

Bridge Factors Factual Report Attachment 2 – Email from Mr. Kenneth Jessell of FIU to Mr. Dan Walsh of NTSB dated June 8, 2018

Miami, FL

HWY18MH009

(2 pages)

Walsh Daniel

Subject: FIU bridge renderings at the time of submittal for 2013 TIGER Grant

From: Kenneth Jessell

Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 6:11 PM

To: Walsh Daniel

Subject: RE: FIU bridge renderings at the time of submittal for 2013 TIGER Grant

Dan, I will need to do some additional research on the dates of the TYLIN consulting services for those drawings and will do that on Monday.

For the other two questions, I am doing a single response which explains the reason for placing the bridge on the West side of 109th Avenue because the two questions are interrelated. Let me know if this answers your questions. Ken

The original location of the bridge was indeed east of 109th Avenue since both 109th Tower and 4th Street Commons Housing Projects were east of 109th. We had even moved the location of the Ambulatory Care Center project at the SE corner of the intersection of SW 8th Street and 109th Avenue to accommodate the bridge and landing on the FIU side. There is indeed a historically designated footbridge over the canal just east of the vehicular bridge. This was the original two lane vehicular bridge which was moved, preserved and historically designated when the new concrete bridge currently used for vehicular traffic was constructed.

Sadly, because of the historic designation, the State of Florida Historic Preservation Office ruled that, as part of the NEPA process, we could not place the pedestrian bridge in the intended location east of 109th Avenue because it would detract from the historic bridge, such as casting a shadow over the bridge. Hence, we had two options: move the pedestrian bridge much further east of the historic foot bridge (which would take it outside of the pedestrian travel path, in between 109th Avenue and 107th Avenue) or move it to the west side of 109th Avenue. We opted to move it to the west side of 109th Avenue.

The historically-designated footbridge was in very bad shape and was unusable at the time 109th Tower was constructed. As part of the permit granted by the City of Sweetwater, the developer was required to restore the bridge so that it could be used again for foot traffic. I do not believe that any permits from the State or SFWMD were obtained. Sadly, the contractor actually destroyed the original planks which were Dade County Pine, so there was really nothing historic left. We did attempt to have the east location revisited under the conditions, but that was denied as well since the belief was that the bridge, even as restored with all new planks and railings, was contributing historic.