Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

Board of County Commissioners Meeting

June 21, 2016
9:30 A.M.
Commission Chamber

Research Division

Office of the Commission Auditor
111 NW First Street, Suite 1030
Miami, Florida 33128
305-375-4354

Board of County Commissioners
June 21, 2016 Meeting
Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
4A **161261**	ORDINANCE RELATING TO ZONING; PROHIBITING USE OF LAND FOR WELL STIMULATION FOR OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION OR PRODUCTION; PROVIDING CRITERIA AND NOTICE AND HEARING PREREQUISITES FOR VARIANCES; PROVIDING FOR APPLICABILITY IN INCORPORATED AREAS; CREATING CHAPTER 33, ARTICLE XLII, SECTIONS 33-435 THROUGH 33-438 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	The proposed ordinance • Prohibits use of land for well stimulation for oil and gas exploration or production; • Provides criteria and notice of hearing prerequisites for variances; • Provides for applicability in incorporated areas; and • Creates Chapter 33, Article XLII, Sections 33-435 through 33-438 of the Miami-Dade County Code. Specifically, the proposed ordinance provides for additional protections against incompatible land uses by prohibiting the use of lands in Miami-Dade County for oil and gas exploration or production through well stimulation including processes commonly known as "fracking." **Additional Information - Seminole County OKs anti-fracking ordinance, criticizes Tallahassee[1]:** • *The Seminole County Commission approved an anti-fracking ordinance Tuesday as it denounced the hydraulic fracturing oil and gas drilling technology and the Legislature for taking up bills that would restrict local decisions about it.* • *The commission voted unanimously on an ordinance that bans "any oil and gas exploration that uses well stimulation within the boundaries and below the geographic territory of Seminole County."* • *Commissioners declared that the ordinance goes far beyond what most cities and counties have done with other anti-fracking measures.* • *Commissioners also spoke out against Tallahassee lawmakers, where House Bill 191 and Senate Bill 318 aim to strip local governments of some of the power they may have to regulate fracking.* • *The commission approved the measure after a public hearing where numerous speakers spoke in support, many of them expressing concern for the Floridan Aquifer. None spoke in opposition.* **Additional Information - Alachua County adopts anti-fracking ordinance[2]:** • *The Alachua County Commission adopted an anti-oil and natural gas extraction ordinance in April 2016.* • *The ordinance, approved unanimously, prohibits both oil and natural gas extractions and prohibits disposing of extraction waste by well-injection methods into the earth. County officials cite concerns over water quality from the extraction process as their reason behind the ordinance.* • *The move has the county joining a growing list of Florida counties that passed similar legislation in the face of House Bill 191 and Senate Bill 318 that put regulations in place allowing for fracking in the Sunshine State. The Senate bill died in committee but the House passed its version.* • *Before the ordinance's passage, anyone wishing to frack in Alachua County would have needed a special-use permit.*
4C **161415**	ORDINANCE RELATED TO AIRPORTS; AMENDING SECTION 21-51 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROHIBITING THE AIMING OF A LASER POINTER AT CERTAIN AIRPORT FACILITIES INCLUDING AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWERS; AMENDING 8CC-10; PROVIDING PENALTIES; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	The proposed ordinance, relating to airports, amends Section 21-51 of the Miami-Dade County Code prohibiting the aiming of a laser pointer at certain airport facilities including air traffic control towers. The proposed ordinance further amends Section 8CC-10 to provide for penalties. **Background:** On June 7, 2016, the BCC, through Ordinance No. 16-60 created Section 21-51 of the Miami-Dade County Code prohibiting the aiming of a laser pointer at an aircraft or manned police vehicle. Additionally, Ordinance No. 16-60 amended Section 8CC-10 of the Miami-Dade County Code providing for penalties for aiming a laser pointer at an aircraft or manned police vehicle.
4D **161254**	ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO ZONING; AMENDING SECTION 33-20 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, PERTAINING TO PORTABLE MINI-STORAGE UNITS; AMENDING CHAPTER 8CC-10 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, PERTAINING TO PENALTIES; PROVIDING FOR CIVIL PENALTIES; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	The proposed ordinance amends Section 33-20 of the Miami-Dade County Code pertaining to portable mini-storage units. Additionally, the proposed ordinance amends Chapter 8CC-10 of the Miami-Dade County Code to provide for civil penalties.

Code Comparison Chart
Sections 33-20 and 8CC-10

Section	*Current*	*Proposed*
Sec. 33-20. *Accessory buildings; utility sheds and pergolas;*	(i) Portable mini-storage unit. For the purpose of this section, the term portable mini-storage unit shall mean a portable container designed for the storage of personal property that is placed on a homeowner's lot, parcel or tract and is designed to be delivered to	(i) Portable mini-storage unit. For the purpose of this section, the term portable mini-storage unit shall mean a portable container designed for the storage of personal property that is placed on a homeowner's lot, parcel or tract and is designed to be delivered to and/or removed

[1] http://floridapolitics.com/archives/201182-seminole-county-commission-approves-anti-fracking-ordinance
[2] http://www.gainesville.com/article/20160415/articles/160419764

Item No.	Research Notes		
	swimming pools; fallout shelters; boat storage; portable mini-storage units.	and/or removed from the homeowner's site by a truck or other street-legal vehicle. One temporary portable mini-storage unit may be placed on a fee simple lot, parcel or tract containing a single-family residence, subject to the following conditions and limitations: (1) The homeowner: (a) has a valid building permit for the major remodeling of, or for a significant addition to, or for damage repair to the single-family residence on the lot, parcel, or tract whereon the portable mini-storage unit is requested to be placed; or (b) is conducting work involving interior improvements that do not require a building permit; or (c) is using the portable mini-storage unit to move personal items or furnishings to another location; and (2) The portable mini-storage unit, shall not exceed 8 feet in width, 16 feet in length, and 8 feet in height; and (3) The portable mini-storage unit shall be placed at ground level, shall be setback a minimum of ten (10) feet from the front property line and a minimum of five (5) feet from all other property lines, and shall comply with the safe sight distance triangle regulations; and (4) In no instance shall hazardous material be placed in the portable mini-storage unit; and (5) The property owner shall apply for and obtain a Zoning Improvement Permit (ZIP) pursuant to Section 33-8.1 for a portable mini-storage unit that will be kept on the lot/parcel for more than 15 days. (6) The ZIP for the portable mini-storage unit shall be a conditional permit and shall be issued for a period not to exceed 90 days. (7) Upon application, the ZIP may be extended for a maximum of 30 consecutive days if the unit is located in the rear of the property or otherwise hidden from view from the street; and (8) No site may have more than 3 ZIP permits issued for a portable mini-storage unit within a 12-month period. No site may have a portable mini-storage unit for more than 21 days total in a 12-month period, or 60 days total in a 12-month period if an extension is granted; and (7) No mechanical, plumbing or electrical installations or connections are made to the portable mini-storage unit. >>All portable mini-storage units must be kept in good, clean, and finished condition, with no visible signs of deterioration, weathering, discoloration, rust, ripping, tearing or other holes or breaks; and	from the homeowner's site by a truck or other street-legal vehicle. One temporary portable mini-storage unit may be placed on a fee simple lot, parcel or tract containing a single-family residence, subject to the following conditions and limitations: (1) The homeowner: (a) has a valid building permit for the major remodeling of, or for a significant addition to, or for damage repair to the single-family residence on the lot, parcel, or tract whereon the portable mini-storage unit is requested to be placed; or (b) is conducting work involving interior improvements that do not require a building permit; or (c) is using the portable mini-storage unit to move personal items or furnishings to another location; and (2) The portable mini-storage unit, shall not exceed 8 feet in width, 16 feet in length, and 8 feet in height; and (3) The portable mini-storage unit shall be placed at ground level, shall be setback a minimum of ten (10) feet from the front property line and a minimum of five (5) feet from all other property lines, **shall not be visible from the street or, if all potential placement areas are visible from the street, shall be placed only on a driveway or paved surface,** and shall comply with the safe sight distance triangle regulations; and (4) In no instance shall hazardous material be placed in the portable mini-storage unit **and it shall be locked at all times when it is not being loaded or unloaded;** and (5) The property owner shall apply for and obtain a Zoning Improvement Permit (ZIP) pursuant to Section 33-8.1 for a portable mini-storage unit that will be kept on the lot/parcel**; and** (6) The ZIP for the portable mini-storage unit shall be a conditional permit and shall be issued for a period not to exceed **7 consecutive** days**; and** (7) Upon application, the ZIP may be extended for a maximum of 30 consecutive days if the unit is located in the rear of the property or otherwise hidden from view from the street; and (8) No site may have more than 3 ZIP permits issued for a portable mini-storage unit within a 12-month period. No site may have a portable mini-storage unit for more than 21 days total in a 12-month period, or 60 days total in a 12-month period if an extension is granted; and **(9)** No mechanical, plumbing or electrical installations or connections are made to the portable mini-storage unit. >>All portable mini-storage units must be kept in good, clean, and finished condition, with no visible signs of deterioration, weathering, discoloration, rust, ripping, tearing or other holes or breaks; and

<table>
<tr><th>Item No.</th><th>Research Notes</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>(8) The portable mini-storage unit shall have clearly posted on the exterior of the unit, the name, current phone number and address of the company providing the portable mini-storage unit, a copy of the current ZIP permit issued for the mini-storage unit, and the date the portable mini-storage unit was placed at the site.

(9) The conditional ZIP approval may be revoked by the Director at any time should the homeowner's utilization of such temporary portable mini-storage unit result in unsafe or unsanitary conditions on the site or upon violation of any of the conditions or limitations stated herein.</td><td>(10) The portable mini-storage unit shall have clearly posted on the exterior of the unit, the name, current phone number and address of the company providing the portable mini-storage unit, a copy of the current ZIP permit issued for the mini-storage unit, and the date the portable mini-storage unit was placed at the site.

(11) The conditional ZIP approval may be revoked by the Director at any time should the homeowner's utilization of such temporary portable mini-storage unit result in unsafe or unsanitary conditions on the site or upon violation of any of the conditions or limitations stated herein. All portable mini-storage units shall be removed immediately upon the issuance of a hurricane watch by a federal agency.

(12) Violations. Failure to comply with any condition or limitation of Section 33-20(i) shall constitute a violation. Violations of this section shall be punishable by a fine enumerated in Section 8CC-10 of this Code. A courtesy warning shall be issued prior to commencing any enforcement action, and the responsible party shall have five calendar days within which to correct the violation. Thereafter, the County may commence appropriate enforcement action.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sec. 8CC-10. Schedule of civil penalties.</td><td>N/A</td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Code Section</td><td>Description of Violation</td><td>Civil Penalty</td></tr>
<tr><td>33-20(i)</td><td>Failure to comply with regulations relating to portable mini-storage units

First offense

Second or More Continuing Violations</td><td>

250.00

500.00</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>4E
161399</td><td>ORDINANCE AMENDING RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS; AMENDING SECTION 2-1 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; ALLOWING ANY COMMISSIONER TO REQUIRE SEPARATE VOTE FOR ANY PART OF MID-YEAR AND END-OF-YEAR BUDGET AMENDMENTS; REQUIRING SEPARATE VOTE FOR CERTAIN PARTS OF MID-YEAR AND END-OF-YEAR BUDGET AMENDMENTS; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</td></tr>
<tr><td>Notes</td><td>The proposed ordinance amends the rules of procedures of the Board of County Commissioners. Specifically, the proposed ordinance amends Section 2-1 of the Miami-Dade County Code allowing any Commissioner to require separate vote for any part of the Mid-Year and End-of-Year budget amendments and requires a separate vote for certain parts of the Mid-Year and End-of-year budget amendments.</td></tr>
<tr><td>4F
161316</td><td>ORDINANCE RELATING TO BISCAYNE BAY MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW; EXPANDING MUNICIPALITIES THAT MAY SUBMIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP ON THE SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE; ESTABLISHING THE BISCAYNE BAY PUBLIC ACCESS TRUST FUND; REMOVING AUTHORITY FOR THE SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE TO FILE JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS; AMENDING SECTIONS 33D-33, 33D-38, AND 33D-39 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE</td></tr>
<tr><td>Notes</td><td>The proposed ordinance relating to Biscayne Bay Management – Shoreline Development Review regulations:
Amends Sections 33D-33, 33D-38 and 33D-39 of the County Code of Ordinances (Code);
Expands municipalities that may submit recommendations for membership on the Shoreline Development Review Committee;
Establishes the Biscayne Bay Public Access Trust Fund; and
Removes authority for the Shoreline Development Review Committee to file judicial proceedings.
Specifically, the proposed ordinance:
Establishes the Biscayne Bay Public Access Trust Fund to further implement the scope of the Shoreline Development Review regulations;</td></tr>
</table>

Item No.	Research Notes
	• Amends the Code to reflect additional municipalities with jurisdiction over portions of the Biscayne Bay shoreline that have incorporated since the enactment of Ordinance No. 85-14 as well as update the names of County departments; and • Removes the Shoreline Development Review Committee's authority to independently file judicial proceedings against municipalities or the County given that their role is advisory in nature. The areas impacted are generally comprised of properties along Biscayne Bay and the northern embayments of Dumfoundling Bay, Maule Lake and Little Maule Lake and the Intracostal Waterway from NE 163 Street to the Broward County line. **Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:** The proposed ordinance would result in no fiscal impact to Miami-Dade County. Implementation of this ordinance does not result in additional staffing needs or operational costs for the County's administration. **Social Equity Impact:** The proposed ordinance is anticipated to benefit the general public by creating the Biscayne Bay Public Access Trust Fund to fund public infrastructure to better access Biscayne Bay as currently intended in the Code. A specific social burden cannot be identified at this time. **Background:** In 1985, the BCC enacted Ordinance No. 85-14, which created Article III of Chapter 33D - Biscayne Bay Management to establish the Biscayne Bay Shoreline Development Review process. More specifically, Article III specifically seeks to "enhance physical and visual access to Biscayne Bay and the northern embayments" and established the Shoreline Development Review Committee and its responsibilities, and the Shoreline Development Action Review Criteria. The Shoreline Development Action Review Criteria includes required shoreline setbacks, visual corridors and side/side streets setbacks for all development within the boundaries except for single-family homes. If any development is unable to meet said criteria, Article III describes mitigation options that could be used upon approval of the Shoreline Development Review Committee. One mitigation option is to build a public access promenade along Biscayne Bay or the eastern portion of the Miami River, depending on the location of the property. The other option, in the event that said promenade is not feasible, is the contribution of monetary funds to the Biscayne Bay Environmental Enhancement Trust Fund. Article III further indicates that when mitigating the inability to meet said criteria with monies, such monies are to be used for the purpose of providing public access to the Biscayne shoreline, preferably within one-half mile of the proposed development site and within the same shoreline basin area. However, the existing Code defining the Biscayne Bay Environmental Enhancement Trust Fund does not provide a mechanism to implement the provision regarding funding Biscayne Bay access improvements. Therefore, establishment of the Biscayne Bay Public Access Trust Fund will enable the use of the mitigating funds in accordance with the purpose of the Article, as reflected by the Shoreline Development Review Committee's resolutions, in both unincorporated and incorporated areas of Miami-Dade County.
4G 161303	ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF MIAMI DADE COUNTY SPECIAL OBLIGATION BONDS, IN ONE OR MORE SERIES, IN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $40,000,000.00 FOR PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, IMPROVING AND/OR RENOVATING CERTAIN CAPITAL ASSETS AND/OR PROJECTS; PROVIDING THAT DETAILS OF SAID BONDS BE DETERMINED IN ONE OR MORE SERIES RESOLUTIONS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY AND EFFECTIVE DATE
Notes	The proposed ordinance enacts the 2016 Ordinance which authorizes the issuance of up to $40 million of Special Obligation Capital Asset Acquisition Bonds in one or more series (Bonds) for the purpose of funding the costs associated with the construction of the New Animal Services Shelter, the Animal Services Satellite Facility, the Boat Ride at Zoo Miami's Florida Exhibit, Venetian Bridge Repairs, and Miscellaneous Park Improvements (2016 Projects). The Projects anticipated to be financed through the issuance of the proposed ordinance may be modified or supplemented for other purposes by a certificate executed by the County Mayor: • **Animal Services Shelter:** The principal use of the facility will be for the re-homing, protection, and shelter of unwanted and stray animals. The new facility will allow the Animal Services Department to provide best-practices in animal education, housing, care, and welfare. It will also include a new public clinic, operating rooms, and quarantine facilities. • **Animal Services Satellite Facility:** The new satellite facility is part of a unique partnership between the Animal Services Department and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA). The partnership will allow for critical pet services to be provided in the Liberty City area and surrounding communities. The area is significantly underserved with regard to veterinary services and is also one of the largest areas for stray dog intake in the County. The satellite facility will provide spay/neuter surgeries and community medical services to the animals of County residents, which will allow better accessibility to these services to area residents. • **Zoo Miami's Florida Exhibit - Boat Ride:** Zoo Miami's latest addition, the Florida Exhibit, is currently under construction and is anticipated to be completed later this year. Included in the proposed exhibit is a boat ride. The boat ride, "Lost Man's River," will take visitors on a tour of the Florida Exhibit where they will have close-up views of the American Crocodile, Alligators, and other species found in Florida. The airboat-themed boats will offer the visitors a different perspective from the walking path. The ride experience will also include a water tunnel, geyser, and other elements to provide excitement for visitors.

<table>
<tr><th>Item No.</th><th>Research Notes</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>

Venetian Bridge Repairs: The Venetian Causeway East Bascule and Purdy Avenue bridges are currently in need of immediate repair. The project includes deck repairs, signage, resurfacing, and repairs to the bridge’s movable machinery, replacement of the electrical system, and track repairs.
Miscellaneous park improvements: The miscellaneous projects generally consist of ADA compliance projects to remove barriers at the most frequently attended facilities, water and sewer backflow compliance and conversion mandates, contamination remediation at Colonial Park, and renovations at various facilities, which include lighting and walkway improvements.

The 2016 Ordinance provides that bonds will only be issued with a subsequent Series Resolution to be approved by the BCC. Each Series Resolution will provide more detailed description of the Projects to be financed, the terms, maturities, interest rates, hedge arrangements, and other details for each series of Bonds to be issued.
<u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u>
The principal and interest on the proposed Bonds are special and limited obligations of the County payable solely from legally available non-ad valorem revenues of the County, as appropriated annually or from revenues otherwise available from authorized funds and debt service reserves. Actual debt payments will be budgeted in the Countywide General Fund and paid for by funds appropriated in the adopted budgets of each entity/department benefitting from the projects with each series of Bonds.
Until a series of bonds is issued, the enactment of the 2016 Ordinance will have no fiscal impact on the County. The terms, maturities, interest rates, and other bond-related details for each series of Bonds will be established in a Series Resolution adopted by the Board prior to the issuance of the Bonds.
<u>Social Equity Statement:</u>
The proposed ordinance is not anticipated to have a specific social equity benefit or burden. The issuance of Capital Asset Acquisition Bonds will allow direct investments in capital assets. These assets will allow the County to provide better treatment of the animals in its care, provide visitors of Zoo Miami with a close-up view of the American Crocodile and other species found in Florida, and allow for the continuation of capital repair/maintenance related to the infrastructure of our bridges and parks.
<u>Background:</u>
The County has approximately $614.030 million of outstanding Capital Asset Acquisition Bonds, with the average annual debt service being approximately $42 million a year. Capital Asset Acquisition Bonds are used to fund various countywide capital equipment or construction projects. Each of these series were issued pursuant to BCC authorized ordinances and subsequent series resolutions.
</td></tr>
<tr><td>8D1
161304</td><td>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED $350,000,000.00 AGGREGATE ORIGINAL PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA SUBORDINATE SPECIAL OBLIGATION REFUNDING BONDS, IN ONE OR MORE SERIES, PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 208 AND 209 OF 1997 ORDINANCE, TO REFUND ALL OR PORTION OF OUTSTANDING 1996B AND 2005 BONDS, WITH ESTIMATED NET PRESENT VALUE SAVINGS OF 13.95%, ESTIMATED COSTS OF ISSUANCE OF $2,750,000.00 AND ESTIMATED FINAL MATURITY OF OCTOBER 1, 2040; PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN DETAILS OF BONDS AND THEIR SALE BY NEGOTIATION; AUTHORIZING MAYOR OR MAYOR’S DESIGNEE, WITHIN CERTAIN LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS, TO FINALIZE DETAILS, TERMS AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF BONDS, THEIR NEGOTIATED SALE AND REFUNDING OF REFUNDED BONDS; APPROVING FORMS OF AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS; PROVIDING CERTAIN COVENANTS; AUTHORIZING COUNTY OFFICIALS TO TAKE ALL NECESSARY ACTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH ISSUANCE, SALE, EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF BONDS AND REFUNDING OF REFUNDED BONDS; WAIVING PROVISIONS OF RESOLUTION NO. R-130-06, AS AMENDED; AND PROVIDING SEVERABILITY</td></tr>
<tr><td>Notes</td><td>
The proposed resolution adopts the Series 2016 Resolution which authorizes the following:

Issuance of Subordinate Special Obligation Refunding Bonds Series 2016 (Series 2016 Refunding Bonds) in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $350 million;
Negotiated sale of the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds;
County Mayor or the County Mayor’s designee to effectuate the issuance of the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds as refunding bonds, pursuant to the County’s refunding policy, which also provides for paying the cost of the issuance; and
Waiver of Resolution No. R-130-06, which provides that any County contract with a third party be finalized and executed prior to its placement on a BCC agenda.

The Series 2016 Refunding Bonds are being issued for the purpose of refunding all or a portion of the currently outstanding Special Obligation and Refunding Bonds, Series 1996B and all or a portion of the Subordinate Special Obligation Bonds, Series 2005A and Series 2005B (the Series 1996B, Series 2005A and Series 2005B, the Refunded Bonds). The Series 2016 Bonds are special and limited obligations of the County derived primarily from the County’s Convention Development Tax.
<u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:</u>
The overall fiscal impact of the proposed transaction is positive. Based on market conditions as of May 20, 2016, the proposed refunding generates debt service savings of approximately $73 million over the life of the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds, representing a net present value savings of $42 million or 13.9 percent of the amount of the Refunded Bonds. Consistent with the County’s refunding policy established by Resolution No. R-1313-09, the net present value savings that will be achieved by issuing the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds exceeds a five (5) percent threshold and the final maturity of the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds is not greater than the final maturity of the Refunded Bonds, which is October 1, 2040.
</td></tr>
</table>

Item No.	Research Notes
	Background: On June 4, 1996, the BCC enacted Ordinance No. 96-85 that authorized the issuance of the Series 1996B Bonds in the amount $175,278,288.75, of which $61,910,000 is currently outstanding. Both the Series 2005A and Series 2005B were issued pursuant to Ordinance No. 97-210, enacted by the BCC on November 18, 1997, as amended by Ordinance No. 05-99, enacted by the BCC on May 17, 2005. The Series 2005A Bonds were issued as Capital Appreciation Bonds (a bond where the bond's interest earnings are added to the principal until maturity instead of being paid semi-annually) and Capital Appreciation Income Bonds in the amount $138,608,939.55, which, when combined with the unpaid interest, as of May 12, 2016 amounts to $194,393,777.95. The Series 2005B Bonds were issued as Capital Appreciation Bonds and Capital Appreciation Income Bonds in the amount of $45,703,308.00, which, when combined with the unpaid interest, amounts to $53,025,000.00 as of May 12, 2016. Resolution No. R-130-06 provides that any County contract with a third party be finalized and executed prior to its placement on an agenda. In order to provide the County maximum flexibility in the market the sale of the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds, which will set the final terms, will not occur until after the effective date of the Series 2016 Refunding Resolution. Therefore, a waiver of Resolution No. R-130-06 is required.
8D2 **161312**	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED $750,000,000.00 OF AVIATION REVENUE REFUNDING BONDS, IN ONE OR MORE SERIES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 211 OF AMENDED AND RESTATED TRUST AGREEMENT FOR PURPOSE OF REFUNDING AND, AS APPLICABLE, REDEEMING CERTAIN OUTSTANDING AVIATION REVENUE BONDS WITH ESTIMATED NET PRESENT VALUE SAVINGS OF 8.74%, ESTIMATED COSTS OF ISSUANCE OF $2,355,000.00 AND ESTIMATED FINAL MATURITY OF OCTOBER 1, 2041; PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN DETAILS OF BONDS AND THEIR SALE BY NEGOTIATION; AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE, WITHIN CERTAIN LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS, TO FINALIZE DETAILS, TERMS AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF BONDS AND REFUNDING AND, AS APPLICABLE, REDEMPTION OF REFUNDED BONDS; PROVIDING CERTAIN COVENANTS; APPROVING FORMS OF AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS; AUTHORIZING COUNTY OFFICIALS TO TAKE ALL NECESSARY ACTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH ISSUANCE, SALE AND DELIVERY OF BONDS; WAIVING PROVISIONS OF RESOLUTION NO. R-130-06, AS AMENDED; AND PROVIDING SEVERABILITY
Notes	The proposed resolution approves the Series 2016 Resolution which authorizes the issuance of the Aviation Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2016A Non-AMT (Series 2016A Bonds) and Aviation Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2016B Taxable (Series 2016B Bonds, and together with the Series 2016A Bonds, the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds) in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $750 million. The Series 2016 Resolution also provides for the following: • Funding the cost of issuance, underwriter's discount and a Credit Facility or Reserve Facility, if any; • Funding the reserve requirement, if any, with proceeds of the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds or a Reserve Facility; and • Authorizes the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee and other County Officials to take all action necessary to issue the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds. The Series 2016A Bonds are being issued to refund and redeem all or a portion of the outstanding Aviation Revenue Bonds, Series 2007B, 2008B, 2009B, and 2010A (Non-AMT Refunded Bonds). The Series 2016B Bonds are being issued to refund and redeem all or a portion of the outstanding Aviation Revenue Bonds, Series 2003E, 2007C, and 2008A which are subject to Alternate Minimum Tax (AMT Refunded Bonds and together with the Non-AMT Refunded Bonds, the Refunded Bonds) restrictions and will be issued as Taxable Bonds. **Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:** The fiscal impact of the proposed transaction is positive. Based on market conditions as of May 24, 2016, the proposed refunding generates a debt service savings of approximately $79 million over the life of the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds, representing a net present value savings of $55.6 million or 8.74 percent of the amount of the Refunded Bonds. The anticipated cost of issuance and underwriter's discount associated with the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds are approximately $2.354 million and $3.227 million, respectfully. Consistent with the County's refunding policy established by Resolution No. R-1313-09, the net present value savings that will be achieved by issuing the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds exceeds a five percent threshold and the final maturity of the Series 2016 Refunding Bonds is not greater than the final maturity of the Refunded Bonds. **Background:** The Aviation Department commenced a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) in 1993. The BCC authorized the issuance of $6.2 billion in Aviation Revenue Bonds pursuant to Ordinance Nos. 95-38, 96-31, 97-207 and 08-121 (Authorizations) of which $5.9 billion were issued. The Refunded Bonds were issued to provide funds to pay a portion of the cost of certain projects included in the Airport's CIP. Resolution No. R-130-06 provides that any County contract with a third party be finalized and executed prior to its placement on a committee agenda. The sale of the Series 2016 Bonds, which will set their final terms, will not occur until after the effective date of the Series 2016 Resolution in order to provide the County maximum flexibility in the market as described above. Therefore, a waiver of Resolution No. R-130-06 is required.
8L1 **161272**	RESOLUTION RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. R-987-14 WHICH ALLOCATED $500,000.00 OF PROJECT 124 FUNDS TO MIAMI EXECUTIVE AVIATION CORPORATE HANGAR, LLC.
Notes	The proposed resolution rescinds the $500,000.00 allocation of funding from the Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond (BBC-GOB) Program, Economic Development Fund Project 124 (Project No. 124) to Miami Executive Aviation Corporate Hangar, LLC (Developer), which was authorized through Resolution No. R-987-14. **Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:**

Item No.	Research Notes
	There will be no fiscal impact to the County with the approval of this item. Rescinding the $500,000.00 allocation to the Developer will make the funds available for reallocation to other eligible Project No. 124 projects. **<u>Background:</u>** On November 5, 2014, the BCC approved Resolution No. R-987-14, which allocated $500,000.00 to the Developer for the Aviation Corporate Hangar Project and also directed the Mayor or Mayor's designee to begin negotiating the terms of a grant agreement. R-987-14 further directed that the grant agreement between the County and the Developer be submitted to the BCC for approval. In April 2015, the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources provided the Developer with a draft grant agreement in an effort to begin negotiations. The Developer acknowledged receipt, but did not return the grant agreement with draft changes to commence negotiations. In July 2015, a revised grant agreement was sent to the Developer with a submission deadline. The Developer communicated that a grant agreement would not be submitted by the deadline. In November 2015, staff communicated to the Developer that an extension of six (6) months had been granted in order to continue negotiating grant agreements. At that point, the Developer advised they would not be pursuing BBC-GOB Program funding. **<u>Additional Information- Economic Development Fund- Project 124</u>** On February 3, 2015, the BCC, through R-123-15, set policy for Miami-Dade County related to the Project No. 124- Economic Development Fund (Project 124) directing the County Mayor or designee to complete negotiations by July 21, 2015 with each potential grant recipient of an allocation from the Project 124 Fund approved by the BCC on or before January 21, 2015 and to prepare and submit a report to the BCC detailing the results of the negotiations. If the BCC approves an allocation of Project 124 Fund proceeds for a Pending Application, the County Mayor or designee is directed to complete negotiations with the proposed grant recipient of such allocation within a six month period following the date of approval by the BCC. On May 5, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-423-15, amended administrative rules governing Economic Development Project No. 124 of the Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond (BBC GOB) Program to be applied to all new applications for funding. The Administrative Rules were amended to add the following at the end of Article II, Section 4.A.1. – Eligibility Requirements for Projects: • *Does the project improve infrastructure for a greater area of impact that can advance economic development substantially beyond the project footprint?* • *Is the project a target industry identified in the May 2012 One Community One Goal Strategic Report or identified by the Beacon Council, from time to time?* • *Does it advance green technology or energy green industry?* • *Does it enhance or advance transit-oriented development?* • *Would the project be vulnerable to sea level rise that would require adaptation strategies and if so, would it contribute to any overall sea level rise adaptation goals established by the County?* Additionally, the County Mayor or designee was to apply the criteria in the amended Administrative Rules to all new applications received by the County for Project 124 funding and was to report the findings to the BCC when a new project is considered by the BCC for an allocation from the Project 124 Fund. On June 2, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-510-15, directed the County Mayor or designee to post on the county's calendar the date and time of any negotiation sessions with recipients of a BCC approved allocation of Project 124 funds; record all such negotiation sessions; include a member of the staff that provides support to the Building Better Communities Citizen's Advisory Committee in each negotiation session; and in the requisite report to the BCC prescribed pursuant to Resolution No. R-123-15, include the date and time of each negotiation session with each potential grant recipient of Project 124 funds from the date the BCC allocated Project 124 funds to the potential grant recipient to the date set forth in Resolution No. R-123-15 for completion of the negotiation of a grant agreement. **<u>Additional Information- Mayor's Report- Project 124 Negotiations</u>** On September 16, 2015, the Mayor, in response to the directive in Resolution No. R-123-15, issued a report on the results of negotiations of Grant Agreements for Building Better Communities General Obligation Bonds, Economic Development Fund Project 124 recipients. The following projects require little additional negotiation: • Larkin Health Sciences Campus; River Landing Miami; Skyrise; and Westview Business Park The following projects require significant additional negotiation: • Carrie Meek International Business Park; Orion Jet Center; and Overtown Gateway The following projects require significant additional negotiation and a County Lease: • Miami Ocean Studios; Miami Wilds Project; and Aviation Corporate Hanger **<u>Previous Economic Development Fund Project 124 Allocations</u>** On July 1, 2014, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-616-14, waived administrative rules for BBC GOB, EDF, Project 124, approving the allocation of $6,000,000.00 from Project 124 to Flagler Street Reconstruction and Economic Development to fund certain economic development projects.

<table>
<tr><th>Item No.</th><th>Research Notes</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>On November 5, 2014, the BCC approved $24,000,000 in allocations from the EDF Project 124 fund for the following projects:
R-986-14- Allocating $5,000,000.00 to the Carrie Meek International Business Park project;
R-987-14- Allocating $500,000.00 to the Aviation Corporate Hangar project;
R-988-14- Allocating $5,000,000.00 to the Orion Jet Center Development project; and
R-1015-14- Allocating up to $13,500,000.00 to Miami Wilds, LLC for the Miami Wilds project.
On December 16, 2014, the BCC approved $20,000,000 in allocations from the EDF Project 124 fund for the following projects:
R-1121-14- Allocating $9,000,000 to Skyrise Miami, LLC to fund the Skyrise Miami Project;
R-1122-14- Allocating $6,000,000 to Overtown Gateway Partners, LLC to fund the Overtown Gateway Project; and
R-1116-14- Allocating $5,000,000 to Larkin Health Science Education Campus.
On January 21, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-37-15, approved the allocation from the EDF Project 124 in the amount of $10,000,000 to Miami Ocean Studios, LLC to fund the Miami Ocean Studio Economic Development Project.
On March 8, 2016, the BCC, through R-234-16, rescinded R-37-15, which allocated $10,000,000.00 of Project 124 funds to Miami Ocean Studios Enterprises, LLC making such funds available for re-allocation to other eligible Project 124 projects.
On March 3, 2015, the BCC approved $15,000,000 in allocations from the EDF Project 124 fund to the following projects:
R-230-15- Allocating $7,500,000 to River Landing Development, LLC for the River Landing Development Project; and
R-233-15- Allocating $7,500,000 to Rosal Westview, LLC for the Rosal Westview Business Park Project.
On April 21, 2015, the BCC approved $15,000,000 in allocations, <u>subject to Recaptured Funds</u>, from the EDF Project 124 fund to the following projects:
R-349-15- Allocating $7,500,000- Neuroscience Centers of Florida Foundation, Inc. to fund Project Mercy; and
R-334-15- Allocating $7,500,000- to the Village of Palmetto Bay for the Downtown Palmetto Bay Project.
On May 5, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-431-15, waived the Administrative Rules that each Project 124 allocation be a minimum of $10,000,000.00 for Turnberry Airport Holdings, LLC with regard to the Fontainebleau Aviation Project and, <u>subject to the Recaptured Funds becoming available</u> for re-allocation and the future consideration by the BCC of a Grant Agreement between the County and Turnberry Airport Holdings, LLC, and approved an allocation of up to $5,000,000.00 from Project 124 to Turnberry Airport Holdings, LLC for the Fontainebleau Aviation Project.

On October 6, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-886-15, approved the allocation, <u>subject to the availability of Recaptured Funds</u>, of up to $10,000,000.00 from Project 124 Funds, to Wexford Miami, LLC for the University of Miami Life Science and Technology Park Project.

On November 3, 2015, the BCC, through R-997-15, waived the requirement in the Administrative Rules that each Project 124 allocation be a minimum of $10,000,000.00 for NKMIA LLC with regard to the Naeem Khan Project and approved, an allocation, <u>subject to the availability of Recaptured Funds,</u> of up to $1,500,000.00 from Project 124 to NKMIA LLC for the Naeem Khan Project.

The following list provides other projects that have been considered:
October 16, 2014- Legislative File No. 141535- Failed in EDPMC- $5,000,000- AVE Aviation Commerce Center project;
October 16, 2014- Legislative File No. 141866- No Action Taken at EDPMC- $18,500,000- Beach Re-nourishment Reserve Fund project; and
November 5, 2014- Legislative File No. 141539- Failed in BCC- $5,000,000- Parkside at Palmetto Bay project.</td></tr>
<tr><td>11A1
161374

11A2
161375</td><td>RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO ENACT LEGISLATION SUPPORTING, CREATING OR FUNDING CHILDREN’S SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

RESOLUTION URGING THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION CREATING CHILDREN’S SAVINGS ACCOUNTS</td></tr>
<tr><td>Notes</td><td><u>11A1 - 161374:</u>
The proposed resolution:
Urges the Florida Legislature to enact legislation to support, create or fund children’s savings accounts;
Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the members of the Miami-Dade County Congressional Delegation, the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, and the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade County State Legislative Delegation;
Directs the County’s state lobbyists to advocate in favor of the legislative action set forth and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2017 State Legislative Package when it is presented to the BCC.
<u>11A2 - 161375:</u>
The proposed resolution:
Urges the United States Congress to enact legislation creating children’s savings accounts;</td></tr>
</table>

Item No.	Research Notes
	• Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the members of the Miami-Dade County Congressional Delegation; and • Directs the County's federal lobbyists to advocate for the legislative action set forth and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to include this item in the 2017 Federal Legislative Package when it is presented to the BCC. **Background:** Children's savings accounts are use restricted savings accounts established for children that are available at designated ages and for designated purposes as a way to encourage families to save for post-secondary educational expenses and other limited uses. Although the rules and structure may vary, the typical model for children's savings accounts is the same – a long term savings account funded by a private, governmental or charitable organization is opened for a young child in the child's name with the goals of providing a source to help pay for post-secondary education and more opportunities to build wealth throughout the child's life. According to a 2010 study from the Center for Social Development at Washington University, children with savings accounts 1) perform better academically, especially in math and reading, 2) are seven times more likely to matriculate and complete college, 3) are less likely to accrue financial debt from higher education, and 4) have a better understanding of fiscal matters, which improves their long term financial stability. The State of Maine launched the nation's first statewide children's savings account program in 2008 and a number of states, including Colorado, Connecticut, Mississippi, Nevada, Oklahoma, Rhode Island and Vermont, have also launched versions of children's savings account programs, which do not use state funds, but instead rely on partnerships between governmental agencies, philanthropic institutions or private entities for funding. Additionally, an increasing number of municipalities and counties have created and/or are administering children's savings accounts programs, for instance, the City of Lansing and Barry County in Michigan; San Francisco, California; Cuyahoga County, Ohio; and Wabash and several other counties in Illinois have programs that establish children's savings accounts for children based on school registration. On December 15, 2015, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-1162-15, which urged Congress to adopt H.R. 4045, by U.S. Representative Joseph Crowley (D-New York) and U.S. Representative Keith Ellison (D-Minnesota). H.R. 4045 would create children's savings accounts, named USAccounts, at birth for all children in the United States and proposed to require USAccounts be opened automatically for every newborn, in the child's name, with a deposit of $500 from the federal government; thereafter, annual deposits of up to $500 would have been matched for children from lower-income families and families eligible for Child Tax Credits who contributed to their children's account would have also been entitled to an additional annual match up to $500. On May 17, 2016, the BCC voted to include Resolution No. R-1162-15 as one of the County's federal legislative priorities and directed its federal lobbyists to advocate for the passage of legislation establishing children's savings accounts or USAccounts. H.R. 4045 has not received a committee hearing, and, as such is unlikely to be adopted before the end of the 114th Congress. The BCC adopted Resolution No. R-454-15, urging the Florida International University Metropolitan Center to conduct an analysis and prepare a report on the feasibility of implementing a community-based prosperity strategy for Miami-Dade County on May 19, 2015 and on May 25, 2016, the "Prosperity Initiatives Feasibility Study," was released and included a recommendation to implement a children's savings account program in Miami-Dade County as a tool to expand economic prosperity in the community. **Additional Information - Florida International University Metropolitan Center "Prosperity Initiatives Feasibility Study"[3]:** The Florida International University Metropolitan Center "Prosperity Initiatives Feasibility Study" examined the structure, feasibility, market and best practices of five potential programs aimed at reducing the County's Prosperity Gap and improving economic opportunity and self-sufficiency. In the study, children's savings account programs was listed as one of the five recommendations for Prosperity Initiative programs as a two-year pilot program, providing seed capital for each program. The pilot program goal was to seed 2,000 savings accounts in two years with recommended funding in the amount of $550,000. The study estimated that 1,000 households would be directly impacted during the course of the pilot program. The Prosperity Initiative Goals Addressed through children's savings accounts would be improved preparation by increasing skills, education and capacity, and wealth building through asset ownership.
11A3 **161406**	RESOLUTION URGING THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS TO ENACT S. 993 OR H.R. 1854, THE COMPREHENSIVE JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH ACT OF 2015, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT AIMS TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR PEOPLE IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM; WAIVING REQUIREMENTS OF RESOLUTION NO. R-764-13 LIMITING NUMBER OF FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES; AMENDING RESOLUTION NOS. R-436-16 AND R-522-16 TO INCLUDE THIS ISSUE AS AN ADDITIONAL 2016 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE PRIORITY
Notes	The proposed resolution: • Urges the Unites States Congress to enact S. 993, H.R. 1854, or similar legislation that aims to improve access to mental health services for people in the criminal justice system; • Waives requirements of Resolution No. R-764-13 and amends Resolution Nos. R-436-16 and R-522-16 to include this issue as an additional 2016 federal legislative priority; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to U.S. Senator Al Franken, U.S. Representative Doug Collins, and the members of the Miami-Dade County Congressional Delegation; and

[3] https://metropolitan.fiu.edu/research/services/economic-and-housing-market-analysis/prosperity-initiative-research-study-executive-summary.pdf

Item No.	Research Notes
	• Directs the County's federal lobbyists to advocate for the legislative action set forth and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 federal legislative package to include this item as a priority. **Background:** On April 16, 2015, United States Senator Al Franken (D-Minnesota) and United States Representative Doug Collins (R-Georgia), respectively, introduced S. 993 and H.R. 1854 entitled the Comprehensive Addiction Recovery Act of 2015, for consideration by the 114th United States Congress. S. 993 and H.R. 1854 propose that stakeholders in the areas of criminal justice, mental health, substance abuse and veterans service agencies collaborate and create a framework to develop a shared understanding of and identify opportunities to best assist and address the needs of individuals in the criminal justice system with mental illness, from initial incarceration through release, including supplying appropriate mental health and substance abuse treatment, providing additional emergency and crisis services, engaging specialized police based responses and offering community and post-incarceration supervision and support. S. 993 and H.R 1854 would, among other things, authorize the Department of Justice to make various grants available, including grants to improve correctional facility capabilities to identify and screen for inmates with mental illness, provide services to address inmates' mental health and substance abuse needs, develop post-release transition plans, develop programs tailored to assist veterans, provide training for law enforcement and federal first responders to improve interactions with individuals with mental illness and increase collaborations between the criminal justice system and other stakeholders that regularly address inmates with mental illness. Additionally, in an effort to improve responses and obtain better outcomes, S. 993 and H.R. 1854 would provide training grants to address and enhance law enforcement officers' interactions with offenders with mental illness. On May 17, 2016, the BCC identified six federal legislative priorities for the remainder of 2016 and on June 7, 2016, the BCC identified an additional four such federal legislative priorities for 2016.
11A4 **161407**	RESOLUTION SUPPORTING A PROVISION IN H.R. 953 THAT WOULD REQUIRE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, IN AWARDING GRANTS TO HELP COMBAT THE NATIONAL EPIDEMICS OF PRESCRIPTION OPIOID ABUSE AND HEROIN USE, TO GIVE PRIORITY TO STATES THAT HAVE IN EFFECT LEGISLATION OR A POLICY UNDER WHICH THE STATE SUSPENDS RATHER THAN TERMINATES MEDICAID ENROLLMENT FOR AN INDIVIDUAL WHO IS INCARCERATED FOR LESS THAN TWO YEARS; WAIVING REQUIREMENTS OF RESOLUTION NO. R-764-13 LIMITING NUMBER OF FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES; AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. R-436-16, AS AMENDED BY RESOLUTION NO. R-522-16, TO INCLUDE PASSAGE OF S. 524, H.R. 953 OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION AS AN ADDITIONAL 2016 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE PRIORITY
Notes	The proposed resolution: • Supports a provision in H.R. 953, a bill entitled the "Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2015," that would require the Attorney General, in awarding grants to help combat the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use, to give priority to states that have in effect legislation or implement a policy under which the state will not terminate, but may suspend, enrollment under the state's Medicaid plan for an individual who is incarcerated for less than two years; • Waives requirements of Resolution No. R-764-13 and amends Resolution No. R-436-16, as amended by Resolution No. R-522-16, to include passage of S. 524, H.R. 953 or similar legislation, including, but not limited to, the provision that would require the Attorney General, in awarding grants to help combat the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use, to give priority to states that have in effect legislation or a policy under which the state suspends rather than terminates Medicaid enrollment for an individual who is incarcerated for less than two years, as an additional federal legislative priority for 2016; • Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to United States Senator Sheldon Whitehouse, United States Representative F. James Sensenbrenner, and the members of the Florida Congressional Delegation; and • Directs the County's federal lobbyists to advocate for the passage of the legislation set forth and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2016 Federal Legislative Package to include this item as a priority. **Background:** Many states terminate, rather than suspend, Medicaid coverage for individuals that are incarcerated or detained, even before the issuance of formal charges or a conviction and, as a result, the counties in such states must provide medical services to all persons incarcerated in local jails and detention facilities. Medicaid allows for—and the federal government encourages—continued eligibility for coverage for a person who is incarcerated and on January 10, 2008, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-57-08 which, among other things, urged the Florida Legislature to amend state law to suspend rather than terminate Medicaid benefits when a person is charged with a crime or serves a sentence of less than a year. During the 2008 state legislative session, the Florida Legislature enacted Chapter 2008-217, Laws of Florida, which amended state law to suspend rather than terminate Medicaid benefits for all Medicaid enrollees who become incarcerated in a state, county, or municipal correctional facility. H.R. 953, a bill entitled the "Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2015," was filed for consideration during the 114th Congress by Representative F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr. (R – Wisconsin) and would provide for a series of incentives and resources, including the award of planning and implementation grants by the Attorney General, to encourage states and local communities to pursue a full array of proven strategies to combat the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use. H.R. 953 includes a provision that would require the Attorney General, in awarding the grants, to give priority to states that have in effect legislation or implement a policy under which the state shall not terminate, but may suspend, enrollment under the state's Medicaid plan for an individual who is incarcerated for less than two years. S. 524, the companion bill to H.R. 953, was also filed for consideration during the 114th Congress, by Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D – Rhode Island). On April 5, 2016, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-298-16 supporting S. 524 or similar legislation and, while S. 524 and H.R. 953 are similar in many respects, the current version of H.R. 953 includes language requiring the Attorney General to prioritize awarding grants to states that have in effect legislation or implement a policy under which the state will not terminate, but may suspend, enrollment under the state's

Item No.	Research Notes
	Medicaid plan for an individual who is incarcerated for less than two years. H.R. 953 has not yet received a committee hearing but the Senate has passed S. 524 and sent it to the House, and the House has passed an amended version of S. 524 and has requested a conference with the Senate. Resolution No. R-298-16 supporting S. 524 or similar legislation was inadvertently omitted from the 2016 federal legislative package that was presented to and approved by the BCC on May 17, 2016 and was also not included on the ballot from which the BCC selected its federal legislative priorities for 2016.
11A5 **161172**	RESOLUTION CREATING SECOND MIAMI-DADE COURT CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE; PROVIDING FOR MEMBERSHIP, ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES; AND SETTING FORTH PURPOSE, FUNCTION, RESPONSIBILITY, AND SUNSET PROVISION [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 161000]
Notes	The proposed resolution creates the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force, provides for membership, organization and procedures. **Purpose** The purpose of the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force is to conduct a more detailed, in-depth analysis of the recommendations of the first Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force, consult with local universities such as the University of Miami and Florida International University, and create a detailed report recommending the best way to address courthouse capital needs including, but not limited to, both the civil and criminal divisions of the Court and the best funding and delivery methodology to achieve those recommendations. **Limitations on Authority** The Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force is advisory only and will not have the power or authority to commit Miami-Dade County or any of its agencies or instrumentalities to any policies, incur any financial obligations or to create any liability, contractual or otherwise, on behalf of Miami-Dade County or any of its agencies or instrumentalities. **Membership** The Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force will consist of the same membership as the Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force with the same chairperson and vice chairperson except that Assistant State Attorney Gary Steven Winston will be added as an additional member of the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force. Any member vacancies on the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force will be filled in the manner provided for in Resolution No. 144-15. In the event of a chairperson vacancy, the vice chairperson will conduct the next meeting and the members of the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force will select a new chairperson at that meeting. In the event of a vice chairperson vacancy, the chairperson will conduct the next meeting and the members of the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force will select a new vice chairperson at that meeting. **Organization and procedures at meetings** The Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force may establish, adopt, and amend bylaws, rules, and regulations for its own governance. The chairperson will preside at all meetings at which he or she is present. The vice chairperson will act as chairperson in the absence of the chairperson. In order to transact any business or to exercise any power vested in the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force, a quorum consisting of a majority of members will be present. Members of the Task Force will serve without compensation. **Regulations** All proceedings of the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force will: • Be conducted in accordance with the Government in the Sunshine Law (Sec. 286.011, Fla. Stats.) and the Citizens Bill of Rights of the Miami-Dade County Home Rule Charter; • Be considered an ''agency'' for purposes of the Public Records Law; • Be governed by all State and County conflict of interest laws, as applicable, including the Miami-Dade County Conflict of Interest and Code of Ethics Ordinance, Section 2-11.1 the Code of Miami-Dade County; and • Meet within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this Resolution. Additional meetings may be held at the discretion of the Task Force. **Report** The Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force will provide its report to the BCC. • The report submitted will consist of a more detailed analysis of the recommendations of the first Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force, the recommendations of local universities such as the University of Miami and Florida International University, a detailed recommendation of the best way to address courthouse capital needs, including, but not limited to, both the civil and criminal divisions of the Court, and the best funding and delivery methodology to achieve those recommendations; • This report will be placed on an agenda of the BCC pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65 for consideration by the BCC; • The BCC may then request such further work of the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task force as may be in the public interest.

Item No.	Research Notes
	Staff The Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force will be provided adequate staff and support services by the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee. The staff will: • Maintain and keep records of the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force; • Prepare the agenda for each meeting; • Be responsible for the preparation of such reports, minutes, documents, or correspondence as the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force may direct; and • Generally administer the business and affairs of the Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force, subject to budgetary limitations. The Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force may request that the BCC provide other specialized consulting expertise as needed. The County Attorney's Office will provide legal counsel to the Task Force as needed. **Sunset** The Second Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force will sunset on the two-hundred-and-twentieth (220th) day from the effective date of this resolution unless the BCC extends the term of service by majority vote. ***During the Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee meeting on May 10, 2016, the proposed resolution was amended to add a review of the County's criminal division courthouse capital infrastructure needs and to add Gary Steven Winston as an additional member of the taskforce.*** **Additional Information – Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force:** On February 3, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-144-15, created the Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force (Task Force). The purpose of the Task Force was to review the County trial court infrastructure needs and identify any needed repairs to existing facilities as well as any current or future infrastructure expansion needs. The Task Force was to recommend mechanisms to finance the repairs and/or expansion of court facilities in the most efficient manner possible. The Task Force was advisory only and did not have the power or authority to commit Miami-Dade County or any of its agencies or instrumentalities to any policies, or to incur any financial obligations or to create any liability, contractual or otherwise, on behalf of Miami-Dade County or any of its agencies or instrumentalities. **Additional Information – Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force Report – Directive 150528:** On February 11, 2016, the Miami-Dade Court Capital Infrastructure Task Force Report was issued. According to the report, the Task Force is comprised of seven (7) members – five (5) appointed by the BCC; one (1) appointed by the Chief Judge of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit of Miami-Dade County; one (1) appointed by the County Mayor. The Task Force held nine (9) meetings: July 17, 2015; August 10, 2015; August 17, 2015; August 24, 2015; September 15, 2015; October 5, 2015; November 19, 2015; December 10, 2015; and December 17, 2015. During the course of these meetings, numerous presentations were made, at the request of the Task Force members. In addition to these presentations, a number of other County Departments were available to answer questions of the Task Force members, including the Office of management and Budget, the Eleventh Judicial Circuit, and Internal Services' Facilities and Construction Management staff. After hearing and deliberating the testimony and information provided, the Task Force established the following priorities based on the needs of the courts system: • The historic Dade County Courthouse is no longer able to support the operational and spatial needs of the civil court and related functions in an environment that is functional, flexible, secure, accessible, dignified and technologically current; • The civil court should be accommodated in a purposely built facility that embodies the characteristics of a 21st century civil courthouse, serves the public and the efficient administration of justice, accommodates growth and change, and continues to represent the community's commitment to the rule of law and equal access to justice under that law; • The estimated size of the recommended facility and/or facilities through 2035 should provide 53 courtrooms to accommodate 53 judicial officers (Circuit Civil, Probate and County Civil Courts) and the associated operations of the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Clerk of Courts as well as the appropriate jury assembly, grand jury space, law enforcement area, law library/community space, security and building management functions. On December 8, the Task Force was provided with the Draft Master Plan, which determined the final number of civil courtrooms through 2035 is 50; and • This facility should be located in the downtown area, close to related courts and as close as possible to a major transportation hub with adequate parking. **Additional Information on Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee Meeting Discussion:** During the Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee meeting on May 10, 2016, the proposed resolution was discussed as follows: • *The Committee asked what has happened so far with the recommendations that came out of first Task Force. The Internal Services Department (ISD) Director explained that the Task Force presented a recommendation as a report approximately two months ago and that the Task Force voted to prioritize the civil courthouse in its recommendation.* • *The ISD Director noted that the Task Force took into consideration the updates Master Plan in their recommendations and evaluated current needs of each courthouse.*