MEETING MINUTES

Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting No. 3
March 9, 2016
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.

City of Miami Beach:
- Lynn Bernstein
- Xavier Falconi

Miami-Dade County:
- James Martinak

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 7:12 p.m.
- Dat Huynh, P.E., FDOT Project Manager introduced the project team and each PAG attendee introduced themselves. Mr. Huynh begun the PowerPoint (PPT) presentation prepared specifically for the PAG and provided an overview of the "Purpose and Need" for the project. He also introduced the following agenda for the presentation:
    - Project Status
    - Alternatives Flowchart
    - Alternatives/Screening Matrix
    - No-Build Alternatives
    - Build Alternatives
    - Life Cycle Costs
    - Environment
    - Next Steps
- Project Status
    - Mr. Huynh gave an update on the project status and went over the project timeline. Mr. Huynh turned the meeting over to Rick Crooks, P.E., Consultant Project Manager to cover some of the remaining agenda items.

- Alternative Flowchart
    - Mr. Crooks showed the flowchart of the various Alternatives that were evaluated and presented at the Alternatives Public Workshop (APW).
- Alternatives/Screening Matrix
    - At the APW the attendees were requested to complete a ballot and the ballot results were presented. The project team conducted screening on the alternatives, the results of which was summarized in a screening matrix. It was pointed out that the highest ranked alternatives that resulted from the balloting was the same as the highest ranking alternatives that resulted from the screening.
- No-Build Alternatives
    - The No-Build Alternatives: Alternative 1 - Do nothing and Alternative 2 – Transportation System Management were presented. However, these alternatives do not match the Purpose and Need for the project.
- Build Alternatives
    - The highest ranked Rehabilitation Alternative – Alternative 4 – Fixed Bridge Rehab with Beam Strengthening, combined with Alternative M1 – Bascule Bridge Rehabilitation was presented.
    - The Typical Section that was selected for the Replacement alternatives was presented. It included 11ft travel lanes, 7ft bike lane, 8ft sidewalks and Venetian traffic railing. It was explained that this wider typical section would also allow for the phased construction of the bridges.
    - Rehabilitation Alternative – Alternative 4 – Fixed Bridge Rehab with Beam Strengthening, combined with Alternative M1 – Bascule Bridge Rehabilitation was presented.
    - Replacement Alternative – Alternative 7 – Fixed Bridge with Arched Beam, combined with Alternative M4 – Double Leaf Bascule Bridge was presented.
    - Jack Hartog, Venetian Way Neighborhood Alliance, expressed his concerns regarding the width of the bike lanes and stated that they may not provide adequate protection for cyclists. Mr. Crooks explained that the lanes meet FDOT's current standards and includes a 2ft buffer strip that improves safety. The recent implementation on Key Biscayne was given as an example.
    - Christina Miller, Venetian resident expressed similar concerns on the bike lanes and encouraged FDOT to look at what has been done in other cities. Mr. Crooks requested that she provide specific examples for the project team to evaluate.
- Life Cycle Costs
    - A graphic depiction of Life cycle cost considerations for the various alternatives was presented. It was pointed out that the No Build Alternatives have an unknown service life. The Rehabilitation Alternatives would result in a 25-year life while the Replacement Alternatives a 75-year life. Mr. Crooks stated that there are four things they should look at when it comes to life cycle costs: Project Cost, Service Life, Maintenance Costs, and Maintenance Cycle. Mr. Crooks presented estimated possible scenarios for the different Alternatives and explained that the life cycle costs for the Rehabilitation Alternative will exceed those for the Replacement Alternative.
- Environment
    - Mr. Crooks presented the environmental impacts of the No-Build vs the Build and pointed out that given the extensive nature of the Rehabilitation Alternative, the impacts were similar.
    - Mr. Jeff Marcus, Stantec Environment Services, further elaborated on the specific environmental impacts.

    - The Historic Resource Impacts of No-Build vs. Build Alternatives were also presented. The No Build Alternatives results in No Adverse Effects/Impacts to the historic resources, the Rehabilitation may likely result in Adverse Effects/Impacts and Replacement in Adverse Effects/Impacts to the historic resources.
    - Mr. Crooks turned over the presentation to Mr. Huynh to discuss the Class of Action (COA) Determination.
    - Mr. Huynh began by stating that a COA has not been determined for this project. He stated that the work done thus far on the project has been part of a scope development process. He continued by saying that the scope development process revealed that the extensive bridge rehabilitation or bridge replacement are viable alternatives for the Project. These alternatives could have a significant impact on the historic bridges. The future PD&E/NEPA study may be assigned an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) class of action and the FHWA will make the final determination.
- Next Steps
    - The presented Timeline for the project indicates that the next step will be the PD&E/NEPA Study for the project

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.