



To: Capital Improvement Oversight Committee

Date:

September 15, 2008

Commissioner Deede Weithorn, Chair

Erik Agazim

Elizabeth Camargo

Christina Cuervo

Fred Karlton

Rick Kendle

Stacy Kilroy

Dwight Kraai

Israel Magrisso

From: Jorge M. Gonzalez, City Manager

Subject: MEETING OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE,
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2008 AT 5:30 P.M. IN THE COMMISSION CHAMBERS

A meeting of the Capital Improvement Project Oversight Committee has been scheduled for Monday, September 15, 2008 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Commission Chambers, 3rd Floor of Miami Beach City Hall. The Agenda for this meeting is as follows:

1. Attendance
2. Review and Acceptance of Minutes
ACTION: Acceptance of Minutes of the July 7, 2008 CIPOC Meeting
3. Items Referred to CIPOC from July 16, 2008 City Commission Meeting
 - a. "Request For Authorization To Award A Contract, Pursuant To Invitation To Bid (ITB) No. 13-07/08; For The South Pointe Phase II Right Of Way Infrastructure Improvements Project, Neighborhood No. 12C, To RIC-Man International, Inc. (RIC-Man), Subject To And Conditioned Upon The Administration Being Able To Negotiate Further With RIC-Man; And Provided Further That, Upon Conclusion Of These Further Negotiations With RIC-Man, The City Manager Will Bring The Bid Back For Consideration By The City Commission, With A Recommendation For Award Of Contract Or For Rejection Of All Bids."
 - b. Sub-Committee Report:
South Pointe Ph. II Right of Way Infrastructure Improvement Project
Stacy Kilroy, Sub-Committee Chair
 - i. Meeting Report August 12, 2008
 - ii. Informational Items
 1. Draft template of proposed unit pricing guide for inclusion with ITB documents
4. Public Comments
Members of the Public are invited to share their views and ask questions pertaining to any City of Miami Beach Capital Improvement Projects
5. Sub-Committee Meeting Reports
 - a. South Pointe Master Booster Pump Station
Dwight Kraai, Sub-Committee Chair
 - i. Meeting Report July 24, 2008
 - ii. Meeting Report August 21, 2008
 - iii. Information Items
 1. "Guidelines for the Performance and Submittal of the Second Cycle Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Survey (SSES)"
 2. Consent Agreement between County and City: July 9, 2007
 3. "February 2006 Volume Sewer Customer Ordinance (VSCO) Requirements and Compliance Plan of Action"
 4. SFWMD Lower East Coast Water Supply Plan

- b.** Sunset Islands I & II
Elizabeth Camargo, Sub-Committee Chair
 - i. Meeting Report August 20, 2008
 - ii. Informational Items
 - 1. Public Works Report: **conditions of sanitary sewers on Sunset 1 & 2, with respect to infiltration and associated relining program**
 - 2. **Public Works Report on stormwater drainage system cleaning on Sunset Islands I & II**
 - c.** Normandy Shores Golf Course
Erik Agazim, Sub-Committee Chair
 - i. Report of Findings (Erik Agazim)
 - ii. Discussion
- 6. Report On Walk-through of Normandy Shores Golf Course
Presented by: Commissioner Deede Weithorn
Deede@miamibeachfl.gov
- 7. Discussion On Placement of Normandy Shores Entrance Sign at Biarritz and South Shore Drive
Presented by: Jorge E. Chartrand, CIP Director
Jorgechartrand@miamibeachfl.gov
- 8. Old Business
 - a.** Procurement Options
Presented by: Jorge E. Chartrand, CIP Director
Jorgechartrand@miamibeachfl.gov
 - i. Design-Bid-Build
 - ii. Design-Build
 - iii. CM@Risk
 - iv. Job Order Contract (JOC)
 - b.** Best Value Procurement Selection Process
Presented by: Jorge E. Chartrand, CIP Director
Jorgechartrand@miamibeachfl.gov
 - c.** Review of Priority Basins
Presented by: Fred Beckmann, Director, Public Works Department
fredbeckmann@miamibeachfl.gov
- 9. Staff Action Report
- 10. Adjournment

JMG:TH:JECh:JCC:shl

C:\Documents and Settings\capilips\My Documents\CIPOC\Cover\Cover 2008-09-15.doc

Call Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Office at 305-673-7071, or if hearing impaired, call the Florida Relay Service (800) 955-8771 (TTY) to request this publication in accessible format; to request sign language interpreters (five days in advance, if possible); or to request information on access for persons with disabilities.

CIP Oversight Committee

Attendance

September 15, 2008

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
ATTENDANCE SHEET**

2008

COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Discipline	6/2	7/7	8/4	9/15	10/6	11/3	12/1
Hon. Deede Weithorn	Chair	Organizational Meeting	X	No August Meeting				
Erik Agazim	Capital Budget/ Finance/Citizen-at-large		X					
Elizabeth Camargo	Architect		X					
Christina Cuervo	Developer/ Citizen-at-Large		X					
William Goldsmith	Developer		X		N/A			
Fred Karlton	Developer		N/A					
Rick Kendle	Engineer/ Citizen-at-Large		X					
Stacey Kilroy Lotspeich	Construction/ General Contractor		X					
Dwight Kraai	Engineer		X					
Israel Magrisso	Citizen-at-Large/Engineer		X					

X = PRESENT

A = ABSENT

CIP Oversight Committee

Review and Acceptance of Minutes July 7, 2008 CIPOC Meeting

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
July 7, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 5:37 p.m.

1. **Attendance – See Attendance Sheet attachment.**

2. **Review and Acceptance of Minutes**

ACTION: Acceptance of Minutes of the June 2, 2008 CIPOC Meeting

Correction: Israel Magrisso is listed in Section 2 of the Minutes as "Retired" Engineer....
He is not retired.

MOVED: Israel Magrisso 2nd: Stacy Kilroy

Note: The June 2, 2008 meeting was considered organizational in nature and will not count toward the total number of absences against those who were not in attendance.

Three members were sworn in by Raul Aguila of the City Attorney's Office:

Erik Agazim

Elizabeth Camargo

William Goldsmith

3. **Old Business**

Review of Legal Guidelines

Presented by Raul Aguila, City Attorney's Office

raulaguila@miamibeachfl.gov

Mr. Aguila briefed the new members of the Committee on Government in the Sunshine Law and legal guidelines for City Committees. They were asked to contact his office for further discussion.

4. **Procurement of Services**

Presented by Gus Lopez, Procurement Division Director

guslopez@miamibeachfl.gov

Mr Lopez gave an overview of the City of Miami Beach Procurement process, focusing on selection of A/E firms and the construction contractor selection process.

Procurement in Florida Municipalities is governed by Florida Statutes. (section 287.055) applying to A/E. Planners and Designers (Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act). The basic steps are as follows:

There are specific guidelines in the statute as to the criteria that municipalities must use in the competitive selection process

- First an agenda item for a project is brought to the City Commission (incorporates scope of services and selection criteria. Weight is assigned to each item within the selection criteria). The Mayor and City Commission are briefed and they authorize the issuance of a Request for Qualifications (RFQ).
- RFQ Issued. Florida Statutes mandate that the municipality focus on the qualifications of the firms as part of the selection process. Florida Statutes also prohibits any discussion of fees at this stage. We cannot ask the competing firms what their fees are. (Discussion of fees only takes place during the negotiation phase). The issuance of an RFQ is noticed through two notification services.

- Pre-qualification submittal meeting. This is held for those interested firms to brief them on the process, stressing the prevailing ordinances and the time schedule for the RFQ, and address questions.
- Firms submit qualification packages.
- Evaluation Committee. The City Manager appoints members for the Evaluation Committee. This committee is an advisory committee to the City Manager. The Committee reviews the submitted proposals, engage in Q&A with the candidates and are tasked with ranking no less than three firms. The top-ranked firm is recommended to the City Manager.
- The City Manager reviews the recommendation of the committee, and, in turn, will make a recommendation to the Mayor and City Commission, which is to:
 - Accept the recommendation and rankings
 - Enter into negotiations with the top-ranked firm – and if not possible, to enter into negotiations with the second-ranked firm
- Negotiation Phase. When the Commission authority is granted, the Manager appoints individuals to negotiate an agreement. For the most part, the agreement is negotiated by the CIP Office.
 - Proposed fees
 - Fee schedules
 - Schedules
- Agreement brought back to City Commission for approval, after careful review from the City Attorney's Office.
- When all parties agree to the executed contract, the A/E firm goes to work.

Q&A:

Erik Agazim asked for clarification on the process, that fees are not discussed until the top firm is selected. That is correct.

William Goldsmith asked if the City could develop their own guidelines for establishing fair fees prior to commencement of the bidding process. When the response came back that the City is prohibited from asking about fees prior to the negotiation phase, Mr. Goldsmith responded by stating that he would not ask the candidates for their fees, but rather tell them in advance what the City expected to pay, that was considered in a commercially reasonable realm and would also add the expectations of a timeframe. Including \$\$ for a retainer, \$\$ for production of schematics and \$\$ when the work is completed. (50% through CDs).

The City is bound by guidelines not to discuss this during the bidding phase, but can present a budget for the entire project to the candidates prior to bid. The items mentioned come up during the competitive negotiations process.

Commissioner Weithorn developed Mr. Goldsmith's question into a motion to recommend to the administration that the Committee develop a set of "standard cost guidelines" based on project scope for each project. She recommended focusing on one aspect of a project at a time (A/E, Different commodities). Commodities, for example, have fluctuating costs, she warned. Commissioner Weithorn added it is staff's job to come up with cost, not the committee's. The Committee makes recommendations.

Christina Cuervo pointed out that the City does try to standardize costs in advance so that A/E firms know up front that there is a maximum on vertical and horizontal construction costs.

Jorge Cano, Assistant Director of CIP explained that typically A/E fees run a percentage of the total job. Typical fee for ROW program is 8 – 10% of overall project. There are components that are not part of the process in the private sector, but are part of the public construction process. The project development process involves community meetings, which add to the cost. The A/E fees on the Flamingo Park project were negotiated down to about 7%.

Ms. Cuervo asked if special industry knowledge was a consideration in determining what the City is willing to pay for A/E fees. **Mr. Cano** explained that those that bid for public projects are bidding for a single event, with no guarantee for repeat business. Mr. Cano used examples of the RFP process explored by the City of Hialeah and the City of Miami. These examples include firms that submit their qualifications in order to be included on a rotating list. If they do not perform, they are removed from the list. This is similar to the City of Miami Beach's JOC system.

Mr. Cano discussed briefly the various procurement options in which the City can engage. The City has moved from Design-Bid-Build to others such as Design/Build, Design/Bid and CM@Risk, as well as JOC. These options aid in transferring risk and compressing timeline.

- Design-Bid-Build has been the standard procedure, which takes the longest because a consultant has to be secured, then have the design worked on, then go through bid and award session, award it, find a contractor to award and then take the project to construction.
- Design/Build is advantageous because a contractor is hired and the contractor in turn hires the engineer and they work as a team. This is procured through an RFP, typically after a City-hired consultant prepares design documents outlining scope and budget. When the response to the solicitation comes in, there is an opportunity to discuss costs, scope changes, phasing etc.
- CM@Risk: City will hire a consultant and construction manager to value-engineer a project from the beginning.

Stacy Kilroy asked if the actual contract to be negotiated is part of the let-go documents. As a standard practice, Mr. Lopez answered, the answer is no. Sometimes firms have asked for a copy of a sample agreement during the selection process for A/E firm. We have provided it as an addendum to the documents.

Ms. Kilroy suggested that the standard contract be included so that the A/E firms know what to expect as far as the requirement of the number of community meetings and other details that are expected in the process. Although the terms and conditions are included within the RFQ document, Ms. Kilroy pointed out that the firms considering a bid would hand the agreement to their attorneys and project managers to make the decisions.

MOTION: Recommendation to include the boilerplate contract in the RFQ documents sent out to A/E firms during the selection process.

Commissioner Weithorn advised sending this electronically. (The Procurement Division is working on making all material available electronically).

Moved by Stacy Kilroy, 2nd: Christina Cuervo -- MOTION PASSED

ACTION FOR STAFF: Report on how this is implemented.

William Goldsmith commented that on all the projects he has developed, he knew at the outset what he was willing to pay. By giving firms a rough idea of the price, he got better and quicker feedback. He suggested trying that on the next CIP project.

He asked, by way of developing a motion, that the Committee develop a reasonable pricing format for CIP projects by implementing this control (spending ceiling) on select new projects as a test for this threshold list. Rather than simply present an overall budget with bid documents, but to also include line items with cost thresholds for certain items to allow contractors to develop budgets more effectively. Mr. Goldsmith feels that the current City bid process does not present realistic budgets at the outset, and associated prices may not be realistic, and that the projects do not necessarily address the needs of the neighborhoods. All this, his says, is done in a manner that is not commercially reasonable.

Commissioner Weithorn assisted by suggesting that the committee implement a pilot, to attempt a new philosophy to a project to establish pricing guidelines. Appoint a committee member to work with CIP as a sub-committee of one. That sub-committee would meet with CIP in more detail, and bring the results back to the Committee.

Mrs. Cuervo asked if there were standard items on the JOC unit price catalog. This includes over 140,000 pre-price items of construction costs in the South Florida market, updated every 18 months. Ms. Cuervo suggested that the JOC manual be used as a preliminary guideline in the development of the pilot program.

ACTION FOR STAFF: Copies (CDs) will be provided to Committee members who request it.

MOTION: The Committee will embark on several pilot projects in implementing the new philosophy of presenting the bidding firms with cost guidelines.

Israel Magrisso asked for clarification as to what the Committee is seeking with price thresholds. He noted that although the discussion began over consultant fees, Mr. Goldsmith was mentioning construction costs.

(Mr. Goldsmith's mic was turned off, so his response was not recorded)

Mr. Magrisso stated that the Design/Build system as it is implemented now, addresses the concerns that Mr. Goldsmith addressed. He stated that the contractor works with the designer to establish pricing that will be most economically beneficial.

Edward Tobin, City of Miami Beach Commissioner, spoke at the gallery podium. He thanked the Committee and specifically thanked Mr. Goldsmith for contributing his time and efforts to evaluate City projects. Comm. Tobin detailed his concerns over fees associated with several CIP projects, specifically the Normandy Shores Golf Course Clubhouse, stating that the Architect established costs that were in excess of \$450 per square foot for construction costs, when it is his opinion based on prevailing commercial construction, that costs should be less than \$250 per square foot.

Mr. Magrisso stated that in a design/build project, the contractor, not the architect, establishes the construction costs.

Commissioner Tobin stated that the City presents a budget first, and then the bidders base their costs on that budget. He also discussed the Flamingo Park Tennis Center construction. The Commission directed CIP to complete the tennis courts in March, 2006. He is dissatisfied with the progress to date on this part of the project. He also stated that the City Manager is committed to improving the CIP process.

Mr. Goldsmith asked for numbers to be reiterated. A/E fees for the NSGC Clubhouse were \$400,000 and an additional \$131,000 for an assisting consulting firm.

Commissioner Weithorn asked for details of the NSGC Clubhouse project to be sent to all committee members.

ACTION FOR STAFF: History and budgeting details sent to committee members.

Ms. Kilroy asked for definition of the scope of the pet projects and what the committee is asked to determine (professional fees, unit pricing, extra fees, etc...)

Mr. Goldsmith said that each project is unique with unique problems to be addressed. He has already done the work for three projects and wanted to present to the committee what he discovered. He feels that the City has gone about projects in a manner that was not in the best interest of the City.

Ms. Cuervo asked if the City was able to implement any of the suggestions that Mr. Goldsmith had made or if it was too late.

Mr. Goldsmith explained that he had met with CH2MHill (the engineering firm that conducted the drainage studies on Miami Beach and designed the Bayshore project), an engineering firm with which he works on Wal-Mart renovations. He discovered that the drainage studies assumed that there was no contribution from private swale renovations to the street flooding. This, he says, is an incorrect assumption that is the basis of the rest of the project.

Ms. Kilroy asked further clarification on the motion: That this is an investigation into various projects so that errors are discovered and corrected before they go into design.

"Pet Projects" (As applied to previous motion)

Applied to four projects:

- Lake Pancoast (Bayshore 8-C)
- Sunset 1&2 (Bayshore 8-B)
- Nautilus Drainage (Orchard Park emergency change order)
- Normandy Shores Golf Course Clubhouse

These will be taken on by various members of the Committee in individual sub-committees of one. Committee members are to volunteer to take on projects on the sub-committee level. If more than one Committee member attends, the meeting will have to be noticed at least 7 days in advance, in compliance with Sunshine.

MOTION PASSED. (One opposed)

STAFF ACTION: Assist committee members in planning sub-committee meetings.

Raul Aguila explained that any communication will be done through the CIP Office in order to comply with Sunshine Laws.

Mr. Goldsmith wants pet projects to be brought to Committee as they come up so that the Committee could be involved as early as possible.

a. & b. Review of Sample A/E Agreement and Contractor Agreement

Stacy Kilroy asked how the Committee could set pricing structures to all ranges of the types of documents that are generated, and apply them to a lump sum contract. (Her reference was the contractor agreement).

Raul Aguila explained that his understanding of what Mr. Goldsmith was proposing was that the pricing structure would be presented in the bid documents. This would be similar to JOC, including unit prices with documents.

Ms. Kilroy noted that prevailing unit prices are mentioned in the contracts. How are these prices determined, as it appears that there are structures already set up?

Mr. Cano answered that benchmarking is provided by the consultants who serve as project managers. The City has an idea of the market and current costs.

Ms. Kilroy knows of several good methods by which to monitor pricing that are already in place.

She also asked about the construction schedule. This is developed following the issuance of the first NTP, as explained by **Raul Aguila**. The schedule becomes part of the contract after the contract is executed. After every request for payment is process, the contractor submits a report detailing the portion of work completed and a look-ahead schedule.

Tim Hemstreet, Assistant City Manager, clarified that when baseline schedule is submitted, the only way that can be amended is through a change-order. For example, if a contractor is behind schedule and submits a pay-application, they can be charged for liquidated damages unless a change order is implemented.

Mr. Goldsmith asked to make a motion that the CIPOC can advise the City on every contract over \$5000 before it goes out.

Raul Aguila explained that this board, as an advisory board, can make any recommendation to the Administration and Commission. The City rarely agrees to changes in terms and conditions, as they are boilerplate documents. There is a concern of time, in that the CIPOC only meets monthly, which may slow down processes. The City is currently reviewing, as it does occasionally, the current front-end documents. The Committee may want to have say on that. Mr. Aguila will advise the Committee on when the meetings to update these documents will take place.

STAFF ACTION: Advise Committee on when the City will be holding meetings to review front-end documents.

Christina Cuervo pointed out that the old board (GOBOC) routinely received copies of contracts before they went out and was under the impression that this committee would also review contracts before they are awarded. The City will make available the contracts prior to them going to the City Commission.

ACTION FOR STAFF: Bring contracts to CIPOC for review prior to presentation to Commission. If time constraints don't provide for that, please advise the Committee on status.

Gus Lopez explained that during the evaluation process, because the City has adopted certain ordinances, and the Committee should be aware of the Cone of Silence and Lobbying registration requirements.

Mr. Aguila clarified that the Committee wants to see contracts once they have been negotiated but before they go to Commission.

Mr. Goldsmith wants to be sure that the City doesn't overpay and that opportunities are not missed.

Erik Agazim pointed out that if large budgets are presented, contractors may take advantage. For example, if a contract for painting a building is made available at \$2 million, but a contractor knows that he can do it for \$1 Million; he would still bid at \$2 Million and make a 200% profit.

Mr. Lopez explained that public construction is under additional constraints and guidelines that must be followed such as the David/Bacon Act that provides for minimum labor standards and minimum pay for employees for projects that utilize federal funds of \$2000+. As another example, the equal benefits domestic partnership coverage is a condition of doing business with the City, and costs more for the contractors.

Mr. Goldsmith's request was TABLED. Commissioner Weithorn wants to work out with staff the best way to utilize the committee to review contracts.

Mr. Goldsmith volunteered that his goal is for the City to get the best commercially reasonable prices.

5. **Procurement Options**

TABLED UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING

6. **Best Value Procurement Selection Process**

TABLED UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING

7. **Review of Priority Basins**

TABLED UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING

8. **Vote on August Meeting**

MOTION: To take a break along with Commission for the month of August

M – Commissioner Weithorn 2nd – (not clear who seconded this motion)

MOTION PASSED

There will be no August meeting, but the sub-committees working on the pilot projects will begin their work, meeting with staff as arranged.

There may be as many as three sub-committee meetings before the September meeting. The CIP Office will coordinate with members in organizing and assisting with these meetings.

ADDITIONAL STAFF ACTION: Commissioner Weithorn asked for a copy of the Capital Budget, once ready, to be given to the Committee.

ADDITIONAL STAFF ACTION: Advise the Committee of any CIP contracts to come before the July Commission meeting. (The South Pointe Streetscape Phase II award will be before the July Commission. Once the selection of the vendor is made by Commission, information will be brought back to Committee, due to Cone of Silence restrictions).

ADDITIONAL STAFF ACTION: As the Capital Budget process is finalized, CIP is asked to bring those projects that are coming online to the Committee.

ADDITIONAL STAFF ACTION: Update Web Site.

The next meeting of the Capital Improvement Projects Oversight Committee will be held at 5:30 pm, Monday, September 8, 2008 (NOTE: Due to Budget Hearing held Sept. 8, the meeting date was moved to September 15, 2008).

JMG/TH/JECh/shl

C:\Documents and Settings\capilips\My Documents\CIPOC\Minutes\MIN07072008.doc.doc

CIP Oversight Committee

Items Referred to CIPOC From July 16, 2008 City Commission Meeting

“Request For Authorization To Award A Contract, Pursuant To Invitation To Bid (ITB) No. 13-07/08; For The South Pointe Phase II Right Of Way Infrastructure Improvements Project, Neighborhood No. 12C, To RIC-Man International, Inc. (RIC-Man), Subject To And Conditioned Upon The Administration Being Able To Negotiate Further With RIC-Man; And Provided Further That, Upon Conclusion Of These Further Negotiations With RIC-Man, The City Manager Will Bring The Bid Back For Consideration By The City Commission, With A Recommendation For Award Of Contract Or For Rejection Of All Bids.”



MIAMIBEACH

City of Miami Beach, 1700 Convention Center Drive, Miami Beach, Florida 33139, www.miamibeachfl.gov

COMMISSION MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Matti Herrera Bower and Members of the City Commission

FROM: Jorge M. Gonzalez, City Manager

DATE: July 16, 2008

SUBJECT: **REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO AWARD A CONTRACT, PURSUANT TO INVITATION TO BID (ITB) NO. 13-07/08; FOR THE SOUTH POINTE PHASE II RIGHT OF WAY INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT, NEIGHBORHOOD NO. 12C, TO RIC-MAN INTERNATIONAL, INC. (RIC-MAN), SUBJECT TO AND CONDITIONED UPON THE ADMINISTRATION BEING ABLE TO NEGOTIATE FURTHER WITH RIC-MAN; AND PROVIDED FURTHER THAT, UPON CONCLUSION OF THESE FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS WITH RIC-MAN, THE CITY MANAGER WILL BRING THE BID BACK FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CITY COMMISSION, WITH A RECOMENDATION FOR AWARD OF CONTRACT OR FOR REJECTION OF ALL BIDS.**

ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Award.

FUNDING

Funding for this Project has been previously appropriated.

ANALYSIS

On February 4, 2004, the City Commission approved the Basis of Design Report (BODR), completed and submitted by Wolfberg Alvarez and Partners (WA) for the South Pointe RDA Phase II Project. This BODR was the culmination of a comprehensive planning effort that included input from and reviews by residents, various City Departments, the Design Review Board (DRB), the Historic Preservation Board (HPB), and a joint meeting of the Neighborhoods and Finance and Citywide Projects Committees.

The Project area encompasses the entire Public Right-of-Way between Fifth Street and Second Street, excluding Third Street, west of Washington Avenue to Michigan Avenue, including Michigan Court and Lenox Avenue between Fourth and Fifth Streets. The South Pointe Phase II Project area is primarily Residential, Medium and Low Density, with a small Commercial General Mixed area at the southeast end of the Project limits.

The Project scope of work includes the replacement of existing water lines within the Courts to enhance the water pressure and water flow; the installation of new stormwater infrastructure, including twenty-one (21) gravity wells, to meet the Master Plan recommended Level of Service (LOS) throughout the project area; streetscape improvements, including traffic calming measures; enhanced pedestrian access; defined neighborhood entrances; landscaping; lighting; and parking improvements.

On December 7, 2007, one hundred percent Construction Documents and a cost estimate for the Project were submitted to City staff for review. The permitting process includes the submission of permit applications to various agencies having jurisdiction, including the Miami-Dade County Department of Health (DOH), Miami-Dade County Water and Sewer Department (WASD), Miami-Dade County Traffic Engineering Division, Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management (DERM), and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). The permitting review process is approximately ninety percent (90%) complete, and the project team anticipates having all the required permit pre-approvals prior to the issuance of the Notice to Proceed (NTP) to the contractor.

Invitation to Bid No. 13-07/08 was issued on January 25, 2008, with an initial bid opening date scheduled for March 7, 2008. A Pre-Bid Conference to provide information to prospective bidders was held on February 8, 2008. Seven (7) Addenda were issued to provide additional information and to answer several questions submitted from prospective bidders, thus extending the bid opening due date to April 17, 2008.

RFP Depot issued bid notices to over one hundred (100) prospective bidders, and Bidnet issued bid notices to nine (9) prospective bidders. Additionally, the Procurement Division supplemented the notification listing and sent the bid notification to other Contractor's listings, as well as those in the Blue Book online, and other construction related websites, thus inviting at least another 75 prospective bidders. The notices resulted in the receipt of the seven (7) bids (Bid Tabulation Attachment 1).

The following Additive Alternates were selected:

- Additive Alternate No. 1, for the removal of encroachments.
- Additive Alternate No. 2, for the cleaning of the existing drainage system for the structures and pipes as defined in the Contract Documents.
- Additive Alternate No. 3, for the pressure vacuuming, cleaning, testing and reconstitution of a single drainage well structure after the completion of the Project, as directed by the City. At this time, the number of wells that will require reconstitution cannot be determined. Therefore, the City will accept this Alternate and reserve an allowance of \$50,000.
- Additive Alternate No. 5, is a requirement of the Contract, to provide Public Information/Liaison Services. The Contractor will procure the services of a Public Relations Firm to provide labor, supplies, and essential communications as may be required for the fulfillment of the intent of the public information/liaison phase of the Work. The goal of these services shall be to allow the Contractor to keep stakeholders (City representatives, property owners, and residents) affected by the work scheduled to be performed, informed prior to, during, and after the Contractor's implementation of the infrastructure work. The Contractor will develop and implement an effective and successful public information/liaison program to ensure that, working in concert with City representatives, all required authorizations/releases are received from affected property owners, and follow-up with stakeholders on any required warranty work and/or complaint resolution that may result from the Work, until resolved by the Contractor.

- Additive Alternate No. 6, is a requirement of the Contract Documents, for the Contractor to provide Staging and Field Office space, as required by the work defined in the Construction Document Specification Section 01026.

This project shall be substantially completed within seven-hundred and thirty (730) calendar days from the issuance of the second Notice to Proceed (NTP), and completed and ready for final payment within sixty (60) calendar days from the date certified by Consultant as the date of Substantial Completion.

On May 29, 2008, the City's Project Team members, as well as support staff from the City's Program Manager, Hazen and Sawyer, the Design Engineering firm, Wolfberg Alvarez and Partners, convened to review the bids submitted for the South Pointe Phase II Right of Way Project. The Team members were also provided with Performance Evaluation Surveys received from clients of the seven (7) prospective Contractors and their proposed Project Manager to be assigned to the Project.

A second meeting was held on June 16, 2008, to allow each Contractor to provide a ten (10) minute presentation, followed by a twenty (20) minute Question and Answer (Q&A) session with the Contractor's team and proposed Project Manager. The Team based its recommendation on the following factors:

- 1) Risk Assessment Plan (RAP)/Value Added Submittal (VAS). A Preliminary Project Schedule was attached to the RAP/ VAS. The description for the risks identified in the RAPs, had no additional cost or time associated with them, but are risks that the contractor will try to minimize. The VAS identified opportunities to add value to the project, as well as the corresponding cost and schedule impact (10 points).
- 2) Past performance - Based on number and quality of the Performance Evaluation Surveys received (10 points).
- 3) Presentation and interview of key personnel (30 points).
- 4) Bid Price (50 points).

It should be noted that Lanzo Construction and Horizon Contractors informed the City that they would not be participating in the Presentation and Interview process, and therefore were not scored on those specific areas based on the criteria outlined above.

The Base Bid prices submitted by all seven prospective bidders, including the Additive Alternates, were all within the Engineer's Estimate of Probable Costs, and within the budget appropriated for the construction of the Project. City staff, its Program Manager and Engineering Consultants, performed extensive reviews of the presentation materials which chronicled the history and past performance of the firms. In addition, the Performance Evaluation Surveys (PES) completed by previous clients were reviewed and evaluated.

CONCLUSION:

Based on the analysis of the bids received, the Administration is requesting authorization to award a contract, pursuant to Invitation to Bid (ITB) No. 13-07/08, for the South Pointe Phase II Right-of-Way Infrastructure Improvements Project, Neighborhood 12C, to Ric-Man International, Inc. (Ric-Man), subject to and conditioned upon the administration being able to negotiate further with Ric-Man, and provided further that, upon conclusion of these further negotiations with Ric-Man, the City Manager will bring the bid back for consideration by the City Commission, with a recommendation for award of Contract or for rejection of all bids.

SOUTH POINTE PHASE II - BID TABULATION

ATTACHMENT 1

BIDDERS	TOTAL BASE BID	Removal of Encroachments Alternate No.1	Cleaning of Drainage System Alternate No. 2	Reconstitute Wells Alternate No. 3	Public Information Liaison Alternate No. 5	Staging Area Alternate No. 6	BASE BID + ALTERNATES 1, 2, 3, 5, & 6
1 Ric-Man International	\$8,183,116.00	\$72,300.00	\$50,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$8,465,416.00
2 Acosta Tractors, Inc.	\$7,834,024.00	\$75,000.00	\$93,050.00	\$10,000.00	\$215,193.00	\$255,000.00	\$8,482,267.00
3 Southeastern Engineering Contractors, Inc.	\$8,365,357.00	\$45,000.00	\$47,490.00	\$10,000.00	\$135,000.00	\$95,000.00	\$8,697,847.00
4 Central Florida Equipment	\$9,085,306.00	\$200,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$200,000.00	\$9,740,306.00
5 Solo Construction Corporation	\$9,510,306.00	\$40,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$240,000.00	\$160,000.00	\$10,025,306.00
6 Lanzo Construction	\$9,560,306.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$9,935,306.00
7 Horizon Contractors	\$9,569,187.00	\$95,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$345,000.00	\$98,000.00	\$10,182,187.00

Alternate No. 4 was for additional isolation gate valves for the water distribution system, and was not selected by CIP to be included in this project

Condensed Title:

Request for authorization to award a contract, pursuant to Invitation to Bid (ITB) No. 13-07/08; for the South Pointe Phase II Right of Way Infrastructure Improvements Project, Neighborhood 12C, to Ric-Man International, Inc., subject to and conditioned upon the Administration being able to negotiate further with Ric-Man; and provided further that, upon conclusion of these further negotiations with Ric-Man, the City Manager will bring the bid back for consideration by the City Commission, with a recommendation for Award of Contract or rejection of all bids.

Key Intended Outcome Supported:

Ensure well designed quality capital projects.

Supporting Data (Surveys, Environmental Scan, etc.): The 2007 Community Satisfaction Survey indicated that 82% to 85% of the recently completed South Pointe and South Beach area capital improvement projects were ranked as good or excellent by residents. Completing the South Pointe Phase II Improvement Project will add to the well needed upgrades in this area and improve overall rating.

Issue:

Should the City Commission approve the award of contract and further negotiate with Ric-Man International, Inc.?

Item Summary/Recommendation:

Invitation to Bid (ITB) No. 13-07/08, for the Project, was issued on January 25, 2008, and a Pre-Bid Conference to provide information to prospective bidders was held on February 8, 2008. Seven (7) Addenda were issued to provide additional information and to answer questions submitted by prospective bidders, resulting in the receipt of seven (7) bids on April 17, 2008.

On May 29, 2008, the City's Project Team, and support staff from the City's Program Manager, Hazen and Sawyer, the Design Engineering firm, Wolfberg Alvarez and Partners, convened to review the bids for the Project, and the Performance Evaluation Surveys.

On June 16, 2008, interviews were scheduled to allow each Contractor a ten (10) minute presentation, followed by a 20-minute Question and Answer (Q&A) session with the Contractor's team and proposed Project Manager. The Project Team based its ranking of the bidders, and recommendation on the following factors:

- 1) Risk Assessment Plan (RAP)/Value Added Submittal (VAS). A Preliminary Project Schedule was attached to the RAP/ VAS. The description for the risks identified in the RAPs, had no additional cost or time associated with them, but are risks that the contractor will try to minimize. The VAS identified opportunities to add value to the project, as well as the corresponding cost and schedule impact (10 points).
- 2) Past Performance - based on number and quality of the Performance Evaluation Surveys received (10 points).
- 3) Presentation and Interview of Key personnel (30 points).
- 4) Bid Price (50 points).

The Base Bid prices submitted by all seven prospective bidders, including the Additive Alternates, were all within the Engineer's Estimate of Probable Costs, and within the budget appropriated for the Project. In addition, City staff performed extensive reviews of surveys and presentation materials, which chronicled the past performance of the seven firms.

Advisory Board Recommendation:

CIP Oversight Committee

Sign-Offs:

Department Director	Assistant City Manager	City Manager
JECh	TH	JMG

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
SOUTH POINTE STREETScape PHASE II
SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

August 12, 2008
Stacy Kilroy, Chair

Attendance

Stacy Kilroy, CIPOC

Christina Cuervo, CIPOC

Jorge Cano, CIP Assistant Director

Mario Gonzalez-Pola, Senior Capital Improvement
Project Coordinator

Carla Dixon, Capital Projects Coordinator

Olivia Almagro, CIP Community Information
Coordinator

David Mancini, RIC-Man International

Albert Dominguez, RIC-Man International

Frank DelVecchio, City Resident, 301 Ocean Drive

South Pointe Streetscape Phase II Right-of-Way Improvement Project, and the results of the Invitation to Bid (ITB) 13-07/08, was the focus of this meeting. Ms. Kilroy asked staff whether the existing median located on Alton Road, South of Fifth Street, had turnarounds with adequate stacking room for vehicles exiting and entering the buildings. It was confirmed that turnarounds in the existing medians were adequately placed with the appropriate stacking capacity.

Following a discussion on the current format of the ITB's, the committee members and resident, discussed the benefits of the current Best Value Procurement method, and suggested that the City consider either publishing the Engineer's Estimate of Probable Costs, and/or requiring that the prospective bidders include in addition to a summary of costs per CSI Divisions, or unit prices bid on pre-selected line items. Mr. Albert Dominguez, of RicMan International, stated that by requiring bidders to provide a detailed unit cost pricing as part of an ITB process required deliverable, would hinder the competitive nature of the process and deter contractors from bidding City projects in the future. They further mentioned that pricing could vary based on the various characteristics of the geographic locations within Miami Beach.

The CIPOC Sub-committee agreed to recommend to the City Commission, that the City proceed with the award of the construction Contract for the South Pointe Phase II Project, as outlined in the July 16th Commission Memorandum, and evaluate the inclusion of unit prices bid for future projects.

In conclusion, staff offered to provide a template that could serve as the basis for discussion of the new division summary, or unit prices format to be included in future bid proposals. Committee members requested that the template be made available at the next CIPOC committee meeting to be held on September 15, 2008.

CIP Oversight Committee

Public Comments

CIP Oversight Committee

Sub-Committee Meeting Reports

- a. South Pointe Master Wastewater
Booster Pump Station
- b. Sunset Islands I & II
- c. Normandy Shores Golf Course

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
SOUTH POINTE MASTER WASTEWATER BOOSTER PUMP STATION
SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

July 24, 2008
Dwight Kraai, Chair

July 24 attendance

Dwight Kraai, CIPOC

Shari Holbert Lipner, CIP Community Information Coordinator

Hiram Siaba, CIP Senior Capital Projects Coordinator

Ignacio Lizama, Project Manager, CDM

The City of Miami Beach maintains that the need for construction and operation of a Master Booster Pump Station has been established based on several factors., including projects made by County and City studies, requirement under the Comprehensive Master Plan and in order to be in compliance with the Miami-Dade County and City of Miami Beach Consent Agreement.

How did CDM, the consulting engineering firm for the City of Miami Beach and Miami-Dade County, decide on the pump capacity?

A variety of models were created and used for the city, including computer schematic models and models using the Hardee/Cross mathematical calculations.

The Sub-committee is interested in following the models used to determine the flow
DATA REQUEST: models used based on master Plan (Justifications published by CDM)

The project began in the late 1980s to include citywide rehabilitation of water and wastewater systems. Miami Beach handles wastewater from the satellite cities of Bay Harbor Islands, Bal Harbour, Surfside, Indian Creek Village and North bay Village. All of this activity plus projections for growth brought the engineering consultants to the peak-flow total of 49,000 gallons of wastewater flowing through the system per minute. (\$7.3 million gallons per year).

Are all existing stations currently operating without any problems?

There have been situations at existing pump stations at times where "tight conditions" have been observed. In some cases, lines are not flowing as fast as they should.

Explain the directive of the consent agreement.

The consent agreement (also referred to as the consent decree) imposed a 10-hour rule. Many pump stations throughout the City have been brought up to the new standards with improvements. The rehabilitated stations still show periods of backup and validate the need for increased flow to bring all the material through the system and out to Virginia Key (treatment plant location).

How did you arrive at the 49,000 gpm figure and what is the absolute minimum size required?

The question was answered with an explanation of the new County regulations. The City is forced by the South Florida Water Management District to reduce water consumption. This is part of a County-mandated five-year plan. CDM submitted a draft report on this to years ago. It is the argument of the Sub-committee that reduction in water use results in less sewage. The City explained that part of the consent agreement -- based on several studies -- require the City to reduce inflow and infiltration (I/I)

The meeting ended with a promise to provide additional material requested by Mr. Kraai, and to reconvene at a later date.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
SOUTH POINTE MASTER WASTEWATER BOOSTER PUMP STATION
SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**August 21, 2008
Dwight Kraai, Chair**

August 21 Attendance

Dwight Kraai, CIPOC

Jorge Cano, Assistant Director, CIP

Shari Holbert Lipner, CIP Community Information
Coordinator

Hiram Siaba, CIP Senior Capital Projects Coordinator

Mike Alvarez, Assistant Director, City of Miami Beach
Public Works

Ernest Sturts, CDM

Jason Johnson, CDM

Ignacio Lizama, Project Manager, CDM

Frank DeVecchio, City Resident, 301 Ocean Drive

To reiterate from last meeting, the pump size flow was determined to be 49,000 gallons/minute. This will require two motors and two pumps for the South Pointe Master Booster Pump Station. This was determined after studies and first presented in the preliminary design report in 1997. The earliest analyzed data dates back to 1994.

Ernie Sturts has been involved in this process since 1993, when CDM was first hired to renovate the existing pumps. The Public Works Department directed CDM to evaluate the system and look at flows in order to calculate projected needs for the wastewater system.

A comprehensive plan was originally developed in 1989 and CDM began their evaluation in 1994. Flow rates were first reported in 1986 and then again studied in 1994. A technical memo developed in 1994 was provided for Mr. Kraai for review.

The first program used to determine flow rates was called KY-Pipe and was developed by the University of Kentucky. (Version 2 was employed for the first models used by CDM). At that time (1994), the peak flow was determined to be upwards of 70,000 gallons per minute. (gpm)

Later studies used a program from MWHSOFT called H2ONet. This models water and sewer flow and has a more graphic interface. These models also show a flow rate of 70,000 gpm. The models include the totals from all pumps in the system including head and flow.

Circa 2004-2005, CDM worked to meet Miami-Dade County requirements to project peak flows. They evaluated statistical projections and the resulting conclusion was a peak flow determination of 49,000 gpm. Even with this lower number, there was still a need for a master booster station, because the flow would tax the capacity of the existing system.

70,000 gpm is the determined peak flow level, 49,000 gpm was derived at using regulatory-driven models. Design flows at each station were each determined using the calculations required by the County. Hydraulic models calculated the total number of heads served by each pump. If one is operating stronger, the system can automatically shut down other pumps along the line.

If calculations are made using the same version or updated versions or different hydraulic simulator models, the peak flow total is the same. Using the models used in the studies, the City and CDM determined the size of the pump station expansion. Rather than make expansions at multiple sites, which would have been more expensive and intrusive to more residents, it was decided to build the Master Booster at South Pointe.

Early in the project, when the studies were first done, it may have been possible to do upgrades at each pump. Now, all the system upgrades that have been made and are being made are in anticipation of the inclusion of the Master Pump Station.

Design was based on population, but did not include significant consideration of I/I calculations. Pump stations are designed for peak times, though, not averages.

Mr. Kraai pointed out that total flow rate has dropped in the last 13 years. Mr. Lizama explained that Miami-Dade County found that I/I contributed to flow, even post-rehabilitation of stations. Additional rehabilitation of some pump stations has had to take place.

The Consent Agreement was signed in 1994 and led to the Inflow and Infiltration (I/I) study. This study was done by the firm of Kimley/Horn. Continued evaluation involves three mandated phases including monitoring and reporting of I/I and recommendations for future use. The most recent evaluation was performed in November 2006. The sweeps are done every ten years.

The County has determined a gdpi of 5,000 gallons per person per day. Seven basins in the City exceeded that threshold. There are 32 basins total within the City. A basin is an area that contributes to a pump station.

Many of the pipes in the City system are old pipes, some made of clay. It is possible to minimize infiltration, but not possible to eliminate it. The majority of the City system falls within the guidelines set by the County.

Outfall legislation from the State mandates that 60% of water flow is to be diverted into re-use. This is to be in effect by 2025. CDM completed a 20-year plan for the County to assist in meeting this requirement. SFWMD determined that the County was pumping out too much water, but there are no meters installed. The 20-year contract with the County includes the introduction of outflow meters. The City of Miami Beach will mirror the County efforts to monitor, reduce and reuse water outflow.

Frank DelVecchio asked Mike Alvarez who were the parties to the consent agreement. Answer: The EPA and the County, extended to satellite cities with individual consent orders in 1991 and 1993. A memorandum from the County Manager prescribes the City of Miami Beach to the Consent Order. The City has been in compliance with the County directives regarding water use since the early 1990s.

The capacity to which the South Pointe Master Booster Pump Station is designed will meet or exceed calculations. This station will lower the suction pressure so that all the flow from other pumps makes it to Virginia Key for treatment.

Final drawings will be submitted by CDM to Building Department, Public Works and Planning and Zoning for review. CIP is responsible for the contract along with Procurement and under prevailing laws and statutes governing the procurement process. Once a contractor is evaluated for selection through the procurement process, the recommendation will go to the City Commission for approval and bid award. The contract is prepared by Procurement and CIP. The budget for this project is to be included in the City's Capital Budget.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
SUNSET ISLAND I & II
SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY**

August 20, 2008

Elizabeth Camargo, Chair

Attendance

Elizabeth Camargo, CIPOC

Christina Cuervo, CIPOC

Dwight Kraai, CIPOC

Fred Beckmann, Director, CMB Public Works
(via conference call)

Jorge Cano, CIP Assistant Director

Keith Mizell, Capital Improvement Project Coordinator

Olivia Almagro, CIP Community Information
Coordinator

Robert Pontak, CH2MHill

Fernando Craveiro, CH2MHill

David Bolger, City of Miami Beach Resident

Keith Mizell introduced the meeting and provided an overview of the right-of-way improvements for Sunset Islands I and II. Mizell informed the group that the design planned for this area was based on the funded improvements that were outlined in the Basis of Design Report (BODR). Mizell added that the improvements planned would encompass roadway resurfacing, spot storm water improvements, watermain replacement and a decorative edge treatment for the roadways with a cobblestone look with the size and color having been approved by the HOA. The edge treatments will be on all roadways on both islands. Pontak informed the residents that the spot stormwater improvements are intended to reduce the ponding at several locations, identified by residents as being problem areas. Mizell explained the City's stormwater priority basins and the level of service related to stormwater improvements. While Sunset Islands I and II are not included in priority basins, the original project scope does include limited stormwater improvements to compliment the existing stormwater collections/outfall system in the islands.

The design completed based on the original BODR was a product of numerous community meetings. Subsequently, after completion of plans the HOA requested additional scope items, including the installation of valley gutters, additional inlet structures, connection to existing outfalls, total reconstruction of the road base and improve the stormwater drainage service above the level of service for the non-priority stormwater basin.



OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER

LTC #

COMMISSION MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Matti Herrera Bower and Members of the City Commission

FROM: Jorge M. Gonzalez, City Manager

DATE: September 10, 2008

SUBJECT: **STATUS REPORT ON THE DRAINAGE AT THE NORMANDY SHORES GOLF COURSE**

The Normandy Shores Golf Course project is substantially complete. The sod is growing-in, and the course is scheduled for opening this fall. In the meantime, the City is addressing several drainage issues at different locations on and around the golf course. Each location has a different solution. These solutions have been conceptually approved by the relevant permitting agencies in telephone conversations and at a meeting with DERM on August 29, 2008. It is not anticipated that modifications to the permits will be required. Rather, it is anticipated that only revised designs and memoranda will be submitted and approved within the next two months. The construction is relatively minor and should be completed shortly thereafter.

Swale to the Rear of the homes on South Shore Drive

There is a swale between the golf course and the backs of the homes on South Shore Drive. While swales are designed to collect rainwater, this swale has several locations where water ponds for an inordinate amount of time. The City is addressing this with additional drainage inlets and piping.

The golf course was required by permit to construct a berm and contain its stormwater. As a result, this swale is needed to collect stormwater runoff from the backyards of the houses and to prevent it from flooding those backyards. It should be noted that the backyards of these homes encroach into the golf course property with fences and other improvements, and a decision was made to not reclaim the land. Consequently, this swale is narrower and deeper than originally intended. This narrower swale has less surface area, and the standing water takes longer to evaporate and percolate into the ground. However, the additional drainage enhancements should relieve the condition.

Swale on Fairway Drive

On the south side of Fairway Drive, there is another swale with ponding water. This condition is due to the construction project in the right-of-way. The right-of-way drainage system is designed to drain from the streets to the swale and then from the swale to Biscayne Bay and the proposed wells. At this time, only the portion of

the system which drains Fairway Drive to the swale is complete. The pipes and structures that drain from the swale to Biscayne Bay and the proposed wells are not yet installed. Therefore, stormwater from Fairway Drive is entering the swale and is not leaving except by evaporation and percolation. Once the right-of-way drainage system is built, the swale will drain.

The dewatering operations of the right-of-way contractor further exacerbate the ponding. The contractor is not allowed to dewater to Biscayne Bay and must dewater to the swale. This water also only leaves the swale via evaporation and percolation.

The consultant has also identified an improvement to its design. The system now requires the first several inches of water in the swale to percolate into the ground to satisfy water quality requirements. The consultant has shown the relevant permitting agencies that there is sufficient water quality treatment in the system to allow for a reduction in the water storage volume of the swale. Several drainage structures will be modified, at a minimal cost, to allow the water to drain from the swale at a lower elevation once construction is complete.

Golf Course

There are also several low points on the golf course that have had standing water since Tropical Storm Fay. These areas of standing water drain into the lake system. The lake system is controlled by a weir (spillway) and drainage wells. The weir limits the rate of discharge from the lakes to the wells. The consultant has received permitting agency approval to lower the notch in the weir. This provides faster discharge, allowing the lakes to drain faster, which ultimately allows the areas with standing water to drain faster.

Normandy Shores and its golf course have never drained well. The elevations are low, the water table is high, and the clay soils do not percolate well. At the beginning of the project, the golf course architect recognized that there were many problem areas on the golf course and proposed a design that would alleviate these conditions. Due to cost considerations, the City directed the golf course architect to simply re-grass the fairways. Despite this, the golf course architect found ways to contour much of the golf course without increasing the cost. The final design raised all the greens and tees and provided for significantly reduced ponding in the fairways. These areas that still pond are typically outside landing areas and should not significantly impact play. However, the proposed modification described above will alleviate the ponding.

JMG\TH\JeCh\JCC\RWS

c: Tim Hemstreet, Assistant City Manager
Jorge Chartrand, CIP Director

CIP Oversight Committee

Report on Walk-through of Normandy Shores Golf Course



COMMISSION MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Matti Herrera Bower and Members of the City Commission

FROM: Jorge M. Gonzalez, City Manager

DATE: September 10, 2008

SUBJECT: Status Report on the Construction of the Normandy Shores Golf Course and Facilities

The Normandy Shores Golf Course project was substantially completed on July 23, 2008. The contractor, QGS Development, turned it over to the City and is now completing the last punch list item involving the drainage wells and the permitting process for the operation of the drainage system. The Right-of-Way consultant is also working with the relevant permitting agencies to resolve ponding issues in the swales on the edge of the golf course. Modifications to the swales will be made once the relevant permitting agencies agree to allow the adjustments. The consultant and CIP have engaged these agencies in order to determine what will be the approved approach to resolving the issue of water accumulation in the swales. A more detailed explanation is provided in a separate Commission Memorandum.

Since the sodding of the golf course was completed and turned over for maintenance, three of the eighteen fairways have experienced ponding conditions at several locations following heavy rains. However, the golf course stormwater drainage system has not been fully operational, pending the receipt of an operating permit from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). Presently, it is anticipated that a response to the FDEP operating permit for the storm water injection well system serving the golf course will be received in September.

The project had an original total budget of \$9,201,183. The total final cost was \$7,235,648 including \$485,965 for design, \$6,591,379 for construction, \$52,230 for CIP fees, and \$106,074 for Art in Public Places. Therefore, the project was completed at \$1,965,535 under the budget for construction and soft costs.

The early completion of the golf course allowed for the new turf to grow-in for several months before golfers are allowed on the course. This provides a real benefit since, generally, the longer the grow-in period the better the condition of the turf when play begins.

The golf course facilities were designed by Architektnics, Inc. and built by Coastal Construction through a Construction Management at Risk Agreement with the City. The completed facilities include the maintenance facility, two restrooms, and the cart barn. The same firms are designing and building the club house through the same contract.

Coastal Construction turned the maintenance facility building over to the City on February 25, 2008. The building is now in operation, and the City is using the maintenance facility as its base of maintenance operations, from which it controls the irrigation system and stores equipment and supplies needed during the grow-in period. The project had a total budget of \$946,823. The total final cost was \$693,458 including \$102,000 for design, \$537,367 for

construction, \$43,366 for CIP fees, and \$10,725 for Art in Public Places. The project was completed at \$186,915 under the budget for the construction and soft costs. There remains an additional \$66,450 budgeted for equipment.

Coastal Construction also completed the two restroom buildings on March 19, 2008. These are now ready for use when the golf course opens for business. These buildings were completed before the grassing and sprigging of the golf course in order to avoid damage from construction activities. The project had a total budget of \$362,537. The total final cost was \$311,586 including \$40,000 for design, \$254,261 for construction, \$13,200 for CIP fees, and \$4,125 for Art in Public Places. The project was completed at \$27,701 under the budget for the construction and soft costs. There remains an additional \$23,250 budgeted for equipment.

Coastal Construction completed the cart barn on July 21, 2008. This early completion provided the City with a larger window of time for ordering, receiving, and storing the golf carts, which are needed before the golf course opening. The project had a total budget of \$1,431,697. The total cost for construction and soft costs was \$1,284,765 including \$115,000 for design, \$1,096,643 for construction, \$55,440 for CIP fees, and \$17,325 for Art in Public Places. The project was completed at \$67,639 under the budget for the construction and soft costs. There remains an additional \$79,650 budgeted for equipment.

At this time, the replica club house project design is progressing on schedule. A JOC contractor, H.A. Contracting, demolished the existing club house and has removed the debris. The demolition of the club house was completed on August 8, 2008. Currently soil borings and testing is in progress in preparation for the construction of the new clubhouse. The project has a budget of \$4,619,681. The current costs are \$598,596 including \$268,000 for design, \$148,235 for additional design and demolition services, \$44,904 for demolition, and \$137,457 for investigations and pre-construction services. There are \$3,000,000 budgeted for construction, \$167,918 for CIP fees, and \$43,219 for Art in Public Places. At this time, the project contingency and un-allocated funding total is \$809,948.

CIP has been in contact with the consultant, Architektnics, Inc. and with Coastal Construction throughout the development of the project documents. CIP staff has visited the consultant's office to review the progress and ascertain that the documents are consistent with the previous scope discussions. Coastal Construction has participated in constructability reviews and in advising the consultant on construction values as part of their pre-construction services already contracted.

The design of the replica project is seventy percent (70%) complete. The plans should be ready for permitting on September 15, 2008. On that day, the City will provide the plans to Coastal Construction for pricing. Negotiations for a Guaranteed Maximum Price for the construction of the replica will begin in October 2008. It is anticipated that an item requesting authorization for this work will be on the agenda of the December 10, 2008 Commission Meeting. If approved, it is estimated that construction will be completed by March 2010.

As the replica club house will not be built before the opening of the golf course, the City will lease a triple-wide trailer to serve as the temporary club house/pro shop. This trailer will be located to the north of the former club house. The City is presently coordinating utility services to this location. The trailer is scheduled for delivery next month, allowing time for stocking the temporary pro shop and clubhouse and connecting utilities before the golf course opens.

The Normandy Shores Golf Course is scheduled for opening by November 2008. This schedule required the completion of multiple, simultaneous projects including the golf course itself, a maintenance facility to operate the course, two restroom buildings, a cart barn to house the golf carts, and a club house/pro shop to arrange starting times, sell golf merchandise, and collect greens fees. The new clubhouse is the only facility still pending completion.

JMG\TH\JECh\JCC

T:\AGENDA\2008\September 10\Regular\Status Report Normandy Shores Golf Course and Facilities.doc

CIP Oversight Committee

Discussion on Placement of Normandy Shores Entrance Sign

CIP Oversight Committee

Old Business

- a. Procurement Options
- b. Best Value Procurement Selection Process
- c. Review of Priority Basins

CIP Oversight Committee

Staff Action Report

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
SATFF ACTIONS
From July 7, 2008 CIPOC Meeting

MOTION: Recommendation to include the boilerplate contract in the RFO documents sent out to A/E firms during the selection process.

Commissioner Weithorn advised sending this electronically. (The Procurement Division is working on making all material available electronically).

Moved by Stacy Kilroy, 2nd: Christina Cuervo - MOTION PASSED

ACTION FOR STAFF: Report on how this is implemented.
A sample draft template of this proposed boilerplate document is included in this agenda packet with Item 3.

ACTION FOR STAFF: Copies (CDs) of JOC guidelines will be provided to the Committee.
One member of the Committee picked up a CD copy of these guidelines from the Procurement Office on July 8, 2008. If other members would like copies, the Procurement Department will make them available. CIP Office will coordinate.

Commissioner Weithorn asked for details of the NSGC Clubhouse project be sent to all committee members.

ACTION FOR STAFF: History and budgeting details sent to committee members.
Information included in this agenda packet with Item 5c and Item 6.

ACTION FOR STAFF: Assist committee members in planning sub-committee meetings for these projects.

To date, four sub-committees have coordinated with CIP. Not all four projects announced at the July 7, 2008 were addressed under formal sub-committees. Mr. William Goldsmith, a former committee member, requested information on several projects: Lake Pancoast (Bayshore 8-C); Sunset Islands I & II; Orchard Park Drainage (part of Nautilus BP-7); Normandy Shores Clubhouse; and Street Improvement on Lenox Avenue and 6th Street. Included in this agenda packet are the reports from sub-committees that met to discuss South Pointe Streetscape Phase II (BP12-C), South Pointe Master Booster Pump Station and Sunset Islands I & II. Mr. Erik Agazim also requested information on the Normandy Shores Golf Course and Clubhouse, and information is included with this agenda packet.

STAFF ACTION: Advise Committee on when the City will be holding meetings to review front-end documents. (Raul Aguila indicated that these items were up for review)
This activity is still pending.

ACTION FOR STAFF: Bring contracts to CIPOC for review prior to presentation to Commission. If time constraints don't provide for that, please advise the Committee on status.

Where time allows, this will be done.

ADDITIONAL STAFF ACTION: Commissioner Weithorn asked for a copy of the Capital Budget, once ready, to be given to the Committee.

Staff will provide a copy for the Committee when it is available.

ADDITIONAL STAFF ACTION: Advise the Committee of any CIP contracts to come before the July Commission meeting. (The South Pointe Streetscape Phase II award will be before the July Commission. Once the selection of the vendor is made by Commission, information will be brought back to Committee, due to Cone of Silence restrictions).\

The Committee was advised at the last meeting of the South Pointe Streetscape Ph II item, and are reviewing this item at this meeting.

ADDITIONAL STAFF ACTION: As the Capital Budget process is finalized, CIP is asked to bring those projects that are coming online to the Committee.

Staff will provide this information with the Capital Budget when it is available.

ADDITIONAL STAFF ACTION: Update Web Site.

This is an ongoing process.

CIP Oversight Committee

Additional Information Items

2008 CIPOC Calendar

	CIPOC DATE	COMMISSION	HOLIDAY
<i>January</i>		January 16	
<i>February</i>		February 13	Pres. Day – 2/18
<i>March</i>		March 12	
<i>April</i>		April 16	
<i>May</i>		May 14	
<i>June</i>		June 25	
<i>July</i>	July 7*	July 16	Independence Day 7/4
<i>August</i>	August 4	HIATUS	HIATUS
<i>September</i>	September 15	September 10	Labor Day 9/1
<i>October</i>	October 6	October 7	Columbus Day 10/13
<i>November</i>	November 3	November 5	Veterans Day 11/11
<i>December</i>	December 1	December 10	