



# Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

## Office of the Commission Auditor

### **Board of County Commissioners**

May 1, 2012  
9:30 A.M.  
Commission Chamber

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

**Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners  
Meeting Agenda**

**May 1, 2012**

**Item Number(s)**

7D
8N3
11A5
11A6

Acknowledgements:

Bia Marsellos, Senior Legislative Analyst

Michael Amador-Gil, Senior Legislative Analyst

Elizabeth Owens, Legislative Analyst

**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY  
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR**



Research Notes

**Agenda Item:** 7D

**File Number:** 120308

**Date of Analysis:** April 09, 2012

**Summary**

This resolution wishes to repeal the Miami-Dade County's regulation pertaining to pit bull dogs if such repeal is approved by the electors by referendum at a special election called in conjunction with the August 14, 2012 primary election.

**Miami-Dade County Pit Bull Ordinance**

On April 4, 1989, the Board of County Commissioners, through Ord. 89-22, adopted the Pit Bull Dog ordinance in response to a series of incidents where residents were attacked and seriously injured by pit bulls.

According to Miami Dade's Animal Services website, it is illegal in Miami-Dade County to own or keep American Pit Bull Terriers, American Staffordshire Terriers, Staffordshire Bull Terriers, or any other dog that substantially conforms to any of these breeds' characteristics.

Persons who acquire or keep a pit bull dog are subject to a \$500 fine and court action to force the removal of the dog from the County. Owners of a dog may bring the animal to the County's Animal Services Department to have the dog's breed evaluated.

Persons whose dog is identified as pit bulls will not receive a citation, but they are required to remove the dog from the County.

Additionally, if the Animal Services Department receives a report or complaint about an address where a pit bull is being kept, the Department will conduct an investigation. If the address of the owner is not known or the pit bull is observed running at large, the pit bull is classified as a stray and, if not registered, will be held for 5 days and then put down.

Pit bulls with identification or that are registered are held for 5 days and the owner will receive a citation and be given the opportunity to remove the animal from the County.

**Background and Relevant Information<sup>1</sup>**

Chapter 767, F.S., contains the State's laws relating to "Damage by Dogs" including restrictions on dangerous dogs.

In 1990, the Legislature specified that nothing limits any local government from placing further restrictions or additional requirements on owners of dangerous dogs or developing procedures and criteria to implement state law relating to dangerous dogs, provided that no such local regulation is breed-specific and that state law is not lessened by such additional local regulations or requirements.

The Florida Legislature, however, grandfathered-in local breed-specific ordinances that had been adopted prior to October 1, 1990. A handful of local governments were grandfathered-in under this provision. Today, Miami-Dade

---

<sup>1</sup> Florida House of Representative and the Florida Senate websites

County, which has a pit bull ordinance, is the only County with a breed-specific ordinance adopted prior to October 1, 1990.

The Florida Legislature during the 2012 session had considered H.B. 997 which removes the exemption for breed-specific local ordinances adopted prior to October 1, 1990. Local governments may continue to use home rule authority to place additional restrictions or requirements on owners of dangerous dogs above that which exists in state law. However, no additional regulation or restriction is allowed to be breed-specific.

The Florida legislature also considered S.B. 1322 which amends Section 767.14 of the Florida Statutes by removing a provision that exempts local ordinances adopted before October 1, 1990 from the prohibition on ordinances that are specific to a breed. **However, both HB 997 and SB 1322 died in committee.**

### **Additional Information**

#### Broward County 2011 Legislation

On January 25, 2011, the Broward County Board of County Commissioners, through Ordinance 2011-03, amended its Animal Care and Regulation Ordinance to modify existing County regulation in connection with dangerous dogs. *(Please refer to Ordinance 2011-03, Section 4-2 for definition of Dangerous Dogs)*

Broward County had sentenced dogs to die after just one serious attack or killing of someone else's pet. Under the amended legislation, dogs will now have to seriously attack or kill at least two domesticated animals before being eligible for euthanasia.

#### Ohio 2012 Legislature

On February 8, 2012, Ohio lawmakers overturned the law that defined pit bulls as "dangerous and vicious" dogs. State law defined a vicious dog as "one that has seriously hurt or killed a person, killed another dog, or is among those commonly known as pit bulls."

The legislators approved Bill HB14, which changed the 20-year old definition by removing the reference to pit bulls. The change would require evidence to prove pit bulls are actually vicious. The change also specifies that the label does not include a police dog that has injured a person or has killed another dog while on duty and is assisting law enforcement.

### **The Florida Senate Review Interim Report**

In October of 2008, the Senate Committee on Community Affairs conducted an interim report that reviewed local breed-specific ordinances and state preemption of them. The purpose of the report was to review the "Damage by Dogs" provisions of Chapter 767, F.S. with a specific focus on the State preemption barring cities and counties from enacting breed specific ordinance. *The report noted that, citing specific studies, advocates of breed specific legislation argue that certain breeds of dogs are inherently more dangerous than other breeds.*

Of the ten responses received from Florida's counties and municipalities, equaling a two percent response rate, only one had a registration requirement which provides information on the total numbers of dogs *by breed*.

- Pinellas County has a total of 122,225 dogs within the county, and in 2007, there was a total of 1,233 dog bites. For a county in which less than 3 percent of the dog population is made up of Pit Bulls, they accounted for over 19 percent of the bites (235).
- The next highest number of bites was attributed to Labrador Retrievers which represent 9 percent of the dog population and accounted for 11.5 percent of the bites (142).
- In 2007, Orange County reported of the 1,208 dog bites, 262 bites were attributed to pit-bull type dogs.
- For Leon County, of the 322 dog bites, 97 were attributed to bull-type dogs.
- Of the 43 dog bites within Taylor County, 23 were attributed to Pit Bull/ Bull dog type breeds.

- Cross City noted that of their 48 dog bites, most were attributed to Pit Bull/ Bull dog cross breeds.
- Similarly, Jackson County noted that while the breed of the dog is not logged in biting incidents, most are attributed to mixed breeds, Pit Bulls, and Labrador Retrievers.
- Hardee County also noted that of the 18 dog bites, 10 were on children under the age of 18.
- For the City of Clermont, of the 158 dog bites from 1995 to 2008, the breeds with the most numbers of bites were Chow Chows with 18, Labrador Retrievers with 16, German Shepherds with 12, and Pit Bulls with 10.

According to the report, with a lack of information in both the total number of dogs *by breed* and the total number of dog bites *by breed*, little evidence either supporting or opposing breed specific legislation can be inferred. For the one county that did have breed specific data on dog bites and dog populations, there seems to be a large number of dog bites by such breeds as Pit Bulls, Chow Chows, and Labrador Retrievers, and a greater number of overall dog bites inflicted on children less than 18 years of age.

**Prepared by:** Michael Amador-Gil

**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY  
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR**



Research Notes

**Agenda Item:** 8N3  
**File Number:** 120583  
**Date of Analysis:** April 27, 2012

**Summary**

This resolution approves the application of American Shuttle, Inc. for a Passenger Motor Carrier (PMC) Certificate of Transportation to provide clients special operation services to common destinations or series of common destinations from their hotel or another location.

The PMC certificate would also allow American Shuttle to offer transportation prearranged at least 24-hours prior to service, using chauffeur driven vehicles with a seating capacity of nine or more, but less than 28 passengers, excluding the driver.

**Background and Relevant information**

On November 15, 2011, the Board of County Commissioners, through, R-952-11, approved an Exclusive Demand Shared Ground Transportation (EDSGT) Services Agreement at Miami International Airport (MIA) between the County and American Shuttle to allow *pre-arranged services to MIA* and *on-demand services to and from MIA*.

Pursuant to Section 31-113, companies awarded Demand Ground Transportation contracts at MIA are not required to have a Passenger Motor Carrier license with the Miami-Dade Consumer Services Department.

Under the EDSGT, American Shuttle is required to provide a certain number of vans and qualified drivers to operate to and from the Terminal Building of MIA; and carry multiple airline passengers to whatever destination the passengers' request, generally within Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties.

*American Shuttle's personnel also provides all Terminal Building curbside services related to the concessionaire's multiple-party vehicles, which includes 24-hours a day, 7-days a week staffing for ground transportation services from designated zones at the Terminal Building.*

The term of the EDSGT is for an initial period of five (5) years from February 20, 2012, with the right at the sole discretion of the County to extend such Agreement for a single three (3) year period of time.

**Pursuant to the EDSGT, American Shuttle pays the County a Minimum Annual Guarantee (MAG) of \$783,137.50.**

**Additional Information**

In response to questions posed by the Office of the Commission Auditor (OCA), Consumer Services and Miami-Dade Aviation staff provided the following information:

- How many PMC certificates does the County currently have? *138 Passenger Motor Carrier Certificates have been issued.*
- After concerns raised by the taxicab industry at the 4/09/12 RTC meeting, Consumer Services staff provided the following notes: *They are concerned that drivers for American Shuttle are actively soliciting passengers inside the terminal. Since taxi drivers are prohibited from entering the terminal, they believe American Shuttle has an unfair competitive advantage.*

- Is there any enforcement at MIA by Consumer Services and/ or MIA staff? *Both SPEED and MIA have staff that monitor areas at MIA. SPEED monitors the taxi lot as well as the upper drive for code enforcement.*
- Is there any way to know, currently, how many passengers does American Shuttle transport versus taxicabs to and from MIA? *At this time we do not have the total passenger count transported by American Shuttle. As far as taxicabs, we know that there were 148,605 taxicab trips originating at MIA in March of 2012. We do not keep passenger counts for taxicabs. The 148,605 trips equal to an average of 4,794 daily taxicab trips leaving MIA; we do not know the number of taxicabs dropping off at MIA.*
- Which other PMC's provide 24hr pre-arranged and on-demand services? Do these PMCs offer similar services to and from MIA? *All PMC's are required to have 24 hour prearrangement. American Shuttle is allowed on-demand due to its contract with the Airport. Other PMC's offer similar services to and from MIA (with the pre-arrangement requirement)*

**Attachment:** Passenger Motor Carrier Certificate Historical Review

**Prepared by:** Michael Amador-Gil

## Passenger Motor Carrier Certificate Historical Review

### Background and Relevant Information

The Passenger Motor Carrier (PMC) provisions located in Article III of Chapter 31, governs for-hire vehicles with a capacity of nine (9) to twenty-eight passengers providing route and non-route service. Route service includes jitneys, fixed route, circulators and limited certificates. Non-route service encompasses charter, contract and special operations, including tour vans, provided on a prearranged basis.

The County has regulated this form of transportation since 1981.

in 1991, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) directed Consumer Services Department (CSD) to conduct a review of all for-hire ordinances, prepare a report, and have the Ground Transportation Regulatory Advisory Committee (G-TRAC) complete a review within 45 days.

The review process was beyond two (2) years, and CSD staff did not agree with many of G-TRAC's recommendations. G-TRAC's authority expired in 1994.

### In 1992, 1993 and 1994, the BCC approved a series of phased reforms:

- A maximum inspection age (15 years) was established for all categories except private school buses;
- A vehicle inspection frequency schedule was established based on vehicle age;
- Uniform and enhanced standards were established for all **for-hire** chauffeurs; and
- Civil violations were also established.

**The PMC revisions were originally intended to be part of the comprehensive for-hire ordinance in 1992, 1993, and 1994.**

**However, when the industry-by-industry approach was adopted, the taxicab and limousine industries were addressed first.**

In 1996, staff introduced a first reading ordinance pertaining to legislation encompassing all for-hire categories. The ordinance included several workshops, and was scheduled for public hearing. The public hearing was cancelled.

### Legislative History

Fiscal Year	Description
July 1998 Ord. 98-105	Taxicab industry recommendation reforms were approved.
1998	Around this time, a large number of PMC applications submitted for approval were more suitable for the limousine ordinance.  Furthermore, many new PMC operators were providing on-demand rather than prearranged services.
December 1998 Reso. 1404-98	As a result, the BCC approved a <b>moratorium</b> on the acceptance of new PMC applications. Exceptions included: (1) municipal circulator service; (2) emergencies; (3) circumstances where the County Manager states that issuance was in the best interest of the County; and (4) issuance of temporary certificates.
October 1999 File No. 042089	A report from the County Manager states the reasons for delaying the PMC amendments.
November 2000 Ord. 00-139	Limousine industry recommendation reforms were approved.



Fiscal Year	Description
April 2003	A draft PMC ordinance was circulated to the industry. Based on the feedback received, a determination was made by staff to separate route and non-route instead of combining them in a single regulation.
December 2, 2008 R-1366-08	The BCC, through R-1366-08, directed the Mayor that the proposed amendment(s) to the PMC Code be finalized and submitted to the BCC within 120 days.
May 12, 2009 File No. 090299	<p>An ordinance eliminating provision related to route service motor carriers within Article III of Chpt. 31 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, and creating a new Article VII Chpt 31 of the Code establishing regulations relating to route service motor carriers <i>was tabled by the Government Operations Committee meeting.</i></p> <p><b>This ordinance would have addressed the April 2003 recommendations, bifurcating route and non-route services into separate regulations.</b></p>
November 15, 2011 File No. 102292	An ordinance recommending significant changes to Chapter 31 Article III which governs the Passenger Motor Carriers was withdrawn by the Board of County Commissioners.

**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY  
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR**



Research Notes

**Agenda Item:** 11A5 and 11A6

**File Number:** 120547 and 120855

**Date of Analysis:** April 10, 2012

**Summary**

These resolutions direct the County Mayor or his designee to do the following:

- Item No. 11A5 - To collect data for a Disparity Study on Sustainability, Planning and Economic Enhancement Department's Oracle Database and to provide a progress report within 45 days; and
- Item No. 11A6 - To issue a solicitation for a Disparity Study of Black, Hispanic, and Women owned business participation in County contracting issued by the Department of Public Works and Waste Management and the Water and Sewer Department within 30 days and to recommend award of a contract within 180 days of the adoption of this resolution.

**Background and Relevant Legislation**

Engineering Contractors Association v. Metro Dade County<sup>1</sup>

In 1997, under the case of Engineering Contractors Association v. Metro Dade County (ECA), the Eleventh Circuit upheld Judge Kenneth Ryskamp's ruling that Miami-Dade County's Minority and Women Business Enterprise (MWBE) programs violated the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause as applied to sectors of the construction contracting industry. Miami-Dade County was permanently enjoined from enforcing the race, ethnicity, and gender-conscious contract measures as they pertained to construction projects only. Despite this adverse decision, Miami-Dade County did not amend, modify, or repeal the remaining sections of its MWBE programs, and further litigation ensued.

Hershell Gill Consulting Engineers, Inc. v. Miami-Dade County (2004)<sup>2</sup>

The case of Hershell Gill Consulting Engineers, Inc. v. Miami-Dade County involved a post-ECA challenge, under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d, *et seq.*, and under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, *see* 42 U.S.C. § 1983, to sections of the Miami-Dade County MWBE programs establishing participation goals for minority and women business enterprises in awarding County architectural and engineering (A&E) contracts. The plaintiffs — Hershell Gill Consulting Engineers, Inc. and Brill and Rodriguez, Inc. — were engineering firms owned by white males. The defendants were Miami-Dade County, former County Manager Merritt Stierheim (sued only in his official capacity), and various former and current County Commissioners sued in their official and individual capacities.

The MWBE programs were found to be unconstitutional as applied to A&E contracts, and were permanently enjoined in that sphere. The Commissioners were absolutely immune in their individual capacities for their votes in favor of the MWBE programs and their subsequent decisions to not repeal or amend the programs. But with

<sup>1</sup> Engineering Contractors Ass'n v. Metropolitan Dade County, 943 F.Supp. 1546 (S.D.Fla.1996), *aff'd*, 122 F.3d 895 (11th Cir.1997) (ECA), Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

<sup>2</sup> Hershell Gill Consulting Eng., Inc. v. Miami-Dade County, 333 F. Supp.2d1305 (2004), Amended Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

respect to their votes to apply MWBE measures to A&E contracts that were presented to them, the Commissioners were acting in their administrative capacities, and do not receive absolute immunity. Because the law was established, since *ECA*, that the MWBE programs were unconstitutional absent the requisite evidentiary support, the Commissioners were not entitled to qualified immunity and were liable for any compensatory and punitive damages in their individual capacities. The plaintiffs, however, failed to prove any compensatory damages, and punitive damages were not warranted. The plaintiffs were only awarded nominal damages and attorney's fees and costs, for which the Commissioners and the County were jointly and severally liable.

#### Miami-Dade County Pre-Disparity Planning Initiative

On June 19, 2001, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) directed the County Manager to engage expeditiously the services of a consultant or consultants to evaluate the County's existing data bases, and the means and methods by which the County gathers and compiles that data, making all appropriate recommendations, all with a view to the County's preparation of a disparity study of the participation of Black, Hispanic and Women owned businesses in County contracts.

MGT of America, Inc. (MGT) submitted the Final Report, entitled Predisparity Planning Initiative, dated March 4, 2005, to the Miami-Dade County Department of Business Development. According to this report, MGT of America was tasked with the following:

- Provide the County a thorough legal review, a review of best practices and policy recommendations.
- Assess the County's capacity to deliver data relevant to a formal disparity study in terms of both time and cost and to make recommendations that will bring the County's current procurement, contract, and payments data system closer to the data needs of such a study.
- Conduct a pre-disparity study, using available data sources, to offer some guidance to MWBE program administrators in terms of procurement policy and procedure development, given an estimate of current levels of MWBE utilization relative to availability.

The following chart provides MGT's recommendations to improve Miami-Dade County's Disparity Study data availability and retrieval and MGT's summary of costs to implement the recommendations to create a disparity-relevant data system:

<b>MGT's Recommendations and Cost to Implement Recommendations</b>	
Miami-Dade County should proceed with its plan to establish a data warehouse to store data extracted from the Department of Procurement Management's ADPICS database and the Department of Finance and Accounting's FAMIS data in a manner that anticipates the addition of disparity-relevant data from several other County data sources.	\$900,000
County bid information should be stored in an electronic data file and should include data relevant to a disparity study.	\$35,000
Building permit data should be stored electronically and extractable to the data warehouse environment.	\$102,500
The Department of Business Development's Contracts Database should be reengineered to accommodate disparity-relevant information from a variety of data sources not currently tapped.	\$70,000
Departments should consistently monitor/maintain subcontractor data and make data available electronically to the Department of Business Development, including data from projects awarded to developers (e.g. large-scale design-build construction projects).	\$50,000
The County should adopt common contract and vendor identification numbers such that the same vendor and contract and purchase order identification information is shared by all involved, informationally, in the contract or purchasing venture, from the central procurement to accounts payable data systems to the level of the individual departments or agencies.	\$85,000

Payments to vendors, including payment dates, should be uniformly linked to purchase orders and contracts. This also means that relevant and related contract, purchase order, and payment information should be linkable both within the respective procurement and accounts payable databases and between them.	\$100,000
All County procurement systems should record vendor business type information based on NAICS code categories selected and assigned by the vendor during the bid phase and/or the vendor registration process.	\$30,000
Charts of accounts in the County's payments databases should be standardized and referenced to disparity-relevant NAICS codes such that disparity-relevant payment information is readily accessible and retrievable in a systematic fashion.	\$40,000
<b>Total Estimated Cost</b>	<b>\$1,412,500</b>

Source: MGT's Predisparity Planning Initiative, Exhibit 5, page xi

### Other Jurisdictions Conducting Disparity Studies

#### City of Tampa and Hillsborough County<sup>3</sup>

In 2006, the City of Tampa and Hillsborough County Aviation Authority conducted a Disparity Study to evaluate their buying practices, focusing on the use of minority and woman-owned business. The joint study examined how well the City of Tampa and the Hillsborough County Aviation Authority have involved small and minority owned businesses in bidding and contracting activity. The study took 15 months to complete.

#### **Findings:**

- **Subcontractor Participation - No Disparity Was Found Regarding the City's Current M/WBE Program**  
There was no finding of disparity found for any minority or woman owned business group in construction or construction related services. The City's program has historically been focused on the participation of subcontractors in City projects and the study shows that the City's Minority Business Development Program has been very successful in this area.
- **Prime Contractor Participation (Contracts Up To \$500,000 and Above) -Disparity Was Found But Current M/WBE Program Is Not Focused On W/MBE's As Prime Contractors**  
There was an underutilization of minority and women owned business groups for formal prime contracts. The utilization of W/MBE's as prime contractors is currently not the focus of the City's M/WBE program.
- **Informal Contract Participation (Contracts \$25,000 or Less) - Disparity Was Found But Current M/WBE Program Is Not Focused On W/MBE's As Prime Contractors**  
There was an underutilization of minority and women owned business groups for informal prime contracts. The utilization of WMBE's as prime contractors is currently not the focus of the City's M/WBE program.

The City of Tampa and the Aviation Authority will evaluate the comments received from each governing board and the community meeting and each will develop a list of recommendations for implementation within their respective organization.

#### Broward County<sup>4</sup>

In June of 2008, the Broward County Board of County Commissioners authorized a study to examine the past and current status of minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises (M/WBEs) in the geographic and product markets for Broward County and to evaluate county contracting and procurement programs. The purpose of the study was to assist the County in evaluating whether its current race- and gender-neutral programs have eliminated discrimination and to determine whether the County's prior program to assist M/WBEs reduced discrimination.

<sup>3</sup>[www.tampagov.net/dept\\_minority\\_business\\_development/information\\_resources/Disparity\\_Study.asp](http://www.tampagov.net/dept_minority_business_development/information_resources/Disparity_Study.asp)

<sup>4</sup>[www.broward.org/econdev/Pages/DisparityStudy.aspx](http://www.broward.org/econdev/Pages/DisparityStudy.aspx)

**Findings:**

- **Disparities in Broward County Contracting and Purchasing**

*The study found evidence of disparities between availability and utilization in many aspects of Broward County's contracting and procurement activities despite the presence of the M/WBE Program.*

*Upon submission of the study results, the Office of Economic and Small Business Development, in conjunction with the Broward County Small Business Advisory Board, held a series of community workshops to allow the public to respond to and comment on the study. The final report and recommendations were formally presented to the Broward County Board of County Commissioners in November 2010.*

**Additional Information**

<b>Prior Legislation for Disparity Studies</b>	
<b>Date and Reso. No.</b>	<b>Title of Legislation</b>
6/20/00 <b>R-645-00</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING RETENTION OF. MANUEL J. CARVAJAL, PH.D., TO PERFORM A DISPARITY STUDY OF ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING FIRMS OWNED BY WOMEN, HISPANICS AND BLACKS IN CONNECTION WITH DEFENSE OF THE CASE OF HERSELL L. GILL CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC. ETC, ET AL V. MIAMI-DADE COUNTY CURRENTLY PENDING IN FEDERAL DISTRICT
2/15/01 <b>R-171-01</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING COUNTY MANAGER TO CONDUCT A COMPETITIVE RFP PROCESS FOR SELECTION OF A CONSULTANT TO PERFORM A DISPARITY STUDY OF BLACK, HISPANIC AND WOMEN OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION IN COUNTY CONTRACTS; AND URGING THE PUBLIC HEALTH TRUST TO CONDUCT ITS OWN DISPARITY STUDY
6/19/01 <b>R-730-01</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO ENGAGE CONSULTANT(S) TO EVALUATE THE COUNTY'S DATA IN SUPPORT OF A DISPARITY STUDY OF BLACK, HISPANIC AND WOMEN OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION IN COUNTY CONTRACTS
6/30/09 <b>R-869-09</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO COLLECT DATA ON THE RACE AND GENDER OF COUNTY CONTRACTORS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES AND REPORT THE FINDINGS TO THE BOARD
7/7/11 <b>R-564-11</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PREPARE A FEASIBILITY REPORT IN PREPARATION FOR A PROPOSAL TO ENACT RACE, ETHNIC AND GENDER BASED PROGRAMS TO REDRESS IDENTIFIED DISCRIMINATION
11/15/11 <b>Ord. 11-90</b>	ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE COLLECTION OF DATA FOR A DISPARITY STUDY IN CONNECTION WITH RACE, GENDER AND ETHNIC BASED CONTRACTING PROGRAMS; REQUIRING COUNTY CONTRACTORS TO REPORT THE RACE, GENDER AND ETHNIC MAKEUP OF THE OWNERSHIP OF SUBCONTRACTORS PERFORMING THE WORK; REQUIRING COUNTY CONTRACTORS TO REPORT PAYMENTS MADE TO ALL SUBCONTRACTORS UNDER THE CONTRACT; AMENDING SECTIONS 2-8.1, 2-8.8 AND 10-34 OF THE CODE; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
BCC 5/1/12 <b>Item No. 11A5</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO COLLECT DATA FOR A DISPARITY STUDY ON THE SUSTAINABILITY, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC ENHANCEMENT DEPARTMENT'S ORACLE DATABASE AND REQUIRING A PROGRESS REPORT
BCC 5/1/12 <b>Item No. 11A6</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO ISSUE A SOLICITATION FOR A DISPARITY STUDY OF BLACK, HISPANIC, AND WOMEN OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION IN COUNTY CONTRACTING FOR CONTRACTS ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND WASTE MANAGEMENT AND THE WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT

**Prepared by:** Elizabeth N. Owens