

MEETING MINUTES

Cultural Resource Committee (CRC) Meeting No. 3
March 6, 2018
Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study
Venetian Causeway
from North Bayshore Drive to Purdy Avenue in Miami-Dade County
Financial Project Number: 422713-2-22-01
ETDM Number: 12756

ATTENDEES

Florida Department of Transportation, District Six (FDOT)

- Dat Huynh, P.E., Project Manager
- Kelsey Condell
- Andrew Jungman
- Barbara Culhane, AICP

FDOT, Office of Environmental Management (OEM)

- Lindsey Guthrie, Project Delivery Coordinator
- Matthew Marino, Cultural Resources Specialist
- Michael Sykes, Engineering Specialist

Miami Design Preservation League (MDPL)

- Steven J. Pynes

Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW)

- Gabriel Delgado, P.E.

State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)

- Ginny Jones

Consultant Project Team (CPT)

- Please see attached sign-in sheets.

MEETING LOCATION

- 1000 Venetian Condominiums (Third Floor, Clubhouse), Miami, FL 33139

MEETING SUMMARY

- Formal meeting began at 7:17 p.m.
- Mr. Dat Huynh, P.E. (FDOT) began the meeting with an introduction of the project team and agency attendees.
- Purpose and Need for Project
 - Mr. Huynh explained the purpose of the proposed project, which is to address identified structural and functional deficiencies of the twelve existing bridges (ten low-level fixed spans and two movable bascules), through potential alternatives such as No-Build, Replacement or Rehabilitation. He continued by presenting a chart that detailed the structural and functional deficiencies of all twelve Venetian bridges.
- Structural and Functional Deficiencies
 - Mr. Huynh reviewed the functional and sufficiency ratings for each of the twelve existing bridges.
- Mr. Huynh reviewed the presentation agenda:
 - Project Status
 - Purpose of CRC

- Alternatives Analysis
 - Viable Alternatives
 - Evaluation Matrix
 - Recommended Alternative
 - Historic Resources
 - Section 106 Process
 - Next Steps
- Project Status
 - Mr. Huynh gave an update on the project status and explained the Class of Action Determination of an Environmental Assessment (EA) on November 10, 2016 by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the NEPA Assignment, which went into effect on December 14, 2016. Mr. Huynh continued to discuss the project status with a timeline of what has transpired to date during Project Scope Development and PD&E/NEPA Study.
- Purpose of the Cultural Resource Committee (CRC)
 - Mr. Huynh continued by outlining the purpose of the Cultural Resource Committee (CRC). Mr. Huynh turned the meeting over to Rick Crooks, P.E. to cover the remaining agenda items. Mr. Crooks began the presentation by giving a brief background on the Venetian Causeway.
- Alternatives Analysis
 - Mr. Crooks detailed the Alternatives Analysis and showed screening matrix of the various alternatives that were evaluated and presented at the Alternatives Public Workshop (APW). Mr. Crooks mentioned that during the APW, a ballot was used to assess the preferences of the attendees. Mr. Crooks noted that the results of the alternatives screening were comparable to the results of the ballots received by the public during the APW.
- Viable Alternatives
 - Mr. Crooks mentioned that based on the results of the alternatives screening, the viable alternatives to be considered for additional study were determined as follows:
 - No-Build:
 - Alternative 1 – Do Nothing
 - Alternative 2- Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSM&O)
 - Build Alternatives:
 - Rehabilitation Alternative 4 – Fixed Bridge Rehabilitation with Beam Strengthening
 - Rehabilitation Alternative M1- Bascule Bridge Rehabilitation
 - Replacement Alternative 7 – Arched Beams
 - Replacement Alternative M4 – Double Leaf Bascule Bridge
 - Estimated Costs
 - Mr. Crooks provided a review of the estimated costs and service life for the No-Build, Rehabilitation and Replacement Alternatives. Mr. Crooks also evaluated the Life Cycle Cost for each Alternative.
 - Anticipated Schedule
 - Mr. Crooks presented the Anticipated Schedule for the various alternatives and explained the construction

process for each alternative. Mr. Crooks continued to describe the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) that will be involved during the construction process of the project.

- Environment
 - Mr. Crooks turned the presentation over to Ken Hardin, Janus Research, to present the environmental impacts of the No-Build and Build Alternatives.
- Evaluation Matrix
 - Mr. Hardin turned the presentation back to Rick Crooks to review the Evaluation Matrix. Ginny Jones, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) asked Mr. Crooks about the popularity of the alternatives during the Alternatives Public Workshop (APW). Mr. Crooks detailed the voting process that took place during the APW to determine the public's preferred alternative. He stated that the meeting took place on May 13, 2015 and the majority voted for the Replacement Alternative for the project. Mr. Hardin and Mr. Crooks further elaborated on the voting process during the APW.
- Recommended Alternative
 - Mr. Crooks presented the Recommended Alternative as follows:
 - Alternative T1: Venetian Railing
 - Alternative 7: Arch Beam
 - Alternative M4: Double Leaf Bascule Bridge
 - Mr. Hardin elaborated on the construction that will be involved in the Replacement Alternative. Ms. Jones asked Mr. Crooks what the height of the gravity wall will be at its maximum. Mr. Crooks stated that the gravity wall height will be 2.3 ft. at its maximum.
 - Ms. Jones inquired about the need to acquire right-of-way parcels with the Replacement Alternative and the height of the gravity wall on the spoil islands. She was informed that no parcels would need to be acquired and that the roadway would be raised about a foot on the island and would require that fill be placed to accommodate the higher grade.
 - Ms. Streelman responded to Ms. Jones comments by stating that because of the most recent alternatives information including the increased height of the bridges and the gravity walls, the APE will be expanded to include the additional residential parcels located across the street from where the current APE is delineated.
- Historic Resources
 - Mr. Crooks turned the presentation over to Amy Streelman, Janus Research, to discuss the historic resources and the potential historic impacts to the project area.
- Section 106 Process

- Ms. Streeleman continued the presentation with a brief description of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and next steps throughout the course of the study.
- Next Steps
 - Mr. Crooks continued the presentation with a timeline of the next steps during the PD&E study of the project. Ms. Jones stated that she would prefer the next CRC meeting take place following the upcoming Public Hearing. Mr. Huynh stated that a letter would be drafted to all the CRC members asking if they would prefer a CRC meeting before or after the Public Hearing. Mr. Steven J Pynes, Miami Design Preservation League (MDPL), asked Mr. Hardin who would be leading the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Mr. Hardin stated that the MOA would be created with the participation of the cooperating parties, with the assistance of Janus Research: State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Office of Environmental Management (OEM), Miami-Dade County (MDC), United States Coast Guard (USCG), and the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE).
- Mr. Huynh asked if there were any additional questions as it relates to the presentation. Ms. Jones asked what would be required to build the gravity wall on the spoil islands. Mr. Crooks responded that they would have to put more fill, but it will be contained within the walls and the islands would be unchanged.
- Ms. Jones stated that when assessing effects, which are one of the next steps in the Section 106 process, the team should look at the construction and engineering of the spoil islands and the changes to these islands over time. How much original design remains? This will need to be addressed when reviewing the proposed improvements and the characteristics and features that contribute to the Causeway's significance. For example, will more fill be added to these?
- Mr. Pynes asked if the bridges would still be considered a historic causeway after construction. Ms. Jones stated that the eligibility would be considered based on the historic characteristics of the causeway, an evaluation of the Section 106 and the impacts of the Recommended Alternative to the historic resource.
- Mr. Huynh concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for their continued participation throughout the PD&E process of the project.
- The meeting adjourned at 8:39 p.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: _____

Myrick Mitchell
 FDOT District Six Consultant Public Information Specialist/The Brand
 Advocates, Inc.

Distribution Date: 03/16/18