

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROJECT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 9, 2002

1. Attendance – See Attendance Sheet attachment.

2. Review and Acceptance of August 5, 2002 meeting minutes.

Mr. Tim Hemstreet explained that the minutes did not reflect that the Administration would present the CIP Office Budget to the GO Bond Oversight Committee after it was presented to the Budget Advisory Committee as requested at the August 5, 2002 GO Bond Oversight Committee meeting. A presentation was made to the Budget Advisory Committee on September 3, 2002. He added that the same information would be presented to the GO Bond Oversight Committee, at its October meeting.

ACTION: Mr. Roberto Sanchez motioned to approve the minutes from the August 5, 2002 meeting with an amendment that the Administration would present the CIP Office Budget and organizational structure at the October 7, 2002 Committee meeting. Mitch Novick seconded the motion. The minutes were passed as amended

ACTION: Mr. Marty Hyman made a motion to further amend the minutes to include a list of items that members of the Committee would like to have provided during that presentation. The request includes: the CIP Table of Organization with job descriptions, total annual budget, estimated total annual value of construction projects with the associated value of GO Bond funding identified for those projects directly managed by the CIP Office. It was seconded by Mr. Larry Herrup. The motion passed.

Mr. Herrup introduced Ms. Deede Weithorn, Vice-Chair of the Budget Advisory Committee. Ms. Weithorn will assume the position of Chairperson of the Budget Advisory Committee effective January 1, 2003. Mr. Herrup explained that his seat expires in January and that Ms. Weithorn will be replacing him on the GO Bond Committee. Ms. Weithorn will be attending the remaining GO Bond Oversight Committee meetings in 2002 to become familiar with the projects and meeting processes.

3. Project Status Report

Mr. Hemstreet explained that a written report is provided to the Committee. There was no presentation planned for any particular project, but that questions were welcome.

Mr. Sanchez wanted to know about the demolition delay at Normandy Isle Park and Pool. Mr. Hemstreet informed him that the demolition delay was due to an FP&L

transformer that controls the traffic signals at 71st Street, Trouville Esplanade and Normandy Drive, which was located in the building. The transformer has been removed and demolition will begin soon. Mr. Todd Osborn of URS explained that the project was delayed because of the transformer, which was discovered when FP&L came out to disconnect power to the building on June 27. He said that between June 28 and August 1, meetings were held between the City of Miami Beach CIP Office, Miami-Dade County, URS and FDOT. It was determined that FDOT had the responsibility of rerouting the electricity. He said that completion of the work with permits was done on August 21 and FP&L also completed their rerouting on August 26. He added that Regosa Engineering received a permit for demolition on September 3^d and began demolition today.

Mr. Sanchez wanted to know who was responsible for the delays. Mr. Osborn responded that FDOT and the County caused the delay and have been put on notice that the City may seek payment from them for any claims made related to the delay. Should any delay claims with dollars attached be presented, the City will have to work with FDOT and the County to resolve the issue.

Mr. Herrup asked if since initial construction has been delayed, would there be a financial implication related to the delay. He added that if there is a claim, it should be brought to the Committee for review. Mr. Osborn responded that a claim may have financial implications but that the contractor has not presented one to date.

Mr. Sanchez wanted to know if an additional \$400,000 that is needed for the park portion of the project had been appropriated. Mr. Hemstreet responded that additional funds had not been allocated toward the project to date.

Mr. Michael Rotbart wanted to know the status on the North Shore Park and Youth Center. Mr. Osborn reported that it was proceeding nicely, and that due to a significant amount of rain, the contractor was about 45 days behind schedule, but aggressively moving forward on the project.

Mr. Novick wanted to know the status of the South Shore Community Center. Mr. Hemstreet responded that the construction drawings were in their final stages of completion. He added that REG Architects, who are the designers on the project, are finalizing their bid package, which should be out to bid sometime in late September or October.

Mr. Novick also wanted to know the status of the debarment investigation for REG Architects. Mr. Hemstreet explained that the issue is being handled by the City's Debarment Committee through the Procurement Division. He said the GO Bond Oversight Committee would be notified as soon as appropriate with information pertaining to this issue.

Ms. Sherri Krassner wanted to know the status of the Bayshore Neighborhood Basis of Design Report (BODR). Mr. Hemstreet responded that the current calendar plans for

the BODR to be brought to the Committee for consideration in November.

Ms. Krassner also wanted to know when the Bayshore Golf Course Clubhouse construction would begin. Mr. Hemstreet responded that awarding a contract for construction was being recommended to the City Commission for action at the Commission meeting on September 11. He added that if the contract is awarded by the City Commission on September 11, construction should begin sometime in October. The golf course would be opened by mid-December.

Ms. Krassner wanted to know the status of the 42nd Street Streetscape project.

Mr. Gordon Loder, a resident and chairperson of the 42nd Street Neighborhood Association, expressed concerns that the construction plans that he saw months ago were not what the neighborhood had agreed upon. He also had heard that there were issues with the funding for the project. He added that the community did not want anymore delays.

Mr. Hemstreet informed the Committee that the funding issue raised by Mr. Loder had been resolved. Mr. Jorge Chartrand from the CIP Office explained that some of the items the community wanted had been agreed upon, and that some were not possible due to lack of funding for them or because of construction related restraints.

Mr. Sanchez expressed his concern as to whether or not this project had been brought before the Committee previously, according to the usual process.

ACTION: Mr. Sanchez motioned that the Administration had to bring the project back to the Committee before putting it out to bid if the project had not previously been brought before the Committee, but, if the project had previously been brought before the Committee, the Administration could move forward with putting the project out to bid. Mr. Rotbart seconded. The motion passed.

Mr. Leonard Wein opposed the motion, and explained that he opposed it because the motion would delay the project further if it had already been approved in the past. It was possible that the project had been in progress prior to the establishment of the GO Bond Oversight Committee, or was discussed just after it had been established.

4. Recommendation to City Commission

a. LaGorce Neighborhood ROW Infrastructure Improvement Project BODR

Mr. Hemstreet informed the Committee that the Basis of Design Report on the LaGorce project would be presented for the Committee's approval, and then if recommended, the approval of the Commission. He added that a number of community workshops and meetings have been held and he believed that consensus was reached. He introduced Joe Gomez, Vice President of Reynolds, Smith & Hills, Inc., who is the consultant for

planning phase services on the project. Mr. Gomez presented the proposed improvements for review with the Committee. The improvements were also further described in the Basis of Design Report distributed to the Committee.

Mr. Frank Del Vecchio brought up concerns regarding the Cherokee Avenue street end seawall that were not clear in the BODR. Mr. Gomez explained that until a geotechnical analysis was done, it would not be known if items might need repair or total replacement. He continued by explaining that if there is a need for replacement, it would be done.

Mayor David Dermer began introducing residents that wanted to voice their comments and opinions on the Basis of Design Report and the proposed plans for the neighborhood.

Mr. Barry Klein, a resident at 6356 Alton Road, presented the Committee with a letter from the Alton Road Extension Homeowner's Association on the LaGorce BODR. He stated that no consensus of opinion was reached by residents regarding the Basis of Design Report (BODR) for this project. He also voiced his concerns on proposed road closures that would affect his neighborhood, in the area of 63rd Street, Alton Road, LaGorce Drive and Pine Tree Drive. The letter was signed by individuals residing at five (5) addresses in the area.

Mr. Oswaldo Mora, a resident and President of the LaGorce Island Homeowners Association, commented that he believed that a simple resolution is to put a no left turn sign on LaGorce Drive heading south from 4-7p.m. with a City of Miami Beach Police Officer for a short time. He added this would solve the problem, not cost the City a lot of money and would eliminate the need for road closures. He added that he was opposed to closing the extension of LaGorce Drive northbound.

Mr. Del Vecchio wanted to know if traffic studies were a component of the BODR. Mr. Hemstreet responded that no traffic studies were done and the recommendations were made by the engineer, who has experience with County statutes, as well as traffic engineering. He added that in order to implement a traffic study, the design aspect of the project needed to be approved.

Mr. Rotbart recommended having a traffic study done in this area.

Mr. Desmond Child, a resident who owns several homes in the area, voiced concerns about calming the traffic in his neighborhood. He also added that he is afraid for his family and would like the streets narrowed. He stated that he was in favor of closing Pine Tree Drive Circle so that traffic could flow one way in and one way out.

Mr. Sanchez commented that maybe North Bay Road could be closed at the intersection with Alton Road.

Mr. Wein stated that it was his belief that the responsibility of the Committee was to authorize designs, which will involve the kind of traffic studies needed for the issues being discussed. The County and/or FDOT would hold public meetings to discuss these issues if this design moves forward. He suggested tabling the discussion on traffic issues and approving the design of the project.

Ms. Joy Malakoff, a resident at 6415 Pine Tree Drive, agreed with Mr. Child about closing Pine Tree Drive Circle. She also added that Royal Palms should be continued in the landscaping plan.

Mr. Sam Luby, a resident at 6320 Alton Road, let the Committee know that he was at the community meetings and there had not been a consensus.

Dr. Steven Bowen, a resident at 6335 LaGorce Drive, agreed that there had not been a consensus and agreed that a traffic study should be done.

Dr. Maria Isabel Fernandez, a resident at 6335 LaGorce Drive, expressed that she was also upset with the traffic problems in the neighborhood. She added that she was never noticed for the community meetings and opposed secret meetings.

Mr. Milton Rajjman, a resident at 6351 Pine Tree Drive, commented on the traffic issue and let the Committee know that he too had not been notified of the meeting and only found out through his neighbors.

Mr. Herrup commented that the homeowners should approach the Commission with a proposal for the road closure to create a temporary solution to the problem.

Mr. Wien said that individuals who sign in at the different meetings that are held will be noticed of upcoming meetings on the topic.

Mr. Frederick Sake, a resident and Vice President of the LaGorce/Pine Tree Homeowners Association, let the Administration and the consultant know that he was very happy that a bike path had been included in the design, but suggested putting it on the other side of the street.

Mr. Jeffery Bercow, a resident of 590 Lake View Drive, commented that he agreed with the BODR. He was concerned about the proposed sidewalk extension on Cherokee Avenue. He added that the problem was that the sidewalk would encroach on the existing landscaping, leaving little green space in that area.

Mr. Sanchez commented that he was not in agreement with spending funds to put a sidewalk on a dead end street. Mr. Hemstreet responded that the reason for putting in a sidewalk is that typically pedestrians are provided a path on streets that end at a body of water.

Mr. David Russin, a resident of the area, commented that he wanted a six foot fence installed at the end of Cherokee Avenue, for the protection of the children that live and play in that area.

ACTION: Mr. Roberto Sanchez made a motion to recommend that the City Commission remove the proposed sidewalk on Cherokee Avenue from the BODR. Ms. Amy Rabin seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Mr. Rotbart wanted to know what the City policy was for dead end streets. Mr. Hemstreet explained that the policy for streets that end at a body of water were being considered by the Administration and a City Commission committee. Practice has been to improve the street ends if funds exist and the neighborhood desires the improvement.

Mr. Bruce Riech, a resident representing the LaGorce/Pine Tree Homeowners Association, spoke on the flow of traffic at the intersection of 51st Street and LaGorce Drive and improvement of the pump station in the area. He also asked that consideration be given to repairing certain sidewalks along La Gorce Drive and Pine Tree Drive. Mr. Hemstreet explained that those streets are County roads, and that maintenance issues such as that should be reported to the Public Works Department to be passed on to the County.

Mr. Joseph Flemming, a resident at 34 La Gorce Circle, explained that consensus was not the way to decide this issue. He added that speed limits should be posted and other options researched.

Mr. Sanchez was concerned that meeting notices were not getting out to the residents. Mr. Hemstreet explained that all meetings are advertised on the City's cable channel, in the newspapers, and the City's website, and that meeting notices are sent out to all residents that have attended and signed in with address information at other community meetings.

Mr. Herrup added that it was very important that residents are receiving information in a timely basis so that issues can be identified and hopefully resolved before they are presented to the Committee.

Mr. Hyman wanted to know where funding is coming from for the seawall. Mr. Hemstreet explained that a separate GO Bond allocation has been set aside for the seawall repairs.

A discussion ensued between the Committee and the Administration on how to proceed with approving the Basis of Design Report (BODR) and how the County would deal with the traffic issues presented in the report. Mr. Gomez explained that the County is presented with and considers collected data, the amount of safety that is gained from proposed improvements and the recommendation from the City. The County makes a decision after that information is considered. The data collection would occur during the design phase of the project.

ACTION: Mr. Sanchez made a motion to recommend that the Administration hold another community meeting to discuss the traffic calming issue north of 63rd Street (Pine Tree Drive, LaGorce Drive and Alton Road) and try to reach a consensus, then to come back before the Committee at the October meeting. Mr. Hyman seconded the motion. The motion passed.

ACTION: Mr. Hyman made a motion to recommend that the City Commission approve the BODR for the LaGorce Neighborhood Improvement project, as amended with regard to the sidewalk on Cherokee Avenue, and not including the traffic calming issues on Pine Tree Drive, LaGorce Drive and Alton Road, north of 63rd Street. Mr. Herrup seconded the motion. The motion passed.

b. EDAW additional services for Flamingo Neighborhood

Mr. Hemstreet explained that the Administration was recommending an amendment to EDAW's agreement with the City for the Flamingo Neighborhood project. It was determined that improvements were necessary for the blocks of Meridian Avenue and Euclid Avenue between 16th Street and Lincoln Lane South, which are outside the geographic scope of services of EDAW's agreement. Funding for these improvements will come from GO Bond funds that had originally been set aside for improvements to Washington Avenue. This project and the funding was never approved, so the funds are available to return to the neighborhood project. The negotiated fee for EDAW to design these improvements is \$35,999.

ACTION: Mr. Del Vecchio made a motion to recommend that the City Commission approve an amendment to the agreement with EDAW for the Flamingo Neighborhood Right of Way Improvement Project, in the amount of \$35,999 from GO Bond funds. Mr. Wein seconded the motion. The motion passed.

5. Informational Items

(a) The Updated Calendar of Scheduled Community Design Workshops was provided to the Committee.

6. Change Orders

The Change Order Report was presented and reviewed.

The Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.