

Broad Causeway Bridge Replacement PD&E Study (FPID 3452428-1-21-01)

FINAL Alternatives Public Workshop Script – September 26, 2023

Slide 2

Welcome to the Alternatives Public Workshop for the Broad Causeway Bridge Replacement Project Development and Environment, or PD&E, study. The project numbers are:

- Florida Department of Transportation, or FDOT, Financial Project Identification Number 452428-1-21-01,
- FDOT Efficient Transportation Decision Making Number 14520 and
- Town of Bay Harbor Islands Number BC-160.

Slide 3

The project limits are from the Causeway Island to East of West Broadview Drive in Miami-Dade County.

Slide 4

Public notice for this meeting was provided in notifications to property owners and tenants in and surrounding the project area and those living within the Town of Bay Harbor Islands.

In addition, emails were sent to interested individuals, elected and appointed officials, government agencies, and local, state and Federal agencies. This public meeting was advertised in the Florida Administrative Register, the Miami Herald and El Nuevo and via social media.

Slide 5

The Town of Bay Harbor Islands is required to comply with various non-discrimination laws and regulations, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, or family status.

Persons wishing to express their concerns about Title VI may do so by contacting the Town of Bay Harbor Islands Title Six Coordinator Jenice Rosado at 305-866-6241 or via email at (*spell out name*) jrosado@bayharborislands-fl.gov or the FDOT Statewide Title Six Coordinator Stefan Kulakowski at 850-414-4742 or via email at (*spell out name*) Stefan.Kulakowski@dot.state.fl.us.

“If translation services are needed during this meeting, please see Alicia Gonzalez in the back of the room for assistance.”

“Si usted necesita servicios de traducción durante esta reunión, por favor hable con Alicia Gonzalez en el fondo de la sala para obtener ayuda.”

Slide 6

Now, I would like to introduce the Town and Consultant Staff who are involved with the project. I am Wendy Lasher, the Assistant Project Manager and National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA Lead representing Atkins Consulting, we also have here Vice Mayor Fuller; Maria Lasday, the Town Manager; Rodney Carrero-Santana, the Town Engineer and Town's Project Manager for the Broad Causeway Bridge project; Alicia Gonzalez, our Community Outreach Specialist with Media Relations Group leading the public outreach effort for this project, and David Konz, the Broad Causeway Bridge Project Manager with Atkins Consulting.

Slide 7

We know many of you have questions about the project and these are the topics we will discuss during our presentation tonight which will hopefully answer most of those questions. This presentation will cover an overview of the project, the proposed alternatives, how we determined and evaluated these alternatives, and how you can stay informed about this project and comment on the alternatives or on the project in general. After the presentation we will try to answer any of your remaining questions during a Question and Answer session.

In-person Meeting

If you wish to speak, please fill out a speaker card available at the sign-in table and we will call you to the microphone during the Q&A session. If you have a question and prefer not to speak, please still fill out a card and write your question down so that our moderator can read your question.

Virtual Meeting

If you wish to speak, please Select **Q&A** to type your questions and during the Q&A session Click the **Raise Hand** button. We will call your name to Unmute yourself. If you just have questions that you would like the moderator to read, Select **Q&A** to type your questions and do not Click the **Raise Hand** button.

Slide 8

In-person Meeting

There are two meetings scheduled to present this information. The presentation is exactly the same at both meetings and a question and answer session will be provided at both tonight's in-person meeting and at the Virtual meeting this Thursday, September 28 at 6 p.m. We will also post a recording of the presentation and the meeting materials on the project website.

Virtual Meeting

If you are attending tonight's meeting using a computer, tablet, or smartphone via Zoom you will remain muted throughout the meeting except for the Question and Answer session at the end of the presentation. For Dial-in Attendees you are also in "listen only" mode. If you are calling via a smart phone, you will be able to raise your hand to provide comments during the Question and Answer session at the end of the presentation.

Slide 9

In addition to coordinating with you, the public, the Town will be coordinating with the FDOT and United States Coast Guard. This is a Town project and the Town is funding the PD&E study, but Federal Highway funding and grants will be requested for future phases of the project including design and construction. Since Federal funds will likely be used, the Town is required to follow the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. Based on the NEPA Assignment Memorandum of Understanding between the Federal Highway Administration and the FDOT, FHWA is the Lead Federal agency and FDOT will be approving the NEPA documents on behalf of FHWA. The Broad Causeway Bridge is over the Intracoastal Waterway, so the U.S. Coast Guard will be a Cooperating agency. There are numerous other agencies, as shown here, that the Town will coordinate with for project information, review, and permitting.

Slide 10

Shown on your right are the phases of the transportation development process starting with Planning and ending with project being complete after Construction. We are currently in the Project Development and Environment (or PD&E) study phase.

The Town has to follow the PD&E study process to:

- Comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, as well as other federal and state environmental laws, and
- It is required to secure federal regulatory approval. All of this is needed in order to obtain Federal funding.

Shown in this triangle on the left side of the slide, the PD&E Study involves:

- Engaging the public,
- Coordinating with federal, state and local agencies,
- Conducting preliminary engineering,
- Evaluating the project's potential impacts to the social, cultural, natural, and physical environments
- Evaluating options to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential environmental impacts, and
- Selecting a preferred alternative to advance to the next phase, Final Design.

Slide 11

The existing bridge was constructed in 1951 and has been effectively maintained by the Town. The bridge has been rated in the past as Good, but minor deterioration has occurred over time and the

rating has reduced to Fair. The bridge is also Functionally Obsolete which means that the bridge design is out of date and does not meet design standards.

The bridge is safe, but as the structure continues to age, frequent costly repairs will be needed to prevent closure or severe deterioration.

The Town of Bay Harbor Islands is considering replacing the bridge with a new structure which would have a minimum life expectancy of 75 years.

Slide 12

A project specific purpose and need is required for these types of projects and must be approved by the FDOT. All options for a new bridge, which are called Build Alternatives, are required to meet the Purpose and Need Statement. The purpose of the project is to identify the best solution for replacement of the existing bridge.

The need for the project is based on these four points:

First, address bridge deficiencies. The bridge railings and guardrail ends do not meet acceptable standards.

Next is to improve safety. There are several vehicular crashes in the project corridor and seven vehicle crashes in the past 5 years involving bicycles and pedestrians that resulted in injuries.

Third is to improve flow of traffic. The project corridor has high traffic volumes since it connects the beach communities and Bay Harbor Islands to the mainland. The a.m. and p.m. rush hours are times of high congestion and future traffic volumes are anticipated to continue to increase. Since the Intracoastal Waterway at the bridge crossing is deemed a navigable waterway by the US Coast Guard, the bridge bascule is required by the Coast Guard to open twice per hour to allow boat traffic through. These movable bridge cycles further compound traffic congestion. Having free flow of traffic or infrequent bridge openings will help relieve congestion and facilitate emergency evacuation.

Lastly, to maintain emergency evacuation. The Broad Causeway Bridge is part of a very important designated emergency evacuation route. All alternatives evaluated during the PD&E study will keep the bridge open to traffic during construction to allow for emergency evacuation during the construction phase.

Slide 13

When evaluating different bridge alternatives, we closely look at both engineering and environmental considerations along with project constraints which I will now explain.

From an engineering standpoint, the PD&E study will begin with geometric consideration for the bridge including height, structure type, the alignment, navigation clearance, and accommodation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

The roadway concepts will provide connectivity to existing conditions at the projects limits to the east and to the west. Access to the service station and your driveways will be maintained and construction impacts and relief to traffic flow will be considered.

Other factors are also evaluated since they could influence the functionality, aesthetics, overall cost, or constructability of the project.

Slide 14

During the environmental evaluation we consider natural resources such as essential fish habitat and water quality, social and cultural resources including historic sites, recreation areas, and the aesthetics of the alternatives, specifically the view looking at the bridge and looking from the bridge. We also consider physical characteristics which includes traffic noise and navigational impacts.

Slide 15

There are several steps that the Town took to determine the viable alternatives we are presenting to you tonight.

We developed the purpose and need that I showed on previous slides, to understand why we need the project and what we want to accomplish with this project.

We gathered engineering and environmental data and then we used this information to identify constraints. By identifying constraints, we can determine which alternatives are viable and which are not. During our evaluation we identified six (6) project constraints. The first was to avoid the Tot Lot which is a community park and a protected Section 4(f) resource. For navigation, we coordinated with the US Coast Guard and determined the required horizontal clearance which is the width of a new bridge and the vertical clearance which is the height of a new bridge. We also needed to avoid the service station on the Causeway island because it is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or NRHP-eligible site and is ranked as "High" as a potential contamination site.

Slide 16

Other constraints include improving pedestrian and bicycle safety with a multi-use path that meets ADA requirements. Next, cost to the Town needs to be carefully considered. With careful planning, the Town has saved enough money to fund this PD&E study and a portion of the design. The Town is working hard to pursue Federal, state, and local grants to supplement the funding gap for design and construction through available grants. Please note that grant funding is not guaranteed and is limited to 80%. The Town will need to pay for the remaining Design and Construction costs from toll revenue. Annual toll revenue is currently budgeted for bi-annual inspections, operation, and required maintenance of the four Town-owned bridges. Lastly, is Right-of-way. The Town owns the vacant parcel to the south of the bridge at West Broadview Drive and has planned to use that parcel

for the new bridge to avoid relocation impacts to the Tot Lot and residents. With that foresight, there are no planned relocations of any residences or businesses.

Slide 17

Included in the Town Charter by the 1953 Senate Bill No. 865, the State of Florida surrendered and granted to the Town of Bay Harbor Islands any claim or control over all tidewaters and other lands, and all bayous and bay bottoms, beaches, waters, waterways and water bottoms, and all riparian rights within and adjacent to the Town limits for municipal purposes only, a strip of 300 feet wide from Kane Concourse, westwardly across Biscayne Bay to approximately 123rd Street in the City of North Miami.

This picture shows that 300 foot area where the causeway island and existing bridge are located. Another constraint for the project is to develop alternatives that stay within this 300 foot area or utilizes the area to the maximum extent possible.

David Konz, the Atkins Consultant Project Manager is now going to present to you the proposed alternatives and some of the engineering considerations of the alternatives analysis.

Slide 18

Based on the engineering and environmental considerations and the project constraints that Wendy just went over, we have developed three alternatives to present to you this evening: the No-Build Alternative, and two build alternatives; Build Alternative 1, a 65-foot high-level fixed bridge and Build Alternative 2, a 40-foot mid-level movable bridge. I am going to discuss each of these in more detail and explain for each alternative: the alignment, the profile (or height of the bridge), the typical section that the driver sees from the roadway, pedestrian accommodations, and an evaluation matrix of the engineering and environmental considerations.

Slide 19

I will start off with the No Build Alternative which would keep the existing bridge in place and not construct a new bridge. This alternative is required to be considered in the NEPA process as a viable alternative throughout the PD&E study and will serve as a comparison to the Build Alternatives. The No-Build Alternative does not meet the project's purpose and need to address bridge deficiencies, improve safety, improve the flow of traffic, or maintain emergency evacuation.

The existing bridge deficiencies will remain with a No-Build Alternative. The bridge would continue to deteriorate, and extensive periodic repairs and maintenance would be conducted to keep the bridge safe. There would be the potential for bridge closures if the movable bridge machinery breaks down. The remaining life span of the existing bridge is estimated to be 15 to 25 years, at which time the bridge will have to be decommissioned or replaced. Please note, the No-Build Alternative eliminates toll revenue and may cause tax increases.

Slide 20

Once the bridge has reached the end of its service life, it will have to be either decommissioned or replaced. An 11-mile detour to the south and a 9-mile detour to the north would have to be utilized if the bridge is decommissioned or closed for extensive repairs. These No-Build Alternative detours would impact emergency response times and evacuation routes as well.

Slide 21

The proposed route, or alignment, for both Build Alternatives will be on the south side of the existing bridge. This was decided in order to avoid a submerged gas line and the Town Tot Lot to the north (shown in blue), utilize the Town-owned vacant parcel to the south (shown in green), and avoid residential relocation. The southern alignment eliminates right-of-way acquisition and would save the Town time and money. It would also eliminate phased construction.

Slide 22

For Alternative 1, these two aerial images show what the high-level fixed bridge would look like with the southern alignment, which is within the 300-foot area controlled by the Town. You can see the southern half of the causeway island is utilized, which I will discuss in more detail in an upcoming slide related to maintenance of traffic during construction. On the east end of the bridge (which is on the right side of the slide), this alignment utilizes the Town's vacant parcel and reconnects to the existing roadway at West Broadview Drive.

Slide 23

For Alternative 2, these two aerial images show what the mid-level movable bridge alignment would look like. It would make the same connections to the west and east as Alternative 1. Although the mid-level movable bridge utilizes the 300-foot area controlled by the Town to the maximum extent possible, it does extend outside of this area due to larger bascule piers that enclose the mechanical elements, which is a new requirement. There are maintenance walkways, and there would be two bascule leaves that would open and close. The existing moveable bridge does not have these additional features.

Slide 24

This rendering gives you a birds eye view of changes to the causeway island for both build alternatives 1 and 2. Both alternatives will cross the causeway island on the south side and partially span over the exiting service station canopy.

We have shown one solution that provides both eastbound and westbound access to the service station, as exists today.

Slide 25

Here is another solution for the service station access roads that was developed after refining vehicle and pedestrian movements to optimize the recreation space on the north side of the island. This service road configuration reduces cost, improves access, and enhances traffic flow.

Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on the causeway island include a perimeter sidewalk at the water's edge on both the north and south side of the island, shown in a coral color.

Slide 26

The perimeter sidewalk and bike lanes provide recreation opportunities as an added feature that connects the Town to North Miami using a circular helix ramp that connect the causeway island with the multi-use path. The rendering on the right shows the circular ramp for Alternative 1 on the east side of the causeway island. The rendering on the left shows the island from the west near North Miami, looking east toward the Town of Bay Harbor Islands.

Slide 27

It is important to visualize the difference in height between the existing bridge and the Build Alternatives. This graphic shows the existing bridge compared to the High-Level Fixed Bridge. The existing bridge is 15.7 feet above mean high water. The fixed bridge is 65-feet. This height was chosen based on US Coast Guard coordination and requirements. This height would allow for all boat traffic to go under the bridge. One of the benefits of this alternative is that there will be no drawbridge openings.

Slide 28

This shows the existing bridge compared to the Mid-Level Movable Bridge which is 40-feet. This height was chosen to accommodate the majority of boat traffic utilizing the Intracoastal Waterway thus reducing the amount of bridge openings and improving both vehicular and vessel flow. Drawbridge openings would still be required for this alternative for larger vessels and during hurricane evacuation.

Slide 29

This is the existing bridge typical section that you are driving on today. It has two 10-foot undivided travel lanes and a narrow sidewalk in each direction with no separation from motor vehicles. The

vehicle lane widths and sidewalks are Substandard. There are no dedicated bike lanes. Bicycles are sharing 30 mph travel lanes with vehicles on lane widths that do not meet current standards. The sidewalk that is present is not ADA compliant, and there are currently no sidewalks on the causeway island west of the bridge. This creates an unsafe condition for pedestrians along the corridor.

Slide 30

This slide shows typical sections for the proposed build alternatives which include two 11-foot divided travel lanes and an 8-foot shoulder that will be used as a designated bike lane in each direction (shown in green). On the north side of the bridge there will be a 10-foot multi-use path separated from the roadway by a barrier wall for safety (shown in coral). The main difference between the two alternatives is the overall width. The mid-level movable alternative is wider because of the maintenance walkways required to access the tender house and machinery and to maintain the moveable portion of the bridge.

Slide 31

Both Build alternatives will provide ADA compliant pedestrian accommodations including a multi-use path on the north side of bridge, bridge overlooks for the pedestrian to rest and enjoy the view, and a sidewalk around the causeway island.

The differences between the two Build alternatives are that the multi-use path on the high-level fixed bridge will require ramp runs and landings as shown in this picture to maintain a slope that will meet ADA requirements and prevent steep incline and declines. Most ramps will be less than 6% slope.

The mid-level moveable alternative has the same pedestrian accommodation but the slope is less being less than 3% on the west side and approximately 4% on the east side of the Intracoastal Waterway. Therefore, it will not require a ramp run and landing feature.

As I previously mentioned, there is a circular ramp on the causeway island to get pedestrians from the bridge down to the island where a sidewalk will be provided around both sides of the island. These renderings show a comparison of this ramp between the two Build Alternatives.

Slide 32

Since the pedestrian accommodations are on the north side of the bridge only, a mid-block pedestrian crossing with a push-button feature will be provided at Broadview Terrace between West Broadview Dive and East Broadview Drive to move pedestrians from the south side to the north of the roadway. Mid-block pedestrian crossings are used up and down the beach with on-demand pedestrian movement and vehicular traffic only being stopped for a few seconds.

There will be no pedestrian access to the bridge on the south side of the roadway and there will be no crossing of Kane Concourse at the base of the proposed bridge.

Slide 33

I wanted to address the Rehabilitation Alternative, since I am sure a few of you may be thinking... “Why don’t we just keep the existing bridge?”. We evaluated this option and many others to identify viable alternatives. Unfortunately, the Rehabilitation Option is not a prudent nor feasible alternative for several reasons. First, to meet design Standards, the existing bridge would have to be widened. Widening to the north is not practicable because of the Tot Lot and gas line. Widening to south is not practicable because of the electrical room and tender house. Secondly, the bridge has undersized bascule components that would be costly to upgrade. Finally, major rehabilitation would be needed to increase the remaining service life including: deck replacement (the surface you drive on), mechanical and electrical upgrades, and corrosion mitigation measures like pile jackets and zinc metalizing. The rehabilitation costs are significant and lead to a 40-year estimated service life, which is approximately half of both build alternatives. Based on the foregoing, rehabilitation was eliminated.

Slide 34

This is the evaluation matrix which incorporates the engineering and environmental considerations that Wendy showed you. This evaluation is a NEPA requirement to determine viable alternatives and complete a comparison analysis. This information, along with public comments, is used to determine a preferred alternative to be advanced to the Design phase.

Some of the differences between alternatives that I would like to point out are that the No-Build Alternative does NOT meet purpose and need. Alternative 1 is the 65-foot high-level fixed bridge and has a steeper profile (5% west of the Intracoastal and 5.8% east of the Intracoastal). Vehicular traffic will be free flowing with Alternative 1. Alternative 2 is the 40-foot mid-level moveable bridge with a mild profile (2.6% west of the Intracoastal and 4.2% east of the Intracoastal). There will be bascule bridge openings with Alternative 2 that impede traffic. Both build alternatives will improve vehicle and marine traffic flow and avoid property relocation and right-of-way acquisitions. The existing bridge will remain open during construction so there will be NO temporary bridge, bridge closures nor detours during construction.

The No Build Alternative will not impact social, cultural, natural or physical resources since the existing bridge would remain.

Slide 35

Regarding natural and physical resource impacts, Alternative 2 will have higher impacts to essential fish habitat, seagrasses, and sovereign submerged lands. The No-Build Alternative has a future lifespan of only 15 to 25 years, whereas both build alternatives have a minimum lifespan of 75 years.

One primary differentiator between the alternatives is cost. All estimates are preliminary and represent the amount of money needed, in 2023 dollars, to reach year 2048. This gives an “apples to apples” comparison from now until the existing bridge is closed. For the No Build Alternative, \$72 million dollars is estimated to reach year 2048. Please note... this cost is for preventative

maintenance only, excludes building ANY new bridge in the future, and excludes major repairs since they are unpredictable as degradation accelerates exponentially near the end of the bridge's service life. When the existing bridge was originally constructed in 1951 it was assumed to have a 50-year design life. The Town has completed numerous rehabilitation projects in the past and has successfully extended the lifespan of the 72-year-old bridge. This proactive approach allows enough time for proper planning of next steps as the bridges nears the end of its service life.

For the Alternative 1 High-level Fixed Bridge, \$225 million dollars is estimated to reach year 2048. Alternative 1 has a design life of 75 years.

For the Alternative 2 Mid-level Movable Bridge, \$424 million dollars is estimated to reach year 2048. Alternative 2 has a design life of 75 years.

Due to the Infrastructure Bill, this is a really good time to proceed with either build alternative due to available funds. The Town will need to use toll revenue to fund at least 20% of the total cost. The Town is pursuing Federal, state, and local grants in hopes of funding the remaining balance for Design and Construction costs.

Slide 36

Key differentiators between the alternatives that will be considered when selecting a preferred alternative are shown here and listed on your comment form to help you decide which alternative you prefer.

There are advantages to the No Build Alternative since there would be no construction or impacts to environmental resources, but it would have disadvantages that I earlier noted including continued deterioration and will be decommissioned at end of estimated 25-year lifespan. There is potential NOW for bridge closures and detours due to machinery failure. The bridge would also continue to open at the same frequency as it does now.

Some of the advantages of Alternative 1, the High-Level Fixed Bridge is that there will be no drawbridge openings and it has the lowest cost between the two build alternatives. Disadvantages are that there will be steeper slopes for vehicles and the multi-use path and potential visual impacts since it is a higher bridge.

Alternative 2, the Mid-Level Movable Bridge is not as high and therefore would have average slopes and less visual impacts, but it would still have bridge openings for large vessels and in emergency evacuation circumstances and slightly higher impacts to Essential Fish Habitat. Since the alignment is outside of the 300 foot area the Town controls there will be impacts to Sovereign Submerged lands. This alternative has the highest cost at \$424.2 million dollars.

Slide 37

The PD&E study schedule shows public milestones as green diamonds.

In February we had the public kick-off meeting, and we are at the Alternatives Public Workshop. Based on the engineering and environmental evaluations and your public input, we will determine and refine a preferred alternative that we will document and present to you at a formal Public Hearing next summer. Lastly, we will finalize our documentation which will be reviewed and approved by the US Coast Guard and FDOT. At the bottom of the schedule graphic, you see the LDCA diamond which is Location and Concept Design Acceptance. This signifies the completion of the PD&E study and from there the project will move into the design phase.

This bottom graphic shows the overall anticipated project schedule if a Build Alternative is selected. We are here in the PD&E phase, which ends in 2025. Next, the design phase will take approximately 2.5 years and includes permitting. We will not have any relocations or right-of-way acquisition, which will save the Town money and reduce the overall schedule. The project will proceed into construction in 2028 with anticipated ribbon-cutting in 2031.

It is VERY important that you recognize... that from PD&E to ribbon-cutting, it is a 10-year process. Your existing bridge has 25 years OR LESS before it will be demolished with the No Build Alternative.

Slide 38

As Wendy mentioned, if a Build alternative is selected the existing bridge will stay open to traffic throughout construction. This graphic shows that all traffic will be shifted temporarily to the north side of the island. This shift will provide a construction work zone to the south, shown in orange. Traffic will then be shifted to the new bridge once construction is complete. At that time the existing bridge will be demolished.

Slide 39

I would like to finish up the presentation by making sure you know how to stay informed and how to provide comments on the project. First, I want to reiterate that public engagement occurs throughout the entire PD&E study and not just at public meetings. Your comments can be provided on the public website at any time. We encourage you to attend the public meetings, participate in surveys when provided, and visit the project website.

Slide 40

Your comments will help the Town make its selection of a preferred alternative. Comments can be provided through the mail or e-mail to Alicia Gonzalez, our Community Outreach Specialist for the project.

In-person Meeting

You can fill out a comment form tonight or mail it to Alicia. Comments can be provided on the public website at any time. The website is shown here along with the QR code that will take you directly to it.

Virtual Meeting

Comments can be provided on the public website at any time. The website is shown here along with the QR code that will take you directly to it.

Slide 41

In-person Meeting

We have now entered the question and answer portion of our meeting. Again, if you wish to speak, please fill out a speakers card and provide your contact information. When we call your name please come and speak into the microphone. You will have exactly two (2) minutes to state your question or comments. We will try to answer your question, but if we are unable to answer at this time, we will make note of it and respond to you via mail or e-mail. If you have a question and prefer not to speak, please still fill out a card and write your question down so that our moderator can read your question.

Slide 42

Virtual Meeting

We have now entered the question and answer portion of our meeting. Again, if you wish to speak, please Select **Q&A** to type your comments or questions.

Click the **Raise Hand** button on the bottom toolbar. When we call your name, please unmute your microphone. You will have exactly two (2) minutes to state your question. We will try to answer your question, but if we are unable to answer at this time, we will make note of it and respond to you via mail or e-mail. If you just have questions that you would like the moderator to read, Select **Q&A** to type your questions and do not Click the **Raise Hand** button.

Slide 43

Virtual Meeting – Dial in-Attendees

If you are calling via a smart phone, you will be able to raise your hand to ask questions by dialing *9. You will be alerted once you are unmuted and allowed to speak.

Slide 44

This concludes the Public Alternatives Workshop. The Town of Bay Harbor Islands would like to thank you for your interest in the project and attending this meeting.

In-person Meeting

If you have any additional questions, please see one of our representatives at the project boards.

Thank you.