OFFICIAL FILE COPY
CLERK OF THE BOARD
OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

Memorandum

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

Date: September 3, 2014

To: Honorable Chairwoman Rebeca Sosa
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

Agenda Item No. 8(F)(3)

From: Carlos A. Gimenez
Mayor

Subject: Recommendation to Reject: Development and Operation of Haulover Pier, Restaurant and Beach Concession

Resolution No. R-750-14

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of County Commissioners (Board) approve the rejection of the sole proposal received in response to RFP No. 844, *Development and Operation of Haulover Pier, Restaurant and Beach Concession*. The County issued a solicitation on behalf of Parks, Recreation, and Open Spaces (PROS) to obtain proposals from qualified firms to seek a developer and operator for a restaurant, pier and beach concession on Haulover Park beachfront property. The selected proposer would provide food service, ancillary retail, recreational fishing, pier events and beach operations to increase public use and establish a high-level of customer service and quality at a proposed development.

The County received one proposal in response to the RFP from Wave House Miami, LLC. An Evaluation/Selection Committee reviewed the sole proposal and held an oral presentation following the guidelines published in the solicitation. After the oral presentation, based on guidance from PROS, the Evaluation/Selection Committee elected to reject the proposal. The Evaluation/Selection Committee recommends rejection of the sole proposer for the following reasons:

1. The sole Proposer relied on a site plan that far exceeded the prescribed boundaries for the project, causing significant impact to other infrastructure.
2. The proposed restaurant was overshadowed by the aquatic features such that the principal restaurant was only a secondary part of the development.
3. The size of the proposed pool necessitated significant modifications to beach parking that were not acceptable.
4. The Proposer did not accept that they would have to bear the costs associated with Phase 3 of the Pier development.

A copy of the Evaluation/Selection Committee Report dated May 7, 2014 is attached. A replacement solicitation is being prepared with modifications to advise potential proposers that the development will be confined basically to the described area and that the development sought is principally a restaurant with pier-related activities and a beach concession.

Scope

The impact of this item would have been limited to PROS.

Fiscal Impact/Funding Source

While this is a rejection of all proposals, it is expected that upon re-solicitation and award, this will be a revenue-generating contract to the County.

Track Record/Monitor

The contract manager is Kevin Asher, Special Projects Manager, PROS. Andrew Zawoyski, CPPO, of the Internal Services Department is the Procurement Contracting Officer.

Vendors Not Recommended for Award

A Request for Proposals was issued under full and open competition on July 26, 2013. One firm responded to the solicitation. The Evaluation/Selection Committee recommended to reject the sole proposer.

Proposer	Reason for Not Recommending
Wave House Miami, LLC	Rejection of proposal

Applicable Ordinances and Contract Measures

No measures apply as this would have been a revenue-generating agreement.

Michael Spring
Senior Advisor

MEMORANDUM
(Revised)

TO: Honorable Chairwoman Rebeca Sosa
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

DATE: September 3, 2014

FROM: R. A. Cuevas, Jr.
County Attorney

SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 8(F)(3)

Please note any items checked.

_____ **"3-Day Rule" for committees applicable if raised**

_____ **6 weeks required between first reading and public hearing**

_____ **4 weeks notification to municipal officials required prior to public hearing**

_____ **Decreases revenues or increases expenditures without balancing budget**

_____ **Budget required**

_____ **Statement of fiscal impact required**

_____ **Ordinance creating a new board requires detailed County Mayor's report for public hearing**

_____ **No committee review**

_____ **Applicable legislation requires more than a majority vote (i.e., 2/3's ____, 3/5's ____, unanimous _____) to approve**

_____ **Current information regarding funding source, index code and available balance, and available capacity (if debt is contemplated) required**

Approved _____ Mayor
Veto _____
Override _____

Agenda Item No. 8(F)(3)
9-3-14

RESOLUTION NO. R-750-14

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE TO REJECT SOLE PROPOSAL RECEIVED FOR THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS TO OBTAIN A DEVELOPER AND OPERATOR OF A RESTAURANT, PIER AND BEACH CONCESSION AT HAULOVER BEACH RFP NO. 844

WHEREAS, this Board desires to accomplish the purposes outlined in the accompanying memorandum, a copy of which is incorporated herein by reference,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, that this Board approves the rejection of the sole proposal received for Request for Proposals No. 844 for a developer and operator of a restaurant, pier and beach concession at Haulover Beach.

The foregoing resolution was offered by Commissioner **Sally A. Heyman**, who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Commissioner **Lynda Bell** and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

	Rebeca Sosa, Chairwoman		**aye**
	Lynda Bell, Vice Chair		**aye**
Bruno A. Barreiro	**absent**	Esteban L. Bovo, Jr.	**aye**
Jose "Pepe" Diaz	**absent**	Audrey M. Edmonson	**aye**
Sally A. Heyman	**aye**	Barbara J. Jordan	**aye**
Jean Monestime	**aye**	Dennis C. Moss	**aye**
Sen. Javier D. Souto	**aye**	Xavier L. Suarez	**absent**
Juan C. Zapata	**aye**		

The Chairperson thereupon declared the resolution duly passed and adopted this 3rd day of September, 2014. This resolution shall become effective ten (10) days after the date of its adoption unless vetoed by the Mayor, and if vetoed, shall become effective only upon an override by this Board.

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

HARVEY RUVIN, CLERK

By: Christopher Agrippa
Deputy Clerk

Approved by County Attorney as
to form and legal sufficiency. MAG

Miguel A. Gonzalez

Memorandum

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

Date: May 7, 2014

To: Lester Sola
Director
Internal Services Department

Thru: Miriam Singer, CPPO
Assistant Director
Internal Services Department

From: Andrew Zawoyski
Chief Negotiator,
Chairperson, Evaluation/Selection Committee

Subject: Report of Evaluation/Selection Committee to reject sole proposal received for RFP No. 844 - Development and Operation of Haulover Pier, Restaurant and Beach Concession

---

The County issued a solicitation to obtain proposals from qualified firms to obtain a developer and operator of a restaurant, pier and beach concession on the Haulover Park beachfront property. The selected Proposer would provide food service, ancillary retail, recreational fishing and pier events and beach operations to increase public use and establish a high-level of customer service and quality at a proposed restaurant.

The Evaluation/Selection Committee (Committee) has completed the evaluation of the sole proposal submitted in response to the solicitation following the guidelines published in the solicitation.

Committee meeting dates: 10-21-13, 11-4-13, 12-2-13, 1-21-14, 4-23-14.

Verification of compliance with contract measures:
Not applicable. No contract measures were assigned to this solicitation.

Verification of compliance with minimum qualification requirements:
The solicitation does not have any minimum qualification requirements.

Local Certified Service-Disabled Veteran's Business Enterprise Preference:
The sole Proposer does not qualify for Veteran's Preference.

Summary of scores:

The preliminary score of the sole proposal was as follows:

Pre-Oral Presentations

Proposer	*Technical Score (max.400)*	*Price Score (max.100)*	*Total Score (max.500)*
1. Wave House Miami, LLC	282.4	71	353.4

During the evaluation of the sole proposal, the Committee, along with technical committee members expressed concerns with the proposal as submitted. The major issues dealt with the introduction of a "wave" pool (a simulated surfing facility) and its impact on the Haulover design guidelines and parking. After discussion, the Committee decided to hold oral presentations and prepared a list of questions for the Proposer to address pertaining issues with the proposal. Price proposals were reviewed in consideration with the technical proposals.

During the oral presentation the Committee addressed the questions as prepared by the Committee (the questions are attached as Attachment 1). Following discussion, the Committee requested that the Proposer submit a revised preliminary design rendering addressing the concerns raised by the Committee. The main issues included a lack of adherence to the Haulover design guidelines, parking and the introduction of the wave pool, which exceeded the intended prescribed boundaries for the project.

The Proposer submitted three revised design options on January 10, 2014. The options were reviewed and discussed at the evaluation meeting of January 21, 2014. The options, while different iterations, did not sufficiently address the main issues as stated above. The Committee decided to seek guidance from the Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces (PROS) Department to evaluate if the proposal as submitted, with options, met the intent of the RFP and the Haulover design guidelines (the guidance request is attached as Attachment 2).

The Committee received a response from the PROS Director on April 1, 2014 (copy attached) addressing concerns about the proposed design. The Director stated that the wave pool was never in the park nor intended by the plan. The Committee met on April 23, 2014 and discussed the matter. The Committee voted to reject the sole proposal and reissue the solicitation.

Scoring after the oral presentation was not performed as the Committee's recommendation was to reject the sole proposal.

Justification for Recommendation:
The Committee rejected the sole proposer for the following reasons:

1. The sole Proposer relied on a site plan that far exceeded the prescribed boundaries for the project, causing significant impact to other infrastructure.
2. The proposed restaurant was overshadowed by the aquatic features such that the principal restaurant was only a secondary part of the development.
3. The size of the proposed pool necessitated significant modifications to beach parking that were not acceptable to PROS.
4. The Proposer did not accept that they would have to bear the costs associated with Phase 3 of the Pier development.

Copies of the score sheets with preliminary scores are attached for each Committee member, as well as a composite score sheet (see Attachment 3).

Attachments

Approved

Lester Sola
Director

5/8/14
Date

RFP No. 844

Development and Operation of Haulover Pier, Restaurant, and Beach Concession

Questions to Proposer for Oral Presentations

1. Section 2.3 #12 describes a Wave House facility.
   - Given the RFP focus on the historic park, and the inclusion of beach, surf and fishing in the facility, what will make Wave House a Haulover Park/Miami experience?
   - Describe how the proposed restaurant design for the Wave House facility is consistent with Haulover design guidelines?
   - What are the proposed fees for the related recreational amenities?

2. Section 2.3 #12 speaks of "Revenues generated from multiple restaurant".
   - Is there more than one operating restaurant, or are there only different seating zone areas within one large restaurant? The RFP allowed for only "one" restaurant.
   - Given guidelines in the RFP, what is the total square footage dedicated to the restaurant(s), including both indoor and outdoor areas?
   - What food choices will be offered?
   - Describe the restaurant experience and explain why only one chef and sous chef will be required?
   - What are the hours of operation for the different venues?
   - Confirm how restaurant operation will not be confused with a night club?

3. Section 2.3 Pier and Beach Concessions. The Proposal envisions a different jetty configuration than the one currently under consideration.
   - Provide an illustration and/or rendering of this different configuration for review.
   - Is the Proposer suggesting that its development proposal and/or financial return are reliant on such modifications?
   - Is the Proposer suggesting that placing a mooring just outside of the surf line is tied to its development proposals and/or financial return?
   - What is the purpose of the mooring line outside the surf line, to temporarily secure a recreational vessel?
   - Does Proposer anticipate any problems with obtaining permit(s)?
   - How does Proposer propose to safely transport boaters from a mooring buoy to the facility?
   - What is the proposed role of the Wave Loch surf boat?
   - How does Proposer plan on accommodating both beach soccer league and public play on this section of beach?
   - How does Proposer plan on operating/controlling a Jet Ski operation on the beach and alongside the "Cut"?

- How does Proposer envision storing beach furniture to allow for regular beach maintenance?
- Provide examples of proposed sightseeing activities listed in the Proposal?

4. Section 2.3 Retail.
   - What other retail experiences beside surf shop will Wave House Miami offer?
   - Does Proposer plan on sub-letting any portion of the facility operation?

5. Section 2.3 Environment speaks to the impacts of the proposed facility.
   - What specific measures are to be taken so that proposed activities, especially certain seasonal night time activities, do not impact the loggerhead turtles?
   - What would the hours of operation be for live entertainment?
   - What are the maximum decibel levels for the Flo rider and wave pool?
   - How will the noise from the music/pools be buffered from the surrounding areas?
   - Does Wave House have experience with storms (South Florida type), have these been taken into consideration and does Proposer have a recovery plan?

6. Section 2.3 #14 Cost Estimate does not seem to adequately address parking. The RFP required that the Proposer include sufficient parking for existing beach users, as well as new restaurant visitors.
   - What is the capacity of the facility as proposed?
   - What is the total number of parking spaces that will be available to visitors to this area and does it meet code requirements for this type of venue.
   - What is Proposer's traffic control and parking plan on holiday and event week-ends when the Park is full?
   - Does Proposer anticipate turning patrons away on those week-ends?
   - Does Proposer envision a shuttle service from other Haulover parking lots or will Proposer construct a parking deck nearby for additional parking?
   - Has the Proposal and Cost Estimate sufficiently reflected the physical size and capital expense associated with this requirement?
   - Although specifics are still unknown, why did the Proposer omit entirely certain costs associated with Phase 3 of the Pier?

7. Section 2.3 #16 Renderings show a large surf pool not originally contemplated in the RFP.
   - How will the Proposer address the displacement and reduction of parking due to the pool?

8. Section 2.4 #22-2.5 Project exceptions includes language attesting that the Proposer will only be responsible for Phase 3 of the Pier if it is not required to participate in its funding. The RFP was very clear in requiring on Page 11 that "the Proposer will later be responsible for constructing,

along with a majority of public funding, the remaining deep-water portion of the Pier, extending from the end of the reconstructed jetty (Phase 2) to the end of the Pier."

- Is the Proposer intending to ignore this requirement completely knowing it may be grounds for declaring this Proposal non-responsive.
- Alternatively, can the Proposer show how use of the proposed 2% capital improvement fund could provide its share of Pier funding?

9. Section 2.4 #22-2.5 D2 Parking speaks to the issue of valet parking. All public parking relies on paying a parking fee at one of two different toll buildings.
   - Does the Proposal not accept that all parties, except for staff, employees, vendors, etc., will have to pay parking fees, or is it asking that they have the authority to charge an additional valet fee?

10. Section 2.4 #22-2.4 Project location speaks to the issue of the one-acre restaurant location now having an additional two-acre surf pool location.
    - Please explain in detail why a wave pool was proposed?
    - Is the Proposer suggesting that the pool is essential to the success of the restaurant?
    - What wave pool size options are available for "Wave Loch Surf Pools"?

11. Section 2.5 Form B-1 Payment and Proposal Schedule speaks to the issue of Rent.
    - Explain why the Rent proposal only addresses the one acre restaurant parcel and not the additional two acre surf pool area?
    - Will the Proposer pay for an open MAI appraisal to properly establish the market rate rental value of the additional property supporting the pool to guide both parties?

12. Section 2.5 Form B-1 Financial Return to the County provides a spreadsheet illustrating the total net rent inclusive of Capital Improvement Reserve.
    - Why are the revenues and expenses for Year 1 so much lower than Year 2?
    - Can the Proposer explain how the CIR works and how it advances development to approved General Plan for the Park?
    - Explain how the "Annual Capital Offset" for capital improvements will be calculated and whether the County will be have any say in what capital improvements should be made.

Zawoyski, Andrew S. (ISD)

From: Asher, Kevin (MDPR)
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2014 3:42 PM
To: Zawoyski, Andrew S. (ISD)
Subject: FW: Wave House Miami - Haulover

fyi

Kevin Asher, AICP, Manager, Special Projects
Miami-Dade County
Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department
275 NW 2 Street, Ste. 542
Miami, FL 33128
305-755-7901 (T) 305-755-7940 (Fax)
kevina@miamidade.gov
"Delivering Excellence Every Day"

From: Navarrete, George (MDPR)
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2014 7:47 AM
To: Asher, Kevin (MDPR)
Cc: Brant, Marlen (MDPR)
Subject: FW: Wave House Miami - Haulover

Please proceed as per Jack's direction.

From: Kardys, Jack (MDPR)
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2014 6:38 AM
To: Asher, Kevin (MDPR); Navarrete, George (MDPR)
Subject: Wave House Miami

Here are my thoughts----I have read all of the backup you have provided and still consider this as a project that is driven primarily by water features as featured prominently in all of their operations around the world. The lighting systems on the surf rider features and the potential for noise and disruption of the tranquility of the Park by the intensity required to make this work is of concern to me. Even in my days as a kid hanging out on the surfing wall in the 70s and 80s, it was a quiet place save the car stereos in the parking lot where the parties were held. In fact the closing of the park at night under the bridge back in the 90's was driven by that very dynamic where people where too loud and disrupted the condos and homes on the Bal Harbour side.

I also share your concern that the pier piece is a part of this proposal and may not be revisited in the future by other potential vendors if we go back out to bid. But a choice of 1 is really not a choice, given the tradeoffs I see and anticipate. I would prefer to go back out, try it again and exclude these water features in the scope and go for something that fits the park plan better and ties into the promenade and pier concept without the Coney Island feel that I'm sure will rankle the neighbors and create a dynamic after hours that was never in the park nor intended by the plan as it was written.

Jack Kardys, Director
Miami-Dade County
Parks, Recreation, and Open Spaces
www.miamidade.gov/parks
305-755-7903

RFP NO. 844
DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HAULOVER PIER, RESTAURANT AND BEACH CONCESSION
EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Composite

SELECTION CRITERIA / PROPOSERS	Maximum Points Per Member	Maximum Total Points (5 members)	Wave House Miami LLC
Project Objectives, related to public benefit, aesthetics, economics and environmental benefits, will clearly and positively advance the improvement of the Park.	15	75	54.4
The Project approach, site plan and renderings imaginatively create a destination that complies with existing site constraints and development guidelines and any phased development cost and schedule can reasonably be accomplished.	30	150	103
The experience and qualifications of Proposer and its Development and Operations/Management Teams - suited to design, construct and operate the various venues proposed.	20	100	75
The financial feasibility of the Proposer and the Project.	15	75	50
Total Technical Points	**80**	**400**	**282.4**
The financial return to the County is consistent with County expectations.	20	100	71
Total Price Points	**20**	**100**	**71**
TOTAL POINTS	**100**	**500**	**353.4**

Signature: [illegible] 5/1/14
Chairperson DATE

[illegible] 5/1/14
Reviewed By DATE

5/1/2014

RFP NO. 844

DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HAULOVER PIER, RESTAURANT AND BEACH CONCESSION

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Michele Raymond (MDAD)

SELECTION CRITERIA / PROPOSERS	Maximum Points Per Member	Wave House Miami LLC
Project Objectives, related to public benefit, aesthetics, economics and environmental benefits, will clearly and positively advance the improvement of the Park.	15	6.4
The Project approach, site plan and renderings imaginatively create a destination that complies with existing site constraints and development guidelines and any phased development cost and schedule can reasonably be accomplished.	30	23
The experience and qualifications of Proposer and its Development and Operations/Management Teams - suited to design, construct and operate the various venues proposed.	20	15
The financial feasibility of the Proposer and the Project.	15	6
Total Technical Points	**80**	**50.4**
The financial return to the County is consistent with County expectations.	20	14
Total Price Points	**20**	**14**
TOTAL POINTS	**100**	**64.4**

RFP NO. 844
DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HAULOVER PIER, RESTAURANT AND BEACH CONCESSION
EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Mark Milisits (City of Miami Beach)

SELECTION CRITERIA / PROPOSERS	Maximum Points Per Member	Wave House Miami LLC
Project Objectives, related to public benefit, aesthetics, economics and environmental benefits, will clearly and positively advance the improvement of the Park.	15	12
The Project approach, site plan and renderings imaginatively create a destination that complies with existing site constraints and development guidelines and any phased development cost and schedule can reasonably be accomplished.	30	22
The experience and qualifications of Proposer and its Development and Operations/Management Teams - suited to design, construct and operate the various venues proposed.	20	18
The financial feasibility of the Proposer and the Project.	15	12
Total Technical Points	**80**	**64**
The financial return to the County is consistent with County expectations.	20	15
Total Price Points	**20**	**15**
TOTAL POINTS	**100**	**79**

RFP NO. 844
DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HAULOVER PIER, RESTAURANT AND BEACH CONCESSION
EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Elva Marin (ISD)

SELECTION CRITERIA / PROPOSERS	Maximum Points Per Member	Wave House Miami LLC
Project Objectives, related to public benefit, aesthetics, economics and environmental benefits, will clearly and positively advance the improvement of the Park.	15	9
The Project approach, site plan and renderings imaginatively create a destination that complies with existing site constraints and development guidelines and any phased development cost and schedule can reasonably be accomplished.	30	18
The experience and qualifications of Proposer and its Development and Operations/Management Teams - suited to design, construct and operate the various venues proposed.	20	12
The financial feasibility of the Proposer and the Project.	15	10
Total Technical Points	**80**	**49**
The financial return to the County is consistent with County expectations.	20	10
Total Price Points	**20**	**10**
TOTAL POINTS	**100**	**59**

RFP NO. 844
DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HAULOVER PIER, RESTAURANT AND BEACH CONCESSION
EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Kevin Asher (PROS)

SELECTION CRITERIA / PROPOSERS	Maximum Points Per Member	Wave House Miami LLC
Project Objectives, related to public benefit, aesthetics, economics and environmental benefits, will clearly and positively advance the improvement of the Park.	15	15
The Project approach, site plan and renderings imaginatively create a destination that complies with existing site constraints and development guidelines and any phased development cost and schedule can reasonably be accomplished.	30	25
The experience and qualifications of Proposer and its Development and Operations/Management Teams - suited to design, construct and operate the various venues proposed.	20	15
The financial feasibility of the Proposer and the Project.	15	10
Total Technical Points	**80**	**65**
The financial return to the County is consistent with County expectations.	20	15
Total Price Points	**20**	**15**
TOTAL POINTS	**100**	**80**

RFP NO. 844
DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HAULOVER PIER, RESTAURANT AND BEACH CONCESSION
EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Tom Morgan (PROS)

SELECTION CRITERIA / PROPOSERS	Maximum Points Per Member	Wave House Miami LLC
Project Objectives, related to public benefit, aesthetics, economics and environmental benefits, will clearly and positively advance the improvement of the Park.	15	12
The Project approach, site plan and renderings imaginatively create a destination that complies with existing site constraints and development guidelines and any phased development cost and schedule can reasonably be accomplished.	30	15
The experience and qualifications of Proposer and its Development and Operations/Management Teams - suited to design, construct and operate the various venues proposed.	20	15
The financial feasibility of the Proposer and the Project.	15	12
Total Technical Points	**80**	**54**
The financial return to the County is consistent with County expectations.	20	17
Total Price Points	**20**	**17**
TOTAL POINTS	**100**	**71**

Memorandum

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

Date: October 15, 2013

To: Those Listed Below

From: Carlos A. Gimenez
Mayor

Subject: Appointment of Selection Committee for Miami-Dade Park, Recreation and Open Spaces Department Request for Proposals (RFP) for Development and Operation of Haulover Pier, Restaurant and Beach Concession – RFP No. 844

In accordance with Administrative Order 3-34, I am hereby appointing those listed below as the Selection Committee for Miami- Dade Park, Recreation and Open Spaces Department Request for Proposals (RFP) for Development and Operation of Haulover Pier, Restaurant and Beach Concession – RFP No. 844:

Selection Committee
Andrew Zawoyski, ISD (Non-Voting Chairperson)
Elva Marin, ISD
Kevin Asher, PROS
Tom Morgan, PROS
Michele Raymond, MDAD
Mark Milisits, City of Miami Beach
Adrian Songer, MDAD (Alternate)

Technical Advisors
Debra Tavera, PROS
Jon Seaman, PROS
Janeen Feiger, PROS
Kathy Haley, PROS

You are directed to assist me in the selection process considering the factors delineated in the solicitation. If you are unable to participate in the selection process, contact this office through Small Business Development (SBD) by memorandum from your department director documenting the reason why you cannot participate. Only in cases of **dire** urgency may you be excused from participation.

Each Selection Committee member shall be responsible for evaluating, rating and ranking the proposals based on the criteria and procedure contained in the solicitation. The Selection Committee will meet to review the written proposals. If required, the Selection Committee will select firms to make oral presentations to the Selection Committee at a properly noticed public hearing. If proposers are invited to make oral presentations, the Selection Committee may re-rate and re-rank the proposals based upon the written documents combined with the oral presentation. You may utilize staff of the issuing department and the using agency to conduct a preliminary review of the proposals for responsiveness. All requests for responsiveness determinations shall be made in writing by the issuing department to the County Attorney's Office.

The alternate committee member will serve only in the event of an approved substitution. No substitution of committee members shall be allowed after the first official meeting of the committee. The Internal Services Department (ISD) may substitute the chairperson to ensure the appropriate level of staffing expertise as deemed necessary to accommodate the needs of this solicitation.

Upon completion of the evaluation process, the Selection Committee Chairperson shall prepare and submit a memorandum to include a narrative of the evaluation and justification of the recommended firm(s) with attach supporting documentation which MUST include the following information:

Name of firm(s)
Quality Rating Score
Price
Adjusted Score (if applicable)
Committee's Overall Ranking

This report should be submitted to me through ISD for review and consideration.

As a matter of administrative policy and to maintain a fair and impartial process, all individuals appointed to the Selection Committee (including the Chairperson) and staff are instructed to refrain from discussing the solicitation with prospective lobbyist and/or consultants. Selection Committee members are reminded that in accordance with the Cone of Silence Ordinance 98-106, they are restrictions on communications regarding the solicitation with potential proposers, service providers, lobbyists, consultants, or any member of the County's professional staff. Violation of this policy could lead to termination of County service.

All questions must be directed to the staff contact person designated by the issuing department.

c: Lester Sola, Director, ISD
Jack Kardys, Director, PROS
Emilio Gonzalez, Director, MDAD
Jack Osterholt, Deputy Mayor/Director, RER
Veronica Clark, Assistant to the Director, SBD/RER

Selection Committee
Andrew Zawoyski, ISD (Non-Voting Chairperson)
Elva Marin, ISD
Kevin Asher, PROS
Tom Morgan, PROS
Michele Raymond, MDAD
Mark Milisits, City of Miami Beach
Adrian Songer, MDAD (Alternate)

Technical Advisors
Debra Tavera, PROS
Jon Seaman, PROS
Janeen Feiger, PROS
Kathy Haley, PROS

SELECTION COMMITTEE
MIAMI-DADE PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACES DEPARTMENT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HAULOVER PIER,
RESTURANT AND BEACH CONCESSION

RFP NO. 844

Committee Member/ Title	Department	Start Year With County	Ethnicity/ Gender	Education	Professional License(s)/ Certification(s)	Telephone #
Andrew Zawoyski (Non-Voting Chairperson)	ISD	---	---	---	---	305-375-5663
Elva Marin Real Estate Manager	ISD	1990	Hispanic Female	Master of Business Administration; Bachelor of Science in Design	Real Estate	305-375-5754
Kevin Asher Supervisor, Special Projects	PROS	2002	White Male	Master's in Natural Resources Development; Bachelor's in Zoology	American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP)	305-755-7901
Tom Morgan Coastal Operations Manager	PROS	1991	White Male	Master's in Parks and Recreation; Bachelor's in Sports Administration	Restricted Pesticides License	305-947-3525
Michele Raymond Chief	MDAD	1993	Black Female	Master of Science in Aeronautical/Aviation Safety; Bachelor of Science in Transportation Technology	Real Estate	305-876-0367
Mark Milisits Real Estate Leasing Specialist	City of Miami Beach	---	White Male	Bachelor of Science in Agriculture	Real Estate Broker License	305-673-7193
Adrian Songer Contracts Manager (Alternate)	MDAD	1990	White Male	Bachelor of Science in Management and Administration	Real Estate (Broker Associate)	305-876-7175
TECHNICAL ADVISORS						
Debra Tavera Parks Business Specialist 3	PROS	2010	Hispanic Female	Master's in Public Administration	None	305-755-5459
Jon Seaman Contract Manager	PROS	1997	White Male	Master's in Public Administration; Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Science	Real Estate License	305-755-7974
Janeen Feiger PROS Business Specialist 1	PROS	2004	White Female	Master's in Comparative Sociology	None	305-755-7984
Kathleen Haley Manager, Marina Operations	PROS	2001	White Female	Master of Science in Education	None	305-755-7939