SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting No. 4
May 16, 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

FDOT District Six:
- Dat Huynh, P.E., Project Manager
- Hong Benitez, P.E.
- Barbara Culhane

City of Miami Beach:
- Claudia Rodriguez
- Kevin Pulido

Miami-Dade County:
- James Martinak
- Dennis Fernandez
- Christopher Taylor (Representative from Commissioner Sally Heyman's Office)

Members of the PAG:
- Please see attached sign-in sheets.

Consultant Project Team:
- Please see attached sign-in sheets.

General Public:
- Please see attached sign-in sheets.

MEETING LOCATION

- 1000 Venetian Way Condominium (Clubhouse), Miami Beach, FL 33139

MEETING SUMMARY

- Formal presentation began at 7:23 p.m.
- Dat Huynh, P.E., FDOT Project Manager, introduced Christopher Taylor, representative from Commissioner Sally Heyman's office and the agencies involved in the project. Mr. Huynh provided an overview of the "Purpose and Need" and the "Structural and Functional Deficiencies" of the project.
- Jüergen Brendel, Venetian Islands Homeowners' Association, asked Mr. Huynh what causes the acceleration in the Sufficiency Ratings. Mr. Huynh explained that the Sufficiency Ratings could increase due to corrosion and several other factors.
- Mr. Huynh also introduced the following agenda for the presentation:
    - Project Status
    - Alternatives Analysis
    - Viable Alternatives
    - Estimated Costs
    - Anticipated Schedule
    - Environment

    - Evaluation Matrix
    - 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). Mr. Huynh discussed the update that the Florida Department of Transportation has assumed Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Assignment, which took effect on 12/14/2016.
- Alternatives Analysis
    - Mr. Rick Crooks, P.E., Consultant Project Manager, explained the evaluation matrix of the various alternatives that were presented at the Alternatives Public Workshop (APW). Mr. Crooks turned the presentation over to Stephanie Romero, P.E., to explain Alternative 6, the High-Level Fixed Bridge.
    - Michael Fryd, a member of the Venetian Islands Homeowners' Association, asked Mrs. Romero if the replacement alternative for the East Bascule Bridge would block north/south traffic on East Rivo Alto Drive. Mrs. Romero replied with yes, that's the reason the roadway would have to be raised followed by a response from Mr. Crooks stating that the road will be raised approximately three feet.
    - Emmanuel Sebag, a member of the Venetian Islands Homeowners' Association, asked Mrs. Romero what the height increase would be between the existing roadway and Alternative 6. Mrs. Romero stated the increase would be 3 ft. at the end of approaches, and about 16 ft. at the retaining walls. This is the smallest increase in height in order to meet the 35 ft. channel clearance.
    - Jüergen Brendel followed with a recommendation to start at a lower height at the approaches and gradually increase the height of the bridge to meet the 35 ft. clearance. Mrs. Romero stated that the maximum slope has to be five percent per ADA requirements and therefore the recommendation is not possible.
    - Carlos Carrillo, a member of the public, asked Mrs. Romero who suggested Alternative 6 as an option. Mr. Crooks responded to Mr. Carrillo's question by stating that the feedback was received as a result of the Alternatives Public Workshop and was also a recommended alternative from a value engineering study that was conducted by the Department.
    - Mrs. Romero turned the presentation over to Mr. Crooks to finalize the details of the Alternatives Analysis.
- Viable Analysis
    - Mr. Crooks continued the presentation by discussing the viable alternatives that were developed and evaluated to meet the project's Purpose and Need.
- Estimated Costs
    - Mr. Crooks followed the Viable Alternatives Analysis with a review of the estimated cost 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 discussed the anticipated schedule for the alternatives and explained that the construction process for the rehabilitation alternative would last for 69 months and the construction process for the replacement alternative would last for 48 months.
- Environment
    - Mr. Crooks presented the environmental impacts of the No-Build vs. the Build alternative and pointed out that given the extensive nature of the rehabilitation alternative, the impacts would be similar.
    - The Historic Resource Impacts of No-Build vs. Build Alternatives were also presented. The No-Build alternative results in a finding of no adverse effects/impacts to the historic resources. The rehabilitation alternative may likely result in adverse effects/impacts. The replacement alternative would result in adverse effects/impacts to the historic resources.
    - Mr. Jeff Marcus, Stantec Environment Services, further elaborated that the higher the bridge the less environmental impacts.
- Evaluation Matrix
    - Mr. Crooks continued the presentation by reviewing the Evaluation Matrix that was used to analyze and score the No-Build and Build Alternatives.
    - Jüergen Brendel asked if a traffic impact study was conducted to combat the traffic issues on the causeway. Mr. Crooks explained that a traffic impact study was not conducted because the only solution would be to add additional lanes.
    - Mr. Sebag made a recommendation to increase the shifts during construction to reduce the construction time. Mr. Crooks suggested two solutions that can reduce the construction time: working on multiple bridges simultaneously and/or give a bonus or incentive to the contractor for completing the project ahead of schedule.
- Next Steps
    - Mr. Crooks concluded the presentation by outlining the next steps in the PD&E process. Mr. Crooks stated that the PD&E study would be completed by 2019. At that time, a procurement would be conducted to bring a firm onboard to design the project.

The meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m.