



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

**Board of County Commissioners Meeting**

April 4, 2017  
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**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
<b>4A</b> <b>170765</b>	ORDINANCE RELATING TO VEHICLES FOR HIRE; AMENDING CHAPTER 31, ARTICLE III OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, REGULATING PASSENGER MOTOR CARRIERS; AMENDING DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATION PROCEDURES; AMENDING CLASSES OF TRANSPORTATION; PROVIDING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL OR DENIAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF TRANSPORTATION; AMENDING PROVISIONS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF PASSENGER MOTOR CARRIER CERTIFICATES OF TRANSPORTATION; REQUIRING THAT ADVERTISEMENTS FOR PASSENGER MOTOR CARRIER SERVICE CONTAIN CERTAIN INFORMATION; AMENDING DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE MIAMI-DADE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS; AMENDING PROVISIONS RELATING TO INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS AND ENFORCEMENT; AMENDING VEHICLE STANDARDS AND RULES OF OPERATION; PROVIDING PROCEDURES FOR THE CONVERSION OF EXISTING CERTIFICATES OF TRANSPORTATION FOR SPECIAL OPERATIONS AND CHARTER SERVICES; PROVIDING PROCEDURES FOR APPLICATIONS BY EXISTING LESSEES OF CERTIFICATES; PROVIDING FOR SELF-CERTIFICATION OF VEHICLES AND CHAUFFEURS; PROVIDING PROCEDURES FOR ISSUANCE OF NEW CERTIFICATES; PROVIDING PROCEDURES FOR SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS; PROVIDING FOR ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES; AMENDING CHAUFFEUR REQUIREMENTS; AMENDING CHAPTER 8CC OF THE CODE PROVIDING CIVIL PENALTIES; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed ordinance relating to vehicles for hire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amends Chapter 31, Article III of the Miami-Dade County Code regulating Passenger Motor Carriers;</li> <li>• Amends definitions and application procedures;</li> <li>• Amends classes of transportation; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The classes of transportation service which the applicant desires to furnish: circulator; contract; fixed route; general tours and transport; and jitney route.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provides for administrative approval or denial of application for certificates of transportation;</li> <li>• Amends provisions relating to transfer of Passenger Motor Carrier certificates of transportation; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The contract disclosing the terms and conditions of the proposed transfer, including amount of compensation which has been paid or is payable to the transferor and any other consideration given or to be given to the transferor in connection with the transfer of the certificate of transportation.</li> <li>○ No certificate of transportation will be assigned, sold or transferred without prior approval of the DTPW.</li> <li>○ Modifications of a certificate will not include changes in the class(es) of service.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requires that advertisements for PMC service contain certain information; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Advertisements must include certificate number of the passenger motor carrier certificate holder.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amends duties and responsibilities of the Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works;</li> <li>• Amends provisions relating to insurance requirements and enforcement; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Limits of liability no less than one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) per person, and three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000) per occurrence for bodily injury, and fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) per occurrence for property damage.</li> <li>○ Coverage for complete 24-hour vehicle operations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amends vehicle standards and rules of operation; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Applicable Federal Motor Vehicle Safety requirements in 49 Code of Federal Regulations, part 571, and Florida Statutes.</li> <li>○ Motor vehicles currently in service as of the effective date of this ordinance will be permitted to remain in service until the motor vehicle reaches its fifteenth model year and must continue to meet all applicable vehicle standards.</li> <li>○ Motor vehicles initially placed into service following the effective date of this ordinance will be no greater than 10 model years of age.</li> <li>○ PMC motor vehicles will be inspected annually.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Operators will adopt and use, after approval by the DTPW, a distinctive, decorative color scheme and uniform signage or business logo. No other color scheme will be employed until approved by the DTPW.</li> <li>○ Advertisement on behalf of third parties may be displayed on the outside of inside of a for-hire vehicle provided approval is given by the DTPW.</li> <li>• Provides procedures for the conversion of existing certificates of transportation for special operations and charter services; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Temporary PMC certificates may be issued for Super Bowls, summits, political conventions and other major special events of national or international significance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provides procedures for applications by existing lessees of certificates;</li> <li>• Provides for self-certification of vehicles and chauffeurs;</li> <li>• Provides procedures for insurance of new certificates;</li> <li>• Provides procedures for suspension and revocation proceedings;</li> <li>• Provides for enforcement and penalties; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Enforcement by authorized personnel of the DTPW, police forces of the various municipalities in Miami-Dade County, and by the Miami-Dade County Police Department.</li> <li>○ Enforcement by personnel of the Port of Miami and Aviation Department, when authorized by the Director of the DTPW, when violations occur within their respective boundaries.</li> <li>○ Any person found guilty on at least two prior occasions within a three year period of advertising or providing for-hire transportation, driving, or operating a for-hire vehicle without having a valid, current for-hire certificate, operating permit, or chauffeur's registration as required by this chapter, will be punishable by fines of greater than \$5,000.00 but less than \$10,000.00 and/or imprisonment not to exceed 45 days.</li> <li>○ Anyone who engages a for-hire vehicle with intent to defraud the chauffeur, certified driver or operator will be subject to a fine of \$500.00 and/or imprisonment not to exceed 10 days.</li> <li>○ Any person who is found guilty of signing an application for issuance, renewal, modification, assignment, sale, or transfer of a fire-hire certificate, chauffeur registration, vehicle certification, driver certification or operating permit which falsely states any material fact will be punished by a fine of \$1,000.00 and/or imprisonment in the County Jail for 30 days.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amends chauffeur requirements; and</li> <li>• Amends Chapter 8CC of the code providing civil penalties.</li> </ul>
<b>4B</b> <b>170763</b>	ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ISSUES; AMENDING ARTICLE XXXIV OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY; PROVIDING THAT THE OFFICE OF COMMUNITY ADVOCACY, RATHER THAN THE OFFICE OF AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT COORDINATION, COORDINATE, SUPPORT AND PROVIDE LIAISON SERVICES FOR THE COMMISSION
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed ordinance, relating to the Commission on Disability Issues, amends Article XXXIV of the Miami-Dade County Code providing that the Office of Community Advocacy, rather than the Office of Americans with Disability Act Coordination, coordinate, support and provide liaison services for the Commission.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Sec. 2-318. – Staff Support</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Office of <b>Community Advocacy</b> shall coordinate, support and provide liaison services for the Commission on Disability Issues.</i></p> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b>  <b>Commission on Disability Issues<sup>1</sup></b>  The Commission on Disability Issues (CODI) is an official advisory board to the Miami-Dade County Commission.</p>

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.miamidade.gov/peoplewithdisabilities/commission-on-disability-issues.asp>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes									
	<p>CODI advises both the Board of County Commissioners and the County administration on issues affecting people with disabilities. County staff may be invited to CODI meetings to make presentations, provide information or discuss issues.</p> <p><b>Miami-Dade County ADA Office<sup>2</sup></b> The Miami-Dade County ADA Office’s mission is to ensure Miami-Dade County’s compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and related laws. The Office helps County departments understand the importance of the ADA, their obligations under the Act, the options for meeting those obligations, and how different options will impact people with disabilities. The Office also works to heighten awareness of disability issues, both within County departments and the local community.</p> <p>The County ADA Office does not enforce the ADA. The ADA is a federal law which is enforced by the federal government.</p> <p>The Office of ADA Coordination provides staff support to the Commission on Disability Issues and interfaces with a network of County departmental ADA coordinators. It administers the Municipal Parking Fines Reimbursement Program which distributes parking citation revenues generated by disabled permit parking violations to municipalities.</p> <p>Issues regarding County employment, including recruitment, job information, the application process, testing, referral, interviews, and reasonable accommodation are the responsibility of Human Resources. Employment discrimination complaints are handled by Human Rights and Fair Employment Practices.</p>									
4C 170708	ORDINANCE RELATING TO BIDS FROM RELATED PARTIES AND BID COLLUSION; AMENDING SECTIONS 2-8.1.1 AND 10-33.02.1 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; REVISING THE DEFINITION OF RELATED PARTIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING A PRESUMPTION OF COLLUSION AND PRE-AWARD DISCLOSURES; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE									
Notes	<p>The proposed ordinance, relating to bids from related parties and bid collusion, amends Sections 2-8.1.1 and 10-33.02.1 of the Miami-Dade County Code to revise the definition of related parties for the purpose of establishing a presumption of collusion and pre-award disclosures.</p> <table><tr><th colspan="3">Code Comparison Chart Sections 2-8.1.1 and 10-33.02.1</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>Current</th><th>Proposed</th></tr><tr><td>Sec. 2-8.1.1. <i>Bids from related parties and bid collusion for the purchase of goods and services, leases, permits, concessions and management agreements.</i></td><td>(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, where two (2) or more related parties each submit a bid or proposal for any County purchases of supplies, materials and services (including professional services, other than professional architectural, engineering and other services subject to section 2-10.4 and Section 287.055, Florida Statutes), lease, permit, licensing agreement, concession or management agreement, such bids or proposals shall be presumed to be collusive. The foregoing presumption may be rebutted by presentation of evidence as to the extent of ownership, control and management of such related parties in the preparation and submittal of such bids or proposals. Related parties shall mean</td><td>(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, where two (2) or more related parties each submit a bid or proposal for any County purchases of supplies, materials and services (including professional services, other than professional architectural, engineering and other services subject to section 2-10.4 and Section 287.055, Florida Statutes), lease, permit, licensing agreement, concession or management agreement, such bids or proposals shall be presumed to be collusive. The foregoing presumption may be rebutted by presentation of evidence as to the extent of ownership, control and management of such related parties in the preparation and submittal of such bids or proposals. Related parties shall mean <b>the bidder or proposer; the principals, corporate officers, and</b></td></tr></table>	Code Comparison Chart Sections 2-8.1.1 and 10-33.02.1				Current	Proposed	Sec. 2-8.1.1. <i>Bids from related parties and bid collusion for the purchase of goods and services, leases, permits, concessions and management agreements.</i>	(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, where two (2) or more related parties each submit a bid or proposal for any County purchases of supplies, materials and services (including professional services, other than professional architectural, engineering and other services subject to section 2-10.4 and Section 287.055, Florida Statutes), lease, permit, licensing agreement, concession or management agreement, such bids or proposals shall be presumed to be collusive. The foregoing presumption may be rebutted by presentation of evidence as to the extent of ownership, control and management of such related parties in the preparation and submittal of such bids or proposals. Related parties shall mean	(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, where two (2) or more related parties each submit a bid or proposal for any County purchases of supplies, materials and services (including professional services, other than professional architectural, engineering and other services subject to section 2-10.4 and Section 287.055, Florida Statutes), lease, permit, licensing agreement, concession or management agreement, such bids or proposals shall be presumed to be collusive. The foregoing presumption may be rebutted by presentation of evidence as to the extent of ownership, control and management of such related parties in the preparation and submittal of such bids or proposals. Related parties shall mean <b>the bidder or proposer; the principals, corporate officers, and</b>
Code Comparison Chart Sections 2-8.1.1 and 10-33.02.1										
	Current	Proposed								
Sec. 2-8.1.1. <i>Bids from related parties and bid collusion for the purchase of goods and services, leases, permits, concessions and management agreements.</i>	(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, where two (2) or more related parties each submit a bid or proposal for any County purchases of supplies, materials and services (including professional services, other than professional architectural, engineering and other services subject to section 2-10.4 and Section 287.055, Florida Statutes), lease, permit, licensing agreement, concession or management agreement, such bids or proposals shall be presumed to be collusive. The foregoing presumption may be rebutted by presentation of evidence as to the extent of ownership, control and management of such related parties in the preparation and submittal of such bids or proposals. Related parties shall mean	(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, where two (2) or more related parties each submit a bid or proposal for any County purchases of supplies, materials and services (including professional services, other than professional architectural, engineering and other services subject to section 2-10.4 and Section 287.055, Florida Statutes), lease, permit, licensing agreement, concession or management agreement, such bids or proposals shall be presumed to be collusive. The foregoing presumption may be rebutted by presentation of evidence as to the extent of ownership, control and management of such related parties in the preparation and submittal of such bids or proposals. Related parties shall mean <b>the bidder or proposer; the principals, corporate officers, and</b>								

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.miamidade.gov/peoplewithdisabilities/>

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes				
		bidders or proposers or the principals, corporate officers, and managers thereof which have a direct or indirect ownership interest in another bidder or proposer for the same agreement or in which a parent company or the principals thereof of one (1) bidder or proposer have a direct or indirect ownership interest in another bidder or proposer for the same agreement. Bids or proposals found to be collusive shall be rejected.	<b>managers of a bidder or proposer; or the spouse, domestic partner, parents, stepparents, siblings, children or stepchildren of a bidder or proposer or the principals, corporate officers, and managers thereof</b> which have a direct or indirect ownership interest in another bidder or proposer for the same agreement or in which a parent company or the principals thereof of one (1) bidder or proposer have a direct or indirect ownership interest in another bidder or proposer for the same agreement. Bids or proposals found to be collusive shall be rejected.		
	Sec. 10-33.02.1. <i>Bids precluded from related parties and colluding bidders.</i>	(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, when two (2) or more related parties each submit a bid or proposal for any construction contract subject to this article, such bid or proposal shall be presumed collusive. The foregoing presumption may be rebutted by presentation of evidence as to the extent of ownership, control and management of such related parties in the preparation and submittal of such bids or proposals. Related parties shall mean bidders or proposers or the principals, corporate officers, and managers thereof which have a direct or indirect ownership interest in another bidder or proposer for the same contract or in which a parent company or the principals thereof of one (1) bidder or proposer have a direct or indirect ownership interest in another bidder or proposer for the same contract. Bids or proposals found to be collusive shall be rejected.	(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, when two (2) or more related parties each submit a bid or proposal for any construction contract subject to this article, such bid or proposal shall be presumed collusive. The foregoing presumption may be rebutted by presentation of evidence as to the extent of ownership, control and management of such related parties in the preparation and submittal of such bids or proposals. Related parties shall mean <b>the bidder or proposer; the principals, corporate officers, and managers of a bidder or proposer; or the spouse, domestic partner, parents, stepparents, siblings, children or stepchildren of a bidder or proposer or the principals, corporate officers, and managers thereof</b> which have a direct or indirect ownership interest in another bidder or proposer for the same contract or in which a parent company or the principals thereof of one (1) bidder or proposer have a direct or indirect ownership interest in another bidder or proposer for the same contract. Bids or proposals found to be collusive shall be rejected.		
<b><u>Additional Information and Background Information</u></b> On February 18, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-172-15, awarded a design-build contract to Ric-Man Construction Florida, Inc., for Project No. DB13-WASD-03, Contract No. 14RMCF001 the Design-Build Services for Replacement of Water Mains and Service Conversions in the Shenandoah Area (Phase A). The total compensation amount was \$11,326,347.00 with a total contract term of 910 calendar days.					
<table><tr><th>Selection Process</th></tr><tr><td>Step 1</td></tr></table>				Selection Process	Step 1
Selection Process					
Step 1					

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
	May 7, 2014	<p>Nine (9) proposals were received by the COB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Layne Heavy Civil, Inc.</li> <li>• Man-Con Incorporated</li> <li>• Metro Equipment Service, Inc.</li> <li>• Marks Brothers, Inc.</li> <li>• Ric-Man International, Inc.</li> <li>• Ric-Man Construction Florida, Inc.</li> <li>• Acosta Tractors, Inc.</li> <li>• David Mancini &amp; Sons, Inc.</li> <li>• Lanzo Construction Co., Florida</li> </ul>
	July 14, 2014	<p>Compliance review memo issued by SBD indicated that all nine (9) proposers were responsive to the CBE and CSBE Step 1 compliance requirements.</p>
	July 23, 2014	<p>The CSC evaluated and ranked the nine (9) proposers as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Layne Heavy Civil, Inc. – 435</li> <li>• Man-Con Incorporated – 420</li> <li>• Metro Equipment Service, Inc. – 404</li> <li>• Marks Brothers, Inc. – 382</li> <li>• Ric-Man International, Inc. – 411</li> <li>• Ric-Man Construction Florida, Inc. – 412</li> <li>• Acosta Tractors, Inc. – 384</li> <li>• David Mancini &amp; Sons, Inc. – 409</li> <li>• Lanzo Construction Co., Florida – 405</li> </ul> <p>The CSC voted to advance four (4) of the nine (9) proposers to the Step 2 evaluation and to submit technical price proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Layne Heavy Civil, Inc. – 435</li> <li>• Man-Con Incorporated – 420</li> <li>• Ric-Man International, Inc. – 411</li> <li>• Ric-Man Construction Florida, Inc. – 412</li> </ul>
	<b>Step 2</b>	
	September 12, 2014	<p>Four (4) technical and price submittals were received by the COB.</p>
	Mid-October 2014	<p>Compliance review issued by SDB indicated that two (2) of the four (4) proposers were responsive to the CBE and CSBE Step 2 compliance requirements.</p> <p>Ric-Man International, Inc. and Man-Con Incorporated were found non-compliant with the CSBE goal established for this solicitation and were eliminated from further evaluation.</p> <p>Oral presentations meeting was held and the CSC ranked Ric-Man Construction Florida, Inc. as the highest ranking firm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Layne Heavy Civil, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presentation score – 427</li> <li>○ Alternate/base price proposal - \$12,436,402.56</li> <li>○ Adjusted Bid - \$29,125.06</li> <li>○ Rank - 2</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ric-Man Construction Florida, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presentation score – 447</li> <li>○ Alternate/base price proposal – \$9,699,987</li> <li>○ Adjusted Bid – \$21,700.19</li> <li>○ Rank – 1</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes				
	<p>An Adjusted Bid is an evaluation process where proposals are evaluated and assigned point values in accordance with established criteria in the solicitation. The qualitative aspects are scored and totaled on a scale of 0 to 100 points, per CSC, and the recommended firm is selected by dividing the price by the technical score to yield an Adjusted Bid.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>October 27, 2014</td><td>The Negotiation Committee was approved by the County Mayor.</td></tr> <tr> <td>December 1, 2014</td><td>Negotiation Committee successfully concluded with Ric-Man Construction Florida, Inc.</td></tr> </table> <p><b>During the BCC meeting on February 18, 2015, R-172-15 was discussed as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Commission asked the Inspector General (IG) to review this contract to determine if the possibility of collusion existed and to present her findings to the BCC.</i></li> <li>• <i>The IG reported that four of the nine companies who submitted proposals had familial relationships; however there was no evidence of any occurrence of collusion. She explained her office discovered many instances where Mancini companies were bidding against each other on county contracts; that as of 2010 there was no overlap of principals for the Mancini family related companies; and opined she was comfortable that the selection process was transparent.</i></li> <li>• <i>The IG also explained that her office also looked into Water &amp; Sewer design/build contracts, and out of four projects during the 2010 to 2014 period, one Mancini company was awarded a contract; in miscellaneous contracts there were five projects where Mancini companies were bidding against each other and none were awarded the contract; and in emergency awards for large transmission project purchase orders, out of seven pre-qualified companies, three were Mancini family related companies. She noted she had some concern with the emergency award contracts process and would be looking into that process further.</i></li> <li>• <i>The IG said her office also reviewed a pending criminal case, State of Florida vs Gus Lopez, which was a procurement fraud case in the City of Miami Beach that involved sixteen companies, of which three were Mancini companies. She noted, at this time, there was insufficient evidence to charge any of the Mancini company principals with any violations and none were being targeted in that investigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>In response to an inquiry regarding the Project Manager, the Director of the Water and Sewer Department (WASD), responded that the responsibility fell under the purview of a department employee who failed to do a portion of their job.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Commission expressed concern that county employees charged with the responsibility of being a project manager were not fulfilling their duties; recommended any employee who failed to do their job in its entirety be reprimanded; and asked the Director to ensure that employees of WASD be made completely aware of their responsibilities.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Commission expressed concern that projects of this size were usually subjected to many change orders which resulted in the initial price being increased.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Commission suggested Administration provide information to each Commissioner on any familial relationships that existed between companies bidding on a contract, prior to the item being presented to the BCC.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Assistant County Attorney clarified that the County had a collusion ordinance currently in place for design/build contracts and for goods and services; however, the ordinance did not create a presumption of collusion where familial relationships existed. He noted the ordinance would need to be amended to include that requirement.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Relevant Legislation Relating to Collusion</u></b></p> <p>On October 7, 2008, the BCC, through Ordinance No. 08-113, amended Sections 2-8.1.1 and 10-33.1 of the Miami-Dade County Code relating to bids from related parties to include a prohibition on collusive bidding, require that recommended bidders submit an affidavit regarding their relation to other bidders, and expand the prohibitions to include the purchase of goods or services.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Legislation Relating to Collusion and Familiar Relationships</u></b></p>	October 27, 2014	The Negotiation Committee was approved by the County Mayor.	December 1, 2014	Negotiation Committee successfully concluded with Ric-Man Construction Florida, Inc.
October 27, 2014	The Negotiation Committee was approved by the County Mayor.				
December 1, 2014	Negotiation Committee successfully concluded with Ric-Man Construction Florida, Inc.				



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes				
	File No. 150504 (introduced on 3/5/2015) amended Sections 2-8.1.1 and 10-33.02.1 of the Miami-Dade County Code relating to bid collusion to include certain familial relations in definition or related parties for the purpose of establishing resumption of collusion and re-award disclosures. File No. 150504 was adopted on first reading during the BCC meeting on March 17, 2015, but has yet to be referred to any BCC Committee meetings.				
<b>5A 170536</b>	RESOLUTION APPROVING SIGNIFICANT MODIFICATIONS TO BUILDING BETTER COMMUNITIES GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROGRAM PROJECT NO. 111 - "LOCAL PARKS IMPROVEMENTS" TO REDUCE ALLOCATION OF \$4,000,000.00 BY \$1,900,000.00 AND NO. 39 - "KENDALL INDIAN HAMMOCKS PARK" TO INCREASE ALLOCATION OF \$6,000,000.00 BY \$1,900,000.00 OF SURPLUS FUNDS FROM PROJECT NO. 111, BOTH IDENTIFIED IN APPENDIX A TO RESOLUTION NO. R-913-04, AFTER A PUBLIC HEARING				
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After a public hearing, approves the significant modification of Project No. 111 in Appendix A to the Parks Resolution to reduce its current allocation from \$4,000,000.00 to \$2,100,000.00; and</li> <li>• Declares \$1,900,000.00 as surplus funds and, after a public hearing, approves the significant modification of Project No. 39 in Appendix A to the Parks Resolution to increase its original allocation of \$6,000,000.00 by the \$1,900,000.00 of surplus funds for a new total allocation of \$7,900,000.00.</li> </ul> <p><b>Background</b></p> <p>Pursuant to Resolution No. R-913-04 (Parks Resolution), the voters of Miami-Dade County approved the issuance of general obligation bonds in a principal amount not to exceed \$680,258,000.00 to construct and improve neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational areas. Appendix A to the Parks Resolution lists projects eligible for funding from the Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond Program (Bond Program) by project number, municipal project location, BCC district, project name, project description, street address and allocation.</p> <p>One of the projects listed in Appendix A to the Parks Resolution is Project No. 111 – “Unincorporated Municipal Service Area - Local Park Improvements”, located in BCC District 10, had an original allocation of \$4,000,000.00, and a project description that reads “General improvements to existing local parks include renovation, and upgrades” (Project No. 111). <b>The current, unused balance of Project No. 111 is approximately \$1,900,000.00.</b></p> <p>Another one of the projects listed in Appendix A to the Parks Resolution is Project No. 39 – “Kendall Indian Hammocks Park”, located in BCC District 10, with an original allocation of \$6,000,000.00, and a project description that reads “Area-wide park improvements include recreation center construction; athletic fields; dog park, vehicular and pedestrian circulation; utilities and land acquisition” (Project No. 39). In 2014, \$4,500,000.00 from Project No. 39 funds were utilized to acquire a 21-acre parcel of land adjacent to Kendall Indian Hammocks Park and to expand the park, and other funds from Project No. 39 were utilized for minor improvements to the park so that <b>currently, the unused balance of Project No. 39 is \$1,200,000.00.</b></p> <p>The County desires to construct a recreation center at Kendall Indian Hammocks Park, as contemplated by the Bond Program, but due to a budget shortfall in Project No. 39 has insufficient funds to do so. <i>Implementing Order 3-47 sets forth a process for the allocation of surplus funds to existing and new Bond Program projects and allows for the use of surplus funds to fund budget shortfalls.</i></p> <p>Resolution No. R-295-13, adopted by the BCC on April 16, 2013, authorized the County Mayor or Mayor’s designee to negotiate with the YMCA of Greater Miami (YMCA) for the establishment of seven regional, recreational centers on County parks, and Kendall Indian Hammocks Park was amongst those seven parks.</p> <p>This item was presented to the Bond Program’s Citizen’s Advisory Committee on January 31, 2017 and received a favorable recommendation.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <b>Ordinance No. 02-137 7/23/2002</b> </td><td> Created the Programming Partners Program. This program fulfills the goals and objectives of the Recreation and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) Objective 4C, Section ii, which provides for PROS to work with community- </td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information		<b>Ordinance No. 02-137 7/23/2002</b>	Created the Programming Partners Program. This program fulfills the goals and objectives of the Recreation and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) Objective 4C, Section ii, which provides for PROS to work with community-
Additional Information					
<b>Ordinance No. 02-137 7/23/2002</b>	Created the Programming Partners Program. This program fulfills the goals and objectives of the Recreation and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) Objective 4C, Section ii, which provides for PROS to work with community-				



**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
		based and non-profit youth service organizations, foundations, facility support societies and other special interest groups to expand opportunities for private, non-profit recreational programming and investment in park improvements.
	2005	PROS commissioned Lambert Advisory to perform a Recreation Market Assessment and make recommendations regarding the development of large regional recreation centers (40,000+ sq.ft.) within Ives Estates, West Kendall District, Amelia Earhart and Homestead Air Reserve Base Parks. The market study provided demographic analysis, recommended the appropriate mix of recreation uses, profiled best practices and benchmarked against similar community centers throughout North America for construction costs, operating expenses and revenue potential. Based on this study, PROS determined that the limited amount of BBC-GOB monies warranted establishing programming partnerships to accomplish the objective of building these types of facilities.
	2009	The YMCA of Greater Miami approached the County to establish a strategic partnership for the development of large RRCs. Ten potential sites were identified as viable opportunities for public/private partnerships to build RRCs. The YMCA, in its strategic plan, determined they have capacity to finance, construct and operate up to seven new RRCs. These seven locations are distributed in the northern, central and southern parts of the County to insure appropriate distribution of these types of services.
	<b>Limited Programming Partnership</b> 2011	PROS and the YMCA entered into a limited Programming Partnership, as a permit agreement, for the North Pointe Community Center, which has significantly reduced PROS' operating impact of the newly constructed facility.
	<b>R-295-13</b> 4/16/2013	<p>Waived competitive bidding and authorized the Mayor or Mayor's designee to negotiate with The YMCA of Greater Miami (YMCA) to establish up to seven Regional Recreational Centers (RRCs) on County park land. Negotiations were to occur within the framework of the Programming Partner Program (Ordinance No. 02-137) established in 2002 and amended in 2009, and pursuant to Section 26-34 of the Miami-Dade Code and Article 5.03(D) of the Home Rule Charter.</p> <p>The preliminary locations of the proposed RRCs are: 1) Kendall Indian Hammocks Park, located in District 10; 2) Ives Estates Park, located in District 1; 3) Tamiami Park, located in District 11; 4) Oak Grove Park or an alternative site as determined by the Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department (PROS), to be located within County Commission District 2; 5) West Kendall District Park or an alternative site as determined by PROS, to be located within County Commission District 11; 6) Chuck Pezoldt Park, located in District 9; and 7) North Pointe Park, located in District 1.</p>
	<b>Report</b> 6/3/2014	<p>The Mayor issued a report regarding the Programming Partnership Operating Agreement with the YMCA of Great Miami. The purpose of the report was to inform the BCC that the Administration was placing the negotiations with the YMCA of Greater Miami to establish Regional Recreation Centers in County parks on hold for up to one year to allow time for the YMCA to conduct a national search for a new Chief Executive Officer. The YMCA made this request to the County.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What is the status of negotiations?</i></li> </ul>
<b>7A</b> <b>170108</b>	ORDINANCE REGARDING PLANNING; AMENDING SECTIONS 2-108.1 AND 2-116 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS AND STATUTORY REFERENCES FOR EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL OF THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN; AMENDING SECTION 2-116.1 OF THE CODE; AMENDING PUBLIC HEARING REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICATIONS TO AMEND THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE	
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed ordinance provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amends Sections 2-108.1 and 2-116 of the Miami-Dade County Code;</li> <li>• Amends the public notice requirements and statutory references for evaluation and appraisal of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan; and</li> </ul>	

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amends public hearing requirements for applications to amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan.</li> </ul> <p>Specifically, as it relates to Evaluation and Appraisal Reports, the proposed ordinance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corrects obsolete statutory references and modifies the public notice requirements for the Evaluation and Appraisal Report process to reflect changes in State law and allow for additional flexibility in the process; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Requirements for completion of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report, as contained in Chapter 163.3191, Florida Statutes, were significantly reduced by the Community Planning Act in 2011.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Deletes the current requirement to publish an Evaluation and Appraisal Report schedule six (6) months prior to a public hearing before the BCC and deletes the current requirement that public workshops be advertised no more than 14 days prior to such workshop meetings;</li> <li>Provides that each public workshop and public hearing be advertised in a newspaper of general circulation no less than seven (7) days prior to a public workshops and no less than ten (10) days prior to a hearing before the Planning Advisory Board or BCC.</li> </ul> <p>Specifically, as it relates to CDMP Amendment Applications, the proposed ordinance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modifies the Planning Advisory Board hearing dates for CDMP amendment applications by removing the requirement that such hearing occur no later than 30 days prior to the first public hearing by the BCC.</li> </ul> <p>The amendments to the Code are applicable to CDMP amendment applications filed on or after the October 2016 CDMP amendment cycle, and do not apply to amendment applications filed in previous cycles.</p>
<b>8A1 170492</b>	<b>RESOLUTION APPROVING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND RICONDO &amp; ASSOCIATES, INC., FOR AVIATION PLANNING AND MASTER PLANNING CONSULTANT SERVICES, PROJECT NO. E16-MDAD-04; IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$5,513,750.00 AND FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; AND AUTHORIZING COUNTY MAYOR OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT AND TO EXERCISE THE PROVISIONS THEREOF, INCLUDING THE RENEWAL AND TERMINATION PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves the Professional Services Agreement (PSA) for Aviation Planning and Master Planning Consultant Services, E16-MDAD-04, with Ricondo &amp; Associates, Inc., in the amount of \$5,513,750.00 for a five (5) year term, and authorizes the County Mayor or designee to execute the agreement.</p> <p>The Consultant will provide a wide variety of airport and aviation master planning services to directly support the Miami-Dade Aviation Department's (MDAD) Aviation Planning Land Use and Grants Division meet federal, state and county regulatory requirements and to supplement the Strategic Airport Master Plan Study for Miami International Airport (MIA) and the County's system of General Aviation Airports (GAAs) which consists of Miami-Opa locka Executive Airport (OPF), Miami Executive Airport (TMB), Miami Homestead General Aviation Airport (X51) and Dade-Collier Training and Transition Airport (TNT).</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>On June 28, 2016, a Notice to Professional Consultants (NTPC) was issued under full and open competition. On August 25, 2016, the Clerk of the Board received two (2) proposals. In accordance with Chapter 287.055 of the Florida Statutes and Chapter 2-10.4 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, both of which govern certification, selection, and negotiation procedures, the Competitive Selection Committee held a first-tier meeting on September 27, 2016 to review the two (2) submittals. By a majority vote, the Committee elected to waive the second-tier phase and ranked the two (2) responsive proposers.</p> <p>The top-ranked firm Ricondo &amp; Associates, Inc. was found by the Selection Committee to have met the qualification requirements. With the approval to move forward with the negotiation process, the Negotiation Committee successfully negotiated an agreement with Ricondo &amp; Associates, Inc. on December 19, 2016.</p> <p><b><u>Assigned Contract Measures</u></b></p> <p>DBE- 25 percent- \$1,250,000.00</p>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><b><u>Contract Measures Achieved at Award</u></b> 27.57 percent</p> <p><b>DBE Subconsultants</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ACAI Associates Inc.- 3%;</li> <li>• American Infrastructure Development Inc.- 4%;</li> <li>• Arora Engineers, Inc.- 5.5%;</li> <li>• Brown &amp; Phillips, Inc.- 1.7%;</li> <li>• Faith Group, LLC- 2%;</li> <li>• Newhouse and Associates, LLC- 11.37%</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b> On December 3, 2013, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-967-13 awarded a Professional Services Agreement, for a five year term, to Ricondo &amp; Associates, Inc. for Aviation Planning Consultant Services in the amount of \$825,000.00.</p> <p>On May 19, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-449-15, approved the First Amendment to the Professional Services Agreement (Agreement) with Ricondo &amp; Associates, Inc. for Aviation Planning Services for the County's System of Airports, increasing the Agreement amount by \$401,000.00 for an adjusted Agreement amount of \$1,226,000.00.</p> <p><b>Contract Measures:</b> CBE goal 15% (\$123,441.00) <b>Contract Measures Achieved At Award:</b> 15% (\$123,441.00)</p> <p><b>CBE Subconsultants:</b> M.C. Harry &amp; Associates, Inc. 7.5% (\$61,720.50) F.R. Aleman &amp; Associates, Inc. 7.5% (\$61,720.50)</p> <p><b>Contract Measures Achieved To Date:</b> 5% CBE goal to date (\$36,375.00); Contract is 87% complete (\$715,220.00) F.R. Aleman and Associates: 0%; and M.C. Harry to date: 5% (\$36,375.00)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>In a letter dated February 2, 2015, Ricondo stated that although the payments to the CBE subconsultants have not reached the monetary amount associated with the 15% goal, project work equal to nearly the full amount of the 15% measure has already been awarded, and they do not foresee any problems meeting the goal.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>8A2 170783</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AVIATION DEPARTMENT TO ISSUE INTERIM AIRLINE USE AGREEMENTS TO AIRLINES USING MIAMI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THIS BOARD APPROVES A SUCCESSOR AIRLINE USE AGREEMENT TO REPLACE THE CURRENT AIRLINE USE AGREEMENT THAT EXPIRES ON APRIL 30, 2017 (SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 170565)</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD) to issue an Interim Airline Use Agreement (AUA) to airlines using Miami International Airport (MIA) until the BCC approves a long-term successor AUA to replace the current Agreement that expires on April 30, 2017.</p> <p>There is no fiscal impact arising from this resolution.</p> <p><i>This item was amended at the March 16, 2017 Economic Development and Tourism Committee (EDTC) meeting to require a report from the Aviation Department on the status of the new Airline Use Agreement at the May 11, 2017 EDTC meeting.</i></p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> The AUA is the primary contractual document between the County and the airlines using MIA. It establishes the fees and charges that each airline must pay and sets forth programs for the benefit of the airlines, such as the airlines' rights to approve or disapprove capital improvement projects and participate in an Aviation User Credit</p>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Program that allows airlines to delay payment of fees and charges until the month after they are incurred, and pay a discounted amount of such fees and charges based on timely payment.</p> <p>The current AUA was approved by this BCC pursuant to Resolution No. R-331-01. The AUA was amended and restated in 2012 to reflect the April 30, 2017 expiration date, as approved by the BCC pursuant to Resolution No. R-198-12. The 2012 Amendment was requested by airlines operating at MIA to reflect changes in the aviation industry over the past decade and clarify, among other things, the conditions under which an Airline can be found to be late in its payments to MDAD.</p> <p>For the past year, MDAD and the airlines have been negotiating the terms of the successor AUA that would take effect on May 1, 2017. Recently, it became apparent that despite the best efforts of MDAD, the successor AUA will not be ready for BCC approval by April 30, 2017.</p> <p>The absence of an Interim AUA would hurt MDAD's efforts to attract new airlines to MIA. New airlines will not accept the current AUA with less than three months remaining in its term. For airlines already operating at MIA, it is in the best interests of the County and such airlines to have a document effective after April 30 that confirms the airlines' payment obligations for operating at MIA.</p> <p>The attached Interim AUA simply states that the terms of the existing 2012 Restated AUA will continue to apply from May 1, 2017 until such time as the BCC approves a successor AUA.</p>
<b>8C1 170432</b>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FUNDING OF THIRTY-FOUR GRANTS FOR A TOTAL OF \$370,000.00 FROM THE FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017 SECOND QUARTER OF THE TOURIST DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL GRANTS PROGRAM ROOM TAX PLAN AND SURTAX CATEGORY TO PROMOTE MIAMI-DADE COUNTY TOURISM; WAIVING RESOLUTION NO. R-130-06, AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE GRANT AGREEMENTS WITH VARIOUS ENTITIES AND TO EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS, INCLUDING CANCELLATION PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves funding of thirty-four (34) grants for a total of \$370,000.00 from the FY 2016-2017 Second Quarter of the Tourist Development Council Grants Program-Room Tax Plan and Surtax Category to promote Miami-Dade County tourism by funding tourist-oriented cultural, sporting, television and special event/promotions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actors' Playhouse Productions, Inc. \$14,000</li> <li>• Bascomb Memorial Broadcasting Foundation, Inc. \$7,500</li> <li>• Borscht Corp. \$9,000</li> <li>• Center for the Advancement of Jewish Education, Inc. \$5,250</li> <li>• Chopin Foundation of the United States, Inc. \$8,000</li> <li>• Coconut Grove Arts &amp; Historical Association, Inc. \$25,000</li> <li>• Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Parade &amp; Festivities Committee, Inc. \$8,000</li> <li>• Florida International University Board of Trustees for the benefit of School of Music \$5,000</li> <li>• Florida International University Board of Trustees for the benefit School of Hospitality Management SoBch Wine \$12,250</li> <li>• Global Arts Project, Inc. \$2,500</li> <li>• GroundUp Music Productions, LLC. \$15,000</li> <li>• Homestead Rodeo Association, Inc. \$10,500</li> <li>• Junior Orange Bowl Committee, Inc. \$8,400</li> <li>• Kiwanis Club of Little Havana, Inc. \$17,500</li> <li>• Miami City Ballet, Inc. \$16,000</li> <li>• Miami Dade College - Miami Film Festival \$14,000</li> <li>• Miami Design Preservation League, Inc. \$22,500</li> <li>• Miami Light Project, Inc. \$9,000</li> <li>• Miami Theater Hub, Inc. \$15,000</li> <li>• Miami-Broward One Carnival Host Committee, Inc. \$13,500</li> <li>• National Foundation for Advancement in the Arts, Inc. \$9,000</li> </ul>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National LGBTQ Task Force \$8,000</li> <li>• National Tropical Botanical Garden \$10,500</li> <li>• New World Symphony, Inc. \$10,000</li> <li>• Orchestra Miami, Inc. \$7,000</li> <li>• Performing Arts Center Trust, Inc. dba Adrienne Arsht Center for the Performing Arts of Miami-Dade County \$10,500</li> <li>• Seraphic Fire, Inc. \$12,000</li> <li>• South Florida Bluegrass Association, Inc. \$5,000</li> <li>• Teatro en Miami Corp. \$5,000</li> <li>• The Deering Estate Foundation, Inc. \$6,000</li> <li>• The Miami Bach Society, Inc. \$9,600</li> <li>• The Miami Foundation, Inc. as fiscal agent for 4Ward Miami, Inc. \$7,500</li> <li>• Tropical Everglades Visitor Center \$20,000</li> <li>• University of Miami, Frost School of Music \$12,000</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b> Funding for the Tourist Development Council (TDC) Grants Program comes from the two (2) percent Tourist Development Room Tax Revenue and the two (2) percent Hotel/Motel Food and Beverage Surtax revenues. In addition, the Greater Miami Convention and Visitors Bureau provides \$25,000.00 to the TDC pursuant to a multi-year agreement. Further, a remaining balance of \$50,097.00 from FY 2015-16 in unspent grant funds was carried over and is being appropriated as part of the FY 2016-17 program.</p> <p>Pursuant to Ordinance 16-104, \$1.2 million has been allocated for FY 2016-17 Tourist Development Council (TDC) Grants. The current Second Quarter recommendations, totaling \$370,000.00, continue the recommended TDC grant allocations for this fiscal year.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> The Tourist Development Council convened on February 10, 2017 to review 34 applications requesting \$611,500.00 for the Second Quarter of the program. The TDC recommended funding 34 applicants for a total of \$370,000.00.</p> <p>The Tourist Development Council Grants Program is responsive on a quarterly basis to organizations/events, which showcase Miami-Dade County's appeal as a tourist destination by sponsoring tourist-oriented sports events, cultural and special events (visual and performing arts, including theater, concerts, recitals, opera, dance, art exhibitions and festivals), and television origination projects.</p> <p>The TDC specifically evaluated each applicant organization based on the following competitive review criteria: 1) tourism impact/marketing plan; 2) quality and track record of the organization and its event; 3) event coordination and management; 4) fiscal feasibility and accountability; and 5) efforts to comply with and incorporate the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) into projects.</p>
<b>8E1 170462</b>	RESOLUTION APPROVING MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND THE FLORIDA DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT TO PROVIDE A MASS EMERGENCY NOTIFICATION SYSTEM FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AT NO COST TO THE COUNTY; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT AND TO EXERCISE THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Florida Division of Emergency Management (FDEM) and Miami-Dade County (County) on behalf of the Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Department (MDFR) to utilize the notification system provided by FDEM to transmit alerts, notifications, and other authorized public safety messaging to residents, businesses, and visitors located in or transiting through the County at no cost. The MOA will become effective on the date of execution by the last signing party through the duration of services provided under FDEM's contract DEM-16-PG-E4-13-00-22-379. This MOA will be effective until June 30, 2019.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p>



**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>There is no associated fiscal impact to the County with the approval of this MOA. FDEM is funding and providing the notification system at no cost to eligible governmental entities for the initial contract and all renewal years through June 30, 2019.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>In 2015, the Florida Legislature made revisions to Section 252.35(2)(a)6 of the Florida Statutes legislating FDEM to “establish a system of communications and warning to ensure that the state’s population and emergency management agencies are warned of developing emergency situations and can communicate emergency response decisions.” As such, FDEM and Emergency Management Agencies, including MDRF’s OEM are the only eligible users of the Statewide Notification System services provided under FDEM’s contract with Everbridge, Inc. The County’s responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administering access of the Everbridge system between municipal emergency management agencies and FDEM;</li> <li>• Using of the system at no cost to the County for notifications of population protective actions, emergency preparedness and response information, disaster recovery information, automated weather warnings;</li> <li>• Assisting with law enforcement searches; and</li> <li>• Recalling County employees, contractors, and other response partners.</li> </ul> <p>By approving the attached MOA, OEM will act as a liaison, administering the use of the notification system provided by FDEM to facilitate its use by the County and municipalities to transmit alerts, notifications, and other authorized public safety messaging to residents, businesses, employees, and visitors located in or transiting throughout the County. Several municipalities have previously communicated a desire to implement an alert and notification system but have noted it was cost prohibitive.</p> <p>OEM utilizes the County’s existing mass call and text notification system, Miami-Dade Alerts, which is currently in the first year of a two-year contract with Airbus DS Communications Inc. for software support to the County’s existing notification system. The County’s initial contract with Airbus DS Communications Inc. for \$220,803 expires July 31, 2018, after which the County has three (3), one-year options to renew. Five (5) County departments can access this contract: Department of Transportation and Public Works, Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department, Miami-Dade Police Department, Information Technology Department, and MDRF, although the Information Technology Department has the only contract allocation. OEM will examine the efficacy of the FDEM’s system in comparison to the agreement with Everbridge and make a recommendation to Information Technology Department as to which system should be adopted by OEM for alert and notification purposes prior to expiration of the County’s current contract.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information-BCC Legislation- Other Warning Systems</u></b></p> <p>On May 8, 2007, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-592-07, directed the County Manager to study the feasibility and effectiveness of establishing a warning system that alerts the public of imminent severe weather conditions such as tornados, using methods such as sirens and automated phone and text messaging warnings, and to report back to the BCC within 90 days.</p> <p>On December 18, 2007, the County Manager presented a Report, to the BCC, in response to Resolution No. R-592-07. The report stated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current public warning capabilities consist of two national avenues for communicating among emergency managers and warning originators; two federally led systems for communicating directly to the public; and a wide variety of warning systems designed, installed, and operated by private industry. Miami-Dade County currently has access to a variety of these systems to ensure information is available to the public during times of emergencies. There are several systems in place that include products maintained and operated by federal agencies and products for sale by the private sector. Some of the emergency alert systems operated by various government agencies include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ National Warning System (NAWAS)</li> <li>○ NOAA Weather Wire Service (NWWS)</li> <li>○ Emergency Alert System (EAS)</li> <li>○ NOAA “All-Hazards” Emergency Notifications-Known as the NOAA Weather Radio (NWR)</li> <li>○ Emergency Alert System formerly known as the Emergency Broadcast System</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to the federal agencies there are systems available at the state level. The State of Florida and its seven domestic security regions have internal systems in place to share sensitive, homeland security related information. All of these systems require security clearances and are used by public safety organizations and their personnel. Several commonly used programs include the Homeland Security Information Network, ThreatCom, and Law Enforcement Online.</li> <li>• Reverse 911 Telephone Notification System allows first responders to use a reverse 911 software program to notify residents and businesses about a potential emergency circumstance by telephone. Media-based emergency notification systems offer email subscription notifications of current events such as weather events, breaking news, traffic delays, etc.</li> <li>• Lastly, audible sirens can be used similar to the Florida Power &amp; Light Turkey Point Nuclear Power Plant sirens currently being used for emergency alerting.</li> <li>• Miami-Dade Alerts: DEM/HS utilized a database system that allows for emergency alert notification. The one-year pilot program consisted of three functions: a community alert notification, an employee emergency alert, and a college/university student and faculty alert. The Community Alert Notification allows system administrators to alert residents and businesses of significant events that may affect them. Similar to the media-related alerts mentioned above, this system is also subscriber-based and uses e-mail accounts, cell phone text messaging, and other handheld devices capable of receiving text messages. The system is currently being used to alert subscribers of emergencies related to severe weather – hurricane watch/warning, evacuation and curfew orders, food and water distribution points, and other public safety related information. Subscribers can sign up on the County’s website and learn more about how the system works.</li> </ul> <p>On October 5, 2016, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-881-16, authorized increased expenditure authority of \$240,000 to Contract No. SS8689-0/19, Lightning Prediction and Warning Systems, for the Miami-Dade Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department. This sole source contract was established in March of 2014 under delegated authority for a five-year term and is used by the Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department for the purchase and installation of Thor Guard, Inc. lightning prediction and warning systems, including maintenance and repairs, at County parks. The systems provide advanced notice of potential lightning strikes, allowing park patrons to timely evacuate a park, preventing a life-threatening scenario. Under the contract, the County has the right to purchase the lightning prediction and warning systems for additional parks. The requested increase in spending authority will be used to cover the cost of the systems for nine (9) additional parks.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information- BCC Legislation- Other Alert Systems</u></b></p> <p>On September 2, 2008, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-920-08, approved a Memorandum of Agreement with the Florida Department of Corrections for the Miami-Dade Corrections and Rehabilitation Department (MDCR) to participate in the Victim Notification Service Network. This automated program notifies crime victims of information regarding an inmate’s escape, release, or death. Through annual appropriation by the Florida Legislature, the Florida Department of Corrections will assume responsibility for paying license and annual maintenance fees to the provider, Appriss, Inc. Should the Legislature cease funding, the MDCR will be required to request funding through the annual resource allocation process to meet this statutory requirement.</p> <p>On December 2, 2014, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1074-14, directed the Mayor or designee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine the feasibility and cost of, and recommend an implementation plan for, creating an information clearinghouse for missing persons in Miami-Dade County and an early warning alert and/or robo-call system, similar to the AMBER Alert, Silver Alert, and/or the Ashley Nicole Valdes Public Safety Alert, for missing persons where there is evidence that the missing person is at risk of imminent bodily harm and would not otherwise qualify for an AMBER or Silver Alert;</li> <li>• Examine the procedures followed by the Miami-Dade Police Department regarding missing persons investigations and any waiting period that is instituted prior to engaging in a missing persons investigation and determine whether any such waiting periods can be waived, and the best methodology and implementation for such a waiver, for cases where there is evidence that a missing person is at risk of imminent bodily harm;</li> <li>• Examine and identify risks factors that local law enforcement can use to identify missing persons that are at risk of imminent bodily harm;</li> </ul>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify resources available within Miami-Dade County and through the State of Florida that can be used by the Miami-Dade Police Department and other local law enforcement agencies in assisting with the dissemination of information regarding missing persons and in advancing a missing persons investigation; and</li> <li>Prepare and provide a report to the BCC within ninety (90) days.</li> </ul> <p>On December 15, 2015, the BCC, through resolution No. R-1159-16, urged the Florida Legislature to enact legislation that creates a statewide emergency alert notification system, similar to the AMBER Alert and Silver Alert, for missing persons 18 years of age or older who are believed to be endangered and would not otherwise qualify for any other statewide emergency alert.</p>
<b>8E2 170497</b>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TERMS OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAY SAFETY AND MOTOR VEHICLES AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, THROUGH THE MIAMI-DADE FIRE RESCUE DEPARTMENT, REGARDING ACCESS TO THE DRIVER AND VEHICLE INFORMATION DATABASE SYSTEM; AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR THE MAYOR'S DESIGNEES TO EXECUTE THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING, APPROVE AMENDMENTS UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES AND EXERCISE OTHER PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor or designee to execute the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV) and Miami-Dade County, through the Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Department (MDFR), to access the Driver and Vehicle Information Database System (DAVID) to comply with the MDFR's statutory and administrative rule requirements. This MOU will become effective once signed by both the Florida DHSMV and Miami-Dade County, and will continue for a period of four (4) years.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b> MDFR will be able to access the information in the DAVID system at no cost.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> The Florida DHSMV collects and maintains personal information which is stored in DAVID. This database provides vital information such as driver license history, signature, photographs, and other information. Based upon the nature of this information, the Florida DHSMV administers DAVID in strict compliance with federal and state statutory requirements, and, in turn, requires that same strict compliance of MDFR, to which it provides access. MDFR must comply with statutory requirements, as well as administrative policies and procedures that govern this information. This partnership with the Florida DHSMV and access to DAVID is vital to the daily work of MDFR to ensure that statutory and/or administrative rule requirements are met. The Florida DHSMV clearly specifies the conditions and limitations under which the Florida DHSMV agrees to provide electronic access to DAVID information to MDFR.</p>
<b>8F4 170495</b>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING A CONTRACT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$700,000.00 FOR SALE AND PURCHASE BETWEEN MARTIN A. KAYE, MICHAEL KAYE, AND KRISTEEN KAYE, AS SELLERS, AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, AS BUYER, FOR APPROXIMATELY 43,631 SQUARE FEET OF LAND IMPROVED WITH AN APPROXIMATE 4,819 SQUARE FOOT STRUCTURE LOCATED AT 18198 OLD CUTLER ROAD, VILLAGE OF PALMETTO BAY, FLORIDA FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING PALMETTO BAY FIRE RESCUE STATION 74; AUTHORIZING THE EXPENDITURE OF UP TO \$15,000.00 FOR CLOSING COSTS; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE CONTRACT, EXERCISE ANY AND ALL RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN, TO TAKE ALL OTHER ACTIONS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE SAID PURCHASE AND ACCEPT CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY BY WARRANTY DEED; AND DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO RECORD SUCH DEED</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves a Contract for Sale and Purchase between Miami-Dade County, the buyer, and Martin A. Kaye, Michael Kaye, and Kristeen Kaye, the sellers. More specifically, the proposed resolution provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorizes the acquisition of a property (Folio No. 33-5034-023-0510) with approximately 43,631 square feet of land improved with an approximate 4,819 square foot structure located at 18198 Old Cutler Road, Village of Palmetto Bay, Florida, intended for demolition to allow for the construction of Palmetto Bay Fire Rescue Station 74;</li> </ul>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authorizes the County Mayor or designee to execute the Contract for Sale and Purchase in the amount of \$700,000 plus closing costs of approximately \$15,000, bringing the total fiscal impact to \$715,000; and</li> <li>• Authorizes the County Mayor or designee to accept the conveyance by Warranty Deed, to record the instrument of conveyance in the public records of Miami-Dade County, and to exercise any and all other rights in the Contract for Sale and Purchase.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b> The estimated total cost of the acquisition is \$715,000 (i.e., \$700,000 for the purchase of real property and \$15,000 for closing costs). The funding source for the acquisition and future construction of Palmetto Bay Fire Rescue Station 74 is from District 4 Fire Impact Fees.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> The property consists of an approximate 43,631 square foot site which has been selected by the Fire Rescue Department to construct the Palmetto Bay Fire Rescue Station 74. The site is improved with a residential structure that will be demolished upon purchase of the land. The proposed station will serve the residents of Palmetto Bay as well as Pinecrest, Cutler Bay, and unincorporated Miami-Dade County. The estimated construction cost is \$3,500,000.</p> <p>FOLIO NUMBER: 33-5034-023-0510</p> <p>ZONING: E-1, Estate Residential, Village of Palmetto Bay. Purchase is contingent upon site plan approval for the proposed fire station.</p> <p>APPRAISAL DATA: Two (2) independent real estate appraisals were procured in August 2016 by the Internal Services Department with market value conclusions of \$670,000 and \$730,000.</p> <p>CONTINGENCIES: The Contract for Sale and Purchase is contingent upon receiving site plan approval for the fire station from the Village of Palmetto Bay. The Fire Rescue Department, in conjunction with the property owners, submitted the zoning hearing application to the Village on October 28, 2016, followed by transmittal of plans the week of November 28, 2016. The Village Council heard the item on February 13, 2017, requested that the Fire Rescue Department hold an additional workshop to discuss the proposed station construction with neighbors, and deferred the item to March 6, 2017 to allow for same.</p> <p><b>The OCA posed the following questions, to which MDFR staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>What was the outcome of the additional workshop?</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ MDFR went before the Village Council on February 13, 2017 seeking site plan approval for the planned fire station. The Contract to purchase was contingent upon site plan approval from the Village Council. MDFR had a positive recommendation for the Zoning Director so it was sure that the Council was going to approve the site plan.</li> <li>○ Unfortunately, as a result of resident concerns and the fact that they would like to see some minor changes to the site plan, the Council deferred the application on the 13th and requested that MDFR hold a Workshop with surrounding neighbors. It was agreed that the workshop will take place on February 23 and that the application will go before the Council again on March 6.</li> <li>○ On February 23, 2017, we held the workshop at Village Hall. MDFR representatives included the Fire Chief, Scott Mendelsberg and Carlos Heredia. There were approximately 8 to 10 neighbors expressing concern regarding the new fire station as well as the site plan configuration. Since the site is irregular and triangular shaped, it was very difficult to fit a station on the property but Angel Lamela, Division Manager of MDFR's Facilities and Construction Division, made it happen. As such, there wasn't much that could be done except increase the landscape buffer along the north property line. The neighbors also asked that MDFR keep the west property line closed at all time; no driveways. They do not want the fire truck driving through their neighborhood. The Fire Chief agreed to all conditions. At the end of the workshop, the neighbors were satisfied with the meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><i>What happened at the March 6, 2017 Village Council meeting?</i></b></li> </ul>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>○ On March 6 MDFR went back before the Council where it was announced that the workshop was held. Some neighbors spoke in opposition to the Fire station and some neighbors expressed support. The Mayor closed the meeting and allowed the Council to ask questions. The Fire Chief responded to all questions and after hearing both sides the Council unanimously approved the site plan as modified. Presently efforts are underway to schedule the item before Committee and BCC.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b>  According to the Miami-Dade County Property Appraiser's website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2016 Market Value for Folio #33-5034-023-0510 is \$654,298; and</li> <li>• The 2016 Assessed Value is \$564,880.</li> </ul>
<b>8F5</b> <b>162928</b>	RESOLUTION ADDING CERTAIN CAPITAL PROJECTS TO THE APPROVED LIST OF ECONOMIC STIMULUS PROJECTS PURSUANT TO THE COUNTY'S ECONOMIC STIMULUS PLAN; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXERCISE THE AUTHORITY UNDER SECTION 2-8.2.7 OF THE COUNTY CODE WITH RESPECT TO ADDED PROJECTS
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves adding 38 projects to the County's Economic Stimulus Plan (ESP) approved list of projects.</p> <p>The addition to the County's ESP-approved list of projects will allow the projects to benefit from the expedited process currently in place under the ESP program. Ordinance No. 08-92 established the ESP program and Resolution No. R-851-08 identified the original list of ESP projects. Section 2-8.2.7 of the Code provides that the BCC may add projects to the ESP list as necessary.</p> <p>Each project being added to the ESP approved list of projects is funded in the FY 2016-17 Proposed Budget and Multi-Year Capital Plan.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b>  The projects listed are currently going through different stages of development and, in all cases, the appropriate selection process and/or invitation to bid will be conducted in order to acquire the services of consultants and contractors. The ESP continues to allow projects to be processed at an accelerated pace, and tracks the number of jobs that each project is expected to create.</p>
<b>8F6</b> <b>170009</b>	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ACCESS OF THE U.S. COMMUNITIES FAIRFAX COUNTY CONTRACT NO. RFP200001701 THROUGH APRIL 30, 2019 FOR THE PURCHASE OF TECHNOLOGY PRODUCTS, SERVICES, SOLUTIONS AND RELATED PRODUCTS AND SERVICES FOR THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$19,400,000.00; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO ACCESS SAME AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE MIAMI-DADE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves the access of a competitively procured and awarded U.S. Communities Fairfax County Contract No. RFP200001701, Technology Products, Services, Solutions and Related Products and Services, for the Information Technology Department for a term through April 30, 2019 in the amount of \$19,400,000.00.</p> <p>The contract permits members of the U.S. Communities contracting group, like Miami-Dade County, to purchase hardware, software, and associated services from multiple manufacturers and service providers through a competitively established discount structure. This allows for the purchase of turnkey solutions not available through other sourced contracts.</p> <p>Projects under this contract include, but are not limited to, wireless, security and web filtering projects for the Aviation Department; parking system digital signage and surveillance cameras for PortMiami; and security and access control for the Fire Rescue and Public Housing and Community Development Departments.</p> <p>The requested expenditure authority will be used as follows:</p>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes										
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grant-funded purchases for the PortMiami, Miami-Dade Fire Rescue, and Public Housing and Community Development Departments totaling \$4,750,000.</li> <li>Support of countywide information technology needs totaling \$14,650,000.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Background</u></b>  The County previously accessed this contract under the Mayor's delegated authority with an allocation of \$500,000 for a term of 33 months which expires on April 30, 2019. This initial access was intended to meet the Information Technology Department's immediate needs while this separate item was prepared for BCC approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the current contract term was from September 16, 2016 through April 30, 2019.</i></li> <li><i>Although Contract No. RFP200001701 was originally accessed under the Mayor's delegated authority for \$500,000, were vendors recommended for award competitively selected?</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b>  The fiscal impact through April 30, 2019 is \$19,400,000. The contract contains four (4) one-year options to renew. <b>The options to renew will be presented to the BCC for approval prior to exercising them.</b> The previous contract, 4400001195, was valued at \$13,850,000 for 26 months. The requested expenditure authority is based on projected needs for identified projects.</p> <p><b><u>Vendors Recommended for Award</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carahsoft Technology Corp. - 1860 Michael Faraday Drive, Suite 100, Reston, VA</li> <li>DLT Solutions, LLC - 2411 Dulles Corner Park, Suite 800, Herndon, VA</li> <li>Insight Public Sector, Inc. - 6820 South Harl Avenue, Tempe, AZ</li> <li>Unicom Government, Inc. - 2553 Dulles View Drive, Suite 100, Herndon, VA</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Awardee</th><th>Category Awarded</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Carahsoft Technology Corporation</td><td>Google Products, Services and Solutions</td></tr> <tr> <td>DLT Solutions, LLC</td><td>Amazon Web Services, Products, and Solutions</td></tr> <tr> <td>Insight Public Sector, Inc.</td><td>Technology Products Technology Services and Solutions Cisco Products, Services and Solutions HP Products, Services and Solutions Dell Products, Services and Solutions Panasonic Products, Services and Solutions EMC-2- Products, Services and Solutions CommVault Products, Services and Solutions Symantec Products, Services and Solutions Veritas Products, Services and Solutions VMWare Products, Services and Solutions Apple Products, Services and Solutions Microsoft Products, Services and Solutions Citrix Products, Services and Solutions NetApp Products, Services and Solutions Related Products, Services and Solutions</td></tr> <tr> <td>Unicom Government, Inc.</td><td>Technology Services and Solutions</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The category of Technology Services and Solutions has been awarded to two vendors, therefore the Information Technology Department will issue requests for quotes to both awarded vendors in order to achieve the lowest cost. This category includes products and services such as virtualization, physical security, communications, cloud, infrastructure, data management, visual communications, unified communications and collaboration, broadcast studio solutions, law enforcement solutions, mobility, asset management, data protection, energy and water conservation, and financial services.</p>	Awardee	Category Awarded	Carahsoft Technology Corporation	Google Products, Services and Solutions	DLT Solutions, LLC	Amazon Web Services, Products, and Solutions	Insight Public Sector, Inc.	Technology Products Technology Services and Solutions Cisco Products, Services and Solutions HP Products, Services and Solutions Dell Products, Services and Solutions Panasonic Products, Services and Solutions EMC-2- Products, Services and Solutions CommVault Products, Services and Solutions Symantec Products, Services and Solutions Veritas Products, Services and Solutions VMWare Products, Services and Solutions Apple Products, Services and Solutions Microsoft Products, Services and Solutions Citrix Products, Services and Solutions NetApp Products, Services and Solutions Related Products, Services and Solutions	Unicom Government, Inc.	Technology Services and Solutions
Awardee	Category Awarded										
Carahsoft Technology Corporation	Google Products, Services and Solutions										
DLT Solutions, LLC	Amazon Web Services, Products, and Solutions										
Insight Public Sector, Inc.	Technology Products Technology Services and Solutions Cisco Products, Services and Solutions HP Products, Services and Solutions Dell Products, Services and Solutions Panasonic Products, Services and Solutions EMC-2- Products, Services and Solutions CommVault Products, Services and Solutions Symantec Products, Services and Solutions Veritas Products, Services and Solutions VMWare Products, Services and Solutions Apple Products, Services and Solutions Microsoft Products, Services and Solutions Citrix Products, Services and Solutions NetApp Products, Services and Solutions Related Products, Services and Solutions										
Unicom Government, Inc.	Technology Services and Solutions										
<b>8F7 170156</b>	<b>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$514,000.00 FOR PREQUALIFICATION POOL NO. 1233-5/19-2 FOR PURCHASE OF ELEVATOR</b>										



**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND MODERNIZATION SERVICES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes increased expenditure authority of \$514,000 to Contract Number 1233-5/19-2, Elevator Maintenance, Repair, and Modernization Services, for the Department of Transportation and Public Works.</p> <p>The original contract awarded Groups 1 to 6 to provide scheduled maintenance and repair services for elevators, escalators and related equipment. The groups were divided by departments. In addition, Group 7 established a pre-qualification pool used for modernization services. The contract allows for additional departments and facilities to be added as needed.</p> <p>The Transportation and Public Works Department's current allocation has been depleted as a result of increased routine maintenance and the replacement of miscellaneous parts required to comply with the existing elevator safety codes. Elevators serviced under this contract are over 32 years old and have worn down components, which limits the availability of elevators as well as increases the cost of repairs and replacement parts. The requested increase in expenditure authority will provide for an increased maintenance schedule as well as the purchase of five (5) replacement jack heads, new elevator cab glass for several locations, replacement door sills at the Dadeland South and Dadeland North Metrorail Stations, and hall stations and car panel replacements at the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>This contract was established by the BCC in May 2010 for a five-year term with five (5), one-year option to renew terms. The contract is currently in its second option to renew term, which expires on May 31, 2017, and has an existing cumulative allocation of \$8,989,000. The contract has been modified multiple times for additional expenditure authority. If the requested modification is approved, the contract will have a modified value of \$9,503,000.</p> <p><b><u>Awarded Vendor</u></b></p> <p>ThyssenKrupp Elevator Corporation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11605 Haynes Bridge Road, Suite 650, Alpharetta, GA</li> <li>• 7481 NW 66 Street, Miami, FL</li> </ul> <p>There are no current performance issues with the awarded vendor on this contract. However, previous performance issues and contractual disagreements were addressed with the vendor, pursuant to the terms and conditions of the contract. Those issues were amicably resolved. Additionally, <b>the County removed this vendor from a contract for elevator services at public housing facilities for failure to perform and, since then, their performance on this subject contract and others has been satisfactory.</b></p> <p><b>The OCA posed the following questions, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>What were the performance issues and contractual disagreements?</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There were issues related to contract enforcement, including (1) deficiencies in work (nonadherence to contractual timeframes to correct deficient work); (2) emergency service response time fails to comply with contractual requirements; and (3) work acceptance issues (elevator stalls and/or breaks down after it has been serviced).</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><i>What were the issues regarding failure to perform?</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>As indicated in the above response, the main issues are: (1) response time is unsatisfactory (repair of down equipment takes an unreasonable amount of time to remedy); (2) inspections violations are not cured in a timely fashion; and (3) many elevator certificates are delinquent.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><i>Did the company commit any violations?</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Failure to comply with contractual duties stipulated in the maintenance agreement is considered a contract violation. An example of such a violation is the delayed vendor response time for emergency services calls, resulting in elevators being inoperable for weeks.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><i>How were they resolved?</i></b></li> </ul>



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>ISD's Office of Elevator Safety issues VNP (vendor non-performance) reports and meets with the vendor to discuss and resolve outstanding issues.</i></li> <li>• <b>Which public housing facilities?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>VNPs were issued for Edison Plaza, Lemon City, Palm Courts and Smathers Plaza.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Current Contract No. 1233-5/19</u></b></p> <p>On May 4, 2010, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-498-10, approved an award of Contract No. 1233-5/19 for elevator maintenance services and modernization of elevator equipment for various County departments. The amount requested was \$3,474,000 for five years with five, one-year OTR periods.</p> <p>According to R-498-10, the purpose of the solicitation was to establish a contract for purchase of elevator maintenance services for six County departments and planned modernization of elevator equipment for specific departments. The contract was divided into groups by departments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group 1 – Miami-Dade Aviation Department</li> <li>• Group 2 – General Services Administration</li> <li>• Group 3 – Miami-Dade Public Housing Agency</li> <li>• Group 4 – Miami-Dade Police Department</li> <li>• Group 5 – Miami-Dade Public Library</li> <li>• Group 6 – Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department</li> <li>• Group 7 established a pool of vendors to perform future modernization of elevator equipment for all County departments using work order competitions.</li> </ul> <p>R-498-10 states that Oracle Corporation was declared non-responsible for Groups 1 through 7 for failure to have an electrical and mechanical engineer on staff, as required by the contract.</p> <p><b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Did other companies submit bids?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No, only ThyssenKrupp.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>On October 2, 2012, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-841-12, modified Contract No. 1233-5/19 for an additional \$633,000 in spending authority to allow the Public Housing and Community Development Department to purchase elevator modernization services. These elevators were located at the following public housing projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lemon City (2 elevators)</li> <li>• Edison Plaza (2 elevators)</li> <li>• Smathers Plaza High Rise (2 elevators)</li> <li>• Smathers Plaza Apartments Low Rise (2 elevators)</li> </ul> <p><i>According to the proposed resolution, the County removed ThyssenKrupp Elevator Corporation from a contract for elevator services at public housing facilities for failure to perform and, since then, their performance on this subject contract and others has been satisfactory.</i></p> <p>On March 5, 2013, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-158-13, modified the prequalification pool for Contract NO. 1233-5/19 for an additional \$1,127,000 in spending authority so Miami-Dade Transit can purchase elevator maintenance, services and modernization services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Was Group 8 created for Miami-Dade Transit?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>R-158-13 states the pricing offered by this modification was approximately 49% lower than pricing on the existing Elevator Maintenance Services contract (0058-2/14-1), for which Miami-Dade Transit was the sole participating department.</i></li> <li>○ <i>According to ISD staff, Group 8 is for PROS, and Group 14 is for DTPW.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Have vendors been added to the pool since the original award?</b></li> </ul>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																																						
	<p>○ No additional vendors have been added.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Contract No. 1233-5/19 According to the Bid Tracking System</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Original Term</b> <b>R-498-10</b> 1233-5/19-2 6/1/2010-5/31/2015</td><td>\$3,474,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 1/8/2011</td><td>\$363,627.76</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 7/3/2012</td><td>\$189,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-841-12</b> 10/2/2012</td><td>\$633,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-841-12</b> 10/2/2012</td><td>\$3,372.24</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-158-13</b> 3/5/2013</td><td>\$1,127,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 4/4/2013</td><td>\$141,024</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 5/1/2013</td><td>\$20,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 5/21/2013</td><td>\$12,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 6/25/2014</td><td>\$250,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 7/22/2014</td><td>\$30,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for Original Term</b></td><td><b>\$6,243,024</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>First OTR</b> 1233-5/19-1 6/1/2015-5/31/2016</td><td><b>\$1,247,979.25</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Second OTR</b> 1233-5/19-2 6/1/2016-5/31/2017</td><td>\$1,247,979.25</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 10/31/2016</td><td>\$241,755.20</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 11/1/2016</td><td>\$7,844.80</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b></td><td><b>\$1,497,579.25</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Cumulative Contract Total</b></td><td><b>\$8,988,582.50</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Relevant Legislation</u></b></p> <p>On July 7, 2005, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-864-05, established a replacement contract and awarded Otis Elevator Company Contract No. SS4416-15/25 in the amount of \$7,870,777 to provide maintenance services for the County's existing elevator and escalator equipment. According to R-864-05, Otis Elevator Company was the sole authorized equipment manufacturer representative and distributor for the original equipment manufacturer (OEM) parts, proprietary software and hardware for the Otis elevator and escalator equipment utilized by the County.</p> <p><b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p>	Additional Information on Contract No. 1233-5/19 According to the Bid Tracking System		<b>Original Term</b> <b>R-498-10</b> 1233-5/19-2 6/1/2010-5/31/2015	\$3,474,000	<b>Modification</b> 1/8/2011	\$363,627.76	<b>Modification</b> 7/3/2012	\$189,000	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-841-12</b> 10/2/2012	\$633,000	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-841-12</b> 10/2/2012	\$3,372.24	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-158-13</b> 3/5/2013	\$1,127,000	<b>Modification</b> 4/4/2013	\$141,024	<b>Modification</b> 5/1/2013	\$20,000	<b>Modification</b> 5/21/2013	\$12,000	<b>Modification</b> 6/25/2014	\$250,000	<b>Modification</b> 7/22/2014	\$30,000	<b>Total Amount for Original Term</b>	<b>\$6,243,024</b>	<b>First OTR</b> 1233-5/19-1 6/1/2015-5/31/2016	<b>\$1,247,979.25</b>	<b>Second OTR</b> 1233-5/19-2 6/1/2016-5/31/2017	\$1,247,979.25	<b>Modification</b> 10/31/2016	\$241,755.20	<b>Modification</b> 11/1/2016	\$7,844.80	<b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b>	<b>\$1,497,579.25</b>	<b>Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$8,988,582.50</b>
Additional Information on Contract No. 1233-5/19 According to the Bid Tracking System																																							
<b>Original Term</b> <b>R-498-10</b> 1233-5/19-2 6/1/2010-5/31/2015	\$3,474,000																																						
<b>Modification</b> 1/8/2011	\$363,627.76																																						
<b>Modification</b> 7/3/2012	\$189,000																																						
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-841-12</b> 10/2/2012	\$633,000																																						
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-841-12</b> 10/2/2012	\$3,372.24																																						
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-158-13</b> 3/5/2013	\$1,127,000																																						
<b>Modification</b> 4/4/2013	\$141,024																																						
<b>Modification</b> 5/1/2013	\$20,000																																						
<b>Modification</b> 5/21/2013	\$12,000																																						
<b>Modification</b> 6/25/2014	\$250,000																																						
<b>Modification</b> 7/22/2014	\$30,000																																						
<b>Total Amount for Original Term</b>	<b>\$6,243,024</b>																																						
<b>First OTR</b> 1233-5/19-1 6/1/2015-5/31/2016	<b>\$1,247,979.25</b>																																						
<b>Second OTR</b> 1233-5/19-2 6/1/2016-5/31/2017	\$1,247,979.25																																						
<b>Modification</b> 10/31/2016	\$241,755.20																																						
<b>Modification</b> 11/1/2016	\$7,844.80																																						
<b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b>	<b>\$1,497,579.25</b>																																						
<b>Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$8,988,582.50</b>																																						

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes																				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>R-864-05 states that proceeds from the Charter County Transit System Sales Surtax may be used to pay for part of the costs of this contract for Miami-Dade Transit only.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>How much was allocated from Surtax funds?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>\$576,680.00 were allocated.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>On May 7, 2013, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-348-13, modified sole source Contract No. SS4416-15/25 for additional spending authority in the amount of \$510,000 for Miami-Dade Transit to upgrade three escalators, manufactured by Otis Elevator Co., at the Tri-Rail Station.</p> <p><b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>R-348-13 authorized the use of Charter County Surtax Funds.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>How much was allocated from Surtax funds?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>\$510,000.00 were allocated.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>On March 7, 2017, the BCC, through Resolution No. R- 225-17, authorized increased expenditure authority of \$3,600,000 to Contract No. SS4416-15/25-2, Elevator Maintenance Services for Otis Elevators, for the Internal Services Department to cover the cost of services at the Richard E. Gerstein Justice Building as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modernization of three (3) passenger elevators and 10 escalators that were installed in 1959.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ While routine maintenance has been performed on the escalators, including a step track retrofit replacement in the 1980s, the equipment has not been upgraded since installation;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Adding approximately 15 safety features that are standard requirements for new escalators; and</li> <li>• Elevator microprocessor computer-based controls with solid state drives to make the elevator group more efficient and better able to handle the foot traffic.</li> </ul> <p><b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Were surtax funds allocated for Resolution No. R-225-17?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No surtax funds were allocated. This modification was for ISD's Facilities and Utilities Management Division for modernization of three passenger elevators and 10 escalators at the Gerstein Justice Building.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Contract No. SS4416-15/25 According to the Bid Tracking System</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>SS4416-15/25</b> R-864-05 10/1/2005-9/30/2010</td><td>\$7,871,227</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 12/8/2008</td><td>\$36,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount of Original Contract Term</b></td><td><b>\$7,907,227</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>First OTR</b> SS4416-15/25-1 10/1/2010-9/30/2015</td><td>\$8,152,351.04</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> R-348-13 5/7/2013</td><td>\$510,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> R-348-13 5/7/2013</td><td>\$648.96</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount of First OTR</b></td><td><b>\$8,663,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Second OTR</b> SS4416-15/25-2 10/1/2015-9/30/2020</td><td><b>\$8,663,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Current Cumulative Contract Total</b></td><td><b>\$25,233,227</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on Contract No. SS4416-15/25 According to the Bid Tracking System		<b>SS4416-15/25</b> R-864-05 10/1/2005-9/30/2010	\$7,871,227	<b>Modification</b> 12/8/2008	\$36,000	<b>Total Amount of Original Contract Term</b>	<b>\$7,907,227</b>	<b>First OTR</b> SS4416-15/25-1 10/1/2010-9/30/2015	\$8,152,351.04	<b>Modification</b> R-348-13 5/7/2013	\$510,000	<b>Modification</b> R-348-13 5/7/2013	\$648.96	<b>Total Amount of First OTR</b>	<b>\$8,663,000</b>	<b>Second OTR</b> SS4416-15/25-2 10/1/2015-9/30/2020	<b>\$8,663,000</b>	<b>Current Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$25,233,227</b>
Additional Information on Contract No. SS4416-15/25 According to the Bid Tracking System																					
<b>SS4416-15/25</b> R-864-05 10/1/2005-9/30/2010	\$7,871,227																				
<b>Modification</b> 12/8/2008	\$36,000																				
<b>Total Amount of Original Contract Term</b>	<b>\$7,907,227</b>																				
<b>First OTR</b> SS4416-15/25-1 10/1/2010-9/30/2015	\$8,152,351.04																				
<b>Modification</b> R-348-13 5/7/2013	\$510,000																				
<b>Modification</b> R-348-13 5/7/2013	\$648.96																				
<b>Total Amount of First OTR</b>	<b>\$8,663,000</b>																				
<b>Second OTR</b> SS4416-15/25-2 10/1/2015-9/30/2020	<b>\$8,663,000</b>																				
<b>Current Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$25,233,227</b>																				

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>The OCA posed the following questions, to which ISD staff responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Contract No. SS4416-15/25 and Contract No. 1233-5/19 both provide similar services for many of the same departments.</b></li> <li>• <b><i>Can you explain why? Are departments using different companies for elevator replacement and repairs in different facilities?</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Contract No. SS4416 is a sole source contract for Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) parts, proprietary software and hardware for Otis elevator and escalator equipment used by the County; Otis Elevator Company is the sole authorized equipment manufacturer and the only company authorized to service its elevator and escalator equipment at the County. On the other hand, Contract No. 1233-5/19 was competitively solicited and awarded to ThyssenKrupp for maintenance, modernization and emergency services to passenger elevators, moving walks, dumbwaiters and wheelchair lifts at County facilities.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><i>Why not use one pool for all services?</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>A pool would not be practical for these services due to OEM implications. There are currently four sole source contracts each awarded to an OEM such as Kone, Otis and Schindler, and there are two competitive contracts for maintenance and repair services, 1233-5/19 and 9103-5/19.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>8F8 170185</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING AWARD OF CONTRACT NO. RFP-00152 TO RESORTS WORLD MIAMI, LLC WITH A POSITIVE FISCAL IMPACT TO THE COUNTY OF APPROXIMATELY \$54,850,000.00 OVER THE INITIAL 90-YEAR TERM OF THE LEASE AND PROVIDING FOR THE JOINT DEVELOPMENT AT THE OMNI BUS TERMINAL AND ADRIENNE ARSHT CENTER METROMOVER STATION SITE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS; APPROVING THE LEASE AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, LEASE AGREEMENT FOR AN INTERIM BUS TERMINAL, AND THE EASEMENT, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38; AND DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PROVIDE AN EXECUTED COPY OF THE LEASE AGREEMENT TO THE PROPERTY APPRAISER'S OFFICE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE EXECUTION OF THE AGREEMENT</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p>	<p>The proposed resolution approves award of Contract No. RFP-00152, Joint Development at the Omni Bus Terminal with Access to Adjacent Adrienne Arsht Center Metromover Station, to Resorts World Miami, LLC (Resorts World) for the development of the Omni Bus Terminal and Adrienne Arsht Center Metromover Station, including air rights over the real property, for the Department of Transportation and Public Works.</p> <p>The County issued a solicitation seeking proposals from experienced developers to achieve the highest and best economic and transit-related use of the Omni Bus Terminal and the Adrienne Arsht Center Metromover Station.</p> <p>The project includes a revenue-generating mixed-use development that (1) promotes maximum patronage of the transit system; (2) provides functional and aesthetic integration of the Adrienne Arsht Metromover Station and Omni Bus Terminal into the overall project; and (3) upgrades and/or redesigns the Metromover station, including the replacement of stairs, elevators, escalators, surveillance systems and flooring, while enhancing site illumination and pedestrian accessibility.</p> <p>The Omni Bus Terminal and Adrienne Arsht Center Metromover Station (development site) is located within the City of Miami and consists of seven (7) contiguous parcels of property totaling approximately 0.987 acres. The negotiated agreements for the development site with Resorts World consist of a Development Agreement, Lease Agreement and an Easement. The easement is needed for construction-related development site ingress and egress. According to the terms of its proposal, Resorts World plans to construct a 300-room hotel and residential service apartments over the expanded bus terminal with retail space at ground level. Resorts World will also make numerous upgrades to the existing transit infrastructure, valued at approximately \$22 million. Under the Development Agreement, Resorts World will submit all design and construction plans to the Department of Transportation and Public Works for review and approval prior to commencing any work on the project.</p> <p>In addition to increasing density around the Adrienne Arsht Metromover Station, the proposed development project provides a substantial long-term revenue source for the County over the 90-year initial term of the lease.</p>

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>The proposed Development Agreement requires the developer to pay \$100,000 in minimum rent to the Department per year through the construction period of the project. Thereafter, the developer will make a one-time \$10 million payment to the County, and, subsequently, pay either 50 percent of gross revenues realized from the retail portion of the development, or \$300,000 per year, whichever is greater.</p> <p>While under construction, it is forecasted that the project will create 1,871 jobs and, once completed, will create 171 direct jobs. It will also stimulate the creation of 100 additional indirect jobs and provide significant revenue to the County and the City of Miami in the form of ad valorem taxes and impact fees.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>There will neither be County nor other governmental funding required to complete this project as it will be exclusively financed by the developer. There will be a positive fiscal impact to the County in the form of rent and transit improvements. The 90-year lease will generate an estimated \$54,850,000 over the term of the lease with a Net Present Value of \$26,862,569. All revenues will accrue to the Department of Transportation and Public Works.</p> <p><b><u>Vendor Recommended for Award</u></b></p> <p>A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued under full and open competition on January 27, 2015. It was expected that there may be limited interest in this project due to the scale, nature (i.e., air rights over the real property) and location of the development site. Accordingly, one (1) proposal was received in response to the solicitation. The RFP method of award was used to obtain the best value to the County by conducting a qualitative review of proposals. The criteria used to evaluate proposals included the proposer's approach to the development site, experience, financial projections and strength and capability to secure financing. Resorts World is a foreign limited liability company formed for the purpose of submitting a proposal in response to this solicitation and thus currently has no employees to report in the chart below.</p> <p>Resorts World Miami, LLC, 1501 Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 500 Miami, FL</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information – Committee Meeting Discussion</u></b></p> <p>During the Transportation and Public Works Committee meeting on March 16, 2017, the proposed resolution was discussed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Committee requested clarification on the amount of jobs to be created and the payments for construction, who will oversee rev realized</i></li> <li>• <i>AB – explained that the revenues would come back into the transit system</i></li> <li>• <i>The Committee asked when the project must be completed by, to which the Director explained that there was a 4 year window to initiate the construction for retail space. Once construction was underway, building permit requirements would apply to complete construction within building permit term.</i></li> <li>• <i>In response to the Committee's questions, the Director clarified that within the 4 years, the company will be paying \$100,000 a year as well as building the bus terminal facility which has a value of \$22 million.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Committee asked if there was anything in the contract that stipulates what would happen if the company does not abide by the terms of the contract, to which the Director stated the County would default them.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Committee asked if there were any conceptual drawings for what was being proposed.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Director noted that in terms of the bus terminal facility, there was basically an outdoor waiting area with some limited type of canopies. She noted that what would be constructed for the bus terminal is an air-conditioned facility with amenities.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>8F9 170224</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL TIME OF FIVE YEARS AND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$2,250,000.00 FOR PREQUALIFICATION POOL NO. 8661-10/19-7 FOR PURCHASE OF TECHNICAL APPLICATION TRAINING SERVICES FOR THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SOLICIT PRICING, AWARD CONTRACTS, EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS AND ANY RESULTING CONTRACTS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38, AND ADD VENDORS TO THE POOL AT ANY TIME, SUBJECT TO RATIFICATION BY THE BOARD ON A BI-ANNUAL BASIS</p>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution approves an extension of Prequalification Pool No. 8661-10/19-7, <b>Technical</b> Application Training Services, for the Human Resources Department for five (5) additional years and increase expenditure authority by \$2,250,000.</p> <p>This pool was established under delegated authority in July 2008 for one (1) year with 10, one-year options to renew. This pool is administered by the Human Resources Department on behalf of all County departments and is used to purchase technical application training in a variety of areas, such as Citrix, UNIX, Symantec, PeopleSoft, Novell, Crystal Reports, and Microsoft Developer. The training delivery methods include classroom, instructor led, mentoring, e-learning and on-site. When there is a specific departmental need, a spot market competition is conducted to obtain pricing for the requested training services, maximizing flexibility and ensuring award based on lowest price or best value.</p> <p>The requirements and terms and conditions of the pool would not change if a replacement solicitation were to be issued. It is anticipated that the same vendors would prequalify for the replacement solicitation. Additional qualified vendors may be added to the pool at any time during the term of the pool, subject to bi-annual ratification by the BCC. This prequalification pool will remain advertised on the Internal Services Department's website to encourage additional participation. Outreach to registered vendors is conducted to increase the number of prequalified vendors.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>This prequalification pool is in its seventh option to renew term and expires on May 31, 2017. The pool's existing cumulative value is \$2,842,000 for eight (8) years and six (6) months. <b>For administrative efficiencies, rather than requesting approval to exercise the three (3) remaining one-year options to renew, the Human Resources Department is requesting a five-year extension of the pool.</b> The requested allocation of \$2,250,000 is based on anticipated usage during the five-year extension period and is consistent with the allocation for the current yearly option to renew term. If this extension is approved, the pool's cumulative value would be an estimated \$5,092,000, and the pool's expiration date would be February 28, 2022.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>According to ISD staff, a cost and time avoidance are realized by not re-soliciting the pool with the same qualification criteria as the current pool as the same vendors in the current pool would, most probably, be the same vendors to submit qualifications for the replacement pool.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Prequalified Vendors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bias Corporation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 825 Lake Ridge Road, Tallahassee, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• GEB Computer Training, LTD dba New Horizons Computer Learning Centers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 400 N Pine Island Road, Number 300, Plantation, FL</li> <li>○ 7757 W Flagler Street, Number 200, Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Global Knowledge Training, LLC aka GK Holdings, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 9000 Regency Parkway, Suite 400, Cary, NC</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Homnick Systems, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 902 Clint Moore Road, Suite 235, Boca Raton, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ironside Group, Inc. aka The Ironside Group, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 10 Maguire Road, Building 4, Lexington, MA</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Lynda.Com, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 6410 Via Real, Carpinteria, CA</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Miami Dade College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 11011 SW 104 Street, Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Spears Holdings, Inc. dba Productivity Point Global <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1580 Sawgrass Corporate Parkway, Number 205, Sunrise, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Academy of South Florida, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3721-1 NW 7th Street, Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Transamerica Training Management, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 6505 Blue Lagoon Drive, Number 105, Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																												
	<p><b><u>Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8661-10/19-7</u></b>  Prequalification Pool No. 8661-10/19-7 was awarded under the Mayor's delegated authority in July of 2008 for one year with 10, one-year options to renew.</p> <p>On October 2, 2012, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-840-12, authorized the fourth and fifth OTR terms for the purchase of technical training to support County employees. The total amount requested for these two OTR terms was \$900,000.</p> <p>On February 3, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-118-15, authorized the sixth and seventh OTR terms to purchase technical application training for the Human Resources Department on behalf of all County departments in an amount of \$900,000. R-118-15 extended the prequalification pool contract until February 19, 2017.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8661-10/19-7 According to the Bid Tracking System</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Original Term</b> 8661-10/19 <i>Awarded under Mayor's delegated authority.</i> 8/20/2008-8/19/2009</td><td>\$90,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 12/6/2008</td><td>\$160,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for Original Term</b></td><td><b>\$250,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>First OTR</b> 8661-10/19-1 8/20/2009-8/19/2010</td><td><b>\$250,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Second OTR</b> 8661-10/19-2 8/20/2010-8/19/2011</td><td><b>\$250,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Third OTR</b> 8661-10/19-3 8/20/2011-8/19/2012 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 10/19/2012.</i></td><td>\$100,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 3/23/2012</td><td>\$115,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 5/3/2012</td><td>\$35,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Proration</b></td><td>\$41,666.67</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for Third OTR</b></td><td><b>\$291,666.67</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Fourth OTR</b> 8661-10/19-4 <b>R-840-12</b> 10/20/2012-10/19/2013</td><td><b>\$450,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Fifth OTR</b> 8661-10/19-5 <b>R-840-12</b> 10/20/2013-10/19/2014 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 2/19/2015.</i></td><td><b>\$450,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Sixth OTR</b> 8661-10/19-6 <b>R-118-15</b> 2/20/2015-2/19/2016</td><td><b>\$450,000</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8661-10/19-7 According to the Bid Tracking System		<b>Original Term</b> 8661-10/19 <i>Awarded under Mayor's delegated authority.</i> 8/20/2008-8/19/2009	\$90,000	<b>Modification</b> 12/6/2008	\$160,000	<b>Total Amount for Original Term</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>	<b>First OTR</b> 8661-10/19-1 8/20/2009-8/19/2010	<b>\$250,000</b>	<b>Second OTR</b> 8661-10/19-2 8/20/2010-8/19/2011	<b>\$250,000</b>	<b>Third OTR</b> 8661-10/19-3 8/20/2011-8/19/2012 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 10/19/2012.</i>	\$100,000	<b>Modification</b> 3/23/2012	\$115,000	<b>Modification</b> 5/3/2012	\$35,000	<b>Proration</b>	\$41,666.67	<b>Total Amount for Third OTR</b>	<b>\$291,666.67</b>	<b>Fourth OTR</b> 8661-10/19-4 <b>R-840-12</b> 10/20/2012-10/19/2013	<b>\$450,000</b>	<b>Fifth OTR</b> 8661-10/19-5 <b>R-840-12</b> 10/20/2013-10/19/2014 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 2/19/2015.</i>	<b>\$450,000</b>	<b>Sixth OTR</b> 8661-10/19-6 <b>R-118-15</b> 2/20/2015-2/19/2016	<b>\$450,000</b>
Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8661-10/19-7 According to the Bid Tracking System																													
<b>Original Term</b> 8661-10/19 <i>Awarded under Mayor's delegated authority.</i> 8/20/2008-8/19/2009	\$90,000																												
<b>Modification</b> 12/6/2008	\$160,000																												
<b>Total Amount for Original Term</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>																												
<b>First OTR</b> 8661-10/19-1 8/20/2009-8/19/2010	<b>\$250,000</b>																												
<b>Second OTR</b> 8661-10/19-2 8/20/2010-8/19/2011	<b>\$250,000</b>																												
<b>Third OTR</b> 8661-10/19-3 8/20/2011-8/19/2012 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 10/19/2012.</i>	\$100,000																												
<b>Modification</b> 3/23/2012	\$115,000																												
<b>Modification</b> 5/3/2012	\$35,000																												
<b>Proration</b>	\$41,666.67																												
<b>Total Amount for Third OTR</b>	<b>\$291,666.67</b>																												
<b>Fourth OTR</b> 8661-10/19-4 <b>R-840-12</b> 10/20/2012-10/19/2013	<b>\$450,000</b>																												
<b>Fifth OTR</b> 8661-10/19-5 <b>R-840-12</b> 10/20/2013-10/19/2014 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 2/19/2015.</i>	<b>\$450,000</b>																												
<b>Sixth OTR</b> 8661-10/19-6 <b>R-118-15</b> 2/20/2015-2/19/2016	<b>\$450,000</b>																												

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes		
		<b>Seventh OTR</b> 8661-10/19-7 <b>R-118-15</b> 2/20/2016-2/19/2017 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 5/31/2017.</i>	<b>\$450,000</b>
		<b>Cumulative Contract Amount</b>	<b>\$2,841,666.67</b>
	<b>Additional Information on Relevant Legislation</b>		
	<b>R-841-06</b> 7/6/2006	Provided that whenever prior BCC approval is required for award of a successor contract or extension of an existing contract in order to assure no hiatus in the provision of goods or services to the County, the County Manager will present the request for such approval to the BCC no later than <b>thirty (30)</b> days before the existing contract expires or needs to be extended.	
	<b>O-09-52</b> 6/30/2009	<p>Further defined the conditions for delegated authority of the Mayor or Mayor's designee to award contracts without BCC approval.</p> <p>The County Manager is delegated the authority to award and reject bids or proposals for contracts for public improvements (construction), and purchases of supplies, materials and services (including professional services, other than professional architectural, engineering and other services costing one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) or less, or in the case of miscellaneous construction contracts designed to provide opportunities for Community Small Business Enterprises specifically authorized by BCC resolution two and one-half million dollars (\$2,500,000.00) or less, without the need for action by the BCC.</p> <p>Specifically, O-09-52 provided that the authority to award contracts will not constitute authority for the County Manager to award any contract where the combined value for such contract's initial term and any options to renew would exceed the monetary limitations set forth above, and in such instances the BCC may delegate the authority to award such options to renew contemporaneously with the award of the contract.</p>	
	<b>R-98-12</b> 1/24/2012	<p>Provided that for all contracts for the purchase of goods and services governed by Administrative Order 3-38:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee evaluate and attempt to negotiate better pricing;</li> <li>• Before any option-to-renew period is exercised by the County on any contract, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee attempt to negotiate better pricing for the County; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In the event that the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee cannot secure better pricing, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee retains any existing authority to exercise option-to-renew periods.</li> <li>○ At the time any contract renewal is presented to the BCC for approval, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee will inform the BCC of the efforts undertaken to negotiate better pricing, the results of the negotiations and, if the County did not secure better pricing, a brief explanation as to why it is in the best interests of the County to renew the contract; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee delegate the authority to enter into contract amendments or modifications where such amendments or modifications reflect a reduction in pricing or costs to the County; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In the event that the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee negotiates an amendment or modification of an existing contract to reduce price or costs to the County in exchange for a longer term or other contractual concession, such amendments or modifications shall be brought to the BCC for approval; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee submit a report to the BCC within 180 days identifying all the contracts where the County successfully secured improved pricing and reduced costs to the County and identifying the total amount of cost savings to the County as a result of the negotiations directed under this resolution. Thereafter, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee would provide this report on a recurring annual basis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Has this been done?</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>O-13-67</b> 7/2/2013	<p>Amended Section 2-8.1, Contracts and Purchases Generally, of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), to exempt Legacy Purchases from competitive bidding. The County Mayor's contract award authority pursuant to Section 2-8.1(b) of the Code remained unchanged.</p> <p>Through O-13-67, Legacy Purchases were defined as the purchase of goods and services where competition is unavailable, impractical or constrained as a result of the need to continue to operate an existing County system which may not be replaced without substantial expenditure.</p> <p>The Code amendments provided for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created Subsection 2-8.1(b)(2), Legacy Purchases.</li> <li>Provided the following regulations and/or policy provisions for Legacy Purchases: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2-8.1(b)(1), formal sealed bids will not be required for Legacy Purchases which do not result in the budget for the user department(s) exceeding the amount approved by the BCC during the annual budget approval process.</li> <li>Such Legacy purchases may be awarded by the BCC upon a majority vote of those Board Members present, where the amount of such award exceeds the threshold for purchases by the Mayor set forth in Section 2-8.1(b)(1).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The County Mayor will include, in any Legacy Purchase award recommendation, a statement as to the need for such purchase and the provisions taken to reduce or eliminate the future need for Legacy Purchases for the particular good or service.</p>
<b>R-140-15</b> 2/3/2015	<p>Directed the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct, prior to the re-procurement of a replacement contract for an existing contract, a full review of the scopes of services and/or requested goods set forth in the replacement solicitation to ensure that the request accurately reflects the County's current needs; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Such review will be conducted with any and all user departments of the goods or services sought to be procured by the prospective contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Include in all recommendations to the BCC for a replacement contract a detailed description of the review conducted and identify any updates to the scope of service or goods requested from the previous contract; and</li> <li>Consult with the Small Business Development Division to ensure that all information included in the replacement solicitation is current and necessary to the County's solicitation of such good or service.</li> </ul>

### Additional Information – Committee Meeting Discussion

During the Government Operations Committee meeting on March 14, 2017, the proposed resolution was discussed as follows:

- The Committee expressed concerns regarding award of legacy contracts.*
- The ISD Director explained the purpose of extending the existing pool and explained that vendors have been added throughout the term. She explained that the addition of local vendors does not exist when there is a standard term contract.*
- The Director explained that if it was not requested that the pool be extended, a re-solicitation would have to be issued with a traditional term contract. ISD now has the flexibility to add local and other*

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><i>vendors along the way. She explained that the pool contracts allow for increased competition and increased locals on these pool contracts.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The Committee asked for clarification on what the Director defined as administrative efficiency, to which the Director explained that administrative efficiency was the amount of time it takes to issue a solicitation, gather requirements from the different departments, advertising solicitation, tallying bids and proposals, and preparing item for the BCC.</i></li> <li><i>The Director of ITD clarified that the proposed resolution related to the training of employees for the use of specific systems and products. He explained that it is not impossible to change systems like Peoplesoft, but it is impractical. He explained that the contract with Peoplesoft would be considered a legacy because it would be very expensive to replace. He noted that it was possible, after the depreciation cycle, to look at another system, but that it would be very expensive to do so.</i></li> <li><i>The Director of ISD clarified that this was coordinated and managed by human resources because it is specific to training for employees. Human Resources work with other departments as they are not the only users. She noted this was a centralized source of tracking of employees.</i></li> </ul>
<b>8F10 170314</b>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING AWARD OF CONTRACT NO. FB-00361 FOR PURCHASE OF CONTRACT EMPLOYEE SERVICES FOR VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENTS IN A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$118,711,000.00; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO GIVE NOTICE OF THIS AWARD, ISSUE THE APPROPRIATE PURCHASE ORDER TO GIVE EFFECT TO SAME AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves award of Contract No. FB-00361, Contract Employee Services, to support the operational needs of various County departments in the amount of \$118,711,000 for a five-year term.</p> <p>The solicitation includes approximately 163 positions, including, but not limited to, administrative, clerical, customer service, internship, laborer, professional, and information technology. Contract employees offer departments a cost-effective, flexible option to meet seasonal requirements, complete special projects, provide back up for permanent staff on maternity or medical leave, and support for other critical services and functions.</p> <p>The awarded vendors are responsible for advertising positions, recruiting contract employees, employment screening, and payroll administration. The awarded vendors are also responsible for maintaining a pool of available contract employees in order to fulfill the operational requirements of County departments as needed.</p> <p>This item is placed for Committee review pursuant to Miami-Dade County Code Section 29-124(f). The BCC may only consider this item if the Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) has forwarded a recommendation to the Board prior to the date scheduled for Board consideration or 45 days have elapsed since the issuance of this recommendation. If CITT has not forwarded a recommendation and 45 days have not elapsed since the issuance of this recommendation, a withdrawal of this item will be requested.</p> <p><b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Are surtax funds being used?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No, DTPW will not be using surtax funds.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>The fiscal impact for the five-year term is \$118,711,000. The previous contract, 9432-4/16, was valued at \$118,524,000 for five (5) years and six (6) months and expires on May 31, 2017.</p> <p>The method of award was to the three (3) lowest-priced responsive, responsible vendors on a line item basis by position. Each item was awarded based on a ranking system of one (1) through three (3), from the lowest price to the highest price.</p> <p><b><u>Vendors Recommended for Award</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>22<sup>nd</sup> Century Technologies, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Executive Drive, Suite 285, Somerset, NJ</li> </ul> </li> <li>A &amp; A Associates, Inc.</li> </ul>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																						
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 951 Sansbury Way West, Palm Beach, FL</li> <li>• Alpha 1 Staffing/Search Firm, LLC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3350 SW 148 Avenue, Suite 110, Miramar, FL</li> <li>○ 1111 Park Centre Boulevard, Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cbyrac, Inc. (SBE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 633 NE 167 Street, Suite 709, North Miami Beach, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Eagle Resource Group, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 12555 Orange Drive, Suite 237, Davie, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Integrated Holdings, Inc. (SBE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 520 NW 165 St. Road, Suite 212E, Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• PackPlus, Inc. dba Josmar Medical Staffing (DBE, SBE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 633 NE 167 Street, Suite 620, North Miami Beach, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Paramount Solutions &amp; Global Services, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 55 SE 2 Avenue, Delray Beach, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Royal Regions, Inc. (LDB, SBE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1031 SW 202 Street, Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Southern Health Care Corporation (SBE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 633 NE 167 Street, Suite 602, North Miami Beach, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Total Connection, Inc. (DBE, LDB, SBE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 20451 NW 2 Avenue, Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• TransHire dba Atrium Personnel, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3601 W Commercial Boulevard, Suite 12, Fort Lauderdale, FL</li> <li>○ 6625 Miami Lakes Drive, Miami Lakes, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Westaff (USA), Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1040 Crown Pointe Parkway, Suite 1040, Atlanta, GA</li> <li>○ 419 West 49 Street, Suite 104, Hialeah, FL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Worksquare, LLC (SBE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1444 Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 114, Miami, FL</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Previous Contract No. 9432-4/16 According to the Bid Stacking System</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Original Term 9432-4/16 <b>R-731-11</b> 12/1/2011-11/30/2012</td><td>\$12,826,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>Modification 2/21/2012</td><td>\$325,312</td></tr> <tr> <td>Modification 4/25/2012</td><td>\$100,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>Modification 6/28/2012</td><td>\$74,688</td></tr> <tr> <td>Modification 8/20/2012</td><td>\$400,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>Modification 10/5/2012</td><td>\$1,266,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for Original Contract Term</b></td><td><b>\$14,992,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td>First OTR 9432-4/16-1 12/1/2012-11/30/2013</td><td>\$14,992,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>Modification <b>R-16-13</b> 1/23/2013</td><td>\$365,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>Modification 3/13/2013</td><td>\$200,000</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on Previous Contract No. 9432-4/16 According to the Bid Stacking System		Original Term 9432-4/16 <b>R-731-11</b> 12/1/2011-11/30/2012	\$12,826,000	Modification 2/21/2012	\$325,312	Modification 4/25/2012	\$100,000	Modification 6/28/2012	\$74,688	Modification 8/20/2012	\$400,000	Modification 10/5/2012	\$1,266,000	<b>Total Amount for Original Contract Term</b>	<b>\$14,992,000</b>	First OTR 9432-4/16-1 12/1/2012-11/30/2013	\$14,992,000	Modification <b>R-16-13</b> 1/23/2013	\$365,000	Modification 3/13/2013	\$200,000
Additional Information on Previous Contract No. 9432-4/16 According to the Bid Stacking System																							
Original Term 9432-4/16 <b>R-731-11</b> 12/1/2011-11/30/2012	\$12,826,000																						
Modification 2/21/2012	\$325,312																						
Modification 4/25/2012	\$100,000																						
Modification 6/28/2012	\$74,688																						
Modification 8/20/2012	\$400,000																						
Modification 10/5/2012	\$1,266,000																						
<b>Total Amount for Original Contract Term</b>	<b>\$14,992,000</b>																						
First OTR 9432-4/16-1 12/1/2012-11/30/2013	\$14,992,000																						
Modification <b>R-16-13</b> 1/23/2013	\$365,000																						
Modification 3/13/2013	\$200,000																						

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes		
		<b>Modification</b> 9/4/2013	\$300,000
		<b>Total Amount for First OTR</b>	<b>\$15,757,000</b>
		<b>Second OTR</b> 9432-4/16-2 12/1/2013-11/30/2014	\$15,757,000
		<b>Modification</b> 3/24/2014	\$774,000
		<b>Modification</b> 6/25/2014	\$1,000,000
		<b>Modification</b> 7/10/2014	\$500,000
		<b>Modification</b> 9/3/2014	\$850,000
		<b>Total Amount of Second OTR</b>	<b>\$18,881,000</b>
		<b>Third OTR</b> 9432-4/16-3 12/1/2014-11/30/2015	\$18,881,000
		<b>Modification</b> 3/3/2015	\$3,133,000
		<b>Modification</b> 6/18/2015	\$48,712.80
		<b>Total Amount for Third OTR</b>	<b>\$22,062,712.80</b>
		<b>Fourth OTR</b> 9432-4/16-4 12/1/2015-11/30/2016 According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date is now 5/31/2017.	\$21,709,332.93
		<b>Modification</b> 3/1/2016	\$4,300,000
		<b>Modification</b> <b>R-375-16</b> 5/17/016	\$12,710,000
		<b>Modification</b> <b>R-375-16</b> 5/17/2016	\$667.07
		<b>Modification</b> 8/4/2016	\$500,000
		<b>Proration</b>	\$7,611,092.80
		<b>Total Amount for Fourth OTR</b>	<b>\$46,831,092.80</b>
		<b>Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$118,523,805.60</b>
<b>Additional Information on BCC Discussion of R-731-11</b>			
<b>BCC</b> 7/19/2011  <i>Adopted</i>	Adopted Resolution No. R-731-11 which approved an award of contract 9432-4/16, Temporary Employment Agency Services, in the amount of \$17,808,000, and <b>authorized the use of Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds.</b>  During the BCC meeting on July 19, 2011, the following was discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>The County Manager advised the BCC that the current temporary employment agency services contract expired this week and affected approximately 500 people who were currently working at the County.</i></li><li><i>The BCC noted that the County was considering the layoff of approximately 800 employees in the FY 2011-12 budgets at the same time a recommendation was being made to fund temporary employment services.</i></li></ul>		



**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Director of the Department of Procurement Management commented that People's Transportation Plan funds were included for the transit allocation following unification and it was approved by the Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust Committee.</li> <li>• The BCC noted that 11 out of the 27 vendors were local vendors and that two vendors had compliance and performance violations related to the underpayment of employees. It was suggested that a system be used to track and provide information about the underpayment of employees before a decision was made.</li> <li>• The Director responded that the requested information was already provided on each of the firms and that underpayment issues with Deanna Enterprises Inc. and Tri-State Employment Service, Inc. had been cured and that those firms were currently in compliance.</li> </ul>
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>BCC</b> 8/2/2011</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Reconsidered and Deferred</i></p>	Resolution No. R-731-11 was reconsidered and deferred to the September 1, 2011 BCC meeting.
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>BCC</b> 9/1/2011</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Deferred</i></p>	Resolution No. R-731-11 was deferred to the September 20, 2011 BCC meeting.
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>BCC</b> 9/20/2011</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>R-731-11</b> <i>Adopted</i></p>	<p>Adopted Resolution No. R-731-11 which approved an award of contract 9432-4/16, Temporary Employment Agency Services, in the amount of \$17,808,000, and <b>authorized the use of Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds.</b></p> <p>During the BCC meeting on September 20, 2011, the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Director of the Department of Procurement Management noted there was no multiplier rate provision included in the foregoing contract. She advised all positions utilizing contract service employees were competitively filled, and the temporary employment agency provided billable hours for each position.</li> <li>• The Director advised that the paying rate for each contract service position differed, and there was approximately an 18% paying rate difference for a procurement position.</li> <li>• The BCC expressed concerns regarding the long-term retention of contract services employees, particularly at the Community Action Agency (CAA) when the County was experiencing layoffs, and the large percentage difference between the paying and billable rates.</li> <li>• The Director advised that such long-term temporary employees could best be characterized as Contract Service Employees, and they supported critical areas of need such as CAA's Weatherization Program and other critical operational needs in other housing programs.</li> <li>• The Director stressed how important it was to hire contract service employees due to flexibility and efficiency factors and pointed out that the proposed contract would provide good pay rates for those new employees.</li> <li>• In response to comments opposing the extended retention of contract employees during lay-offs of County employees, the Director confirmed that these employees had the experience and skills necessary to provide the services required.</li> <li>• The Director of the Department of Human Services advised that, to be more cost effective, the County used contract service employees inasmuch as many of those positions provided services funded by grants, and funding adjustments were easier to make with unfunded programs or those not funded at the same previous year's funding level. She also noted that it represented a cost savings in terms of fringe benefits, healthcare insurance, and other costs associated with a permanent</li> </ul>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes				
	<p><i>County employee since the majority of contract employees were part-time employees.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>In response to an inquiry regarding whether hiring contract employees was more expensive, the Director of Procurement Management advised that the Human Resources Department analyzed 67 of the most frequently hired positions listed in the temporary services contract, comparing them to County positions receiving fringe benefits on July 2011, and it was found that the cost to employ an individual as a County employee would have been 27.5 percent higher.</i></li> <li><i>The Director advised that the contractor paid contract employees an hourly rate without fringe benefits; and the only contract employees receiving healthcare benefits were those positions covered by the provisions of the Living Wage Ordinance as the policy of the BCC.</i></li> <li><i>The Director of Human Resources, advised that departments were required to evaluate the position after six (6) months of employment to determine its continuation in accordance with the ordinance relating to contractual services; and the Human Resources Department was required to further evaluate the position after one (1) year of employment to determine if it would be more appropriate to establish a permanently budgeted position for the contracted services.</i></li> </ul> <table border="1"> <tr> <td> <b>BCC</b>  <i>1/23/2013</i>   <b>R-16-13</b>  <i>Adopted</i> </td><td> Modified Contract No. 9432-4/16 for an additional \$265,000 in spending authority to allow MDT to provide additional contract employee support for operational needs at the new Miami International Airport Station and <b>authorized the use of Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds.</b> </td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>BCC</b>  <i>5/17/2016</i>   <b>R-375-16</b>  <i>Adopted</i> </td><td> Approved a designated purchase under Contract No. 9432-4/16-4, Contract Employee Services, for <b>increased expenditure authority of \$12,710,000</b> to support the operational needs of the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Elections, Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces, and Corrections and Rehabilitation Departments. </td></tr> </table> <p><b><u>Additional Information – Committee Meeting Discussion</u></b></p> <p>During the Government Operations Committee meeting on March 14, 2017, the proposed resolution was discussed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The Director of ISD explained that of the 8 vendors included the prior contract, 7 were included in the current contract. She explained that the new contract has expanded competition for these services and there are now 14 vendors on this contract providing service to different groups.</i></li> <li><i>The Director explained that this contract was based on the best price and value that the County could get for the different positions.</i></li> <li><i>The Director clarified that these were temporary positions accessed by many departments and agencies of the County and the allocations were carefully scrutinized and compared to previous usage amounts.</i></li> <li><i>The Director noted that one of the vendors, Alpha-1, had submitted a bid protest regarding another firm who had been award most of the work in the contract, but later withdrew the bid protest.</i></li> <li><i>The Committee asked if there was a multiplier, to which the Director responded that there was no multiplier language but that each agency provides their own increase based on what profit margin they need to have.</i></li> <li><i>The Committee asked how many contract employees are being recommended in the proposed resolution, to which the Director explained that contract employees are in place for six months or less but if they needed to stay on longer for operational reasons there is a process for departments to request that approval.</i></li> <li><i>The Director explained that there were currently 690 contract employees in the County at this time.</i></li> <li><i>The Committee inquired as to the length of time that each of these contract employees were working with County.</i></li> <li><i>The Director explained that ISD conducted a review and determined that there were no concerns as to whether the companies on the contract would be able to provide services under this contract.</i></li> </ul>	<b>BCC</b> <i>1/23/2013</i>  <b>R-16-13</b> <i>Adopted</i>	Modified Contract No. 9432-4/16 for an additional \$265,000 in spending authority to allow MDT to provide additional contract employee support for operational needs at the new Miami International Airport Station and <b>authorized the use of Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds.</b>	<b>BCC</b> <i>5/17/2016</i>  <b>R-375-16</b> <i>Adopted</i>	Approved a designated purchase under Contract No. 9432-4/16-4, Contract Employee Services, for <b>increased expenditure authority of \$12,710,000</b> to support the operational needs of the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Elections, Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces, and Corrections and Rehabilitation Departments.
<b>BCC</b> <i>1/23/2013</i>  <b>R-16-13</b> <i>Adopted</i>	Modified Contract No. 9432-4/16 for an additional \$265,000 in spending authority to allow MDT to provide additional contract employee support for operational needs at the new Miami International Airport Station and <b>authorized the use of Charter County Transportation Surtax Funds.</b>				
<b>BCC</b> <i>5/17/2016</i>  <b>R-375-16</b> <i>Adopted</i>	Approved a designated purchase under Contract No. 9432-4/16-4, Contract Employee Services, for <b>increased expenditure authority of \$12,710,000</b> to support the operational needs of the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Elections, Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces, and Corrections and Rehabilitation Departments.				

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The Committee expressed concerns regarding employees who have retired but are then hired as temporary workers.</i></li> </ul>
<b>8F11 170395</b>	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ACCESS OF FLORIDA SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION CONTRACT NO. FSA16-VEL24.0 FOR POLICE RATED, ADMINISTRATIVE, UTILITY VEHICLES, TRUCKS AND VANS FOR COUNTY DEPARTMENTS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$27,128,000.00; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO ACCESS SAME AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT INCLUDING EXTENSIONS AND RENEWALS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves accessing a competitively established Florida Sheriffs Association contract, FSA16-VEL24.0, for purchase of police rated, administrative, utility vehicles, trucks and vans for various County departments.</p> <p>This contract was the result of a cooperative bid program designed to benefit public entities in the State of Florida, such as local governments, police agencies and state universities and colleges, by aggregating volume to strengthen purchasing power.</p> <p>The requested allocation will be used to purchase fleet vehicles for Fiscal Year 2016-17. The vehicles are required to support the operations of County departments and will replace aging fleet that are beyond their useful life. Market research indicates that accessing this contract is in the County's best interest as it was competitively bid and provides the lowest prices found for the needed fleet. Financing for these vehicles will be handled by the Finance Department through a separate agenda item that will be submitted for BCC approval. The departmental requests are enumerated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>What is the separate agenda item?</b></li> <li><b>Animal Services</b> is requesting <b>\$60,000;</b></li> <li><b>Aviation</b> is requesting <b>\$3,275,000;</b></li> <li><b>BCC</b> is requesting <b>\$27,000;</b></li> <li><b>Corrections and Rehabilitation</b> is requesting <b>\$4,154,000;</b></li> <li><b>Elections</b> is requesting <b>\$75,000;</b></li> <li><b>Fire Rescue</b> is requesting <b>\$1,059,000;</b></li> <li><b>Medical Examiner</b> is requesting <b>\$100,000;</b></li> <li><b>Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces</b> is requesting <b>\$2,547,000;</b></li> <li><b>Police</b> is requesting <b>\$10,000,000;</b></li> <li><b>Regulatory and Economic Resources</b> is requesting <b>\$1,900,000;</b></li> <li><b>Vizcaya Museum and Gardens</b> is requesting <b>\$30,000;</b> and</li> <li><b>Water and Sewer</b> is requesting <b>\$3,901,000.</b></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>The fiscal impact for the term, which expires on September 30, 2017, is \$27,128,000. The requested allocation under this contract is based on identified purchases and projected future needs.</p> <p>In FY 2016-17, the Adopted Budget and Multi Year Capital Plan assumes a procedural change regarding the purchasing of light and heavy fleet for all County departments. In prior fiscal years, departments contributed on an annual basis to a Fleet Replacement Trust Fund towards the replacement of their fleet upon its useful life. The Internal Services Department, in conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget and Finance, will now be working with each department to coordinate bulk purchases while utilizing the most appropriate contract and financing instrument.</p> <p><b><u>Awarded Vendors</u></b></p> <p>There are 33 awarded vendors, of which the County is recommending award to the 16 that have completed the vendor registration process. <b>One out of the 16 awarded vendors is located in Miami-Dade County.</b></p>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
<b>8F12 170396</b>	RESOLUTION APPROVING REJECTION OF THE PROPOSALS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO. 00031 FOR A CAR SHARING PROGRAM FOR THE INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves the rejection of all proposals received in response to Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 00031, Car Sharing Program. Miami-Dade County issued a solicitation to obtain proposals from experienced and qualified vendors to provide a car sharing program.</p> <p>The solicitation was prepared in response to Resolution No. R-147-14, which directed the County Mayor to solicit a car sharing program to improve government efficiency and reduce the costs of maintaining and operating County-owned vehicles. In June 2015, the BCC authorized the advertisement of the solicitation through Resolution No. R-568-15. The program would start in the downtown Miami area to supplant the existing loaner fleet system administered by the Internal Services Department, with the potential to expand to other County loaner fleet locations. The solicitation approved by the BCC requested a program to offer a variety of fuel efficient vehicles such as electric and hybrid sedans, utility vehicles, and cargo and passenger vans, for use by authorized County employees through a self-service reservation system.</p> <p><b>Selection Process</b></p> <p>The Request for Proposals was issued under full and open competition. Three (3) responses were received, of which one (1) was a “No Bid.” The Competitive Selection Committee evaluated the two (2) proposals and determined that neither proposal met the needs of the County nor would improve efficiency and reduce costs, per the Board’s directive. More specifically, one (1) proposer limited program participation to employees qualified by the proposer, rather than employees preauthorized by the County with a valid driver’s license and County identification as required by the solicitation. Some employees would be left without access to a vehicle, which would require the County to maintain a separate, smaller loaner pool for certain employees who require a vehicle to perform their job functions, but were not qualified by the proposer under its policies. The cost to maintain a smaller loaner pool for this purpose would diminish the intended fiscal benefits of using a car sharing program to supplant the existing loaner fleet system.</p> <p>Neither proposal was recommended for negotiations, resulting in this recommendation to reject. <b>There is no intent to re-solicit for this program.</b> Market research indicates that existing car sharing programs, including those in the cities referenced in Resolution No. R-147-14, are not feasible for the County for the reasons described above.</p> <p>The County will continue to operate the existing pool vehicle system, periodically right-sizing the pool to ensure all vehicles are needed and actively used, with a responsible number of fuel efficient vehicles. <b>In the downtown vehicle loaner pool, there are currently 89 vehicles, of which 2 are electric and 79 are hybrid.</b></p>
<b>8F13 170398</b>	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL TIME OF FIVE YEARS AND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$3,000,000.00 FOR PREQUALIFICATION POOL NO. 8680-10/19-7 FOR PURCHASE OF PROFESSIONAL TRAINING SERVICES FOR THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO SOLICIT PRICING, AWARD CONTRACTS, EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS AND ANY RESULTING CONTRACTS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38, AND ADD VENDORS TO THE POOL AT ANY TIME, SUBJECT TO RATIFICATION BY THE BOARD ON A BI-ANNUAL BASIS
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves an extension of Prequalification Pool No. 8680-10/19-7, <b>Professional</b> Training Services, for five (5) additional years and increase expenditure authority by \$3,000,000.</p> <p>This pool was established under delegated authority in July 2008 for one (1) year with 10, one-year options to renew. The Human Resources Department administers the pool on behalf of all County departments. The training services under the pool are delivered in a variety of methods, including, but not limited to, classroom, instructor led, mentoring, e-learning and on-site. The pool facilitates countywide training in various disciplines and subjects, such as diversity in the workplace, business etiquette, management innovations, and ethics. When there is a specific departmental need, a spot market competition is conducted to obtain pricing for the requested training services, maximizing flexibility and ensuring award based on lowest price or best value.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																		
	<p>The requirements, terms, and conditions of the pool would not change if a replacement solicitation were to be issued. It is anticipated that the same vendors would prequalify for the replacement solicitation. Additional qualified vendors may be added to the pool at any time during the term of the pool, subject to bi-annual ratification by the Board. This prequalification pool will remain advertised on the Internal Services Department's website to encourage additional participation. Outreach to registered vendors is conducted to increase the number of prequalified vendors.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>This prequalification pool is in its seventh option to renew term, which expires on February 19, 2017. The pool has a cumulative allocation of \$3,067,000 for eight (8) years. <b>The pool has three (3) remaining options to renew, which require BCC approval.</b> To promote administrative efficiencies, the Human Resources Department is requesting a five-year extension of the pool, rather than approval for the three (3) remaining one-year options to renew. The requested allocation of \$3,000,000 is based on anticipated usage of \$600,000 per year during the five-year extension period. The increase in the annual allocation during the extension period is attributed to a countywide rise in the demand for training services purchased under this pool. If this extension is approved, the pool's cumulative value would be \$6,067,000, and the pool's expiration date would be February 19, 2022.</p> <p><b>9 out of the 36 prequalified vendors are located in Miami-Dade County.</b></p> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8680-10/19-7</u></b></p> <p>On November 8, 2012, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-904-12, authorized the fourth and fifth OTR terms to obtain professional training for County staff. The total amount requested for the option terms was \$648,000.</p> <p>On February 3, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-118-15, authorized the sixth and seventh OTR terms to purchase computer software, diversity, management and web-based training for the Human Resources Department on behalf of all County departments in an estimated amount of \$776,000. Approval of R-118-15 extended the prequalification pool contract until February 19, 2017.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8680-10/19-7 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System</i></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Original Term</b> 8680-10/19 <i>Awarded under Mayor's delegated authority</i> 8/20/2008-8/19/2009</td><td>\$60,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 3/11/2009</td><td>\$30,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for Original Term</b></td><td><b>\$90,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>First OTR</b> 8680-10/19-1 8/20/2009-8/19/2010</td><td><b>\$90,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Second OTR</b> 8680-10/19-2 8/20/2010-8/19/2011</td><td>\$90,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 8/31/2010</td><td>\$400,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b></td><td><b>\$490,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Third OTR</b> 8680-10/19-3 8/20/2011-8/19/2012 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 2/19/2013.</i></td><td>\$114,000</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8680-10/19-7 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System</i>		<b>Original Term</b> 8680-10/19 <i>Awarded under Mayor's delegated authority</i> 8/20/2008-8/19/2009	\$60,000	<b>Modification</b> 3/11/2009	\$30,000	<b>Total Amount for Original Term</b>	<b>\$90,000</b>	<b>First OTR</b> 8680-10/19-1 8/20/2009-8/19/2010	<b>\$90,000</b>	<b>Second OTR</b> 8680-10/19-2 8/20/2010-8/19/2011	\$90,000	<b>Modification</b> 8/31/2010	\$400,000	<b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b>	<b>\$490,000</b>	<b>Third OTR</b> 8680-10/19-3 8/20/2011-8/19/2012 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 2/19/2013.</i>	\$114,000
Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8680-10/19-7 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System</i>																			
<b>Original Term</b> 8680-10/19 <i>Awarded under Mayor's delegated authority</i> 8/20/2008-8/19/2009	\$60,000																		
<b>Modification</b> 3/11/2009	\$30,000																		
<b>Total Amount for Original Term</b>	<b>\$90,000</b>																		
<b>First OTR</b> 8680-10/19-1 8/20/2009-8/19/2010	<b>\$90,000</b>																		
<b>Second OTR</b> 8680-10/19-2 8/20/2010-8/19/2011	\$90,000																		
<b>Modification</b> 8/31/2010	\$400,000																		
<b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b>	<b>\$490,000</b>																		
<b>Third OTR</b> 8680-10/19-3 8/20/2011-8/19/2012 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 2/19/2013.</i>	\$114,000																		

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes		
		<b>Modification</b> 3/23/2012	\$210,000
		<b>Modification</b> 10/2/2012	\$81,000
		<b>Modification</b> <b>R-900-12</b> 11/8/2012	\$162,000
		<b>Total Amount for Third OTR</b>	<b>\$567,000</b>
		<b>Fourth OTR</b> <b>R-904-12</b> 8680-10/19-4 2/20/2013-2/19/2014	\$324,000
		<b>Modification</b> 1/14/2014	\$17,076
		<b>Total Amount for Fourth OTR</b>	<b>\$341,076</b>
		<b>Fifth OTR</b> <b>R-904-12</b> 2/20/2014-2/19/2015	\$324,000
		<b>Modification</b> 8/7/2014	\$64,000
		<b>Total Amount for Fifth OTR</b>	<b>\$388,000</b>
		<b>Sixth OTR</b> <b>R-118-15</b> 8680-10/19-6 2/20/2015-2/19/2016	\$388,000
		<b>Modification</b> 4/14/2015	\$77,600
		<b>Modification</b> 11/12/2015	\$34,400
		<b>Total Amount of Sixth OTR</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>
		<b>Seventh OTR</b> <b>R-118-15</b> 8680-10/19-7 2/20/2016-2/19/2017 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date is now 5/31/2017.</i>	\$500,000
		<b>Modification</b> 8/23/2016	\$100,000
		<b>Modification</b> 3/1/2017	\$150,000
		<b>Total Amount for Seventh OTR</b>	<b>\$750,000</b>
		<b>Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$3,216,076</b>
	<p><b>According to the item, the cumulative allocation for the pool is \$3,067,000 however, according to the Bid Tracking System, the cumulative total is \$3,216,076.</b></p> <p><b>Resolution No. R-118-15 approved the sixth and seventh OTRs in an amount of \$388,000 for each OTR, or \$776,000 in total, however, according to the Bid Tracking System, the sixth OTR was originally allocated \$388,000 but the seventh OTR was allocated \$500,000.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>According to ISD staff, a modification was processed earlier this month for \$150,000, accounting for the difference in allocation. Regarding the difference in the OTR allocations for the sixth and seventh OTRs: the sixth OTR was established with an allocation of \$388,000 which was later modified by \$112,000, resulting in a total allocation of \$500,000 for the term; the seventh OTR was exercised at the modified amount (\$500,000), reflecting the departmental requirements at the time.</i></li> </ul>		



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
<b>8F14 170407</b>	RESOLUTION APPROVING REJECTION OF ALL BIDS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO INVITATION TO BID NO. FB-00340 FOR AIR CONDITIONING CHILLERS, AUXILIARY EQUIPMENT, AND WATER TREATMENT FOR THE WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution rejects all bids received under Invitation to Bid FB-00340, Air Conditioning Chillers, Auxiliary Equipment, Water Treatment – Full Service Contract for the Water and Sewer Department.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> Miami-Dade County issued a solicitation under full and open competition to obtain bids for turnkey maintenance and water treatment services for air conditioning chillers and auxiliary equipment, such as cooling towers, condensate and chilled water pumps, and air compressors, located at various Water and Sewer Department facilities.</p> <p>Eight (8) bids were received in response to the solicitation, including two (2) “No Bids.” During the evaluation process, it was determined that the solicitation’s method of award included conflicting language that prevented the County from making an award recommendation. More specifically, the method of award stated that to be considered for award, the bidder will offer prices for all items per site. Subsequent language stated that if the bidder failed to submit an offer for all items per site, its offer for that particular site may be rejected. The latter statement changed the method of award from an intended grand total award to a site-by-site award. As a result, the rejection of all bids received is recommended. The method of award was revised for the successor contract to clarify that the award is to be made to a single bidder offering the lowest aggregate price for all sites.</p>
<b>8F15 170427</b>	RESOLUTION APPROVING AWARD OF CONTRACT NO. FB-00403 FOR PURCHASE OF CHILLERS AND HEATING, VENTILATING, AIR CONDITIONING EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE SERVICES FOR THE WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT IN A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,432,000.00 FOR THE SIX YEAR TERM; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO GIVE NOTICE OF THIS AWARD, ISSUE THE APPROPRIATE PURCHASE ORDER TO GIVE EFFECT TO SAME AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves award of Contract No. FB-00403, Chillers and Heating, Ventilating, Air Conditioning Equipment Maintenance for the Water and Sewer Department, to Johnson Controls, Inc. in the amount of \$1,432,000 for a six-year term.</p> <p>Under the contract, the awarded vendor will deliver a comprehensive maintenance program for the air conditioning chiller systems and related HVAC equipment installed at Water and Sewer Department offices, facilities and treatment plants. More specifically, the awarded vendor will conduct regular, systematic testing and inspecting as well as perform routine and emergency repair of all chiller and related HVAC equipment, such as cooling towers, valves, gauges, water pumps and piping, to ensure a safe operating environment. In addition to equipment maintenance, the awarded vendor will institute a complete water treatment program to protect air conditioning and heating equipment and piping from deterioration.</p> <p>The award of this contract is contingent on the rejection of a prior solicitation for these services which is being presented in parallel as a separate item for BCC consideration.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b> The fiscal impact for the six-year term is \$1,432,000. The allocation requested for this award is based on the lowest aggregate pricing offered plus an additional 20 percent for initial repairs required to align with Original Equipment Manufacturer standards.</p> <p>Currently, the Water and Sewer Department issues requests for quotes under Pool RTQ-00299, HVAC and Controls, for repairs of chillers and related equipment. The department has determined that a full-service, all-inclusive maintenance contract structured similarly to the contracts established for the Aviation, PortMiami, Internal Services and Corrections and Rehabilitation Departments will reduce cost and promote administrative efficiencies.</p> <p><b><u>Vendor Recommended for Award</u></b> Johnson Controls, Inc., 5757 N Green Bay Avenue Milwaukee, WI; 15901 SW 29 Street, Suite 801, Miramar, FL</p>

**Board of County Commissioners**

**April 4, 2017 Meeting**

**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes								
	<p><b>Vendors Not Recommended for Award</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Hyvac, Inc. was deemed non-responsive for failing to meet the solicitation's qualification requirements for technicians.</li><li>• Cool Water Air Conditioning, Inc. (SBE), Premier Air Conditioning &amp; Refrigeration, Inc. (SBE) and Trane US, Inc. submitted bids higher than the lowest bidder.</li><li>• Conserv Building Services, Inc. and Weathertrol Maintenance Corp did not submit bids.</li></ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Current Pool RTQ-00299, HVAC and Controls</u></b></p> <p>On May 17, 2016, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-373-16, approved the establishment of a pre-qualification pool, RTQ-00299, for the purchase of heating, ventilating and air-conditioning (HVAC), and controls services for multiple County departments for an eight-year term in the amount of \$10,328,000.</p> <p>According to the Bid Tracking System, RTQ-00299 has been modified twice as follows:</p> <table><tr><td><b>Original Term</b> RTQ-00299 <b>R-373-16</b> 6/1/2016-5/31/2024</td><td>\$10,328,000</td></tr><tr><td><b>Modification</b> 6/15/2016</td><td>\$250,000</td></tr><tr><td><b>Modification</b> 7/8/2016</td><td>\$60,000</td></tr><tr><td><b>Current Contract Total</b></td><td><b>\$10,638,000</b></td></tr></table> <p>The services under this pre-qualification pool are divided into four (4) groups: (A) Repair, Replace, Supply, Install and/or Rent HVAC Equipment and Controls; (B) Testing, Adjusting and Balancing HVAC Equipment; (C) Air-Conditioning Duct Cleaning and Sanitizing; and (D) Emergency Repairs.</p> <p>Pre-qualified vendors would compete for departmental projects, including, but not limited to, ductwork, repair and/or replacement of chillers, piping, cooling towers, air handlers, enclosures, and supporting structures via a work order process.</p> <p><b>Vendors Recommended for Award Under RTQ-00299</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Air Balance and Diagnostic Company (Micro/SBE)</li><li>• Airmax Service Corporation</li><li>• Carrier Corporation</li><li>• D.A.C. Air Conditioning Corp. (SBE, DBE)</li><li>• Johnson Controls, Inc.</li><li>• Loss Control and Recovery, Inc. d/b/a Adventaclean Commercial Services Group</li><li>• Master Mechanical Services, Inc. (SBE)</li><li>• Pool &amp; Kent Company of Florida</li><li>• Thermo Air, Inc.</li><li>• Trane U.S., Inc. d/b/a Trane</li></ul> <p><b><i>The OCA posed the following questions to Water and Sewer Department staff:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b><i>Will RTQ-00299 be terminated? How many work order have been issued so far under RTQ-00299 and to which vendors? Why is the proposed resolution recommending award to only one vendor instead of a pool of vendors?</i></b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ <i>WASD had been using Contract# 6046 for the maintenance of the chillers located in the Douglas and LeJeune facilities, however, the contract and the accompanying release purchase orders expired prior to the award of the FB-403 contract. The gap in coverage was longer than anticipated because the original replacement bid was rejected as explained in the agenda item. This Contract, Contract# FB-00403, is the second solicitation. In order to maintain the</i></li></ul></li></ul>	<b>Original Term</b> RTQ-00299 <b>R-373-16</b> 6/1/2016-5/31/2024	\$10,328,000	<b>Modification</b> 6/15/2016	\$250,000	<b>Modification</b> 7/8/2016	\$60,000	<b>Current Contract Total</b>	<b>\$10,638,000</b>
<b>Original Term</b> RTQ-00299 <b>R-373-16</b> 6/1/2016-5/31/2024	\$10,328,000								
<b>Modification</b> 6/15/2016	\$250,000								
<b>Modification</b> 7/8/2016	\$60,000								
<b>Current Contract Total</b>	<b>\$10,638,000</b>								

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><i>Douglas and LeJeune chillers during the interim, WASD issued a quote for maintenance services using RTQ-00299 which is a county-wide prequalification pool used by multiple County Departments.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How much has been paid?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>From April 2012 to March 2017 \$242,468 has been paid.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Were vendors awarded under RTQ-00299 notified and provided opportunity to bid on Contract No. FB-00403?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Procurement notifies all vendors registered in a particular commodity code that there is a bidding opportunity.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>8F16</b> <b>170452</b>	<b>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$827,000.00 FOR CONTRACT NO. BW8970-4/14-4 FOR ARTISTS, PERFORMERS AND EXHIBITIONS SERVICES FOR THE PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM AND AVIATION DEPARTMENT</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes additional expenditure authority of \$827,000 to Pool No. BW8970-4/14-4, Artists, Performers and Exhibitions, for the Aviation Department and the Public Library System.</p> <p><b>This pool was established in February 2009 for a one-year term under delegated authority.</b> The pool included four (4) one-year renewal periods, which were approved by the BCC. In September 2014, to the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-807-14, extending the pool by five (5) years. The current pool term expires on November 25, 2019. The Aviation Department and Public Library System rely on this pool to procure artistic and exhibition services, such as art installation and de-installation services, performers, conservation services, art consultants and design services, providing airport and library patrons access to free, high-quality public art.</p> <p>The <b>additional \$330,000</b> allocation requested by the <b>Public Library System</b> for this extension period will replenish the Library System's allocation through the remainder of this extension period. This funding is budgeted annually for programs offered throughout the Library System's 50 branches. More specifically, the department will utilize the funding for artists and performers to participate in important literary, artistic, and cultural initiatives. Examples include national campaigns such as Hispanic Heritage Month, Native American Heritage Month, Black History Month, Women's History Month, National Poetry Month, special holiday programs and summer reading programming. Moreover, the Library System utilizes this funding for programming that aligns with current events and community concerns such as early literacy, anti-bullying, and the County Mayor's initiatives on aging and technology. The additional funds will pay for the procurement of qualified individuals to lead classes, seminars, showcases and performances supporting such programming.</p> <p>The <b>additional \$497,000</b> allocation requested by the <b>Aviation Department</b> was not included in the department's original forecast for this extension period. Historically, the department used remaining funds from the countywide Art in Public Places fund to fulfill much of its needs for artistic and exhibition services. These funds are included in the Aviation Department's budget but are not available until the end of each fiscal year. Accordingly, the Aviation Department is requesting the additional allocation to support ongoing and planned projects. These projects include the inauguration of a permanent art exhibition hall at Miami International Airport's South Terminal; the purchase of artwork; commissioned or site-specific art projects; exhibitions for the department's five (5) major galleries; traveling exhibitions; musical and cultural performances; historical and conservation services; photographic documentation and printed materials; and collaborative projects with community cultural institutions. The increased spending authority will also cover unforeseen projects assigned by the administration.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b>  The current pool term expires on November 25, 2019. The pool has a cumulative allocation of \$1,497,000. If this request is approved, the pool will have a modified cumulative value of \$2,324,000. The requested increase in expenditure authority is based on anticipated usage.</p> <p><b><u>Awarded Vendors</u></b>  Since the contract's inception, over 200 vendors have participated and additional vendors may be added throughout the term of the contract at the request of the user departments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How many of the vendors in the pool are local?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>According to ISD staff, purchase orders have been issued to 246 vendors since August 2013, the start of the current term; 147 vendors have been reviewed and of that number 110 are local.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																										
	<p><b><u>Additional Information on Contract No. BW8970-4/14</u></b>  On December 1, 2009, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1366-09, authorized increased expenditure authority in the amount of \$25,000 for Contract No. BW8970-4/14 for the Miami-Dade Public Library Department to provide a pool of artists and exhibitors for presentations and exhibitions. Additionally, R-1366-09 exercised the first option-to-renew period in the amount of \$125,000.</p> <p>On February 15, 2011, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-113-11, exercised the second option-to-renew period for Contract No. BW8970-4/14 to procure artist and exhibition services used by the Miami-Dade Public Library System in the amount of \$125,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, \$150,000 were allocated to the second OTR period.</i></li> </ul> <p>On April 3, 2012 the BCC, through Resolution No. R-282-12, exercised the remaining two, one-year option-to-renew terms for artist and exhibitions services for the Miami-Dade Public Library System and the Miami-Dade Aviation Department in the amount of \$158,000 for each option term, for a total of \$316,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, \$238,000 were allocated to the fourth OTR period.</i></li> </ul> <p>On September 16, 2014, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-807-14, extended Contract No. BW8970-4/14 for an additional five years so the Public Library System and the Aviation Department may continue to use this pool to purchase artist and exhibition services. <b>The amount requested for the five-year extension was \$325,000.</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on BW8970-4/14 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System</i></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Original Term</b> BW8970-4/14 <i>Awarded under the Mayor's delegated authority.</i> 2/26/2009-2/25/2010</td><td>\$49,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 5/4/2009</td><td>\$51,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-1366-09</b> 12/1/2009</td><td>\$25,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for Original Term</b></td><td><b>\$125,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>First OTR</b> <b>R-1366-09</b> BW8970-4/14-1 2/26/2010-2/25/2011</td><td>\$125,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 12/21/2010</td><td>\$25,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for First OTR</b></td><td><b>\$150,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Second OTR</b> <b>R-113-11</b> BW8970-4/14-2 2/26/2011-2/25/2012 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 8/25/2012.</i></td><td>\$150,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 8/29/2011</td><td>\$8,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Proration</b></td><td>\$79,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b></td><td><b>\$237,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Third OTR</b> <b>R-282-12</b> BW8970-4/14-3</td><td>\$158,000</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on BW8970-4/14 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System</i>		<b>Original Term</b> BW8970-4/14 <i>Awarded under the Mayor's delegated authority.</i> 2/26/2009-2/25/2010	\$49,000	<b>Modification</b> 5/4/2009	\$51,000	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-1366-09</b> 12/1/2009	\$25,000	<b>Total Amount for Original Term</b>	<b>\$125,000</b>	<b>First OTR</b> <b>R-1366-09</b> BW8970-4/14-1 2/26/2010-2/25/2011	\$125,000	<b>Modification</b> 12/21/2010	\$25,000	<b>Total Amount for First OTR</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>Second OTR</b> <b>R-113-11</b> BW8970-4/14-2 2/26/2011-2/25/2012 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 8/25/2012.</i>	\$150,000	<b>Modification</b> 8/29/2011	\$8,000	<b>Proration</b>	\$79,000	<b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b>	<b>\$237,000</b>	<b>Third OTR</b> <b>R-282-12</b> BW8970-4/14-3	\$158,000
Additional Information on BW8970-4/14 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System</i>																											
<b>Original Term</b> BW8970-4/14 <i>Awarded under the Mayor's delegated authority.</i> 2/26/2009-2/25/2010	\$49,000																										
<b>Modification</b> 5/4/2009	\$51,000																										
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-1366-09</b> 12/1/2009	\$25,000																										
<b>Total Amount for Original Term</b>	<b>\$125,000</b>																										
<b>First OTR</b> <b>R-1366-09</b> BW8970-4/14-1 2/26/2010-2/25/2011	\$125,000																										
<b>Modification</b> 12/21/2010	\$25,000																										
<b>Total Amount for First OTR</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>																										
<b>Second OTR</b> <b>R-113-11</b> BW8970-4/14-2 2/26/2011-2/25/2012 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 8/25/2012.</i>	\$150,000																										
<b>Modification</b> 8/29/2011	\$8,000																										
<b>Proration</b>	\$79,000																										
<b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b>	<b>\$237,000</b>																										
<b>Third OTR</b> <b>R-282-12</b> BW8970-4/14-3	\$158,000																										

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes										
		8/26/2012-8/25/2013									
		<b>Modification</b> 6/18/2013	\$80,000								
		<b>Total Amount for Third OTR</b>	<b>\$238,000</b>								
		<b>Fourth OTR</b> <b>R-282-12</b> BW8970-4/14-4 8/26/2013-8/25/2014 According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 11/25/2019.	\$238,000								
		<b>Modification</b> 3/1/2016	\$124,000								
		<b>Proration</b>	\$384,500								
		<b>Total Amount for Fourth OTR</b>	<b>\$746,500</b>								
		<b>Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$1,496,500</b>								
	<b>8F17 170480</b>	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$451,000.00 FOR CONTRACT NO. 6938-2/22 FOR GARBAGE COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL SERVICES FOR VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENTS									
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes increased expenditure authority of \$451,000 to Contract No. 6938-2/22, Garbage Collection and Disposal Services, for multiple County departments.</p> <p>This contract was approved by the BCC in September 2013 for a five-year term with two (2), two-year option to renew terms pursuant to Resolution No. R-740-13. County departments use this contract to purchase waste and bio-hazard wet screen debris collection and disposal services, inclusive of labor, materials and equipment. Service locations include, but are not limited to, multi-story office buildings, parks, multi-family developments and single family homes.</p> <p>The departments requesting additional expenditure authority have nearly depleted their current allocations and will use the additional funds to support their operational need for garbage collection and disposal services through the remainder of the term. The increased spending authority will be applied as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <b>Animal Services Department</b> is requesting <b>\$65,000</b>;</li><li>• The <b>Community Action and Human Services Department</b> is requesting <b>\$185,000</b>;</li><li>• The <b>Cultural Affairs Department</b> is requesting <b>\$91,000</b>; and</li><li>• <b>PortMiami</b> is requesting <b>\$110,000</b>.</li></ul> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>The contract is in its initial term, which expires on November 30, 2018, and has an existing allocation of \$16,953,000 which includes modifications that were authorized pursuant to the delegated authority. The recommended modification will authorize additional expenditure authority of \$451,000 increasing the total contract value to \$17,404,000.</p> <p><b>All three of the awarded vendors are local.</b></p> <table><tr><th colspan="2">Additional Information on Contract No. 6938-2/22 According to the Bid Tracking System</th></tr><tr><td><b>6938-2/22</b> R-740-13 12/1/2013-11/30/2018</td><td>\$14,136,000</td></tr><tr><td><b>Modification</b> 12/9/2015</td><td>\$2,252,000</td></tr><tr><td><b>Modification</b> 4/19/2016</td><td>\$550,000</td></tr></table>			Additional Information on Contract No. 6938-2/22 According to the Bid Tracking System		<b>6938-2/22</b> R-740-13 12/1/2013-11/30/2018	\$14,136,000	<b>Modification</b> 12/9/2015	\$2,252,000	<b>Modification</b> 4/19/2016	\$550,000
Additional Information on Contract No. 6938-2/22 According to the Bid Tracking System											
<b>6938-2/22</b> R-740-13 12/1/2013-11/30/2018	\$14,136,000										
<b>Modification</b> 12/9/2015	\$2,252,000										
<b>Modification</b> 4/19/2016	\$550,000										

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes		
		<b>Modification</b> 10/31/2016	\$7,614
		<b>Total Amount for Current Term</b>	<b>\$16,945,614</b>
<b>8F18</b> <b>170484</b>	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$400,000.00 FOR CONTRACT NO. 94131608-16-P FOR CLEANING CHEMICALS AND SUPPLIES FOR THE CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION DEPARTMENT		
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes additional time of 46 months and additional expenditure authority of \$400,000 to Contract No. 94131608-16-P, Cleaning Chemicals and Supplies - PRIDE, to support the operational needs of the Corrections and Rehabilitation Department.</p> <p>The County accessed this non-competitive contract on April 18, 2016 for a one-year term and uses it to purchase cleaning chemicals and supplies for correctional facilities. Pursuant to a settlement agreement between the County and the United States Department of Justice, the Corrections and Rehabilitation Department is required to use cleaning products at its facilities that target major viruses and bacteria.</p> <p><b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Why was the contract non- competitively accessed?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>It was determined that accessing this State of Florida contract, i.e., the terms and conditions and established pricing, would enable MDCR to capitalize on favorable pricing while readily facilitating compliance with a US DOJ settlement agreement regarding proper chemical control and inmate safety at County correctional facilities.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>During the contract period, the vendor, Prison Rehabilitative Industries and Diversified Enterprises, Inc. (PRIDE), installed a customized tamperproof system with double-locking mechanisms at the Turner Guilford Knight Correctional Center, preventing inmates from having access to chemicals; only the unit officer may access the system and dispense chemicals. By limiting access, the system complies with Corrections and Rehabilitation Department policies and procedures governing inmate protection. The system is free of charge to the County, so long as the County purchases the chemicals from PRIDE.</p> <p>The County issued Invitation to Bid No. FB-00351, Janitorial, Cleaning and Sanitizing Supplies, Installation and Maintenance Services, under full and open competition. The solicitation was issued to determine if better pricing could be secured from the marketplace through the County's competitive procurement process for a long-term solution to satisfy this need. The County received 11 bids in response to the solicitation, including four (4) "No Bids." The County Attorney's Office deemed six (6) bidders non-responsive for failure to bid on all items in the group, as required by the solicitation. The County conducted a responsibility review of the one (1) remaining bidder and determined the products offered lacked the ingredients required to meet statutory and legal obligations to kill certain viruses and bacteria in the sanitizing of correctional facilities. The bidder was thus deemed non-responsible and all bids received in response to the solicitation were rejected under delegated authority.</p> <p><b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Are there plans to re-solicit?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No, MDCR, in the instant item, is requesting additional time of 46 months.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>The contract term expires on April 17, 2017. The contract has a cumulative allocation of \$250,000. If this request is approved, the contract will have a modified cumulative value of \$650,000 and will expire on February 11, 2021. The requested increase in expenditure authority is based on anticipated purchases.</p> <p><b>Awarded Vendor</b></p>		



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes								
	<p>Prison Rehabilitative Industries and Diversified Enterprises, Inc. dba PRIDE Enterprises 223 Morrison Road, Brandon, FL</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Contract 94131608-16-P</th></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Original Contract</b>            94131608-16-P            4/18/2016-4/17/2017         </td><td>\$100,000</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Modification</b>            12/28/2016         </td><td>\$150,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Cumulative Contract Total</b></td><td><b>\$250,000</b></td></tr> </table>	Additional Information on Contract 94131608-16-P		<b>Original Contract</b> 94131608-16-P 4/18/2016-4/17/2017	\$100,000	<b>Modification</b> 12/28/2016	\$150,000	<b>Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>
Additional Information on Contract 94131608-16-P									
<b>Original Contract</b> 94131608-16-P 4/18/2016-4/17/2017	\$100,000								
<b>Modification</b> 12/28/2016	\$150,000								
<b>Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>								
<b>8F19 170498</b>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING AWARD OF GROUPS B THROUGH F, CONTRACT NO. FB-00418, FOR PURCHASE OF MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OF POWER GENERATING SYSTEMS FOR COUNTY DEPARTMENTS; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO GIVE NOTICE OF AWARD TO GROUPS B THROUGH F, ISSUE THE APPROPRIATE PURCHASE ORDER TO GIVE EFFECT TO SAME AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38; AUTHORIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF GROUP A PREQUALIFICATION POOL FB-00418 FOR PURCHASE OF INSTALLATION SERVICES FOR POWER GENERATING SYSTEMS; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SOLICIT PRICING FOR GROUP A, AWARD CONTRACTS, EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS AND ANY RESULTING CONTRACTS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38, AND ADD VENDORS TO THE POOL AT ANY TIME, SUBJECT TO RATIFICATION BY THE BOARD ON A BI-ANNUAL BASIS; AND AUTHORIZING AGGREGATE EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY FOR GROUPS A THROUGH F IN A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$33,155,000.00 FOR THE CONTRACT AND PREQUALIFICATION POOL COMBINED OVER THE FIVE-YEAR TERM</p>								

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves award of a <b>Groups B through F</b>, Contract No. FB-00418, for purchase of <b>maintenance and repair</b> services for power generating systems for County departments;</li> <li>• Authorizes the establishment of a <b>Group A</b> prequalification pool FB-00418 for the purchase of <b>installation</b> services for power generating systems; and</li> <li>• Authorizes aggregate expenditure authority in a total amount not to exceed \$33,155,000.00 for Groups A through F over the five-year term.</li> </ul> <p>Generators support County operations by delivering power to County facilities and buildings, such as the Stephen P. Clark Center, in the event of an electricity outage until normal power is restored.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>The fiscal impact for the five-year term is \$33,155,000. The current contract, Contract No. 9208-2/16, is valued at \$4,034,500 for a six-year and six-month term and expires on April 30, 2017. The allocation under this replacement contract is higher than the current contract's as the current contract covered only maintenance services while the replacement adds purchase and installation services as well as five (5) new user departments. Prior to the addition of Group A, departments used small purchase orders for the purchase and installation of power generating systems.</p> <p><b>For Group A:</b> Upon approval of this item, a pool of prequalified vendors will be established to participate in spot market competitions. The County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee will have the authority to solicit pricing and award contracts up to an aggregate amount of the allocation authorized by the BCC. The County Mayor or the County Mayor's designee will also have the authority to (a) exercise all provisions of the solicitation documents and any resulting contracts pursuant to Section 2-8.1 of the County Code and Implementing Order 3-38 and (b) add vendors to the pool at any time, subject to ratification by the BCC on a bi-annual basis.</p> <p><b>For Groups B through F:</b> If approved, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee will have the authority to exercise all provisions of the contract pursuant to Section 2-8.1 of the County Code and Implementing Order 3-38.</p> <p><b>Vendors Prequalified for Pool for Group A</b></p> <p>Eight (8) vendors responded to the solicitation, of which three (3) were "No Bids." The following five (5) vendors that satisfied the solicitation's qualification criteria are recommended for inclusion in the pool.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Condo Electric Industrial Supply, Inc. (SBE), 3746 E 10 Court, Hialeah, FL</li> <li>• KW Power Systems Corp., 10603 NW 122 Street, Medley, FL</li> <li>• Power Pro-Tech Services, Inc., 377 Maitland Avenue, Suite 1010, Altamonte Springs, FL</li> <li>• TAW Power Systems, Inc., 6312 78 Street, Riverview, FL</li> <li>• Zabatt Engine Services, Inc. dba Zabatt, Inc., 4612 Highway Avenue Jacksonville, FL</li> </ul> <p><b>Vendor Recommended for Award for Groups B through F</b></p> <p>All Power Generators, Corp., 9841 NW 117 Way Medley, FL</p> <p><b>Applicable Ordinances and Contract Measures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The two (2) percent User Access Program provision applies and will be collected on all purchases where permitted by the funding source.</li> <li>• For Group A, the Small Business Enterprise Bid Preference will be determined prior to advertising each spot market competition. The Local Preference Ordinance will be applied at the time of spot market competition where permitted by the funding source.</li> <li>• For Groups B, C, D, and F, the Small Business Enterprise Bid Preference and Local Preference were applied.</li> <li>• The Small Business Enterprise Bid Preference and Local Preference were not applicable to Group E due to the federal funding source.</li> <li>• The Living Wage Ordinance does not apply.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Current Contract No. 9208-2/16</u></b></p>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																				
	<p>On October 5, 2010, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-983-10, awarded Contract No. 9208-2/16 for purchase of power generating systems, repair services and maintenance for the Miami-Dade Aviation and Fire Rescue departments. The amount requested was \$1,011,000 for a period of two years with two, two-year options to renew.</p> <p>During the Budget, Planning and Sustainability Committee meeting on September 28, 2010, R-983-10 was discussed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The Committee asked the Department of Procurement Management Director to provide a report explaining the \$500,000 cost increase in Item 1.1: Power Generating Systems, maintenance, repair, and purchase for the Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD).</i></li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Contract No. 9208-2/16 According to the Bid Tracking System</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Original Term</b> 9208-2/16 <b>R-938-10</b> 11/1/2010-10/31/2012</td><td><b>\$1,011,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>First OTR</b> 9208-2/16-1 11/1/2012-10/31/2014</td><td>\$1,011,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 5/13/2014</td><td>\$200,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for First OTR</b></td><td><b>\$1,211,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Second OTR</b> 9208-2/16-2 11/1/2014-10/31/2016 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 4/30/2017.</i></td><td>\$1,211,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 5/12/2016</td><td>\$239,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Proration</b></td><td>362,500</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount of Second OTR</b></td><td><b>\$1,812,500</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Cumulative Contract Total</b></td><td><b>\$4,034,500</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on Contract No. 9208-2/16 According to the Bid Tracking System		<b>Original Term</b> 9208-2/16 <b>R-938-10</b> 11/1/2010-10/31/2012	<b>\$1,011,000</b>	<b>First OTR</b> 9208-2/16-1 11/1/2012-10/31/2014	\$1,011,000	<b>Modification</b> 5/13/2014	\$200,000	<b>Total Amount for First OTR</b>	<b>\$1,211,000</b>	<b>Second OTR</b> 9208-2/16-2 11/1/2014-10/31/2016 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 4/30/2017.</i>	\$1,211,000	<b>Modification</b> 5/12/2016	\$239,000	<b>Proration</b>	362,500	<b>Total Amount of Second OTR</b>	<b>\$1,812,500</b>	<b>Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$4,034,500</b>
Additional Information on Contract No. 9208-2/16 According to the Bid Tracking System																					
<b>Original Term</b> 9208-2/16 <b>R-938-10</b> 11/1/2010-10/31/2012	<b>\$1,011,000</b>																				
<b>First OTR</b> 9208-2/16-1 11/1/2012-10/31/2014	\$1,011,000																				
<b>Modification</b> 5/13/2014	\$200,000																				
<b>Total Amount for First OTR</b>	<b>\$1,211,000</b>																				
<b>Second OTR</b> 9208-2/16-2 11/1/2014-10/31/2016 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System, the expiration date was extended to 4/30/2017.</i>	\$1,211,000																				
<b>Modification</b> 5/12/2016	\$239,000																				
<b>Proration</b>	362,500																				
<b>Total Amount of Second OTR</b>	<b>\$1,812,500</b>																				
<b>Cumulative Contract Total</b>	<b>\$4,034,500</b>																				
<b>8F20</b> <b>170499</b>	RESOLUTION APPROVING REJECTION OF ALL BIDS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO INVITATION TO BID NO. FB-00176 FOR ACOUSTICAL PANELS, POSTS, BRACKETS AND ASSOCIATED HARDWARE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS																				
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed approve the rejection of all bids received under Invitation to Bid No. FB-00176, Acoustical Panels, Posts, Brackets and Associated Hardware, for the Department of Transportation and Public Works.</p> <p>The County issued a solicitation under full and open competition for the purchase and delivery of acoustical panels, posts, brackets and associated hardware to support transit operations. The acoustical panels purchased under the contract would have been used along the elevated sections of the Metrorail tracks for repair purposes.</p> <p>Three (3) bids were received in response to the solicitation, including one (1) "No Bid." The bid from Atlantic Industries, Ltd. was deemed non-responsive by the County Attorney's Office as the bidder conditioned its bid which conflicted with the requirement for bid prices to be held for 180 days (see attached opinion). The bid from Eastern Rail Corp. was non-responsive as the bidder failed to meet several of the minimum requirements for the acoustical panels, such as warranty, corrosion protection systems, material safety and noise reduction. Department of Transportation and Public Works intends to re-solicit this contract in the near future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On July 15, 2015, the CAO issued a memo regarding the responsiveness determination for Invitation to Bid (ITB) No. FB-00176: Acoustical Panels, Posts, Brackets and Associated Hardware. According to the</li> </ul>																				

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>memo, Atlantic Industries Ltd.'s bid submittal was non-responsive as the "Terms of Offer" in the bid submittal conflicted with the requirement that bid prices be held for 180 days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Why did it take so long to request rejection of bids from the BCC?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>According to the Internal Services Department (ISD), Eastern Rail was deemed non-responsible and thus the evaluation of its bid to remedy that responsibility determination continued well beyond July 2015, the date of the non-responsiveness determination for Atlantic Industries Ltd. Specifically, in an effort to cure the non-responsibility determination, an evaluation of Eastern's technical specifications was conducted from May through September 2015; that evaluation included the following: (1) a review of whether its bid complied with Florida Building Code and noise reduction requirements; (2) verification of whether the required noise reduction tests were performed by an independent National Voluntary Laboratory Accredited Program; (3) review of design calculations; and (4) impact testing for wind-borne debris during hurricane events. Eastern was found non-responsible following this multi-step evaluation process which concluded in September 2015.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Following that finding, in early 2016, ISD staff re-examined Atlantic Industries Ltd.'s submission to determine if a contract could be awarded to it as a designated purchase. The client department, DTPW, concluded that that wasn't a viable option due to Atlantic's warranty terms.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>8F21 170504</b>	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL TIME OF FIVE YEARS AND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$7,735,000.00 FOR PREQUALIFICATION POOL NO. 9574-0/17 FOR PURCHASE OF MOBILE MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT FOR COUNTY DEPARTMENTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SOLICIT PRICING, AWARD CONTRACTS, EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS AND ANY RESULTING CONTRACTS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38, AND ADD VENDORS TO THE POOL AT ANY TIME, SUBJECT TO RATIFICATION BY THE BOARD ON A BI-ANNUAL BASIS</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the extension of Prequalification Pool No. 9574-0/17, Mobile Materials Handling Equipment, for an additional five (5) years and increases the expenditure authority by \$7,735,000.</p> <p>This pool was established in August 2012 under delegated authority for a five-year term and provides County departments with an open pool of prequalified vendors for future spot market purchases of various types of mobile materials handling equipment, such as forklifts, power sweepers, skid steers, golf carts, trams, trolleys, compressors, lifts, all-terrain vehicles, lawn mowers, light towers, water pumps and trailers. <b>This pool does not include the purchase of parts or repair services.</b></p> <p>The user departments rely on this pool to purchase new and replacement equipment for its fleet. The Aviation, Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces, and Water and Sewer Departments are the largest users of the pool.</p> <p>The requirements, terms and conditions of the pool would not change if a replacement solicitation were issued. It is anticipated that the same vendors would prequalify for a replacement solicitation. Additional qualified vendors may be added to the pool at any time during the term of the pool, subject to bi-annual ratification by the BCC. This prequalification pool will remain advertised on the County's Internal Services Department webpage to encourage additional participation. Outreach to registered firms was conducted to increase the number of prequalified firms.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>The pool has an existing allocation of \$7,670,000 and expires on August 31, 2017. The requested additional allocation of \$7,735,000 is based on anticipated usage. If approved, the recommended modification would increase the total pool value to \$15,405,000.</p> <p><b>17 of the 36 prequalified vendors list addresses in Miami-Dade County however, the item states that 20 out of the 36 are local.</b></p>

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes																										
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On October 6, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-831-15, approved a two-year extension of the Interlocal Agreement between Broward County and Miami-Dade County for Reciprocity of Local Preference Ordinances and Programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Section 2-8.5(6) of the Miami-Dade County Code<sup>3</sup> relating to procedure to provide preference to local business in county contracts states that “in the event Broward, Palm Beach or Monroe County extends preferences to local businesses, Miami-Dade County may enter into an interlocal agreement with such County wherein the preferences of this section may be extended and made available to vendors that have a valid occupational license issued by Broward, Palm Beach or Monroe County to do business in that County that authorizes the vendor to provide the goods, services, or construction to be purchased, and a physical business address located within the limits of that County.”</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Applicable Ordinances and Contract Measures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two (2) percent User Access Program provision applies where permitted by the funding source.</li> <li>The Small Business Enterprise Bid Preference and Local Preference ordinances are applied at the time of spot market competition where permitted by the funding source.</li> <li>The Living Wage Ordinance does not apply.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 9574-0/17 According to the Bid Tracking System</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Original Term</b> 9574-0/17 <i>Awarded under the Mayor’s delegated Authority.</i> 8/8/2012-8/31/2017</td><td>\$1,000,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-349-13</b> 5/7/2013</td><td>\$285,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 5/29/2013</td><td>\$250,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-979-13</b> 12/3/2013</td><td>\$1,194,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 2/19/2014</td><td>\$130,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 3/18/2014</td><td>\$365,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-508-14</b> 6/3/2014</td><td>\$250,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 6/16/2014</td><td>\$436,189</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 7/15/2014</td><td>\$225,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 10/24/2014</td><td>\$33,611</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-93-15</b> 2/3/2015</td><td>\$763,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 7/10/2015</td><td>\$100,000</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 9574-0/17 According to the Bid Tracking System		<b>Original Term</b> 9574-0/17 <i>Awarded under the Mayor’s delegated Authority.</i> 8/8/2012-8/31/2017	\$1,000,000	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-349-13</b> 5/7/2013	\$285,000	<b>Modification</b> 5/29/2013	\$250,000	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-979-13</b> 12/3/2013	\$1,194,000	<b>Modification</b> 2/19/2014	\$130,000	<b>Modification</b> 3/18/2014	\$365,000	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-508-14</b> 6/3/2014	\$250,000	<b>Modification</b> 6/16/2014	\$436,189	<b>Modification</b> 7/15/2014	\$225,000	<b>Modification</b> 10/24/2014	\$33,611	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-93-15</b> 2/3/2015	\$763,000	<b>Modification</b> 7/10/2015	\$100,000
Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 9574-0/17 According to the Bid Tracking System																											
<b>Original Term</b> 9574-0/17 <i>Awarded under the Mayor’s delegated Authority.</i> 8/8/2012-8/31/2017	\$1,000,000																										
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-349-13</b> 5/7/2013	\$285,000																										
<b>Modification</b> 5/29/2013	\$250,000																										
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-979-13</b> 12/3/2013	\$1,194,000																										
<b>Modification</b> 2/19/2014	\$130,000																										
<b>Modification</b> 3/18/2014	\$365,000																										
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-508-14</b> 6/3/2014	\$250,000																										
<b>Modification</b> 6/16/2014	\$436,189																										
<b>Modification</b> 7/15/2014	\$225,000																										
<b>Modification</b> 10/24/2014	\$33,611																										
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-93-15</b> 2/3/2015	\$763,000																										
<b>Modification</b> 7/10/2015	\$100,000																										

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.municode.com/library/fl/miami-dade\\_county/codes/code\\_of\\_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR\\_CH2AD\\_ARTIINGE\\_S2-8.5PRPRPRLOBUCOCO](https://www.municode.com/library/fl/miami-dade_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH2AD_ARTIINGE_S2-8.5PRPRPRLOBUCOCO)

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes														
	<table> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 8/10/2015</td><td>\$61,197.60</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 9/21/2015</td><td>\$235,460</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 1/13/2016</td><td>\$582,356</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-975-16</b> 11/1/2016</td><td>\$1,597,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-975-16</b> 11/1/2016</td><td>\$140,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 11/23/2016</td><td>\$22,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Amount for Original Term</b></td><td><b>\$7,669,813.60</b></td></tr> </table>	<b>Modification</b> 8/10/2015	\$61,197.60	<b>Modification</b> 9/21/2015	\$235,460	<b>Modification</b> 1/13/2016	\$582,356	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-975-16</b> 11/1/2016	\$1,597,000	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-975-16</b> 11/1/2016	\$140,000	<b>Modification</b> 11/23/2016	\$22,000	<b>Total Amount for Original Term</b>	<b>\$7,669,813.60</b>
<b>Modification</b> 8/10/2015	\$61,197.60														
<b>Modification</b> 9/21/2015	\$235,460														
<b>Modification</b> 1/13/2016	\$582,356														
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-975-16</b> 11/1/2016	\$1,597,000														
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-975-16</b> 11/1/2016	\$140,000														
<b>Modification</b> 11/23/2016	\$22,000														
<b>Total Amount for Original Term</b>	<b>\$7,669,813.60</b>														
<b>8F22 170505</b>	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL TIME OF FIVE YEARS AND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$20,781,000.00 FOR PREQUALIFICATION POOL NO. 8318-5/17-5 FOR PURCHASE OF VARIOUS PETROLEUM PRODUCTS FOR COUNTY DEPARTMENTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SOLICIT PRICING, AWARD CONTRACTS, EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS AND ANY RESULTING CONTRACTS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38, AND ADD VENDORS TO THE POOL AT ANY TIME, SUBJECT TO RATIFICATION BY THE BOARD ON A BI-ANNUAL BASIS</p>														
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves an extension of Prequalification Pool No. 8318-5/17-5, Various Petroleum Products, for an additional five (5) years and increase expenditure authority by \$20,781,000.</p> <p>This pool was established in January 2008 for a five-year initial term plus five (5), one-year option to renew terms and is used by multiple County Departments to purchase over 200 types of oils, lubricants, coolants, greases, fluids and related petroleum products for automobiles, buses, trucks, boats and aircraft. The pool is also used to purchase petroleum products for maintenance of lawn, farm, construction and other types of industrial equipment.</p> <p>Petroleum products are purchased in bulk quantities and in various container sizes, from quart size containers to 55 gallon drums. New, technologically-advanced petroleum products are continuously added as newer vehicles and equipment are purchased, requiring the latest product specifications be met to maintain warranty and ensure safety. Due to the volatility of the petroleum product market and new product specifications, spot market quotes are conducted semiannually to achieve competitive pricing.</p> <p>The requirements and terms and conditions of the pool would not change if a replacement solicitation were to be issued. It is anticipated that the same vendors would prequalify for a replacement solicitation. Additional qualified vendors may be added to the pool during the term of the pool, subject to bi-annual ratification by the BCC. This prequalification pool will remain advertised on the Internal Services Department's website to encourage additional participation. Outreach to registered firms is ongoing to increase the number of prequalified firms. Internal Services Department staff contacted the Beacon Council to solicit its assistance with identifying additional local vendors engaged in this line of business. Staff will engage in proactive follow-up with any vendor(s) identified through these efforts.</p> <p>This item is placed for Committee review pursuant to Miami-Dade County Code Section 29-124(f). The Board may only consider this item if the Citizens' Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) has forwarded a recommendation to the Board prior to the date scheduled for Board consideration or 45 days have elapsed since the issuance of this recommendation. If CITT has not forwarded a recommendation and 45 days have not elapsed since the issuance of this recommendation, a withdrawal of this item will be requested.</p> <p><b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Are surtax funds being used?</i></li> </ul>														



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes												
	<p style="text-align: center;">○ <i>Surtax funds will not be used.</i></p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b>  This pool, which is in its final option to renew term, expires on December 31, 2017, and has a cumulative allocation of \$37,525,000 for a term of 10 years. The total allocation requested for the five-year extension period is \$20,781,000.</p> <p>Some departments expect a higher cost for petroleum products due to an increase in vehicles and/or equipment to their fleet. Other departments expect an increase in expenditure due to the volatility of petroleum products, emissions and other regulatory requirements. Yet other departmental allocation requests remain the same or have lowered from their initial projections 10 years ago. The unallocated funds under this pool will be used for unforeseen increases in use of petroleum products such as prolonged and unscheduled maintenance during activations and other emergencies.</p> <p><b>12 of the 25 prequalified vendors are located in Miami-Dade County however the item states that 16 have a local address.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On October 6, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-831-15, approved a two-year extension of the Interlocal Agreement between Broward County and Miami-Dade County for Reciprocity of Local Preference Ordinances and Programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Section 2-8.5(6) of the Miami-Dade County Code<sup>4</sup> relating to procedure to provide preference to local business in county contracts states that “in the event Broward, Palm Beach or Monroe County extends preferences to local businesses, Miami-Dade County may enter into an interlocal agreement with such County wherein the preferences of this section may be extended and made available to vendors that have a valid occupational license issued by Broward, Palm Beach or Monroe County to do business in that County that authorizes the vendor to provide the goods, services, or construction to be purchased, and a physical business address located within the limits of that County.”</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8318-5/17-5</u></b>  On November 6, 2007, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1227-07, established a pool of pre-qualified vendors to provide various petroleum products and lubricants for various County departments in the amount of \$3,480,000 for five years with five options to renew on a year-to-year basis. The allocation for Miami-Dade Transit (MDT) was to be funded by Operating Revenue and the Surtax allocation formula.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8318-5/17-5 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System</i></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Original Term</b> 8318-5/17 <b>R-1227-07</b> 1/1/2008-12/31/2012</td><td>\$3,480,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-496-08</b> 5/6/2008</td><td>\$130,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-1028-08</b> 10/7/2008</td><td>\$10,340,103</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 3/25/2010</td><td>\$188,500</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-280-12</b> 4/3/2012</td><td>\$1,568,000</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8318-5/17-5 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System</i>		<b>Original Term</b> 8318-5/17 <b>R-1227-07</b> 1/1/2008-12/31/2012	\$3,480,000	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-496-08</b> 5/6/2008	\$130,000	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-1028-08</b> 10/7/2008	\$10,340,103	<b>Modification</b> 3/25/2010	\$188,500	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-280-12</b> 4/3/2012	\$1,568,000
Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 8318-5/17-5 <i>According to the Bid Tracking System</i>													
<b>Original Term</b> 8318-5/17 <b>R-1227-07</b> 1/1/2008-12/31/2012	\$3,480,000												
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-496-08</b> 5/6/2008	\$130,000												
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-1028-08</b> 10/7/2008	\$10,340,103												
<b>Modification</b> 3/25/2010	\$188,500												
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-280-12</b> 4/3/2012	\$1,568,000												

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.municode.com/library/fl/miami\\_dade\\_county/codes/code\\_of\\_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR\\_CH2AD\\_ARTIINGE\\_S2-8.5PRPRPRLOBUCOCO](https://www.municode.com/library/fl/miami_dade_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH2AD_ARTIINGE_S2-8.5PRPRPRLOBUCOCO)

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes																																				
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <b>Modification R-280-12</b> 4/3/2012 </td><td>\$2,397</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Modification</b> 8/9/2012 </td><td>\$181,000</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Total Amount for Original Contract Term</b> </td><td><b>\$15,890,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>First OTR</b> 8318-5/17-1 1/1/2013-12/31/2013 </td><td>\$3,178,000</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Modification</b> 3/13/2013 </td><td>\$75,000</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Modification</b> 7/3/2013 </td><td>\$397,000</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Modification R-39-14</b> 9/17/2013 </td><td>\$636,000</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Modification</b> 10/9/2013 </td><td>\$10,000</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Total Amount for First OTR</b> </td><td><b>\$4,296,000</b></td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Second OTR</b> 8318-5/17-2 1/1/2014-12/31/2014 </td><td>\$4,286,000</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Modification</b> 11/3/2014 </td><td>\$321,491</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b> </td><td><b>\$4,607,491</b></td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Third OTR</b> 8318-5/17-3 1/1/2015-12/31/2015 </td><td>\$4,245,274</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Modification</b> 9/17/2015 </td><td>\$10,000</td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Total Amount for Third OTR</b> </td><td><b>\$4,255,274</b></td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Fourth OTR</b> 8318-5/17-4 1/1/2016-12/31/2016 </td><td><b>\$4,255,274</b></td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Fifth OTR</b> 8318-5/17-5 1/1/2017-12/31/2017 </td><td><b>\$4,218,326</b></td></tr> <tr> <td> <b>Current Contract Total</b> </td><td><b>\$37,522,365</b></td></tr> </table> <p>The item states that the cumulative contract total is \$37,525,000 however, the Bid Tracking System indicates that the current contract total is \$37,522,365 with \$2,554 unallocated.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information – Committee Meeting Discussion</u></b></p> <p>During the Government Operations Committee meeting on March 14, 2017, the proposed resolution was discussed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Committee asked if the proposed resolution had to do with petroleum derivatives and asked whether the price of fuel going down would cause the price of petroleum derivatives to go down.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Director of OSD explained that the allocation was increased as a result of the additional departments and fleet vehicles that departments are maintaining not necessarily because of the price of the product.</i></li> </ul>	<b>Modification R-280-12</b> 4/3/2012	\$2,397	<b>Modification</b> 8/9/2012	\$181,000	<b>Total Amount for Original Contract Term</b>	<b>\$15,890,000</b>	<b>First OTR</b> 8318-5/17-1 1/1/2013-12/31/2013	\$3,178,000	<b>Modification</b> 3/13/2013	\$75,000	<b>Modification</b> 7/3/2013	\$397,000	<b>Modification R-39-14</b> 9/17/2013	\$636,000	<b>Modification</b> 10/9/2013	\$10,000	<b>Total Amount for First OTR</b>	<b>\$4,296,000</b>	<b>Second OTR</b> 8318-5/17-2 1/1/2014-12/31/2014	\$4,286,000	<b>Modification</b> 11/3/2014	\$321,491	<b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b>	<b>\$4,607,491</b>	<b>Third OTR</b> 8318-5/17-3 1/1/2015-12/31/2015	\$4,245,274	<b>Modification</b> 9/17/2015	\$10,000	<b>Total Amount for Third OTR</b>	<b>\$4,255,274</b>	<b>Fourth OTR</b> 8318-5/17-4 1/1/2016-12/31/2016	<b>\$4,255,274</b>	<b>Fifth OTR</b> 8318-5/17-5 1/1/2017-12/31/2017	<b>\$4,218,326</b>	<b>Current Contract Total</b>	<b>\$37,522,365</b>
<b>Modification R-280-12</b> 4/3/2012	\$2,397																																				
<b>Modification</b> 8/9/2012	\$181,000																																				
<b>Total Amount for Original Contract Term</b>	<b>\$15,890,000</b>																																				
<b>First OTR</b> 8318-5/17-1 1/1/2013-12/31/2013	\$3,178,000																																				
<b>Modification</b> 3/13/2013	\$75,000																																				
<b>Modification</b> 7/3/2013	\$397,000																																				
<b>Modification R-39-14</b> 9/17/2013	\$636,000																																				
<b>Modification</b> 10/9/2013	\$10,000																																				
<b>Total Amount for First OTR</b>	<b>\$4,296,000</b>																																				
<b>Second OTR</b> 8318-5/17-2 1/1/2014-12/31/2014	\$4,286,000																																				
<b>Modification</b> 11/3/2014	\$321,491																																				
<b>Total Amount for Second OTR</b>	<b>\$4,607,491</b>																																				
<b>Third OTR</b> 8318-5/17-3 1/1/2015-12/31/2015	\$4,245,274																																				
<b>Modification</b> 9/17/2015	\$10,000																																				
<b>Total Amount for Third OTR</b>	<b>\$4,255,274</b>																																				
<b>Fourth OTR</b> 8318-5/17-4 1/1/2016-12/31/2016	<b>\$4,255,274</b>																																				
<b>Fifth OTR</b> 8318-5/17-5 1/1/2017-12/31/2017	<b>\$4,218,326</b>																																				
<b>Current Contract Total</b>	<b>\$37,522,365</b>																																				
<b>8F23 170509</b>	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL TIME OF FIVE YEARS AND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY IN A TOTAL AMOUNT UP TO \$21,965,000.00 FOR PREQUALIFICATION POOL NO. 4056-0/16 FOR PURCHASE OF COARSE AGGREGATES FOR MULTIPLE COUNTY DEPARTMENTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SOLICIT PRICING,																																				

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	AWARD CONTRACTS, EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS AND ANY RESULTING CONTRACTS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE COUNTY CODE AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38, AND ADD VENDORS TO THE POOL AT ANY TIME, SUBJECT TO RATIFICATION BY THE BOARD ON A BI-ANNUAL BASIS
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves an extension of Prequalification Pool No. 4056-0/16, Coarse Aggregates, for five (5) additional years and increase expenditure authority by \$21,965,000.</p> <p>This pool was approved by the BCC on February 7, 2012 for a five-year term pursuant to Resolution No. R-132-12 for County departments to purchase coarse aggregates, such as lime and ballast rocks, pit run and mason, natural silica, white yard and overburden sand. The aggregates are used for filling gardens and roads, buttressing shorelines for beach re-nourishment and other projects.</p> <p>The requirements, terms and conditions of the pool would not change if a replacement solicitation were to be issued. It is anticipated that the same vendors would prequalify for the replacement solicitation. The original pool was established with seven (7) local vendors, of which one (1) – Black Velvet Topsoil, Inc. – has been removed from the pool for failure to maintain qualification requirements. <b>Since the pool’s inception, eight (8) vendors have been prequalified, six (6) of which are local, thus increasing competition for these goods.</b></p> <p>This item is placed for committee review pursuant to Miami-Dade County Code Section 29-124(f). The BCC may only consider this item if the Citizens’ Independent Transportation Trust (CITT) has forwarded a recommendation to the Board prior to the date scheduled for Board consideration or 45 days have elapsed since the issuance of this recommendation. If CITT has not forwarded a recommendation and 45 days have not elapsed since the issuance of this recommendation, a withdrawal of this item will be requested.</p> <p><b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Are surtax funds being used? According to the item, the Transportation and Public Works Department is allocated DTPW operating funds.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Surtax funds will not be used.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>This prequalification pool expires on May 31, 2017 and has an existing allocation of \$19,517,000 for the 63-month term. The requested additional expenditure authority of \$21,965,000 is based on anticipated usage during the five-year extension period. If this modification is approved, the pool’s cumulative allocation for the 10-year term would be \$41,482,000.</p> <p>The increase in allocation during the extension period for the Water and Sewer Department is attributed to a \$13.5 billion capital improvement program that will enhance and upgrade the department’s infrastructure. On a daily basis, crews are dispatched to repair and install mains, hydrants, valves and other appurtenances of the water distribution system. All of these activities require the use of aggregates and asphalt to restore roadways. As the department’s infrastructure continues to age, it will require larger quantities of aggregates to meet operational demands. All other departmental allocations are substantially the same for the extension period.</p> <p><b>9 of the 14 prequalified vendors under the pool are located in Miami-Dade County however, the item states that 12 have local addresses.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On October 6, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-831-15, approved a two-year extension of the Interlocal Agreement between Broward County and Miami-Dade County for Reciprocity of Local Preference Ordinances and Programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Section 2-8.5(6) of the Miami-Dade County Code<sup>5</sup> relating to procedure to provide preference to local business in county contracts states that “in the event Broward, Palm Beach or Monroe County extends preferences to local businesses, Miami-Dade County may enter into an interlocal agreement with such County wherein the preferences of this section may be extended and made available to vendors that have a valid occupational license issued by Broward, Palm</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.municode.com/library/fl/miami-dade\\_county/codes/code\\_of\\_ordinances?nodeId=PTIIICOR\\_CH2AD\\_ARTIINGE\\_S2-8.5PRPRPRLOBUCOCO](https://www.municode.com/library/fl/miami-dade_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIIICOR_CH2AD_ARTIINGE_S2-8.5PRPRPRLOBUCOCO)

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes																				
	<p><i>Beach or Monroe County to do business in that County that authorizes the vendor to provide the goods, services, or construction to be purchased, and a physical business address located within the limits of that County.”</i></p> <p><b>Applicable Ordinances and Contract Measures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The two (2) percent User Access Program provision applies where permitted by the funding source.</li> <li>• The Small Business Enterprise Bid Preference and Local Preference ordinances will be applied at the time of spot market competition where permitted by funding source. A set-aside applies for spot market competition up to \$100,000, where permitted by the funding source, when there are three (3) or more certified firms available.</li> <li>• The Living Wage Ordinance does not apply.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 4056-0/16 According to the Bid Tracking System</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>4056-0/16</b> <b>R-132-12</b> 3/1/2012-2/28/2017</td><td>\$13,946,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 2/7/2013</td><td>\$1,312,186</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> <b>R-229-13</b> 4/2/2013</td><td>\$814</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 11/20/2014</td><td>\$2,000,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 12/9/2015</td><td>\$220,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 2/22/2016</td><td>\$500,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Modification</b> 9/20/2016</td><td>\$377,800</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Proration</b></td><td>\$929,340</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Current Contract Total</b></td><td><b>\$19,516,140</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 4056-0/16 According to the Bid Tracking System		<b>4056-0/16</b> <b>R-132-12</b> 3/1/2012-2/28/2017	\$13,946,000	<b>Modification</b> 2/7/2013	\$1,312,186	<b>Modification</b> <b>R-229-13</b> 4/2/2013	\$814	<b>Modification</b> 11/20/2014	\$2,000,000	<b>Modification</b> 12/9/2015	\$220,000	<b>Modification</b> 2/22/2016	\$500,000	<b>Modification</b> 9/20/2016	\$377,800	<b>Proration</b>	\$929,340	<b>Current Contract Total</b>	<b>\$19,516,140</b>
Additional Information on Prequalification Pool No. 4056-0/16 According to the Bid Tracking System																					
<b>4056-0/16</b> <b>R-132-12</b> 3/1/2012-2/28/2017	\$13,946,000																				
<b>Modification</b> 2/7/2013	\$1,312,186																				
<b>Modification</b> <b>R-229-13</b> 4/2/2013	\$814																				
<b>Modification</b> 11/20/2014	\$2,000,000																				
<b>Modification</b> 12/9/2015	\$220,000																				
<b>Modification</b> 2/22/2016	\$500,000																				
<b>Modification</b> 9/20/2016	\$377,800																				
<b>Proration</b>	\$929,340																				
<b>Current Contract Total</b>	<b>\$19,516,140</b>																				
<b>8F24</b> <b>170603</b>	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ACCESS OF FLORIDA SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION CONTRACT NO. FSA16-VEH14.0 FOR PURCHASE OF CAB AND CHASSIS TRUCKS AND OTHER FLEET EQUIPMENT FOR COUNTY DEPARTMENTS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$12,408,000.00; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO ACCESS SAME AND EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CONTRACT INCLUDING EXTENSIONS AND RENEWALS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2-8.1 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA AND IMPLEMENTING ORDER 3-38</p>																				
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves accessing the Florida Sheriffs Association competitively-established contract, FSA16-VEH14.0 (Cab and Chassis Trucks and Other Fleet Equipment), for purchase of various fleet vehicles in the amount of \$12,408,000 to support departmental operations.</p> <p>This contract was designed to benefit public agencies in the State of Florida, including local government, school districts, municipalities, public safety agencies and other local public entities.</p> <p>The requested allocation will be used to purchase fleet vehicles for Fiscal Year 2016-17 for seven (7) departments to support critical operational functions. These vehicles, as enumerated below, have been administratively approved based on an analysis of useful life and will replace aging fleet. Financing for these vehicles will be handled by the Finance Department through a separate agenda item that will be submitted for BCC approval once the final cost has been determined. The departments will apply the requested funds as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The OCA posed the following question, to which ISD staff responded:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>What is the separate item?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>																				

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Once authority to access this contract is approved by the BCC and the needed vehicles have been ordered, the Finance Department will process a separate agenda item for BCC approval of the financing for the vehicles. The financing item is slated for a May BCC agenda.</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Aviation</b> is requesting <b>\$1,908,000</b>;</li> <li>• <b>Corrections and Rehabilitation</b> is requesting <b>\$350,000</b>;</li> <li>• <b>Fire Rescue</b> is requesting <b>\$1,300,000</b> in expenditure authority to procure eight (8) cab and chassis with utility bodies and one (1) heavy rescue recovery vehicle;</li> <li>• <b>Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces</b> is requesting <b>\$2,049,000</b>;</li> <li>• <b>Solid Waste Management</b> is requesting <b>\$707,000</b>;</li> <li>• <b>Vizcaya Museum and Gardens</b> is requesting <b>\$80,000</b>; and</li> <li>• <b>Water and Sewer</b> is requesting <b>\$6,014,000</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b> The fiscal impact for this purchase is \$12,408,000 and is based on the estimated cost of the required fleet. The County will access the contract through its expiration date, September 30, 2017.</p> <p>In FY 2016-17, the Adopted Budget and Multi Year Capital Plan assumes a procedural change regarding the purchasing of light and heavy fleet for all County departments. In prior fiscal years, departments contributed on an annual basis to a Fleet Replacement Trust Fund towards the replacement of their fleet upon its useful life. The Internal Services Department, in conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget and Finance, will now be working with each department to coordinate bulk purchases while utilizing the most appropriate contract and financing instrument.</p> <p><b><u>Awarded Vendors</u></b> There are 43 awarded vendors. Of the 43 vendors, six (6) are located in Miami-Dade County.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information – Committee Meeting Discussion</u></b> During the Government Operations Committee meeting on March 14, 2017, the proposed resolution was discussed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Committee questioned whether the proposed resolution provided a savings and expressed concerns regarding inclusion of local firms.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Director of ISD explained that a supplement for the proposed resolution would be provided for the BCC meeting to describe why there are so few locals on both FSA contracts. The Director explained that staff queried on a different pool for local dealerships. She explained that there were 8 vendors in that pool, 4 of which are in Miami-Dade County and the prices on the vehicles queried were between \$400 and \$4,000 more per vehicle for the local dealers. She explained the benefit of accessing aggregate dealers across the state.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Committee questioned whether or not Miami-Dade Fire Rescue (MDFR) needed more vehicles, to which the Director of OMB noted that there is another item for MDFR that has \$21 million worth of expenditures.</i></li> </ul>
<b>8F24 SUPP. 170768</b>	<b>SUPPLEMENT TO RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL TO ACCESS THE FLORIDA SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION CONTRACT FOR CAB AND CHASSIS TRUCKS AND OTHER FLEET EQUIPMENT–LEGISTAR 170603</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>This supplement provides additional information regarding the availability of local vehicle vendors to fulfill the departmental requirements under this contract. The County owns and operates over 12,000 light, heavy, construction and specialized vehicle assets which are utilized to provide various services to the community. Of these units, approximately 8,000 vehicle assets are under the direct maintenance purview of the Internal Services Department's Fleet Management Division. Approximately 60 percent (4,500) of that fleet is over 10 years of age and 29 percent (2,320) has over 100,000 odometer miles. Replacement vehicles are necessary due to the advanced age and/or mileage of the fleet, which result in high repair costs. Additionally, due to vehicle age, repair parts are often obsolete. Accordingly, all County departments have prepared five-year replacement schedules in concert with the Internal Services Department's Fleet Management Division and the Office of Management and Budget.</p>

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>As part of this fleet replacement initiative, all vehicles requested have been reviewed to be strategic, operationally necessary and economically sound; moreover, environmentally conscious technologies will be utilized where practical.</p> <p>In an effort to seek a fiscally feasible award method, which also allowed for the participation of a sufficient number of local vehicle vendors, staff communicated with the contract custodian for the Florida Sheriffs Association contract. The contract custodian confirmed that a state-wide open and competitive solicitation was done which included all government fleet vendors for the northern, southern, western and central zones of Florida. The open solicitation only yielded responses from two (2) local vendors. This contract also yielded the lowest vehicle pricing when compared to other open and competitively bid contracts.</p> <p>Unlike the traditional consumer vehicle marketplace, which has a greater per unit profit margin in favor of the vendor, the “Government Fleet” market has a much lower per unit profit margin and is dependent on volume sales on equipment to yield desirable vendor returns. While conducting market research, sales data provided by the Ford Motor Company was reviewed, revealing that in the State of Florida only 88 vendors participate in government sales and that those vendors sold over 9,900 government fleet vehicles in Fiscal Year 2015-16. Of those dealers, only seven (7) local dealers participated in this market, selling 316 government fleet vehicles, representing three (3) percent of vehicles sold.</p> <p>A comparison of vehicle pricing under the Florida Sheriffs Association contract and the County’s Automotive Vehicles Prequalification Pool (8193-0/12), which includes seven (7) local dealers, was conducted. Two (2) of the seven (7) local dealers responded to a survey for price data across a range of vehicle types; that market research found that the unit pricing from those two (2) pool vendors ranged from \$400 to approximately \$5,000 more per unit than the pricing available on the Florida Sheriffs contract for the same vehicle type. Due to these results, the Florida Sheriffs contract was deemed as the most fiscally prudent option for the County.</p>
<p><b>8L3 170401</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SOUTH MIAMI AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY TO PROVIDE FILM PERMITTING SERVICES FOR A FIVE-YEAR TERM WITH OPTION TO RENEW FOR ONE ADDITIONAL FIVE-YEAR TERM; AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OR MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME AND EXERCISE THE PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN, INCLUDING RENEWAL AND TERMINATION</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p>	<p>The proposed resolution approves an Interlocal Agreement (Agreement) with the City of South Miami (City) by the County Mayor or designee to allow the Miami-Dade Office of Film and Entertainment in the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources to issue permits to film, television, and still photography production companies desiring to use the City’s facilities.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b> Under the proposed Agreement, the Miami-Dade Office of Film and Entertainment will receive a \$100.00 application fee for each film permit processed on behalf of the City, which assists with the maintenance of the permitting system utilized by County staff</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> Ordinance No. 91-50 authorizes the Miami-Dade Film and Entertainment Office to provide one-stop film, television and still photography permitting services for all of the County’s municipalities, creating a film-friendly environment which encourages more local production. Without these interlocal agreements, film, television and still photography companies would face obstacles at each municipal boundary with additional permitting, unnecessary paperwork, further man-hours and additional fees.</p> <p>Currently, Miami-Dade County provides these services under agreements with 17 municipalities, allowing efficient processing of permits for most filming locations.</p>
<p><b>8L4 170445</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY STORMWATER UTILITY BY WHICH THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION WOULD PAY UP TO \$2,650,000.00 FOR ENGINEERING, MAPPING, AND SURVEYING SERVICES RELATED TO THE NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM PROGRAM; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY</p>



**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT AND EXERCISE ANY TERMINATION PROVISIONS AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONTAINED THEREIN
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution authorizes the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to execute a Department Funded Agreement (Agreement) with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District Six.</p> <p>Under this Agreement, Miami-Dade County will provide FDOT District Six with engineering, mapping, and surveying services related to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program.</p> <p>The term of this Agreement is through September 30, 2021.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact / Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>The FDOT District Six has programmed funding for the work to be performed under this Agreement and has agreed to reimburse the County for eligible costs up to a five-year not-to-exceed amount of \$2.65 million. The County will perform, contract, supervise, and inspect all aspects of the work funded under this Agreement. The County will monitor costs throughout the term of the Agreement to ensure that services provided to FDOT District Six do not exceed the amount FDOT District Six has allocated. The County's upfront costs will be covered by the fees supporting the Miami-Dade County Stormwater Utility.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>To comply with the requirements of its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit, FDOT District Six is required to inventory, survey, and map its stormwater infrastructure. Under a Joint Participation Agreement (now known as a Department Funded Agreement) that was approved by the BCC through Resolution No. R-766-11, which expired on September 30, 2016, the County provided engineering, mapping, and surveying services to FDOT District Six. FDOT District Six has requested that the County continue to assist it with engineering, mapping, and surveying services. The Agreement will allow the County to continue providing these services to FDOT District Six. FDOT District Six will execute this Agreement after execution by the County.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information – Committee Meeting Discussion</u></b></p> <p>During the Infrastructure and Utilities Committee meeting on March 14, 2017, the proposed resolution was discussed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>In response to the Committee's questions, the Assistant Director for the Regulatory and Economic Resources (RER) Department explained that the County is involved with stormwater modeling and surveying all of the infrastructure. He explained that in this particular case, DOT, as part of its permit, is required to have survey information about the drainage system associated with the highways. Since that is done by County to understand how drainage works in our County, in addition to the highways, the County is already doing this kind of work, so they are actually paying us for the County's services.</i></li> <li><i>The Committee noted that there have been other contracts in which the County is paying other companies to do surveys and yet in this item the County is being paid to conduct surveys.</i></li> <li><i>The Assistant Director explained that it depends on the level of surveys. He noted that the County does have its own surveyors however in this case, if the County is contracting a surveyor to find out where the piping location is and map it out, the County would pass that cost onto DOT.</i></li> <li><i>In response to a question regarding what the County surveyors do, the Assistant Director explained that the County surveyors map out elevations of the roads, find where the sewer infrastructure is located and make drawings showing where all the infrastructure is located.</i></li> </ul>
<b>8N1 170308</b>	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, THE STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY FOR THE INSTALLATION OF RAILROAD CROSSING TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES AT NORTH RIVER DRIVE IN THE VICINITY OF NW 38 AVENUE WITH YEARLY MAINTENANCE FEES PAID BY MIAMI-DADE COUNTY OF \$3,558.00
<b>8N2 170309</b>	RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, THE STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY FOR THE INSTALLATION OF RAILROAD CROSSING TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES AT NW 46 STREET IN THE VICINITY OF NW 37 COURT WITH YEARLY MAINTENANCE FEES PAID BY MIAMI-DADE COUNTY OF \$4,465.00

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
<p><b>8N3 170311</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, THE STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY FOR THE INSTALLATION OF RAILROAD CROSSING TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES AT NW 62 STREET IN THE VICINITY OF NW 37 AVENUE WITH YEARLY MAINTENANCE FEES PAID BY MIAMI-DADE COUNTY OF \$4,465.00</p>
<p><b>8N5 170022</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE APPROVAL OF A RAILROAD CROSSING LICENSE AGREEMENT, BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND FLORIDA EAST COAST RAILWAY, FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF A RAILROAD CROSSING AND TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES AT NE 16 AVENUE IN THE VICINITY OF NE 131 STREET IN THE AMOUNT ESTIMATED AT \$650,852.45; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT, TO TAKE ALL ACTIONS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE SAME, AND TO EXERCISE ALL PROVISIONS CONTAINED THEREIN</p>
<p><b>8N6 170319</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, THE STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY FOR THE INSTALLATION OF RAILROAD CROSSING TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES AT NW 22 AVENUE IN THE VICINITY OF ALI BABA AVENUE WITH YEARLY MAINTENANCE FEES PAID BY MIAMI-DADE COUNTY OF \$4,465.00</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p>	<p><b><u>8N1 – 170308</u></b>  The proposed resolution authorizes the execution of a Tri-Party Agreement among Miami-Dade County (County), the State of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), and the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) for the installation of railroad crossing traffic control devices at North River Drive, in the vicinity of NW 38 Avenue.</p> <p>The yearly safety diagnostic review coordinated by FDOT revealed the need for crossing traffic control devices at the aforementioned railroad crossing.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b>  The County will be responsible for <b>yearly maintenance fees for the crossing traffic control devices in the amount of \$3,558.00</b>, which is 50 percent of the total maintenance fee. SFRTA will cover the other 50 percent as stipulated by the cost sharing policy. SFRTA will install all the necessary facilities and FDOT will pay for the installation costs. <b>The County is not responsible for the installation costs.</b> The funding source to be used is Secondary Gas Tax under project: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS COUNTYWIDE (2000000541)/Site 68855-RAILROAD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost sharing policy was approved by the BCC on October 5, 1976 under Resolution No. R-1090-76, which stipulates that the “County may participate in the cost of maintaining grade crossing protection devices in the amount of fifty percent (50%) of the cost”.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>8N2 – 170309</u></b>  The proposed resolution authorizes the execution of a Tri-Party Agreement among Miami-Dade County (County), the State of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), and the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) for the installation of railroad crossing traffic control devices at NW 46 Street, in the vicinity of NW 37 Court.</p> <p>The yearly safety diagnostic review coordinated by FDOT revealed the need for crossing traffic control devices at the aforementioned railroad crossing.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b>  The County will be responsible for <b>yearly maintenance fees for the crossing traffic control devices in the amount of \$4,465.00</b>, which is 50 percent of the total maintenance fee. SFRTA will cover the other 50 percent as stipulated by the cost sharing policy. SFRTA will install all the necessary facilities and FDOT will pay for the installation costs. <b>The County is not responsible for the installation costs.</b> The funding source to be used is</p>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Secondary Gas Tax under project: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS COUNTYWIDE (2000000541)/Site 68855-RAILROAD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cost sharing policy was approved by the BCC on October 5, 1976 under Resolution No. R-1090-76, which stipulates that the “County may participate in the cost of maintaining grade crossing protection devices in the amount of fifty percent (50%) of the cost”.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>8N3 – 170311</u></b></p> <p>The proposed resolution authorizes the execution of a Tri-Party Agreement among Miami-Dade County (County), the State of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), and the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) for the installation of railroad crossing traffic control devices at NW 62 Street, in the vicinity of NW 37 Avenue.</p> <p>The yearly safety diagnostic review coordinated by FDOT revealed the need for crossing traffic control devices at the aforementioned railroad crossing.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>The County will be responsible for yearly maintenance fees for the crossing traffic control devices in the amount of \$4,465.00, which is 50 percent of the total maintenance fee. SFRTA will cover the other 50 percent as stipulated by the cost sharing policy. SFRTA will install all the necessary facilities and FDOT will pay for the installation costs. <b>The County is not responsible for the installation costs.</b> The funding source to be used is Secondary Gas Tax under project: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS COUNTYWIDE (2000000541)/Site 68855-RAILROAD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cost sharing policy was approved by the BCC on October 5, 1976 under Resolution No. R-1090-76, which stipulates that the “County may participate in the cost of maintaining grade crossing protection devices in the amount of fifty percent (50%) of the cost”.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>8N5 – 170022</u></b></p> <p>The proposed resolution authorizes the execution of a Railroad Crossing License Agreement (Agreement) between Miami-Dade County (County) and Florida East Coast Railway, LLC (FEC) for the reconstruction of the railroad crossing and traffic control devices at NE 16 Avenue in the vicinity of NE 131 Street, in the amount estimated at \$650,852.45.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p> <p>The cost of <b>construction is estimated at \$650,852.45</b> and is funded through RESURFACING IMPROVEMENTS COUNTY WIDE, (Project 2000000539), in the FY 2016-17 Multi-year Capital Plan. The <b>annual maintenance fee for the crossing protective devices is \$1,800.00</b> and is funded through SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS COUNTYWIDE (Project 2000000541), in the FY 2016-17 Multi-Year Capital Plan.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>The reconstruction includes widening of the railroad crossing and new traffic control devices. Once the crossing and devices are completed, the County will be responsible for the maintenance of the crossing surface on an as needed basis, and pay 50 percent or \$1,800.00 of the annual maintenance fee of the traffic control devices as established in the Agreement.</p> <p><b><u>8N6 – 170319</u></b></p> <p>The proposed resolution authorizes the execution of a Tri-Party Agreement among Miami-Dade County (County), the State of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), and the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) for the installation of railroad crossing traffic control devices at NW 22 Avenue, in the vicinity of Ali Baba Avenue.</p> <p>The yearly safety diagnostic review coordinated by FDOT revealed the need for crossing traffic control devices at the aforementioned railroad crossing.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>The County will be responsible for <b>yearly maintenance fees for the crossing traffic control devices in the amount of \$4,465.00</b>, which is 50 percent of the total maintenance fee. SFRTA will cover the other 50 percent as stipulated by the cost sharing policy. SFRTA will install all the necessary facilities and FDOT will pay for the installation costs. <b>The County is not responsible for the installation costs.</b> The funding source to be used is Secondary Gas Tax under project: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS COUNTYWIDE (2000000541)/Site 68855-RAILROAD CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cost sharing policy was approved by the BCC on October 5, 1976 under Resolution No. R-1090-76, which stipulates that the “County may participate in the cost of maintaining grade crossing protection devices in the amount of fifty percent (50%) of the cost”.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8N4</b> <b>170278</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION APPROVING A MASTER AGREEMENT AND A MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND THE CITY OF CORAL GABLES, WHEREIN THE CITY OF CORAL GABLES WILL PAY MIAMI-DADE COUNTY \$158,686.73 IN BACK RENT AND QUARTERLY RENT OF 75 PERCENT GROSS REVENUE, LESS CERTAIN DEDUCTIONS, ON THE PARKING SPACES LOCATED WITHIN LOTS 42 AND 43, AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR THE COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME FOR AND ON BEHALF OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p>	<p>The proposed resolution approves a Master Agreement revising an existing 1979 parking agreement and a Management Agreement between Miami-Dade County (County) and the City of Coral Gables (City) for two (2) municipal parking lots (Lots 42 and 43).</p> <p>The lots are partially located on Metrorail right-of-way owned by the County near University Station (approximately 75 percent) and on adjacent City right-of-way (approximately 25 percent).</p> <p>Specifically, the Master Agreement contains the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resolves non-compliance issues with the original 1979 agreement between the City and the County by eliminating the cap on the number of parking spaces between Red Road and LeJeune Road, and restricts parking adjacent to residential areas.</li> <li>Allows the City to manage the parking lots within the applicable Metrorail right-of-way and to share the revenue generated by the parking lots with the County.</li> <li>Formally authorizes access across Metrorail property by the City to its Fire Station #2.</li> </ul> <p>Specifically, the Lot 42 and 43 Management Agreement contains the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows the City to manage, operate and maintain the Metrorail right-of-way on which Lots 42 and 43 were constructed;</li> <li>Beginning on November 1, 2016, requires the City to pay to the County 75% of revenue generated, less certain deductions outlined in section 3(c) of the Management Agreement, by the use of the parking lots. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>According to Section 3(c) of the Management Agreement, only necessary and reasonable expenses in maintaining the parking lots and the necessary and reasonable expenses in administering parking lease(s) on the parking lots will be deducted from rent payments. In no event will the deduction for maintenance of the parking lots and administering such lease be great than 10% of the gross revenue under such lease. The City will be entitled to deduct expenses pertaining to major “state of good repair” capital projects upon verified receipt by the County of such expenditures and approval of such project and expenditures by the County Mayor or designee.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>For the five years prior to November 1, 2016, requires the City to pay, as back rent, 50% of the revenue generated by the parking lots (approximately \$158,686.73).</li> </ul> <p>Both agreements have an initial term of 30 years with two automatic 30-year renewals and allow the County to terminate either agreement for various reasons including breach of the provisions by the City and the determination by the County that the property is needed for a transit related use.</p> <p>The County has obtained the approval of both agreements from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b></p>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>There will be no County or other governmental funding required for this project. There will be a positive fiscal impact to the County wherein the City will pay Back Rent equal to a 50 percent share of the total gross revenue acquired from the lease of Lots 42 and 43 for the past five (5) years preceding the effective date of the Management Agreement. Additionally, the City will commence paying the County quarterly rent of 75 percent gross revenue on the parking spaces located within Lots 42 and 43 with the first payment to be made on November 1, 2016.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b>  In 1979, the County purchased right-of-way from the Florida East Coast Railway (FEC) for the construction of the southern portion of the Metrorail System. Also in 1979, the County entered into an agreement with the City whereby the City agreed to convey to the County a portion of Ponce de Leon Boulevard right-of-way to allow for the construction of the University Metrorail Station and station parking area. As a part of this agreement, both the City and the County agreed to limit the number of parking spaces to 686 in the Metrorail corridor and adjacent City right-of-way between Red Road (SW 57 Avenue) and LeJeune Road (SW 42 Avenue). To date, there are a total of 856 spaces, 170 above the required agreement threshold.</p> <p>In addition, two (2) parking lots (Lots 42 and 43) constructed partially on Ponce de Leon Boulevard right-of-way (approximately 25 percent) and partially on Metrorail right-of-way (approximately 75 percent) between Red Road and Alhambra Circle had been improved by the City and are being subleased by the City to the University of Miami. Unaware of any agreement allowing for this use of Metrorail property, County staff contacted the City, which subsequently acknowledged that they were also unable to locate any such agreement.</p> <p>After discussions, the County and the City have negotiated two agreements to resolve issues arising out of mutual non-compliance with the 1979 agreement and the use of Metrorail right-of-way by the City: a Master Agreement and the Lot 42 and 43 Management Agreement.</p>
<b>8N7 170494</b>	<p><b>RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN HARDESTY &amp; HANOVER, LLC, AND MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$350,875.00 FOR POST-DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE PROJECT ENTITLED REPLACEMENT OF THE TAMiami SWING BRIDGE AT 2000 NW SOUTH RIVER DRIVE, CONTRACT NUMBER 20080236, AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SAME</b></p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution approves the First Amendment to the Professional Services Agreement (PSA) with Hardesty &amp; Hanover, LLC (H&amp;H), entitled Replacement of the Tamiami Swing Bridge located at 2000 NW South River Drive, and increases the original PSA amount by \$350,875.00.</p> <p>Due to the complexity of the project, additional efforts have been required of H&amp;H to include review over 300 requests for information, and shop drawings; as well as, weekly conferences, field visits, design changes, and plans revisions. Therefore, an additional \$350,875.00 is being requested through this Amendment to the PSA.</p> <p>H&amp;H prepared the construction documents, has provided post design services to date, and is the Engineer of Record for the project. They are, therefore, uniquely qualified to provide these services.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b>  The fiscal impact is to Road Impact Fee District 2 in the amount of \$350,875.00 through FY 2016-17 Capital Budget Project number 604790.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b>  The BCC approved the award recommendation for the original PSA on March 2, 2010, under Resolution R-231-10. The original contract includes \$200,000.00 for Post-Design services that are needed after the design phase was complete. Since the existing bridge was determined to be a historical bridge structure and was required to be relocated to a new location where it will function only as a fixed/static pedestrian bridge, DTPW included the relocation and retrofit plan as part of the project design in order to facilitate the relocation of the bridge. Due to design issues, that were not anticipated at the time of award, as well as the need for additional survey services, geotechnical work, and permitting, the post-design monies were fully expended during design. Therefore, in order to not delay construction activities, a Special Request through the Equitable Distribution Program (EDP), in the</p>



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>amount of \$150,000.00, was approved on December 23, 2015 to provide the needed funds for the post-design services.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b></p> <p>On March 2, 2010, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-231-10, awarded a Professional Services Agreement (PSA) to Hardesty &amp; Hanover, LLP and Miami-Dade County for the General Obligation Bond (GOB) Project Entitled Design Services for the Replacement of the Tamiami Swing Bridge in the amount of \$1,969,457.74.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PSA was for design services. One the project was constructed, the estimated annual operational cost would be approximately \$212,992 and was anticipated to be the General Fund. The estimated annual maintenance cost was approximately \$64,081 and was anticipated to be from the General Fund.</li> <li>• Contract measures: CBE – 15% (\$295,418.66) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>According to a memo issued March 29, 2017 regarding Project No. E08-PW-03 GOB, Replacement of the Tamiami Swing Bridge, the prime consultant, Hardesty &amp; Hanover, LLC, has achieved 137.23% of the SBE goal applicable to the portion of the contract work performed to date. Specifically, this contract is approximately 100.69% complete based on paid to date to prime consultant. To date, the SBE-A/E firms meeting the goal have been paid \$392,212.14 or 19.78% of the dollars paid to the prime consultant.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>On May 3, 2011, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-337-11, authorized the execution of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) among Miami-Dade County, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the City of Miami (City). The Agreement established the understanding of the parties relative to the relocation of the existing Tamiami Canal/NW South River Drive Swing Bridge (bridge), as part of a permit condition for a future project to construct a new single leaf bascule bridge at the present site.</p> <p>On January 23, 2013, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-29-13, authorized the execution of a Local Agency Program (LAP) Agreement between Miami-Dade County (County) and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). The Agreement provided the County with funding up to \$16,000,000 for the relocation of the existing Tamiami Canal/NW South River Drive Bridge, and the construction of a new single leaf bascule bridge at the present site (Project).</p> <p>On June 2, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-492-15, approved the contract for the project entitled Tamiami Canal Bridge Replacement, in the amount of \$35,053,422.13 to Archer Western Construction, LLC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work to be performed under this Contract consisted of, but was not limited to, furnishing all supervision, labor, required materials, tools, and equipment; and performing all operations necessary to replace the swing bridge that currently spans the Tamiami Canal along NW South River Drive; and relocating the existing historic swing bridge to span the C-5 canal, also known as the Comfort Canal, west of NW 22 Avenue between the Miami Police Benevolent Association Park and Fern Isle Park.</li> <li>• The work also included providing pedestrian and bicycle access between the two (2) public facilities in the City of Miami. This project also included the widening and improvements to the approach roadways, dredging the Tamiami Canal, and relocating the existing 24-inch water main. The existing water main would be removed within canal dredging limits and a new 24-inch high density polyethylene water main would be installed under the Tamiami Canal using horizontal directional drilling.</li> </ul> <p>On July 14, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-658-15, added the renovation of the Tamiami Swing Bridge located in District 5, to the County's Economic Stimulus Plan approved list of projects.</p>
<b>11A1 170414</b>	<p>RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING BOARD POLICY REGARDING COUNTY-OWNED REAL PROPERTY; REQUIRING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PROVIDE WRITTEN NOTIFICATION TO DISTRICT COMMISSIONER IN WHICH COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY LIES NO LESS THAN FOUR WEEKS PRIOR TO 1) ANY ISSUANCE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL OR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST REGARDING THE SALE, LEASE, OR DEVELOPMENT OF SUCH COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY OR 2) PLACING ANY ITEM ON THE AGENDA OF THIS BOARD OR ANY COMMITTEE OF THIS BOARD REQUESTING THE APPROVAL OF THE SALE, LEASE, OR SURPLUS OF COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY</p>



**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution establishes policy that the County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee provide written notification to the District Commissioner in which the subject County-owned property lies no less than four weeks prior to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issuance of any request for proposal or expression of interest regarding the sale, lease, or development of such County-owned property; or</li> <li>• Placing any item on the agenda of the BCC or any committee of the BCC requesting approval of the sale, lease, or surplus or County-owned property.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>When County-owned property is being surplus, sold or leased, such items are presented to the BCC for approval. On occasion, the County Mayor or County Mayor’s designee issues requests for proposal or expressions of interest in connection with the sale, lease or development of County-owned property, which are later presented to the BCC for approval. It is the informal policy of the Internal Services Department (ISD) to notify the District Commissioner of the district where the County-owned property is located prior to placing an item on the agenda of the BCC to surplus, sell, or lease such property. The decision to sell, lease and/or develop County-owned property is of great interest to the Commissioner representing the area where these properties are located, and there is no formal procedure for notifying Commissioners of these decisions across all the relevant departments.</p>
<b>11A2 170727</b>	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO PROVIDE A REPORT TO THE BOARD WITHIN 45 DAYS IDENTIFYING PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES OF THE MIAMI-DADE POLICE DEPARTMENT THAT RELATE TO IMMIGRATION AND IMMIGRANT COMMUNITIES AND PROVIDING RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENSURE MIAMI-DADE POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICERS ARE NOT PERFORMING FEDERAL IMMIGRATION DUTIES; FURTHER DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO NOTIFY THE BOARD IF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY IS ASKED TO ENTER INTO ANY AGREEMENT WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 287(G) OF THE INA [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 170671]</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution sets Miami-Dade County policy to prohibit County law enforcement officers from performing the functions of federal immigration officers pursuant to the Executive Order signed by President Donald J. Trump.</p> <p><i>This item was amended at the March 15, 2017 Public Safety &amp; Health Committee to reduce the time for the County Mayor or designee to provide a report from 60 days to 45 days, and was amended to further direct the County Mayor or designee to notify the BCC if Miami-Dade County is asked to enter into any agreement with the federal government pursuant to Section 287(g) of the INA.</i></p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>On January 25, 2017, President Donald J. Trump signed an Executive Order entitled, “Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States” (Executive Order) directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to “take appropriate action, through agreements under section 287(g) of the INA, or otherwise, to authorize state and local law enforcement officials . . . to perform the functions of immigration officers” and authorizing local law enforcement to perform the functions of immigration officers may undermine the trust between local law enforcement and the immigrant community of Miami-Dade County.</p> <p>The Executive Order notes any agreements between the Secretary of Homeland Security and local law enforcement to perform the functions of immigration officers will be entered into “with the consent of state or local officials.”</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b></p> <p>On December 3, 2013, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1008-13, directed the Mayor or designee to implement a policy whereby Miami-Dade Corrections and Rehabilitations Department may, in its discretion, honor detainer requests issued by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement only if the federal government agrees in writing to reimburse Miami-Dade County for any and all costs relating to compliance with such detainer requests and the inmate that is the subject of such a request has a previous conviction for a Forcible Felony, as defined in Florida Statute section 776.08, or the inmate that is the subject of such a request has, at the time the Miami-Dade Corrections and Rehabilitations Department receives the detainer request, a pending charge of a non-bondable</p>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>offense, as provided by Article I, Section 14 of the Florida Constitution, regardless of whether bond is eventually granted.</p> <p>On February 17, 2017 the BCC held a Special Meeting to consider matters related to the County's policy regarding immigration detainer requests from the United States Department of Homeland Security Immigration and Customs Enforcement as set forth in Resolution No. R-1008-13.</p> <p>The following resolutions were adopted by the BCC at the February 17, 2017 Special Meeting:</p> <p><b>Resolution No. R-163-17</b> provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reaffirms its position that, with respect to immigration detainer requests, Miami-Dade County remains fully compliant with the United States Constitution and all applicable federal laws;</li> <li>• Amends Resolution No. R-1008-13 to direct the Mayor or designee to ensure that, related to immigration detainer requests, Miami-Dade County: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1. Remains fully compliant with all applicable federal laws and the United States Constitution;</li> <li>○ 2. Is cooperating with the federal government to the extent permissible by law;</li> <li>○ 3. Rejects any label or designation as a "sanctuary jurisdiction" pursuant to the recent Executive Order;</li> <li>○ 4. Protects the taxpayers of Miami-Dade County from any actions to render the County ineligible for current or future federal funding;</li> <li>○ 5. Continues to require the federal government to show probable cause on all immigration detainer requests; and</li> <li>○ 6. Will no longer require the federal government to reimburse Miami-Dade County for any and all costs relating to compliance with ICE detainer requests.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rejects any label or designation of Miami-Dade County as a "sanctuary jurisdiction", "sanctuary city", or "sanctuary county" when there is no black letter law or Webster's definition of such terms and when such label or designation will likely result in adverse consequences to the people of Miami-Dade County; and</li> <li>• Remains committed to the position that all fundamental human rights should be protected.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolution No. R-164-17</b> provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directs the County Attorney's Office, upon receipt of written notice from the federal government of Miami-Dade County's ineligibility to receive federal funding or denial of federal funding on the basis of the County's immigration detainer policy, to take the appropriate legal steps to challenge such action.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b>  <a href="http://www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/tns-miami-immigration-ruling.html">http://www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/tns-miami-immigration-ruling.html</a>  According to the article:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Miami-Dade County faced with threats by President Donald Trump to cut off federal funding violated the U.S. Constitution when it agreed to jail people slated for deportation, a judge ruled on Friday.</i></li> <li>• <i>Circuit Judge Milton Hirsch wrote that the policy violated the 10th Amendment, which limits the reach of the federal government over states. "Of course we must protect our country from the problems associated with unregulated immigration," Hirsch wrote. "We must protect our country from a great many things; but from nothing so much as from the loss of our historic rights and liberties."</i></li> <li>• <i>The immediate impact of the ruling was unclear. For one thing, the judge did not explicitly order Miami-Dade jailers to stop honoring requests by the federal government to hold people marked for deportation or suspected of violating immigration laws. Hirsch's ruling also could be delayed by more litigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>The county immediately filed a notice of appeal with the Third District Court of Appeal. "It is Miami-Dade County's position that immigration is a federal issue which should be handled in federal court," according to a mayor's spokesman.</i></li> </ul>
<b>11A3 170824</b>	<b>RESOLUTION SETTING POLICY FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY ESTABLISHING THE MINIMUM VOLUNTEER AGE WITH MIAMI-DADE ANIMAL SERVICES AT 16 YEARS OF AGE AND PERMITTING STUDENTS UNDER 16 YEARS OF AGE WHO ARE ENROLLED IN THE VETERINARY SCIENCES PROGRAM AT FELIX VARELA SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TO VOLUNTEER AT MIAMI-DADE ANIMAL SERVICES; DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO DEVELOP A</b>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	PLAN FOR YOUTH VOLUNTEERS AND REPORT TO THE BOARD WITHIN 90 DAYS [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 170409]
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution sets Miami-Dade County policy to establish the minimum volunteer age at Miami-Dade Animal Services at 16 years of age and directs the County Mayor to develop a plan and procedures, to present to the BCC within 90 days, for providing volunteer opportunities for 16 to 18 year olds consistent with the policy.</p> <p><i><b>This item was amended at the Public Safety and Health Committee to allow students younger than 16 and enrolled in the Veterinary Sciences Program at Felix Varela Senior High School to volunteer.</b></i></p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>The current minimum age for volunteers at Miami-Dade Animal Services is 18 years of age. Through volunteering, youth can develop the requisite experience, skills, and work ethic for future employment. Miami-Dade Public Schools and many private and charter schools require that students perform volunteer service prior to graduation. The proposed resolution seeks to provide more youth with volunteer opportunities at Miami-Dade County Animal Services and changing the minimum volunteer age from 18 years of age to 16 years of age is consistent with this goal. Miami-Dade Animal Services Department encourages volunteer participation in meeting their mission of re-homing and caring for abandoned cats and dogs.</p>
<b>11A4 170580</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PREPARE A FEASIBILITY REPORT RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO REDUCE PEDESTRIAN FATALITIES BY INCORPORATING COMPONENTS OF LOS ANGELES' VISION ZERO CAMPAIGN AND PRESENT SAID REPORT TO THE COUNTY COMMISSION PURSUANT TO ORDINANCE NO. 14-65
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to prepare a feasibility report relating to the establishment of a comprehensive plan to reduce pedestrian fatalities by incorporating components of Los Angeles' Vision Zero campaign;</li> <li>• Directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to provide the requested feasibility report to the BCC within 90 days of the effective date of this resolution, which will be placed on a BCC agenda.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Relevant Legislation</u></b></p> <p>On June 7, 2016, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-529-16, provided for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopted the Miami-Dade Safer People, Safer Streets Local Action Plan and directed the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to work with the Safer People, Safer Streets Local Action Team and coordinate quarterly meetings to ensure implementation of the Miami-Dade Safer People, Safer Streets Local Action Plan and provide an annual report of the progress of the Safer People, Safer Streets Local Action Plan to the BCC;</li> <li>• Directed the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to assign the Transportation and Public Works Department to lead the implementation and support of the Safer People, Safer Streets Local Action Plan in coordination with the Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department, Miami-Dade Police Department and Miami-Dade Regulatory and Economic Resources Department;</li> <li>• Directed the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to work with the Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization to coordinate its programs and resources with the Safer People, Safer Streets Local Action Plan; and</li> <li>• Directed the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to pursue funds and evaluate programs that can further the Safer People, Safer Streets Local Action Plan vision of providing a more livable Miami-Dade through the realization of healthier, safer streets accommodating all modes of transportation.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Los Angeles' Vision Zero Campaign<sup>6</sup></u></b></p> <p>Vision Zero Los Angeles is the city's commitment to eliminate all traffic deaths by 2025. As directed by Mayor Garcetti, this citywide effort brings together transportation engineers, police officers, advocates, and policymakers to work together towards creating safer streets. The focus will be protecting the most vulnerable road users, including children, older adults, and people walking and bicycling.</p>

<sup>6</sup> <http://visionzero.lacity.org/what-is-vision-zero-la/>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>The Los Angeles Department of Transportation has identified a network of streets, the High Injury Network (HIN), where strategic investments will have the biggest impact in reducing deaths and severe injuries. Despite making up only six percent of city streets, nearly two-thirds of all deaths and severe injuries involving people walking occur on the HIN.</p> <p><b>Giving Pedestrians a Head Start</b> Twenty-two new Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs) were installed at signals throughout the City, giving people walking a head start when crossing the street against turning vehicles. LPIs have been shown to reduce collisions between people walking and driving by as much as 60 percent at treated intersections.</p> <p><b>Hollywood &amp; Highland Pedestrian Scramble</b> The City installed a pedestrian scramble at the intersection of Hollywood and Highland, increasing safety for people walking by stopping vehicle traffic in all four directions during the crossing period. In the first 11 months of 2015, before installing the pedestrian scramble, there were 19 collisions and 13 injuries. In the six months after the installation, our first evaluation using provisional data revealed only one non-injury collision.</p> <p><b>Cesar E. Chavez Avenue Curb Extensions</b> The City installed curb extensions on many corners along Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, reducing the crossing distance for people walking and increasing the visibility for people driving. By “tightening” the intersection, these improvements will also reduce the speed of turning vehicles. Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, one of the 15 Great Streets, is part of the High Injury Network, the 6 percent of City streets that account for 65 percent of deaths and serious injuries for people walking.</p> <p><b>Vision Zero Los Angeles releases RFQ for Community-Based Organizations and Artists</b> The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) has received approximately \$250,000 in funding from the California Office of Transportation Safety (OTS) to work directly with community based organizations to implement innovative, creative and engaging, site-specific interventions, outreach, and education along 10 specific corridors suffering from some of the highest rates of traffic deaths and serious injuries in Los Angeles.</p>
<p><b>11A5 170732</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO NEGOTIATE CHANGE ORDER NO. 3 TO MISCELLANEOUS CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT NO. MCC-8-10 WITH MUNILLA CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT, LLC, EXTENDING THE CONTRACT TIME ON A MONTH TO MONTH BASIS, BUT NOT TO EXCEED ONE YEAR AND INCREASING THE CONTRACT AMOUNT BY NO MORE THAN \$6,000,000.00; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SUCH CHANGE ORDER WITHOUT NEED FOR SUBSEQUENT BOARD ACTION AND TO EXERCISE DELEGATED AUTHORITY DESCRIBED THEREIN [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 170529]</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p>	<p>The proposed resolution provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directs the County Mayor or designee to negotiate Change Order No. 3 to Miscellaneous Construction Contract No. MCC-8-10 with Munilla Construction Management, LLC (MCM);</li> <li>• Increases the contract duration for a year from the effective date of this Resolution;</li> <li>• Increases the contract amount by no more than \$6,000,000.00 (<i>to \$96,125,000 from the original award amount of \$50,125,000</i>);</li> <li>• Provides for a termination for convenience clause in the contract; and</li> <li>• Authorizes the County Mayor or designee to execute such change order without need for subsequent BCC action, and to exercise the provisions therein.</li> </ul> <p><i>This item was amended at the March 16, 2017 Economic Development &amp; Tourism Committee changing the extension from a one-year extension to a month to month extension not to exceed one year.</i></p> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b> On December 19, 2011, the BCC through Resolution No. R-1122-11, awarded the MDAD Miscellaneous Construction Contract, MCC-8-10, to MCM in the amount of \$50,125,000. The contract provides for a licensed general contractor to subcontract projects on a competitive basis to allow MDAD to respond in a timely</p>

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>and efficient manner to demands for construction projects at its facilities. Projects include minor renovations, refurbishments, repairs, modifications, upgrades, installation of landscaping and related lighting, irrigation and maintenance work as well as various types of emergency and periodic maintenance for MDAD airport facilities.</p> <p>According to Resolution No. R-1122-11:</p> <p><i>The general contractor attempts to maximize participation of Community Small Business Enterprise (CSBE) subcontractors certified by the Small Business Development (SBD) Department. Each work order describes the scope of work to be performed and includes the applicable CSBE contract measures for the project.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>MCC-8-10 has a Small Business Enterprise measure of 18 percent on pre-construction services. MCM has achieved 16 percent Small Business Enterprise (Construction) participation to date. This percentage is expected to increase once outstanding projects are awarded upon approval of Change Order No. 1. The current participation of Small Business Enterprise (Construction) contractors is approximately 34 percent. This change order authorizes the issuance of a work order to the Small Business Enterprise (Construction) firm for supplemental pre-construction services and project management in an amount not to exceed \$617,000.00 to more accurately reflect the intent of the goal.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The MCC-8-10 contract has already committed to projects in excess of \$45 million, many of which have been awarded or are in the bidding process. The available contract allocation has been reduced to approximately \$3.82 million for bidding and award of additional projects.</i></p> <p><i>It was necessary to use this contract to complete several unforeseen critical construction projects with crucial time constraints to support the development of the MIA North and South Terminals as well as the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC) and the Central Boulevard relocation. In total, nearly 30 percent of the original award amount has been committed to support these construction projects:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>FIS Station Interior Finish -- \$89,679.60; FIS Security Doors Upgrade -- \$122,453.00; NTD FIS Station Interior Finish -- \$868.16; NTD Back-up A/C Units Installation -- \$66,059.80; Central Boulevard Piers Grounding System Relocation -- \$17,363.20; Central North Terminal Development (NTD) Market Place, Phases II and III -- \$3,170,291.45; NTD Terminal Operations Supervisors Offices -- \$3,933.86; NTD Ticket Counters Concourse Level -- \$4,678,417.65; NTD FPL Vaults Fire Rated Damper -- \$116,706.71; South Terminal 5th Floor Mechanical Room Exiting Modifications -- \$35,526.48; and NTD Baggage Handling System (BHS) Phase 3 Mechanical-Electrical -- \$4,762,925.30.</i></li> </ul> <p>CONTRACT MEASURES: Small Business Enterprise (Construction) goal 18% (Pre-Construction Services) \$32,036.00</p> <p>CONTRACT MEASURES ACHIEVED TO DATE: MCO Construction and Services, Inc. 16% (\$28,080.00) Participation to date</p> <p><i>During the original agreement, there was a mistake made with the calculation of the goal percentage. The percentage should have been based upon the entire Project Management portion of the contract. However, it was based on the pre-construction work in the amount of \$177,980.00. In order to correct this miscalculation, this change order authorizes the issuance of a Work Order to MCO Construction and Services, Inc. for the entire Project Management participation as originally intended in an amount not to exceed 18% (\$617,000.00).</i></p> <p><b><u>Additional Information- Change Order No. 1</u></b></p> <p><b>On February 18, 2015, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-187-15, approved Change Order No. 1 to the Miscellaneous Construction Contract, MCC-8-10, with Munilla Construction Management (MCM), LLC, increasing the contract by an amount not to exceed \$30 million to \$80,125,000.00 from the original award amount of \$50,125,000.00. The term of the Agreement is four (4) years with one (1) additional year to complete all authorized work initiated during the previous four year term of the contract. No Project Order will be issued where the base award amount exceeds \$5,000,000.00 excluding allowance accounts, pre-construction fees and MCC-8 construction fees.</b></p> <p><b><i>Additional Information- File No. 141780- Resolution authorizing execution of Change Order No. 1- File No. 141780 was deferred at the October 17, 2014 BCC meeting and withdrawn at the October 21, 2014 BCC</i></b></p>



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><i>meeting, however prior to being withdrawn, File No. 141780 was discussed at the August 25, 2014 Finance Committee meeting as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>MDAD clarified that the change order was for an additional \$30 million, representing an increase from \$50 million to \$80 million and noted that the initial funding source was North Terminal Capital Improvement funds and reserve maintenance funds.</i></li> <li><i>In response to questions as to why the project was underestimated, MDAD explained that MDAD was unaware that they would receive a flat, low cost contract with an 8 percent markup and further explained that large North Terminal emergency rehabilitation funding expenses were incurred. A decision to expand the current contract was made rather than to secure a new agreement at a higher markup.</i></li> <li><i>The Committee noted concern that the bid was not originally offered at \$80 million, thus attracting contractors offering lower markups and pointed out that this process encouraged vendors to initially underbid contracts and inflate the contract later, the intended amount of work should have been included in the original bid and that there was no attempt made to rebid the contract.</i></li> <li><i>It was explained that MDAD explained that funds were used to cover the cost associated with large emergency expenditures at the North Terminal.</i></li> <li><i>The Committee commented that the procurement process encouraged companies to submit low initial bids and then find reasons to raise the contract amount later and pointed out that the proposed change order represented more than 50 percent of the original contract amount, noting that this proposal was not a good policy decision.</i></li> <li><i>The Committee inquired whether MDAD or the contractor initiated the request for work order changes or funding and whether the intent was to expand the existing contract to cover maintenance, operations, emergency, and construction costs associated with an existing project and pointed out that this request was associated with ongoing projects and that some of the money from the initial project was redirected to other purposes and that the current request was to replenish funds allocated to the original project that were used for other purposes and that the original scope was not being changed.</i></li> <li><i>MDAD initiated the request and that an existing contract was being expanded.</i></li> <li><i>The Committee stated that the proposal could have been documented to reaffirm that the change order was not impacting the previously approved scope of work but to replace funds that were used for other purposes.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information- Change Order No. 2</u></b>  <b>On March 8, 2016, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-228-16, directed the County Mayor or designee to negotiate Change Order No. 2 to Miscellaneous Construction Contract No. MCC-8-10 with Munilla Construction Management, LLC, extending the contract time for one year, increasing the contract amount by no more than \$10,000,000 to \$90,125,000 from the original award amount of \$50,125,000, and providing for a termination for convenience clause.</b></p> <p><i>The ability to issue new work orders under the MCC was to expire on February 29, 2016. The County had begun the process of procuring a replacement contract, MCC-9.</i></p> <p><b>Discussion pertaining to Resolution No. R-228-16- Change Order No. 2- at the March 3, 2016 BCC meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Commissioners expressed concern regarding continuously extending the contract and how a \$50 million procurement contract ended up becoming a \$90 million contract;</i></li> <li><i>MDAD, explained that this change order enabled staff to advance work that needed to be done at MIA that was planned for the future. The advantage to using this contract was the prime administrator's rate was much lower than the current market price;</i></li> <li><i>Commissioners requested a commitment for the record that this would be the last request for an extension on this contract;</i></li> <li><i>Commissioners inquired what the consequences would be if this was not approved today to which MDAD explained that staff was trying to expedite as much construction as possible to accommodate MIA's rapid growth. MDAD reported that 3% growth was projected; however, there was actually 8% growth and stated the advantages to using this contract allowed work orders to be issued immediately on future</i></li> </ul>



# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><i>work; however, MDAD did not want to give the impression that work would stop if this change order was denied, the work would be bid out.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Commissioners inquired about MCC 9; whether it had been prepared and released and the amount, to which MDAD responded that the MCC9 was prepared, but not released and the contract amount was \$50 million.</i></li> <li><i>MDAD explained that approximately 90 projects and 41 different small businesses were performing on the MCC 8 project; with 37% on direct services indicating \$16.8 million on the Small Business Enterprise (SBE) local portion. MDAD stated that the disadvantaged business enterprise portion had a \$2.3 million injection.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information- ITB-MDAD-MCC-9-16- Rejecting All Bids</u></b></p> <p>On March 6, 2017, File No. 170493 was deferred at the EDTC meeting. File No. 170493, rejects the six (6) bids received by the Miami-Dade Aviation Department (MDAD) for Invitation to Bid (ITB) for Miscellaneous Construction Contract (MCC), ITB No. MDAD-MCC-9-16.</p> <p><b>Background</b></p> <p>The ITB for the subject project was advertised on September 20, 2016 to obtain the services of a licensed General Contractor who would enter into subcontractor agreements with and provide education and business training for subcontractors (with an emphasis on Small Business Development (SBD) and Certified Community Small Business Enterprise (CSBE) subcontractors to perform construction, maintenance and construction services).</p> <p>Bids were received from six (6) firms on November 4, 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NV2A Group, LLC;</li> <li>Cherokee Enterprises, Inc.;</li> <li>TGSV Enterprises, Inc.;</li> <li>Munilla Construction Management, LLC, d/b/a MCM;</li> <li>GEC Associates, Inc.; and</li> <li>Turner Construction Company.</li> </ul> <p>Why has it taken so long for the Rejection of Bids to come before the BCC?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>According to MDAD, the new solicitation cannot be issued until the BCC approves the rejection of bids for the current solicitation.</i></li> </ul> <p>The ITB asked bidders to bid on hourly rates for various construction management positions and various multipliers which would be applied to work by their subcontractors. During the bid evaluation process, however, it was discovered that the number of hours for the construction management positions under the Preconstruction Services were understated by a significant factor. The amount that the County will spend on construction management is therefore understated in the bids, resulting in the bids being skewed, as differences in bidder hourly rates are significantly smaller than would be accurate. This has also resulted in a bid that is not representative of the costs of needed services from the bidders.</p> <p>The matter has been addressed with the MDAD staff responsible for this situation. MDAD intends to correct the number of hours and rebid the contract, which will ensure that all bidders are competing on a level playing field and the County awards this contract to the firm that will provide the lowest price over the life of the contract.</p>
<p><b>11A6 170545</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION DECLARING CERTAIN FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY; WAIVING, BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT, THE PROCEDURE FOR DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY; AUTHORIZING THE DONATION OF SUCH EQUIPMENT TO THE CITY OF ROATAN, HONDURAS FIRE DEPARTMENT; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE A FOREIGN GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY DONATION AGREEMENT, TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN AND TO TAKE ANY AND ALL ACTIONS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THE FOREGOING</p>
<p><b>11A7 170547</b></p>	<p>RESOLUTION DECLARING CERTAIN FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY; WAIVING, BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT, THE PROCEDURE FOR DISPOSITION OF</p>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
<p><b>11A8 170550</b></p> <p><b>11A9 170551</b></p>	<p>SURPLUS PROPERTY; AUTHORIZING THE DONATION OF SUCH EQUIPMENT TO THE CITY OF PALIN, GUATEMALA FIRE DEPARTMENT; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE A FOREIGN GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY DONATION AGREEMENT, TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN AND TO TAKE ANY AND ALL ACTIONS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THE FOREGOING</p> <p>RESOLUTION DECLARING CERTAIN FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY; WAIVING, BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT, THE PROCEDURE FOR DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY; AUTHORIZING THE DONATION OF SUCH EQUIPMENT TO THE CITY OF ASUNCION, PARAGUAY FIRE DEPARTMENT; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE A FOREIGN GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY DONATION AGREEMENT, TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN AND TO TAKE ANY AND ALL ACTIONS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THE FOREGOING</p> <p>RESOLUTION DECLARING CERTAIN FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY; WAIVING, BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT, THE PROCEDURE FOR DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY; AUTHORIZING THE DONATION OF SUCH EQUIPMENT TO THE CITY OF CHICHIGALPA, NICARAGUA FIRE DEPARTMENT; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE A FOREIGN GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY DONATION AGREEMENT, TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN AND TO TAKE ANY AND ALL ACTIONS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THE FOREGOING</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p>	<p>The proposed resolutions provide for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Declares certain firefighting equipment surplus, obsolete and cannot legally be used by another County department, a municipality in Miami-Dade County or an eligible community based organization;</li> <li>• Declare such equipment, with the listed residual value and other characteristics, to be surplus pursuant to chapter 274, Florida Statutes, and section 2-11.2.1 of the Code;</li> <li>• Waive by a two-thirds vote of members present and pursuant to subsection (d) of section 2-11.2.1 of the Code, the procedure for the disposition of County surplus property set forth in subsection (b) of section 2-11.2.1 of the Code, and donate the equipment to the Donee;</li> <li>• Authorize the County Mayor or designee to execute the foreign governmental entity donation agreement with the Donee; and</li> <li>• The Donee will take possession of the equipment within 60 days of the effective date of this resolution and will be responsible for any and all costs of transferring the equipment. If, for any reason, the Donee fails to take possession of the equipment within 60 days of the effective date of this resolution, then this resolution will be null and void, and the ownership rights to the equipment will revert back to the County.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>11A6 - 170545</u></b></p> <p>The following firefighting equipment is obsolete and cannot legally be used by another County department, a municipality in Miami-Dade County or an eligible community based organization. The City of Roatan, Honduras Fire Department (Donee) has expressed an interest in the property and desires to use the equipment within the Country of Honduras:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 Sets of Turnout Gear: Coats &amp; Pants; Est. Value \$5,000;</li> <li>• 50 Fire Helmets; Est. Value \$500; and</li> <li>• 50 Sets of Fire Boots; Est. Value \$500.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>11A7 - 170547</u></b></p> <p>The following firefighting equipment is obsolete and cannot legally be used by another County department, a municipality in Miami-Dade County or an eligible community based organization. The City of Palin, Guatemala Fire Department (Donee) has expressed an interest in the property and desires to use the equipment within the Country of Guatemala:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 Sets of Turnout Gear: Coats &amp; Pants; Est. Value \$5,000;</li> <li>• 50 Fire Helmets; Est. Value \$500; and</li> <li>• 50 Sets of Fire Boots; Est. Value \$500.</li> </ul>

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><b><u>11A8 - 170550</u></b></p> <p>The following firefighting equipment is obsolete and cannot legally be used by another County department, a municipality in Miami-Dade County or an eligible community based organization. The Cuerpo de Bomberos Voluntarios de Asuncion, Paraguay—the City of Asuncion, Paraguay Fire Department—(Donee) has expressed an interest in the property and desires to use the equipment within the Country of Paraguay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 Sets of Turnout Gear: Coats &amp; Pants; Est. Value \$5,000; and</li> <li>• 50 Sets of Fire Boots; Est. Value \$500.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>11A9 - 170551</u></b></p> <p>The following firefighting equipment is obsolete and cannot legally be used by another County department, a municipality in Miami-Dade County or an eligible community based organization. The City of Chichigalpa, Nicaragua Fire Department (Donee) has expressed an interest in the property and desires to use the equipment within the Country of Nicaragua:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 Sets of Turnout Gear: Coats &amp; Pants; Est. Value \$5,000;</li> <li>• 50 Fire Helmets; Est. Value \$500; and</li> <li>• 50 Sets of Fire Boots; Est. Value \$500.</li> </ul>
<b>11A10 170781</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE MAYOR OR MAYOR’S DESIGNEE, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, TO COORDINATE WITH THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, FLORIDA LEAGUE OF CITIES, GREATER MIAMI & THE BEACHES HOTEL ASSOCIATION, AND GREATER MIAMI CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU FOR THE PURPOSE OF IDENTIFYING BEST PRACTICES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT ENTITIES TO ADDRESS ISSUES RELATED TO AIRBNB-TYPE ENTITIES OPERATING IN THE SHORT-TERM RESIDENTIAL RENTAL MARKET, INCLUDING COLLECTING TAXES AND ENFORCING REGULATIONS; AND TO RESEARCH HOW OTHER LOCAL GOVERNMENT ENTITIES ARE ADDRESSING SUCH ISSUES RELATED TO AIRBNB-TYPE ENTITIES; AND TO PROVIDE A REPORT [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 170526]
<b>11A24 170822</b>	RESOLUTION APPROVING A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE TAX COLLECTOR OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND AIRBNB, INC. FOR THE COLLECTION OF TOURIST TAXES; DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE SUCH MEMORANDUM AND EXERCISE ALL RIGHTS CONTAINED THEREIN; DIRECTING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO NEGOTIATE AND EXECUTE SIMILAR MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING WITH OTHER ONLINE BOOKING PLATFORMS AND TO EXERCISE ALL RIGHTS CONTAINED THEREIN
<b>Notes</b>	<p><b><u>11A10 – 170781</u></b></p> <p>The proposed resolution directs the Mayor or designee, in conjunction with the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, to coordinate with the National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, Florida Association of Counties, and Florida League of Cities for the purpose of identifying best practices for local government entities to address issues related to Airbnb-type entities operating in the short-term residential rental market, including collecting taxes and enforcing regulations; and to research how other local government entities are addressing such issues related to Airbnb-type entities.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the Mayor or designee to prepare and provide a report to the BCC within 90 days on a BCC agenda in accordance with Ordinance No. 14-65.</p> <p><i>This item was amended at the March 16, 2017 Economic Development &amp; Tourism Committee meeting to include additional topics to the list of issues that the BCC is directing the Mayor to investigate relating to short-term rentals via platform or peer to peer entities; and to add additional non-governmental entities, Hotel Association and the Greater Miami Convention and Visitor’s Bureau, to coordinate with to gather information about how to address issues related to short-term rentals.</i></p> <p><b>11A24 – 170822</b></p>

## Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

### Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approves the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Tax Collector and Airbnb, Inc. for the purpose of collecting the two percent (2%) Tourist Development Room Tax (TDT), one percent (1%) Professional Sports Franchise Facility Tax (PSFFT) and three percent (3%) Convention Development Tax (CDT), collectively (Tourist Taxes) on short-term rental bookings conducted on Airbnb's platform throughout Miami-Dade County.</li><li>• Directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to execute such Memorandum of Understanding with Airbnb, Inc.;</li><li>• Directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to negotiate and execute similar memoranda of understanding with other online booking platforms.</li></ul> <p>This MOU is entered into for the sole purpose of facilitating the immediate collection and remittance of Tourist Taxes by Airbnb resulting from booking transactions made on Airbnb's internet-based platform. The MOU does not provide for the remittance of Tourist Taxes relating to accommodations that were booked prior to the effective date of the MOU; however, the County reserves its right to pursue these remittances from Guests, Hosts or Airbnb in the future.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>Pursuant to Sections 29-51.2 and 29-61.2 of the Miami-Dade County Code, the Tax Collector of Miami-Dade County (Tax Collector) has the same duties and powers as those vested in the Florida Department of Revenue under Chapter 212, Florida Statutes, with respect to the local collection of the Tourist Development Room Tax, Professional Sports Franchise Facility Tax and Convention Development Tax or other similar taxes (Tourist Taxes).</p> <p>In 2014, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-817-14, directing the County Mayor and County Attorney to determine the impact of peer-to-peer room rentals on County revenues and the County's hotel industry, and make recommendations on steps to minimize any negative impacts. Subsequently, in July of 2016, the Strategic Planning and Government Operations Committee directed the Administration to pursue a contractual arrangement with Airbnb so that Tourist Taxes can be remitted to the County for booking transactions on Airbnb's internet-based platform.</p> <p>As reported to the BCC in October, the County entered into negotiations with the goal of retaining its rights to: (1) begin collection of Tourist Taxes for transactions on the Airbnb platform, (2) collect back taxes from the party responsible to pay them, (3) audit tax payments, and (4) obtain the identity of host names and addresses either upfront or upon termination of a collection agreement. Both parties entered into the MOU voluntarily in order to facilitate the collection of tourist taxes in Miami-Dade County resulting from booking transactions on Airbnb's platform. The agreement provides for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Airbnb to register as a "Dealer" under Chapter 212.03(2) of the Florida Statutes for the reporting, collection and remittance of Tourist Taxes on behalf of the guest and/or host as of the effective date of the agreement;</li><li>• Airbnb to maintain a complete record of each booking transaction and property in their records; and</li><li>• The ability for the County Tax Collector to audit Airbnb in the manner provided under County Code, subject to the modification regarding non-disclosure of House and Guest name and address.</li></ul> <p>The MOU does not require Airbnb to disclose to the County the name or address of the Houses and Guests involved in booking transactions made on the Airbnb platform. However, the MOU contains a favored nation clause that requires Airbnb to disclose this information to the County if Airbnb enters into a collection agreement with any other County or municipality in Florida, or the State of Florida Department of Revenue regarding Tourist Taxes that provides for disclosure of such information to any such entity. Nothing in the MOU limits the powers of Miami-Dade County BCC or municipalities and it does not impair or adversely affect the County's performance of its obligations under County bond indentures.</p> <p>Though the MOU does not address zoning and other regulatory concerns, the County reserves the right to pursue additional agreements or take legal action to enforce any and all regulations. Additionally, the MOU does not confer legitimacy, bless, or otherwise authorize the operation of a short-term room rental that violates County or</p>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>municipal regulations. The MOU also requires Airbnb to update its website pages for Miami-Dade County to include, under its “Responsible Hosting” link, information about zoning, building housing standards, business license, and taxes within Miami-Dade County and its municipalities.</p> <p>The State Department of Revenue has executed a similar agreement with Airbnb for the collection of sales and local tourist taxes on behalf of twenty-four (24) Florida counties. Additionally, eleven (11) other counties in the State have entered into similar agreements.</p> <p><b><u>Fiscal Impact/Funding Source</u></b>  Airbnb will begin collecting and remitting Tourist Taxes no later than the first day of the calendar month not less than two weeks after the MOU is fully executed, projected to be May 1, 2017. Collections for the first year of the MOU are estimated at \$6,000,000 based on reported figures. The Tourist Taxes collected will be deposited into prescribed trust funds and used for eligible expenses pursuant to Chapter 29 of the Miami-Dade County Code and Chapter 212.0305 of the Florida Statutes.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information – Homestead Exemption Fraud<sup>7</sup></u></b>  The Miami-Dade County Property Appraiser warns that homeowners may be committing homestead fraud. According to the Property Appraiser, homestead exemptions must be cancelled under the following conditions<sup>8</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The property is rented</li> <li>• The property is not your permanent residence</li> <li>• You have homestead exemption on another property</li> <li>• Your spouse has homestead exemption on another property</li> <li>• You receive a permanent residency benefit or tax credit in another state</li> <li>• The original applicant passed away</li> </ul> <p>Improperly claiming homestead exemption will result in tax liens up to 10 years taxes, plus a 50% penalty and 15% interest.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information – Proposed Legislation<sup>9</sup></u></b>  Senate Bill 188 and House Bill 425 permit a local law, ordinance, or regulation that regulates activities that arise when a property is used as a vacation rental. However, such regulation must apply uniformly to all residential properties without regard to whether the property is used as a vacation rental or a long-term rental, or is rented by the property owner. The bill retains the current requirement that local governments cannot prohibit vacation rentals or regulate the duration or frequency of vacation rentals. The bill also retains the grandfather provision in current law that exempts from the prohibition any local law, ordinance, or regulation that was enacted by a local government on or before June 1, 2011, and seeks to also permit a local government to amend a law, ordinance or regulation adopted on or before June 1, 2011, to be less restrictive.</p> <p>Senate Bill 188 passed favorably in the senate Regulated Industries Committee and has been placed on the senate Community Affairs Committee meeting agenda for April 3, 2017.</p> <p>House Bill 425 passed favorably in the house Careers and Competition Subcommittee and has been referred to the house Commerce Committee.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b>  <i>According to Airbnb.com,<sup>10</sup> when deciding whether to become an Airbnb host, it's important to understand how the laws work in your city. Some cities have laws that restrict your ability to host paying guests for short periods.</i></p>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.miamidade.gov/pa/exemptions.asp>

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.miamidade.gov/pa/library/exemption-fraud-insert.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2017/00188>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.airbnb.com/help/article/376/what-legal-and-regulatory-issues-should-i-consider-before-hosting-on-airbnb>



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p><i>These laws are often part of a city's zoning or administrative codes. In many cities, you must register, get a permit, or obtain a license before you list your property or accept guests. Certain types of short-term bookings may be prohibited altogether. Local governments vary greatly in how they enforce these laws. Penalties may include fines or other enforcement. These rules can be confusing. In some tax jurisdictions, Airbnb will take care of calculating, collecting, and remitting local occupancy tax on your behalf. Occupancy tax is calculated differently in every jurisdiction, and we're moving as quickly as possible to extend this benefit to more hosts around the globe.</i></p> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b></p> <p><b>Warning to Miami-Dade's Airbnb hosts: You may risk tax fraud – March 17, 2017<sup>11</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Miami-Dade homeowners frequently renting stays to Airbnb customers risk losing their homestead exemptions, according to a new advisory from the elected property appraiser — the latest example of the popular “home sharing” service dividing the county’s political establishment.</i></li> <li>• <i>A one-page flier prepared by the office of Property Appraiser carried the headline “Homestead Exemption Fraud and Airbnb” and warns that Miami-Dade property owners utilizing the property-tax discount may be violating the law if they also rent to Airbnb travelers.</i></li> <li>• <i>In an interview, the Property Appraiser pointed to a state statute that bars homestead exemptions when someone rents out all or most of a residence for at least 30 days two years in a row.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Property Appraisers advisory comes as various mayors in Miami-Dade have lined up on opposite sides of the Airbnb issue. The mayors of Miami and Miami Beach have rallied to reject Airbnb in their cities saying the service disrupts residential living and can cause strife with neighbors.</i></li> <li>• <i>According to ads Airbnb has been airing in Miami-Dade, 66 percent of hosts in the county use the money they make from the platform to pay their rent or mortgage. In the city of Miami, 64 percent of hosts rent out their primary residence for an average of 39 days a year, according to a report the platform released in December.</i></li> <li>• <i>The homestead exemption is reserved for primary residences and often means substantial savings on the annual property-tax bill. Homeowners may deduct \$50,000 off their property’s taxable value, as well as restrict the value’s growth to 3 percent a year.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Airbnb reaches tax agreement with Miami-Dade County – March 20, 2017<sup>12</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Airbnb finally reached a tax deal with Miami-Dade County, part of Airbnb’s fourth largest market in the U.S.</i></li> <li>• <i>If the county commission approves the deal, Airbnb will collect and remit occupancy taxes on behalf of its roughly 6,800 hosts in Miami-Dade. Based on 2016 numbers, the short-term rental giant would collect \$8 million. The first two months of 2017 are already up 25 percent compared to the year before.</i></li> <li>• <i>The deal means that Airbnb would tack on a 6 percent tax for its hosts in most of the county. The company reached an agreement with Surfside in March, which is excluded from the county’s, and has not reached an understanding with Bal Harbour, also excluded. In Miami Beach, one of its biggest and most contentious cities within the county, Airbnb would collect a 3 percent convention tax, but not the city’s 4 percent bed tax.</i></li> <li>• <i>Miami-Dade marks the 36th county in Florida with which Airbnb has reached similar deals. Within the county, though, the short-term rental platform has faced significant opposition from Miami Beach and city of Miami mayors. They are set to hold a joint press conference on Monday regarding Airbnb and other short-term rentals.</i></li> <li>• <i>On Friday, the Miami-Dade County Property Appraiser issued a press release about homestead exemption fraud. In Florida, homeowners can receive a \$50,000 exemption on the assessed value of their primary residence. The property appraiser’s office warned homeowners that they may lose their exemption status and “may also have to pay back taxes with a 50% penalty and 15% interest rate,” if renting their houses out on platforms like Airbnb.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Miami City Commission will vote on Thursday on a mayor-sponsored resolution requiring the city to “vigorously” enforce its zoning laws. The Miami mayor has argued that the best way to tackle the issue</i></li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/local/community/miami-dade/article139201473.html>

<sup>12</sup> <https://therealdeal.com/miami/2017/03/20/airbnb-reaches-tax-agreement-with-miami-dade-county/>



# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>is by going after Airbnb hosts in a way similar to the city of Miami Beach, which enacted legislation imposing \$20,000 fines against homeowners who illegally rent their properties through Airbnb.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the Miami-Dade agreement, Airbnb would likely collect and remit taxes every two weeks. The company is also in talks with Broward County on a similar arrangement, he said. In Miami-Dade, hosts earned the most out of any other county at \$113 million in 2016, and the tri-county area's hosts raked in a combined \$160 million, Airbnb said in December.</li> <li>• Airbnb, valued at \$31 billion, brought in \$1 billion during its latest round of fundraising, 10 percent of which came from China's sovereign wealth fund, the China Investment Corporation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Miami Mayor Wants More Limits on Airbnb and Home-Sharing – March 20, 2017<sup>13</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airbnb and other home-sharing platforms face more restrictions in Miami, where the mayor plans for more aggressive enforcement of regulations prohibiting rentals of single-family homes in its residential areas.</li> <li>• Miami Mayor pledged to crack down on short-term rentals that generate complaints about parties and other noisy disruptions.</li> <li>• Though popular with travelers and homeowners looking to earn extra money, Airbnb faces significant backlash from officials and hoteliers in major tourist destinations worldwide, including Miami Beach, which imposes up to \$20,000 fines for illegal short-term rentals.</li> <li>• Airbnb spokesman said in an email that the company wants to work with Miami and Miami Beach on regulations that protect all homeowners, but the cities "seem more interested in protecting the massive Miami hotel lobby than empowering their own constituents." Miami Beach would be excluded from a pending tax agreement between Airbnb and Miami-Dade County.</li> <li>• Representatives from a handful of homeowners associations in Miami and Miami Beach complained that visitors using Airbnb don't value their communities and create security concerns and nuisances for full-time residents. More than a dozen Airbnb hosts also gathered outside city hall said their investments to upgrade their properties for rentals helps promote additional spending in the local economy.</li> <li>• Most of Airbnb's 6,800 hosts in Miami-Dade County are in Miami or Miami Beach, and they hosted over 500,000 guests last year.</li> </ul> <p><b>City of Miami passes Regalado's resolution, could sue platforms like Airbnb – March 23, 2017<sup>14</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The city of Miami commissioners passed a resolution that effectively reiterates existing regulations on short-term rentals, with an amendment that would have the city look into suing short-term rental platforms like Airbnb.</li> <li>• Hosts, super hosts and proponents of the short-term rental platform spoke out against Miami Mayor's resolution to affirm and "vigorously" enforce existing short-term rental regulations. Under the city's current zoning code, daily and weekly rentals of residential properties are illegal.</li> <li>• South Florida is Airbnb's fourth largest market in the U.S., and the city of Miami has about 3,500 hosts on Airbnb. The company said in a recent report that its hosts in South Florida took in \$160 million in 2016.</li> <li>• Commissioners were open to working with Airbnb and other platforms, but said that the proposed resolution was about only enforcing existing rules, especially when it pertains to single-family neighborhoods.</li> </ul>
<b>11A11 170413</b>	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO RESEARCH AND DEVELOP A PILOT PROGRAM TO INCORPORATE WEBCAM SYSTEMS IN HEAD START AND EARLY HEAD START CLASSROOMS THAT PRODUCE A LIVE FEED ACCESSIBLE TO PARENTS, PROVIDE VIDEO RECORDINGS FOR TEACHER AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT, AND SERVE AS EXTERNAL SECURITY CAMERAS AND SECURITY ACCESS DEVICES; DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PROVIDE REPORTS CONCERNING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND EXPANSION OF THE PILOT PROGRAM</p>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/florida/articles/2017-03-20/miami-mayor-wants-more-limits-on-airbnb-and-home-sharing>

<sup>14</sup> <https://therealdeal.com/miami/2017/03/23/city-of-miami-passes-regalados-resolution-could-sue-platforms-like-airbnb/>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or designee to research and develop a pilot program for a webcam system to be utilized in the Head Start Program and the Early Head Start Program (Program) classrooms and provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County Mayor or designee will develop the pilot webcam system at the Lillie M. Williams Head Start Center;</li> <li>• The webcam system will provide a live feed of the Program’s classroom accessible by parents of children in the Program, and have a video recording option for providing instructional feedback to the Program’s teachers and staff; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Additionally, the webcam system should have the technological capacity to be developed along with and used for additional purposes such as security measures, including but, not limited to, serving as security cameras and security access devices.</i></li> <li>○ <i>For instance, it should be determined whether the webcam system could provide keypad access using a personal identification number or special code, or an electronic device such as a biometric identifier that verifies the identity of a person through a personal attribute such as a fingerprint, at the entry/exit door of a Program’s facility and limit and control unauthorized access to the facility.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• The County Mayor or designee will investigate the feasibility of including the cost for purchasing and maintaining the camera system and security equipment in the current Program’s budget, while making use of any preexisting security equipment at the Program’s facility;</li> <li>• The County Mayor or designee will develop webcam consent provisions and policies that limit access to parents of children in the Program and that prevent access by unauthorized users, as well as classroom and external security camera policies that outline the rights and responsibilities of the students, teachers, and staff with respect to the cameras, including a statement of the appropriate reasons for using the cameras, who will have access to the footage, how long the footage will be kept and when it will be destroyed, and consent provisions;</li> <li>• The County Mayor or designee will also seek any necessary approvals from the Policy Council and recommendations or approvals from United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS);</li> <li>• The County Mayor or designee to report back to the BCC in 60 days with the plan for implementation of the pilot program and place on a BCC agenda no later than 30 days after the completion of said report; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The report will include the projected implementation date of the webcam system at the Lillie M. Williams Head Start Center.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• The County Mayor or designee, upon such time as the pilot program has been implemented, is also directed to report back to the BCC with the plan for expanding the measures to the Program’s facilities countywide and place such reports on a BCC no later than 30 days after the completion of said report.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>The Head Start Program and the Early Head Start Program (Program) promote school preparation and provide comprehensive child development services for low income children, from birth to age five, and their families. Miami-Dade County is a grantee of the Program, which is funded and regulated by the DHHS and the Program is administered by the County’s Community Action and Human Services Department (CAHSD).</p> <p>In Fiscal Year 2015-16 the Program served 7,455 preschool and 680 infant and toddler children and their families in the County and the Program’s services are currently provided Countywide through 11 County-owned sites, and 78 delegate-owned or leased sites.</p> <p>Family and parental engagement in a child’s education is a key component of the Program. Webcam access to the Program’s classroom that is accessible to parents will foster the parent-child relationship by providing a window through which a parent can watch their child learn, play with other children, and grow. Webcam access to the Program’s classroom promotes transparency and accountability and will allow parents to feel confident in their children’s safety and in the quality of care their children receive in the Program.</p>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>Additionally, visual video recordings taken from webcams or cameras in the Program's classrooms can be used to provide instructional feedback to the Program's teachers and staff and serve as a training model and provide valuable teachable moments.</p> <p>By selecting a single Program location to serve as a pilot location with webcam access for parents, at which classroom video usable for the Program's teachers and staff development will be captured, and external security cameras and measures to restrict user accessibility are utilized, it can be determined how to most effectively implement such measures into the Program countywide, the costs associated with implementing and maintaining these measures, and the feasibility of utilizing any preexisting security systems to support these measures,</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b></p> <p>The Head Start / Early Head Start Program<sup>15</sup> provides comprehensive child development services for low income children and families in Miami-Dade County. The program is open to children ages new born through age 5, and provides care and instruction for children in a classroom setting.</p> <p>Head Start provides a variety of services that are aimed at enhancing the lives of children, building strong family units, and providing opportunities for empowering and obtaining self sufficiency by collaborating with other Community Action and Human Services programs and projects.</p> <p>Head Start provides services to its participants in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Education and Early Childhood Development:</u></b> Education involves providing a learning environment, which helps children, develop socially, intellectually, physically and emotionally in a manner appropriate to their age and state of development. An individualized approach is taken towards assessing a child's needs. The parent is encouraged to be an integral part of the child's development and learning process.</li> <li>• <b><u>Health, Nutrition and Mental Health:</u></b> A comprehensive health program is provided to promote preventive health services and early intervention. The child's family is provided with the necessary skills and insight to link the family to an on-going health care system to insure continued comprehensive health care. Head Start / Early Head Start health services include: medical, dental, and developmental screening, exams and follow-up, nutritional services, mental health services, and health education.</li> <li>• <b><u>Disability Services:</u></b> Disabled children and families receive the full range of services received by all Head Start/Early Head Start participants. Children suspected of having a disabling condition and/or children with a disability are provided services to include outreach recruitment / enrollment, screening for possible intervention, development and implementation of the Individual Education Plan (IEP) and transition into Head Start and later into their local school district.</li> <li>• <b><u>Family Support Services:</u></b> Social Services involves recruitment and enrollment of children, serving as an advocate for Head Start families, and assisting families in becoming aware of community resources to improve the condition and quality of family life. Services are also available to assist families in their own efforts to become self-sufficient.</li> <li>• <b><u>Parent Involvement:</u></b> Parents are an essential part of the Head Start / Early Head Start program since they are active participants in classroom and parent group activities, in their child's growth, and in the program planning and decision-making process. They serve on parent committees and may represent their center on the Head Start Policy Council.</li> </ul>
<b>11A12 170534</b>	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO CONDUCT COMPETITIVE SELECTIONS WHENEVER FEASIBLE INSTEAD OF EXPANDING THE TERM OR SERVICES UNDER EXISTING CONTRACTS, TO INCLUDE IN ANY RECOMMENDATION TO THIS BOARD FOR THE EXPANSION OF TERM OR SERVICES UNDER EXISTING CONTRACTS A WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION OF WHY A COMPETITIVE PROCESS IS NOT FEASIBLE, TO INCLUDE TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT POSSIBLE IN ANY SUCH PROPOSED EXPANSION OF TERM OR SERVICES ANY REQUIREMENTS OF ORDINANCE OR RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THIS BOARD SUBSEQUENT TO THE INITIAL CONTRACT, AND TO REPORT TO THIS BOARD IN THE RECOMMENDATION WHICH REQUIREMENTS WERE ADOPTED AND REJECTED</p>

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.miamidade.gov/socialservices/head-start.asp>

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes										
Notes	<p>The proposed resolution provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The County Mayor or County Mayor's Designee is directed to conduct competitive procurements for contracts whenever feasible; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>For the purposes of this Resolution, the term Contract will include any contract, agreement, lease, or concession agreement whereby the County purchases goods, services, construction contractors, architects/engineers, lessees, or concessionaires.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>The County Mayor or County Mayor's Designee will, in any item presented to the BCC seeking to extend a contract or to authorize Additional Scope, provide specific findings of fact as to why the provision of goods and services through competition instead of via an extended contract or via adding Additional Scope is not feasible. These findings of fact will be set forth in a separate portion of the Mayor's Memorandum to the BCC accompanying such item;</li> <li>The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee will seek to include in any Contract modification, amendment, or change order extending or adding Additional Scope to a Contract, and which requires approval by the BCC, to include, as a condition of extension or addition that the Contract be amended to include all then current requirements of the BCC as pertains to the type of County contract or agreement being extended or amended, including but not limited to, Living Wage, Responsible Wage, Labor Peace, Community Workforce, and Community Small Business Enterprise/Community Business Enterprise/Small Business Enterprise goals; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the event that the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee does not or is unable to include such requirements in return for such proposed extension or amended, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee will specifically inform the BCC of the reasons such requirements were not included, including the efforts made by the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to include such requirements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Contracts which are extended or expanded by the BCC which are not in accordance with the provisions of this Resolution will be nonetheless effective.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Additional Information on Relevant Legislation</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>R-234-01</b> 3/8/2001</td><td> <p>Granted the County Manager authority to negotiate changes in contracts, permits and concessions that are about to expire to assure that the County does not lose revenue opportunities due to delays in obtaining a successor contract, permit or concession.</p> <p>Additionally, where BCC approval or action is required in order to effectuate such changes, the Manager will submit same to the BCC at the next available BCC meeting.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td><b>R-544-05</b> 5/3/2005</td><td> <p>Directed that whenever prior BCC approval is required for award of a successor contract or extension of an existing contract in order to assure no hiatus in the provision of goods or services to the County, the County Manager will present the request for such approval to the BCC no later than <b>sixty (60) days</b> before the existing contract expires or needs to be extended.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td><b>R-841-06</b> 7/6/2006</td><td> <p>Provided that whenever prior BCC approval is required for award of a successor contract or extension of an existing contract in order to assure no hiatus in the provision of goods or services to the County, the County Manager will present the request for such approval to the BCC no later than <b>thirty (30) days</b> before the existing contract expires or needs to be extended.</p> </td></tr> <tr> <td><b>O-09-52</b> 6/30/2009</td><td> <p>Further defined the conditions for delegated authority of the Mayor or Mayor's designee to award contracts without BCC approval.</p> <p>The County Manager is delegated the authority to award and reject bids or proposals for contracts for public improvements (construction), and purchases of supplies, materials and services (including professional services, other than professional architectural, engineering and other services costing one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) or less, or in the case of miscellaneous construction contracts designed to provide opportunities for Community Small Business Enterprises specifically authorized by BCC resolution two and one-half million dollars (\$2,500,000.00) or less, without the need for action by the BCC.</p> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Additional Information on Relevant Legislation		<b>R-234-01</b> 3/8/2001	<p>Granted the County Manager authority to negotiate changes in contracts, permits and concessions that are about to expire to assure that the County does not lose revenue opportunities due to delays in obtaining a successor contract, permit or concession.</p> <p>Additionally, where BCC approval or action is required in order to effectuate such changes, the Manager will submit same to the BCC at the next available BCC meeting.</p>	<b>R-544-05</b> 5/3/2005	<p>Directed that whenever prior BCC approval is required for award of a successor contract or extension of an existing contract in order to assure no hiatus in the provision of goods or services to the County, the County Manager will present the request for such approval to the BCC no later than <b>sixty (60) days</b> before the existing contract expires or needs to be extended.</p>	<b>R-841-06</b> 7/6/2006	<p>Provided that whenever prior BCC approval is required for award of a successor contract or extension of an existing contract in order to assure no hiatus in the provision of goods or services to the County, the County Manager will present the request for such approval to the BCC no later than <b>thirty (30) days</b> before the existing contract expires or needs to be extended.</p>	<b>O-09-52</b> 6/30/2009	<p>Further defined the conditions for delegated authority of the Mayor or Mayor's designee to award contracts without BCC approval.</p> <p>The County Manager is delegated the authority to award and reject bids or proposals for contracts for public improvements (construction), and purchases of supplies, materials and services (including professional services, other than professional architectural, engineering and other services costing one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) or less, or in the case of miscellaneous construction contracts designed to provide opportunities for Community Small Business Enterprises specifically authorized by BCC resolution two and one-half million dollars (\$2,500,000.00) or less, without the need for action by the BCC.</p>
Additional Information on Relevant Legislation											
<b>R-234-01</b> 3/8/2001	<p>Granted the County Manager authority to negotiate changes in contracts, permits and concessions that are about to expire to assure that the County does not lose revenue opportunities due to delays in obtaining a successor contract, permit or concession.</p> <p>Additionally, where BCC approval or action is required in order to effectuate such changes, the Manager will submit same to the BCC at the next available BCC meeting.</p>										
<b>R-544-05</b> 5/3/2005	<p>Directed that whenever prior BCC approval is required for award of a successor contract or extension of an existing contract in order to assure no hiatus in the provision of goods or services to the County, the County Manager will present the request for such approval to the BCC no later than <b>sixty (60) days</b> before the existing contract expires or needs to be extended.</p>										
<b>R-841-06</b> 7/6/2006	<p>Provided that whenever prior BCC approval is required for award of a successor contract or extension of an existing contract in order to assure no hiatus in the provision of goods or services to the County, the County Manager will present the request for such approval to the BCC no later than <b>thirty (30) days</b> before the existing contract expires or needs to be extended.</p>										
<b>O-09-52</b> 6/30/2009	<p>Further defined the conditions for delegated authority of the Mayor or Mayor's designee to award contracts without BCC approval.</p> <p>The County Manager is delegated the authority to award and reject bids or proposals for contracts for public improvements (construction), and purchases of supplies, materials and services (including professional services, other than professional architectural, engineering and other services costing one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) or less, or in the case of miscellaneous construction contracts designed to provide opportunities for Community Small Business Enterprises specifically authorized by BCC resolution two and one-half million dollars (\$2,500,000.00) or less, without the need for action by the BCC.</p>										

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	Specifically, O-09-52 provided that the authority to award contracts will not constitute authority for the County Manager to award any contract where the combined value for such contract's initial term and any options to renew would exceed the monetary limitations set forth above, and in such instances the BCC may delegate the authority to award such options to renew contemporaneously with the award of the contract.
<b>R-98-12</b> 1/24/2012	<p>Provided that for all contracts for the purchase of goods and services governed by Administrative Order 3-38:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee evaluate and attempt to negotiate better pricing;</li> <li>• Before any option-to-renew period is exercised by the County on any contract, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee attempt to negotiate better pricing for the County; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In the event that the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee cannot secure better pricing, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee retains any existing authority to exercise option-to-renew periods.</li> <li>○ At the time any contract renewal is presented to the BCC for approval, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee will inform the BCC of the efforts undertaken to negotiate better pricing, the results of the negotiations and, if the County did not secure better pricing, a brief explanation as to why it is in the best interests of the County to renew the contract; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee delegate the authority to enter into contract amendments or modifications where such amendments or modifications reflect a reduction in pricing or costs to the County; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In the event that the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee negotiates an amendment or modification of an existing contract to reduce price or costs to the County in exchange for a longer term or other contractual concession, such amendments or modifications shall be brought to the BCC for approval; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee submit a report to the BCC within 180 days identifying all the contracts where the County successfully secured improved pricing and reduced costs to the County and identifying the total amount of cost savings to the County as a result of the negotiations directed under this resolution. Thereafter, the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee would provide this report on a recurring annual basis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Has this been done?</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>R-140-15</b> 2/3/2015	<p>Directed the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct, prior to the re-procurement of a replacement contract for an existing contract, a full review of the scopes of services and/or requested goods set forth in the replacement solicitation to ensure that the request accurately reflects the County's current needs; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Such review will be conducted with any and all user departments of the goods or services sought to be procured by the prospective contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Include in all recommendations to the BCC for a replacement contract a detailed description of the review conducted and identify any updates to the scope of service or goods requested from the previous contract; and</li> <li>• Consult with the Small Business Development Division to ensure that all information included in the replacement solicitation is current and necessary to the County's solicitation of such good or service.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Additional Information – Committee Meeting Discussion</u></b></p> <p>During the Government Operations Committee meeting on March 14, 2017, the proposed resolution was discussed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Committee expressed concerns regarding the proposed resolution and inquired how the item would impact the County's existing procurement process.</i></li> </ul>	



**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Director of the Internal Services Department (ISD) explained that while she was still in the process of reviewing the proposed resolution, she believed the item sought to add an additional layer of review for contracts before they came before the BCC for approval. She noted her commitment to streamlining the procurement process to make it more efficient and requested additional time to meet with the sponsor to gain a better understanding of the pools the item would apply to.</li> <li>• The Director proceeded to review Sections 3 and 4 of the proposed resolution in an attempt to explain the intent of the item.</li> <li>• The Committee commented on the complexity of legal language and spoke about the BCC's desire to eliminate all legacy contracts to ensure a more competitive and fair procurement process.</li> <li>• The Committee asked for clarification from the County Attorney's Office about the difference between the proposed resolution and legislation already in place which required staff and the administration to negotiate all contracts.</li> <li>• The Committee noted on May 3, 2005, July 6, 2006 and January 24, 2012 the Deputy Mayor addressed legislation which required staff and the administration to negotiate all contracts with an option to renew; and noted that the then ISD confirmed that the legislation was applicable to all contracts.</li> <li>• The Assistant County Attorney explained that the proposed resolution contained additional reporting requirements and the opportunity for staff to inform the BCC of situations where specific contracts such as Wage and Small Business contracts could not be negotiated due to governing ordinances.</li> <li>• The Committee argued that the existing legislation already included a written justification component and spoke about the BCC's commitment to protecting and promoting local vendor participation in the County's procurement processes as evident in the numerous ordinances in place. He pointed out that despite the presence of legislation; problems persist due to the lack of adherence and enforcement by the BCC.</li> <li>• The Committee suggested considering including a resident requirement component for local vendors when revising the local vendor definition.</li> <li>• The Committee spoke about creating a comprehensive procurement package which could be used to promote discussion and reform.</li> </ul>
<b>11A14 170737</b>	RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO COORDINATE WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD, THE OFFICE OF AGENDA COORDINATION, AND THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE MIAMI-DADE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) TO PROVIDE FOR CENTRALIZED ELECTRONIC DISTRIBUTION OF: COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN (CDMP) APPLICATIONS AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS TOGETHER WITH THE PUBLICATION OF THE CDMP HEARING AGENDAS; ZONING MEETING AGENDAS AND RELATED MATERIALS; AND MPO GOVERNING BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDAS AND RELATED MATERIALS [SEE ORIGINAL ITEM UNDER FILE NO. 170537]
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to coordinate with the Clerk of the Board, the Office of Agenda Coordination, and the Executive Director of the Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to provide, through the "Legislative Information Center" webpage on miamidade.gov, for electronic distribution and subscription of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) applications and staff recommendations, along with CDMP meeting agendas;</li> <li>• Agendas and related materials for meetings of the MPO Governing Board and of MPO Committees of which County Commissioners are members; and</li> <li>• Zoning meeting agendas and related materials.</li> </ul> <p><i>During the Infrastructure and Utilities Committee meeting on March 14, 2017, the proposed resolution was amended to include the Office of the Agenda Coordination among the agencies being consulted, and to make conforming changes to the title.</i></p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> Regular BCC and special meeting agendas and related materials are available on the "Legislative Information Center" webpage on miamidade.gov, which also provides a subscription service to receive agendas by e-mail. Through Resolution No. R-1041-16, the BCC directed the administration to provide for electronic distribution of,</p>



**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>and e-mail subscription service for, zoning hearing agendas, as is currently done for the BCC's legislative agenda items.</p> <p>Currently, the BCC's CDMP hearing agenda items are distributed like other legislative agenda items, but the CDMP agenda package only includes a summary memorandum and the ordinances and resolutions to take action on each application, not links to the CDMP applications themselves or the lengthy staff recommendations that accompany each application. Instead, the CDMP applications and staff recommendations are publicly accessible by requesting hard copies or by finding them electronically on the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources website. Similarly, agendas of the MPO) and MPO committees, on which BCC members serve, are available through the MPO's website but not through the County's "Legislative Information Center" webpage.</p>
<b>11A15 170539</b>	<p><b>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO IDENTIFY TOOLS TO ASSIST THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION IN PREVENTING FUTURE TECHNOLOGY INTERRUPTIONS AND OUTAGES AT THE MIAMI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT</b></p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or designee to identify tools to assist the United States Customs and Border Protection in preventing future technology interruptions and outages at the Miami International Airport.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed resolution directs the Mayor or designee to prepare and provide a report to the BCC within 90 days on a BCC agenda in accordance with Ordinance No. 14-65.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b>  On January 2, 2017, the United States Customs and Border Protection's (CBP) processing systems experienced an outage for four hours, requiring CBP officials to process international travelers manually. Although CBP had access to national security-related databases and maintained screening according to security standards, the outage caused delays for up to two hours for thousands of international travelers across the country and because the Miami International Airport (MIA) is the second busiest airport in international passenger traffic, the effects of the outage were rather severe at MIA with hundreds of international travelers at MIA missed their connecting flights.</p>
<b>11A16 170544</b>	<p><b>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO PROVIDE A REPORT TO THE BOARD WITHIN 30 DAYS IDENTIFYING EXISTING LEGACY PURCHASE CONTRACTS PER COUNTY DEPARTMENT AND A PLAN TO REDUCE OR ELIMINATE THE NEED FOR FUTURE LEGACY PURCHASE CONTRACTS</b></p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to provide a report to the BCC within 30 days identifying the County's existing Legacy Purchase contracts and the user County departments which utilize the Legacy Purchase contracts and outlining a plan to reduce or eliminate the future need for Legacy Purchase contracts. The County Mayor or County Mayor's designee will place the completed report on a BCC agenda pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b>  It the policy of this County, as provided for in Section 5.03(D) of the Miami-Dade County Home Rule Charter and Section 2-8.1 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, Florida, that, whenever practicable, County contracts should be entered into on the basis of a competitive process. Entering into County contracts on the basis of an open and fair competition helps ensure that the County obtains the best value in its contracts. Competition for County contracts also broadens the opportunities for businesses, including local and small businesses, to provide important goods and services to the County.</p> <p>County Code Section 2-8.1(b)(2) recognizes that formal sealed competitive bids will not be required for Legacy Purchases. County Code Section 2-8.1(b)(2) also defines a Legacy Purchase as the "purchase of goods and services where competition is unavailable, impractical or constrained as a result of the need to continue to operate an existing County system which may not be replaced without substantial expenditure."</p> <p>Consistent with this definition, the BCC has, from time to time, approved contracts for the purchase of systems such as County specialized information technology systems as Legacy Purchase contracts. Although the County Code allows for the entry into Legacy Purchase contracts without competitive bidding, the Code explicitly provides that each and every time the approval of a Legacy Purchase is sought from the BCC "[t]he County Mayor</p>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>shall include . . . a statement as to the need for such purchase and the provisions taken to reduce or eliminate the future need for Legacy Purchases for the particular good or service.”</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Relevant Legislation</u></b> On July 2, 2013, the BCC, through Ordinance No. 13-67, amended Section 2-8.1, Contracts and Purchases Generally, of the Code of Miami-Dade County (Code), to exempt Legacy Purchases from competitive bidding. The County Mayor’s contract award authority pursuant to Section 2-8.1(b) of the Code remained unchanged.</p> <p>Through O-13-67, Legacy Purchases were defined as the purchase of goods and services where competition is unavailable, impractical or constrained as a result of the need to continue to operate an existing County system which may not be replaced without substantial expenditure.</p> <p>The Code amendments provided for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Created Subsection 2-8.1(b)(2), Legacy Purchases.</li> <li>• Provided the following regulations and/or policy provisions for Legacy Purchases: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2-8.1(b)(1), formal sealed bids will not be required for Legacy Purchases which do not result in the budget for the user department(s) exceeding the amount approved by the BCC during the annual budget approval process.</li> <li>○ Such Legacy purchases may be awarded by the BCC upon a majority vote of those Board Members present, where the amount of such award exceeds the threshold for purchases by the Mayor set forth in Section 2-8.1(b)(1).</li> <li>○ The County Mayor will include, in any Legacy Purchase award recommendation, a statement as to the need for such purchase and the provisions taken to reduce or eliminate the future need for Legacy Purchases for the particular good or service.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>11A17 170549</b>	<b>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE MAYOR OR MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO CREATE PROGRAMMING ON MIAMI-DADE TV TO EDUCATE THE PUBLIC ABOUT SEA LEVEL RISE AND THE COUNTY’S SEA LEVEL RISE RELATED WORK</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution directs the Mayor or designee to create programming for Miami-Dade TV and other communication channels, as appropriate, in consultation with the County’s Office of Resilience as to the content of such programming, in order to educate the public about sea level rise, issues related to sustainability and resilience, the recommendations of the Miami-Dade County Sea Level Rise Task Force, and the County’s efforts to implement those recommendations and address sea level rise, sustainability and resilience issues.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b> Miami-Dade County has demonstrated leadership on issues related to sea level rise through the creation of the Miami-Dade County Sea Level Rise Task Force and the County’s Office of Resilience. In 2013, the BCC adopted Resolution No. R-599-13 creating the Miami-Dade County Sea Level Rise Task Force.</p> <p>The Miami-Dade County Sea Level Rise Task Force presented its recommendations, and the final reports on those recommendations cumulatively contain over 400 pages of information and analysis related to sea level rise, and this information may be of interest to residents and businesses in Miami-Dade County.</p> <p>Miami-Dade TV is the County’s government access television station, and it is carried by all cable TV systems in Miami-Dade County and provides public information programming, along with televised County meetings. The County could provide an additional public service by making this information on sea level rise, sustainability and resilience available and accessible through Miami-Dade TV and other communication channels. This use of Miami-Dade TV may allow the County to reach a larger audience, to promote education and information about the issues of sea level rise, sustainability and resilience, and this use of Miami-Dade TV may also better inform County residents about the work that the County is undertaking in order to address these important issues.</p>
<b>11A18 170548</b>	<b>RESOLUTION DIRECTING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO PARTNER WITH THE MIAMI-DADE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION AND FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT (“FPL”) TO EXAMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF CONNECTING FPL OWNED PROPERTY AND/OR COUNTY RIGHT-OF-WAY WHERE FPL UTILITY EASEMENTS EXIST TO CREATE BICYCLE AND WALKING TRAILS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY; FURTHER DIRECTING COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR’S DESIGNEE TO PREPARE A REPORT</b>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to partner with the Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization and Florida Power and Light (FPL) to examine the feasibility of connecting FPL owned property and/or County right-of-way where FPL utility easements exist to create bicycle and walking trails throughout the County;</li> <li>• Directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to provide the report to the BCC within 120 days of the effective date of this resolution and place the completed report on a BCC agenda; and</li> <li>• Directs the Clerk of this Board to send a certified copy of this resolution to the Executive Director of the Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization.</li> </ul>
<b>11A19 170546</b>	<p>RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO SURVEY AND IDENTIFY SITES IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY RELATING TO THE COLD WAR AND TO PREPARE A REPORT MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPROPRIATE RECOGNITION OF SUCH SITES, INCLUDING POSSIBLE HISTORICAL RECOGNITION</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution directs the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to survey and identify sites in Miami-Dade County relating to the Cold War and to prepare a report making recommendations for appropriate recognition of such sites, including possible historical recognition. The report will be provided to the BCC within 180 days of the effective date of this resolution, and will be placed on a BCC agenda pursuant to Ordinance No. 14-65.</p> <p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>The Cold War was a state of political and military tension following World War II between the Western allies, led by the United States, and the Eastern bloc, led by the Soviet Union. The Cold War is generally understood to have spanned the second half of the 20th century, between 1947, when the Truman Doctrine that promised aid to nations threatened by Soviet expansionism was announced, and 1991, when the Soviet Union collapsed.</p>
<b>11A21 170721</b>	<p>RESOLUTION DECLARING THE MONTH OF APRIL 2017 AS WATER CONSERVATION MONTH IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution designates the month of April 2017 as Water Conservation Month in Miami-Dade County and urges all water users to take action by increasing their water use efficiency and taking the appropriate measures to conserve and protect our state's most vital natural resource.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Miami-Dade County Water Conservation Plans &amp; Initiatives<sup>16</sup></u></b></p> <p><b>Water Use Efficiency Plan</b></p> <p>Through the Water Use Efficiency Plan, Miami-Dade County is implementing various programs to make water use more efficient, through alternative water supplies, reuse water projects and the water conservation program.</p> <p>In April 2006, the Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners adopted the Miami-Dade Water Use Efficiency Plan through Resolution No. R-468-06. The plan is part of a bigger effort to improve management of traditional water supplies while encouraging the development of alternative water supplies and improving the efficiency of our current water use.</p> <p>Several incentive programs have been implemented to encourage the efficient use of water and help residents save money. They include: plumbing retrofits, landscape irrigation evaluations and residential and commercial water use evaluations and rebates.</p> <p>Miami-Dade residents have responded to the call to be more efficient in their water use contributing to an unprecedented drop in consumption. The current demand for finished water is 44 million gallons per day lower than what was projected in November 2007.</p> <p>The lower demand is the result of lower-than-projected population growth, permanent landscape irrigation restrictions, water loss reduction and the success of the water conservation initiatives and best management practices that have been implemented.</p>

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.miamidade.gov/waterconservation/plans-initiatives.asp>

# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>As a result of the lower-than-projected demand, the Miami-Dade Water &amp; Sewer Department re-evaluated the County's water use projections and has adjusted the schedule of capital water supply projects. This collective awareness has allowed for the per capita use to drop from 158 to 134 gallons per person per day during the same period of time.</p> <p><b>Water Loss Reduction Plan</b> By supplying water in a sustainable manner and reducing and controlling losses, the recovered losses become a major alternative source of water that will save more money than developing expensive new water supplies.</p> <p>Miami-Dade County has an aggressive water loss reduction program and it has currently enhanced this program as part of the 20-Year Water Use Permit. Through this aggressive program, Miami-Dade will be able to save more than 14.25 million gallons of water per day by 2017.</p> <p><b>20-Year Water Use Permit</b> Miami-Dade County's Water Use Efficiency Plan is tailored to meet the South Florida Water Management District requirements for WASD's consumptive use permit -- the 20-Year Water Use Permit -- first approved by the district in November 2007.</p> <p>This will allow us to achieve an improvement in water use efficiency through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accommodating future economic development and population growth while protecting our water resources;</li> <li>• Reducing or deferring the cost of maintaining and expanding water delivery, treatment and disposal systems;</li> <li>• Reducing energy and maintenance costs of Water and Sewer Department facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Water Supply</b> During the 2005 State Legislative Session, a bill creating the Water Protection and Sustainability Program, or Senate Bill 444, was enacted, providing significant state funding for Alternative Water Supply Projects that are identified in the Water Management Districts' Regional Water Supply Plans.</p> <p>Alternative Water Supply Projects are defined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saltwater and brackish water</li> <li>• Surface water captured predominately during wet-weather flows</li> <li>• Sources made available through the addition of new storage capacity</li> <li>• Reclaimed water</li> <li>• Stormwater (for use by a consumptive use permittee)</li> <li>• Any other source designated as nontraditional in a regional water supply plan</li> </ul> <p><b>Water Reuse</b> Water reuse plays an important role in water resource, wastewater, and ecosystem management in Florida. It reduces demands on valuable surface and ground water, sources used for drinking water. Reclaimed water also reduces discharges to surface waters, recharges ground water, and postpones costly investment for development of new water sources and supplies. Water reuse has allowed some communities to continue to grow where the availability of historically used freshwater sources has become extremely limited.</p> <p>Water reuse involves taking domestic wastewater, giving it a high degree of treatment, and using the resulting high-quality reclaimed water for a new, beneficial purpose. The resulting water is called reclaimed water. Extensive treatment and disinfection ensure that public health and environmental quality are protected. Reclaimed water can be used for many purposes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irrigation of golf courses, parks, residential properties, highway medians, and other landscaped areas</li> <li>• Urban uses such as toilet flushing, car washing, dust control, and aesthetic purposes (i.e. decorative lakes, ponds, and fountains)</li> <li>• Agricultural uses such as irrigation of edible food crops such as, citrus, corn, and soybeans; other crops such as, pasture lands, grasslands, and other feed and fodder crops; and irrigation at nurseries</li> </ul>

**Board of County Commissioners  
April 4, 2017 Meeting  
Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wetlands creation, restoration, and enhancement</li> <li>• Recharging ground water with the use of rapid infiltration basins (percolation ponds), absorption fields, and direct injection to ground waters</li> <li>• Augmentation of surface waters that are used for drinking water supplies</li> <li>• Industrial uses including plant wash down, processing water, and cooling water purposes</li> </ul> <p>Continuous monitoring of the reclaimed water is required and ensures excellent water quality for protection of the public and the environment. The Florida Department of Health has stated a reuse facility designed, constructed, and operated in accordance with applicable rules poses no threat to public health. The use of reclaimed water has increased significantly throughout the nation, state, and district for all types of uses.</p> <p><b>Aquifer Storage Recovery (ASR)</b>  Aquifer Storage Recovery (ASR) is defined as the storage of freshwater in an aquifer by injecting water through the wells during wet periods for subsequent retrieval from these same wells during dry periods. The freshwater forms a bubble of injected water within the aquifer around the ASR well, and it can be retrieved when needed to meet seasonal, long-term, emergency or other demands. During the past ten years, ASR technology has evolved from merely a concept to a proven, cost-effective and environmentally desirable water management tool.</p> <p><b>Reverse Osmosis (RO)</b>  Reverse osmosis is a process used to purify concentrated solutions of dissolved minerals and salts. Reverse osmosis involves forcing water through a semipermeable membrane under high pressure, leaving the dissolved salts and other solutes behind on the surface of the membrane.</p> <p><b>Satellite Reuse</b>  Wastewater is extracted from sewage and then treat it to produce.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Information on the South Florida Water Management Districts (SFWMD) Water Conservation Programs<sup>17</sup></u></b>  The District's Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan includes voluntary and incentive-based initiatives, regulatory work, education and outreach. The amount of water used by the region's 8.1 million residents has fallen from near 180 gallons of water per person per day in 2000 to about 140 gallons in 2014. Other SFWMD actions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with the University of Florida's Institute of Food and Agricultural Services to certify nine District facilities as having Florida-Friendly Landscaping</li> <li>• Creating and helping organizations complete the Self-Assessment Guide for Commercial and Institutional Water Efficiency Improvement (download the manual and how-to spreadsheet calculators here)</li> <li>• Hosting a yearly Water Conservation Expo and Vendor Fair</li> <li>• Supporting local government water conservation projects with a Cooperative Funding Program</li> </ul> <p>The SFWMD also supports many water-saving initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through the Water Savings Incentive Program, the District invested \$250,000 in nine local projects in 2015 that saved an estimated 86 million gallons of water per year. This program has helped local communities save water for more than a decade, investing \$5.1 million in 181 projects that save nearly 3 billion gallons of water per year.</li> <li>• Water conservation education programs, including The Great Water Odyssey, have reached more than 2,700 students.</li> <li>• The District also administers the Florida Water Star program, increasing water efficiency for homes, commercial properties and communities. More than 900 single-family homes and four commercial properties have met the program's water-saving goals.</li> </ul>

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.sfwmd.gov/community-residents/water-conservation>



**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the voluntary WaterCHAMP program, 98 hotels in 13 municipalities have installed water conservation devices or made changes in linen service covering nearly 8,000 rooms. The water savings can average 20 gallons per night per occupied room.</li> <li>• SFWMD also follows the Year-Round Landscape Irrigation Rule that targets outdoor irrigation, which can account for up to half of the residential water use in South Florida.</li> </ul> <p>Basic water conservation practices include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replacing aerators in kitchen and bathroom sinks with models rated for 1.5 gallons per minute or less</li> <li>• Watering the lawn based on its actual needs and following the District's year-round landscape irrigation water conservation measures and/or local ordinances</li> <li>• Installing low-flow appliances, such as a dishwasher</li> <li>• Installing low-flow water fixtures, such as showerheads</li> <li>• Implementing many more easy water conservation practices found in our Water Conservation Publications</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information on Relevant Legislation</u></b></p> <p>On November 1, 2005, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-1271-05, directed the County Manager to develop the County's Water Conservation Plan, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County Manager was directed to develop a County Water Conservation Plan in accordance with this resolution, as part of a long-range water conservation planning process which incorporates the goal of responsible stewardship of natural resources; while safeguarding the on-going business practices of the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department;</li> <li>• The Water Conservation Plan was to be goal-based, accountable, tailored, and measure water conservation efforts for the BCC's consideration by April of 2006; and</li> <li>• The Water Conservation Plan was to address water use efficiency issues to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Applying more stringent water conservation requirements to County-owned facilities (leading by example);</li> <li>○ Involving other communities and water users in the conservation effort and support;</li> <li>○ Evaluating existing land use planning and zoning laws affecting water use and revise them as necessary to be consistent with the conservation strategy;</li> <li>○ Evaluating existing State legislation or Federal policy to incorporate additional water conservation measures;</li> <li>○ Developing and implementing additional water conservation projects such as plumbing retrofit projects to include the exchange of Ultra-low Volume Shower Heads, Ultra-low Volume Toilets and the development of a Water Use Audit Program; and</li> <li>○ A Water Conservation Plan that is sensitive to the low income residents, and the elderly on a fixed income of Miami-Dade County.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>On April 25, 2006, the BCC, through Resolution No. R-468-06, approved the Miami-Dade County Water and Sewer Water Use Efficiency Five-Year Plan, which comported with the requirements of Resolution No. R-1271-05.</p> <p>The overall objective of the Miami-Dade County Water Use Efficiency Plan was to identify and promote supply and demand side management measures and best management practices for use by retail and wholesale customers. The specific objectives of the plan included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve water-use efficiency</li> <li>• Reduce the loss and waste of water</li> <li>• Comply with statewide legislative criteria and new initiatives</li> </ul>
<b>11A22 170764</b>	<b>RESOLUTION URGING THE FLORIDA LEGISLATURE TO ENACT SB 158, HB 143, OR SIMILAR LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCLUDE CANCER AS A PRESUMPTIVE CONDITION FOR FIREFIGHTERS FOR PURPOSES OF STATE DISABILITY AND DEATH BENEFITS</b>
<b>Notes</b>	The proposed resolution:



# Board of County Commissioners

April 4, 2017 Meeting

## Research Notes

Item No.	Research Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urges the Florida Legislature to enact Senate Bill (SB) 158, House Bill (HB) 143, or similar legislation that would include cancer as a presumptive condition for firefighters for purposes of state disability and death benefits;</li> <li>• Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Governor, Senate President, House Speaker, Senator Jack Latvala, Representative Heather Fitzenhagen, and the Chair and Members of the Miami-Dade State Legislative Delegation; and</li> <li>• Directs the County's state lobbyists to advocate for the passage of the legislation and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2017 State Legislative Package to include this item.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Background</u></b>  Identical Senate and House bills, SB 158 by Senator Jack Latvala (R–Clearwater) and HB 143 by Representative Heather Fitzenhagen (R–Fort Myers), have been filed for consideration during the 2017 session of the Florida Legislature. SB 158 and HB 143 would, among other things, provide that any condition or impairment of the health of a firefighter employed fulltime by a state or local government which is caused by multiple myeloma, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, prostate cancer, or testicular cancer and results in total or partial disability or death is presumed to have been accidental and to have been suffered "in the line of duty" unless the contrary is shown by competent evidence.</p> <p>"In the line of duty" retirement compensates an employee whose disability or death arises out of and in the actual performance of employment and would thus provide greater compensation to the firefighter or his or her dependents than would otherwise be available. In order to be entitled to the cancer presumption, a firefighter must have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successfully passed a pre-employment physical examination that did not reveal any evidence of a health condition;</li> <li>• Been employed as a firefighter with the current employer for at least five continuous years before becoming disabled or before the employee's death;</li> <li>• Not used tobacco products for at least five years before becoming disabled or before the employee's death; and</li> <li>• Not been employed during the preceding five years in any other position that is proven to create a higher risk for the named diseases.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Information</u></b>  SB 158 passed unanimously in the Senate Government Oversight and Accountability Committee meeting on January 24, 2017. SB 158 has two more senate committee references: Community Affairs, Appropriations Subcommittee on General Government and Appropriations.</p> <p>HB 143 was workshopped during the House Oversight, Transparency &amp; Administration Subcommittee meeting on March 13, 2017. HB 143 has two more house committee references: Appropriations Committee and Government Accountability Committee.</p>
<b>11A23</b> <b>170759</b>	<b>RESOLUTION URGING THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS TO MATCH THE FUNDING MIAMI-DADE COUNTY HAS PROVIDED FOR THE CREATION AND OPERATION OF THE MIAMI MILITARY MUSEUM AND MEMORIAL</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The proposed resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urges the United States Congress to match the \$3 million funding Miami-Dade County has provided fund for the creation and operation of the Miami Military Museum and Memorial;</li> <li>• Directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the members of the Florida Congressional Delegation; and</li> <li>• Directs the County's federal lobbyists to advocate for the issue and authorizes and directs the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs to amend the 2017 Federal Legislative Package to include this item.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Background</u></b>  During World War II, Naval Air Station Richmond in Miami-Dade County became the world's largest military blimp base. During World War II, Naval Air Station Richmond was a critical United States base from which Navy</p>

**Board of County Commissioners**  
**April 4, 2017 Meeting**  
**Research Notes**

Item No.	Research Notes
	<p>blimps fought against the attack of Nazi U-boats which sunk 42 ships near the Florida coast, 27 in the Gulf of Mexico, and 20 more in the Caribbean. Building No. 25 was the headquarters for the blimp base at Naval Air Station Richmond and is the only remaining wood-frame building from the blimp base.</p> <p>Building No. 25 continued to be used after World War II for various functions, including serving as the Central Intelligence Agency's headquarters for JM-WAVE, a covert operation against Fidel Castro during the Cuban Missile Crisis. During the Cuban Missile Crisis, Building No. 25 was also a command site and location of a fully-operational battery of Hawk Missiles manned by the United States Army Air Defense Artillery. Building No. 25 subsequently served as a reserve center for the United States Army, and as a reserve center for the United States Marine Corps.</p> <p>In 2005, Miami-Dade County residents voted to save the building as part of a general obligation bond referendum. Building No. 25 has been relocated to county-owned land near Zoo Miami and the Gold Coast Railroad Museum for use as the Miami Military Museum and Memorial (museum). Starting in 2008, Miami-Dade County has provided \$3 million dollars in funding to stabilize the building and commence restoration.</p> <p>Due to its historical significance, the Miami-Dade Historic Preservation Board, in 2010, named Building No. 25 a historic landmark. The museum, after many years, received sufficient restorative funding from the Florida Legislature and Miami-Dade County to open its doors for a soft opening to the public in the summer of 2017.</p>