



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

**Metropolitan Services Committee**

April 13, 2016

2:00 P.M.

Commission Chamber

**Research Division**

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

**Metropolitan Services Committee**  
**April 13, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
<b>1G1</b> <b>153014</b>	<p>ORDINANCE RELATED TO TOWING, RECOVERY, STORAGE AND IMMOBILIZATION OF VEHICLES WITHOUT CONSENT; AMENDING SECTION 30-461 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING DEFINITIONS; AMENDING SECTION 30-476 OF THE CODE; PROVIDING THAT MAXIMUM RATES FOR TOWING, RECOVERY, STORAGE AND IMMOBILIZATION WITHOUT CONSENT CAN BE ESTABLISHED BY ORDINANCE; ESTABLISHING REVISED MAXIMUM RATES FOR TOWING, RECOVERY AND STORAGE OF VEHICLES AT THE REQUEST OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS AND POLICE AGENCIES, AS WELL AS ALL OTHER TOWS WITHOUT PRIOR CONSENT OF THE VEHICLE OWNER OR A DULY AUTHORIZED DRIVER; INCORPORATING EXISTING IMMOBILIZATION RATES INTO THE CODE; RESCINDING RESOLUTION NOS. R-694-99, R-853-03 AND R-621-08; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed ordinance, relating to towing, recovery, storage and immobilization of vehicles without consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amends Section 30-461 of the Miami-Dade County code;</li> <li>• Amends Section 30-476 of the Miami-Dade County code;</li> <li>• Provides that maximum rates for towing, recovery, storage and immobilization without consent can be established by ordinance;</li> <li>• Establishes revised maximum rates for towing, recovery and storage of vehicles at the request of private property owners and police agencies, as well as all other police directed tows without prior consent of the vehicles owner or a duly authorized driver;</li> <li>• Incorporates existing immobilization rates into the code; and</li> <li>• Rescinds Resolution Nos. R-694-99, R-853-03 and R-621-08, which removes the \$3.00 gas surcharge currently charged by towing companies.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact Statement:</u></b>  Under the proposed ordinance, the maximum rates for police directed, non-consent tows of motor vehicles will increase; however, the maximum rates for private-property, non-consent tows and immobilization will remain the same and the \$3 gas surcharge will no longer be authorized for either type of tow.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance will have a minimal fiscal impact on Miami-Dade County. Implementation of this ordinance will not result in additional staffing needs or create future operational costs for the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources. However, there would be a minimum impact to the Miami-Dade Police Department. Per Florida Statute, the registered vehicle owners must pay for the first tow, regardless of circumstances; however, the law enforcement agency is responsible for any additional tows. Based on historical expenditures, the increase in fees will have an estimated impact of \$3,000 or less to the Miami-Dade Police Department on an annual basis.</p> <p><b><u>Social Equity Statement:</u></b>  Owners of vehicles towed or stored at the direction of the Miami-Dade Police Department will incur the cost associated with the rate increases, which in turn provides companies performing these types of services an opportunity to generate additional revenue. However, in the case of a vehicular accident where the police directs the tow, the owner’s insurance company may incur the expense depending on the type of insurance coverage.</p> <p>The rates for such police tows increase by approximately 15 percent in the proposed ordinance. The rates for private property (non-police directed), non-consent tow rates will also be codified through the proposed ordinance, but are not adjusted from the current amounts. Therefore, the companies performing private property, non-consent tows will not receive the same benefit as those performing police-directed, non-consent tows.</p> <p>Additionally, towing companies performing both police and private property directed, non-consent tows are currently authorized to charge a \$3.00 gas surcharge, which was established in 2008 as a result of increased fuel prices. The \$3.00 gas surcharge is currently charged by towing companies to the vehicle owner. The proposed ordinance removes the \$3.00 gas surcharge, which will benefit vehicle owners but also reduces the amount of revenue generate by towing companies.</p> <p><b><u>Background:</u></b>  Section 125.0103, Florida Statutes, authorizes counties to establish maximum rates which may be charged for the towing of vehicles from or immobilization of vehicles on private property, or as directed by law enforcement, without the consent of the vehicle’s owner or authorized operator. Article III of Chapter 30 of the Code of Miami-Dade County sets forth the County’s towing regulations and provides that the BCC will establish the maximum rates for towing, recovery, storage, and immobilization of vehicles at the direction of law enforcement or from private property at the request of the private property owner, without the consent of the vehicle owner or duly authorized driver (“non-consent tows”). Maximum rates provide a rate ceiling for non-consent tows, although individual towers may establish rates that are lower than the maximum permitted rates.</p> <p>On June 22, 1999, the BCC enacted Resolution No. R-694-99, which established the maximum rate for removal of an immobilization or booting device attached to a vehicle without prior consent of the owner or operator. In the past, the BCC periodically has set and subsequently increased the maximum rates for non-consent tows, most recently in 2003. On July 22, 2003, the BCC enacted Resolution No. R-853-03, which rescinded a prior resolution establishing towing rates, amongst other rates, and established new revised maximum rates for non-consent tows. Resolution No. R-853-03 also provided for an automatic increase in the maximum rates for non-consent tows of Class A vehicles based upon the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index (All Urban Customers Area: Transportation) for the 12 month period following the effective date of the Resolution.</p> <p>On June 3, 2008, the BCC enacted Resolution No. R-621-08, which authorized, as a result of increased diesel fuel prices, a fuel surcharge of up to \$3 per non consent tow until such time that the maximum towing rates established in R-853-03 are amended. But for the authorized</p>

**Metropolitan Services Committee**  
**April 13, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>fuel surcharge, it has been more than 11 years since an adjustment has been made to the maximum rates established by the BCC for non-consent tows.</p> <p>Industry costs have increased substantially, as evidenced by the 37 percent annualized inflation rate in the Consumer Price Index for Transportation and 31 percent annualized inflation rate in the Producer Price Index for Truck Transportation, over the period since the last rate increase.</p>
<b>Additional Information on Relevant Legislation</b>	
<p><b>R-130-99</b> 2/2/1999</p>	<p>R-130-99 rescinded Resolution No. R-1472-93 and established a revised maximum towing rate for Class A vehicles for companies providing towing services from private property at the request of the property owner, but without the consent of the vehicle owner, and a revised maximum towing rate for Class A vehicles for companies providing nonconsensual towing services requested by a police agency. Specifically, R-130-99 increased the rate by 10% to \$88.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>R-1472-93 increased the maximum rates set in 1989 to \$80 for Class A vehicles.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>R-99-70</b> 6/22/1999</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amended Section 30-461 pertaining to definitions;</li> <li>• Amended Section 30-470 pertaining to records required;</li> <li>• Amended Section 30-476 pertaining to maximum towing and storage rates for providing tow services at the request of property owners or police agencies;</li> <li>• Created Section 8A-479 pertaining to requirements for immobilizing vehicles without prior consent of a vehicle owner or duly authorized driver of a vehicle; and</li> <li>• Amended Section 8CC-10 to provide penalties of \$500 for failure to satisfy immobilization requirements.</li> </ul> <p><b>During the BCC meeting on June 22, 1999, the following was discussed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Director of Consumer Services indicated the proposed ordinance could be reviewed in one year to assess what was happening in the industry.</li> <li>• The proposed ordinance was amended to include a one year review.</li> </ul>
<p><b>R-694-99</b> 6/22/1999</p>	<p>R-694-99 established the maximum rate for the removal of an immobilization or booting device attached to a vehicle without the prior consent of the vehicle's owner or the duly authorized driver of the vehicle as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal rate - \$65.00</li> <li>• Removal rate where immobilization or booting device operator is still at scene - \$32.50</li> </ul> <p><b>During the BCC meeting on June 3, 2008, the following was discussed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Commission requested that the proposed resolution be amended to provide a rate structure and specify the procedure to release a vehicle at the scene prior to its being towed and that the issue of release on site be defined.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Commission noted the fees set in the foregoing resolution had a one year review period.</i></li> <li>• <i>In response to a question, the Director of Consumer Services indicated the towing rates in the County had just been raised from \$80 to \$88.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>R-853-03</b> 7/22/2003</p>	<p>R-853-03 rescinded R-130-99 and established new maximum rates for towing, recovery and storage of vehicles at the request of private property owners, police agencies, and all other tows without prior consent of the vehicle owner or a duly authorized driver.</p> <p>Specifically, R-853-03 provided for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflects a 10-day effective date rather than a delayed effective date of October 10, 2003 as originally proposed.</li> <li>• The recommended rate for Class A tows remains \$97, an increase of 10% from the current rate of \$88; however, the resolution allows for a single automatic adjustment in twelve months by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for Transportation. With annual CPI increases averaging 2.5%, it is expected that the rate would rise to approximately \$100 at that time.</li> <li>• Class C tows are recommended at \$235 and Class D at \$300 from their current rates of \$175 and \$200, respectively. These classes do not affect average consumers and relate to oversized vehicles such as dump trucks, buses and tractor trailers, typically commercial vehicles, representing a minor percentage of all tows. The waiting time rates for Class C and D equal one quarter of the tow rate and change accordingly. The Class D per mile rate is increased from \$4.50 to \$5.50. Lowboy tows are recommended at \$230 to remain consistent with the Class C tow. Lowboys are specialized trailers designed to carry large vehicles. Although some communities do not regulate Class C and D rates, staff believes retaining maximum rates is appropriate.</li> <li>• Daily storage rates are calculated based on vehicle size and remain unchanged. Vehicles under 20 feet are assessed a rate of \$25 for inside storage and \$20 for outside. Vehicles exceeding 20 feet remain at \$40 inside and \$35 outside.</li> </ul> <p><b>During the BCC meeting on July 22, 2003, the following was discussed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Director of the Consumer Services Department (CSD), provided an overview of the proposed maximum uniform rates for towing, recovery and storage of abandoned or unauthorized vehicles at the request of</i></li> </ul>

**Metropolitan Services Committee**

**April 13, 2016 Meeting**

**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes															
		<i>private property owners on which the vehicles were parked and for non-consent police ordered tows. She noted the changes were made based upon the towing industry's input.</i>														
	<b>R-621-08</b> 6/3/2008	R-621-08 authorized Miami-Dade County towing companies to levy up to a \$3.00 fuel surcharge per non-consent tow performed due to the increase in the cost of diesel fuel.														
<b>2A</b> <b>152320</b>	ORDINANCE RELATED TO RED LIGHT CAMERAS; AMENDING SECTION 30-422 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; REPEALING THE AUTHORITY FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY TO USE TRAFFIC INFRACTION DETECTORS/RED LIGHT CAMERAS; REPEALING RESOLUTION NO. R-759-10, REPEALING DIRECTION AND AUTHORITY TO THE MAYOR OR DESIGNEE TO IMPLEMENT A RED LIGHT CAMERA PROGRAM FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; SETTING POLICY THAT NO RED LIGHT CAMERA PROGRAM SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED OR MAINTAINED BY MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE															
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed ordinance, related to red light cameras:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amends Section 30-422 of the Miami-Dade County Code;</li> <li>• Repeals the authority for Miami-Dade County to use traffic infraction detectors/red light cameras;</li> <li>• Repeals Resolution No. R-759-10;</li> <li>• Repeals the direction and authority to the Mayor or designee to implement a red light camera program for Miami-Dade County; and</li> <li>• Sets policy that no red light camera program will be implemented or maintained by the County.</li> </ul> <p><b>Social Equity Statement:</b> The amendment of this ordinance will not impact the residents of Miami-Dade County. No traffic infraction detectors or Red Light Cameras have been implemented on the roadways or unincorporated Miami-Dade County.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th align="center" colspan="2">Additional Information on Previous Legislation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>R-937-05</b> 8/23/2005</td> <td>Directed the County Manager to explore the feasibility, cost and benefit of installing cameras at certain dangerous intersections with traffic signals to curb red-light running.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>R-1248-07</b> 11/6/2007</td> <td>Urged the Florida Legislature to allow the use of unmanned cameras at intersections with traffic signals in an effort to reduce red-light running.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>R-759-10</b> 7/8/2010</td> <td>Established policy for Miami-Dade County authorizing the installation of red light cameras at high crash, high volume intersections; and directed the Mayor or his designee to implement a red light camera program in Miami-Dade County.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9/16/2010</td> <td>The Health, Public Safety and Intergovernmental Committee deferred a resolution directing the Mayor or designee to study the feasibility of negotiation with municipalities in Miami-Dade County to create a single, uniform countywide program for red light cameras with revenues generated in municipalities to be provided to such municipalities.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>O-11-01</b> 1/20/2011</td> <td>Created Section 30-422 of the Code of Miami-Dade County and authorized and regulated the use of Traffic Infraction Detectors in the Unincorporated Areas.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Background</b></td> <td> <p>The County issued a solicitation to obtain proposals from experienced and qualified firms to establish a turnkey Red Light Camera Program (Program) for the MDPD. It was anticipated that the Program would be at no-cost to the County, funded through the revenue generated by the citations issued. It was also anticipated that the Program would be deployed in phases, with the initial implementation phase of 50 cameras. Additional cameras would have been added in increments of up to 50 cameras for up to a total of 150 cameras at the County's discretion. The RFP required the selected proposer to fully fund all costs associated with the implementation of the Program.</p> <p>Florida law permits public entities to use Traffic Infraction Detectors (Detectors), subject to rules and procedures established by the Florida Department of Transportation. More specifically, the law allows a county or municipality to install traffic detectors on state, county, or municipal rights-of-way within the boundaries of that county or municipality. Local agencies are required to provide a hearing for individuals who are issued a notice of a traffic infraction. There has been substantial discourse in the Florida House and Senate regarding the proper application of Detectors, including the administration of the Detectors, by local agencies.</p> <p>In October 2014, the Fourth District Court of Appeal ruled that the City of Hollywood was not authorized to delegate police power by entering into a contract that allowed a private vendor to screen data and decide whether a violation had occurred before sending that data to a Traffic Infraction Enforcement Officer for authorization of a citation. The Fourth District reasoned that such outsourcing to a third-party for-profit vendor of a city's statutorily mandated obligation to issue uniform traffic citations for red light camera violations was contrary to the Florida Statutes. The Fourth District's decision was appealed to the Florida Supreme Court, which declined to hear the appeal.</p> <p>In light of this and the time that has elapsed since the January 24, 2014 proposals submission date, it was recommended that all proposals be rejected without prejudice to the proposers. The County would determine the feasibility of re-issuing a solicitation for this Program pending judicial and legislative action that have an impact on the administration of Detectors.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Additional Information on Previous Legislation		<b>R-937-05</b> 8/23/2005	Directed the County Manager to explore the feasibility, cost and benefit of installing cameras at certain dangerous intersections with traffic signals to curb red-light running.	<b>R-1248-07</b> 11/6/2007	Urged the Florida Legislature to allow the use of unmanned cameras at intersections with traffic signals in an effort to reduce red-light running.	<b>R-759-10</b> 7/8/2010	Established policy for Miami-Dade County authorizing the installation of red light cameras at high crash, high volume intersections; and directed the Mayor or his designee to implement a red light camera program in Miami-Dade County.	9/16/2010	The Health, Public Safety and Intergovernmental Committee deferred a resolution directing the Mayor or designee to study the feasibility of negotiation with municipalities in Miami-Dade County to create a single, uniform countywide program for red light cameras with revenues generated in municipalities to be provided to such municipalities.	<b>O-11-01</b> 1/20/2011	Created Section 30-422 of the Code of Miami-Dade County and authorized and regulated the use of Traffic Infraction Detectors in the Unincorporated Areas.	<b>Background</b>	<p>The County issued a solicitation to obtain proposals from experienced and qualified firms to establish a turnkey Red Light Camera Program (Program) for the MDPD. It was anticipated that the Program would be at no-cost to the County, funded through the revenue generated by the citations issued. It was also anticipated that the Program would be deployed in phases, with the initial implementation phase of 50 cameras. Additional cameras would have been added in increments of up to 50 cameras for up to a total of 150 cameras at the County's discretion. The RFP required the selected proposer to fully fund all costs associated with the implementation of the Program.</p> <p>Florida law permits public entities to use Traffic Infraction Detectors (Detectors), subject to rules and procedures established by the Florida Department of Transportation. More specifically, the law allows a county or municipality to install traffic detectors on state, county, or municipal rights-of-way within the boundaries of that county or municipality. Local agencies are required to provide a hearing for individuals who are issued a notice of a traffic infraction. There has been substantial discourse in the Florida House and Senate regarding the proper application of Detectors, including the administration of the Detectors, by local agencies.</p> <p>In October 2014, the Fourth District Court of Appeal ruled that the City of Hollywood was not authorized to delegate police power by entering into a contract that allowed a private vendor to screen data and decide whether a violation had occurred before sending that data to a Traffic Infraction Enforcement Officer for authorization of a citation. The Fourth District reasoned that such outsourcing to a third-party for-profit vendor of a city's statutorily mandated obligation to issue uniform traffic citations for red light camera violations was contrary to the Florida Statutes. The Fourth District's decision was appealed to the Florida Supreme Court, which declined to hear the appeal.</p> <p>In light of this and the time that has elapsed since the January 24, 2014 proposals submission date, it was recommended that all proposals be rejected without prejudice to the proposers. The County would determine the feasibility of re-issuing a solicitation for this Program pending judicial and legislative action that have an impact on the administration of Detectors.</p>
Additional Information on Previous Legislation																
<b>R-937-05</b> 8/23/2005	Directed the County Manager to explore the feasibility, cost and benefit of installing cameras at certain dangerous intersections with traffic signals to curb red-light running.															
<b>R-1248-07</b> 11/6/2007	Urged the Florida Legislature to allow the use of unmanned cameras at intersections with traffic signals in an effort to reduce red-light running.															
<b>R-759-10</b> 7/8/2010	Established policy for Miami-Dade County authorizing the installation of red light cameras at high crash, high volume intersections; and directed the Mayor or his designee to implement a red light camera program in Miami-Dade County.															
9/16/2010	The Health, Public Safety and Intergovernmental Committee deferred a resolution directing the Mayor or designee to study the feasibility of negotiation with municipalities in Miami-Dade County to create a single, uniform countywide program for red light cameras with revenues generated in municipalities to be provided to such municipalities.															
<b>O-11-01</b> 1/20/2011	Created Section 30-422 of the Code of Miami-Dade County and authorized and regulated the use of Traffic Infraction Detectors in the Unincorporated Areas.															
<b>Background</b>	<p>The County issued a solicitation to obtain proposals from experienced and qualified firms to establish a turnkey Red Light Camera Program (Program) for the MDPD. It was anticipated that the Program would be at no-cost to the County, funded through the revenue generated by the citations issued. It was also anticipated that the Program would be deployed in phases, with the initial implementation phase of 50 cameras. Additional cameras would have been added in increments of up to 50 cameras for up to a total of 150 cameras at the County's discretion. The RFP required the selected proposer to fully fund all costs associated with the implementation of the Program.</p> <p>Florida law permits public entities to use Traffic Infraction Detectors (Detectors), subject to rules and procedures established by the Florida Department of Transportation. More specifically, the law allows a county or municipality to install traffic detectors on state, county, or municipal rights-of-way within the boundaries of that county or municipality. Local agencies are required to provide a hearing for individuals who are issued a notice of a traffic infraction. There has been substantial discourse in the Florida House and Senate regarding the proper application of Detectors, including the administration of the Detectors, by local agencies.</p> <p>In October 2014, the Fourth District Court of Appeal ruled that the City of Hollywood was not authorized to delegate police power by entering into a contract that allowed a private vendor to screen data and decide whether a violation had occurred before sending that data to a Traffic Infraction Enforcement Officer for authorization of a citation. The Fourth District reasoned that such outsourcing to a third-party for-profit vendor of a city's statutorily mandated obligation to issue uniform traffic citations for red light camera violations was contrary to the Florida Statutes. The Fourth District's decision was appealed to the Florida Supreme Court, which declined to hear the appeal.</p> <p>In light of this and the time that has elapsed since the January 24, 2014 proposals submission date, it was recommended that all proposals be rejected without prejudice to the proposers. The County would determine the feasibility of re-issuing a solicitation for this Program pending judicial and legislative action that have an impact on the administration of Detectors.</p>															

**Metropolitan Services Committee**  
**April 13, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
R-477-15 6/2/2015	<p>Approved the rejection of the proposals received under Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 881, Red Light Camera Program for the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD) and directed the County Mayor, or Mayor's designee, to re-solicit for the Program within 60 days or report to the BCC on why it was unable to re-solicit.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information – Metropolitan Services Committee Meeting Discussion:</u></b></p> <p>During the March 16, 2016 Metropolitan Services Committee meeting, the proposed ordinance was discussed and deferred as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Committee noted that the pilot program concerned 11 intersections that were deemed the most dangerous and noted that the current legislation was an exceptional model and it would be a disservice to the community to repeal it.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Committee expressed concern with the language in the proposed legislation which provided that the County would not maintain the equipment.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Committee pointed out that there were other ways to increase the safety at intersections, such as changing their design.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Assistant County Attorney provided the commissioners with the history of this item noting that the original resolution that this item would be repealing passed in 2010; that resolution directed the Mayor or Mayor's designee to implement the red light camera program in Miami-Dade County.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Deputy Mayor noted no changes had occurred legislatively. He stated that several months ago the Mayor delegated him the authority to prepare a procurement item on red light cameras, or provide the reasons why this program should not be implemented. The Deputy Mayor said that he submitted that report to the BCC along with a recommendation not to proceed with the program. He stated that currently the County did not have red light cameras in operation.</i></li> <li>• <i>In response to questions as to the reasons for repealing the legislation, the Deputy Mayor stated that the Mayor delegated this issue to him, and he issued a memorandum to the BCC on November 12, 2015. He said that he and his team reviewed the legislation at the State level; they reviewed the litigation on this issue; and they obtained information on the cost of the program. The Deputy Mayor noted typically municipalities had outsourced this program to vendors; however, this was no longer feasible, and if the program were retained it would have to be administered by the County. He stated that he and his team compared the cost with the revenue and determined that it was not the best time to move forward with this program, especially in light of the litigation and the unknowns with State law. He noted he would forward his report to all of the commissioners.</i></li> <li>• <i>The proposed ordinance was deferred to the next Committee meeting.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information – Red Light Camera Status Report – November 12, 2015:</u></b></p> <p>In response to Resolution No. R-477-15, the administration released a status report of the Red Light Camera Program for the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD).</p> <p>Based on changes in the legislation pertaining to the manner in which citations may be reviewed and issued, the burden of responsibilities and costs have now shifted to the County. As such, the services to be provided will change, requiring a thorough review of the operational and fiscal impact for the establishment and management of the Program.</p> <p>In order to administer the Program, the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD) would establish a unit within the Special Patrol Bureau and utilize approximately 25 personnel to manager and perform the tasks necessary. The new unit would consist of one (1) Lieutenant to supervise and oversee the unit; two (2) Sergeants to manage the operations of their respective shifts; four (4) Police Officers to testify in court and review red light violations; 17 Public Service Aides to view all red light camera videos and identify violations; and one (1) Secretary to perform administrative tasks, assist with mailing notices, and assign public records requests.</p> <p>It is expected that any County Program would commence with 150 cameras. The intersections where the cameras would be located are expected to generate up to 1,000,000 videos during the first and second years, before decreasing to approximately 500,000 videos for subsequent years, as drivers comply with the traffic control devices. It is expected that the cameras will produce approximately 180,000 Notice of Violations (NOV) each year during the first two (2) years, before decreasing to approximately 115,000 in subsequent years. The size of the new unit, the time needed for court, and the number of vehicles needed for the unit are based on this data. The cost of personnel and vehicles per year is expected to be approximately \$2.6 million. Of that amount, the estimated vehicle cost is about \$275, 000.</p> <p>It is anticipated there will be an additional \$400,000 in costs to the County to include internet upgrades, office space, computer equipment, stationary, and mailing needs. This estimate takes into account that the MDPD will be responsible for the mailing of NOVs and any subsequent mailing of Uniform Traffic Citations (UTC). The total estimated cost for personnel, infrastructure, and equipment for MDPD is approximately \$3,000,000, the majority of which will be recurring annual expenses. Previously, these costs were not contemplated, as the vendor would have been responsible for many of the required tasks.</p> <p>Due to the size of the new unit and the need for continuous ongoing video viewing, it was recommended by the City of Miami Police Department, and suggested by the County's Information Technology Department's Engineering Design Service Manager, that the new unit be equipped with dedicated internet lines capable of handling the expected volume of internet use without impacting normal operations. While the exact cost of the necessary equipment cannot be obtained without first identifying the location to house the new unit, an estimate for the installation of dedicated internet lines within the Special Patrol Bureau and MDPD Headquarters Building, where the infrastructure is already in place, is approximately \$25,000, with an additional \$15,000 per year in service costs.</p> <p>Additionally, MDPD would use certified and trained public service aides to review and approve the NOVs and UTCs. In order to meet the requirements of Florida State Section 316.0083, the Mark Wandall Traffic Safety Program, the public service aides selected for the Program</p>

**Metropolitan Services Committee  
April 13, 2016 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>would have to attend a 40-hour in-service training course to meet the requirements to be authorized to review and approve the NOV's and UTCs. The cost of training public service aides has not yet been determined.</p> <p><i>Market research cannot be conducted to assess what the estimated costs for the Program would now be, based on the County's anticipated changes to the scope of services. This is due to the fact that the revised scope of services that the County would be requesting has not been performed before in Florida. Most agencies within Florida that operate a red light camera program continue to pay the same rates in their contracts, even with reduced services provided by the vendors.</i></p> <p>The public service aides dedicated to the Program will be removed from all of their normal patrol functions, which include but are not limited to, preparation of vehicle crash reports, responding to and documenting minor law violations, assisting with traffic control and scene security on traffic accidents, and enforcing parking and County ordinance violations related to improperly parked vehicles. This loss of personnel will have an adverse impact, as it will increase the calls-for-service for sworn uniformed personnel and reduce that amount of available time for them to conduct proactive enforcement activities. The County would utilize personnel assigned to the new unit in the Special Patrol Bureau to answer public records requests. If the number of the public records requests becomes too voluminous for allocated staff to respond to, additional staff or overtime will be needed.</p> <p>With the recent ruling by the Fourth District Court of Appeal, and based on consultations with the County Attorney's Office, the County would have to take on a larger role in the Program. MDPD would be tasked with issuing the NOV's and UTCs and, in order to avoid conflict of interest, it is suggested that the collection of fines be administered by another department or separate unit within Police. While there are several ways to handle this aspect of the Program, they all may require hiring of additional personnel. Additional personnel would have to be hired if the County determined that the most efficient and effective way to handle the payment of fines is in-house. Potentially a computer software program would also have to be acquired that would be dedicated to track this process. These costs are undetermined at this time.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Clerk of Courts will lonely manage and conduct hearings related to a UTC. Per the legislative changes of 2013, municipalities and counties having red light cameras must make a hearing for NOV's, which are conducted by the municipality or county of jurisdiction, available. In order to comply with this change and foster citizen satisfaction and Program legitimacy consistent with procedural justice, the County needs to identify a department or entity independent from the MDPD, Clerk of Courts, or Finance Department that would be responsible for administering this portion of the Program, which includes scheduling NOV hearings, notifying the violators of their hearing date/time, conducting the hearing, and administering all paperwork related to the hearing. Additionally, a location to conduct these hearing would have to be identified along with the proper staff to conduct the hearings, to include the hiring of a magistrate to preside over the hearing, who cannot be associated or employed by the Clerk of the Courts. At this time, an accurate cost projection to comply with this mandate cannot be calculated, but it should be noted that this could be a substantial cost.</p> <p>The Administrative Office of the Courts, in conjunction with the Clerk of Courts, determined that if current courtroom space is utilized for these hearings at the Gerstein, North Dade, and South Dade, no additional court room security monitor of clerk staff would be needed. If it is determined that the red light camera hearings would need to expand to additional court rooms at North Dade or South Dade, then the issue of required equipment and staffing would need to be re-addressed.</p> <p><b>Changes in Approach and Scope of Services Going Forward</b> Currently, one (1) potential vendor would require the County to list at least three (3) locations for every intersection where a red light camera is proposed. After completion of their independent research, the vendor would then select which intersections are most suitable for red light camera equipment placement and revenue generation. This presents a major issue for the MDPD, as the intersections chosen may not be the ones with the most reported traffic crashes or safety needs and would be a change in the approach for the Program.</p> <p><b>Legislative Impact</b> At this time, there are no legislative changes pending. On September 25, 2015, a final ruling was issued by Judge Steve Leifman, Associate Administrative Judge for the County Court Criminal Division, on the motion to dismiss filed by attorneys representing an individual that received a violation issued by the City of Aventura. The motion to dismiss was filed based on the decision of the Fourth District Court of Appeal on October 2014, regarding procedural issues in the processing of red light camera cases between the municipalities and private vendors.</p> <p>In his ruling, Judge Steve Leifman granted the individuals motion to dismiss, however, in addition, certified three (3) areas of concern to the Third District Court of Appeal. Based on Judge Leifman's ruling, attorneys for the City of Aventura filed an appeal to the Third District Court of Appeal and a motion entitles "Motion for Recognition of automatic stay and extension of same to Other Traffic Court Proceeding." In response to the City of Aventura's filed motion, attorneys representing other individuals on Red Light Camera Cases, filed a motion to strike the "City of Aventura's motion for recognition of automatic stay." A hearing was scheduled before Judge Leifman on October 16<sup>th</sup> and issued an order by Judge Leifman granting the City of Aventura's motion for stay. A final decision is not anticipated until the Third District Court of Appeals addresses the three (3) issues raised by Judge Leifman in his prior ruling.</p> <p>Additionally, a class action lawsuit against three red light camera vendors and more than 70 Florida counties and cities is moving forward after a Miami federal judge rejected a motion to dismiss, seeking more than \$200,000,000 in damages for tickets issued in violation of federal and Florida Laws. <b>It is important to note that Miami-Dade County has been dismissed from this suit since we do not have red light cameras.</b></p> <p><b>Additional Information – Proposed Statewide Legislation:</b></p>

**Metropolitan Services Committee**  
**April 13, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																		
	<p>During the 2016 Legislation Session Senate Bill (SB) 168, which would repeal state statutes authorizing red light cameras, and the House companion bill, House Bill (HB) 4027, were proposed but not passed.</p> <p><b>Additional Information – OPPAGA Report: Florida Red Light Camera Programs<sup>1</sup> – February 7, 2014</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the end of Fiscal Year 2012-13, 79 jurisdictions (74 municipalities, 5 counties) operated red light camera programs in 26 Florida counties and the DHSMV’s most recent survey of local governments operating red light camera programs found that, as of June 30, 2013, cameras were installed at 922 approaches to intersections however, there can be multiple cameras at each intersection;</li> <li>• Local governments consider several criteria when making red light camera placement decisions; use of countermeasures at red light intersections varies among jurisdictions;             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Using information about a variety of factors, engineering countermeasures can be developed to help reduce the occurrence of hazardous driver behaviors such as red light running. Selecting the most appropriate countermeasures for red light running depends on individual intersection characteristics and can only be determined after conducting an engineering study that investigates existing intersection design elements and intersection safety as related to red light running and the occurrence of red light violations.</i></li> <li>○ <i>Although national and state transportation organizations strongly recommend the use of countermeasures, OPPAGA’s survey results indicate that most (56%) of the respondents did not implement countermeasures prior to installing red light cameras. Of the jurisdictions that did implement countermeasures prior to installing red light cameras (44%), the most frequent types of countermeasures were</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Installation of signal ahead signs;</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Use of LED signal lenses;</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Modification of signal-cycle length; and</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Alteration of yellow light change intervals.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Yellow light change intervals are relevant to red light camera programs because altering their duration can affect the frequency of red light running;             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Recent research indicates that using a value greater than 1.0 second would encompass the reaction times of a larger proportion of the driver population. Based on these research results, the Florida Department of Transportation recently revised requirements for yellow light timing across all of the state’s jurisdictions. DOT increased the perception/reaction time to 1.4 seconds, effectively increasing the department’s previous minimum yellow light change interval by 0.4 seconds. Intersections with existing red light cameras were required to comply with the new standards by December 31, 2013.</i></li> <li>○ <i>According to OPPAGA’s survey of counties and municipalities that operate red light camera programs, most (58%) jurisdictions reported using DOT standards for yellow light interval timing, while some (43%) jurisdictions reported not having the authority to change yellow light interval timing, as it is often managed at the county level for many cities and towns.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Jurisdictions use red light cameras to enforce several types of traffic infractions including the enforcement of right turns on red without making a complete stop and right turns on red at intersections with “No Turn on Red” signs;</li> <li>• State and local red light camera revenue has increased more than 200% since Fiscal Year 2010-11;             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Red light camera program revenues have increased significantly over the last three fiscal years. Between Fiscal Year 2010-11 and Fiscal Year 2012-13, total revenues grew from \$37.6 million to \$118.9 million, an increase of 215%.</i></li> <li>○ <i>Of the local governments that reported revenues to the Department of Revenue in Fiscal Year 2012-13, a small number of jurisdictions accounted for a large portion of the \$56.4 million in local red light camera revenues.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #c6e0b4;">Jurisdiction</th> <th style="background-color: #c6e0b4;">Jurisdiction Revenue</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Miami</td> <td>\$5,841,750</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Miami Gardens</td> <td>\$2,889,975</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tampa</td> <td>\$2,786,695</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Apopka</td> <td>\$1,835,625</td> </tr> <tr> <td>North Miami</td> <td>\$1,822,345</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Orlando</td> <td>\$1,725,300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aventura</td> <td>\$1,423,125</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sweetwater</td> <td>\$1,254,290</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nearly 50% of fines collected by local governments are used to pay red light camera vendors;             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>To examine the financial arrangement between jurisdictions and red light camera vendors, OPPAGA reviewed 36 contracts and city ordinances from 20 unique jurisdictions and found that jurisdictions typically pay vendors between \$4,250 and \$4,750 per camera, per month. These payments cover costs associated with site selection; camera</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Revenue	Miami	\$5,841,750	Miami Gardens	\$2,889,975	Tampa	\$2,786,695	Apopka	\$1,835,625	North Miami	\$1,822,345	Orlando	\$1,725,300	Aventura	\$1,423,125	Sweetwater	\$1,254,290
Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Revenue																		
Miami	\$5,841,750																		
Miami Gardens	\$2,889,975																		
Tampa	\$2,786,695																		
Apopka	\$1,835,625																		
North Miami	\$1,822,345																		
Orlando	\$1,725,300																		
Aventura	\$1,423,125																		
Sweetwater	\$1,254,290																		

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.thenewspaper.com/rlc/docs/2014/fl-oppaga.pdf>

**Metropolitan Services Committee**  
**April 13, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>installation, operation, and maintenance; review of possible violations; violation issuance; payment collection; data collection; and customer service. In general, fees are fixed.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimates of the safety effects of other states' red light camera programs vary considerably; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ <i>As of December 2013, 502 communities in the U.S. had red light camera programs.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Red light camera research results differ due to wide variation in factors examined; many studies have been limited by methodological concern;</li> <li>• Notices of violation and uniform traffic citations issued by jurisdictions with red light camera programs have increased significantly since Fiscal Year 2010-11.<sup>19</sup> Based on OPPAGA survey results, notices of violation issued and notices of violation paid increased significantly from Fiscal Year 2010-11 to Fiscal Year 2011-12, and increased slightly from Fiscal Year 2011-12 to Fiscal Year 2012-13.<sup>20</sup>; and</li> <li>• Crashes resulting in fatalities decreased at red light camera intersections on state roads but rear-end and angle crashes increased.</li> <li>• Among the counties with red light camera intersections on state roads, nearly 40% had increases in rear-end and angle crashes.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information:</u></b>  <b>Red-light camera ticket ruling to impact local drivers - Court says it's illegal to have vendor prescreen videos before officers see them – February 22, 2016<sup>2</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Orange County, Florida court ruled the city was not following the red-light camera law. The case could affect other cities and counties where tickets are pending.</li> <li>• The court ruled that allowing the city's vendor, American Traffic Solutions, to prescreen videos before sending them to Orlando's enforcement officer was an unlawful delegation of police power.</li> <li>• The attorney who won a red-light camera case said cities in Orange and Osceola counties are bound by the ruling.</li> <li>• Of 86 cities and counties that have the systems, nine have deactivated their cameras, including Palm Bay, Winter Springs and Dunnellon. Last year, ticket revenue was down 15 percent.</li> <li>• Last fall, Orange County put on hold a plan to add cameras.</li> <li>• Last year, local cities and counties collected \$21 million in ticket revenue.</li> </ul> <p><b>Lawsuit takes aim at Tampa's red-light camera program – Tampa Bay Times – August 18, 2015<sup>3</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new lawsuit could mean the beginning of the end for Tampa's red-light camera program — one that lawyers call unconstitutional and activists say can be abused.</li> <li>• The lawsuit was filed by a group of Florida lawyers Aug. 11 in Hillsborough circuit court against the city of Tampa and the private, for-profit merchant the city uses to review video footage and issue tickets for red-light infractions.</li> <li>• The suit argued that the city's delegation of its powers to ticket and fine drivers who run red lights to American Traffic Solutions goes against Florida statutes and aims for all tickets issued since the program started in 2011 to be declared void.</li> <li>• Since Tampa's program started in November 2011, the city has collected \$11.4 million in revenue from red-light tickets through May 2015. Of that, \$7 million has gone to ATS.</li> <li>• Red-light cameras have been hotly debated across the Tampa Bay area and Florida but have lost favor in some jurisdictions. The technology is used by municipalities in Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas counties, but last year St. Petersburg ended its program.</li> <li>• The Tampa lawsuit's legal argument follows an October decision from Florida's 4th District Court of Appeal, which dismissed a citation against a Hollywood motorist. The appellate court in West Palm Beach ruled that officials delegated too much authority to the vendor, which was also American Traffic Solutions.</li> <li>• That decision — which the Florida Supreme Court declined to review — spawned several class-action lawsuits that have been consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.</li> <li>• Tampa was originally named as a defendant among more than 70 Florida municipalities in that case, but the city argued it shouldn't be sued in Miami.</li> <li>• Tampa Police Department spokeswoman defended the program, saying its goal is to save lives by stopping drivers from running red lights. The number of red-light tickets police issued fell 33 percent, according to city data, going from 61,618 in 2012 to 41,369 in 2014.</li> <li>• Florida law authorizes municipalities to delegate the initial review of potential traffic violations captured by red-light cameras, the suit argued, but it doesn't authorize them to delegate the power to determine who violated the law or the ability to send out notices of violation and issue traffic citations.</li> <li>• Under Tampa's program, ATS reviews recorded images and video from red-light cameras and determines whether those images should be sent to a police officer. When an officer authorizes enforcement, ATS automatically sends a notice of violation with a copy of the officer's signature and badge number.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information – 4<sup>th</sup> District Court of Appeal:</u></b>  <b>Red-light refund seekers find red tape<sup>4</sup> - Sun Sentinel - February 24, 2015</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The 4th District Court of Appeal in West Palm Beach recently struck down camera programs in Hollywood and Davie, ruling that the way those cities delegated police authority to a private vendor was improper. The legal uncertainty has caused some cities to rethink red-light cameras; for example, Boca Raton abruptly stopped its program earlier this month.</i></li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.wesh.com/news/redlight-camera-ticket-ruling-to-impact-local-drivers/38136496>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.tampabay.com/news/courts/civil/lawsuit-takes-aim-at-tampas-red-light-camera-program/2241810>

<sup>4</sup> <http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/153BCC105C54E630?p=NewsBank>

## Metropolitan Services Committee

April 13, 2016 Meeting

### Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>As for refunds, class-action suits against South Florida cities are in the early stages, say some lawyers involved in the fight. Even if those lawsuits are successful, those who paid tickets might only get back a fraction of what they paid.</i></li> <li>• <i>The final verdict on red-light cameras isn't in, as Hollywood intends to take the issue to the Florida Supreme Court. American Traffic Solutions, the Arizona-based vendor that runs the program in most Florida cities, will pay for Hollywood's legal fees, according to a city spokeswoman.</i></li> <li>• <i>The camera program was authorized by the Florida Legislature in 2010, and those who have paid tickets could fight to get money back. That could leave cities and the state (which divided the red-light ticket money) on the hook for huge liabilities. At its peak, more than 70 Florida municipalities and counties had red-light cameras, generating over \$100 million in some years.</i></li> <li>• <i>Because no class-action suits have been certified yet, it's unclear who'll be eligible to seek refunds: Those who paid the \$158 "Notice of Violation" (NOVs) sent by the vendor, those who waited 60 days until the violations turned into \$265 Uniform Traffic Citations (UTCs), or both.</i></li> <li>• <i>An attorney involved in class-action suits against Fort Lauderdale, Sunrise and other South Florida cities, said he believes only those who let violations lapse into citations would be eligible.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Court delivers new strike to Volusia-Flagler red-light cameras<sup>5</sup> - Daytona Beach News-Journal (FL) - February 2, 2015</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Florida's 4th District Court of Appeal recently turned down a request to reconsider its decision in October that the city of Hollywood didn't have authority under state law to delegate the ability to issue uniform traffic citations to its red-light camera vendor.</i></li> <li>• <i>The South Florida appeals court decision matters to Daytona Beach, Holly Hill and Palm Coast — the only municipalities in Volusia and Flagler with red-light cameras — because it could set a precedent for the way citations have to be issued. It could also spur lawsuits brought by people who want their fine money back, and it could scare the three cities into dropping their red light programs.</i></li> <li>• <i>For now, though, all three local cities are watching a flurry of lawsuits work their way through the courts before deciding whether to change course.</i></li> <li>• <i>Reacting to the October ruling in the Hollywood case, late last year Daytona Beach and Holly Hill suspended their red light enforcement programs. Palm Coast decided to keep using its cameras and issuing citations, although Palm Coast hasn't been going after the people who refuse to pay.</i></li> <li>• <i>The three cities are going to keep tabs on whether the Florida Supreme Court agrees to consider the Hollywood case. In its ruling Friday, the 4th DCA refused to recommend that the Florida Supreme Court take up the challenge to the way many cities across the state have handled red light citation issuance. Hollywood could still ask the Supreme Court to take up the case, but attorneys say its chances of getting Florida's highest court to oblige are severely weakened without the appeals court endorsement.</i></li> <li>• <i>Daytona Beach is also going to be watching a new federal court case with 15 plaintiffs challenging red light cameras. Daytona Beach, which was just served last week with the federal suit, was one of 29 cities named as defendants in the class action filed in November challenging red light camera programs, Hartman said. The case in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida also lists as defendants the state government and American Traffic Solutions, the private for-profit company that Hollywood, Palm Coast and other Florida cities have used in their red light programs.</i></li> <li>• <i>There are also seven additional federal red light lawsuits against individual cities pending in South Florida.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Oct. 15 ruling in the 4th DCA suit said only police officers and traffic infraction enforcement officers have the authority to make the initial review of the images caught on the cameras, decide which cases will be pursued and ultimately issue citations. Daytona's system was similar to what Hollywood had, with the Daytona vendor selecting and sending video footage for Daytona Beach police to make decisions on and the vendor mailing out citations.</i></li> <li>• <i>Daytona Beach put up its first red-light cameras in 2010, and now has 12 cameras at seven intersections. Daytona has used Massachusetts-based Gatso USA as its vendor, and last year began a new three-year contract with the company.</i></li> <li>• <i>The contract allows the city to terminate the agreement for changes in state law or court decisions, and it allows both parties to end the contract for "convenience" with 90 days' written notice.</i></li> <li>• <i>The cameras, owned by Gatso, are still up but they're turned off and the city is not using them for anything.</i></li> <li>• <i>In 2008, Palm Coast became the first area city to get red-light cameras, and now has 43 cameras at 27 intersections. Palm Coast has been monitoring the court cases but continues its red light program. American Traffic Solutions is still issuing notices of violation for Palm Coast, and the city is still paying the company's fees, said the city spokeswoman.</i></li> <li>• <i>Between Nov. 1 and Monday, 2,119 notices of violation had been issued. The only change is that those who don't pay the \$158 fine within 60 days aren't being pursued — at least for now.</i></li> <li>• <i>Holly Hill also installed red-light cameras in 2010, and has eight cameras at four intersections. Holly Hill also uses Gatso as its vendor.</i></li> <li>• <i>Holly Hill's cameras are still up and turned on, but they're only used for other types of investigations.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Clearwater tightens control of red-light camera citations<sup>6</sup> - The Tampa Tribune (FL) - January 1, 2015</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>In an attempt to avoid a court challenge, city officials have tightened procedures for issuing traffic citations stemming from the use of red-light cameras.</i></li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> <http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/153434603B6FBA90?p=NewsBank>

<sup>6</sup> <http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/15293EDAF250DFE8?p=NewsBank>

**Metropolitan Services Committee**  
**April 13, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citations for running red lights no longer will be mailed from Arizona by Clearwater’s camera vendor, RedFlex Traffic Systems, the Assistant City Attorney recently told council members. The move comes in reaction to a decision by Broward County’s Fourth District Court of Appeal.</li> <li>• In October, the court ruled that the City of Hollywood illegally delegated to its red-light camera vendor the ability to issue traffic citations.</li> <li>• To protect Clearwater’s program against a similar challenge, the city delayed issuing more than 100 red-light camera citations since October until it could change its practices.</li> <li>• The appellate court objected to Hollywood’s program because it allowed American Traffic Solutions, or ATS, to print and send out violation notices and then issue citations if motorists failed to pay their fines.</li> <li>• Under a contract change Clearwater council members recently approved, local police now will mail the traffic citations after the vendor prints them. This local control should address the district court’s objection and put the city “solidly in a defensible position.”</li> <li>• The city’s red-light camera contract expires in August. The cameras have prompted protests and lawsuits since Florida cities began putting them up to catch drivers who ignore stop lights and fly through intersections. Proponents say the cameras have made streets and intersections safer, while critics contend they have made cities and vendors richer.</li> </ul>
<b>2B 160747</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO ANALYZE THE FEASIBILITY OF IDENTIFYING ADDITIONAL FUNDING FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE SOURCE FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXPANDING THE RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP PROGRAM IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS TO ADDITIONAL GRADE LEVELS AND TO PROVIDE A REPORT ON SAME WITHIN 120 DAYS OF THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS RESOLUTION AND SHALL PLACE THE COMPLETED REPORT ON AN AGENDA OF THE BOARD, PURSUANT TO ORDINANCE NO. 14-65
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or the County Mayor’s designee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze the feasibility of identifying additional funding from any legally available source for the purpose of expanding the Responsible Pet Ownership Curriculum in Miami-Dade County schools to additional grade levels and to provide a report on same;</li> <li>• Include in said report recommendations regarding the source of this additional funding; and</li> <li>• Complete said report within 120 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Background:</b>  In 2013, the Miami-Dade County Animal Services Department launched the Responsible Pet Ownership Curriculum in Miami-Dade County schools for elementary school students in third, fourth and fifth grade. This program promotes responsible pet ownership and at the same time stimulates students to develop strong character traits, while caring for pets. This program currently reaches over 89,000 students however, the Animal Services Department does not currently have the funding resources to expand this program.</p>
<b>3A 160555</b>	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$19,000,000.00 FOR PREQUALIFICATION POOL NO. 9711-0/23 FOR PURCHASE OF PIPE AND FITTINGS FOR WATER AND WASTEWATER SERVICES TO FURTHER FACILITATE CONSENT DECREE PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED BY THE WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes additional expenditure authority in an amount up to \$19,000,000.00 for prequalification pool 9711-0/23 for the purchase of pipe and fittings for water and wastewater services to further facilitate the Consent Decree Projects implemented by the Water and Sewer Department.</p> <p>This prequalification pool was originally approved by the BCC on September 17, 2013 for a 10-year term. The pool provides the Water and Sewer Department with access to vendors for the purchase of pipes, valves and fittings for force mains and pump stations that are integral to the proper functioning of Miami-Dade County’s water and wastewater plants.</p> <p>This increase in allocation is being requested to facilitate the Consent Decree projects as mandated by the County’s agreement with the United States Department of Justice and to support daily operations. The projects include infrastructure upgrades to force mains and pump stations, requiring the use of this pool to purchase materials.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</b>  The contract expires on December 31, 2023 and has an existing allocation of \$28,500,000. The recommended modification will authorize additional expenditure authority of \$19,000,000 increasing the total pool value to \$47,500,000.</p> <p><b>Prequalified Vendors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A &amp; B Pipe and Supply, Inc. (SBE) 6500 NW 37 Avenue Miami, FL</li> <li>• American Cast Iron Pipe Company 1501 31 Avenue North Birmingham, AL</li> <li>• Corcel Corp. (MICRO/SBE, DBE) 2461 NW 23 Street Miami, FL</li> <li>• Ferguson Enterprises, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 12500 Jefferson Avenue Newport News, VA</li> <li>○ 10810 SW 184 Street Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Forterra Pressure Pipe, Inc. 300 E John Carpenter Freeway Irving, TX</li> <li>• HD Supply Waterworks, LTD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3100 Cumberland Boulevard Suite 1700 Atlanta, GA</li> <li>○ 10470 SW 187 Street Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Lehman Pipe and Plumbing Supply, Inc. (SBE) 230 NW 29 Street Miami, FL</li> <li>• Tom Evans Environmental, Inc. 3200 Flightline Drive Suite 302 Lakeland, FL</li> <li>• Valve &amp; Actuation Services LLC d/b/a Chalmers &amp; Kubeck South IVG 1050 Industrial Boulevard Watkinsville, GA</li> </ul>

**Metropolitan Services Committee  
April 13, 2016 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes								
	<p><b>Applicable Ordinances and Contract Measures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two (2) percent User Access Program provision applies and will be collected on all purchases.</li> <li>The Small Business Enterprise Bid Preference and Local Preference will be applied in accordance with the ordinances at the time of spot market competition.</li> <li>The Living Wage Ordinance does not apply.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Information:</b> On September 17, 2013, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-740-13, approved the establishment of a prequalification pool for purchase of valves, cast ductile-iron and cast gray-iron pipe and fittings for the Water and Sewer Department. The amount requested for the ten-year term was \$28,500,000.</p> <p>Since the establishment of the prequalification pool, five (5) vendors have been added to the pool.</p>								
<b>3B 160626</b>	RESOLUTION APPROVING AWARD OF CONTRACT NO. FB-00301 FOR PURCHASE OF AQUEOUS AMMONIA FOR THE WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT IN A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$2,682,000.00 OVER THE INITIAL TWO-YEAR TERM AND THE ONE, TWO-YEAR OPTION TO RENEW; 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 CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38								
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves award of Contract No. FB-00301 for purchase of aqueous ammonia for the Water and Sewer Department in a total amount not to exceed \$2,682,000.00 over the initial two-year term and the one, two-year option to renew period. Additionally, the proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to give notice of this award and issue the appropriate purchase order.</p> <p>The recommended vendor, Airgas Specialty Products, Inc. (Airgas), will deliver aqueous ammonia in tanker truck loads to the Alexander Orr Jr. Water, John E. Preston Water, and the Hialeah Water Treatment Plants.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</b> The fiscal impact for the two-year term is \$1,341,000. If the County chooses to exercise the one (1), two-year option-to-renew term, the contract's cumulative value will be \$2,682,000. The fiscal impact for the initial contract term and the option-to-renew term is based on the estimated usage at the price per pound.</p> <p>The current contract, FB-00075, is valued at \$999,000 for five (5) years and scheduled to expire on November 30, 2019. The user department, Water and Sewer, has elected to cancel the current contract and recommends awarding this replacement contract in order to obtain better pricing. The allocation under the recommended contract is higher than the current contract due to an increase in estimated quantities of aqueous ammonia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>According to the Internal Services Department, contract FB-00075 was awarded to Airgas Specialty Products, Inc. under the Mayor's delegated authority.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Vendor Recommended for Award</b> An Invitation to Bid was issued under full and open competition on November 4, 2015. Three (3) vendors responded to the solicitation, one (1) of which was a "No Bid." The method of award was to the single lowest-priced responsive and responsible bidder that met the solicitation's minimum qualifications.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;">Awardee</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Principal Address</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Address of Branch Offices or Headquarters in Miami-Dade or Broward</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Number of employee residents in Miami-Dade or Broward</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Airgas Specialty Products, Inc.</td> <td>2530 Sever Road Suite 300 Lawrenceville, GA</td> <td style="text-align: center;">None</td> <td style="text-align: center;">None</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Vendors Not Recommended for Award</b> Tanner Industries, Inc. was deemed non-responsive by the County Attorney's Office (CAO) for taking exceptions to the solicitation's General Terms and Conditions.</p> <p>Pursuant to Resolution No. R-140-15, prior to the re-procurement of this replacement contract, a full review of the scope of services was conducted to ensure the replacement contract reflects the County's current needs. The review included conducting market research, posting a draft solicitation for industry comments, and holding meetings and drafting sessions with the user department. The solicitation was updated to revise the unit of measure from tons to pounds as well as to increase the estimated annual quantity.</p> <p><b>Applicable Ordinances and Contract Measures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two (2) percent User Access Program provision applies and will be collected on all purchases.</li> <li>The Small Business Enterprise Bid Preference and Local Preference were applied in accordance with the ordinances.</li> <li>The Living Wage Ordinance does not apply.</li> </ul>	Awardee	Principal Address	Address of Branch Offices or Headquarters in Miami-Dade or Broward	Number of employee residents in Miami-Dade or Broward	Airgas Specialty Products, Inc.	2530 Sever Road Suite 300 Lawrenceville, GA	None	None
Awardee	Principal Address	Address of Branch Offices or Headquarters in Miami-Dade or Broward	Number of employee residents in Miami-Dade or Broward						
Airgas Specialty Products, Inc.	2530 Sever Road Suite 300 Lawrenceville, GA	None	None						
<b>3C 160583</b>	RESOLUTION APPROVING AN IMPLEMENTING ORDER ESTABLISHING FUNDRAISING GUIDELINES FOR THE MIAMI-DADE COUNTY YOUTH COMMISSION								

**Metropolitan Services Committee**  
**April 13, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves the Miami Dade County's Youth Commission (YC) Fundraising Policy and Guidelines Implementing Order.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u></b>            If approved, this implementing order will not have a fiscal impact, as monies collected will be utilized for authorized purposes, including purchasing refreshments for Youth Commission sponsored events.</p> <p><b><u>Social Equity Statement:</u></b>            Pursuant to Resolution No. R-778-14, if approved, this implementing order will allow for the equitable and fair distribution of fundraised monies. YC will be able to fundraise in the specified manners for purposes such as the purchasing of refreshments for YC sponsored events.</p> <p><b><u>Background:</u></b>            Since 2010, the YC has served as an advisory board to the BCC. Youth Commissioners are high school students ages 15 through 18 who represent and articulate the needs of youth in Miami-Dade County. The YC advises the Mayor and BCC on matters affecting the youth in the community.</p> <p>In order to assist in carrying out youth-related activities, the YC has requested the ability to fundraise. On September 3, 2014, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-778-14 which directed the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee to prepare an implementing order with fundraising guidelines for the Miami-Dade County Youth Commission.</p>
<b>3D 160530</b>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TERMS AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE MEMORANDA OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY TO ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN SUPPORT DURING AN ACTUAL OR ANTICIPATED EMERGENCY AND/OR ESCAPE FROM FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FACILITIES LOCATED WITHIN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, SPECIFICALLY HEREIN, THE SOUTH FLORIDA RECEPTION CENTER AND DADE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE SAME OR SIMILAR MEMORANDA OF AGREEMENT WITH THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS FOR SUPPORT AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXERCISE TERMINATION PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to execute Memoranda of Agreements (Agreements) between the Florida Department of Corrections and Miami-Dade County through the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD). The purpose of these Agreements is to provide support during an actual or anticipated emergency, and/or escape from a Florida Department of Corrections' facility located within Miami-Dade County, and specifically for the South Florida Reception Center and Dade Correctional Institution. The Agreement for each of these facilities is effective for a period of five (5) years upon execution through March 30, 2021.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u></b>            There is no fiscal impact to Miami-Dade County.</p> <p><b><u>Background:</u></b>            The MDPD has established and maintains longstanding partnerships with correctional agencies both at the county level, via the Miami-Dade Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, and the state level, via the Florida Department of Corrections. In the event that the Florida Department of Corrections experiences or anticipates an emergency and/or an escape from a facility located in Miami-Dade County, this state agency depends upon support from the MDPD due to MDPD's number of highly trained sworn personnel and the department's specialized capacity, which may include crisis negotiators, crime scene investigators, K-9, and Aviation services, as well as communications capabilities.</p>
<b>3E 160536</b>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TERMS AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY ACCESS TO DRIVER AND VEHICLE INFORMATION DATABASE SYSTEM BETWEEN THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAY SAFETY AND MOTOR VEHICLES AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ANY AMENDMENT, RENEWAL OR EXTENSION OF THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AND EXERCISE THE CANCELLATION AND TERMINATION PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to execute the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Law Enforcement Access to the Driver and Vehicle Information Database System (DAVID) between the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV) and Miami-Dade County, through the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD). This MOU will become effective once signed by both the Florida DHSMV and Miami-Dade County and will continue for a period of six (6) years.</p> <p>Approval of this proposed resolution will replace Resolution No. R-554-12, approved by the BCC on July 3, 2012. The Florida DHSMV has revised the terms of this MOU such that it clearly specifies the conditions and limitations under which the Florida DHSMV agrees to provide electronic access to DAVID information to law enforcement agencies and specifically MDPD. As a result, a new resolution is necessary to authorize the execution of the revised MOU.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u></b>            The approval of this MOU will not have a negative fiscal impact to Miami-Dade County.</p> <p><b><u>Background:</u></b>            The Florida DHSMV collects and maintains personal information which is stored in DAVID. This database provides vital information such as driver license history, signature, photographs, and other information related to a tag for vehicles or vessels (boats). Based upon the nature of this information, the Florida DHSMV administers DAVID in strict compliance with federal and state statutory requirements, and in turn, requires that same strict compliance of the law enforcement agencies to which it provides access. MDPD must comply with statutory requirements, as well as administrative policies and procedures, which govern this information.</p>

**Metropolitan Services Committee  
April 13, 2016 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><b><u>Additional Information:</u></b> On July 3, 2012, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-554-12, approved a Memorandum of Understanding between the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, and Miami-Dade County, on behalf of the Miami-Dade Police Department, authorizing a data exchange from the Driver and Vehicle Information Database. This data exchange was for law enforcement purposes only and provides the Miami-Dade Police Department with vital information on drivers, and vehicle or vessel information. <b>The Memorandum of Understanding was effective upon execution and lasted for a period of three years.</b></p>
<b>3F 160545</b>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TERMS AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COLLEGE AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, THROUGH THE MIAMI-DADE POLICE DEPARTMENT, TO SERVE AS A RESOURCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A VICTIM SERVICES PROGRAM TO BE KNOWN AS THE MIAMI-DADE COLLEGE NORTH CAMPUS VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM; AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AMENDMENTS AS REQUIRED BY LAW, AND TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution ratifies the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee's action to execute the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Miami Dade College and Miami-Dade County through the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD). The MOU will be for a period of five (5) years upon execution through 2021.</p> <p>This MOU will authorize the MDPD to provide assistance to Miami Dade College in developing and implementing a violence prevention program, specifically, at the Miami Dade College North Campus located at 11380 NW 27th Ave, Miami, FL 33167.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u></b> There is no fiscal impact to the County.</p> <p><b><u>Background:</u></b> Miami Dade College is preparing a grant application to the U.S. Department of Justice in response to the grant solicitation entitled "Grants to Reduce Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence and Stalking on Campus Program." A statutory requirement for this funding request is a signed MOU; Failure to include a signed MOU with a law enforcement partner, such as the MDPD, will disqualify Miami Dade College's grant application.</p> <p>Miami Dade County, through the MDPD and its Special Victims Bureau, will participate in this proposed project to expand victim services at Miami Dade College through this violence prevention program, at the Miami Dade College North Campus.</p>
<b>3G 160547</b>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING EXECUTION OF AN INTERLOCAL MASTER AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND THE CITY OF CORAL GABLES REGARDING UTILITY WORK FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND ESTABLISHING THE PROCEDURES FOR THE PERFORMANCE AND REIMBURSEMENT OF THE UTILITY WORK; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE INDIVIDUAL JOINT PARTICIPATION AGREEMENTS WITH THE CITY OF CORAL GABLES AS UTILITY WORK PROJECTS ARE IDENTIFIED AND TO EXERCISE ANY PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the execution of an Interlocal Master Agreement between the City of Coral Gables (City) and Miami-Dade County for a term of ten years.</p> <p>This Interlocal Master Agreement establishes procedures for the performance and reimbursement of any utility work, utility design work, and utility construction work deemed to be necessary by the County and the City involving the installation, relocation, replacement, or removal of water facilities for projects in the City. It also authorizes individual Joint Participation Agreements between both parties for each project.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u></b> The County will provide the funding for the utility work proposed for each project because the County owns the water system and all related appurtenances located in the City. As projects are identified, individual Joint Participation Agreements will be issued listing the funding sources for upgrades to the water system which may include any combination of: Water Revenue Bonds Sold, Water Connection Charge, Future Revenue Bonds, and the Renewal and Replacement Fund.</p> <p><b><u>Background:</u></b> The County, through WASD, owns and operates the water system in the City and provides water service directly to the City's residents of the City. The City provides sewer services to its customers in the City's sewer service area through the provision of wholesale services by the County to the City.</p> <p>On January 12, 2016, the City of Coral Gables Commission approved this Interlocal Master Agreement under Resolution No. R-2016-03.</p>
<b>3H 160733</b>	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ACCESS OF THE FLORIDA SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION AND FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES CONTRACT NO. 15-23-0904 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2016 FOR THE PURCHASE OF POLICE RATED, ADMINISTRATIVE, UTILITY VEHICLES, TRUCKS AND VANS FOR THE MIAMI-DADE ANIMAL SERVICES, POLICE AND WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENTS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$11,585,000.00; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO ACCESS SAME AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT INCLUDING EXTENSIONS AND RENEWALS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves the access of a competitively procured and awarded Florida Sheriffs Association (FSA) and Florida Association of Counties (FAC) Contract No. 15-23-0904 for a term through September 30, 2016 in the amount of \$11,585,000.00 for the purchase of police rated, administrative, utility vehicles, trucks and vans for the Miami-Dade Animal Services, Police and Water and Sewer</p>

**Metropolitan Services Committee**

**April 13, 2016 Meeting**

**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																																												
	<p>Departments. FSA-FAC is a statewide cooperative procurement program for participating local government agencies, sheriffs' offices, State of Florida agencies, state universities and colleges.</p> <p>There will be a total of 533 vehicles purchased.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Police Department</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><i>The Police Department will purchase 489 vehicles to support various law enforcement activities. The fleet to be purchased will include mixed-use marked police patrol and unmarked investigative vehicles and will replace vehicles that have reached the end of their useful life or are slated for retirement due to damage, mileage or ongoing mechanical issues.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Vehicle Type</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Order Quantity</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Police Packaged Full-Sized Sedan</td> <td align="right">218</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unmarked Investigative Mid-Sized Sedan</td> <td align="right">201</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consumer Grade SUV</td> <td align="right">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marked Police Packaged SUV</td> <td align="right">28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unmarked Investigative SUV</td> <td align="right">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pickup Trucks</td> <td align="right">25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vans (Cargo, Passenger or Prisoner)</td> <td align="right">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Motorcycle</td> <td align="right">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td align="right"><b>489</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Water and Sewer Department</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><i>The Water and Sewer Department will purchase 38 vehicles to support its operations. The vehicles to be purchased include cargo vans and pickup trucks that will be used to facilitate repairs at treatment plants and for various activities in the field and will replace vehicles that have exceeded their operational life.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vans (Cargo)</td> <td align="right">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pickup Trucks</td> <td align="right">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td align="right"><b>38</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Animal Services Department</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><i>The Animal Services Department will purchase six (6) vehicles to support its operations. The vehicles to be purchased will include cargo vans and pickup trucks that will be used to conduct investigations and inspections related to animal complaints.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vans (Cargo)</td> <td align="right">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pickup Trucks</td> <td align="right">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td align="right"><b>6</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u></b>                      The fiscal impact for the purchase of 533 vehicles during the contract term, through September 30, 2016, is \$11,585,000. The cost of the Animal Services and Police Departments' vehicles will be covered by financing proceeds. The cost of Water and Sewer vehicles will be covered by proprietary funds. A competitively solicited financing agreement will be recommended and presented to the BCC as a separate Finance Department item at a later date. It is anticipated that since vehicle deliveries will be staggered in groups over the remaining term of the contract, once a group of vehicles is delivered and accepted, monthly financing payments would begin for a five-year period.</p> <p><b><u>Vendors Recommended for Award</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beck Nissan, Inc. 252 Highway 17 North Palatka, FL</li> <li>• Daytona Harley-Davidson 1637 North US Highway 1 Ormond Beach, FL</li> <li>• Don Reid Ford, Inc. 1875 S Orlando Avenue Maitland, FL</li> <li>• Duval Motor Company d/b/a Duval Ford 1325 Cassat Avenue Jacksonville, FL</li> <li>• Hub City Ford-Mercury, Inc. 4060 S Ferdon Boulevard Crestview, FL</li> <li>• Moore Family LLC Management d/b/a Rountree-Moore Chevrolet/Cadillac/ Nissan 4316 W US Hwy 90b Lake City, FL</li> </ul> <p><i>*None of the vendors recommended for award have branch offices or headquarters in Miami-Dade or Broward County and none have employees who are residents in Miami-Dade or Broward County.</i></p> <p><b><u>Applicable Ordinances and Contract Measures</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The two (2) percent User Access Program provision does not apply.</li> <li>• The Small Business Enterprise Bid Preference and Local Preference Ordinances do not apply.</li> </ul>	Police Department		<i>The Police Department will purchase 489 vehicles to support various law enforcement activities. The fleet to be purchased will include mixed-use marked police patrol and unmarked investigative vehicles and will replace vehicles that have reached the end of their useful life or are slated for retirement due to damage, mileage or ongoing mechanical issues.</i>		Vehicle Type	Order Quantity	Police Packaged Full-Sized Sedan	218	Unmarked Investigative Mid-Sized Sedan	201	Consumer Grade SUV	3	Marked Police Packaged SUV	28	Unmarked Investigative SUV	6	Pickup Trucks	25	Vans (Cargo, Passenger or Prisoner)	7	Motorcycle	1	<b>Total</b>	<b>489</b>	Water and Sewer Department		<i>The Water and Sewer Department will purchase 38 vehicles to support its operations. The vehicles to be purchased include cargo vans and pickup trucks that will be used to facilitate repairs at treatment plants and for various activities in the field and will replace vehicles that have exceeded their operational life.</i>		Vans (Cargo)	3	Pickup Trucks	35	<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	Animal Services Department		<i>The Animal Services Department will purchase six (6) vehicles to support its operations. The vehicles to be purchased will include cargo vans and pickup trucks that will be used to conduct investigations and inspections related to animal complaints.</i>		Vans (Cargo)	4	Pickup Trucks	2	<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>
Police Department																																													
<i>The Police Department will purchase 489 vehicles to support various law enforcement activities. The fleet to be purchased will include mixed-use marked police patrol and unmarked investigative vehicles and will replace vehicles that have reached the end of their useful life or are slated for retirement due to damage, mileage or ongoing mechanical issues.</i>																																													
Vehicle Type	Order Quantity																																												
Police Packaged Full-Sized Sedan	218																																												
Unmarked Investigative Mid-Sized Sedan	201																																												
Consumer Grade SUV	3																																												
Marked Police Packaged SUV	28																																												
Unmarked Investigative SUV	6																																												
Pickup Trucks	25																																												
Vans (Cargo, Passenger or Prisoner)	7																																												
Motorcycle	1																																												
<b>Total</b>	<b>489</b>																																												
Water and Sewer Department																																													
<i>The Water and Sewer Department will purchase 38 vehicles to support its operations. The vehicles to be purchased include cargo vans and pickup trucks that will be used to facilitate repairs at treatment plants and for various activities in the field and will replace vehicles that have exceeded their operational life.</i>																																													
Vans (Cargo)	3																																												
Pickup Trucks	35																																												
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>																																												
Animal Services Department																																													
<i>The Animal Services Department will purchase six (6) vehicles to support its operations. The vehicles to be purchased will include cargo vans and pickup trucks that will be used to conduct investigations and inspections related to animal complaints.</i>																																													
Vans (Cargo)	4																																												
Pickup Trucks	2																																												
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>																																												

**Metropolitan Services Committee**

**April 13, 2016 Meeting**

**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Living Wage Ordinance does not apply.</li><li>• The Inspector General Fee does not apply.</li></ul>