

TURNBULL CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The Turnbull Creek Community Development District RFP Committee met Monday, February 2, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. at the Murabella Amenity Center, 101 Positano Avenue, St. Augustine, Florida.

Committee members present were:

Aage G. Schroder, III  
Chuck Labanowski  
Ralph DeFranzo  
Philip Sweeting  
Matt Durkee

Also Present were:

David deNagy  
Mike Eckert  
Preston Doub  
Alvaro Rios  
Eddie Smith

The following is a summary of the minutes of the February 2, 2015 RFP Committee meeting. A copy of the proceedings can be obtained by contacting the District Manager.

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Mr. deNagy called the meeting to order.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Audience Comments**

There being none, the next item followed.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Discussion of Proposal Received in Response  
to Published RFP**

Mr. deNagy stated I handed out documents to the RFP committee, you will find an outline of the documents that were required and whether or not they were submitted, some price comparisons on the second page, some questions on the pond restoration and a couple emails

with questions about the RFP proposal for your reference. I don't know if we are going to talk about those at today's meeting but I wanted you to have those in front of you in case we do.

Mr. Doub stated I went through the submittal and put together the second page that Dave passed out and pretty much everything is there. There are a couple of minor comments on the schedule values was a little bit limited on the information provided and the supervisory personnel were not included but that is minor and the staffing was not completely outlined but that is pretty minor too.

Mr. Eckert stated the one thing that I had that was not crystal clear on the bonding capacity issue because I think the letter the district received said \$800,000 but I think the bond was 125% of the proposed contract price, which would have been \$845,000. I think that is something the district can deal with in terms of if the board decides to go ahead and hire these folks that they could just require that the payment and performance bond be in the correct amount and their application seemed to indicate that they have the bonding capacity to cover that extra \$45,000.

Mr. Rios stated to clarify that we are very busy in the office and when I had to request a bid bond I just put a number on there of what I thought initially it would be without diving into the plans so I just put \$800,000. That is what they request from us as far as what the cost is going to be on the project.

Mr. Smith stated we have to throw a temporary budget number is what we are saying.

Mr. Eckert stated I think it should be a committee member discussion on what the issues are that are identified then if the committee members want to reach out to address things let's handle it that way.

Mr. Doub stated we don't see any significant issues with the bid.

Mr. Eckert stated there was nothing that I saw in my review that the district board could not waive if they wanted to.

Mr. Doub stated beyond that I looked at the pricing and the pricing I put together is different from the contractor's proposal and was done before we put together the bid documents so it was done with a different approach. Overall the costs are very close or under our numbers in almost all cases. I feel good with the proposal from a cost standpoint.

Mr. Eckert stated we need a map showing the route you are going to go back and forth and showing whichever lots you want to go on the easement on to be able to do your job and if

there are other issues that you see that are private issues on lots that you think are inconsistent with what you are trying to do we can mark those too and have a conversation with the owners.

After a thorough discussion of different aspects of the bid, personnel, equipment, access points to be used, restoration and pricing the following motion was made.

On MOTION by Mr. Sweeting seconded by Mr. Labanowski with all in favor the bid was found to be responsive and from a responsible bidder and recommend the board find them qualified to do the work.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.