

MIAMI-DADE

1795

Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study: Model City/Brownsville

December 2009







The preparation of this report has been financed in part by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and/or the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the State Planning and Research Program (Section 505 of Title 23, U.S. Code) and Miami-Dade County, Florida.

The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation.



Acknowledgements

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. would like to acknowledge the many groups who contributed to the successful completion of the Miami-Dade County Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study: Model City/ Brownsville.

The Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department (MDPR) served as the day-to-day management agency for the project. Mark Heinicke was instrumental in managing the project throughout the duration of the study providing direction to the consultant and coordinating public outreach activities.

The Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) funded the study through the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). David Henderson, Bicycle/Pedestrian Specialist for the MPO, provided an education, enforcement and encouragement perspective throughout the study.

The Miami-Dade County Public Works Department (MDPWD), provided assistance and coordination. Jeff Cohen, P.E., reviewed the plans and provided input from an engineering and safety perspective.

The multi-agency Study Advisory Committee established for this study provided guidance and coordination throughout.

EBS Engineering, Inc. assisted with the existing conditions analysis and field inventory for this study.



Valuable feedback was gathered at a public workshop and a public open house for the Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study.







Honorable Carlos Alvarez, Mayor



Board of County Commissioners

Dennis C. Moss, Chairman José "Pepe" Diaz, Vice-Chairman

Barbara J. Jordan	District 1	Katy Sorenson	District 8
Dorrin D. Rolle	District 2	Dennis C. Moss	District 9
Audrey M. Edmonson	District 3	Senator Javier D. Souto	District 10
Sally A. Heyman	District 4	Joe A. Martinez	District 11
Bruno A. Barriero	District 5	Jose "Pepe" Diaz	District 12
Rebeca Sosa	District 6	Natacha Seijas	District 13
Carlos A. Gimenez	District 7		

George M. Burgess, County Manager Alex Muñoz, Assistant County Manager

Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department (MDPR)

Jack Kardys W. Howard Gregg Maria Nardi Joe Webb, RLA, ASLA Mark Heinicke, CPRP, CLARB Director Deputy Director Chief of Planning and Research Planning Section Supervisor Park Planner III – Project Manager

Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

David Henderson

Bicycle Pedestrian Coordinator

Miami-Dade Public Works Department (MDPWD)

Jeff Cohen, P.E.

Assistant Chief Traffic Engineering

Study Advisory Committee

Alfrieda Hodgson Collin Worth Joe Webb, RLA, ASLA Jorge Herrera Kim Brown Kevin Kirwin Commission Aide, District 2 Bike Ped Specialist, City of Miami Planning Section Supervisor, MDPR Police Lieutenant, MD Police Department Senior Planner, MDDPZ Assistant to the Director, MDPR

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (KHA)

Stewart Robertson, P.E. Melanie Lynch Project Manager Graphic Designer





Introduction	1
Bicycle Boulevard - Definition	2
General Criteria for a Bicycle Boulevard Goals and Objectives Selection of Streets for Bicycle Boulevards	2
Selection of Streets for Bicycle Boulevards	3 1
Transportation System Overview	4 5
Traffic Counts	8
Tool Box and Bicycle Boulevard Layout	12
Implementation Plan	42

Figures

MAY USE FULL LANE

Figure 1:	Study Area Map with Proposed Bicycle Boulevard Study Corridors7
Figure 2:	Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on Proposed Bicycle Boulevards10
Figure 3:	Typical Section and Plan View of Bicycle Boulevard

Tables

Table 1:	Tool Box Summary	12
Table 2:	Potential Implementation Costs	45

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Sources	. 48
Appendix B: Base Data Collection Maps	. 49
Appendix C: Miami-Herald Meeting Advertisements	. 56
Appendix D: Task Memorandum Notes	. 58
Appendix E: BPAC Resolution of Support	. 70
Appendix F: City of Miami Bicycle Master Plan	. 71



v

7

List of Acronyms

AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AV	Avenue
BLVD	Boulevard
BPAC	Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee
FDOT	Florida Department of Transportation
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GOB	General Obligation Bond
KHA	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
MDPR	Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department
MDPWD	Miami-Dade County Public Works Department
MDT	Miami-Dade Transit
MPH	Miles per Hour
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MUTCD	Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
NE	Northeast
NW	Northwest
ROW	Right-of-way
SE	Southeast
ST	Street
SW	Southwest
UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program





This page intentionally left blank.

1:

1 in a a



Introduction

MAY USE Full lane

The Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department (MDPR), in partnership with Miami-Dade County Public Works Department (MDPWD), and the Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has initiated a comprehensive planning study to develop a Miami-Dade County Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study: Model City/Brownsville.

The objectives of the study are to:

- Incorporate bicycle safety features near community resources
- Establish design and development criteria consistent with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and MDPWD
- Minimize additional right-of-way and pavement needed for bicycle improvements
- Develop cost effective strategies
- Facilitate signage and pavement marking improvements into the bicycle route network
- Develop bicycle boulevard and traffic calming strategies that minimize impacts on emergency vehicles
- Minimize non-local motorized traffic on bicycle boulevards
- Create distinctive look and ambiance

The Model City/Brownsville area has been selected for this study because of the opportunities created by the extensive grid network of streets, lack of short-term opportunities for the development of traditional off-road shared-use paths or multi-use trails in the area, and need for establishing ways to improve bicycle safety and circulation. The study is being funded by the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) through the Miami-Dade MPO. The study area for this project is defined by Little River Drive in the north; the Airport Expressway in the south; NW 7 Avenue in the east; and NW 32 Avenue in the west. The results of this study are to be transferrable to other parts of the County.

Community assets within the study area include several parks, community centers, schools and Metrorail stations as follows: Marva Y. Bannerman Park and Pool, Olinda Park, Joseph Caleb Community Center, Partners park, African Heritage Cultural Arts Center, Gwen Cherry Park, Arcola Park, Arcola Lakes Park, Hadley Park, Martin Luther King Memorial Park, Drew Park, Marva Y. Bannerman Elementary, Corporate Academy South, Olinda Elementary, Charles R. Drew Elementary, and the Earlington Heights, Brownsville, and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Metrorail stations.

Bicycle Boulevard - Definition

A Bicycle Boulevard can be defined as "A hybrid facility that uses various methods and forms to improve bicycle safety, convenience and connectivity to make bicycling a preferred option through a variety of improvements".

Bicycle Boulevard strategies attempt to create a bicycle arterial while calming traffic and helping to remove non-local vehicles from the street.

Bicycle Boulevards enhance bicycle travel through various engineering and regulatory tools:

- Pavement markings
- Traffic calming
- Motor vehicle diversion
- Signage

MAY USE Full Lane

• Other methods of improving the safety, comfort and efficiency of bicycling



Pavement Marking requires adoption by FHWA

During the course of this Study, the Bicycle Boulevard Planning & Design Guidebook, Initiative for Bicycle and Pedestrian Innovation was published by Alta Planning + Design in July 2009. This guidebook was used by the study team for planning assistance and perspective during the latter stages of the project. According to the Bicycle Boulevard Planning & Design Guidebook, bicycle boulevards take the shared roadway bike facility to a new level, creating an attractive, convenient, and comfortable cycling environment that is welcoming to cyclists of all ages and skill levels. Research indicates that there is a strong preference by cyclists for bicycle boulevards, and suggests that they may be a key tool for attracting new cyclists who typically are less comfortable riding in traffic. In addition, these low-speed and low-volume facilities are also pleasant places for pedestrians and other non-motorized users. Bicycle boulevards are also attractive to local agencies for their ability to serve cyclists on existing road networks, including cyclists who may not feel comfortable riding on busy streets, even when bike lanes are provided.

General Criteria for a Bicycle Boulevard

The general criteria for a bicycle boulevard are to have or create one or more of the following conditions:

- Low traffic volume road
- Low motor speeds
- Significant east-west and north-south connectivity
- Free-flow bicycle travel
- Access to major destinations
- Comfortable bicycling conditions
- Minimize conflict with motorists and pedestrians
- Intersection crossing safety treatments



Discussing the study with a local

Goals and Objectives

The Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study Advisory Committee developed the following goals and objectives to guide the design process for the bicycle boulevards:

Goals

MAY USE

- 1. To improve the safety and connectivity of bicycling.
- 2. To expand the potential bicycle route network beyond bicycle lanes and separated multi-use trails.
- 3. To create livable communities through calming traffic and more efficient bicycle routes in local communities.
- 4. To increase the awareness of bikeways for both cyclists and motorists.

Objectives

- 1. Incorporate bicycle safety features near community resources such as parks, cultural centers, schools, and transit stations.
- 2. Establish design and development criteria that are consistent with permitted public use of FDOT and MDPWD road right-of-way.
- 3. Minimize the amount of additional right-of-way needed for bicycle improvements.
- 4. Minimize the amount of additional pavement needed for bicycle improvements.
- 5. Develop cost effective strategies for bicycle boulevards.
- 6. Facilitate signage and pavement marking improvements into the bicycle route network.
- 7. Develop bicycle boulevard and traffic calming strategies that minimize impacts on emergency vehicles.
- 8. Minimize non-local motorized traffic on bicycle boulevards.
- 9. Create distinctive look and ambiance so that cyclists become aware of the existence of bicycle boulevard and motorists are alerted.

Selection of Streets for Bicycle Boulevards

Bicycle boulevards tend to work well in grid pattern road networks, which are often found in urban centers and in traditional neighborhoods such as the Model City/Brownsville area. The interconnected layout of traditional street networks are generally easy to navigate, tend to be continuous over long distances, and provide numerous route options to destinations. If one street is selected as the bicycle boulevard and treated to reduce through motor vehicle trips, several parallel streets remain available to motorists as alternates. The selection process for identifying bicycle boulevard alignments also accounts for the operational characteristics of the street including what may be achieved through typical bicycle boulevard implementation strategies.

As part of the planning process, potential bicycle boulevard corridors were identified for this study. The following criteria were used to select the roadways that make up the bicycle boulevard network for this study:

- 1. Local street or low-volume collector
- 2. Not a truck route

MAY USE

- 3. Preference to streets with a low percentage of commercial frontage
- 4. Spaced between 1/2 and 1 1/2 miles from a parallel bicycle boulevard
- 5. Continuous segments of at least $\frac{1}{2}$ mile in length
- 6. Traffic signals at major intersections
- 7. Access to at least two community facilities such as parks, cultural centers, schools, transit stations, shopping centers, and employment centers
- 8. Connections to at least two bike lanes or bicycle boulevards
- 9. Few stop signs along the corridor

Existing Conditions / Data Collection

In the support of the defined study area, pertinent base data were collected to define the existing conditions. In accordance with task of data collection and analysis, the following information has been gathered from existing available data. This task consisted largely of gathering pertinent planning, environmental, land use, transportation and engineering information necessary to assess the study area corridors. The information gathered included data necessary to perform adequate evaluations of the environmental, transportation, and recreation aspects of the study area facilities. To the extent possible, the existing conditions data were collected as geospatial data compatible with ArcGIS.

It is important to note the following observations that were derived from the data collection efforts:

- There are many existing neighborhood parks, schools, cultural and recreational facilities, and Metrorail stations that represent potential connection opportunities for the bicycle boulevard network. These include Marva Y. Bannerman Park and Pool, Olinda Park, Joseph Caleb Community Center, Partners Park, African Heritage Cultural Arts Center, Gwen Cherry Park, Arcola Park, Arcola Lakes Park, Hadley Park, Martin Luther King Memorial Park, Drew Park, Marva Y. Bannerman Elementary, Corporate Academy South, Olinda Elementary, Charles R. Drew Elementary, and the Brownsville, Earlington Heights and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr Metrorail stations
- There is an existing Model Cities Bike Path from NW 48 St to NW 87 St primarily along NW 21 Av, NW 22 Av, and NW 19 Av
- The Hadley Park Trail has an existing small loop trail along the perimeter of the park

Transportation System Overview

MAY USE

As part of the field review observations, details regarding roadway inventory which includes the location of stop signs, traffic lights, number of lanes, roadway width and width of sidewalk were also collected. Several arterial roadways are within the study area including:

- NW 54th Street Four Lanes Undivided
- NW 62nd Street Four Lanes Divided
- NW 79th Street Six Lanes Divided
- NW 27th Avenue Four Lanes Divided
- NW 22nd Avenue Six Lanes Divided
- NW 17th Avenue Four Lanes Undivided
- NW 12th Avenue Four Lanes Undivided
- NW 7th Avenue Four Lanes Undivided

Appendix B presents the base data collection maps.



Crossing arterials such as NW 54th Street requires safety improvements

Field Review Observations

A field review was conducted by KHA staff and Miami-Dade County staff on April 10, 2009, to review potential bicycle boulevards with proper connectivity within the study area. Additional field work was conducted by consultant staff over the next two months to supplement the data. The following information was documented during the field review:

- Existing condition of streets
- Inventory of existing intersection control devices and traffic calming devices
- Inventory of roadway characteristics including width of travel lane and existence and conditions of sidewalks
- Pavement condition
- Location of existing parks, neighborhood areas, and recreational and cultural facilities for bicycle boulevard improvements
- The following are the list of issues and problems with possible solutions that were identified during the field review:
 - ^o Unsignalized crossings at major road intersections
 - Provide traffic circles
 - New traffic signal
 - New pedestrian/bicycle signal



NW 14th Avenue is a typical street identified as a potential bicycle boulevard

Installation of raised medians along major arterials

Unsignalized crossing features including crosswalks and median refuges

Route bicycle boulevard path to the closest signalized intersection

° Crossing Little River (C-7) Canal

New trail bridge along theoretical NW 12 Av.

° FEC Railroad crossing north of NW 71 St.

Route bicycle boulevards along existing bridge at NW 12 Av.

Detailed field observations of the corridors identified as possible Bicycle Boulevards were conducted to determine existing conditions of the study corridors, width of travel lanes, sidewalk width, posted speed limits, inventory of traffic control devices at all intersections (includes stop signs and traffic signals) including direction of two-way stop signs, intersection diagram of signalized intersections including the medians of the cross street, presence of on-street parking and identify which roads have striping. Photographs were taken at several locations along the study corridors to help depict the existing conditions and are located in a separate Field Review Report prepared by EBS Engineering. The following are the list of study corridors that were included in the field review:

- 1. NW 21st Avenue from NW 41st Street to NW 83rd Street
- 2. NW 14th Avenue from NW 43^{rd} Street to NW 83^{rd} Street
- 3. NW 43rd Street from NW 14^{th} Avenue to NW 21^{st} Avenue
- 4. NW 50th Street from NW 7^{th} Avenue to NW 32^{nd} Avenue
- 5. NW 58th Street from NW 7^{th} Avenue to NW 27^{th} Avenue
- 6. NW 67th Street from NW 7th Avenue to NW 27th Avenue
- 7. NW 83rd Street from NW 12th Avenue to NW 21st Avenue
- 8. NW 11th Avenue from NW $50^{\mbox{\tiny th}}$ Street to NW $67^{\mbox{\tiny th}}$ Street

The following are some of the common observations on the study corridors:

- Two-lane roads with 11-12 feet travel lanes
- Swale on both sides of the roads and the width of the swale varied from 8 to 12 feet
- Side walk on both sides and the width of the side walk varied 5 to 6 feet
- Nine (9) feet parking lane on NW 50th Street and NW 58th Street
- The posted speed limit is 30 MPH
- The location of the stop signs and traffic signals on the study corridors were also identified and are shown in Figure 1

MAY USE



⊨⊨⊨	FEC Railroad
₽	Signalized Intersection
4-WAY	Fourway-stop
STOP	Two-Way Stop on Side Street
STOP	Two-Way Stop on Bicycle Boulevard
•	Bus Stop
i,	Library
H	Hospital
	Schools
\bigcirc	Metrorail Station
	StudyArea
	City Boundary
	Parks
	Water
	Commission District 2
	Commission District 3

Traffic Counts

MAY USE

Twenty-Four hour bi-directional tube traffic counts were collected on July 21, 2009 (Tuesday) at the following 10 locations within the study area:

- 1. NW 43rd Street between NW 17th Avenue and NW 21st Avenue
- 2. NW 50th Street between NW 12th Avenue and NW 14th Avenue
- 3. NW 58th Street between NW 17th Avenue and NW 21st Avenue
- 4. NW 67th Street between NW 17th Avenue and NW 21st Avenue
- 5. NW 83rd Street between NW 17th Avenue and NW 14th Avenue
- 6. NW 21st Avenue between NW 79th Street and NW 83rd Street
- 7. NW 21^{st} Avenue south of NW 62^{nd} Street
- 8. NW 14th Avenue between NW 79th Street and NW 83th Street
- 9. NW 14^{th} Avenue south of NW 62^{nd} Street
- 10. NW 11^{th} Avenue south of NW 62^{nd} Street

Figure 2 shows a map with tube count locations along with seasonally-adjusted Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) at that location. It was observed that the roadways selected/identified for the tube count locations have low traffic volumes and the selected roadways can be possible candidates to implement a bicycle boulevard.



This page intentionally left blank.

1:

1 in a a



MIAMI-DADE COUNTY BICYCLE BOULEVARD PLANNING STUDY: MODEL CITY/ BROWNSVILLE

Figure 2 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on Proposed Bicycle Boulevard Corridors

Legend

	Corridor 1 - NW 21 AVE
	Corridor 2 - NW 14 AVE
	Corridor 3 - NW 43 ST
	Corridor 4 - NW 50 ST
	Corridor 5 - NW 58 ST
	Corridor 6 - NW 67 ST
	Corridor 7 - NW 83 ST
	Corridor 8 - NW 11 AVE
	Existing Hadley Park Walkway/Trail
	Possible Connection to Gwen Cherry Park
	Proposed Bike-Ped Bridge 1
	Proposed Bike-Ped Bridge 2
	- Local Road N
	Greenway Network
	• Metrorail
_	Tri-rail
	FEC Railroad
①	Signalized Intersection
4-WAY	Fourway-stop
STOP	Two-Way Stop on Side Street
STOP	Two-Way Stop on Bicycle Boulevard
\bigcirc	Metrorail Station
4	Study Area
	City Boundary 310 Traffic Count
	Parks
	Water
	Commission District 2
	Commission District 3
0	0.25 0.5 1
	Miles
	Kimlev-Horn and Associates. Inc.



TOOL BOX STRATEGIES



10 00 00

-

Tool Box and Bicycle Boulevard Layout

This chapter describes the tool box developed for the Miami-Dade County Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study: Model City/Brownsville. The toolbox lists a set of strategies that were developed to make the bicycle boulevards safer and more efficient. The strategies listed in the toolbox are flexible and will help to design a bicycle boulevard to meet the requirements and issues at specific locations.

The strategies are grouped into two categories based on the applicability and requirements of the bicycle boulevard. The first category is called **Basic Tools**. These strategies are applicable to all bicycle boulevards. These include:

• Signage

MAY USE Full Lane

- Pavement Markings
- Landscaping/Aesthetics

The second category is called **Site Specific Tools**. These strategies will be applicable to address issues specific to a particular site and would be determined in collaboration with the local residents. These include:

- Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools
- Crossing Major Streets

It is anticipated that the strategies in the toolbox may need to be modified as detailed designs for each bicycle boulevard are developed in collaboration with neighboring residents and cyclists. New strategies may also need to be added, and some strategies in the toolbox may not be used at all. This toolbox therefore should be viewed as a guideline, not a rule, for developing bicycle boulevards. The specific elements needed to create a bicycle

TOOL BOX SUMMARY

	BASIC TOOLS
Α.	Signage
	1. Bicycle Boulevard Designation Signs
	2. Street Name Sign
	3. Advance Warning Sign
	4. Wayfinding Sign with Distances
	5. Other signs to be used as needed for site-specific applications
в.	Pavement Markings
	1. Bicycle Boulevard Pavement Markings
	2. Bike Lane Striping and Marking
C.	Landscaping / Aesthetics
	1. Planter Strip Landscaping
	2. Street Trees
	SITE SPECIFIC TOOLS
_	
D.	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools
D.	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles
D.	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out
D.	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out 3. High Emphasis Crosswalks
D.	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out 3. High Emphasis Crosswalks 4. Chicane
D.	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out 3. High Emphasis Crosswalks 4. Chicane 5. Partial Street Closure
D.	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out 3. High Emphasis Crosswalks 4. Chicane 5. Partial Street Closure 6. Speed Cushions
D.	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out 3. High Emphasis Crosswalks 4. Chicane 5. Partial Street Closure 6. Speed Cushions Crossing Major Streets
D.	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out 3. High Emphasis Crosswalks 4. Chicane 5. Partial Street Closure 6. Speed Cushions Crossing Major Streets 1. Traffic Signal
D. 	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out 3. High Emphasis Crosswalks 4. Chicane 5. Partial Street Closure 6. Speed Cushions Crossing Major Streets 1. Traffic Signal 2. Traffic Signal with Bike Detection Loops
D. 	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out 3. High Emphasis Crosswalks 4. Chicane 5. Partial Street Closure 6. Speed Cushions Crossing Major Streets 1. Traffic Signal 2. Traffic Signal with Bike Detection Loops 3. Bike Boxes
D. 	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out 3. High Emphasis Crosswalks 4. Chicane 5. Partial Street Closure 6. Speed Cushions Crossing Major Streets 1. Traffic Signal 2. Traffic Signal with Bike Detection Loops 3. Bike Boxes 4. Traffic Signal (Bicycles Only) with Turn Restrictions for Motor Vehicles
E.	Neighborhood Traffic Management Tools 1. Traffic Circles 2. Landscape Curb Extensions Bulb-Out 3. High Emphasis Crosswalks 4. Chicane 5. Partial Street Closure 6. Speed Cushions Crossing Major Streets 1. Traffic Signal 2. Traffic Signal with Bike Detection Loops 3. Bike Boxes 4. Traffic Signal (Bicycles Only) with Turn Restrictions for Motor Vehicles 5. All-Way Stop Sign

Table 1: Tool Box Summary

boulevard must be tailored to the unique conditions of each corridor.

A summary of the toolbox is presented in Table 1. The strategies listed in the toolbox will be combined accordingly so that the cumulative effect will create a look and feel that will tell both motorists and cyclists that the street is special – it is not a speedway but rather a special place where people live and where many people ride their bikes. The combined impact of the tool box strategies is far greater than any single strategy alone. A sample layout of the NW 14th Avenue study corridor, presented on pages 31 through 37, illustrates conceptually how the various tool box strategies can be combined to create a bicycle boulevard. Figure 3 on page 38 illustrates a typical section view and plan view of a bicycle boulevard.

STRATEGY A-1: BICYCLE BOULEVARD DESIGNATION SIGNS

• Basic Tool - Signage

MAY USE Full Lane

- Informs all roadway users that the current street is a bicycle boulevard
- Enhances the look and feel of the street for a bicycle boulevard
- \$300 approximately for sign and sign structure









Note: The Bicycle Boulevard signage must be integrated within the County's Wayfinding signage program and bicycle route numbering system. The Bicycle Boulevard signage must also be compliant with FHWA standards found in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

STRATEGY A-2: STREET NAME SIGN

• Basic Tool - Signage

MAY USE Full Lane

- Add-on to typical intersection street signs to indicate bicycle boulevard status
- Can be applied to intersections along bicycle boulevard
- Enhances the look and feel of the street for a bicycle boulevard
- \$200 approximately for sign and sign structure





D3-1



Requires adoption by FHWA

STRATEGY A-3: ADVANCE WARNING SIGNS

• Basic Tool - Signage

- Provides advance warning to motorists approaching a bicycle crossing
- Can be applied at all major intersections along a bicycle boulevard
- Enhances the safety on a bicycle boulevard
- \$300 approximately for sign and sign structure





STRATEGY A-4: WAYFINDING SIGNS WITH DISTANCE

• Basic Tool - Signage

to MAY USE FULL LANE

- Provides wayfinding and distance information for cyclists
- Larger signs could also improve an area-wide map
- \$300 approximately for sign and sign structure





by FHWA



E1 Facility Directional Sign



D1-2c



STRATEGY B-1: BICYCLE BOULEVARD PAVEMENT MARKINGS

Basic Tool - Pavement Markings

AAY USE FULL LANE

- Unique pavement marking provides strong emphasis on bicycle boulevards
- Defines the anticipated lateral positioning of cyclists
- Typically applied on bicycle boulevard sections without bike lanes
- Enhances the look and feel of the bicycle boulevard
- Alerts motorists of the potential presence of cyclists and the lateral location they are likely to occupy
- Shared Lane Marking (MUTCD Figure 9C-9) is the current preferred pavement marking for bicycle boulevards
- \$400 per pavement marking







Example marking plan from Berkeley, CA of an alternative pavement marking

Note: The Bicycle Boulevard pavement marking must be compliant with FHWA standards found in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

STRATEGY B-2: BIKE LANE STRIPING AND MARKING

• Basic Tool - Pavement Markings

- Bike lanes are one-way facilities that carry bicycle traffic in the same direction as adjacent motor vehicle traffic
- Typically applied to arterial and collector roadways
- Minimum width of a bike lane is 4 feet, 5 feet preferred; 5 feet required when adjacent to parking or between travel lanes
- Cost varies widely depending on design and street type





Note: Colored pavement marking on bike lane requires request for experimentation from FHWA.



STRATEGY C-1: PLANTER STRIP LANDSCAPING

- Basic Tool Landscaping/Aesthetics
- Enhances look and feel for bicycle boulevard
- Adds green space
- Cost varies depending on design and street type
- Ideally, plants used for landscaping are native or low maintenance
- Adds safety between bicycles and pedestrians







STRATEGY C-2: STREET TREES

- Basic Tool Landscaping/Aesthetics
- Beautifies the streetscape and provides traffic calming benefits
- Provides shade

- Adds new green space
- Low maintenance
- Cost varies depending on design and street type
- Vertical elements slow vehicle speeds



STRATEGY D-1: TRAFFIC CIRCLES

- Site Specific Tool Neighborhood Traffic Management Tool
- Typically applied on bicycle boulevards where intersection traffic calming is desired and where bicycle boulevard traffic has stop sign
- Helpful at intersection of two bicycle boulevards
- Enhances the look and feel of the bicycle boulevard
- Helps for traffic calming and pedestrian safety
- Additional opportunity for neighborhood beautification through landscaping
- Cost may vary depending on design (approximately \$50,000 \$250,000 for the landscaped neighborhood traffic circle)

Coral Gables, FL







Note: Roundabout design on bicycle boulevards must incorporate bicycle and pedestrian treatments.



STRATEGY D-2: LANDSCAPED CURB EXTENSIONS BULB-OUT

- Site Specific Tool Neighborhood Traffic Management Tool
- Bulb-out is a curb extension or a traffic calming measure intended to prevent driving through parking spaces and to reduce crosswalk distance
- Helps for traffic calming and increases pedestrian safety at intersections
- Helps reduce sight distance concerns associated with vehicles parking too close to an intersection
- Additional opportunity for neighborhood beautification through landscaping
- Cost may vary depending on design (\$2,000 \$50,000)





STRATEGY D-3: HIGH EMPHASIS CROSSWALKS

- Site Specific Tool Neighborhood Traffic Management Tool
- Helps to reduce approaching motor vehicle speeds and to create a visible prominent crossing location for cyclists and pedestrians
- Helps for traffic calming and increases pedestrian safety at midblock locations and intersections
- \$30,000 approximately



STRATEGY D-4: CHICANE

- Site Specific Tool Neighborhood Traffic Management Tool
- Raised curbs that create a serpentine, horizontal shifting of the travel lanes along the roadway
- The shifting lanes reduce speeds by eliminating long stretches of straight roadway where motorists can pick up speed and by forcing motor vehicles to shift laterally
- Additional opportunity for neighborhood beautification through landscaping
- Cost may vary depending on design (\$3,000 \$15,000)





Vancouver, BC



Berkeley, CA



STRATEGY D-5: PARTIAL STREET CLOSURE

- Site Specific Tool Neighborhood Traffic Management Tool
- Partial street closures at intersections eliminate certain motor vehicle movements while allowing the remainder of the street to function as two-way
- Restricts access to motor vehicles while allowing cyclists to access the street
- Partial non-motorized crossings include constructed barriers and signed restrictions that eliminate a motor vehicle turn movement
- Additional opportunity for neighborhood beautification through landscaping
- Cost may vary widely depending on design and existing conditions



STRATEGY D-6: SPEED CUSHIONS

- Site Specific Tool Neighborhood Traffic Management Tool
- Normally designed as two or three small speed humps
- Effectively slows cars, but still allows for emergency vehicles and school buses to pass them without slowing
- Speed cushions are more affordable than speed humps
- Helps for traffic calming in neighborhood while allowing cyclists unimpeded access
- \$3,000 approximately for rubberized speed cushions



STRATEGY E-1: TRAFFIC SIGNAL

• Site Specific Tool - Crossing Major Streets

- Assists cyclists and pedestrians to cross major streets
- Helps for crossing and pedestrian safety
- Typically applied at intersection of Bicycle Boulevard with Major Street where existing traffic control is Two-Way STOP controlled for bike boulevard
- \$300,000 \$400,000 approximately depending on design and existing conditions



STRATEGY E-2: TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH BIKE DETECTION LOOPS

- Site Specific Tool Crossing Major Streets
- Assists cyclists crossing signalized intersections by allowing a cyclist to call a green signal phase through the use of loop detectors
- Helps for crossing safety

- Can be applied at any signalized intersection, particularly useful at intersections with low to moderate side street traffic volumes
- Can also be applied at bicycle only traffic signals
- \$2,000 \$4,000 approximately for loop detector installation, signage, and pavement markings









Portland, OR
STRATEGY E-3: BIKE BOXES

• Site Specific Tool - Crossing Major Streets

- Cyclists pass through the intersection first during a green signal phase rather than queuing behind motor vehicles
- May reduce right-turn conflicts between cyclists and motorists at intersections by increasing cyclist visibility to drivers and providing a space for cyclists to wait at signalized intersections
- The motorists will be alerted by the bike box at the intersection
- For use at signalized intersections with a high volume of cyclists
- The bike box is an experimental intersection treatment and is still being evaluated by FHWA
- Cost may vary depending on design and existing conditions (\$5,000 \$10,000)



STRATEGY E-4: TRAFFIC SIGNAL (BICYCLES ONLY) WITH TURN RESTRICTIONS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES

• Site Specific Tool - Crossing Major Streets

- Typically applied at the intersection of Bicycle Boulevard with Major Street where existing traffic control is Two-way STOP for the bike boulevard
- Helps for crossing and pedestrian safety
- A traffic signal would be installed, but in conjunction with a turn-restriction for motor vehicles
- Bicycles may proceed straight and autos must turn right
- Installing a median across the major street will help force motorists to turn right but would also prevent left-turns from entering (see Strategy E-7)
- Turn restrictions do not necessarily require signalization. Turn restrictions can also be placed at non-signalized intersections
- Cost may vary depending on design and existing conditions (\$100,000 \$200,000)



STRATEGY E-5: ALL-WAY STOP SIGN

- Site Specific Tool Crossing Major Streets
- Helps Bicycle Boulevard crossing at non-signalized intersections
- Traffic circle is preferable to an all-way stop intersection if right-of-way allows
- Two-way stop intersection is also preferable if traffic conditions warrant (eliminating stops in the direction of the Bicycle Boulevard)
- Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) provides warrants for all-way stop controls
- Should not be used as a traffic calming or speed control technique
- Care should be exercised in using all-way stops since they also make cyclists stop
- \$2,000 approximately per intersection



R1-3P NOTE: This plaque shall be installed under each stop sign



Miami, FL

STRATEGY E-6: CROSSWALK WITH MEDIAN REFUGE (WITH OPTIONAL TURN RESTRICTIONS)

• Site Specific Tool - Crossing Major Streets

- Constructing on undivided roads or using on multiple lanes and/or high volume arterials facilitates crossings by providing a space in the center of the roadway for cyclists or pedestrians to wait for gaps in traffic
- Allows cyclists and pedestrians to cross while focusing on one direction of traffic at a time
- Effective when located midblock between intersections
- Large refuge areas allow groups of cyclists or pedestrians to cross simultaneously
- Medians can be extended along major street across bike boulevard street forcing right turn movements by motor vehicles consequently reducing the number of potential conflict points between motor vehicles and cyclists
- Cost may vary depending on design (\$20,000 \$40,000)











EXAMPLE CORRIDOR



10 00 -

7









Corridor 2 (Example) - NW 14 AVE

SHEET 1 OF 7







Corridor 2 (Example) - NW 14 AVE

SHEET 2 OF 7









Corridor 2 (Example) - NW 14 AVE

SHEET 3 OF 7









Corridor 2 (Example) - NW 14 AVE

SHEET 4 OF 7

37









Corridor 2 (Example) - NW 14 AVE

SHEET 5 OF 7









Corridor 2 (Example) - NW 14 AVE

SHEET 6 OF 7









Corridor 2 (Example) - NW 14 AVE

SHEET 7 OF 7

40





Figure 3a: Typical Section and Plan View of Bicycle Boulevard without Parking



Figure 3b: Typical Section and Plan View of Bicycle Boulevard with Parking



IMPLEMENTATION PLAN





Implementation Plan

This section describes the implementation phase and detailed phasing plan for the Miami-Dade County Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study. This phase will involve developing specific designs for the boulevards in conjunction with neighborhoods and cyclists. Possible funding options to pay for the planned improvements will have to be identified simultaneously. Approval from the Miami-Dade County Public Works Department will be needed for specific design changes that will be proposed for some of the streets in the study area. As the current planning study moves forward, changes to this approach may be required.

Each bicycle boulevard will have different design elements to meet the unique conditions on each corridor. All of the tool box strategies or a subset of the strategies may be used on a single corridor based on how favorable the existing conditions are for bicycle mobility. It should be noted that design elements described in this document have been used effectively on bicycle boulevards and similar roadway designs in the United States according to the background research conducted for this study. However, certain design elements may not yet be approved in local and national guidelines. According to *Bicycle Boulevard Planning & Design Guidebook*, local agencies may use these design features based on engineering judgment and the success of the design in other communities, or can request permission for an experimental design from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Implementation Approach

Two strategies were proposed for implementing the bicycle boulevard system. The first is a corridor based approach and the second is a neighborhood based approach.

Corridor Based

- Install signs and pavement markings along initially selected corridor NW 14th Avenue from NW 43rd Street to NW 83rd Street
- Provide traffic calming devices
- Install devices to cross major streets (NW 54th Street, NW 62nd Street, and NW 79th Street) along the corridor
- Implement the NW 43rd Street corridor along with the NW 14th Avenue corridor to provide access to the Earlington Heights Metrorail Station
- Provide intersection traffic studies at key locations

Neighborhood Based

- Work with the study area neighborhood by looking at all of the bicycle boulevard segments. Address the elements and issues along the bicycle boulevards in the neighborhood.
- Install signage and pavement legends on all bicycle boulevards
- Install devices to help bicycles and pedestrians cross all major streets
- Remove selected stop signs and replace with suggested traffic calming devices



Suggested Approach

MAY USE

Based on the public meetings and the input from the project Study Advisory Committee, it is recommended to follow elements from both approaches. First, a corridor based signing and awareness program is recommended. This program would consist primarily of signing and pavement legends and provide for various techniques listed in the Bicycle Boulevard Tool Box. This process should involve local residents and businesses to prioritize remaining corridors and to select appropriate tools from the tool box. Finally, it is recommended to implement the remaining elements on one boulevard at a time by working closely with the local residents and businesses to create a bicycle boulevard tailored to the unique conditions for each corridor in each neighborhood.

Priority Recommendations

- Install signing and pavement markings and legends on all bicycle boulevards
- Secure funding through sources:
 - ^o General Roadway Resurfacing or Maintenance
 - ° FDOT Safety Funds
 - ^o Transportation Enhancements
 - ° Safe Routes to School
 - ° Transportation Sustainability and Social Equity Grants
- Conduct intersection traffic studies
- Install devices to help cross major streets
- Remove unwarranted STOP signs and replace as needed with traffic calming devices
- Provide school area safety improvements and improved awareness



Implementation Costs

The total cost of implementation for the bicycle boulevards depends on the strategies that would be selected from the tool box. These costs are site specific and a detailed opinion of probable cost should be developed for each corridor when the final selection of strategies has been made for that corridor. However, the cost of implementation for basic signage, which includes street names, wayfinding signs and pavement markings/treatment, can be estimated. The cost of traffic calming devices at specified locations was also estimated.

The cost per mile for a Bicycle Boulevard that includes signing and pavement markings and legends, crossing major streets, and traffic calming devices are shown in Table 2 below. The implementation cost per mile of a bicycle boulevard is approximately \$372,600 and the total cost for 15.5 miles (total length of all proposed bicycle boulevard corridors in the Model City/Brownsville study area) is approximately \$5,775,300. The implementation costs do not include the cost for the proposed bicycle and pedestrian bridges across the FEC railroad and Little River (C-7) Canal.

Funding for bicycle boulevards can come from a variety of sources including federal, state, regional, and local programs. Although the cost of construction will vary depending on the specific traffic calming and intersection treatments that are chosen, bicycle boulevards can be relatively inexpensive compared to separate bicycle facilities in exclusive rights-of-way. Building upon existing traffic calming features and paying for traffic calming devices and intersection crossing devices from general traffic improvement funds and/or roadway safety funds can also help implement bicycle boulevards in a cost-effective manner.

		Signage and Pav	vement Markings	Basic Elements)		Crossing M	lajor Streets	Traffic	Calming
	Designation Signs	Street Name Signs	Advance Warning Signs	Wayfinding signs	Pavement Markings	Median Island	Bicycle Signal Crossing	Traffic Circles	Speed Cushions
No.of items/mile	4	4	4	8	20	1	1	2	3
Cost per item (\$)	\$300	\$200	\$300	\$300	\$400	\$30,000	\$120,000	\$100,000	\$3,000
Cost per mile of Bicycle Boulevard	\$1,200	\$800	\$1,200	\$2,400	\$8,000	\$30,000	\$120,000	\$200,000	\$9,000

Cost Source: FDOT and Fundamentals of Bicycle Boulevard Planning and Design , Alta Planning + Design (July 2009) Table does not include the cost for proposed Bicycle/Pedestrian bridges across the FEC Railroad and Little River Canal.



Table 2: Potential Implementation Costs

Lessons Learned from Other Communities

According to the *Bicycle Boulevard Planning & Design Guidebook*, the following is a summary of lessons learned from other communities with successful bicycle boulevard corridors.

- Public involvement in the planning and design of the bicycle boulevard is key. Neighborhood forums and further community outreach meetings are highly recommended
- Residents along proposed bicycle boulevards, as well as those on nearby streets, are frequently concerned about changes to traffic along their streets and access to their homes. Particularly in locations where no bicycle boulevard exists, the proposed function of bicycle boulevards needs to be communicated to the public
- Consult with local emergency services regarding traffic calming and reduction designs
- Continually evaluate the performance of the bicycle boulevard as well as traffic impacts on nearby streets
- Bicycle maps are the most common method of disseminating information about the bicycle boulevards. Organized community bicycle rides and other creative methods are also frequently mentioned
- Use what resources are available. Capitalize on existing features that reduce speed and volume of motor vehicle traffic non-motorized bridges and one-way streets, but remember that the boulevard still needs to connect to key destinations
- Schedule improvements in coordination with repaving and other major projects

Monitoring Phase

MAY USE

After the installation of the bicycle boulevard strategies, an evaluation of the impacts will need to be made. Especially when stops signs are removed, traffic volumes and speeds should be monitored to ensure that the street has not become significantly more attractive as a through route for motorists. The following strategies could be used if desired by the neighborhood after the evaluation phase to address any potential impacts, including to prevent diversion if necessary:

- Turn restrictions from major streets
- Diagonal diverters (bikes exempted)
- Force right-turns (bikes exempted)

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Sources	. 48
Appendix B: Base Data Collection Maps	49
Appendix C: Miami-Herald Meeting Advertisements	56
Appendix D: Task Memorandum Notes	. 58
Appendix E: BPAC Resolution of Support	.70
Appendix F: City of Miami Bicycle Master Plan	.71



MAY USE FULL LANE

Appendix A: Sources





1. North Dade Greenways Master Plan

Prepared by FIU School of Architecture Graduate Program in Landscape Architecture for Miami-Dade County Metropolitan Planning Organization December, 1997

2. 2009 MUTCD Manual

MAY USE Full Lane

3. Miami-Dade County Aesthetics Master Plan for Miami-Dade County Gateways, Corridors, and Facilities

Prepared by EDAW / AECOM for the Community Image Advisory Board January, 2009

4. Sign Implementation Manual for Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department

Prepared by Glatting Jackson Kercher Anglin for Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department December, 2007

- 5. Fundamentals of a Bicycle Boulevard Planning & Design
- 6. Berkeley Bicycle Boulevard Network Design Tools and Guidelines



48





Appendix B: Base Data Collection Maps

200





Figure 1 Study Area Aerial

Legend

•	Metrorail Station
+ +	Metrorail
	Local Road
	Study Area
	Parks
	Water





Figure 2 Neighborhood Characteristics Map

Le	egend	N
•	Bus Stop	
i.	Library	
	Hospital	
1	Schools	
\bigcirc	Metrorail Station	
+-+	Metrorail	
	Local Road	
	Tri-Rail	
	FEC Railroad	
	Greenway Network	
	StudyArea	
	City Boundary	
	Commercial Parcel	
	Office	
	Parks	
	Water	
	Commission District 2	
	Commission District 3	
0.25	0.5	1





Miles







Figure 3A Existing Land Use Map

Legend



StudyArea City Boundary Landuse Residential Hotels/Motels Commercial Industrial



Institutional



Agriculture

Right-of-Way

- Other
 - Vacant Undeveloped

Water













Figure 3B Right-of-Way Map

Legend







Appendix C: Miami-Herald Meeting Ads

GR MiamiHerald.com/Neighbors | THE MIAMI HERALD | THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2009

11

MAY USE FULL LANE

METRO-DADE COUNTY NBRS Grove/GR11/Dade

Section/Page/Zone:

2X5.5

Insertion Number:

The Miami Herald 🕼

Ad Number

B&W

Color Type: Miami Herald on the

Size: Color ⁻

Description

Client Name

833270401 833270401

Advertiser

way exploit or

or in any

vorks.

create

bot

nav

/ou

and page indicated.

date

Fhe

04/30/2009 idence that the ad appeared

Publication Date: This E-Sheet(R) is provided as conclusive

Appendix C: Miami-Herald Meeting Ads

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

to MAY USE FULL LANE

> repurpose any works, or in any way exploit or not create derivative may You page indicated. pue late Miami Herald on the 10/01/2009 that the Publication Date: This E-Sheet(R) is provided as conclusive

for the

Looking

Turn to Employment ads in careerbuilder

in The Miami Herald and online at MiamiHerald.com/careerbuilder

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability or family status. Multiple members of individual community councils may attend

THURSDAY, OCT(

Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

To:	Mark Heinicke, CPRP, CLARB Date: January 15, 2009 Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department (MDPR)	Suite 109 5200 Northwest 33 rd Aver Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309
From:	 Stewart Robertson, PE Naveen Modali Poorna Bhattacharya, AICP Kimley-Horn and Assoc. (KHA) Subject: Kick-off Meeting Notes Task 1a 	S
Projec	ect: District No. 2 & 3 Bicycle Boulevard Job No.: 040829019 Planning Study	
:	ded by: Mark Heinicke, Park Planner III – MDPR David Henderson, Bike/Ped Specialist – Miami-Dade County MPO Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade Public Works	
The r attend summ pertin	ded by: Mark Heinicke, Park Planner III – MDPR David Henderson, Bike/Ped Specialist – Miami-Dade County MPO Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade Public Works Naveen Modali – KHA Poorna Bhattacharya – KHA meeting began with introductions by the project team members in dance. MDPR staff provided the kickoff meeting agenda, which narized items to be discussed. The following list describes the nent discussion topics during the meeting.	
The r attend summ pertin	ded by: Mark Heinicke, Park Planner III – MDPR David Henderson, Bike/Ped Specialist – Miami-Dade County MPO Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade Public Works Naveen Modali – KHA Poorna Bhattacharya – KHA meeting began with introductions by the project team members in dance. MDPR staff provided the kickoff meeting agenda, which narized items to be discussed. The following list describes the nent discussion topics during the meeting. cle Boulevard Planning Study, Kick-Off Meeting Discussion	
The r attend summ pertin Bicvc • M ob pc ar He Li	ded by: Mark Heinicke, Park Planner III – MDPR David Henderson, Bike/Ped Specialist – Miami-Dade County MPO Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade Public Works Naveen Modali – KHA Poorna Bhattacharya – KHA meeting began with introductions by the project team members in dance. MDPR staff provided the kickoff meeting agenda, which narized items to be discussed. The following list describes the nent discussion topics during the meeting. cle Boulevard Planning Study, Kick-Off Meeting Discussion Mark Heinicke started off the discussion by reviewing the project bjectives. Mr. Heinicke explained that the study can explore the ossibilities of having a Bicycle Boulevard on any road within the study rea, but not restrict to the three main corridors listed in the scope. Mr. Heinicke and David Henderson stressed to have a connection to the ittle River on the north end.	
The r attend summ pertin Bicvc • M ob pc ar Ho Li	ded by: Mark Heinicke, Park Planner III – MDPR David Henderson, Bike/Ped Specialist – Miami-Dade County MPO Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade Public Works Naveen Modali – KHA Poorna Bhattacharya – KHA meeting began with introductions by the project team members in dance. MDPR staff provided the kickoff meeting agenda, which narized items to be discussed. The following list describes the nent discussion topics during the meeting. cle Boulevard Planning Study, Kick-Off Meeting Discussion Mark Heinicke started off the discussion by reviewing the project bjectives. Mr. Heinicke explained that the study can explore the ossibilities of having a Bicycle Boulevard on any road within the study rea, but not restrict to the three main corridors listed in the scope. Mr. Ieinicke and David Henderson stressed to have a connection to the .ittle River on the north end. Mr. Cohen suggested having a possible connection to the Miami River Greenway and the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC) using the proposed	

MAY USE FULL LANE

Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

NAY USE FULL LAN

Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

To:	Mark Heinicke, CPRP, CLARB Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department (MDPR)	Date:	June 29, 200	9	Suite 109 5200 Northwest 33 rd Aven Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309
From:	Stewart Robertson, PE Naveen Modali Kimley-Horn and Assoc. (KHA)	Subject:	Meeting No – Phase 1 R	tes eview	
Projec	t: District No. 2 & 3 Bicycle Bouleva Planning Study	ard Jo	ob No.: 04082	29019	
	David Henderson, Bike/Ped Speciali Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade County P Alfreda Hodgson – Office of County Collin Worth – City of Miami	IDPR ist – Miar ublic Wo / Commis	ni-Dade Coun rks Departmer ssioner Distric	nty MPO nt t 3	
The m attenda items t topics	David Henderson, Bike/Ped Speciali Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade County P Alfreda Hodgson – Office of County Collin Worth – City of Miami Jorge Herrera – Miami-Dade Police Stewart Robertson – Kimley-Horn a Naveen Modali – Kimley-Horn and neeting began with introductions by ance. MDPR staff provided the meet to be discussed. The following list d during the meeting.	1DPR ist – Miar ublic Wo 7 Commis Departmend Associate Associate 9 the pro- eting agen lescribes	ni-Dade Coun rks Departmen ssioner Distric ent iates, Inc. es, Inc. oject team mo nda, which su the pertinent o	ty MPO nt t 3 embers in mmarized discussion	
The m attenda items t topics Bicvel	David Henderson, Bike/Ped Speciali Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade County P Alfreda Hodgson – Office of County Collin Worth – City of Miami Jorge Herrera – Miami-Dade Police Stewart Robertson – Kimley-Horn an Naveen Modali – Kimley-Horn and neeting began with introductions by ance. MDPR staff provided the meet to be discussed. The following list d during the meeting.	1DPR ist – Miar ublic Wo 7 Commis Departmend Associate Associate y the pro- eting agen lescribes	ni-Dade Coun rks Departmen ssioner Distric ent iates, Inc. es, Inc. oject team mo nda, which su the pertinent o w Meeting Di	tty MPO nt t 3 embers in mmarized discussion	
The m attenda items topics Bicycl Stee of bic Mm exp Mm peo	 Walk Heinke, Fark Hainer Hiller W David Henderson, Bike/Ped Speciali Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade County P Alfreda Hodgson – Office of County Collin Worth – City of Miami Jorge Herrera – Miami-Dade Police Stewart Robertson – Kimley-Horn and Naveen Modali – Kimley-Horn and neeting began with introductions by ance. MDPR staff provided the meeting bediscussed. The following list d during the meeting. e Boulevard Planning Study, Phase ewart Robertson started off the discutation by a bicycle boulevard along with activation gave an overview of plained the information provided in the tennicke requested KHA to sendelstrian crash data from the study area 	IDPR ist – Miar ublic Wo 7 Commis Departmond Associate Associate y the pro- eting ager lescribes 1 Reviev assion by dvantages f the bas he maps. d a map a.	ni-Dade Coun rks Departmen ssioner Distric ent iates, Inc. s, Inc. oject team mo nda, which su the pertinent of <u>w Meeting Di</u> explaining the and disadva se data inven with the bio	ty MPO nt t 3 embers in mmarized discussion <u>scussion</u> e concept intages of ntory and cycle and	

MAY USE FULL LANE

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study:

Aodel City/Brownsville

Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

MAY USE FULL LANE

Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

	MEMO	RANDUM		
To:	Mark Heinicke, CPRP, CLAF Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department (MDF	RB Date: d PR)	June 18, 2009	Suite 109 5200 Northwest 33 rd Aver Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309
From:	Stewart Robertson, PE Naveen Modali Kimley-Horn and Assoc. (KF	Subject IA)	: Workshop Meeting – Task 2a	g Notes
Project	District No. 2 & 3 Bicycle B Planning Study	Soulevard J	ob No.: 040829019	
	County Commissioner Dorrin County Commissioner Audrey Gerard Philippeaux – Office o Marta Martinez–Aleman –Off Pete Villa – Office of County Natalia Escobo – Office of Co Junita Roundtree – Office of Co Dr. May Bryant – Office of Co Marie Russell – Office of Cov Collin Worth – City of Miami	Rolle – Comm / Edmonson – G of County Commissioner Ounty Commissioner County Commissioner Sounty Commissioner Commissioner Sounty Commissioner Sounty Commissioner Sount	Ission District 2 Commission District 3 missioner District 3 Commissioner District District 3 ioner District 3 ssioner District 3 soner District 3 oner District 3	3

MAY USE FULL LANE
Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

Kimley-Hor and Associ	n ates, Inc.	
The meeting was started attendance followed by a the concept of bicycle bo benefits and possible stra After the presentation b input on existing probler and possible bicycle bou	with introductions by the project team members in a detailed presentation by the KHA team presenting bulevards and their safety, efficiency, neighborhood ategies that can be used on bicycle boulevards. reak-out sessions were conducted to gather public ns on bicycle boulevard streets, connectivity issues levards.	Suite 109 5200 Northwest 33 ^{ert} Avenue Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309
The following are the life additional bicycle boulew • Connect to new p • Connect to day-ca • Connect to county • Connect to Rober The following are the roa the study team as bicycle • NW 50 St from N • NW 66 St/NW 67 • NW 18 Ave from • NW 14 Ave from • NW 11 Ave from • NW 6 Ave from 1	st of issues that were recorded from the public for vard concepts: volice sub station ares y facilities to Clemente Park adways suggested by the public for consideration by boulevards: IW 33 Ave to NW 10 Ave 7 St NW 41 St to NW 60 St NW 41 St to NW 60 St NW 50 St to NW 62 St NW 46 St to NW 67 St NW 54 St to NW 67 St	
Meeting Adjourned		
FEI 954 535 5100	Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study – Task 2a	



Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

	MEMORANDUM	
To:	Mark Heinicke, CPRP, CLARB Date: October 22, 2009 Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department (MDPR)	Suite 109 5200 Northwest 33 rd Aven Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309
From:	Stewart Robertson, PESubject:Public Open HousNaveen Modali- Task 2eKimley-Horn and Assoc. (KHA)	se Meeting
Project	t: District No. 2 & 3 Bicycle Boulevard Job No.: 040829019 Planning Study	
	Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade Public Works County Commissioner Dorrin Rolle – Commission District 2 County Commissioner Audrey Edmonson – Commission District Marta Martinez–Aleman –Office of County Commissioner District Brian Gillis – Office of County Commissioner District 3 Junita Roundtree – Office of County Commissioner District 3 Marie Russell – Office of County Commissioner District 3 Jamie Caulkins – Bike Safe Naveen Modali – Kimley-Horn and Associates Inc	3 ct 3
The lis	Stewart Robertson – Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. st of general public along with the others that were present at open house is shown in the attachment.	the
1	open house, the study team displayed information about the Tool 1	Box

Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
 The concepts of bicycle boulevard and public input and opinions about was collected. The following are the list of issues additional bicycle boulevard concept Provide more trees in the area The concept of the bicycle boulevard shou when possible. 	planning were explained in more detail the study and the information presented that were recorded from the public for ts: a. pulevard is a good idea. Id be provided on the side of the road	Suite 109 5200 Northwest 33rd Avenue Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309
Meeting Adjourned		
	Disusle Daulauard Discusses Of the Table 2	
TEL 954 535 5100 FAX 954 739 2247	Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study – Task 2e Page 2 of 2	

Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

	MEMORANDU	UM		
To:	Mark Heinicke, CPRP, CLARB Miami-Dade County Park and Recreation Department (MDPR)	Date: Septer	mber 29, 2009	Suite 109 5200 Northwest 33 rd Avenu Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309
From:	Stewart Robertson, PE Naveen Modali Kimley-Horn and Assoc. (KHA)	Subject: Meeti Draft Implen	ing Notes nentation Plan	
Projec	t: District No. 2 & 3 Bicycle Bouleva Planning Study	rd Job No.:	040829019	
	Mark Heinicke, Park Planner III – MI Joe Webb - MDPR David Henderson, Bike/Ped Specialis Kimberly Brown – Miami-Dade Cour Zoning Jeff Cohen – Miami-Dade County Pu Stewart Robertson – Kimley-Horn an Naveen Modali – Kimley-Horn and A	DPR st – Miami-Dade nty Department blic Works Dep d Associates, In Associates, Inc.	e County MPO of Planning and partment ne.	
The n attend items topics	neeting began with introductions by ance. MDPR staff provided the meet to be discussed. The following list de during the meeting.	the project ter ting agenda, where the pert	am members in nich summarized tinent discussion	
<u>Bicycl</u> Discus	e Boulevard Planning Study, Draft] ssion	<u>Implementatio</u>	<u>n Plan Meeting</u>	
 Steen of Main that foll Joe Boot 	wart Robertson started off the discus a bicycle boulevard. Robertson gave an overview of the t involved in the selection of the pr lowed by the Tool Box that was propo webb mentioned about the connect ulevard to Hadley Park and commented	project and exproposed streets sed for the stud tion of the 14 th ed that the 14 th	hing the concept blained the steps for this project y. Avenue Bicycle Avenue Bicycle	
TEL 954	535 5100 Bicycl 739 2247	e Boulevard Plann	ing Study – Task 2f Page 1 of 2	
1700 004				

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study:

Aodel City/Brownsville

Appendix D: Meeting Summary Notes

FULL LAN





Kimley-Horn

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study:

Model City/Brownsville

Appendix E: BPAC Resolution of Support





Appendix F: City of Miami Bicycle Master Plan





This report for the Miami-Dade County Bicycle Boulevard Planning Study has been reviewed and accepted as presented.

NAME/TITLE	DEPARTMENT/ DIVISION	SIGNATURE	DATE
Jack Kardys Director	Park and Recreation		
W. Howard Gregg Deputy Director	Park and Recreation Planning and Development		
Frank Faragalli Assistant Director	Park and Recreation Operations		
Carolyn Gibson North Region Manager	Park and Recreation Operations		
Maria Nardi Chief	Park and Recreation Planning and Research		
Joe Webb, RLA, ASLA Section Supervisor	Park and Recreation Park Systems Planning		
Mark Heinicke, CPRP, CLARB Park Planner III	Park and Recreation Park Systems Planning		

5to

MAY USE Full Lane