



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT SIX  
I-395 PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROJECT  
FIN NO. 251668-1-52-01  
AESTHETIC STEERING COMMITTEE (ASC) MEETING NO. 6  
ADRIENNE ARSHT CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS  
JOHN S. AND JAMES L. KNIGHT CONCERT HALL  
PEACOCK FOUNDATION EDUCATION CENTER  
1301 BISCAYNE BLVD., MIAMI, FL 33132  
JANUARY 30, 2015 AT 9:00 A.M.

**MEETING TYPE:**

Aesthetic Steering Committee (ASC) No. 6

**ATTENDEES:**

Committee Members in Attendance:

- Irene Hegedus (IH), Zoning Administrator, City of Miami
- The Honorable Audrey M. Edmonson (AE), Miami-Dade County Commissioner
- 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
- Javier Betancourt (JB) attending on behalf of Alyce Robertson (AR), Executive Director, Miami Downtown Development Authority

Elected Officials:

- The Honorable Audrey M. Edmonson (AE), Miami-Dade County Commissioner

FDOT Staff:

- Gus Pego, P.E. (GP), FDOT District Six Secretary
- Raul Quintela, P.E. (RQ), FDOT Project Manager
- Harold Desdunes, P.E., (HD), Director of Transportation Development
- Jason Watts (JW), Assistant General Counsel
- Tom Martinelli (TM), FDOT Government Affairs

FDOT Consultant Project Team:

- Beth Steimle, P.E. (BS), T.Y. Lin
- Michael Fitzpatrick (MF), T.Y. Lin
- Alex Sanjines (AS), T.Y. Lin
- Mariano Valle (MV), T.Y. Lin
- Tasha Cunningham (TC), Commonground/MGS
- Myrick Mitchell (MM), Commonground/MGS
- Maria Fernandez Porrata (MFP), Commonground/MGS

Miami-Dade County Staff:

- Bruce Libhaber (BL), Assistant County Attorney
- Gerald Sanchez (GS), Assistant County Attorney
- Robert Garland (RG), Sergeant-at-Arms

Members of the Public:

- Please reference attached sign-in sheet.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Sign-in sheet

**SUMMARY OF MEETING:**

1. GP opened the meeting at 9:15 a.m. TC took roll call and the meeting was then turned over to AE.
2. AE announced the start of the public comment portion of the meeting. No public comments were received. AE called for a motion to approve the minutes of the November 14, 2014 meeting. MJR stated that he had four proposed amendments to the minutes of that meeting. The amendments were proposed by MJR as follows:
  - In Step 2, second sentence, change the word “options” to “examples”
  - In Step 2, third sentence, change verbiage to reflect “option chosen to concept develop”
  - In Step 3, replace the word “utilize” with either “apply” or “reallocate”
  - In Step 4, insert a new sentence as follows: “However, bids delivered below the allowable mix will not be favored on that basis.”
3. AE asked whether the information being proposed in the amendments was actually discussed at the last meeting. MJR indicated that he believed that the proposed amendment in Step 4 was discussed. AE stated that she wanted to be certain. AE stated that she did not want to add or amend anything unless that was the way the information was discussed.
4. BB asked MJR to repeat the proposed amendments. MJR repeated the proposed amendments.
5. Each of the four amendments was discussed further among the committee members. At the point where the discussion turned to the fourth amendment, AE asked MJR to explain what he proposed in further detail. MJR stated that at the last meeting a great deal of conversation occurred about aesthetics and he wanted to make sure that coming in below the project budget was not going to be weighted in favor of aesthetics. AE stated that coming in under the \$600 million budget was not a determinant of whether or not a firm is shortlisted. MJR stated that it was his understanding that budget was not going to be weighed against aesthetics. AE stated that it was her understanding that the ASC would not accept any design/build team coming in over the established \$600 million budget.
6. Further discussion took place regarding the weighted value of the project aesthetic portion of the score versus the finance portion. FDOT agreed that the financial component would be weighed considerably less than the aesthetic portion of the project. BB stated that he had concerns because if a team came in with \$599 million and everything the committee was looking for, then with the proposed language of the amendment, that team would not be able to participate. AE stated that the ASC committee did not want to simply go with the lowest bidder. BB stated that he agreed. IE stated that this discussion goes back to the formula that was talked about at earlier ASC meetings. GP stated that these factors were taken into consideration as part of the formula with aesthetics having a heavy value in that analysis. JW asked MJR a question regarding a concern he had. He asked, “If the aesthetics portion has considerably more weight than the finance portion, but finance is still evaluated as part of the process, would that be acceptable?” MJR stated that the intent is for firms bidding on the project not to exceed the \$600 million budget. MJR stated that the goal is to get the biggest bang for the buck. He further stated that without knowing how each element will be weighted, there needs to be assurances that cost savings will not trump aesthetics. JW gave an example of a hypothetical breakdown in points between finance and aesthetics with the greater number of points being given to aesthetics and asked MJR if that would be acceptable. MJR stated that it would. IH stated that while she understands the overall concept, the committee did not understand the grading criteria being created. She stated that the committee needed to understand what the formula is, what the timing, duration of construction and numbers are. JW stated that he could briefly address IH’s comments. JW stated that FDOT was working on the hard numbers and would be presenting those to the committee in the future. JW provided a broad overview of how FDOT intends to procure. JW stated that out of a 100 point scale, FDOT intended for price to have very little points. He stated that every sentence in the RFP is going to encourage firms bidding on the project to spend the money that is allocated. Out of the remainder of points, FDOT saw aesthetics as equally valued as the technical portion of the bridge. JW

stated that this speaks to the fact that the bridge portion is only 10% financially of the overall roadway construction project. JW stated that FDOT is giving the bridge roughly 50% of the score, although it only comprises 10% of the overall project. He stated that FDOT believes this goes a long way in showing the importance of aesthetics on the project. MJR asked how this could be codified in the minutes. JW stated that if the committee wanted an assurance from the Department that the finance portion will absolutely be weighted lower than the aesthetics, then that could be codified in the minutes. MJR said he was happy with that. AE stated that she wanted to make sure that she understood what JW just explained. JW explained again that the aesthetics would be given more weight in scoring. He stated that the presentation would explain the process in further detail. JW further explained the pass/fail portion of the procurement in which the ASC would be involved. He stated that points would be given for aesthetics and for the financial portion. He reiterated that the financial portion would be small, but that if there is a company that can deliver everything the Department wants cheaper, that should be considered. AE stated that she would accept the amendment, but that she wanted the conversation about scoring to be reflected in detail in the minutes. GP agreed. AE reiterated that the discussion would be reflected in the minutes of the January 30, 2015 meeting and not the previous ASC meeting of November 14, 2014.

7. As a result, the committee voted to defer the approval of the November 14, 2014 meeting minutes to the next ASC meeting. AE also requested that the January 30, 2015 meeting minutes include the specific conversation on scoring. MJR called for a motion to defer. AE seconded the motion. MJR asked JW if additional communications that occurred between members of the committee were going to be in the minutes. JW stated that as a note, a communication from Mr. Richard was sent articulating the points he went through regarding the four proposed amendments to the minutes of the November 14, 2014 meeting. JW stated that the communication would be included in the minutes as a reflection of Mr. Richard's opinion. MJR asked if a motion was required. AE stated that she did not believe a motion was necessary.
8. AE called for the next agenda item which was new business. GP introduced the presentation and gave a reminder to the committee about the Cone of Silence and communication between individual committee members.
9. BS began the presentation showing a slide regarding the Sunshine Law. She stated that once the project is advertised, FDOT and the ASC Committee will be under the Cone of Silence.
10. BS continued the presentation by providing an outline of the presentation:
  - I-395 Project Update
  - Procurement Process
  - Schedule
  - Industry Workshop
  - MDX SR 83611
  - I-95 Pavement Reconstruction
11. BS provided a brief update on the project and stated that it now consisted of a combination of three projects: I-395 Reconstruction, MDX SR 836.11 and I-95 Pavement Reconstruction.
12. BS spoke about the overall procurement process. She emphasized the importance of the RFP process and the time commitment of the ASC, which is going to be throughout the entire project, and presented the following slides as part of the presentation:
  - Understanding RFP Process
  - Time Commitment of ASC
    - Entire project
  - Importance of the RFP process
13. BS continued with the procedures and practices for the procurement. She stated that teams will be judged on the following:
  - Maximum Price Approach
  - Process that Provides Innovation and Creativity
  - Provides Best Value
  - Overall Project Aesthetics
  - Aesthetics Project Technical Enhancements (APTEs)
  - Technical Requirements

14. BS mentioned that the Industry Forum will be held one week after the project is advertised and noted that general format of the Forum as follows:
- Day 1 – General Session
    - ASC to define vision
    - Overall project description
    - Selection/Scoring Process
  - Day 2 – One-on-One Meeting with Teams
    - Teams can present project approach
    - Statutory Exemption F.S. 286.0113 (2)
    - ASC will provide limited feedback
15. BS noted that the Industry Forum is different from the Industry Workshop, which is an informal session scheduled for February 12. BB asked if that timeframe could be changed to later in February and prior to the start of the legislative session to accommodate teams that may be coming in from out of the town. BS stated that the project team will work on changing the date of the Workshop.
16. BS continued the presentation by going through the four steps of the procurement process as follows:
- Four Step Procurement Process
    - Step 1 – Advertise and Short List DB Teams
    - Step 2 – RFP Response Phase 1: Signature Bridge Aesthetics Submittal
    - Step 3 – RFP Response Phase 2: Technical Submittal
    - Step 4 – RFP Response Phase 2: Price Submittal
17. BS further elaborated on the four steps of the procurement process as follows:

**Step 1 - Advertise and Short List DB Teams**

It was noted that no points will be awarded in this phase and that this was a qualifications process.

Discussion occurred regarding the complex steel and concrete design of the bridge. BS stated that the shortlist would be based on the ability of the competing firms to meet qualifications. BS also stated that the procurement would be a max price, best value selection.

**Step 2 - RFP Response Phase 1: Signature Bridge Aesthetics Submittal**

BS stated that this step was the aesthetics bridge submittal review. The RFP includes two examples, the Wishbone and Lotus. There will be an allowance for the design/build teams to present their own concepts. A maximum of two concepts per team will be allowed. In this phase, a pass/fail criteria will be used. BS stated that the teams will present to the ASC at a meeting that will be exempt from Sunshine Laws in accordance with state statutes. There will be one vote per member and majority rules. A written portion will also be included. The passing teams will be announced at a public meeting. The FDOT selection committee will shortlist three or four teams from the ones that have been passed by the ASC. JW stated that it is important to note that when the technical submissions come in, design/build teams will be given a rendering. JW stated that the internal staff at FDOT will do a review of the submissions and produce a write up for each of them. This information will be provided to the ASC. JW noted that FDOT's internal staff will be looking at the feasibility of construction and this information will help the committee to have an understanding of feasibility from an engineering perspective. JW noted that FDOT felt it would be beneficial to the committee to have that evaluation done.

JB asked if it is possible in the ASC review to have a higher threshold for the vote versus majority rules. He asked if a super majority would be feasible. BB asked if JB was referring to a 2/3 vote. BB stated that it would be four of the five committee members voting in favor. BB called for a motion in support of a super majority vote on the submissions. MJR seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

BS continued the presentation. BB then asked the committee if the super majority issue could be revisited. BB mentioned a concern with the super majority concept and having enough teams to conduct the procurement. JW stated that the concern is that if there is a super majority, there could be an issue with having enough teams to conduct the procurement. JW stated that FDOT has to ensure that there is fair amount of competition on the proposals received. JW stated that the Department likes to shortlist three to four teams on their procurements. JW noted that if there are not enough teams, the procurement

could be challenged later on. AE stated that she liked the super majority concept. JB asked who the five voting members of the ASC were. AE stated the names of the voting members of the ASC. JB asked if there were any FDOT members who vote. JW stated that BB was the representative from FDOT. IH stated that she was not concerned about the super majority. AE stated that she was not concerned about it because the committee is usually in sync about what they like. BB stated that he was still concerned about getting at least three teams in the competitive solicitation. BB stated that he agreed with AE about the committee thinking along the same lines in terms of aesthetics. JW stated it was important to note that each member of the committee will make their evaluations to themselves. It will not be done in a public meeting. Committee members will fill out score sheets. Those score sheets will be opened at a public meeting which will occur at a later date.

AE asked if the wording could be crafted to address the super majority concept. JW stated that the RFP could be written in such a way that as long as you have four teams that receive a super majority vote, then the submission moves forward. If at least four or five teams do not receive a super majority, then a standard majority would be used. BB stated that the statement made by JW addressed his concern. AE called for a motion to amend the previous vote to include this information. JB moved the motion as amended. MJR seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

### **Step 3 - RFP Response Phase 2: Technical Submittal**

BS stated that this step is the technical proposal phase. She stated that there would be one signature bridge design per team in this phase. Adjectival scoring will be used – excellent, very good, good, fair and poor. BS noted that aesthetics will be considered in this phase including over project aesthetics (Signature Bridge, Mainline and Streetscape). BS noted that the ASC will solely evaluate aesthetics and act as scorers for this section of the proposal. BS stated that aesthetics should reflect Context Sensitive Design incorporating the following elements:

- Visual Consistency
- Main Span
- Mainline and Connector Ramps
- Retaining Walls
- Street Scape
- Lighting

### **Step 4 - RFP Response Phase 2: Price Submittal**

It was noted that the review criteria would be weighted in favor of aesthetic qualities. BS reiterated that the procurement would be a max price, best value selection. She stated that bids have to be at or below max allowed. However, bids delivered below the allowable mix will not be favored upon that basis.

18. BS discussed the schedule for the project and presented the following:
  - Expected Advertisement Date – September 2015
  - Draft RFP provided to teams with Advertisement
  - Aesthetic Submittal – October 2015
  - Aesthetics Results Meeting – November 2015
  - Final RFP to proposers – November 2015
  - ATC Rounds – December 2015 to January 2016
  - Technical Proposal Due – May 2016
  - Price Proposal Due – May 2016
  - Anticipated Award Date – July 2016
  - Anticipated Execution Date – July 2016
19. BS continued the presentation and announced that the I-395 Project Office opened in Overtown on January 5, 2015. She stated that the project office was a resource for the public and it was being managed by the Department's public information consultant Commonground/MGS.
20. BS then turned the presentation over to Albert Sosa, P.E. of HNTB to discuss the MDX SR 836.11 portion of the project.

21. Albert Sosa, P.E. gave a brief overview of the MDX SR 836.11 project and stated that the budget is just under \$200 million dollars. IH asked if the project becomes an \$800 million project because of the portion being contributed by MDX. IH also asked if money could be transferred from MDX to FDOT. Mr. Sosa stated that due to the bond structure at MDX, a transfer of funds would not be allowed.
22. Mr. Sosa continued the presentation by further explaining the project and what improvements would occur. He stated that MDX has its' own aesthetic guidelines that would be followed during construction.
23. BS concluded the presentation on the I-95 Pavement Reconstruction portion of the presentation and gave a brief overview of the project.

**During and after the presentation the following points were also discussed:**

24. IH stated that BS mentioned in the presentation that the schedule had moved so significantly. IH further stated that the last time the ASC discussed the schedule, it was noted that the RFP process would begin in early 2015, but it has moved to May 2015. IH asked what happened during the time in between. JW answered the question by stating that since this project is being procured under the P3 statute, it has to get legislative and Governor's approval prior to submitting the actual start date.
25. IH stated that she is concerned that the Department is going to take too long, the price of materials will go up and they won't be able to afford the project. JW responded and stated that this is the fastest schedule FDOT could come up with at the current time.
26. JW mentioned changing the name of the Steering Committee to the Review Committee once the procurement process begins. AE moved the motion. It was seconded and passed unanimously.
27. IH followed by proposing a motion that any bridge submitted by the design/build teams proposing as a segmental box bridge on the signature portion of the proposal would automatically be disqualified. AE stated that as a committee the ASC will make the final decision on what they want as a signature structural bridge so that wording would not be needed in the RFP.
28. MJR discussed changing the term "signature bridge" to "signature structural bridge" when referencing the bridge portion of the project. AE moved the motion and it was unanimously passed.
29. AE asked that the Adrienne Arsht Center garage plan update be discussed. GP updated the committee and talked about the discussions FDOT has had with the county about swapping property. GP stated that they have a follow up meeting with Michael Spring and his staff to discuss the County process and property management issues.
30. IH asked a question regarding the standards of MDX aesthetics relating to the proposals that are submitted as part of the procurement.
31. AE mentioned that the overall cost of the project would be \$825 million with the inclusion of the MDX SR 836.11 project and the I-95 Pavement Reconstruction project.
32. JB asked about the public engagement plan for the project. AE asked that an overview of public engagement be added as a discussion item to the agenda for the next meeting.
33. IH asked if the committee would see the RFP prior to public distribution. JW stated that he could send the sections related to the ASC in the next few months to committee members.
34. The meeting adjourned at 10:21 a.m.

**The following minutes will be considered an accurate record of the meeting unless FDOT is notified in writing within ten (10) business days following the distribution date.**

Minutes Prepared By: \_\_\_\_\_

Tasha Cunningham  
District VI Design Public Information Specialist

**Distribution Date: 02/17/15**