



**SUBJECT**

Krome Avenue South PD&E Study – 11<sup>th</sup> CAC Meeting

**DATE & TIME**

March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2007  
6:00 PM – 9:15 PM

**LOCATION**

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

**ATTENDEES**

**CAC Members:**

- Richard Alger, Alger Farms
- Medora Krome, Concerned Citizens Farmers and Nurserymen
- Bill Losner, Citizen Activist
- Brian Kimball, Florida City State Farmers
- Alice Peña, The United Property Owners of the 8.5 Square Mile Area
- Paul Mulhern, Grove Inn and Country Guest House
- Pamela Gray, Redlands Edge
- Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon Society
- Dewey Steele, Tropical Fruit Growers of South Florida
- John Wade, Citizen Activist
- Clara Waterman Power, Greater Homestead/Florida City Chamber of Commerce (Rep. for Mary Finlan)
- Mike Hatcher, CTAC

**Public Attendance:**

- Monica Cejas, EAC
- Patricia Natter, EAC

**Project Team:**

- Vilma Croft, FDOT-D6
- Phil Steinmiller, FDOT-D6
- Andres Berisiarty, FDOT-D6
- Julio Bouclé, URS
- Raj Shanmugam, URS
- Ana Sandoval, URS
- Rafael Montalvo, FCRC
- 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.
- Mr. Bouclé provided an update of the project status. He informed that several reports and documents have been submitted to FDOT for review and explained that the Project Team is currently working on implementing the comments received by the Department. He indicated that the project is expected to be completed next year. Mr. Bouclé reported that the construction cost estimates had increased from the \$62 millions originally estimated to \$90<sup>+</sup> millions and also indicated that the estimates will be revised in August 2007. He informed that the right-of-way cost of the four-lane alternative with the reduced typical was estimated at \$99.3 million last year and that this estimate would be revised this year at the end of the second quarter. He further stated that construction costs have increased significantly in the recent years.
- Mr. Losner inquired if the cost estimates presented were in today’s dollars and if it was right to assume that the cost would be much higher by the time the right-of-way was acquired.
- Mr. Bouclé responded affirmatively and stated that he estimated that the Engineering Design phase of the project would begin approximately in the year 2014 - 2015, the right-of-way acquisition around 2015 and the construction approximately in year 2017. He explained that the construction could be segmented as it was done for the North Krome project which was divided into 5 subsections.
- Mr. Montalvo asked if the reported costs appeared excessively high.
- Mr. Bouclé responded that the costs were indeed very high in his opinion.
- Mr. Mulhern asked for a description of the work and cost of the intersection improvements recently done at several intersections along Krome Avenue.
- Mr. Bouclé explained that the projects included the addition of left turn lanes, shoulder improvements, resurfacing, etc. He will research the costs associated with those improvements.
- Ms. Cejas stated that she was the FDOT Project Manager for the intersection improvement projects and reported that the cost of the projects was approximately \$4.5 millions per intersection. She also indicated that the information was available on the MPO’s webpage.
- Ms. Croft added that the information was also available on FDOT’s webpage.
- Mr. Montalvo further added that Comp Plan decisions and amendments were also available and advised if anyone was interested in this information he would give those directions on where to locate it.
- Mr. Bouclé distributed a crash statistics handout and presented an update of the crash data including years 2004 and 2005.





- Ms. Gray asked if the crash information presented was for the entire Krome corridor or for the south project only.
- Mr. Bouclé clarified that the information was for the south project only.
- Mr. Wade pointed out that the number of injuries had decreased in 2005. Also, he stated that he did not feel comfortable with the way the safety ratio was calculated because it considers the total number of crashes instead of focusing on the fatalities.
- Ms. Waterman Power requested that the crash data handout be revised to clarify the limits of the project and also the source of the information. She further explained that several years from now this information would be very useful for other people reviewing this document.
- Mr. Alger stated that the reduction in the number of injuries can be attributed to many different causes, for example due to the fact that people are now using the seatbelt more than before.
- Mr. Losner added that another reason may be that many people are using alternative roads to avoid Krome Avenue.
- Mr. Wade inquired as to the reason for the increase in the safety ratio from 2.100 in year 2004 to 2.741 in year 2005 when the total number of crashes increased only by seven.
- Ms. Sandoval explained that the safety ratio depends on different variables and not only the number of crashes. Some of the variables involved in the calculations include annual average daily traffic and Florida average crash rate for roads in the same category. She also added that the formulas and variables used in the calculations had been presented at the CAC Meeting No. 5.
- Ms. Gray pointed out that the number of injury crashes had decreased. Also, she added that given that rear-end crashes were the leading type of crashes she couldn't understand how four-laning would help prevent this type of crash.
- Mr. Shanmugam explained that the severity of the crashes may have decreased due to many different factors. For example the fact that we have better vehicles today with enhanced safety features. He also explained that although it may not be everyone's perception, traffic engineering theories and studies indicate that four-laning prevents rear-end crashes. He further added that with one lane in each direction, all vehicles are forced to follow one trail which increases the chances of rear-end impacts.
- Mr. Montalvo distributed Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS) standards and criteria, including Level of Service standards.
- Mr. Alger inquired on the classification of Krome Avenue. He asked if Krome Avenue was considered a "Limited Access" facility.





- Mr. Solis-Rios responded that Krome Avenue was classified as a “Controlled Access” facility. He clarified that the “Limited Access” facilities were the expressways.
- Mr. Shanmugam informed that the definition of “Controlled Access” facility was included in item 13 of the Level of Service handout.
- Mr. Wade asked if the segment of Krome Avenue in Homestead was designed for a speed of at least 50 mph.
- Mr. Solis-Rios and Mr. Bouclé responded that they didn’t know as that segment of Krome Avenue was not part of this study.
- Mr. Wade inquired if it was possible that the design speed rule was not applied to the segment of Krome Avenue in Homestead, however, it was being enforced in the Redland segment.
- Mr. Bouclé presented the plans for Alternative 4 (172-foot typical section). He explained the different elements shown in the plans such as the existing and proposed right-of-way lines, shared-use path, impacted parcels, median openings, etc. The Team would like to receive additional input and comments from the CAC in reference to this alternative.
- Mr. Alger asked if the alternative being presented was final.
- Mr. Bouclé responded that it was not final and explained that the final alternative would be decided after the Public Hearing.
- Ms. Guerra inquired about the reasons for providing a shared-use path. She stated that she thought this would be removed from the plans based on previous requests from the CAC members, especially because it had been a unanimous decision.
- Mr. Bouclé responded that the path had been kept because there was interest from other groups to keep it as part of the Greenway Network. He added that a shared use path will not require additional right of way since it is within the clear zone of the project, it will offer protection to pedestrian and cyclists alike.
- Ms. Guerra asked if the typical section for alternative 4 was the reduced 4-lane typical section.
- Mr. Bouclé explained that the Team had applied for an exception to reduce the design speed of the facility in order to reduce the typical section width, but it was denied by Tallahassee. He also advised that a variation to reduce the border width had been approved by District resulting in some reduction in the typical section width.
- Ms. Guerra pointed out that there wasn’t always land between the existing and proposed right-of-way lines shown in the plans. She asked if the areas were the two lines matched corresponded to land that had already been acquired for the intersection improvements.





- Mr. Solis-Rios responded that it may have been the case in some instances but also it could have been that it was possible to accommodate the typical section within the existing right-of-way due to the meandering alignment.
- Ms. Guerra inquired on the procedure to select the parcels to be impacted when there were similar land uses on both sides of the road. She asked if the impacts were equally distributed between the parcels.
- Mr. Bouclé explained that the impacts were not distributed equally because there were design standards that needed to be followed and the alignment couldn't be shifted abruptly. He advised that efforts had been made to select the best possible alignment while trying to minimize impacts to critical properties.
- Mr. Wade also asked why the shared-use path was needed.
- Mr. Bouclé explained that the path would be contained within the limits of the proposed right-of-way that would be acquired for the project regardless. He also informed that the path had been presented to other boards; i.e., BPAC, TARC, and it had been endorsed.
- Mr. Bouclé showed the location of the preliminary median openings on the plans and explained that they had been designed to meet the standards. This plan will be presented to FDOT for review and approval.
- Ms. Gray asked if the net loss of agricultural land had been calculated.
- Mr. Bouclé responded affirmatively and also added that this calculation had been done for several types of land uses.
- Mr. Wade asked if any land/property had been purchased just south of SW 200 Street.
- Mr. Bouclé responded that nothing had been purchased for this project yet. He indicated that acquisitions may have taken place as part of the intersection improvement projects; however, he had no knowledge of that specific area.
- Mr. Montalvo asked the CAC members their opinion on the alternative presented.
- Mr. Alger indicated that he was happy that a decision had been finally made and added that the decision shouldn't be questioned.
- Mr. Hatcher stated that he wasn't sure if there was anything to be discussed. He asked if the Team had already tried everything to minimize impacts in coming up with the alternative presented.
- Mr. Bouclé explained that the Team had tried to minimize the impacts to certain parcels such as the EEL property, which would require some variation from the standards.
- Mr. Hatcher invited the CAC members to express any concerns about the alternative presented such as things that they absolutely can't accept.





- Ms. Peña stated that the alternative presented looked very good and that she would like to see it implemented as soon as possible. She also added that the crash statistics confirm the safety problem in Krome Avenue because the number of crashes continues to increase.
- Ms. Krome stated that she was very impressed with the job done by the Team and she said that the alternative presented was a fair compromise recognizing that it wasn't possible to please everybody.
- Ms. Waterman Power said that she had no comments.
- Mr. Kimball stated that a good job had been done.
- Mr. Steele stated that he was against four-laning for the reasons he had always mentioned. He would prefer to maintain Krome Avenue as a two-lane road to keep the rural character of the area. He also added that if four-lane is decided, he hopes that safety is certainly increased.
- Ms. Gray also agreed that a good job was done by the Team; however, because she likes open space, she would have preferred that the two-lane alternative with improvements had been chosen. She stated that it was very sad to lose agricultural land.
- Ms. Guerra stated that she was disappointed that the two-lane alternative with improvements was not chosen. Also she asked if the affected parties would be notified of the impacts to their properties.
- Mr. Bouclé responded affirmatively.
- Ms. Guerra added that she appreciated the extra effort of the Team in protecting the EEL property.
- Mr. Losner stated that the Team had done a great job. He said that he had been born in the area and that he loved the rural environment. However, he recognized that people will continue to come and nobody can't stop that, therefore, it is important to plan for the future.
- Mr. Mulhern stated that he thought that such a big typical section was a waste of space. Also, he indicated that he is in favor of the shared-use path. He asked how the path would be funded and if funds from the Greenway Network would be allocated. Also he inquired about the maintenance of the path.
- Mr. Bouclé responded that he was not sure about where the funds would come from but he would investigate the answer.
- Mr. Wade said that with the bike path and swale it would be almost impossible for the farmers on the west side to use their land. Also he pointed out that the premises of this project were based on safety not capacity. In his opinion, to date, no justification has been provided to support this. He added that it was unnecessary to waste agricultural land. He also said that this project would only increase capacity (not safety). He proposed that the two-lane alternative be revisited with the addition of safety features to the road. He further stated that he was very discouraged that justification for the original project objective had never been provided.





- Ms. Peña stated that farmlands were being lost on a daily basis not necessarily because of this project. She also asked if safety would be increased as a result of the increase in capacity.
- Mr. Bouclé and Mr. Shanmugam responded affirmatively.
- Mr. Shanmugam advised that literature is available indicating that four-lane roads are safer than two-lane roads with all other features remaining the same.
- Mr. Bouclé stated that in response to a comment about the shared-use path interfering with the access to certain properties, he advised that current access would be maintained.
- Mr. Bouclé informed that the Public Hearing would be held at the beginning of 2008.
- Mr. Montalvo stated that he would touch basis with all the CAC members in order to prepare a summary of considerations and to document any comments that they may have. Also, he asked the members if they needed to have another meeting.
- Mr. Mulhern inquired about the committee to which the shared-use path was presented.
- Mr. Bouclé responded that the shared-use path had been presented to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and that it would be presented again. It was also presented to the Transportation Aesthetics Review Committee (TARC) and Citizens Advisory Committee (CTAC) among others.
- Mr. Losner requested that the CAC be notified of future presentations to BPAC.
- Mr. Bouclé responded that they would be notified of these presentations and of any other major milestone in the project.
- Mr. Steele asked how and when the property owners are notified of the impacts to their properties.
- Mr. Bouclé responded that the Public Hearing would be advertised in the local newspaper 3 weeks and 1 week in advance of the meeting. He added that direct invitation is sent by mail to every property owner within 300 ft. from the existing right of way line along both sides of the corridor prior to the Public Hearing.
- Mr. Bouclé presented some statistics of the Public Workshop for this project: 79% in favor of safety improvements, widening, 19% opposed to widening, and 2% were questions.
- Ms. Gray asked if the comments were available for review because she was interested in knowing whether the people who made the comments live in the area.
- Mr. Bouclé responded that the table with the summary of the statistics was available immediately but he would have to check with the FDOT legal department on the availability of the comment cards as they may contain information that can't be disclosed without permission.





- No requests were received for additional CAC meetings.
- The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM.

