

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROJECT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 6, 2001

1. Attendance – See Attendance Sheet attachment.
2. Review and Acceptance of July 2, 2001 meeting minutes.

ACTION: A motion to approve the minutes of July 2, 2001, Committee meeting was made by Frank Del Vecchio and seconded by Marty Hyman. The minutes were unanimously approved.

3. Project Status Report

DISCUSSION: Tim Hemstreet introduced the new format for the project status report. He recognized Donald Shockey and Mark Alvarez who worked on reformatting the report; He explained that one of the goals that the Staff has had since Bob Middaugh and himself came on board with the C.I.P. Office was to get a project management report that is more informative.

Mr. Hemstreet explained that the report provides the name of the project, description of the project, and location; which program it's in; whether it's in the neighborhoods or the parks GO Bond program(s); whether the program is being managed by Hazen & Sawyer, URS or the City of Miami Beach; identifying who the architect engineer is and the name of contractor once the project moves into the construction phase.

Mr. Hemstreet also explained that specific funding was chosen; cost/dollars descriptions that the City tried to standardize across the board and one thing he wanted to note is there is a row for prior allocations that was taken off the top. In most cases that has been brought to the GO Bond Oversight Committee already. For example, on page one on the report for Biscayne Point Neighborhood Improvements; the signage plan was previously funded; the report identifies what that allocation of cost was to the project. Anywhere else where costs are shown, the staff has tried to identify that in the comments. Some major milestones that should be consistent for each project are shown and the intention is to eventually identify all the dates and put those in the report as well as a narrative for the project status.

Commissioner Dermer welcomed Laura Jamieson who is one of the new members on the board; Ms. Jamieson is a South Beach Neighborhood Representative.

Amy Rabin asked why are the Sunset Island Enhancement Project and the Sunset Island 3 & 4 Beautification Project was divided up and on the 3 & 4 Beautification Project it does not show that CH2Mhill has anything to do with the project. Mr. Hemstreet responded that the reason these projects are listed separately is because that is how it was listed in the GO Bond. When the GO Bond was put together and formatted; each of these neighborhoods had separate funding sources and were identified individually within the GO Bond itself. For instance in Sunset Island 3 & 4 on page 21 on the report it is actually being managed by the City of Miami Beach. It is not part of the Hazen & Sawyer project or the right-of-way program that they're managing. Ms. Rabin asked if the City proceeds with the underground utilities and if that neighborhood is not being supervised by Hazen & Sawyer or CH2Mhill what would happen? Mr. Hemstreet responded that the C.I.P. Office would be responsible, that he or Mr. Middaugh will make sure it gets coordinated.

4. Community Expectations on the GO Bond Projects

Mr. Middaugh explained the expectations versus the funding, not just on the GO Bond but in all the capital projects, that will be coming through. There are three primary funding sources that the City has: 1) Stormwater Bond 2) Water and Sewer Bond and 3) GO Bond. Mr. Middaugh explained that there is a certain expectation that has been created in City residents that does not necessarily match up with the available funding. He talked about the approach that it would take to actually implement the different capital projects, how the process will go, and how the City is going to deal with and recognize those expectations.

The first source of funding the City has is the Stormwater Bond funding and one important thing to know is that it was masterplanned. The City went out and did an analysis first of what were the needs of the community and where the City had priorities. Mr. Middaugh explained that Citywide there are 160 stormwater drainage basins. These are geographic areas that are engineered to drain to a certain point of those 160 basins that cover the entire Island.

There are 34 basins that were deemed to be a priority, these 34 basins then had estimates prepared and became the basis for the Stormwater Bond that was then passed by the voters and those are the ones the committee principally focuses upon as the City goes forward with the capital projects.

The budget for the 34 basins is \$54m and there also has been a \$6m contingency provided. So it can range from 70% to 150% in terms of its accuracy. It is presumed that all of the contingency will be needed to deal with ground situations that will be experienced as the projects are actually developed, designed and constructed.

The levels of service that the City will be able to achieve during this part of the stormwater improvements are different for different kinds of roadways. The key point to recognize is that there will still be, and people will see, water on the roads. This does not mean that it will be dry all of the time; as this is still an island at sea level, but the water will be able to drain within a period of time. The City is trying to achieve a five to a ten to not more than eight inches of flooding to overcrowd the road depending on which roadway is being considered.

The Consultant that did the report in an attempt to identify the priority basins looked at several factors including federal standards. The City looked at what area complaints were coming from and the City did a staff analysis and ranked each of those areas that were known to be problematic. From that evolved the 34 basins. The secondary funding identified and approved is the water and sewer plan and that also was developed through a masterplan.

Mitch Novick said he wanted clarification you regarding who approved the stormwater bond; the voter's or the Mayor and Commission. To his recollection that was the Mayor and Commission. Mr. Middaugh responded that Mr. Novick was correct; the majority of the commission approved the idea of a revenue bond that was passed.

In the water and sewer masterplan the study identified that the City needed to upgrade some 30,000 lineal feet of undersized pipe; literally two small pipes in the ground that run into that pipe on Collins Avenue. For example, where there is a six-inch line serving principally the hotels, the City will be replacing it with a 20-inch line. Of about another 600,000 other of lineal feet of watermain, it is estimated that about 2/3 (or 400,000 lineal feet) that is going to be tuberculated that just curoded over time and reduced its ability to convey water efficiently.

There maybe another 150,000 lineal feet that wasn't provided for but may still be out there, that is not specifically funded. There is a \$30m budget and the \$6m contingency is available to deal with the 150,000 lineal feet of line that was not exactly funded and also the recognizance level estimates that were provided.

Finally, the third funding source is the GO Bond program. The key here is that the program was not masterplanned, which created a series of citizen expectations and anxieties that we will have to find a way to deal with.

The GO Bond is broken into a couple of major areas. The ones that are typically available that the citizens will see are the right-of-way improvements, shoreline and stabilization and the facilities which total about \$56m. The balance of the GO Bond are for parks and for fire facilities and equipment, not street or streetscape issues. In terms of right-of-way improvements, the portion of GO Bond going towards right-of-way improvements is \$48m.

The City held a series of community workshops with citizens, which generated a wishlist of what citizens would like in their neighborhood. The wishlist was very comprehensive, very broad, and there was general attention the beautification, roadway upgrades, stormwater management, and signage. There was no attempt at that time to match the wishes to the actual budget and the amount of the GO Bond was not actually based on a masterplan or construction estimates.

What the City is running into at this is a belief that expectations exceed the City's funding. By taking the available funding and apportioning it across the whole City it was determined that \$116 per lineal foot was available for improvements. It is approximated that the desires identified by the community during the workshops reach into the \$400 per lineal foot range. The \$100 dollar per lineal foot really is the minimalist approach; which will include some landscaping; and some repairs (not replacement) on sidewalk and streets. But then \$400 per lineal foot cost figure includes much more lush landscape treatment; sod and irrigation; sidewalk and pavement replacement and probably mild resurfacing of roadways. Mr. Middaugh tried to create a graphic example of what this would look like.

The City's plan to deal with this issue is to first create the budget and recognize that there is a limited amount of money. After creating a plan to provide things that are reality based for those citizens the City will go out and talk to the citizens and let them know what we can do within the budgets. An important part of the program is that the City will capture things that can not be funded in the neighborhoods that citizens would like to see be improved or done over time. The City will capture that information and put it into the on-going capital improvement program for possible future funding.

The City is in planning phase, where most of the Architectural and Engineering firms have been engaged. They are starting to meet and create designs with the communities; formal designs will be created after they have a completed the community meetings. The following step will be to award contracts.

It is important to recognize that a realistic timetable from meeting with the community to the design to the bid award process to actually turning some dirt to construction is 12 to 24 months, depending upon what kind of project and how complicated it may be.

It is important to note that undergrounding utilities is not in the plan at this time, as there is no funding for it, but there is an opportunity to coordinate any work that the neighborhood want's to do together with the work the City is doing. There are a bunch of the stormwater basins that are not funded so the City will not be doing stormwater improvements across the entire City of Miami Beach. Some of the high end things like flag poles, fountain entry features, some traffic calming devices probably will not be included as there isn't the ability to fund some of those either.

Ms. Rabin asked that if there were enough monies and a neighborhood identified a priority, for instance entry features, streetlighting upgrade and enhanced street signage, if that would that be OK in the proposed written program. Mr. Middaugh responded that if any neighborhood expressed interest in spending their allocation of money on one feature that it is certainly legal to do so but that would be discussed the design meetings.

Mr. Middaugh explained that a process would be started very soon with community information and an involvement effort. In part the City wants people to broadly understand what the design process means and more importantly have them understand that there must be an end to the design process. The City has a history of repeated designing; and the frustration for the citizens and staff as well is that projects sometimes don't get to the construction phase, so the City is trying to create a process that will allow the City to get things BUILT.

The City will actually go into the community planning and review workshops where at the first meeting, the A&E firm engaged will take into whatever neighborhood, a design concept that represents what can be done with the budget available. The City is at the point now where the designing from the staff level is pretty much done, need now to actually get into the construction drawings phase. It was Mr. Middaugh expectation for the GO Bond Oversight Committee that they will form a very important review process as we move through this planning effort.

The Committee will be a venue or a forum for the neighborhoods to come and speak about things that maybe they may not happy with. Projects will go to a more formalized review process with the Historic Preservation Board or Design Review Board, depending on what the project is, to get there formal sign off. Finally, the City Commission is the last public forum for people to come and speak about a project. The Commission will be asked are going to ask the Commission to actually sign off on the project design.

Professor Jean-Francois LeJeune asked how the lineal cost of \$116 was determined? Mr. Middaugh responded what was intended was to illustrate that there was not enough money to do every street with a very lush treatment, only a minimal treatment in a lot of areas.

Commissioner Dermer asked if there is a way to sufficiently notice the neighbors that would be affected? Mr. Middaugh responded that as the project moves through the construction processes, the City we will try in each case to provide an information guideline to each homeowner.

Frank Del Vecchio asked a question regarding the funding of the streetscape improvements in conjunction with the stormwater and water and sewer projects. He also commented that it may be total waste of funds to give orders to proceed to many of these neighborhoods design consultants if it is we known in the neighborhood that there will be no more money available other than the General Obligation Bond streetscape fund than to fix up streets, lighting, trees, etc. Mr. Middaugh responded that the way to describe the allocation is where the Architectural & Engineering firms typically would approach the neighborhood where the City is going to be making intrusions in the neighborhood is to focus on those streets potentially the main corridors.

Mr. Leonard Wein stated that this is time to decide what is really important for the first phase, but to give up for now on the other ideas that appear on the wish list. It was his hope to have the neighborhoods and the City work together to see if funding can be obtained so we can build those things that are deemed important.

Ms. Rabin asked about the repaving of the streets in her neighborhood. Mr. Middaugh responded that there are not sufficient funds to repave the streets in the community. The \$116 per lineal foot will deal with patching the streets not paving. Ms. Rabin also asked that if the neighborhood would like to have all the streets paved is there an option to repave the whole neighborhood. Mr. Middaugh responded that it was an option if funds are available.

5. Neighborhood Infrastructure Projects Cost Model by Hazen & Sawyer

Bert Vidal provided the Cost Model to GO Bond Committee. The purpose of his presentation was to provide the committee with a basic understanding of the program funding, expense adjustments and the resulting construction budgets. The Right-of-Way Improvements Cost Model includes: GO Bonds, Water/Sewer Bonds, South Pointe RDA, City Center RDA, Section 108 Loan and miscellaneous Funding Sources. Total Right-of-Way Program is \$168,455,641.

Mr. Vidal focused on the GO Bonds and explained that the total Right-of-Way Program GO Bond funding is \$46,171,150 and the remainder of \$92m in GO Bonds is allocated to parks and facilities and that it is being tracked by the Capital Improvement Projects Office. Mr. Vidal explained how the construction budget is determined.

1. The total GO Bond fund is identified
2. Adjustments to the budget are made for:
 - a. Miscellaneous expenses (previously approved by the GO Bond Committee)
 - b. Architectural and Engineering Fees
 - c. Program Management Fees
 - d. City construction management costs
 - e. A 10% construction contingency

A final construction budget is then established.

6. Informational Items A & B

- A. Mr. Hemstreet provided a report on the Normandy Drive/71st Street FDOT project. Mr. Hemstreet explained that the Florida Department of Transportation project, as a part of the Livable Communities Program, hired the firm of Renaissance Planning Group to examine strategies that integrate community and transportation planning solutions in reference to the State Road 934 Corridor.
- B. Mr. Hemstreet provided a report on the Normandy Isle Park and Pool project. Mr. Hemstreet explained that pursuant to the rejection of all the bids by the Mayor and Commission, and the subsequent authorization given to the Administration to seek new proposals for the construction of the Normandy Park and Pool project, a Request for Proposal (RFP) #21-00/01 was issued. The Administration is now in the process of selecting a selection committee.

Meeting adjourned at 7:22p.m.

JMG/RM/TH/KLM/jv