



**City Commission Meeting  
SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL 2**

**City Hall, Commission Chambers, 3rd Floor, 1700 Convention Center Drive  
June 10, 2015**

Mayor Philip Levine  
Vice-Mayor Jonah Wolfson  
Commissioner Michael Grieco  
Commissioner Joy Malakoff  
Commissioner Micky Steinberg  
Commissioner Edward L. Tobin  
Commissioner Deede Weithorn

City Manager Jimmy L. Morales  
City Attorney Raul J. Aguila  
City Clerk Rafael E. Granado

Visit us at [www.miamibeachfl.gov](http://www.miamibeachfl.gov) for agendas and video "streaming" of City Commission Meetings.

**ATTENTION ALL LOBBYISTS**

**Chapter 2, Article VII, Division 3 of the City Code of Miami Beach entitled "Lobbyists" requires the registration of all lobbyists with the City Clerk prior to engaging in any lobbying activity with the City Commission, any City Board or Committee, or any personnel as defined in the subject Code sections. Copies of the City Code sections on lobbyists laws are available in the City Clerk's office. Questions regarding the provisions of the Ordinance should be directed to the Office of the City Attorney.**

**SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA**

**R7 - Resolutions**

R7M A Resolution Accepting The Recommendation Of The City Manager, Pursuant To Invitation To Negotiate (ITN) 2014-170-SW For A Gated Revenue Control System For The City's Parking Garages; Approving The Material Terms Of An Agreement Between The City And Skidata, Inc., As Set Forth In The Term Sheet Attached As Exhibit "A" Hereto; Authorizing The City Manager And The City Attorney's Office To Finalize The Agreement Based Upon The Material Terms Approved Herein; Provided That They May Make Any Non-Substantive And Non-Material Revisions And/Or Additions To The Agreement, As They Deem Necessary; Authorizing The Mayor And City Clerk To Execute The Final Agreement; And, In The Event That The City Is Unable To Finalize Successful Negotiations With Skidata, Inc., Authorizing The City Manager And The City Attorney's Office To Negotiate An Agreement With Amano McGann, Inc. Based Upon The Material Terms Approved In Exhibit "A" Herein (Provided That They May Make Any Non-Substantive And Non-Material Revisions And/Or Additions To The Agreement).

(Procurement/Parking)

**(Memorandum & Resolution)**

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**Condensed Title:**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH FLORIDA, ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY MANAGER PURSUANT TO INVITATION TO NEGOTIATE (ITN) 2014-170-SW FOR A GATED REVENUE CONTROL SYSTEM FOR THE CITY'S PARKING GARAGES.**

**Key Intended Outcome Supported:**

Ensure expenditure trends are sustainable over the long term.

**Supporting Data (Surveys, Environmental Scan, etc):** N/A

**Item Summary/Recommendation:**

The City's Parking Department is seeking a state of the art gated parking revenue control system, including centralized processing of data for all of the City's parking garages, a central monitoring station for: intercoms, CCTV at all entrance and exit lanes, and access control for all garage equipment. This will allow for operational savings as well as enhanced audit controls. In order to achieve this service level, all garages must have compatible hardware, software, firmware, and equipment, meaning that one system (vendor) must equip and service all garages.

The City's municipal parking garages are currently operated with on-site cashiers/parking attendants and a gated revenue control system, provided by 3M (manufacturer). The equipment runs along several model lines ranging from several years to over a decade old. Additionally, 3M notified its customers, including the City, of its intent to discontinue its gated parking revenue control subdivision and related equipment and services.

At the September 10, 2014 City Commission meeting, the Mayor and City Commission adopted Resolution No. 2014-28720 accepting the recommendation of the City Manager pertaining to the ranking of proposers pursuant to Invitation To Negotiate (ITN) 2014-170-SW for a Parking Garage Gated Revenue Control System. Further, the Resolution authorized the Administration to enter into negotiations with all the proposers. The Administration was requested to present the final contract for the Commission's review prior to entering into an agreement with the parking equipment companies. The details of the contract negotiation phase and comparative analysis of final replies is attached.

The City Manager, after carefully considering the results of the negotiation process and staff recommendation, recommends that the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, accept the recommendation of the City Manager, pursuant to Invitation To Negotiate (ITN) 2014-170-SW for a gated revenue control system for the City's parking garages; approving the material terms of an agreement between the City and Skidata, Inc., as set forth in the term sheet attached as Exhibit "A" hereto; authorizing the City Manager and the City Attorney's Office to finalize the Agreement based upon the material terms approved herein; provided that they may make any non-substantive and non-material revisions and/or additions to the Agreement, as they deem necessary; authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the final Agreement; and, in the event that the City is unable to finalize successful negotiations with Skidata, Inc., authorizing the City Manager and the City Attorney's Office to negotiate an Agreement with Amano McGann, Inc. based upon the material terms approved in Exhibit "A" herein (provided that they may make any non-substantive and non-material revisions and/or additions to the Agreement).

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Approve the Resolution.**

**Advisory Board Recommendation:**

**Financial Information:**

Source of Funds:	Amount	Account
1	\$ 303,000	142-6176-000674
2	362,000	463-6176-000674
3	471,000	467-6176-000674
4	2,696,000	480-6176-000674
5	400,000	480-0463-000349
<b>OBPI</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,232,000</b>

**Financial Impact Summary:**

**City Clerk's Office Legislative Tracking:**

Alex Denis, Extension 6641

**Sign-Offs:**

<b>Department Director</b>	<b>Assistant City Manager</b>	<b>City Manager</b>
AD  SF 	MT  KGB 	JLM 

T:\AGENDA\2015\June\PROCUREMENT\ITN 2014-170-SW Parking Garage Gated Revenue Control System for the City of Miami Beach SUMMARY.doc





# MIAMI BEACH

City of Miami Beach, 1700 Convention Center Drive, Miami Beach, Florida 33139, www.miamibeachfl.gov

## COMMISSION MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Philip Levine and Members of the City Commission

FROM: Jimmy L. Morales, City Manager

DATE: June 10, 2015

**SUBJECT: A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA, ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY MANAGER, PURSUANT TO INVITATION TO NEGOTIATE (ITN) 2014-170-SW FOR A GATED REVENUE CONTROL SYSTEM FOR THE CITY'S PARKING GARAGES; APPROVING THE MATERIAL TERMS OF AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY AND SKIDATA, INC., AS SET FORTH IN THE TERM SHEET ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT "A" HERETO; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER AND THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE TO FINALIZE THE AGREEMENT BASED UPON THE MATERIAL TERMS APPROVED HEREIN; PROVIDED THAT THEY MAY MAKE ANY NON-SUBSTANTIVE AND NON-MATERIAL REVISIONS AND/OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGREEMENT, AS THEY DEEM NECESSARY; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY CLERK TO EXECUTE THE FINAL AGREEMENT; AND, IN THE EVENT THAT THE CITY IS UNABLE TO FINALIZE SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATIONS WITH SKIDATA, INC., AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER AND THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE TO NEGOTIATE AN AGREEMENT WITH AMANO MCGANN, INC. BASED UPON THE MATERIAL TERMS APPROVED IN EXHIBIT "A" HEREIN (PROVIDED THAT THEY MAY MAKE ANY NON-SUBSTANTIVE AND NON-MATERIAL REVISIONS AND/OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGREEMENT).**

### ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the resolution.

### KEY INTENDED OUTCOME SUPPORTED

Ensure expenditure trends are sustainable over the long term.

### FUNDING

Funding for the one-time capital cost is available as follows:

	Amount	Account
1	\$ 303,000	142-6176-000674
2	362,000	463-6176-000674
3	471,000	467-6176-000674
4	2,696,000	480-6176-000674
5	400,000	480-0463-000349
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,232,000</b>	

Funding for the annual maintenance costs will be subject to appropriation in the annual budget process.

## **BACKGROUND**

The City's Parking System currently has ten (10) municipal parking garages, totaling 6,106 parking spaces. An 11th facility, Collins Avenue Garage is funded and currently in design with an estimated 470 parking spaces, for a grand total of 6,576 parking spaces. The City's Parking Department is seeking a state of the art gated parking revenue control system, including centralized processing of data for all of the City's parking garages, a central monitoring station for: intercoms, CCTV at all entrance and exit lanes, and access control for all garage equipment. This would allow for operational savings as well as enhanced audit controls. In order to achieve this service level, all garages must have compatible hardware, software, firmware, and equipment, meaning that one system (vendor) must equip and service all garages.

The City's municipal parking garages are currently operated with on-site cashiers/parking attendants and a gated revenue control system, provided by 3M (manufacturer). The equipment runs along several model lines ranging from several years to over a decade old. Additionally, 3M notified its customers, including the City, of its intent to discontinue its gated parking revenue control subdivision and related equipment and services.

On May 21, 2014, the Mayor and City Commission approved the issuance of Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) No. 2014-170 for a Parking Garage Gated Revenue Control System. In response to the ITN, the City received proposals from the following five (5) firms:

- Amano McGann, Inc.
- Consolidated Parking Equipment
- Scheidt & Bachmann USA, Inc.
- Skidata Inc.
- WPS USA Corp.

At the September 10, 2014 City Commission meeting, the Mayor and City Commission adopted Resolution No. 2014-28720 accepting the recommendation of the City Manager pertaining to the ranking of proposers pursuant to Invitation To Negotiate (ITN) 2014-170-SW for a Parking Garage Gated Revenue Control System. Further, the Resolution authorized the Administration to enter into negotiations with all the proposers. The Administration was requested to present the final contract for the Commission's review prior to entering into an agreement with the parking equipment companies.

## **CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS**

On December 10, 2014, the Parking and Procurement Departments convened negotiation session No. 1 with all proposers and attended the meeting with Skidata, Inc., Amano MCGann, Inc., LCN, Inc. D/B/A Consolidated Parking Equipment, WPS USA Corp., and Scheidt & Bachmann USA, Inc. The intent of negotiation session No. 1 was to: 1) provide an overview of the ITN negotiation process and clarify any questions proposers may have; 2) discuss and review with proposers the Term Sheet and Cost Proposal Sheets which would form the basis of negotiation discussions; and, 3) schedule site visits with all proposers for December 22 and 23, 2014, to evaluate equipment and inspect all parking garages.

On December 17, 2014, the City was notified by Consolidated Parking Equipment that it had withdrawn its proposal pursuant to the ITN because it had been informed by 3M, the manufacturer of the equipment proposed, that 3M would no longer be producing the proposed equipment. Following this notification from Consolidated, the City ceased further negotiations with Consolidated.

On December 22, and December 23, 2014, site visits were held and attended by the remaining four (4) Proposers: Amano McGann, Inc., Scheidt & Bachmann USA, Inc., Skidata, Inc., and WPS USA Corp. Proposers were given until December 30, 2014, to submit their questions relating to the cost proposal. As a result of questions arising from evaluating the equipment, the Procurement Department issued Response 1, 2, and 3, on January 15, January 28, and January 30, 2015, respectively. On January 30, the City requested cost proposals, for which a due date of February 6, 2015, was established.

On February 6, 2015, cost proposals from Amano McGann, Inc., Skidata, Inc., and WPS USA Corp. were received. At this time, Scheidt & Bachmann USA, Inc., notified the City that, due to schedule conflicts, it had withdrawn its proposal pursuant to the ITN. The following is a brief summary, from the information provided in each firm's proposals, of the final three (3) proposers:

- Amano McGann, Inc. is headquartered in Roseville, Minnesota, with approximately 290 employees across the United States. With over 290 employees, 20 branch offices and over 40 distribution partners throughout the U.S., according to Amano McGann, it has performed over 6,000 installations worldwide along with its parent company Amano Corporation. Amano provides parking, time and access solutions to universities, hotel chains, airports, sports complex and municipalities. Recent clients include the City of West Palm Beach, City of Portland Smart Park Garages, and the City of Detroit.
- SKIDATA, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of SKIDATA, AG (founded in Austria in 1977), was established in North America in January 2000 to serve the off-street parking and revenue control system market segment. According to SKIDATA, it has built over 750 systems in Canada, USA and Mexico. Their products and services are found in airports, municipalities, shopping centers, universities and medical centers across North America. Recent clients include the City of Oklahoma City, City of Beverly Hills, City of St. Louis and Downtown Salt Lake City. Their services include consulting, integration, direct support, documentation and training.
- WPS USA Corp. has over twenty (20) years of experience using bar code technology in their parking access systems. According to WPS, it introduced the first "Credit Car In/Credit Card Out" solution back in the early 1990's. Recent clients have been the City of Norfolk, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation, Rockville Town Square and the Union Station Parking Garage in Washington, D.C.

Several negotiation sessions with all three (3) proposers were scheduled, as well as a request for best and final cost proposals offers. The Administration received final replies to the referenced negotiations on May 19, 2015.

### **ANALYSIS**

Parking gated revenue control system is necessary for the operation of the City's parking facility, as well as the management of over \$16 million in annual revenue at these facilities. A system with robust functionality and reporting/audit capabilities, as well as a partnership with a qualified service provider is critical for the effective management of a system that serves over 3.3M customers annually and through which significant revenue is yielded. For these reasons, the Administration believes that, in the best interest of the City, functionality, prior performance record and cost of the system are critically important considerations. With that in mind, a comparative analysis follows with the purpose of illustrating major differences among the three finalist with whom the City has negotiated.

1. **System Functionality.** The three (3) proposed systems offer basic access and revenue control functionality. The major differences among the three (3) firms are in the areas of ticket technology (barcode vs. magnetic stripe), and validation of disabled permits.

a. **Ticket Technology.** The major difference in the area of functionality is the technology utilized for ticket transactions (vs card access), which is typically either a barcode ticket or magnetic stripe ticket. Historically, each type has been lauded by the industry as the preferred methodology over years. Currently, barcode tickets are the most widely accepted and enjoys a substantial portion of the market share. While all indications seem to point towards continued use and growth of barcode tickets, there is no clear indication of either taking the full market share. The following are the options available for each of the three (3) proposers in the barcode vs. magnetic stripe technologies:

- *Amano McGann, Inc. offers both barcode and magnetic stripe ticket systems; however, both systems cannot be deployed simultaneously in each garage.*
- *Skidata offers both barcode and magnetic stripe ticket systems which may be deployed simultaneously.*
- *WPS offers bar code system only.*

While staff believes that either barcode or magnetic stripe methodologies are acceptable, it is important to note that once a decision on bar code or magnetic stripe is made, future changes in technology will require major system upgrades.

b. EMV (Europay Mastercard & Visa) – Chip embedded credit card technology, which provides users added protection against fraud, is quickly approaching, if not already here.

- *Both Skidata and Amano have solutions for EMV and committed to providing their solution at no additional cost to the City. WPS has advised the City that they are developing an EMV solution; however, its availability and cost is contingent upon various factors. The following is an excerpt from an email sent by Mr. Garrett Coleman, Manufacturer's Representative, on March 17, 2015.*

*"Please understand that there are a number of requirements that companies like WPS are not responsible for completing. These need to be resolved by the credit card industry. Until these are resolved, it is not possible to state for sure there will not be any added costs when the regulations are released and enforced."*

c. **Validation of Disabled Permits.** The process to confirm legitimate disabled parking transactions, typically processed as exception validations, requires human interaction. Disabled parking permits are issued and directly linked to an individual. A disabled parking permit with matching user information on a government issued identification, such as a driver's license or state identification card must be presented to an attendant (at a remote location) for confirmation. Once confirmed, a validation may be processed for a parking fee waiver (the exception), as required by Code. The following are the exception validation solution provided by each proposer:

- *Amano's solution provides individual components; however, the solution is not currently integrated resulting in a very labor intensive process to audit and reconcile validations. Amano offered to further develop their solution, if requested to do so at no additional cost to the City.*
- *Skidata provides an automated audit feature to specifically confirm, track, and retrieve at any point in the future, all validations through a single source, the transient ticket transaction number. The following is a brief description of the Skidata automated solution for validations (exceptions).*

*A customer provides their credentials (disabled parking permit and identification) for viewing by an attendant at a remote centralized monitoring location. The attendant can view the credentials and an image of the credentials is stored as an attachment (electronic file) to the specific transaction number for that customer. At a later date, any or all validations, including disabled parking validations, may be easily retrieved by referencing a single source (ticket transaction number) for auditing purposes. The images of the disabled parking permit and identification are easily retrieved, viewed, and confirmed.*

- *WPS proffered to develop (and preliminarily tested) a similar functionality through their license plate recognition (LPR) system. However, their proposed solution is in the developmental stage.*

In FY 2013/14, there were a total of 26,968 disabled parking permit exception validation transactions, at all ten municipal parking garages, with a value of \$254,766. Without an effective exception validation system, the validation process for these transactions is vulnerable to manipulation/fraud. The Skidata solution closes this loophole with a proven, efficient, and user-friendly auditable feature for validated exception transactions. Amano and WPS proposed to enhance their current functionality; however, the proposed solutions are, to date, either unbuilt or untested.

It is important to note gated revenue control systems may also be used in municipal parking lots with high demand providing greater audit controls and preserving the integrity of disabled parking.

2. **References.** The City contacted references provided by each proposer and conducted a survey/questionnaire. All references for Skidata were deemed satisfactory; however, there were issues brought to the City's attention with regard to the past performance of Amano and WPS. The following are excerpts from responses received to the survey/questionnaire:

Amano Reference – City of West Palm Beach:

- System does not work off-line. Monthly access cards do not work off-line due to different facility codes at garages. Previous equipment from Federal APD would batch credit card. This equipment does not batch. Unable to process credit card transactions when there is a power outage, as evidenced in a recent lightning strike.

- Credit card jams on insertion. Recommends swipe.
- No capability to send information to spitter or exit gates. Example: when a ticket jams and the machine is turned off, the device does not reset itself and requires on-site reprogramming (cannot be reprogrammed remotely from central station).
- Intercoms go on and off-line. Currently, four are off-line (system is only two years old). Amano is quick to respond but intercoms are still down.

WPS Reference – City of Norfolk

Q. Are you satisfied with the audit/accounting capabilities of the software? Please explain system capabilities.

A. Not satisfied. Cash does not match shift report. Cash received via Pay-In-Lane (PIL) devices are not tallying correctly.

- PIL cash refunds are inaccurate due to issuance of same amount of change due to customer in both bills and coins resulting in a duplicate refund.
- WPS was not aware of this issue until advised by Reference.
- Reference has been thorough in providing WPS documentation regarding these malfunctions.
- This is particularly of concern in remote centralized motoring, since there is no cashier present to witness this occurrence. Reference personally witnessed this malfunction.
- This was discovered at their third busiest garage.
- Reference attempted unsuccessfully to have WPS provide replacement equipment; consulted with their legal department; and was advised to allow WPS to address the issue.
- New software update is required. Update was scheduled last year. There have been issues resulting in delays. Update is now scheduled for Spring/Summer 2015.
- Reference stated that it is prepared to pursue legal action.

3. **COST PROPOSALS.** The final cost proposals are itemized into three major areas: (1) cost of installed equipment; (2) rebate and removal of existing equipment; and (3) ten (10) year maintenance/support.

	<b>Amano</b>	<b>Skidata</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Equipment and Installation	\$3,418,950.00	\$3,667,412.00	\$2,769,205.00
Rebate on Existing Equipment	\$(273,100.00)	\$(32,500.00)	\$11,470.00
Maintenance and Support (10 Year)	\$3,823,237.52	\$3,158,266.60	\$2,478,461.00
<b>Total 10 Year Costs</b>	<b>\$6,969,087.52*</b>	<b>\$6,793,178.60</b>	<b>\$5,259,136.00*</b>

\*These figures represent the final costs negotiated with and confirmed by each Proposer. As noted in Exhibit C, the City and the Proposers engaged in several rounds of cost negotiations to assure best pricing, address certain errors and omissions in Proposer’s cost proposals and create a functional system baseline so that all proposals could be compared equitably. For example, Amano’s original cost proposals inadvertently omitted the required dedicated employees (at a cost of \$821,197.52 over the ten year term) and Skidata’s omitted the required training (at a cost of \$12,000.00 as an initial cost). Additionally, all proposers offered extra goods and services (above and beyond what is required for a fully functional system) that could enhance system operation and is available to the City for future consideration.

### **CITY MANAGER'S DUE DILIGENCE**

The City's ten parking garages are currently operated with on-site cashiers/parking attendants and a gated revenue control system, provided by 3M (manufacturer). Collectively, all garages generate over \$16M in revenues with a labor expense for cashiers/attendants of \$3M, annually.

As you know, a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Parking Attendants was issued and an award is anticipated by the July 2015 City Commission meeting. A critical component required to manage and operate our municipal garages is a state-of-the-art revenue control system with remote monitoring. Remote monitoring will automate cashier operations at all parking garages reducing cashier labor expenses from \$3M to \$1.8M, a savings of \$1.2M (40%), annually. Therefore, a robust and reliable gated revenue control system is essential to process, collect, and audit transactions and their related revenues. While the City has considered a metered operations approach (see Exhibit B) to a gated system, the Administration has concluded that such approach is not cost effective.

Skidata's PARCS solution is composed of gated entrance and exit control systems with the ability to accept credit card payment in-lane and access credentials such as access cards, pay by mobile phone applications, or validations; automated pay stations with the ability of accepting credit card and cash payments; garage offices and central monitoring work stations composed of desktop computers, monitors and audio/video (intercoms); and software system that integrates with all revenue control devices at all garages and interfaces with the City's permit and financial management systems. More importantly, the system allows for Remote Monitoring reducing the need for cashier (labor) functions. This is anticipated to reduce parking attendant/cashier labor cost by 40%. In addition, remote monitoring allows for a variety of technology enhancements, including real time utilization, ability to change rates based on utilization, grant gate access, diagnose, troubleshoot, and potentially resolve a variety of alarms related to in-lane or peripheral equipment.

The City Manager, after carefully considering the results of the negotiation process and staff recommendations, recommends that the Mayor and City Commission authorize the Administration to finalize negotiations on final contract terms with Skidata, Inc.; and, upon successful conclusion of the negotiation terms by the Administration, authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an Agreement for a gated revenue control system for the City's parking garages with Skidata. In support of this recommendation, the City Manager finds as follows:

#### **Functionality**

While Amano, Skidata, and WPS are very competitively matched in terms of general system functionality, the review and analysis conducted by staff indicate some significant differences in a few areas. Of greatest concern is the need to efficiently and effectively process transactions through remote monitoring while maintaining a user-friendly and reliable auditable trail, of validated transactions, most notable are disabled parking permit exemptions with an annual value exceeding \$250,000.

**References**

Section 2-369 of the City Code requires that, in the award of contracts, the following be considered:

- (1) The ability, capacity and skill of the bidder to perform the contract.
- (2) Whether the bidder can perform the contract within the time specified, without delay or interference.
- (3) The character, integrity, reputation, judgment, experience and efficiency of the bidder.
- (4) The quality of performance of previous contracts.
- (5) The previous and existing compliance by the bidder with laws and ordinances relating to the contract.

Skidata client references indicate that it has a satisfactory history of past performance. Past clients of both Amano and WPS expressed some concerns of each firm’s respective systems and response to system issues. Especially concerning is the experience shared by a past client of WPS in which it stated that the system was unable to accurately record and reconcile cash balances. This is a very dangerous scenario when one considers the amount of revenue (\$16M annually) flowing through the City’s gated revenue control system.

**Cost**

While system costs for all proposed systems are significant, the current estimated annual revenue yielded through the parking operations at which the reference equipment will be utilized is approximately \$16M. The following tables indicate costs as a percentage of revenue over the contract term for the new proposed systems, both in terms of overall project cost as well as yearly maintenance costs.

<b>Equipment &amp; Installation</b>	<b>Amano</b>	<b>Skidata</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Equipment and Installation	\$3,418,950.00	\$3,667,412.00	\$2,769,205.00
Rebate for Existing Equipment and/or Cost of Removing Existing Equipment	(\$273,100.00)	(\$32,500.00)	\$11,470.00
<b>Total Initial Costs</b>	<b>\$3,145,850.00</b>	<b>\$3,634,912.00</b>	<b>\$2,780,675.00</b>

<b>Recurring Annual Maintenance</b>	<b>Amano</b>	<b>Skidata</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Total Maintenance Costs Over 10 Years	\$3,823,237.52	\$3,158,266.60	\$2,478,461.00
Estimated Revenue (10 Years)	\$160,000,000.00	\$160,000,000.00	\$160,000,000.00
<b>Maintenance Only Cost as a Percentage of Revenue</b>	<b>2.39%</b>	<b>1.97%</b>	<b>1.55%</b>

While cost is clearly an important consideration, the gated parking revenue control system is a major system for the City through which nearly \$16M is processed each year. System functionality and prior performance of the contractor is as critical as is the cost of the system.

**Remote Monitoring Savings and Resulting Net Cost**

The following is a comparison of current staffing cost versus proposed (reduced) staffing levels; new equipment/remote monitoring, including maintenance costs, over a ten year period.

The proposed reduction in attendant labor hours may be achieved as follows:

- Elimination of the second and third Parking Attendant I (cashier), if applicable, from all locations, Monday through Friday, dayshifts; and
- Elimination of all Parking Attendant I during off-peak (overnight) hours.
- Reduction of Parking Attendant II during off-peak hours.

Remote monitoring is anticipated to reduce cashier labor hours by 40%. This is attributed to a centralized remote monitoring consolidating cashier functions and tasks at one centralized location. Each workstation is equipped with data access control to process parking transactions; intercoms and video monitors for audio/video interactions with the customers; and will interface with the security camera system to be deployed in all garages under a separate formal competitive procurement process for security system. Additionally, annual maintenance costs over the next ten (10) years are less than current annual maintenance costs.

<b>YEAR 1</b>	<b>CURRENT</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>	<b>DIFFERENCE</b>
Staffing	\$2,943,000*	\$1,800,000*	\$ (1,143,000)
Equipment Cost		\$3,635,000	\$3,635,000
Equipment Maintenance	\$225,000*	\$132,000	\$(93,000)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,168,000</b>	<b>\$5,567,000</b>	<b>\$2,399,000</b>
<b>YEAR 2</b>			
Staffing	\$2,943,000*	\$1,800,000*	\$ (1,143,000)
Equipment Maintenance	\$225,000*	\$173,000	\$ (52,000)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,168,000</b>	<b>\$1,973,000</b>	<b>\$ (1,195,000)</b>
<b>YEAR 3</b>			
Staffing	\$2,943,000*	\$1,800,000*	\$ (1,143,000)
Equipment Maintenance	\$225,000*	\$331,000	\$106,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,168,000</b>	<b>\$2,131,000</b>	<b>\$ (1,037,000)</b>
<b>YEAR 4</b>			
Staffing	\$2,943,000*	\$1,800,000*	\$(1,143,000)
Equipment Maintenance	\$225,000*	\$342,000	\$117,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,168,000</b>	<b>\$2,142,000</b>	<b>\$(1,026,000)</b>
<b>YEAR 5</b>			
Staffing	\$2,943,000*	\$1,800,000*	\$(1,143,000)
Equipment Maintenance	\$225,000*	\$353,000	\$128,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,168,000</b>	<b>\$2,153,000</b>	<b>\$(1,015,000)</b>
<b>YEAR 6</b>			
Staffing	\$2,943,000*	\$1,800,000*	\$ (1,143,000)
Equipment Maintenance	\$225,000*	\$364,000	\$139,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,168,000</b>	<b>\$2,164,000</b>	<b>\$ (1,004,000)</b>
<b>YEAR 7</b>			
Staffing	\$2,943,000*	\$1,800,000*	\$(1,143,000)
Equipment Maintenance	\$225,000*	\$376,000	\$151,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,168,000</b>	<b>\$2,176,000</b>	<b>\$(992,000)</b>
<b>YEAR 8</b>			
Staffing	\$2,943,000*	\$1,800,000*	\$(1,143,000)
Equipment Maintenance	\$225,000*	\$388,000	\$163,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,168,000</b>	<b>\$2,188,000</b>	<b>\$(980,000)</b>
<b>YEAR 9</b>			

Staffing	\$2,943,000*	\$1,800,000*	\$(1,143,000)
Equipment Maintenance	\$225,000*	\$400,000	\$175,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,168,000</b>	<b>\$2,200,000</b>	<b>\$(968,000)</b>
<b>YEAR 10</b>			
Staffing	\$2,943,000*	\$1,800,000*	\$(1,143,000)
Equipment Maintenance	\$225,000*	\$413,000	\$188,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,168,000</b>	<b>\$2,213,000</b>	<b>\$(955,000)</b>
<b>TOTAL 10 YRS</b>	<b>\$31,680,000</b>	<b>\$24,907,000</b>	<b>\$(6,773,000)</b>

\* Assumes No Increase

The proposed solution results in an estimated total cost savings of \$6,773,000, over a ten year period.

Therefore, based on a combination of factors that includes equipment and comparable installations, past performance on previous public sector contracts and cost savings (especially when compared to the current system), the City Manager recommends that the Mayor and City Commission authorize the Administration to finalize negotiations on final contract terms with Skidata, Inc.

The City Manager further recommends that in the event that the City is unable to finalize successful negotiations with Skidata, Inc., to finalize negotiations on final contract terms with Amano McGann, Inc.

As a side note, the City Manager notes that during phase 1 evaluation of proposals, Skidata was recommended as the first-ranked Proposer by every Evaluation Committee member. Amano McGann followed Skidata with one second-place rank, one third-place rank and one fourth-place rank as scored by the Evaluation Committee.

**CONCLUSION**

The Administration recommends that the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, accept the recommendation of the City Manager, pursuant to Invitation To Negotiate (ITN) 2014-170-SW for a gated revenue control system for the City’s parking garages; approving the material terms of an agreement between the City and Skidata, Inc., as set forth in the term sheet attached as Exhibit “A” hereto; authorizing the City Manager and the City Attorney’s Office to finalize the Agreement based upon the material terms approved herein; provided that they may make any non-substantive and non-material revisions and/or additions to the Agreement, as they deem necessary; authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the final Agreement; and, in the event that the City is unable to finalize successful negotiations with Skidata, Inc., authorizing the City Manager and the City Attorney’s Office to negotiate an Agreement with Amano McGann, Inc. based upon the material terms approved in Exhibit “A” herein (provided that they may make any non-substantive and non-material revisions and/or additions to the Agreement).

JLM/KGB/MT/SF/AD

**TERM SHEET (EXHIBIT A)**

<b>BRIEF SCOPE OF WORK</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
	Removal/buy back of existing equipment, new equipment at all garages, installation, hardware/software, 10 years maintenance/support.		
<b>PROPOSED EQUIPMENT</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
	Submitted Electronically	Submitted Electronically	Submitted Electronically
<b>NEW EQUIPMENT COST - INSTALLED</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Equipment	2,885,500.00	2,830,004.00	2,332,315.00
Installation	-	143,750.00	76,630.00
Software Installation	227,975.00	331,579.00	29,800.00
Other	305,475.00	362,079.00	330,460.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,418,950.00</b>	<b>\$3,667,412.00</b>	<b>\$2,769,205.00</b>

Skidata is \$248,462 (7%) higher than Amano and \$898,207 (32%) higher than WPS.

**REBATE/BUYBACK OF EXISTING EQUIPMENT**

<b>EXISTING EQUIPMENT</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Rebate/Buy back for existing equipment	(288,100.00)	(50,000.00)	-
Cost to remove existing equipment	15,000.00	17,500.00	11,470.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$(273,100.00)</b>	<b>\$(32,500.00)</b>	<b>\$11,470.00</b>

**MAINTENANCE/SUPPORT TEN (10) YEARS**

<b>10 YEAR MAINTENANCE</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Maintenance - Year 1	206,462.00	122,192.10	138,420.00
Maintenance - Year 2	299,881.00	163,241.70	205,900.00
Maintenance - Year 3	325,159.75	320,446.30	218,254.00
Maintenance - Year 4	350,527.25	330,844.20	229,985.00
Maintenance - Year 5	375,986.61	341,553.70	248,384.00
Maintenance - Year 6	401,543.04	352,583.40	270,698.00
Maintenance - Year 7	427,142.87	363,944.50	276,107.00
Maintenance - Year 8	452,948.55	375,646.40	284,391.00
Maintenance - Year 9	478,808.63	387,699.70	295,767.00
Maintenance - Year 10	504,777.81	400,114.60	310,555.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,823,237.52</b>	<b>\$3,158,266.60</b>	<b>\$2,478,461.00</b>

Skidata is \$664,970.92 (17%) lower than Amano and \$679,805.60 (27%) higher than WPS.

**SUMMARY/GRANDTOTAL OF ALL COSTS – TEN (10) YEARS:**

	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Equipment Cost	2,885,500.00	2,830,004.00	2,332,315.00
Additional Installation Cost	-	143,750.00	76,630.00
Software Cost	227,975.00	331,579.00	29,800.00
Existing Equipment	(273,100.00)	(32,500.00)	11,470.00
Maintenance Cost - 10 YEARS	3,823,237.52	3,158,266.60	2,478,461.00
Other	305,475.00	362,079.00	330,460.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$6,969,087.52</b>	<b>\$6,793,178.60</b>	<b>\$5,259,136.00</b>

Over a ten (10) year period, including all maintenance and support, the grand total cost of Skidata is \$175,908.92 (3%) lower than Amano and \$1,534,042.60 (29%) higher than WPS.

**GATED REVENUE CONTROL SYSTEMS v. METERED OPERATIONS  
ALTERNATIVE OPTION ANALYSIS  
(EXHIBIT B)**

Recently, the concept of operating municipal garages as metered operations in lieu of gated revenue control systems was suggested. The Parking Department evaluated these two alternative methods of operating the City's parking garages and the following are the results.

Metered (pay station) parking is the standard in the industry for operating on-street parking and surface parking lots. This is predominantly due to parking spaces being dispersed over large geographic areas in these settings. Based on the concept presented, staff evaluated the potential impacts of converting garage operations in the City to metered operations. The following are high level impacts of operating garages with meters:

- Parking gated revenue control systems garners 100% of parking revenues as users must pay for their parking session prior to exit. Metered operations are based on enforcement levels and would require more intensive staffing levels.
  - The City's metered system has a compliance ratio of 85%, meaning 8.5 of 10 users pay for their parking. Therefore, 15% (\$2.4M of \$16M) in garage revenues would stand to be lost, if operated with meters.
  - In order to achieve the 85% compliance level 24/7 for all 10 garages, an estimated 50 additional enforcement officers would be needed, at an estimated cost of \$2,818,400, including salaries, health and pension benefits.
  - For the remaining 15% who do not pay, the City's citation capture rate is 10%, which could generate approximately \$972,000 in citation revenue (assuming a 90% collection rate), but the County retains \$611,820 of this, which represents the County's portion of 1/3 of citation revenue, as well as contributions to school crossing guards and technology (Autocite) fund.
- Citations and related fines derived from parking enforcement often have negative implications with the public. The City's portion of revenue generated from an \$18 overtime parking citation equates to \$6.67 per citation, after the County's fees are assessed.
- Diminished revenues related to potential disabled placard abuse. Identity of placard owner is not verified in metered facilities but is verified in staffed/gated garages.

In closing, the current cost of operating the gated revenue control systems in the City's 10 garages is \$2,985,500. With technology enhancements and remote monitoring, labor hours/costs are estimated to decrease by 40% to \$1,800,000. Even taking the capital costs of new equipment for all garages into account, the gated revenue control system would appear more cost/revenue effective.

Additional detail is provided in the analysis below, including increased capital expenses and other recurring operational expenses incurred with metered operations as compared to gated revenue control systems.

**GATED REVENUE CONTROL SYSTEMS - METER COMPARISON**

Equipment	\$3,635,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$3,635,000
Staffing	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$5,400,000
Maintenance	\$123,000	\$164,000	\$321,000	\$608,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$5,558,000</b>	<b>\$1,964,000</b>	<b>\$2,121,000</b>	<b>\$9,643,000</b>

137 METERS	\$1,027,500	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$1,027,500
Staffing	\$2,818,400	\$2,874,768	\$2,932,263	\$8,625,431
License Plate Recognition Vehicles	\$767,350	\$0	\$0	\$767,350
Maintenance	\$43,200	\$43,200	\$43,200	\$129,600
Meter Collections	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$660,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$4,876,450</b>	<b>\$3,137,968</b>	<b>\$3,195,463</b>	<b>\$11,209,881</b>

**CONCLUSION:**

Even taking the capital costs of new equipment for all garages into account, the gated revenue control system would appear more cost/revenue effective. Technology enhancements and remote monitoring available with the new gated revenue control system result in a reduction of labor hours/costs of approximately 40% to \$1,800,000 (currently at \$2,985,500). Furthermore, the cost of contracted labor at living wage rates is significantly lower than City employee labor expense (salary/benefit/pension).

**EXHIBIT C  
 SUMMARY OF COST NEGOTIATIONS**

Below please find original cost proposal submittal from each proposer due by February 6, 2015. The chart below provides a chronology of negotiations and their respective results. Please note the FINAL offer for each firm was confirmed as follows: Amano: April 23, 2015; Skidata: May 19, 2015; and WPS: March 19, 2015.

<b>Original Cost Proposal After Site Visits – Received February 6, 2015</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Equipment Cost	\$2,883,500.00	\$2,906,329.00	\$2,370,745.00
Additional Installation Cost	\$0.00	\$143,750.00	\$76,630.00
Software Cost	\$227,975.00	\$331,579.00	\$29,800.00
Equipment Removal and Rebate	-\$213,100.00	\$17,500.00	\$11,470.00
Maintenance Cost	\$3,252,260.00	\$3,518,161.00	\$2,390,041.00
Other	\$655,500.00	\$257,102.00	\$476,704.00
<b>PRELIMINARY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$6,806,135.00*</b>	<b>\$7,174,421.00*</b>	<b>\$5,355,390.00*</b>

\* After negotiation discussions with each Proposer to understand the cost proposals, staff requested revised Cost Proposals which were received on March 12, 2015.

<b>Revised Cost Proposal – Received March 12, 2015</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Equipment Cost	\$2,883,500.00	\$2,906,329.00	\$2,332,315.00
Additional Installation Cost	\$0.00	\$143,750.00	\$76,630.00
Software Cost	\$227,975.00	\$331,579.00	\$29,800.00
Equipment Removal and Rebate	-\$273,100.00	-\$32,500.00	\$11,470.00
Maintenance Cost	\$3,002,040.00	\$3,280,512.00	\$2,478,461.00
Other	\$699,900.00	\$217,102.00	\$444,070.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$6,540,315.00</b>	<b>\$6,846,772.00</b>	<b>\$5,372,746.00</b>

\* Staff determined that the revised cost proposals contained errors and omissions or additional equipment not requested by the City as follows.

<b>Errors and Omissions</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Corrections for Mathematical Errors on Cost Proposal	-\$346,975.00		
Reduction for Supplemental Items (Table 1)	-\$45,450.00		
Add Cost of Dedicated Employee Omitted from Amano's Cost Proposal	\$821,197.52		
Corrections for Mathematical Errors on Cost Proposal		\$72,743.56	
Reduction for Supplemental Items (Table 1)		-\$126,337.00	
Corrections for Mathematical Errors on Cost Proposal			\$28,200.00
Reduction for Supplemental Items (Table 1)			-\$141,810.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$428,772.52</b>	<b>-\$53,590.44</b>	<b>-\$113,610.00</b>

<b>Final Adjustments Confirmed by Proposers</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Date Confirmed by Proposer	4/23/2015	5/19/2015	3/19/2015
Equipment Cost	\$2,885,500.00	\$2,830,004.00	\$2,332,315.00
Additional Installation Cost	\$0.00	\$143,750.00	\$76,630.00
Software Cost	\$227,975.00	\$331,579.00	\$29,800.00
Equipment Removal and Rebate	-\$273,100.00	-\$32,500.00	\$11,470.00
Maintenance Cost	\$3,823,237.52	\$3,158,266.60	\$2,478,461.00
*Other	\$305,475.00	\$362,079.00	\$330,460.00
<b>FINAL TOTAL</b>	<b>\$6,969,087.52</b>	<b>\$6,793,178.60</b>	<b>\$5,259,136.00</b>

**TABLE 1: SUPPLEMENTAL ITEMS**  
*Items not necessary for implementation/operation of system but available to the City in the future on an as needed basis.*

<b>AMANO</b>	
G7 Bollards (\$150 x 8 = \$1,200)	\$1,200.00
G8 Bollards (\$150 x 1 = \$150)	\$150.00
G10 Bollards (\$150 x 2 = \$300)	\$300.00
Booth Removal (per booth)	\$2,000.00
Online Validation Software (eParcVal)	\$4,000.00
Daily pass online software (eFlexPass)	\$10,000.00
Bulk Validation Software (eFlexPrint)	\$6,000.00
Pedestrian Warning System (per system)(\$500 x 10 garages)	\$5,000.00
Basic signage package (per lane)(\$400 x 42 lanes)	\$16,800.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$45,450.00</b>

<b>SKIDATA</b>	
WEBKey Managed System (annual fee year 1)	\$9,500.00
WEBKey Managed System (annual fee maintenance years 2-10)	\$98,617.00
Pedestrian Alert signage (Per Garage)(\$1,349 x 10 garages)	\$13,490.00
Lot Full Signage (\$473ea x 10 garages)	\$4,730.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$126,337.00</b>

<b>WPS</b>	
Pedestrian warning light & buzzer at each exit	\$8,160.00
Printed graphic static signage: Budget	\$20,000.00
Additional protective bollard if required: (Each)	\$450.00
Electronic locks for accessing equipment housings (Lump sum)	\$85,000.00
Booth Removal: Not to exceed \$3,000.00 per booth Budget	\$3,000.00
Level Counting, Exterior Monument Sign: (Budget Each)	\$9,500.00
Floor Space Available Sign: (Budget Each)	\$2,800.00
Ramp counter for level counting using camera detection: (Each)	\$4,500.00
LPR Cameras, housing, and installation: (Each)	\$3,400.00
LPR site infrastructure where possible per lane: (Budget Each)	\$5,000.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$141,810.00</b>

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA, ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY MANAGER, PURSUANT TO INVITATION TO NEGOTIATE (ITN) 2014-170-SW FOR A GATED REVENUE CONTROL SYSTEM FOR THE CITY'S PARKING GARAGES; APPROVING THE MATERIAL TERMS OF AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY AND SKIDATA, INC., AS SET FORTH IN THE TERM SHEET ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT "A" HERETO; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER AND THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE TO FINALIZE THE AGREEMENT BASED UPON THE MATERIAL TERMS APPROVED HEREIN; PROVIDED THAT THEY MAY MAKE ANY NON-SUBSTANTIVE AND NON-MATERIAL REVISIONS AND/OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGREEMENT, AS THEY DEEM NECESSARY; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY CLERK TO EXECUTE THE FINAL AGREEMENT; AND, IN THE EVENT THAT THE CITY IS UNABLE TO FINALIZE SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATIONS WITH SKIDATA, INC., AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER AND THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE TO NEGOTIATE AN AGREEMENT WITH AMANO MCGANN, INC. BASED UPON THE MATERIAL TERMS APPROVED IN EXHIBIT "A" HEREIN (PROVIDED THAT THEY MAY MAKE ANY NON-SUBSTANTIVE AND NON-MATERIAL REVISIONS AND/OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGREEMENT).

**WHEREAS**, on May 21, 2014, the Mayor and City Commission authorized the issuance of Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) 2014-170-SW for a Gated Revenue Control System for the City's parking garages, including centralized processing of data for all of the City's parking garages; a central monitoring station for intercoms and CCTV at all entrance and exit lanes; and centralized access control for all garage equipment; and

**WHEREAS**, on May 22, 2014, ITN 2014-170-SW was issued with an opening date of July 10, 2014; and

**WHEREAS**, on September 10, 2014, the Mayor and City Commission approved Resolution 2014-28720, accepting the recommendation of the City Manager and authorizing the Administration to enter into negotiations with all the proposers; to wit: Skidata Inc.; Amano McGann, Inc.; LCN, Inc. d/b/a Consolidated Parking Equipment; WPS USA Corp.; and Scheidt & Bachmann USA, Inc.; and

**WHEREAS**, on December 17, 2014, the City was notified by Consolidated Parking Equipment that it had withdrawn its proposal pursuant to the ITN; and

**WHEREAS**, on February 6, 2015, Scheidt & Bachmann USA, Inc. notified the City that it had withdrawn its proposal pursuant to the ITN; and

**WHEREAS**, staff held several negotiation sessions with all three (3) proposers, as well as a request for best and final cost proposals offers; and the Administration received final replies to the referenced negotiations on May 19, 2015.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT DULY RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA,** accept the recommendation of the City Manager, pursuant to Invitation To Negotiate (ITN) 2014-170-SW for a gated revenue control system for the City's parking garages; approving the material terms of an agreement between the City and Skidata, Inc., as set forth in the term sheet attached as Exhibit "A" hereto; authorizing the City Manager and the City Attorney's Office to finalize the Agreement based upon the material terms approved herein; provided that they may make any non-substantive and non-material revisions and/or additions to the Agreement, as they deem necessary; authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the final Agreement; and, in the event that the City is unable to finalize successful negotiations with Skidata, Inc., authorizing the City Manager and the City Attorney's Office to negotiate an Agreement with Amano McGarrn, Inc. based upon the material terms approved in Exhibit "A" herein (provided that they may make any non-substantive and non-material revisions and/or additions to the Agreement).

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2015.

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rafael E. Granado, City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Philip Levine, Mayor

T:\AGENDA\2015\June\PROCUREMENT\ITN 2014-170-SW Parking Garage Gated Revenue Control System for the City of Miami Beach RESO.doc

APPROVED AS TO  
FORM & LANGUAGE  
& FOR EXECUTION

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
City Attorney

6/1/15  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**TERM SHEET (EXHIBIT A)**

<b>BRIEF SCOPE OF WORK</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
	Removal/buy back of existing equipment, new equipment at all garages, installation, hardware/software, 10 years maintenance/support.		
<b>PROPOSED EQUIPMENT</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
	Submitted Electronically	Submitted Electronically	Submitted Electronically
<b>NEW EQUIPMENT COST - INSTALLED</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Equipment	2,885,500.00	2,830,004.00	2,332,315.00
Installation	-	143,750.00	76,630.00
Software Installation	227,975.00	331,579.00	29,800.00
Other	305,475.00	362,079.00	330,460.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,418,950.00</b>	<b>\$3,667,412.00</b>	<b>\$2,769,205.00</b>

Skidata is \$248,462 (7%) higher than Amano and \$898,207 (32%) higher than WPS.

**REBATE/BUYBACK OF EXISTING EQUIPMENT**

<b>EXISTING EQUIPMENT</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Rebate/Buy back for existing equipment	(288,100.00)	(50,000.00)	-
Cost to remove existing equipment	15,000.00	17,500.00	11,470.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$(273,100.00)</b>	<b>\$(32,500.00)</b>	<b>\$11,470.00</b>

**MAINTENANCE/SUPPORT TEN (10) YEARS**

<b>10 YEAR MAINTENANCE</b>	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Maintenance - Year 1	206,462.00	122,192.10	138,420.00
Maintenance - Year 2	299,881.00	163,241.70	205,900.00
Maintenance - Year 3	325,159.75	320,446.30	218,254.00
Maintenance - Year 4	350,527.25	330,844.20	229,985.00
Maintenance - Year 5	375,986.61	341,553.70	248,384.00
Maintenance - Year 6	401,543.04	352,583.40	270,698.00
Maintenance - Year 7	427,142.87	363,944.50	276,107.00
Maintenance - Year 8	452,948.55	375,646.40	284,391.00
Maintenance - Year 9	478,808.63	387,699.70	295,767.00
Maintenance - Year 10	504,777.81	400,114.60	310,555.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,823,237.52</b>	<b>\$3,158,266.60</b>	<b>\$2,478,461.00</b>

Skidata is \$664,970.92 (17%) lower than Amano and \$679,805.60 (27%) higher than WPS.

**SUMMARY/GRANDTOTAL OF ALL COSTS – TEN (10) YEARS:**

	<b>AMANO</b>	<b>SKIDATA</b>	<b>WPS</b>
Equipment Cost	2,885,500.00	2,830,004.00	2,332,315.00
Additional Installation Cost	-	143,750.00	76,630.00
Software Cost	227,975.00	331,579.00	29,800.00
Existing Equipment	(273,100.00)	(32,500.00)	11,470.00
Maintenance Cost - 10 YEARS	3,823,237.52	3,158,266.60	2,478,461.00
Other	305,475.00	362,079.00	330,460.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$6,969,087.52</b>	<b>\$6,793,178.60</b>	<b>\$5,259,136.00</b>

Over a ten (10) year period, including all maintenance and support, the grand total cost of Skidata is \$175,908.92 (3%) lower than Amano and \$1,534,042.60 (29%) higher than WPS.

