

MINUTES OF MEETING
SIX MILE CREEK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Six Mile Creek Community Development District was held on Wednesday, January 20, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. at the Offices of Governmental Management Services, 475 West Town Place, Suite 114, St. Augustine, Florida 32092.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Chris Kuhn	Chairman
Grady Miars	Vice Chairman (by phone)
Chris O'Bannon	Supervisor
Rose Bock	Supervisor
Mike Veazey	Supervisor

Also present were:

Jim Oliver	District Manager
Wes Haber	District Counsel
Zack Brecht	District Engineer

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order

Mr. Oliver called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Audience Comments

There were no audience members in attendance.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes of the December 16, 2015 Meeting

Mr. Oliver stated included in your agenda package is a copy of the minutes of the December 16, 2015 meeting. Are there any additions, corrections or deletions?

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Ms. Bock with all in favor the Minutes of the December 16, 2015 Meeting were approved.
--

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Items Related Reissuance of Bonds

- A. Consideration of Preliminary Supplemental Assessment Methodology for 2016 Bonds**

- B. Consideration of Preliminary Supplemental Engineer’s Report for the 2016 Bonds**
- C. Consideration of Resolution 2016-03, Declaring Special Assessments**
- D. Consideration of Resolution 2016-04, Setting a Public Hearing Date on Special Assessments**

These items were tabled.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of First Amendment to Construction Easement

Mr. Haber stated as the board may recall, we recently awarded a contract for the construction of an amenity center. The District has a construction easement over the entire project but when we went back and looked at that construction easement, we noticed that the exhibit to the construction easement that identifies the improvements that the District is authorized to construct on the property didn’t include the amenity center because the engineer’s report was amended at a later date to include the amenity center, so we wanted to update the construction easement to include a more recent version of the engineer’s report to make it explicitly clear that amenity facilities were included in the improvements that the District can construct on the property. There were also a few clean up items. There was a scrivener’s error as it relates to the type of LLC that the Developer was. There was also a blank in the version related to the expiration date of the easement, which we filled in to be February 1, 2019. This form of document has been provided to Counsel for the Developer. She was fine with it.

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Mr. Veazey with all in favor the First Amendment to Construction Easement was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposal for Boundary Survey for Amenity Site

Mr. Haber stated it turns out that the site where the amenity facilities are going to be constructed will never be platted. Typically once a tract gets platted, it is defined in the plat and then it is very easy for the Developer to convey that tract to the District via deed. Because we are not going to be able to do that, we need to have a survey and a metes and bounds description of that tract created, so that way we are able to have an exhibit to a deed for the Developer to convey that tract to the District. We would like to get that prepared and the tract into the CDD’s hands in connection with the CDD’s construction of the facilities, so when it is all said and done, the CDD owns the real property on which the amenity facility is being constructed. You have a

proposal from A&J Land Surveyors to prepare the legal description and the boundary survey. You will see there are two options. One option is for the survey without showing any of the above ground improvements for \$2,000 and the second one is for \$4,500, where they would include the above ground improvements, mainly the pond, the storm structures and the utilities. In speaking with your engineer, as well as your Chair, I think the thought was to lean towards the less expensive one because we will have as-builts and other documentation on where those improvements are located.

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Mr. O'Bannon with all in favor Proposal for Boundary Survey for Amenity Site with Option 1 for \$2,000 was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposals for RFP for Phase 4 Infrastructure Construction

Mr. Brecht stated these are hard copies of the scoring criteria that we have developed based on review of the proposals that came in. We received proposals on January 11, 2016. Copies of the proposals were sent to District Counsel, the board of supervisors and the District Manager for review. We went ahead and scored each of the proposals based on the evaluation criteria that was set forth in the project manual. Based upon our scoring, we have ranked the proposers for each of the three different parts that were bid upon. You have part one, part two and part three. As far as the scoring is concerned, the lowest price and the fewest number of days were based off of mathematical formulas. 15 points were allocated for those items. The other proposers received a percentage of those points based on how their schedule or price matched up to the original.

Mr. Kuhn stated I have typically scored our proposers and then we have walked through them as a board. If the rest of the board is agreeable then we would take that approach again today. I met with Zack and Scott on Monday of this week and then we met again this morning. We have gone through these in some detail and are comfortable with our opinion of how the scoring should roll out. I would be happy to share our scores and our thoughts on how we got there with the board. You will also note that there is a second sheet of paper behind this that shows the completeness of the proposals.

Mr. Haber stated there are three separate parts of the project and we specified that the District has the right to award each part to a separate contractor or multiple parts to one contractor; such that, the District is going to evaluate each one independently.

Mr. Kuhn stated let's start with part one, which is the 43 foot village and the infrastructure that is supporting that. We received four proposals. They were from Vallencourt, Petticoat Schmidt, United Brothers and Watson Civil.

Mr. Brecht stated based on price, Watson Civil was the lowest price with just over \$3M. Petticoat Schmidt was second in price. Vallencourt was third in price and United Brothers was fourth. Based on the percentages, Watson got 15 of the total points. Petticoat got 14.9 points. Vallencourt got 14.4 points and United Brothers got 13 points. We also asked for a schedule of values. There are three zeros under Watson Civil, Petticoat Schmidt and Vallencourt because they did not provide a schedule of values, so we could not assess the reasonableness of unit prices. We provided United Brothers with a five. Based on the fact that since they were high bid, the reasonableness of price didn't quite get them the full 10. For schedule, you have Vallencourt at 215 days, Petticoat Schmidt is at 76 days, United Brothers did not provide a schedule, so they got a zero and Watson Civil was 266 days. When you allocate the 15 total points to Petticoat for the lowest number of days and you figure out the percentages from there then Vallencourt gets 11.7 points and Watson Civil gets 7.3 points. All four firms got the full 10 points for schedule costs. I don't think that was something that we specifically asked for.

Mr. Kuhn stated so it is even across the board.

Mr. Brecht stated then you get into the personnel. We gave Vallencourt a nine, based on the fact that there was some documentation that they did not provide that we requested in the original RFP. Petticoat Schmidt got a 10. United Brothers got an eight and we gave Watson Civil a nine. For proposers experience, we gave Vallencourt the full 20 points. Petticoat Schmidt received 18 points. United Brothers received 12 points. Watson Civil got 15 points. For understanding the scope of work, we gave Vallencourt an eight because they did not provide us certain documentation that we requested in the RFP. Petticoat Schmidt received a nine. United Brothers received a seven because they didn't provide additional documents. Watson Civil got an eight. For financial capability, we gave Vallencourt a nine. Petticoat Schmidt received a seven. United Brothers received a nine and Watson Civil received a nine. All of those numbers were based off of the information that was provided to us in the RFP.

Mr. Haber stated the RFP package includes specific language as it relates to the District's ability to waive certain irregularities. Unfortunately for all four proposers, irregularities have been waived. As a board, you are making an affirmative decision to score these proposals instead of knocking them all out for having irregularities. You are not knocking them out for failure to include a schedule of values or failure to include a timing schedule. Instead of doing that, you are choosing to give them zeros in the cases where they didn't provide the documentation. I think the RFP contemplates your ability to do that.

Mr. Kuhn stated based on the phase four part one, the highest score is Petticoat Schmidt with 83.9 out of 100 points. Vallencourt received 82.1. Watson Civil received 73.3 points and United Brothers received 64 points.

On MOTION by Mr. Veazey seconded by Ms. Bock with all in favor to Send a Notice of Intent to Award to Petticoat Schmidt as the Highest Scored Proposer for Phase 4, Part 1 was approved.

Mr. Brecht stated part two had five proposers. Proposals were received from Florida Roads, Vallencourt, Petticoat Schmidt, United Brothers and Watson Civil. The lowest bid was Florida Roads at \$1.6M followed by Watson Civil, United Brothers, Vallencourt and Petticoat Schmidt. The schedules for the five had Florida Roads at 182 days, Vallencourt was at 186 days, Petticoat Schmidt was at 106 days, United Brothers did not provide a schedule and Watson Civil came in at 196 days. When you run the numbers and allocate based on the scoring criteria, you get 15 total points for Florida Roads, 10.8 points for Vallencourt, 10.1 points to Petticoat Schmidt, 12.2 points to United Brothers and 13.1 points to Watson Civil. For the fewest number of days for the schedule, the full 15 points went to Petticoat Schmidt, who had 136 days. Florida Roads received 9.9 points. Vallencourt received 9.5 points. Watson Civil received 8.4 points and United Brothers received 0 points, since they didn't provide a schedule. For the reasonableness of unit prices, Vallencourt, Petticoat Schmidt and Watson Civil did not provide a schedule of values, so we gave them zeros. Florida Roads and United Brothers did provide a schedule of values. The reasonableness of unit prices for Florida Roads was a 10. United Brothers received a five, since they were one of the higher bidders. For personnel, Florida Roads received the full 10 points. Vallencourt received nine points. Petticoat Schmidt received 10 points. United Brothers received eight points and Watson Civil received a nine. For proposers

experience, we gave Florida Roads the full 20 points. Vallencourt received the full 20 points. Petticoat Schmidt received 18 points. United Brothers received 12 points and Watson Civil received 15 points. On proposers experience, we took into account the experience they have had with prior CDDs and the work they have done with CDDs in the past and that is why Watson Civil and United Brothers were scored lower. For understanding the scope of work, we gave a 10 to Florida Roads. Vallencourt received eight points, since they were missing some information. Petticoat Schmidt received nine points. United Brothers received seven points and Watson Civil received eight points. For financial capability, Florida Roads received 10 points. Vallencourt received nine points. Petticoat Schmidt received seven points. United Brothers received nine points and Watson Civil received nine points. Florida Roads received the most points with 94.9 out of 100. Petticoat Schmidt came in second with 79.1 points. Vallencourt came in third with 76.3 points. Watson Civil came in fourth with 72.5 points and United Brothers came in fifth with 63.2.

Mr. Haber stated to the extent that you adopt these scores, you are making the determination to waive irregularities for failure to provide the timing schedule or the schedule of values and instead scoring them by assigning zeros for the items that were forgotten. You can adopt the scores as gone through by your Engineer.

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Mr. Veazey with all in favor to Send Notice of Intent to Award to Florida Roads as the Highest Scored Proposer for Phase 4, Part 2 was approved.

Mr. Brecht stated next is part three. The proposers were Florida Roads, Vallencourt, Petticoat Schmidt, United Brothers and Watson Civil. Florida Roads was the lowest bidder at just under \$3.2M. Watson Civil was at \$3.4M. Vallencourt was at \$3.6M. Petticoat Schmidt was just under \$3.9M and United Brothers was just over \$3.9M. For schedule of days, Florida Roads was at 246 days, Vallencourt at 210 days, Petticoat Schmidt was at 178 days, United Brothers did not provide a schedule and Watson Civil was at 287 days. For price Florida Roads get the full 15 points. Vallencourt gets 13 points. Petticoat Schmidt gets 11.9 points. United Brothers gets 11.5 points and Watson Civil received 13.8 points. For the fewest number of days for the schedule, Petticoat Schmidt was at 178 days, so they got the full 15 points. Vallencourt got 12.3 points. Florida Roads got 9.3. Watson Civil got 9.3 and United Brothers did not

provide a schedule, so they got a zero. For reasonableness of unit prices, Vallencourt, Petticoat Schmidt and Watson Civil did not provide a schedule of values, so they got a zero. Florida Roads did provide a schedule of values. We agreed with their prices and gave them the full 10 points. United Brothers received five points. For personnel, we gave Florida Roads a 10. Vallencourt received nine points. Petticoat Schmidt received 10 points. United Brothers received eight points. Watson Civil received nine points. For experience, we gave Florida Roads 20 points. Vallencourt received 20 points. Petticoat Schmidt received 18 points. United Brothers received 12 points and Watson Civil received 15 points. For understanding the scope of work, we gave Florida Roads a 10. Vallencourt received eight points. Petticoat Schmidt received nine points. United Brothers received seven points and Watson Civil received eight. For financial capability, we gave Florida Roads a 10, Vallencourt a nine, Petticoat Schmidt a seven, United Brothers a nine and Watson Civil a nine. It is pretty much the same as part two. Florida Roads received the most points at 94.3 out of 100. Vallencourt was second with 81.3. Petticoat Schmidt was third with 80.9 points. Watson Civil was fourth with 74.1 and United Brothers was 62.5 points.

Mr. Kuhn stated for the fewest number of days for Florida Roads should be 10.9 instead of 9.3 points, so they would now have 95.9 points.

Mr. Haber stated to the extent that you adopt these scores, you are making the determination to waive irregularities for failure to provide the timing schedule or the schedule of values and instead scoring them by assigning zeros for the items that were forgotten. You can adopt the scores as gone through by your Engineer.

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Ms. Bock with all in favor to Send Notice of Intent to Award to Florida Roads as the Highest Scored Proposer for Phase 4, Part 3 was approved.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Mr. Kuhn stated over the past few months we have entered into an agreement with Prosser Hallock. We approved their contract and their hourly rates, so this would be their first task authorization. These are items that we would engage Prosser with to help us in resolving some of the issues with the parcel with Mr. East and the fence that is being requested over there. There are a number of community common areas for which they will perform landscape design

and irrigation design and permitting to produce construction documents for us. There is a mail kiosk structure that needs to be designed for the T&D area of the neighborhood.

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Mr. O'Bannon with all in favor Task One to Prosser Hallock Contract with a not to exceed amount of \$37,300 was approved.

Mr. Haber stated this has general conditions, which may conflict with the terms of the agreement that we signed, so we will take the work that is described in this proposal and convert it to work authorizations.

Mr. Kuhn stated the next item is a construction administration proposal for our consultants on the amenity center. The amenity center has broken ground. The site has been cleared and the contractor has mobilized. They are actively engaged in the work out there. This is a proposal from ELM. Their services will include architectural, structural and mechanical plumbing at \$4,500 a month for a not to exceed six month period. Connelly & Wicker is the civil consultant. He has provided a proposal for three specific scopes of work in the amount of \$18,500. That includes some construction document clean up and redesign that was based on the value engineering we did with the contractor to get the amenity center in budget. There was a lump sum amount for permitting and then the construction administration itself. Connelly & Wicker will be a sub to ELM under this scenario.

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Mr. O'Bannon with all in favor Task Authorization to ELM for Construction Administration in the Amount of \$45,500 was approved.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. Haber stated now that we have authorized the notice of intent to award for the various parts for the phase four infrastructure work, with the amenity center moving forward and the other items of work that the District has ongoing, the District will need to enter into a funding agreement with the Developer to make sure that it is going to have sufficient funds to pay for this work until it issues bonds or finds another source of funding. This board has already approved a funding agreement with the Developer for the amenity center. I think the form of agreement

would be substantially similar to that. My recommendation would be to authorize your Chair to negotiate and finalize a funding agreement in the substantial form of the one you approved in connection with the amenity center for the items of work that you approved today.

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Mr. Veazey with all in favor to Authorize Chair to Negotiate & Finalize a Funding Agreement with the Developer for Items Approved Today was approved.

B. Engineer

1. Ratification of Requisitions 275 and 276 Bond Series 2007A

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Mr. Veazey with all in favor Requisition Nos. 275 & 276 were ratified.

2. Consideration of Requisitions 277 through 283 Bond Series 2007A

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Mr. O'Bannon with all in favor Requisition Nos. 277 through 283 totaling \$24,382.79 were approved.

3. Consideration of Work Authorization No. 19 – Phase 4 CEI Services

On MOTION by Mr. Veazey seconded by Mr. Kuhn with all in favor Work Authorization No. 19 for Phase 4 CEI Services for ETM with a not to exceed amount of \$79,000 was approved in substantial form.

C. Manager

There being none, the next item followed.

D. Field Services

There being none, the next item followed.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors' Requests and Audience Comments

There being none, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Financial Statements as of December 31, 2015

Mr. Oliver stated included in your agenda package is a copy of the financial statements as of December 31, 2015.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Consideration of Funding Request FY16-#5

Mr. Oliver stated included in your agenda package is Funding Request FY16-#5 in the amount of \$21,776.


On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Mr. Veazey with all in favor Funding Request FY16-#5 was approved.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Next Scheduled Meeting – Wednesday, February 17, 2016 @ 2:00 p.m. at the Offices of GMS

Mr. Oliver stated the next meeting is scheduled for February 17, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. at this location.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Kuhn seconded by Ms. Bock with all in favor the Meeting was adjourned.



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chairman/Vice Chairman