

MEETING MINUTES
HARBOUR HEIGHTS WATERWAY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
December 2, 2009
10:00 a.m.

Attendees: Joe Fleming, Ken Wangler, Steve Johnson, Jr., and Mel Staudmyer
County - Dawn Harrison and Chuck Mopps
Absent - Larry Rand and Lee Phillips
Coastal Engineering – Michael Poff and Jamie Cohmeyer
Marine Contracting Group – Bruce Midolo and Suzette Baxter

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

Minutes: No minutes were submitted for approval.

Business:

- Mr. Poff from Coastal Engineering conducted a power point presentation reviewing the current contract. The presentation was showing a typical cross section for the Dover canal minus 5 feet mean low water. Mr. Poff explained the difference between NGVD29 and NAVD88. The canals have different size widths depending on seawalls, boatlifts, and docks. The original cost to remove the silt estimation was \$966,000, the dredge cost \$884,000, service provided by Coastal was \$22,000, and the Public Works services combined totaled \$60,000. Mr. Poff reviewed the bid forms and construction plans with the Committee. Mr. Poff discussed the 11 spoils sites, environmental monitoring, and trucking cost to the landfill. The estimation on the yards of material to be removed from the canals was \$16,840. Mobilization of the project would be at 5% of the total bid price. MCG (Marine Contracting Group) was given a local preference, to lower their bid, and were successful on being awarded the contract. MCG bid came in at \$455,000 at the unit price of \$17.50 and \$6.00 for the trucking cost. The original construction schedule was to mobilize the equipment in August, have the spoil site prepared, and start dredging in September. The contractor is inline with the original schedule.
- The debate at hand is the old vertical NGVD29 survey verses the new NAVD88 datum. The NGVD29 is 1.1 feet above NAVD88 mean low water line. The survey information collected in the field was the new NAVD88; the mistake made was the information plotted on an old plan set at NGVD29. The result of the mistake is the survey is off 1.1 feet vertical. The dredge volume is less. Mr. Poff with Coastal Engineering apologized for the mistake to the Committee and previously to the County.
- The statement was made from Mr. Poff that we need to move forward from here. 31,345 yards of material to be removed from the canal is what should have been in the contract compared to the 16,841 that was in the contract. The cost of the contract would have been \$831,000.

- No additional spoil site will be needed for the extra material that needs to be removed from the waterways.
- Mr. Poff presented options to the Committee on how to proceed with the current contract. The first option is to complete the original design template. The first option would go to Purchasing for a change order to get the additional material removed. The second option is reduce the amount of canals that are proposed in the contract. Another option is to sell the silt being removed from the canals to subsidize the off-set of the cost for additional removal of material.
- Mr. Mopps stated that the contractor has done work in most of the canals now and reducing the number of canals to be dredged would not be fair to the contractor.
- Coastal is willing to offer \$35,000 in service or write a check payable to the MSBU or to the Contractor. The \$35,000 is the deductible from Coastal professional liability insurance.
- In the Desoto Canal an additional 3,600 yards of material still needs to be removed; some of the material is in depth and some in width.
- Mr. Fleming asked if MCG would be willing to propose the same rate or reduce the rate for the additional material. Mr. Midolo stated he would be willing to give the same rate.
- Mr. Mopps discussed the current project; the production rate of the project is now moving rapidly. Mr. Midolo expressed the desire to continue with the project.
- The statement was made that there are no tapping fees from the landfill on this project.
- Coastal is aware of a business that may be interested in purchasing the fill and will investigate further. The County does not permit any filling or raising the elevation of vacant land unless you have a building permit at the time; the contractor is using the land as a spoil site.
- The Committee is excepting the offer of \$35,000 from Coastal, but does not considering this offer as a settlement.
- Mr. Poff apologized again to the Committee members and residents of Harbour Heights for the error that accrued with the survey information.

Ms. Harrison will contact the Committee members on the date for the next scheduled meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:52 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Harrison
Municipal Services District Representative

DH/cs

copy: File 27010001 – 100105dh