

Neighborhood Resiliency Projects Advisory Committee

Committee Members

Clare McCord, Chair
Curt Dyer, Vice-Chair
Julie Basner
Stephan Ginez
Karin Matos
Barbara Montero
Ronald Starkman

TO: Members of the Neighborhood Resiliency Projects Advisory Committee

DATE: September 17, 2026

SUBJECT: DRAFT Minutes of the Neighborhood Resiliency Projects Advisory Committee held on June 11, 2026

Present: Clare McCord, Chair, Curt Dyer, Vice-Chair, Julie Basner, Stephan Ginez (virtual), Barbara Montero, Ron Starkman

Absent: Karin Matos

City Staff:

Amy Knowles, Liaison

Commissioner Alex J. Fernandez

Sydney Alonso, Sabrina Batlle, Maria Cerna, Lauren Firtel, Caroline Sorenson

CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

C. McCord called the meeting to order and welcomed all who attended.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Virtual Attendance

C. McCord moved to approve virtual attendance for Committee Member Stephan Ginez, allowing him to be considered virtually present for the meeting. The motion was seconded by J. Basner and approved unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

C. McCord moved to approve the minutes from the April 28th, 2026, Neighborhood Resiliency Projects Advisory Committee (NRPAC) meeting. The motion was seconded by B. Montero and approved unanimously.

Committee Members

Clare McCord, Chair
Curt Dyer, Vice-Chair
Julie Basner
Stephan Ginez
Karin Matos
Barbara Montero
Ronald Starkman

Discuss Recommendations related to City Commission Item, Expand Stop the Pause Ordinance

C. McCord reviewed the agenda and noted that the Committee's sole topic for the meeting was a recommendation related to the Stop the Pause ordinance. Explaining that changes had been made following the previous meeting. C. McCord then opened the floor for discussion.

J. Basner pointed out language in the document referencing "important design milestones" and asked for clarification on what this referred to. Committee members confirmed that the term pertains to the 30%, 60%, and 90% design milestones.

Commissioner Fernandez clarified that the Office of Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) has historically defined these milestones, as outlined in the definitions section of the ordinance. A. Knowles noted that the preceding recital also identifies the 30%, 60%, and 90% stages as significant milestones, ensuring the intent is clearly stated.

S. Ginez stated support for the current language, emphasizing that while communication improvements are important, they can be addressed separately. S. Ginez noted that the proposed changes adequately address the primary intent. S. Ginez added that attempting to incorporate broader communication procedures into this ordinance could be lengthy.

C. McCord thanked the Committee and expressed agreement with prior comments, noting that the collaboration with Commissioner Fernandez had helped refine language ensuring the ordinance clearly reflects the intention to incorporate resident feedback within the ordinance.

The Committee then discussed expectations around public meetings during the design process. R. Starkman noted that in addition to the meeting held at design kickoff, they had expected the ordinance to explicitly state that a public session would occur at the 30% design milestone.

Commissioner Fernandez clarified that holding a public meeting at 30% design is already the established practice, as projects proceed to Design Review Board or Historic Preservation Board review shortly after that stage. For this reason, it may not have been explicitly included in the draft. Commissioner Fernandez emphasized the importance of codifying these existing practices within the ordinance so that future staff understand that public engagement at these milestones is intended to continue. Commissioner Fernandez requested that staff work with M. Cerna and the City Attorney to develop appropriate language to institutionalize the existing practice.

Committee Members

Clare McCord, Chair

Curt Dyer, Vice-Chair

Julie Basner

Stephan Ginez

Karin Matos

Barbara Montero

Ronald Starkman

The Committee and staff discussed the value of holding a public meeting at the project kickoff stage. Members agreed that this early meeting provides the community with the strongest opportunity to give input before significant design work occurs. They noted that by the 30% design milestone, many elements are already developed, making major changes more difficult. The Committee expressed support for ensuring both the kickoff meeting and the 30% meeting are reflected in the ordinance. Commissioner A. Fernandez added that all public-meeting practices currently in place will be incorporated into the ordinance. The Committee and staff then discussed what the current practices are.

J. Basner asked how project information is shared with the community prior to public meetings.

M. Cerna and L. Firtel explained that staff are working to expand the project webpages to include clearer updates indicating whether a project is at the 30%, 60%, or 90% design stage. They noted that while full plan sets are typically not posted due to their size and technical complexity, presentations and renderings can be made available online. Staff added that residents who wish to review detailed plan sheets may schedule one-on-one meetings to go through the documents with staff.

C. Dyer asked about the volume of City projects and which types would fall under the ordinance. Staff explained that there are currently several Neighborhood Improvement Projects (NIPs) underway, as well as additional construction projects.

Staff provided examples of projects that could be applicable, such as the North Beach Log Cabin reconstruction, where discussions about relocating the structure could impact project costs. Staff noted that Public Works oversees a large number of projects citywide, while not every project is a facility project, many undergo some level of public engagement even without being formally tied to the ordinance. The Committee acknowledged and discussed the numerous City projects are currently in construction or design phases.

R. Starkman noted support for the 30% design requirement, explaining that it creates an early checkpoint for residents and leaves sufficient time between the 30% and 60% stages for community concerns to be raised with commissioners if needed. R. Starkman emphasized that stronger engagement early in the process leads to better outcomes.

C. McCord made a motion that after working with Commissioner Fernandez and the Inspector General and having several robust discussions have approved the language proposed for the ordinance amendment with the addition of a public meeting at the 30% milestone. J. Basner

Neighborhood Resiliency Projects Advisory Committee

Committee Members

Clare McCord, Chair
Curt Dyer, Vice-Chair
Julie Basner
Stephan Ginez
Karin Matos
Barbara Montero
Ronald Starkman

seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and shared via Letter to Commission (LTC) (Attachment A).

FUTURE MEETING DATES/TOPICS

The Committee agreed to discuss West Avenue at the next meeting, focusing on communication efforts during the summer and rainy season, with the goal of recommending improvements to the current communication process and sharing those recommendations via LTC.

The Committee also agreed to discuss resiliency infrastructure as it relates to increased development and developer projects, including whether resiliency elements being adequately considered. Additionally, the Committee will review traffic-related safety concerns and strategies for effectively communicating these efforts to residents.

The Committee reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule and agreed to cancel the July 16 meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- No public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

C. McCord made a motion to adjourn. B. Montero seconded the motion.

MIAMI BEACH

LTC # 273-2026

LETTER TO COMMISSION

TO: Honorable Mayor Steven Meiner and Members of the City Commission

FROM: Rafael E. Granado, City Clerk Signed by: Rafael Granado
FAB8BA0BF8E4CF...

DATE: June 22, 2026

SUBJECT: **Neighborhood Resiliency Projects Advisory Committee Motion**

The purpose of this Letter to Commission (LTC) is to inform the Mayor and City Commission of a motion passed by the Neighborhood Resiliency Projects Advisory Committee at its meeting on June 11, 2026.

At the February 25, 2026 City Commission Meeting, during discussion of item R5 S, Stop the Pause Policy, the ordinance was referred for further discussion to the Neighborhood Resiliency Projects Advisory Committee.

The Neighborhood Resiliency Projects Advisory Committee made the following motion:

At its June 11, 2026, meeting, "the Neighborhood Resiliency Projects Advisory Committee, after working with Commissioner Fernandez and the Inspector General and having several robust discussions have approved the language proposed for the ordinance amendment with the addition of a public meeting at the 30% milestone."

Motion made by: Clare McCord, Chair Signed by: Clare McCord
45E175AED34F43D

Motion seconded by: Julie Basner

Motion Passed: 5-0

Members present: Clare McCord, Curt Dyer, Barbara Montero, Julie Basner, Ronald Starkman

Members virtually present: Stephen Ginez

Members absent: Karin Matos

Attachment A: DRAFT Ordinance reviewed by Committee

To view the full meeting recording, please visit:

<https://youtu.be/SzYV22cpNe4>

DS
MH DS
AK

MH/AK

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 2 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATION," BY AMENDING ARTICLE II, ENTITLED "CITY COMMISSION," BY AMENDING SECTION 2-18 ENTITLED "STOP THE PAUSE POLICY" TO ESTABLISH MINIMUM VOTING THRESHOLDS FOR THE CITY COMMISSION RELATING TO SPECIFIED PROJECTS AT ADVANCED STAGES OF COMPLETION HAVING AN ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST ABOVE A STATED THRESHOLD; TO FULLY INFORM THE PUBLIC OF THE DETAILS AND ADDITIONAL EXPENSE OF MATERIAL CHANGES TO SUCH PROJECTS; AND PROVIDING FOR REPEALER, SEVERABILITY, CODIFICATION, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City of Miami Beach enacted Ordinance No. 2024-4648 on September 21, 2024, establishing voting thresholds for critical infrastructure projects; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission now desires to expand the coverage of the ordinance to include all capital projects having an estimated construction cost above a stated threshold at stated points of completion where substantial taxpayer funds have already been expended except in the case of unforeseen site conditions that materially impact the cost of the project; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission further finds that material changes to increase the scope of a project could result in significant cost overruns or negate the project entirely, and therefore should require a higher voting threshold than a simple majority; and

WHEREAS, these amendments will ensure clarity, fiscal responsibility, and continuity in the execution of capital projects, as well as greater transparency of their costs and consequences; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission finds that it is prudent to establish a higher threshold of approval by the Commission and heightened awareness by the public of the anticipated additional expense to pause, delay, stop, or materially modify capital projects at advanced stages to ensure continuity, timely completion, and accountability, while allowing for exceptions in the case of unforeseen site conditions that materially impact the cost of the project, and provided, this policy shall not in any way limit the City Commission's ability to accept the recommendation of the City Manager to reject all bids or to take any action the Commission deems necessary to protect the City's rights under a contract with a design consultant or contractor; and

WHEREAS, the City ~~provides will~~ ensure robust communications in advance of design and throughout the project, including public meetings, a project specific web page, a map of active projects, dedicated Public Information Outreach (PIO) firm, door-to-door distributions, onsite coordination, and other mechanisms to clarify information and timely address stakeholder questions and feedback, and

WHEREAS, the 30, 60, and 90-percent design completion points are significant milestones, and as the design advances, changes become more difficult and costly, and

~~WHEREAS, the City will continue to utilize robust communication methods to engage the community for feedback at important design milestones leading up to and including any action by the City to materially modify the specified projects; and~~

WHEREAS, the City will utilize robust communications to inform the community about the nature, process and critical timelines of important design milestones and engage the community for feedback prior to important design milestones being reached leading up to and including any action by the City to materially modify the specified projects.

WHEREAS, the City Commission finds that holding a public project "kick-off" meeting immediately following execution of the design contract will serve the community well by providing an opportunity for residents to meet the design consultants and provide feedback at the earliest phase of project development; and

WHEREAS, such early engagement will assist in the development of the 30% design documents, allowing community concerns and input to be meaningfully incorporated into the design process, provided such input remains within the authority and project definition resolved by the City Commission; and

WHEREAS, establishing such higher thresholds of approval and cost transparency to pause, delay, stop or materially modify projects will also result in substantial cost savings to taxpayers.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Article II of Chapter 2 of the Code of the City Miami Beach is hereby amended to create Section 2-18 as follows:

**CHAPTER 2
ADMINISTRATION**

* * *

ARTICLE II. CITY COMMISSION

* * *

Sec. 2-18. Stop the Pause Policy.

(1) Definitions.

For purposes of this section only:

~~(a) critical infrastructure projects shall be defined to include:~~

~~(i) Projects relating to fire flow, stormwater systems, potable water, and sanitary sewer projects deemed by the city manager to be critical due to risk of failure;~~

~~(ii) Utility projects to replace and/or upgrade systems that are at or near capacity; and~~

~~(iii) Neighborhood Improvement Projects ("NIPs") that have been approved by the city commission, that may include resiliency-related improvements such as road raising and harmonization.~~

(2) Voting Requirements to Pause, Delay, Stop or Materially Modify Critical Infrastructure Projects.

~~(a) A 5/7th vote of the City Commission shall be required before the City Commission may take any action that has the effect of pausing, delaying, stopping or materially modifying a critical infrastructure project (as defined herein) having an estimated construction cost of \$1,000,000 or more that is at least at 60% design.~~

~~(b) A 6/7th vote of the City Commission shall be required before the City Commission may take any action that has the effect of pausing, delaying, stopping or materially modifying a critical infrastructure project having an estimated construction cost of \$1,000,000 or more that has obtained all permits and is shovel-ready.~~

~~(c) Notwithstanding the requirements of subsections (a) and (b), only a 4/7th vote shall be required for the Commission to take any action that has the effect of pausing, delaying, stopping or materially modifying a critical infrastructure project having an estimated construction cost of \$1,000,000 or more in the event of (i) unforeseen site conditions that materially impact the cost of construction, (ii) funding limitations, and/or (iii) funding emergencies, and provided, the provisions of this section shall not in any way limit the Commission's ability, on a 4/7th vote, to accept the recommendation of the City Manager to reject all bids or to take any action the Commission deems necessary to protect the City's rights under a contract with a design consultant or contractor.~~

~~(d) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this section, with regard to critical infrastructure projects having an estimated construction cost of \$1,000,000 or more, the approval of (i) material changes to increase the scope of any such critical infrastructure project or (ii) an increase to the contract price for any such project shall continue to require a simple majority (i.e. 4/7th) vote of the commission.~~

(1) Definitions.

For purposes of this section only:

(a) Capital projects shall include all projects contained in the City's five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

(b) 30% Design Completion Milestone shall mean the stage at which the overall vision and main ideas for the project have been developed. At this stage the design will reveal the project's size, shape, and purpose. Deliverables generally include:

(i) Site plan and basic floor plans showing overall layout, adjacencies, and key dimensions;

- (ii) Initial building systems approach (structural concept, preliminary (MEP) strategies);
 - (iii) Preliminary architectural concepts (massing, elevations, basic materials);
 - (iv) Initial code and regulatory analysis identifying major constraints; and
 - (v) Preliminary cost estimate
- (c) 60% Design Completion Milestone shall mean the stage at which drawings and documents have much more detail, showing how different systems and materials will come together and how the building will actually function, based on the concept developed at the 30% level. At 60%, the design has been substantially developed, enabling detailed cost reconciliation and value engineering decisions. Deliverables typically include:
- (i) Updated architectural drawings, including developed plans, elevations, and building sections;
 - (ii) Detailed engineering documents, including structural framing plans, MEP system layouts, and civil/utility design progress.
 - (iii) Outline specifications expanded to identify all major materials, equipment, and performance criteria.
 - (iv) More refined code compliance analysis.
 - (v) Second phase cost estimate from the Architect (required at each benchmark).
- (d) 90% Design Completion Milestone shall mean documents are nearly complete and suitable for final cost setting and the start of permitting, including:
- (i) Full architectural and engineering construction drawings, nearing final coordination level.
 - (ii) Final technical specifications covering all divisions.
 - (iii) Integrated MEP, structural, civil, landscape, and specialty systems with minimal outstanding decisions.
 - (iv) Quality control and interdisciplinary coordination completed, with only minor adjustments anticipated.
 - (v) 90% cost estimate (A/E) supporting preparation of the City's bid documents or the CM's Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)"

(2) Public Outreach Requirements

- (a.) Immediately following execution of the design contract for any capital project subject to this section, the City shall hold a public "project kick-off" meeting for the purpose of introducing the design consultants, presenting the scope and objectives of the project, and obtaining community feedback. Input received at this meeting shall be considered in the development of the 30% Design Completion Milestone documents, to the extent such input remains within the authority and project definition resolved by the City Commission.

~~(2)(3)~~ -Voting Requirements to Pause, Delay, Stop or Materially Modify Capital Projects.

- (a.) A 5/7th vote of the city commission shall be required before taking any action that has the effect of pausing, delaying, stopping, or materially modifying (including, without limitation, material modifications increasing or decreasing the project scope) a capital project having an estimated construction cost of \$1,000,000 or more that has reached or exceeded the 60% Design Completion Milestone.
- (b.) A 6/7th vote of the city commission shall be required before taking any action that has the effect of pausing, delaying, stopping, or materially modifying (including, without limitation, material modifications increasing or decreasing the project scope) a capital project having an estimated construction cost of \$1,000,000 or more that has reached or exceeded the 90% Design Completion Milestone and has obtained all required permits necessary for commencement of construction.
- (c.) In connection with any vote taken by the City Commission pursuant to subsections (a) or (b), a detailed cost estimate of the modification shall be included in any public information provided by the City prior to the vote, and the amount of such estimate shall be stated in the text of any resolution for approval of same.
- (d.) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), only a 4/7th vote shall be required for the city commission to take such action in the event of unforeseen site conditions that impact the cost of construction and provided, the provisions of this section shall not in any way limit the commission's ability, on a 4/7th vote, to accept the recommendation of the city manager to reject all bids, to value engineer a project to reduce costs if it is more than 10% over budget, or to take any action the commission deems necessary to protect the city's rights under a contract with a design consultant or contractor.

SECTION 2. REPEALER.

All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith be and the same are hereby repealed.

SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY.

If any section, subsection, clause or provision of this Ordinance is held invalid, the remainder shall not be affected by such invalidity.

SECTION 4. CODIFICATION.

It is the intention of the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, and it is

hereby ordained that the provisions of this Ordinance shall become and be made part of the Code of the City of Miami Beach, Florida. The sections of this Ordinance may be renumbered or relettered to accomplish such intention, and the word "ordinance" may be changed to "section," "article," or other appropriate word.

SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Ordinance shall take effect on the _____ day of _____, 2026.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this _____ day of _____, 2026.

ATTEST:

Rafael E. Granado, City Clerk

Steven Meiner, Mayor

(Sponsored by Commissioner Alex J. Fernandez)

Underline denotes additions

~~Strikethrough~~ denotes deletions

Double underline denotes additions on second reading

APPROVED AS TO
FORM & LANGUAGE
& FOR EXECUTION

City Attorney *RR*

Date