MEMORANDUM

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

Date: March 18, 2008

To: Honorable Chairman Bruno A. Barreiro
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

Agenda Item No. 14B1

From: George M. Burgess
County Manager

Subject: Contract Award Recommendation for Cruise Terminal B, C & Boarding Hall Re-roofing - Project No: 2007.007; Contract No: 2007.007, to Triple M. Roofing Corp.

Recommendation

This Recommendation for Award for Construction Contract Number 2007.007 between Triple M Roofing, Corp. and Miami-Dade County has been prepared by the Miami-Dade Seaport Department and is recommended for approval.

Scope

PROJECT NAME: Cruise Terminal B, C & Boarding Hall Re-roofing

PROJECT NO: 2007.007

CONTRACT NO: 2007.007

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Seaport Department has the need to secure one (1) General Contractor to provide all necessary materials, personnel, equipment, and services for the demolition and installation of approximately 132,000 square feet of modified built up roof system at Cruise Terminals B and C and a common boarding hall for both terminals. The project will remove and replace the existing building roof and perform work as required and includes but is not limited to: demolition and tear off of existing roof system down to substrate including disposal of debris and hoisting, installation of a vapor barrier on both concrete and steel decks, installation of new roof system and cap sheet, installation of coping caps, metal fascia, gutters, downspouts and plumbing stacks, removal of A/C units and replace new A/C stands and reconnect A/C units to original working conditions, and other incidental related work. A dedicated allowance for two (2) new fifteen (15) ton A/C units is included, if required, for the removal, disposal and replacement of the existing A/C units.

PROJECT LOCATION: Port of Miami

PRIMARY COMMISSION DISTRICT: District 5 Bruno A. Barreiro

APPROVAL PATH: Board of County Commissioners

USING DEPARTMENT: Miami-Dade Seaport Department

MANAGING DEPARTMENT: Miami-Dade Seaport Department

Fiscal Impact / Funding Source

FUNDING SOURCE:	**SOURCE**	**AMOUNT**
	FEMA Reimbursements (Direct and from Project # 6432900 FEMA reimbursements)	$3,220,242.55

PTP FUNDING: No

GOB FUNDING: No

CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS:	**BUDGET PROJECT / DESCRIPTION**	**AWARD ESTIMATE**
	6432900-CRUISE TERMINAL B AND C IMPROVEMENTS Book Page: 123 Funding Year: Adopted Capital Budget Book for FY 2007-08, FY 2007-08 Funds	$875,000.00
	6432900-CRUISE TERMINAL B AND C IMPROVEMENTS Book Page: N/A Funding Year: Amount not in Capital Budget Book. 100% FEMA Reimbursable. See attached FEMA 322: Public Assistance Guide, Page 13 of 17.	$2,345,242.55
	Project Totals:	$3,220,242.55

PROJECT TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS: Miami-Dade County Contractor's Certification is required in one of the following categories: General Building, General Engineering, or other categories as applicable to Chapter 10 of the Miami-Dade County Code, or State of Florida General Contractor's License.

BID PACKAGES ISSUED: 34

BIDS RECEIVED: 14

CONTRACT PERIOD: 180 Days.

CONTINGENCY PERIOD: 18 Days.

IG FEE INCLUDED IN BASE CONTRACT: Yes

ART IN PUBLIC PLACES: No

BASE ESTIMATE:	$3,924,125.04			
BASE CONTRACT AMOUNT:	$2,717,028.80			
	TYPE	**PERCENT**	**AMOUNT**	**COMMENT**
CONTINGENCY ALLOWANCE (SECTION 2-8.1 MIAMI DADE COUNTY CODE):	Renovation	10%	$271,702.88	
PERMIT FEES :	$27,170.29	1.00%		
BONDS & INSURANCE :	$54,340.58	2.00%		
NEW A/C UNITS :	$150,000.00	5.52%		
TOTAL DEDICATED ALLOWANCE:	$231,510.87			
TOTAL AMOUNT:	$3,220,242.55			

Track Record / Monitor

SBD HISTORY OF VIOLATIONS: None

EXPLANATION: The project was advertised on December 26, 2007. Fourteen bids were received on February 6, 2008, and thirteen bids were found compliant with the CSBE measures, and subsequently opened. The bid amounts ranged from $2,290,228.81 to $6,110,935.04. Advanced Roofing, the first lowest bidder, submitted a base bid of $1,894,007.80. Therma Seal Roof System, Inc., the second lowest bidder, submitted a base bid of $2,294,360.00. Both bidders were found non-responsive due to the lack of submission of the Contractor's Roofing Applicator's Certificate for the FEMA approved membrane manufacturer system specified in the contract documents. Triple M Roofing, Corp., the third lowest bidder, submitted a base bid of $2,717,028.80, and was found to be the lowest responsive and responsible bidder.

The base estimate included within the Request to Advertise ($3,924,125.04) was revised during the bid advertisement period, in response to inquiries made by potential bidders. The bidder's inquiries were pertaining to new material placement given the existing site conditions. These inquiries led the design team to conduct additional investigation given the existing site conditions and determine that the new materials specified could be reduced without

compromising the effectiveness of the proposed roofing system. Therefore, line item quantities were reduced to reflect the re-assessed existing site conditions and eliminate unnecessary additional project cost. As a result, the revised base estimate, $3,717,775.00, is 5.26% below the original base estimate. The bids were reviewed by Seaport staff and the apparent low bidder (Triple M Roofing, Corp.) was found to be responsible and responsive to all bid requirements. The low bid amount is 30.76% below the original base estimate and 26.9% below the revised base estimate.

Taking into consideration that thirty-four bid packages were issued, thirty-seven different roofing contracting companies attended the pre-bid meeting, and 14 bids were received, it is the staff's opinion that the bids came in at a very competitive level given the slow down of the roofing/construction boom. The Architect of Record has reviewed the bid submittals and finds the bid to be reasonable given current economic conditions. There is no evaluation on record for this company in the Capital Improvement Information System, and there is no contract history within the last five years in the County. However, Triple M Roofing, Corp. has indicated 47+ years experience as a general contractor and 20+ years experience as a subcontractor in construction work similar to the work for this Contract. The Roofing Contractor's references listed in the bid package were contacted and provided a satisfactory review for both the company and their experience installing the specified manufacturer's system. Therefore, the Seaport Department recommends that this contract be awarded to Triple M Roofing, Corp.

BID OPEN DATE:	2/8/2008
BID BOND EXPIRES:	6/7/2008
BID VALID UNTIL:	6/7/2008
ESTIMATED NOTICE TO PROCEED:	5/12/2008
PRIME CONTRACTOR:	Triple M. Roofing Corp.
COMPANY PRINCIPAL:	Thomas J. Milanese
COMPANY QUALIFIERS:	Thomas J. Milanese
COMPANY EMAIL ADDRESS:	TOM@triplemroofing.com
COMPANY STREET ADDRESS:	914 NW 19 AVE

COMPANY CITY-STATE-ZIP:	Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311
YEARS IN BUSINESS:	47
PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE WITH COUNTY IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS:	Based upon the Firm History Report provided by the Department of Small Business Development, Triple M Roofing, Corp. has held no contracts with the County within the last five years.
SUBCONTRACTORS AND SUPPLIERS (SECTION 10-34 MIAMI DADE COUNTY CODE):	Florida Roof Solutions, Coralaire, Badco Supply, and W.P. Hickman
MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS EXCEED LEGAL REQUIREMENTS:	No
STANDARD PAYMENT AND PERFORMANCE BOND:	Yes
REVIEW COMMITTEE:	**MEETING DATE:** 11/7/2007 **SIGNOFF DATE:** 11/7/2007
RESPONSIBLE WAGES:	Yes

REVIEW COMMITTEE ASSIGNED CONTRACT MEASURES:

TYPE	GOAL	ESTIMATED VALUE	COMMENT
CSBE	20.00%	$543,405.00	
CWF	15.00%	$0.00	

MANDATORY CLEARING HOUSE:	Yes		
CONTRACT MANAGER NAME/PHONE/EMAIL:	Maria Cerna	(305) 347-4916	MCerna@miamidade.gov
PROJECT MANAGER NAME/PHONE/EMAIL:	Bart E. Sanfilippo	(305) 371-7678	BARTSAN@miamidade.gov

Background

BACKGROUND: The original roofs on Cruise Terminals B & C were installed in the 1980's. In 1996 the expansion to Cruise Terminal B, C and the boarding hall buildings was conducted with a new roof installation on the expansion areas only. The original roofs on Cruise Terminals B and C were not refurbished or replaced. On October 24, 2005, Hurricane Wilma made landfall in South Florida with high winds, wind blown rain and debris causing extensive damage to the Cruise Terminals B, C, and Boarding Hall roofs. The Port of Miami Maintenance Division has made temporary repairs to the damaged areas however, the Cruise Terminal B, C, and Boarding Hall roofs are currently leaking. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has agreed to reimburse the Port of Miami at 100% for costs associated with the repair of this roof. FEMA 322 Public Assistance Guide dated June 2007, stipulates that FEMA pays based on final actual costs.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY:

Ordinance No. 07-142: The General Conditions for the contract, Article 42, "Disputes", section B states that any and all disputes shall be decided by the Contracting Officer. The contract stipulates that the Contracting Officer for this contract is the Director of the Miami-Dade Seaport Department and/or his/her designee.

OPERATIONS COST/MAINTENANCE COST IMPACT AND LIFE EXPECTANCY:

Ordinance No. 07-138: This project is not a new facility; it is the re-roofing of an existing facility. The project will result in reduced maintenance costs and provides a life expectancy of 20-25 years. The roof contains an installation warranty covering the first 5 years and a manufacturer's warranty covering the first 20 years".

BUDGET APPROVAL
FUNDS AVAILABLE: OSBM DIRECTOR — DATE 2/22/08

APPROVED AS TO
LEGAL SUFFICIENCY: COUNTY ATTORNEY — DATE 2/22/08

CAPITAL
IMPROVEMENTS
CONCURRENCE: for OCI DIRECTOR — DATE 2/26/08

ASSISTANT COUNTY
MANAGER — DATE

CLERK DATE

DATE

Passenger Facilities Improvements

CRUISE TERMINAL B AND C IMPROVEMENTS **PROJECT # 6432900**

DESCRIPTION: Construct Improvments and upgrades to Terminals B and C

LOCATION: Dante B. Fascell Port of Miami-Dade
Dante B. Fascell Port of Miami-Dade

DISTRICT LOCATED: 5
ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING IMPACT: $22 DISTRICT(s) SERVED: Countywide

REVENUE SCHEDULE:	PRIOR	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	FUTURE	TOTAL
FEMA Reimbursements	875	875	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,750
Seaport Bonds/Loans	2,125	4,125	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,250
TOTAL REVENUE:	**3,000**	**5,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,000**

EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE:	PRIOR	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	FUTURE	TOTAL
Construction	3,000	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES:	**3,000**	**5,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,000**

CRUISE TERMINALS F AND G IMPROVEMENTS **PROJECT # 647810**

DESCRIPTION: Gangway and other modifications to berth Genesis class ships

LOCATION: Dante B. Fascell Port of Miami-Dade
Dante B. Fascell Port of Miami-Dade

DISTRICT LOCATED: 5
ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING IMPACT: Minimal DISTRICT(s) SERVED: Countywide

REVENUE SCHEDULE:	PRIOR	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	FUTURE	TOTAL
Seaport Bonds/Loans	0	1,000	4,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,000
TOTAL REVENUE:	**0**	**1,000**	**4,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5,000**

EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE:	PRIOR	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	FUTURE	TOTAL
Construction	0	1,000	4,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES:	**0**	**1,000**	**4,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5,000**

NEW TERMINAL A **PROJECT # 645200**

DESCRIPTION: Design and construct new Terminal A for expanded business

LOCATION: Dante B. Fascell Port of Miami-Dade
Dante B. Fascell Port of Miami-Dade

DISTRICT LOCATED: 6
ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING IMPACT: $1,000 DISTRICT(s) SERVED: Countywide

REVENUE SCHEDULE:	PRIOR	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	FUTURE	TOTAL
Seaport Bonds/Loans	0	0	35,000	0	0	0	0	0	35,000
TOTAL REVENUE:	**0**	**0**	**35,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**35,000**

EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE:	PRIOR	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	FUTURE	TOTAL
Planning and Design	0	0	3,500	0	0	0	0	0	3,500
Construction	0	0	20,000	11,500	0	0	0	0	31,500
TOTAL EXPENDITURES:	**0**	**0**	**23,500**	**11,500**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**35,000**

BUDGET PROJECT 6432900

Project Title: 6432900-CRUISE TERMINAL 8 AND 9 IMPROVEMENTS

Project Desc: Design and construct improvements for Terminal 8 and 9

Project($$ in 000's)	Start:	End:	Prior:	07-08:	08-09:	09-10:	10-11:	Tota
Expenditures	1/1/2002	9/30/2005	3,000	5,000	0	0	0	8,0C
Revenue			3,000	5,000	0	0	0	8,0C

Project Type: Capital Update Type

CDPWeb Project Milestones ($ IN 000'S)

Milestone:	Start:	End:	Prior:	07-08:	08-09:	09-10:	10-11:	Tota
Construction	N/A	N/A	3,000	5,000	0	0	0	8,0C

CIIS Milestones Add GEO Coded Site

EXIT

Current Contracts for Project 6432900

Dept	ContractNo	Contract Name	RTA Budget Allocation	Award Budget Allocation	CIIS Award
SP	2007.007	Cruise Terminal B, C & Boardin	$4,584,261.30	$0.00	$2,717,028.80
SP	2007.007	Cruise Terminal B, C & Boardin	$0.00	$875,000.00	$2,717,028.80
SP	2007.007	Cruise Terminal B, C & Boardin	$0.00	$2,345,242.55	$2,717,028.80
		Total Allocated:	$4,584,261.30	$3,220,242.55	

Current Sites for Project 6432900

Site	Location
68475	Dodge Island
71416	1015 N AMERICA WY
71417	1015 N AMERICA WY
71493	1015 N AMERICA WY

DBD DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Dept. of Business Development
Project Worksheet

Project/Contract Title:	PORT OF MIAMI-TERMINAL B.C. & BOARDING HALL RE-ROOFING (SIC 17)	**RC Date:**	11/07/2007
Project/Contract No:	07.007	**Item No:**	3-04
Department:	SEAPORT	**Funding Source:** FEMA	
Estimated Cost of Project/Bid:	$4,584,261.00	**Resubmittal Date(s):**	06/27/2007
Description of Project/Bid:	To establish a contract to proceed with the necessary work to re-roof 1,320 sq. ft. of the Terminals B, C & Boarding Hall of the Port of Miami		

Contract Measures Recommendation

Measure	Program	Goal Percent
Goal	CSBE	19.57%
Workforce Goal	CWP	15.00%

Reasons for Recommendation

An analysis of the factors contained in section VI C of Administrative Order 3-22 indicate that a 20% CSBE goal is appropriate for this project in the trade categories of Roofing, Siding, and Sheet Metal Contractors (removal - 13.8%, flashing repairs and gutter - 5.58%) and Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors (mechanical - .152%).

This project was previously presented before the 06/27/2007 Review Committee with a 22% CSBE goal. This is a resubmittal due to a change is scope and funding source and an increase in estimated project cost from $3,835,442 to $4,584,261.
***The CSBE dollars have increased from $841,879.52 to $897,231.56.

This project is located within the East/West Corridor Empowerment Zone and the Central Enterprise Zone.

CWP Estimated Workforce: 36
CWP Workforce Recommendation: 5

CWP Designated Target Areas: Enterprise Zones, Empowerment Zones

Analysis for Recommendation of a Goal

Subtrade	Cat.	Estimated Value	% of Items to Base Bid	Availability
Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning Contractors	CSBE	$6,968.08	0.15%	28
Roofing, Siding, and Sheet Metal Contractors	CSBE	$890,263.49	19.42%	15
Total		$897,231.56	19.57%	

Living Wages: YES [ ] NO [X] **Highway:** YES [ ] NO [X] **Heavy Construction:** YES [ ] NO [X]
Responsible Wages: YES [X] NO [ ] **Building:** YES [X] NO [ ]

Ordinance 90-143 is applicable to all construction projects over $100,000 that do not utilize Federal Funds

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Tier 1 Set Aside _____

Set Aside _____ **Level 1** _____ **Level 2** _____ **Level 3** _____

Trade Set Aside (MCC) _____ **Goal** 20% CSBE 15% CWP **Bid Preference** _____

No Measure _____ **Deferred** _____ **Selection Factor** _____

[signature] 11/07/2007 [signature]
Chairperson, Review Committee Date County Manager Date

DBDR0000 v. 2005101

10

CRUISE TERMINALS B, C BOARDING HALL RE-ROOFING
BID TABULATION
PROJECT NO. 2007.007

BID ITEM	DESCRIPTION	Engineer's Estimate 12/17/07				Revised Engineer's Estimate 2/6/08			Advanced Roofing, Inc.		Therma Seal Roof	
		UNIT	EST. QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	COST	EST. QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST
1.00	MOBILIZATION	L.S.	1.00	$386,046.64	$386,046.64	1.00	$337,980.00	$337,980.00	$110,000.00	$110,000.00	$150,000.00	$150,000.00
2.00	DEMOLITION AND TEAR OFF OF EXISTING ROOF SYSTEM DOWN TO SUBSTRATE INCLUDING DISPOSAL OF DEBRIS AND HOISTING	S.Q.	1,320.00	$480.59	$634,378.80	1,320.00	$480.00	$633,600.00	$105.05	$138,666.00	$390.00	$514,800.00
3.00	INSTALL VAPOR BARRIER CONSISTING ON BOTH CONCRETE AND STEEL DECKS INCLUDING DISPOSAL OF DEBRIS AND HOISTING	S.Q.	1,320.00	$363.09	$479,278.80	1,320.00	$363.00	$479,160.00	$168.25	$222,090.00	$235.00	$310,200.00
4.00	INSTALL NEW ROOF SYSTEM AND CAP SHEET INCLUDING DISPOSAL OF DEBRIS AND HOISTING	S.Q.	1,320.00	$1,637.44	$2,161,420.80	1,320.00	$1,103.00	$1,455,960.00	$482.59	$637,018.80	$686.00	$905,520.00
4A	TAPERED INSULATION	S.F.	0.00	$0.00	$0.00	90,000.00	$4.58	$412,200.00	$4.05	$364,500.00	$2.92	$262,800.00
5.00	INSTALL COPING CAP, METAL FASCIA, GUTTERS, DOWNSPOUTS, AND PLUMBING STACKS	L.S.	1.00	$256,000.00	$256,000.00	1.00	$256,000.00	$256,000.00	$388,688.00	$388,688.00	$120,000.00	$120,000.00
6.00	REMOVE AIR CONDITIONING UNITS, REPLACE WITH NEW AIR CONDITIONING STANDS AND RECONNECT AIR CONDITIONING UNITS TO ORIGINAL WORKING CONDITIONS	E.A.	14.00	$500.00	$7,000.00	14.00	$2,000.00	$28,000.00	$750.00	$10,500.00	$1,000.00	$14,000.00
7.00	CONCRETE RESTORATION	S.F.	0.00	$0.00	$0.00	1,140.00	$75.00	$85,500.00	$3.00	$3,420.00	$6.00	$6,840.00
8.00	STEEL DECK RESTORATION	S.F.	0.00	$0.00	$0.00	175.00	$25.00	$4,375.00	$15.00	$2,625.00	$6.00	$1,050.00
9.00	EXHAUST FAN CODE UPGRADES	E.A.	0.00	$0.00	$0.00	9.00	$1,000.00	$9,000.00	$500.00	$4,500.00	$350.00	$3,150.00
10.00	A/C CURBS CODE UPGRADES	E.A.	0.00	$0.00	$0.00	8.00	$2,000.00	$16,000.00	$1,500.00	$12,000.00	$750.00	$6,000.00
	SUBTOTAL				**$3,924,125.04**			**$3,717,775.00**		**$1,894,007.80**		**$2,294,360.00**
	CONTINGENCY* (10% of Base Bid)		10%		$392,412.50	10%		$371,777.50		$189,400.78		$229,436.00
	Dedicated Allowance Account for Permits* (1% of base bid)		1%		$39,241.25	1%		$37,177.75		$18,940.08		$22,943.60
	Dedicated Allowance Account for Bonds and Insurance* (2% of Base Bid)		2%		$78,482.50	2%		$74,355.50		$37,880.16		$45,887.20
	Dedicated Allowance Account for New A/C Units		$150,000.00		$150,000.00	$150,000.00		$150,000.00		$150,000.00		$150,000.00
	TOTAL				**$4,584,261.30**			**$4,351,085.75**		**$2,290,228.81**		**$2,742,628.80**
	Grand Total Amount reported in Bid Form									***$2,474,851.80***		***$2,742,025.00***

Prepared *Feburary 8, 2008*

CRUISE TERMINALS B, C BOARDING HALL RE-ROOFING
BID TABULATION
PROJECT NO. 2007.007

Triple M Roofing Corp.		Weiss & Woolrich		P & A Roof & Sht Metal		Murton Roofing Corp.		Isaacs Roofing		Nat'l Roofing of So. FL	
UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST
$150,000.00	$150,000.00	$28,596.00	$28,596.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$12,160.00	$12,160.00	$108,966.00	$108,966.00	$60,726.22	$60,726.22
$219.70	$290,004.00	$375.00	$495,000.00	$303.00	$399,960.00	$184.00	$242,880.00	$624.00	$823,680.00	$709.00	$935,880.00
$314.39	$414,994.80	$560.00	$739,200.00	$217.00	$286,440.00	$410.00	$541,200.00	$485.41	$640,741.20	$700.00	$924,000.00
$1,074.00	$1,417,680.00	$790.00	$1,042,800.00	$1,365.00	$1,801,800.00	$1,074.00	$1,417,680.00	$625.37	$825,488.40	$550.00	$726,000.00
$2.63	$236,700.00	$2.60	$234,000.00	$3.05	$274,500.00	$3.51	$315,900.00	$3.49	$314,100.00	$3.10	$279,000.00
$115,000.00	$115,000.00	$47,000.00	$47,000.00	$123,840.00	$123,840.00	$460,033.00	$460,033.00	$122,000.00	$122,000.00	$283,723.78	$283,723.78
$2,500.00	$35,000.00	$4,100.00	$57,400.00	$950.00	$13,300.00	$1,100.00	$15,400.00	$2,300.00	$32,200.00	$950.00	$13,300.00
$10.00	$11,400.00	$17.00	$19,380.00	$7.00	$7,980.00	$6.00	$6,840.00	$150.00	$171,000.00	$8.00	$9,120.00
$10.00	$1,750.00	$8.00	$1,400.00	$7.00	$1,225.00	$6.00	$1,050.00	$30.00	$5,250.00	$8.00	$1,400.00
$500.00	$4,500.00	$1,200.00	$10,800.00	$500.00	$4,500.00	$1.00	$9.00	$2,073.00	$18,657.00	$650.00	$5,850.00
$5,000.00	$40,000.00	$6,100.00	$48,800.00	$750.00	$6,000.00	$1.00	$8.00	$8,700.00	$69,600.00	$3,200.00	$25,600.00
	$2,717,028.80		**$2,724,376.00**		**$2,929,545.00**		**$3,013,160.00**		**$3,131,682.60**		**$3,264,600.00**
	$271,702.88		$272,437.60		$292,954.50		$301,316.00		$313,168.26		$326,460.00
	$27,170.29		$27,243.76		$29,295.45		$30,131.60		$31,316.83		$32,646.00
	$54,340.58		$54,487.52		$58,590.90		$60,263.20		$62,633.65		$65,292.00
	$150,000.00		$150,000.00		$150,000.00		$150,000.00		$150,000.00		$150,000.00
	$3,220,242.54		**$3,228,544.88**		**$3,460,385.85**		**$3,554,870.80**		**$3,688,801.34**		**$3,838,998.00**
	$3,220,255.00		***$3,228,545.00***		**$3,460,563.00**		**$3,558,080.00**		***$3,688,891.74***		***$3,841,710.00***

12

Prepared *Feburary 8, 2008*

CRUISE TERMINALS B, C BOARDING HALL RE-ROOFING
BID TABULATION
PROJECT NO. 2007.007

Taylor Contract & Roof		Bisc Construction Co.		Bel-Mac Roofing		A-1 Duran Roofing Inc.		J. Reynolds & Co., Inc.	
UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST	UNIT PRICE	COST
$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$182,177.00	$182,177.00	$60,000.00	$60,000.00	$15,000.00	$15,000.00
$395.00	$521,400.00	$150.00	$198,000.00	$355.32	$469,022.40	$350.00	$462,000.00	$1,200.00	$1,584,000.00
$766.00	$1,011,120.00	$850.00	$1,122,000.00	$450.81	$595,069.20	$540.00	$712,800.00	$900.00	$1,188,000.00
$682.00	$900,240.00	$1,136.36	$1,499,995.20	$1,881.43	$2,483,487.60	$1,207.73	$1,594,200.04	$1,040.00	$1,372,800.00
$6.65	$598,500.00	$3.87	$348,300.00	$1.22	$109,800.00	$13.00	$1,170,000.00	$10.10	$909,000.00
$317,200.00	$317,200.00	$250,000.00	$250,000.00	$318,837.00	$318,837.00	$433,000.00	$433,000.00	$176,775.00	$176,775.00
$2,520.00	$35,280.00	$800.00	$11,200.00	$7,160.83	$100,251.62	$2,000.00	$28,000.00	$1,500.00	$21,000.00
$3.15	$3,591.00	$20.00	$22,800.00	$12.75	$14,535.00	$2.63	$3,000.02	$3.00	$3,420.00
$3.60	$630.00	$10.00	$1,750.00	$8.95	$1,566.25	$40.00	$7,000.00	$5.25	$918.75
$360.00	$3,240.00	$800.00	$7,200.00	$1,200.00	$10,800.00	$2,000.00	$18,000.00	$250.00	$2,250.00
$2,250.00	$18,000.00	$1,100.00	$8,800.00	$1,500.00	$12,000.00	$5,250.00	$42,000.00	$250.00	$2,000.00
	$3,499,201.00		$3,520,045.20		$4,297,546.07		$4,530,000.06		$5,275,163.75
	$349,920.10		$352,004.52		$429,754.61		$453,000.01		$527,516.38
	$34,992.01		$35,200.45		$42,975.46		$45,300.00		$52,751.64
	$69,984.02		$70,400.90		$85,950.92		$90,600.00		$105,503.28
	$150,000.00		$150,000.00		$150,000.00		$150,000.00		$150,000.00
	$4,104,097.13		$4,127,651.08		$5,005,227.06		$5,268,900.07		$5,110,935.04
	$4,104,097.13		$3,977,315.50		$4,975,956.54		$5,268,900.00		$5,110,933.00

13

Prepared *Feburary 8, 2008*

Memorandum

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

Date: Feburary 15, 2008

To: Bill Johnson, Director
Port of Miami

From: Penelope Townsley, Director
Small Business Development

Subject: CSBE Compliance Review for Project No. 07.007 Cruise Terminal B, C & Boarding Hall Re-Roofing

---

The Department of Small Business Development (SBD), has completed its compliance review for the above-referenced project with the Community Small Business Enterprise (CSBE) Program. The contract measure applicable to this project is a 20% CSBE goal.

The Construction Contracts Section of the Port of Miami has submitted bid documents from Advanced Roofing, Inc., Therma Seal Roof System, Inc., Triple M. Roofing Corp., Weiss & Woolrich Southern Enterprises, Inc. and P & A Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc. for compliance review.

Advanced Roofing, Inc. has submitted the required Schedule of Intent (SOI) Affidavit forms committing to utilize Presidential Builders, Inc., a certified CSBE firm, to perform roofing work at 20%. Presidential Builders, Inc. signed the required SOI Affidavit confirming the information listed. Advanced Roofing, Inc. has fulfilled the contract measure requirement and is in compliance with the CSBE Participation Provisions.

Therma Seal Roof Systems, Inc. has submitted the required SOI Affidavit forms committing to utilize Unlimited Roofing Services, Inc., a certified CSBE firm, to perform roofing removal and vapor retardation work at 22%. Unlimited Roofing Services, Inc. signed the required SOI Affidavit form confirming the information listed. Therma Seal Roof Systems, Inc. has fulfilled the contract measure requirement and is in compliance with the CSBE Participation Provisions.

Triple M. Roofing Corp. has submitted the required SOI Affidavit forms committing to utilize Florida Roofing Solutions, Inc., a certified CSBE firm, to perform roofing work at 20%. Florida Roofing Solutions, Inc. signed the required SOI Affidavit form confirming the information listed. Triple M. Roofing Corp. has fulfilled the contract measure requirement and is in compliance with the CSBE Participation Provisions.

Weiss and Woolrich Southern Enterprises, Inc. has submitted the required SOI Affidavit forms committing to utilize IGWT, Inc., a certified CSBE firm, to perform roofing, demolition, maintenance of traffic, dumping, hauling and concrete restoration work at 21%. IGWT, Inc. signed the required SOI Affidavit form confirming the information listed. Weiss & Woolrich Southern Enterprises, Inc. has fulfilled the contract measure requirement and is in compliance with the CSBE Participation Provisions.

P & A Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc. has submitted the required SOI Affidavit forms committing to utilize Florida Roofing Solutions, Inc., a certified CSBE firm, to perform roofing, demolition and debris removal work at 22%. Florida Roofing Solutions, Inc. signed the required SOI Affidavit form confirming the information listed. P & A Roofing & Sheet Metal has fulfilled the contract measure requirement and is in compliance with the CSBE Participation Provisions.

Please note that SBD staff only reviewed and addressed compliance with the CSBE program. The Construction Contracts Section of the Port of Miami is responsible for any other issues that may exist.

Should you have any questions or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to call Caesar E. Suarez at (305) 375-3141.

PT: ces

cc: Maria Cema, POM
Heather Fraser, SBD
Patrice King, SBD
File

Find Contracts With Search String ==>

Status View Exit Projects Goto Bottom

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

Capital Improvements Information System

All Projects for Contractor Triple M. Roofing Corp.

DST	DPT	Contract	Name	Location / Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	Total Award	Last Status Date	% Complete / Status *
5	SP	2007.007	Cruise Terminal B, C & Boardin	Port of Miami	N/A	$2,717,029		0% / N/A
				Totals:	1	$2,717,029		

* Yellow Status=Inactive Contract

Status View Exit Projects Goto Top

Cerna, Maria (Seaport)

From: vhoffman@solid-resources.com
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2008 11:09 AM
To: Cordoves, Jose A. (Seaport)
Cc: Ogden, Elizabeth (Seaport); Cerna, Maria (Seaport); de la Campa, Raul (FIN); planneau@solid-resources.com
Subject: Reference for Actual Costs and Project Changes

Jose-

As requested, here are the references for several pertinent FEMA policy links:

1. For estimated permanent work projects being paid based on final actual costs:

FEMA 322 Public Assistance Guide - June 2007 - Chapter 3, Page 83, Grant Processing, Large Projects:

http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/pa/pag07_3.shtm#Grant%20Processing

2. For your information, discussion for changes in Scope of Work and Costs:

FEMA 322 Public Assistance Guide - June 2007 - Chapter 3, Page 115, Changes in Scope of Work and Costs:

http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/pa/pag07_5.shtm#Changes%20in%20Scope%20of%20Work%20and%20Costs

I hope that these links will give the information you need.

Thanks,

Valarie Hoffman
PAC Coordinator
Department of Transportation

6505 Blue Lagoon Drive, Suite 435
Miami, Florida 33126
Cell: 678.764.3692
Office: 786.662.3144
Fax: 786.662.3147
mailto: vhoffman@solid-resources.com

FEMA

Public Assistance Guide

FEMA 322 / June 2007

Chapter 3: Applying for Public Assistance

Table of Contents Foreword Acronyms Chapters: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5

Following a disaster declaration by the President, FEMA makes assistance for recovery from the disaster available to eligible applicants. This chapter describes the process through which this assistance becomes available.

Process Overview
The PA Program is implemented through the steps listed below, each of which is described in this chapter.

- a Preliminary Damage Assessment (PDA) is performed and Immediate Needs Funding and the need for Expedited Payments are identified.
- an Applicants' Briefing is held.
- potential applicants submit the *Request for Public Assistance.*.
- a PAC Crew Leader (Public Assistance Coordinator) is assigned to each applicant.
- the PAC Crew Leader holds a Kickoff Meeting with the applicant.
- the applicant's specific needs are identified and cost estimates developed through the project formulation process.
- cost estimates for small projects that have been prepared by the applicant are checked through the validation process.
- FEMA approves and processes funding for the applicant's projects.

Standard Operating Procedures
FEMA has developed a series of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that provide guidance for FEMA, the State and applicants on the processes discussed in this Chapter. SOPs are available on FEMA's website (www.fema.gov/government/grant/pa/). The following documents are included.

- 9570.2 Public Assistance Coordinator
- 9570.4 Kickoff Meeting
- 9570.5 Project Formulation
- 9570.6 Validation of Small Projects
- 9570.7 Immediate Needs Funding.
- 9570.8 Cost Estimating Format for Large Projects.
- 9570.9 Historic Review

Preliminary Damage Assessment, Immediate Needs Funding, and Expedited Payments

The **Preliminary Damage Assessment** (PDA) is performed to document the impact and magnitude of the disaster on individuals, families, businesses, and public property and to gather information for disaster management purposes. FEMA, the State, and an applicant representative participate in this effort. The information gathered during the PDA process is used to determine whether Federal assistance should be requested by the Governor and forms the basis for the disaster declaration.

While conducting the PDA, potential urgent needs in the immediate aftermath of the disaster may be identified. If the President declares a disaster and if the State has requested it, FEMA may provide Immediate Needs Funding (INF) to an applicant for emergency work that must be performed immediately and paid for within the first 60 days after the disaster declaration.

Immediate Needs Funding (INF) is for emergency work that must be performed immediately and paid for within the first 60 days after the disaster declaration. This form of funding must be requested by the State. Activities eligible for INF typically include:

- debris removal; and.
- emergency protective measures.

The funding may be used to cover such costs as overtime payroll, equipment costs, materials purchases, and contracts when these costs are incurred for emergency work. The amount of INF is limited to 50 percent of the PDA estimate of emergency work.

INF is not intended for those emergency work items that involve environmental or historic preservation concerns, work covered by insurance, or items of work that will require longer than 60 days to complete. Some examples of work for which INF is not appropriate are:

- demolition of historic structures or parts of historic structures;
- emergency work efforts covered by an existing insurance policy (such as building demolition or the removal of building debris);
- debris removal and disposal within the Coastal Barrier Resources system; and.
- large debris removal/disposal projects or major demolition of destroyed building projects that will require more than 60 days to complete.

PWs will be labeled as "INF."

Expedited Payments are made for applicants who participated in the PDA and who have applied for Public Assistance. FEMA will obligate 50 percent of the Federal share of the estimated cost of work under Categories A and B as estimated during the PDA. Payment for Category A will be within 60 days after the estimate was made and no later than 90 days after the *Request for Public Assistance* was submitted. Expedited payments are not intended for work that involves environmental or historic preservation concerns or work covered by insurance. The payments will need to be reconciled with actual costs. PWs will follow the normal PW process.

Applicants' Briefing
An Applicants' Briefing is a meeting conducted by a representative of the State for potential Public Assistance applicants. The briefing occurs after an emergency or major disaster has been declared and addresses application procedures, administrative requirements, funding, and program eligibility

criteria.

The State representative is responsible for notifying potential applicants (State and local governments and PNPs) of the date, time, and location of the briefing. The size of the disaster area and the number of possible applicants determine whether more than one briefing is held. FEMA personnel participate in the briefing to clarify issues regarding eligibility, floodplain management, insurance requirements, environmental and historic preservation considerations, hazard mitigation, and Federal procurement standards. To obtain the maximum benefit from the information presented at the briefing, each applicant should send representatives from each of the following:

- management;
- public works; and.
- finance.

Request for Public Assistance
The *Request for Public Assistance (Request)* is an applicant's official notification to FEMA of the intent to apply for Public Assistance. The Request for Public Assistance is available in the PA Forms Library. The form outlines general information identifying the applicant, including the applicant's name, address, and primary and secondary contacts.

Typically, the *Request* form is submitted at the Applicants' Briefing. If an applicant is unable to submit the *Request* at the briefing, the applicant must submit the form within 30 days of the date of designation of the area (county, parish, etc.) for Public Assistance. An applicant need not wait until all damage is identified before requesting assistance. Federal and State personnel will review each *Request* to ensure applicant eligibility. Once a *Request* has been submitted, the project formulation process can begin.

Assignment of the Public Assistance Coordination (PAC) Crew Leader
Once the *Request* has been forwarded to FEMA, the PAC Crew Leader is assigned to the applicant. The PAC Crew Leader is a program expert (FEMA or State) who serves as the applicant's customer service representative on PA Program matters and manages the processing of the applicant's projects. The PAC Crew Leader:

- conducts a kickoff meeting with the applicant to discuss the program and its application to the applicant's specific needs;
- works with the applicant to develop projects; obtains the appropriate technical assistance, if required, for the applicant's project(s);
- reviews projects for compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and policies;
- ensures that any Special Considerations associated with a project are identified and reviewed; and.
- ensures that the applicant's Case Management File is maintained.

Kickoff Meeting
This meeting differs from the Applicants' Briefing conducted by the State at the onset of disaster operations. While the Applicants' Briefing describes the application process and gives a general overview of the PA Program, the Kickoff Meeting is conducted by the PAC Crew Leader and designed to provide a much more detailed review of the PA Program and the applicant's needs. The meeting is the first step in establishing a partnership among FEMA, the State, and the applicant and

is designed to focus on the specific needs of that applicant. The meeting focuses on the eligibility and documentation requirements that are most pertinent to an applicant.

The PAC Crew Leader also discusses Special Considerations, such as insurance, hazard mitigation opportunities, and compliance with environmental and historic preservation laws, including floodplain management issues, that could potentially affect the type and amount of assistance available and the documentation needed. Special Considerations are discussed in Chapter 4. If any Special Considerations issues are anticipated, the appropriate Technical Specialist (Specialist) should be invited to attend the meeting.

Project Formulation
Project formulation is the process of identifying the eligible scope of work and estimating the costs associated with that scope of work for each of the applicant's projects. This section describes the elements of the project formulation process.

Small and Large Projects
A project is a logical method of performing work required as a result of the declared event. The applicant is responsible for identifying all work that is required as a result of the disaster.

To facilitate project review, approval, and funding, projects are divided into small and large projects based on the monetary threshold established in Section 422 of the Stafford Act and elaborated on in 44 CFR §206.203(c). Small projects are those projects with a total estimated cost below the threshold, and large projects are those projects with a total estimated cost at or above the threshold. The threshold is adjusted each fiscal year to account for inflation and published in the Federal Register. For Federal fiscal year 2007, the threshold is $59,700. The determination of the threshold that will be used for a disaster is based on the declaration date of the disaster, regardless of when project approval is made or when the work is performed. Projects are categorized as large or small based on the eligible damage cost of the approved PW. Subsequent PW versions prior to closeout affect categorization as large or small. Funding methods for small and large projects differ as explained below.

Small Projects. Small project funding is based on estimated costs, if actual costs are not yet available. Payment is made on the basis of the initial approved amount, whether estimated or actual. Even if not all funds are expended on the project, the Federal share amount is not changed. Revisions to the initial PWs may be required if there are omissions or changes in scope; revisions to PWs may result in changes in funding level and/or category. Payment methods are described in more detail on page 109 of this guide.

Large Projects. Large project funding is based on documented actual costs. Because of the complexity and nature of most large projects, however, work typically is not complete at the time of FEMA approval. Therefore, most large projects initially are approved based on estimated costs. Funds generally are made available to the applicant on a progress payment basis as work is completed. When all work associated with the project is complete, the State performs a reconciliation of actual costs and transmits the information to FEMA for consideration for final funding adjustments. Payment methods are described in more detail on page 109 of this guide.

The Project Worksheet
An applicant has 60 days following the first substantive meeting, usually the Kickoff Meeting, with

FEMA to identify and report damaged facilities to FEMA. The PW is the primary form used to document the location, damage description and dimensions, scope of work, and cost estimate for each project. It is the basis for the grant. The Project Worksheet is available in the PA Forms Library.

The applicant may choose to prepare PWs for small projects and submit them to the PAC Crew Leader. If the applicant opts to prepare small project PWs, the applicant must submit them to the PAC Crew Leader within 60 days of the Kickoff Meeting to go through the validation process, although FEMA or the State may set an earlier deadline. See pages 106-108 for a further discussion of validation. Applicants are strongly encouraged to submit PWs as soon as possible to expedite the assistance process.

If the applicant requires assistance with the preparation of PWs, the PAC Crew Leader may assign a Project Specialist (Project Officer) or Technical Specialist (Specialist) to provide the applicant with technical assistance.

For large projects, a Project Specialist is responsible for working with the applicant to prepare the PW. The Project Specialist may lead a team that includes a representative of the State and one or more Technical Specialists, depending on the type and complexity of the project.

The applicant is responsible for requesting inspections and changes in PWs at any point in the grant process when changes in the project or its costs are identified. The State and FEMA will evaluate the information and, if significant, take appropriate action.

Combining Work and Creating Projects

The applicant, in coordination with the PAC Crew Leader, may combine work items into projects. In this manner, the projects may be organized around the applicant's needs. A project may consist of one item of work, such as repairs to a single structure, or work that occurs at multiple sites, such as repairs to several washouts along a road. Table 7 describes generally accepted methods of combining projects. It is the responsibility of the PAC Crew Leader to ensure that the resulting project is logical and consistent with other criteria described below.

Table 7: Combining Work

Method	Explanation
Type of Facility	an applicant could combine all sewer pump stations or gravel roads together
System	an applicant could combine repair of several breaks in a water distribution system together
Boundaries	an applicant may have divided power lines into sectors or a road department into divisions for ease of operations
Method of Work	one contract could be a project or a group of contracts let to one contractor could be a project

Note that emergency work and permanent work may be combined into one project only when the emergency work is incidental to the permanent work. For example, if storm-generated debris must be removed from a building before the building can be repaired, the project could include both the debris removal and the repair work. If multiple sites are combined into one project with a total estimated cost above the large project threshold, that project will be considered a large project. Categories of permanent work may not be combined. A Project Specialist will be assigned to work with the applicant to complete the PW for that project.

Responsible officials should consider preparing separate PWs if Special Considerations (e.g., insurance, hazard mitigation, and environmental and historic preservation issues) are of concern for individual sites. Compliance requirements of a particular Special Considerations issue for the one site could delay funding for other sites, if grouped on one PW.

FEMA regulations state that individual projects of less than $1,000 in estimated costs are not eligible. However, it is acceptable to combine sites less than $1,000 in estimated costs into one PW when the work meets the conditions shown above for combining sites. Separate sites less than $1,000 in estimated costs without a reasonable relationship to other sites may not be combined; they are ineligible.

Identifying the Damaged Facility
If a project is a single site, record the name of the facility and its basic function (if necessary), e.g., City Library or Friendship Park. If the project is comprised of multiple sites, and possibly a combination of emergency work and a category of permanent work, the damaged facility title may be more general. For instance: Hill's County Sector A Debris Removal or Chester Elementary School Campus. For these cases, more specific names and location information should be provided for each site within the Damaged Description and Dimensions area of the PW. Detailed maps and sketches may be necessary to identify each location.

Project Location
The exact location of the damaged facility or area where the disaster costs covered by the project were or will be incurred must be identified. This information should be specific enough to enable other field personnel to locate the facility easily if a site visit is necessary. If possible, the precise latitude and longitude of the damaged site should be included. Location examples are:

Latitude: 25.69387 / Longitude: -80.16359
5520 Harrison Ave N.W., Springdale, Minnesota 55309
0.20 mile west of intersection of County Rd. 22 and County Rd. L
Northwest sector bound by King Street, Main Street, and Shady Canal

When a project combines several damage sites, a general location reference should be included in the Location block and more detailed information to identify specific locations for each individual site should be provided in the Damage Description block. For instance, if debris removal were performed within numerous streets to clear emergency evacuation routes, an entry of "county evacuation route" may be provided in the Location block. Specific roadways would then be identified in the Damage Description section and located on accompanying maps.

Damage Description and Dimensions
When appropriate, a brief description of the facility should introduce this block. For example "Highway 20, a two-lane asphalt surface road," or "Smith Library, a two-story, steel framed, brick-faced building." The cause of damage, a description of the damaged elements of the facility, and the dimensions of the damaged elements must be included on the PW.

All damage must be documented. Damage sustained as a direct result of the disaster event should be differentiated from pre-existing or non-disaster related damage. The specific cause of damage must relate to the incident for which the disaster was declared. It is important to completely describe the cause of damage because it can affect eligibility determinations. For instance, consider the two

situations described below.

- If an uninsured public building located in the 100-year floodplain is damaged by wind, the total cost of repairs is eligible. However, if the same building is damaged by a flood, the amount of assistance would be reduced by the maximum amount of flood insurance available under the National Flood Insurance Program. Both scenarios could occur in the same disaster.
- Widespread "alligator cracking" of roads generally is not eligible for repair because it indicates damage that was present before the disaster. However, cracking in specific areas due to uplift from soils saturated by floodwaters is eligible for repair.

The damage must be described in terms of the facility, features, or items requiring repair. All damaged elements must be clearly defined in quantitative terms with physical dimensions (such as length, width, depth, and capacity). Without appropriate dimensions of the damaged elements, proper estimates of material quantities cannot be developed.

In some disasters, applicants may perform emergency protective measures work to protect against a threat to improved property before, during, or immediately after the disaster. For such situations, the PW should contain a brief description of the threat and of the threatened improved property.

Scope of Work

The scope of eligible work necessary to repair the damage must be completely described and correspond directly to the cause of damage. The work should be specified as an action with quantifiable (length, width, depth, capacity) and descriptive (brick, wood, asphalt, timber deck bridge) terms. The scope of work should not be described only as "restore to pre-disaster design" If part of the work is completed prior to project approval, the work that has been completed should be distinguished from the work remaining.

Any other information that is pertinent to the scope of work should be documented, such as:

- eligible codes and standards, providing copies of specific codes and standards, especially if proposed repairs or replacements exceed the pre-disaster design;
- evidence of pre-disaster damage, such as cracks on a steel bridge covered by rust and corrosion;
- pre-disaster inspection reports noting deficiencies;
- ineligible work, maintenance, inactive facilities, responsibilities of Other Federal Agencies, etc.;
- reference to a Hazard Mitigation Proposal if one is included for the project;
- indication that the project is an Improved Project, if applicable. A description of the overall project must be included;
- any special equipment or construction approach, such as very heavy trucks, access roads, staging areas, coffer dams, etc.; and.
- a description of the larger action, if the project is part of one, e.g., one building within a complex.

If additional damage to the facility is found after the PW is completed, it is necessary to document that damage, show how the damage is disaster-related, and request a re-inspection by FEMA.

Examples:

Damage Description and Dimensions:
Floodwaters from Fern Creek overtopped Fernwood Drive, a 26-ft. wide roadway with 3-in. asphalt pavement and 8-in. aggregate base, located in the Village of Bolingbrook. The floodwaters washed out a 150-linear foot (LF) by 26-LF section of the roadway pavement and aggregate base. Additionally, the fill embankment-26-ft. wide (top) x 4-ft. high x 42-ft. wide (bottom)-was washed out for a length of 100 LF beneath the damaged section of roadway. Floodwaters damaged 300 LF of steel guardrail (150 LF on each side) along the entire stretch of the washed out road.

Scope of Work:
Replace fill embankment with unclassified fill for 100-LF x 4-ft. (high) x 26-ft. (top width) x 42-ft. (bottom width). Replace 150-LF x 26-ft. x 8-in. base course and 150 LF x 26-ft. x 3-in. asphalt pavement. Remove and replace 300 LF of steel guardrail. Place 100 LF of 1-ft. thick x 2-ft. high riprap along the stream side of the constructed embankment slope in accordance with Village of Bolingbrook Code provision #101A.

Damage Description and Dimensions:
Floodwaters and debris damaged several facilities within Riverside Park in the Town of Springville. Six toilets and four sinks in the public restroom became clogged and rendered unusable. Nine 4x8-foot, redwood picnic tables and four heavy metal barbecue grills with 1x2-foot cooking surfaces were washed away. Floodwaters and floating debris demolished 300 LF of 8-ft high chain link fence. 100 CY of sediment and other debris were scattered over the 125,000 SF area of the park.

Scope of Work:
Repair (unclog and clean) six public restroom toilets and four sinks using 40 hours of force account labor. Replace nine redwood picnic tables and four barbecue grills. Repair and reinstall 300 LF of existing chain link fence. Remove and dispose of 100 CY of debris.

Cost Estimate
FEMA may grant funds on the basis of actual costs or on estimates of work to be completed. The three primary methods for determining costs are time and materials, unit cost, and contracts. If work is completed at the time of the site visit, actual costs should be used.

Work to be completed: If the work has not been initiated, the unit cost method should be used whenever possible.

Work complete: If the work was completed by force account labor, actual personnel, materials, and equipment costs are used (time and materials method.) If a contractor performed the work, reasonable actual contract costs are used.

Time and Materials. The time and materials method is used to summarize actual costs of force account labor, equipment, and materials. Costs must be documented by payroll information, equipment logs or usage records, and other records, such as invoices, receipts, or work orders prepared by the applicant. This method also may be used for work to be completed, if appropriate.

As stated in Chapter 2, FEMA publishes a national listing of equipment rates. FEMA equipment rates, however, do not include operator costs. The applicant should identify operator labor separately. FEMA equipment rates do not apply to contracted or rental equipment, unless the equipment is

rented from another public entity. An applicant's own equipment rates or rates established by the State may be used, provided that they meet the criteria outlined in Chapter 2.

Unit Cost. The unit cost method is usually used to develop PWs for work to be completed. Under this method, unit costs are applied to specific elements of the scope of work. Typically unit prices are based on in-place costs, incorporating site preparation, materials, labor, equipment, insurance, overhead, and profit (if by contract) for all activities needed to complete that item of work. For example:

> The $14 per linear foot unit cost to replace concrete curb and gutter includes all costs for setting up and breaking down the forms and buying, pouring, and finishing the concrete. In other words, the $14 includes the cost of labor, equipment, and materials. Removal of the damaged old material may be included as a separate work item with its own unit price.

There are several sources that may be used in the preparation of estimates based on unit costs. These sources, provided in their order of preference, include:

> State or local data from previously completed projects;
> commercial estimating sources; and
> FEMA cost codes.

Contracts. Contract pricing is used to determine the cost of work for which the applicant has used labor, equipment, and material from an outside source. In general, and assuming that the contract was awarded following Federal procurement guidelines, contract costs are used for work already complete. In some cases, contract information may be used to estimate costs for work that is just beginning or still underway. If work has not yet begun on a project, but a contract has been bid or let, the contract price can be used.

Example:

> **Damaged Facility:** Utility shed
> **Location:** 419 Ocean Avenue South, Williams High School Utility Shed
>
> **Damage Description and Dimensions:** Wood structure: approximately 75 feet by 75 feet with 15-foot high walls. Painted interior drywall sustained cracking due to the earthquake. Tile flooring was displaced and destroyed. All damaged equipment is covered by the school district's insurance policy.
>
> **Scope of Work:** Seal cracking and paint drywall on all four 15-foot high x 75-foot wide walls. Remove and replace the entire 75-foot long x 75-foot wide tile floor.

Project Cost:

Item	Code	Narrative	Quantity/Unit	Unit Price	Cost
1	5187	Seal	4500/SF	$0.35	$1,575
2	5082	Paint	4500/SF	$0.48	$2,160
3	5060	Tile	5625/SF	$2.25	$12,656
				Total	$16,391

Cost Estimating Format (CEF)
FEMA uses a cost estimating methodology called the Cost Estimating Format (CEF) for Large Projects to better estimate the total cost of large projects. The CEF is a forward-pricing model that allows FEMA to account for all possible costs associated with projects for which the base costs of labor, materials, and equipment meet or exceed the large project threshold. FEMA uses experienced cost estimators as part of the project formulation team for projects on which the CEF is used.

The CEF should only be used on large projects for which the permanent restorative work is 90% or less complete. Projects greater than 90% complete are not required to be estimated using the CEF. In these cases, the Project Specialist should use the actual costs of the eligible work and extend those costs to cover the remaining work.

The CEF relies on the development of a clear definition of the scope of work that is eligible for Public Assistance. Once this scope of work has been developed, the CEF is applied. **Part A** represents the base cost of completing the project; it includes the labor, materials, and equipment necessary to complete each item of the scope of work. Parts B through H contain job-specific factors that are added to the base cost determined in Part A. These factors are described below:

Part B includes construction costs not typically itemized in Part A, such as the contractor's supervision costs.

Part C reflects construction cost contingencies and addresses budgetary risks associated with project complexity during the design process.

Part D accounts for the contractor's home-office overhead, insurance, bonds, and profit.

Part E accounts for cost escalation over the life of the project.

Part F includes fees for special reviews, plan checks, and permits.

Part G is the applicant's reserve for change orders, hidden damages, and differing site conditions after construction starts.

Part H accounts for the applicant's cost to manage the design and construction of the project.

The construction-related costs represented by Parts B through H are usually encountered during the course of construction and can normally be expected to occur. However, these construction-related costs may already be a component of the Part A costs. In all cases, the cost estimator determines the makeup of the unit costs used in Part A, before applying one or more of the Parts B through H factors. Costs considered in Part A cannot be duplicated in Parts B through H factors.

Table 8 depicts the hierarchy of preferred pricing with actual costs for the eligible completed work favored first and R.S. Means cost data favored least. FEMA cost data is normally not used when estimating large project costs by means of the CEF.

Table 8: Preferred Pricing When Using the CEF

	Types of Costs Used in Part A and Typical Application of Factors			
CEF Part	Completed Work	Bid Tab	Local Cost Data	R.S. Means Cost Data
B	*	*	*	Y
C	*	*	*	Y
D	*	*	*	Y
E	*	*	Y	Y
F	*	Y	Y	Y
G	*	Y	Y	Y
H	Y	Y	Y	Y

Y = Part or Factor Normally Applied * = Part or Factor Normally Not Applied

Specific instructional guidance relating to the application of the CEF should be obtained from FEMA's website. (Go to www.fema.gov/government/grant/pa/resources/ and select from among the Cost Estimating Format resources.)

Validation

The applicant may prepare PWs for small projects without assistance from FEMA or the State. Validation is conducted for those applicants who prepare their own small project PWs. The validation procedures apply only to small projects. Large projects are developed by the Project Specialist, working with the applicant, and are submitted directly to the PAC Crew Leader for review and processing.

The purpose of the small project validation process is to ensure that:

- the applicant has developed complete, accurate scopes of work;
- the work and costs included in the PWs are eligible for Public Assistance; and.
- the cost estimates are accurate and reasonable.

Typically, 20 percent of an applicant's small projects are assessed in the validation process. However, if significant discrepancies are found in the sample, a second sample of 20 percent is assessed. If discrepancies are again found in that sample, the applicant will be provided with technical assistance for review of all small projects.

Unless FEMA or the State has set an earlier deadline, an applicant typically has 60 days from the date of the Kickoff Meeting to submit small project PWs. The 20 percent sample only applies to projects submitted within this 60-day deadline. Small project PWs submitted after 60 days are subject to 100 percent validation. For this reason, applicants are encouraged to submit small project PWs as early as possible.

FEMA validates projects for facility, work, cost, and contract eligibility, and Special Considerations. Typically, a site visit is required during the validation process. Funding for all small projects (except those with Special Considerations) that are in the group submitted for validation will be obligated at one time as long as any required corrections are made. Small projects with Special Considerations will be obligated as each one completes the necessary Special Considerations reviews. Refer to the *Public Assistance Applicant Handbook* (FEMA 323) and FEMA Policy 9570.6, Standard Operating

Procedures on Validation of Small Projects, for additional discussion regarding the validation process.

Facility and Work. FEMA reviews projects to ensure that the damaged facility and work meets all applicable eligibility criteria, as described in Chapter 2. The damage description and scope of work must be accurate and complete. The review ensures that the scope of work is appropriate for the type and dimensions of damage, and that Special Considerations are clearly documented (these considerations are described in Chapter 4).

Cost. Costs must be error-free and eligible. Applicants must provide labor, equipment, and materials summaries for use in the review. Items that will be checked include:

- identification of persons whose wages are being included in the cost summary, by date, position, and hours worked;
- separate summaries for overtime and regular time hours with the fringe benefit rates identified for both;
- a summary of operator hours for any equipment being claimed (operator hours must match or exceed equipment hours; note that regular time hours for emergency work, even though ineligible, are needed to justify equipment usage);
- identification of volunteer, prison, or reassigned labor; and.
- copies of purchase orders, invoices, inventory records, or stock tickets with material type and quantity included.

Contract. FEMA reviews contracts to ensure that they adhere to appropriate procurement regulations, are based on reasonable costs, and pertain to the eligible scope of work. The applicant must provide FEMA with a copy of the contract.

Special Considerations. The Technical Specialist who conducts the validation must note possible Special Considerations, such as insurance, hazard mitigation, and compliance with environmental and historic preservation laws, including floodplain management, and report those considerations to the PAC Crew Leader for further review, as necessary. Insurance payments must be resolved prior to applicant closeout.

Grant Processing

FEMA and the State share responsibility for making PA Program funds available to the applicant. FEMA is responsible for determining eligibility, conducting environmental/ historic preservation review, approving projects, and making the Federal share of the approved amount (that is, the grant) available to the State through a process known as obligation. Funds that FEMA has obligated are available to the State via electronic transfer, but reside in a Federal account until the State is ready to award grants to the appropriate applicants. The State cannot request funds more than three business days before the day it disburses them. The State is responsible for providing the State share of the eligible costs and for notifying the applicant that funds are available. The State must use methods and procedures for payment that minimize the time between the transfer of funds to the State and disbursement by the State in accordance with Federal cash management requirements. For applicants requesting Immediate Needs Funding or Expedited Payment, the State should request funds expeditiously to meet the intent of the funding (see pages 90-91).

Methods of Payment

The method of payment to the applicant is dependent on the type of project.

Small Projects. Payment for small projects is made at the time of project approval on the basis of the estimate. The State is required to make payment of the Federal share to the applicant as soon as practicable after FEMA has obligated the funds.

Once all small projects are complete, the State must certify that all work has been completed in accordance with the approved scope of work on the PW, in compliance with FEMA standards and policies, and that all payments due have been made. This certification does not specify the amount spent on the projects, only that the projects were completed. If a small project, including any mitigation work, was not started or was not completed, funds will be de-obligated. If the applicant spends less than the amount approved by FEMA, the Federal share will not be reduced to match actual costs. However, if the applicant incurs costs significantly greater than the total amount approved for **all** small projects, the applicant may appeal for additional funding.

Note that this opportunity applies only to a net cost overrun for all small projects combined, not to an overrun for an individual project. This policy is based on the fact that small projects with cost underruns typically offset those small projects where the applicant experienced cost overruns. Such a request for a net cost overrun is considered a first appeal, as described on pages 112-114 of this guide.

Large Projects. Large projects are funded on documented actual costs. Because of the nature of most large projects, work typically is not complete at the time of project approval; therefore, FEMA obligates grants based on an estimated cost.

Grant funds may not be immediately drawn down by the State. Instead, progress payments are made to the applicant as actual costs are documented. Upon completion of a large project, an applicant must submit documentation to the State to account for all incurred costs. The State is responsible for ensuring that all incurred costs are associated with the approved scope of work and for certifying that work has been completed in accordance with FEMA standards and policies. The State then submits documentation of project costs to FEMA for review. FEMA may conduct a final inspection as part of this review. Once the review is complete, FEMA determines whether funds should be obligated or deobligated for the project.

Funding Options

Grants for most projects are processed in the manner described above. However, an applicant may elect to use a Public Assistance grant for activities that are outside of the originally approved scope of work. Funding options available to the applicant are described below.

Improved Projects. When performing permanent restoration work on a damaged facility, an applicant may decide to use the opportunity to make improvements to the facility while still restoring its pre-disaster function and at least its pre-disaster capacity. For example, the applicant may decide to lay asphalt on a gravel road or replace a firehouse that originally had two bays with one that has three. Projects that incorporate such improvements are called improved projects. For the most part, these are projects for which the funding for the improvements cannot be separated from the costs for the original repair work.

An applicant may request an improved project for either a small or large project. The improved facility must have the same function and at least the pre-disaster capacity as that of the pre-disaster facility. Time limits that would be associated with repairing the damaged facility to its pre-disaster design apply to the improved project construction. Funding for such projects is limited to the Federal share of the costs that would be associated with repairing or replacing the damaged facility to its pre-disaster design, or to the actual costs of completing the improved project, whichever is less. If eligible repair or replacement costs exceed the original estimate and costs can be separately documented (i.e., if approved costs can be tracked separately from improvement costs), the applicant may appeal the amount of the grant. Any additional costs for complying with codes and standards or compliance with environmental and historic preservation laws, regulations, and EOs (see Chapter 4) required by the construction of the improvements, but not required by the original eligible scope of work, are not eligible. The balance of the funds is a non-Federal responsibility. Funds to construct the improved project can be combined with a grant from another Federal agency; however, Federal grants cannot be used to meet the State or local cost-share requirement unless the legislation for the other grant allows such use, e.g., the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program.

If the original facility is being repaired and improvements are being added, FEMA may provide assistance with hazard mitigation under Section 406 of the Stafford Act. These funds must be applied to the original facility. If the improved project involves a complete new facility on the same site or on a different site, FEMA cannot approve Section 406 Hazard Mitigation funding that may otherwise have been eligible for the original facility. See pages 124-127 for further discussion of hazard mitigation. (See Fact Sheet 9580.102, *Permanent Relocation.*)

The applicant must obtain approval for an improved project from the State **prior to the start of construction.** Further, any improved project that results in a significant change from the pre-disaster configuration (that is, different location, footprint, function, or size) of the facility must also be approved by FEMA prior to construction to ensure completion of the appropriate environmental and/or historic preservation review.

Alternate Projects. An applicant may determine that the public welfare would not be best served by restoring a damaged facility or its function. In this event, the applicant may use the PA grant for that facility for other eligible purposes. (See FEMA Policy 9525.13, Alternate Projects.) Funds may also be used on more than one alternate project, and an applicant may request an alternate project in lieu of either a small or large project, but only on permanent restoration projects. Funds for debris removal and emergency protective measures cannot be used for alternate projects. The alternate project must serve the same general area that was being served by the originally funded project. The original facility must be rendered safe and secure, sold, or demolished. If an applicant opts to keep a damaged facility for a later or another use, it will not be eligible for FEMA funding in a subsequent disaster unless it is repaired to meet codes and standards, and mitigation measures that would have been approved are applied.

In general, alternate project funding may be used to repair or expand other selected public facilities, to construct new facilities, to demolish the original structure, to purchase equipment, to cover Section 406(d) (Stafford Act) insurance reductions on a facility eligible under the PA Program, or to fund cost-effective hazard mitigation activities, as long as the purpose is to meet a need for governmental services and functions in the disaster area. Alternate projects for PNP applicants must be for facilities that would be eligible for assistance under Section 406 of the Stafford Act. The proposed alternate project may not be located in the regulatory floodway and flood insurance will be required if it is located in the 100-year floodplain. Funds for alternate projects cannot be used for operating costs or

to meet the State or local share requirement on other Public Assistance projects or projects that utilize other Federal grants. 406 Hazard Mitigation funds that may have been approved for the original facility cannot be applied to an alternate project. All requests for alternate projects must be made within 12 months of the Kickoff Meeting and must be approved by **prior to construction**. FEMA must ensure that the proposed project represents an appropriate use of funds and complies with applicable environmental and historic preservation laws.

Funds for alternate projects for publicly owned facilities are limited to 90 percent of the approved Federal share of the estimated eligible costs associated with repairing the damaged facility to its pre-disaster design, or to 90 percent of the Federal share of actual costs of completing the alternate project, whichever is less. Funds for alternate projects for PNP applicants are limited to 75 percent of the approved Federal share. The costs of complying with laws, regulations, and EOs on the damaged facility are considered project costs for purposes of calculating the grant. Any additional costs for complying with codes and standards or compliance with environmental and historic preservation laws, regulations, and EOs (see Chapter 4) for the alternate facility are not eligible. Mitigation funding cannot be included in the calculation of the amount of alternate project funding. A sample calculation follows:

$130,000	eligible damage
- 30,000	insurance reduction
$100,000	new eligible amount
x .9	to adjust for 10% reduction*
$ 90,000	new project amount
x .75	Federal cost share
$ 67,500	maximum amount of Federal funds applicant may receive. Applicant must spend at least $90,000 on the approved alternate projects to receive $67,500 of Federal funds.

* except for projects of PNP organizations, which are reduced 25%

Appeals

The appeals process is the opportunity for applicants to request reconsideration of FEMA determinations regarding application for or the provision of assistance. There are two levels of appeal. The first level appeal is to the RA. The second level appeal is to FEMA Headquarters.

Typical appeals involve the following:

- an entity is not an eligible applicant;
- a facility, an item of work, or a project is not eligible for disaster assistance;
- approved costs are less than the applicant believes to be necessary to complete the work;
- a requested time extension was not granted;
- a portion of the cost claimed for the work is not eligible;
- the applicant disagrees with the approved Scope of Work on the PW; or.
- the applicant incurs a significant net cost overrun on small projects.

The applicant must file an appeal with the State within 60 days of the applicant's receipt of a notice of the action that is being appealed. The applicant must provide documentation to support the appeal. This documentation should explain why the applicant believes the original determination is wrong and the amount of adjustment being requested. Applicants appealing for a net small project overrun must make application within 60 days of completion of the last small project and must include cost data on all small projects. The State reviews the appeal documentation and request additional information if necessary. The State then prepares a written recommendation on the merits of the appeal and forwards that recommendation to FEMA within 60 days of its receipt of the appeal letter or receipt of additional information that it had requested. The State need not endorse the appeal position but must forward all appeals it receives.

The RA reviews the appeal and within 90 days takes one of two actions:

- render a decision on the appeal and inform the State of the decision; or.
- request additional information.

Normally, the applicant has 60 days to provide any additional information, and the RA provides a decision on the appeal within 90 days of receipt of that information. If the appeal is granted, the RA takes appropriate action, such as approving additional funding or sending a Project Specialist to meet with the applicant to determine additional eligible funding.

If an appeal is denied by the RA, the applicant may submit a second appeal following the procedures included in the RA's denial. The applicant must submit the second appeal to the State within 60 days of receiving the RA's denial. The State must forward the appeal with a written recommendation to the RA within 60 days of receiving the applicant's letter. The RA reviews the information provided with the appeal and requests additional information if required. The RA forwards the appeal with the recommendation for action to FEMA Headquarters as soon as practicable.

FEMA Headquarters reviews the appeal and within 90 days renders a decision or requests additional information from the applicant. In an unusual case involving highly technical issues, FEMA may request an independent scientific or technical analysis by a group or person having expertise in the subject matter of the appeal. Upon receipt of requested information from the applicant and any other requested reports, FEMA renders a determination on the appeal within 90 days. Any required actions, such as obligation or deobligation of funds, are taken by the RA. See 44 CFR §206.206 for the process description.

Closeout

The PA Program is considered programmatically closed when FEMA assures that all of the grants awarded under the PA Program for a given disaster meet the statutory and regulatory requirements governing the program. To achieve programmatic closure, FEMA ensures that all funds have been obligated. This includes any compliance with environmental and historic preservation requirements and any insurance purchase requirements. In addition, FEMA must resolve any appeals before programmatic closure is complete. With programmatic closure, FEMA has a reasonably well defined understanding of the total amount of Federal funds that will be obligated for the disaster.

Financial reconciliation of the grant, or grant closure, occurs later, when FEMA and the State reach agreement that all applicable administrative actions related to the PA Program are complete and all program funds related to the disaster have been reconciled. At that point, all PA Program projects

have been completed, the State has awarded all grant funds and submitted its final expenditure report to FEMA, and FEMA has adjusted the funding level for the program, as appropriate. Once grant closure occurs, no additional actions related to the program may occur other than possible audits. FEMA may conduct an audit of the program during or after grant closure.

June 2007
This guide describes FEMA's Public Assistance Program's basic provisions and application procedures. Because this document is not exhaustive and the provisions are subject to modification, the information contained herein should be verified with FEMA PA Program officials before becoming the basis for decision making.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

PROJECT WORKSHEET

PAPERWORK BURDEN DISCLOSURE NOTICE

Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 90 minutes. The burden estimate includes the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the needed data, and completing and submitting the forms. You are not required to respond to this collection of information unless a valid OMB control number is displayed in the upper right corner of the forms. Send comments regarding the accuracy of the burden estimate and any suggestions for reducing the burden to: Information Collection Management, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street, SW, Washington, DC 20472, Paperwork Reduction Project (3067-0151). NOTE: Do not send your completed form to this address.

DECLARATION NO.	PW REF #	STD. PROJECT NO.	FIPS NO.	DATE	CATEGORY
FEMA- 1609 DR- FL	DAD9717	599	086-99086-00	03/23/06	E

DAMAGED FACILITY	WORK COMPLETED AS OF: DATE:	PERCENT:
TERMINALS B, C AND BOARDING HALL	3/23/06	2%

APPLICANT	COUNTY
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY	MIAMI DADE

LOCATION	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
1575 NORTH CRUISE BLVD, MIAMI, FL, 33132	25.77453	-80.16553

DAMAGE DESCRIPTION AND DIMENSIONS:

ON OCTOBER 24, 2005, HURRICANE WILMA MADE LANDFALL IN SOUTH FLORIDA WITH HIGH WINDS, WIND BLOWN RAIN AND WIND BLOWN DEBRIS CAUSING DAMAGES TO BUILDINGS WITHIN MIAMI DADE COUNTY, INCLUDING THE PORT OF MIAMI (POM) TERMINAL B&C AND BOARDING HALL, TERMINAL 'F', TERMINAL '2' AND BUILDING 1050. SEE SITE SHEETS FOR DETAILS.

POM HIRED BEA INTERNATIONAL TO PERFORM A DAMAGE ASSESSMENT. THESE DAMAGES WERE VERIFIED BY FIELD INSPECTION. UNIT PRICING FOR ROOF REPLACEMENT IN THIS PW IS ESTIMATED TO BE $500/SQ, TAKEN FROM RS MEANS NUMBERS 075003004800, 075003000850, 132811208250, WHICH IS REMOVAL COST, INSTALL 3 SHEETS MOPPED FELT, AND INSTALL CAP SHEET. OTHER ACTUAL COSTS WERE OBTAINED FROM THE APPLICANT.

SCOPE OF WORK: SEE SITE SHEETS

Does the Scope of Work change the pre-disaster conditions at the site?	☐ YES	☑ NO
Special Considerations issues included?	☑ YES	☐ NO
Is there insurance coverage on this facility?	☑ YES	☐ NO
Hazard Mitigation proposal included?	☐ YES	☑ NO

PROJECT COST

ITEM	CODE	NARRATIVE	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	COST
		WORK COMPLETED				$ -
1	9999	SITE 1 TERMINALS B, C AND BOARDING HALL	1	LS	$ 22,253.48	$ 22,253.48
						$ -
						$ -
						$ -
						$ -
		WORK NOT COMPLETED				$ -
2	9999	SITE 1 TERMINALS B, C AND BOARDING HALL	1	LS	$ 723,150.00	$ 723,150.00
3	9999	SITE 2 TERMINAL 'F' ROOF	1	LS	$ 16,350.00	$ 16,350.00
4	9999	SITE 3 TERMINAL '2' ROOF	1	LS	$ 176,750.00	$ 176,750.00
						$ -
						$ -
5	9999	INSURANCE PROCEEDS ANTICIPATED	1	LS		$ -
					TOTAL COST THIS PAGE	$ 938,503.48

PREPARED BY:	EDMUND SALDAÑA	TITLE:	FEMA PROJECT OFFICER		
FEMA PAC:	EILEEN HAYES	STATE PAC:	GILBERTO GONZALEZ	6/8/06	
APPLICANT:	RAUL DE LA CAMPA	DATE:	6/1/06	PHONE:	(305) 375-5080

SCANNED 6/7/06

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

	SITE #	1	OF	3			
Fips #	086-99086-00	FEMA -	1609	DR -	FL	Category	E
Applicant:	MIAMI-DADE COUNTY				Project Reference #		DAD9717
Damaged Facility/Project Name	TERMINALS B, C AND BOARDING HALL						
Address of Facility if a Building:	1741-1751 NORTH CRUISE BLVD						
City:	MIAMI		State:	FL	Zip Code:		
Site Latitude:	-25.77453		Site Longitude:		-80.16553		

#2. LOCATION: (Road # and name, mile point and direction from nearby intersection.)

DAMAGE DESCRIPTION AND DIMENSIONS:

1) HIGH WINDS DAMAGED ONE 10' X 10' METAL ROOF HATCH ABOVE MECHANICAL ROOM. 2) 125,600 SQUARE FEET OF MODIFIED BUILT UP ROOF WAS DAMAGED BY HIGH WINDS. THIS BUILDING CONSISTS OF TERMINAL B, TERMINAL C, AND A COMMON BOARDING HALL FOR BOTH TERMINALS. THE ROOF OF THE BUILDING HAS 13 AREAS AT DIFFERENT LEVELS, BUT THE TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE OF ROOF IS 125,600 SQUARE FEET, WHICH IS ALL MODIFIED BUILT UP ROOF. 3) WATER INTRUDED THE FIRE ALARM SYSTEM AND SHORTED OUT CONNECTIONS AND DAMAGED WIRING, 4) CAUSED FAILURE OF FIRE ALARM PULL STATION DEVICES, 5) WATER INTRUDED THE HORN/STROBE SYSTEM AND CAUSED ELECTRICAL SHORTS AND DAMAGED WIRING 6) DAMAGED THREE FIRE ALARM HORN/STROBES. 7) HIGH WINDS BLEW OFF THREE METAL SIDE PANEL COVERS (48" X 24") ON 25-TON A/C PACKAGED UNITS. 8) BLEW OFF TWO METAL SIDE PANEL COVERS (24" X 24") ON 5-TON A/C PACKAGED UNITS. 9) DAMAGED CONDENSER COILS ON TEN INDIVIDUAL 5-TON A/C UNITS.

SCOPE OF WORK:

WORK TO BE COMPLETED: 1) REMOVE AND REPLACE ONE 10' X 10' METAL ROOF HATCH ABOVE MECHANICAL ROOM 2) REMOVE AND REPLACE 125,600 SQUARE FEET OF MODIFIED BUILT UP ROOF. 3) PROCURE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN SERVICES TO EXECUTE THE DESIGN INCLUDING CODE REQUIRED UPLIFT TESTING, REPORTING, AND PERMITTING (ACTUAL PROCURED COST SHOWN).

WORK COMPLETED: 4) REPAIR FIRE ALARM SYSTEM BY DRAINING WATER OUT OF DEVICES AND REPAIRING WATER DAMAGED AND SHORTED OUT PORTIONS OF ELECTRICAL SYSTEM (FORCE ACCOUNT - WORK ORDER #20830) 5) REPLACE AND RE-SET DAMAGED FIRE ALARM PULL STATION DEVICES (CONTRACTOR: SIMPLEX) - WORK ORDER #20830) 6) REPAIR HORN/STROBE SYSTEM BY DRAINING WATER OUT OF DEVICES AND REPAIRING DAMAGED AND SHORTED OUT PORTIONS OF ELECTRICAL SYSTEM (FORCE ACCOUNT - WORK ORDER #20832) 7) REPLACE THREE DAMAGED HORN/STROBE DEVICES (CONTRACTOR: FLORIDA STATE FIRE & SERCURITY - WORK ORDER #20832) 8) REPLACE THREE SIDE PANEL METAL COVERS (48" X 24") ON 25-TON A/C PACKAGED UNITS (FORCE ACCOUNT - WORK ORDER #20884) 9) REPLACE TWO SIDE PANEL METAL COVERS (24" X 24") ON 5-TON A/C PACKAGED UNITS (FORCE ACCOUNT - WORK ORDER #20885) 10) REPLACE TEN CONDENSER COILS ON TEN INDIV

PROJECT COSTS

WORK NOT COMPLETED:

ITEM	CODE	NARRATIVE	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	COST
1	9999	R/R METAL ROOF HATCH (NO INVOICE)	1	LS	$ 8,900.00	$ 8,900.00
2	9999	R/R ROOF TERMINAL B,C AND BOARDING HALL	1256	SQ	$ 500.00	$ 628,000.00
3	9999	ENGINEERING, DESIGN, TESTING, PERMITTING	1	LS	$ 86,250.00	$ 86,250.00
WORK COMPLETED:						
4	9007	REPAIR FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	1	LS	$ 2,745.64	$ 2,745.64
5	9025	REPLACE/RESET FIRE ALARM PULL STATIONS	1	LS	$ 3,000.00	$ 3,000.00
6	9007	REPAIR HORN/STROBE SYSTEM	1	LS	$ 1,492.10	$ 1,492.10
7	9025	REPLACE HORN/STROBE DEVICES	1	LS	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500.00
8	9007	REPLACE 3 A/C UNIT SIDE PANEL COVERS	1	LS	$ 1,425.13	$ 1,425.13
9	9007	REPLACE 2 A/C UNIT SIDE PANEL COVERS	1	LS	$ 2,090.61	$ 2,090.61
10	9999	REPLACE TEN 5 TON CONDENSER UNITS	1	LS	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00
					TOTAL COSTS THIS SITE LOCATION	$ 745,403.48

(13)

Federal Emergency Management Agency

HAZARD MITIGATION PROPOSAL (HMP)

Declaration No.	PW#	FIPS#	Date	Category
FEMA - 1609 - DR - FL	DAD9717	086 - 99086 - 00	5/31/2006	E

APPLICANT:	County:
Port of Miami Dade County, Terminals B, C, & Boarding Hall	Miami Dade

SCOPE OF MITIGATION WORK:

Per FEMA PA Response and Recovery Policy 9526.1, dated 08/13/1998, Appendix A, Sections 2B and 2F, this facility is eligible for 406 Hazard Mitigation for up to 100% of the eligible cost of repairs. The roof structure at the Boarding Halls is lightweight concrete over metal deck; at the Terminals the roof structure is lightweight concrete fill over structural tees. Mitigation measures to include: removing the lightweight conc. fill at the Boarding Halls and the Terminal Buildings; adding 1" thk. polyisocyanurate insulation base layer board at Boarding Halls. Mitigation at Terminals and Boarding Halls to include: 3" thick polyisocyanurate insulation tapered 1/4"/foot in lieu of the in-kind lightweight concrete fill; add secondary membrane, consisting of a fully adhered coated polyester base sheet and two fully adhered premium Type IV glass plies; 180 mil thk. SBS cap sheet; and, install W.P.Hickman's Factory Mutual approved Universal Fascia and Gravel Stop System and Modular Coping System(or equal), consisting of .050" thk aluminum components w/continuous galvanized cleats for edge metals, fascias, and copings, in - lieu of the in-kind copings and fascias.

Color by applicant. Contractor formed fascias, copings, etc. shall not be used.

Install fully adhered 1" thk. polyisosyanurate insulation board over metal deck at Boarding Halls. At Terminals and Boarding Halls hot mop and fully adhere base sheet and two glass fibre roofing plies. Install 3" thk polyisocyanurate insulation, fully adhered, and at Boarding Halls use High Strength #14 screws and metal disc washers of sufficient length to penetrate both layers of insulation and metal deck. See Project Worksheet and install and fully adhere 1/2" thk. high density wood fibre recovery bd. to the insulation, and, after installing fully adhered base sheet from Project Worksheet to the recovery board, then, install remaining roofing plies from Project Worksheet. Install fully adhered cap sheet. Fascia and Coping cleats shall be set in roofing cement and be mechanically attached w/staggered stainless steel screws. Fastening schedules to be determined by licensed architect/engineer from the State of Florida. All work included in this HMP and the Project Worksheet shall carry a Miami Dade Notice of Acceptance and be installed as one system

Eligible Cost of Repairs: $625,000.00. **Hazard Mitigation Proposal (HMP):** $540,881.00. HMP is less than 100% of the eligible cost of repairs. HMP is cost effective and is technically feasible.

Item	Code	Material and/or Description	UoM	Qty	Unit Price	COST
1	9999	Add 1" thk Polyisocyanurate Base Layer At Boarding Halls	SF	22700	$ 1.03	$ 23,381.00
2	9999	Add secondary Membrane	SQ	1250	$ 96.00	$ 120,000.00
3	9999	Add 3" thick tapered Polyisocyanurate insulation	SQ	1250	$ 250.00	$ 312,500.00
4	9999	Add cap sheet	SQ	1250	$ 169.00	$ 211,250.00
5	9999	Upgrade fascias and copings	LF	1000	$ 25.00	$ 25,000.00
6	9999	Deduct: In-kind lightweight concrete fill	SF	125,000	$ (1.31)	$ (163,750.00)
7	9999	Deduct: In-kind fascias and copings	LF	1000	$ (12.50)	$ (12,500.00)
						$ -
						$ -
				TOTAL → (Not to be included in PW)		$ 515,881.00

RECOMMENDED BY *(Signature)**	AGENCY	DATE
Arnold M. Gentilezza: HM Architect	FEMA	6/2/2006
CONCURRENCE BY STATE INSPECTOR *(Signature)**	AGENCY	DATE
CONCURRENCE BY LOCAL REPRESENTATIVE (Signature)*	AGENCY	DATE

Note: *Signature by the Federal Inspector is not an approval of this work, and signature by the State and local applicant is not a commitment to perform the work.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT

STATE OF _____) ss.:

COUNTY OF _____)

THIS AGREEMENT made and entered into as of the _____ day of _____, 20__, by and between Miami-Dade County and Triple M Roofing Corp. hereinafter called the Contractor:

WITNESSETH, that the said Contractor for and in consideration of the payments hereinafter specified and agreed to be made by Miami-Dade County, hereby covenants and agrees to furnish and deliver all the materials required, to do and perform all the work and labor required to complete **Project No. 2007.007, entitled, CRUISE TERMINAL B, C & BOARDING HALL RE-ROOFING,** within the time specified, in strict and entire conformity with the Contract Documents hereinafter listed, which are hereby incorporated into this Contract by reference:

Contract Documents: Conformed Contract Specifications and Drawings

The Contractor agrees to make payment of all proper charges for labor and materials required in the aforementioned work, and to defend, indemnify and save harmless Miami-Dade County and all its officers and agents against and from all suits and costs of every kind and description, and from all damages to which the said Miami-Dade County or any of its officers and agents may be put, by reason of injury or death to persons or injury to property of others resulting from the performance of said work, or through the negligence of the Contractor, or through any improper or defective machinery, implements or appliances used by the Contractor in the aforesaid work, or through any act or omission on the part of the Contractor, or his agent or agents, employees or servants.

The Contractor agrees that the requirements of this contract are reasonable and achievable.

The Contractor further agrees that the Rates of Wages for all laborers, mechanics and apprentices employed by the Contractor or any Subcontractor shall be not less than the prevailing rate of wages for similar skills or classifications, all in accordance with Section 215.19, Florida Statutes, which said Section is hereby incorporated into this Contract by reference, or in accordance with the decision of the Secretary of Labor of the United States Department of Labor, as applicable and all provisions thereof shall be strictly complied with by the Contractor and his Subcontractors.

In consideration of the premises, Miami-Dade County hereby agrees to pay to the Contractor for said work, when fully completed, the total sum of Three million, two hundred twenty thousand, two hundred forty-two dollars and fifty-four cents ($3,220,242.54), being the amount obtained from either the aggregate lump sum prices, the application of unit prices to the quantities shown in the Bid Form or the combination of both.

The total sum is subject to such additions and deductions as may be provided for in the Contract Documents.

Payments on account will be made as provided for in the Contract Documents.

In Witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this Contract to be executed by their appropriate officials, as of the date first above written.

(OFFICIAL SEAL)

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
BY ITS BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS

ATTEST:

HARVEY RUVIN, CLERK

By:_____
Deputy Clerk

By:_____
County Manager

Approved by County Attorney
as to Form and Legal Sufficiency _____

When Contractor is an individual:

_____ By _____
Witness (Signature of individual)

_____ _____
Witness (printed name of individual)

_____

_____
(address)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

STATE OF _____)ss.:

COUNTY OF _____)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO (or affirmed) before me on _____
(Date)

by _____. He / She is personally known to
(Affiant)

me or has presented _____ as identification.
(Type of Identification)

_____ _____
(Signature of Notary) (Serial Number)

_____ _____
(Print or Stamp Name of Notary) (Expiration Date)

Notary Public _____
(State)

Notary Seal:

When Contractor is a sole proprietorship or operates under a trade name:

_____
(printed name of firm)

_____ By: _____
Witness (signature of individual)

_____ _____
Witness (printed name of individual)

_____

_____
(address)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

STATE OF _____) ss:

COUNTY OF _____)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO (or affirmed) before me on _____
(Date)

by _____. He / She is personally known to me
(Affiant)

or has presented _____ as identification.
(Type of Identification)

_____ _____
(Signature of Notary) (Serial Number)

_____ _____
(Print or Stamp Name of Notary) (Expiration Date)

Notary Public _____
(State)

Notary Seal:

When Contractor is a partnership:

_____
(printed name of partnership)

_____
Witness

By _____
(signature of partner)

_____
Witness

_____
(printed name of partner)

_____

_____
(address)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

STATE OF _____) ss.:

COUNTY OF _____)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO (or affirmed) before me on _____
(Date)

by _____. He / She is personally known to me
(Affiant)

or has presented _____ as identification.
(Type of Identification)

_____ _____
(Signature of Notary) (Serial Number)

_____ _____
(Print or Stamp Name of Notary) (Expiration Date)

Notary Public _____
(State)

Notary Seal:

When Contractor is a corporation:

(CORPORATE SEAL)

TRIPLE M ROOFING CORP.
(printed name of corporation)

New York
(printed state of incorporation)

By: _____
(signature of president or vice-president & capacity)

By: Thomas J. Milanese, President
(printed name of president or vice-president & capacity)

By: _____
(signature of secretary or assistant secretary & capacity)

Peter Milanese, Secretary
(printed name of secretary or assistant secretary & capacity)

914 NW 19 Avenue

Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33311
(business address of corporation)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

STATE OF Florida) ss.:

COUNTY OF Broward)

Before me personally appeared Thomas J. Milanese as President, to me well known or has presented _____ as
(Type of Identification)
identification and Peter Milanese, as Secretary, to me well known or has presented _____ a
(Type of Identification)
identification and known to me to be the individuals described in and who executed the foregoing instrument as Thomas Milanese President and Peter Milanese Secretary of the above named Triple M Roofing Corp a Corporation, and severally acknowledged that they executed such instrument as President and _____ Secretary, respectively, of said corporation, and that the seal affixed to the foregoing instrument is the corporate seal of said corporation and that it was affixed to said instrument by due and regular corporate authority, and said instrument is the free act and deed of said corporation.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO (or affirmed) before me on 2.20.08
(Date)

by Thomas J. Milanese. He / ~~She~~ is personally known to me.
(Affiant)

or has presented _____ as identification.
(Type of Identification)

(Signature of Notary) DD 494189 (Serial Number)

Nancy Niblock 12.06.09

(Print or Stamp Name of Notary) (Expiration Date)

Notary Public Florida
(State)

Notary Seal:

NANCY NIBLOCK
MY COMMISSION # DD 494189
EXPIRES: December 6, 2009
Bonded Thru Notary Public Underwriters

When Contractor is a joint venture:

_____
(printed name of joint venture)

_____

_____
(business address of joint venture)

Note: Complete in accordance with Article 10 of the Instructions to Bidders.

PROJECT TITLE: CRUISE TERMINAL B, C & BOARDING HALL RE-ROOFING – PROJECT NO. 2007.007

IF THIS PROPOSAL IS ACCEPTED, THE UNDERSIGNED BIDDER AGREES TO COMPLETE ALL WORK UNDER THIS CONTRACT WITHIN SIX (6) MONTHS AFTER THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF NOTICE TO PROCEED.

Item No.	Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Total Price
1.	Mobilization	1	LS	$ 150,000.	$ 150,000.
2.	Demolition and tear off of existing roof system down to substrate including disposal of debris and hoisting.	1,320	SQ	$ 219.70	$ 290,004.00 ~~290,000.~~
3.	Install vapor barrier consisting on both concrete and steel decks including disposal of debris and hoisting.	1,320	SQ	$ 314.39	$ 414,994.80 ~~415,000.~~
4.	Install new roof system and cap sheet including disposal of debris and hoisting. (Less Tapered Insulation)	1,320	SQ	$ 1,074.	$ 1,417,680.00 ~~1,417,700.~~
4A.	Tapered Insulation	90,000	SF	$ 2.63	$ 236,700.
5.	Install coping cap, metal fascia, gutters, downspouts, and plumbing stacks.	1	LS	$ 115,000.	$ 115,000.
6.	Remove air conditioning units, replace with new air conditioning stands and reconnect air conditioning units to original working conditions.	14	EA	$ 2,500.	$ 35,000.
7.	Concrete Restoration	1,140	SF	$ 10.00	$ 11,400.
8.	Steel Deck Restoration	175	SF	$ 10.00	$ 1,750.
9.	Exhaust Fan Code Upgrades	9	EA	$ 500.	$ 4,500.
10.	A/C Curbs Code Upgrades	8	EA	$ 5,000.	$ 40,000.
				BASE BID TOTAL	$ 2,717,028.80 ~~2,717,050.00~~

Contingency Allowance* (10% of Base Bid) $ 271,702.88 ~~271,705.~~

Dedicated Allowance Account for Permits* (1% of Base Bid) $ 27,170.29 ~~27,150.~~

Dedicated Allowance Account for Bonds and Insurance* (2% of Base Bid) $ 54,340.58 ~~54,341.~~

Dedicated Allowance Account for New A/C Units* $ 150,000.00

*For explanation of the Allowance Accounts see Contract Conditions, paragraph 1.07.

GRAND TOTAL (Base bid plus allowance accounts) $ 3,220,242.54 ~~3,220,266.00~~

TOTAL BID PRICE, THE SUM OF Three Million Two Hundred Twenty Thousand Two Hundred ~~Sixtysix.....~~ FORTY-TWO AND FIFTY-FOUR CENTS

$ 3,220,242.54 ~~3,220,266.00~~

46

THE BIDDER UNDERSTANDS AND AGREES THAT THE ABOVE GRAND TOTAL IS INCLUSIVE OF ALL WORK NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THE WORK AS DESCRIBED IN THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, AND IF THIS PROPOSAL IS ACCEPTED, THE UNDERSIGNED BIDDER AGREES TO ENTER INTO AND EXECUTE THE CONTRACT WITH THE NECESSARY BOND AND ACCEPT THE ABOVE TOTAL PRICE AS FULL COMPENSATION FOR THE WORK PERFORMED UNDER THIS CONTRACT.

D. C. CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCY NO. CCC1328254 BIDDER'S NAME TRIPLE M ROOFING CORP

BIDDER'S TELEPHONE NUMBER (954) 524-7000 BIDDER'S ADDRESS 914 NW 19 Avenue Ft.Lauderdale, FL 33311

M.Q.

When Bidder is a Corporation:

In witness whereof, the Bidder hereto has executed this Bid Form this 6 day of February 20 08.

TRIPLE M ROOFING CORP
(Printed name of Corporation)

New York
(Printed State of Incorporation)

(CORPORATE SEAL) By: [signature]
(Signature of President or Vice-President & capacity)

Peter Milanese
(Printed name of Secretary or Assistant Secretary & capacity)

914 NW 19 Avenue
(Business Address of Corporation)

Ft. Lauderdale, FL /3311

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

STATE of Florida)ss.:

COUNTY of Broward)

Before me personally appeared Thomas J. Milanese, as President, to me well known or has presented _____ as
(Type of Identification)

identification and Peter Milanese, as Secretary, to me well known, or has presented _____ as
(Type of Identification)

identification and known to me to be the person described in and who executed the foregoing instrument as Thomas J. Milanese President and Peter Milanese as Secretary of the above name Triple M Roofing Corp a Corporation, and severally acknowledged that they executed such instrument as such _____ President and _____ Secretary, respectively, of said corporation, and that the seal affixed to the foregoing instrument is the corporate seal of said corporation and that it was affixed to said instrument by due and regular corporate authority, and said instrument is the free act and deed of said corporation.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO (or affirmed) before me on 2.6.08 (Date) by Thomas J. Milanese (Affiant)

He/She is personally known to me or has presented _____ as identification (Type of Identification)

Notary Public _____ (Signature of Notary) DD494189 (Serial Number) 12.06.09 (Expiration Date) FL (State)

Nancy Niblock
(Print or Stamp Name of Notary)

Notary Seal:

NANCY NIBLOCK
MY COMMISSION # DD 494189
EXPIRES: December 6, 2009
Bonded Thru Notary Public Underwriters

84