



SUBJECT

Krome Avenue South PD&E Study – 7th CAC Meeting

DATE & TIME

January 24, 2006
6:15 PM – 9:00 PM

LOCATION

Miami-Dade County
John D. Campbell Agricultural Center
18710 S.W. 288th Street
Miami, Florida

ATTENDEES

CAC Members:

- Katie Edwards, DCFB/Rep. Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce
- Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon Society
- Mike Hatcher, CTAC
- Medora Krome, Concerned Citizens Farmers and Nurserymen
- Bill Losner, Citizen Activist
- Paul Mulhern, Grove Inn and Country Guest House
- Miguel Uzquiano, FNGA
- John Wade, Citizen Activist
- Pat Wade, Redlands Citizens Association
- Pamela Gray, Redlands Edge
- Alice Peña, The United Property Owners of the 8.5 Square Mile Area
- Brian Kimball, Florida City State Farmers
- Mary Finlan, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce
- Dewey Steele, Tropical Fruit Growers of South Florida

Public Attendance:

- John Arrieta
- Sidney Robinson
- Mayantti Bakin
- Arlene Samalion
- Charlie McGarey
- Bill Enright





Project Team:

Monica Diez, FDOT-D6
Phil Steinmiller, FDOT-D6
Susanne Travis, FDOT-D6
Rafael Montalvo, FCRC
Richard Garcia, RGA
Julio Boucle, URS
Raj Shanmugam, URS
Ana Sandoval, URS
Mike Ciscar, TCG
Ryan Solis-Rios, TCG
Barbie Rodriguez, TCG

MEETING SUMMARY

The following is a summary of the meeting:

- Mr. Montalvo initiated the meeting by giving a brief description of the items listed in the agenda. He presented a summary of the previous meeting and reiterated the fact that the CAC will not be making recommendations.
- Mr. Ciscar gave an overview of the project status and explained that since the last meeting, the Team had been working on a request for a design exception which was eventually denied by Tallahassee.
- Mr. Montalvo explained that the minutes of the meetings can be modified if anyone feels that their comments have not been properly documented.
- Mr. Montalvo went over the different topics contained in the draft document of the Summary of Citizens Advisory Committee Perspectives.
- Page 4 – Safety: Ms. Wade indicated that a significant statistic has not been supplied by the Team to date.
- Page 6: Mr. Losner wanted to clarify if the assumption that the urban development boundary would not be moved (for traffic forecasting purposes) was the County’s assumption.
- Mr. Boucle confirmed that it was.
- Page 7: No comments.
- Page 9: No comments.
- Page 10: No comments.





- Mr. Montalvo explained that comments can be provided at any time during the process – not only during the meetings.
- Mr. Shanmugam explained that there are several traffic simulation programs. The Team used SYNCHRO microsimulation, which uses every vehicle in the traffic network. The network was calibrated and some model adjustments were made to better represent actual conditions.
- Mr. Shanmugam indicated that based on the results of the analysis, the corridor is operating at a good level of service, however, in the future, if no improvements are done in the corridor, the level of service will deteriorate significantly. However, he emphasized the fact that the objective of the study is to improve safety –not traffic operations. The results are presented to ensure that operational improvements will result from the safety improvements (even though it was not the objective that originated the study).
- Ms. Wade asked if the team had looked at the ‘No-build’ scenario with the signal optimization and the intersection improvements that are already programmed.
- Mr. Ciscar explained that the ‘Two-lane’ alternative presented by Mr. Shanmugam was valid for all two-lane scenarios.
- Mr. Wade stated that he was confused with the Level of Service at the intersections. For example, in documents previously submitted by the team, the projected traffic on the side streets at the intersection of SW 296 Street appeared excessively high considering that nothing is being done on the side streets.
- Mr. Hatcher stated that based on his conversations with FHWA in Tallahassee, they do not care about the level of service – safety and the environment is their only concern.
- Mr. Garcia explained that the level of service at the intersections is the result of a weighted average from all the approaches.
- Ms. Gray stated that in the ‘four-lane’ scenario, the delays at the intersection of SW 296 Street are excessive. More than two cycles are required to clear the intersection. Also, she is concerned about the speed limit – a transition section should be provided between the study corridor and the segment in Homestead.
- Mr. Montalvo asked if in fact, Tallahassee didn’t care about the Level of Service.
- Mr. Ciscar replied that he had no knowledge of that.
- Ms. Diez responded that the state looks at everything however for the Krome Avenue project, safety is the main concern.
- Ms. Edwards asked if the funding was already programmed for the four-laning up to SW 296 Street. In which case, she was concerned about the change from four lanes to two lanes at the intersection of SW 296 Street.





- Ms. Diez explained that the funding was programmed, however, this didn't imply that four-laning was a fact. The PD&E study would determine the number of lanes.
- Ms. Edwards asked if the increased traffic presented in the traffic projections was due to the population growth or due to the road widening. "If you build it, they'll come?"
- Mr. Shanmugam answered that it was a combination of both factors: population and safety; which will bring more traffic to Krome Avenue.
- Mr. Losner stated that the study was for Krome Avenue, not for SW 184 St, SW 186 St, etc. He said that some members of the CAC kept bringing up the issue of four-laning as a problem, when in fact, four-lane highways are very common in the state road system.
- Ms. Gray inquired if the 2005 crash information was already available.
- Mr. Shanmugan answered that the information was not yet available.
- Ms. Diez further explained that it takes about 1½ years for the information to be uploaded into the database. She added that the information is available for fatalities only.
- Ms. Gray requested that the fatality information be provided by the team.
- Ms. Wade stated that the existing typical section presented on sheet 6 was misleading because it showed a 5-foot paved shoulder, which was not the case for most of the length of the study corridor.
- Mr. Boucle explained that the shoulder varies from 0 to 5 feet.

Alternative 1

- Ms. Wade indicated that the equestrian path was not a good idea and also added that she thought this had been discarded in the Action Plan.
- Mr. Ciscar informed that the alternatives presented were from the Action Plan final documents.
- Mr. Wade indicated that he was concerned about the loss of agricultural land and agricultural activities with the footprint of the alternatives presented.
- Mr. Ciscar explained that the team had explored the possibility of a design exception that would allow for a reduction in the footprint but this was turned down by the Central Office because Krome Avenue is part of the Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS). Construction on this type of facility must meet the highest standards.
- Mr. Mulhern indicated that his understanding was that federal funds would not be available unless bike paths were provided.





- Ms. Diez explained that the requirement is that bike paths be considered but not necessarily provided.
- Mr. Mulhern reiterated that he was told that no federal funds could be granted if no bicycle paths were provided.
- Mr. Boucle stated that he didn't think that was correct, however, the team would investigate and bring an answer to the next meeting.

Alternative 2

- Mr. Ciscar explained that this alternative meets all the Department's standards, except for the border width, which would require a variation.
- Mr. Losner asked for the location of the passing zones in this alternative.
- Mr. Ciscar answered that this alternative did not include passing zones.
- Mr. Boucle added that turning lanes would be provided at intersections.
- Ms. Krome indicated that a two-lane divided section with no passing zones was very unrealistic.
- Ms. Guerra asked if the median width could be reduced.
- Mr. Ciscar explained that it's possible to reduce the median width if a physical barrier is provided, for example, a guardrail, barrier wall, etc.

Alternative 3

- Mr. Ciscar explained that this alternative was similar to Alternative 2 but with passing zones (staggered). He added that this typical section would only be applicable to the northern portion of the study corridor – between SW 168 Street and SW 136 Street.
- Ms. Krome asked what was the length of passing zones.
- Mr. Boucle responded that this work is in progress.

Alternative 4

- Mr. Ciscar stated that this alternative met all the design standards.

Alternative 5

- Mr. Ciscar stated that this alternative met all the design standards but not the SIS standards.





- Ms. Guerra pointed out that alternatives 4 and 5 were very wide and asked if there would be significant private property impacts and environmental impacts. Were they taken into consideration in the analysis?
- Mr. Ciscar responded that there would be significant impacts. Yes, both the property impacts and environmental impacts are in the analysis.
- Ms. Guerra asked if the information on the impacted properties would be available.
- Mr. Ciscar replied that the information would be available later in the process.
- Ms. Guerra suggested that a cost-benefit analysis be done.
- Mr. Ciscar said it would be done as part of the study.
- Ms. Peña asked if all the businesses along the corridor would be wiped-out.
- Mr. Boucle responded that not necessarily all businesses would be impacted. He explained that as part of the process, different alignments would be considered in an effort to avoid critical parcels.
- Ms. Krome requested an explanation on the recoverable terrain clear zone.
- Mr. Ciscar explained that this is the area adjacent to the road (when there is no curb and gutter) provided for vehicles that loose control, so that they can recover.
- Ms. Krome asked how it is possible to have equestrian paths within the clear zone.
- Mr. Boucle explained that it was possible because they are not considered fixed objects.
- Ms. Peña asked if the elimination of the equestrian trail from alternative 5 would allow for a reduction in the section width.
- Mr. Boucle explained that the section width could not be reduced because the path was part of the border width.
- Ms. Gray indicated that raising the speed to 65 mph could be very dangerous.
- Mr. Ciscar explained that the speed limit would not be raised. Only the design speed would be increased, which means that the team would be designing to the standards for a 65 mph facility but the posted speed limit would continue to be 45 mph.
- Ms. Guerra asked for the reason to design for a 65 mph road instead of 45 mph.
- Mr. Ciscar responded that the reason was that Krome Avenue is part of the FIHS and therefore is required to meet the highest standards.





- Mr. Losner asked what was the usual difference between the design speed and the posted speed?
- Mr. Ciscar responded that the design speed usually is 5 to 10 mph above the speed limit.
- Mr. Losner asked if it's the same for the North side of Krome Avenue.
- Ms. Diez responded yes, the design speed is 65 mph and the posted is 55 mph.
- Ms. Krome asked why the south segment of Krome has a difference of 20 mph between the posted speed and the design speed while the north segment only has a 10 mph difference.
- Mr. Ciscar explained that the difference was due to the type of area.
- Ms. Edwards asked about the mandates for equestrian paths?
- Mr. Ciscar replied that there were none.
- Mr. Wade indicated that an aerial photograph provided by the team at an earlier meeting had a note saying that the right of way was limited in certain areas to 40 feet. Then how can a typical section of 200 feet be accommodated?
- Mr. Boucle explained that right of way acquisition would be necessary and also explained that different alignments would be analyzed – for example shifting the centerline to the west, to the east and/or a meandering alignment.
- Ms. Guerra indicated that introducing a curve would make the road more dangerous.
- Mr. Boucle explained that curves are not unsafe if they are designed to standards.
- Mr. Montalvo asked if the alignments would be available for the next meeting.
- Mr. Boucle responded that most probably they would not.
- Mr. Uzquiano asked what is the right-of-way on Krome Avenue.
- Mr. Mulhern commented that for most of the study corridor, the right-of way is 90 feet.
- Mr. Montalvo asked if the Action Plan alternative involved right of way acquisition.
- Mr. Ciscar responded that this alternative required some right of way acquisition.
- Ms. Diez mentioned that all the intersection improvements being done required right-of way; these are from the Krome Action Plan.
- Ms. Wade asked if there was a statute that mandated that FIHS roads must have four lanes.





- Ms. Diez responded that there is one and that the information is available in the internet at www.myflorida.com
- Mr. Montalvo asked if there would be changes in the alternatives for next meeting.
- Mr. Boucle explained that the changes will consist of modifying the Action Plan alternative to bring it up to standards and the removal of the equestrian path.
- Ms. Krome emphasized that she strongly objects to the equestrian path.
- Ms. Wade requested that the footprints of the alignments be presented with the aerials in the background.
- Mr. Ciscar explained that the alternatives will be presented with the aerials in the background at a large scale and also measurements of right of way acquisition will be provided.
- Mr. Wade asked if the existing right of way can be provided in an aerial photograph.
- Ms. Diez responded that the information would be available later.
- Mr. Ciscar presented a matrix with the criteria used to evaluate the different alternatives.
- Ms. Krome requested an explanation of multi-modal accommodations.
- Mr. Ciscar explained that the term referred to multiple modes of transportation, in this case, the equestrian path and bike path.
- Mr. Hatcher asked if the criteria incorporated NEPA compliance.
- Mr. Boucle responded affirmatively.
- Ms. Guerra asked if there would be any weighting of the different factors in the matrix.
- Mr. Montalvo suggested that the committee members gave their opinion as to the weight that every factor should have.
- Mr. Hatcher stated that they should not be asked to weight the factors. He assumed that there must be some standards to which the team should adhere to.
- Mr. Ciscar explained that there are no standards as far as weighting the criteria. This process is project specific. In this case the order of priorities is: 1) Safety, 2) Preservation of the road, 3) Addition of capacity. He further explained that it is up to the team to make the decision because ultimately they are the ones carrying all the liability.





- Mr. Montalvo reiterated that if any members of the committee would like to express their opinion on the weight that should be assigned to each element, they are welcome to submit their comments and the team will document them for the records.
- Mr. Mulhern indicated that some properties extend to the centerline of the roadway. He asked if this is considered in the right of way acquisition estimates.
- Mr. Ciscar responded that all of that is considered in the estimates.
- Ms. Diez further added that some problems arose when the intersection improvements were being done because although FDOT owns the road and some land beyond the road, some homeowners were paying taxes on land up to the centerline of the roadway.
- Mr. Boucle distributed copies of the response letter from FDOT to Ms. Pat Wade's inquiries regarding safety issues.
- Mr. Montalvo closed the meeting by saying that the team reserves the right of the analysis of the project; however, the committee is welcome to make suggestions on additional criteria that should be evaluated.
- Mr. Boucle added that all reasonable requests would be considered.
- The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.

