

MEETING MINUTES

Agency Coordination Meeting
June 28, 2017
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
- Hong Benitez, P.E.
- Shereen Yee Fong (**Teleconference**)
- Brittany Bianca (**Teleconference**)

City of Miami Beach (CMB)

- Pedro Fuentes
- Josiel Ferrer, E.I.
- Deborah Tackett (**Teleconference**)

Miami-Dade County (MDC)

- Mike Bauman
- Dennis Fernandez
- Angus Laney
- Michael Ruiz
- Sarah Cody (**Teleconference**)

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

- Tarrie Ostrofsky (**Teleconference**)

South Florida Water Management District

- Mindy Parrott (**Teleconference**)

United States Coast Guard (USCG)

- Randall Overton (**Teleconference**)

State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)

- Ginny Jones (**Teleconference**)

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

- Jennifer Schull (**Teleconference**)

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

- John Wrublik (**Teleconference**)

Consultant Project Team (CPT)

- Please see attached sign-in sheets.

MEETING LOCATION

- 1000 NW 111th Avenue (ROW Conference Room), Miami, FL 33172

MEETING SUMMARY

- Formal meeting began at 1:41 p.m.
- Mr. Dat Huynh, P.E. (FDOT) began the meeting with an introduction of project team and agency attendees.
- Mr. Huynh followed the introductions with an overview of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Assignment and explained that the Office of Environmental Management (OEM) is acting as the lead federal agency on the project.
- Mr. Randy Overton (USCG) made a comment regarding the order of the wording on a slide in the “Project Team” portion of the presentation related to the definition of a cooperating agency versus a participating agency. Mr. Huynh provided an overview of the difference between a cooperating agency and a participating agency involved in the project. Mr. Overton stated that the definitions were reversed on the slide. Mr. Huynh responded to Mr. Overton and stated that FDOT will make the correction on all past, present and future project documentation.
- Mr. Huynh reviewed the presentation agenda:
 - Purpose and Need for Project
 - Project Status
 - Alternatives Analysis
 - Viable Alternatives
 - Estimated Costs
 - Maintenance of Traffic
 - Anticipated Schedule
 - Environment
 - Evaluation Matrix
 - Next Steps
- Purpose and Need for Project
 - Mr. Huynh explained that the purpose of the proposed project 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.
- Ms. Sarah Cody (MDC), asked what the differences were between Functionally Obsolete and Structurally Deficient. Mr. Huynh explained to Ms. Cody that Functionally Obsolete doesn't meet the current standards and does not include structural components of the bridge.
- 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 turned the meeting over to Rick Crooks, P.E., (CPT) to cover the remaining agenda items.
- Alternatives Analysis
 - Mr. Crooks detailed the Alternatives Analysis and showed the flowchart and screening matrix of the various Alternatives that were evaluated and presented at the Alternatives Public Workshop (APW). Ms. Cody (MDC) mentioned the importance of maintaining the historic railing of the various bridges. Mr. Crooks continued the presentation by discussing the various alternatives that were developed and evaluated to meet the project needs. During the APW a ballot was used to access the preferences of the attendees. The CPT also conducted an Alternatives Screening and

provided the results in a matrix. The results of the alternatives screening were comparable to the results of the ballots.

- Viable Alternatives
 - 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
 - Replacement Alternative T1- Venetian Railing
 - Rehabilitation Alternative M1- Bascule Bridge Rehabilitation
 - Replacement Alternative 7 – Arched Beams
 - Replacement Alternative T1- Venetian Railing
 - 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.
- Maintenance of Traffic
 - Mr. Crooks continued by detailing the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) options for each bridge alternative and the individual bridge detours.
- Anticipated Schedule
 - Mr. Crooked presented the Anticipated Schedule for the various Alternatives and explained the construction process for each bridge alternative.
- Environment
 - Mr. Crooks presented the environmental impacts of the No-Build versus the Build Alternative and pointed out that given the extensive nature of the Rehabilitation Alternative, the impacts were similar.
 - The Historic Resource Impacts of No-Build vs. Build Alternatives were also presented. The No-Build Alternatives results in No Adverse Effects/Impacts to the historic resources, the Rehabilitation may likely result in Adverse Effects/Impacts and Replacement in Adverse Effects/Impacts to the historic resources.
 - Mr. Jeff Marcus (CPT) further elaborated on the specific environmental impacts.
- Evaluation Matrix
 - Mr. Crooks continued the presentation by reviewing the Evaluation Matrix that would be used to analyze and score the No-Build and Build Alternatives.
- Next Steps
 - Mr. Crooks concluded the presentation by outlining the next steps in the PD&E process.
- Mr. Huynh discussed any requirements needed by the cooperating agencies involved in the project. Mr. Overton (USCG), stated that he would provide the project team with the Coast Guard Bridge Application Guide, which details all the requirements needed by the

Coast Guard. Ms. Tarrie Ostrofsky (USACE) explained that her agency would regulate any discharges associated with any of the approaches.

- Mr. Marcus (CPT) asked if a replacement were chosen over rehabilitation, would it affect the permitting and jurisdiction of the USCG and the USACE. Mr. Overton (USCG), replied to Mr. Marcus' question by stating that it all depends on the scope of the work and the extent of rehabilitation.
- Mr. Huynh acknowledged any agency questions and comments. Mr. Michael Ruiz (MDC) requested an explanation of the construction timeline for the different bridge alternatives. Mr. Crooks and Mr. Huynh explained the overall timeline of the various alternatives.
- Mr. Huynh continued the meeting by explaining the next steps in the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) study process. He explained that the project team is preparing the draft documents for internal review before they are submitted to OEM, USCG and USACE.
- The meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.