

MEETING MINUTES

**Cultural Resource Committee (CRC) - Meeting No.1
September 24, 2014
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.

State Historic Preservation Office/Tallahassee:

- Ginny Jones, State Historic Preservation Officer, Architectural Historian
- Dan McClarnon, State Historic Preservation Officer, Archaeologist

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA):

- Cathy Kendall, Environmental Specialist

City of Miami:

- Megan Schmitt, Preservation Officer

City of Miami Beach:

- Debbie Tackett, Senior Planner
- Jake Seiberling, Planner

United States Coast Guard:

- Darayl Tompkins, Bridge Management Specialist
- Evelyn Smart, Bridge Management Specialist

Miami Design Preservation League:

- Daniel Ciraldo, Director

General Public:

- Arva Parks, Historian

Project Team:

- Rick Crooks, P. E. – EAC Consulting
- Rodney C. Devera, P. E. – EAC Consulting
- Daniel Greenberg – EAC Consulting
- Ken Hardin – Janus Research
- Amy Streelman – Janus Research
- Maria Fernandez Porrata – Cunningham Group

MEETING LOCATION

- 1000 Venetian Causeway (Clubhouse), Miami Beach, Florida 33139

MEETING SUMMARY

- Meeting began at 3:12 p.m.
- Dat Huynh, P.E., FDOT Project Manager introduced the project team. He welcomed everyone and invited each attendee to introduce themselves. Mr. Huynh stated that this was the first CRC meeting being held to introduce, welcome and present the project

overview, existing conditions, PD&E process, milestones, and timeline. Mr. Huynh stated that all participants are encouraged to provide their expertise, opinions and commitment to the project and its process to completion.

- Mr. Huynh turned the meeting over to Rick Crooks, Consultant Project Manager
- Mr. Crooks gave a PowerPoint presentation prepared specifically for the CRC which highlighted the following topics:
 - PD&E Process
 - Purpose of the CRC
 - Existing Condition
 - Rehabilitation Parameters
 - Section 106 Process
 - Historic Significance
 - Next Steps
- During Mr. Crooks' presentation the following points were discussed among the committee members and the public present:
 - Darayl Tompkins/U.S. Coast Guard stated that if the bridge is just going to be rehabilitated the U.S. Coast Guard would not require a permit.
 - Dan McClarnon/State Preservation Office asked a question in reference to the reduction of the sufficiency rating throughout the corridor in different bridges over the last three years and what was being done to address this. Mr. Huynh replied that this study will analyze the existing conditions and present the most feasible alternative. Mr. Huynh noted that safety was a top priority for FDOT on this project. During the time for the project to be completed, the County will continue to maintain the bridges. Mr Huynh further stated that generally FDOT inspects bridges within the state system every two years, however, the bridges along the Venetian Causeway are being inspected and closely monitored on a yearly basis.
 - Cathy Kendall/FHWA asked Mr. Huynh about the "Purpose and Need" for the project and if safety was the main concern. Mr. Huynh noted that while safety is a top concern, the study will take into consideration all factors to derive the most feasible alternative.
 - Ms. Kendall asked about the Class Action determination type and timeframe. Mr. Huynh replied that it a Class of Action (COA) has not yet been established, but an Environmental Assessment (EA) was being recommended. The final COA depends on how the study develops and the extent of the impacts of the recommended alternative. The timeframe, as shown on Slide 49 of the presentation would be approximately three years.
 - Ginny Jones/State Historic Preservation Officer asked about the difference in the designations of non-critical, critical and extreme, as noted on Slide 32 (Hurricane Resistance) of the presentation.
 - Mr. Crooks explained the differences and confirmed that for this study FDOT is using the designation of "critical" and that the final designation would be made by the County, the owner of the bridges.
 - Ms. Kendall asked about the type of funding FDOT is using for this project. She asked whether federal funding was being sought. Mr. Huynh stated that the project does not have federal funding. He stated that the project had SIGP and local funding only.
 - Ms. Kendall stated that if the project did not have federal funding, then FHWA would not be involved in the project and will not require approvals or signage on any of the permitting or supporting documentation. She stated that if there is a bridge replacement project without federal funding, the U.S. Coast Guard would be responsible for any permitting and the execution of documentation related to the project.

- Evelyn Smart/U.S. Coast Guard commented that if the final alternative calls for a bridge replacement, it would definitely require full Coast Guard and Army Corps of Engineers permits. She stated that if the recommended alternative will exclude any work on the bascule bridges and the navigable channels; then, there will no Coast Guard permits required. In which case, only the Army Corps would be involved for the dredge and fill permit.
- Mr. Tompkins, concurred with the comment made by Ms. Kendall and added that the Army Corps of Engineers will be also part of the process during the permitting and final documentation approval for this project.
- Mr. Huynh mentioned that it is anticipated that the County will request federal funding for any project that results from the PD&E Study and that he would like to see all the agencies participate in the CRC process.
- Mr. Huynh asked that if any of the members present cannot attend a meeting in the future, they could assign a proxy to attend in their behalf. .
- Ken Hardin/Janus Research commented that due to the physical location of the project, both the cities of Miami and Miami Beach would be directly involved. He highlighted that both FDOT and Miami-Dade County will have to go through the appropriate processes for the required permits.
- Mr. Crooks turned the meeting over to Mr. Hardin who gave a detailed presentation regarding the Section 106 process. Mr. Hardin discussed the steps in the Section 106 process, where the project stands in the process, and the remaining tasks under Section 106. Mr. Hardin turned the meeting over to Amy Streelman/Janus Research who continued the discussion in reference to the bridges' history, historical significance, characteristics, future preservation and studies to continue under the Section 106 process.
- Ms. Smart asked about what other resources may be in the Area of Potential Effect, and Mr. Hardin noted these will be identified during the CRAS. This could possibly include a historic district of the bridges/causeway and the islands.
- 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, 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 opened the floor for questions, and announced that everyone will receive an invitation for the next CRC meeting proposed to take place sometime in the winter of 2015. There were no additional questions or comments.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.