MEETING MINUTES

Project Advisory Group (PAG) - Meeting No.2
February 24, 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

Please see enclosed sign-in sheet.

MEETING LOCATION

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

MEETING SUMMARY

- Meeting began at 7:00 P.M.
- Dat Huynh, P.E., FDOT Project Manager welcomed attendees to the meeting and introduced the project team. He discussed the Purpose and Need for the project and provided a brief objective of the project. Mr. Huynh went through the rehabilitation parameters that was presented to the Project Advisory Group (PAG) at the last meeting held on September 18, 2014. Mr. Huynh stated that the purpose of the PAG is to ensure that the range of stakeholder views regarding possible improvements to the Venetian Causeway is clearly understood and fully considered by the project team. Mr. Huynh also stated that all materials presented at the meeting would be available on the website.
- Mr. Huynh went through the agenda of the presentation and turned the meeting over to Rick Crooks, P.E. to conduct a PowerPoint presentation specifically prepared for the PAG meeting. The presentation included the following topics:
    - PD&E Process and Status
    - Purpose of Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting #2
    - Study Parameters
    - Alternatives Matrix and Flowchart
    - No-Build Alternatives
    - Build Alternatives
    - Other Considerations

During the presentation the following points were discussed among the project team, PAG members and the general public present:

PD&E Process and Status

- Mr. Crooks stated that the work done to date concentrated first on data collection and public involvement. The initial PAG meeting allowed for the determination of the rehabilitation parameters and that those had been utilized to develop rehabilitation alternatives. Replacement alternatives were also developed and the different alternatives will be presented to the PAG. The No-Build will be carried forward along with the Build Alternatives which includes both the Rehabilitation and Replacement Alternatives. Environmental analysis had also begun in order to evaluate the impacts of the various alternatives on the environment.

Purpose of Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting #2

- Mr. Crooks discussed the purpose of the second PAG meeting which was to present the project alternatives that have been developed by the project team. Mr. Crooks stated that alternatives being considered as part of the study would be presented for input by the PAG. He noted that the presentation would address the ability of the alternatives to safely carry traffic, pedestrians and bicyclists and that the possible impacts of the different alternatives on the environment, historic resources, aesthetics and the public would also be presented.
- Mr. Crooks discussed the purpose of the project and the need. He stated that the purpose of the proposed project is to examine the potential replacement or rehabilitation of the twelve existing bridges (ten low-level fixed spans and two movable bascules).

Study Parameters

Mr. Crooks presented a series of slides that presented the parameters for the study and discussed the specifics of each. These slides included:

- The Venetian Causeway as a Historic Resource and the requirements of Section 106/4(f) of National Historic Preservation Act. The requirement to evaluate whether the alternatives were feasible and prudent was also discussed.
- Hurricane resistance design requirements. It was explained that the County has classified the bridges as “extremely critical”. This classification requires that the bridges be operational after a hurricane.
- Vessel collision resistance design requirements.
- The Rehabilitation Parameters from PAG 1. These parameters were utilized for the development of the rehabilitation alternatives.
- Mr. Crooks introduced Bill Scannell of Concorr, Inc. to discuss cathodic protection. Which was been studied for the project in order for the bridges to achieve the 25 year life that was one of the determined rehabilitation parameters. Mr. Scannell discussed cathodic protection, an electrochemical method of corrosion protection that takes advantage of the electrochemical nature of corrosion by transforming a metal into a non-corroding cathode. He discussed the need for it on the project to avoid corrosion. He stated that cathodic protection does not replace steel that has already been corroded. Mr. Scannell stated that cathodic protection would be utilized to decrease future corrosion. Mr. Scannell stated that cathodic protection is the only proven technique to decrease the corrosion of reinforcing steel in concrete.
- The parameters for the development of the replacement alternatives were presented. The alternatives will meet the current standards and loading requirements and will have a 75 year service life.

Alternatives Matrix and Flowchart

Mr. Crooks presented a matrix of the various alternatives that were development for the study. The alternatives were split into No-Build – Do Nothing and Transportation System Management, and Build – Rehabilitation and Replacement. A flowchart was also presented that illustrated the manner in which the alternatives will be evaluated and the selection of the viable alternatives made.

- Mr. Crooks discussed the fact that public input is important to FDOT. He reiterated that the purpose of the PAG is offer input and feedback on the alternatives that were being presented and that there would be designated points in the presentation where people could ask questions as well as at the end of the presentation.

No-Build Alternatives

The Do Nothing and Transportation System Management alternatives were presented and it was noted that these alternatives did not meet the purpose and need for the project.

- Mr. Crooks discussed No Build Alternative 1 – Do Nothing. Mr. Crooks stated that this alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.

- Mr. Crooks discussed No Build Alternative 2 – Transportation Management System involving enhanced bus service. However, the existing bridge deficiencies would remain. Mr. Crooks stated that this alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project.
- Mr. Crooks discussed the Alternative Corridor option. This option studied building a new structure at a different location without affecting the historic integrity of the old bridge, as required by Section 4(f) the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Mr. Crooks stated that given the location of the islands and the causeway, the causeway as the only way to access the islands and that this option was not feasible or prudent.

Build Alternatives

- Mr. Crooks stated that rehabilitation is considered a build alternative. The Rehabilitation Alternatives were presented and the efforts to achieve the established rehabilitation parameters explained. Mr. Crooks stated that the prices shown for each of the alternatives is without cathodic protection and those costs would be additional. Mr. Crooks discussed the Rehabilitation Alternatives as follows:
    - Alternative 3 - Fixed Bridge Rehab w/out Beam Strengthening
    - Alternative 4 - Fixed Bridge Rehab with Beam Strengthening
    - Alternative M1 - Bascule Bridge Rehabilitation
- Mr. Crooks discussed the Replacement Alternatives and stated that the service life is 75 years. As such, the cost of these alternatives provide a solution that is 3 times longer than those of the rehabilitation alternatives.
- There was a question on the relationship between the study and the planned replacement of some of the Bridge 1 spans. Mr. Huynh reiterated the differences between the FDOT PD&E Study and the Miami-Dade County Emergency Bridge Replacement project. The PD&E study includes the westernmost span and that it will be considered as an existing condition for the PD&E Study.
- Mr. Crooks discussed the replacement alternatives as follows:
    - Alternative 5 – Tunnel – the PAG members did not feel this alternative was practical for the causeway.

- Bradley Touchstone presented the different railing options as follows:
    - T1 – Venetian Railing (a typical section of Alternative T1 was shown)
    - T2 – Wyoming Railing TL-4 at coping 4 (a typical section of Alternative T2 was shown)
    - T3 – Wyoming Railing TL-3 at curb and Original Venetian Railing at Coping (a typical section of T3 was shown)
    - T4 – Wyoming Railing TL-3 at curb and Custom Railing at Coping (a typical section of T3 was shown)
- The PAG expressed their desire to keep the Venetian railing.

- Mr. Crooks continued the discussion of the replacement alternatives (fixed bridges) by presenting Alternative 6 – High Level Fixed Bridge. The PAG members did not feel this alternative was practical for the causeway.
- Mr. Crooks discussed Alternative 7 – Arch Beam with both Venetian and Wyoming Railing and discussed the advantages of this alternative. The PAG agreed that keeping the historic arches and the existing railing was critical to any of the build alternatives.
- Mr. Crooks presented Alternative 8 – Florida I-beam (FIB) with Arched Fascia (FA) and discussed the advantages of this alternative. The PAG members did not feel this alternative was practical for the causeway as they preferred that the arches be utilized for all the beams.

- Mr. Crooks presented Alternative 9 – FIB (F) and discussed the advantages of this alternative. The PAG members did not feel this alternative was practical for the causeway.
- Mr. Crooks presented Alt. 10 – Flat Slab (FS) and discussed the advantages of this alternative and its ability to better address the hurricane resistance requirements. The PAG members did not feel this alternative was practical for the causeway but stated they would consider an arched slab.
- Mr. Patton discussed Alternative M2 – Swing Bridge/ Movable Span and the advantages/disadvantages of this option. The PAG members did not feel this alternative was practical for the causeway.
- Mr. Patton continued with a discussion of the following movable bridge alternatives:
    - Alternative M3 – Vertical Lift Bridge. The PAG members did not feel this alternative was practical for the causeway.
    - Alternative M4 – Movable Span Alternative – Double Leaf
    - Alternative M5 – Movable Span Alternative - Single Leaf. The PAG members did not feel this alternative was practical for the causeway as it would change the arched appearance that is currently offered by the existing double leaf bascule span which complements the fixed arched spans.

Other Considerations

- Mr. Crooks and Mr. Huynh stated that hybrid alternatives could be developed that combine one or more of the alternatives such as a different structural system on the fixed bridges than on the fixed approach to the movable bridge. Some members of the PAG did not feel a hybrid alternative was practical for the causeway.
- Mr. Patton discussed the bridge clearances for the movable bridges and presented two options. One option raised the existing profile to ensure the walls of the bascule pier would be at the height of the 100 year storm event. This would ensure the machinery would remain dry during a hurricane event and be operational after a hurricane. The second option raised the bridge as high as possible given the constraints of the adjacent islands. The estimated reduction in the bridge openings for each alternative was also presented. The estimates were based on a recent vessel survey during bridge openings and assumed opening on demand.
- Mrs. Carter presented the impacts of the alternatives on the environment. Ms. Carter stated that a no build decision would have no environmental impacts. It was pointed out that the impacts of both the rehabilitation and the replacement would be similar as the rehabilitation alternatives required the demolition of the existing bridge decks. The following environmental impacts results from the build alternatives: (1) Potential impact to corals on substructure and scour protection areas; (2) Temporary impacts due to construction methods; (3) barge use, water quality, noise, air quality; (4) minimal threatened and endangered species and; (5) retain and improve bicycle and pedestrian access.
- Mr. Crooks stated that the alternatives will seek to maintain traffic as well as utilities and referenced the previous use of a temporary bridge at Bridge 10 during the last major rehabilitation in 1998. Upon selection of a recommended alternative, there will be additional study to determine the feasible alternatives for maintenance of traffic and utilities.

There were numerous questions during the presentation. Some of the questions asked during the presentation include:

- Christina Miller, a member of the public asked if Florida Greenbook Standards were being used. Mr. Crooks and Mr. Huynh stated that the standards were being used.

- Hava Rivlin asked about lane widths and stated that FDOT minimum standards are not sufficient for walking and biking.
- Ms. Rivlin said she wanted to make sure this meeting was about getting feedback. Mr. Crooks stated that it was and that the PAG has a very important role in the planning process of this project.
- PAG member Marcia Orovitz asked if there was a way to have a new bridge constructed parallel to the existing bridge. Mr. Crooks stated that it was not feasible as there was no right-of-way available to connect the bridge to City of Miami or the Venetian Islands or City of Miami Beach; as such, the causeway is the only available corridor.

The presentation closed with a discussion on the Anticipated Project Schedule which a planned Alternatives Workshop just prior to summer 2015. Mr. Huynh discussed how stakeholders can reach the project team and get more information.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

Project Advisory Group Meeting (PAG) No. 2
TEAM SIGN-IN SHEET

February 24, 2015

Venetian Causeway
Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study
Venetian Causeway from North Bayshore Drive to Purdy Avenue, Miami-Dade County
Financial Management Number: 422713-2-22-01
Efficient Transportation Decision-Making Number (ETDM): 12756

Name (PLEASE PRINT)	Office/Address	City	Zip Code	Telephone E-mail Address
Dat Huynh, P.E.	1000 NW 111 AVE MM	MIAMI	33172	
Barbara Culhane	1000 NW 111 Ave., Rm. 6101 Miami, FL F.D.O.T.			305-470-5231 barbara.culhane@
Aileen Varela Margolles	1000 NW 111 Ave Miami, FL 33172 FDOT HQ D6	Miami	33172	305 470 5405 Aileen.varelamargolles@dot.state.fl.us
Hong Benitez	1000 NW 111 Ave. Rm 6247 Miami. FL		33172	
Rick Crooks, P.E.	815 NW 57th Ave #402 Miami, FL 33126			305 265 5400 RCROOKS@EACCONSULT.COM
Dinesh Dagly, P.E.				
Rodney C. Devera, P.E.	815 NW 57TH AVE STE 402 MIAMI, FL 33126			305 265 5400 RDEVERA@EACCONSULT.COM
Daniel Greenberg	11			305-265-5400 dgreenberg@eaconsultants

Project Advisory Group Meeting (PAG) No. 2
TEAM SIGN-IN SHEET

February 24, 2015

Venetian Causeway
Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study
Venetian Causeway from North Bayshore Drive to Purdy Avenue, Miami-Dade County
Financial Management Number: 422713-2-22-01
Efficient Transportation Decision-Making Number (ETDM): 12756

Name (PLEASE PRINT)	Office/Address	City	Zip Code	Telephone / E-mail Address
Tasha Cunningham				
Maria Fernandez Porrata				
Stephanie Romero, P.E.	815 NW 57th Avenue, Suite 402 Miami, FLORIDA 33126			305-265-5400 sromero@eacconsult.com
Nicole Carter	901 Ponce de Leon Blvd Coral Gables, FL 33134			305-445-2900
George Patton, PE	7650 W. Courtney Campbell Cswy Tampa, FL 33607			813-675-6560 george.patton@aecom.com
BRADLEY TOUCHSTONE	3011 POWELL RD TALLAHASSEE, FL 32308			btouchstone@ touchstone architecture.com
MAXIM NASAB	11			mnasab@ touchstone architecture.com
Gabriel Delgado	FDOT-D6 1000 NW 111th Ave			305-470-5427 Gabriel.Delgado@dot.state.fl.us

Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting No. 2
SIGN-IN SHEET

February 24, 2015

Venetian Causeway
Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study
Venetian Causeway from North Bayshore Drive to Purdy Avenue, Miami-Dade County
Financial Management Number: 422713-2-22-01
Efficient Transportation Decision-Making Number (ETDM): 12756

Name/Nombre	Address/Dirección	City/Ciudad	Zip Code/Codigo Postal	Telephone/ Teléfono E-mail Address/Correo Electronico
MARIA PERDOMO.	1000 NW 111 Ave.	Miami	33172	305 [illegible] 640 7186
John Labus	10 VENETIAN WAY	M.B.	33139	305 531 1965
Matt Samuelian	10 Venetian Way, #1502	MB	33139	mysamuelian@gmail.com

Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting No. 2
SIGN-IN SHEET

February 24, 2015

Venetian Causeway
Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study
Venetian Causeway from North Bayshore Drive to Purdy Avenue, Miami-Dade County
Financial Management Number: 422713-2-22-01
Efficient Transportation Decision-Making Number (ETDM): 12756

Name/Nombre	Address/Dirección	City/Ciudad	Zip Code/Codigo Postal	Telephone/ Teléfono E-mail Address/Correo Electronico
Scott Diffenderfer				
Jack Hartog				
Juergen Brendel		✓	✓	✓
Steve Evron				
Tim Rose				
Mark Weithron				
Ahmad Lee Khamsi	302			
Merri Mann				

Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting No. 2
SIGN-IN SHEET

February 24, 2015

Venetian Causeway
Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study
Venetian Causeway from North Bayshore Drive to Purdy Avenue, Miami-Dade County
Financial Management Number: 422713-2-22-01
Efficient Transportation Decision-Making Number (ETDM): 12756

Name/Nombre	Address/Dirección	City/Ciudad	Zip Code/Codigo Postal	Telephone/ Teléfono E-mail Address/Correo Electronico
Steve Rhodes				
John L. Bilou				
James Martinack				
Marcos Redondo				
Christina Miller				
Lynn Berstein				
Joseph Manning				
Nancy Liebman				

Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting No. 2
SIGN-IN SHEET
February 24, 2015

Venetian Causeway
Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study
Venetian Causeway from North Bayshore Drive to Purdy Avenue, Miami-Dade County
Financial Management Number: 422713-2-22-01
Efficient Transportation Decision-Making Number (ETDM): 12756

Name/Nombre	Address/Dirección	City/Ciudad	Zip Code/Codigo Postal	Telephone/ Teléfono E-mail Address/Correo Electronico
Marcia Orovitz				
Hava Rivlin				
Diane Star Heller				
Marcella Paz Cohen				
Michael Fryd MEP				
Christine Florez				
Erin Laura Demirjian				
Barbara Bisno				

Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting No. 2
SIGN-IN SHEET

February 24, 2015

Venetian Causeway
Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study
Venetian Causeway from North Bayshore Drive to Purdy Avenue, Miami-Dade County
Financial Management Number: 422713-2-22-01
Efficient Transportation Decision-Making Number (ETDM): 12756

Name/Nombre	Address/Dirección	City/Ciudad	Zip Code/Codigo Postal	Telephone/ Teléfono E-mail Address/Correo Electronico
Bill Scannell	3915 Wild Pine Lane	Merritt Island	32952	321-288-0106 bill@concertfloridainc.com
ELSA RIVEROL	1000 NW 111th Ave	MIAMI	33172	305 470-5105 elsa.riverol@dot.state.fl.us