



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT SIX
I-395 PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROJECT
FIN NO. 251668-1-52-01
AESTHETIC STEERING COMMITTEE (ASC) MEETING NO. 8
ADRIENNE ARSHT CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS
ZIFF BALLET OPERA HOUSE
PEACOCK FOUNDATION STUDIO
1301 BISCAYNE BLVD., MIAMI, FL 33132
JULY 17, 2015 AT 9:00 A.M.

MEETING TYPE:

Aesthetic Steering Committee (ASC) No. 8

ATTENDEES:

Committee Members in Attendance:

- The Honorable Audrey M. Edmonson (AE), Commissioner, Miami-Dade County
- Brian Blanchard, P.E., (BB), FDOT Assistant Secretary for Engineering & Operations
- M. John Richard (MJR), President and CEO, Adrienne Arsht Center for the Performing Arts

Elected Officials:

- The Honorable Audrey M. Edmonson (AE), Commissioner, Miami-Dade County

FDOT Staff:

- Gus Pego, P.E. (GP), FDOT District Six Secretary
- Raul Quintela, P.E. (RQ), FDOT Senior Project Manager
- Harold Desdunes, P.E., (HD), Director of Transportation Development
- Jason Watts (JW), Chief Counsel, Contracts and Real Property
- Roger Wood (RW), FDOT Office of the General Counsel
- Thomas Andres (TA), FDOT Asst. State Structures Design Engineer
- Christopher Rosenberg (CR), FDOT Asst. Work Program Administrator

FDOT Consultant Project Team:

- Beth Steimle, P.E. (BS), T.Y. Lin
- Michael Fitzpatrick (MF), T.Y. Lin
- Courtney Cunningham (CC), Commonground/MGS
- Tasha Cunningham (TC), Commonground/MGS
- Myrick Mitchell (MM), Commonground/MGS

Miami-Dade County Staff:

- Gerald Sanchez (GS), Assistant County Attorney
- Marie Denis (MD), Department of Cultural Affairs
- Alex Peraza (AP), Construction Projects Manager

Members of the Public:

- Please see attached sign-in sheet

ATTACHMENTS:

- Sign-in sheet

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

1. GP opened the meeting at 9:13 a.m. TC took roll call and the meeting was turned over to AE.
2. AE announced the public comment portion of the meeting. One public comment was received thanking the ASC for their work on this project. AE called for a motion to approve the minutes of the November 2014, January 2015, and May 2015 ASC meetings. MJR moved the approval of the minutes and also extended an apology to TC. At the previous ASC meeting on May 29, 2015, MJR stated that he had not received the meeting minutes. He stated for the record that he had indeed received the minutes and wanted to apologize to TC. MJR offered TC tickets to an upcoming Arsht Center event. AE asked if anyone would like to be recorded “no” in terms of approving the minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.
3. AE called for the next agenda item, which was new business and turned the meeting over to BS who began with a discussion of confidentiality and the cone of silence. BS showed a slide regarding the Sunshine Law. She stated that once the project is advertised, FDOT and the ASC would be under the cone of silence. She also elaborated on the procedures shown in the slide including the fact that all meetings related to the project must cease once the project is officially advertised. In order to ensure a fair, competitive and open procurement process, all communications between interested firms and the Department (including ASC) must be directed to Harry Orvil, Professional Services Unit (PSU) Administrator, from the point of advertisement through the posting of final selection results.
5. BS continued by providing an outline of the presentation:
 - o Public Involvement
 - o Overview of Aesthetics
 - o Training of Members
 - o Expected Timeline and Schedule
 - o Discussion, Q&A
6. BS discussed the next slide regarding the I-395 Project Office. She began detailing the slide by describing the updated pictures. She mentioned the office location at 1035 NW 3rd Avenue in Overtown. She stated that the project office is staffed Monday – Friday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. and that the office is managed by Commonground/MGS. BS encouraged the ASC and attendees to stop by to gain information and leave comments.
7. BS continued the presentation with the Public Involvement Plan. She specified that FDOT will maintain updated fact sheets at the project office and on the project website, plan and host informational sessions and workshops for potential contractors and vendors from the Overtown area, and host workshops to teach prospective vendors how to become registered with FDOT.
8. BS followed the Public Involvement Plan with the Aesthetics Manual, which detailed the Signature Bridge Requirements and the major steps in the procurement process. Before she continued with the Aesthetics Manual she presented a disclaimer, which stated that, “the material presented is in draft form and is subject to change and will be clearly defined in the actual contract documents. FDOT will provide the ARC with the contract requirements as the procurement progresses and will cover the details in the upcoming training.”
9. BS began to outline the Aesthetics Manual in the next slide. She stated that the Aesthetics Manual is a 75-page document describing the aesthetics requirement for the project. She continued by mentioning that it contains baseline requirements by all teams and potential enhancements that the teams are expected to provide. She mentioned that the Aesthetics Manual embodies Context Sensitive Design and Solutions. She specified that FDOT wants the designers to look not only at the engineering requirements but also at the context within which the completed project will exist.
10. BS continued by detailing the evolution of the project. She began with the Project Advisory Group, and now the Aesthetic Steering Committee, which has helped develop the procurement process and the aesthetics. She mentioned that this process would continue through the design and construction portion of the project.

11. BS continued with the Visual Quality Intentions for Design in the Aesthetics Manual by highlighting key areas:
 - The Signature Bridge Span(s) is intended to be a world-class, iconic structure and serve as a City of Miami landmark.
 - All bridges are integrated and all elements complement the overall appearance of the Signature Bridge Span(s) structure.
 - Bridges possess an elegant simplicity in which the engineered lines and proportions are the primary design elements, e.g. form follows function.
 - The design elements exhibit fluid lines in the overall presentation of the bridges.
12. BS further discussed the different chapters of the Aesthetics Manual:
 - Corridor-wide Elements
 - Zone A: I-95/SR-936/I-395 Midtown Interchange
 - Zone 1: Overtown Area
 - Zone 2: Overtown to Omni Area
 - Zone 3: Omni to MacArthur Area
13. BS continued with a slide that graphically illustrates the zones that were discussed in the previous slide.
14. BS presented a new slide outlining the Aesthetic Baseline Requirements:
 - Component shapes
 - Textures
 - Colors
 - Other project aesthetic criteria
15. BS also stated that there would be Aesthetic Enhancements submitted as part of Aesthetic Project Technical Enhancements throughout the process.
16. BS continued with visuals of the baseline requirements in the 5 next slides. She began comparing the Baseline Requirement with the Suggested Enhancement.
17. BS refocused the presentation to the lighting portion of the project. She started describing the next slide, which contained a plan view of the Zone 1 under bridge. BS indicated that the green dots represent round under bridge deck lighting and the red lines that go across the street are portal lighting, which are linear lights across every single cross street within the project.
18. BS continued the presentation with renderings of the daytime and nighttime lighting for the under bridge. She revealed that some of the baseline requirements in the rendering are the sidewalk path and the stamped concrete. BS specified that the city has identified that as a very critical component into Zone A, which will potentially have farmer's markets, art fairs and other future events.
19. BS continued with renderings of Zone 3 daylight and nightlight under bridge. She revealed that part of the Baseline Requirement is the sidewalk path.
20. BS followed the renderings by outlining the Signature Bridge Requirements that will be presented in the RFP. The list of the criteria were as follows:
 - Minimum apex above street level = 245'
 - Minimum length of bridge = 650'
 - Minimum suspended span length = 500'
 - Visual consistency between approach and main span
 - Signature Bridge shall span Biscayne Blvd.
 - Final bridge to look as one – no duplicity, i.e. twin arches
21. BS presented a graphic of the Signature Bridge Requirements following the previous slide. She stated that the graphic details the two piers from left to right, the minimum span length of 650 feet at the top of the graphic, and the minimum suspended span length where the cables will support the bridge.
22. BS continued the presentation detailing Part 2 of the process, which was the Signature Bridge Submittal. She mentioned that part of the process, the ASC members are required to look at some Signature Bridge templates during the grading process. The Signature Bridge templates were as follows:
 - Looking NB along Biscayne
 - Looking SB along Biscayne
 - Traveling EB on I-395
 - Traveling WB on I-395 from MacArthur

- Aerial View – Day Only
 - Two Transition Views – Day Only
23. BS began to present examples of Signature Bridge templates in the next few slides that displayed looks of the Wishbone and Lotus along NB Biscayne Avenue day and night as well as the aerial and transition views during the day.
24. JW went into additional detail regarding the graphics for the Signature Bridge proposals. He indicated that FDOT would provide all of the proposer teams' graphics for them to insert their bridges, so that way the ASC members can look at the exact same pictures except for the different bridges inserted by the teams.
25. BS continued the presentation with the Alternative Technical Concepts (ATC). She mentioned that:
- ATC's are proposed changes to the contract documents (changes to RFP documents)
 - Have to be "equal or better" than RFP
 - Reviewed by subject matter experts at FDOT
 - Examples: Roadway alignment change
 - Begins after Step 2 Signature Bridge Submittal
 - All ATC's finalized before technical proposal are due
26. BS continued the presentation with the Aesthetic Project Technical Enhancements (APTE). She disclosed that the Technical Enhancements are similar to the ATC process but it's for Aesthetics only. She stated that the APTE:
- Have to be "equal or better" than aesthetic baseline requirements
 - Reviewed by the FDOT and the ARC
 - Examples: Pavers, enhanced lighting on Signature Bridge, sculptures, etc.
 - Occurs with the ATC rounds
27. BS followed the APTE requirements with Training the Members. She stated that the training would begin September 2015 and the ARC members would receive final instructions along with the Aesthetics Manual. She further mentioned that the training would be one-on-one and would not be public.
28. BS continued the presentation with a diagram of the Expected Timeline and Schedule:
- Advertise and Short List Five DB Teams
 - Advertisement September 23
 - September to November 2015
 - No ARC Involvement
 - Signature Bridge Aesthetics Submittal
 - December 21 – Submittals Due
 - January 15 – Summary to ARC
 - January 16 to February 4 – ARC Review
 - February 8 – Results; Public Meeting
 - ATC Process/APTE Process
 - February 22 to March 24
 - ARC participation in APTE review
 - Technical Proposal Submittal
 - July 12 – Proposals Due
 - July 26 – Summary to ARC
 - August 29 – ARC Scores Due
 - Price Submittal
 - Due August 30
 - Anticipated Award September
29. BS concluded the presentation by opening up the floor for questions.
30. MJR and AE complimented BS on the presentation. BB reiterated by saying that the presentation was very clear and concise.
31. AE began with the next Agenda item: Project Expectations. AE explained that she placed this item on the agenda to hear the committee's expectations on what ASC is actually looking for as it pertains to the project.

32. AE posed a question to MJR regarding his main priorities and what he is expecting to see as it relates to the project.
33. MJR responded by stating that he thinks the work of the committee has lead the ARC to the right criteria and priorities. He furthered stated the fact that Aesthetics has a higher ranking priority and to hear that ASC might see 15 different concepts of the bridge is an extremely important outcome, and further demonstrates what the committee has been working towards. He continued by mentioning one small criteria in the area of aesthetic that could be an impact to the buildings, and that is the sound and vibration. He identified that he wants to be sure the committee is vetting the engineering of the structure and the potential impacts of the Ballet Opera House so that the committee is mitigating any potential vibrations into the rooms. He continued by stating that this is something the teams that would be proposing can address as part of the Aesthetic plan. MJR began to discuss the topic of the construction time window. He affirmed that what the committee has heard to date is that it is going to be a five-year time window and that he is hopeful to hear from the teams the potential of a shortened time frame of five years. He continued by mentioning that the committee has to manage and mitigate 5 years of construction in front of the buildings and if there were expeditious ways to do this project with the same positive outcome, it would be helpful.
34. AE agreed with MJR. She addressed the committee by reiterating MJR's comments about expediting the construction time frame.
35. JW responded to MJR's comments by stating that part of the technical score will include a time component and the teams that can build it faster will get more points.
36. AE thanked JW and MJR for their comments and opened up comments from BB.
37. BB stated that his goal is to meet the expectations of the taxpayers and minimize potential bid protest. He furthered stated that he agrees with the one-on-one training and that the committee ask questions so they understand the process to minimize the risk of the project not moving forward. BB continued by expressing that he wanted to make sure the project is constructed quickly and that having technical points for addressing contract time would be in the RFP as JW mentioned. BB wanted to clarify if the committee mentioned if they are allowing the DB teams to submit up to 3 signature bridge proposals.
38. BS agreed.
39. BB stated that he believes the project is on the right track, and with the help of all parties, the project will have a successful procurement with help from JW and the project team.
40. AE thanked BB for his comments and mentioned that she thought BB was going to mention that one of his expectations was to stay under the \$600 million dollar cap.
41. AE responded by revealing that one of her expectations will be for the teams to stay under the \$600 million dollar cap as well as attention being placed to the Overtown area as it is to the bridge. She continued by mentioning the bridge is on the priority list but also the Overtown community as well. AE mentioned that the same aesthetics and lighting that will be used in the downtown area also be used in the Overtown area. She continued by declaring that she does not want to see the Overtown area penalized so that the downtown area can benefit from certain things. She also mentioned that she is looking for a pedestrian and bike type trail from the Overtown area to the Downtown area. AE continued to indicate that she is not looking for a "Cut and Paste" bridge but a true signature bridge. AE indicated even though the committee will be using the Lotus and Wishbone as a sample, she is looking for creativity as it pertains to other bridge examples, under the \$600 million dollar cap. She concluded by mentioning that the Overtown area has been separated and would like to see Overtown and Downtown become one again and a bridge that will pop out as a representation of Miami.
43. AE moved on to the final agenda item, Discussion, Q&A.
44. GP opened up the discussion by mentioning that due to the absence of other committee members, that another short meeting take place in September before the training in order to finalize the actions of the committee, as well provide letters appointing the ASC as the ARC. GP further detailed the amount of effort the DB teams have put towards this project and how the teams have been underway for years. GP continued by affirming he is, on behalf of FDOT, very pleased that the project has gotten to this point and thanked AE for taking the lead on the project. GP further acknowledged the attendees in the room and thanked them for their perseverance in keeping the project on track as well as the commitment FDOT made in reuniting the Overtown area, minimizing impact to the Downtown area and the Performing Arts

centers. GP concluded the discussion by mentioning that he believes FDOT has included all the objectives in the RFP and as FDOT works to finalize the document and training of the ARC members, it is going to be something that everyone involved in the project would take great pride in.

45. AE thanked GP for his comments and asked if there were any other comments.

46. The meeting adjourned at 9:48 a.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: _____

Tasha Cunningham

District VI Design Public Information Specialist

Distribution Date: 07/31/15