Miami-Dade County Analysis of Incorporation and Annexation within the Unincorporated Area

Purpose of the Study

- Recommend the best of four options to future Incorporation and Annexation within the County
  - Full Incorporation or Annexation
  - No further Incorporation, only Annexation
  - No further Incorporations or Annexations
  - Increased Metropolitan governance at the County level

Basic Question

- Should the County Commission refocus to only address major issues of county-wide and regional significance
  - General functions to be addressed by Local Units of Government

Legal Issues

- At present, full incorporation is not possible without a Charter change
  - Some neighborhoods are opposed to becoming a part of a municipality
- The Broward County example was only possible because of an Act of the Legislature
  - Neighborhoods were required to choose an adjoining municipality or form their own
  - Full incorporation has not occurred

Fiscal Issues

- All unincorporated area cannot be Incorporated or Annexed, some form of UMSA must remain
  - Area outside of the UDB
  - Environmentally Sensitive Lands
- If a small amount of Incorporation or Annexation occurs (10%), the fiscal impact will be minimal
- As the amount of the UMSA area decreases, the fiscal pressure on the UMSA and General Fund budget will grow significantly possibly making it untenable to remain unincorporated

Options

- Two options have been presented for consideration by the Commission
  - Option A – Full Incorporation
  - Option B – Incorporation or Annexation based feasibility or desirability

Changes to Procedure Regardless of Option

- Any Incorporation or Annexation proposal cannot result in an Enclave
- All proposals must contain an acceptance of the County policies on environmental issues and transportation nodes
- Adopt a new policy regarding Areas or Facilities of Countywide Significance
- Establish a minimum size for new municipalities

Changes to Procedure Regardless of Option

- Where a referendum is not required (less than 250 electors), require the consent of businesses for annexation
- Continue County operation of CRAs
- MACS should not be limited to County Commission boundaries
- Give preference to MACS where there is a conflict between their boundaries and an annexation application

Changes to Procedure Regardless of Option

- Insure consideration of low-income areas
  - Annexations of high-income areas should be offset by low-income areas
  - MAC areas cannot exclude low-income areas
  - No enclaves can be permitted particularly if they are low-income areas
- Prohibit small area annexation (Cherry Picking)
- Prohibit irregular boundaries

Next Steps

- Discussion at Committee level and then full Commission
- Consider Code changes for portions of the recommendations
- Discuss long-range policy

Annexation Applications

Annexation Applications Recommended Approvals

- North Miami Beach
- North Miami – Sunkist Grove
- North Miami – Gratigny
- North Miami – NE 149th Street
- Opa locka – Area A

Annexation Applications Approvals with Changes

- Coral Gables – Include all of the High Pines area
- Florida City "D" –Remove enclaves
- Florida City "H" –Remove enclaves
- Opa locka Area "B" – Wait for decision on North Central MAC

Annexation Applications Recommended Denials

- North Miami Biscayne Corridor
  - Cherry Picking
  - Neighborhoods split
- Biscayne Park
  - Cherry Picking
  - Neighborhoods split
- Miami Shores
  - Cherry Picking
  - Neighborhoods split