



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT SIX
I-395 PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROJECT
FIN NO. 251668-1-52-01
AESTHETIC STEERING COMMITTEE (ASC) MEETING NO. 2
ADRIENNE ARSHT CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS
ZIFF BALLET OPERA HOUSE (BOARD ROOM)
1300 BISCAYNE BLVD., MIAMI, FL 33132
APRIL 4, 2014 AT 9:00 A.M.

MEETING TYPE:

Aesthetic Steering Committee (ASC)

ATTENDEES:

Committee Members in Attendance:

- Alice Bravo, P.E. (AB), City of Miami, Deputy City Manager
- The Honorable Audrey Edmondson (AE), Miami-Dade County Commissioner
- Alyce Robertson (AR), Executive Director, Miami Downtown Development Authority
- M. John Richard (MJR), President and CEO, Adrienne Arsht Center for the Performing Arts
- Brian Blanchard, P.E., (BB), FDOT Assistant Secretary for Engineering & Operations

FDOT Staff:

- Gus Pego (GP), P.E., FDOT District Six Secretary
- Vilma Croft (VC), P.E., FDOT Senior Project Manager
- Harold Desdunes, P.E., (HD), Director of Transportation Development
- Tomas Martinelli, FDOT, Government Affairs

FDOT Consultants:

- Joe Gómez (JG), P.E., T.Y. Lin
- Michael Fitzpatrick (MF), T.Y. Lin
- Tasha Cunningham (TC), Cunningham Group
- Beth Steimle, P.E. (BS), T.Y. Lin
- Sandra Buitrago (SB), T.Y. Lin

Elected Officials:

- The Honorable Audrey Edmondson (AE), Miami-Dade County Commissioner

Members of the Public:

- Please see attached sign-in sheet

ATTACHMENTS:

- Sign-in sheet

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

GP opened the meeting at 9:36 a.m. Committee members in attendance introduced themselves. GP discussed that the purpose of the ASC was to help the Department with the aesthetic evaluation of bridge designs. GP reviewed the agenda and asked that all committee members sign and return their ethics forms. GP reminded the committee and members of the public that the meeting was being held in the Sunshine and noted that members of the public were welcome to speak. GP also reminded the committee that if two or more members of the committee meet and discuss the project, it is a Sunshine violation. GP stated that FDOT is committed to transparency. GP then asked for any comments from the public. GP then turned the meeting over to JG and MF to make a presentation to the committee. During and after the presentation the following points were discussed:

- The street level master plan for the project
- The project is almost complete with preliminary designs
- The RFP is currently being prepared
- The mission is to have a contract ready for award in the latter part of 2015
- The presentation made to the committee will be available online at the project website after the meeting
- MF conducted the presentation and reviewed each of the bridge designs under consideration
- During the presentation, AE asked MF if the committee could see the Lotus and Wishbone designs side-by-side for comparison; MF said that was not possible at this meeting.
- MF reviewed the various lighting options, including daytime ambient lighting
- MF reviewed the structural depth of the signature span and the segmental spans
- MF reviewed the street level master plan and animations of each design
- A member of the public, Maurice Ferre, expressed concern about connectivity to Museum Park and Bayside.
- A member of the public, Maurice Ferre, suggested the Lotus design be renamed the “M” design because it looks like an “M” and represents Miami.
- After the presentation, GP called for the appointment of a chairperson. MJR made a motion to nominate AE as chairperson. AB seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- GP stated that the whole purpose of the committee was to ensure that FDOT commitments are kept
- GP asked MJR about an update on parking at the Adrienne Arsht; MJR responded that there are no updates at this time
- BB stated that he would like another option other than the Wishbone. He stated that it is important to make sure that the project comes in under the \$600 million cap.
- A member of the public, Maurice Ferre, asked BB about acquiring right-of-way (ROW)
- BB stated that ROW acquisitions should be completed by the fall
- A member of the public, Maurice Ferre, asked about the type of project this would be.
- GP stated that the project will be a Design/Build/Finance and that the procurement will take approximately one year
- A member of the public, Maurice Ferre, asked about whether FDOT was coordinating with MDX as it relates to the project; GP stated that coordination with MDX was ongoing; JG stated that bi-weekly coordination meetings with MDX are ongoing
- AB asked AE if the committee could formalize some of the discussions that had occurred in the first meeting of the group on February 28, 2014; AE said yes.
- AB asked AE if she needed to make a motion to make that official; AE advised AB to make a motion
- AB made a motion that the committee only be able contemplate a signature bridge alternative and not a dressed up segmental bridge with aesthetic treatments.
- AR seconded the motion and AE opened the floor for discussion.
- BB asked what would happen in a case that the bids come in too high and then there is no project. He asked the committee if they understood that.
- AB stated that to further that point she would make a motion that there would be some kind of Design/Build process where creative alternatives from firms would be considered as long as they meet the \$600 million cap. The motion passed unanimously.
- AB then made a motion that the \$600 million CAP and other design criteria would be minimums as part of the procurement and that the design of the bridge would be focus; AE stated that in other words, you don’t want cost to be a factor in the selection criteria.
- BB stated that through the alternative technical concept process, firms could come in with alternative signature designs. He asked the committee if that would be allowed. AB and AE stated yes.
- GP noted that maintenance, duration of construction time and the maintainability would also have to be considered; AB stated those would be minimum criteria; AE stated that she liked that idea.
- AR seconded the motion. AE opened the floor to discussion. The motion passed unanimously.
- BB noted that all alternative technical concepts will be confidential.
- AB stated that the ASC should be the selection committee for the procurement.

- AE asked if the ASC is just an advisory board and whether or not their recommendations would be taken into consideration.
- AB stated that she understood that the ASC would be ranking the proposals after FDOT ensured that the minimum selection criteria such as coming in under the CAP, etc. would be met.
- GP stated that the ASC recommendation would be one component of the selection. It would not be the sole determinate.
- GP stated that FDOT is doing this procurement, not the ASC and that it was formed to ensure that the commitments were met. He stated that there are other factors such as maintainability. He stated that the ASC recommendation was just one factor in the entire procurement process. He stated that the ASC recommendation is not the sole determinant.
- AB stated that the previous motion was that the factors would be minimums and that the ASC recommendation would be the selection.
- GP stated that the selection would be made by the Department with the input of the ASC.
- AB stated that things like coming in under the cap, duration of construction, warranty, etc. should not be part of the formula for selection. Her motion was to make those factors minimums.
- GP stated that the ASC will decide if an alternative technical concept is equal or better and whether we have an aesthetically pleasing bridge.
- AB stated that she felt FDOT was deviating from what was agreed to in the settlement agreement.
- GP stated that this is something that can be discussed.
- GP stated that if an alternative concept was to be reviewed, the ASC would do so and that it would be confidential.
- AB stated that her motion had nothing to do with alternative technical concepts. She stated that the only ranking should be aesthetic value.
- MJR asked AB whether the concept of speed to market, etc. is not going to be considered.
- The committee agreed to take up AB's motion at their next meeting.
- The next meeting of the ASC was scheduled for May 9, 2014 at the Adrienne Arsht Center at 9:00 a.m.
- The meeting adjourned at 11:32 a.m.

ACTION ITEMS CREATED AT MEETING:

ITEM NO.	ACTION	INITIATOR	ASSIGNEE	DEADLINE
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

The following minutes will be considered an accurate record of the meeting unless T.Y. LIN and FDOT are notified otherwise in writing within ten (10) business days following the distribution date.

Minutes Prepared By: _____
 Tasha Cunningham
 District VI Design Public Information Specialist

Distribution Date: 04/07/14