



**Bicycle/Pedestrian
Advisory
Committee**
of the
**Metropolitan Planning
Organization**
for the
Miami Urbanized Area

Chairperson

Brett Bibeau

Vice-Chairperson

Gabrielle Redfern

Members

Javier Betancourt

Anamarie Garces de
Marcilla

Jeremy Gauger

Steve Greenberg

Ken Groce

Susan Kairalla

Lee Marks

John O'Brien

Larry Thorson

Eric Tullberg

Paul Yavis

Contact Information

David Henderson,
Bicycle/Pedestrian
Coordinator

davidh@miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade MPO

111 NW 1 Street, #920

Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-1647

www.miamidade.gov/mpo



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2009

5:30 P.M.

STEPHEN P. CLARK GOVERNMENT CENTER

111 NW FIRST STREET

18th FLOOR - CONFERENCE ROOM 3

MIAMI, FLORIDA 33128

AGENDA

- I. BPAC MEMBERSHIP UPDATE
 - a. Anamarie Garces de Marcilla
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 22, 2009
- IV. CITIZEN COMMENTS (5 minutes)
- V. PRESENTATIONS
 - A. MIAMI-DADE PUBLIC WORKS UPDATE – J. Cohen, MDPW
 - B. FDOT PROJECT UPDATE – K. Jeffries, FDOT
 - C. FDOT LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DESIGN GUIDELINES – D. Korros, FDOT
 - D. FEC RR/MIAMI AVE PROPOSAL – B. Knoefler
- VI. INFORMATION
 - A. MONTHLY REPORT
 - B. BPAC ATTENDANCE
- VII. MEMBER COMMENTS

It is the policy of Miami-Dade County to comply with all requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The facility is accessible. For sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or materials in accessible format, please call 305-375-4507 at least five business days in advance.

	<p>B/P-related e-mails. Annual presentations to local elected officials would help.</p> <p>BB: As an MPO Governing Board subcommittee, the BPAC does not necessarily represent Miami-Dade County. Often people are not aware that the two are separate entities. He inquired whom on the MPO Board represents Pinecrest.</p> <p>DH: The smaller cities are represented by the municipal representative that is appointed by the Governor, currently Bill Kerdyk from Coral Gables.</p> <p>BB: Perhaps part of the problem is that Mr. Kerdyk has not chosen a BPAC representative to discuss B/P issues with. <i>He suggested SG to contact Mr. Kerdyk, and perhaps volunteer to become a BPAC member.</i> Commissioner Gimenez' District includes portions of South Miami and Pinecrest; he and Lee Marks, his BPAC appointment, may assist with SG's desires/concerns as well.</p>
<p>MIAMI BIKE MASTER PLAN</p>	<p>- ML: <i>Currently surveys are being collected regarding residents' requests and perceptions on cycling. The first of two bike summits will be held on June 15, 2009 at J. Marti Community Center from 6-9 pm.</i></p>
<p>FDOT LIVABLE COMMUNITIES DESIGN GUIDELINES</p>	<p>- DK: The 2009 version of the <u>Plans Preparation Manual</u> (PPM) has a chapter (21) on <u>Transportation Design for Livable Communities</u> (TDLC). Stakeholders in District 6 are interested that the FDOT implement this concept. The existing built-out characteristics of the area are one of the major hindrances to do so. The FDOT has to overcome reluctance from engineers to incorporate some of these principals into their designs.</p> <p>AS: District 6 is advancing some concepts more than some Districts. The document more-clearly defines and supplements the concept of TDLC for roadways. DH also provided review and content towards this draft. One of the PPM's updates is that bikeway review is now "required" in all roadway projects.</p> <p>JB: The same caveats exist. This review is not required for RRR projects.</p> <p>AS: There are 2 basic types of projects: Widening and Resurfacing. Although there are caveats, this represents a new policy towards bikeway incorporation. In the past, bicycle advocates had to argue their case before the FDOT. Now, the consideration is required as projects are designed. Various best practices from around the country were reviewed, and some incorporated, for this document. A major effort is to emphasize where flexibility exists for the roadway designer. Unfortunately, Miami-Dade County was zoned in a way that inhibits B/P mobility; with narrow sidewalks and wide intersections. <i>Many portions of the PPM address the process of preparing for plans; others about how facilities are included. Geometric designs for facilities are detailed. Safety, Bicycles, Pedestrians, Transit, and other considerations are all included in Chapter 21.</i> The TDLC states: "It is the policy of the department to consider TDLC features when these features are desired and feasible..."</p> <p>KM: Inquired when would TDLC features not be desired. This is vague.</p> <p>AS: For instance, when ROW is limited, or the type of project does not warrant changing moving the curbs.</p> <p>DK: There may be a community more interested in tackling their congestion.</p> <p>AS: It takes a coordinated effort by transportation staff, agencies, groups and the public to make this effective. <i>A PPM chart provides guidance on various design scenarios in respect to lane width and availability; Chapter 21 provides an expanded choice to consider.</i> For instance narrowing lanes to incorporate other features. <i>TDLC looks at context, instead of predetermined solutions to create a balance between Safety and Mobility. Chapter 8 focuses on B/P mobility. "Smart Code" defines various types of development, and suggests tools that determine</i></p>

corridors types suitable for a particular area. The FDOT broke this down to a more-general definition of Urban Core, Urban, Suburban and Rural. While keeping the narrowly defined Federal Functional Classification System, roadway types have been generalized into the classifications of Boulevards, Avenues, Streets and Rural Roads. Boulevards and Avenues are further classified, such as Main Streets, depending on the zoning of the area. There are also different types of facilities for the various classifications, such as sidewalks.

CW: The reference chart only lists roads with speeds under 35 MPH.

AS: *TDLC applies to those roads.*

KM: Inquired if TDLC would not apply to roads with speeds over 35 MPH; or whether the FDOT would reduce the speeds where TDLC is desired.

DK: All the stakeholders and the transportation team have to make the 1st decision whether TDLC is desired.

KM: Although the FDOT is attempting to meld various policies of roadway design from various adopted documents/guidelines into a consistent mix, there are other facility types that don't seem to be included in the cross-sections, such as: curb-side bike lanes and bike blvds.

CW: Inquired whether the FDOT would automatically honor a municipality's policies, such as Miami's Complete Streets; or would the municipality have to reiterate it to every Project Mgr. for every project within the municipality.

DK: *TDLC is considered on a project-by-project basis.* The municipality would be part of the process and let their intentions be known.

JC: The chart included in Chapter 21 states that bike lanes are Not Applicable along Rural roads. A lot of cyclists use Hwy 9336 every weekend traveling to the Everglades. Rural roads, like this one, can be narrow and high speed. *The chart should be corrected.* Also, when a facility transects different zones, *a bike lane shouldn't be dropped because it doesn't comply to the new zone standard.* Additionally, the Furniture zone included in Chapter 21 doesn't depict benches, trash receptacles, tables, etc. Inquired if FDOT would allow these common features within the zone; and if allowing people to inhabit the area directly adjacent to the roadway violates the Clear zone.

AS: Other districts allow ROW use for commercial purposes.

JC: It is M-DPW's standpoint that the Frontage zone is more appropriate for tables and chairs. Allowing this in the Furniture zone violates the "Green Book". A stroll thru Coconut Grove's restaurant area is difficult.

AG: Inquired as to the ratio of Conventional to TDLC projects being developed.

DK: TDLC has been adopted into the PPM for over a decade. However, very few projects have been developed using TDLC. ROW is often constrained and congestion relief is a priority over TDLC. The FDOT is attempting to bring TDLC to a higher priority and provide engineers with more knowledge of its existence and use; as well as feeling more confident to incorporate it where applicable. Hopefully, over time, there will be more TDLC projects.

AG: Inquired if there has been follow-up on the effectiveness of these few treatments for the communities that have them. Often people do not understand the benefits of Livable Communities. They need to be educated.

AS: Unaware of any type of follow-up.

ET: This document states bike lanes aren't needed along Rural roads, since they contain paved shoulders. It would be preferable to mark the shoulders as bike lanes to inhibit parking automobiles on them. Shoulders along high-speed roads should be treated with inverted rumble strips for safety. He has reviewed the

entire document and is submitting more suggestions from a cyclist's standpoint. One is the width of a standard bike lane. He would prefer 6' bike lanes to negate the need to swerve into the next travel lane to avoid an opening car door.

JC: Disagrees; the extra width should be for the parking stall, so the opened door is within that zone. Venetian Cswy. parking stalls are at least 9' wide.

ET: The problem would still exist when drivers park along the striped edge.

JC: *The law states automobiles must be parked no more than 1' from the curb.*

ET: Disputed the rationale requiring 5' bike lanes along swales. If endangered, a cyclist can ride into the swale, since it is not supposed to have any fixed objects.

SG: It is his experience that 5' bike lanes and 8' parking stalls are suitable.

LT: He's often heard about how bikes are supposed to be considered along roadways; if this TDLC policy is not implemented, then the future of cycling looks bleak, instead of one of the solutions to counter automobile use. Someone mentioned that a roadway is usually conceived within the initial phase of design. When developers lay-out their property, they've already got a concept of the design. So, this initial phase has past by the time the FDOT or a community gives input. Inquired how enough ROW can be secured to avoid a lost opportunity.

DK: The MPO's Zoned ROW Study recommendations have been submitted to revise the County Code and provide opportunities in the future. ROW can be very expensive. An issue arose with the NW 74 St. project; ROW had been reserved for many years based on the antiquated standards. There isn't enough space to include bike lanes in this 6-lane, divided cross-section. Traffic is congested; so, there are trade-offs. Everyone has to work together.

AS: It is vital to have ideas considered early in the process. The FDOT's Local Government Coordination steps are detailed in the TDLC.

JO: This document is very important. It is a shame it wasn't implemented sooner. *It is important for all transportation stakeholders to have access to it and understand the implications.* In some instances, it is better to have language that can be interpreted in a broad sense, so that a boilerplate mentality is substituted for various options. Regarding the Furniture Zone: benches, etc. can be placed outside this zone. Where the document describes the design process, it seems that FDOT can internally decide the preferred design and quell future discussion on alternatives. Inquired whether there is a stipulation that internal staff have to discuss alternatives with outside entities before a final design is determined.

DK: District designers have to be comfortable in their decisions.

JO: Concerned that staff can ignore B/P mobility needs to fast-track "Safety" projects. They often begin at 90% design before public review. Recently, FDOT presented the City of North Miami with 90% plans for NW 135 St. These plans had no provisions for bicyclists and no crosswalk at an intersection; even though NW 135 St. is a designated bicycle corridor for the City, and bicycle paths are being recommended for the remainder of the roadway. FDOT's PPM guidelines state that Safety projects don't have to consider TDLC. "Safety" projects should consider the safety of all users; as well as give the local government the opportunity to comment before plans are final. *The FDOT eventually did meet with the City on this issue, and is considering these options.*

KG: The developer has a lot of power towards design. *Governmental entities and the surrounding community need to have more power over these initial designs.*

JavierB: Inquired whether parallel parking along State roads is discouraged.

	<p>DK: Unaware of any policy to this effect.</p> <p>JulioB: Often this provision is “grandfathered” in. The Business community has a long tradition of fighting for on-street parking in those areas.</p> <p>JavierB: <i>The DDA desires to eliminate the median parking along Biscayne Blvd. The intended proxy location would be parallel parking along the curb.</i></p> <p>DK: <i>Eliminating a travel lane to do so would be met with FDOT opposition. Regarding the Furniture zone; it is completely desirous to have one along the sidewalk. Throughout the world, furniture zones are some of the most vibrant and desirous locations. Coconut Grove and South Miami would loose a lot of ambiance if these zones were removed. However, there should be flexibility on their placement within the sidewalk; yet, not precluded from the street edge.</i></p> <p>AS: <i>Placement would be on a case-by-case basis. Regulations should ensure the placements be free&clear of obstacles and pedestrian traffic.</i></p> <p>JC: If furniture is placed next to on-street parking, there is room for compromise.</p> <p>AG: Since there is a lot to read, <i>will be providing comments via e-mail.</i></p> <p>CW: Regarding the parallel vs. angle parking debate – both have their disadvantages; so, <i>this document should not recommend one or the other. It has to be reviewed case-by-case. However, it should be noted that angled parking should be used cautiously, because most roadways are too narrow to incorporate angled parking along with bicycle lanes, wider sidewalks, or street furniture areas. The TDLC also states that, within 1-mile of the urban core, bike lanes are a standard. In cases of reconstruction, even where there is on-street parking, bike lanes would take priority over parking, because it is the standard; and there is no standard that parking is to be included. Finally, other types of bikeways, such as sharrows, should be mentioned in the document. These can be incorporated where a full 5’ bike lane cannot.</i></p> <p>SG: It is important to note that, in this area, there are more people whom are more comfortable riding on the sidewalks, instead of the road. <i>Therefore, designers should be accommodating them by eliminating all the obstructions put in their space, such as signs, benches, etc.</i></p> <p>ML: Concerned with the difference between the FDOT’s Urban, Suburban, (etc.) characteristics, compared to the public’s traditional concept of these areas. Inquired if there will be a process to educate the public on these differences.</p> <p>DK: That issue jumps ahead of what is being attempted. At this time, the FDOT is just hoping to get this document adopted and started to be used.</p>
<p>M-DPW UPDATE</p>	<p>- JC: <i>He has been coordinating with the Cities of Miami and Miami Beach to determine which roadways could accommodate the introduction of bike lanes without intrusion to the surrounding infrastructure.</i></p> <p>DW: At a previous BPAC meeting, she suggested to review connections between educational institutions. For instance, the UofM area could be improved.</p> <p>JC: A few years ago, the City of Coral Gables indicated they were willing to create a more bike-friendly roadway network. M-DPW Staff suggested San Amaro and Campos Sano to have bike lanes; however, the City rejected this idea. <i>Staff have also made a recommendation to MDT to consider routes to Miami-Dade Colleges. M-DPW also reviews the possibility of bike lanes to new schools.</i> However, usually the area is too built-up, with little opportunity. The SW 97 Av. project, from Bird Rd. to Sunset Dr., was just completed with bike lanes. That serves several schools. Since he has been assigned Bicycle/Pedestrian</p>

Coordinator for M-DPW, he has earned a reputation amongst his colleagues as a pest; attempting to incorporate B/P mobility needs into every project.
DW: She heard about an M-DP&R incentive to develop bike routes connecting parks to other parks; inquired if JC was participating in that endeavor.
JC: *He routinely meets with M-DP&R staff, and has done several field reviews. One Model Cities area project attempts to locate roads where sharrows can be installed to connect to schools and a transit station. These roads are not the major arterials; but, local streets near major development. Stop signs are being realigned to reduce cyclists' need to stop at each intersection. Other signage will be introduced to warn motorists of a more-expected cycling presence.*
MH: *MDPR works on regular basis with the MPO on several different studies. For example, the MPO is doing a new Parks Pedestrian Safety Plan at County parks; and, he has coordinated with M-DPW staff on the Bicycle Blvd. Study.*

FEC RR/MIAMI AV. PROPOSAL

- **BK:** *(Providing a video presentation.) He owns property on Miami Av. adjacent to the FEC R/R in the Park West neighborhood. He plans to create a neighborhood association to work with the railroad to clean up the tracks. He has a formal agreement with FEC allowing him to beautify the railroad along his property. FEC will not perform upgrades, except to satisfy code requirements. The DDA assisted through their Neglected Corners program. He hopes to expand these efforts, through Rails-with-Trails funding, etc. There is a B/P greenway near the area (9th St. Promenade); but, it was fenced-off because it became a homeless encampment. The idea for his project would be one that beautifies the area with landscaping but does not promote loitering. Including a paved path would encourage more legitimate activity and less walking on the tracks. No large shade trees are envisioned. The area within the CRA is from the Freedom Tower to NW 1 Av., and then north to NW 19 St. The agreement he has with FEC goes all the way to NW 79 St. He also envisions a connection to the existing 9th St. Promenade, which also would lead to Bicentennial Park; proper sidewalks and intersections, which would include railroad mast arms. This initial project, broken-up into 3 phases, might cost approx. \$1.2 million. That includes a 10' path. It was brought before the CRA on March 30, 2009. There are a few minor issues to finalize the design. One issue of importance is getting the City of Miami to sign-off on a liability agreement for any public walkway.*

Another issue to be dealt with in the future is the lack of sidewalks along streets that cross the tracks. On some streets, Miami or Miami-Dade County have never signed a grade-crossing agreement with the FEC and cannot extend sidewalks across the railroad property. The FEC will not allow the City to make improvements on their property, because they never executed an agreement to build the crosswalks in the 1st place. These can cost anywhere from \$60,000-180,000/crossing because of ADA requirements.

AG: *Many children cross the railroad to get to/from school in Morningside.*
KG: *Motion in support of the concept for a Rail-Trail along the FEC R/R, from Freedom Tower to NW 19 St., with a request to various City and County agencies to seek-out funding sources; seconded by AG; vote – unanimous.*

BK: *Stressed the importance of obtaining funds for R/R crossing mechanisms.*

BB: *That is a separate issue that needs more information.*

JG: *Perhaps this could be an Agenda item for a future meeting.*

BB: *Requested staff to invite relative agencies for presentations on this matter.*

FEDERAL HIGHWAY INTERNATIONAL HIGHWAY SCAN	- DH: He participated in an FHWA review of European practices in bike and pedestrian safety and mobility. <i>A report will be generated within 180 days; which will be available to the BPAC.</i>
MONTHLY REPORT	- DH: He is aware that the monthly report does not include any 2009 Resolutions. <i>Next month, these will be included, and the 2007 Resolutions will be omitted.</i>
ATTENDANCE REPORT	- Reviewed.
MEMBER COMMENTS	- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PY: He was talking to the Surfside Police Chief the other day about riding without lights. The Chief informed him that is an opportunity to stop the cyclist for interrogation. It seemed like that was more important to him than to ensure safety. He plans to attend a meeting of the Chiefs of Police Association to talk about enforcement of traffic laws related to biking and walking. • ET: He provided comments/suggestions regarding the Snake Creek Trail bridge to MDP&R staff. • ET: The Palmetto Bay Ludovici Park had a grand opening. The Palmetto Bay Village Center has a 1.1 mile path around the grounds that begins and ends at that park. • ET: He participated in the Everglades-Biscayne Greenway ride. • ET: He spoke with Commissioner Gimenez. <i>There is \$700,000 available for M-Path quick fixes.</i> • ET: He attended a South Miami City Hall meeting to discuss bicycle issues. • ET: He attended a meeting regarding the M-Path crossing of Snapper Crk. Hwy. entrance ramps. <i>Two alternatives have been developed.</i> He prefers Alt. #2., which would create 2 dedicated right-turn lanes with 3 thru lanes on the southbound side of US-1. • ET: He provided comments regarding the recent Old Cutler Rd. improvements. Curbs were introduced that inhibit access to the trail. • LT: Curbing along SR A1A at Haulover Pk. forces cyclists riding along the shoulders into the travel lane. • LT: He referenced a <u>Miami Herald</u> article regarding Growth Mgmt. He would like the BPAC to consider a Resolution requesting the Governor to veto the bill awaiting his signature. Several naturalist groups oppose it, as well as the FL. Assoc. of Counties, due to the expected clogging of roads for construction. This bill would relax restrictions on road building, including the requirement for bikeways. <i>The deadline is June 2nd..</i> JavierB: Suggested an informational item on the use of Mobility Fees for the next BPAC meeting. The group could suggest developers to use more of these funds for B/P facilities.
NEXT MEETING DATE	- BB: <i>The next meeting will be June 24, 2009.</i>

- *The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.*