



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT SIX
I-395 PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROJECT
FIN NO. 251668-1-52-01
AESTHETIC STEERING COMMITTEE (ASC) MEETING NO. 9
ADRIENNE ARSHT CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS
ZIFF BALLET OPERA HOUSE
PEACOCK FOUNDATION STUDIO
1301 BISCAYNE BLVD., MIAMI, FL 33132
SEPTEMBER 9, 2015 AT 9:00 A.M.

MEETING TYPE:

Aesthetic Steering Committee (ASC) No. 9

ATTENDEES:

Committee Members in Attendance:

- The Honorable Audrey M. Edmonson (AE), Commissioner, Miami-Dade County
- Brian Blanchard, P.E., (BB), FDOT Assistant Secretary for Engineering & Operations
- M. John Richard (MJR), President and CEO, Adrienne Arsht Center for the Performing Arts
- Irene Hegedus (IH), Zoning Administrator, Miami-Dade Transit
- Alyce Robertson (AR), Executive Director, Miami Downtown Development Authority

Elected Officials:

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

FDOT Staff:

- Gus Pego, P.E. (GP), FDOT District Six Secretary
- Raul Quintela, P.E. (RQ), FDOT Senior Project Manager
- Harold Desdunes, P.E., (HD), Director of Transportation Development
- Jason Watts (JW), Chief Counsel, Contracts and Special Projects
- Mario Cabrera, P.E. (MC), FDOT District Six Construction Engineer
- Mikhail Dubrovsky, P.E. (MD), CCEI/Plans Review Engineer
- Jacqueline Sequeira, P.E. (JS), Construction Program Manager

FDOT Consultant Project Team:

- Beth Steimle, P.E. (BS), T.Y. Lin
- Michael Fitzpatrick (MF), T.Y. Lin
- Dennis Martinez, P.E. (DM), T.Y. Lin
- Gus Schmidt, P.E. (GS), T.Y. Lin
- Courtney Cunningham (CC), Commonground/MGS
- Tasha Cunningham (TC), Commonground/MGS
- Myrick Mitchell (MM), Commonground/MGS
- Marisela Bertot (MB), Commonground/MGS

Miami-Dade County Staff:

- Gerald Sanchez (GS), Assistant County Attorney
- Marie Denis (MD), Department of Cultural Affairs
- Alex Peraza (AP), Construction Projects Manager
- Tracie Auguste (TA), Office of Miami-Dade County Commissioner Audrey Edmonson

Members of the Public:

- Please see attached sign-in sheet

ATTACHMENTS:

- Sign-in sheet

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

1. GP opened the meeting at 9:16 a.m. TC took roll call and the meeting was turned over to AE.
2. AE announced the public comment portion of the meeting. One public comment was received from Daniel Alzuri, senior director of operations for the Adrienne Arsht Center on behalf of resident Nikki Zapol (Attached).
3. AE posed a question regarding the technical requirements for the pedestrian experience.
4. BS responded by saying that part of the technical requirements will be to improve the pedestrian connectivity, upgrade the pedestrian signals and enhance the crosswalks.
5. IH responded to BS inquiring if this information would be part of the review committee.
6. BS answered by stating that it will be a requirement by the teams so the committee will be reviewing this information.
7. AR requested a response be sent back to Nikki Zapol. AR responded by saying that she certainly conquers with Nikki's message and that the pedestrian experience in all of downtown Miami is definitely critical to the Miami Downtown Development Authority and FDOT is doing everything they can to enhance the situation for pedestrians. AR continued by saying that two hundred and twenty thousand people come into downtown Miami everyday and once they park their cars they become pedestrians and a vote from this committee will make this issue a high priority.
8. AE called for a motion to approve the minutes of the July 17, 2015 ASC meeting.
9. MJR moved the approval of the minutes.
10. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously.
11. AE called for the next agenda item, which was new business, and turned the meeting over to BS who began with a discussion of confidentiality and the cone of silence. BS showed a slide regarding the Sunshine Law. She stated that once the project is advertised, FDOT and the ASC would be under the cone of silence. She also elaborated on the procedures shown in the slide including the fact that all meetings related to the project must cease once the project is officially advertised. In order to ensure a fair, competitive and open procurement process, all communications between interested firms and the Department (including ASC) must be directed to Harry Orvil, Professional Services Unit (PSU) Administrator, from the point of advertisement through the posting of final selection results.
12. BS continued by providing an outline of the presentation:
 - Overview of Corridor Development
 - Highlight of Aesthetic Requirements
 - Expected Timeline & Schedule
 - Aesthetic Review Committee Formation
13. BS discussed the next slide regarding the Overview of Corridor Development. She specified that in the very beginning of the project, before the Aesthetic Steering Committee helped finalize the project, there was the Project Advisory Group (PAG). She mentioned that the PAG consisted of:
 - 38 Stakeholders
 - Five Meetings from November 2011 to January 2013
 - Early development of visual quality concepts and recommendations
 - * Iconic
 - * Inviting
 - * Usable
14. BS further elaborated on the Overview of Corridor Development with the Aesthetic Steering Committee (ASC). She mentioned that the ASC consisted of:

- Nine Meetings from January 2014 to September 2015
 - Instrumental in formalizing the RFP process
 - Driving the Signature Bridge selection
 - Technical Advisory Committee involved in all phases
15. BS followed the Overview of Corridor Development with a list of previous meeting dates for the Aesthetic Steering Committee. She began to discuss the highlights of each ASC meeting as well as the decisions that were made, starting with ASC Meeting No. 1. She stated that the highlights of the ASC Meeting No. 1 were:
- The Procurement Process
 - Record of Decision
 - Review Four Signature Bridge Alternatives
 - * Three Sail Regatta
 - * Emergence
 - * Lotus
 - * Wishbone
16. BS began to outline the Procurement Process during the ASC Meeting No. 1. She noted on the slide that the text in yellow were decisions that changed over time. BS continued with the Record of Decision on the next slide. She stated that the Record of Decision explains the minimum vertical clearance, the minimum span length, the Signature Bridge as well as the aesthetic that's part of the RFP process.
17. BS continued the next few slides with renderings of the Signature Bridge Alternatives during ASC Meeting No. 1. She identified that the final decisions from the ASC was to eliminate the "Three Sail Regatta" and the "Emergence," make the "Lotus" structural and accept the "Wishbone" as a signature bridge alternative.
18. BS continued with the overview of the ASC Meeting No. 2. She stated that the highlights of the ASC Meeting No. 2 were:
- PAG Bridge Concepts
 - Two Signature Alternatives
 - * Structural Lotus
 - * Wishbone
 - Streetscape
19. BS described renderings of the bridge concepts that were detailed during the PAG meeting in the next slide.
20. BS discussed the streetscape design following the bridge concepts. She stated that at the time there were only three zones: Zone 1, Zone 2 and Zone 3. In the next few slides, BS showcased renderings of the zones described in the streetscape design.
21. BS explained that the final decisions from the ASC Meeting No. 2 were:
- Memorialized ASC Decision No. 1 regarding non-structural alternatives
 - Only Structural Solutions for Signature Bridge
 - Motion to allow a process where creative teams would be competitive as long as they met a financial cap.
22. BS stated that the final decisions from ASC Meeting No. 3 were:
- ASC will play a role in the procurement process for selection of Structural Signature Bridge.
 - Aesthetics to play an important role in selection criteria.
 - Price, maintenance, construction time are important but will play a minor role when compared with aesthetics.
23. BS continued with the overview of ASC Meeting No. 4 and No. 5. She stated that the highlights of ASC Meeting No. 4 and No. 5 were:
- Request for Proposal Process
 - * Maximum Price Approach
 - * Process that Provides Innovation and Creativity
 - * Provides Best Value
 - * Overall Project Aesthetics
 - * Technical Requirements

- Streetscape Design
24. BS began to elaborate on the Four Step Design Process that the FDOT is following for the RFP. She reminded the committee that the text in yellow represents decisions that have changed over time.
 25. BS described in the next slide the addition of Zone A in the Streetscape Design. She mentioned that FDOT wanted to recognize the investment the department made in the interchange. In the next few slides, BS displayed a few more designs showcasing the different zones in detail.
 26. BS stated that the final decisions from ASC Meeting No. 4 and No. 5 were:
 - Approval of RFP Process
 - Comments provided on Streetscape
 - Aesthetics of overall project importance
 27. BS followed the final decisions from ASC Meeting No. 4 and No. 5 with the overview from ASC Meeting No. 6. She listed that the highlights from ASC Meeting No. 6 were:
 - Procurement Process Refined
 - Introduction of SR 836.11 and I-95
 - Context Sensitive Design
 - * Visual Consistency
 - * Main Span
 - * Mainline Connector and Ramps
 - * Retaining Walls
 - * Streetscape
 - * Lighting
 28. BS continued with the Procurement Process. She mentioned that during the previous meetings the use of the Wishbone and Lotus were going to be an automatic pass but hearing the feedback from the ASC, it was changed to a maximum of two concepts per team for any Signature Bridge concept.
 29. BS mentioned that in ASC meeting No. 6, FDOT introduced the Aesthetic Project Technical Enhancements. She itemized that the Aesthetics Project Technical Enhancements consisted of:
 - Teams being encouraged to submit APTEs, in order to utilize savings from other areas of the project on aesthetics.
 - Substantial portion of the overall score
 - Constructability and maintenance vetted by FDOT
 - Evaluation of enhancement for aesthetics solely by the ASC
 30. BS began to discuss the I-395 Project Office, first introduced during the ASC Meeting No. 6.
 31. BS continued the next slide with the MDX 83611 Project. She explained that this project would provide a direct connection to I-395 westbound to northwest 12th avenue, widen the bridges, provide a new westbound connector and help with some of the weaving movements during interchange.
 32. BS followed the MDX 83611 Project with the I-95 Project Update that was discussed during ASC Meeting No. 3.
 33. AR posed a question to BS regarding Zone A and if it was apart of the overall cap on the budget.
 34. BS responded by stating that Zone A was always apart of the budget but was not treated as a specific zone.
 35. BS listed that the final decisions from ASC Meeting No. 6 were:
 - Aesthetics to play a significant role
 - ASC Signature Bridge Selection- Pass/Fail
 - * Super Majority
 - Aesthetics play a more important role than bids
 - * Bids, construction time, and maintenance will be considered but to a lesser degree
 - Adjectival Scoring
 36. BS listed that the final decisions from ASC Meeting No. 7 were:
 - Aesthetic Steering Committee will become Aesthetic Review Committee (ARC)
 - Training for each ARC member
 - Public Involvement Importance
 37. BS continued with the overview of the ASC Meeting No. 8. She stated that the highlights of the ASC Meeting No. 8 were:

- Aesthetics Manual Overview
 - * Baseline
 - * Expectations of Design Build Teams
 - Timeline and Schedule
38. BS continued the presentation discussing the Aesthetics Manual. She mentioned that the Aesthetics Manual would be apart of the RFP, rolling out the baseline and suggested enhancements for the projects vision. BS began to elaborate on the Aesthetics Manual in the next few slides of the presentation.
 39. BS followed the Aesthetics Manual with the Signature Bridge Requirements in the RFP that was discussed during ASC Meeting No. 8.
 40. BS continued the next slide with the Signature Bridge Templates. She mentioned that FDOT created templates to help with Signature Bridge Phase 2 that every team is required to submit. She continued the presentation with examples of templates detailing the Aerial and Transition views of the Wishbone and Lotus.
 41. BS explained in the next slide that the Aesthetic Project Technical Enhancements were also discussed during ASC meeting No. 8.
 42. BS listed that the final decisions discussed during the ASC Meeting No. 8 were:
 - Aesthetics would play a significant role in all areas of the project
 - ASC members stated individual visions.
 43. BS followed the final decisions discussed during the ASC Meeting No. 8 with the Expected Timeline and Schedule. She listed that FDOT is still on track to:
 - Advertise and Short List Five DB Teams: Fall 2015
 - Signature Bridge Aesthetics Submittal: Winter 2015 to Early 2016
 - ATC Process and APTE Process: Spring 2016
 - Technical Proposal Submittal: Summer 2016
 - Price Submittal: August 2016
 44. BS continued the Training of Members portion of the presentation. She stated that training should not be more than two hours and FDOT will conduct all the training of the members in the same week.
 45. BS followed the presentation with the Aesthetic Steering Committee Accomplishments. She explained to the committee they accomplished:
 - Aesthetics Importance
 - Imparted Vision
 - Shaped Structural Signature Bridge Criteria in RFP
 - Shaped Procurement Process
 - * Tailored for this unique project
 - * Continual Involvement
 - Shaped Streetscape Design
 - Aesthetic Review Committee
 46. BS concluded the presentation by introducing GP to award each committee member with certificates of appreciation.
 47. GP stated that with all the hard work the committee has put towards the project, FDOT wanted to present to the committee a certificate on behalf of Secretary Jim Boxold from Tallahassee, for the committee's leadership and involvement of the ASC as they transition to the ARC after advertisement. He requested that the committee stand and he will present the certificates on the Secretary's behalf.
 48. The committee stood for a group photo.
 49. AE thanked FDOT for the certificates.
 50. GP also thanked everyone who actively participated and helped form an innovative procurement process for the project. He stated that the project team made a lot of commitments as they went through the process from the early peak of the PD&E stage to where the project is today. He continued by saying that the only challenge is for the industry to step up and meet or exceed the challenges that will be put before them. He further elaborated that he has no doubt that there will be very fine proposals presented to the ARC.
 51. AE thanked GP, JW, TC as well as GS for assisting the committee. She also expressed to the committee that she enjoyed working with them as the ASC and will enjoy working with them as the ARC.

52. AE asked the committee if they have any comments or discussions.
53. MJR asked if there was an opportunity to ask questions before the transition to the ARC about the procurement process and if there was any room to influence the requirements of presentation by the different firms that will be bidding. He continued with an additional questions regarding the firms' presentations. He asked if the committee would be seeing the presentations either electronically or on paper and if the committee will be meeting with a representative from the firm for personal presentations.
54. JW responded to MJR question by stating the intent is each of the firms submits an Aesthetic package, DOT engineers will evaluate the package to make sure the bridge is realistic and feasible, and small meeting between DOT staff and the firms to make sure everything was included in the package. He continued by mentioning that the ARC will receive a package and the package will have each of the renderings, including the day and night views.
55. BS agreed with JW and elaborated on the renderings. She explained that looking northbound and southbound along Biscayne, the project team wanted the day and the night views and traveling on the eastbound I-395 there would only be the day view. BS continued by mentioning that the project team could add additional rendering requirements but would primarily want to keep the renderings the same.
56. IH asked if there would be an opportunity for the project team to go over the packages with the committee or once they receive the packages, they simply grade the packages alone.
57. JW responded to IH's question by explaining that in order to have the Aesthetic Committee as a Review Committee, they want to make sure the committee is evaluating the teams equally so each member will be grading the package solo, but then the committee will come together as a group, all the scores will be open by the Procurement Officer, the committee will see which teams passed and failed and the Project Selection Committee affirms the votes. He continued by saying that FDOT did not want to have presentations because the committee's role is to view only aesthetics and not how entertaining the presentations are.
58. IH asked JW how they would grade the baseline of the pedestrian component.
59. JW responded by saying that the pedestrian component is a part of the second phase, so after the department goes through the package and pass/fail the bridges, then there would be another submission for the rest of the project, along with aesthetic project technical enhancements. JW continued by stating that the technical enhancements will be reviewed first by the department for constructability.
60. IH responded to JW by saying she would like to see it a part of the submittal so the committee can see the scale.
61. BS responded to IH comment by stating that the scale is one of the reasons the project team likes the aerial view, because it provides, in context, the scale of the buildings.
62. IH responded by mentioning that she knows that the committee has talked about lighting significance and would like to see that as well.
63. AE asked if the committee would review the RFP prior to being released.
64. JW agreed and responded by saying that the department has an ATC process that is involved in all of the projects, and if the teams get a bridge that is passed by the ARC and the teams want to make a change to the ATC process, the teams should expect that the change may not be approved unless it's an emergency.
65. AE requested that JW elaborate on his response.
66. JW responded by saying once the committee passes the bridge, the teams are not able to come back to the department and request significant changes to the bridges.
67. MJR made a comment stating that he appreciates the protection of being entertained as it relates to the presentations but in terms of fairness to the teams, there is an artistic expression in building an iconic structure. He posed a question about the inspiration that would be expressed by the teams and how the committee would learn the narrative that would reflect the creative thinking of the team's structures.
68. GP responded to MJR's question by stating that the department wanted to get away from the presentation format for reasons JW previously stated but the department could evaluate a consideration for an audiotape to be submitted with the package, so that the committee can get an overview from the artistic point of view of the teams.
69. JW followed GP response by saying that the department has discussed the notion of putting a one-page explanation of the teams design.

70. IH responded by saying that the project is dealing with artist, people who are going to impact what Miami is all about and the department is asking the committee to review a bridge of the aesthetic component and the committee is not benefiting from a presentation from the teams.
71. GP responded to IH by stating that the project team will take it back to the department and consider a video presentation but wants to keep the process at a level playing field and keeping it in a written format. He continued by stating that he likes the idea of an audiotape but thinks the minimum should be a one-page document.
72. MJR responded by saying audio can be limited to time.
73. GP responded by saying that there are other things that can happen on an audio that teams can do to manipulate the process.
74. AE asked if audio was ever used during the process.
75. GP responded with No.
76. JW responded by explaining that the department's fear is that they will have a team that will hire an actor or someone famous that would sway the committee more than the renderings as opposed to a team that uses someone from their office.
77. AE agreed with JW and stated that she understands why the department wants to keep it as transparent as possible.
78. AR posed a question regarding the baseline aesthetics. She stated that she did not find the diamond and the octagon appealing and if teams were allowed to come up with alternatives.
79. BS responded to AR's question and stated that all of the baseline aesthetics are to show the vision and the department expects the baseline to be enhanced.
80. JW reiterated BS's response by stating that part of the aesthetics project technical enhancements are scored so teams are encouraged to modify the baselines to give more than what the department requests.
81. AR posed another question regarding an email from Maurice Ferré.
82. GP addressed the question by explaining that he had a conversation with Maurice Ferré regarding the removal of the causeway between the museum and park so that pedestrians can move freely to the north and the south between the two properties. He continued by stating that the Department evaluated what it would take to entertain that possibility. He stated that removing the causeway in that area would delay this project by at least a year. He stated that the cost for the additional project is not in the budget for this project and would create engineering constraints. GP further elaborated by saying to have pedestrian connectivity is limited to two options: one is the promenade along Biscayne Blvd. and secondly the City of Miami is requiring, and the Genting Development is proposing, a connection of a bay walk under the McArthur bridge between the Museum and the Genting properties.
83. AE thanked everyone for their comments and asked if there were any additional questions.
84. IH responded by acknowledging that she will no longer be with the City of Miami effective September 1st and will be with Miami-Dade Transit beginning October 1st.
85. AE requested a motion allowing her to approve the meeting minutes due to the ASC/ARC transition.
86. The motion was moved by MJR and seconded by AR.
87. AE asked if anyone wished to record a "No" vote.
88. AE requested for a motion for adjournment.
89. BS responded by thanking the committee on her behalf and the leadership of GP, HD, and RQ. She requested that the project team stand and be acknowledged.
90. AE thanked the project team and requested a motion for adjournment.
91. The meeting adjourned at 10:05 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
FDOT District Six Consultant Public Information Specialist

Distribution Date: 10/12/15