the study will identify which anticipated criteria for SunTrail funding the Underline meets, and, for those criteria the Underline does not currently meet, provide recommendations as to how the Underline can meet such criteria, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How the Underline can be designated a Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization priority; ▪ How the Underline can be included in the FDOT work plan; and ▪ How the Underline can be included in the Florida Greenways & Trails Land Trails Priority Map. • Directs the Mayor or Mayor’s designee to provide a written report detailing the findings, results and recommendations of the study to the BCC within 30 days of the effective date of this resolution and place the completed report on an agenda of the BCC pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65; and • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization. <p>Background: The Underline is part of the 2008 Miami-Dade County Parks and Open Spaces System Master Plan, and serves as the spine of the County’s regional framework for building a system of parks, public spaces, natural and cultural areas connected by greenways, waterways, trails and complete streets designated as linear parks in order to create a healthier, greener and a more economically vibrant place to live, work and play.</p> <p>The Underline endeavors to transform various lands below the County’s elevated Metrorail system into a contiguous, 10-mile linear park and urban trail and could connect communities, improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety, provide an accessible space for exercise, attract development along the trail’s path, and generate a positive economic impact. The Underline seeks to make the County a safer and more enjoyable place for bicyclists, motorists, and pedestrians and the Underline land is primarily Metrorail right-of-way, publicly owned, and is thus available for immediate development.</p> <p>A master plan for the Underline has been developed, and the project is “shovel ready”. Construction is set to begin in 2016 on the project’s first “demonstration” phase, a three-quarter-mile-long stretch around the Brickell Metrorail Station that will be laden with distinctive features, including picnic pockets, a dog park, an outdoor gym, and a playground shaded by a replenished canopy of oaks and other hardwood trees.</p> <p>On June 23, 2015, Governor Scott vetoed \$2 million in funding for the Underline in the 2015-16 state budget and during the recent 2015 Special Session A, the Florida Legislature enacted Chapter No. 2015-22B Laws of Florida (Senate Bill 2514A), which established the Florida Shared-Use Nonmotorized Trail (SunTrail) network and provided for the annually recurring allocation of \$25 million to fund SunTrail projects.</p> <p>On October 6, 2015, pursuant to Resolution No. R-911-15, the BCC adopted as one of its state legislative priorities for the 2016 session, Resolution No. R-617-15, urging the Florida Department of Transportation to include the Underline, the Ludlam Trail, the Biscayne-Everglades Greenway and Black Creek Trail in the SunTrail network, as well as to provide funding for said trails.</p> <p>It is anticipated that to receive state funding as part of the SunTrail program, a project must be designated by a metropolitan planning organization as a priority trail, included in the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) work plan, and included in the Florida Greenways & Trails Land Trails Priority Map.</p> <p>Additional Information: On June 30, 2015, pursuant to Resolution No. R-617-15, the BCC urged the Florida Department of Transportation to direct \$6.7 million of the \$25 million allocated for SunTrail funding to Miami-Dade County trail projects in the 2015-2016 state fiscal year, and on September 1, 2015, pursuant to Resolution No. R-744-15, the BCC urged the Florida Department of Transportation to direct \$10 million of the at least \$25 million that will be allocated for SunTrail funding to the Ludlam Trail project in the 2016-2017 state fiscal year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Resolution No. R-617-15, urged the Florida Department of Transportation to include the following trails and respective funding in the Florida Shared-Use Nonmotorized Trail Network Program in the 2015-16 state fiscal year budget: \$2 million for the Underline, \$3 million for the Ludlam Trail, \$1.5 million for the Biscayne-Everglades Greenway, and \$200,000 for the Black Creek Trail.</i>
11A8 152881	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING HB 687, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD FACILITATE NET METERING FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENCOURAGE THE USE OF RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVICES; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT PROVISIONS OF HB 687 THAT WOULD PREEMPT LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVICES ARE REMOVED
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports House Bill (HB) 687, or similar legislation that would facilitate net metering for renewable energy and encourage the use of renewable energy devices; provided, however, that provisions of HB 687 that would preempt local government regulation of renewable energy devices are removed; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Governor, the Senate President, the House Speaker, Representative Fred Costello, and the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade State Legislative Delegation; and • Directs the County’s state lobbyists to advocate for the legislative action and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item.

Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Background: House Bill 687 (HB 687) has been filed for consideration during the Florida Legislature’s 2016 session by Representative Fred Costello (R – Ormond Beach). Renewable energy sources, such as solar and wind power, offer a clean and naturally replenishing alternative to fuel-based power sources and provide the potential to improve our environment and reduce our dependence on imported oil and fossil fuels. “Net metering” allows homeowners and businesses who connect approved, renewable generation systems, such as solar panels, to the electric grid to buy and sell electricity to others. When net metering is used, any excess energy that is produced can be sold back to the grid, with that amount of energy deducted from the person’s monthly bill or credited toward a future bill in the same calendar year. HB 687 would, among other things, deregulate several aspects of Florida’s renewable energy industry and allow homeowners and businesses that generate up to two megawatts of renewable power to sell energy to their neighbors and sell any excess energy back to the grid.</p> <p>HB 687 shares some similarities with the ballot initiative put forth by the Floridians for Solar Choice, which would allow Florida voters to decide if the Florida Constitution should be amended to allow non-utility companies to provide solar energy directly to customers. One difference is that HB 687 proposes to open the market to multiple forms of renewable energy – including, for example, solar energy, geothermal energy, wind energy, ocean energy, and hydroelectric power – while the Floridians for Solar Choice initiative focuses exclusively on opening the market to solar power.</p> <p>According to the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, both HB 687 and the proposed ballot initiative are intended to achieve common aims, including opening the market for solar and renewable energy, overcoming barriers to competition, and preventing discriminatory actions by the utility companies. However, HB 687 contains some provisions that would preempt local governments from regulating, or from entering into a covenant to regulate, the design, specification, type, location, and appearance of devices that produce local renewable energy in a manner more stringent than the Florida Building Code.</p> <p>Additional Information – Relevant Legislation: On December 15, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1175-15, supported the Floridians for Solar Choice ballot initiative which, if successful, would present before the voters of Florida the opportunity to decide if the Florida Constitution should be amended to allow non-utility companies to provide solar energy directly to customers.</p> <p>According to the Florida Solar Energy Association, the State of Florida has the third greatest solar rooftop energy generation potential, but is 13th in installed capacity. Florida is one of only four states that prohibits residents from buying electricity from anyone other than a utility company and this prohibition limits customer choice and restricts the growth of solar energy.</p> <p>A Solar Power Purchase Agreement (SPPA) is a financial arrangement in which a third-party developer owns, operates and maintains a solar power system, and a host customer agrees to site the system on its roof or elsewhere on its property and purchases the system’s electric output from the solar services provider for a predetermined period. Permitting non-utility solar energy providers to enter into SPPAs with customers could remove the cost-barrier to entry for many homeowners by reducing or eliminating the upfront cost to install solar energy systems on homes and businesses.</p> <p>The Floridians for Solar Choice Coalition was founded by Christian Coalition of America, Conservatives for Energy Freedom, Florida Alliance for Renewable Energy, Florida Retail Federation, Florida Solar Energy Industries Association, Libertarian Party of Florida, Republican Liberty Caucus of Florida, Republican Liberty Caucus of Tampa Bay, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, and WTEC, and is supported by at least 53 environmental, civic, religious, and business organizations. The Floridians for Solar Choice ballot initiative seeks to place a question on the 2016 general election ballot asking voters to decide on expanding solar choice to Florida’s families and businesses. The municipalities of North Bay Village, Pinecrest, South Miami, and Surfside in Miami-Dade County have passed supporting resolutions for the Floridians for Solar Choice ballot initiative. The petition, if passed, will expand solar choice by allowing Floridians the option to power their homes or businesses with solar power and decide who provides it to them.</p> <p>According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute and the Solar Foundation, more than 173,000 Americans are employed in the solar energy industry, which is experiencing greater than 20 percent growth with nearly 90 percent of the new jobs in the installation sector and United States Military Veterans comprise 10 percent of the solar energy workforce in this country. A significant source of industry growth is due to third-party financing and lease arrangements now prohibited in Florida.</p>
11A9 152560	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO ADVERTISE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE AWARD OF \$14,018,000.00 IN SOCIAL SERVICE GRANTS TO COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO ISSUE ADDENDA AS NECESSARY AND REQUIRING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO DESCRIBE ADDENDA IN MEMORANDUM TO BOARD RECOMMENDING GRANT AWARDS; DIRECTING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO BRING GRANT AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD FOR CONSIDERATION; ADOPTING GRANT FUNDING PROCESS, SERVICE PRIORITY AREAS, AND FUNDING ALLOCATIONS DESCRIBED IN REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS; SETTING-ASIDE \$1,300,000.00 EQUALLY DIVIDED BETWEEN THE 13 COMMISSION DISTRICTS FOR GRANTS TO COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS TO BENEFIT MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; AND AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE AMENDMENTS TO EXTEND EXISTING COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION CONTRACTS ON MONTH-TO-MONTH BASIS NOT TO EXCEED TWO MONTHS</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee to advertise the Request for Proposals for the award of \$14,018,000.00 in social service grants to community-based organizations; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>The County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee is authorized to issue addenda as necessary to address issues that may arise during the period the Request for Proposals is advertised.</i> ○ <i>The County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee will include in the memorandum to the BCC recommending the grant awards what addenda, if any, were issued.</i>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes						
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee to place the Request for Proposals grant award funding recommendations as an action item on an appropriate BCC agenda for BCC review and consideration; and • Adopts the community-based organization grant funding process, service priority areas, and funding allocations described in the Request for Proposals. <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets-aside \$1,300,000.00 equally between the 13 commission districts, with \$100,000.00 apportioned to each commission district for allocation to non-profit, 501(c)(3) community-based organizations in the form of social service grants to benefit Miami-Dade County; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>The commission district allocations will be awarded via an informal competitive application process or other process, similar to the Mom and Pop grant process. Allocations may be made by motion or resolution approved by the BCC.</i> • Authorizes the County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee to execute amendments to existing community-based organization continuation contracts to extend the term of these agreements on a month-to-month basis not to exceed two months. <p>Background: Based on the fiscal year 2015-2016 adopted budget, a total of \$15,318,000.00 in general funds will be allocated for the first 12-month period of the community-based organization grant funding process. On July 1, 2014, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-625-14, which required the development of a new competitive process for the award of grants to community-based organizations and the establishment of a process for receiving and reviewing outside community input regarding the funding priorities approved pursuant to Resolution No. R-380-10.</p> <p>On March 3, 2015, the BCC received a memorandum containing the County Mayor’s preliminary recommendations. The Mayor recommended a competitive process for community-based organization grant funding which included: a process to obtain community input and public comment; restriction of eligibility to apply to 501(c)(3) non-profit organizations; limitation of funding to the provision of direct client services; proposed scoring criteria; an initial list of service priorities and percentage allocations; and a tentative timeline. The Mayor also recommended in his report that an additional amount for grant funding be set aside and divided evenly between the 13 commission districts for allocation by each Commissioner among eligible applicant organizations through an informal competitive application or other process of each Commissioner’s choice, similar to the Mom and Pop grant process.</p> <p>During the month of June 2015, Office of Management and Budget staff conducted five publically noticed town hall meetings attended by more than 230 participants, mainly representatives of community-based organizations. Attendees offered general comments, specific recommendations, and public testimony and additional written observations and detailed recommendations were received via a dedicated web page and e-mail address established for this process. The Office of Management and Budget staff also met with representatives from a broad cross-section of other local funding sources to discuss the process and obtain their feedback including: United Way, The Miami Foundation, Allegany Franciscan Ministries, Peacock Foundation, The Women’s Fund, South Florida Behavioral Network, Inc., Health Foundation of South Florida; Florida Department of Juvenile Justice; Alliance for Aging, Florida Department of Health in Miami-Dade County; Florida Department of Children and Families, The Children’s Trust, the County’s Youth Crime Task Force, and the Dade-Miami Criminal Justice Council.</p> <p>The Office of Management and Budget staff developed a draft Request for Proposals document that was posted online for industry and public review and comment and based on the extensive input and recommendations received through this community outreach process, the Office of Management and Budget staff prepared the Request for Proposals allocating \$14,018,000.00 of the budgeted \$15,318,000.00 for community-based organization grant funding in the following service priority areas and allocated percentages: Children, Youth and Families (17.5 percent), Special Needs (16 percent), Criminal Justice (16 percent), Elder Needs (13.5 percent), Basic Needs (13.5 percent), Children and Adults with Disabilities (6.5 percent), Anti-violence Initiatives (4 percent), Preventive Health (4 percent), Immigrants/New Entrants (4 percent), Workforce Development (4 percent), and Other, including Community/Economic Development (2 percent).</p> <p>Each Commissioner will conduct an informal competitive application process or other process of each Commissioner’s choice, similar to the Mom and Pop grant process, for the selection of such community-based organizations.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Additional Information- Legislative History of the CBO Funding Process</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">2nd Budget Hearing- FY 2007-08</td> <td>During the second budget hearing for the FY 2007-08 Resource Allocation Plan, the need for the development of a new competitive solicitation process to allocate funding for Community Based Organizations (CBOs) was discussed. Staff was directed to work on a process, and submit it to the BCC for consideration.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R-420-08 4/8/2008</td> <td>The BCC approved the model process for the solicitation and allocation of funding for CBOs and established the Community-Based Organization Advisory Board (CBOAB). The CBOAB was comprised of twenty-one (21) members representing community, business, civic, education, non-profit, social service, service recipient, and religious groups.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information- Legislative History of the CBO Funding Process		2nd Budget Hearing- FY 2007-08	During the second budget hearing for the FY 2007-08 Resource Allocation Plan, the need for the development of a new competitive solicitation process to allocate funding for Community Based Organizations (CBOs) was discussed. Staff was directed to work on a process, and submit it to the BCC for consideration.	R-420-08 4/8/2008	The BCC approved the model process for the solicitation and allocation of funding for CBOs and established the Community-Based Organization Advisory Board (CBOAB). The CBOAB was comprised of twenty-one (21) members representing community, business, civic, education, non-profit, social service, service recipient, and religious groups.
Additional Information- Legislative History of the CBO Funding Process							
2nd Budget Hearing- FY 2007-08	During the second budget hearing for the FY 2007-08 Resource Allocation Plan, the need for the development of a new competitive solicitation process to allocate funding for Community Based Organizations (CBOs) was discussed. Staff was directed to work on a process, and submit it to the BCC for consideration.						
R-420-08 4/8/2008	The BCC approved the model process for the solicitation and allocation of funding for CBOs and established the Community-Based Organization Advisory Board (CBOAB). The CBOAB was comprised of twenty-one (21) members representing community, business, civic, education, non-profit, social service, service recipient, and religious groups.						

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>The following organizations comprise the CBOAB: United Way of Miami-Dade, The Children’s Trust, Dade Community Foundation, Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Greater Miami Religious Leaders Coalition, and the Alliance for Aging, Inc.</p> <p>The CBOAB is primarily charged with the responsibility of recommending to the Board policies, goals, objectives, and strategic investments related to CBO Funding.</p>
CBOAB Meeting 12/19/2008	<p>During the months of October, November, and December 2008, the CBOAB met several times to hear presentations from local experts and representatives of other funding sources, review community needs assessment data, obtain input from non-profit service providers and CBOs, and discuss and formulate recommendations for the BCC.</p> <p>On December 19, 2008, the CBOAB finalized its recommendations to the BCC. In developing its recommendations the CBOAB took into consideration community needs, an inventory of local funding of human, social, and criminal justice-related services from County and non-County sources, and current and past levels of funding from the County. Decisions were made utilizing a consensus-based process, and all final recommendations were adopted by a formal vote of the CBOAB members.</p>
R-541-09 5/5/2009	<p>The BCC, through R-541-09, approved the CBO funding and RFP process, service priority areas, and percentage allocations for funding commencing FY 2010-11 (originally for funding commencing FY 2009-10).</p> <p>This resolution was based on the funding, contracting, and outcome measurement recommendations adopted by the CBOAB on December 19, 2008 and as amended on March 24, 2009, for funding commencing FY 2009-10.</p> <p>However, due to the County’s Fiscal Year 2009-10 budget process, the RFP was postponed and continuation contracts (with decreased allocations) were awarded instead.</p>
R-1079-09 9/1/2009	<p>The BCC, through R-1079-09, amending R-541-09, eliminated the previously-established cap on the maximum amount of funding that any one CBO may request in response to the 2009-2010 Human and Social Services CBOs Funding and RFP; and reinforces that despite the elimination of this cap, no single CBO will be awarded more than \$1 million through the RFP process.</p> <p><i>In other words, this resolution removed the \$1 million restriction on the amount requested, allowing an organization to request more than \$1 million; however, no organization would receive more than \$1 million.</i></p>
R-380-10 4/6/2010	<p>The BCC authorized the advertisement and solicitation of RFP No. 0411, the RFP process for the funding of CBOs, with the majority of the CBOAB recommendations in place.</p> <p><i>In addition to approving the CBO funding process, R-380-10, also provided that in scoring the proposals submitted in response to the Human and Social Services CBO Funding RFP, extra points would be awarded to agencies offering services within the Magic City Zone.</i></p> <p><i>Further, an award of up to five extra points would be given to proposals with a clear and feasible plan to provide services to residents from: Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSA); Targeted Urban Areas (TUA); Enterprise Zone; Magic City Zone; or other statutorily-defined human and social services high risk/high need areas.</i></p>
<p>Subsequently, the CBOAB requested a three month and then a one year extension of the RFP process, continuing funding at the same level for those CBOs that previously received funding. The one year extension was until April 2012.</p>	
File No. 110349 3/3/2011	<p>Miami-Dade County’s Legistar shows that the Office of Strategic Business Management placed a resolution under File No. 110349 on the March 3, 2011, BCC Agenda, awarding contracts under RFP No. 0411 for Human and Social Services CBO funding in an annualized amount not to exceed \$19,436,900; and authorizing the County Mayor or his designee to negotiate, execute, amend, extend and renew said contract. <u>This item was not assigned to a committee and did not come before the BCC.</u></p> <p><i>File No. 110349 states that ten Evaluation/Selection Committees comprised of 29 five member teams (145 committee members, eight non-voting chairpersons) were appointed to review 575 individual service proposals received from 308 community-based organizations in response to the RFP. However, as stated above, the drafted item never came before the BCC.</i></p>
FY 2011-12 FY 2012-13	<p>The CBO funding adopted for FY 2011-12 was \$20,166,932 and for FY 2012-13 was \$20,166,932, which continued funding at the same levels.</p>
R-700-13 9/4/2013	<p>R-700-13 imposes a twenty-five (25) percent cap (Cap) on the amount that any single CBO may receive from the County’s General Fund for its administrative budget, including but not limited to salaries, benefits and fringes of</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>the CBO's management personnel (i.e. executive directors, agency heads); overhead costs; and clerical or other administrative personnel who do not directly provide the services required pursuant to contract with the County.</p>
R-1019-13 12/3/2013	<p>R-1019-13 amended R-700-13 to delay enforcement and implementation of the Cap until the beginning of the next County fiscal year. The Cap will be imposed on Community-Based Organizations with contracts beginning on or after October 1, 2014. Any waiver of the Cap following October 1, 2014 pursuant to Resolution No. R-700-13 will require further action by the Board.</p> <p>The Board directed the County Mayor or his designee to advise affected Community-Based Organizations that enforcement and implementation of the Cap has been delayed, and that the Cap will not be effective until October 1, 2014.</p>
R-625-14 7/1/2014	<p>The BCC, through R-625-14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established as BCC policy that social service grants for Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) remain funded in fiscal year 2014-2015 at a level to be determined through the County's fiscal year 2014-2015 budget process; • Directed the County Mayor or his designee to incorporate funding for CBOs into his proposed County fiscal year 2014-2015 budget; • In anticipation of the need in the community for social services provided by CBOs for fiscal year 2014-2015, directed the County Mayor or his designee to commence negotiations with currently funded CBOs to renew agreements for fiscal year 2014-2015, subject to subsequent BCC approval of all such grants and appropriation in sufficient amounts to fund such agreements in the County's fiscal year 2014-2015 budget; • Directed the County Mayor or his designee to establish a mechanism for receiving and reviewing outside community input regarding the CBOs funding priorities approved pursuant to Resolution No. 380-10, such as by holding workshops for public input; • Directed the County Mayor or his designee to develop an internal competitive process (Proposed Process) for the selection of CBOs to receive funding in County fiscal year 2015-2016 administered through the County's Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Grants Coordination division, and to present such process, prior to implementation, for review and approval by the BCC within ninety (90) days of the adoption of this item; and • Directed the County Mayor or his designee to include in the Proposed Process an implementation timeline, procedures governing the competitive process, service priority areas with percentage allocations, and a three-year funding cycle which includes a recommended approach for handling reductions or increases in available funding, subject to appropriation and funding by the County through the County's annual budget process. <p>During the BCC meeting on Jul 1, 2014, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Commission spoke on the need to consider adding organizations that positively impacting the community but not receiving County funding rather than providing continuation funding to those that did not, and expressed a desire for the County Mayor to develop a process that would allow the BCC to select new CBOs, to continue with functional CBOs; or to stop funding dysfunctional CBOs. The Commission asked that this process also considered CBOs in specific districts that needed County assistance more than others, such as District 2, 3 and 5. The Commission also asked that the process be kept in-house to minimize the expenditure of the tax payer's dollars.</i> • <i>The Commission noted that some CBOs could be selected countywide and others to serve each district.</i> • <i>It was clarified that some districts in some communities had greater needs than others, even though there were needs that existed countywide.</i> • <i>The Commission recalled the discussion to develop a CBO budget process during last year's budget development.</i> • <i>In response to an inquiry regarding the number of times the County had funded the same CBOs the Budget Director from the Office of Management and Budget reported that this was the eighth cycle of funding the same CBOs; that the same process would be used this year; and that a new process would be implemented to prevent repeated funding.</i> • <i>The Commission expressed concern that this issue was a repeated cycle that was not acted on by this Commission because the members did not like the recommendations and suggested that last year's recommendations were pulled and reevaluated as a method to proceed.</i> • <i>Discussion ensued regarding a suggestion to develop a selection process that would start in Fiscal Year 2015-16, within the next 90 days.</i> • <i>The Assistant County Attorney advised that a directive was included in Section 5 for the County Mayor to come back to the BCC with a proposed process within 60 days; however, noted that it would now be amended to reflect 90 days.</i> • <i>The Commission pointed out that this proposal allowed for more accountability, and transparency.</i>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Commission expressed concern that the Administration did not meet with the CBOs to determine services that were being either over or under-funded and of the existing process of automatically funding CBOs.</i> • <i>The Commission requested a report reflecting CBO funding be provided up-front, noting some CBOs received funding that shut down shortly thereafter and other CBOs existed that could have benefited from those funds. The Commission noted the amount of funding CBOs received from other entities needed to be considered in relation to the amount of county funding.</i> • <i>The Budget Director pointed out that Administration was more strident with the CBOs with the Commissions support. She noted that funding for 24 CBOs was currently rescinded because either they were unable to execute a contract or could not meet the County requirements; that five CBOs had unresolved concerns and were pending contract execution; and that 17 CBOs were suspended. She stated that the County was actively working with the CBOs to ensure funding was spent as intended in their contracts and that many CBOs were unfunded due to prior performance which was an issue with the recommendations.</i> • <i>The Commission asked the County Attorney's Office to prepare an item that would establish an annual report card for every CBO receiving county funding and that this information be submitted to this Commission in order to track programs.</i> • <i>The proposed resolution was amended for the County Mayor or Mayor's designee to prepare a competitive process plan for BCC approval, within 90 days.</i>
R-142-15 2/3/2015	<p>The BCC, through R-142-15, directed the County Mayor or designee to create a Report Card for all Community Based Organizations (CBOs) receiving or applying for County social service funds. The Report Card was to track each CBO's status and progress, including but not limited to significant successes, noteworthy delivery of services, contract status, contract accomplishments or failures, significant complaints received from constituents or beneficiaries, and other aspects of each CBO's progress or status which is potentially relevant to the BCC decision-making process regarding contracting with or funding each particular CBO.</p> <p>The County Mayor or designee was to include on the Report Card information from the Due Diligence Affidavit completed by each CBO pursuant to Resolution No. R-630-13. The process developed by the County Mayor or designee to create the Report Card was to include a step where each CBO is provided with a draft of the Report Card and an opportunity to respond, which response would be included in the final Report Card presented to the BCC. The County Mayor or designee was to present the final Report Card to the BCC as a report within 90 days of the effective date of this resolution and will place the completed report on an agenda of the BCC pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65.</p> <p>Thereafter, the County Mayor or designee was to prepare an updated Report Card quarterly. In addition, the County Mayor or designee was to include the most recent Report Card as an attachment to or as part of any agenda item where the BCC would consider taking action related to a particular CBO, including but not limited to funding or contracting decisions.</p>
R-338-15 4/21/2015	<p>The BCC, through R-338-15, amended R-625-14 to add a new section directing the County Mayor or designee to present to the BCC for review and approval, prior to implementation, a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the selection of Community-Based Organizations to receive County funding in County fiscal year 2015-2016.</p> <p>The proposed resolution directed the County Mayor or designee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include in the RFP "Anti-Violence Initiatives" as a new service priority area, which will receive at least four percent of any County funding ultimately awarded through the RFP; • Include in the RFP the County Mayor's or designee's recommendations regarding other service priority areas and the competitive process, which may include, but are not limited to, those recommendations contained in the Report. If any of the County Mayor's or designee's recommendations require action by the BCC in addition to approval of the RFP itself, then the County Mayor or designee will describe such additional steps as may be required in an accompanying memorandum when the RFP is presented to the BCC for review and approval; and • Place the RFP as an action item on an agenda of the BCC within 90 days of the adoption of this item.
<p>Additional Information – Mayoral Report - New Competitive Process for Grants to Community-Based Organizations – April 21, 2015: Pursuant to Resolution No. R-625-14, this report provided the BCC with recommendations to create a new competitive process for the awarding of grants to community-based organizations (CBOs) in FY 2015-16, including a mechanism for receiving and reviewing community input related to such a process and incorporating a performance review and reporting process pursuant to Resolution No. R-142-15, which was approved by the BCC on February 3, 2015.</p> <p>Background The BCC has provided continuation funding as part of the budget process to organizations included in the CBO list for over ten (10) years. A portion of these grants were initially awarded by the BCC as a result of a past competitive process conducted in 2003 by the Alliance for Human Services (AHS), an independent nonprofit. The remaining awards on the list were originally made as direct, non-competitive</p>	

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>allocations by the BCC. In 2007, the AHS again issued a competitive solicitation that was later rescinded and the BCC instead approved continuation funding.</p> <p>The BCC approved the last competitive solicitation for CBO funding and related service priorities and percentage allocations on April 6, 2010, which was the result of prior BCC action in April 2008 to approve a model CBO grant process and establish the Community-based Organization Advisory Board to recommend policies, goals, objectives, funding priorities, and percentage allocations to the BCC. As a result, the County issued RFP No. 0411 and award recommendations were sent to the BCC in February 2011. More than 300 organizations submitted nearly 600 individual service proposals and requested more than \$80 million, although less than \$20 million was available to be allocated. The proposals were reviewed by 29 five-member review teams, comprised of 145 committee members and eight (8) non-voting chairpersons. It is important to note that creating and conducting such a process consumed considerable time and resources for the County, participating CBOs, and other interested parties and volunteer reviewers. Ultimately, the award recommendations were never acted upon and continuation funding was once again approved for the balance of FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 through two (2) separate Board actions.</p> <p>Process</p> <p>As required by Resolution No. R-625-14, it is recommended that the County establish a process to obtain community input, inclusive of public comment. This process will be facilitated by the Office of Management and Budget. This community and public input would include discussions of the proposed process, service priorities, and funding allocations with other local funders of human and social services, such as the United Way, the Children’s Trust, the Alliance for Aging, the Women’s Fund, Florida Department of Children and Families, Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Miami Foundation, among others. In addition, it is recommended that five (5) publicly-noticed town hall meetings be conducted throughout the County to obtain public comment and receive testimony from CBOs and other interested parties. Finally, a web page and dedicated e-mail address will be created to obtain additional feedback and input from the providers and the community.</p> <p>The recommended solicitation process is based on a standard County procurement utilizing a request for proposals process that has been modified slightly for use in allocating CBO funding to human and social services organizations. It is recommended that the Cone of Silence and appeals process requirements be waived in order to facilitate communication, as well as the provision of technical assistance to organizations that may never have been required to prepare a formal grant application, and to minimize costs and time required to conduct the County’s formal appeal process. A CBO may directly appeal to the Board on the date of final award. Additionally, criminal justice-related funding subject to the recommendations of the County’s Youth Crime Task Force and the Dade-Miami Criminal Justice Council would be included in the competitive solicitation as a separate category of funding and a separate solicitation would be issued for related program evaluation services. An initial 12-month contract term is recommended, with up to two (2) additional one-year options to renew based on performance and at the County’s sole discretion. A CBO whose contract is terminated or found to be in breach of the agreement will not be eligible for contract renewal, and organizations will be required to successfully close out the prior year contract to be eligible for renewal.</p> <p>Eligibility to apply for CBO funding would be limited to 501(c)3 nonprofit organizations located in Miami-Dade County that provide human and social services directly to clients. Service coordination and capacity building programs will not be considered for funding as part of this process. All applicant organizations will be subject to the requirements of Resolution No. R-630-13, including the submission of a detailed project budget, sources and uses statement, default certifications, and a due diligence check. The results of the due diligence review conducted by staff will be shared with evaluation/selection committee members for their consideration in scoring applications. Administrative costs would be limited to no more than 15 percent of the program budget.</p> <p>In light of limited human and social services funding available in the community and the creation of a new competitive contracting process, the BCC may wish to review the practical implications of the requirements of Resolution No. R-700-13, which requires that no more than 25 percent of a CBO’s total administrative budget may be paid from County general funds. This restriction presents significant challenges for many local CBOs, which in part led the effective date of the legislation to be postponed twice. The Board may wish to reconsider this legislation and instead consider rewarding applicant CBOs with application scoring criteria that awards points for diversified agency funding and limited and/or low administrative costs.</p> <p>Scoring Criteria</p> <p>Review and scoring criteria are tentatively recommended as follows, subject to modification based on feedback obtained during the community and public comment process and Board approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of Need 20 points • Organizational Capacity and Staffing Plan 15 points • Program Plan 35 points • Collaboration and Coordination of Services 10 points • Budget, Administrative Costs, and Funding Mix 20 points • Total: 100 points <p>Additional scoring criteria may include past performance and the ability to deduct up to five (5) points based on a past contract suspension, termination, breach, or other significant past poor performance or significant findings as a result of due diligence. Bonus points could be awarded for organizations that provide services in designated target areas or to address particular Board adopted critical priorities.</p> <p>Service Priorities, Percentage Allocations, and Funding Model</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>The service priorities and percentage funding allocations included in previously issued RFP No. 0411 will serve as the starting point for discussions with other local funders, the community, and the public input process. Final recommended priorities and percentage allocations will be brought back to the BCC for approval as part of the draft competitive solicitation document. These priorities and allocations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic Needs 12.5% • Children and Adults with Disabilities 6.5% • Children, Youth, and Families 21.5% • Criminal Justice 15.0% • Elder Needs 13.5% • Health 4.0% • Immigrants/New Entrants 4.0% • Other, including Economic Development 2.0% • Special Needs 16.0% • Workforce Development 4.0% • Criminal Justice Program Evaluation (separate solicitation) 1.0% <p>The total funding available for allocation through this process and annually thereafter to exercise renewal funding is subject to the appropriation by the Board through the annual budget process. All award recommendations developed by evaluation/selection committees appointed by the Mayor in accordance with County procurement requirements will be brought to the Board for final approval. It is further recommended that an additional amount be set aside and divided evenly between the 13 Commission Districts for allocation by each Commissioner among eligible applicant organizations, through a selection process of their choice, similar to the Mom and Pop grant process.</p> <p>Timeline</p> <p>The proposed tentative timeline was subject to change based on the timeliness of completing each step in the process and its required BCC action. Although specific dates may change, the timeline is offered to provide a rough approximation for the time necessary for each step and the proper sequence of events.</p> <p>The process, timeline, and procedural recommendations presented in this report are based on the past experience gained in developing and conducting RFP No. 0411 and other similar grant processes.</p> <p>It is the intention of the Administration, with BCC concurrence, to conduct the community and public comment process, release a draft solicitation to obtain industry feedback, and bring a final draft of the proposed request for proposals document to the BCC, including contract requirements, scoring criteria, service priorities, and percentage allocations.</p>
11A10 152277	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING, BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF THE BOARD, AN AMENDMENT TO CITY OF MIAMI GARDENS' CHARTER WHICH WOULD DELETE SECTION 9.6 OF THE CITY'S CHARTER, RESULTING IN THE TRANSFER FROM MIAMI-DADE COUNTY TO THE CITY OF MIAMI GARDENS OF ZONING, PERMITTING, AND OTHER LAND USE JURISDICTION OVER THE AREA KNOWN AS STADIUM PROPERTIES AND DOLPHIN CENTER SUBJECT TO A VOTE OF THE ELECTORS OF THE CITY OF MIAMI GARDENS</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes, by a two-thirds vote of the BCC, an amendment to the Charter of the City of Miami Gardens as set forth in City of Miami Gardens Resolution No. 2014-125-2104 which would delete Section 9.6 of the City's Charter, so that the City would have jurisdiction over such matters as building, zoning and other land use decisions regarding the properties described in Appendix C and Appendix D to the City's Charter.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Joint Public Conflict Resolution Meeting between Miami-Dade County BCC and the City Council of the City of Miami Gardens:</u></p> <p>On December 1, 2015, a Joint Public Conflict Resolution Meeting was held between Miami-Dade County BCC and the City Council of the City of Miami Gardens, regarding the lawsuit entitled City of Miami Gardens vs. Miami-Dade County., Circuit Court Case No. 2014-017408 CA 01, as part of the conflict assessment process that is required by Florida law.</p> <p>As required by Florida law after a lawsuit is filed by one government entity against another, the City Council of the City of Miami Gardens and the BCC are required to have a joint public meeting. In this meeting, governing bodies of these entities are required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the statement of issues; • Seek an Agreement; and • Schedule additional meetings of the entities in conflict or of their designees to continue to seek resolution of the conflict. <p>In its lawsuit, the City of Miami Gardens (City) is asking the court to interpret Section 9. Of their municipal charter, which was required by the BCC as a condition of the City's incorporation in 2003.</p> <p>On December 1, 2015, File No. 152830 was accepted to eliminate Section 9.6 of the City of Miami Gardens (City) Charter, to allow the City to have full jurisdiction over those properties; to have a resolution to effectuate this action; and come back to the BCC at the soonest opportunity.</p>
11A11 152891	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO CONDUCT AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CITY OF OPA-LOCKA'S WATER AND WASTEWATER UTILITY, INCLUDING INFRASTRUCTURE AND FINANCES, AND SUBMIT A REPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS TO THIS BOARD</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p>

Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee to conduct an inventory and assessment of the infrastructure of the City of Opa-locka’s water and wastewater utility and a financial audit of the City’s water and wastewater utility; and • Directs the County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee to prepare a report on this inventory and assessment of the infrastructure and the financial audit, as well as any other information that may be relevant to a full assessment of the City of Opa-locka’s water and wastewater utility. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This report will also include recommendations to the BCC as to what actions should be taken related to the City’s water and wastewater utility; and ○ The County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee will provide this report to the BCC within 90 days and will place the completed report on an agenda of the BCC pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65. <p>Background: The City of Opa-locka currently operates a water and wastewater utility within its municipal boundaries and has not completed certain studies, evaluations, and repairs of its sanitary sewer system that are required pursuant to both County regulations and a Consent Decree with the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The City of Opa-locka failed to obtain an operating permit from the Miami-Dade County Division of Environmental Resource Management (DERM) for its utility for the 2015 calendar year, and as a result, DERM imposed a moratorium in July 2015 on approvals of any new projects connected to the City of Opa-locka’s water or wastewater systems. Under this moratorium, businesses within the City of Opa-locka could not get Certificates of Occupancy for expansions or new construction that would need additional sewage loading capacity.</p> <p>If the City of Opa-locka does not complete the required studies, evaluations and repairs of its sanitary sewer system by the deadlines set pursuant to the Consent Decree with the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the failure to meet any of those deadlines would also trigger a moratorium and because these required studies and evaluations of the City’s sanitary sewer system have not yet been completed, it is unknown what the extent of necessary repairs and maintenance to the utility’s infrastructure would be. The current state of the City of Opa-locka’s water and wastewater utility may negatively affect the public health, safety and welfare of residents and business owners in the City.</p> <p>Additional Information - On brink of financial collapse, Opa-locka seeks state help - Miami Herald, November 4, 2015⁶:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A detailed letter sent to the state by the city manager’s office Wednesday raised serious concerns about money that was not being paid for water and sewer services — about \$1.5 million — by thousands of residents and businesses.</i> • <i>The city’s biggest creditor: Miami-Dade County, which is currently owed \$3.4 million for water, sewer and other charges, including \$679,000 in utility fees the city already collected from residents but never passed onto the county. By December, the debt will be \$4 million.</i> • <i>The city controls and owns its own water lines, but pays the county for treating the sewage and water delivered to thousands of businesses and homes.</i> • <i>If the state agrees to take over the city’s finances, there would be several options for oversight. The governor’s office could require the city to provide an action plan to get out of debt. The state may also establish an emergency board and appoint members to oversee the city’s spending.</i> • <i>The money owed to the county also has created other problems. Miami-Dade has imposed what amounts to a ban on any new building until a significant amount of the money owed to the county is paid.</i>
11A12 152685	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO REVIEW AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECTS FUNDED BY THE COUNTY AND DEVELOPED OR CONSTRUCTED BY BISCAYNE HOUSING GROUP, INC., OR ITS PRINCIPALS GONZALO DERAMON AND MICHAEL COX; CARLISLE DEVELOPMENT GROUP, OR ITS PRINCIPALS MATTHEW GREER AND LLOYD BOGGIO; SILTEK GROUP, INC., OR SILTEK AFFORDABLE HOUSING, LLC, OR THEIR PRINCIPAL RENE SIERRA; BJ&K CONSTRUCTION, INC., OR ITS PRINCIPAL MICHAEL RUNYAN; DESIGN MANAGEMENT AND BUILDERS CORPORATION, OR ITS PRINCIPAL ARTURO HEVIA, OR ANY ENTITIES RELATED TO THESE ENTITIES OR PRINCIPALS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING IF THE COUNTY HAS BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY CRIMINAL ACTIVITY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT THEFT OR FRAUD, BY ANY OF THESE ENTITIES OR PERSONS; AND DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO TAKE APPROPRIATE LEGAL OR OTHER ACTIONS TO RECOVER COUNTY FUNDS, TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT A REPORT WITHIN 90 DAYS, AND TO UPDATE SAID REPORT EVERY THREE MONTHS DURING THE FIRST YEAR AND AT LEAST ANNUALLY THEREAFTER</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee to review the Subject Developments and all other projects funded by the County and developed or constructed by the Developers, the Contractors or any entities related to the Developers or the Contractors for the purpose of determining whether the County has been a victim of criminal activity, including, but not limited to, theft, fraud or conspiracy by any of these entities or persons. If necessary, the County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee is further directed to consult with the Miami-Dade Office of the Inspector General, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development and its inspector general, and other appropriate law enforcement agencies to assist in the investigation of matters contained herein. The proposed resolution further authorizes the County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee to file a lawsuit, join another lawsuit, or otherwise take measures to recover any misused County funds.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution provides that the County Mayor, or Mayor’s designee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare and submit a report to the BCC within 90 days of the effective date of this resolution. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>The report will describe the progress and results of the investigation, review, legal action or other measures taken.</i>

⁶ <http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/158EDA2D5D406F10?p=NewsBank>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare an updated report at least every three months for the first year and then at least annually thereafter, which reporting will continue until the latter of the following occur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The criminal cases against the Developers and the Contractors are resolved; ○ The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee determines that the County has not been a victim of any criminal activity or misuse of County funds; or ○ The County has recovered all funds misused as a result of the unlawful activity described in the Superseding Information, Superseding Indictment or the Hevia Criminal Complaint or discovered during the review. • The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee will place all reports required by this resolution on a BCC agenda pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65. <p>Additional Information – Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee Meeting Discussion: During the Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee meeting on December 8, 2015 the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Committee recalled numerous instances of affordable housing development agencies committing fraud against the County, noting those agencies could still be operating under another name, with the same people involved, the same addresses and the same phone numbers.</i> • <i>The Committee stated that efforts to ensure that the County was protected in the future needed to be implemented.</i> • <i>The Committee inquired whether it would be a routine process to consider the implications to the County and conduct research to determine if agreements were being negotiated with parties who previously committed fraud.</i> • <i>The Executive Director of Public Housing and Community Development (PHCD) reported that PHCD had discussed this situation and evaluated options with the County Attorney's Office and the Office of Inspector General; that new certifications and clarification of responsibilities were being drafted; and that an audit process was being added to ensure the PHCD would be better equipped to identify the practices identified by the federal government.</i> • <i>The Committee asked the Deputy Mayor to provide a report at the next Committee meeting addressing concerns pertaining to the recovery of \$1.2 million from a construction project at Bird Road and S.W. 89 Avenue that was previously stolen by the contractor, and to request to place this item on the meeting agenda.</i> • <i>The Committee noted this resolution was another step in a positive direction to protect the County against fraudulent contractors and questioned whether the County could recover funds for local use rather than the money being reclaimed by the Federal government and the process used by the County to try to prevent such occurrences.</i> • <i>The Assistant County Attorney responded that there was a standard provision in all County contracts allowing the Office of Inspector General, the U.S. Comptroller, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to conduct audits. He noted provisions whereby any misrepresentation or fraudulent activity by the borrower was considered a breach of contract. The Assistant County Attorney also noted loan documents allowed the County to foreclose and take other action to collect money. He indicated that the County Attorney's Office would take a closer look at documents being approved; however, safeguards were already included in contracts and loan documents protected the County.</i> • <i>The Assistant County Attorney said that ongoing contract monitoring would become the PHCD's responsibility and that the County Attorney's office would enforce contract terms if necessary.</i> • <i>The Committee asked the Executive Director of PHCD whether any additional legislation was needed or any limitations existed preventing him from moving forward. He informed the Committee that additional skilled manpower was needed to monitor costs, invoices and labor charges. He pointed out the issue took on a national interest looking at the low income housing tax credit program and the U.S. Government Accounting Office conducted a study which revealed Internal Revenue Service and HUD monitoring problems, noting that Florida has not been selected for additional scrutiny at this time.</i> • <i>The Committee stated that the County had problems, noting there was not enough professional staff available to assist in identifying and enforcing these problems and suggested teaming up with local law enforcement professionals who were capable of handling forensic and fraud investigations.</i> <p>Additional Information - August 2016 trial for ex-CEO in \$36M affordable housing fraud⁷:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>An August 2016 trial date has been set for the former chief executive officer of a South Florida development company accused in a \$36 million affordable housing fraud case.</i> • <i>A federal judge set the Aug. 24 date after defense attorneys for 69-year-old Lloyd Boggio said they needed more time to prepare for a trial. Boggio is co-founder of Carlisle Development Group. He has pleaded not guilty to conspiracy, wire fraud and money laundering charges.</i>
11A13 152755	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE AND RECORD A UNITY OF TITLE ON COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY LOCATED AT 10300 S.W. 216 STREET, MIAMI AND 21910 S.W. 102 AVENUE, MIAMI; DIRECTING THAT A RECORDED COPY OF THE UNITY OF TITLE BE PROVIDED TO THE CLERK OF THE BOARD; AND DIRECTING THE CLERK TO STORE A RECORDED COPY OF THE UNITY OF TITLE WITH THIS RESOLUTION
Notes	The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee to execute and record on behalf of Miami-Dade County a Unity of Title on County-owned property located at 10300 S.W. 216 Street, Miami (Folio No. 30-6017-003-0010) and 21910 S.W. 102 Avenue, Miami (Folio No. 30-6017-003-0020) and legally described in the Unity of Title. The proposed resolution further directs that a recorded copy of the Unity of Title be provided to the Clerk of the BCC within 30 days after execution and directs the Clerk of the BCC to attach and permanently store a recorded copy of the Unity of Title together with this resolution.

⁷ <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/oct/18/aug-2016-trial-for-ex-ceo-in-36m-affordable-housin/>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><u>Background:</u> The Public Health Trust (Trust) is an agency and instrumentality of Miami-Dade County, Florida, responsible for the operation, maintenance and governance of Jackson Health System, including, but not limited to, Jackson Memorial Hospital, Jackson North Medical Center, Jackson South Community Hospital, Ryder Trauma Center, and other designated facilities in accordance with Chapter 25A of the Code of Miami-Dade County, Florida.</p> <p>On May 6, 1997, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-483-97 designating the following County-owned real property (Property) used in connection with the delivery of health care as designated facilities of the Trust: 10300 S.W. 216 Street, Miami (Folio No. 30-6017-003-0010) and 21910 S.W. 102 Avenue, Miami (Folio No. 30-6017-003-0020). Prior and subsequent to the adoption of Resolution No. R-483-97, Community Health of South Florida, Inc. (CHI), a Florida non-profit corporation and a Federally Qualified Health Center, leased the Property for the provision of health care to the indigent and non-indigent residents of the County at CHI's Doris Ison South Dade Community Health Center. In March, 2015, the Trust and CHI entered into a new 30-year lease, with a 10-year option to renew, for CHI's continued provision of health care to the community. In response to patient feedback and to better serve County residents, CHI has developed plans to construct a 20 bed Children's Crisis Center and expand the parking capacity on the Property (CHI Project). As part of the permitting process for the CHI Project, the Miami-Dade County Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources requires that a Unity of Title be executed and recorded on the Property. On August 31, 2015, the Board of Trustees of the Trust adopted Resolution No. PHT 08/15-068, which authorized the Trust to seek BCC approval of the Unity of Title related to the CHI Project and to be recorded on the Property.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Relevant Legislation:</u> On May 6, 1997, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-483-97 designating the following County-owned facilities used in connection with the delivery of health care as designated facilities of the Public Health Trust (Trust): 10300 S.W. 216th Street, Miami, Florida 33190 and 810 West Mowry Drive, Homestead, Florida 33030 (Trust Designated Facilities). Resolution No. R-483-97 further directed the Trust to enter into an agreement with Community Health of South Florida, Inc., formerly known as Community Health of South Dade, Inc. (CHI) relating to the operation, maintenance and governance of the Trust Designated Facilities used by CHI for delivery of health care to the community, subject to approval by the BCC.</p> <p>Through Resolution No. R-1564-97 adopted on December 16, 1997, the BCC approved a memorandum of agreement between the Trust and CHI related to the Trust Designated Facilities used by CHI. On October 27, 2014, the Public Health Trust Board of Trustees adopted Resolution No. PHT 10/14-074 authorizing the Trust President to negotiate and execute a new agreement with CHI, and directing the Trust President to seek BCC approval. The Trust and CHI have negotiated a new agreement relating to the operation, maintenance and governance of the Trust Designated Facilities, for an initial term of one year with four one-year automatic renewal options.</p> <p>On January 21, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-42-15, authorized execution of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Public Health Trust and Community Health of South Florida, Inc., in the amount of \$6,924,000.00 during year one and amounts to be agreed upon in subsequent years relating to the operation, maintenance and governance of the Trust Designated Facilities used in connection with the delivery of health care by Community Health of South Florida, Inc.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Property Values:</u> According to the Office of the Property Appraiser, the 2015 assessed value of the properties are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10300 S.W. 216 Street, Miami (Folio No. 30-6017-003-0010) - Assessed value - \$6,904,177; and • 21910 S.W. 102 Avenue, Miami (Folio No. 30-6017-003-0020) - \$1,874,767
11A14 152796	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT A REPORT TO THE BOARD WITHIN 120 DAYS STUDYING THE FEASIBILITY, COST, AND MEANS OF IMPLEMENTING A DESIGNATED PARKING PROGRAM FOR VETERANS IN COUNTY FACILITIES
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor to prepare and submit a report to the BCC, within 120 days, studying the feasibility, cost and means of implementing a designated parking program for veterans at facilities owned and operated by Miami-Dade County. In addition, the report will consider means of encouraging the public and private sectors to include designated veterans' parking for new and existing structures other than those used for single-family, duplex, townhouse, or multifamily uses. Said report will also consider and develop eligibility criteria for veterans, fees that should be charged to offset costs imposed by the program, and means of enforcement to prevent the abuse of the designated parking program by non-eligible persons. In developing said eligibility criteria, the County Mayor or designee is directed to consult with the Military Affairs Board.</p> <p><u>Additional Information</u> <i>Wounded warriors Family Support, an Omaha, Nebraska based group that helps families of injured or killed soldiers, is providing establishments with signs that grant reserved parking to wounded veterans. The signs, which the nonprofit distributes free of charge, offer a simple salute to the men and women injured in combat. The group developed the mission in 2012 to honor the estimated 1.8 million recipients of the Purple Heart, but the mission is inclusive of all wounded military members. To pay veterans a simple tribute, the nonprofit makes aluminum parking signs that read "Combat Wounded" and are illustrated with a Purple Heart. However, the signs are not "official" regulatory signs, it's more of an honor type system. November 5, 2015 www.huffingtonpost.com</i></p> <p><i>There may soon be reserved parking spots for veterans at certain government buildings in Collier County. The spots have already been installed in several places throughout Lee County as a way to than veterans for their sacrifice. December 3, 2015 www.winknews.com</i></p>
11A15 152426	RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING COUNTY POLICY REQUIRING THE COUNTY TO TAKE MEASURES WHEN ENTERING INTO LEASES OF COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY TO ALLOW THE COUNTY TO RE-TAKE POSSESSION OF THE PROPERTY IN EMERGENCY SITUATIONS, AND DIRECTING THE

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO INCLUDE PROVISIONS IN ALL LEASES, TO THE EXTENT PRACTICABLE, FOR TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION OF LEASES WHEN NEEDED BY THE COUNTY ON AN EMERGENCY BASIS FOR A PUBLIC PURPOSE
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution establishes County policy, when leasing County-owned property, to include a termination or suspension provision in the lease in the event that an emergency situation arises wherein the property is needed by the County for an emergency public purpose. The County Mayor or designee will include such provisions in all leases to the extent practicable, as determined by the County Mayor or designee on a case specific basis.</p> <p>The County leases County-owned property to various persons and entities throughout Miami-Dade County on both short and long term bases. Unforeseen events may occur during the term of a lease necessitating the termination or suspension of such lease for a public purpose in the event that an emergency situation arises.</p> <p><u>Additional Information:</u> According to the County Attorney's Office, there is not currently a codified termination for emergency provision with respect to leases. This would be drafted prospectively, on a case by case basis, depending on each unique transaction.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee Meeting Discussion:</u> During the Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee meeting on December 8, 2015, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Committee explained that property was leased for County departments use at excessive costs, noting we could save taxpayers' dollars by using County owned property as an alternative and said only short-term leases should be impacted, otherwise the County might have difficulty leasing property on a long-term basis.</i> • <i>The Committee inquired whether a termination clause was included in properties that the County leased to other parties in the event of an emergency and what constituted an emergency to which the Assistant County Attorney reported that leases contained a termination clause and that the specifics of emergency situations were established in the lease agreement and approved by the BCC.</i> • <i>The Committee questioned whether there was any concern that this would jeopardize the County's ability to lease properties to which the Assistant County Attorney noted she believed it would be determined by the lease negotiation process and specific circumstances of the property. She reported that the condition would not necessarily be a requirement of all leases but where it was practical to do so.</i> • <i>The Committee stated that the County Attorney's Office would review agreements for legal sufficiency and ensure it was not in violation of the Burke Harris Law. She pointed out that the requirements were understood at the beginning of the agreement, rather than being imposed later and that it would apply only to future leases, where applicable.</i> • <i>The Committee asked that the Deputy Mayor provide information from the Internal Services Department as to the impact of the proposed legislation on County rental properties, prior to this legislation being considered by the BCC.</i>
11A16 152759	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO WORK WITH DELEGATE AGENCIES, THE HEAD START POLICY COUNCIL AND THE COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY BOARD TO DEVELOP A CURRICULUM FOR TEACHING EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE COUNTY'S HEAD START PROGRAM ABOUT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, INCLUDING HOW TO IDENTIFY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TRIGGERS, CONTROL VIOLENT IMPULSES, AND RECOGNIZE AND REPORT SIGNS OF ABUSE, AND TO PROVIDE A STATUS REPORT WITHIN 90 DAYS
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or Mayor's designee to work with delegate agencies, the Head Start Policy Council and the Community Action Agency Board to develop a curriculum (Curriculum) for teaching early childhood students enrolled in the County's Head Start program about domestic violence, including how to identify domestic violence triggers, control violent impulses, and recognize and report signs of abuse. The proposed resolution further directs the County Mayor or Mayor's designee to provide a report on development of the Curriculum, and place the report on a BCC agenda pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65 within 90 days of the effective date of this resolution.</p> <p><u>Background:</u> Domestic violence is a pattern of controlling behaviors – violence or threats of violence – that one person uses to establish power over a current or former spouse, intimate partner or family or household member in order to control that person's actions and activities. Domestic violence may include threats, physical violence, sexual assault, stalking, kidnapping and many other types of unwanted behavior or any criminal offense resulting in physical injury or death and can happen to anyone, regardless of age, religion, or social, economic, ethnic or educational background.</p> <p>According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, a woman is assaulted or beaten every nine seconds in the United States and one-third of women and one-fourth of men will encounter some form of physical violence from an intimate partner within their lifetimes. Only 34 percent of victims hurt by their intimate partners receive medical care for their wounds and one in 15 children are exposed to domestic violence each year. Many children who witness domestic violence at home suffer silently because the abuse remains a family secret as fears of reprisal, escalated violence, financial ruin, deportation, and other factors make it difficult for many victims of domestic violence to report crimes committed against them.</p> <p>Children exposed to domestic violence at home are at risk of post-traumatic stress, depression, and anxiety, as well as low self-esteem, and poor school performance and children who see domestic violence at home may grow up to become domestic violence aggressors themselves. Education is crucial to encouraging children to report domestic violence and to break deep-rooted patterns and cycles of abuse.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Relevant Legislation:</u></p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>On December 1, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1117-15, directed the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to seek collaboration of the Miami-Dade County School Board (School Board) in providing a domestic violence education program to elementary, middle and high school students (the Program); to research resources (Resources) with which to launch the Program; and to report back to the BCC with a plan for funding and implementing the Program and to place the completed report on an agenda of the BCC pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65 within 90 days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>During the BCC meeting, R-1117-15 was amended to include the collaboration of charter schools in providing a domestic violence education program to elementary, middle and high school students.</i> <p>On December 1, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1118-15, directed the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to establish the Domestic Violence Trust Fund (Trust Fund) to be administered by the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee for the sole purpose of receiving private sector, tax deductible donations in support of a County program to educate children about domestic violence (the Program).</p>
11A17 152793	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PROCEED WITH A PILOT PROGRAM FOR ADAPTATION ACTION AREAS RELATED TO SEA LEVEL RISE AND THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to actively proceed with the pilot program for Adaptation Action Areas and "area planning for newly-identified vulnerable areas," as discussed in the Sea Level Rise Task Force (Status Report).</p> <p>Background: In 2013, pursuant to Resolution No. R-599-13, the BCC created the Miami-Dade County Sea Level Rise Task Force and subsequently adopted multiple resolutions in order to implement the recommendations of the Sea Level Rise Task Force, and some of those resolutions required that reports subsequently be presented to the BCC. On October 23, 2015, the County Mayor submitted the Second Quarter Status Report in Response to Multiple Resolutions Pertaining to Recommendations by the Status Report, and this Status Report includes a feasibility assessment for Adaptation Action Areas, as requested by Resolution No. R-44-15.</p> <p>As described in more detail in the Status Report, Adaptation Action Areas may be designated in a local government's Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) to identify those areas that experience coastal flooding due to extreme high tides and storm surge and that are vulnerable to the related impacts of rising sea levels, for the purpose of prioritizing funding for infrastructure needs and adaptation planning. The feasibility assessment for Adaptation Action Areas in the Status Report discussed four different approaches, and recommended the fourth approach, referred to as "area planning for newly-identified vulnerable areas," at least on a pilot program basis. "Area planning for newly-identified vulnerable areas" would involve using the best available science on vulnerable areas, including the results of the United States Geological Survey's integrated surface and groundwater modeling for Miami-Dade County, in order to designate Adaptation Action Areas on the basis of their vulnerability to rising sea levels and related impacts.</p> <p>Although the Status Report acknowledged that a more comprehensive vulnerability analysis is needed to carry out the above-mentioned approach, pilot Adaptation Action Areas could be selected based on available information. The Status Report's "Recommended Next Steps" includes thorough and well thought out plans of how Miami-Dade County could begin such a pilot program, including how to select the initial pilot locations and how to involve and collaborate with interested municipalities, and such a program may ultimately involve the identification of specific problems and possible solutions.</p>
11A18 152795	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR DESIGNEE TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT A REPORT TO THE BOARD SETTING FORTH THE COUNTY'S MARINA CAPACITY AND PROVIDING A LONG-TERM PLAN FOR ADDRESSING SHORTAGES IN MARINA CAPACITY
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution directs the Mayor or Mayor's designee to prepare a written report setting forth the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing extent of boat storage capacity in County-operated marina facilities (including dry and wet storage) and how capacity is anticipated to change in the next five years; • How many individuals are on waiting lists for each of the County-operated marina facilities; • Whether changes to the County's pricing structure for marina facilities would ameliorate shortages (e.g., by charging County residents a discounted amount versus non-County residents); • What County properties are suitable for marina development; and • The County's long-term plan for addressing the existing marina shortage issues. <p>The County Mayor or designee will provide the report to the BCC within 180 days of the effective date of this resolution and will place the completed report on an agenda of the BCC pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65.</p> <p>Additional Information: During the BCC meeting on December 1, 2015, File No. 152818, relating to the storage of recreational vehicles or private watercraft, was adopted on first reading. The proposed ordinance directs the County Mayor or Mayor's Designee to temporarily suspend application of Section 33-20(e),(f),(h)(7), and (h)(8) of the Miami-Dade County Code for storage of recreational vehicles or private watercraft meeting the following limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational vehicles and camping equipment will not exceed the maximum length, width, height and weight permitted under applicable provisions of the motor vehicle laws of the State of Florida; provided, however, the maximum length will not exceed forty (40) feet, the maximum width will not exceed eight feet, six inches (8' 6") and the maximum height will not exceed fourteen (14) feet; and • Boats will not exceed forty (40) feet in maximum length, one hundred and two (102) inches in maximum width, and fourteen (14) feet in maximum height.

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	The moratorium will expire upon enactment of any new ordinance(s) or resolution(s) addressing the underlying complaints or one year from the effective date of this ordinance, whichever date is earliest.
11A19 160009	RESOLUTION URGING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S ADMINISTRATION TO REFRAIN FROM ESTABLISHING A CUBAN CONSULATE IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
Notes	The proposed resolution urges President Barack Obama's administration to refrain from establishing a Cuban consulate in Miami-Dade County and directs the County's federal lobbyists to advocate against this and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2016 Federal Legislative Package when it is presented to the BCC.
11A20 153013	RESOLUTION OPPOSING SB 750 AND HB 563, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD, AMONG OTHER THINGS, CHANGE HOW TEMPORARY CASH ASSISTANCE BENEFITS ARE CALCULATED FOR FAMILIES THAT INCLUDE AN UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANT BY COUNTING THE ENTIRE SALARY - RATHER THAN JUST A PART OF IT - OF A LOW-INCOME UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANT AGAINST HIS OR HER FAMILY'S BENEFITS
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution opposes SB 750 and HB 563, or similar legislation that would, among other things, change how temporary cash assistance benefits are calculated for families that include an undocumented immigrant by counting the entire salary - rather than just a part of it - of a low-income undocumented immigrant against his or her family's benefits.</p> <p>The proposed resolution directs the County's state lobbyists to oppose the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 state legislative package to include this item.</p>
11A21 153020	RESOLUTION URGING THE U.S. CONGRESS AND THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AS WELL AS THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE AND THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER SERVICES, TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL RELIEF TO FARMERS IMPACTED BY HISTORIC RAINFALLS IN SOUTH FLORIDA DURING DECEMBER 2015
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as well as the Florida Legislature and the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, to provide financial relief to farmers impacted by historic rainfalls in South Florida during December 2015; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Florida Congressional Delegation, the U.S. Senate President, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Commissioner of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Governor, the Florida Commissioner of Agriculture, the Florida Senate President, the Florida House Speaker, and the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade State Legislative Delegation; and • Directs the County's federal and state lobbyists to advocate for the legislation and appropriation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2016 Federal Legislative Package and to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item. <p>Background: December 2015 was one of the wettest on record for South Florida, with more than 8 inches of rain falling in just the first two weeks of the month, and some areas receiving significantly more. Farmlands in southwest Miami-Dade County and in and around Homestead were particularly impacted, with some areas having received up to 15 inches of rain in a 48-hour period, way more than water management systems can handle at any one time. Even weeks after the heavy rains subsided, some farms remained underwater despite nonstop pumping, with high tides continuing to flood fields twice a day.</p> <p>The County's more than 80,000 acres of farmland supply much of the winter vegetables east of the Mississippi River and, according to the 2012 Census of Agriculture, amounted to sales of about \$592 million. Farmlands in the County remain susceptible to impacts from rain and flooding, as this winter is predicted to bring above normal rainfall due to a strong El Niño in the Pacific Ocean, which is expected to last through the spring. The Dade County Farm Bureau has called upon state officials to declare a state of emergency due to the significant crop loss caused by the heavy rains and flooding in early December and Adam Putnam, Florida's Commissioner of Agriculture, has expressed an intention for the state to work with the U.S. Department of Agriculture on assessing the damage and providing growers with as much assistance as possible.</p> <p>Additional Information - Miami-Dade sees record rain for December - December 5, 2015, Miami Herald⁸:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Five days into the month on Saturday, Miami had received enough rainfall for December to rank as the third "wettest" in history with a total 7.67 inches, the National Weather Service reported.</i> • <i>Only the Decembers of 1929 and 1905 have seen more rainfall — but this month is only a week old.</i> • <i>The reason behind this month's record rainfall? A front that rolled down the state and then stalled out over South Florida, pulling up extra moisture from the south, Ross said.</i> • <i>All day Saturday a steady, soggy drumbeat of rain fell across South Florida: 2.4 inches in West Palm Beach, 4.8 inches in Fort Lauderdale, 2.9 inches in Miami, and 8.5 inches in West Kendall-Tamiami.</i> • <i>Inundated streets, parking lots and fields were testimony to the persistent precipitation as the NWS issued urban flood warnings for Kendall, Goulds and the Redland.</i> • <i>Homebound and bored but still receiving reliable Internet service, some residents of South Miami-Dade vented their rain-soaked frustrations on the social media site, Twitter.</i>
11A22 153023	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING H.R. 4226 OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PROVIDE FINANCIAL RELIEF FOR FARMERS IMPACTED BY THE ORIENTAL FRUIT FLY
Notes	The proposed resolution:

⁸ <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/local/community/miami-dade/article48236745.html>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports H.R. 4226 or similar legislation that would provide financial relief for farmers impacted by the Oriental Fruit Fly; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit certified copies of this resolution to U.S. Representatives Carlos Curbelo and Gwen Graham, and the remaining members of the Florida Congressional Delegation; and • Directs the County’s federal lobbyists to advocate for the passage of legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2016 Federal Legislative Package when it is presented to the BCC. <p>Background: On December 10, 2015, U.S. Representatives Carlos Curbelo (R-Miami) and Gwen Graham (D-Panama City) introduced H.R. 4226 to Provide Relief for Farmers Impacted by the Oriental Fruit Fly. H.R. 4226 would amend the Agriculture Act of 2014 to provide supplemental disaster assistance to producers who have incurred market and production losses of their crop due to a federal or state government quarantine to control the Oriental Fruit Fly. H.R. 4226 would direct the U.S. Department of Agriculture Secretary to make mandatory funds available from the Commodity Credit Corporation, a government corporation partially tasked with helping to support disaster assistance programs to farmers.</p> <p>Funds administered via H.R. 4226 would be made available to reimburse eligible farmers and producers that have incurred losses because of an inability to ship their crops to market or from planting and growing their crop due to the quarantine. The U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) has quarantined a 98-square mile area around the core areas where detections have been made in order to prevent the spread of the fly.</p> <p>On September 15, 2015, Florida Commissioner of Agriculture Adam H. Putnam declared a state of agricultural emergency due to the Oriental Fruit Fly infestation in Miami-Dade County. The FDACS has also treated several areas with pesticides, removed fruit from host trees, and set up fly detection systems throughout Miami-Dade County to monitor the infestation. The quarantine is expected to last until late February 2016, or when state and federal officials decide to lift the embargo.</p> <p>The Oriental Fruit Fly is considered one of the most invasive and economically costly pests because it attacks more than 430 different fruits, vegetables, and nuts. Since the first detection of the Oriental Fruit Fly in August 2015, over 150 flies have been detected in Miami-Dade County and the Oriental Fruit Fly threatens Florida’s \$123 billion agriculture industry and, locally, Miami-Dade County’s \$1.6 billion industry and 11,000 jobs.</p> <p>Additional Information - Florida declares farming emergency to deal with Asian fruit flies in Miami-Dade – September 15, 2015, Miami Herald⁹:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Florida’s agriculture commissioner declared a state of emergency Tuesday to deal with an outbreak of an aggressive Asian fruit fly in part of Miami-Dade County’s fertile farmlands.</i> • <i>The declaration allows Agriculture Commissioner Adam Putnam to expand state authority and tap into additional resources, including law enforcement, to control the largest outbreak on record and maintain an 85-square-mile quarantine in the Redland, home to tropical fruit groves and some of the region’s largest packing houses.</i> • <i>The largest outbreak of Oriental fruit flies in state history led Agriculture Commissioner Adam Putnam to declare a state of emergency Tuesday. University of Florida Institute of Food and Agriculture Services</i> • <i>As of Tuesday, the state had destroyed more than eight tons of infested fruit and trapped 158 flies.</i> • <i>Traps first detected flies in the area on Aug. 28, about two weeks after a single fly turned up in an almond tree in Kendall. Another fly turned up last week southeast of Miami International Airport, but the outbreak appears to be contained to the Redland.</i> • <i>The state is working with the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s smuggling interdiction team to find the source of the flies, said Florida agriculture spokesman. Because so many flies appeared so quickly, officials suspect an infested shipment of fruit was dumped.</i> • <i>Oriental fruit flies have been turning up in Florida for more than a decade, but never in such large numbers. As part of the state’s pest management program, about 56,000 traps are monitored statewide. But since 1999, the flies have been trapped in fewer than 10 locations and usually only one at a time.</i> • <i>The appearance of the Oriental fruit fly raises serious concern because it infests such a wide array of fruits and vegetables, including tomatoes, bananas, peppers, mangoes and avocado, or about 95 percent of the crops grown in South Florida. In Hawaii, where it was accidentally introduced in the 1940s, the fly now infects almost every commercial fruit crop, except pineapple and sugarcane. California, the only other state infested by the flies, has battled outbreaks every year since 1966, according to the California Department of Food and Agriculture.</i> • <i>Female flies inject their eggs into fruit, which the larvae in turn feed on, making any infested produce unsuitable for sale.</i> • <i>To deal with the outbreak, state workers have set an additional 674 traps, the Florida agriculture spokesman said. Male traps are more effective so efforts typically focus on catching males.</i> • <i>Workers are also using an organic insecticide to drench soil up to about 1,300 feet around fruit infested with fly larvae. So far, the larvae have only been found in mangoes on a single property, he said. The quarantine, which can only be lifted after 90 fly-free days, bans the removal of fruits or plants without a treatment plan approved by the state. About 460 plans have been approved.</i> • <i>In addition to expanding the state’s authority to treat the flies, a spokeswoman said it also emphasizes the seriousness of the outbreak. The region produces much of the nation’s winter crops, including tomatoes, and represents about \$1.6 billion of the state’s \$123 billion agricultural industry.</i>

⁹ <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/local/environment/article35324667.html>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
11A23 153024	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SB 912, HB 761, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REQUIRE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL SECURITY MEASURES AT RETAIL PETROLEUM FUEL STATIONS THAT WOULD HINDER OR PROHIBIT THE UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS OF CUSTOMER PAYMENT CARD INFORMATION AND INCREASE CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR POSSESSION OR USE OF COUNTERFEIT CREDIT CARDS OR ILLEGALLY OBTAINED CREDIT CARD INFORMATION
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Senate Bill (SB) 912 and House Bill (HB) 761, or similar legislation that would require implementation of additional security measures at retail petroleum fuel stations that would hinder or prohibit the unauthorized access of customer payment card information or increase criminal penalties for possession or use of counterfeit credit cards or illegally obtained credit card information; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit certified copies of the resolution to the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, Senator Anitere Flores, Representative Dana Young, and the Chair and the remaining members of the Miami-Dade State Legislative Delegation; • Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package previously approved by the BCC board to include this item. <p>Background: Senate Bill 912 (SB 912) and House Bill 761 (HB 761) have been filed for consideration during the 2016 session of the Florida Legislature by Senator Anitere Flores (R – Miami) and Representative Dana Young (R – Tampa), respectively. The proposed legislation would, among other things, help protect consumers from identity theft at gas station pumps by: (1) requiring self-service fuel dispensers to use certain security measures to prevent theft of consumer financial information; (2) increasing enforcement authority against those who possess or traffic fraudulent credit cards; (3) reclassifying the crime of unlawful conveyance of fuel, which increases the maximum sentence; and (4) increasing the offense level of the crime, which affects the sentencing guidelines. In particular, the proposed legislation could help protect consumers from credit card skimmers. Credit card skimmers are devices that thieves install on equipment that accepts payment via a credit or debit card to illegally capture and steal the customer's credit or debit card information.</p> <p>The use of credit card skimmers at gas stations across the state is a growing concern as the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services estimates that each credit card skimmer victimizes between 100 and 5,000 consumers and steals an average of \$1,000 per consumer, which represents an impact of approximately \$100,000 to \$5,000,000 per skimmer. In response to this problem, the Florida Commissioner of Agriculture has authorized statewide sweeps to be conducted at gas stations throughout 2015. Since March 2015, inspectors with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services have uncovered 166 skimmers used for identity theft at Florida gas stations. Many of these skimmers were installed in Miami-Dade County. In a three-month period, the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services found 16 skimmers at gas stations in Miami-Dade County, which represented a total of approximately 16 percent of all skimmers uncovered at Florida gas stations during that time.</p> <p>Additional Information - Officials look to crack down on credit-cardskimmers - Sun Sentinel - December 13, 2015¹⁰:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Drivers should feel less at risk using their credit cards at the pump if the Legislature passes a new bill to crack down on credit-cardskimmers.</i> • <i>The bill requires harsher penalties for identity thieves and beefed up security at gas stations -- the most common target of credit-cardskimmers. It comes as identity theft of all kinds is on the rise, with 13.1 million victims nationwide in 2014, up 500,000 from two years before.</i> • <i>The use of skimmers to commit fraud would become a second-degree felony as opposed to a third degree one, which means a prison sentence with a maximum of 15 years instead of five. The bill also makes it mandatory for gas station owners to tape the opening of the cabinets in their gas pumps. Broken tape would alert people the cabinet has been opened.</i> • <i>The bill will be considered during the next legislative session, which takes place Jan. 12 to March 10. It already has strong support in the House as well, where it is championed by House Majority Leader Dana Young, R-Tampa.</i> • <i>Last spring, after an uptick in people reporting their creditcard information stolen, state inspectors began checking gas stations statewide for credit-cardskimmers. The hard-to-notice devices fit into the slots at gas station pumps and ATMs, storing creditcard information to be passed along to the thieves that implant them.</i> • <i>With skimmers easily purchased on the Internet, thieves could be anyone. In one recent case, the store manager of a Champs Sports in the Sawgrass Mills Mall was arrested for the crime. In another, two Florida men were arrested by police in Kennewick, Wash. for planting skimmers around the city.</i> • <i>In their three-month investigation, the Florida Agriculture Department inspectors found 103 skimmers at 7,571 gas stations throughout Florida. A single Shell station in Miami had three of them, the only station with that many.</i> • <i>In announcing his support of the legislation, Agriculture Commissioner Adam Putnam noted the number of Floridians affected could be anywhere from 100 to 5,000 this year, with victims losing \$1,000 on average</i> • <i>In the meantime, the department has these tips for avoiding the skimmers:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Pay cash. It's the only sure-fire way of protecting your credit-card information.</i> ○ <i>Make sure no one has tampered with the pump. Many pumps already have yellow tape across their cabinets to show they've been inspected. If the tape is broken, don't use the pump.</i> ○ <i>Use a gas pump closer to the store. Identity thieves tend to place credit-cardskimmers at pumps furthest away from the store in order to avoid detection.</i> ○ <i>If you have to use a card, take credit over debit. Credit cards usually have better fraud protection.</i>

¹⁰ <http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/159B5C4E16F09AB8?p=NewsBank>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>If you have to use a debit card, call it a creditcard anyway. When the pump asks whether you're using a debit card, say no, even if it is a debit. That way, you avoid inputting your PIN number and essentially handing over your bank account to thieves.</i>
11A24 153025	RESOLUTION OPPOSING SB 118, HB 9, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD MAKE IT A CRIME UNDER FLORIDA LAW TO REENTER THE STATE AFTER BEING DENIED ADMISSION OR REMOVED FROM THE UNITED STATES OR AFTER DEPARTING THE UNITED STATES WHILE AN ORDER OF REMOVAL IS OUTSTANDING
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the Florida Legislature to oppose SB 118, HB 9, or similar legislation that would make it a crime under Florida law to reenter the state after being denied admission or removed from the United States or after departing the United States while an order of removal is outstanding; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, Senator Travis Hutson, Representative Carlos Trujillo and the Chair and remaining Members of the Miami-Dade County State Legislative Delegation; and • Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate against the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item. <p>Background: Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution grants the federal government with the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization. In furtherance of that authority, the federal government has enacted an extensive and comprehensive framework of immigration laws including, but not limited to, criminal penalties for individuals who reenter the United States after being denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed or after departing the United States while an order of deportation is outstanding unless certain limited circumstances exist, such as attaining consent to reapply by the United States Attorney General.</p> <p>Senate Bill (SB) 118 and House Bill (HB) 9 have been filed for consideration during the 2016 session of the Florida Legislature by Senator Travis Hutson (R – Palm Coast) and Representative Carlos Trujillo (R - Doral), respectively. The current version of these bills would make it a third degree felony under Florida law for any individual to reenter or be found in the state if he or she has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed, or has departed the United States while an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal is outstanding, unless he or she has attained consent from the United State Attorney General to reapply for admission or has established that he or she was not required to obtain advance consent under federal law. This legislation would create a nearly identical prohibition under state law for a prohibition that already exists under federal law, 8 U.S.C. § 1326, and impose a maximum sentence (five years) that is greater than the maximum sentence under federal law (two years). Similar efforts by other states have been struck down by the United States Supreme Court as being preempted by federal law. The Supreme Court found in Arizona, 132 S.Ct. at 2498, that "it is fundamental that foreign countries [and family members] concerned about the status, safety, and security of their nationals in the United States must be able to confer and communicate on this subject with one national sovereign, not the 50 separate states".</p>
11A25 160041	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO AMEND THE MARCHMAN ACT SO THAT THE PROCEDURES FOR THE INVOLUNTARY ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE SUBSTANCE ABUSE IMPAIRED ARE MORE SIMILAR TO BAKER ACT PROCEDURES FOR THE INVOLUNTARY EXAMINATION AND TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE A MENTAL ILLNESS
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution urges the Florida Legislature to amend the Marchman Act to the extent permitted by law so that the procedures for the involuntary assessment and treatment of individuals who are substance abuse impaired are more similar to the procedures in the Baker Act for the involuntary examination and treatment of individuals who have a mental illness.</p> <p>The proposed resolution directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the issues above, and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item.</p>
11A26 153019	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO ENACT SB 1152, HB 67, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ENCOURAGE THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES TO DESIGNATE A SPECIFIED NUMBER OF SECURE LOCATIONS THROUGHOUT THE STATE TO SERVE AS STATE SAFE HAVENS FOR SALES TRANSACTIONS RELATED TO ITEMS OR SERVICES ON CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENT WEBSITES AND LIMIT THE LIABILITY OF THE STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, AND THE OFFICERS, EMPLOYEES, AND AGENTS OF THE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS THAT PROVIDE STATE AND LOCAL SAFE HAVEN FACILITIES
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the Florida Legislature to enact Senate Bill (SB) 1152, House Bill (HB) 67, or similar legislation that would encourage the Florida Department of Management Services to designate a specified number of secure locations throughout the state to serve as state safe havens for sales transactions related to items or services on classified advertisement websites and limit the liability of the state, local governments, and the officers, employees, and agents of the state and local governments that provide state and local safe haven facilities; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Governor, the Senate President, the House Speaker, Senator Miguel Diaz de la Portilla, Representative Barbara Watson, and the Chair and remaining Members of the Miami-Dade County State Legislative Delegation; and • Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item. <p>Background: People list items for sale and purchase items on classified advertisement websites, however such sites do not oversee how their users conduct the sale of items posted on the site. Classified advertisement websites have become a popular place for criminals to prey on individuals and in recent years, there have been a number of cases in South Florida which people selling cellphones, computers, or other</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>valuable goods on classified advertisement websites have been targeted by criminals who intend to rob them or commit other criminal acts when they meet to exchange goods for cash.</p> <p>In response to robberies in the Cities of Sunrise and Weston, the Broward County Sheriff's Office announced in July 2014 that its Weston substation would serve as a safe haven for anyone seeking to complete an internet sales transaction. Police in the City of Boca Raton announced the same safe haven plan in early 2014 after there were three armed robberies in a three week period that began as cellphone and computer sales via a classified advertisement website. Police in the Cities of Sunrise, Fort Lauderdale, Delray Beach, and Boynton Beach have announced that they have no formal program, but that the public is welcome to complete transactions at police stations during regular business hours if it makes them feel safer.</p> <p>On December 14, 2014, the BCC passed Resolution No. R-1147-14 urging the Florida Legislature to enact legislation that would deter criminal activity associated with internet sales transactions by designating state safe haven facilities and encouraging local governments to designate local safe haven facilities. Thereafter, Senate Bill (SB) 286 and House Bill (HB) 323 were filed by Senator Miguel Diaz de la Portilla (R – Miami) and Representative Barbara Watson (D – Miami Gardens), respectively, for consideration during the 2015 session of the Florida Legislature.</p> <p>SB 286 would have encouraged the designation of a specified number of state safe haven facilities and encouraged local governments to approve the use of public local governmental buildings as local safe haven facilities and HB 323 would have designated a specified number of state safe haven facilities and authorized the use of state or local governmental buildings to serve as safe haven facilities. Neither SB 286 nor HB 323 was enacted during the 2015 session.</p> <p>On February 3, 2015, the BCC passed Resolution No. R-126-15 directing the Mayor or Mayor's designee to examine the feasibility and availability of providing safe haven locations in Miami-Dade County. The Mayor's report in response to Resolution No. R-126-15 identified four locations in Miami-Dade County that could serve as local safe haven facilities.</p> <p><u>Additional Information - Craigslist-related robberies prompt Weston, Boca police to offer safe space for transactions - July 22, 2014, Sun Sentinel¹¹:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Forget about dark alleys. Craigslist is becoming a popular place for criminals to lurk, so South Florida police agencies are opening their doors to online buyers and sellers looking to close a danger-free deal.</i> • <i>There have been at least five cases in South Florida since June 4 in which people selling cellphones or computers through Craigslist have been targeted by robbers when they met to exchange goods for cash.</i> • <i>The Broward Sheriff's Office announced that its Weston substation, 17300 Royal Palm Blvd., would serve as a safe haven for anyone seeking to complete such a transaction. The move comes in response to robberies in Weston and Sunrise.</i> • <i>Boca Raton police announced the same safe haven plan two weeks ago after three armed robberies in three weeks that began as cellphone and computer sales via Craigslist.</i> • <i>Sunrise, Fort Lauderdale, Delray Beach and Boynton Beach police say they have no formal program, but that the public is welcome to complete transactions at police stations during regular business hours if it makes them feel safer.</i>
11A27 153026	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO ENACT SB 604, HB 439, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD EXPAND JAIL DIVERSION PROGRAMS AND OTHER TREATMENT OPTIONS FOR INMATES WITH MENTAL ILLNESS
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the Florida Legislature to adopt Senate Bill (SB) 604, House Bill (HB) 439, or similar legislation that would expand jail diversion programs and other treatment options for inmates with mental illness; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, Senator Miguel Diaz de la Portilla, Representative Charles McBurney, and the Chair and remaining Members of the Miami-Dade County State Legislative Delegation; and • Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the legislative action and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item. <p><u>Background:</u></p> <p>Mental illness can affect anyone, regardless of age, religion, or social, economic, ethnic or educational background; mental illness diagnoses are made to men, women, elderly and children. People with mental illness may be more visible to law enforcement and vulnerable to arrest due to delusional, psychotic or nuisance behaviors, homelessness or substance abuse and are often jailed for minor offenses, such as trespassing, disorderly conduct or disturbing the peace, which contributes to the criminalization of such individuals rather than long term treatment. Individuals with mental illness who are jailed tend to stay in jail longer than those without mental illness, return to jail more often and require more medical services and monitoring than other inmates.</p> <p>Florida prisons and jails are the state's largest mental health treatment facilities; individuals with mental illness in Florida jails and prisons outnumber those in state mental hospitals and according to Florida TaxWatch, the number of prisoners with mental illness increased by 112 percent between 1996 and 2014. In December 2014, the Florida Council for Community Mental Health reported that, on any given day in Florida, there are approximately 16,000 prison inmates and 15,000 local jail detainees with a serious mental illness, and that annually as many as 125,000 people with a mental illness requiring treatment are arrested and booked into Florida jails.</p>

¹¹ http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2014-07-22/news/fl-craigslist-crime-safe-haven-20140722_1_boca-police-boynton-beach-police-police-perimeter

Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>According to a recent series in the Tampa Bay Times and Sarasota Herald-Tribune, Florida spends at least \$50 million annually on mental health treatment to attain competency of individuals charged with nonviolent crimes which will not result in prison time and although the state expends a significant amount of funding to ensure criminal defendants are competent to face charges, it does not offer programs or services to support continued competency after treatment.</p> <p>Companion House and Senate bills have been filed for consideration during the 2016 session of the Florida Legislature, Senate Bill (SB) 604 by Senator Miguel Diaz de la Portilla (R – Miami) and House Bill (HB) 439 by Representative Charles McBurney (R – Jacksonville). SB 604 and HB 439 would, among other things, allow counties to create forensic hospital diversion pilot programs, create and fund treatment-based mental health courts and programs, direct individuals charged with crimes and diagnosed with mental illness to medical treatment facilities instead of correctional facilities, expand the definition of veteran for participation in veterans’ court, permit a defendant with a mental illness to participate in pretrial mental health court programs, and allow judges to require offenders to participate in post-adjudicatory treatment-based mental health programs, subject to eligibility criteria. The measures proposed in SB 604 and HB 439 would create a statewide framework for counties to provide alternatives to incarceration of individuals being prosecuted who have mental illness, offer support for community reintegration, provide access to and improve the quality of life of those receiving treatment, improve public safety by reducing criminal recidivism, reduce costs of treatment and incarceration and help reverse the trend of jails and prisons functioning as mental health facilities.</p>
11A28 153028	RESOLUTION OPPOSING SB 872 AND HB 675, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PREEMPT POLICIES SET BY THIS BOARD RELATED TO IMMIGRATION DETAINER REQUESTS
Notes	The proposed resolution opposes SB 872 and HB 675, or similar legislation that would preempt policies set by this Board related to immigration detainer requests and directs the County’s state lobbyists to oppose the passage of such legislation, and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item.
11A29 160020	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO INCREASE FUNDING TO MENTAL HEALTH HOSPITALS TO SUPPORT INCREASED STAFFING AND IMPLEMENT ENHANCED SAFETY MEASURES
Notes	The proposed resolution urges the Florida Legislature to increase funding to mental health hospitals to support increased staffing and implement enhanced safety measures and directs the County’s state lobbyists to advocate for the funding, and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item.
11A30 160029	RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESS TO REINSTATE THE FEDERAL ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN; URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO IMPOSE A STATE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN; ALTERNATIVELY, URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO LIFT THE PREEMPTION ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS’ REGULATION OF ASSAULT WEAPONS IN FLORIDA AND ALLOW LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO IMPOSE AN ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges Congress to reinstate the federal assault weapons ban; • Urges the Florida Legislature to impose a state ban on assault weapons; • Alternatively, urges the Florida Legislature to lift the preemption on local governments’ regulation of assault weapons and allow local governments to impose an assault weapons ban; • Directs the County’s federal and State lobbyists to advocate for the legislation; and • Authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include these issues, and to include this item in the 2016 Federal Legislative Package when it is presented to the BCC.
11A31 153021	RESOLUTION URGING THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION TO HIRE, TRAIN AND STAFF ADDITIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS AT MIAMI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the Federal Aviation Administration to hire, train and staff additional air traffic controllers at Miami International Airport; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the members of the Florida Congressional Delegation and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; and • Directs the County’s federal lobbyists to advocate for action. <p>Background: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) hires, trains and staffs air traffic controllers at airports throughout the country and more than 14,000 federal air traffic controllers in airport traffic control towers, terminal radar approach facilities and air route traffic control centers guide pilots through the system. Air traffic controllers provide air navigation services to aircraft in domestic airspace, including 24.6 million square miles of international oceanic airspace. Air traffic controller teams in airport towers and radar approach control facilities watch over all aircraft traveling through the terminal airspace, organize the flow of aircraft into and out of an airport, closely monitor each aircraft to ensure a safe distance between aircraft, guide pilots during takeoff and landing and keep pilots informed about changes in weather conditions.</p> <p>In September 2014, the FAA issued a comprehensive workforce plan entitled, “A Plan for the Future: 10-year Strategy for the Air Traffic Control Workforce 2015-2024” and according to the plan, in 2014 the FAA planned to hire 1,772 air traffic controllers to replace controllers lost to attrition, but only hired 1,178 air traffic controllers. The FAA was unable to hire enough air traffic controllers to meet its demand due to budget cuts and past government shutdowns that closed the FAA’s controller training academy for nine months, resulting in a delay of initial training for several classes of new air traffic controllers. The National Air Traffic Controllers Association reports that air traffic control towers are understaffed and at their lowest staff in 27 years. The FAA expects to lose almost 1,400 controllers due to retirements, promotions and other losses this fiscal year.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
11A32 153022	RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESS TO ENACT THE AIRPORT SECURITY ENHANCEMENT AND OVERSIGHT ACT, S. 2361, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PROVIDE ENHANCED SECURITY AT U.S. AIRPORTS
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges Congress to enact the Airport Security Enhancement and Oversight Act, S. 2361, or similar legislation that would provide enhanced security at U.S. airports; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to U.S. Senators Bill Nelson and John Thune, and the remaining Members of the Florida Congressional Delegation; and • Directs the County's federal lobbyists to advocate for the legislation and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2016 Federal Legislative Package when it is presented to the BCC. <p>Background: The Airport Security Enhancement and Oversight Act was introduced to the U.S. Senate on December 7, 2015 by U.S. Senators Bill Nelson (D-Florida) and John Thune (R-South Dakota). The proposed bill would tighten internal security at airports across the country by enhancing background checks and requiring the Transportation and Security Administration (TSA) to increase employment screening of aviation workers at over 450 U.S. airports. The proposed bill would also allow TSA to access additional terrorism-related databases maintained by the federal government, increase the use of undercover "red teams" to test the security of secured areas at airports, and conduct a review of the insider threat posed by airport employees. The TSA does not currently have real-time access to the Terrorist Identities Datamart Environment, a database maintained by American central intelligence offices.</p> <p>Miami International Airport and Orlando International Airport are the only two major airports that currently conduct thorough daily employee security screenings however there is currently no federal requirement that airport employees at U.S. airports be screened when reporting to work.</p>
11A33 153027	RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESS AND THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO ALLOCATE FUNDING FOR PEDIATRIC CANCER RESEARCH AT NICKLAUS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL, HOLTZ CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL AND THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI SYLVESTER COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CENTER
Notes	The proposed resolution urges Congress and the Florida Legislature to allocate funding for pediatric cancer research at Nicklaus Children's Hospital, Holtz Children's Hospital and the University of Miami Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center and directs the County's federal and state lobbyists to advocate for the funding, and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item and to include this item in the 2016 Federal Legislative Package when it is presented to the BCC.
11A34 160032	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SB 584 AND HB 929, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PROVIDE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO IMPLEMENT FLOOD RISK REDUCTION POLICIES AND PROJECTS; AND URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO SEEK FUNDING FOR SB 584 AND HB 929 FROM NON-AMENDMENT 1 SOURCES
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports SB 584 and HB 929, or similar legislation that would provide technical and financial assistance to local governments to implement flood risk reduction policies and projects; • Urges the Florida Legislature to seek funding for SB 584 and HB 929 from non-Amendment 1 sources; • Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the legislative action; and • Authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item.
11A35 160039	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO ENACT SB 1174, HB 885, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE ADDITIONAL SITE SELECTION REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL HOMES
Notes	The proposed resolution urges the Florida Legislature to enact SB 1174, HB 885, or similar legislation that would create additional site selection requirements for community residential homes and directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the legislation, and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 State Legislative Package to include this item.
11A36 160040	RESOLUTION AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. R-911-15 TO REVISE THE BOARD'S STATE LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR THE 2016 LEGISLATIVE SESSION TO INCLUDE FUNDING FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY'S ENVIRONMENTALLY ENDANGERED LANDS PROGRAM FOR CONSERVATION LAND ACQUISITION AS A PRIORITY; WAIVING RESOLUTION NO. R-764-13 LIMITING THE NUMBER OF STATE LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amends Resolution No. R-911-15 to revise the BCC's state legislative priorities for the 2016 legislative session to include funding for Miami-Dade County's EEL Program for conservation land acquisition as a priority; • Waives Resolution No. R-764-13 to permit inclusion of more than 10 state legislative priorities; and • Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for this issue as a priority among the BCC's state legislative priorities for the 2016 session. <p>Background: The 2016 session of the Florida Legislature began on January 12, 2016 and on January 24, 2012, the BCC approved Resolution No. R-59-12, which directed the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, when it presents the proposed federal or state legislative agenda to the BCC, to include all "urging" resolutions and other resolutions related to federal or state legislation passed by the BCC to date for the current Congress or session.</p> <p>On September 17, 2013, the BCC approved Resolution No. R-764-13, which directed that the federal and state legislative packages each be presented to the BCC in two separate companion items, one consisting of no more than ten (10) priorities for distribution to the Miami-Dade Legislative Delegation and the other to include guiding principles, BCC "urging" resolutions enacted to date, and departmental items for approval by the BCC. On October 20, 2015, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-949-15, which urged the Florida Legislature to allocate funding for Miami-Dade County's Environmentally Endangered Lands (EEL) Program for conservation land acquisition and management pursuant to</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
January 20, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>the Florida Water and Land Conservation Initiative, Florida Constitutional Amendment 1. Resolution No. R-949-15 also urged the Florida Association of Counties to identify the issue of funding for the County's EEL Program as one of its priorities for the 2016 legislative session.</p> <p>On October 6, 2015, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-911-15, which approved ten state legislative priorities for the 2016 session and thereafter, the BCC added two additional priorities for the 2016 session, Resolution No. R-1022-15 which opposed legislation that would preempt local governments with respect to public works projects, and Resolution No. R-1161-15 which urged the Legislature and Florida Department of Transportation to provide funding for the acquisition of the 35-mile Homestead Rail Line.</p> <p>On November 4, 2014, 75.64 percent of Florida voters overwhelmingly approved Florida Constitutional Amendment 1, the Florida Water and Land Conservation Initiative, which authorizes no less than 33 percent of net revenues collected from the existing excise tax on real estate documents (stamp tax) to be used to acquire, restore, and improve land and water areas throughout Florida. The revenues collected pursuant to Amendment 1 may be used to help finance the acquisition and management of conservation land in Miami-Dade County.</p> <p>In 1990 the citizens of Miami-Dade County voted to create the Environmentally Endangered Lands Program (EEL Program), and approved a two-year property tax to fund the EEL Program's acquisition, protection, and maintenance of environmentally endangered lands. The EEL Program and its purchasing partners have brought more than 20,700 acres of environmentally endangered lands into public ownership within the County and manages 2,800 additional acres of natural lands within Miami-Dade County Parks.</p> <p><u>Additional Information on Relevant Legislation:</u></p> <p>On December 4, 2007 the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-1300-07 authorizing the EEL Program to bid on and to purchase tax deeds for properties that have been previously designated by the County Commission as Priority A properties on the EEL Acquisition List without further authorization by the Commission. The purchase price was to be less than or equal to either the appraised value of the tax-assessed value of the property. Tax deeds purchased by the EEL Program were to be reported annually to the County Commission.</p> <p>On January 21, 2015, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-47-15 directing the Mayor or Mayor's designee to continue strategic implementation of Miami-Dade County's Environmentally Endangered Lands (EEL) Program to identify additional potential longer-term funding sources for continued acquisition of EEL lands. Additionally, the Mayor was directed to prepare a report and quarterly status reports regarding the issues identified.</p> <p>During the 2015 state legislative session, the BCC passed Resolution No. R-173-15, which urged the state legislature to allocate funding for Miami-Dade County's EEL Program.</p> <p>Since the last Annual Report for the period of November 22, 2013 to December 31, 2014, no tax deed purchases were made by the EEL Program at auction.</p> <p><u>Additional Information on Mayoral Report regarding First Quarterly Status Report on Resolution No. R-47-15:</u></p> <p>On August 20, 2015, the Mayor issued a report regarding the First Quarterly Status Report on Resolution No. R-47-15.</p> <p>Quarter 1 Progress (January 31, 2015 – April 30, 2015) - Strategic Implementation through Acquisitions</p> <p>Between January 21, 2015 (the date the Board approved R-47-15) and April 9, 2015, the EEL Program has acquired 41.410 acres within the South Dade Wetlands EEL Preserve at a total cost of \$162,000 (\$75,000 in GOB and \$87,000 in EEL Trust Funds). This acreage includes the purchase of seven (7) folios ranging in size from five (5) acres to almost nine (9) acres.</p> <p>Potential Future Funding Sources</p> <p>Funding for acquiring properties on the EEL acquisition lists includes the EEL Acquisition Trust Fund and the Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond funds. These funding sources have been specifically designated for EEL land purchases by referendum and Board approval. Any other source of funding that becomes available for EEL purchase, such as grants, is also subject to approval by the Board. The EEL Program's land management activities are currently funded through the EEL Program's Management Fund. The EEL Program has been increasingly successful in the last few years at securing other funds for land management and at engaging community partners and volunteers to help meet unmet management needs in EEL Preserves. However, these are non-predictable remedies and do not provide long-term assurance that program activity levels can be sustained. Therefore, it is important that long-term and sustainable funding options be identified. One potential option includes allocation of funds made available under Florida Constitutional Amendment 1.</p> <p>Amendment 1 may result in more than \$10 billion over the next 20 years for conservation, management, and restoration of water and land resources. Miami-Dade County is the most populous county in Florida and generates a significant share of Florida's total stamp tax revenues which will be directed to Amendment 1 Programs.</p> <p>On February 18, 2015, the BCC approved Resolution No. R-173-15 urging the Florida Legislature to allocate funding for Miami-Dade County's EEL Program for conservation land acquisition and management pursuant to the Florida Water and Land Conservation Initiative, Florida Constitutional Amendment 1.</p>