

## **MEETING MINUTES**

**Cultural Resource Committee (CRC)**  
**May 14, 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.,
- Barbara Culhane
- Aileen Varela Margolles
- Hong Benitez, P.E.
- Maria Perdomo, P.E.

State Historic Preservation Office/Tallahassee:

- Ginny Jones

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA):

- Cathy Kendall

City of Miami Beach:

- Lynn Bernstein

Dade Heritage Trust:

- Laura Lavernia

United States Coast Guard:

- Darayl Tompkins

Members of the CRC:

- 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 2:28 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 stated the ranking ballot results from the Alternatives Public Workshop that indicated support for Replacement and mentioned the suggestion to extend the spoil islands and eliminate the bridges.
- Mr. Huynh stated the next steps was the CRC 3 meeting in the beginning of 2016.
- 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 CRC 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 Cultural Resource Committee (CRC)
  - To conduct and document good faith consultation with affected parties in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
- Study Parameters
  - The agreed upon Rehabilitation and Replacement Parameters were presented as well as the requirements associated with the parameters.
  - An overview of the Venetian Causeway's historic resources
  - Ken Harden, Janus Research, addressed Ms. Liebman's questions about historic preservation. He explained the Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes that outline the approach to considering the impacts to the historic resource that would result from any improvements.
  - The requirement for measures to minimize harm as well as a binding Memorandum of Agreement on any proposed action in the event of an Adverse Effect to the historic resource. It was also explained that the process was documented in the slides with applicable references so attendees could research further if desired.
  - Cathy Kendall, FHWA questioned if the spoil Islands had any specific designation. If there was a special use for the islands? She stated that it is important to check the zoning for the spoil islands.
  - The required 25-year life for the Rehabilitation resulted in the consideration of Cathodic Protection (CP) for the existing bridges.
- 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 part of 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.
- Build Alternatives – Rehab
  - Rehab alternatives with and without beam strengthening was presented. The alternative with beam strengthening satisfied the required Rehabilitation Parameters.
  - The CP design and cost was presented.
- 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.
  - The Tunnel Alternative was presented
  - Five Fixed Bridge Replacement alternatives were presented.
  - 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 25-year life while the Replacement Alternatives a 75-year 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.
  - Rick Crooks asked if the Section 106 consultation process and CRC was going in accordance with their expectations and if SHPO or FHWA thought there needed to be any changes. They both replied that they were satisfied with the way things were going.
  - Mr. Crooks also asked Ms. Ginny Jones, SHPO, about the possibility of the Causeway maintaining its historic designation given the demolition of the remaining historic portion of the West Bridge. Ms. Jones indicated that it would maintain its historic designation. Mr. Crooks further questioned the possibility of this being the case if the rest of the bridges were replaced but maintained the historic character of the existing bridge. Ms. Jones indicated that this could be discussed further with SHPO.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.