



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

**Strategic Planning & Government  
Operations Committee Meeting**

February 9, 2016  
9:30 A.M.  
Commission Chamber

**Research Division**

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

**Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee**  
**February 9, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes									
<b>1G1 153018</b>	ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 2-10.4 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY RELATING TO ACQUISITION OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL, ENGINEERING, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL OR LAND SURVEYING AND MAPPING SERVICES TO INCLUDE A LOCALLY HEADQUARTERED PREFERENCE; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE									
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 2-10.4 of the Miami-Dade County Code, relating to acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services, to include a locally headquartered preference.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact:</b>  The application of Locally Headquartered Preference may result in a change to the order of the final ranking of the firms and the potential for increased pricing. For Architectural and Engineering (A/E) design proposals, the price/fees are not scored, but are considered only at the time of contract negotiation with the successful firm. Therefore, the fiscal impact resulting from this change, if any, can only be determined on a contract by contract basis.</p> <p>For design/build procurements, the change may result in a locally headquartered bidder being ranked higher than a non-locally headquartered bidder with a lower priced offer. The fiscal impact resulting from this change may be significant, but can only be quantified on a contract by contract basis.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">Code Comparison Chart Section 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Section</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Current</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">           Sec. 2-10.4.  <i>Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services.</i> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">           (5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.             (e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local proposers within five percent of the points assigned to those recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as local business in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.         </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">           (5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.             (e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. <b>If two local firms, one locally headquartered and one not locally headquartered, are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the not locally headquartered firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. If two firms, one locally headquartered and one nonlocal are within ten (10) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection.</b> In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference <b>and locally headquartered preference</b> shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local <b>and locally headquartered</b> proposers within five <b>or ten</b> percent of the points assigned, <b>as set forth above</b>, to those <b>firms</b> recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. <b>This local preference and locally headquartered preference shall be applied after the ordinal ranking of the firms to determine the final ranking of selection.</b> For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as <b>Local Business and Locally Headquartered Business shall have the same meaning as Locally Headquartered Business as set forth</b> in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.         </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Code Comparison Chart Section 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County			Section	Current	Proposed	Sec. 2-10.4. <i>Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services.</i>	(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.  (e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local proposers within five percent of the points assigned to those recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as local business in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.	(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.  (e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. <b>If two local firms, one locally headquartered and one not locally headquartered, are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the not locally headquartered firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. If two firms, one locally headquartered and one nonlocal are within ten (10) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection.</b> In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference <b>and locally headquartered preference</b> shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local <b>and locally headquartered</b> proposers within five <b>or ten</b> percent of the points assigned, <b>as set forth above</b> , to those <b>firms</b> recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. <b>This local preference and locally headquartered preference shall be applied after the ordinal ranking of the firms to determine the final ranking of selection.</b> For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as <b>Local Business and Locally Headquartered Business shall have the same meaning as Locally Headquartered Business as set forth</b> in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.
Code Comparison Chart Section 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County										
Section	Current	Proposed								
Sec. 2-10.4. <i>Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services.</i>	(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.  (e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local proposers within five percent of the points assigned to those recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as local business in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.	(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.  (e) If two firms, one local and one nonlocal are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the local firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. <b>If two local firms, one locally headquartered and one not locally headquartered, are within five (5) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the not locally headquartered firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection. If two firms, one locally headquartered and one nonlocal are within ten (10) percent of each other's total Qualitative Scores, and for design build solicitations, the adjusted low bid, as defined in the corresponding Implementing Order, the locally headquartered firm shall be ranked higher than the nonlocal firm in the final ranking of the County Mayor or Mayor's designee made in accordance with this subsection.</b> In case of a two-tiered evaluation process, the local preference <b>and locally headquartered preference</b> shall also apply at the conclusion of the first tier to allow eligible local <b>and locally headquartered</b> proposers within five <b>or ten</b> percent of the points assigned, <b>as set forth above</b> , to those <b>firms</b> recommended to participate in the second tier evaluation. <b>This local preference and locally headquartered preference shall be applied after the ordinal ranking of the firms to determine the final ranking of selection.</b> For purposes of this subsection, the term local firm shall have the same meaning as <b>Local Business and Locally Headquartered Business shall have the same meaning as Locally Headquartered Business as set forth</b> in Section 2-8.5 of this Code.								
<b>1G2 160014</b>	ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 2-10.4 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY RELATING TO ACQUISITION OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL, ENGINEERING, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL OR LAND SURVEYING AND MAPPING SERVICES TO INCLUDE PRIOR WORK AWARDED TO AFFILIATES OF A PROPOSING FIRM IN EVALUATING THE VOLUME OF WORK PREVIOUSLY AWARDED TO A FIRM; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE									

**Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee**  
**February 9, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed ordinance amends Section 2-10.4 of the Miami-Dade County Code, relating to acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services, to include prior work awarded to affiliates of a proposing firm in evaluating the volume of work previously awarded to a firm.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact:</b>            For Architectural and Engineering (A/E) procurements, this change may result in an increase in the amount of the volume of work considered by the Competitive Selection Committee for a firm, and potentially result in a lower score for that firm in the applicable evaluation criterion. For A/E design proposals, pricing is not scored, but is considered following a qualitative evaluation. Therefore, the fiscal impact resulting from this change cannot be determined in advance.</p>	
	<b>Code Comparison Chart</b>	
	<b>Section 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County</b>	
	<i>Current</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Sec. 2-10.4. <i>Acquisition of professional architectural, engineering, landscape architectural or land surveying and mapping services.</i>	<p>(1) Definitions.</p> <p>(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.</p> <p>(d) The County Manager shall select no less than three (3) firms, in the order of preference (provided that at least three (3) firms are identified in accordance with subsection (b) above) by the competitive selection committee to be the most highly qualified to perform the required services. The competitive selection committee shall rank the firms in the order of their competence and qualification after considering such factors as the ability of professional personnel, past performance, willingness to meet time and budget requirements, locations of the firms, the recent, current, and projected workloads of the firms, and the volume of work previously awarded to the firm by the agency with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms. The competitive selection committee shall score the firms based on a qualitative evaluation of the selection criteria (the "Qualitative Score") but shall base its recommended ranking on the aggregate ranking provided by members of the selection committee (the "Ordinal Score") all as more particularly described in the Implementing Order. The competitive selection committee shall report to the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee the recommended ranking of the firms including both Qualitative Scores and Ordinal Scores. The competitive selection committee shall report no fewer than three (3) firms determined to be the most highly qualified, provided at least three (3) qualified firms have responded to the solicitation.</p> <p>Following the review of the selection committee's report, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall determine the final ranking of firms in the order of competence and qualification upon application of the criteria set forth in</p>	<p>(1) Definitions.</p> <p><b>(j) The term "Affiliates" shall mean business concerns, organizations, or individuals that directly or indirectly where: (i) one controls or has the power to control the other; or (ii) a third party controls or has the power to control both. Indicia of control include, but are not limited to, interlocking management or ownership, identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment, common use of employees, shared office space, shared local business tax receipt addresses, or a business entity organized by a debarred entity, individual, or affiliate following the debarment of a contractor that has the same or similar management, ownership, or principal employees as the contractor that was debarred or suspended.</b></p> <p>(5) Competitive selection committees for publicly announced projects or planning or study activities which are not provided under continuing contracts.</p> <p>(d) The County <b>Mayor or County Mayor's designee</b> shall select no less than three (3) firms, in the order of preference (provided that at least three (3) firms are identified in accordance with subsection (b) above) by the competitive selection committee to be the most highly qualified to perform the required services. The competitive selection committee shall rank the firms in the order of their competence and qualification after considering such factors as the ability of professional personnel, past performance, willingness to meet time and budget requirements, locations of the firms, the recent, current, and projected workloads of the firms, and the volume of work previously awarded to the firm &gt;&gt;and its affiliates&lt;&lt; by the agency with the object of effecting an equitable distribution of contracts among qualified firms. The competitive selection committee shall score the firms based on a qualitative evaluation of the selection criteria (the "Qualitative Score") but shall base its recommended ranking on the aggregate ranking provided by members of the selection committee (the "Ordinal Score") all as more particularly described in the Implementing Order. The competitive selection committee shall report to the County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee the recommended ranking of the firms including both Qualitative Scores and Ordinal Scores. The competitive selection committee shall report no fewer than three (3) firms determined to be the most highly qualified, provided at least three (3) qualified firms have responded to the solicitation.</p> <p>Following the review of the selection committee's report, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall determine the</p>

**Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee**  
**February 9, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
	subsection (d) above and the local preference considerations set forth in subsection (e) below. The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall at all times abide by the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms. The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall file the names of the firms he selects together with his order of preference with the Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners. The County shall then negotiate a contract in accordance with the procedures set forth hereafter.	final ranking of firms in the order of competence and qualification upon application of the criteria set forth in subsection (d) above and the local preference considerations set forth in subsection (e) below. The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall at all times abide by the principle of selection of the most highly qualified firms. The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee shall file the names of the firms he selects together with his order of preference with the Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners. The County shall then negotiate a contract in accordance with the procedures set forth hereafter.
<b>2B 160118</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO STUDY THE ISSUE OF ACCEPTING PAYMENTS THROUGH MOBILE PAYMENT AND DIGITAL WALLET SYSTEMS AND TO PROVIDE A REPORT TO THE BOARD ON THE COST AND FEASIBILITY OF ACCEPTING SUCH PAYMENT METHODS AND WHETHER THE MAYOR RECOMMENDS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SUCH A POLICY	
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution directs the Mayor or Mayor's designees to study the issue of Miami-Dade County accepting payments through "mobile payment" and "digital wallet" systems, and submit a report to the BCC. The report will, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine the County departments or County-operated facilities that would most benefit from being able to accept payments through "mobile payment" and "digital wallet" systems;</li> <li>• Assess the cost and feasibility of enabling Miami-Dade County to accept these payment methods at those locations;</li> <li>• Evaluate the potential impact that acceptance of these payment methods will have on security, primarily whether they increase, decrease, or have no effect on the risk for identity theft;</li> <li>• Provide information about other jurisdictions or current departments that have begun to accept these payment methods; and</li> <li>• Advise whether, based on the foregoing, the County Mayor recommends accepting payments through "mobile payment" and "digital wallet" systems.</li> </ul> <p>The County Mayor or Mayor's designee is further directed to submit this report to the BCC within 90 days of the effective date of this resolution and to place the completed report on an agenda of the BCC pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65.</p> <p><b>Background:</b>  In response to the public's growing use and dependence on mobile devices, companies like Apple, Samsung, and Google have unveiled technology that allows their mobile devices to make secure transactions and thereby replace the magnetic stripe or chip technology on credit or debit cards. Software developers, such as PayPal, Venmo, and Square, and financial institutions, such as Bank of America, JP Morgan Chase, and Well Fargo, have also developed apps that allow users to transfer funds via mobile devices. These innovations are frequently referred to as "mobile payment" or "digital wallet" systems.</p> <p><b>Additional Information - Report: Digital Wallet Usage Increased 20% From 2014 to 2015, Social Times, January 26, 2016<sup>1</sup>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Digital wallet usage increased by 20 percent from 2014 to 2015, according to new data from Citi Retail Services.</i></li> <li>• <i>The results from two 'Let's Get Digital' surveys of U.S. consumers (one from January 2014 and the other from December 2015 to January 2016) showed 55 percent of respondents in the 2015 survey had used a digital wallet to make a purchase with their smartphone, up from 35 percent of respondents in 2014.</i></li> <li>• <i>In the 2015 survey, when non-users were asked why they have not used a digital wallet product to make a purchase, 47 percent of these users said it was easier to pay with another form of payment, such as cash or a credit card. This is up from 41 percent of respondents in 2014. In addition, 45 percent of users said they didn't see the benefit of using a digital wallet, which is an increase of 10 percent from 2014.</i></li> <li>• <i>Other reasons include a concern over the security of payments (45 percent in 2015, down from 52 percent in 2014), and a lack of knowledge about digital wallet tools (44 percent in 2015, up from 42 percent in 2014).</i></li> <li>• <i>Of these non-users, 66 percent said they 'could be convinced' to use a digital wallet in their everyday lives, if they were educated about the benefits.</i></li> </ul>	
<b>2C 160124</b>	RESOLUTION REQUIRING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO ATTACH TO ALL ITEMS RECOMMENDING DESIGN AND/OR CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARDS OF \$1,000,000.00 OR GREATER A LIST OF ALL COUNTY CONTRACTS AWARDED IN THE PREVIOUS THREE YEARS TO THE RECOMMENDED CONTRACTOR AND A SUMMARY OF COUNTY EVALUATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDED CONTRACTOR'S WORK; AND REQUIRING ALL COUNTY DEPARTMENTS TO COMPLETE CONTRACTOR EVALUATIONS BEFORE CLOSING OUT A CONTRACT AND MAKING FINAL PAYMENT TO A CONTRACTOR	
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution requires the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to attach to all items seeking approval of a design and/or construction contract award of \$1,000,000.00 or greater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A list of all contracts that the recommended contractor has been awarded at the County for the prior three years; and</li> <li>• A summary of the County evaluations for contracts awarded for the prior three years that are available on the Internal Services Department database for the recommended contractor.</li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.adweek.com/socialtimes/report-digital-wallet-usage-increased-20-from-2014-to-2015/633290>

**Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee**  
**February 9, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Additionally, the proposed resolution requires that, as of the Effective Date of this Resolution, prior to closing a County contract and making a final payment to the contractor, all applicable County departments must complete an evaluation of the contractor's work and ensure that such evaluation is accessible on the Internal Services Department evaluation database.</p> <p><b>Background:</b>  The Internal Services Department of the County maintains a database that identifies all County contracts awarded to a contractor and tracks the County evaluations received by that contractor. For every County project, an evaluation of the contractor's work should be performed and added to the Internal Services Department's database before the contract is closed and final payment to the contractor is made.</p>
<b>2D 160125</b>	<p>RESOLUTION AMENDING IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38, MASTER PROCUREMENT IMPLEMENTING ORDER, TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO ENTER INTO PILOT PROJECT AND PRODUCT DEMONSTRATION AGREEMENTS FOR TESTING AND OBSERVING INNOVATIVE AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES, PRODUCTS, AND PROCESSES</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The propose resolution amends Implementing Order 3-38, Master Procurement Administrative Order to authorize the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to enter into pilot project and product demonstration agreements.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>PILOT PROJECT AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS</b></p> <p><i>The County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee may enter into pilot project and product demonstration agreements with County vendors or prospective County vendors for the purpose of testing and evaluating technology, products and services provided that such agreements are: (1) for a period not to exceed twelve (12) months; (2) provided at no cost to the County with the exception of any ordinary cost for County employees or consultants to review such technology, products or services; (3) do not contain any exclusive dealing, in-kind or advertising commitments by the County; (4) provide for indemnification of the County; (5) provide for County ownership of any data generated during the testing and observation period; and (6) are terminable at will by the County.</i></p> <p><i>Each pilot project or product demonstration agreement shall be subject to review and approval by the County Attorney's Office for legal sufficiency prior to execution. In the event that the County seeks to procure a similar technology, product or service through the County's competitive process, any solicitation document shall include all information regarding the pilot project and the technology, product or services tested.</i></p> <p><i>Pilot project and product development agreements may not serve as a basis for any non-competitive purchase other than a bid waiver or sole source purchase.</i></p>
<b>2E 160231</b>	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE MAYOR OR DESIGNEE TO COLLABORATE WITH THE MIAMI CENTER FOR ARCHITECTURE &amp; DESIGN (MCAD) IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ACTIVE DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND CITIES, FUNDED BY THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION (CDC) AND THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH; AND DIRECTING THE MAYOR OR DESIGNEE TO REPORT BACK TO THIS BOARD WITH THE FEASIBILITY OF ADOPTING THE GUIDELINES WHEN COMPLETED</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution directs the Mayor or designee to collaborate with the Miami Center for Architecture &amp; Design (MCAD) in the development of Active Design Guidelines for Miami-Dade County and cities, and to report back to the BCC with the feasibility of adopting the Active Design Guidelines once completed in 2016.</p> <p>The Mayor or designee will provide a report on the feasibility of adopting the Active Design Guidelines to the BCC within 60 days of the effective date of this resolution, and will place the completed report on an agenda of the BCC pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65.</p> <p><b>Background:</b>  Obesity, a common and costly health issue that increases risk for heart disease, type 2 diabetes, and cancer, affects more than one-third of all adults and 17 percent of youth in the United States. Obesity among adults in Florida is on track to hit 58.6 percent by 2030, more than double the 26.6 percent experienced in 2012 according to a report commissioned by Trust for America's Health and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. To reverse the obesity epidemic, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends that community efforts should focus on supporting healthy eating and active living in a variety of settings. Planners, architects, and public health professionals, working collaboratively, have an essential role in addressing the rapidly growing epidemics of obesity and related chronic diseases, especially in light of mounting scientific evidence demonstrating the impact of environmental design on physical activity and healthy eating.</p> <p>The Florida Department of Health was awarded a grant by the CDC and contracted with the Miami Center for Architecture &amp; Design (MCAD), a 501c3, in October 2015 to create Active Design Guidelines for use by Miami-Dade County and cities by the end of the grant term in September 2016. Active Design Guidelines provide architects and urban designers with a manual of strategies for creating healthier buildings, streets, and urban spaces, based on the latest academic research and best practices in the field. These Guidelines were first developed in New York City through a broad, collaborative effort and MCAD will use the New York Guidelines as a starting point for Guidelines that are appropriate and relevant for Miami-Dade County and cities.</p> <p>Through Resolution No. R-995-14, Miami-Dade County developed, in coordination with the Florida Department of Transportation, the Metropolitan Planning Organization, and other applicable entities, a plan for BCC approval to implement a "Complete Streets" Program in Miami-Dade County. Miami-Dade County's sustainability plan, GreenPrint, under the Healthy Communities Goal Area, includes strategies and initiatives to decrease our community's lifestyle disease rates such as diabetes and heart disease through healthy eating and exercise, as well as increase the number of short walking and biking trips through safety programs and other programs.</p>

**Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee**  
**February 9, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><b><u>Additional Information- A Tale of Two ObesCities: The Role of Municipal Governance in Reducing Childhood Obesity in New York City and London, U.S. National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health Journal Article, September 2010<sup>2</sup>:</u></b></p> <p>As rates of childhood obesity and overweight rise around the world, researchers and policy makers seek new ways to reverse these trends. Given the concentration of the world’s population, income inequalities, unhealthy diets, and patterns of physical activity in cities, urban areas bear a disproportionate burden of obesity. To address these issues, in 2008, researchers from the City University of New York and London Metropolitan University created the Municipal Responses to Childhood Obesity Collaborative. The Collaborative examined three questions: What role has city government played in responding to childhood obesity in each jurisdiction? How have municipal governance structures in each city influenced its capacity to respond effectively? How can policy and programmatic interventions to reduce childhood obesity also reduce the growing socioeconomic and racial/ethnic inequities in its prevalence? Based on a review of existing initiatives in London and New York City, the Collaborative recommended 11 broad strategies by which each city could reduce childhood obesity. These recommendations were selected because they can be enacted at the municipal level; will reduce socioeconomic and racial/ethnic inequalities in obesity; are either well supported by research or are already being implemented in one city, demonstrating their feasibility; build on existing city assets; and are both green and healthy.</p> <p>In recent decades, rates of childhood obesity have soared around the world, imposing health and economic burdens on both developed and developing nations. Given obesity’s role in the etiology of major chronic diseases, this trend threatens global progress in achieving improvements in population health. Because of the increasing concentration of the world’s population in cities and the role of the urban built environment and urban life styles in obesity, cities experience a disproportionately heavy cost from rising rates of childhood obesity. Although municipal governments have the potential to play a leading role in the effort to reduce obesity, researchers have focused little attention on defining these opportunities or comparing the efficacy of various municipal-level approaches to obesity prevention and control.</p> <p>To address these problems, in 2008, researchers from the City University of New York (CUNY) and London Metropolitan University (London Met) created the Municipal Responses to Childhood Obesity Collaborative to seek answers to these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How have New York City and London responded to rising rates of childhood obesity?</li> <li>• What are the similarities and differences in their responses?</li> <li>• How have different municipal governance systems shaped these responses?</li> <li>• What can the two cities learn from each other to strengthen their responses to childhood obesity?</li> <li>• What can other cities learn from the New York City and London experiences?</li> </ul> <p>Our collaborative sought to build on the work of other local, national, and global bodies that have recently examined childhood obesity, but we identified three distinct themes that characterized our inquiry. First, we focused on the role of city government in responding to childhood obesity.</p> <p><b>Childhood Obesity in New York City and London</b></p> <p>New York City and London share social and political characteristics. Both cities have large and diverse populations. Because London is geographically larger, and development is subject to more stringent planning controls, it is less densely populated than New York. Available evidence indicates that New York has greater extremes of inequality and is more segregated by race/ethnicity and class than London. Both cities have the highest rates of income inequality in their nations.</p> <p>Rates of childhood obesity and overweight also share common patterns in the two cities. In both cities, the prevalence of obesity and overweight increases with age; is more common among boys than girls until puberty, when the gender ratio changes; and is more common among low income, immigrant, and certain ethnic/racial groups. Racial and ethnic disparities in childhood obesity in these cities reflect the geopolitical histories of United States and Great Britain, so that in New York, Latino children are the most obese and in London, this burden falls on Southeast Asian children. These striking socioeconomic differences highlight the ways that differences in childhood obesity and overweight mirror broader health inequities in the two cities.</p> <p><b>Municipal Programs to Control Childhood Obesity</b></p> <p>The Collaborative identified responses to childhood obesity in the two cities in six sectors: food, transportation, green space, planning and housing, schools, and health care and health inequities. These initiatives fell into three broad categories: policy changes to modify environments that shaped health choices, programs to increase access to services or resources that helped to prevent obesity, and educational initiatives to assist individuals to make more informed choices.</p> <p>Each city has created a diverse portfolio of educational, programmatic, and policy initiatives in the six sectors. To a large extent, these responses reflect the much larger universe of policy proposals that have made their way through the policy and political processes in the two cities. In his influential essay on policy development, Kingdon suggests that policy proposals that are actually implemented are those that can find “windows of opportunity” in three overlapping “streams”: framing the problem, proposing feasible policy solutions, and negotiating political processes.</p> <p>To what extent are the paths chosen the most effective ways for reducing childhood obesity? An examination of policy proposals that have not succeeded provides some insights. For example, in New York City, proposals to impose congestion pricing fees to reduce traffic and promote</p>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2937123/>

**Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee**  
**February 9, 2016 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>mass transit and walking; to tax sweetened beverages; to use zoning laws to reduce the density of fast food outlets; or to balance growing budget deficits with new taxes on the wealthy rather than cuts in health, educational, and other services for the poor have for the most part not succeeded. These examples show that suggestions for even modest reforms that challenge the status quo of elites face formidable opposition.</p> <p>Similarly, in London, the 2012 Olympics and Paralympics will be hosted by five boroughs whose children experience some of the deepest deprivation and health burdens in the UK. It is notable that the intended health legacy of the 2012 Olympics is at odds with its commercial sponsorship, which includes McDonalds, Coca Cola, and Cadbury, companies implicated in the spread of obesity. In both cities, modest efforts to increase availability of healthy food and opportunities for physical activity seem more feasible than reducing the promotion and availability of unhealthy food or making more substantial changes in the built environment.</p> <p>The GLA's London Health Inequalities Strategy commits to attempting to "influence the food industry to provide clearer information and reduce unhealthy food content" and hopes to work in partnership with the Food and Drink Federation, the food industry trade association. Whether these intentions can be translated into policy change will test the city's ability to address more fundamental causes of childhood obesity.</p>
<b>2F 160122</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXPLORE THE FEASIBILITY OF DEVELOPING AND USING SEA LEVEL RISE CHECKLISTS FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND TO PREPARE A REPORT FOR THIS BOARD
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to continue to explore the feasibility of developing and using a "Sea Level Rise Checklist," similar to, or inspired by, San Francisco's "Sea Level Rise Checklist," as discussed in the Second Quarter Status Report.</p> <p>The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee will prepare a report regarding same, and will provide this report to the BCC within 6 months of the effective date of this resolution and place the completed report on an agenda of the BCC pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65.</p> <p><b>Background:</b>  In 2013, pursuant to Resolution No. R-599-13, the BCC created the Miami-Dade County Sea Level Rise Task Force and the BCC subsequently adopted multiple resolutions in order to implement the recommendations of the Sea Level Rise Task Force, and some of those resolutions required that reports subsequently be presented to the BCC on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>On October 23, 2015, the County Mayor submitted the Second Quarter Status Report in Response to Multiple Resolutions Pertaining to Recommendations by the Sea Level Rise Task Force (Second Quarter Status Report). As described in the Second Quarter Status Report, city departments in San Francisco that have responsibility for implementing capital projects are required to complete a "Sea Level Rise Checklist" for projects over \$5 million that are located within a city-designated Vulnerability Zone. The City of San Francisco further requires that each completed "Sea Level Rise Checklist" be submitted for review to San Francisco's Capital Planning Committee and the City Engineer's Office.</p> <p><b>Additional Information – Sea Level Rise Guidance, San Francisco<sup>3</sup>:</b>  The following instructions were created to establish and apply a consistent and comprehensive review, planning, and implementation process to carry out the "Guidance for Incorporating Sea Level Rise into Capital Planning in San Francisco". The guidance was originally adopted by the Capital Planning Committee on September 22, 2014; revisions and a supplement were adopted on December 14, 2015.</p> <p><b>Short Term- Submission Requirements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each department with responsibility for implementing capital projects should do the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify and map project sites included in the 10 year capital plan or submitted within a budget or supplemental request to verify if it falls within the area defined as the SLR Vulnerability Zone. "Vulnerability Zone" is defined and mapped by the CCSF SLR Committee as the area that would be impacted by SLR in the Year 2100 by a combination of unlikely but possible high end SLR plus a 100 year flood. The Vulnerability Zone map will be provided to departments as a shape file in ArcGIS for inputting at their request.</li> <li>○ Fill out the Sea Level Rise Checklist for each of the capital projects over \$5 million that have been identified for funding over the next ten years. Please note that in order to complete the Checklist correctly, Departments must review the full Guidance.</li> <li>○ Submit the completed forms to the Capital Planning Committee by January 31. Departments are encouraged to submit their completed Checklists earlier than the deadline to allow for timely review by CPC and City Engineer.</li> <li>○ In cases where projects are at an early stage of development or within a program that doesn't have specific information but are or may be within the Vulnerability Zone, inform the CPC staff and the City Engineer when specific projects will be defined and the checklist will be completed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The SFPUC and its Sewer System Improvement Program consulting firm, AECOM, will provide information and training as requested to each department to assist in implementing the SLR Guidance, use of the SFPUC inundation maps referred to in the Guidance and Checklist, and completion of the Checklist.</li> <li>• All submissions and any accompanying vulnerability assessment materials will be forwarded to the Public Works Department – City Engineer's Office by February 10.</li> <li>• The City Engineer will utilize existing resources available within DPW to combine all CCSF mapped projects provided by departments on a GIS map. The City Engineer's Office will interact directly with each department as needed to clarify meaning or correct any</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> <http://onesanfrancisco.org/staff-resources/sea-level-rise-guidance/>

**Strategic Planning & Government Operations Committee  
February 9, 2016 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>deficiencies. This interaction could include any needed hydraulic, structural, regulatory, or other reviews to verify vulnerability assessments should the Capital Planning Committee or the department responsible for the asset deems it necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the request of the Capital Planning Committee Chair, the City Engineer will prepare and submit a report on projects submitted for the Capital Plan.</li> <li>• Submissions for capital projects seeking funding through the budget process will be due by March 15. Projects seeking funding for a supplemental appropriation will be due two weeks prior to the date at which the supplemental will go before the Capital Planning Committee.</li> </ul> <p><b>Long Term Requirements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Departments which have projects within the Vulnerability Zone will need to provide specific long term strategies to specifically address sensitivity and adaptive capacity as defined in the Sea Level Rise Guidance. This will occur at the time for bond proposals or other funding requests.</li> <li>• DPW – City Engineer’s Office, in collaboration with the CCSF SLR Committee if needed, will assist client departments in developing specific long term strategies to specifically address sensitivity and adaptive capacity of individual projects.</li> </ul>
<b>2G 160116</b>	<p>RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING AS COUNTY POLICY THAT THE AREA OF THE STEPHEN P. CLARK CENTER LOBBY THAT IS ENCLOSED BY GATES DURING NON-REGULAR WORKING HOURS BE USED ONLY FOR THE DISPLAY OF CULTURAL AND ART EXHIBITS AND REQUIRING THAT ALL PROPOSED EXHIBITS BE APPROVED BY THE BOARD IN ADVANCE OF ANY DISPLAY; DIRECTING COUNTY MAYOR OR MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PRESENT, THROUGH A SPONSORING COUNTY COMMISSIONER, ANY PROPOSED EXHIBIT FOR THE AREA OF THE STEPHEN P. CLARK CENTER LOBBY THAT IS ENCLOSED BY GATES DURING NON-REGULAR WORKING HOURS TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution establishes as a policy of Miami-Dade County that the Secured Lobby Area of the Stephen P. Clark Center be used only for the display of cultural and art exhibits and requires that all proposed exhibits be approved by the BCC in advance of any display.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or Mayor's designee to present, through a sponsoring County Commissioner, any proposed exhibit for the Secured Lobby Area to the BCC for approval prior to installation.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The lobby area of the Stephen P. Clark Center is used by permitted vendors to sell goods such as plants and jewelry and to provide information to County employees such as on the various health insurance options available to County employees. The area of the Stephen P. Clark Center that is enclosed by gates during weekends and non-regular working hours (i.e. 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m.) (Secured Lobby Area) however has been limited in its use to exhibits and displays that are endorsed by Miami-Dade County government or to convey a message from County government.</p>