



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners
Office of the Commission Auditor

Legislative Analysis

Transit, Infrastructure & Roads
Committee

February 11, 2009
2:00 PM
Commission Chamber

Charles Anderson, CPA
Commission Auditor

111 NW First Street, Suite 1030
Miami, Florida 33128
305-375-4354

**Transit, Infrastructure & Roads Committee
Agenda Notes
February 11, 2009**

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
1(C)1	Resolution Modifying the Miami-Dade Transit Schedule of Transit Fares, Rates and Charges	<p>This resolution amends the Miami-Dade Transit (MDT) Schedule of Transit Fares, Rates and Charges (Schedule).</p> <p>The proposed changes to the Schedule include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminates the tokens from fare schedule; • Adds fees for transfers from Metrobus to Metrobus Express/Special: \$0.85 for base fare; \$0.40 for discount fare; Seniors are free; • Eliminates the Monthly Group Discount – up to four passes: \$95 per pass; • Adds a new Daily Transit Pass for \$5.00; • Adds a discount fare for the Daily Transit Pass: \$2.50; • Adds an EASY Card/EASY Ticket fee of \$2.00; • Eliminates the Special Events Fares and Charter Fares sections; • Sets the replacement fee for the Golden Passport at \$10 as opposed to the current graduated replacement schedule (\$5 for first replacement, \$20 for second replacement, \$50 for third replacement); • Eliminates the promotional program allowing hotels which sell transit passes to retain a portion of the profit; • Establishes the daily rate for youth through grade 12 at \$2.50. <p><u>Legislative History</u> Resolution R-924-08 (Sept. 2, 2008): This resolution modified the fare schedule by increases rates by \$.50 and establishing an automatic fare increase every three years based on the Consumer Price Index.</p> <p><u>Questions (answers provided by MDT)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the elimination of tokens (and the activities associated with the collection and collection of tokens) result in any staff layoffs? If so, to what extent? A: No. From the experience gained from peer properties that have implemented a fare collection system, there were shifts in staff-not any reductions. 	<p><u>Public Hearing Requirement</u> This resolution is properly before the Transit, Infrastructure & Roads Committee as a public hearing item.</p> <p>Pursuant to Chapter 2, Article XIX, Sec. 2-150 of the Code of Miami-Dade County, the Board of County Commissioners may only adopt modifications to transit fares, rates and charges after a public hearing.</p>



Item No.	Subject Matter		
		Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
2(A)	<p>Resolution Directing the Mayor or his Designee to Quickly Develop and Prioritize a Proposed List of Miami-Dade County Infrastructure Projects</p> <p>Prime Sponsor Commissioner Audrey M. Edmonson</p>	<p>This resolution directs the Mayor or his designee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and prioritize a proposed list of Miami-Dade County infrastructure projects for submission to the federal government; • The list of projects should consist of County projects that can be started within the next two years; and • Provide the proposed priority list of infrastructure projects to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) within 30 days of the adoption of this resolution. <p>Background On July 17, 2008, BCC adopted Resolution No. 851-08 and Ordinance No. 08-92, regarding Miami-Dade’s Economic Stimulus Plan.</p> <p>Ordinance No. 08-92 amended the procurement process to expedite the implementation of certain capital projects identified by BCC as Economic Stimulus Projects (ESP).</p> <p>Resolution No. 851-08 identified the projects included in the County’s ESP totaling \$731 million. This list can be amended by resolution.</p> <p>So far, under the ESP, the BCC has awarded three projects:</p>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much funding does MDT estimate will be generated by adjusting the college discounted rate from \$42.50 to \$50.00? A: During fiscal year 2008, MDT sold approximately 50,000 college discount passes. Therefore, by increasing the fare from \$42.50 to \$50.00, MDT will generate additional revenue of approximately \$375,000. • How much funding does MDT estimate will be generated by adjusting the fees for replacing Golden Passports? A: The fees are not meant to be revenue generating – the \$10 fee is the estimated fee to cover costs incurred by the County for reprinting the ID with a photo. The former tiered fee system was primarily implemented to discourage fraud. However, since the new fare equipment will allow MDT to disable a card immediately when reported lost, we are recommending a flat fee of \$10. Based on 5,160 cards reported lost or stolen last year, MDT could estimate generating approximately \$51,160. 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>(1) Beauchamp Construction Co., Inc. for \$35,044,836.00 at Miami International Airport; (2) Solo Construction Corporation for \$2,907,696.29 Port of Miami; and (3) Munilla Construction Management, LLC dba MCM for \$ 25,299,169 at the Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Department.</p>	
2(H)	<p>Resolution Approving the Terms of and Authorizing the Mayor or his Designee to Execute a Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond Grant Agreement</p> <p>Prime Sponsor Chairman Dennis C. Moss</p>	<p>District 9</p> <p>This resolution provides for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes the Mayor or his designee to execute the Building Better Communities General Obligation Bond (BBC-GOB) Program Grant Agreement; • Waives the 25 year compliance requirement in the BBC-GOB Administrative Rules Specified Project Allocations for the Gold Coast Railroad Museum, Inc. (GCRM) located at 12450 S.W. 152 Street; and • Funds \$489,132 to install new railroad tracks and other amenities at the GCRM from the Not-For-Profit Community Organization Capital Fund (Fund) by the end of February 2009. <p>Background</p> <p>On November 2, 2004, the residents of Miami-Dade approved a \$2.9 billion General Obligation Bond Program which included Project No. 223 for not-for-profit organizations.</p> <p>On May 15, 2005, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) approved Resolution 595-05 which established the Administrative Rules Specified Project Allocations that governed the allocation and criteria for programs identified in the BBC-GOB. For example, the Not-for-Profit Program mentioned above funds and sets the eligibility requirements for 501(c)(3). The objective of the Fund is to build and sustain the capability and capacity of the not-for-profit sector. A total of \$30 million was allocated to this Fund.</p> <p>During FY 2006, 74 not-for-profit organizations submitted their funding applications; however, only 37, one of which was the GCRM, were approved by the Project Review Committee to receive funding. (See Resolution 884-07)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">One of the compliance responsibilities under the Administrative Rules Specified Project Allocations states that any funding allocation for the purpose of development, improvement, rehabilitation or restoration will be expended for these purposes only on land owned by a recipient or on lands the recipient holds a lease for an unexpired term of 25 years.</p> <p>The GCRM is now requesting that the BCC waive the compliance responsibility requiring site control for 25 years as a pre-condition to receive \$489,132 in BBC-GOB funds. If approved, the \$489,132 will be used for the following: renovate existing operational narrow gauge steam train track and its expansion; replace fencing inside the GCRM; and purchase a new trolley.</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>Gold Coast Museum The GCRM’s mission is to preserve, exhibit and operate historic railroad equipment for educational purposes in accordance with the American Association of Museum standards. GCRM leases over 50 acres of County owned property and offers train rides and hosts fieldtrips, birthday celebrations, lectures and special events.</p> <p>Comments According to Section 13 of the Administrative Rules Specified Project Allocation, the County Manager is authorized to interpret these rules and their interpretation of any matters governed will be final and may only be overturned by a majority vote of the BCC.</p>	
3(A)	Resolution Declaring Surplus County-owned Property Located at East 25 Street and East 6 Avenue, Hialeah	<p>Pursuant to Section 125.35(2) Florida Statutes, this resolution declares surplus County-owned property located at East 25th Street and East 6th Avenue, Hialeah.</p> <p>The requirements of Administrative Order 8-4 are waived through this resolution for the sale of this property. This also resolution authorizes the sale of this property via a closed bid, competitive process. The Mayor or the County Mayor’s designee is authorized to take all necessary action accomplish the sale of this property.</p> <p><u>Background</u> This property will be sold to the highest bidder through a sealed bid competitive process for no less than \$133,000. The value of the land is based on an appraisal of the property which took place on Jan. 15, 2007.</p> <p>This land was acquired by Miami-Dade Transit (MDT) as part of the Hialeah Metrorail Corridor. Proceeds from the sale of this property will be applied to MDT’s budget deficit, pursuant the department’s deficit reduction plan.</p> <p><u>Public Interest in Land</u> According to the General Services Administration, the adjacent property owner is interested in purchasing this property from the County. The adjacent property is owned by Building 600 #25th Street, LLC. According to state records, the registered agent of this company is Eugene Sanders, and the manager is Jesus Del Valle.</p> <p><u>How a Sealed-bid Land Sale Works</u></p>	<p><u>Florida Statutes</u> Florida Statutes Section 125.35(2) authorizes the Board of County Commissioners to effectuate a private sale of county-owned property when the Board determines that a parcel of land can only be used by the adjacent property owner due to the size, shape, location, and value of the parcel.</p> <p><u>Administrative Order</u> This resolution waives the requirements of Administrative Order 8-4 which states that a recommendation will be requested from the Planning Advisory Board, to indicate whether such proposal is in the public interest and also recommending proper land use classification if applicable.</p> <p><u>Property Restrictions</u> Because this property is adjacent to Metrorail right-of-way, certain restrictive covenants are attached to the property, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All plans for improvements to the

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>A sealed-bid sale of County-owned property generally has five phases, according to the General Services Administration. First, a bid package is put together containing the bid requirements i.e. minimum bid amount approved by the Board, date of bid opening, sale terms, etc.</p> <p>A notice is then put in a newspaper of general circulation (usually the Daily Business Review) which advertises that the property is for sale and directs interested parties to the County's website where they can download a package. In some instances, a sign is posted on the property and the County holds an open house or inspection period. State Statute requires that this notice be published once a week for two consecutive weeks.</p> <p>The bid period is usually 30-45 days during which time the interested parties can inspect the property. Next, potential bidders are required to submit the bid to the Clerk of the Court in a sealed envelope.</p> <p>The bids are then opened publicly by the Clerk on the bid due date. Finally, the property is awarded to the highest bidder.</p> <p><u>Sealed-bid Land Sales in FY 2008-09</u> Since October 1, 2008 only one property has been put out to bid in this format. No bids were received.</p> <p><u>Success Rate of Sealed-Bid Property Sales</u> According the General Services Administration, the County has sold valuable property over the years through this process. However, the majority of these properties had interested buyers before they were put out to bid.</p> <p>The bulk of the County's surplus properties are acquired for non-payment of taxes and may be located in areas which are less commercially viable. Such properties may be hard to sell through this process, particularly since the minimum sales price is based on market value. Also, because it is a bid process, the Cone of Silence applies, which could make it difficult to market the properties.</p>	<p>parcel must be submitted to the MDT Office of Safety and Security Fire/Life/Technical Committee for review, comment, possible revision and approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No above ground or underground storage containers of flammable materials is permitted to be kept on the property at any time. <p><i>(See handwritten pages 6-7 of the proposed item for a full list of restrictions.)</i></p> <p>Also, the following uses will not be permitted on the site: gas stations, coin-operated or self service laundries, automotive parts stores, restaurants, eateries, grocery stores, copy services, car washes, or pawn shops.</p>
3(B)	Resolution of Interlocal Agreement	This resolution implements an interlocal agreement between Miami-Dade County and the City of Doral for the operation of the Doral Trolley.	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	<p>Between Miami-Dade County and the City of Doral for the Provision of Public Transportation Services</p>	<p><u>Agreement Details</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fare: Doral trolley fares will be in set in accordance with the County’s transit fares. The City also has the option of charging passengers additional fare upon the approval of the County Manager. • Connection with County Bus Routes: The Doral circulator will connect with regular County routes at points where the routes intersect, merge or diverge. • Bus Schedules: The County will include the Doral circulator on future County’s transit maps. • Transfers: Riders transferring from bus to trolley, or from trolley to bus will pay the standard rate for transfers which are noted in the County’s Schedule of Transit Fares, Rates and Charges. <p><u>Questions (answers provided by MDT)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Doral Circulator began in Feb. 2008, why does the County need to enter into this agreement now? A: This item formalizes the pilot program which began 12 months ago. Additionally, per County Code, municipalities must enter into an Interlocal with the County if they contract out the service or charge a fare for their circulator. • Does Doral receive any PTP funds to supplement the cost of this circulator? A: No. • How many similar Interlocal agreements has the County entered into with other municipalities operating local circulators? A: The County has entered into 9 agreements with other municipalities operating local circulators. They are: Aventura, Coral Gables, North Miami, Bal Harbour, Palmetto Bay, Hialeah, North Bay Village, Miami Beach, and the City of Homestead. • What MDT routes currently service the city of Doral? 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>A: Routes: 7, 36, 41, 71, 87, 95, 132, 137, and 238.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will this interlocal agreement result in any duplication of service with existing MDT routes? <p>A: Yes, there will be some duplication with MDT routes on NW 87 and 107 Avenues, however, minimal ridership impact is expected since the Doral Trolley connects neighborhoods throughout Doral while the MDT routes are regional routes operating along the NW 87 or 107 Avenue corridors. More likely there will be a ridership increase as residents of Doral outside of walking distance to existing MDT service will now have access to these regional routes.</p> 	
3(C)	Equitable Distribution Program Professional Services Agreements Second and Third Quarter 2008 Ratification Reports	<p>This resolution ratifies the County Manger’s execution of 28 Equitable Distribution Program (EDP) Professional Services Agreements for the Second and Third Quarter 2008 for architectural, engineering and landscape architectural firms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the 28 firms seeking ratification, 16 are existing EDP consultants. • 9 existing EDP consultants do not have performance evaluations. • 7 existing EDP consultants were identified with several contracts, but provided few performance evaluation ratings. (Capital departments are tasked with completing contract performance evaluations per service order for EDP assignments) • The item states that from the implementation of the EDP in 2002 through June 2008, there were 321 EDP firms; however, the EDP Contractors List on the CIIS lists 231. Also, the item states there were 1,200 EDP assignments; however, a query search of EDP assignments revealed 1,071. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If there are 231 EDP firms currently listed in the CIIS, why does the item state that 257 participants received awards? <p>Background</p> <p>The EDP was created in June 2001 when the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) adopted Administrative Order 3-33. The purpose for establishing the EDP was to fairly and equitably distribute Architectural and Engineering (A/E) professional services for all miscellaneous type projects in which construction costs do not exceed the thresholds required by Section 287.055, Florida Statutes. Due to the development of various computer programs, databases, development of the pre-qualification pool, and forms, full implementation of the program did not take place until July 2002 when the first work assignment was made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of Capital Improvements (OCI) is tasked with overall administration of the EDP. • The Miami- Dade County Pre-Qualification Process (PQC) is currently on an annual basis and is administered by 	

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background			Analysis / Comments / Questions																																																			
		<p>OCI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over three hundred firms have been part of the EDP since its inception. In order to participate in the rotational selection process, a firm must meet all PQC criteria which includes technical certification, submittal of affirmative action verification and business entity registration. The EDP is not a minority and/or small business program. Creation of the EDP was to establish ties with firms that did not have any previous work relationship with the County. The EDP provides work assignment opportunities to firms by employing a rotational selection process. The EDP provides a process to equitably distribute assignments for projects with an estimated construction cost of less than \$1 million and \$50,000 for study activities. According to OCI staff, several revisions were proposed during FY 2008 for program eligibility, compliance policies and pool rotation positions. Staff is working on these revisions. 																																																							
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="531 641 737 738">Firm</th> <th data-bbox="737 641 877 738">Existing Member</th> <th data-bbox="877 641 1041 738">EDP Contracts</th> <th data-bbox="1041 641 1161 738">PSA</th> <th data-bbox="1161 641 1390 738">Overall Performance Evaluation</th> <th data-bbox="1390 641 1961 738">Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 738 737 808">Avino & Associates</td> <td data-bbox="737 738 877 808">Y</td> <td data-bbox="877 738 1041 808">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1041 738 1161 808">1</td> <td data-bbox="1161 738 1390 808">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1390 738 1961 808">There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 808 737 911">Barnes, Ferland & Associates</td> <td data-bbox="737 808 877 911">Y</td> <td data-bbox="877 808 1041 911">7</td> <td data-bbox="1041 808 1161 911">1</td> <td data-bbox="1161 808 1390 911">3.2</td> <td data-bbox="1390 808 1961 911">Performance evaluations were provided for only two contracts: EDP-DE-003-MDHA and EDP-DE-004-MDHA</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 911 737 1013">Beiswenger, Hoch & Associates</td> <td data-bbox="737 911 877 1013">Y</td> <td data-bbox="877 911 1041 1013">2</td> <td data-bbox="1041 911 1161 1013">5</td> <td data-bbox="1161 911 1390 1013">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1390 911 1961 1013">No performance evaluation was provided in the EDP Contractors List.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 1013 737 1115">Brown & Brown Architects</td> <td data-bbox="737 1013 877 1115">Y</td> <td data-bbox="877 1013 1041 1115">3</td> <td data-bbox="1041 1013 1161 1115">1</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1013 1390 1115">3.7</td> <td data-bbox="1390 1013 1961 1115">Performance evaluations were provided for only two contracts: EDP-AV-EF370 and EDP-FR-S-DB-07/08</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 1115 737 1185">JRA, Inc.</td> <td data-bbox="737 1115 877 1185">Y</td> <td data-bbox="877 1115 1041 1185">6</td> <td data-bbox="1041 1115 1161 1185">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1115 1390 1185">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1390 1115 1961 1185">No performance evaluation was provided in the EDP Contractors List.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 1185 737 1287">N25 Architecture Co.</td> <td data-bbox="737 1185 877 1287">Y</td> <td data-bbox="877 1185 1041 1287">6</td> <td data-bbox="1041 1185 1161 1287">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1185 1390 1287">4.0</td> <td data-bbox="1390 1185 1961 1287">A Performance evaluation was provided for only one contract: EDP-DA-AD0050</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 1287 737 1390">Coastal Systems International</td> <td data-bbox="737 1287 877 1390">Y</td> <td data-bbox="877 1287 1041 1390">5</td> <td data-bbox="1041 1287 1161 1390">2</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1287 1390 1390">3.2</td> <td data-bbox="1390 1287 1961 1390">A Performance evaluation was provided for only one contract: 651014</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="531 1390 737 1453">EE&G Environmental</td> <td data-bbox="737 1390 877 1453">Y</td> <td data-bbox="877 1390 1041 1453">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1041 1390 1161 1453">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1390 1390 1453">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1390 1390 1961 1453">There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Firm	Existing Member	EDP Contracts	PSA	Overall Performance Evaluation	Comments	Avino & Associates	Y	N/A	1	N/A	There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.	Barnes, Ferland & Associates	Y	7	1	3.2	Performance evaluations were provided for only two contracts: EDP-DE-003-MDHA and EDP-DE-004-MDHA	Beiswenger, Hoch & Associates	Y	2	5	N/A	No performance evaluation was provided in the EDP Contractors List.	Brown & Brown Architects	Y	3	1	3.7	Performance evaluations were provided for only two contracts: EDP-AV-EF370 and EDP-FR-S-DB-07/08	JRA, Inc.	Y	6	N/A	N/A	No performance evaluation was provided in the EDP Contractors List.	N25 Architecture Co.	Y	6	N/A	4.0	A Performance evaluation was provided for only one contract: EDP-DA-AD0050	Coastal Systems International	Y	5	2	3.2	A Performance evaluation was provided for only one contract: 651014	EE&G Environmental	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.	
Firm	Existing Member	EDP Contracts	PSA	Overall Performance Evaluation	Comments																																																				
Avino & Associates	Y	N/A	1	N/A	There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.																																																				
Barnes, Ferland & Associates	Y	7	1	3.2	Performance evaluations were provided for only two contracts: EDP-DE-003-MDHA and EDP-DE-004-MDHA																																																				
Beiswenger, Hoch & Associates	Y	2	5	N/A	No performance evaluation was provided in the EDP Contractors List.																																																				
Brown & Brown Architects	Y	3	1	3.7	Performance evaluations were provided for only two contracts: EDP-AV-EF370 and EDP-FR-S-DB-07/08																																																				
JRA, Inc.	Y	6	N/A	N/A	No performance evaluation was provided in the EDP Contractors List.																																																				
N25 Architecture Co.	Y	6	N/A	4.0	A Performance evaluation was provided for only one contract: EDP-DA-AD0050																																																				
Coastal Systems International	Y	5	2	3.2	A Performance evaluation was provided for only one contract: 651014																																																				
EE&G Environmental	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.																																																				

Item No.	Subject Matter		Background			Analysis / Comments / Questions	
		Services					
		Ecology and Environment, Inc.	Y	3	1	3.9	A Performance evaluation was provided for only one contract: EDP-WS-S-104
		GNP Engineering Group, Inc.	Y	7	N/A	3.7	A Performance evaluation was provided for only one contract: EDP-AV-EF-411
		HADP Architecture, Inc.	Y	4	N/A	N/A	There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.
		Handex Consulting & Remediation	Y	2	N/A	N/A	There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.
		Nova Consulting, Inc.	Y	4	2	N/A	There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.
		RVD Architect, Inc.	Y	7	N/A	N/A	There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.
		The Architectural Partnership	Y	5	N/A	4.0	A Performance evaluation was provided for only one contract: EDP-AV-0306-65659
		Westhorp & Associates, Inc.	Y	4	1	N/A	There is no performance evaluation in the EDP Contractors List.
3(E)	Approval of the Use of Charter County Transit System Surtax Funds for the Purchase of Goods and Services	<p>This item approves the use of Charter County Transit System Surtax funds for five contracts. The fiscal impact on the Surtax is \$10,967,870.</p> <p>The amount of Surtax funds used for each contract is properly limited to 19.2% of the total contract amount, reflecting the percentage of new service charges which could be attributed to the Surtax.</p> <p>The complete list of contracts is detailed on handwritten pages 2-3 of the item.</p>					
3(I) & 3(L)	Contract Award Recommendation for the people's Transportation Plan	<p>Item 3(I)</p> <p>This resolution approves a contract award recommendation to Quality Paving Corp. (Project No. 20080223) to perform intersection improvements at various locations in Miami-Dade County.</p> <p>Project location for item 3(I): S.W. 97 Avenue South of 77; S.W. 97 Ave and 74 Street Circle; S.W. 109 Road and 117</p>					

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>Avenue; S.W. 34 Street and S.W. 123 Avenue; S.W. 34 Street and S.W. 123 Avenue; S.W. 34 Street and S.W. 124 Avenue; and S.W 85 Avenue and S.W. 68 Street.</p> <p>Item 3(L) This resolution approves a contract award recommendation to Kailas Corp. (Project No. 20080210) to perform intersection improvements at various locations in Miami-Dade County.</p> <p>Project location for item 3(L): Old Cutler Road and S.W. 179 Street; Old Cutler Road and S.W. 70 Avenue; Old Cutler Road and S.W. 157 Terrace; Old Cutler Road and S.W. 176 Street; Old Cutler and S.W. 179 Street; Old Cutler Road and S.W. 174 Street; Old Cutler Road and S.W. 82 Avenue; and Old Cutler Road and S.W. 77 Avenue.</p> <p>Managing Dept.: Public Works Department (PWD)</p> <p>Funding Source: Charter County Transit System Sales Surtax</p> <p>Base Amount: \$577,000 includes contingency and dedicated allowances</p> <p>Contract Measure: CSBE goal of 100%</p> <p>Violations: According the Department of Small Business Development, Quality paving Corp. has no violations on file; however, there are 4 closed violations all issued in 2006.</p> <p>Bid history for Quality Paving Corp: On November 20, 2008, PWD forwarded an RPQ for the Intersection Improvement Contract, utilizing the Office of Capital Improvement (OCI) contract CICC 7040-0/07, to a list of 44 pre-qualified firms. Seven (7) firms purchased contract documents and four (4) firms proffered a bid. Quality Paving Corp. proffered the lowest responsive, responsible base bid of 0.98 percentage factor.</p> <p>Bid history for Kailas Corp.: On November 26, 2008, PWD forwarded an RPQ for the Intersection Improvement Contract, utilizing the OCI contract CICC 7040-0/07, to a list of 44 pre-qualified firms. Six (6) firms purchased contract documents and three (3) firms proffered a bid. Kailas Corp. proffered the lowest responsive, responsible base bid of 1.08 percentage factor, 8% over the County's cost estimate.</p>	
3(K)	Joint Participation Agreement Between Miami-Dade County and the Florida Department of	<p>District 6</p> <p>This resolution approves a Joint Participation Agreement (JPA) between Miami-Dade County (County) and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) in the amount of \$133,321. The scope of services includes the construction of a portion of the new alignment of the North Line Canal adjacent to the S.R. 826 and S.R. 836 Interchange.</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
	Transportation	<p>Fiscal Impact Under this JPA, FDOT will reimburse the County for the North Line Canal project. The County will complete the project on or before January 31, 2011. According to the JPA, any invoices submitted after May 31, 2011 will not be paid.</p> <p>Terms Under the JPA, FDOT will utilize the resources of the County to contract, construct and administer these improvements.</p>	
3(M)	Resolution Authorizing Construction of Intersection Improvements on Old Cutler Road	<p>District 8</p> <p>This resolution authorizes the construction of intersection improvements along Old Cutler Road (7 intersections) totaling \$194,361.</p> <p>Funding Source: Charter County Transit System Sales Surtax</p> <p>Comments: On April 13, 2004, the Board of County Commissioners accepted the Old Cutler Charrette Report. The report focused on then current and projected road operations; proposed roundabouts; and pedestrian/bicycle path possibilities.</p> <p>See TI&R Item 3(L)</p>	
3(O)	Contract Award Recommendation to Triangle Associates, Inc.	<p>Districts 3 & 4</p> <p>This resolution approves Contract Award No. 20070661, to Triangle Associates, Inc. for a design project for Venetian Causeway Bridge Replacement in the amount of \$3,398,590.76.</p> <p>Using and Managing Department: Public Works Department</p> <p>Years in Business: 12 years</p> <p>Funding Source: Sunshine State Financing \$1,500,000; Florida Department of Transportation (County Incentive Grant Program) \$1,500,000; Causeway Toll Revenue \$398,590.76 (Joint System Venetian and Rickenbacker Joint System); and any other funding sources except the people's Transportation Plan and General Obligation Bond proceeds.</p> <p>Contract Period: 1095 days</p> <p>Contract Measures: CBE 30% (\$1,019,5776.23)</p>	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>Bid Summary: There were 98 Notice to professional Consultants downloaded and 7 proposals received. The Competitive Selection Committee (CSC) evaluated all proposals and selected and ranked the top three firms. The CSC recommended negotiations with Triangle Associates, Inc.</p> <p>Previous Contracts within the last five years: According to the Department of Small Business Development, Triangle Associates, Inc. has received 9 contracts for a total amount of \$1,721,108.90. The Office of Capital Improvements CIIS database reported Triangle Associates, Inc. overall performance rating is 2.9 out of possible 4.0.</p> <p>History of Violations: There is no history of violations for this company according to the Department of Small Business Development's History of Violations report (02/06/2009).</p> <p>Company Principal(s): Osiris Quintana, P.E. The firms address is 14100 Palmetto Frontage Road, Suite 390, Miami Lakes, Florida 33016.</p> <p>Venetian Causeway Bridge Replacement information:</p> <p>1- <u>Project No. 20070776. Venetian Bridge Rehabilitation.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project is independent from the <u>Venetian Causeway Streetscape Improvements and/or the Venetian Bridge Design</u>. The construction work will not impact the <u>Venetian Causeway Streetscape Improvements and/or the Venetian Bridge Design</u>. • Project Status: The item was presented on the Board of County Commissioners 01/22/09 meeting. <p style="text-align: center;">Construction Cost: \$ 4,748,788.70</p> <p>2- <u>Project No. 662519 Venetian Causeway Streetscape Improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Status: Plans are in final design stage Pending is San Marco Island drainage design from the City of Miami to be incorporated in the plans Joint Participation Agreement with the City of Miami to be executed for the additional work DERM Class II Permit to be submitted • Construction Cost: \$ 7,868,687 	

Item No.	Subject Matter	Background	Analysis / Comments / Questions
		<p>Comments Through Resolutions 501-08 and 502-08, the Board of County Commissioners, approved the execution of a County Incentive Grant Program Agreement on May 6, 2008 with the Florida Department of Transportation for the rehabilitation and design to replace the 12 Venetian Causeways totaling \$14,000,000. The rehabilitation of the bridges commenced around September 2008. The design of the replacement bridges is projected to be completed in August 2010, with construction commencing approximately by June 2011 and lasting 30 months until December 2013.</p>	
3(P)	Resolution Approving Execution of a Memorandum of Agreement	<p>District 4 This resolution approves a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Miami-Dade County (County) and the City of Sunny Isles Beach (City) in the amount of \$200,000 for landscaping improvements along Collins Avenue from 186 Street to 192 Street. The City estimates the project will cost \$800,000 to complete.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact Under this MOA, funds are being provided by a Joint Participation Agreement between the County and the Florida Department of Transportation for the design and installation of landscape improvements.</p> <p>Distribution Process Miami-Dade County has two government agencies that municipalities may request funding from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Image Advisory Board (CIAB); and • Miami-Dade County Landscape Committee (MDLC). <p>For this MOA, the MDLC approved the \$200,000 as a maximum contribution to the City.</p> <p>Comments According to the Office of Community Image staff, programming of \$225,000 for Tree canopy replacement and enhancement was allocated for work in Commission Districts 2 and 3 in preparation for the Super bowl. The CIAB has programmed a \$275,000 Super bowl Clean-up effort beginning next summer focusing on major corridors used by visitors, the beaches, and centers of commerce.</p> <p>Legislative History A similar MOA was approved by the Board of County Commissioners on October 7, 2008 between the County and the City of Sweetwater totaling \$20,000. (See Resolution 1037-08)</p>	