



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

Board of County Commissioners Meeting

March 17, 2015

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
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
4A 150524	ORDINANCE RELATING TO ZONING; AMENDING SECTIONS 33-238 AND 33-259 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING FOR AGRICULTURAL USES WITHIN ELECTRICAL UTILITY EASEMENTS, PUBLIC PROPERTIES AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY IN BU (BUSINESS USE) AND IU (INDUSTRIAL USE) ZONING DISTRICTS SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE	
Notes	The proposed resolution amends sections 33-238 and 33-259 of the Miami-Dade County Code to provide for agricultural uses within electrical utility easements, public properties and rights-of way in business use and industrial uses zoning districts.	
	Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments <i>Section 33-238 of the Code, Zoning</i>	
	Section of the Code <i>Sec. 33-238</i> Uses permitted	Current Code N/A
		Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments</i> (1.4) Agricultural uses are authorized in electrical utility easements, public properties, and rights-of-way, with the consent of the property owner, subject to the following conditions: (a) No on-site retail sales shall be permitted; (b) The use shall be conducted on sites with a minimum of one (1) acre; (c) Permitted agricultural uses shall include horticulture, floriculture, viticulture, forestry and apiculture; (d) No permanent structures shall be permitted; (e) Where parking is provided on-site, the parking spaces shall be provided on an unimproved surface; (f) If a nursery is located in an easement or right-of-way identified in the Metropolitan Planning Organization's Bicycle Facilities Plan or in the County's Park and Open Space Master Plan as part of the County's bicycle network or as a greenway/trail, a bicycle and pedestrian easement shall be provided subject to the property owner's approval; (g) A Certificate of Use shall be obtained, and shall be renewed annually subject to the conditions contained in this subsection; and (h) The use shall not be located closer than 25' to the boundary of a residentially-zoned property or a property designated on the Land Use Plan (LUP) map for residential use.

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
	<p>Sec. 33-259</p> <p>Uses permitted</p>	<p>(89.1) Plant nurseries are authorized in utility easements and railroad rights-or-way, with the consent of the property owner, subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>(a) The nursery use shall be conducted by a not-for-profit corporation and shall be incidental to an on-site educational program that provides career training or medical or educational therapy programs.</p> <p>(b) No on-site sales shall be permitted;</p> <p>(c) The use shall be conducted on sites with a minimum of one (1) acre net lot area;</p> <p>(d) A Certificate of Use shall be obtained, and shall be renewed annually subject to the conditions contained in this subsection; and</p> <p>(e) The use shall not be permitted on property abutting residentially zoned properties or properties designated on the Land Use Plan (LUP) map for residential use.</p>
		<p>(89.1) Agricultural uses are authorized in electrical utility easements, public properties and rights-or-way, with the consent of the property owner, subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>(a) No on-site retail sales shall be permitted;</p> <p>(b) The use shall be conducted on sites with a minimum of one (1) acre net lot area;</p> <p>(c) Permitted agricultural uses shall include horticulture, floriculture, viticulture, forestry and apiculture;</p> <p>(d) No permanent structures shall be permitted;</p> <p>(e) Where parking is provided on-site, the parking spaces shall be provided on an unimproved surface;</p> <p>(f) If the nursery is located in an easement or right-of-way identified in the Metropolitan Planning Organization's Bicycle Facilities Plan or in the County's Park and Open Space Master Plan as part of the County's bicycle network or as a greenway/trail, a bicycle and pedestrian easement shall be provided subject to the property owner's approval;</p> <p>(g) A Certificate of Use shall be obtained, and shall be renewed annually subject to the conditions contained in this subsection; and</p> <p>(h) The use shall not be located closer than 25' to the boundary of a residentially-zoned property or a property designated on the Land Use Plan (LUP) map for residential use.</p>
4B 150515	ORDINANCE REVISING ZONING AND LAND USE REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO THE MODEL CITY URBAN CENTER DISTRICT; AMENDING SECTION 33-284.99.42 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE	
Notes	The proposed ordinance revises the zoning and land use regulations pertaining to the Model City Urban Center District and amends sections 33-384.99-42 of the Miami-Dade County Code.	
	<p>Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments <i>Section 33-284.99.42, of the Code</i> <i>Zoning</i></p>	
	<p>Section of the Code</p>	<p>Current Code</p>
	<p>Uses</p>	<p>Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments</i></p>
	<p>Sec. 33-284.99.42</p>	<p>2. In the Industrial District (ID) area, the following uses: (a) MC uses at maximum residential densities shown on the Density Regulating Plan in Section 33-284.99.43 of this Code.</p>
		<p>2. In the Industrial District (ID) area, the following uses: (a) Mixed Use Corridor uses at maximum residential densities shown on the Density Regulating Plan in Section 33-284.99.43 of this Code.</p> <p>3. In the Mixed-Use Corridor area on lots adjoining Northwest 22nd Avenue between Northwest 54th and 62nd Streets hand car washes accessory to a permitted retail, food service, or office use shall be permitted subject to the following:</p> <p>(a) Parking spaces used for car washing and patrons waiting for car washing shall not occupy parking spaces required for the principal uses of the lot.</p> <p>(b) Attention attracting devices, such as blinking or flashing lights, streamer lights, pennants, banners, streamers and all fluttering or spinning advertising devices (either mobile or stationary) are prohibited, except as permitted under point of sale sign regulations.</p> <p>(c) All outdoor paging or speaker systems are prohibited.</p> <p>(d) The areas used for car washing shall not occupy required landscape areas.</p> <p>(e) Street trees and parking lot buffers required by Chapter 18A shall be provided.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes															
	<p>Additional Information: On February 3, 2015, the BCC passed File No. 150084 on first reading amending Section 33-284.99.43 revising zoning and other land development regulations, updating the regulating plans, development parameters, and non-conforming use provisions for the Model City Urban Center District.</p>															
4C 150504	ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 2-8.1.1 AND 10-33.02.1 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA RELATING TO BID COLLUSION TO INCLUDE CERTAIN FAMILIAL RELATIONS IN DEFINITION OF RELATED PARTIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING PRESUMPTION OF COLLUSION AND PRE-AWARD DISCLOSURES; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE															
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 2-8.1.1 and 10-33.02.1 of the Miami-Dade County Code (Code) relating to bid collusion to include certain familial relations in definition of related parties for the purpose of establishing presumption of collusion and pre-award disclosures.</p> <p>Section 2-8.1.1 and Section 10-33.02.1 of the Code prohibits collusion among bidders or proposers on County purchases of goods, and services and on construction contracts. The Collusion Ordinances require bidders or proposers to identify, prior to award, all other "related parties" who also submitted a bid or proposal on the same solicitation. Related Parties are defined as bidders or proposers or the principals, corporate officers, and managers which have a direct or indirect ownership interest in another bidder or proposer for the same contract or in which a parent company or the principals of one bidder or proposer have direct or indirect ownership in another bidder or proposer for the same contract.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance amends the Collusion Ordinances to include the spouse, domestic partner, parents, stepparents, sibling, children or stepchildren of a bidder or proposer or the principals, corporate officers, and managers thereof in the definition of related parties.</p>															
4D 150470	ORDINANCE RELATING TO ZONING; MODIFYING REGULATIONS REGARDING CHAIN LINK FENCES; AMENDING SECTIONS 33-11 AND 33-311 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA ("CODE"); PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE (SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 150330)															
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance amends section 33-11 and 33-311 of the Miami-Dade County Code to modify regulations prohibiting chain link fences. Regulations set forth in the proposed ordinance are countywide.</p> <p>The provisions do not apply to farm fences governed by Section 604.50 of the Florida Statutes.</p> <p>Additional Information/Relevant Legislation: On July 8, 2003, the BCC adopted Ordinance No. 03-159 which amended section 33-11 of the Miami-Dade County Code to restrict the use of chain link fences in certain residential zoning districts. Ordinance 03-159 was amended to exempt chain link fences that were in lawful existence prior to the effective date of the Ordinance.</p> <p>On December 7, 2010, the BCC adopted Ordinance No. 10-87 which required that all fences and walls be maintained in good/clean/finished conditions, deleted provisions requiring that all fences/walls be constructed with uniform materials and color. Fences with finished and unfinished sides were to be erected so that the finished side of property faces the street and neighboring property. Ordinance No. 10-87 also deleted provisions requiring that both sides of fences visible from the street or open space be finished and deleted provisions requiring that continuous fences and walls with multiple ownership be constructed with uniform materials and color.</p> <p>On February 5, 2013, the BCC adopted Ordinance 13-09 which removed language that was added under Ordinance No. 03-159, restricting the use of chain link fences in certain residential zoning districts. Additionally, Ordinance 13-09 removed language referring to the unfinished side of the fence that was added under Ordinance No. 10-87, regulating the appearance and maintenance of walls and fences in all districts.</p> <p>The proposed resolution includes the following changes:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #d9ead3; text-align: center;">Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments <i>Section 33-11 and 33-311 of the Code, Zoning</i></th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Section of Code</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Current Code</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Sec. 1-33-11(a) <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i></td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><i>Permits; conformance to requirements; erection on property lines.</i></td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;"><i>Permits; conformance to requirements; erection on property lines; chain link fences prohibited.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Sec. 1-33-11(a)(1) <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i></td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">N/A</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Except as hereinafter restricted, all walls, fences and hedges may be placed on the property lines. This section, however, shall not be construed to permit such walls, fences and hedges to extend beyond the official right-of-way lines or property lines.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Sec. 1-33-11(a)(2)</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">N/A</td> <td style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Notwithstanding anything in this Code to the contrary, chain link fences shall be prohibited in all district, and GU districts trended agricultural are permitted if approved upon public</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments <i>Section 33-11 and 33-311 of the Code, Zoning</i>			Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i>	Sec. 1-33-11(a) <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	<i>Permits; conformance to requirements; erection on property lines.</i>	<i>Permits; conformance to requirements; erection on property lines; chain link fences prohibited.</i>	Sec. 1-33-11(a)(1) <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	N/A	Except as hereinafter restricted, all walls, fences and hedges may be placed on the property lines. This section, however, shall not be construed to permit such walls, fences and hedges to extend beyond the official right-of-way lines or property lines.	Sec. 1-33-11(a)(2)	N/A	Notwithstanding anything in this Code to the contrary, chain link fences shall be prohibited in all district, and GU districts trended agricultural are permitted if approved upon public
Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments <i>Section 33-11 and 33-311 of the Code, Zoning</i>																
Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i>														
Sec. 1-33-11(a) <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	<i>Permits; conformance to requirements; erection on property lines.</i>	<i>Permits; conformance to requirements; erection on property lines; chain link fences prohibited.</i>														
Sec. 1-33-11(a)(1) <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	N/A	Except as hereinafter restricted, all walls, fences and hedges may be placed on the property lines. This section, however, shall not be construed to permit such walls, fences and hedges to extend beyond the official right-of-way lines or property lines.														
Sec. 1-33-11(a)(2)	N/A	Notwithstanding anything in this Code to the contrary, chain link fences shall be prohibited in all district, and GU districts trended agricultural are permitted if approved upon public														

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
	<i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	hearing. This provision shall not apply to farm fences governed by Section 604.50, Fla. Stat.
	<i>Sec. 1-33-11(a)(1)(i)</i> <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	N/A Chain link fences lawfully existing prior to [the effective date of this ordinance] may remain, subject to the nonconforming use provisions of Section 33-35 of this chapter, except that nonconforming chain link fences in IU districts, AU districts, GU districts trended agricultural shall be exempt from Section 33-35(B)(3)(b)(ii).
	<i>Sec. 1-33-11(a)(1)(ii)</i> <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	N/A The Board may, by resolution, direct the Mayor to establish a program allocating the fines collected for violations of the chain link fence regulations in this section to fund a need-based subsidy program for residential properties: to replace legally existing, nonconforming chain link fences with permitted walls, fences, or hedges; or to install appropriate landscaping to screen such fences from view.
	<i>Sec. 1-33-311(A)(14)(f)</i> <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	An alternative maximum height of walls, hedges or fences for a single-family or duplex dwelling shall be approved upon demonstration of the following: (7) Safe sight distance triangles are maintained pursuant to this code.
	<i>Sec. 1-33-311(A)(15)(d)</i> <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	An alternative maximum height of walls, hedges or fences for a zero lot line dwelling shall be approved upon demonstration of the following: (7) Safe sight distance triangles are maintained pursuant to this code.
	<i>Sec. 1-33-311(A)(15.1)(h)</i> <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	An alternative maximum height of walls, hedges or fences for a three-unit or four-unit apartment house use, multiple-family apartment house use of multiple-family housing development shall be approved upon demonstration of the following: (7) Safe sight distance triangles are maintained pursuant to this code.
	<i>Sec. 1-33-311(A)(20)(g)</i> <i>Fences, walls, bus shelters and hedges</i>	An alternative maximum height of walls, hedges or fences for a commercial development shall be approved upon demonstration of the following: (7) Safe sight distance triangles are maintained pursuant to this code.
7A 150414	ORDINANCE RELATING TO RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS; AMENDING SECTION 2-1 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, REGARDING PREPARATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS; ESTABLISHING A TIMEFRAME WITHIN WHICH A PRIME SPONSOR MUST REQUEST PLACEMENT OF AN ITEM ON AN AGENDA; PROHIBITING ANOTHER COUNTY COMMISSIONER FROM REQUESTING THAT THE SAME OR SIMILAR ITEM BE PLACED ON THE AGENDA DURING SUCH TIMEFRAME; ALLOWING ANOTHER COUNTY COMMISSIONER TO REQUEST THAT THE SAME OR SIMILAR ITEM BE PLACED ON THE AGENDA AFTER THE EXPIRATION OF SUCH TIMEFRAME; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 142691]	
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance, relating to Rules of Procedure of the Board of County Commissioners, amends Section 2-1 of the Miami-Dade County Code regarding preparation of ordinances and resolutions providing for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishes a timeframe within which a prime sponsor must request placement of an item on an agenda; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>The prime sponsor will have six (6) months from the date of the request for legislation within which to submit the item to the Chairperson of the County Commission for placement on the appropriate agenda.</i> • Prohibits another County Commissioner from requesting that the same or similar item be placed on the agenda during such timeframe; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Prior to submission by the prime sponsor of the item to the Chairperson of the County Commission for placement on the appropriate agenda, no other Commissioner may request that the same or substantially similar item be placed on the</i> 	

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																				
	<p align="center"><i>agenda.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows another County Commissioner to request that the same or similar item be placed on the agenda after the expiration of such timeframe. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ <i>If a requested item is not submitted by the prime sponsor to the Chairperson of the County Commission for placement on the agenda within six months from the date of the request for the legislation, any other Commissioner may request that the same or substantially similar item be prepared for placement on the agenda.</i> <p>The proposed ordinance was amended at the February 10, 2015, Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee meeting to include the following provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the requested ordinance or resolution is not ready to be submitted to the Chairperson of the County Commission within six months from the date of request due to circumstances beyond control of the prime sponsor the Board of County Commissioners may by a motion or resolution waive the six month requirement and propose another time period within which the prime sponsor may submit the item to the Chairperson. The item was also amended to require the scheduling of a Sunshine Meeting, if requested, prior to the implementation of this proposed amendment.</i> 																				
<p>7B 141707</p>	<p>ORDINANCE AMENDING BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF THE COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP SECTION 29-124 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA BY ELIMINATING FARE FREE TRANSPORTATION SERVICE ON METROMOVER; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</p>																				
<p>Notes</p>	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 29-124 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), by a two-thirds vote of the Commission membership, eliminating fare free transportation service on Metromover.</p> <p><i>According to the item, it is estimated that the initial start-up capital cost to install fare collection equipment could range between \$2.4 million to \$9 million, depending upon the level of security and method of fee collection. In addition, depending on the collection system selected, it is estimated that on-going fare collection operations could cost an average of \$525,000. Finally, assuming a fare of \$1.00, it is estimated that between \$1.8 million and \$2.7 million of additional revenue will be generated, depending upon the ultimate elasticity in ridership.</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="272 892 1490 1318"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="272 892 1490 924">Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="272 924 1490 955">Section 29-124 of the Code</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="272 955 1490 987">Special Fund Created; Uses of Surtax Proceeds; and Role of Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="272 987 451 1045">Section of Code</th> <th data-bbox="451 987 868 1045">Current Code</th> <th data-bbox="868 987 1291 1045">Proposed Amendments</th> <th data-bbox="1291 987 1490 1045">Notes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 1045 451 1318"> <p><i>Sec. 29-124</i> Fee Computation by Independent Study</p> </td> <td data-bbox="451 1045 868 1318"> <p>Surtax proceeds shall be applied to expand the Golden Passport Program to all persons (regardless of income level who are over the age of 65 or are drawing Social Security benefits, and to provide fare-free public transportation service on Metromover, including extensions.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="868 1045 1291 1318"> <p><i>Surtax proceeds shall be applied to expand the Golden Passport Program to all persons (regardless of income level who are over the age of 65 or are drawing Social Security benefits.</i></p> </td> <td data-bbox="1291 1045 1490 1318"> <p><i>Amends Code by removing language referring to fare-free public transportation service on Metromover, including extensions.</i></p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Additional Information- County Mayor's report dated February 3, 2014, titled, "Analysis Regarding the Impact of Reinstating Metromover Fees – Directive #131143</p> <p>For the 12-month period ending June 2013, Miami-Dade Transit (MDT) had 98.3 million boardings on both Metrobus and Metrorail (not including Metromover). The combined operating and maintenance cost for these services was approximately \$480 million. Thus, an average cost of transporting each boarding passenger on Metrobus and Metrorail was approximately \$4.15. Currently, only an estimated 38% of all boarding passengers paid the then full \$2.00 base fare, so the subsidy was \$2.15. An estimated 23% of all passenger boardings on both Metrobus and Metrorail pay no fare, in those cases the subsidy was the full \$4.15.</p> <p>Overall, revenues from paid fares in FY 2012 (\$110 million) covered less than 23% of the operating and maintenance costs. The remaining cost was covered by subsidies from the General Fund, Federal and state grants, miscellaneous sources (e.g. advertising contracts) and the Transit Surtax (People's Transportation Plan – PTP).</p> <p>Metromover carries an estimated 9.1 million passengers per year, many of whom transfer from Metrorail and Metrobus. During the July 9, 2002 discussion of the Transit Surtax ordinance, the Board approved an amendment which provided for fare-free transportation on Metromover upon passage of the PTP, which was approved by the voters in November 2002. The fare-free Metromover is included in the annual subsidy from the PTP. Reinstatement of a fare for Metromover would require a revision to the PTP ordinance, installation of new fare collection equipment and maintenance of that equipment. If a \$0.50 fare is implemented, it is estimated that nearly \$600,000 would be collected annually. The cost for fare collection equipment for the 22 metromover stations and installation would range from a \$2.4 million honor like system (where riders would pay at a machine and retain the receipt in case they are asked to display it since there is no gate) to \$9 million for a system comparable to the one used on Metrorail. The annual cost for collecting, maintaining, and servicing the fare collection system would be approximately \$475,000. Therefore, it would take MDT approximately 5 to 10 years to recover the start-up cost.</p>	Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments				Section 29-124 of the Code				Special Fund Created; Uses of Surtax Proceeds; and Role of Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust				Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments	Notes	<p><i>Sec. 29-124</i> Fee Computation by Independent Study</p>	<p>Surtax proceeds shall be applied to expand the Golden Passport Program to all persons (regardless of income level who are over the age of 65 or are drawing Social Security benefits, and to provide fare-free public transportation service on Metromover, including extensions.</p>	<p><i>Surtax proceeds shall be applied to expand the Golden Passport Program to all persons (regardless of income level who are over the age of 65 or are drawing Social Security benefits.</i></p>	<p><i>Amends Code by removing language referring to fare-free public transportation service on Metromover, including extensions.</i></p>
Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments																					
Section 29-124 of the Code																					
Special Fund Created; Uses of Surtax Proceeds; and Role of Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust																					
Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments	Notes																		
<p><i>Sec. 29-124</i> Fee Computation by Independent Study</p>	<p>Surtax proceeds shall be applied to expand the Golden Passport Program to all persons (regardless of income level who are over the age of 65 or are drawing Social Security benefits, and to provide fare-free public transportation service on Metromover, including extensions.</p>	<p><i>Surtax proceeds shall be applied to expand the Golden Passport Program to all persons (regardless of income level who are over the age of 65 or are drawing Social Security benefits.</i></p>	<p><i>Amends Code by removing language referring to fare-free public transportation service on Metromover, including extensions.</i></p>																		

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Reinstating a fare of \$.50 could reduce Metromover ridership with the most likely scenario that short trips would be reduced significantly. Passengers using the Easy Card would not be impacted, nor would they generate additional revenues due to the policy of no transfer cost for Easy Card users. A ridership of approximately 4.2 million would bear the brunt of the new fare and potentially be reduced to only 1.2 million passengers that would then pay a fare for this service. Metromover ridership in the next 10 years is expected to grow at a minimum by 10.5% or 1 million riders. It is important to note that according to the Miami-Dade economic profile, 32.5% of County residents earn less than \$25k per year. If a fare were reinstated, it would be a reasonable assumption that a number of riders would migrate from Metromover to the fare-free City of Miami Trolley because of economic necessity.</p> <p>Alternatively, several studies have been done that identified creative funding options. One option is a Public Private Partnership for Metromover with an organization such as the Downtown Development Authority and/or the City of Miami. This type of relationship could include sponsoring operational aspects such as aesthetics, cleaning, security, and local promotions, while MDT focuses on mechanical maintenance and customer service related expenses. Funding from the City's share of surtax funds or the possibility of creating a special taxing district has been explored recently by the CITT. Of course, the utilization of these techniques would require additional policy formulation on behalf of the Board as well as the City. Other creative options include the naming rights to the Metromover stations that the County is currently pursuing. It is not yet clear at this point how much revenue could be generated through this strategy.</p> <p><u>Additional Information- Transit and Mobility Services Committee (TMSC)</u> During discussion at the February 11, 2015, TMSC meeting the following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Executive Director, Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust appeared before the TMSC members and noted the challenges faced related to this item that would be reviewed every six months by the Trust. He noted the opinion of the Trust points to the promises made to the voters should only be changed for the following specific reasons: - If there was a compelling public purpose - If there was a significant gain and no unintended consequences and upon reviewing this item there was an inverse relationship if the fare was reestablished at a low rate, such as a quarter, there would not be enough revenue generated for a compelling public purpose. However, if there was higher fare established such as a dollar, it would result in a number of unintended consequences. He said there would be a significant adverse impact on ridership and the metro rail and bus passengers would be impacted as well as City of Miami Trolley passengers who pay fares because there was no fare mechanism for a transfer from a bus to rail service. The Trust members could not identify a compelling public purpose to change the policy and promise to voters.</i> • <i>In response to questions regarding how the number of transit users was monitored, Miami-Dade Transit Director noted there was an electronic eye that takes count and was tested to monitor any occurring problems such as data, and trends. She noted this information was part of the monthly report submitted to this Committee. She noted September report listed approximately 32,000 transit users per day, and had increased by 1.3 percent yearly. She noted that her staff would provide information on the entire operation and maintenance in addition to debt services, such as the purchase of new vehicles. Miami Dade Transit noted that the all expenditures on the existing system for the Miami Metro- Mover were approximately \$22 million a year, which included capital and operations.</i> • <i>It was requested that Miami Dade Transit Director and Deputy Mayor provide a report before this item was considered by the County Commission on the number of Metro Mover or circulators existing around the country at no cost to the public, and to include information on the length of time in existence, the distance of travel, and information on like services provided in Miami-Dade County.</i> <p>In response to the request made at the TMSC meeting, a Report on other Automated People Mover Systems in the United States was provided on March 2, 2015. According to the National Transit Database (NTD, 2013) and property websites, aside from Miami-Dade County/Miami-Dade Transit's Metromover, there are two other cities with publicly operated automated mover systems operating in the United States: Detroit and Jacksonville.</p> <p>The Miami-Dade County Metromover (Mover) system is a fully automated people mover system consisting of 4.4 miles of elevated dual-lane track and guideway. Service to the Downtown/Inner Loop began in April 1986 and was later expanded with the Omni and Brickell Loop extensions in May of 1994. The Mover offers convenient access to a variety of government, businesses, entertainment and cultural centers in the Central Downtown, Omni and Brickell areas, servicing 21 stations. The Mover fleet consists of 29 vehicles operating approximately 1,222,385 annual vehicle revenue miles. The Mover operates on three routes or loops (Inner, Omni and Brickell) Monday through Sunday from 5:00 am to 12:00 am; connects to Metrobus, Metrorail and the Airport. The Mover is fare free to all residents and visitors.</p> <p><u>Detroit People Mover</u> The Detroit Transportation Corporation, City of Detroit, is the owner and operator of the Detroit People Mover (DPM). The DPM is a fully automated light rail system that was developed as part of a planned regional transit system in 1987. The DPM operates on an elevated single track loop in Detroit's central business district. The 2.9 mile system provides connections between the courts and administrative offices of several levels of government, sports arenas, exhibition centers, major hotels, and commercial, banking and retail districts. DPM operates 586,382 annual vehicle revenue miles. The DPM fare is \$0.75 and offers discounted fares for certified riders.</p> <p><u>Jacksonville Skyway</u> The Jacksonville Skyway (Skyway) is an automated people mover in Jacksonville, Florida. It is operated by the Jacksonville Transportation Authority (JTA). Opening in 1989 with three stations in Downtown Jacksonville, the Skyway was extended in 1996, 1998, and 2000 following a conversion from Matra technology to Bombardier equipment. The system currently comprises two routes across 2.5 miles of</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>track, serving eight stations. The Skyway is fare free. In 2013, the Skyway registered 183,197 annual vehicle revenue miles.</p> <p>In addition, there are two other public transportation systems with privately owned and/or operated automated people mover systems: Las Vegas Monorail Company and the City of Seattle Monorail.</p> <p><u>Las Vegas Monorail (private)</u> The Las Vegas Monorail Company (LVMC) runs the only privately-owned public transportation system in the United States. It is a 3.9 mile (6.3 km) monorail mass transit system located adjacent to the Las Vegas Strip in Nevada. The Monorail opened in 2004 and services seven stations. The single trip fare is \$5.00 and the only discounts offered are to Nevada residents. LVMC operated 2,034,976 annual vehicle revenue miles.</p> <p><u>Seattle Center Monorail</u> The Seattle Center Monorail System (SMS) is an elevated monorail line composed of two trains and a fixed guideway. The SMS which was completed in January 1962 for the Seattle World's Fair, is the nation's first full-scale commercial monorail system and has a guideway just under 1 mile. The SMS is owned by the City of Seattle and operated by a private contractor, Seattle Monorail Services. A one-way trip is \$2.25 for adults and \$1 for Seniors, children ages 5 - 12, passengers with disabilities, Medicare recipients and active duty U.S. Military personnel. Roundtrip fares are twice the price of a one-way fare and children under the age of four ride fare free. The trains carry approximately 2 million passengers every year and operates 223,612 annual vehicle revenue miles.</p> <p>Finally, it should be noted that in 2013 of the 5 systems detailed above, MDT had the most annual trips (9.6 million). Las Vegas was second, with 4.1 million trips, followed by Detroit (2.3 million), Seattle (2 million) and Jacksonville (1 million), respectively.</p>
7C 150354	<p>ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROGRAM; AMENDING SECTION 2-8.1.1.1.1 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA TO CREATE CERTIFICATION TIERS BASED UPON THREE YEAR AVERAGE GROSS REVENUES, REMOVE CERTIFICATION FOR WHOLESALERS AND MANUFACTURERS BASED UPON NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, PROVIDE VIRTUAL OFFICE DEFINITION, REQUIRE ONE YEAR DOING BUSINESS IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PRIOR TO CERTIFICATION, REQUIRE QUARTERLY REPORTING OF CONTRACTS TO CERTIFIED FIRMS BY PUBLIC HEALTH TRUST, ALLOW APPLICATION FOR RECERTIFICATION AFTER SUBMITTAL OF REQUIRED DOCUMENTS, AND CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND WELL-BEING OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; AND PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN CODE AND EFFECTIVE DATE [SEE ORIGINAL ITEMS UNDER FILE NOS. 141585, 142420]</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance pertaining to Small Business Enterprise program, amends Section 2-8.1.1.1.1 of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amends graduation definition to include personal net worth; • Removes the definition of Micro Enterprise from the Code; • Review Committee will make recommendations as needed; • Require quarterly reporting of contracts to certified firms by the Public Health Trust; • Specifies tier system under contracts of \$100,000 or less; and • Increases the threshold for the administrative review of proposed contracts from the current \$50,000 to \$100,000. <p><u>Additional Information – Small Business Enterprise:</u> Small Business Enterprises (SBE) are small businesses that provide goods and/or services to Miami-Dade County. The SBE program, which is race and gender neutral, consists of two tiers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Micro Enterprise (Micro) - three (3) year average annual gross revenues cannot exceed 2 million dollars except manufacturers whose number of employees cannot exceed fifty (50) and wholesalers whose number of employees cannot exceed fifteen (15). • Small Business Enterprise (SBE) - three (3) year average gross revenues cannot exceed 5 million dollars except manufacturers whose number of employees cannot exceed one hundred (100) and wholesalers whose number of employees cannot exceed fifty (50). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Micro/SBE Business Requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Must be located and performing a commercially useful function in Miami-Dade County; ▪ Must be properly licensed to do business with Miami-Dade County; ▪ Completion of Vendor Registration Package with the Department of Procurement is highly recommended; ▪ Must own only one certified Micro/SBE certified firm; ▪ Must be an established business for at least one-year; and ▪ Annual Continue Eligibility required. ○ Certification Forms - <i>The following forms are used in evaluating firms for participation in Miami-Dade County's Business Enterprise certification programs.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request New Certification Package - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ <i>This form needs to be completed by all firms applying for CBE/CSBE/SBE certification programs.</i> ▪ Small Business Continuing Eligibility Affidavit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Used for required Annual Eligibility Review. ▪ Re-Certification Application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ <i>This form is to be used when CBE, CSBE and Micro/SBE certification programs expire after the three-year period.</i> ▪ Change of Status

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
----------	----------------

➤ Used to request changes to current certification status.

- Personal Financial Statement
 - This form is required to be completed by firms submitting a New Certification Application, Annual Continuing Eligibility Affidavit and Re-Certification Application for certification.
- Certification Application Checklist
 - This document should be used to assist in compiling all documents required in the certification process.

Additional Information:
On November 13, 2014, File No. 141585 was withdrawn at the Economic Development and Port Miami Committee meeting, and item 142420 became the substitute but was deferred.

- *The substitute differed from the original item in that it removed the new Tier 4; provided a ten percent (10%) bid preference on contracts of \$100,000.00 or less for any SBE when there is no set-aside; and changed the set-aside for Tier 1 SBEs to contracts from \$100,000.00 to \$750,000.00.*

Then, on February 12, 2015, File No. 142420 was amended during the Economic Prosperity Committee and became File No. 150354 which is the proposed ordinance.

File No. 150354 passed during the Economic Prosperity Committee meeting on February 12, 2015 with the following amendment:

- Provided that wholesalers and manufacturers that should immediately graduate the program due to exceeding the three (3) year average gross revenues size limits imposed upon enactment of the ordinance, would instead graduate six (6) months from April 1, 2015.

According to the Internal Services Department Small Business Development Division, there are currently 94 Wholesaler/Manufacturer certified firms whose size standard is determined based on the number of employees (60 wholesalers and 34 manufacturers). With the proposed amendment, 77 firms would remain in the SBE Program and 17 firms will graduate (after being in the Program for an average of 8 years).

The proposed resolution includes the following changes:

Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments*			
Section 2-8.1.1.1.1 of the Code, Small Business Enterprise			
Section of Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments.</i>	Notes
Sec. 2-8.1.1.1(2)(22) Definitions – Small Business Enterprise (SBE)	<i>Small Business Enterprise (SBE)</i> means a business entity certified by SBD, providing goods or services, which has an actual place of business in Miami-Dade County and whose three-year average gross revenues does not exceed five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00) . The term Small Business Enterprise shall also include a manufacturer with one hundred (100) employees or less or wholesaler with fifty (50) employees or less without regard to gross revenues whose actual place of business is located in Miami-Dade County. Representations as to a business entity's average gross revenues and payroll shall be subject to audit. The County Mayor or designee shall be authorized to adjust the SBE/ <i>Micro-SBE</i> size limits every five (5) years at his/her discretion based on the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) calculated by the U.S. Department of Commerce or other appropriate tool of inflation measures as applied to Miami-Dade County for the preceding five (5) years. The first indexing adjustment shall occur for the 2013–2014 calendar year using the figures provided for the calendar year ended December 31, 2012, and every five (5) years thereafter. The County Mayor or designee shall advise the Board of any such adjustment.	<i>Small Business Enterprise (SBE)</i> means a business entity certified by SBD, providing goods or services, which has a valid business tax receipt issued by Miami-Dade County at least one (1) year prior to certification , an actual place of business in Miami-Dade County, not a Virtual Office , and whose three year average gross revenues does not exceed the following contracting participation levels: (i) Tier 1 – \$0 to \$750,000; (ii) Tier 2 – \$750,001 to \$2,000,000; (iii) Tier 3 – \$2,000,001 to \$5,000,000; or No firm shall be certified as a SBE where the personal net worth of any of its owners is more than one million five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000), exclusive of: (a) the value of the primary residence for which there is a homestead exemption; (b) the value of the business; and (c) funds invested in an individual retirement account (“IRA”), 401k, pension, or other official retirement account. The owner MUST provide information about the terms and restrictions of the account(s) to SBD, and certify that the retirement account(s) is legitimate. Representations as to a business entity's average gross revenues, personal net worth of owners and payroll shall be	Create certification tiers based upon three year average gross revenues. Remove certification for wholesalers and manufacturers based upon number of employees. Require one year doing business in Miami-Dade County prior to certification. Specifies that SBEs have an actual place of business and are not virtual offices. Amends SBE definition to include personal

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes			
			subject to audit. The County Mayor or designee shall be authorized to adjust the SBE size limits every five (5) years at his/her discretion based on the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) calculated by the U.S. Department of Commerce or other appropriate tool of inflation measures as applied to Miami-Dade County for the preceding five (5) years. The first indexing adjustment shall occur for the 2013-2014 calendar year using the figures provided for the calendar year ended December 31, 2012, and every five (5) years thereafter. The County Mayor or designee shall advise the Board of any such adjustment.	<i>net worth.</i> <i>Renumbers subsection to Sec. 2-8.1.1.1(2)(21).</i>
	Sec. 2-8.1.1.1(2)(25) Definitions – Virtual Office	N/A	Virtual Office means an agreement that provides a receptionist, mail and facsimile services, and similar services, that give the appearance of having a business presence at a location, but the business entity has no ongoing, full-time physical presence in the building. Virtual Offices are invalid for certification purposes.	<i>Provide virtual office definition.</i>
	Sec. 2-8.1.1.1(3)(c)(1)(a) Contracts Greater than \$100,000 – Set Asides	Competitive bidding requirements may be waived (by the County Manager or County Commission depending on whether the amount of the contract is above or below the minimum amount established by ordinance for competitive bidding) for a contract and the contract set-aside for bidding solely by SBEs where prior to bid advertisement, there are at least three (3) available SBEs to perform the contract, and where such set-aside is in the best interest of the County.	Competitive bidding requirements may be waived (by the County Manager or County Commission depending on whether the amount of the contract is above or below the minimum amount established by ordinance for competitive bidding) for a contract and the contract set-aside for bidding solely by SBEs where prior to bid advertisement, there are at least three (3) available SBEs to perform the contract, and where such set-aside is in the best interest of the County. Where applicable: (i) contracts from \$100,000 to \$750,000 shall be set-aside for Tier 1 SBEs; contracts from \$750,001 to \$2 million shall be set aside for Tier 2 SBEs; (iii) contracts from \$2,000,001 to \$5 million shall be set aside for Tier 3 SBEs.	<i>Specifies tier system under contracts greater than \$100,000 - set asides.</i>
	Sec. 2-8.1.1.1(3)(c)(1)(b) Contracts Greater than \$100,000 – Set Asides	N/A	In the event there is no availability in the designated SBE tier, SBD may assign a set-aside to the next level tier which will retain a set-aside recommendation. Lower tier SBE firms may bid on higher tier set asides.	<i>New subsection.</i>
	Sec. 2-8.1.1.1(3)(c)(3)(c) Contracts Greater than \$100,000 – Set Asides	N/A	Transferring to non-SBE through subcontracting or otherwise all or part of the actual work of a set-aside contract to a non-SBE is prohibited unless such transfer receives prior approval from SBD.	<i>New subsection</i>
	Sec. 2-8.1.1.1(3)(c)(3)(b)	The preference accorded on contracts \$1 million or less shall be ten (10) percent of the price bid. The preference accorded on contracts greater than \$1 million shall be 5% of	The preference accorded on contracts \$1 million or less shall be ten (10) percent of the price bid for Tier 1 SBEs, five (5) percent for Tier 2 SBEs, and five (5) percent for Tier	<i>Specifies tier system for contracts greater than \$100,000.</i>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes			
	<p>Contracts Greater than \$100,000 – Bid Preference</p>	<p>the price bid.</p> <p>Preferences shall be applied to the bid price of bidders that:</p> <p>I. Are SBEs/<i>Micro Enterprises</i>; II. Are joint ventures with at least one SBE/<i>Micro Enterprises</i>;</p>	<p>3 SBEs. The preference accorded on contracts greater than \$1 million shall be 5% of the price bid for all tiers.</p> <p>Preferences shall be applied to the bid price of bidders that:</p> <p>I. Are SBEs; or II. Are joint ventures with at least one SBE.</p>	
	<p>Sec. 2-8.1.1.1.1(3)(h)(2) Certification</p>	<p>Any SBE/<i>Micro Enterprise</i> that exceeds the size limits shall immediately be graduated from the program after formal written notification. Such SBE/<i>Micro Enterprises</i> shall be allowed to remain through the contract period on awarded contracts and any options to renew on the contract. The graduated firm shall not be eligible for any new contracts under the SBE program under the existing certification. With exception of provisions described in the ordinance for graduation from the SBE/<i>Micro Enterprise</i> program, loss of certification may lead to removal of the firm from continued participation in the Small Business Enterprise program.</p>	<p>Any SBE that exceeds the personal net worth or size limits shall immediately be graduated from the program after formal written notification. Such SBE shall be allowed to remain through the contract period on awarded contracts and any options to renew on the contract. The graduated firm shall not be eligible for any new contracts under the SBE program under the existing certification. With exception of provisions described in the ordinance for graduation from the SBE program, loss of certification may lead to removal of the firm from continued participation in the Small Business Enterprise program. Any wholesaler or manufacturer which should immediately graduate from the program because it exceeds the size limits pursuant to this section, shall graduate six (6) months from April 1, 2015.</p>	<p><i>Amends certification to include personal net worth.</i></p> <p><i>Extends the graduation date for wholesalers or manufacturers that exceed the three (3) year average gross revenue size limits imposed upon enactment of the ordinance.</i></p>
	<p>Sec. 2-8.1.1.1.1(3)(h)(4) Certification</p>	<p>The Department of Small Business Development shall not certify an applicant, shall not recertify an SBE or Micro Enterprise, and shall decertify an SBE or Micro Enterprise that fails to comply with the criteria or procedures for obtaining or maintaining certification. SBD shall have authority to suspend the certification of a SBE or Micro Enterprise during any appeal of a decertification decision.</p>	<p>Small Business Development shall not certify an applicant, shall not recertify an SBE, and shall decertify an SBE that fails to comply with the criteria or procedures for obtaining or maintaining certification. SBD shall have authority to suspend the certification of a SBE during any appeal of a decertification decision. Firms that have been decertified for non-submittal of documents, may apply for recertification once said documents have been submitted and verified by SBD.</p>	<p><i>Allows firms that have been decertified due to the non-submittal of required documents, to be able to immediately reapply for recertification once said documents have been submitted and verified, rather than waiting a year before doing so.</i></p>
	<p>Sec. 2-8.1.1.1.1(3)(h)(6) Certification</p>	<p>Applicants and certified SBEs or Micro Enterprises must have a Miami-Dade County local business tax receipt, and an actual place of business in Miami-Dade County at which they perform a commercially useful function in the provision of the applicable type of goods or services for which certification is sought in order to be eligible for certification or remain certified.</p>	<p>Applicants and certified SBEs must have a valid business tax receipt issued by Miami-Dade County at least one (1) year prior to certification, and an actual place of business in Miami-Dade County, not a Virtual Office, at which they perform a commercially useful function in the provision of the type of goods and services for which certification is sought in order to be eligible for certification or remain certified. In addition, a firm shall not be certified unless it contributes to the economic development and well-being of Miami-Dade County in a verifiable and measurable way. This may include, but not be limited to the retention and expansion of employment opportunities and the support and increase to the County's tax base.</p>	<p><i>Requires a valid business tax receipt issued by Miami-Dade County at least one (1) year prior to certification, in alignment with the local preference requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Requires contribution to economic development and well-being of Miami-Dade</i></p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes										
	<p align="right"><i>County.</i></p> <p><i>*In addition to the proposed amendments depicted by this chart, several subsections were only amended to provide the correct name of Small Business Development and change County Manager to County Mayor. Furthermore, the proposed amendments remove Micro Enterprises from this section of the Code. These amendments are <u>not</u> depicted in this chart.</i></p>										
<p>7D 150293</p>	<p>ORDINANCE RELATING TO ZONING; REVISING DEVELOPMENT PARAMETERS FOR NORTH CENTRAL URBAN AREA DISTRICT; AMENDING SECTION 33-284.99.52 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</p>										
<p>Notes</p>	<p>The proposed ordinance revises the development parameters for the North Central Urban Area District (NCUAD) and amends section 33-284.99.52 of the Miami-Dade County Code.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="272 562 1490 1108"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="272 562 1490 598"> Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments <i>Section 33-284.99.52, of the Code</i> <i>Zoning</i> </th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="272 640 430 688"> Section of the Code </th> <th data-bbox="435 640 901 688"> Current Code </th> <th data-bbox="906 640 1490 688"> Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments</i> </th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 695 430 1102"> <p>Sec. 33-284.99.52</p> <p>Development Parameters</p> </td> <td data-bbox="435 695 901 1102"> <p>C. At a minimum, streets within the NCUAD shall comply with the Street Type Parameters for Type 5, Minor Street, as provided in section 33-284.85.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="906 695 1490 1102"> <p>C. At a minimum, streets within the NCUAD shall comply with the Street Type Parameters for Type 5, Minor Street, as provided in section 33-284.85. It is provided, however, that lots with frontage on streets with a zoned right-of-way of seventy (70) feet or greater may instead be developed in accordance with the following standards;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The front and side street setbacks shall be measured from the property line. 2. Required street trees may be planted within the setback area. 3. For business and mixed uses, the minimum sidewalk width shall be five (5) feet. 4. For multi-family residential uses, the minimum sidewalk width shall be eight (8) feet. 5. For single-family residential uses, the minimum sidewalk width shall be six (6) feet. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Additional Information – Relevant Legislation:</u> On August 8, 2011, the BCC, through Ordinance No. 11-65, created Sections 33-284.99.48 through 33-284.99.54 and amended Section 33C-7 of the Miami-Dade County Code. Specifically, Ordinance No. 11-65:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established the NCUAD and outlined the district’s purpose, intent and applicability; • Established requirements that all developments within the NCUAD will comply with; • Established permitted, conditionally permitted, and temporary uses within the NCUAD; and • Established regulating plans for the NCUAD. <p><i>On July 13, 2011, during the Infrastructure and Land Use Committee meeting, a substitute to this item was adopted to update the Boundary Map and the Regulating Plans to include the entire parcel of property owned by Miami-Dade Transit located just north of 95th Street on 27th Avenue.</i></p> <p><u>Additional Information – North Central Miami-Dade Charrette Report/ North Central Miami-Dade Master Plan:</u> The North Central Miami-Dade Charrette Report is the main product of the North Central Charrette held from May 3rd to May 10th, 2002. The Report contained the "North Central Miami-Dade Master Plan" which is the Citizens' vision for the growth and development of the unincorporated area of North Central Miami-Dade County in Commission District 2. The boundaries of the North Central Charrette's study area were: NW 119 Street to the north, NW 79 Street to the south, NW 7 Avenue to the east, and NW 27 Avenue to the west. The North Central Miami-Dade Master Plan was developed in compliance with the County's CDMP and it addresses the physiology of development within this infill area.</p> <p>The goal of the North Central Miami-Dade Master Plan was to create a framework that will facilitate development and investment in private land as well as in public infrastructure, preserve the community's heritage, enhance its livability and sense of unity, and encourage design quality, both architectural and urban. The North Central Miami-Dade Master Plan sought to, among other things, implement a plan that promotes growth and infill development; define the community's structure; create a main street, along NW 95 Street; assure a range of housing types; improve general infrastructure; improve the community's appearance; and attract businesses, both retail and offices, that would provide a wide range of jobs easily accessible to residents.</p> <p>The North Central Miami-Dade Charrette Report was subject to considerable public input, including the Charrette's Steering Committee meetings and public hearings at the North Central Community Council 8 and the Planning Advisory Board.</p>		Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments <i>Section 33-284.99.52, of the Code</i> <i>Zoning</i>			Section of the Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments</i>	<p>Sec. 33-284.99.52</p> <p>Development Parameters</p>	<p>C. At a minimum, streets within the NCUAD shall comply with the Street Type Parameters for Type 5, Minor Street, as provided in section 33-284.85.</p>	<p>C. At a minimum, streets within the NCUAD shall comply with the Street Type Parameters for Type 5, Minor Street, as provided in section 33-284.85. It is provided, however, that lots with frontage on streets with a zoned right-of-way of seventy (70) feet or greater may instead be developed in accordance with the following standards;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The front and side street setbacks shall be measured from the property line. 2. Required street trees may be planted within the setback area. 3. For business and mixed uses, the minimum sidewalk width shall be five (5) feet. 4. For multi-family residential uses, the minimum sidewalk width shall be eight (8) feet. 5. For single-family residential uses, the minimum sidewalk width shall be six (6) feet.
Comparison of Current Code and the Proposed Amendments <i>Section 33-284.99.52, of the Code</i> <i>Zoning</i>											
Section of the Code	Current Code	Proposed Amendments <i>Bold refers to proposed amendments</i>									
<p>Sec. 33-284.99.52</p> <p>Development Parameters</p>	<p>C. At a minimum, streets within the NCUAD shall comply with the Street Type Parameters for Type 5, Minor Street, as provided in section 33-284.85.</p>	<p>C. At a minimum, streets within the NCUAD shall comply with the Street Type Parameters for Type 5, Minor Street, as provided in section 33-284.85. It is provided, however, that lots with frontage on streets with a zoned right-of-way of seventy (70) feet or greater may instead be developed in accordance with the following standards;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The front and side street setbacks shall be measured from the property line. 2. Required street trees may be planted within the setback area. 3. For business and mixed uses, the minimum sidewalk width shall be five (5) feet. 4. For multi-family residential uses, the minimum sidewalk width shall be eight (8) feet. 5. For single-family residential uses, the minimum sidewalk width shall be six (6) feet. 									

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	On April 27, 2004, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-497-04 which accepted the North Central Miami-Dade Charrette Report, including its plan and recommendations, directed County Staff to be guided by such plan and recommendations in the application of the Code of Miami-Dade County as allowed by law, and further directed the County Manager to present to the County Commission necessary amendments to the Code of Miami-Dade County to implement the Charrette's plan and recommendations.
7E 150017	ORDINANCE RELATED TO CONDUCTING CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECKS; CREATING SECTION 2-30 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; CODIFYING AND REVISING THE AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECKS ON CERTAIN COUNTY EMPLOYEES, APPOINTEES, CONTRACTORS, VENDORS, REPAIR PERSONS, AND DELIVERY PERSONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH STATE LAW; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE (SEE AGENDA ITEM NO. 9A1)
9A1 150151	RESOLUTION RESCINDING ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER 7-41, APPROVING IMPLEMENTING ORDER 7-41, PRE-EMPLOYMENT FINGERPRINT-BASED CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS CHECK, AS AUTHORIZED BY SECTION 125.5801, FLORIDA STATUTES; AND AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN (SEE AGENDA ITEM NO. 7E)
Notes	<p><u>7E</u> The proposed ordinance creates Section 2-30 of the County Code to authorize the County to perform comprehensive pre-employment fingerprint-based criminal history record checks for specified county employees, applicants, volunteers, interns, contractors, and contractual temporary personnel prior to the commencement of employment or service with the County. The ordinance also authorizes fingerprint-based criminal history records checks on any private contractor, employee of a private contractor, vendor, repair person, or delivery person who has direct contact with individual members of the public or access to any public facility or publicly operated facility in such a manner or to such an extent that the governing body of the County finds that preventing unsuitable persons from having such contact or access is critical to security or public safety.</p> <p><i>The proposed ordinance reflects changes made to section 125.5801, Florida Statutes, which authorizes criminal history record checks for certain County employees and appointees including applicants, volunteers, interns, contractors and contractual temporary personnel prior to the commencement of employment or service with the County.</i></p> <p>County departments currently conduct pre-employment fingerprint-based criminal history record checks as authorized by Administrative Order 7-41. This proposed ordinance would codify the current procedures and authorize these same procedures for individuals accessing public facilities in such a manner or to such an extent that the governing body of the County finds that preventing unsuitable persons from having such contact or access is critical to security or public safety.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact</u> The cost incurred by user departments to perform background checks is \$40.50 for applicants, contractors and contractual temporary personnel, and \$33.00 for volunteers and non-paid interns. These rates do not change and an additional fiscal impact to the County is not anticipated with the approval of this item given that the County is already conducting pre-employment fingerprint-based criminal history record checks.</p> <p>The Human Resources Department will continue to manage the use of criminal history background checks in the recruitment and selection process. Guidelines from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will be utilized while working with all County departments concerning the use of pre-employment fingerprint-based criminal history record checks in the selection of applicants, volunteers, interns, contractors and contractual temporary personnel.</p> <p><u>Additional Information- Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee (SPGOC):</u> During the discussion at the February 10, 2015 SPGOC meeting, the following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Director, Recruitment, Testing and Career Development, Human Resources Department, clarified that the County conducted a criminal history background check on its volunteers and applicants. She said this ordinance was needed in order to be able to continue accessing local, state and national reports. The cost for the reports was billed to the department where the individual was assigned. She pointed out that reports were not specifically mandated for employees working for vendors and it was up to the department to determine whether a report was needed. Reports were required in instances where the individual posed a threat, had access to databases or other sensitive information.</i> • <i>In response to a question about the consequences should this legislation not be approved, Assistant County Attorney said that Section 125.5801 of the Florida Statutes required the County to adopt this legislation. He indicated that the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) would not provide County system access to conduct background checks if the ordinance was not adopted.</i> <p><u>9A1</u> The proposed resolution rescinds Administrative Order 7-41 and approves Implementing Order 7-41, governing the execution of the policy established by Section 2-30 of the Code of Miami-Dade County to perform comprehensive pre-employment fingerprint-based criminal history record checks as authorized by Section 125.5801, Florida Statutes.</p> <p>All information obtained from the background checks are exempt from public records requests and will be used by hiring managers to make informed hiring selections to provide for fair, non-discriminatory treatment and to minimize exposure to any post-employment misconduct.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact</u> There will be a fiscal impact to all County departments conducting pre-employment fingerprint-based criminal history record checks. This is based upon the wider scope of potential employees, volunteers, interns, contractors and appointees that will require background checks as</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>specified in Implementing Order 7-41. The cost associated with this process will be borne by each County department as applicable.</p> <p><u>Additional Information:</u> Implementing Order 7-41 authorizes Miami-Dade County to perform pre-employment fingerprint-based criminal history record check on applicants, volunteers, interns, contractors, and contractual temporary personnel prior to commencement of employment or service with the County, who have been identified as critical to security or public safety. This order also applied to any private contractor, employee of a private contractor, vendor, repair person, or delivery person who have direct contact with individual members of the public or access to any public facility or publicly operated facility critical to security or public safety.</p>
8A1 150155	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AMERICAN SHUTTLE, INC., D/B/A SUPER SHUTTLE, THE CURRENT PROVIDER EXCLUSIVE DEMAND SHARED GROUND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES AT MIAMI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, TO CHARGE A PREMIUM FARE FOR LUXURY VAN SERVICES; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE SUCH FARE, IF ANY, AND AUTHORIZE ESCALATION IN SUCH FARE AS MAY BE ALLOWED UNDER THE EXISTING AGREEMENT, AND TO EXERCISE THE TERMS OF THE EXISTING AGREEMENT WITH RESPECT TO SUCH PREMIUM FARE, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, CANCELLATION OF SUCH FARE</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes American Shuttle, Inc., (American Shuttle) D/B/A SuperShuttle, who has the Exclusive Demand Shared Ground Transportation Services Agreement (Agreement) at Miami International Airport (MIA), to charge a premium fare for luxury van exclusive demand services.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact</u> This is a revenue generating agreement for the Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD). American Shuttle's contract requires a Minimum Annual Guarantee (MAG) payment to the County of \$783,137.50 (\$65,261.45 per month) or 6.4 percent of American Shuttle's total monthly gross revenues, whichever is greater. Currently, American Shuttle is paying the County \$792,535.00 the increased amount is due to the Consumer Price Index. The luxury van service is a new service, MDAD cannot estimate the additional revenue that this service could generate.</p> <p><u>Delegation of Authority</u> The County Mayor or designee, pursuant to Sec 5.05 of the Agreement, is authorized to execute documents needed to American Shuttle Inc. to charge a premium fare, in accordance with the fare schedule, for exclusive demand shared ground transportation services provided via luxury vans which meet the minimum requirements of the Agreement. The County Mayor or Designee is further authorized to provide for escalation of such premium fare pursuant to the existing escalation clause of the Contract and is authorized to enforce all terms of the Agreement with respect to such premium fare, including cancellation provisions.</p> <p><u>Background</u> American Shuttle staffs and operates kiosks along the curbside of MIA's arrival section and facilitates transportation services to and from MIA. The demand for luxury transportation available curbside at MIA continues to increase. The desirability of providing more curbside transportation options has been repeatedly requested. Per Section 5.05 of the Agreement, American Shuttle may request the County to have additional fare classifications; in this case American Shuttle wishes to charge a premium fare for luxury van service. If approved by the BCC, this item authorizes a new fare schedule for luxury transportation utilizing luxury vans, such as Mercedes vans. The luxury vans must meet all existing requirements in the Agreement, including the requirement that all vans have a minimum rated passenger capacity of ten persons.</p> <p><u>Additional Information- Trade and Tourism Committee (TTC)</u> During discussion at the February 12, 2015 TTC meeting, the following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A workshop was discussed in which all new transportation modes can be discussed and that this item should be part of a comprehensive discussion at a workshop relating to new shared-ride services throughout the County, and then a final decision could be made on each of these transportation alternatives;</i> • <i>In response to questions whether the luxury van service was a new service at the Airport, Deputy Director, MDAD, said American Shuttle, d/b/a as Super Shuttle, was currently operating this service at the Airport within its contract guidelines; however, the request to charge a premium fare for the luxury van service was a new part of Super Shuttle's service he advised that currently, these vans could not be preordered and were randomly distributed. He noted Super Shuttle wanted to charge a premium fare to facilitate passengers who wished to pay for a luxury ride;</i> • <i>Assistant County Attorney advised that Super Shuttle was currently allowed to provide a fleet mix of their choice, and if they chose to operate with the luxury vans versus other vans, it was permissible under their contract. He noted if Super Shuttle wanted to set a differential rate for those vans, it would require approval by the Board and advised the luxury van service could be, and was being performed under the contract. He noted the item was before the Committee because the vendor wished to charge a higher rate which would require Board approval;</i> • <i>It was noted MDAD was unable to determine how much revenue the luxury van service would generate at the Airport without a bidding process;</i> • <i>In response to questions from the Committee members regarding the number of Super Shuttle vans that were providing service at the Airport, Director, Landside Operations, said 60 Blue vans were operating at the Airport and Super Shuttle bought an additional ten vans, 10 Mercedes Sprinter vans operating at the Airport; however, they had not been able to charge extra for the additional 10 Sprinter vans. Super Shuttle's contract did not prohibit them from purchasing or using Sprinter vans; did not prohibit them from using black vans provided the vans had an identifying mark on them; that there was no maximum cap on the fleet; and that they</i>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>were meeting the contract requirements; If this proposed resolution was not approved, Super Shuttle could still operate the ten Sprinter vans at the Airport; however, they could not increase the rate. The contract had exclusivity to the curbside;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In response to questions regarding Super Shuttle’s vehicle age limitation; and whether a specific rate existed for sole ridership in a Super Shuttle van, Assistant County Attorney advised that the vehicles must be no more than four years old; Super Shuttle’s contractual obligation was for shared-ride services; Director, Landside Operations commented that in past practices Super Shuttle had provided exclusivity upon a passenger’s request, while using the Blue vans. Currently the Blue vans could be exclusive; and there was an exclusivity charge and a rate structure for this charge; • MDAD said it would be difficult to speculate on the amount of money that would be generated until the service could be advertised. He explained that the decision to not put the contract out for bid was one of logistics at the Airport. Super Shuttle’s contract provided them with curbside exclusivity for the two inner roadways at the Airport which would expire in 2016. He noted if the contract was put out for bid as a Request for Proposals, and someone bid on the contract, they would be prohibited from parking the van on the two inner roadways, taking away the concept of an on-demand service; and • Inquiries whether staff had requested Super Shuttle to utilize the Sprinter vans; and whether these vans were currently being used to pick up passengers at home, Director, Landside Operations said the company wanted to bring in the Sprinter vans. She noted Super Shuttle picked up passengers at home; however, their main operation was to and from the Airport. <p><u>Additional Information- Agreement between American Shuttle, Inc. and Miami-Dade County R-952-11</u> On November 15, 2011, the BCC, through R-952-11, approved the Agreement between American Shuttle, Inc. and Miami-Dade County for Exclusive Demand Shared Ground Transportation Services at Miami International Airport. American Shuttle bid a Minimum Annual Guarantee payment to the County of \$783,137.50 (which is \$65,261.45 per month), and under the Agreement, the County will be paid the greater of \$65,261.45 per month or 6.4% of American Shuttle’s total monthly gross revenues. The initial term of the Agreement is for five (5) years and at the sole discretion of the County, the initial five (5) year term may be extended for one (1) three (3) year period provided the extension is mutually agreed to by the County and the Concessionaire in writing.</p> <p>Article 17.03 permits the Aviation Department (MDAD) to act whenever the County itself has the right to act under the Agreement. The Agreement was awarded with the following Delegations of Authority, MDAD may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change Service Zones under Article 5.02(d); • Reassign use of the vehicle storage area under Article 5.02(e); • Allow changes in scheduled departure services under Article 5.02(f); • Take into account under Article 5.02(j) the maintenance and condition of the vans in determining whether to extend the Agreement for the three-year period; • Purchase the vans under Article 5.02(j) upon termination of the Agreement; • Require American Shuttle under Article 5.02(v) to provide emergency parking shuttle services; and • Authorize the adjustment of per passenger fares under Article 5.05. <p>Background The agreement with Southern Shuttle Services, Inc. d/b/a SuperShuttle for Exclusive Demand Shared Ground Transportation Services at Miami International Airport was expiring on February 19, 2012. In order to allow for a transition period, an Invitation to Bid (No. MDAD-03-10) was advertised on June 24, 2011 for a single qualified Exclusive Demand Shared Ground Transportation Services Concessionaire for Miami International Airport. American Shuttle was the highest bidder, and once the BCC approved the Agreement (R-952-11), American Shuttle commenced services on February 20, 2012 immediately upon expiration of the SuperShuttle Agreement.</p> <p>Airports provide a wide range of transportation services for its passengers. Such services include pre-arranged services (where a passenger arranges for a specific type of transportation in advance of arriving at the airport) and demand services (where a passenger may request or “demand” to be taken to the place of his or her choice). Demand services can be provided by taxi cabs or by shared passenger vehicles. MDAD issued the ITB to select a single provider of demand ground transportation services for multiple parties utilizing vans of a stated size.</p> <p>Under the Agreement, American Shuttle is required to provide a certain number of vans and qualified drivers to operate to and from the Terminal Building of Miami International Airport, carrying multiple airline passengers to whatever destination the passengers’ request, generally within Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties. They will also provide all Terminal Building curbside services related to the Concessionaire’s multiple-party vehicles, which will include 24-hours a day, 7-days a week staffing for demand shared ground transportation services from designated zones at the Terminal Building. Additionally, the County allows the nonexclusive right to provide pre-arranged shared ground transportation services to the Terminal Building, with drop-off areas at the Terminal Building designated by the Aviation Department from time to time.</p> <p>Responses were received from the following firms on August 12, 2011: American Shuttle, Inc.; and SuperShuttle, Inc. submitted a “No Bid” letter explaining that the company determined that the Concession Agreement would not be advantageous for the company to pursue. SuperShuttle was the provider for 18 years at MIA.</p> <p>The Concessionaire will provide a minimum of fifty (50) new air-conditioned, suitable, modern, transportation vehicles, in full compliance with all requirements of law applicable to such vehicles. The vehicles will have a rated seating capacity of ten (10) persons or more, be of good quality, ready for use and immediately available to transport all passengers requesting demand ground transportation.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>CONTRACT MEASURES: Fifteen percent (15%) Airport Concession Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (ACDBE) Goal</p> <p>CONTRACT MEASURE ACHIEVED: Fifteen percent (15%)</p> <p>ACDBE Firms: MM Professional Transportation – Eight percent (8%) = \$62,651.00 WRP & Associates, Inc. – Seven percent (7%) = \$54,819.63</p>
8D1 150474	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING SELECTION OF BANC OF AMERICA, PUBLIC CAPITAL CORP TO PROVIDE CAPITAL IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$13,200,000.00 FOR LEASE PURCHASE OF MARKED AND UNMARKED POLICE VEHICLES AND TO PAY FINANCING COSTS; APPROVING TERMS OF RELATED COMMITMENT LETTER; AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE COMMITMENT LETTER AND ANY AGREEMENTS AND DOCUMENTS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITMENT LETTER PROVIDED THE TERMS ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE COMMITMENT LETTER AND TO TAKE ALL ACTION NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THE LEASE PURCHASE; WAIVING THE REQUIREMENTS OF RESOLUTION R-130-06</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approves the selection of Banc of America Public Capital Corp (BAPCC) to provide capital in an amount not to exceed \$13,200,000.00 for the lease/purchase of marked and unmarked police vehicles, and to pay the costs of financing; • Approves the terms of a BAPCC commitment letter; • Authorizes all actions necessary to effectuate the Lease Purchase through related agreements by the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee consistent with the terms of the BAPCC commitment letter; and • Waives Resolution R-130-06, which requires that any contracts of the County with third parties be executed and finalized prior to their placement on an agenda for Board consideration. <p>The closing is anticipated to occur on April 1, 2015.</p> <p>Background: On January 21, 2015, the County's Financial Advisor, Public Financial Management, Inc., released a solicitation document to the banking and financial industry consistent with the County's objectives to: a) obtain a means of financing police vehicles at the lowest cost of funds based on the current market at the most favorable terms, and b) preferably without a covenant to budget and appropriate pledge of the County's non-ad valorem revenues.</p> <p>On February 6, 2015, the Financial Advisor received eight (8) proposals from major banking institutions. Upon review of the proposals and based on the recommendation of the County's Financial Advisor, staff determined that the proposal submitted by BAPCC conformed to the requirements of the solicitation at the lowest cost, with an offer letter and term sheet that provides the County with the most favorable terms and overall conditions. The interest rate was offered at 1.4105 percent and was locked in until March 30, 2015 with the County's acceptance of the term sheet pending Board approval of this item.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source: The amount to be financed to fund the vehicle purchases and related financing costs will not exceed \$13,200,000.00 for a recommended five (5) year term at an interest rate of 1.4105 percent with a debt service structure having equal principal payments each year. Annual interest payments would occur on October 1 and April 1 each year of the financing term, with the annual principal payment made on April 1. The total interest cost to the County over the financing period is estimated to be \$559,000.00.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>There are no up-front bank charges, underwriting fees, maintenance, or processing fees associated with the escrow or ongoing disclosure requirements. The County would only be obligated to pay its own finance closing expenses to include Financial Advisor fees and outside counsel fees estimated at \$53,000.00.</i></p> <p>The first of five (5) annual expenditure appropriations to fund the principal and interest payments has been included in the Miami-Dade Police Department's FY 2014-15 Adopted Budget, which is supported by the General Fund. Future payments will be included in the Miami-Dade Police Department's budget. The lease/purchase agreement is a contractual obligation and does not further encumber the County's bonding capacity using a non-ad valorem backed revenue pledge for future financing purposes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Proceeds of the lease/purchase financing would be escrowed with Bank of America, National Association (Bank of America, National Association and BAPCC are banking affiliates of the Bank of America Corporation). Escrowed financing proceeds would be released as vehicles are delivered and accepted by the County. The County will receive credit for all interest earned on the escrow and will hold title to the vehicles upon delivery, acceptance, and payment to the vehicle vendor.</i></p> <p>Additional Information: On April 17, 2012, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-348-12, authorized the access of Florida Sheriff's Association Contract No. 11-19-0907-MD in the amount of \$2,657,000 for the purchase of model year 2012 police patrol vehicles for the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD).</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 MDPD in the amount of \$4,331,000. The vehicles were to replace automobiles that were retired due to age, costly mechanical issues, or accident. Market research determined that accessing the FSA contract</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes								
	<p>would be cost effective for the County as the FSA contract's vendors offered the lowest prices for the desired vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of the 211 vehicles, 110 are pursuit vehicles. The 110 pursuit vehicles are 2014 Ford Interceptors equipped with the manufacturer's "Police Packages," which include special engines for high-speed pursuits, upgraded suspensions, cooling systems, and other enhancements. The remaining 101 non-pursuit vehicles are to be used for investigative and specialized purposes. <p>On February 18, 2015, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-171-15 approving accessing the Florida Sheriffs Association (FSA) competitively established contract, 14-22-0904 in the amount of \$13,147,000 for the purchase of marked and unmarked police vehicles for the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD).</p> <p><i>During the February 18, 2015 BCC meeting, the commission inquired about the overall impact of this purchase. The Deputy Director of the Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD), noted 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 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> <p><i>The commission asked how the purchase would be funded the Deputy Mayor responded that a line of credit loan was being obtained through the competitive process and the Budget Director from the Office of Management and Budget, noted that the payment to secure the line of credit was included in the Miami-Dade Police Department's operating budget and funded through the General Fund for Fiscal Year 2014-15.</i></p> <p><i>When asked if the money acquired from criminal activities could be used to offset the costs associated with this purchase and other MDPD needs, the Director of MDPD, 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></p> <p><i>The commission requested that 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>								
8F1 150352	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING AWARD OF CONTRACT NO. FB-00002 TO NEW FLYER OF AMERICA, INC. FOR PURCHASE OF 60-FOOT ARTICULATED HYBRID BUSES IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$71,387,000.00 FOR THE MIAMI-DADE TRANSIT DEPARTMENT; AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME AND EXERCISE ANY CANCELLATION, RENEWAL AND OTHER PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN; AND AUTHORIZING THE USE OF CHARTER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION SURTAX FUNDS FOR SUCH PURPOSES [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 150010]</p>								
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves award of Contract No. FB-00002 to New Flyer of America, Inc. for purchase of 60-Foot Articulated Hybrid Buses in the total amount not to exceed \$71,387,000.</p> <p><i>During the Transit and Mobility Services Committee meeting on February 11, 2015, the proposed resolution was amended to reflect that NABI Bus, LLC was merged into New Flyer of America, Inc. effective December 28, 2014.</i></p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact and Funding Source:</u></p> <p>The fiscal impact for the five-year term is \$71,387,000 for the purchase of up to 64 buses and supported by existing and future federal and state grant funds. Some of the grants will require a local match from Charter County Transportation Surtax funds. The buses will only be purchased upon the County obtaining the necessary grant funds.</p> <p>The solicitation issued was strictly for diesel/electric hybrid buses in order to comply with the federal and state requirements that the buses be more efficient and reduce emissions. Additionally, the State of Florida Department of Transportation grants identified below require the buses to have diesel/electric hybrid propulsion systems. In order to not miss the opportunity to purchase more fuel efficient buses that generate fewer emissions, the County sought hybrid buses at the same time that it is in the process of completing a solicitation for compressed natural gas vehicles.</p> <p><i>If the County chooses to purchase compressed natural gas vehicles as an alternative, the agreements with the federal and state governments can be amended and a new procurement will be sought for the purchase.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Quantity of Hybrid Buses</th> <th style="background-color: #d9ead3;">Funding Source</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">41</td> <td>State of Florida Department of Transportation Grant and 50 percent local match from Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Federal Transit Administration 5307 Grant (these two buses will supplement service along the South Miami-Dade Busway)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">21</td> <td>Future State of Florida Department of Transportation Grant and a 50 percent local match from Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>An Invitation to Bid was issued under full and open competition on January 24, 2014. One bid was received in response to the solicitation. The method of award was to the lowest-priced responsive, responsible bidder in the aggregate.</p>	Quantity of Hybrid Buses	Funding Source	41	State of Florida Department of Transportation Grant and 50 percent local match from Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds	2	Federal Transit Administration 5307 Grant (these two buses will supplement service along the South Miami-Dade Busway)	21	Future State of Florida Department of Transportation Grant and a 50 percent local match from Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds
Quantity of Hybrid Buses	Funding Source								
41	State of Florida Department of Transportation Grant and 50 percent local match from Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds								
2	Federal Transit Administration 5307 Grant (these two buses will supplement service along the South Miami-Dade Busway)								
21	Future State of Florida Department of Transportation Grant and a 50 percent local match from Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds								

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
	Additional Information on Relevant Legislation	
	Resolution	Research Notes
	Resolution	Additional Information
	R-178-02 Adopted 2-26-2002	Reaffirmed the Board's prior decision to refrain from purchasing any additional articulated buses, and directing the County Manager to seek the Board's approval prior to purchasing any articulated buses in the future.
	R-514-06 Adopted 5-9-2006	Authorized the execution of a County Incentive Grant Program (CIGP) Agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) in the amount of \$3,747,000 to purchase up twenty three (23) conventional buses. It was further recommended that the Board authorize the receipt and expenditure of funds as specified in this CIGP, and commit up to \$3,747,000 in Charter County Transit System Surtax (Surtax) funding or Surtax backed funding as a local match.
	R-482-08 Adopted 5-6-2008	Authorized the execution of a Supplemental County Incentive Grant Program (SCIGP) Agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to change the scope to allow for the purchase of up to twelve (12) 40-foot, heavy-duty, low floor hybrid (diesel-electric), transit buses instead of the originally programmed diesel only buses. Additional Information: This supplemental agreement had no fiscal impact as it was only for the change in scope from diesel to hybrid (diesel-electric) and does not involve additional match funding over the original \$3,747,000, which was approved by the Board and the Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) in May 2006. Resolution No. R-514-06 matched the State's \$3,747,000 funding contribution equally with \$3,747,000 from Surtax or Surtax backed funding.
	R-350-09 Adopted 4-7-2009	Approved the award of a contract to purchase thirteen (13) forty foot diesel/electric hybrid mass transit buses in the amount of \$7,494,000 for Miami-Dade Transit. R-350-09 further authorized the award of this contract as a Bid Waiver because of the use of non-federal funding sources, as well as negotiated changes to bus component requirements.
	R-508-09 Adopted 5-5-2009	Approved the award of a contract to purchase twenty five (25) sixty foot diesel/electric hybrid mass transit buses in the amount of \$21,585,000.00 for Miami-Dade Transit. R-508-09 further authorized award of this contract as a Bid Waiver because of negotiated changes to bus component requirements.
	R-946-10 Adopted 9-21-2010	Ratified the actions of the County Mayor or County Mayor's Designee, as authorized by Section 2-8.2.7 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, in approving the selection of Gillig LLC in the amount of \$3,254,904 for the purchase of five (5) Heavy Duty Transit Buses for Miami-Dade Transit Department. R-946-10 further authorized the use of the Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds. Additional Information: On July 17, 2008, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) adopted Ordinance No. 08-92, the Economic Stimulus Plan (ESP), creating an expedited process for certain capital projects to stimulate economic development and delegating authority to the Mayor or his designee to advertise and award construction contracts and professional service agreements subject to the Board ratification. Subsequently, on June 30, 2009, the BCC approved Ordinance No. 09-60, amending the ESP to provide the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extended the sunset provision to July 1, 2011; and • Allowed the acquisition of goods and services funded through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) to be included under the ESP. <p>On January 22, 2010, the County Manager approved the purchase of five hybrid buses by accessing a competitively awarded contract from Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority (LYNX). The first bus is scheduled to be delivered in August 2010. The remaining four buses were to be delivered in December 2010. The grant expired on May 31, 2011.</p> <p>The total cost of the five (5) hybrid buses is \$3,254,904, with a cost per bus of \$650,981. The National Clean Diesel Funding Assistance Program is providing \$731,850 in grant funds. This is the total maximum reimbursement for all five (5) buses. Pursuant to EPA, the grant contribution is up to 24.6% of the cost of each bus, not to exceed the total funding of \$731,850. If each hybrid bus receives \$146,370 in grant funding that amounts to 22% of the purchase cost.</p> <p>According to MDT, the purchase of these five (5) hybrid buses was previously anticipated as part of the bus replacement plan. The ARRA grant provides only part of the funding source. The remaining funding amount of \$2,523,054 is from MDT operating funds.</p> <p>According to MDT, these buses are similar but have significant differences. The engines of the Gillig buses must meet the more stringent EPA 2010 emission standards which increases the cost. The 2009 hybrid bus purchase did not have to meet this requirement. Also, the body construction has improved materials in the structure (Gillig uses stainless steel and aluminum compared to carbon steel used by NABI). Additional improvements to the buses were the inclusion of the "mini" hybrid engine cooling package, break monitoring system, electric A/C, advanced power management system and composite flooring. These improvements along with the cost for the 2010 EPA engine and other modifications increased the price of the Gillig buses. In addition, the Gillig contract includes</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>maintenance, training and operator orientation – items that are not included in the 2009 NABI contract.</p>
R-386-12 Adopted 5-1-2012	<p>Authorized the execution of a Joint Participation Agreement (Agreement) with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to provide State funding in the amount of \$6,000,000 for the purchase of twelve (12) 60-foot, heavy-duty, low-floor, articulated, diesel-electric hybrid buses for the South Miami-Dade Busway Service Expansion Project. R-386-12 further recommended that the Board authorize the receipt and expenditure of funds as specified in the Agreement. Miami-Dade County proposed to provide an equal match of \$6,000,000 for this Agreement from Charter County Transportation Surtax Bond (Surtax) proceeds.</p> <p>Additional Information: At this point in time, MDT operated 40-foot standard buses on the Busway. In the two years following, MDT would begin replacing the 40-foot buses with 60-foot, heavy-duty, low-floor, articulated, diesel-electric hybrid buses to be utilized on the Busway MAX. The main benefit of using 60-foot articulated buses was greater passenger capacity. Additionally, MDT planned to improve the peak headway of the Busway MAX, which had the highest ridership servicing the South Miami-Dade Busway with an approximate average of 7,800 weekday boardings. The peak headway was to be improved from 12 minutes to 10 minutes and the seating capacity was to increase by 170 seats per hour in the peak. Additional benefits of expanding this service included: reduced energy usage, supporting sustainability, improved system punctuality, reliability and improved ride quality for passengers.</p> <p>During the May 1, 2012 BCC meeting, the Commission expressed concerns about R-386-12 because on February 26, 2002 R-178-02 was adopted reaffirming the Board's prior decision to refrain from purchasing any additional articulated buses. It was noted that in 2002 the very long buses were almost empty yet the funding for maintaining and operating these buses was exceedingly high.</p> <p><i>The Director of the Miami-Dade Transit Department (MDT) stated that the reason the department was recommending the purchase of the articulated buses was because of overcrowding on two key Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridors and that was more economical to run these articulated buses because of reduced labor and fuel costs as these were hybrid buses.</i></p> <p><i>The Commission pointed out that the size of the buses was problematic, because when they turned the corner they rode over the sidewalk. The MDT Director stated that the turning radius of these buses was adequate for the bus routes, and the department made sure that the buses could be driven safely ensuring that she would review the buses' turning radiuses to ensure they were adequate.</i></p>
R-387-12 Adopted 5-1-2012	<p>Authorized the execution of a Joint Participation Agreement (Agreement) with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to provide State funding in the amount of \$9,000,000 for the purchase of eighteen (18) 60-foot, articulated, diesel-electric hybrid buses for the Biscayne Enhanced Bus Service project. R-387-12 further recommended that the Board authorize the receipt and expenditure of funds as specified in the Agreement. Miami-Dade County proposed to provide an equal match of \$9,000,000 for this Agreement from Charter County Transportation Surtax Bond (Surtax) proceeds.</p>
R-448-14 Adopted 5-6-2014	<p>On May 6, 2014, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-448-14 directing the Mayor or Mayor's designee to provide quarterly reports to the Board of County Commissioners on ridership numbers for articulated buses run by Miami-Dade County.</p>
R-486-14 Adopted 6-3-2014	<p>Authorized the receipt and expenditure of funds as specified in the Agreement. Miami-Dade County proposed to provide an equal match of \$5,225,000.00 for this Agreement from Charter County Transportation Surtax Bond (Surtax) proceeds for a total Agreement of \$10,450,000.00.</p> <p><i>During the June 3, 2014 BCC meeting the Director of Miami-Dade Transit (MDT), explained this item covered the 27th Avenue corridor and noted there would be \$27 million available in 2019 to address the east/west corridor. The commission commented that the half-penny tax imposed was not used as intended and expressed concern with the amount of time taken to address the major corridors in the county, noting that in the 30 years since the inception of Metrorail, the corridor in the north end of the county had not been addressed. The commission stressed the need for new plans to include and explanation on how the existing system would be maintained.</i></p> <p>Authorized the execution of a Joint Participation Agreement (Agreement) with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to provide County Incentive Grant Program funding in the amount of \$5,225,000.00 for the purchase of eleven (11) 60-foot articulated, diesel-electric hybrid buses for an Enhanced Bus Service along the NW 27th Avenue Corridor from the Miami-Dade/Broward County Line (NW 215 Street and NW 27 Ave) to the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC) at the Miami International Airport (MIA). This was a multi-year Agreement providing State funding for the project in Fiscal Years (FY) 2014 and 2015.</p> <p>Additional Information: On February 26, 2002, the Board adopted Resolution R-178-02, which instructed the administration to refrain from purchasing any additional articulated buses without receiving prior Board approval. As a result, waiver of Resolution 178-02 is also requested.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																																				
	<p><u>Additional Information – Miami-Dade Transit Ridership Report (October-December 2014):</u></p> <p>October For the reporting period of October 2014, overall system average daily ridership was lower compared to the October 2013 period, with a 3 percent decrease. This was generated by a 5.5 percent decrease in average weekday Metrobus boardings, for which the 3.1 percent increase in Metrorail average weekday boardings and the 2.5 percent increase in Metromover average weekday boardings (compared to October 2013) could not compensate.</p> <p>The largest increases in average weekday Metrobus boardings from October 2013 to October 2014 were registered on the following routes:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin: 10px 0;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #d9ead3;"> <th style="width: 60%;">Metrobus Route</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Percentage Increase</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Boardings Increase</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Route 36 (Omni to International Mall & Dolphin Mall via 36th Street)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11.1%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">346</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route 150 (Miami Airport Metrorail to South Drive – South Beach)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18.2%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">239</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>November For the reporting period of November 2014, overall system average daily ridership was lower compared to the November 2013 period, with a 2.97 percent decrease. This was generated by a 4.74 percent decrease in average weekday Metrobus boardings and a 1.26 percent decrease in Metromover average weekday boardings, for which the 2.13 percent Metrorail increase (compared with November 2013) could not compensate.</p> <p>The largest increases in average weekday Metrobus boardings from November 2013 to November 2014 were registered on the following routes:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin: 10px 0;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #d9ead3;"> <th style="width: 60%;">Metrobus Route</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Percentage Increase</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Boardings Increase</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Route 36 (Omni to International Mall & Dolphin Mall via 36th Street)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7.2%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">216</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route 150 (Miami Airport Metrorail to South Drive – South Beach)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">16.8%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">239</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route 88 (Dadeland North to 152nd/88th Street via Kendall Drive)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10.6%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">275</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route 208 (SW 8th Street Little Havana Corridor)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9.5%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">216</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>December For the reporting period of December 2014, overall system average daily ridership was lower compared to the Decemebr 2013 period, with a 1.52 percent decrease. This was generated by a 3.23 percent decrease in average weekday Metrobus boardings, for which the 2.63 percent increase in Metrorail average weekday boardings, and the 2.60 percent increase in Metromover average weekday boardings (compared with December 2013) could not compensate.</p> <p>The largest increases in average weekday Metrobus boardings from December 2013 to December 2014 were registered on the following routes:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin: 10px 0;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #d9ead3;"> <th style="width: 60%;">Metrobus Route</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Percentage Increase</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Boardings Increase</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Route 7 (Downtown to International Mall & Dolphin Mall via NW 7th Street)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5.7%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">545</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route 3 (Downtown to Aventura via Biscayne Blvd.)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5.3%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">432</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Route 150 (Miami Airport Metrorail to South Drive – South Beach)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">28.3%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">387</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Additional Information:</u> On March 11, 2015, File No. 150325 was amended and passed during the Transit and Mobility Services Committee (TMSC) meeting. File No. 150325 authorized the Mayor or Mayor’s designee to execute a Joint Participation Agreement (Agreement) with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to provide County Incentive Grant Program for the purchase of twelve (12) 60-foot buses for the State Road (SR) 836 Express Enhanced Bus Service (EBS). The estimated project cost of twelve (12) CNG buses for the SR 836 Express EBS is \$10,746,000.00. The State’s Participation Rate for this project is 50 percent. This multi-year Agreement will provide \$2,275,566.00 in County Incentive Grant Program funding in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 and \$3,097,434.00 in FY 2016 for a combined total of \$5,373,000.00. Bond proceeds from the Charter County Transportation Sales Surtax (Surtax) will be used for the required equal local match of \$5,373,000.00 for this Agreement. The item was amended to allow for sooner implementation if funding was available.</p> <p>During the TMSC meeting on March 11, 2015, the committee discussed alternative to the articulated buses, such as double decker buses and asked MDT if they had been considered during the procurement of buses. The representative from MDT present at the committee meeting was unaware of any mention of double decker buses and said the department would look into it. Additionally, the committee expressed</p>	Metrobus Route	Percentage Increase	Boardings Increase	Route 36 (Omni to International Mall & Dolphin Mall via 36th Street)	11.1%	346	Route 150 (Miami Airport Metrorail to South Drive – South Beach)	18.2%	239	Metrobus Route	Percentage Increase	Boardings Increase	Route 36 (Omni to International Mall & Dolphin Mall via 36th Street)	7.2%	216	Route 150 (Miami Airport Metrorail to South Drive – South Beach)	16.8%	239	Route 88 (Dadeland North to 152 nd /88 th Street via Kendall Drive)	10.6%	275	Route 208 (SW 8 th Street Little Havana Corridor)	9.5%	216	Metrobus Route	Percentage Increase	Boardings Increase	Route 7 (Downtown to International Mall & Dolphin Mall via NW 7 th Street)	5.7%	545	Route 3 (Downtown to Aventura via Biscayne Blvd.)	5.3%	432	Route 150 (Miami Airport Metrorail to South Drive – South Beach)	28.3%	387
Metrobus Route	Percentage Increase	Boardings Increase																																			
Route 36 (Omni to International Mall & Dolphin Mall via 36th Street)	11.1%	346																																			
Route 150 (Miami Airport Metrorail to South Drive – South Beach)	18.2%	239																																			
Metrobus Route	Percentage Increase	Boardings Increase																																			
Route 36 (Omni to International Mall & Dolphin Mall via 36th Street)	7.2%	216																																			
Route 150 (Miami Airport Metrorail to South Drive – South Beach)	16.8%	239																																			
Route 88 (Dadeland North to 152 nd /88 th Street via Kendall Drive)	10.6%	275																																			
Route 208 (SW 8 th Street Little Havana Corridor)	9.5%	216																																			
Metrobus Route	Percentage Increase	Boardings Increase																																			
Route 7 (Downtown to International Mall & Dolphin Mall via NW 7 th Street)	5.7%	545																																			
Route 3 (Downtown to Aventura via Biscayne Blvd.)	5.3%	432																																			
Route 150 (Miami Airport Metrorail to South Drive – South Beach)	28.3%	387																																			

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>concern over minimizing instances in which the articulated buses were empty and asked if the buses acquired could not be used throughout other corridors. A representative from MDT noted that as per the grant specifications, buses could not be used elsewhere however, once service is met, buses can be used in another corridor to minimize the situations in which buses had no passengers.</p> <p>The committee also suggested that MDT analyze how to improve upon the use of buses during non-peak hours and whether or not a system similar to that of an airline could be implemented to ensure maximum capacity on articulated buses.</p>
8F2 150531	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING AWARD OF CONTRACT NO. RFP 872 TO ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGIES, INC. FOR FOREIGN OBJECT DEBRIS DETECTION SYSTEM IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT, INCLUDING RENEWAL PERIODS, NOT TO EXCEED \$7,299,000.00 FOR THE MIAMI-DADE AVIATION DEPARTMENT; AND AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME AND EXERCISE ANY CANCELLATION, RENEWAL AND OTHER PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves the award of Request for Proposals No. 872 Foreign Object Debris Detection System to Organizational Strategies, Inc. (OSI) for a turn-key airport Foreign Object Debris Detection System (System) that will be utilized by the Miami-Dade Aviation Department to detect objects on the airfield that have the capacity to injure airline personnel, damage aircrafts, or impact aircrafts during flight. The System will initially be installed on Runway 8R-26L at Miami International Airport, which handles the majority of air carrier operations, to allow for automated, continuous detection of foreign object debris on the runway without disrupting airside operations.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u> The initial five-year term of the contract is \$4,658,000, which includes the associated hardware maintenance support services for the System. The cumulative value of the contract will be \$7,299,000 for 14 years if the County exercises the three (3), three-year options to renew. The \$4,658,000 will be allocated to the Aviation Department and the funding sources are as follows: Federal Funds - \$2,550,000; State Funds - \$1,053,740; and Proprietary Funds - \$1,053,740.</p> <p>A Request for Proposals was issued under full and open competition on September 16, 2013. Two (2) proposals were received in response to the solicitation. Prior to the receipt of proposals, three (3) pre-proposal conferences, including site visits, were provided to potential vendors so they may understand the project requirements, observe site and traffic flow conditions within Miami International Airport, and review the technical drawings and documents pertinent to Runway 8R-26L. Two (2) proposals were received in response to the solicitation.</p> <p>Upon completion of the Selection Committee's evaluation of the proposals, Varec, Inc. (Varec), the highest-ranked proposer, was recommended for negotiations. A total of six (6) negotiation sessions and five (5) site visits with Varec took place to discuss general terms and conditions, approach, methodology, airfield conditions, utilization of existing infrastructure, and pricing. Varec was granted additional site visits to inspect the airfield in an effort to identify opportunities to reduce their proposed price and submitted a revised price offering that proffered a new conduit system for the proposed foreign object debris detection system. The revised price proposal increased the price from \$6,531,170 to \$7,981,827 for the initial contract term. The total cost exceeded the \$5 million project budget by over \$2.9 million.</p> <p>It was determined by the Negotiation Team that the revised price proposal was not acceptable, as it significantly exceeded the project budget and included additional time for the implementation of the project. Consequently, the Negotiation Team voted to terminate negotiations with Varec and to proceed to the second highest-ranked proposer, OSI. Negotiations with OSI resulted in a best value contract that meets all of the requirements within the solicitation and falls below the established project budget.</p> <p><u>Supplement to Contract Award Recommendation for Contract No. RFP 872 – Foreign Object Debris Detection System – Bid Protest:</u> This supplement is being provided in conjunction with the contract award to OSI to report the findings of a bid protest that was filed with the Clerk of the Board on December 22, 2014 by Varec, one (1) of the two (2) respondents to Request for Proposal RFP 872.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>In accordance with bid protest policies and procedures, as set forth in Section 2-8.4 of the County Code and Implementing Order 3-21, a Hearing Examiner was appointed and a bid protest hearing was conducted on January 26, 2015. The Hearing Examiner upheld the Mayor's contract award recommendation.</i></p> <p><u>Additional Information:</u> According to the Organizational Strategies, Inc. (OSI) website, the company uses proprietary Video Analytics technology and proprietary Edge Focused Differencing technology in its products to provide users the power to quickly identify and communicate differences in topography, and location of assets and personnel, and easily isolate, highlight and view objects in motion from any type of digital video feed.</p>
8J1 150157	<p>RESOLUTION RETROACTIVELY APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE PRIOR ISSUANCE OF CERTAIN NEW COUNTY STEVEDORING LICENSES PREVIOUSLY ISSUED ADMINISTRATIVELY BY PRIOR SEAPORT DIRECTORS WITHOUT COUNTY COMMISSION APPROVAL</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution retroactively approves and authorizes the prior issuance of new stevedoring licenses, which were issued administratively without Board of County Commissioners (BCC) approval.</p> <p><u>Background</u> Pursuant to Chapter 28A-6 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, requests for new County stevedoring licenses are reviewed and issued by the BCC upon recommendation by the Mayor and subsequent to screening by the Miami-Dade Police Department, the Port Director and Port staff. Currently, under Chapter 28A-6.6 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, existing stevedoring licenses and Port stevedoring permits may be renewed by the Port Director without being presented to the BCC when applicable requirements of Chapter 28A-6 of the Code and the Port Tariff are met.</p> <p>The majority of stevedoring license requests received by the Port each year are for renewals of existing licenses. For example, in 2014, the Port received approximately 20 requests for renewals of existing licenses, but only a single request for the issuance of a new license. The</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes		
	<p>Port went through an eight year period (2001-2008) where it did not receive any applications for new licenses. The last new stevedoring licenses issued by the BCC occurred in 2000.</p> <p>As part of the review process for recently proposed changes to Section 28A-6 of the County Code, the Port discovered that since 2009 thirteen (13) prior requests for new stevedoring licenses were processed like requests for license renewals and issued administratively, without approval from the BCC.</p> <p>Although these administratively issued new licenses were not presented to the BCC for approval, past Seaport administrative practices complied with all other Code requirements for new licenses. These requirements included conducting Miami-Dade Police Department criminal background checks of applicants, insurance requirement reviews by Port permitting staff, obtaining personal character and qualification information through Port-required personal character inquiry forms and Port stevedoring questionnaires.</p> <p>As the administrative issuance of new licenses occurred in error, it is requested that the BCC retroactively approve the 13 administratively issued New stevedoring licenses listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2009: Christopher C. Arocha; James R. Callaham; Stefano Borzone; Charles Towsley; • 2010: Jeff White; John David Morgan; John Ballestero; Lars Jakob Ljoen; • 2011: John C. Gorman; Dusko Pesic; • 2012: Albert Smalls, Jr.; • 2013: Bruno Ramos; and • 2014: Sherif Assal. <p>Additional Information</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>File No. 142595 December 2, 2014</p> <p><i>The proposed ordinance was adopted on first reading and set for public hearing before the BCC on Tuesday, December 16, 2014.</i></p> <p><i>County Attorney noted that Administration requested suspension of the BCC Rules of Procedure requiring Committee review of this Item and a request to schedule the Public Hearing and Second Reading before the full Board on December 16, 2014.</i></p> <p><i>This item was withdrawn at the December 16, 2014 BCC meeting and a substitute item was presented, File No. 142649 (see below).</i></p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 28A-6 (6.1-6.7) of the Code of Miami-Dade County providing for modifications to the stevedore permit renewal process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling stevedoring firms to renew their business permits every three (3) years instead of annually; • Deleting the stevedoring needs assessment requirement, thereby allowing the PortMiami Director to expand the number of stevedoring providers on port; • Expanding stevedoring license and permit criteria; and • Authorizing the PortMiami Director to issue County stevedoring licenses and PortMiami stevedoring permits. <p>Currently, the Code provides that the County Manager will present the application with his recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners for issuance of a license.</p> <p>Permittees will now be required to pay for three years of stevedoring permit fees at the current PortMiami Terminal Tariff No. 010 annual stevedoring permit rate. Each stevedoring provider will pay the three year permit fee upfront valued at \$17,400 or, if deemed credit worthy by the Port Director will pay the fee in annual installments (\$5,800 per year). PortMiami currently has a total of ten stevedoring companies licensed and permitted to do business at the port. Stevedoring licenses will continue to be processed at no charge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>With the adoption of this ordinance, and the related proposed resolution amending Implementing Order 4-4 and Port Terminal Tariff No. 010, Item 714, stevedoring firms will be required to pay the three (3) year permit fee at the applicable Port Terminal Tariff No. 010 PortMiami stevedoring permit rate. However, stevedoring firms may request that their three-year permit fee be paid in three annual payments, provided that applicants remain obligated for the full three-year fee even if they withdraw or cease using the permit prior to the expiration of the three (3) year term.</i> <p>In an effort to streamline the permit renewal process for stevedoring firms, PortMiami proposes to change the duration of port stevedoring permits and County stevedoring licenses from one (1) year to three (3) years. Under this proposed ordinance, any Port stevedoring permit or County stevedoring license issued by the PortMiami Director after January 1, 2015 will expire three years after date of permit issuance unless earlier revoked or suspended by the PortMiami Director.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed ordinance deletes the current stevedoring needs assessment requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Under the current ordinance, the PortMiami Director may limit the number of permitted stevedores based on a needs assessment. The proposed ordinance would delete the needs assessment requirement, thereby allowing for the PortMiami Director to permit any qualifying applicant. The issuance of additional permits may increase the number of available and competing stevedoring providers which could reduce stevedoring costs for the PortMiami's cruise and cargo line customers.</i> <p>The proposed ordinance also expands current stevedoring permit issuance criteria in order to address the importance of stevedoring firms having sufficient and suitable equipment to efficiently and safely meet the stevedoring needs of the PortMiami's cruise and cargo line customers.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>File No. 142595 December 2, 2014</p> <p><i>The proposed ordinance was adopted on first reading and set for public hearing before the BCC on Tuesday, December 16, 2014.</i></p> <p><i>County Attorney noted that Administration requested suspension of the BCC Rules of Procedure requiring Committee review of this Item and a request to schedule the Public Hearing and Second Reading before the full Board on December 16, 2014.</i></p> <p><i>This item was withdrawn at the December 16, 2014 BCC meeting and a substitute item was presented, File No. 142649 (see below).</i></p>	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 28A-6 (6.1-6.7) of the Code of Miami-Dade County providing for modifications to the stevedore permit renewal process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling stevedoring firms to renew their business permits every three (3) years instead of annually; • Deleting the stevedoring needs assessment requirement, thereby allowing the PortMiami Director to expand the number of stevedoring providers on port; • Expanding stevedoring license and permit criteria; and • Authorizing the PortMiami Director to issue County stevedoring licenses and PortMiami stevedoring permits. <p>Currently, the Code provides that the County Manager will present the application with his recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners for issuance of a license.</p> <p>Permittees will now be required to pay for three years of stevedoring permit fees at the current PortMiami Terminal Tariff No. 010 annual stevedoring permit rate. Each stevedoring provider will pay the three year permit fee upfront valued at \$17,400 or, if deemed credit worthy by the Port Director will pay the fee in annual installments (\$5,800 per year). PortMiami currently has a total of ten stevedoring companies licensed and permitted to do business at the port. Stevedoring licenses will continue to be processed at no charge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>With the adoption of this ordinance, and the related proposed resolution amending Implementing Order 4-4 and Port Terminal Tariff No. 010, Item 714, stevedoring firms will be required to pay the three (3) year permit fee at the applicable Port Terminal Tariff No. 010 PortMiami stevedoring permit rate. However, stevedoring firms may request that their three-year permit fee be paid in three annual payments, provided that applicants remain obligated for the full three-year fee even if they withdraw or cease using the permit prior to the expiration of the three (3) year term.</i> <p>In an effort to streamline the permit renewal process for stevedoring firms, PortMiami proposes to change the duration of port stevedoring permits and County stevedoring licenses from one (1) year to three (3) years. Under this proposed ordinance, any Port stevedoring permit or County stevedoring license issued by the PortMiami Director after January 1, 2015 will expire three years after date of permit issuance unless earlier revoked or suspended by the PortMiami Director.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed ordinance deletes the current stevedoring needs assessment requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Under the current ordinance, the PortMiami Director may limit the number of permitted stevedores based on a needs assessment. The proposed ordinance would delete the needs assessment requirement, thereby allowing for the PortMiami Director to permit any qualifying applicant. The issuance of additional permits may increase the number of available and competing stevedoring providers which could reduce stevedoring costs for the PortMiami's cruise and cargo line customers.</i> <p>The proposed ordinance also expands current stevedoring permit issuance criteria in order to address the importance of stevedoring firms having sufficient and suitable equipment to efficiently and safely meet the stevedoring needs of the PortMiami's cruise and cargo line customers.</p>
<p>File No. 142595 December 2, 2014</p> <p><i>The proposed ordinance was adopted on first reading and set for public hearing before the BCC on Tuesday, December 16, 2014.</i></p> <p><i>County Attorney noted that Administration requested suspension of the BCC Rules of Procedure requiring Committee review of this Item and a request to schedule the Public Hearing and Second Reading before the full Board on December 16, 2014.</i></p> <p><i>This item was withdrawn at the December 16, 2014 BCC meeting and a substitute item was presented, File No. 142649 (see below).</i></p>	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 28A-6 (6.1-6.7) of the Code of Miami-Dade County providing for modifications to the stevedore permit renewal process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling stevedoring firms to renew their business permits every three (3) years instead of annually; • Deleting the stevedoring needs assessment requirement, thereby allowing the PortMiami Director to expand the number of stevedoring providers on port; • Expanding stevedoring license and permit criteria; and • Authorizing the PortMiami Director to issue County stevedoring licenses and PortMiami stevedoring permits. <p>Currently, the Code provides that the County Manager will present the application with his recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners for issuance of a license.</p> <p>Permittees will now be required to pay for three years of stevedoring permit fees at the current PortMiami Terminal Tariff No. 010 annual stevedoring permit rate. Each stevedoring provider will pay the three year permit fee upfront valued at \$17,400 or, if deemed credit worthy by the Port Director will pay the fee in annual installments (\$5,800 per year). PortMiami currently has a total of ten stevedoring companies licensed and permitted to do business at the port. Stevedoring licenses will continue to be processed at no charge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>With the adoption of this ordinance, and the related proposed resolution amending Implementing Order 4-4 and Port Terminal Tariff No. 010, Item 714, stevedoring firms will be required to pay the three (3) year permit fee at the applicable Port Terminal Tariff No. 010 PortMiami stevedoring permit rate. However, stevedoring firms may request that their three-year permit fee be paid in three annual payments, provided that applicants remain obligated for the full three-year fee even if they withdraw or cease using the permit prior to the expiration of the three (3) year term.</i> <p>In an effort to streamline the permit renewal process for stevedoring firms, PortMiami proposes to change the duration of port stevedoring permits and County stevedoring licenses from one (1) year to three (3) years. Under this proposed ordinance, any Port stevedoring permit or County stevedoring license issued by the PortMiami Director after January 1, 2015 will expire three years after date of permit issuance unless earlier revoked or suspended by the PortMiami Director.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed ordinance deletes the current stevedoring needs assessment requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Under the current ordinance, the PortMiami Director may limit the number of permitted stevedores based on a needs assessment. The proposed ordinance would delete the needs assessment requirement, thereby allowing for the PortMiami Director to permit any qualifying applicant. The issuance of additional permits may increase the number of available and competing stevedoring providers which could reduce stevedoring costs for the PortMiami's cruise and cargo line customers.</i> <p>The proposed ordinance also expands current stevedoring permit issuance criteria in order to address the importance of stevedoring firms having sufficient and suitable equipment to efficiently and safely meet the stevedoring needs of the PortMiami's cruise and cargo line customers.</p>		
	<p>File No. 142649 <i>This substitute differs from the original in that it corrects formatting in Section 1 of the item in which</i></p>		

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
	<p>December 16, 2014</p> <p><i>This item is the substitute to File No. 142595.</i></p> <p><i>The BCC deferred this item at the December 16, 2014 meeting.</i></p>	<p><i>language being added was not previously underscored and language being deleted was not shown. In addition, this substitute adds new language in subsection 28A-6.6 requiring stevedoring permit and license holders to annually submit information to portMiami evidencing continued compliance with permit and license requirements.</i></p> <p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 28A-6 (6.1-6.7) of the Code of Miami-Dade County providing for modifications to the stevedore permit renewal process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling stevedoring firms to renew their business permits every three years instead of annually; • Deletes the stevedoring needs assessment requirement, allowing the PortMiami Director to expand the number of stevedoring providers on port; • Expands stevedoring license and permit criteria; and • Authorizes the PortMiami Director to issue County stevedoring licenses and PortMiami stevedoring permits. <p>Fiscal Impact Permittees will now be required to pay for three years of stevedoring permit fees at the current PortMiami Terminal Tariff No. 010 annual stevedoring permit rate. Each stevedoring provider will pay the three year permit fee upfront valued at \$17,400 or, if deemed credit worthy by the Port Director, will pay the fee in annual installments (\$5,800 per year). PortMiami currently has a total of ten stevedoring companies licensed and permitted to do business at the port. Stevedoring licenses will continue to be processed at no charge.</p> <p>Background In an effort to streamline the permit renewal process for stevedoring firms, PortMiami proposes to change the duration of port stevedoring permits and County stevedoring licenses from one (1) year to three (3) years. Under this proposed ordinance, any Port stevedoring permit or County stevedoring license issued by the PortMiami Director after January 1, 2015 will expire three years after date of permit issuance unless earlier revoked or suspended by the PortMiami Director.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed ordinance deletes the current stevedoring needs assessment requirement. Under the current ordinance, the PortMiami Director may limit the number of permitted stevedores based on a needs assessment. The recommended ordinance would delete the needs assessment requirement, thereby allowing for the PortMiami Director to permit any qualifying applicant. The issuance of additional permits may increase the number of available and competing stevedoring providers which could reduce stevedoring costs for the PortMiami's cruise and cargo line customers.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance also expands current stevedoring permit issuance criteria in order to address the importance of stevedoring firms having sufficient and suitable equipment to efficiently and safely meet the stevedoring needs of the PortMiami's cruise and cargo line customers. With the adoption of this ordinance, and the related proposed resolution amending Implementing Order 4-4 and Port Terminal Tariff No. 010, Item 714, stevedoring firms will be required to pay the three (3) year permit fee at the applicable Port Terminal Tariff No. 010 PortMiami stevedoring permit rate. However, stevedoring firms may request that their three-year permit fee be paid in three annual payments, provided that applicants remain obligated for the full three-year fee even if they withdraw or cease using the permit prior to the expiration of the three (3) year term.</p>
	<p>File No. 142622 December 16, 2014</p> <p><i>The BCC deferred this item at the December 16, 2014 meeting.</i></p>	<p>The proposed resolution amends Implementing Order 4-4 and PortMiami Terminal Tariff No. 010, Item 714, extending port stevedoring permits and licenses from one (1) year to three (3) years, and authorizing certain permit fee payment options. The proposed amendment to Port Tariff Item 714 will also authorize the Director to approve a stevedore permit applicant's request to make three annual payments of \$5,800 each provided the applicant agrees to pay the entire three-year permit fee even if the applicant returns the permit or elects not to use the permit prior to the expiration of the three year permit period. The PortMiami Director may rescind, revoke or suspend a permit for reasons relating to non-compliance with any terms of Ordinance 28A-6 of the Code of Miami-Dade County or Port Terminal Tariff No. 10.</p>
	<p>On December 11, 2014, the Office of the Commission Auditor posed the following questions, followed by their responses, to the Seaport: The item states that the Port currently has a total of 10 stevedoring companies licensed and permitted to do business at the Port. Please provide the name of each company and how many years has each company has been operating at the Port?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ceres Marine Terminal (previously R.O. White), over 20 years operating at PortMiami. 2. Eller ITO, over 20 years operating at PortMiami. 3. Florida Stevedoring, over 20 years operating at PortMiami. 4. Florida Transportation Services, 3 years' with stevedoring permit at PortMiami. 5. Metro Cruise Services, 5 years' operating at PortMiami. 6. POMTOC, 2 years with stevedoring permit at PortMiami, over 20 years working as a terminal operator at PortMiami. 7. Ports America (previously P&O Ports), over 10 years operating at PortMiami. 8. Seaboard Marine, over 30 years operating at PortMiami. 9. South Florida Container Terminal (previously Universal Maritime), over 20 years operating at PortMiami. 	

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>10. United Stevedoring (previously Hallmark), over 20 years operating at PortMiami.</p> <p>What is the current approval process for obtaining a stevedore license (does the BCC currently approve the application for a stevedore license)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new applicants must obtain a stevedore license from the Board after examination. The County Manager (now Mayor) shall present the application with his recommendation to the Board. No person shall employ a stevedore to perform services as such within Miami-Dade County, Florida, unless such stevedore is licensed by the Board. All renewal applications (which are 95% of all applications) are authorized and issued by the Port Director, pursuant to Chapter 28A-6.6 of the Code of Miami-Dade County. All renewals, which are the overwhelming majority of applicants, are administered and reviewed by PortMiami's permitting staff and seen by the Port Director for final issuance. It has been identified by the Port Director that previous practices have been misinterpreted, and have attached a supplement to this item explaining past, present and recommended actions and procedures. <p>Does the amendment (28A-6.4 (a) & (b)) remove the MDPD criminal background check for renewal applications? Are MDPD criminal background checks currently performed for renewal applications?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, background checks are only conducted on new stevedoring license applications. The Stevedoring Permit is issued to the actual firm, which does not require a background check. The Stevedoring License is issued to an individual, which does require a one-time MDPD background check, to new applicants. The Amendment to 28A-6.4 does not remove the MDPD background checks to new applicants. New applicants will remain subject to MDPD background checks. MDPD background checks are not required for renewing applicants. Along with the background check, new applicants must additionally fill out a Personal Character Form and License Questionnaire.
8M2 150543	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING SALE AND PURCHASE CONTRACT WITH THE STATE OF FLORIDA FOR PURCHASE OF APPROXIMATELY 82 ACRES OF VACANT LAND ADJACENT TO I-75 IN NORTHWEST MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, WAIVING PROVISIONS OF SECTION 2-10.4.2 OF THE COUNTY CODE REQUIRING TWO APPRAISALS, AND AUTHORIZING MAYOR OR DESIGNEE TO FINALIZE PURCHASE PRICE AT AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED APPRAISED VALUE OF \$12,300,000.00 AND TO EXECUTE SUCH CONTRACT; UPON SATISFACTION OF CERTAIN CONDITIONS, APPROVING AGREEMENT WITH MIAMI-DADE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD FOR PAYMENT OF \$7,250,000.00 FOR TERMINATION OF ITS LEASEHOLD INTEREST ON A PORTION OF THE PROPERTY, AUTHORIZING MAYOR OR DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME; AUTHORIZING PURCHASE OF THE PROPERTY AND TRANSMITTAL OF CONTRACTS TO STATE; DECLARING PROPERTY SURPLUS, WAIVING ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER 8-4 AS IT RELATES TO REVIEW BY PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD, REQUIREMENTS OF RESOLUTION NO. R-130-06 AND PROVISIONS OF SECTION 2-10.4.2 OF THE COUNTY CODE REQUIRING TWO APPRAISALS, APPROVING SALE AND PURCHASE CONTRACT WITH INTERNATIONAL ATLANTIC, LLC FOR SUCH PROPERTY IN AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO FUNDS EXPENDED BY COUNTY AND AUTHORIZING MAYOR OR DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME; UPON SATISFACTION OF CERTAIN CONDITIONS, APPROVING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CONVEYANCE PURSUANT TO FLORIDA STATUTES, SECTION 125.045, AUTHORIZING CHAIRPERSON OR VICE-CHAIRPERSON OF THIS BOARD TO EXECUTE COUNTY DEED, AND AUTHORIZING MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SUCH CONTRACTS, TO EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN SUCH CONTRACTS, AND TO COMPLETE ALL ACTS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE SUCH TRANSACTION; APPROVING ESCROW LETTER AGREEMENT WITH ARNSTEIN & LEHR, LLP AND WAIVING ANY CONFLICT IN HAVING SUCH LAW FIRM REPRESENT INTERNATIONAL ATLANTIC, LLC AND ACT AS ESCROW AGENT</p>
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes a series of transactions involving approximately 82 acres of vacant land for economic development purposes. More specifically, this item provides for following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorizes the purchase from the State of Florida, Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund (TIITF) of four (4) non-contiguous parcels of land with one Folio No. 30-2009-001-0170, totaling approximately 82 acres of vacant land; and Authorizes the County Mayor or the designee to execute the Contract for Sale and Purchase with the TIITF; <i>The land will be purchased with funds provided by International Atlantic, LLC (IAL) that are being held in escrow with an escrow agent at the final revised appraised value of the Property fee simple absolute as determined by the State of Florida not to exceed \$12,300,000 in order to facilitate an economic development conveyance of such land to IAL, a third party for-profit developer who will create new jobs and development;</i> Authorizes the payment of \$7,250,000 to the Miami-Dade School Board (School Board), which is the appraised value of the School Board's remaining leasehold interest, for its agreement to terminate its lease with the TIITF encumbering approximately 44.5 acres of the Property through the Year 2054 and authorizes the County Mayor or the designee to execute the Agreement with the Miami-Dade School Board. This payment to the School Board is in addition to the payment to the TIITF for the full value of the Property unencumbered by the School Board Leasehold Interest. The payment will be made pursuant to a fully executed Termination of Lease Agreement between the School Board and the TIITF. <i>The payment will be made with funds provided by IAL that are being held in escrow with an escrow agent;</i> Waives the requirements of Administrative Order 8-4 in light of the nature of this transaction as further described herein, and declares the Property surplus; Approves the Escrow Letter Agreement between the County and Arnstein & Lehr, LLP in order to have them act as escrow agent for this transaction and waives any conflict that may now, or hereinafter exist, with having Arnstein & Lehr, LLP act as escrow agent for this transaction as well as representing IAL in this transaction and any future matter in a capacity adverse to the County; Authorizes, pursuant to Section 125.045 of the Florida Statutes, the conveyance of the same four (4) non-contiguous parcels of land with Folio No. 30-2009-001-0170 to IAL totaling approximately 81.988 acres of vacant land; Authorizes the County Mayor or the designee to execute a Contract for Sale and Purchase with IAL for the payment by IAL to the County of a purchase price at the final revised appraised value of the Property fee simple absolute as determined by the State of Florida not to exceed \$12,300,000 and for the payment by IAL to the County of \$7,250,000, the additional appraised value of the

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>School Board's leasehold interest in the Property, as stated above, in exchange for the School Board's agreement to terminate its lease with the State, for a total Contract Price not to exceed \$19,550,000 plus all expenses and costs associated with the closing and recording of the various transactions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waives, pursuant to Section 2-10.4.2(b) of the Code of Miami-Dade County, Florida, the requirement that whenever the County purchases or sells property valued in excess of five million dollars (\$5 million) that the County will have the property appraised by two (2) real estate appraisers holding an M.A.I. designation. It is recommended that the Board waive this requirement for the purchase and the sale of the property because the State of Florida dictates that we must use the state's appraisal and we are not using County funds to purchase the property. <p>As a result of these transactions, IAL, an affiliated company within the Triple Five Group of Independent Companies, plans to develop and operate a multi-phase commercial mixed use development in Miami-Dade County, including retail, entertainment, amusement, and recreation, along with parking (Project).</p> <p>It is expected that during the several years of construction of all phases of this project there will be approximately 25,000 construction jobs. It is anticipated that once all phases of this project are completed there will be 25,000 permanent new jobs at the entire complex, including operations of the complex, services associated with the complex and employees of all tenants at the complex.</p> <p><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></p> <p>IAL has placed \$19,750,000 in escrow with the escrow agent in order to pay all of the costs and expenses associated with these transactions, including the agreed upon maximum contract price for the Property purchase from the State, the agreed upon compensation for the lease termination by the School Board, and all costs associated with the closing and recording of these transactions. The County is a third party beneficiary to this agreement.</p> <p>There is an associated cost for ensuring that the developer complies with the County's small business programs. The developer will be responsible to Small Business Development (SBD) of the County for any costs for monitoring SBD goals during the design and construction phases of the project. IAL has agreed to cover such costs up to a maximum of \$300,000 per year.</p> <p>In order for there to be no cost to the County for the purchase of the Property, the transactions should occur in the following order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAL will first place into an escrow account with the escrow agent \$19,750,000 (such funds already have been placed in such escrow account by IAL). • Of the total amount in escrow with the escrow agent, \$7,250,000 will be paid in a simultaneous closing transaction by the escrow agent on behalf of the County to the Miami-Dade School Board for its agreement to terminate its 50-year lease encumbering 44.5 acres of the Property. • In a simultaneous closing transaction, the escrow instructions to the escrow agent will provide that the County will purchase the Property from the TIITF at the final revised appraised value of the property fee simple absolute as determined by the State of Florida not to exceed \$12,300,000. • In a simultaneous closing transaction, the escrow instructions to the escrow agent will provide that the County will then immediately convey, by County Deed, the Property to IAL as per the Contract between IAL and the County and will record the Declaration of Restrictions along with the Deeds. <p>As a result of the actions above, no County funds will be utilized for this transaction.</p> <p><u>Background</u></p> <p>The Beacon Council introduced IAL to the County in January of 2014 stating that IAL desired to develop a major mixed-use retail, shopping, tourist, amusement, commercial and entertainment complex that will become one of the largest projects of this type in the world. It is anticipated that this project will be larger than the Mall of America in Minnesota that totals over 4 million square feet.</p> <p>IAL's preferred site for this project was a large tract of land in the Northwest corner of Miami-Dade County just west of I-75. While the total project will involve over 225 acres, including IAL's purchase of other privately owned land, the State of Florida currently owns a key piece of land totaling approximately 82 acres with frontage on I-75. This acreage is critical for exposure to those travelling on I-75 as well as for the scope of the development. Approximately 44.5 acres of the Property were declared surplus by the State of Florida in 2004, and, according to the procedures of Florida Statutes, Sections 253.034 and 253.0341, the 44.5 acres were leased to the School Board for 50 years at the standard administrative fee of \$300 per year.</p> <p>The School Board will be considering an item to terminate its lease in exchange for compensation equal to the appraised value of its leasehold interest in the amount of \$7,250,000. The TIITF obtained an appraisal for the entire Property and is evaluating two (2) review appraisals submitted to the TIITF to determine the final revised appraised value of the property fee simple absolute, but has determined that the final price will be a value not to exceed \$12,300,000.</p> <p>After the County expressed an interest in purchasing the Property for economic development, the TIITF issued the official notice to surplus the entire 82 acre property first to State agencies and colleges on January 16, 2015 and then officially to the County on February 23, 2015, and made the property available to the County for purchase at the final revised appraised value, provided that the School Board first approves and executes its Termination of Lease with the State and the Agreement with the County, that IAL and the County finalize and execute the Contract for Sale and Purchase between the County and IAL, and the approval by the State of this transaction.</p> <p>The County Mayor is working with the developer to incorporate the goals and initiatives of the One Community One Goal initiative developed with the Mayor's Office and the Beacon Council.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>In order to induce IAL to pursue this project, the County will use Florida Statutes 125.045 for the sale of this property to IAL, a private for-profit entity. This transaction also places approximately 82 acres of land on the tax rolls that were previously not subject to ad valorem taxes. The purchase and sale agreement with IAL also includes an indemnification provision, requiring IAL to indemnify the County for any liability, loss or damage arising from this conveyance.</p> <p>Additionally, in connection with the conveyance, IAL is required to execute the Declaration of Restrictions, which among other things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires the creation of a minimum threshold of 5,000 permanent jobs within ten years of the conveyance to IAL, with an additional minimum of 2,500 jobs within 15 years from the date of conveyance; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Permanent jobs are defined as full time and part time employees for new, permanent, temporary or seasonal employment opportunities including but not limited to all management, maintenance, clerical and administrative jobs arising in connection and at the Project, but will exclude construction and other temporary jobs generated in connection with the development and construction of the Project prior to its completion. • Once IAL has created, or has caused the creation of a minimum of 7,500 jobs at the Project, the Declaration of Restrictions will be terminated and be null, void and of no further force or effect. • Requires compliance with the County’s Small Business Enterprise Architecture and Engineering Program, Small Business and Enterprise Construction Services Program, and utilization of the County’s Small Business Division’s hiring clearinghouse to recruit workers to fill needed positions for skilled laborers on the Project; • IAL will adhere to an aggressive small business outreach program (Construction Outreach Program); • IAL will require by contract, for those contracts executed after March 17, 2015 that all consultants, architects and design professionals to consult with the County’s Small Business Division (SBD); to allow SBD to review and recommend a hiring goal for all such firms, make reasonable good faith efforts to comply with the terms of the CBE-A/E Program and comply with the monitoring procedures; • IAL will require by contract, for those contracts executed after March 17, 2015 that all contractors and construction managers consult with the SBD; to allow SBD to review and recommend a hiring goal for all such firms, make reasonable good faith efforts to comply with the terms of the CSBE Program and comply with the monitoring procedures; • Requires IAL to aspire to have at least 35% of the firms hired for architectural and construction services to be firms located in Miami-Dade County, and wherever practical aspire to have 65% of the construction workers for the Project to be residents of Miami-Dade County; • Provides that if the necessary zoning is not obtained, within 5 years after the Conveyance, then the restrictions in the Declaration will be terminated and of no further force or effect except for the restrictions that the Property must still be utilized for any economic development purpose under Florida Statute Section 125.045 for at least twenty (20) years from the Date of Conveyance; • Provides for liquidated damages up to \$5,000,000 in the event of non-compliance with the required job creation; • Requires the posting of security in an amount reasonably determined by the County, not to exceed \$5,000,000, in the event of a transfer of the Property to a non-affiliate of IAL, and an assumption of indemnification obligations to the County if the Property is transferred to an affiliate of IAL; • IAL may seek to convey Tracts 33 and 44 to one or more third parties. Upon written request from IAL, the County agrees, the its County Mayor, to execute any documents reasonably necessary to release Tracts 33 and 44 from the Declaration of Restrictions; and • Provides for termination of the Declaration of Restrictions after twenty (20) years from the Date of Conveyance. <p>If all of the Purchase Conditions are not satisfied on or before April 3, 2015, then this approval and authorization will be deemed null and void and of no further force and effect.</p> <p>The proposed resolution directs the County’s State lobbying team to advocate for the State’s approval of the State Purchase Contract, and any other actions related to furthering the transactions, and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item as part of its ongoing State legislative activities.</p>
11A1 150204	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE MAYOR OR DESIGNEE TO REPORT TO THE BOARD REGARDING THE COST AND FEASIBILITY OF BUILDING A SIDEWALK ALONG THE WEST SIDE OF N.W. 57TH AVENUE BETWEEN N.W. 173RD STREET AND 183RD STREET OR CONNECTING EXISTING PRIVATE SIDEWALKS IN THE AREA
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the Mayor or designee to study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The cost and feasibility of constructing a public sidewalk along the west side of N.W. 57th Avenue between N.W. 173rd Street and N.W. 183rd Street but east of the County Canal; or, alternatively ○ The cost and feasibility of building a public sidewalk using the existing Private Sidewalks to the west of the County Canal along this portion of N.W. 57th Avenue between N.W. 173rd Street and N.W. 183rd Street; and ○ This study will include meeting with and considering the input of any other governmental stakeholders, including but not limited to the Florida Department of Transportation. <p>The proposed resolution further directs the Mayor or designee to provide a report regarding the issues identified in the study to this Board within ninety (90) days of the effective date of this resolution and place the completed report on an agenda of the Board pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
11A2 150119	RESOLUTION APPROVING A NEW MIAMI-DADE TRANSIT BUS ROUTE, THE WESTCHESTER CIRCULATOR, FOR IMPLEMENTATION ON OR AFTER JUNE 1, 2015; AND DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO TAKE THE NECESSARY STEPS TO IMPLEMENT SUCH SERVICE WITHIN THE APPROPRIATED FUNDS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 2014-15 BUDGET FOR MIAMI-DADE TRANSIT
Notes	The proposed resolution approves a new Miami-Dade Transit bus route, the Westchester Circulator for implementation on or after June 1, 2015 and directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to take the necessary steps to implement such service within the funds appropriated in the Fiscal Year 2014-15 budget for Miami-Dade Transit.
11A3 150506	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO REDUCE REGULATIONS ON JEWELRY LOAN CENTERS AND CREATE A NEW CATEGORY FOR JEWELRY LOAN CENTERS INSTEAD OF REGULATING THEM AS PAWNBROKERS
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the Florida Legislature to reduce regulations on jewelry stores that have a small ancillary business of advancing loans in exchange for jewelry, by creating a new category for "jewelry loan centers," with regulations tailored for such businesses, instead of regulating such uses as pawnbrokers; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Governor, the Senate President, the House Speaker, the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade State Legislative Delegation; and • Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the passage of legislation and promulgation of rules accomplishing the goals set forth in the proposed resolution, and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2015 state legislative package to include this item. <p>Additional Information: On March 3, 2015, the BCC passed File No. 150396 on first reading. The proposed ordinance amends section 33-247 of the Miami-Dade County Code to provide zoning for Jewelry Loan Centers.</p> <p>Under File No. 150396, jewelry loan centers would be subject to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A jewelry loan center is a service offered at a jewelry store where a loan is secured by jewelry. Said jewelry loan center will be ancillary to a jewelry store, and the loan center service will cease if the primary use is discontinued; • The operating hours for the jewelry loan center will not extend beyond 8 p.m.; • No jewelry loan center will be located less than twenty-five hundred (2,500) feet from a place of business having an existing, unabandoned, legally established jewelry loan center or pawnbroker. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The twenty-five hundred (2,500) foot distance requirements will be measured by following a straight line from the nearest entrance to the site where the business is located. • Attention attracting devices, such as blinking or flashing lights, streamer lights, pennants, banners, streamers, and all fluttering, spinning advertising devices (either mobile or stationary), will be prohibited, except as permitted under point-of-sale sign regulations; • The jewelry loan center will have all applicable licenses issued by the State of Florida for the jewelry loan center use; • A Certificate of Use will be obtained and renewed annually. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Certificate of Use application will contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A certified spacing survey from a registered surveyor, which will indicate that the distance requirements of this section have been met. ▪ A site plan will be submitted as part of the Certificate of Use indicating location of structure/structures, entrances and egresses, walls, fences, landscaping, signage and distance to nearest residential development. The use will be established and maintained in accordance with the approved plan.
11A4 150522	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO ENACT LEGISLATION THAT ENABLES THE BOARD TO LEVY AN ADDITIONAL ONE PERCENT TOURIST DEVELOPMENT TAX AND CONVENTION DEVELOPMENT TAX TO FUND CAPITAL EXPENDITURES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE PLANNING, DESIGN, ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, EXTENSION, ENLARGEMENT, OR IMPROVEMENT, FOR MASS TRANSIT PROJECTS, UPON APPROVAL OF ELECTORS VOTING IN A REFERENDUM; WAIVING REQUIREMENTS OF RESOLUTION NO. R-764-13 LIMITING NUMBER OF STATE LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES; AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. R-1143-14, AS AMENDED BY RESOLUTION NO. R-155-15, TO REVISE THE BOARD'S STATE LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR THE 2015 LEGISLATIVE SESSION TO INCLUDE THIS ISSUE AS A PRIORITY; PRELIMINARILY IDENTIFYING THIS ISSUE AS A CRITICAL COUNTY PRIORITY FOR THE 2016 LEGISLATIVE SESSION
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the Florida Legislature to enact legislation that enables this Board to levy an additional one percent Tourist Development Tax and an additional one percent Convention Development Tax to fund capital expenditures, including but not limited to the planning, design, acquisition, construction, extension, enlargement, or improvement, for mass transit projects, upon approval of electors voting in a referendum; • Waives requirements of Resolution No. R-764-13 and amends Resolution No. R-1143-14, as amended by Resolution No. R-155-15, to revise the Board's state legislative priorities for the 2015 legislative session to include a twelfth priority urging the Florida Legislature to enact legislation supported in this item; • Approves the state legislative priorities for the 2015 session; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, and the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade 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 2015 State Legislative Package to include this item as a priority, and to include this item in the 2016 State Legislative Package when it is presented to the Board and to preliminarily identify this item as a critical priority when the Board determines priorities for the 2016 session as provided in Resolution No. R-764-13.

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><u>Additional Information on The Tourist and Convention Development Tax:</u> Tourist and Convention Development Taxes fall within three main categories.</p> <p>Tourist and Convention Development Taxes on Transient Rentals (bed taxes) In total, there is a six percent (6%) tax collected on the rental amount from any person who rents, leases or lets for consideration any living quarter accommodations in a hotel, apartment hotel, motel, resort motel, apartment motel, rooming house, mobile home park, recreational vehicle park, single family dwelling, beach house, cottage, condominium, or any other sleeping accommodations rented for a period of six months or less. If the rental is for more than six months, a bonafide written lease must be provided in order to be exempt per F.S 212.03. The 6% tax is made up of the following 3 taxes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three percent (3%) Convention Development Tax (CDT) collected throughout Miami-Dade County, with the exception of the cities of Surfside and Bal Harbour. Two-thirds (2/3) of the CDT receipts are distributed to Miami-Dade County, and one-third (1/3) is used to fund the Miami Arena (excess one-third (1/3) receipts go back to Miami-Dade County). • Two percent (2%) Tourist Development Tax (TDT) collected throughout Miami-Dade County, with the exception of the cities of Surfside, Bal Harbour and Miami Beach. Sixty percent (60%) of the TDT is distributed to the Greater Miami Convention and Visitors Bureau, twenty percent (20%) to the Miami-Dade County Department of Cultural Affairs, and twenty percent (20%) to the City of Miami. • One percent (1%) Professional Sports Facilities Franchise Tax collected throughout Miami-Dade County, with the exception of the cities of Surfside, Bal Harbour and Miami Beach. This one percent (1%) tax is used only for debt service payments on county debt for professional sports facilities. <p>Tourist Development Surtax (TDS) on Sales of Food and Beverages in Hotels/Motels A two percent (2%) Food and Beverage Tax is collected on the sale of all food and beverages (alcoholic and non-alcoholic) by restaurants, coffee shops, snack bars, wet bars, night clubs, banquet halls, catering or room services, and any other food and beverage facilities in or on the property of a hotel or motel.</p> <p>The TDS is collected throughout Miami-Dade County with the exceptions of facilities in the cities of Surfside, Bal Harbour or Miami Beach. TDS receipts are distributed to the Greater Miami Convention and Visitors Bureau.</p> <p>Homeless and Domestic Violence Tax on Sale of Food and Beverages A one percent (1%) Homeless and Domestic Violence Tax is collected on all food and beverage sales by establishments that are licensed by the State of Florida to sell alcoholic beverages for consumption on the premises, except for hotels and motels. Only businesses that make over \$400,000 in gross receipts annually are obligated to collect this tax.</p> <p>The Homeless and Domestic Violence Tax is collected throughout Miami-Dade County with the exception of facilities in the cities of Miami Beach, Surfside and Bal Harbour. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the tax receipts goes to the Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust, and fifteen percent (15%) goes to Miami-Dade County for domestic violence centers.</p> <p>On December 16, 2014, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1143-14, approved the state legislative priorities for the 2015 session and directed the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the state legislative priorities for the 2015 session.</p>
11A5 150505	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING HB 205, SB 334, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REDUCE THE TIME PERIOD FOR WHICH CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS OF MINORS MUST BE RETAINED BEFORE EXPUNGEMENT
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports House Bill 205, Senate Bill 334, or similar legislation that would reduce the time period for which criminal history records of minors must be retained before expungement; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, Senator Arthenia Joyner, Representative Mia Jones, and the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade County State Legislative Delegation; and • Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the passage of the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2015 State Legislative Package to include this item. <p><u>Additional Information:</u> According to Chapter 943.0515 of the Florida Statutes, currently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The criminal history records of minors are retained before expungement for five (5) years after the date the offender reaches twenty one (21) years of age if the minor is classified as a serious habitual juvenile offender or committed to a juvenile correctional facility or juvenile prison; and • The criminal history records of minors are retained before expungement for five (5) years after the date the offender reaches nineteen (19) years of age if the minor is not classified as a serious habitual juvenile offender or committed to a juvenile correctional facility or juvenile prison. <p>House Bill 205 and Senate Bill 334 reduces the time period for which criminal history records of minors must be retained before expungement to the time of the minor's eighteenth (18) birthday.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><u>Additional Information – State Attorney Katherine Fernandez Rundle Offers ‘Second Chance – One Stop’ Sealing and Expungement Program:</u> State Attorney Katherine Fernandez Rundle is offering a ‘Second Chance – One Stop’ Sealing and Expungement Program for individuals who have been charged with a crime in Miami-Dade County and the case did not result in a conviction. For those who qualify, the State Attorney’s office will assist with processing the application for submission to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement. The program will be offered on Thursday, March 19, 2015 from 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm at the Phichol Williams Community Center located at 951 SW 4th Street, Homestead, Florida.</p>
11A6 150507	RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESS, PRESIDENT OBAMA’S ADMINISTRATION AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT TO EXPAND THE MOVING TO WORK PROGRAM TO PERMIT MORE PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES, INCLUDING MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROGRAM
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges Congress, President Obama’s Administration and Housing and Urban Development to expand the Moving to Work program to permit more public housing agencies, including Miami-Dade County, to participate in the program; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to Senators Bill Nelson and Marco Rubio, the remaining members of the Miami-Dade County Congressional Delegation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; and • Directs the County’s federal lobbyists to advocate for the passage of the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2015 Federal Legislative Package to include this item.
11A7 150517	RESOLUTION OPPOSING EFFORTS BY THE VILLAGE OF PINECREST TO INSTALL RED LIGHT CAMERAS AT THE INTERSECTIONS OF US 1 AND SW 104, 112, 124, AND 128 STREET OR OTHER INTERSECTIONS ALONG US 1 WITHIN THE VILLAGE OF PINECREST
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes efforts by the Village of Pinecrest to install red light cameras at the intersections of US 1 and SW 104, 112, 124, and 128 Street or other intersections along US 1 within the Village of Pinecrest; and • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Pinecrest Village Council and Pinecrest Village Manager. <p>Due to the fact that US 1 is a state road, the Village of Pinecrest would be required to obtain a permit from FDOT to install red light cameras at the intersections of US 1 and SW 104, 112, 124, and 128 Street. The northbound lanes are along the border of the Village of Pinecrest’s boundaries and are not within any Village of Pinecrest neighborhoods and therefore, red light cameras at these intersections would have a substantial impact on drivers residing throughout Miami-Dade County, not just those who reside in the Village of Pinecrest.</p> <p><u>Background Legislative History:</u> On August 23, 2005, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), through Resolution 937-05, 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.</p> <p>On November 6, 2007, the BCC through 1248-07, urged the Florida Legislature to allow the use of unmanned cameras at intersections with traffic signals in an effort to reduce red-light running.</p> <p>On July 8, 2010, the BCC, through Resolution 759-10, 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. This proposed ordinance would supersede Resolution 759-10.</p> <p>On September 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.</p> <p>On January 20, 2011, through Ordinance No. 11-01, the BCC 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.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Fines Levied on Violators:</u> Florida Statute 316.0083 provides for a \$158 fine levied on violators who fail to stop at a traffic signal as required by ss. 316.074(1) or 316.075(1)(c)1., F.S. When the \$158 fine is the result of a local government’s traffic infraction detector, \$75 is retained by the local government and \$83 is deposited with the Florida Department of Revenue (DOR). The DOR subsequently distributes the fines by depositing \$70 in the General Revenue Fund, \$10 in the Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund, and \$3 in the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Trust Fund.</p> <p>If a law enforcement officer cites a motorist for the same offense, the fine is still \$158, but the revenue is distributed from the local clerk of court to DOR, where \$30 is distributed to the General Revenue Fund, \$65 is distributed to the Department of Health Administrative Trust Fund and \$3 is distributed to the Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Trust Fund. The remaining \$60 is distributed in small percentages to a number of funds pursuant to s. 318.21, F.S. Violations of ss. 316.074(1) or 316.075(1)(c)1., F.S., enforced by traffic infraction detectors may not result in points assessed against the operator’s driver’s license and may not be used for the purpose of setting motor vehicle insurance rates.</p> <p><u>Additional Information – Proposed Senate Bill 1184 (2015):</u> Senate Bill 1184:</p>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibits a notice of violation or uniform traffic citation to be issued through the use of a traffic infraction detector not compliant with all specifications. • Requires the Department of Transportation (DOT) to identify engineering countermeasures intended to reduce red-light violations which may be considered and applied, where appropriate, prior to the installation of a traffic infraction detector on any roadway. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any new installation of a traffic infraction detector, after the bill's effective date, must be based on the results of a traffic engineering study. The study must document the implementation and failure of any engineering countermeasure for the specific location, and must be signed and sealed by a professional engineer. • Adds specific information that must be submitted to the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV) by each county or municipality operating a traffic infraction detector. The report must be submitted by September 30, annually, and must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The name of the jurisdiction and contact information of the person responsible for the red-light camera program; ○ The location of each camera, including geospatial and cross-road descriptions; ○ The date each camera became operational, and dates of operation including any status change of the camera's use; ○ Data related to the issuance and disposition of notices of violation and uniform traffic citations; ○ Vehicle crash data for crashes that occurred within a 250-foot radius of the geospatial coordinates for each traffic infraction detectors during the 12-month period immediately preceding the initial date of camera operation; ○ Identification of any and all alternative safety measures the jurisdiction considered or implemented in lieu of or in addition to the use of a traffic infraction detector; and ○ The date of implementation of any such alternative safety measures. ○ If the county or municipality fails to comply with the reporting requirements, as determined by the DHSMV, its revenues from red-light camera violations, while noncompliant, will be remitted to the Department of Revenue. The Department of Revenue must maintain records of the noncompliant county's or municipality's remissions. The revenue will be returned to the affected county or municipality once it becomes compliant. The DHSMV will notice the Department of Revenue when the county or municipality establishes compliance with the reporting requirements. <p>Additional Information – OPPAGA Report: Florida Red Light Camera Programs – February 7, 2014 http://www.thenewspaper.com/rlc/docs/2014/fl-oppaga.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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"> ○ <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> ○ <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"> ▪ <i>Installation of signal ahead signs;</i> ▪ <i>Use of LED signal lenses;</i> ▪ <i>Modification of signal-cycle length; and</i> ▪ <i>Alteration of yellow light change intervals.</i> • 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"> ○ <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> ○ <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> • 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; • State and local red light camera revenue has increased more than 200% since Fiscal Year 2010-11; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <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>

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <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> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Jurisdiction</th> <th>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"> • Nearly 50% of fines collected by local governments are used to pay red light camera vendors; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <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 installation, operation, and maintenance; review of possible violations; violation issuance; payment collection; data collection; and customer service. In general, fees are fixed.</i> • Estimates of the safety effects of other states' red light camera programs vary considerably; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>As of December 2013, 502 communities in the U.S. had red light camera programs.</i> • Red light camera research results differ due to wide variation in factors examined; many studies have been limited by methodological concern; • Notices of violation and uniform traffic citations issued by jurisdictions with red light camera programs have increased significantly since Fiscal Year 2010-11.19 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 2012-13.20; and • Crashes resulting in fatalities decreased at red light camera intersections on state roads but rear-end and angle crashes increased. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Among the counties with red light camera intersections on state roads, nearly 40% had increases in rear-end and angle crashes.</i> <p><u>Additional Information – Related News Articles:</u> Florida lawmaker looks to eliminate red-light cameras Bradenton Herald, The (FL) - March 12, 2015 http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/mh/news/15406714DAA3E688?p=NewsBank</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two government studies show intersections with red-light cameras have more accidents since installation. The Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles reported crashes at red-light intersections in 68 jurisdictions increased 7.65 percent from 6,791 crashes the year before installations to 7,311 crashes between July 2013 and June 2014. • The Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability had similar findings, reporting a 12 percent increase in accidents between 21 and 36 months after cameras were activated compared with 21 and 36 months before without them. Numbers were based on state roads only, citing issues with uniform reporting on county and city streets. 	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																		
11A8 150518	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO ENACT LEGISLATION, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES TO AMEND THE APPLICABLE RULES, TO EXEMPT FROM LICENSURE REQUIRED UNDER CHAPTER 402, FLORIDA STATUTES, NOT-FOR-PROFIT COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS NOT IN THE BUSINESS OF PROVIDING CHILD CARE BUT WHICH ADMINISTER AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS, AND AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY A LOCAL GOVERNMENT AT ITS PARKS, SERVING SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN BY PROVIDING ACTIVITIES FOCUSED ON FITNESS, NUTRITION AND WELLNESS, ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT, THE APPRECIATION FOR NATURE, SCIENCE OR THE CULTURAL ARTS, OR THE DEVELOPMENT OF GOOD CHARACTER OR SPORTSMANSHIP																		
Notes	The proposed resolution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the Florida Legislature to enact legislation that exempts from licensure required under Chapter 402, Florida Statutes, and urges the Department of Children and Families to amend the applicable rules to exempt from licensure required under Chapter 402, Florida Statutes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Under Chapter 402, Florida Statutes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (1) <i>not-for-profit community organizations which are not in the business of providing child care, but which administer after-school programs serving school-age children by providing activities that focus on fitness, nutrition and wellness, academic enrichment, the appreciation for nature, science or the cultural arts, or the development of good character or good sportsmanship, and which operate for a maximum of four hours a day, except for on teacher planning days, holidays, and intercessions that occur during the school district's official calendar year; and</i> ▪ (2) <i>after-school programs administered by a local government at its parks serving school-age children by providing activities that focus on fitness, nutrition and wellness, academic enrichment, the appreciation for nature, science or the cultural arts, or the development of good character or good sportsmanship.</i> 																		

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade State Legislative Delegation, and the Secretary of the Department of Children and Families; and Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the legislation and rule amendment, and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2015 State Legislative Package to include this item and to include this item in the 2016 State Legislative Package when it is presented to the Board.
11A9 150508	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SB 1124, HB 1029, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD IMPOSE REGULATIONS ON THE USE OF LIQUID NITROGEN IN THE PREPARATION AND PRESENTATION OF FOOD AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Senate Bill 1124, House Bill 1029, or similar legislation that would impose regulations on the use of liquid nitrogen in the preparation and presentation of food and alcoholic beverages; Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, Senator Oscar Braynon, Representative Alan Williams, the Chair and remaining Members of the Miami-Dade County State Legislative Delegation, the Secretary of the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation, and Florida's Surgeon General; and Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the passage of the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2015 State Legislative Package to include this item. <p>Additional Information: On June 17, 2014, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-566-14, urged the Florida Legislature to adopt legislation to impose reasonable regulations on the use of liquid nitrogen to create a visual effect in the presentation of food and drinks at bars and restaurants.</p> <p>Additionally, R-566-14 urged the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation, which has regulatory oversight over restaurants and bars in Florida, and the Florida Department of Health to impose reasonable regulations on the use of liquid nitrogen to create a visual effect in food and drink presentation in Florida restaurants and bars.</p> <p>Furthermore, R-566-14 directed the County's state lobbyists to advocate the passage of legislation accomplishing these goals and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2015 state legislative package.</p>
11A10 150511	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE 2015 STATE AND FEDERAL ENERGY AND CLIMATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS OF THE SOUTHEAST FLORIDA REGIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE COMPACT; INCORPORATING THE COMPACT'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS INTO MIAMI-DADE COUNTY'S 2015 FEDERAL AND STATE LEGISLATIVE PACKAGES
Notes	<p>The proposed Legislation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact Counties' 2015 State and Federal Energy and Climate Legislative Programs; Urges Congress and the Florida Legislature to enact the policies set forth in the Compact Counties' 2015 State and Federal Energy and Climate Legislative Programs; Directs the County's federal and state lobbyists to advocate for the Compact Counties' 2015 State and Federal Energy and Climate Legislative Programs, and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend Miami-Dade County's 2015 Federal and State Legislative Packages to include the Compact Counties' 2015 Legislative Programs; Directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs and the County's federal and state contract lobbyists to coordinate efforts with their counterparts in Broward, Monroe, and Palm Beach Counties in pursuing the Compact Counties' 2015 Legislative Programs; and Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Mayor, County Manager, or other Chief Administrative Officer of Broward, Monroe, and Palm Beach Counties, the members of the Florida Congressional Delegation, the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, and the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade County State Legislative Delegation. <p>Additionally, the provisions of this resolution will only be effective upon receipt by the Mayor of Miami-Dade County of legislation of the other three Compact Counties approving the Compact Counties' 2015 State and Federal Energy and Climate Legislative Programs. Upon receipt, the Mayor or the Mayor's designee will provide a certified copy of such legislation to the Clerk of the Board.</p> <p>Additional Information: On December 1, 2009, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1388-09, established the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact and committed to developing joint policy positions and legislative policy statements with Broward, Palm Beach and Monroe Counties with respect to climate change issues. R-1388-09 further committed to developing a Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Action Plan with Broward, Palm Beach and Monroe Counties, participating in a regional climate team and in the second Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change summit.</p>
11A11 150513	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO ENACT SOLAR ENERGY INITIATIVES TO ALLOW FOR VIRTUAL "NET METERING," TO EXEMPT SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEMS FROM COMMERCIAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENTS AND THE TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX, TO ALLOW FOR THE USE OF POWER PURCHASE AGREEMENTS IN FLORIDA, AND TO CONTINUE TO REQUIRE UNIFORM APPROVAL AUTHORITY THROUGH THE FLORIDA SOLAR ENERGY CENTER FOR ALL SOLAR ENERGY SYSTEMS SOLD IN FLORIDA
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urges the Florida Legislature to expand existing laws and policies to allow for virtual "net metering," to exempt solar PV systems from commercial property assessments and the tangible personal property tax, to allow the use of Power Purchase Agreements in Florida, and to continue to require uniform approval authority through the FSEC for all solar energy systems sold in Florida;

**Board of County Commissioners
March 17, 2015 Meeting
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Governor, the Senate President, the House Speaker, and the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade State Legislative Delegation; and • Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the passage of the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2015 state legislative package to include this item and to include this item in the 2016 state legislative package when it is presented to the Board.
11A12 150519	RESOLUTION URGING THE STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND THE MIAMI-DADE EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE INCREASED SIGNAGE REGARDING FLORIDA'S "SLOW TRAFFIC KEEP RIGHT" LAWS, AS DEFINED IN SECTION 316.081, FLORIDA STATUTES
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the State of Florida Department of Transportation and the Miami-Dade Expressway Authority to provide increased signage regarding Florida's "Slow Traffic Keep Right" laws, as defined in section 316.081, Florida Statutes; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade State Legislative Delegation, the Secretary of the State of Florida Department of Transportation, and the Executive Director of the Miami-Dade Expressway Authority.
11A13 150462	RESOLUTION URGING ALL LATIN AMERICAN CONSULATES IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY TO COMMUNICATE WITH THEIR AMBASSADORS TO PRESS FOR DEMOCRATIC REFORM IN CUBA
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges all Latin American Consulates in Miami-Dade County to communicate with their ambassadors to press for democratic reform in Cuba; and • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Consulates General of all Latin American Consulates in Miami-Dade County and the United Nations Secretary-General.
11A14 150535	RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AGREEMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$38,500,000.00 (PLUS CLOSING COSTS) FOR SALE AND PURCHASE BETWEEN AAAA UNIVERSE, LLC, A FLORIDA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, AS SELLER, AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, AS BUYER, FOR APPROXIMATELY 27.27 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 7800 NW 29TH STREET, DORAL, FLORIDA, FOR EXPANSION OF JACKSON HEALTH SYSTEM TO WEST MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT, EXERCISE ANY PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN, TO TAKE ALL OTHER ACTIONS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE SAID PURCHASE AND ACCEPT CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY BY WARRANTY DEED; AND DESIGNATING THE REAL PROPERTY AS A DESIGNATED FACILITY OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH TRUST UNDER CHAPTER 25A OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the execution of an Agreement for Sale and Purchase between AAAA Universe, LLC, a Florida limited liability company, the Seller, and the County, the Buyer, for property located at 7800 NW 29th Street, Doral, Florida in the amount of \$38,500,000.00 (plus closing costs in the amount of \$90,000) and designates the property to the Public Health Trust (Trust). The Trust will operate, maintain and govern the property in accordance with Chapter 25A of the Code. The property has been appraised as reflected in the two appraisal summaries, in the amounts of \$39,300,000.00 and \$38,490,000.00.</p> <p>Proposed construction, equipment and other capital needs on the site are expected to cost an additional \$31,000,000. Funding of approximately \$15,000,000 would be a capital contribution from the Jackson Health System's operating budget. The balance of approximately \$54,500,000 would be funded through the Jackson Miracle- Building Bond Program approved by voters in November 2013.</p> <p>On February 27, 2015, the Board of Trustees of the Trust adopted Resolution No. PHT 02/15-014, authorizing the Trust to acquire a 27.27 acre property located at 7800 NW 29th Street for the expansion of Jackson Health System to west Miami-Dade County (Jackson West). Jackson West will bring the world-renowned services of the Jackson Health System to an area of Miami-Dade County with a rapidly increasing population which presently lacks optimal access to certain medical services, including emergency medical services. The Trust's planned development of Jackson West includes a children's outpatient clinic, a free-standing emergency department and urgent care center, physician clinics, as well as other medical facilities.</p> <p><u>Additional Information</u> On May 6, 2014, the BCC through Ordinance No. 14-44 created the Jackson Health System General Obligation Bond Citizens' Advisory Committee for the purpose of advising the Board of County Commissioners, the Public Health Trust and the Mayor regarding Jackson Health System's General Obligation Bond Program.</p>
11A15 150545	RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO PROVIDE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, INCLUDING MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, WITH THEIR "FAIR SHARE" BACK IN REVENUE
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the Florida Legislature to provide local governments, including Miami-Dade County, with their fair share back in revenue; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Governor, the Senate President, the House Speaker, and the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade State Legislative Delegation; and • Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the passage of the legislation, and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2015 state legislative package to include this item.