



## Project Advisory Group Meeting No. 2

Date: Thursday, January 12, 2017  
Time: 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
Location: Miami Dade College  
InterAmerican Campus  
627 SW 27th Avenue  
Miami, Florida 33135  
Attendees: See Sign-in Sheet at the End of this Document

HNTB Consultant Project Manager Vilma Croft, P.E., welcomed the attendees and led the discussion with a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation included: the meeting goals, a project overview, project status, traffic analysis, and the preliminary alternatives analysis. The main purpose of the meeting was to focus on the alternatives analysis and to have Project Advisory Group (PAG) members select two alternatives that will move forward into further analysis.

Carlos Alba Gave a brief overview of the traffic forecasting analysis, the variables and the data resources that the model uses. The traffic analysis for existing conditions was completed based on a multi-modal LOS. The graphics illustrated how the LOS was ranked from levels A to F: "A" being the best and "F" the worst, for automobiles, bicycles, pedestrians and buses. Intersections and the actual arterial segments were used for the automobile data.

Some of the project segments showing a LOS F, highlighted in red on the presentation, indicates the segment exceeds capacity. The bike LOS is D and, in some cases, E, so it's approaching peak levels of capacity. The pedestrian LOS is C and the bus LOS is A, with the exception of a few segments in the eastern part of the corridor which are F. The Miami-Dade bus routes only go up to 1st Avenue. There is no transit service between SW 1st Avenue and Brickell Avenue.

Question: What does the "F" in red mean? Is it failing?

Carlos Alba: Yes, it means it's failing, so you're not getting a good experience as a cyclist, a pedestrian or an automobile driver.

Question: What does LOS E mean?

Carlos Alba: LOS E means "at capacity."

Comment: I see that the automobile is failing in many of the areas that you're showing. Pedestrians have it much worse, and bicycles are even worse than that. Shouldn't it show LOS F throughout the corridor? I'll leave automobiles to the traffic engineers.

Carlos Alba: We're putting together the actual report right now and you can get all of the data that was used for the analysis. The service for pedestrians is usually driven by the presence of a sidewalk and the fact that there is on-street parking. Pedestrians feel protected on a sidewalk with parked cars between them and the moving vehicles. The posted speed and the free-flow speed for automobiles is relatively low, so that's what triggers a LOS C for pedestrians.

Comment: The width of sidewalk you have for a commercial street is beyond LOS F.

Vilma Croft: The program we are using is one of the few that calculates a multimodal LOS. Though it might seem like a narrow sidewalk, keep in mind that by Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Standards, a sidewalk is usually six feet wide. A nine-foot sidewalk is considered a wide sidewalk.

Question: Did you do an analysis for the transit you are proposing?

Vilma Croft: The existing conditions analysis becomes the basis for future conditions. We have not conducted the future conditions analysis yet.

Comment: If you are presenting to us, in order for us to be informed, would it not be a good idea to do the traffic analysis for the plans that you are proposing? If you start narrowing the streets you are going to have a bottleneck where you did not have one before.

Vilma Croft: To prepare a traffic analysis, the existing conditions are analyzed first and that becomes the base. Once we start narrowing down to two potential build alternatives (currently we have four potential build alternatives) then we will do the future traffic analysis on those two alternatives. That analysis will show you what will happen with the traffic in 2020 and 2040. Currently, we're showing you the existing conditions based on the LOS methodology.

Comment: I think one of the reasons you're doing this study is because of all the pedestrians that have been killed on 8th Street and 7th Street. When you say that it's a LOS C for pedestrians, as the existing condition, then shouldn't it be a LOS F? You don't even have bike lanes on 8th Street and 7th Street, so you're saying that vehicles are more important than people who are crossing the street with a child or an elderly person. They should be the major concern.

Vilma Croft: Safety is the FDOT's number one priority. A LOS F for vehicles does not mean that vehicles are more important than bicycles or pedestrians. There are different parameters used based on the mode of transportation to determine the LOS for each mode. We are using the FDOT's approved methodology for a multimodal LOS which is used for all projects. It is not saying that vehicles are more important, it just gives you a grade based on the parameters of the existing conditions.

Comment: SW 7th Street does not have parking, so that should be LOS F. There is parking on SW 8th Street and you show a LOS C, because the parking protects pedestrians. To have both streets at the

same LOS is absurd. It concerns me that the information you are providing for a future project in our neighborhood is based on using parked cars to protect pedestrians.

Vilma Croft: SW 7th Street doesn't have parking like SW 8th street does; however, there is a six and one-half foot sidewalk, which might seem narrow, but it's wider than the sidewalks you have in other areas.

Question: How do you determine what constitutes LOS A, B, C, E or F?

Vilma Croft: The DOT approved methodology is "ARTPLAN" which is the name of the software that is used to calculate the multimodal LOS.

Comment: I believe what you are saying is, if you have a nine-foot sidewalk on SW 8th Street with trees as a buffer and parking, then that's a LOS C. Then, what is SW 7th Street with a sidewalk that is much narrower and does not have parking? I think that's what jumps out at people and makes them suspect of the numbers, or that if you are going to evaluate the options, those numbers are not correct.

Comment: I think something is wrong with the LOS for pedestrians in that everything is LOS C, especially between 12th Avenue and 17th Avenue. In the chart, everything looks the same. Is there any way we can re-evaluate or take a closer look at the LOS for pedestrians?

Comment: I want to address the same point. I think people are trying to understand what you are presenting, but in your long speech about LOS C, did you say this does not include safety considerations?

Comment: Looking at that sidewalk presence, for example, in the middle of 8th Street around 15th Avenue, you have a sidewalk approximately three-feet wide. The reason this is important is, if we are going to trust and, hopefully, work with you and add input into your process as we go forward, there needs to be some level in which we can look at things like the deaths that have occurred, or the many car accidents that happen every year on that street. If there was information in the presentation that said "deaths and injuries by cars to pedestrians," that would make it more believable.

Carlos Alba: The reason that language is not included is because the safety analysis is separate from the multimodal LOS. This presentation is showing you the multimodal LOS.

Comment: You don't have the sidewalk widths on 7th Street and there are places where I don't even see a sidewalk.

Comment: I think one of the problems in this criteria is the sidewalk presence is all the same width, and I think it makes a big difference when you have a sidewalk that's 10 feet wide in some places and six feet wide in others. I think that would make a difference.

Comment: I'm trying to follow and see what we're missing in this discussion. What I want to know is how you do the analysis and how you measure the results. Does someone just click on a button to say where there's a sidewalk and people are walking or where there's a barrier?

Carlos Alba: The analysis is conducted segment by segment, starting with the existing conditions. Data is gathered on the number of vehicles and speed, for example, and there is specific information for each segment. The posted speed limit is constant at 30 mph and there is a free-flow speed that is a little higher. All this data goes into the software and that becomes part of the analysis.

Question: That's not measured data. Is that correct?

Comment: I also want to mention that this methodology is something that is instilled into FDOT, not just this team. If we have concerns with the methodology, we have to go higher to the FDOT District Office and say that there is a flaw in the methodology as opposed to looking at Vilma and her team and saying "you guys are doing this wrong." Let's just keep that in mind. This is the methodology that they are required to use for an FDOT project.

Comment: This advisory committee was set up a year ago, and I met with Director Wolfe and told him the process was flawed. One of the problems with the process is that we are relying on software that is for traffic engineering and it gives results based on traffic. I don't have to tell you that anyone who walks along SW 7th Street takes their life into their own hands. All I'm saying is, if you use this as your benchmark, your design is going to be flawed. As an advisor, I would recommend that you use the software with a grain of salt and go out there and walk along the streets and get a feel for what the LOS is, because it certainly is not a C for pedestrians on SW 7th Street or on SW 8<sup>th</sup> Street. If you go back to the slide where you talk about automobiles, you're showing a boulevard and you're measuring by the number of cars you have there. But, SW 8<sup>th</sup> Street is a commercial street and it's not about the number of cars. In fact, the more cars you have, the slower they go and the safer the pedestrians are. There's a balance there that goes beyond the software and everything is contextual.

Vilma Croft: The alternatives analysis, includes a "No build" alternative, a Transportation Systems Management and Operations or TSM&O alternative, and four build alternatives. The build alternatives are:

- Two lanes plus transit
- A two-way alternative
- Three lanes in reverse directions, and
- The existing three-lane configuration

In the preliminary alternatives analysis, engineering and environmental factors are analyzed to start ranking the alternatives. Under engineering, we look at safety for all modes of transportation, not just safety for cars. We look at access, whether it's access to businesses or improving access at the I-95 interchange. This is a multimodal LOS, so we do the analysis for all modes of transportation, maintenance of traffic and cost. Some of the build alternatives will have simpler maintenance of traffic than others. We look at cost for right of way and

construction. The environment analysis includes cultural resources. There are a lot of cultural resources within this corridor. We also look at the physical and the natural environment. We look at some of the potential effects of contamination, noise, and water quality.

Question: What do you mean by contamination?

Vilma Croft: Contamination depends on the alternative. For example, if you reverse the existing flow of traffic, you would need to replace the existing signals. When you excavate, you have the potential to encounter a contaminated site depending on the business or what uses were in the area. It could go back several years, maybe an old gas station. If there's a need for new drainage pipe or signal poles, then there is a potential to encounter a contaminated site.

Question: So, it's really the existing contamination in the right of way as opposed to creating contamination?

Vilma Croft: Yes - that is correct.

Question: Would the contamination level look at an increase in pavement width?

Vilma Croft: We conduct a level one assessment. We usually look at any areas where excavation may be needed.

The "no build" alternative means no improvements would be made. There would be no expenditure of funds and the existing conditions would be left the way they are. There would be no impact to maintenance of traffic. No improvements would be made for safety, LOS, access or complete streets. The "no build" alternative is a viable option all the way to the end of the study.

The next alternative is what we call a Transportation Systems Management and Operations or a TSM&O alternative. This option usually entails minor improvements such signal timing and minor safety improvements. The pros for this option would be improvements in the LOS for automobiles because we would be maximizing the signals. We would not create a bike lane because that would be considered a build alternative. Only minor operational improvements would be made. The cons would be that there would be no major improvements to I-95 access.

This same type of analysis would be done for all the "build" alternatives. Engineering and environmental factors would be analyzed to select a preferred alternative. At this time, we are going to stop the presentation and break out into groups. We would like you to evaluate the build alternatives in your individual groups to develop the pros and cons of each.

ATTENDEES ARE BROKEN OUT INTO FOUR GROUPS TO WORK SEPARATELY

There was an open group discussion about the build alternatives.

Vilma Croft: We'll start with the two lanes plus transit alternative.

Comment: For this alternative, we came up with the following pros: a quicker and improved transit system for buses and trolleys, bike safety, and an improved LOS. The cons are that you'll have residential overflow traffic and confusion about the direction of traffic. Some people might get confused as to where to catch a bus or cross the street. You also lose one lane of traffic and you lose parking.

Comment: We believe that this model encourages growth in use of public transit and it is pedestrian friendly. To us, it's the best option, and it creates a human scale that the other alternatives don't. But we would recommend that you look at other options within this alternative. For instance, the removal of parking is not good.

Comment: I think this group does not understand that the people who pay taxes on SW 8<sup>th</sup> Street and SW 7th Street are the property owners. If you take away parking on SW 8th Street you are removing the ability for some of those businesses to stay in business and removing the taxes that feed SW 8th Street and SW 7th Street. Removing parking along the street is a bad idea.

Comment: We like this option but, on SW 8th Street in particular, we would prefer the elimination of the bike lane in order to retain parking on both sides.

Vilma Croft: The concept that we are looking at in pros and cons is taking away a traffic lane to provide a transit-only lane. If you think this is a concept that should be further considered, we can look at the typical section elements. We can't focus on the elements of the four build alternatives. We want to narrow the alternatives and select the best two to develop the typical section elements.

Comment: Since it was our team's turn we would like to finish. In the four build alternatives you provided to us, all of them remove the parking on SW 8th Street. You're telling us about the concept but we want to point out that none of the alternatives have parking on SW 8th Street. Whichever alternative we choose, we don't want to eliminate the parking.

Comment: As far as the transit lane goes, are tour buses going to be running in that lane?

Vilma Croft: No, the transit lane is not for tour buses.

Comment: How does that work? We will still have the tour buses but one travel lane will be gone.

Comment: There is a new project starting where parking is proposed on 15th Avenue for the tour buses.

Comment: They were trying to enforce no parking within 300 feet of the commercial area on SW 8th Street. If you can't park on SW 8th Street and you can't park on the side streets, where are you going to park?

- Question: If you choose one of the two alternatives, are you stuck with the two alternatives or can you build on those?
- Vilma Croft: Yes, you can build on those alternatives.
- Comment: I think parking is a big deal for everyone.
- Comment: Instead of a designated bike lane, that should be substituted for parking. Both are elements of complete streets. I think you are really wanting us to focus on the flow of traffic, how many lanes should there be, and if the street is one-way or two-way.
- Comment: It's equally important that they understand that we don't want to lose parking.
- Comment: You came with four alternatives which have no parking.
- Comment: I believe that none of the four alternatives you presented to us are acceptable. I think you should come up with different alternatives that are acceptable to this community.
- Comment: I think if we are looking at what they are putting in black and white, we are going to end up with hundreds of alternatives. Is there a bike lane or not, is there parking or not, is there extended sidewalk or not. What we are trying to do here is look at the flow of traffic right now. I completely understand that parking is needed. They are not saying let's eliminate the parking.
- Comment: Yes, they are. You can't come over here and tell us that it's an alternative when it's not. I'm not signing off on an alternative that has no parking.
- Comment: When we look at the alternatives. We can choose and say, instead of a designated bike lane, we'd rather have parking. That's looking at the level of complete streets. Those are things we will look into at upcoming meetings. Let's look at the transit lanes. Do we want the travel lanes going in one direction, do we want opposite directions, or do we want three car lanes?
- Vilma Croft: For each alternative, we would look at the typical section elements. These alternatives came from the previous study, the previous study had a lot of typical sections. If I were to show you 30 typical sections to select two alternatives, it would be even more difficult. Let's focus on the concepts. Whether you think that adding a transit lane is something that would be beneficial. This corridor is not part of the Strategic Miami Area Transit known as "SMART Plan."
- Comment: Beyond that, this pros and cons exercise is not going to come up with a plan. Based on this meeting, if a con is on every part of this plan (like the fact that there's no parking), then that's a con we will list for every alternative.
- Comment: Would we really need to cut 33 per cent of our automobile traffic flow for a transit lane that's only going to be for buses? That's a con.

Vilma Croft: Would you say that this is an alternative that deserves further analysis? Would you say that it is not desirable to give a lane to transit?

Comment: Compared to the other alternatives, we have more cons on the other ones than on this one.

Comment: I understand the concept of complete streets and I understand that you're trying to put in transit and remove parking. I wonder if you understand the land ownership pattern on SW 8th Street. If you adversely impact these businesses by taking away parking, then you are actually forcing these properties to go on the market. They would then be assembled for larger development and that is in total opposition to the concept of preserving the historic character of this area. When you ignore the economic viability of these small businesses because you want to have a more efficient roadway in and out of Brickell then you are changing the character of Little Havana. These businesses cannot survive without parking. It's going to affect the character because you've been focusing on bike lanes and transit and not on who owns the land. Is it more important to have a bike lane or to maintain the historic character of SW 8th Street? Is a bike lane necessary on SW 7th Street? If you're supposed to get people walking, is transit necessary on SW 8th Street and SW 7th Street?

Vilma Croft: Let's say the bike lanes are taken away and we keep the parking. Would you say that would be a better alternative than the existing traffic flow or not? Taking away a travel lane to provide a transit lane, with all the other elements remaining the same?

Comment: There would be concerns.

Comment: Could you do it timed like they do in San Francisco?

Comment: Is the question, "should we take a bike lane out to add to parking?"

Comment: I know we are just looking at concepts, and there are pros and cons in all of them. There isn't one that we really like. The most important concern is the parking, but there are other concerns as well. That's why, when you say that we can't look at the 30 options, I don't know. The fact is, the previous study came up with these four options without much community input. I don't really know how you ended up with these four.

Vilma Croft: We have posted all the reports from the previous study on the project website. There was a lot of public involvement. The reports include the meeting records if you like to review.

Comment: I was in many of those meetings and most of the input that we gave never made it to the documents that are on the web site.

Comment: Can we agree that we want parking on both sides?

Vilma Croft: Yes.

- Comment: I think the business community needs to look at greater solutions to parking. Look at Wynwood - they don't have a lot of on-street parking but they have managed shared parking and built shared garages.
- Comment: That's part of the solution, but it starts with parallel parking.
- Comment: Parking on both sides of the road?
- Comment: It's a common mistake of small retail owners and even restaurant owners to believe that three or four spaces in front of their businesses are going to make it possible for them to succeed. Little Havana is going to need small space parking storage facilities, even if they are only small 150 car garages. There is also a need for areas where bicycles can be parked.
- Comment: It's not just about providing enough parking for all the businesses. It's about the fact that parallel parking creates friction with the moving vehicles and slows them down and makes pedestrians more comfortable. I'm not saying that parallel parking would solve all problems, but it would humanize the street.
- Comment: If you look at Wynwood and the Grove, and what the Gables is going to end with, you will find parking storage facilities and less reliance on parking in front of the businesses. I'm not saying that it's the way Little Havana should go. They should choose which way they want to go, but there is not enough on-street parking to sustain the popularity of Little Havana in the future.
- Comment: Las Olas has more right of way than SW 7th Street and is also a commercial street by zoning. We have six-foot lanes here with no protection, no trees on these sections and no parallel parking. It is really not human at all. That is something that we need to consider as well.
- Comment: What about the suggestion of putting parallel parking on one side of the street? It doesn't matter which side it's on. That could provide more parking spaces. I don't care if my business has parallel parking in front or not, but I do care about parking because it does make a difference.
- Comment: If you put parking on both sides of the street it will take a travel lane.
- Comment: If you have parking on one side, you would have more parking spaces per square foot, because you would have parallel parking as opposed to what you have now, which straight parking.
- Comment: Isn't that called parallel parking?
- Comment: It's called angled parking.
- Comment: After looking at four options we get to choose the two best options. Or should we look at any that we can just discard.

Vilma Croft: That would be great. If we don't select two options at this meeting, then we will come back and discuss at another meeting. Why don't we look at the two-way option?

Comment: A pro for us on this option is that it would be prettier. It has bike lanes and the greenery, but that's it. We also thought all that green space would be an inefficient use of space.

Comment: Historically, we are learning from our mistakes. SW 8th Street used to be like that and it didn't work.

Vilma Croft: Does anyone want to talk about their pros and cons for this one?

Comment: This alternative is more pedestrian friendly, but that's about it. It's only good for people on foot. Obviously, there's no parking and no transit.

Question: Can there be combinations that have parking on both sides of the street?

Vilma Croft: Yes, once we have selected two alternatives out of the four we can look at the typical section elements.

Comment: The three-lane reversed option and the two-way were the least popular for us.

Question: Why did you rate the reversed lanes alternative as the worst alternative when that's what already exists?

Comment: We agree that people in the morning go into the Brickell area and at night they come out of the Brickell area. Imagine people driving through SW 8th street at night, which is a bigger street, causing accidents because they can't see.

Comment: There would be major disruption during construction to switch two major corridors in order for vehicles to travel in the opposite direction.

Comment: I see what you're saying. I agree.

Vilma Croft: This alternative shows bike lanes right now but, we can take out the bikes and put in parking. Some of the cons are that when you switch the traffic direction, the maintenance of traffic is not as easy. It would be difficult to reduce the construction zone and change the traffic patterns. Environmentally, there could be potential contamination issues. You would have to excavate to add new poles for signals.

We need to remember the interchange at I-95. This alternative would provide a new off ramp onto SW 8th Street. It's shown as the green and orange ramp on the slide illustration. Some of the pros for this alternative would be better access from I-95 and some of the cons would be that the intersection on SW 3rd Avenue is already congested.

Let' discuss the three-lane reversed alternative. Do you have any pros and cons for this alternative?

Comment: It's like what we said before - it's not a favorite.

Vilma Croft: All the signal poles would be on the wrong side of the street and would have to be replaced. For pros, the access from Brickell would be better because you won't have to make a left turn but access to Brickell would be worst.

Comment: I'll just say the one positive would be that people shop at night, not in the morning, so businesses would benefit when people are on their way home from work.

Comment: There's also more traffic at a lower visibility time. Not everybody is shopping, a lot of people are just going home.

Comment: Talking about low visibility. Basically, Little Havana has highway lighting (35-foot cobra lights) and it gives an eerie effect. People were complaining about light spill. I counted from 27th Avenue down to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and, except for one little area around the Ball and Chain, you have one pedestrian-scale street lamp on each side of a block. If you want people to pull over, they're not going to pull over in those conditions. Street lights should be another factor in your alternative.

Questions: Are the safety flashing lights going to be taken out with the new project?

Vilma Croft: The flashing lights will not be taken out with this project.

Comment: We had been told that if they were at odds with what was being done with this project, the flashing lights would be removed.

Vilma Croft: Most of the flashing lights are at the mid-block crossings, so I don't think they would be impacted. For the three-lane reversed alternative, we would need to change the access at I-95. We would have a new on-ramp at SW 7th Street and a new on-ramp at SW 8th Street that would eliminate the existing ramps. Some of the pros are safety improvements and some of the cons are right of way impacts. In the existing configuration, the three-lane alternative, some of the pros would be that maintenance of traffic would be a lot easier than some of the other alternatives. Did anyone come up with pros or cons for this alternative?

Question: Have you looked at additional crossings? Right now, one of the issues is, to make it into Brickell, the sidewalks along SW 8th Street cross the interchange at I-95 with cars traveling at high speeds and turning. It's very dangerous. Have you looked at any details on how to make this better? The study says that pedestrian safety is a priority.

Vilma Croft: We are still at the beginning of the study. Once we have two build alternatives, then we will focus on more details. Most of the intersections near I-95 are high-crash locations. We will be looking at that in more detail when we do the safety analysis.

Comment: Accidents happen when there are conflicts between two cars. The fatality rate is lower than when there is a conflict between a car and a pedestrian or a car and a bicycle. When you have additional lanes and additional access to I-95, you potentially increase the possibility of conflicts. Minimizing the number of turns, the number of lanes, access and slowing vehicles down. It would be one solution for safety improvements.

Carlos Alba: Separating cars from pedestrians altogether is what that particular option indicates.

Question: Would there be eminent domain on that one?

Vilma Croft: Yes, additional right of way would be needed for the new ramps.

Question: Would the new ramps be between 8th Avenue and 9th Avenue?

Vilma Croft: The ramps would be within the limited access right of way, but it would be necessary to evaluate the drainage and other elements. The three-lane alternative would also have improved access to I-95. The improvements would include a new ramp on SW 7th Street. There would also be a free-flow ramp. That would be a safety improvement because there is a lot of friction between the traffic that wants to get onto I-95 and the traffic that wants to continue eastbound. With this option, you wouldn't have to compete with the traffic that wants to get onto I-95. That would separate the traffic movement and improve safety. Since this is preliminary, the right of way and the cost for this ramp has not been evaluated yet. It might be that we would keep the three-lane alternative and not construct the ramp, due to high costs.

Question: Why do we have to choose on the ramps for I-95? Why does that have to be a part of the project we are reviewing?

Comment: If we change the flow of traffic, then the exits to I-95 will change.

Vilma Croft: We may keep the existing configuration and not build the new ramp. The ramp would need right of way acquisition and it would be costly to build. We could keep the two-lane configuration and only make revisions to the bottom ramp. We may not need to build two ramps. This will be evaluated as a separate analysis from the arterial roadway.

Comment: You would have a ramp going from SW 7th Street onto I-95. Is that correct? Right now you have to turn down 3rd Avenue and then turn onto the ramp on SW 8th street to get on I-95. Where is the SW 8th Street ramp?

- Vilma Croft: Part of the reason for these improvements is because the intersections along I-95 are on the high-crash list. Separating the movements is considered a safety measure. Right now, to get onto I-95, you have to make a left onto SW 8th Street. The ramp on the bottom is what we call a free-flow ramp. If you're coming in on 4th Avenue, traffic coming to I-95 has to move over three lanes. By moving the vehicles that are going eastbound, you create less friction. If you're going eastbound on the orange ramp (illustrated on the slide) you won't have to stop at the signal. That's an advantage for the person not going onto I-95 to take that lane. It would avoid the conflict between the person that wants to go eastbound and the person that wants to get onto I-95.
- Comment: Just a reminder, it's taking a high-speed movement into a pedestrian zone. It's already been voted on and approved by the City Commission and County Commission to reduce speeds to 25 mph for this entire area. You're encouraging the free-flow movement from the interstate, so people could continue at high speed coming into a downtown corridor.
- Comment: If you don't build that ramp on SW 8th Street and leave it the way it is right now and then build the ramp on SW 7th Street? Wouldn't that still lessen traffic on SW 8th Street?
- Vilma Croft: It would improve safety at those intersections.
- Comment: Why not consider it? If we choose reverse or not, it wouldn't affect that.
- Vilma Croft: If we reverse the travel lanes, the geometry for that ramp is not correct. This geometry is for the traffic that is going west. Are there any more questions? Does anybody have any favorite alternatives? We already know the least favorite for one group. Do the others have a least favorite?
- Comment: The two-way is probably the least favorite for our group.
- Comment: The alternatives you put before us have made us react badly. Because out of the thirty initial options these are the four worst ones. You're setting up these meetings for traffic, for cars. Of the options you're presenting here, none of them are ones that we would design. They all have some sort of flaw.
- Vilma Croft: Look at the concepts that you like us to analyze further. Then we'll look at the traffic conditions, the typical sections, and the engineering and environmental elements to select the preferred.
- Comment: We see the reverse alternative and two-way alternative as not being viable. We don't need a green area. That leaves the other two for further analysis.
- Comment: Can we bridge the gap between what the community wants and what we think the engineers want from us? If we want this team to study a two-way scenario, regardless of whatever section it is, we know we have a 70-foot right of way on SW 8th Street and a 50-foot right of way on SW 7th Street. Would you like this team to study a two-way scenario?

- Comment: The other alternatives on the table are a two-way alternative and what we have right now with transit, regardless of the section and reverse. So what are the two optimal scenarios?
- Comment: That's just putting them on the table. Not deciding on them right now, but analyzing them to have the best level of comparison: the best two-way and the best three-lane.
- Comment: Decide on the traffic flow and then dissect the 70-foot right of way and decide what would be best for the two-way or the three-way, or whatever. What are the most viable alternatives?
- Comment: If we change one of these roads to go in the opposite direction, look at Flagler Street and what's happened there, and the direction hasn't been changed. We're talking about facing the opposite way, changing street lights, changing poles, and intersections. Holes would have to be bigger and the sidewalk would be reduced.
- Comment: The problem is money and the FDOT.
- Comment: No, it's not money. It's more time to build and more inconvenience for the local businesses.
- Comment: We don't need more time to build, we need more time to study.
- Comment: If we have to change the signal poles because the flow of traffic has changed, then it would take additional time and have more impact on businesses.
- Question: Is there a preference for traffic flow? Is there a preference to keep the traffic flow as it is right now, or is there a preference to add transit?
- Comment: Our preferences right now are two-lanes plus transit, two-way, three lanes reversed and three lanes. Can we mesh the two-lane transit plus the three-lane alternative? I think we are all in agreement that reversing the flow is not an option. If we eliminate that one and mesh the other two, those would be our alternatives. Then we can look at the best plans: having parking or not, having bike lanes or not, etc. That way we can leave this meeting with having narrowed down something.
- Comment: That's narrowing it down, and that's good for the FDOT, but I still think there are options we have not looked at. Some which have been done all over the world.
- Comment: I think it was a good idea to eliminate the transit on SW 8th Street. Use SW 7th Street for the transit, eliminate the bypass on SW 7th Street and then creating an alternative where the transit goes in one direction in the morning and in the other direction in the afternoon.
- Comment: We could analyze a Lincoln Road alternative.
- Comment: There would not be a transit lane on SW 8<sup>th</sup> Street. You could have parking on both sides of the street. You already have two bike lanes on SW 8th Street, so having another bike lane on

SW 7th Street would be unnecessary. Take out that bike lane and you can increase the transit lane. Now the bus, to be faster, would be coming into the city in the morning and out of the city at night. The traffic lanes don't switch directions, only the transit lane.

Vilma Croft: Remember, you wanted those bike lanes to become parking.

Comment: I know 6th Street is not your responsibility, but you should look at SW 6th Street. I know, it's not an FDOT road. But, when you do your study, you have to keep in mind that SW 6th Street, even if it's not yours, is a two-way street going west.

Vilma Croft: We have some residents on SW 6th Street that were concerned with the possibility that some traffic would be diverted onto SW 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

Comment: I think we should try to advance this. When we did 17th and got behind that, there were five options from do nothing to the extreme. I think we can do something here. The first two options are the ones I think you've taken out. Then we have the two-lane and three-lane alternatives. I think that makes sense. So we have a three-lane traffic. . .

Comment: Where the traffic changes, that's fine. Then we have a two-way and you can consider that. The other option is the more drastic one, which is the reverse and that has a big gamut of stuff where you can look at the iterations.

Vilma Croft: I thought the group did not see a benefit on the reverse traffic flow.

Comment: Not reversed, but reversible.

Vilma Croft: Just the transit lane would be reversed?

Comment: Why not throw that in and look at it. You would have five options there.

Comment: I like the suggestion for SW 7th Street, which is getting rid of the bicycle lane and creating two transit lanes that would alternate. In the morning, buses would travel in one direction and, in the afternoon, they would switch over to the other side, so people would get off the bus on that side of the street. The lane that was used for transit in the morning would become an automobile lane in the afternoon.

Comment: You would still have transit. If you change it to the left side and you're coming west, the bus has to have a door to let people get out on that side.

Comment: That's why we're saying create two transit lanes that would be reversible at certain times.

Comment: The other option is on SW 7th Street. To keep it like it is, but have a three-foot shoulder, or a concrete island adjacent to the transit lane so that people could cross from the bus stop and then get on from the other side.

- Comment: We need to see this as a whole system. The FDOT is working on a plan for the whole area.
- Comment: Yes, the plan is online.
- Comment: Are you also looking at the one-way streets between SW 7th Street and SW 8th Street? Is that part of the study or not? Some of those streets should not to be one-way. That is an issue too.
- Comment: The side streets are not FDOT roads.
- Question: Has there been a study where all three bodies worked together, FDOT, county and city?
- Comment: I think that happened once, but a lot more information would have to be gathered to make those avenues two-way streets. If they want to see those streets go two-way they would have to bring it to the attention of the commissioner of that district.
- Question: Is anybody opposed to the FDOT using the three-lane alternative and the two-way alternative to develop and research all the different concepts: with or without parking, with bike lanes or whatever? Should they use those two models and do more evaluations?
- Comment: The two-lane plus transit is essentially the three-lane alternative, but you're sometimes allocating one of the lanes for transit and vice versa, so you have different versions of that.
- Comment: I don't believe there should be any dedicated lane for transit.
- Comment: There could be two different designs, one with a dedicated lane. That way we could look at the different options.
- Comment: Don't waste your time because we won't look at anything without parking.
- Question? Does everyone want three lanes of traffic? Is that accurate? If you remove the transit lane, does everyone still want three lanes of traffic?
- Comment: Some of the models will have a designated transit lane, and some of the models will not.
- Comment: I understand that it's not that pretty. I don't know how traffic is going to go down getting in and out of the neighborhood. Traffic is pretty thick in there.
- Comment: One of the models actually showed a reduction of traffic over time, because of the Dolphin Expressway and people not getting off on 22nd Street.
- Comment: I don't know if I buy that.
- Question: What about the increasing population density?

Question: Can people cross into the transit lane?

Vilma Croft: Automobiles cannot use the transit lane

Question: How do the businesses that are next to that travel lane have customers come into their business?

Vilma Croft: Automobiles can't use the transit lane for traveling but they can use it for turning. When you turn, you turn from that lane. I know they have dedicated transit lanes in Orlando and people are very respectful of the transit lane.

Question: In the two-lane plus transit option, I see the arrows going one way and then they go the other way, why is that?

Vilma Croft: Is called a contraflow lane. Transit travels in the opposite direction.

Comment: Does that mean the transit goes in one direction and the traffic goes in the other direction?

Vilma Croft: They did a lot of public involvement and found that it was the best scenario for this option.

Comment: In that scenario, could you come up with iterations?

Comment: The reason I asked is because I just noticed the arrows and that would make more sense on SW 7th Street. You don't need to have the time-lapse. Right now you have two lanes going west on SW 7th Street, but the bus is going east. That's good because people can cross and go to SW 8th Street. That would reduce the fatalities in crossing because the bus would leave you on the south side of SW 7th Street going to SW 8th Street. This is all very confusing: the meetings, the presentation, etc.

Comment: I think we need to discuss whether or not we're satisfied with selecting two alternatives now or should we come back to the table with options that are clearer?

Comment: They're going to take the two alternatives that we're selecting. They're going to do additional evaluations and bring back different examples of the two alternatives we select.

Comment: Which ones are we selecting?

Comment: What we are recommending is folding the two-lane plus transit into the three-lane alternative as it exists. There are three lanes of moving cars, but in some of the versions they show us, we can have designated transit lanes and in other versions we don't need designated transit lanes. They will come back with different options. The other alternative is the two-way lanes. They will incorporate different things. You need to make sure there is parking.

Questions: Do we agree with the two-way option?

Comment: Personally, I don't think that's a viable option. But, at the same time, if we're going to pay people to look at stuff . . .

Comment: We had that in the 80's and it didn't work.

Comment: When you say it didn't work in the 80's, Little Havana was totally different then. Miami was totally different. If you look at the two-way, you should look at the two-way on SW 7th Street and on SW 8th Street. It would have to be two-way on both streets.

Comment: We'll see what that does in terms of traffic.

Question: Are you doing an analysis of the parking on the corridor? Are there parking counts or parking volumes? I'm asking because that is a typical thing that FDOT would do during a PD&E process. At least they did that with Flagler Street and 1st Street. Considering that you're doing LOS for travel lanes, for bicycles and pedestrians, parking is obviously the highest priority for a lot of people, so maybe you should do a LOS for parking.

Question: Do you think that the City Planning Department can assist with a study of parking deficiencies?

Comment: I don't work for the Planning Department so I am not sure.

Vilma Croft: At the next PAG meeting we can start showing the two options with parking and without parking. We'll run what we call the 2040 model for traffic, and then look at what would happen with two lanes or three lanes. We won't be able to do the final traffic analysis until the mid-year 2017.

Comment: I would like to get a copy of the meeting minutes. I have to send them to our representative and tell him exactly what we have discussed.

Vilma Croft: The minutes will be uploaded on the website. I think I sent the minutes from the last PAG meeting as an attachment to the meeting invitation. I can send them to you again.

I like to thank you for coming and participating in the PAG. I know it was a long meeting, but we had a great discussion.

### END OF MEETING SUMMARY

This meeting summary is not a word-for-word transcript, but is a summary of the comments. If you feel that clarifications are necessary, or if this differs from your understanding, please notify Eileen LaSeur by telephone at 407-883-8257 or by email at [eileen.laseur@qcausa.com](mailto:eileen.laseur@qcausa.com) within five (5) working days upon receipt of this summary.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Katie Gant	President of Roads Neighborhood Assn.
David Henderson	MPO
JOSE CASANOVA	ARCHITECT - URBAN PLANNER
Joe Penna	Miami Dade College
Hernando Vesquez	Miami Dade College
LUISANA Perez	STATE SENATOR Jose' Javier Rodriguez
FRANK SCANDMAN	SELF
Raissa Fernandez	Resident (Business owner)
<b>DAVID COLLINS</b>	<b>L.M. BID</b>
MIGUEL SOLIMAN	RESIDENT
Brenda Belancourt	Repr. David Richardson
Marc O'Keefe	HNTB
Steve Wright	SELF - live in area
David Snow	City of Miami (Planning)
Collin Worth	City of Miami (Transportation)
Miles Marcotte	CURTIS + ROGERS Landscape Arch.
Jennifer Lorente	Miami-Dade County / Next Streets M.
Carlos Faust Miranda	Artist
JORGE TORRES	Business Owner
Aida Curtis	Curtis + Rogers Design
Jacob Lafere	Curtis + Rogers Design Studio
JUAN MULLERAT	PLUSURBIA DESIGN
ISABEL GONZALEZ	QCA

NAME

REPRESENT

Carlos A. Alba

HNTB

WINSTON HARRIS

RS&H

VILMA CROFT

HNTB

ARMANDO ARIAS

HNTB

IVETTE FONTANELLAS

FDOT

BAOYING WANG

FDOT