



## Project Advisory Group (PAG) Hybrid Meeting No. 9

Date: Thursday, February 3, 2022  
Time: 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.  
Location: In person: Shenandoah Park, 1800 SW 21 Avenue, Miami, Florida 33145  
Virtual at: <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com>  
Call in at: (631) 992-3221 and Access Code: 737-241-162

### MEETING SUMMARY

Maria Camacho, Public Involvement Coordinator from Quest, opened the meeting by welcoming attendees and offering instructions to online attendees on how to participate on the virtual meeting.

#### **Maria Camacho:**

Before we start the presentation, I will share a few items to help you participate in this meeting, and for those of you participating online on your computer or device screen, you should see something that looks like what is shown on the right-hand side of the screen. All online attendees will be placed in listen only mode throughout the meeting, except for the open discussion session.

Please use the raise hand button on the panel to provide a comment. We ask that you provide your name and address before you begin. You will have three minutes to ask questions or provide comments so that everyone who wants to participate is provided the opportunity. If you prefer to listen by phone, select telephone in the audio pane of the control panel, and dial in using the information displayed.

The meeting is being recorded and will be available after the meeting. If you are participating by phone, you will not be able to provide comments during the meeting, please contact Jose Velez at 786-510-6113, or e-mail, [Jose.Velez@QCAusa.com](mailto:Jose.Velez@QCAusa.com) for assistance.

Tonight's presentation is available at [www.fdotmiamidade.com/calleochostudy](http://www.fdotmiamidade.com/calleochostudy) and it's also available on the GoToWebinar site. Title VI information was relayed to the attendees. The Florida Department of Transportation is required to comply with various nondiscrimination laws and regulations including Title Six of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Comments or questions can be submitted at any time during the meeting, we will take questions from the PAG members during the presentation. We kindly ask all others to allow us to hold your questions until the end of the presentation. If we are unable to respond to your question today, we will provide responses following the meeting. Before I turn it over to the presenters, I would like to take a moment to thank the PAG members for their commitment to the project. As many of you know, the PAG was established early in the project to serve as a special resource to the project team.

Members are selected with the assistance of local governments, and it is comprised of local persons having an active role in the community, as well as representatives from the city, county, regional, and neighborhood groups. The group has met throughout the life of the PD&E phase to assist in the evaluation of proposed transportation alternatives. And to ensure that these alternatives are developed in the best interest of the local community, as well as our roadway users. It is not a decision-making body and carries no authority. Thank you.

**Bao-Ying Wang, P.E., FDOT Project Manager:**

Good evening, my name is Bao-Ying Wang. I am The Project Manager for the Florida Department Transportation here with me tonight is the consultant team, as well as other FDOT staff members either here in person or attending virtually.

Tonight, is the Project Advisory Group meeting for the State Road 90/SW 8 Street and SW 7 Street PD&E study. The presentation includes project description, project alternatives, preferred alternative, and the next steps. What's going to happen after we complete the study?

Since the last Project Advisory Group meeting held, we have selected a Preferred Alternative which includes the closure of SW 4 Avenue at SW 7 Street. This is the first time we will be discussing the closure of SW 4 Avenue. There will be more details presented in the upcoming slides.

The project corridor includes SW 8 Street and SW 7 Street from SW 27 Avenue to Brickell Avenue, including the I-95 interchange. SW 8 Street as you are already familiar, is one-way eastbound into the downtown Brickell area with sidewalks and parking on both sides of the street. SW 7 Street is one-way westbound from Brickell with sidewalks on both sides. SW 8 Street between Brickell Avenue and the Palmetto Expressway, as well as Brickell Avenue from the Miami River south to SW 25 Road are designated State Historical Highways. This designation prohibits some, or certain changes onto the roadway without approval from the Department of State.

The purpose and need of the PD&E Study includes safety. The Study will evaluate how best to improve safety, traffic operations, multimodal level of service, access to the urban central business districts, and multimodal connectivity.

There are three components of a PD&E Study: engineering, environmental, and public involvement. The No Build alternative, which means that the corridor remains in its current existing condition is the base line from which all other alternatives are compared against. We also evaluated a Transportation Systems Management and Operations alternative, and eight build alternatives.

Vilma Croft is the project manager from HNTB. She will discuss the specific details of the alternatives evaluated.

**Vilma Croft, P.E., Consultant Project Manager:**

As part of this PD&E Study, we evaluated the No Build alternative, which means no expenditure of funds. It maintains the existing roadway configuration with no impacts to maintenance of traffic or the environment. However, the No Build alternative does not address the Purpose and Need of the project. There will be no improvements along SW 8 or SW 7 Street or access improvements to I-95. The corridor will remain as is.

**Question:** If the project chooses the No Build alternative, will it affect I-95?

**Vilma Croft:** The No Build alternative means nothing is done at all on this project and everything remains as is. No build is always the basis that we compare all the other alternatives against.

The TSM&O or Transportation Systems Management and Operations includes minor improvements like signal timing. Again, there will be no impacts, because it's minor improvements, but then, again, it does not address the Purpose and Need of the project. We looked at eight built alternatives. All the build alternatives, as I mentioned, include improvements at the I-95 interchange.

Due to the dense nature of both SW 8 Street and SW 7 Street, the build alternatives did not consider pavement widening, widening the existing roadway width was considered not feasible.



Alternative 1 is a two-way alternative, proposes one lane in each direction with a center turn lane. Both SW 7 Street and SW 8 Street will be converted to two-way traffic, only one lane in each direction, and a center turn lane.

Alternative 2 is also a two-way alternative. Again, one lane in each direction, but instead of having a center turn lane, we looked at a transit only lane. The concern with this alternative is that it would impact the parking to provide turn lanes at the signalized intersections. Since you only have one lane in each direction, every time someone would need to make a left turn it would block traffic. To avoid congestion, we evaluated turn lanes at the signalized intersections, since widening the existing pavement is not feasible, we estimated approximately 60% of the parking will be impacted.

Alternative 2A is somewhat similar to Alternative 2. However, instead of having a transit only lane, we would have a buffer bike lane. The existing travel lanes are 11 feet. A buffer bike lane requires 7 feet – 4 feet for the bike lane and 3 feet for the buffer area. The remaining four feet would be used to widen the sidewalk.

We proposed widening the sidewalk on the opposite side of the bike lane to provide pedestrians the same kind of buffer from traffic.

Alternative 3 is a one-way alternative with two travel lanes where SW 8 Street will be used for the eastbound traffic as it exists today, and SW 7 Street will be used for the westbound traffic. The 3<sup>rd</sup> travel lane will be repurposed for a buffered bike lane.

Alternative 3A is a hybrid, where we would have a shared parking and travel lane. During peak hours, we have three travel lanes, and during non-peak hours that lane would be used as a parking lane. The outside lane will be converted to an 11-foot travel lane. This alternative would require reconstruction to remove the pedestrian islands. We would have to correct the slope of the outside lane to be able to convert it from a parking to a travel lane. It provides the opportunity to have a buffered bike lane and still have the three travel lanes during peak hours.

Alternative 4 maintains the existing configuration with the three travel lanes eastbound along SW 8 Street with parking and sidewalks on both sides. SW 7 Street with three travel lanes westbound with sidewalks on both sides. However, as I mentioned before, all the built alternatives include improvements at I-95, so even though this alternative maintains SW 8 Street and SW 7 Street as is, it includes improvements at the I-95 interchange. That's the difference between Alternative 4 and the No Build Alternative.

**Question:** Does Alternative 4 include any construction along the arterial for drainage or any of that?

**Vilma Croft:** With Alternative 4, there will be no construction along SW 7 and SW 8 Street. The only construction will be in the I-95 interchange area.

Alternative 5 is what we call the reverse flow alternative. We maintain the sidewalk and the parking, but we switch where SW 8 Street will be used for the westbound traffic and SW 7 Street will be used for the eastbound traffic. Although this alternative maintains the number of travel lanes, sidewalks and parking, it requires reconstruction to replace all the mast arms to the opposite side of the street.

Alternate 6 combines two of the alternatives. Along SW 8 Street it is similar to Alternative 3A where we have the shared parking and travel lane. The shared travel and parking lane gives us the ability to provide a buffered bike lane. On SW 7 Street, since there is no parking, we do not have that option, we repurposed one travel lane for a buffered bike lane. This alternative provides a buffered bike lane on both SW 7 Street and SW 8 Street.

The engineering and environmental analysis as well as public involvement resulted in Alternative 4 selected as the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4 maintains the existing configuration on SW 7 Street and SW 8 Street, but it includes improvements at the I-95 interchange. Since we maintain the existing configuration along SW 8 and SW 7 Street, there will be no planned construction between SW 27 Avenue and SW 4 Avenue as part of the PD&E

Study's recommended improvements.

**Question:** With the proposed improvements, will there be any additional pedestrian crosswalks along SW 7 Street?

**Vilma Croft:** FDOT just completed a safety study along SW 7 Street, I am not sure if the study recommended any of the pedestrian crossings. Let's also answer some questions from online.

**Web Question:** I am very concerned that there is no bike lane connection from SW 7 Street or SW 8 Street Coral Way to the Underline. How does this study fit into FDOT's overall bicycle-pedestrian masterplan? If we want to create a multimodal network this does not exceed at that.

**Vilma Croft:** We did look at alternatives that included a buffered bike lane. There were several alternatives that included the buffered bike lane. Due to the engineering analysis, those alternatives, were not considered safe in terms of congestion. It created a lot of diversion of traffic into the paralleled roadways. The FDOT District Secretary is committed to working with the City of Miami to look for options for bike lanes within parallel corridors. For this study, the right of way is constrained, and those options that included a bike lane were determined to be not feasible.

**Web Question:** What was the criteria you used in identifying the Preferred Decision? Were certain factors given more weight than others? The preferred option seems to have no benefit for pedestrians and cyclists or those utilizing public transportation, which is a large portion of the little Havana community.

**Vilma Croft:** As mentioned, there were options that widened the sidewalk. There were alternatives that looked at buffered bike lanes but based on the analysis, and there was extensive analysis that was done, the preferred alternative is to maintain the existing configuration. That was based on engineering as well as public involvement. Once we had a preferred alternative for the arterial, we focused on I-95. The reason for doing so was to reduce the number of alternatives. For I-95, we looked at the No Build and seven build alternatives.

Alternative B-1, we looked at an elevated on-ramp from SW 7 Street and an elevated off ramp to SW 8 Street. There were a lot of concerns with the geometry of the off ramp.

I-95 is very high in this area so to be able to touch down to the existing elevation at SW 8 Street, the grade was very steep coming into a signalized intersection. It was determined that the off-ramp geometry had safety concerns and this alternative was dropped from further analysis.

Alternative B-2 looked at just the elevated on-ramp. This alternative continued through the process as a viable alternative.

Alternative B-3 looked at the southbound off ramp to SW 8 Street. Similar to Alternative B1, this alternative was deemed non-viable due to the geometric concerns to be able to tie onto SW 8 Street.

Alternative B-4 looked at an at-grade solution. In lieu of an elevated ramp, we looked at converting SW 3 Avenue into one way to facilitate the entrance to I-95. Converting SW 3 Avenue to one way southbound improves access to I-95.

Alternative B-5 looked at the same I-95 elevated on ramp at SW 7 Street and an at-grade solution for the off ramp since the elevated off ramp had geometric concerns. This option also had geometric concerns since the radius are very sharp. We have the existing I-95 bridge piers, going around the piers was just not ideal. There were concerns with being able to turn at SW 3 Avenue and SW 2 Avenue. This alternative was considered not viable.

Alternative B-6 looked at just the at-grade solution. Similarly, to B-5, this alternative was determined not viable.

Alternative B-7, we looked at the elevated on-ramp from SW 7 Street, as well as some at-grade solutions. We evaluated the closure of SW 4 Avenue at SW 7 Street. This alternative maintains that elevated on ramp from SW 7 Street to I-95 and proposes the closure of SW 4 Avenue at SW 7 Street. SW 4 Avenue and SW 3 Avenue will be converted into two-way traffic so that anyone living in the residential complex will be able to come in and go out and be able to go westbound on SW 7 Street. SW 4 Avenue will be a dead-end street. Access to westbound SW 7 Street will be provided from SW 3 Avenue.

**Web Question:** Medieval cities work with right of way constraints and still have protected bike lanes.

**Vilma Croft:** I don't believe there might have been as much traffic in medieval cities and the analysis conducted back in medieval times may possibly not have been as detailed as the analysis we have done during this study.

**Web Question:** Are the results of the analysis able to be shared?

**Vilma Croft:** This presentation is posted on the project website; we will be posting the Preliminary Engineering Report prior to the Public Hearing. We have done a lot of public involvement, especially some of the PAG members that have attended these meetings from the beginning of the project. This is our ninth PAG meeting. We have also coordinated with elected officials and worked very closely with the City of Miami and Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works. We have presented to all the Miami-Dade TPO subcommittees, also including the Transportation Aesthetic Committee and CTAC, the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee.

For next steps, we are looking to go to Public Hearing to finish the study in the fall. The project will be advancing to design.

This concludes the presentation, are there any comments or questions? You can also send us an email or call, or post questions or comments on the project website.

Thank you for attending and participating in the PAG meeting tonight.

### END OF MEETING SUMMARY

This meeting summary is not a word-for-word transcript; it is a summary. If you feel that clarifications are necessary, or if this differs from your understanding, please notify Maria Camacho by telephone at 305-731-7699 or by email at [maria.camacho@gcausa.com](mailto:maria.camacho@gcausa.com) within five (5) working days upon receipt of this summary.

### LIST OF ATTENDEES

#### In-Person Attendees

- PAG - Brenda Betancourt, Calle 8 Inter-American Chamber of Commerce - President/Poderosa Radio, US & Latin Veterans Support Embassy, Fausto Commercial Consultant Business Development, 1436 SW 6 Street, Miami FL 33135, 786-523-1310, [brenda1betancourt@gmail.com](mailto:brenda1betancourt@gmail.com)
- Mark A. Tobin, Greenberg Traurig (a property owner's lawyer), 333 SE 2 Avenue, 305-389-2111, [tobinm@gtlaw.com](mailto:tobinm@gtlaw.com)
- Ron Nelson, Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works, Special Projects Administrator, (former chief of staff for Miami Commissioner Marc D. Sarnoff), 786 469-5018, [ronnelson@me.com](mailto:ronnelson@me.com)
- Fernando Harb, Calle Ocho Chamber (also Spotlight Hospitality Group), 954-864-0714, [fernando@spotlighthospitalitygroup.com](mailto:fernando@spotlighthospitalitygroup.com)
- BaoYing Wang, FDOT, Project Manager, 305-470-5211, [BaoYing.Wang@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:BaoYing.Wang@dot.state.fl.us)
- Vilma Croft, HNTB, Consultant Project Manager, 305-222-1457, [vcroft@HNTB.com](mailto:vcroft@HNTB.com)
- Maria Camacho, Quest, Public Involvement, 305-731-7699, [Maria.Camacho@QCAusa.com](mailto:Maria.Camacho@QCAusa.com)
- Jose Velez, Quest, Public Involvement, 786-510-6113, [Jose.Velez@QCAusa.com](mailto:Jose.Velez@QCAusa.com)
- Sergies Duarte, Quest, Public Involvement, 305-216-3617, [Sergies.Duarte@QCAusa.com](mailto:Sergies.Duarte@QCAusa.com)

#### Web Virtual Attendees

- Barbara Culhane, FDOT, District VI Cultural Resources Coordinator/Environmental Supervisor, [Barbara.Culhane@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Barbara.Culhane@dot.state.fl.us)
- Victoria Vogt, FDOT, Environmental Specialist III, [Victoria.Vogt@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Victoria.Vogt@dot.state.fl.us)
- Juan Carlos Martin, Quest, Public Involvement, [Juan.Martin@QCAusa.com](mailto:Juan.Martin@QCAusa.com)
- David Alberts, Quest, IT Support, [David.Alberts@QCAusa.com](mailto:David.Alberts@QCAusa.com)
- PAG - Daniel Rodriguez, Resource Officer Brickell Neighborhood, [5964@miami-police.org](mailto:5964@miami-police.org)
- PAG - Jed Royer, Miami Shenandoah Neighborhood Association, [Jed@royerdesign.com](mailto:Jed@royerdesign.com)
- PAG - Sofia Cuenca Aguirre on behalf of Michael Roman, Healthy Living Little Havana, [sofia@healthylittlehavana.org](mailto:sofia@healthylittlehavana.org)
- Meg Daly, Underline founder, [meg.daly@theunderline.org](mailto:meg.daly@theunderline.org)
- Matt Irvine, Production Manager at Mesimer and Associates (St. Petersburg), [matt@mesimer.com](mailto:matt@mesimer.com)
- Truett Hall, Policastro Law Group, [truett@policastrolaw.com](mailto:truett@policastrolaw.com)
- Mari Chael, architect and urbanist, [mchael@chaelcooper.com](mailto:mchael@chaelcooper.com)
- Jacqueline Gonzalez, Greenberg Traurig, [gonzalezjac@gtlaw.com](mailto:gonzalezjac@gtlaw.com)

