

HOMELAND DEFENSE/
NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT
BOND OVERSIGHT BOARD
MINUTES

5-23-06 – 6:00 P.M.
CITY OF MIAMI
CITY HALL CHAMBERS
3500 Pan American Drive
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33133

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m., with the following members found to be

Present: Rolando Aedo (in at 6:10 p.m.)
Elaine Black (in at 6:25 p.m.)
Eileen Broton
Luis Cabrera
Mariano Cruz
Luis De Rosa
Robert A. Flanders (Chairman)
Walter Harvey (in at 6:28 p.m.)
David Kubiliun
Gary Reshefsky (out at 7:50 p.m.)
Manolo Reyes (Vice Chairman)

Absent: Kay Hancock Apfel
Ringo Cayard
David E. Marko
Jami Reyes

ALSO PRESENT: Rafael O. Diaz, Deputy City Attorney
Mary Conway, Director, CIP & Transportation
Gary Fabrikant, CIP Department
Zimri Prendes, CIP Department
Ed Blanco, Parks & Recreation
Enrique Nuñez, Planning Department
Stephen Bogner, Public Facilities
Guy Forchion, Virginia Key Beach Park Trust, Director of Operations
Brett Bibeau, Miami River Commission, Managing Director
Jose Ortega, CIP Department
Roger Hatton, CIP Department
Jim Brittain, CIP Department
Marcel Douge, CIP Department
John De Pazos, CIP Department
Teri E. Thomas, City Clerk's Office

May 23, 2006

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 25, 2006.

HD/NIB MOTION 06-9

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 25, 2006.

MOVED: M. Cruz
SECONDED: L. De Rosa
ABSENT: K. Apfel, R. Cayard, D. Marko, J. Reyes

Note for the Record: Motion passed by unanimous vote of all Board Members present.

II. NEW BUSINESS:

INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBER:

- David M. Kubiliun nominated by Commissioner Regalado

Chairman Flanders introduced and welcomed David M. Kubiliun, appointee of Commissioner Regalado, as a new member of the Homeland Defense Bond Oversight Board.

NEW ITEM:

- Program Management Services Agreement for Orange Bowl Renovation Project

NAME OF PROJECT: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR THE ORANGE BOWL STADIUM RENOVATION PROJECT

TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT: \$6,500,000 (not to exceed)

SOURCE OF FUNDS: Orange Bowl Ramps/Improvements & Structural Repairs

ACCOUNT CODE(S): CIP # 324002

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: To award an agreement with Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc. to provide program, project, construction, and post-construction management to oversee the design and construction of the renovations of the Orange Bowl. The scope also includes financial, economic and marketing analysis to maximize access to potential sources of revenue as well as the game day experience of the attendees at the Orange Bowl.

HD/NIB MOTION 06-10

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AUDIT COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION TO FUND THE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR THE ORANGE BOWL STADIUM RENOVATION PROJECT.

MOVED: M. Reyes
SECONDED: L. De Rosa
ABSENT: K. Apfel, R. Cayard, D. Marko, J. Reyes

Note for the Record: Motion passed by unanimous vote of all Board Members present, with the exception of L. Cabrera.

UPDATES:

1. Fuel Dock at Dinner Key Marina

Chairman Flanders: Updates. Fuel dock at Dinner Key Marina.

Mary Conway (Director, Capital Improvements Program & Transportation): Gary, let Enrique speak to the issue. This is an item that -- well, it was discussed at the last meeting, and I had responded that the City had put this project on hold, and that we had deferred the funding to the second series and swapped it because of issues that had been raised by the community as we were moving forward with the Coconut Grove Waterfront Master Plan study, and Enrique can briefly give you further information.

Enrique Nuñez: Well, good evening. My name is Enrique Nuñez. I'm the chief of urban design for the City of Miami Planning Department, and as you are aware, the Coconut Grove Waterfront Master Plan is underway under the direction of the firm of Sasaki Associates, which is based in Boston. They're heading a team of design consultants with different specialists working together, so at the direction of the City Manager, and at the request of the constituents, the consultants are looking at the proposed location of the fuel dock facility and are looking at other possible locations for the fuel dock facility and the pump-out station. The consultants are also looking at the economics for the fuel pump facility, so with that in mind, that's where this project is at. It's based on the study of the master plan, which is now involved in initial concepts and visions, design.

Ms. Conway: And basically, when this issue arose, we had discussion at a staff level. We also had discussion with the City Manager, and he directed us to put the project on hold, pending resolution, because we didn't want to be in a position where we were going to lose face with community and feel that we were not being truthful about there being a public process associated with the waterfront and the master plan study, and I would think we agree that it's unfortunate that the timing in this project was such that the two conflicted, but we do think it's important to allow the public dialogue to continue before making the final decisions about what's going to advance in this area.

Gary Reshefsky: Could I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Flanders: Gary.

Mr. Reshefsky: I'd like a little more spec -- feel that you could be a little more specific about some of the issues because we've been here now -- we've got the -- we have the, you know, item here. We had four updates, I think, and I want to thank Zimri and the staff for making sure we got all the updates so we could see that we saw this project every six months. Nobody's ever come here and questioned this project. It's been on television; it's been on these agendas. I don't know if it ever went to the Waterfront Advisory Board. I'd like to know if it did. It did go to the Waterfront Advisory Board is my understanding. What exactly is the problem here? Where -- what's the location that it can't go and what's the deal?

Mr. Nuñez: Well, again, as a result of this master plan study, of which there is a team -- a multidisciplinary team involved in looking at the aspects of public access to the waterfront, the maximizing of recreational opportunities, and bringing people to the waterfront and allowing not only access to the waterfront, but also the spoil islands areas. The design team was analyzing all of the existing conditions and looking at all of the areas which may

offer opportunities and constraints. One of the observations from the group of consultants was that the proposed location may not be the best location from a site planning and site design standpoint, so then, at the direction of the Manager and at the request of the constituents, the team was -- has been asked to look at alternative possible locations with the involvement of the economic consultant to see if there is a more preferable location for the fuel dock.

Mr. Reshefsky: So it -- where's the dock -- where was the fuel dock supposed to go, at Dinner Key Marina, right?

Mr. Nuñez: Yes, at the marina, at one point, adjacent to one of the main piers, and at this point, I -- it's --

Ms. Conway: Basically, it's south of where we are right now.

Mr. Nuñez: Yes. It's --

Ms. Conway: From where the boat launch area is --

Mr. Nuñez: Yes. It's adjacent, relatively close to the Seminole boat ramp area, at one point, where --

Ms. Conway: But further east.

Mr. Nuñez: Yeah, further to the east, where -- close to that sailboat or anchorage area currently exists.

Mr. Reshefsky: But there was people in the community that were opposed to where it was located --

Mr. Nuñez: As a matter of --

Mr. Reshefsky: -- or is it --?

Mr. Nuñez: -- fact, yes. At the request of the constituents and the residents of the area, they requested for alternative areas to be studied because of those areas in particular of having maximizing views to the west, the sunsets, and to access, and the potential for conflicts with hurricane issues. Those are some of the concerns that came about, so as part of this master plan process, they will be looking at alternative locations.

Mr. Reshefsky: So what happens with the money that we spent on the project and the permits that were applied for and were obtained? That might not be an answer for --

Mr. Nuñez: Well --

Mr. Reshefsky: -- you, but --

Ms. Conway: We'll be -- we're in a situation right now where we have plans that are designed and permitted, and pending what the final outcome is -- if the final outcome is to allow it to proceed as designed and permitted, then we'll move forward with the project and we'll build it, as soon as the second series monies become available. However, if we end up in a situation where there's a different decision that's taken -- similar to the

unfortunate situation that we're in with Bryan Park -- then we'll have to go back and reassess, and we'll have to pay to redesign the project.

Mr. Reshefsky: Was it the second series that's the issue or the master plan? And what's - you know --?

Ms. Conway: No, no, no, no, no. We have -- because we have the objective of making sure that we deliver these projects and spend the bond monies -- commit them and spend them as timely as possible, we made a decision to move the monies for the construction of this project out to second series because we made the decision to put this on hold. It -- the reason is because of the Waterfront Master Plan study and the public concerns that were raised so that we could respond to them.

Mr. Reshefsky: OK. My concern is the waste, is the \$29,000 that was spent, because we went and got permits and I want to make sure those permits aren't going to expire and that money doesn't get wasted. If not, put the money back in the bond fund and kill the project. I don't really care if there's a fuel dock, but we started the project, so we ought to finish it. If these permits are going to go bad, then you're going to come back again and you're going to spend the money and the administrative time to get the permits again, so that's my concern. That's where I'm coming from.

Rolando Aedo: The other thing that I wanted to add was that, from my understanding, this is a revenue-producing opportunity for the City --

Mr. Nuñez: Right.

Mr. Aedo: -- so the waste not only comes from the money -- the (UNINTELLIGIBLE) cost, but also the lost revenue, which -- and I'm not well versed in terms of how much this potentially would have generated, but I guess this was originally approved back -- almost going back three years now, so we need to take that -- you know, that lost revenue is a hard -- is now becoming a significant cost as well.

Mr. Nuñez: Yeah. As I mentioned, the economics will also be -- the consultants will also be looking at the economics of this project and looking at potential alternative locations.

Chairman Flanders: OK. I guess what we're hearing is that despite the initial studies, despite the fact that this is coming out of the strategic initiative fund, despite the fact that it's permitted, that we are going to hold it, so I guess the bottom line is, how long is the new master plan going to take? What is the hiatus on this project?

Mr. Nuñez: The Waterfront Master Plan is currently in the conceptual design stage. They have already done their due diligence of analysis and presentations to the community, and are currently generating design concepts and visions and alternatives of which they will be sharing with staff and the community in June, and with potential public presentations of those alternatives in July. This project will carry through to the fall and -- for eventual adoption of the master plan.

Chairman Flanders: So when could we anticipate this facility -- wherever it's going to be located, according to the new master plan -- when could we anticipate its completion and its beginning to generate revenue for the City?

Mr. Nuñez: Well, as you know, the master plan will make recommendations for where this facility might be. At that point and once accepted by -- and adopted as a master plan, adopted by the City Commission, at that time we would look at any needed revisions to environmental permits, and then the process of proceeding with the rebidding.

Mr. Reshefsky: Mr. Chair, could I --?

Chairman González: Yes, Gary.

Mr. Reshefsky: I noticed Stephen Bogner's here, and I don't want to put him on the spot, but I know he's got the pulse of the people at Dinner Key Marina, and I'm reading here, you know, there's 1,500 boats at the marina. I'm just curious what the people at the marina, who are paying the City money for these space -- these slips, what they're expecting. I mean, this has been going on for three years now, so --

Stephen Bogner (Public Facilities): Well, it's forgone. Mary was pretty succinct. The Administration's put the project on hold until the master planning process has been completed. I sense a clear desire from -- on the part of my Dinner Key Marina dockage customers for a fuel dock and a pump-out station. As you all know, we're separately before the board pushing for our managed mooring field. Permits are just about in hand, and we're looking forward to going ahead with that in the fall. Whether the fuel dock gets built or it doesn't get built, we're still going to need a pump-out station as well, so these are elements that are being looked at outside of our staff.

Chairman Flanders: There's another question that begs to be asked here, and that is -- since I happen to be a boater who keeps my boat at Dinner Key -- are the constituency or the customers of Dinner Key, are they being considered in the master plan, what they want in terms of placement, where the fuel dock could go?

Mr. Nuñez: Obviously, the master plan is a very open, public process of which many of -- there are many constituents that are also involved with the marina or have boats within the marina, and also have lived in the immediate and surrounding community, so the process is one that will involve the public and has involved the public from its beginning. It's a process that has included stakeholder interviews of neighborhood associations, of merchants, of hoteliers, and a broad spectrum of the community to take the master plan to the point where it's at now, which is the development of actual design concepts and visions for the entire waterfront, and this waterfront study is from Peacock Park all the way to Kennedy Park, looking at all of the waterfront areas and connections of the Village center and the surrounding neighborhoods to the waterfront, so this is a very comprehensive study.

Mr. Reshefsky: Is there a possibility that this fuel dock will not get built at all?

Mr. Nuñez: That might be a possibility. That might -- there might be an analysis by the team of consultants that may look at nearby or adjacent fuel dock facilities, and that may very well be one of the recommendations. Of course, it's open now, but they have been -- looked -- they've been requested to look at the different scenarios at the point.

Luis Cabrera: Mr. Chairman --

Chairman Flanders: Yes, Luis.

Mr. Cabrera: -- as a recommending body that we are, can we make a motion or can we recommend to the City Administration to -- and request that they continue to direct the project on the -- on -- the way that we voted on this project, the way that it was permitted, the way we had approved? And send a clear message, regardless of how they direct themselves, that, you know, the fact that they bring issues to us, we review them, we make decisions, and we try to be as informed as we can, you know. I think that we have to send out a message and let them know, hey, listen, you know, we can't keep spending the citizens' money, the bonds money, and then just turning around and saying, oops, we're going to do something else. I mean, it just sends out -- it makes me -- it's a bad -- we're sending out a bad -- you know, we can't continue as a board to say it's OK, it's OK. It's OK with the Orange Bowl. It's OK with this; it's OK with that. We've made mistakes. We can't -- I mean, that's what we're here for, and I think we should at least make a recommendation that we don't agree with any other changes, and that we want this project -- if that's what the Board feels -- to continue to move forward. What they decide is beyond our control.

Mr. Reshefsky: I second that, if that was a motion.

Chairman Flanders: Well, I was going to say, if you'll frame the motion --

Mr. Reshefsky: You need a third?

Chairman González: -- I think you have a second.

Mr. Cabrera: I'll frame it as a motion.

Mr. Reshefsky: And if I could just second it with an amendment that we have a transcript of this discussion sent to each of the City Commissioners and the Mayor so that they're aware of this issue as well.

Mr. Aedo: And let me just add one thing. On a personal note, I mean, of course we're here representing the citizens and the Commissioners, but we're spending a lot of time up here --

Vice Chairman Reyes: That's right.

Mr. Aedo: -- and we're investing time, and in many cases, many hours that we'd rather be with loved ones and doing other good deeds, so for us to invest that time and as -- you know, as it was pointed out, just to have these decisions that were proposed by City staff reversed, kind of sits a little raw in my craw, actually, because I'd rather be doing other things, and I don't know. I just -- I guess I'm getting a lot frustrated, not just a little frustrated, with a lot of things that have been happening, and I think it's going to come to a head sooner or later --

Mr. Cabrera: And especially --

Mr. Aedo: -- but hopefully, it will.

Mr. Cabrera: -- Rolando, when you pick up the newspaper and you read that issues are being -- you know, citizens are expressing concerns that things are being done without bids and the committee is not doing what we need to do, and you know, it sends out a bad message 'cause the community is going to think that we're out here just acting as puppets,

and not only that, that we're not, you know, expressing their concerns, and I think, as a board, we need to let them -- you know, let the City know that this needs to stop. It needs to stop. There's an issue that's going to be brought up today, which was in the paper again, with these ball fields and these parks at Grapeland, and you know, we keep getting slapped with issues that we keep telling the City, don't continue to do, don't continue to do.

Mr. Bogner: If I can make a -- just a small point of clarification. This was an item that was competitively bid. It was awarded by the City Commission.

Mr. Reshefsky: We have a contract.

Unidentified Speaker: There you go.

Mr. Reshefsky: Get a vendor.

Chairman Flanders: Yeah. No, we --

Mr. Reshefsky: Pull it out. I mean, this is ridiculous.

Chairman Flanders: -- we're aware of that, but let me -- let us address one thing, actually, that Luis Cabrera said. This body approved the negotiated bid process, and we did it for expediency. We were educated on it. We -- those of us who've attended most of the meetings understand it. We -- it was a tough thing to chew on. We continue to understand it, and we understand the reason why it exists in many cities, counties, and states across the United States, so we actually have not done a no-bid process. What we've done is a negotiated bid process with firms that we have picked out of a basket, so please do not send a message that the City is engaged in a no-bid process. We are not. Now what I'm hearing is a sense of frustration, and it's borne of the fact that, A, we are losing money in not having this facility opened. Number two, we don't know, in fact, if it's actually going to be built. Number three, everybody knows that it's connected with the marina. I'm connected with the Palm Bay Marina, and I could tell you that fuel is an amenity that is so highly prized. I only know of one public facility, and that's Miami Beach Marina, and I think it's dreadful that they have the lock on this kind of an amenity. To me, it makes -- it even makes the facility itself, the Dinner Key Marina, more saleable and more desirable, which means you can raise the rents, so how much money is this costing the City by holding this particular project up?

Vice Chairman Reyes: Do we know why it has been held? Do we know why it has been held? Because this was approved on June 24, 2003; it's going to be three years. Three years and nothing has been done.

Mr. Nuñez: The concerns are more of the proposed locations of the fuel dock facility, and --

Vice Chairman Reyes: But that was --

Mr. Nuñez: -- concerns and the requests --

Vice Chairman Reyes: Excuse me --

Mr. Nuñez: -- for --

Vice Chairman Reyes: -- but --

Mr. Nuñez: Yeah.

Vice Chairman Reyes: -- when they came -- if my memory doesn't betray me, when they came in front of this board --

Mr. Nuñez: Yes.

Vice Chairman Reyes: -- the location was already picked. They even came with a budget, which I did argue that that budget was not realistic; that it was too low, and I remember when this came in front of us, and the location at the time was picked. Everything was ready to go, and the time of completion was probably six, eight months. It's been three years.

Mr. Nuñez: Right.

Vice Chairman Reyes: Three years and nothing has been done.

Mr. Nuñez: Right.

Vice Chairman Reyes: And what he said, the economic cost of this probably is high because the City is not making any money out of it, and I don't know what you -- now you want to change plans. You want to -- maybe, probably you're moving -- you're looking for a place to locate this fueling facility. If that's the case, why you come in front of us with a plan and with a project that -- and waste our time telling us that you -- we need this. This is a -- I mean, we're going to start doing this, and within six months, it's going to be completed. Because at the time -- and correct me, Gary -- we always gave -- I mean, there was a time frame given to this.

Mr. Reshefsky: Absolutely, yeah.

Vice Chairman Reyes: Why? Why?

Ms. Conway: I really think, at this point, that it's more prudent for the Board to make a motion if you want it to be reconsidered, and let the Administration reconsider it based on the motion, but I don't know that there's anything else that we can say that we haven't already stated this evening.

Vice Chairman Reyes: Well, the truth of the matter is that we are frustrated.

Mr. Aedo: We're venting a little. Excuse us.

Mr. Reshefsky: We get the Clerk to read the question and we can vote --

Chairman Flanders: We do have --

Mr. Reshefsky: -- but I agree with Mary. Let's just do a motion.

Chairman Flanders: -- a motion, but I'd like to hear it stated, please, Luis.

Mr. Cabrera: I want to make a motion that the Board makes a recommendation to the City to continue forward with the current plans and projects that we have in place that we agreed on and voted on on this Board.

Chairman Flanders: Is there a second?

Eileen Broton: I second.

Chairman Flanders: OK. Any further discussion? All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

Chairman Flanders: Anyone opposed? Motion carries unanimously.

HD/NIB MOTION 06-11

A MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY MOVE FORWARD WITH THE CURRENT PLANS AND PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE HOMELAND DEFENSE BOND OVERSIGHT BOARD.

MOVED: M. Reyes
SECONDED: L. De Rosa
ABSENT: K. Apfel, R. Cayard, D. Marko, J. Reyes

Note for the Record: Motion passed by unanimous vote of all Board Members present.

Mr. Reshefsky: Mr. Chair, can I make a second motion? It's similar -- it's just to clarify -- just in addition, that the transcript of this discussion go to the members of the City Commission --

Mr. Aedo: Second.

Mr. Reshefsky: -- and the Mayor.

Chairman Flanders: Any further discussion? All in favor?

The Board Members (Collectively): Aye.

Chairman Flanders: Anyone opposed? Motion carries.

HD/NIB MOTION 06-12

A MOTION TO PROVIDE TRANSCRIPT OF DISCUSSION ON FUEL DOCKS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CITY COMMISSION AND THE MAYOR.

MOVED: M. Reyes
SECONDED: L. De Rosa
ABSENT: K. Apfel, R. Cayard, D. Marko, J. Reyes

Note for the Record: Motion passed by unanimous vote of all Board Members present.

Chairman Flanders: Thank you very --

Mr. Nuñez: Thank you.

Chairman Flanders: -- look, this is not easy, and we know that the City is involved because I'm in the Upper East Side. We're in the first quadrant of Miami 21, and we do have -- I think everybody up here has an appreciation for the Planning process and how important it is to the City, but this is one small item, but it's a very big item when you look at it in terms of lost revenue and salability of leases in the marina, so I think maybe we have singled out this particular item as a prime example of well, wait a minute, so --

Mr. Nuñez: Very well.

Mr. Reshefsky: Yeah. We have a few others. We have a long list here, Rob.

Vice Chairman Reyes: Yeah. We have --

Mr. Reshefsky: There might be more. There might be more.

Vice Chairman Reyes: Every single --

Mr. Nuñez: Thank you.

Vice Chairman Reyes: -- month we sit here and we get these updates, and there's not a single project that has been completed.

Chairman Flanders: No, that's not true.

Ms. Broton: That's not true.

Vice Chairman Reyes: Well, that's not true, but they're -- I mean, most of the projects that we have approved two years ago, you see, we get updates and they're not completed.

Chairman Flanders: That's -- OK.

2. Additional Funding and Scope Of Work Change for VKBPT-Capital Related Consulting

Guy Forchion, director of Operations, Virginia Key Beach Park Trust, reported that projects totaled \$317,430 in bond funds. The construction of a modular office is complete at a cost of \$186,880. The removal of trash leftover from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers shoreline stabilization project, at a cost of \$16,000, is complete. The Trust is awaiting a new ordinance of the City of Miami that would approve the buoy line installation on Virginia Key Beach. IMDC completed an electrical master plan for the park. The Trust has been moving forward with negotiations with NOAA (National Oceanic & Atmospheric Association) and RSMAS (Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science) on the island. They've chosen a \$12,550 undersea monitoring device to start and continue a yearlong survey of the safest areas to swim in Bear's Cut. The Erosion Control Line process started some time ago. The Trust is in the process now of scheduling a public hearing, which is part of that process, so

that there will be a clear understanding of the responsibilities for the Trust, the City, and the federal government.

3. Miami Circle Greenway

Brett Bibeau, managing director, Miami River Commission, reported that the Department of State has not replied to numerous attempts to obtain an update on this project. As indicated in the provided July 2002 letter, attached to the May 2006 letter, the Department of State indicates they do have the available funding to repair the seawall at the Miami Circle site, which is necessary prior to construction the river walk. As of October 2005, the Army Corps and DERM seawall repair permits were issued, leaving obtaining the City of Miami's permit before the seawall repair may commence. In October 2005, Mr. Javier Carbonell, City of Miami Building Department, stated that the City's structural engineer had met with the Department of State's environmental engineer to review the deficiencies in their permit applicant originally submitted in May 2005. Mr. Bibeau has not been informed that the Department of State submitted the additional information requested by the City's structural engineer, and if so, whether or not this final permit has been issued. In October 2005, the Department of State informed Mr. Bibeau that they had already hired Shoreline Foundation, Inc., which is prepared to commence the seawall repairs within a few months of obtaining the final required permit. The Miami River Commission and the City of Miami continue to share the mutual goal of providing public access to the Miami Circle site via the Miami River Greenway. Therefore, both groups will continue to work with the Department of State towards bringing this widely supported project to fruition.

In response to Eileen Broton's question concerning the project's timeline, Mr. Bibeau stated that neither the Miami River Commission nor the City of Miami really controls the strings on this project because it is owned by the Department of State, controlled by the Department of State. The good news is that the longest timeline on the permits to do the seawall repair, which is required before the river walk construction, is the Army Corps of Engineer permit, which has been issued. The timeline would be upon issuance of the permit, shoreline repair would start within one to two months, and then upon completion of the shoreline repair, construction of the river walk should be ready to move forward.

In response to Chairman Flanders concern regarding the matching funding for the project, Mr. Bibeau stated that the source of the matching funding has changed and the match amount has increased. The original match was \$100,000 from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, and that was matched with \$25,000 from the City, so that was \$125,000 for the river walk alone. Now the seawall repair is a component of the overall necessary project, and there is \$350,000 on the table from the Department of State, plus the City's \$25,000.

4. Bicentennial Park Shoreline Stabilization Phase II

Jose Ortega, CIP Department, reported that the project started June 2005. The project is substantially completed, well within budget, and within schedule.

5. Bicentennial Park Shoreline Stabilization Phase III – Design Services

Mary Conway, Director, CIP & Transportation, reported that both phase I and phase II of the project have been completed on time and within budget. There have been no change orders increasing the value. The contractor, Shoreline, has done an outstanding job, and the contract is now in place for phase III so that they'll be able to continue with the final phase of

the project unless there's a possibility that the County may want to continue with the parcel B portion of the seawall.

Jose Ortega, CIP Department, reported that phase III is scheduled to start within the first two weeks of June. Punch list items on phase II are presently being wrapped up. As soon as all of the issues regarding phase I and phase II are complete, phase III will begin, approximately mid-June.

6. Henry Reeves Park Community Building Improvements

Roger Hatton, CIP Department, reported that the scope of work is interior frames, windows, doors, interior finishes, acoustic ceilings, and lighting. The project is 90 percent complete. It is scheduled for completion mid-June, so it is currently on schedule. The CIP Department is currently working with the Communications Department to schedule the ribbon-cutting for the facility.

7. Miami Police Department Stables

Jim Brittain, Transportation Department, reported that the police horse stables are scheduled for completion in late July. The project is approximately 65 percent complete and it is currently within budget.

8. Professional Services for Jose Marti Gym.

Roger Hatton, CIP Department, reported that the project is 90 percent design complete. The plans are in the Building Department and in the permitting process. The design comments are expected to be back by the end of July. The construction is anticipated to begin October 1. The designer on the project is Zyscovich.

9. Grapeland Heights Park Ballfield Complex Design Build Contract

Roger Hatton, CIP Department, reported that the design build contractor is RDC, Recreational Design & Construction. Remediation work is currently being done. This phase is expected to be completed within 30 days. The plans for this phase are currently in permitting. Permits are anticipated for mid-June.

Luis Cabrera suggested that the Commissioner's office and the community should be more involved with the project before the department moves forward with more recommendations for the park.

Mary Conway, Director, CIP & Transportation, stated that the City does not feel that there is an issue. The issue of the size of the ball fields has nothing to do with anything but the physical size of the park. For there to be fields larger than what are proposed right now, you would not be able to accommodate the required parking on the site or the planned community center and water park. The City's already made a decision that it's more desirable to have four smaller fields than only two large fields because they will serve a broader number of people, and there are other larger fields in other City parks.

In response to Gary Reshefsky's inquiry concerning the park's timeline, Mr. Hatton stated that the time frames given by Cary Sanchez-Rea at a previous meeting are within reason, but the remediation pushed the scheduled forward for a longer time frame, but the four year completion date is accurate.

In response to Gary Reshefsky's inquiry concerning the park's timeline Ms. Conway stated that the timelines were given prior to the discovery of incinerator ash and contaminants and the coordination with DERM. These events impacted the schedule by six months. Now that building permits will be obtained within a week and be able to start, RDC is ready to have as many people out there as possible to have the ball fields open as close to the end of this calendar year, beginning of the next calendar year as possible.

Mr. Hatton reported that building permits have been submitted for phase II of this project.

10. Sewell Park Restrooms/Park Facility Building

Marcel Douge, CIP Department, reported that the project design is 100 percent complete. Construction is anticipated to start in September 2006, with construction completion by July 2007.

Mary Conway, Director, CIP & Transportation, stated that this one of a handful of projects that came in above the specified budget and the Department had to go through a value engineering exercise and make some design modifications and re-permit the project before starting, so there was an impact of several months to the schedule, but the project should be underway by September, if not sooner.

11. Juan Pablo Duarte Building Renovation/Expansion

Marcel Douge, CIP Department, reported that the project design is 90 percent complete. Construction is anticipated to start in September 2006, with construction completion by June 2007. The scope of the project includes a 1,000 square foot addition with new office space and storage room, and also a new A/C system for the building.

12. Fire Station No.11

Marcel Douge, CIP Department, reported that the project design is 20 percent complete. Completion on the design and permitting is anticipated for April 2007. Construction is anticipated to start by June 2007, with completion of construction by June 2008. The address of the project is 5920 West Flagler Street.

13. Margaret Pace Park Improvements Phase II

Jose Ortega, CIP Department, reported that the project is scheduled to begin May 30, 2006. The preconstruction meeting was held Thursday of last week. The NTP will probably be issued tomorrow based on some findings that the contractor has. The estimated cost is approximately \$2 million. It's 1,145 linear feet of shoreline stabilization. The park improvement area, the playground area, has already been constructed, and it's basically just the shoreline stabilization.

14. Robert King High Park New Building and Site Improvements AND

15. Robert King High Park Soccer Field

Gary Fabrikant, CIP Department, reported that the soccer field's estimated construction cost is \$1.9 million. The scope of work includes the construction of the new soccer field, restroom facilities, parking lot, and irrigation system related work. The design is 50 percent complete. The other project for the park is for an estimated value of \$1.7 million and includes the

construction of a new community recreation building, new covered basketball courts, new tennis courts, parking, and new access road. The design on the new community recreation building is 95 percent complete. CIP is currently looking at revising the scope of the work to include the possibility of adding a Cuban museum that is being proposed by a nonprofit organization.

Mary Conway, Director, CIP & Transportation, stated that this is an issue that was raised by the district Commissioner. The district Commissioner has been in discussions with the nonprofit that is proposing a Cuban museum. They have funding within the County's General Obligation Bond to be able to advance the Cuban museum project, and the district Commissioner directed the Administration to look at being able to site the Cuban museum within this park, fronting the roadway. Several meetings have been held with them along those lines, but to be able to site the museum, the plans for the parking building and improvements as designed and permitted would have to be modified, so CIP is in the process of working out some terms and conditions about how the City and the nonprofit could be able to partner so that both projects could move forward. The plans for the community center and what would happen in the park between the roadway and the canal are substantially completed, but there is the issue now of having to go back and redo the site plan, and it may also impact the proposed site plan for the soccer field, which is on the other side of the canal.

In response to Rolando Aedo's inquiry concerning the cost associated with revisiting the plans, Ms. Conway stated the cost could be anywhere between \$50,000 to \$100,000.

In response to Rolando Aedo's question concerning the name of the nonprofit organization, John De Pazos, CIP Department, stated that the name of the nonprofit is Cuban Museum/Museo Cubano, a not-for-profit 501(c)3.

Ms. Conway stated that CIP can pull the history of the City Commission meetings and the blue page items that the Commissioner had to discuss this and share those with the Board at the next meeting and give the board members who represent the district Commissioner the opportunity to speak with him between now and the next meeting. This issue came up several months ago. There were discussion items that were on the Commission agenda that dealt with the Cuban museum and Robert King High Park and the potential siting, and based on the last direction, the Administration has been working with the Cuban Museum to see whether there's ability to collocate and still provide the proposed park amenities, while also allowing the museum to site, and that's why the Department is on hold, pending resolution.

Chairman Flanders stated that the Board has, since its inception, invited each of the district Commissioners to appear before the Board when they have an item or pet project. In this case, everybody seems to be a little out of the loop, and the Board would invite the Commissioner to the meeting next month to update the Board on what his thoughts are. Ms. Conway stated that she would extend the Board's invitation.

16. Professional Services Agreement with HDR Engineering, Inc. for Professional Program Management Services

Mary Conway, Director, CIP & Transportation, reported that this is an item where the Administration took some of the monies that had been earned on interest on the first series bond proceeds to fund a portion of the program management services. As discussed previously, the City CIP Department is funded through administrative charges to all of the funding sources on projects. Based on the volume, typically, the City has advanced approximately \$10 - \$15 million worth of projects annually. In the 2005 budget year, the CIP

Office spent over \$94 million on capital improvement projects. The only way to do that was to look at trying to assemble additional City staff and find the right qualified staff to join the City's team, or to reach out and partner with industry, and the Administration chose to reach out and partner with industry for program management services. The people that have been before the Board tonight have been City staff people as well as program management staff people. As far as the payment, these monies have been expended.

III. CHAIRPERSON'S OPEN AGENDA:

Chairman Flanders stated that he would be very happy to carry both the congratulations and the concerns of the Board to the City Commission when he addresses the Commission in July.

IV. ADDITIONAL ITEMS:

Mary Conway, Director, CIP & Transportation, reported that, based on the latest figures, the Administration has expended over 55 percent of the bond monies. Almost all of the bond monies have been committed on contracts and via purchase orders, and over 55 percent has actually been paid out and spent, and that continues to go up exponentially, month-by-month, as these projects advance in construction.

Luis De Rosa requested an update on Roberto Clemente Park.

Mary Conway, Director, CIP & Transportation, reported that the project should be starting in construction within the next month or two, but an update will be brought at the next meeting.

Rolando Aedo stated that he has been receiving an influx of comments and inquiries regarding the Coral Way Uplighting project and the Cuban Memorial Boulevard maintenance. He questioned the specific plans being put in place and budgeted to make sure projects, such as the Cuban Memorial Boulevard, are maintained. He also requested a brief update on the Coral Way Uplighting project.

Mary Conway, Director, CIP & Transportation, reported that an update was just provided to the district Commissioner. All of the shields and visors on the lights have just been installed on Coral Way. Final testing is being completed, and the project is anticipated to be completed by the first week of June. The landscape is going through a final punch list process with closing out the construction contract.

HD/NIB MOTION 06-8

A MOTION TO ADJOURN TODAY'S MEETING.

MOVED: M. Reyes
SECONDED: R. Aedo
ABSENT: K. Apfel, R. Cayard, D. Marko, J. Reyes

Note for the Record: Motion passed by unanimous vote of all Board Members present.