

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
Monday, August 5, 2019
6:30 p.m.**

**City Hall
400 Alexandria Boulevard
Oviedo, Florida**

PURSUANT TO SECTION 286.0105, FLORIDA STATUTES, ANY PERSON DESIRING TO APPEAL ANY DECISION MADE BY THE CITY COUNCIL, WITH RESPECT TO ANY MATTER CONSIDERED AT ANY MEETING OR HEARING, WILL NEED A RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND MAY NEED TO INSURE THAT A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS IS MADE WHICH INCLUDES THE TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE UPON WHICH THE APPEAL IS TO BE BASED. This record is not provided by the City of Oviedo.

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**ORDER OF
BUSINESS**

COUNCIL BUSINESS

CEREMONIAL ITEMS AND PRESENTATIONS

1. None.

COUNCIL BUSINESS

2. Approval of Minutes for the July 15, 2019 Regular Session.

PUBLIC COMMENT

3. Citizen Comment.

CONSENT AGENDA

4. Resolution No. 3770-19, Purchase Order to People Ready Florida, Inc.
5. Resolution No. 3775-19, Employee Benefit Insurance for FY 2019-20.
6. Resolution No. 3776-19, Geotechnical Consultants.
7. Resolution No. 3777-19, Perpetual Easement in Favor of FDOT.
8. Resolution No. 3778-19, Change Order for Regional Stormwater Park Design Services.
9. Resolution No. 3779-19, Architectural Design Order No. 047-19 for Oviedo on the Park Lot 4 Building B.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

10. Ordinance No. 1685, Providing for the Establishment of the City Public Arts' Logo.

FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES

11. None.

RESOLUTIONS

12. Resolution No. 3780-19, Site Development Order/Final Engineering (SDOFE) No. 504-19: Speak Easy Medical Office.

13. Resolution No. 3781-19, Site Development Order No.503-19: Oviedo on the Park, Lot 4.

14. Resolution No. 3762-19, Award of RFP 19-32 Risk Management Program.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

15. None.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

COMMUNICATIONS/REPORTS

- Councilman Bob Pollack
- Councilman Steve Henken
- Councilman Jeff Chudnow
- Councilman Keith Britton
- Mayor Dominic Persampiere

FUTURE MEETING DATES

- Monday, August 19, 2019, 5:30 p.m. CRA Governing Board
- Monday, August 19, 2019, 6:30 p.m. Regular Session
- Thursday, September 5, 2019, 6:30 p.m. Regular Session
- Monday, September 16, 2019, 5:30 p.m. CRA Governing Board (Tentative)
- Monday, September 16, 2019, 6:30 p.m. Regular Session

Adjournment

PERSONS WITH A DISABILITY, SUCH AS A VISION, HEARING OR SPEECH IMPAIRMENT, OR PERSONS NEEDING OTHER TYPES OF ASSISTANCE, AND WHO WISH TO ATTEND CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS OR ANY OTHER BOARD OR COMMITTEE MEETING MAY CONTACT THE CITY CLERK IN WRITING, OR MAY CALL 407-971-5500 FOR INFORMATION REGARDING AVAILABLE AIDS AND SERVICES.

AGENDA
MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Bryan Cobb, City Manager
DATE: August 5, 2019
SUBJECT: Resolution No. 3770-19, Work Order 1831-01

Introduction: This is a request for City Council to approve a work order in the amount not to exceed \$130,000 with PeopleReady Florida, Inc. (PeopleReady) for providing temporary staffing services for Facilities and Parks maintenance.

Discussion: On October 1, 2018, City Council adopted Resolution No. 3630-18 approving the selection of four (4) firms to provide Temporary Staffing Services on an as-needed basis. PeopleReady was one of the selected firms. The subject agreement with PeopleReady is provided in the Attachment and is effective for a period of three (3) years, with two (2) one-year renewals for a total of (5) years.

The City's Recreation & Parks Department (Department) uses full time staff to provide daily maintenance and custodial services to City buildings, parks facilities, and athletic fields. Currently, the Department employs custodians and maintenance staff in three (3) divisions. Throughout the fiscal year, the Department has had to facilitate daily operations while dealing with continuing position vacancies. The vacancies have led to obstacles in completing daily custodial and maintenance schedules, as well as, an increase in overtime expenses.

In an attempt to minimize overtime expenses and maintain the current operational workload, the Department has utilized PeopleReady to provide temporary services in areas which have vacant positions. The City has utilized salary savings from the open vacancies to fund temporary staffing services. The Department will continue to need temporary staffing services for the remainder of the fiscal year while attempting to fill vacancies. The cost of these temporary staffing services will exceed the City Manager's purchasing authority. Therefore, City Council approval of the subject work order is necessary.

Budget Impact: There are sufficient salary savings in the FY 2018-19 Budget to fund temporary staffing services for Recreation & Parks.

Strategic Impact: To continue high levels of customer service, productivity, and efficiency while maintaining the operational workload in facilities and parks daily maintenance.

Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council adopt Resolution No. 3770-19.

Attachment: PeopleReady Florida, Inc. Agreement

Prepared by: Paul Belden, Recreation Business Manager

Reviewed by: Dru D. Boulware, Recreation & Parks Director

Kelly Jones, Assistant Finance Director & Jerry Boop, Finance Director

**AGENDA
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: Bryan Cobb, City Manager

DATE: August 5, 2019

SUBJECT: Resolution No. 3775-19, Employee Benefit Insurance for FY 2019-2020

Introduction: This is a request for City Council to approve employee benefit insurance renewals and new agreements and authorize execution of contracts with providers for Fiscal Year 2019-2020.

Discussion: The Gehring Group, the City’s benefits advisor and broker, negotiated renewal rates for the expiring Dental, Health Reimbursement Account (HRA), Flexible Spending Account (FSA), Cobra, group health administrative fees, and stop loss coverage. City Council is requested to approve the proposed renewals with the following insurance providers:

Insurance	Provider
Group Health – Administrative Fee	Florida Blue
Group Health Reinsurance	Sun Life
Dental	MetLife
HRA/FSA, Cobra	TASC

1. GROUP HEALTH ADMINISTRATIVE FEES AND REINSURANCE

Health Plan Administration: The City has an Administrative Services Agreement with Florida Blue to provide group health plan administration for the administration and payment of health claims through September 30, 2019, at a rate of \$56.30 per employee per month. Florida Blue has agreed to continue services with no increase for plan year 2019-20.

Excess Reinsurance: An important component of an Administrative Services Only (ASO) program is Excess Risk Reinsurance. Excess Risk Reinsurance covers the City against aggregate loss which is the dollar amount of claims paid for the entire plan over the plan year and employee specific claims which are limited to \$150,000 per occurrence. This year the City weighed its options with The Gehring Group and decided to increase the Individual Specific Deductible from \$150,000 per occurrence to \$175,000 with Sun Life Assurance Company. The renewal premiums for the employee-specific reinsurance through Sun Life Assurance Company will increase by two and seven tenths (2.7) percent which is primarily related to plan experience and medical inflation. The Aggregate Stop Loss component for FY 2019-20 increased by five (5) percent. The new Stop Loss premiums are as follows:

Coverage Type	2018-19	2019-20
Stop Loss Employee Specific	\$109.64	\$112.60
Stop Loss Employee & Spouse	\$248.61	\$255.32
Stop Loss Employee & Child	\$213.09	\$218.84
Stop Loss Employee & Family	\$367.00	\$376.91

The City’s deductible level for an employee-specific claim will increase to \$175,000 and an aggregating specific deductible will remain at \$21,500 with all costs in excess of \$175,000 reimbursed back to the City. Increasing the individual deductible is the most favorable option to contain the excess loss premium. All costs in excess of \$175,000 will be reimbursed to the City through “stop loss” reinsurance after meeting the aggregating specific deductible of \$21,500. In addition, the City still manages and self-insures one (1) large claim that is lasered at \$600,000. Reinsurance begins when the self-insured claims exceed \$600,000. Increased reinsurance costs are partially based on the group’s claim experience and partially based on the market. The main reason the stop loss market is experiencing rising costs is the high cost of advanced new treatments for acute conditions such as cancer, and the cost of new specialty medications.

The FY 2019-2020 estimated cost for Excess Risk Reinsurance is \$791,328, which is based on a projected census count of enrolled employees. The actual cost incurred during the fiscal year will depend on the actual enrollment numbers for the various coverage tiers. Staff recommends renewal with Sun Life for excess reinsurance.

Affordable Care Act Fees: The ACA requires employers to report the medical coverage provided to each employee on form 1095-C and transmittal form 1094-C. The administrative costs for compliance totaled \$1,302.50 for FY 2018-2019 and are projected to remain the same for FY 2019-2020.

The City will continue to fully fund the claims and the actual costs of the medical plan. The City continues to realize savings through the use of our clinic and have experienced significant savings in our group claims. The Gehring Group, in conjunction with Wakely Consulting, recommends the City increase the premium by only two (2) percent for FY 2019-20. As such, staff recommends that this additional funding be provided by increasing the contributions made by the City. The new proposed group health premium rates by coverage type for FY 2019-2020 are as follows:

GROUP HEALTH PPO				
Monthly Rates – Non-Tobacco User				
Coverage Type	Current Rates	Renewal Rates	City Subsidy	Employee
	FY 18-19	FY 19-20	FY 19-20	FY 19-20
Employee	\$1,010.00	\$1,030.20	\$1,030.20	\$ 0.00
Employee/Spouse	\$1,846.50	\$1,883.60	\$1,465.34	\$418.26
Employee/Child(ren)	\$1,759.02	\$1,794.40	\$1,419.88	\$374.52
Family	\$2,543.92	\$2,594.80	\$1,827.84	\$766.96

**GROUP HEALTH PPO
Monthly Rates – Tobacco User**

Coverage Type	Current Rates	Renewal Rates	City Subsidy	Employee
	FY 18-19	FY 19-20	FY 19-20	FY 19-20
Employee	\$1,010.00	\$1,030.20	\$930.20	\$100.00
Employee/Spouse	\$1,846.50	\$1,883.60	\$1,365.24	\$518.26
Employee/Child(ren)	\$1,759.02	\$1,794.40	\$1,319.88	\$474.52
Family	\$2,543.92	\$2,594.80	\$1,727.84	\$866.96

As previously stated, the City will continue to pay 100 percent of employee-only coverage for non-tobacco users. Tobacco users will continue to pay a premium of \$100.00 per month

Retirees are responsible for 100 percent of the cost of medical premium coverage. Staff recommends the following FY 2019-2020 retiree rates:

Coverage Type*	Current Rates	Retiree
	FY 18-19	FY 19-20
Retiree	\$1,010.00	\$1,030.20
Retiree/Spouse	\$1,846.50	\$1,883.60
Retiree/Child(ren)	\$1,759.02	\$1,794.40
Retiree/Family	\$2,543.92	\$2,594.80

*Only non-tobacco user rates provided

With respect to the group health insurance benefit structure, the core benefits provided under the PPO Plan remain the same as prior year.

2. DENTAL INSURANCE

Dental insurance is a voluntary benefit whereby the employee pays 100 percent of the premium. The City’s current provider, MetLife, has provided a wide local network and good service to the employees. The Gehring Group negotiated a two (2) year rate guarantee beginning with the FY 2019-20 plan year which expires on September 30, 2021. The PPO low and high plans will not have a premium rate increase which represents two (2) years with the same premiums. The DHMO plan premiums will increase by five (5) percent. This is the first increase in our DHMO rates since 2015. Staff recommends renewing with MetLife for dental services with new rates as follows:

Coverage	MetLife Dental Monthly Rates			
	DHMO		PPO (Low Plan / High Plan)	
	Current FY 2018-2019	Proposal FY 2019-2021	Current FY 2018-2019	Proposal FY 2019-2021
Employee	\$16.43	\$17.25	\$30.87 / \$36.49	\$30.87 / \$36.49
Employee + 1	\$28.76	\$30.20	\$68.25 / \$80.93	\$68.25 / \$80.93
Employee + 2	\$45.18	\$47.44	\$112.82 / \$131.22	\$112.82 / \$131.22

3. GROUP LIFE, AD&D, GROUP LONG TERM DISABILITY AND GROUP SHORT TERM DISABILITY INSURANCE

Life, AD&D, Long Term Disability and Group Short Term Disability: The City is in the second year of a two (2) year rate guarantee for Life, AD&D, Long Term Disability and Group Short Term Disability insurance with CIGNA through September 30, 2020, as such, there is no premium increase. CIGNA's service to the City continues to be outstanding.

Group Basic Life and AD&D Insurance: The City pays 100 percent of the cost of Group Basic Life Insurance, equal to one (1) times the annual salary, rounded to the nearest thousand up to \$130,000.

Long Term Disability (LTD): The City pays 100 percent of the premium for Long Term Disability insurance for full time employees. The LTD plan covers employees after 90 days of a disability and pays the employee 66 2/3 percent of their salary up to \$7,500 per month.

Voluntary Group Short Term Disability: Employees can purchase a separate Voluntary Group Short Term Disability Insurance policy. This benefit is received for up to thirteen (13) weeks, payable on the first (1st) day of an accident and on the eighth (8th) day of an illness resulting from a covered non-work-related disability. The benefit pays sixty (60) percent of the employee's salary up to \$1,000 per week. CIGNA continues to deliver a high level of service to the employees and the City.

Voluntary Life Insurance: Employees can also purchase a separate Voluntary Life Insurance policy for up to five (5) times basic annual earnings up to \$200,000, rounded to the nearest thousand with a guarantee issue of \$150,000. With the purchase of a voluntary life policy CIGNA offers a policy for dependents (\$10,000 for spouses and \$5,000 for children) for \$2.54 per family unit. Retirees are eligible to purchase guaranteed issue life insurance in the amount of \$10,000 for \$1.84 per month.

Staff recommends continuing with CIGNA for Group Life, Accidental Death and Dismemberment, Long-Term and Short-Term Disability, and Voluntary Life Insurances for FY 2019-2020. CIGNA has provided the City with exceptional customer service in handling and processing benefit payments.

CIGNA FY 2019-2020

Life Insurance	\$0.130
AD&D	\$0.030
Combined	\$0.160* Rate/\$1,000 of benefits at 1x annual salary
Long Term Disability	\$0.380/\$100 of monthly covered payroll*
Short Term Disability	\$0.501/\$10 of weekly benefit**

*Monthly total fluctuates based on enrollment and total covered salary.

**Employee Pays 100% of premium.

4. HRA/FSA, COBRA

**TASC
FY 2019-2020**

FlexSystem	\$4.12 pp
HRA	\$4.12 pp

TASC has been providing Flexible Spending for Medical and Dependent Care for the City since 2016. The rate was increased from \$4.00 per person per month to \$4.12 per person per month. This is the first increase in three years of two and eight tenths (2.8) percent. TASC provides the City with Cobra administration services at no additional cost.

5. FIREFIGHTERS AND POLICE OFFICERS STATUTORY AD&D

The Statutory AD&D with Chubb/ACE is in the second year of a two-year agreement, which will expire September 30, 2020. In Senate Bill 7098, the Florida Governor approved an increase in Accidental Death & Dismemberment benefits available to Police and Firefighters. The change in benefits has resulted in the insurance carriers issuing a premium increase to reflect the change in benefits. The premium has been increased by \$425.00 for the following benefits:

- \$75,000 Line of Duty (Previously \$69,802)
- \$75,000 Fresh Pursuit (Previously \$69,802)
- \$225,000 Unlawful & Intentional (Previously \$198,670)

6. VISION INSURANCE

Vision insurance is a voluntary benefit whereby the employee pays 100 percent of the premium. Humana is the City's current provider of vision insurance. The City is in the second year of a two-year rate guarantee with no increase in premiums. Staff recommends that City Council award vision services to Humana for FY 2019-2020. Monthly rates are as follows:

**Humana Vision 130 Monthly Rates
FY 2019-2020**

Coverage Type	Monthly Rate
Employee	\$5.00
Employee/Spouse	\$9.50
Employee/Child(ren)	\$10.00
Family	\$14.68

7. INDIVIDUAL SHORT TERM AND DISABILITY ANCILLARY INSURANCE

Colonial is the City's current provider of Individual and Ancillary Short Term and Disability Coverage. Colonial also offers Cancer, Accident, Critical Illness, Hospitalization, and Individual Short-Term Disability. Staff recommends continuing with Colonial for FY 2019-2020. Colonial continues to provide a very strong customer service team and competitive rates on their products to employees. The rates will remain the same for the participants.

8. EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Aetna Behavioral Health is the City's current provider of Employee Assistance Program (EAP) services. These services include unlimited telephonic access, six (6) face-to-face counseling sessions for all employees per problem, legal, financial services, identity theft, online work life services including caregiving services and personal services, critical incident support and critical incident stress debriefing services (on-site response in two (2) hours or less), training and education services and drug-free workplace services. The Gehring Group negotiated rates for a three (3) year Agreement. The City is in the last year of the three-year agreement. Effective October 1, 2019, the cost per eligible employee per month will increase from \$1.79 to \$1.82 per employee per month. Aetna continues to provide very good support to the City and its employees at competitive rates. Staff recommends continuing its Agreement with Aetna Behavioral Health.

Budget Impact: The maximum claims costs are estimated to increase for FY 2019-2020 based upon the most current claims information. As discussed above, increased group health plan costs are primarily related to the medical inflationary trend rate and specialty medications which have negatively impacted the plan over the past several years. The new plan rates, effective October 1, 2019 have been included in the 2019-20 proposed budget.

Strategic Impact: Continue high levels of customer service, productivity, and efficiency while maintaining fiscal and organizational health.

Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council adopt Resolution No. 3775-19.

Prepared By: Connie Collins, Human Resources Director
Reviewed By: Jerry Boop, Finance Director
Kelly Jones, Assistant Finance Director

**AGENDA
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Bryan Cobb, City Manager
DATE: August 5, 2019
SUBJECT: Resolution No. 3776-19, Geotechnical Consultants

Introduction: This is a request for City Council to approve the selection of four (4) firms to provide Professional Geotechnical Services on an as-needed basis according to the provisions of Florida Statute 287-055.

Discussion: The City of Oviedo maintains continuing service contracts for the purpose of obtaining professional geotechnical services when the need arises. These services are normally requested in order to obtain knowledge of subsurface conditions for construction projects such as roadways, utilities, parks and other capital projects and for material testing services to ensure projects are constructed in accordance with plans.

The existing contracts for Continuing Geotechnical Services expired in June. The City advertised in the Orlando Sentinel and broadcasted a Request for Qualification (RFQ) under RFQ 19-34. The City received seven (7) submittals in response to the advertisement, all of which were responsive. A listing of the submitting firms is identified in the bid opening minutes provided in Attachment 1. The City's Evaluation Committee reviewed all of the submittals and met on July 10, 2019 to make their recommendation. A copy of the Evaluation Committee minutes and scoring information is provided in Attachment 2. The Committee recommends the selection of the following four (4) firms to provide Geotechnical Services to the City as the need occurs:

Ardaman and Associates, Inc.
Geotechnical and Environmental Consultants, Inc.
Professional Service Industries, Inc.
S&ME, Inc.

Copies of the proposed contracts for the recommended firms are provided as Exhibits to Resolution No. 3776-19. Geotechnical Services will be completed on a Work Order basis as needed and budgeted. The subject agreements are for a period of one year with two annual renewals for a total of three years.

Budget Impact: There are no budget impacts by awarding the contracts. Costs for services will be deducted from individual projects on a Work Order basis as budgeted.

Strategic Impact: Develop infrastructure that enables quality growth.

Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council adopt Resolution No. 3776-19.

Attachments: 1. RFQ Opening Minutes
 2. Evaluation Team Minutes and Ranking

Prepared by: Priya Persaud, Business Analyst
Reviewed by: Susan Sheikh, Operational Resources Manager
 Bobby Wyatt, Public Works Director

**AGENDA
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Bryan Cobb, City Manager
DATE: August 5, 2019
SUBJECT: Resolution No. 3777-19, Perpetual Easement in Favor of FDOT

Introduction: This is a request for City Council to approve a Perpetual Easement in favor of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) relating to Parcel Number 809.1 as required for the SR426/CR419 Phase 2 Road Widening Project.

Discussion: Phase 2 of the SR426/CR419 Road Widening Project which addresses SR426 from Pine Avenue to SR 434 and CR 419 from SR 434 to Avenue B is currently in the advanced right-of-way acquisition process by FDOT. As part of that process, FDOT requests a perpetual easement in favor of FDOT from the City for the purpose of constructing, operating, and maintaining drainage, as required for the project. The easement area consists of approximately 2,500 square feet. The location is identified on the attached FDOT right-of-way map.

There are no negative impacts to the City by executing the Perpetual Easement. The City will have the same right of access it would to any other State easements as is required for maintenance activities and to preserve and keep the drainage easement functional and in good working order.

A copy of the proposed Perpetual Easement is included in Exhibit 1 to Resolution No. 3777-19.

Budget Impact: There are no impacts to the budget by approving the Easement.

Strategic Impact: Continue implementation of the City's Transportation Master Plan.

Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council adopt Resolution No. 3777-19.

Prepared by: Susan Sheikh, Operational Resources Manager
Reviewed by: Bobby Wyatt, Public Works Director

**AGENDA
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Bryan Cobb, City Manager
DATE: August 5, 2019
SUBJECT: **Resolution No. 3778-19**, Change Order for Regional Stormwater Park Design Services

Introduction: This is a request for City Council to approve a Change Order in the amount of \$18,500 to the Purchase Order issued to Dix Hite + Partners, Inc. (Dix Hite) for the Regional Stormwater Park project.

Discussion: On February 19, 2018, City Council approved a Work Order in the amount of \$97,500 to Dix Hite, with the adoption of Resolution No. 3536-18, for design of a Downtown Stormwater Park associated with the Regional Stormwater Pond Project No. 14-016. A purchase order was issued to Dix Hite and was recently increased by \$4,000 to accommodate a change in the irrigation design from a drip system to hard piped system. The current purchase order amount to Dix Hite for this project is therefore \$101,500.

Design services for the project, located on 8.8 acres off of East Franklin Street and Geneva Drive, included schematic plans, design development, utility needs and coordination, site lighting plan and electrical needs, hardscape plans, landscape and irrigation plan. The original scope did not include post design services.

Staff requested a proposal from Dix Hite to provide Post Design Services. These services are needed to supplement in-house staff in providing construction oversight necessary to ensure that the project is built in accordance with the plans. Cost for these additional services is \$18,500 as provided the scope of services provided in Exhibit 1 of Resolution No. 3778-19; which also includes the proposed additional tasks.

Because the change (increase) in cost exceeds ten percent (10%) of the current purchase order/contract amount, City Council approval is required per the City's Purchasing Policy.

Budget Impact: Adequate funding exists in account 304-4100-541.63-22 to fund this increase to P.O. 180251.

Strategic Impact: The Regional Stormwater Pond and Park will foster redevelopment of the historic downtown while developing infrastructure that enables quality growth while maintaining and enhancing stormwater management.

Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council adopt Resolution No. 3778-19.

Prepared by: Susan Sheikh, Operational Resources Manager
Reviewed by: Bobby Wyatt, Public Works Director
Kelly Jones, Assistant Finance Director

**AGENDA
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Bryan Cobb, City Manager
DATE: August 5, 2019
SUBJECT: **Resolution No. 3779-19**, Architectural Design Order No. 047-19 for Oviedo on the Park Lot 4 Building B

Introduction: This is a request for the City Council to approve Architectural Design Order (ADO) No. 047-19 for Oviedo on the Park Lot 4 Building B.

Discussion: The proposed development is located on the north side of Mitchell Hammock Road and west side of Oviedo Boulevard. The total land area is approximately 4.25 acres. The applicant and property owner is Michael Collard of O.O.T.P., LLC. The architect of record is William Joe Fisher Jr. of Fisher and Assoc., LLC.

Per LDC Section 2.5 (A)(18), the City Council shall have final approval authority to issue Architectural Design Orders associated with a Site Development Order or Building Permit application associated with a Mixed Use Development, Multifamily Development, Townhome Development, Office Development, and Commercial Development in all zoning districts.

The subject property is designated as Downtown Mixed-Use (DMU) on the City's Future Land Use Map and MUD-VC (Mixed-Use District Village Core) on the City's Official Zoning Map. The project consists of a 7,800 square foot multi-tenant retail and restaurant building, as part of a larger development on the site with multiple commercial buildings.

Staff reviewed the proposed architectural design according to the standards of the City's Land Development Code (LDC) Article VIII, Architectural and Urban Design Standards and the Comprehensive Plan. Color elevations and 3D renderings of the proposed building are provided in Attachment 3.

The Applicant requests the following deviations to the LDC minimum architectural standards.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN DEVIATIONS:

1. East Elevation (Secondary Façade):

a. LDC Sec. 8.7.C(4), Fenestration: A 30 square-foot deviation to the requirement that windows, doors and openings shall occupy a minimum of 20% (20% = 150 sq. ft. required) of a secondary façade to allow the facade to have 120 sq. ft. of windows, doors and openings, a 20% deviation.

b. LDC Sec. 8.7.C(5), Materials: A 155 square-foot deviation to the requirement the maximum percentage of stucco shall be 50% (50% = a maximum of 316 sq. ft. permitted) of a secondary façade to allow the facade to have 471 sq. ft. of stucco, a 49% deviation.

Per LDC Section 8.3(C), Number of Mitigation Techniques, deviations of LDC Section 8.7 architectural requirements require architectural mitigation techniques, depending on the highest deviation requested. The highest deviation requested is a 49% deviation for stucco on the East secondary facade. This requires two (2) architectural mitigation techniques to be applied to the building. The project has similar treatment and exceeds the minimum required brick or stone percentage on all façades, meeting the minimum mitigation requirement.

A copy of the proposed site plan, which is pending for City Council approval, is provided in Attachment 2. Staff recommends approval of ADO No. 047-19.

Budget Impact: There is no impact to the budget as a result of the approval of the Architectural Design Order No. 047-19.

Strategic Impact: The proposed development is consistent with the Economic and Vitality strategic goal.

Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council adopt Resolution No. 3779-19.

Attachments: 1. Location Map
 2. Proposed Site Plan
 3. Colored Façade Elevations and 3D Rendering
Prepared by: J. Higbee, Development Review Manager

**AGENDA
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Bryan Cobb, City Manager
DATE: August 5, 2019
SUBJECT: Ordinance No. 1685, Establishment of the City Public Arts' Logo

Procedure: Call Up Item
Mayor asks Attorney to Read Ordinance by Title Only
City Manager Background
Public Hearing
Council Motion & Discussion
Council Action

Introduction: This is a request for City Council to amend the City's Code of Ordinances Section 2-12 to establish the City Public Arts' Logo as one of the official City logos.

Discussion: The Public Arts Board recommended to City Council an official Public Arts Logo to be used to promote the City's Public Arts policy and respective programs. On June 17, 2019, City Council adopted Resolution No. 3761-19, approving the Public Arts Logo design created by Ms. Caryn Dahm, a Public Arts Board member and a well-known local water color artist. The Public Art's Logo design is the following:

Adoption of Ordinance No. 1685 will incorporate the Public Arts logo into the Code of Ordinances, and it will be subject to the same conditions of the other City Logos. Code of Ordinances Sections 2-13 provides for sole use of the various City Logos, including any facsimiles thereof, by authorized officials and officers of the City of Oviedo in conducting the official business of the City. No other person shall be authorized to use the City Public Arts Logo for any other purpose without the City's authorization. In addition, Section 2-14 authorizes the City Attorney to take any actions as may be authorized by controlling law to protect the City Logos, including the Public Arts Logo as the intellectual property of the City.

The City Attorney has reviewed Ordinance No. 1685 and offered no objections. Staff recommends approval of Ordinance No. 1685.

Budget Impact: There are no anticipated budgetary impacts as a result of adoption of Ordinance No. 1684.

Strategic Impact: Foster and maintain a strong sense of community identity and of place as part of the Community Character strategic goal.

Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council read Ordinance No. 1685 by title only, conduct a public hearing and adopt Ordinance No. 1685.

Prepared by: Teresa Correa, Development Services Director

**AGENDA
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Bryan Cobb, City Manager
DATE: August 5, 2019
SUBJECT: **Resolution No. 3780-19**, Site Development Order/Final Engineering (SDOFE)
No. 504-19: Speak Easy Medical Office

Procedure: Call Up Item
City Manager Background
Applicant Presentation
Public Comment - Request to Speak Forms submitted prior to beginning of meeting.
Council Motion & Discussion
Council Action

Introduction: This is a request for the City Council to approve Site Development Order/Final Engineering (SDOFE) No. 504-19: Speak Easy Medical Office.

Discussion: Per LDC Section 2.7(B), the City Council is authorized to approve a deviation greater than twenty (20) percent of a minimum LDC requirement.

The subject property is designated as Commercial (CM) on the City's Future Land Use Map and C-2 on the City's Official Zoning Map. The applicant proposes to develop the property with an office building of 6,252 square feet. The proposed development is located on the north side of Clark Street and east side of West Broadway Street (SR 426). The total land area is approximately 0.78 acres. The applicant and property owner is Kidani Acquisitions LLC.

Architectural approval for the medical office building was approved by City Council on May 20, 2019.

The Applicant requests the following deviations to the Land Development Code minimum requirements. The site layout is provided in Attachment 2. The applicant's justification and mitigation letter for the deviations is provided in Attachment 3.

Site Plan Deviations, LDC Sections 12.4 and 12.5 (Landscaping), 8.7 and 13.1 (Parking):

1. A 2-foot deviation to the requirement that the North A2 landscape bufferyard be a minimum width of 10 feet, allowing a reduced width of 8 feet, a 20% deviation.
2. A 1-medium tree deviation to the requirement that the North A2 landscape bufferyard contain a minimum of 5 medium trees, to allow 4 medium trees, a 20% deviation.

3. A 3-large tree deviation to the requirement that the South A1 & A2 landscape bufferyards contain a minimum of 8 large trees to allow 5 large trees, a 37.5% deviation.
4. A 1-medium tree deviation to the requirement that the South A2 landscape bufferyards contain a minimum of 3 medium trees to allow 2 medium trees, a 33.33% deviation.
5. A 2-foot deviation to the requirement that the East A2 landscape bufferyard be a minimum width of 10 feet, allowing a reduced width of 8 feet, a 20% deviation.
6. A 1-large tree deviation to the requirement that the East A2 landscape bufferyard contain a minimum of 5 large trees, to allow 4 large trees, a 20% deviation.
7. A 3 large tree deviation of the requirement for 5 large trees in the West A1 landscape bufferyard to allow 2 large trees, a 60% deviation.
8. A 1-landscape parking island deviation to the requirement that the vehicular use area as configured contain a minimum of 6 landscape parking islands to allow 5 landscape parking islands, a 16.6% deviation.
9. A deviation to the requirement that 0 out of 26 total parking spaces be located in front of the building line on a local street to allow 2 parking spaces to project in front of the building line along Clark Street, a 7.7% deviation.
10. A 6 parking space deviation to the requirement for a minimum of 31 parking spaces, to allow 25 parking spaces, a 19.3% deviation.

Budget Impact: There is no impact to the budget as a result of the proposed Site Development Order.

Strategic Impact: The proposed development is consistent with the Economic and Vitality goal.

Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council adopt Resolution No. 3780-19.

Attachments: 1. Location Map
 2. Site Layout
 3. Applicant justification and mitigation letter for deviation requests
Prepared by: J. Higbee, Development Review Manager

**AGENDA
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Bryan Cobb, City Manager
DATE: August 5, 2019
SUBJECT: **Resolution No. 3781-19**, Site Development Order No.503-19: Oviedo on the Park, Lot 4

Procedure: Call Up Item
City Manager Background
Applicant Presentation
Public Comment - Request to Speak Forms submitted prior to beginning of meeting.
Council Motion & Discussion
Council Action

Introduction: This is a request for the City Council to approve Site Development Order No. 503-19, for Lot 4 at Oviedo on the Park. The proposed development is located on Northwest corner of Mitchell Hammock Road. and Oviedo Boulevard. The applicant and property owner is Michael Collard of O.O.T.P., LLC.

Discussion: The subject property's future land use designation is Downtown Mixed Use (DMU) and its zoning district is Mixed Use District-New Downtown Village Core (MUD-VC). The proposed development is located within the Oviedo on the Park Master Plan.

Per LDC Section 6.4(F)(3)(a), the Land Use Administrator shall issue site development orders and permits for permissible uses within the New Downtown Village Core District. On May 5, 2014, City Council adopted Resolution No. 2833-14, providing through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), that the City Council will act as the Land Use Administrator with regard to lands assigned the New Downtown Village Core and New Downtown Zoning Districts and subject to the Oviedo on the Park Master Plan.

The total land area is approximately 4.25 acres. The project includes two (2) restaurant buildings of 6,200 square feet and 4,480 square feet, a third multi-tenant commercial building of 7,800 square feet, two (2) future commercial development sites, 264 off-street parking spaces and some existing on-street parking abutting the site. The proposed amount of parking is sufficient and may exceed the needed parking for the proposed and future development at the remainder of the site. The site layout is provided in Attachment 2.

The Applicant requests the following deviations to the Land Development Code minimum requirements. The applicant's letter providing justification and mitigation for the requested deviations is provided in Attachment 3. Staff has no objection to the deviation requests.

Deviation Requests

1. LDC Sec. 6.4(L)(7)(b): A 5-interior landscape island deviation to the requirement that an interior landscape island shall be provided for each 10 parking spaces, to allow 12 islands instead of the 17 interior islands required per Code, a 30% deviation.
2. LDC Sec. 6.4(L)(7)(b): A 1-terminal landscape island deviation to the requirement that parking space rows have terminal islands, to allow 22 terminal island trees instead of the minimum of 23 terminal landscape islands required per Code, a 4.3% deviation.
3. LDC Sec. 8.7(A)(3)(b): A 3-street tree deviation to the minimum street tree requirements to allow 8 street trees instead of the minimum of 11 street trees required per Code along Mitchell Hammock Road, a 27% deviation.
4. LDC Sec. 6.4(L)(6)(f): An 18-large landscape buffer tree deviation to the minimum large buffer tree requirements to allow 0 large buffer trees, instead of the minimum 18 large buffer trees required per Code on the South buffer landscape area, a 100% deviation.
5. LDC Sec. 6.4(L)(6)(f): A 7-understory landscape buffer tree deviation to the minimum understory buffer tree requirements to allow 11 understory buffer trees instead of the 18 minimum understory trees required per Code on the South buffer landscape area, a 39% deviation.
6. LDC Sec. 6.4(L)(6)(d): A 2-large landscape buffer tree deviation to the minimum large buffer tree requirements to allow 18 large buffer trees instead of the 20 minimum large buffer trees required per Code to be located along parking areas facing Mike Roberto Way, a 10% deviation.
7. LDC Sec. 6.4(L)(6)(d): A 5-foot deviation to the minimum landscape buffer width requirement, to allow a buffer width of 5 feet on the east buffer landscape area instead of the minimum 10-foot width required per Code, a 50% deviation.
8. LDC Sec. 8.7(B)(3)(b): A 24-parking-space deviation to the requirement that no more than one row of surface parking shall be located in front of the principal building or the extension of the line of the primary façade on an arterial road, to allow 52 out of the 92 parking spaces to be located in between the building and the road, a 26% deviation.

Interior Lot Lighting

The applicant requests to use LDC Section 8.7(A)(4)(c) to propose alternative lighting design, which requires City Council approval. Per LDC Section 8.7, the City Council may approve alternative lighting design based upon an evaluation of the aesthetic of the design and its overall consistency with proximate architectural features.

LDC Section 6.4(U)(4)(b) requires the following:

(b) **Fixture Type**

(i) Light poles shall be of a uniform design that is consistent with the architecture of the New Downtown Village Core and New Downtown Districts, and shall include ornamentation which provides visual interest.

(ii) All exterior lighting installations shall use concealed source fixtures. These shall be cut off type fixtures in which the lenses do not project below the opaque section of the fixture. Fixture

styles shall be consistent throughout the site and selected for their aesthetic value as well as their functional value.

(iii) Other types of fixtures shall be approved by the Land Use Administrator if it is demonstrated that:

1. The fixture will not cause glare;
2. The fixture will not cause light spillover onto adjacent properties which are either in residential use or are not part of the parcel proposed for development.
3. The fixture is of a type which is more complimentary to the architecture of the site than the fixtures which are in strict compliance with Subsection 6.4(U)(4)(b)(i); and
4. The use of the fixture will enhance the aesthetic character of the project compared to the fixtures which are in strict compliance with Subsection 6.4(U)(4)(b)(i).

The Applicant proposes to install a twenty-five foot (25'), fluted light pole with a flat LED fixture mounted on top.

The applicant's letter justifying the alternative design is provided in Attachment 4. A copy of the proposed lighting plan is provided in Attachment 5. The applicant requests approval of the proposed alternative design because the proposed flat LED light fixture is inconsistent with LDC Section 6.4(U)(4)(b), and with nearby non-residential lighting within Oviedo on the Park. The applicant's justification letter states the following:

1. While the decorative pedestrian light pole is ideal for walkways and pedestrian plazas it is not so ideal (or economical) for streets & parking lots. The tight circular light pattern of the decorative light is not capable of lighting a parking lot and was not designed for that purpose.
2. The LED light fixtures that we are proposing are mounted on 25' tall fluted light poles and are designed (based on their throw pattern) to illuminate parking areas and drive aisles. We are asking that you approve our alternative Photometric Plan for the following reasons:
 - A) The height of the decorative pole is 16' and classified as a pedestrian light where as our proposed light pole height is 25" and classified as street & parking area light that meets code.
 - B) The tight circular light pattern of the decorative light is not capable of lighting beyond the adjacent parking space and into the drive aisles. We would have to add a lot more light poles to try and meet the uniformity code. The decorative light fixtures are not designed to light parking areas.
 - C) The light fixtures and wall packs that we are proposing are highly efficient, forward throwing light patterns that are designed to light roadways and large parking lots.
 - D) Non-decorative light poles similar to ours have already been installed in the Strand's parking lot across the street from Marlowe's Tavern (please see attached photo 'B') and other areas of OOTP (see attached Photo 'C').
 - E) We are proposing a 25' tall, fluted decorative light pole that meets code.

The applicant’s justification letter expresses concerns that if a design for ornamental lighting similar to that on nearby non-residential lots in Oviedo on the Park is required, it may not provide enough lighting, and it may require redesign of the lighting plan.

Staff reviewed the proposed alternative lighting design and found the following:

1. The proposed 25’ tall fluted light pole, though taller than the 18’ tall non-residential light poles within Oviedo on the Park, is consistent with the fluted design of the decorative light poles within Oviedo on the Park. Staff has no objection to the proposed light pole.
2. The proposed flat, LED box fixture is inconsistent with the bell-shaped light fixtures installed in the other non-residential parking lots, the bell-shaped light fixtures installed within the City parking lot and the bell-shaped light street light fixtures within Oviedo on the Park.
3. The proposed flat LED box fixture is consistent with the parking lot light fixtures provided in the parking lots of the Strand and Strand II Multi-family complexes.

With the exception of a few locations, the Strand and Strand II parking lot lights are hidden by the buildings and not visible from Oviedo Boulevard, Mitchell Hammock Road, Mike Roberto Way, Center Lake Lane, and City Walk Lane. The proposed light fixtures for Lot 4 will be visible from Mitchell Hammock Road, Oviedo Boulevard, City Walk Lane, and Mike Roberto Way. The proposed fixtures will be the first thing seen by people traveling west on Mitchell Hammock Road from east of Oviedo Boulevard.

4. The proposed light fixture cannot be classified as ornamental or consistent with other non-residential properties within Oviedo on the Park.
5. The proposed light fixture is not of a type which is more complimentary to the architecture of the site than the fixtures installed in the other non-residential properties within Oviedo on the Park.
6. The proposed light fixture will not enhance the aesthetic character of the project compared to the fixtures installed in the other non-residential properties within Oviedo on the Park.
7. A comparison of the lighting levels depicted in the applicant’s proposal to lighting levels depicted in photometric plans for other Oviedo on the Park non-residential properties indicates a range of lighting levels on the nearby properties, some less than proposed, with Marlow’s/ Maple Street showing a higher average lighting level than the proposed lights for Lot 4. See the table below.

Project	Light Fixture Type	Number of Poles	Minimum Lighting Level	Maximum Lighting Level	Average Lighting Level
OOTP Lot 4 (Proposed)	Non-ornamental	26	1.0	4.4	2.43
Chipotle/ Starbucks	Ornamental	9	0.1	3.8	1.0
Marlow’s/ Maple Street	Ornamental	7	0.9	5.6	2.9
Panera Bread	Ornamental	10	0.1	4.6	Not provided
City Parking Lot	Ornamental	15	0.2	3.6	0.9

8. The Downtown Master Plan and the Oviedo on the Park Master Land Use Plan and enabling agreements have a strong focus on a particular design. The ornamental light fixtures are needed to be maintain the design consistency planned for Oviedo on the Park.

Based on the above findings, Staff recommends the following:

1. Staff recommends approval of the applicant's proposed pole. Although it is taller than the existing poles in Oviedo on the Park, the proposed pole is consistent with the existing poles from an appearance perspective.
2. Staff recommends denial of the applicant's proposed light fixture. Staff recommends that the applicant install an ornamental light fixture that is consistent with the bell-shaped light fixtures installed in the other non-residential parking lots, the bell-shaped light fixtures installed within the City parking lot and the bell-shaped light street light fixtures within Oviedo on the Park.

Staff's review also identified potential conflicts between interior light poles on the lighting plan and landscape trees. The applicant was unable to address this issue prior to the City Council meeting, but has indicated a willingness to do so. In order to keep the project moving forward, Staff added a condition of approval to Site Development Order No. 503-19.

Staff recommends that an LED street light with specific type of pole be installed on within the Mitchell Hammock Road right-of-way. The recommended street light is not depicted on the proposed lighting plan. In order to keep the project moving forward, Staff added a condition to Site Development Order No. 503-19.

Staff has included the following Conditions of Approval within Site Development Order No. 503-19 to implement the above recommendations.

10. The applicant shall provide an amended lighting and photometric plan, including interior lot lighting with ornamental light fixtures, consistent throughout the lot, as well as similar to and consistent with nearby ornamental light fixtures in nonresidential properties of Oviedo on the Park. Such amended plan shall also correct to the extent necessary, interior light pole location conflicts with the location of proposed landscape trees. Such amended plan shall be provided to City Council for approval prior to the installation of any such interior lot lighting.
11. Prior to obtaining the first certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall provide a street light for the site along Mitchell Hammock Road, with a concrete architecturally enhanced pole in black or dark gray, and LED fixture mounted at a height recommended by the lighting engineer. The location of the light shall be agreed upon by the lighting engineer and the Oviedo Public Works Dept.

Three mobility strategies are required for this development, based on traffic generation, as required by the Comprehensive Plan, Policy 2-2.4.1. The applicant agrees to making a payment of \$8,441.16 to the City of Oviedo Mobility fund, in lieu of installing mobility improvements. This is reflected in the Site Development Plans, and Condition of Approval No. 12 in Site Development Order No. 503-19. A copy of Site Development Order 503-19 is provided in Exhibit 1 of Resolution No. 3781-19.

An architectural design order has been approved for Building F at this site. An architectural design order is pending for Building B.

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 3781-19, inclusive of the above-noted conditions of approval for decorative interior lot lighting fixtures, resolving interior light pole and tree conflicts, street lighting and mobility strategies, which are included in the Site Development Order No. 503-19.

Budget Impact: There is no impact to the budget as a result of the adoption of Resolution No.3781-19.

Strategic Impact: Community Character Strategic Focus Area and Economic Vitality and Development.

Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council adopt Resolution No. 3781-19, with conditions as noted above.

Resolution No. 3781-19 does not approve the applicant's request for alternative lighting design. If City Council desires to approve the applicant's request, the Council's motion to approve the applicant's request will need to include direction to Staff to amend Site Development Order No. 503-19 to reflect City Council's approval of the proposed alternative lighting design prior to its execution.

Attachments:

1. Location map
2. Site plan
3. Applicant's justification and mitigation for deviations
4. Applicant's request and rationale for alternative lighting design
5. Applicant's proposed lighting plan

Prepared by: J. Higbee, Development Review Manager
Reviewed by: Teresa Correa, Development Services Director

**AGENDA
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: Bryan Cobb, City Manager

DATE: August 5, 2019

SUBJECT: **Resolution No. 3762-19**, Award of RFP 19-32 Risk Management Program

Procedure: Call up Item
City Manager Background
Consultant Presentation
Public Comment – Request to Speak Forms submitted prior to beginning of meeting
Council Motion & Discussion
Council Action

Introduction: This is a request for City Council to award RFP 19-32 to Public Risk Management of Florida (PRM) as the Risk Management Program provider for the City.

Discussion: PRM was formed in 1987 as a public agency of the State of Florida for the purpose of creating a risk management and self-insurance association pursuant to the terms of Florida Statutes Sections 768.28(16)(a), 440.57 and 163.01, Florida Interlocal Cooperation Act of 1969. The City approved an Interlocal Agreement and placed its Program with PRM on October 1, 1998, and because of the Interlocal Agreement, the City has not competitively bid risk management services since the original placement. The City's purchasing policy, under Section III 1. Purchasing Thresholds, does not require a competitive bid for services provided by other governmental agencies. At its June 25, 2018, Work Session, City Council discussed the City's Risk Management Program and determined that the Program needed to be competitively bid due to the length of time with PRM and continued annual premium increases. Additional deliberations took place as to how quickly the bid should take place. It was decided that it would be best to wait until after the expiration of the hurricane season, December 1, 2018. There were also additional considerations as the City was entering the second year of a two-year rate guarantee and needed to avoid the penalties for early withdrawal. Due to these considerations, City Council directed Staff to advertise a Request for Proposals (RFP) in early calendar year 2019.

In January 2019, the Human Resources Department began to search for a skilled, independent insurance consulting firm with the internal expertise and integrity to assist with the preparation of the RFP and evaluation of the RFP respondents. The City obtained three (3) proposals from the following consulting firms: E.W. Siver and Associates, Inc., Ben Few and Associates and UIC Inc. As provided in Attachment one (1), following a thorough review of references, Staff

determined that E.W. Siver and Associates, Inc. (Siver) was the most responsive to the City's needs. On March 5, 2019, a work order was issued to Siver in an amount not to exceed \$15,000.

With the assistance of Human Resources and Purchasing Staff, Siver developed a comprehensive formal solicitation. RFP No. 19-32, provided in Attachment 8, was broadcast on VendorLink on April 5, 2019, and advertised in the Orlando Sentinel on April 7, 2019. The due date for submittals was May 20, 2019.

The City received the following three (3) submittals which were recorded as responsive in providing the required City Forms:

1. The Florida League of Cities Florida Municipal Insurance Trust (FMIT) and Foundation Risk Partners and Halifax/Acentria Public Risk submitted a proposal with the majority of coverages being provided by FMIT. This proposal was later withdrawn.
2. Risk Management Associates, dba Public Risk Insurance Advisors (PRIA), submitted a proposal with the majority of coverages being provided by the Preferred Government Insurance Trust (PGIT).
3. World Risk Management submitted a proposal with the majority of coverages being provided by Public Risk Management of Florida (PRM).

Bid Opening Minutes are provided in Attachment 2. Under the facilitation of the City's Purchasing Agent, a committee was formed to review the submittals. It was comprised of the following City employees:

Jerry Boop	Finance Director
Bryan Cobb	City Manager
Jennifer Clark	Sr. Human Resources Coordinator
Connie Collins	Human Resources Director
Susan Sheikh	Operational Resources Manager

A copy of the submittals was transmitted to Siver via FEDEX to perform an analysis and to provide a review of their findings. Siver compiled a comprehensive Summary of Proposals which is provided in Attachment 3. The comprehensive summary is seventy (70) pages and goes into great detail comparing the different premiums, limits and liabilities provided in each submittal. In addition, the committee developed Hypothetical Loss Claim Scenarios, provided in Attachment 4, and requested Siver to provide an in-depth analysis on the loss outcome of each claim based on the proposals of the three respondents.

The Committee held a public meeting on June 6, 2019, to discuss the RFP responses and Loss Claim scenarios. A conference call was held between the Committee and Siver requesting their guidance in navigating through the information. It was the consensus of the Committee that the next step would be to conduct reference checks as a group, and that Siver would finalize their

report and offer a recommendation at a future date. Minutes from this meeting are provided in Attachment 5.

The Committee met on consecutive days to complete the reference check process. Provided in Attachment 6 are the names of the agencies, the individuals contacted, and the questions that were asked. This process permitted the agencies an opportunity to discuss the services they receive and their level of satisfaction with their provider.

The Committee held a public meeting on June 25, 2019, at which, Siver presented the final Summary of Proposals, Attachment 3, and Loss Claim Scenarios, Attachment 4. Siver stated that the City received three (3) reputable proposals and were it not for the RFP, the renewal process for the City would likely have resulted in a premium increase due to the current condition of the property market. Overall, the proposals offer the same bundle of services. However, there are certain advantages and disadvantages with each proposal which are provided in Attachment 7, Memorandum, Summary of Key Issues and Proposals. Minutes from this meeting are provided in Attachment 9.

On July 22, 2019, The Florida League of Cities Florida Municipal Insurance Trust (FMIT) and Foundation Risk Partners and Halifax/Acentria Public Risk withdrew their proposal and should no longer be considered.

Property Risk Management (PRM)

Advantages

PRM's property policy sub-limits are significantly higher than PGIT. These sub-limits can result in significantly higher recoveries in many potential loss situations which are illustrated in the Loss Claim Scenarios, provided in Attachment 4, and the Memorandum, Summary of Key Issues and Proposals provided in Attachment 7.

PRM offers \$3,000,000 of employer's liability coverage compared to \$1,000,000 in the other program.

PRM's structure is vastly different from the other proposer. They buy layers of insurance and pass on much of the risk to the excess carriers.

PRM pays back member dividends so surpluses do not accumulate unnecessarily.

In the Loss Claim Scenarios, PRM had better coverage for business interruption claims, unnamed locations, unintentional errors and omissions, course of construction and additions, money and securities, increased cost of construction, transit and Employers Liability.

Disadvantages

PRM has shared property limits. Although many of the PRM property sub-limits are higher than PGIT, it is important to note that, in a single occurrence (such as a hurricane), these limits would be shared among all program members in that occurrence. If multiple members suffer damage from the same occurrence, the amount of coverage available to the City could be greatly reduced.

The defense costs under the Public Officials Liability coverage erode the available limit of coverage. While these defense costs are included in liability claims limits under the PRM Program, Siver advised that Statutory limits of \$200,000/\$300,000 protect the City in most scenarios from exceeding the limits of \$5 million per claim. The only instance that would potentially put those limits at risk would be a claim that had support for a Senate Claims Bill.

Of the two proposers, which are all offering insurance through a government insurance pool, PRM is the smallest in terms of members and surplus. Unlike PGIT, PRM requires the City to pay for the run-out administration of open claims if the City decides to exit the program. This run-out cost is estimated at a one-time cost of approximately \$60,000. PRM also requires notice be provided prior to any exit from the Program. This is considered by some to be a disadvantage of the Program because it creates potential barriers to testing the market, however, it also results in stability within the membership. In general, this is a much larger concern for entities that are considering joining PRM than it is for entities that are already members. As the City is already a member, it is only a consideration if the City decides to exit the program.

Preferred Government Insurance Trust (PGIT)

Advantages

PGIT offered to provide a two-year rate option.

Although many of the sub-limits are lower than PRM, the limits shown are guaranteed to be available for each insured. However, there is an overall program shared limit of \$340,000,000.

The PGIT program offers a \$1,000 deductible for equipment breakdown versus \$10,000 in the other programs.

PGIT offers first dollar (\$0) Workers Compensation coverage compared to the current deductible of \$10,000 per occurrence.

PGIT is offering \$2,000,000 limits for most Cyber liability coverages compared to the current \$1,000,000 limits.

The defense costs under the Public Officials Liability coverage do not erode the available limit of coverage.

Disadvantages

As shown in the chart in the Memorandum, Summary of Key Issues and Proposals provided in Attachment 7, PGIT has significantly lower sub-limits for many coverages when compared to PRM. When the Loss Scenarios were analyzed, PGIT's coverage resulted in much higher out-of-pocket costs to the City in Scenarios 3, 4 and 5 as shown in Attachment 4. These out-of-pocket costs were significantly greater than the amount saved by the zero-deductible option.

PGIT did not include a separate proposal for Pollution Liability, but instead stated they would recommend that the City stay with its current XL Pollution Liability policy.

After meeting with the Committee and thoroughly vetting the various reports provided, Siver recommended staying with the current provider, PRM, for the following reasons:

- PRM shared property limits are better than PGIT coverages.
- PRM's property coverage will result in higher payouts to the City and significantly lower out-of-pocket costs.
- PRM has no limit on unscheduled property.
- Overall coverage from the PRM Program is superior.
- PRM offered the most cost-effective and comprehensive Program.
- Change in providers will not result in any savings PRM's coverage, customer service, and legal representation has been outstanding since inception.

It was the consensus of the Committee to move forward with Siver's recommendation, which is provided in Attachment 10, Siver's Summary and Recommendation, and accept World Risk Management's proposal of major lines for coverage through the PRM Program.

Budget Impact: Total program cost for the current Fiscal Year 2018-19 is \$1,182,152. If approved, Request for Proposal No. 19-32 will result in a Fiscal Year 2019-20 total program cost of \$861,786, a savings of \$320,366, or 27.1%. In addition to the program cost savings of \$320,366, the City will receive a participation credit of \$31,365 for an overall savings of \$351,731 or 29.8%.

Strategic Impact: Continue high levels of customer service, productivity, and efficiency while maintaining fiscal and organizational health.

Recommendation: It is recommended that City Council adopt Resolution No. 3762-19.

Attachment: 1. Memo and Related Work Order, Selection of Siver
 2. Bid Opening Minutes
 3. Summary of Proposals
 4. Loss Scenarios Comparison
 5. Meeting Minutes, June 6, 2019
 6. Meeting Minutes, June 19, 2019
 7. Memorandum, Summary of Key Issues and Proposals
 8. RFP 19-32 Property & Casualty Insurance
 9. Meeting Minutes, June 26, 2019
 10. Siver's Summary and Recommendation

Prepared by: Jerry Boop, Finance Director and Connie Collins, Human Resources Director