

**URBAN EXPANSION AREA TASK FORCE
MEETING SUMMARY
Monday, December 18, 2017, 1:00 P.M.
Stephen P. Clark Center
111 NW 1st Street, Room 18-3 (18th Floor), Miami, FL 33128**

Task Force Members Present

Member	Representing	
Kerri Barsh	Rock mining representative	Present
Ashley McElheny	Florida East Coast Chapter of Associated Builders & Contractors	Present
Erin Clancy	Tropical Audubon Society	Present
William Delgado	Latin American Business Association	Absent
Enid Washington	Community Council 15	Absent
Demps		
Alex Diaz	Community Council 11	Absent
Nick Diaz	Property Owners' Representative for the Eastern UEA	Present
Dany Garcia	Sierra Club	Present
Richard Gomez	Florida Home Builders Association	Present
Steve Green	Tropical Fruit Growers of South Florida	Present
Richard Grosso	Nova Southeast Shepard Broad Law Center	Absent
Mike Hatcher	Redland Citizens Association	Present *
Thomas Hawkins	1000 Friends of Florida	Absent
James Humble	Agricultural Practices Advisory Board	Present
Matt Johnson	Biscayne National Park	Absent
Robert Johnson	Everglades National Park	Present
Yesenia Fatima Lara	Community Council 14	Absent
Maria Lievano-Cruz	Builders Association of South Florida	Present *
Bill Losner	Dade County Farm Bureau	Present
Francisco Pines	Property Owners' Representative for the Western UEA	Present
John Renne	Urban Land Institute – the SE FI/Caribbean Chapter	Present
Laura Reynolds	Friends of the Everglades	Present *
Barney Rutzke Jr.	Florida Nursery Growers & Landscape Association	Absent
Paul Schwiep	Urban Environment League	Present
Erick Valderrama	Latin Builders Association	Absent
Larry Ventura	Homestead Air Reserve Base	Present
Vacant	Miccosukee Tribe of Florida	Absent

* Present after roll call

Board member McElheny left at 3:10.

Board members Losner and Humble left at 3:19.

Board member Pines left at 4:20.

Board member Barsh left at 4:23.

Board member Green left at 4:24.

Board members Hatcher and Reynolds left at 4:28.

Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources (RER) Planning Division Staff

Jerry Bell, Assistant Director for Planning; Kim Brown, Supervisor of Long-Range Planning; Noel Stillings, Senior Planner; Vinod Sandanasamy, Transportation Planning Section Supervisor, Mark Dorsey, Principal Planner; Helen Brown, Principal Planner; Manny Armada, Chief; Robert Hesler, Supervisor for Demographics and Economic Development; Lourdes Gomez, Deputy Director; and Charles LaPradd, RER-Agricultural Manager.

Other Miami-Dade County and Government Staff

Christine Velazquez and Craig Grossenbacher, RER-Division of Environmental Resources (DERM); Elizabeth Rockwell, Chief Communications Officer, Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization; Jesus Guerra, Deputy Director, Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization; Mayra Diaz, Miami-Dade Expressway Authority

I. Attendance

Ms. Stillings called roll of the members, 14 members were present. The meeting commenced at 1:08 pm.

II. Approval of the December 1, 2017 Meeting Summary

Motion. Board member Humble made a motion to approve the December 1, 2017 meeting summary. Board member Pines seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously as follows:

Kerri Barsh	Yes	James Humble	Yes
Ashley McElheny	Yes	Matt Johnson	Absent
Erin Clancy	Yes	Robert Johnson	Yes
William Delgado	Absent	Yesenia Fatima Lara	Absent
Enid Washington Demps	Absent	Maria Lievano-Cruz	Absent
Alex Diaz	Absent	Bill Losner	Yes
Nick Diaz	Yes	Francisco Pines	Yes
Dany Garcia	Yes	John Renne	Yes
Richard Gomez	Yes	Laura Reynolds	Absent
Steve Green	Yes	Barney Rutzke Jr.	Absent
Richard Grosso	Absent	Paul Schwiep	Yes
Mike Hatcher	Absent	Erick Valderrama	Absent
Thomas Hawkins	Absent	Larry Ventura	Yes

III. Staff Coordinator's Report

Ms. Brown stated that she had emailed an online survey to board members asking their availability for future meetings. In response to a request from Board Member Humble, Ms. Brown noted that the board previously discussed moving meetings around to different locations, and if it was the will of the task force to move future meetings down south, that could be accommodated. Ms. Brown asked the board members to indicate through a show of hands if they preferred the south Miami-Dade area or downtown Miami for future meetings. Ms. Brown identified that the majority of the board members indicated a preference for future meetings to be held in south Miami-Dade.

As follow-up to items requested at the December 1, 2017 Task Force meeting, Ms. Brown reviewed items emailed to board members, including the Seven50 Plan weblink, and the Urban Infill Area map. Ms. Brown noted pending items for board members that include the buildout date map by MSA and the UEA survey. Ms. Brown reviewed today's handouts to board members including the December 1, 2017 meeting summary, and a climate change article requested for distribution by Board Member Losner in place of a presentation. Ms. Brown clarified that while board members had voted to hear a presentation with a differing viewpoint on climate change, Staff was not able to find anyone locally with the proper credentials to make the presentation.

IV. Scheduled Presentation: Strategic Miami Area Rapid Transit (SMART) Plan

Elizabeth Rockwell and Jesus Guerra of the Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) provided a presentation on the TPO's Strategic Miami Area Rapid Transit (SMART) Plan, including:

- TPO Governing Board on February 18, 2016 passed Resolution No. 06-16 which set as highest priority the advancement of rapid transit corridor projects in Miami-Dade County. TPO Governing Board on April 21, 2016 passed Resolution No. 02-16 which adopted the SMART plan with directive that the TPO Executive Director to take all necessary steps to implement the SMART plan.
- Ms. Rockwell passed out a brochure with a map detailing the location of the SMART corridors.
- Ms. Rockwell presented an approximately two-minute video on the SMART plan, available on the TPO website at: <http://www.miamidadetpo.org/smartplan.asp>, with highlights including:
 - Miami-Dade County is the most populous county in Florida, and experiences millions of visitors each year.
 - TPO has prioritized the growth and expansion of mass transit in order to address congestion and provide alternate transportation choices for residents and visitors.
 - SMART plan identifies six rapid transit corridors and six Bus Express Rapid Transit (BERT) corridors that directly support the mobility of the County's future population and employment growth.
 - The six rapid transit corridors in SMART plan have long been documented in the TPO's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and are consistent with the People's Transportation Plan (PTP).
 - The SMART plan will advance the corridors to Project Development and Environmental Phase (PD&E) in order to pursue federal and state transportation funds.
 - During the PD&E phase, more detailed analysis will be completed in order to determine the most appropriate transit solution for each corridor.
 - Project stakeholders including the general public, businesses and elected officials, will be engaged during the process.
 - The process includes the development of a comprehensive financial plan, that will be based on the unique needs of each corridor including the capital investment, operation and maintenance costs needed to advance the SMART plan corridors. This may involve a multi-year phasing plan for implementation.

- SMART plan builds on existing backbone of the transit network and will meet the needs of the regional travel patterns. This regional connectivity is supported by regional transportation partners across the region.
- The SMART plan includes a comprehensive approach which will allow the plan to support future population and employment growth in the region.
- The TPO will coordinate with federal, state, and local transportation agencies in order to implement the required policy and funding network necessary to advance the plan.
- Ms. Rockwell identified the six Rapid Transit corridors in the SMART Plan as: Beach, East-West, Kendall, North, Northeast and South.
- Two activities are currently underway for these corridors, namely:
 - PD&E phase, being conducted by Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District VI and the County's Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW).
 - Implementation phase being conducted by the TPO through land use planning charrettes
- The six Bus Express Rapid Transit (BERT) network corridors are:
 - Beach Express, Flagler Street, Florida Turnpike, the Northwest Miami-Dade Express, the South Miami-Dade Express, and the Southwest Miami-Dade Express.
 - These BERT corridors represent over 90 miles of express bus network.
- Over 63% of the County's population, approximately 1.7 million residents, live within a two-mile radius of the corridors. Over 855,000 employees are located within a two-mile radius of the corridors.
- Over 77% of residents commute to work outside their residential district, well above the national average of 66%. Graphic representation depicting the existing and future travel time comparisons for commuters, with future projections showing decreased travel times once the SMART plan corridors are implemented.
- The SMART plan is endorsed by the TPO, multiple municipalities, and other state and regional transportation agencies such as FDOT and the Miami-Dade Expressway Authority (MDX).

Task Force Discussion. Board member Reynolds inquired about the funding and implementation timeframe for the SMART Plan. Ms. Reynolds stated that timing was critical because once the SMART corridors are built it would alleviate some of the pressure on the UEAs by offering better mobility in the urban cores. Ms. Rockwell introduced TPO Deputy Director Jesus Guerra to answer funding inquiries. Mr. Guerra explained that the TPO has been discussing funding for many years, not only the capital needed for construction but also funding needed for operations and maintenance. Mr. Guerra stated that the three funding sources needed for the SMART plan were state, local and federal. Mr. Guerra emphasized that federal funding is getting limited and the County could not depend on the past 80% federal/20% local match, and that percentage was moving to a 50/50 and even a 40/60 match. Mr. Guerra emphasized that the TPO was working with partners such as FDOT and with the PTP plan to allocate federal funds as a local match and also for bonding revenue, for SMART plan funding. Board member Reynolds reiterated that if the TPO was to get the necessary funding, what would be the timeframe to implement the SMART Plan. Mr. Guerra responded that the TPO has \$75 million in

place for years 2023 to 2053, which will be used for right-of-way acquisition. Mr. Guerra explained that the TPO Governing Board passed a resolution to advance the North and South Corridors first. Mr. Guerra stated that the TPO will make a decision about the alignment and stations, the design and construction, and would like to have something in place by 2023 or 2025.

Board member Humble recollected that when he initially moved to the Redlands, it only took 30 minutes travel time to the Miami International Airport, with no tolls. Mr. Humble observed that same commute now is congested, takes hours and costs tolls, opining that it was not “smart” planning. Mr. Guerra responded that the SMART plan corridors have been in place for over twenty years, and are the major corridors in the County that move the largest amount of people. Mr. Guerra explained that major cities such as Chicago, New York and London have in place good transportation systems but still experience traffic problems. Mr. Guerra emphasized that the SMART plan was to provide people with options, such as bus rapid transit or other transit modes, to provide people with “smart choices.” Mr. Guerra also pointed out the TPO is working to provide people with a “first and last mile” options with other modes, including bicycling, pedestrianism, Uber, and carpools. Mr. Guerra added that the TPO hopes to offer by summer 2018 “on demand” solutions to have riders picked up from transit stations and transported to their residences. Board member Losner observed that while sports stadiums get built, his area, southern Miami-Dade County, was a “stepchild” which does not receive infrastructure. Mr. Guerra explained that the SMART plan was not planning for all of the County, just the six rapid transit corridors and the BERTs. Mr. Guerra stated that the South Corridor is approximately 20 miles, and is the longest corridor in the SMART plan. Mr. Guerra emphasized the TPO is trying to provide reliable transportation from south to central Miami-Dade County which may include bus stations, transit oriented development (TOD), park-and-rides and other improvements in order to accomplish that. Mr. Guerra stated that different communities either supported--or opposed--development along the corridor, and urged board members to participate in the SMART plan charrettes and express their viewpoints. Board Member Lievano-Cruz asked for clarification on board member Reynolds’ earlier inquiry regarding the SMART plan timeframe. Mr. Guerra pointed out that two months ago the TPO Governing Board prioritized the North and South Corridors. Board Member Lievano-Cruz inquired why those two corridors were selected and if the TPO consulted other transportation agencies. Mr. Guerra explained that the TPO Governing Board decision was made because the North and South Corridors had numerous studies performed and thus had more complete documentation needed for federal funding. Mr. Guerra emphasized that the TPO is working with other agencies, such as with MDX on the East-West corridor, with Florida’s Turnpike Authority on the Kendall Corridor, and with All Aboard and Tri Rail on the Northeast Corridor.

Board Members Green and Renne stated that while they appreciated the SMART plan presentation, they wanted to know how the SMART Plan presentation was related to the mission of this board concerning the UEAs. Mr. Guerra responded that the South Corridor is a challenge because it is different from the other corridors and involves numerous different uses, and that they needed support from parties and input on any suggested improvements. Ms. Brown added that this SMART plan presentation was requested by this board back in August, and suggested that board members should try to keep the

discourse to the issues under the purview of this board. Board member Pines inquired if the East-West and Kendall corridors would address some of the areas in the western part of the County. Mr. Guerra replied that they are working with MDX on the East-West corridor to provide bus rapid transit in the first phase, from downtown Miami to the MIC and then to FIU. Mr. Guerra stated that the Kendall Corridor would be from Dadeland to Krome Avenue. Board Member Pines inquired if some of the SMART project corridors would address some of the traffic concerns. Mr. Guerra emphasized that it was not only the transit service they would provide, but also Transit Oriented Development options and planning scenarios to analyze the best option to promote the corridors.

Board member Diaz opined that if employment hubs were located in southern Miami-Dade County, it would help alleviate traffic congestion. Mr. Guerra responded that there were several hubs on the South Corridor they were considering for TOD development, and also are looking at economic development along the entire South Corridor. Mr. Guerra stressed that it is a 1.5 billion cost estimate, just for the North and South Corridors. Mr. Guerra outlined that the TPO was working on creative funding solutions for the SMART plan, including partnering with MDX and Turnpike, and also public-private partnerships. In response to Board member Diaz' further inquiry, Mr. Guerra explained that the buffer around the corridors is a half-mile on either side.

Board Members Schwiep and Pines asked for clarification on the Northeast Corridor, inquiring if the issue of commuter rail was resolved. Mr. Guerra clarified that the Northeast Corridor was All Aboard's Brightline commuter rail line, and the County had no jurisdiction on that as it was a FEC corridor. Mr. Guerra explained that there are current discussions for Tri-Rail to run its trains on the Brightline corridor. Responding to board member Pines' question, Mr. Guerra clarified that All Aboard is building one of its main stations here in downtown Miami within the County's urban areas, and is expected to provide jobs and services. In response to Board member Schwiep' s inquiry, Mr. Guerra stated that BRT, Metrorail elevated, and Metrorail at-grade are being evaluated for the North Corridor, and the DTPW had not reached a decision yet on the modes for the South Corridor. Mr. Guerra reiterated that the 1.5 billion cost estimate was just for the North and South corridors.

Board Member Pines inquired about the concept of land use and transportation planning. Mr. Guerra responded that before those planning efforts were done separately, but with the SMART plan RER is now part of the process. Mr. Guerra remarked that RER is assisting the TPO in developing different planning scenarios with the different types of transit mode technology, assessing changes in land uses, facilities, and projections.

Board Member Schwiep noted the existing traffic congestion in the western and southern portions of the County. He pointed out that the design and funding for the west and south corridors of the SMART Plan are still in the early stages and may take a long time to be implemented. Therefore, urban expansion to the west or to the south would make an existing problem worse. He also noted that the northeast corridor is further along with approximately 8 planned stops. Mr. Guerra responded that the TPO is working to complete the PD&E for the south corridor by Summer 2018 but noted that, at the same, the TPO is evaluating the adjacent land uses to help expedite the process. Board Member Reynolds indicated that, in the past, the County has expanded westward in response to

transportation problems. The SMART plan will provide more opportunities for infill development that will negate the need for western expansion. Board Member Hatcher further noted that the SMART Plan provides an opportunity to look at the existing urban areas where infill can happen. It is impossible to get around in the southern portion of the County because there is no transportation infrastructure, adding more people without improving the infrastructure will only add to the problems. We need to look at how the infrastructure can be improved in these urban areas.

In response to a question from Board Member Pines, Mr. Guerra noted that ridership projections will be determined as part of the PD&E. Mr. Pines asked about the cost to implement the SMART plan, noting that estimates have varied widely. Mr. Guerra responded that the preliminary estimate for the North and South corridors is \$1.5 billion but the final number will come out with the PD&E in the summer of 2018. Board Member Losner requested ridership totals on the South Dade Busway from Florida City to Dadeland over the last 7 years.

In response to a question from Board Member Lievano Cruz, Mr. Guerra indicated that the PD&E for the Kendall Corridor is being conducted by FDOT and by next year they will come up with the proposed alignment and technology. Mr. Guerra also indicated that the TPO is working with the Turnpike Enterprise to try to provide express bus service along the Kendall Corridor noting that state law allows the Turnpike Enterprise to provide feeder routes up to five miles from their facility. This will allow for increases in ridership before moving forward with other options for the corridor. Board Member Lievano Cruz asked whether there is anything in the CDMP that would prevent the necessary improvement to implement the SMART Plan and specifically inquired about the process to put a park-and-ride outside of the UDB. Ms. Brown and Mr. Guerra responded that it would require an amendment to the UDB. Mr. Guerra indicated that one of the issues on the Kendall Corridor is availability of land, we have to look at creating Transit Oriented Developments.

Board Member Pines asked whether the TPO considered the West Kendall Charrette recommendation of building employment hubs in the western portion of the County that may reverse the traffic patterns. Mr. Guerra described the charrette process that is being conducted as part of the SMART Corridor planning studies.

In response to a request from Board Member Barsh, Ms. Brown indicated that a map of the SMART corridors in relation to the UEAs would be provided. Board Member McElheny indicated that some of the UEAs are within the SMART Plan buffer. Ms. Brown reiterated that the buffers around the SMART corridors are for planning purposes and do not identify the specific area where land uses will change.

V. Scheduled Presentation: Concurrency Backlogs

Vinod Sandanasamy, Supervisor, Transportation Planning, provided a presentation on transportation concurrency backlogs in the County including:

- The information presented was based on a review of the existing and short-term impacts on roadways near the UEAs

- Provided an overview of transportation concurrency including definition and history. Mr. Sandanasamy noted the limitations of the concurrency system and emphasized that it is not possible to pave your way out of congestion.
- Provided an overview of Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas, Transportation Concurrency Management Areas, Long-Term Concurrency Management, and Multi-Modal Transportation Districts.
- Provided an overview of proportionate fair share mitigation
- Showed a table of countywide adopted level of service standards
- Showed a table of existing traffic conditions for roadways near the eastern UEAs. He indicated that, with the exception of Old Culter Road (from SW 184th Street to Franjo Road) and SW 112th Avenue (from the Turnpike to SW 280th Street), most roadways have capacity.
- Showed a table of existing traffic conditions for roadways near the western UEAs. He noted that several roadways are running out of capacity but not yet failing.
- Showed a table of planned projects from the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and indicated that the planned projects would add capacity. Mr. Sandanasamy indicated that the planned projects are designed to serve the land uses in the CDMP. Discussion ensued regarding mitigation requirements for the impacts of large project. Mr. Sandanasamy noted that large developments pay for the impacts they create. In response to a question from Board Member Barsh, Mr. Sandanasamy clarified the funding priorities for projects in the LRTP. Priority I projects have a timeframe of 5 years. Priority II has a timeframe of 2021 to 2025. He further indicated that Priority I projects are funded. Board Member Lievano Cruz asked who is responsible for building the planned projects. Mr. Sandanasamy indicated that the identified projects would be funded by various sources which are identified in the LRTP.
- Mr. Sandanasamy showed a map of the planned SR836 extension project and indicated that it could add capacity in that area.
- Mr. Sandanasamy showed a map of existing transit corridors near the UEAs and indicated that these transit services increase capacity in the area that allows the County to maintain a lower level of service for the roadway.
- Mr. Sandanasamy showed a map of the SMART Plan and indicated that the planned projects would also add capacity.

Task Force Discussion. Board Member Schwiep inquired about the level of service on SR836 and Krome Avenue. Mr. Sandanasamy indicated that he did not have the information for SR836 but would provide it. Mr. Sandanasamy indicated that the level of service of Krome Avenue is “C”. Board Member Diaz identified the existing transportation corridors near UEA No. 3 including the Turnpike which is being expanded and currently includes two exits, US-1, Old Cutler Road, SW 112th Avenue and the Busway. Board Member Diaz also noted that Black Point Marina which is located near UEA No. 3 could support water transportation. Board Member Diaz opined that the area would benefit from an employment hub to relieve pressure on the roadways.

VI. Scheduled Presentation: Commuting Patterns

Mr. Manuel Armada, Chief, Planning Research, provided a presentation on commuting patterns in the County including:

- Urban development and expansion can have benefits to residents in terms of housing choices and suburban amenities, among other things. When development and expansion become “sprawl,” the costs to residents and the community at large begin to accelerate. Most obvious among these costs are commuting costs to and from work.
- Mr. Armada presented a chart depicting the mode of transportation to work for workers in Miami-Dade County and indicated that the number of residents that work at home increased 36% between 2012 and 2016.
- Mr. Armada presented a chart showing average travel time to work by mode for 2012 and 2016. The chart showed that commute times have increased for all modes of transportation.
- To analyze commute patterns, Mr. Armada combined MSAs 6.1 and 6.2 which are located near the western UEAs and combined MSAs 7.3 and 7.4 which are located near the eastern UEA’s, then looked at other areas to see if the patterns are replicated. For MSAs 6.1 and 6.2, Mr. Armada presented a chart based on census LEHD (Longitudinal Employment & Household Dynamics) data that shows that 31,229 people are employed in the area and live outside of the area, 122,994 people live in the area and are employed outside of the area, and 16,706 people are employed and live in the area. Mr. Armada showed a chart that indicated that people that work in MSAs 6.1 and 6.2 tend to have lower annual income and those that leave the area tend to have higher incomes.
- For MSAs 7.3 and 7.4, Mr. Armada presented a chart based on census LEHD (Longitudinal Employment & Household Dynamics) data that shows that 8,833 people are employed in the area and live outside of the area, 35,094 people live in the area and are employed outside of the area, and 5,179 people are employed and live in the area. Mr. Armada showed a chart that indicated that people that live and work in MSAs 7.3 and 7.4 tend to have lower annual income.
- For comparison, Mr. Armada showed data from Miami Lakes, Doral, South Miami, Hialeah, Downtown Miami and Homestead. He indicated that the data does not account for the mode of transportation.
 - The data from Miami Lakes showed a similar pattern, more people leave Miami Lakes for work than come into the area and people that leave the area tend to have higher incomes.
 - In Doral, those that are employed in the area and live outside have higher wages. In addition, more people come into Doral for work than go out.
 - In South Miami, more people come into the area for work than go out. Salaries are higher, probably due to the hospital, but the commute patterns are similar.
 - In Hialeah, more people leave the area for work.
 - Downtown Miami which includes the DDA area and Brickell brings in more people than any other MSA, but only 5% live and work in this area. Board Member Reynolds inquired about the number of people coming into Downtown that use public transit. Mr. Armada noted in MSA 5.2 for Downtown Miami, less than 4% who live and work in this area use public transit, he does not have the percentage on those who use public transit living outside the Downtown Miami area.
 - In Homestead, more workers leave the area than come into the area.
- Mr. Armada presented a series of conclusions from the data as follows:
 - In all of the diverse areas analyzed, the vast majority of residents leave the area to work. The vast majority of workers in an area commute from outside of the area. Those residents that live and work in an area tend, generally, to have lower incomes (some may be students or part-time workers). The areas that seem to resist these trends are

- those with a much larger work force than resident population such as Downtown Miami, Doral, and South Miami.
- The decision on where to live and where to work appears to be a highly complex decision subject to many, possibly contradictory, factors which appear in the data to be unresponsive to mere proximity of housing and employment. In order to increase the number of residents who work in their community it appears necessary to dramatically increase the ratio of jobs relative to residents as well as increase substantially the amount of affordable and workforce housing. Even then, the data suggests the impact on commuting patterns will be modest. The current data demonstrates that since most workers leave their area of residence for jobs and most workers in an area commute from an outside-the-area residence, efficient and affordable transportation systems remain paramount because people want connectivity and accessibility to jobs.

Task Force Discussion. Board Member Losner asked where the number on earning patterns comes from. Mr. Armada indicated that the earnings number come from the LEHD and US Labor and Statistics. Mr. Armada indicated that the data reflects reality but he lamented that fact that it does not provide narrower wage categories. Board Member Green inquired if the LEHD data included undocumented workers. Mr. Armada indicated that they would only be included if they get a social security number or if they reported by their employer.

Board Member Schwiep indicated that the data on the number of people that live and work in Downtown Miami seems low and inquired about the number of residential units that are in the pipeline in Downtown Miami. Mr. Armada did not have the specific number but speculated that it is probably substantial. He indicated that he would provide the data.

Board Member Pines inquired about the definition of sprawl as used in the presentation and asked how sprawl is addressed in the CDMP. Ms. Brown responded that the indicators of sprawl include those that were discussed in the prior task force meeting. Mr. Armada clarified that, in order for a development to be self-contained, it would need to contain a sufficient number of jobs and workforce housing. The Area Median Income (AMI) is \$51,800 which is higher than the median household income in Miami-Dade County which is \$45,955, the units would need to be affordable at 140% of AMI.

Board Member Schwiep noted that the data seems to show that in self-contained areas where jobs and housing are available, people still commute outside of the area. Mr. Armada indicated that the exception to that trend is Doral and Downtown Miami where the jobs-to-resident population ratio is very high. Mr. Armada reiterated that there are many considerations that factor into an individual's decision on where to live. Board Member Hatcher noted that there are many government offices and educational institutions in Doral that provide jobs. Board Member Losner noted that housing costs are a major factor when deciding where to purchase a home. Board Member Hatcher noted that the affordable areas tend to be more remote, such as south Dade and people that purchase in these areas do not take into account the cost and time of commuting.

Board Member Pines inquired about population projections over the next 10 to 15 years. Mr. Armada noted that he is in the process of updating those figures. Ms. Brown noted that we have some numbers on the projected growth out to the Evaluation and Appraisal

Report planning horizon of 2040. Mr. Armada noted that Miami-Dade County is a mature area, and is not growing at not an increasing rate.

Board Member Garcia inquired if there are general trends on where people are going to work. Mr. Armada responded that the data can provide the general area. In general, the people working in Kendall are coming from south Dade, MSA 7.3 and 7.4; the people living in Kendall are going to work in Doral, Downtown Miami and Coral Gables.

Board Member Diaz inquired if the UEAs were developed where there is workforce housing and employment centers, for example if you had an Amazon down south or smaller ones people would live and work in the same area and it would help alleviate traffic. Mr. Armada noted that Amazon headquarters wanted to be in the core area and where there rapid transit accessibility, so that by itself eliminates many areas in the county, but smaller employment centers would work. In many cases you have to have the zoning and infrastructure and over time the market would change, but it does take time.

In response to a question from Board Member Clancy, Mr. Armada stated that the data does not negate the need for mass transit and noted the importance of having areas with concentrations of employment and density to make transit feasible. Board Member Clancy indicated that she would like where people going to work in employment hubs like Doral and Downtown Miami are coming from. Mr. Armada indicated people going to work in Doral are coming from Kendall, the north, the east and south, because the businesses are very specific.

Board Member Barsh inquired if all the people coming to Downtown Miami are from Miami-Dade County. Mr. Armada indicated there is a substantial number of people coming from Broward to Downtown Miami and Doral, but not so much to south Miami-Dade; but that does not change the commuting pattern of travel in Miami-Dade County. Mr. Armada stated that the data shows that people are not living, working and playing in mixed use areas as would be expected but that could be changed, to some extent, by changing some of the parameters, making transit feasible and lowering pressure to move outside of the area.

Board Member Schwiep asked if the data indicates whether people that live in transit oriented developments are using transit. Ms. Brown noted that transit does have data linking housing units and transit boardings.

VII. Scheduled Presentation: Miami-Dade Expressway Authority Projects

Mr. Albert Sosa representing Miami-Dade Expressway Authority (MDX), provided a presentation on MDX Projects in the County including:

- Mr. Sosa gave an overview MDX, and addressed a proposed project located in one of the UEA's. Mr. Sosa informed the members that MDX controls 5 roadways in Miami-Dade County, SR 924, SR 112, SR 874, SR 878 and SR 836, and when feasible and necessary MDX looks to expand those roadways. MDX is funded by user fees.
- Mr. Sosa displayed a map showing how the MDX roadways relate to the Smart Plan.
- Some of MDX's major ongoing projects include:
 - the Dolphin Park-in-Ride, on the west end of SR 836, which serves as an anchor for transit services
 - widening SR 836 from NW 87 Avenue to NW 17 Avenue,
 - expanding SR 836 to 195, and

- expanding SR 874 to SW 128 Street.
- Some projects currently under PD&E study include:
 - 2 projects for SR 924, one to the West from SR 826 to HEFT; and one to the East from NW 32 Avenue to I95.
 - There is a project outside the UDB located in an UEA, it is an extension of SR 836 to the south and to the west to SW 136 Street. Currently SR 836 ends at NW 12 Street and NW 137 Avenue. This project is proposed to increase connectivity in the area and improve travel time; it is not proposed to serve areas outside the UDB. The traffic projections for it are for current traffic demands inside the UDB. It is proposed to serve traffic currently going east on Sunset and Kendall Drive to the Turnpike to employment centers. Once the facility is put in place the model shows traffic splits and creates contra flow on the streets, it balances the traffic on the arterial roadways, and there is less travel time on these roadways, there is an overall reduction in vehicle miles travelled from the creation of this expressway. The proposed roadway is a 4-lane expressway, 2 lanes north, 2 lanes south with a shared-use path on one side for pedestrians and bikes, and recreational use, similar to SR 836 between 82nd and 107th Avenues. MDX is also reserving space for potential future transit, so if the County wanted to add an exclusive transit service in the future, there is an area for the use. MDX is also looking at the use of the inside shoulders as dedicated express transit envelopes, which are called express technology lanes.
 - MDX is currently modifying the existing SR836 corridor to accommodate express transit on the inside shoulders. MDX is also looking at accommodating transit on the inside shoulders on SR874.

Task Force Discussion. Board Member Renne noted that the models for the 836 extension project do not examine growth outside the UDB, but inquired if MDX could run a model to see how much growth outside the UDB would be allowable before traffic on that roadway segment would start to fail, as the purpose of the Task Force is to look at growth outside the UDB, this could assist the Task Force in their work and mission. Mr. Sosa indicated from a technical perspective MDX could do that but from a practical perspective MDX runs the model based on the land use in place, MDX said they could look into doing this.

Board Member Reynolds asked whether a mass transit component would actually be built as part of the 836 extension project or if it only reserves space for future transit. Mr. Sosa responded that MDX is planning as part of the project to have the interior twelve feet of asphalt for transit use. In addition, MDX is reserving space in the design for possible future fixed guideway transit. Board Member Reynolds asked about the total acreage that needs to be acquired for the project. Mr. Sosa indicated that he did not have the information on-hand but indicated that it would be about 12 miles long and about 300 feet wide.

Board Member Schwiep indicated that the existing CSX line could potentially be used for commuter rail instead of building the 836 extension. He asked whether MDX can allocate some of its budget to transit. Mr. Sosa indicated that they have always partnered with other governmental agencies to incorporate transit components when appropriate. Board Member Reynolds asked whether there was a recent change in state law that allowed a

portion of the MDX budget to be used for public transit. Mr. Sosa responded that House Bill 1049 indicated that 20% to 50% of MDX's budget can be directed to the County for transportation purposes but did not specify the mode.

Board Member Reynolds asked whether MDX has looked at ways to prevent the impacts of the 836 extension project or how to prevent the type of sprawl development that would result. Mr. Sosa responded that MDX does not believe that the project will cause sprawl. We're not proposing an expansion of the UDB or additional development. The project is meant to serve existing traffic from existing land uses. Mr. Sosa indicated that MDX's traffic projections take into account projects proposed in the SMART Plan. There is a very large latent demand in the area that will be served by the project.

Board Member Schwiep asked whether a UDB amendment is needed to allow for the 836 extension project. Ms. Brown clarified that it would not require an amendment to the UDB but would require updating other portions of the CDMP text and figures to identify the facility.

In response to a question from Board Member Lievano Cruz, Mr. Sosa indicated that MDX is currently going through the Planning Development and Engineering (PD&E) process and evaluating different alignments for the project. They will eventually decide on a recommended alignment. He indicated that they are currently working with the Miami-Dade County Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources on a CDMP amendment application to allow for the project and maps showing various alignments have been submitted to support the application. Board Member Lievano Cruz stated that the project will allow people already living out there to go west to connect with the project and this will alleviate traffic. Mr. Sosa confirmed that it will alleviate traffic on some of the east-west roadways. Board Member Lievano Cruz asked what CDMP changes are necessary to allow for the project to occur. Mr. Bell clarified that the application will require an update to the maps in the Transportation Element of the CDMP to show the proposed alignment and update some of the corresponding text. Mr. Sosa noted that the application is going through a similar process to what was required for the Krome Avenue widening project.

Board Member Reynolds asked why the County is making the application rather than MDX. Mr. Sosa indicated that the County Mayor has directed his staff to work with MDX on the application. Mr. Bell noted that it will be filed as part of the October 2017 Cycle. Staff will analyze the application which will be reviewed by the various agencies then go through the public hearing process. Discussion ensued regarding the denial of a resolution by the Board of County Commissioners that would have required staff to file an amendment related to the SR836 extension. Mr. Bell confirmed that the denial of that resolution did not preclude a staff application from being filed.

Board Member Reynolds asked whether MDX included the Krome Avenue widening and SMART Plan corridors in their analysis. Mr. Sosa responded that MDX's traffic modeling contemplates bus rapid transit along Kendall Drive and shows that there is still a need for the project to serve the latent demand in the area.

Board Member Reynolds asked whether MDX looked at the cost of a dedicated transit lane on 157th Avenue for example. Mr. Sosa noted that the Kendall Bus Rapid Transit project is projected to cost \$200 to \$300 million and carry about 8,000 passengers per day while the 836 extension project would cost \$600 to 800 million and will be designed to carry 80,000 passengers per day.

Board Member Reynolds expressed concerns that the 836 extension project may increase the concurrency capacity for development outside of the UDB. She further suggested that MDX should purchase buffers along the corridor to prevent sprawl, and noted that this would have the added benefit of preserving farmland and environmentally-sensitive land and would allow for flood attenuation. Mr. Bell noted that staff will look at adding protections into the application to prevent the roadway improvement from creating sprawl or adding concurrency capacity. Mr. Sosa responded that MDX may be able to accomplish some of the goals Board Member Reynolds mentioned as part of their wetland mitigation.

In response to a question from Board Member Pines, Mr. Bell clarified that Urban Expansion Areas are areas where, if there is a demonstrated need for additional development is warranted, these are the areas that should be considered. Mr. Bell reiterated that the charge of the task force is to review and recommend changes to the UEAs.

Board Member Garcia noted that part of the need for the Krome Avenue expansion was for emergency evacuation and asked why the 836 extension project is not being built inside the UDB. Mr. Sosa responded that MDX considered ten alignments at the beginning of the project including some that were located inside of the UDB but found that the impacts to residents and cost were so great that they were not feasible. Mr. Sosa reiterated that the project was not designed to serve the area outside of the UDB. Board Member Garcia opined that the roadway will put additional pressure for further westward expansion.

Board Member Clancy noted the need to evaluate the current UEAs in light of considerations such as the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan and inquired about the cost of tolls on the proposed facility. Mr. Sosa responded that MDX has not yet gone through the toll setting process but they expect it to be similar to existing MDX facilities, about \$0.16 per mile. Board Member Clancy indicated that the cost of tolls should be reviewed against the income data for commuters in the area to see how much it is impacting people commuting to their jobs.

In response to a question from Board Member Schwiep, Mr. Sosa noted that the Operating and Maintenance costs will likely be around \$500,000 per centerline mile per year but emphasized that this is a very rough number.

In response to a question from Board Member Reynolds, Mr. Sosa indicated that MDX has not spent Operating and Maintenance money on transit but they work in coordination with the County to provide capital funding for infrastructure improvements associated with transit. He noted MDX's current investments including the Dolphin Park-and-Ride and the SR836 improvements to allow express bus service on the shoulders. Mr. Sosa stated that

MDX's expenditures on transit also included over \$80 million on the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC) and the Metrorail Earlington Heights extension to the MIC. Board member Reynolds requested that Mr. Sosa e-mail that information to her and expressed her viewpoint that MDX should be spending more on transit.

Board Member Schwiep noted that the SR836 expansion project prejudices the process that Task Force is tasked with and paves over environmentally-sensitive land.

Motion. Board Member Schwiep made a motion for a resolution to oppose the SR 836 Southwest Extension project to build outside the UDB. Board Member Reynolds seconded the motion. Ms. Brown indicated that, if approved, the opposition should be noted in the final report of the Task Force rather than through a resolution to the Board of County Commissioners. Board member Lievano-Cruz stated that the SR 836 SW Extension Project opined that the motion went beyond the purview of the board, and expressed her support for the project. Board Member Reynolds disagreed stating that the SR 836 SW Extension Project placed undue pressure on the UEAs, and that it is within the board's purview. Discussion ensued regarding the appropriate format of the recommendation. During the discussion, quorum was lost and no vote was taken on the motion. Ms. Brown indicated that the motion could be brought back at the next meeting.

Board member Renne questioned the modeling assumptions made for the SR 836 SW Extension project, opining that more data should be analyzed. Board member Renne stated that MDX should perform additional analysis for future development scenarios involving land uses outside the UDB, and for the impacts of that additional traffic. Mr. Bell explained that the SR 836 SW Extension Project was being filed as a staff amendment, and that analysis would be performed as it went through the review process and in the Initial Recommendations report. Mr. Sosa replied that MDX's analysis only looked at existing land uses and did not conjecture about future land uses. Board member Renne observed that looking at future land uses was a best planning practice typically done through modeling for most transportation projects, and stressed that it should be performed for this \$800 million dollar project.

Board Member Renne asked if the project would be required to include National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis including completion of an Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Sosa replied that the project will require Federal permits and will, therefore, include NEPA analysis.

In response to Board member Clancy's inquiry, Mr. Sosa clarified that the monies used to build the SR 836 SW Extension project would be generated by the roadway tolls on that roadway, and it was not the case that they would have \$600 to \$800 million to spend somewhere else.

Board member Clancy inquired as to the importance of transit income five to ten years ahead, in MDX's business plan. Mr. Sosa replied that MDX had not projected that far ahead for transit ridership, and stated that MDX views providing transit as an option and a way to help reduce congestion.

VIII. Public Comment:

Ms. Brown announced that she had received one speaker card, but that person had already left. Ms. Brown asked if other members of the public wished to speak, none came forward.

IX. Task Force Discussion:

Ms. Brown asked whether the Task Force wanted to move forward with the Seven50 presentation or move it to the next meeting. Discussion ensued reflecting a preference to move the presentation to the next meeting. Ms. Brown noted that it would be added to the agenda of the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 pm.