

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
December 7, 2004**

1. **Attendance – See Attendance Sheet attachment.**
2. **Review and Acceptance of November 2, 2004 meeting minutes.**

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

3. **Contingency Report**

Mr. Tim Hemstreet, Director of the Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Office, informed the Committee that there were no new items as of the last report given during the November G.O. Bond meeting.

4. **Project Status Report**

- (A) Fire Station No. 2

Mr. Mauro Burgio, Senior Capital Projects Coordinator for the project, informed the Committee that the tanks, the pump station portion and the physical work of the project that preceded the fire station is complete and the project is in the process of being closed out. The Contractor is currently in the process of submitting all the manuals and closing out permits and will be doing such activities over the next month until the project is completely closed out. A notice to proceed has been issued on the new building for Fire Station No. 2. There will be separate notices to proceed on each portion of the project (the new building versus the rehab of the existing building). Construction of the new building is scheduled to begin sometime in 2005.

Mr. Scott Needelman asked what the difference was between the first and second notices to proceed. Mr. Burgio stated that the first notice to proceed is issued so the Contractor can start preparing all their documents and submittals. The Contractor must have a series of documents and items in line before they start to mobilize and before the start of physical work. The second notice to proceed allows them to actually start the physical work. Mr. Hemstreet stated that having the two (2) notices to proceed limits the City's liability from the prospective that if the Contractor is unable to get the necessary documents and items before commencing work with the second notice to proceed, then the City has the option of relieving that Contractor of their responsibilities. Also, having the two (2) notices to proceed enables the Administration to know what

the baseline schedule is, which helps in controlling the Contractor and also forces the Contractor to have mechanisms in place so they are able to manage their sub-contractors.

A brief discussion regarding the differences between a Gross Maximum Price (GMP) contract and the typical competitive bid process was held.

(B) Fire Station No. 4

Ms. Alex Rolendelli, Senior Capital Projects Coordinator for the project, informed the Committee that the project is on schedule. The second notice to proceed was issued on November 15, 2004. There have been some delays with respect to the seawall portion of the project but the construction has continued and all the work that was supposed to be done before the piling was installed has been completed. The decking has been completed and the anchoring devices have been formed for the seawall. Project completion is anticipated for sometime in January, 2005.

Mr. Frank Delvecchio asked what would happen if there is a cost overrun or is there no ceiling placed on the construction costs. Mr. Hemstreet stated that the cost is controlled by way of a lump sum contract. The existing project is under a lump sum basis for the existing set of permitted construction drawings and specifications. Mr. Hemstreet stated that for there to be a cost overrun, there would have to be an unforeseen site condition or something that can be demonstrated by the Contractor that is out of scope and was not anticipated within the existing construction documents.

A brief discussion regarding the differences between the Job Order Contracting (J.O.C.) system versus the competitive bid process was held.

(C) Normandy Isle Park and Pool

Mr. Tim Hemstreet informed the Committee that the Administration has received all the deliverables and revised construction documents from the A/E of record and has transmitted them to the Surety and the proposed replacement contractor for pricing. The Administration is waiting for pricing to come back as well as for the Surety to make a decision as to what they will do regarding the performance bond that is currently out on the project. Once the Administration gets the information back from the Surety and the pricing back from the Contractor, the Administration will be in a

better position to make a decision as to how to proceed with the project construction.

Mr. Roberto Sanchez asked what the timeframe was for getting back the Contractor's price. Mr. Hemstreet stated that the Administration anticipated receiving the Contractor's first draft at pricing the project before the end of the calendar year.

Mr. Michael Rotbart asked if there were any options or alternatives regarding this project with respect to possibly demolishing what is existing and starting over. Mr. Hemstreet stated that from a financial perspective, it would be less expensive to continue with the existing design for the permitted project than it would be to demolish the existing project progress.

(D) Normandy Drive/ 71st Street Corridor

Mr. Frank DeVecchio asked what specific relevance do the issues raised in the report have to do with the mission of this Committee. Ms. Joyce Meyers, Principal Planner, Planning Department stated that there is one (1) project in the G.O. Bond that is applicable to the Miami Beach portion of this project. The portion is unplanned to date, but that the scope is to make improvements to the landscaping and lighting on Normandy Drive and 71st Street. Ms. Meyers stated that at some point when the project is developed, it will be referred to the G.O. Bond Committee.

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) 2005 Calendar of General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee Meetings

Discussion regarding which day of the week is more convenient for the Committee Members to meet was held. It was decided that the January Committee meeting will remain as scheduled, however the future meetings may change to the first Monday of the month.

Mayor Dermer raised a discussion regarding the traffic calming devices recently installed in the City. He pointed out that while many neighborhoods have asked for them, it is difficult to visualize what they will look like and how they will impact the driving patterns and behaviors of the drivers in the City. The Committee discussed a way to let those who are interested in what traffic calming devices look like to be able to experience them and see them. Alternative, removable devices were also discussed.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

JMG/RCM/TH/KLM/kmc

F:\CAPI\SalIKRISTAL\G.O. BOND\MINUTES\MIN12072004-DRAFT.doc