

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
March 7, 2005**

1. **Attendance – See Attendance Sheet attachment.**
2. **Review and Acceptance of February 1, 2005 meeting minutes.**

ACTION: Mr. Frank DelVecchio motioned to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Michael Rotbart. The motion passed.

3. **Contingency Report**

Mr. Jorge Chartrand, Acting Director of the Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Office, informed the Committee that no new items were approved since the last report given during the February Committee meeting.

4. **Discussion Items**

- (A) Assistant City Manager Robert Middaugh stated that the Administration had put together some discussion points regarding the Committee's role moving forward, as per the request at the February meeting.

The first recommendation was for the Committee to take an active role in securing additional funds. Often times, funding agencies react more to citizens than staff. Also, the Administration will still prepare informational reports and updates, as requested, for all G.O. Bond funded projects or related issues.

With regard to oversight of the County G.O. Bond funds, many of the projects funded in part by the County G.O. Bond are already under the review of the Committee, so there will be some oversight role.

The largest component is an expanded role with regard to public outreach. As many of the neighborhood projects have not yet reached construction, the Committee can help the Administration deal with questions, complaints and concerns regarding the actual construction. The Administration recommends that there be a sub-committee put together to help define how the public outreach component will be structured.

Mr. Chartrand relayed to the Committee examples of the disturbances experienced in the neighborhoods during prior construction projects and how it has interfered with the normal flow of the citizens and residents. He suggested that the City has to take a more active role in communicating with the residents as construction of future projects moves forward. The Committee would act as a liaison to the residents to get the necessary

information out to the community, and discuss concerns with the Administration in an effort to resolve any issues the Administration may not hear of.

Ms. Joy Malakoff offered that the Neighbors section of the Miami Herald could be useful to communicate with the residents. Informational articles, with timelines and explanations of anticipated activities or issues that arise would be helpful.

Mayor David Dermer reiterated the importance of getting the information out to the residents about upcoming construction that may occur in the area. Suggesting that any major construction to a roadway may affect a resident's lifestyle, having a community meeting in that neighborhood a week or so before actual construction would be vital.

Mr. Leonard Wien outlined some of the Committee's prior successes, such as requiring the status updates, hiring the Program Managers and helping the CIP Office establish priorities. The Committee should continue to be involved in public outreach through the completion of the bond work.

Mr. Bert Vidal, Program Manager from Hazen and Sawyer, stated that the Committee's presence at community meetings and getting information out to the residents before construction is extremely important in preparing the residents for what's coming.

Ms. Deede Jeryl Weithorn stated that it may be a good idea to set aside time for residents to express any concerns they may have about construction at the G.O. Bond meetings.

Mr. Frank DeVecchio suggested that, at least in South Beach, the Committee should reach out to the Neighborhood Associations and use them to assist with the communication effort, as they are expanding their contact lists.

Assistant City Manager Middaugh recommended that a sub-committee work with the CIP Office to create a more defined structure for this expanded public outreach role. The meetings would be less formal, but still subject to advertising requirements.

5. Project Status Report

(A) Fire Station No. 2

Mr. Jorge Chartrand, Acting Director of the Capital Improvements Projects (CIP) Office, informed the Committee that the Fire Station No. 2 project has already begun construction. The work on the new construction has

begun on the structural components. The new temporary parking lot for the Firefighters and the Public Works staff while the project is in construction has almost reached completion.

(B) Fire Station No. 4

Ms. Alex Rolandelli, Senior Capital Projects Coordinator for the project, informed the Committee that the seawall capping has been poured. It is estimated that another 3 weeks is needed until substantial completion is reached. With regard to the Fire Station the grade beams have been poured, and the stem walls will be poured in the next week or so. The project is on schedule and within budget at this time.

Mr. Michael Rotbart asked for a copy of the Critical Path schedule. The Administration will provide this at the next meeting.

Mr. DeVecchio asked if the budget would be sufficient enough to fund the furnishings, fixtures and equipment (FF&E). Mr. Chartrand stated that additional funding would have to be determined. Some funding was requested at the time the project was let; however, at this time it is not known whether or not the funding will cover everything. Mr. DeVecchio stated that the Fire Chief appeared before the board and gave an estimate of about \$250,000, which may now be a variable because of some redesign that was done to the kitchen. He stressed that if funds were not available, the City needed to monitor when the project would be finished so funds could be identified in time for opening of the facility.

Ms. Weithorn asked if there was any idea of what fiscal year the Fire Station completion was going to fall into. Ms. Rolandelli stated that estimated substantial completion would take place in December 2005, so the final acceptance would be January 2006 which would place it in Fiscal Year 2005/2006. Ms. Weithorn stated that the Fiscal Year 2005/2006 budget is not complete; however, the FF&E would be put on a list of projects for the Budget Advisory Committee to review to see if any dollars have been budgeted or are available for the FF&E.

(C) Normandy Isle Park and Pool

Ms. Alex Rolandelli, Senior Capital Projects Coordinator for the project, informed the Committee that there was a meeting with the Surety company was held on March 4, 2005. The Surety Company informed the City that they would be issuing an invitation to bid in the next thirty (30) days that would be managed by the Surety to complete the pool portion of the project. The CIP Office also coordinated reports for the inspections between the threshold inspectors and the building department's structural inspectors to make sure that all existing conditions are acceptable, providing a basis to move construction forward.

Mayor Dermer asked if the City has done everything possible to ensure that the project is moving as quickly as possible. Mr. Chartrand stated that a major effort was made to maintain the permit as active. In maintaining that permit as active, and in communication with the building officials, when there is a contractor on board, the City will only have to do a change of contractor so that the project can continue to move.

Mr. Sanchez asked what was meant by the Normandy Isle Park and Pool project being completed by the completing contractor. Mr. Chartrand stated that when a project of this nature goes bad, and the contractor is terminated, the bonding company comes in to evaluate the status of the project. Since all this has happened, it was agreed that the project needs to be finished under the performance bond. Therefore, a contractor will be selected by the Surety under a competitive bidding process, which they are allowing the CIP Office to participate in with respect to the scope. Once the bidding process is complete, a contractor would be hired to finish the project. The cost of this effort would be incurred by the Surety Company. This is the normal process under a performance bond to cure bad performance.

Mr. Sanchez asked if a timeframe been given to the City by the Surety as to when the project would start moving. Ms. Rolandelli stated that Surety would be issuing an invitation to bid for a General Contractor in the next thirty (30) days. Mr. Chartrand stated that a standard length of competitive bid like this would be around ninety (90) days.

Assistant City Manager Middaugh asked if this procurement process was subject to the City's bid practice or rather the Surety's bid practices. Mr. Chartrand stated that it was not subject to the same rules, regulations and statutes as the City.

Mr. Michael Rotbart asked what the amount the performance bond was. Mr. Chartrand stated that the performance bond was for the total value project and whether the project cost was over or not, the Surety Company has to cover whatever differences there are for the scope included in the contract with the former contractor.

Mr. Sanchez asked when would the park portion of the project would be completed. Ms. Rolandelli stated that the CIP Office is reviewing the drawings and the JOC contractor that is on board is pricing the park portion. Ms. Rollandelli stated that it would be another thirty (30) to sixty (60) days before work would likely begin. Mr. Sanchez stated that he would like to have a better idea of when the park portion of the project will be under construction. Mr. Chartrand stated that the CIP Office would provide a better timetable at the next meeting.

A discussion was held regarding the cost of the project, the scope of the project, and the obligations of the Surety under the performance bond. The Surety is responsible for completing the scope of work under the construction contract, as amended through change orders. The Surety has committed to completing the project. The cost of completing work is to be funded by the balance of the contract price, and any costs over that will be the responsibility of the Surety.

Ms. Weithorn asked how much money is in the project for the park portion. The Administration will provide that information at the next meeting.

(D) West Avenue Neighborhood

Mr. Donald Shockey, Senior Capital Projects Planner, informed the Committee that the City hired a consultant in 2001, who did some initial planning work. At that time, it became clear that the stormwater and water infrastructure components of the project were substantially under funded. The overwhelming consensus from the residents at the first Community Design Workshop (CDW) was to stop immediately and to go find additional funding for the project, which still has not been obtained. The stormwater portion of the project has escalated substantially and approximately \$9,500,000 is still needed to implement the master plan level of stormwater improvements. The City has been negotiating with the consultant on a modified scope. Those negotiations are almost complete. Once an amendment is approved the planning phase of the project will resume. However, the actual implementation of the project will still be contingent upon identifying the funding for the construction.

Mayor Dermer asked what the resolution was about certain streets tying into West Avenue. Mr. Shockey stated that the street ends at 10th Street, 14th Street and 16th Street had been included. The improvements at 14th Street were done by the adjacent developer of the Waverly Condominium. The improvements at 16th Street are under a pending DRB approval to be done through the same process. The only remaining street end to be included in the project is 10th Street.

(E) Venetian Causeway

Mr. Donald Shockey, Senior Capital Projects Planner, informed the Committee that because the Causeway is a County road, the County would be the lead entity and that the City of Miami Beach would participate in funding the improvements with some degree of oversight through an Interlocal Agreement. The County has taken some time in implementing some strategies for the project and are ready to go. The City and County are drafting the Interlocal Agreement, which should be

completed and executed soon. The planning process will begin, but it will be a difficult project to coordinate due to three separate entities being involved: the City of Miami Beach, the City of Miami and Miami-Dade County.

(F) Venetian Islands Neighborhood – Belle Isle

Mr. Chartrand stated that the issue of Belle Isle is currently tied up in negotiations with the consultant for additional services. They have completed a portion of the design. When the County reviewed the construction documents, they wanted changes made due to regulatory issues. After additional services are awarded to the consultant, the design phase can move forward.

Ms. Amy Rabin asked if the City had been able to address Professor LeJuene's concerns regarding the bridge railing and exposed areas. The photographs were passed on to Public Works, and an update will be requested.

Mr. DeVecchio asked what the County issues were. Mr. Shockey stated that the issue that the County brought up was the number of crosswalks. There were to be crosswalks at each condominium driveway on South Island Avenue crossing over to the park. The issue that the County brought up was one of sightline visibility traffic safety issues, and they are only willing to approve 3 of the originally proposed crosswalks.

(G) Bayshore Neighborhood

Mr. Keith Mizell, Senior Capital Projects Planner, informed the Committee that Bid Package 8A, which is Central Bayshore, has been put on a recovery schedule and the consultant has committed to providing their 30% submittals by May. On Bid Package 8B, which is Lower North Bay Road, the consultant has completed their 30% submittals and it is currently out for departmental review. On Bid Package 8C, which is Lake Pancoast, the 30% design submittal has been received and has been out for departmental review. Comments have been received and submitted to the consultants so they can begin the work to address them prior to receiving the remaining comment items, which should be received shortly. On Bid Package 8D, which is Sunset Islands, the 30% design submittal was received, sent out for review and comments received back due to the fact that Sunset Islands III & IV is going to be under-grounding the utility infrastructure (electrical wires, etc.) based on this. The submittals were sent back to the consultant and they made revisions to the design based on the comments. The consultant has returned those revised designs and they will be delivered to the homeowners association for coordination with FPL. Sunset Islands I & II are going to be repackaged with Bid Package

8B. They will become part of the Lower North Bay Road project and by the time 60% design submittal has been reached they will be pulled from 8D and incorporated into 8B.

(H) Alton Road and Chase Avenue Improvements

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

6. Informational Items

A) Updated Calendar of Scheduled Community Meetings

The updated Calendar of Scheduled Community Meetings was presented, but not reviewed during the meeting.

B) Updated Calendar of Committee Meetings

The updated calendar of Committee meetings was presented, but not reviewed during the meeting.

Ms. Joy Malakoff was welcomed to the Committee as the Planning Board Representative to the Committee.

The Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:00 p.m.