

MEETING MINUTES

**Alternatives Public Workshop (APW)
May 13, 2015
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
- Barbara Culhane
- Aileen Varela Margolles
- Hong Benitez, P.E.
- Geidy Coello
- Joy Castro
- Maria Perdomo, P.E.

State Historic Preservation Office/Tallahassee:

- Ginny Jones

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA):

- Cathy Kendall

City of Miami Beach:

- Lynn Bernstein
- Lauren Firtel
- Dwayne Drury
- Xavier Falconi
- Virgil Fernandez

Dade Heritage Trust:

- Laura Lavernia

Consultant Project Team:

- Please see attached sign-in sheets.

General Public:

- Please see attached sign-in sheets.

MEETING LOCATION

- Miami Beach Botanical Garden, 2000 Convention Center Drive, Miami Beach, FL 33139

MEETING SUMMARY

- Formal presentation began at 7:30 p.m.
- Dat Huynh, P.E., FDOT Project Manager introduced the project team. Mr. Huynh provided an overview of the purpose of the Alternatives Public Workshop (APW) and discussed the ranking ballots and other information provided at sign-in.
- Mr. Huynh turned the meeting over to Rick Crooks, P.E., Consultant Project Manager
- Mr. Crooks and Mr. Huynh gave a PowerPoint presentation prepared specifically for the APW which included the following agenda:
 - Project Purpose and Need
 - Section 106 Process
 - Study Parameters

- Alternatives Matrix and Ranking Ballot
- No-Build Alternatives
- Build Alternatives
- Other Considerations
- Evaluation Matrix
- Next Steps

During the presentation the following points were discussed among the public present:

- Purpose and Need for Project
 - 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 replacement or rehabilitation.
- Purpose of Alternative Public Workshop (APW)
 - The purpose of the APW is to get feedback on the alternatives being considered for possible improvements to the Venetian Causeway. The feedback will be used to determine the viable alternatives and select the recommended alternative.
- Study Parameters
 - The agreed upon Rehabilitation and Replacement Parameters were presented as well as the requirements associated with the parameters.
 - The required 25year life for the Rehabilitation resulted in the consideration of Cathodic protection for the existing bridges.
 - A resident asked why there were so many rehabilitations on these bridges. Mr. Crooks stated that the bridges were very low to the water making them susceptible to corrosion and deterioration.
 - Given the rate of deterioration, there was concern about the bridges not being improved for another 9 years or so.
- An overview of the changes that have been implemented along Venetian Causeway over the past decade and why temporary relief has been the only option tried during that Alternatives Matrix and Ranking Ballot
 - The Alternatives were presented in a Ballot format which allowed attendees to provide their opinion on the best improvement for the project. It was explained that this feedback would be considered by the project team as we developed the study.
 - The Ballots were handed out at the APW and posted on the project website. The ballots were requested to be returned in person at the APW, e-mailed or mailed (post marked) by May 20, 2015 to Mr. Huynh.
- No Build Alternatives
 - The No Build Alternatives with continued routine maintenance were presented.
 - There were concerns that the do nothing alternatives would result in continuous deterioration and the need for continuous maintenance repairs.
 - It was agreed that no alternative corridors existed for the residents to access the islands.
- Build Alternatives – Rehab
 - Rehab alternatives with and without beam strengthening was presented. The alternative with beam strengthening satisfied the required Rehabilitation Parameters.
 - The Cathodic Protection (CP) design and cost was presented.
 - A Resident asked how long Cathodic Protection (CP) has been around and how often it was used on concrete bridge structures. He also asked about the service life with or without CP. Bill Scannell stated that CP has been around for over 100

years and has been very widely used in Florida. CP will result in a service life of 25 years or more with the proper maintenance.

- Build Alternatives – Replacement
 - Four typical section alternatives were presented that utilized different railing configurations.
 - The dimensions of the wider typical section was presented with wider sidewalks and bicycle lanes and a 1 ft. reduction in the travel lanes. It was explained that it resulted from the community's desire and need to better satisfy the high pedestrian and bicycle traffic.
 - It was stated that widening the Causeway would cause the structures to move closer to private property. The Tunnel Alternative as well as Five Fixed Bridge Replacement alternatives were presented.
 - A resident suggested replacing the bridges with fill to create longer spoil islands. There was some consensus from other attendees and it was requested those wanting this alternative to indicate such on their ballot.
 - Four Movable Bridge Alternatives were presented and the differences explained.
- Other Considerations
 - Life cycle cost considerations were explained and the fact that the Rehab Alternatives would result in a 25year life while the Replacement Alternatives a 75year life.
 - Environmental and Historic Resource Impacts were presented.
 - Maintenance of Traffic options and Utility Considerations were presented
- Evaluation Matrix
 - A sample evaluation matrix was presented and it was explained that a similar matrix would be utilized by the project team to select a recommended alternative.
 - The Ranking Ballot was again presented and it was requested that they be completed and returned so they may be considered by the project team.
- Summary and Next Steps
 - Mr. Huynh presented a summary of action items and milestones for the project and stated that it was important to include the collaboration and input from all interested parties including the public, the Project Advisory Group, the CRC and all intergovernmental agencies involved.
 - Mr. Huynh gave the audience his personal contact information and links to the project webpage to obtain up dated project information.
 - Mr. Huynh thanked all participants for attending the meeting and participating in the process. There were no additional questions or comments.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.