

May 6, 2017

Carmen Sanchez, Deputy Planning Director

Rogelio Madan, Senior Planner  
City of Miami Beach

CC: Antoinette Stohl and City Officials

VIA EMAIL

**RE: Comments on Casino Traffic Congestion**

---

The Coalition Against Causeway Chaos submits these comments in support of ordinances prohibiting Gambling and Casinos throughout Miami Beach.

There are three known and understood issues related to casinos and traffic on Miami Beach:

- Casinos add a surge in short-term automobile traffic.
- Traffic on Miami Beach has already become one of the most serious challenges to the health, safety and quality of life for residents, enjoyable leisure time for visitors, and success for businesses.
- Increased traffic across the causeways between Miami and Miami Beach are perilously close to a tipping point which may diminish the future of Miami Beach and change its character.

One doesn't need to retain new traffic experts to envision the future. The City already has. Why ignore the information the City is now sitting on....

- 20 months of studies
- Over \$200,000 spent
- Two separate experts, *from out of the local area to attempt to assure no political interference*
- Two sets of conclusions, both of which show serious gridlock on

MacArthur Causeway, with impact on Venetian and Julia Tuttle causeways

And all that work gathers dust as it sits on the shelf at City Hall. We attach our review of those studies.

The simple conclusions: *already planned* developments put parts of the main link between Miami and Miami Beach into *Level of Service Failure*. Adding even more challenging traffic flows is not just inconvenient; it is dangerous.

These studies by the City of Miami Beach examined the impact of the Flagstone Island Gardens mega-development on tiny Watson Island. The 2004/2007 plan under which Flagstone is preparing to break ground – could increase travel times at some points by 40 minutes.

These studies did not include either the *revised* Terminal Island project or a casino. Both projects should be denied.

But the City Mayor and Commission have taken no action to reduce the harm to Miami Beach regarding Watson Island, for example, by pursuing the “Interjurisdictional Mediation” provisions of Florida law. Their inaction is wrong and hypocritical.

Florida law permits one jurisdiction harmed by another to enter in negotiations to “mitigate the damage” caused by one. The Flagstone project has already been demonstrated to create such a crisis for MacArthur causeway, that one likely solution -- two more lanes on MacArthur -- could become the Beaches cost alone.

The Genting interest in a casino at the former Miami *Herald* site on the mainland at the end of the Venetian Causeway will only make traffic worse—much worse on both sides of the Bay if they prevail.

And of course a casino within the City of Miami Beach will prove equally catastrophic.

Despite the conclusion of their own traffic studies last August, the Mayor and Commission have done nothing to remedy current problems by way of mitigating the potential damage of the Flagstone project on Watson Island. CACC

does not understand why, but the citizens of Miami Beach, to protect itself, must ask and get answers.

In support of these comments we have attached the following:

- The CACC Report on the Traffic Study Conducted by the City of Miami Beach and what we believe to be the erroneous conclusions drawn by the City Manager;

And....

- An extract of the report by the Greater Miami Visitors and Convention Bureau on the rising dissatisfaction of visitors published last week by the Greater Miami Visitors and Convention Bureau.

In short, it concludes: that travelers cite traffic as the “least liked” feature of their trip. That is more than half (54%) of all reasons given for dissatisfaction, up from 43% in 2014. Perhaps it’s no wonder that the Miami area has dropped to 7<sup>th</sup> place in the top 25 Hotel Markets in the U.S.

The GMCVB report can be found at <http://bit.ly/2p7neJV>

We welcome any comments or questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Roger M. Craver".

Roger M. Craver, President

Coalition Against Causeway Chaos

[CausewayChaos2015@gmail.com](mailto:CausewayChaos2015@gmail.com)



**MIAMI BEACH RESIDENTS AND  
BUSINESSES MAY PAY A STREEP PRICE  
FOR CITY OFFICIALS' HANDLING OF  
WATSON ISLAND DEVELOPMENT AND  
REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS.**

CACC's report and analysis of the City of Miami Beach's handling of its Flagstone Island Garden Development approval and traffic impact study of the Flagstone Island Garden mega-yacht development on Watson Island.

Prepared for City of Miami Beach officials and residents and businesses of Miami Beach by the Coalition Against Causeway Chaos.

This report will soon be posted on and may be [downloaded from the Coalition's website](#) and contains links to supporting documentation.

## **Table of Contents**

- Executive Summary
- What is wrong with the studies' conclusions?
- What if the Coalition is right and the City is wrong?
- What are the failures with the first study?
- What are the failures with the second study?
- The actual findings of the Miami Beach studies.



## Executive Summary

The Coalition Against Causeway Chaos (CACC) believes a September 20, 2016 letter from the City Manager of Miami Beach (CMB) does not accurately reflect the conclusions of a series of traffic studies involving the impact of the Watson Island Flagstone Island Gardens project on Miami Beach.

The City Manager's summary explicitly excluded the current plan for the mega-development and addressed only the (then) pending request to add another 140,000 sq. ft. of retail space to the project.

By ignoring the already approved 240,000 sq. ft. of retail and the entire based project, the City Manager erroneously concluded that the addition will not have a significantly adverse impact on MacArthur Causeway." That approach has subsequently been criticized by the Florida Department of Transportation in its 2017 instructions to the City of Miami for doing the same thing.

### Background

The traffic study process was launched with a great sense of urgency on January 14, 2015 with the unanimous approval of the Mayor and Commission. Nearly two years later –20 months to be exact, the City Manager informed the Commission that the traffic impact of Flagstone was minimal.

*HOWEVER, when the entire project is examined by independent experts, the opposite conclusion is inescapable: In reality, the Flagstone Watson Island project poses significant economic, lifestyle, and public safety threats for the resident and businesses of Miami Beach and their visitors.*

Despite the actual impacts verified by the studies, *Miami Beach officials have yet to take appropriate action to mitigate the damage* expected from the Flagstone development. At this late date, it still has an opportunity to act in a reasonable timeframe to avoid putting Miami Beach at risk, to avoid having wasted at least \$220,000 of taxpayer funds on studies; to avoid repeating the same mistake for which Miami has subsequently been challenged by the FDOT's instruction to Miami to consider the entire project, not just a currently proposed increment; and, most importantly,

avoid considering the actual analysis and in-depth conclusions presented in the studies of its own experts.

The City of Miami Beach can reduce what CACC believes will be serious harm to residents, businesses and the economy by invoking the State's Interjurisdictional Mediation mechanism and enter negotiations with the City of Miami to mitigate the negative impacts of the Watson Island Flagstone project.

We hope those negotiations will be conducted in public so that Miami Beach Commissioners may earn the trust of their residents in the conduct of the process which poses a threat to their health, safety, quality of life and economic livelihoods.



# What is wrong with the City's 9/20/2016 Summary?

The following represent key failings of the summary of the studies undertaken by CMB and presents key facts of the full studies.

## The City Manager's Summary

For whatever reason, the traffic impact summary completely ignored the effect of the project as originally approved by the City of Miami in 2004 (and the 2007 modification, referred here as the 2004 or "current" plan). Instead it chose to focus *only* on the effect of a pending request by the developer to add an additional 140,000 square feet of retail space.

In his report to the Mayor and Commission, CMB's City Manager wrote of the proposed addition:

"The Traffic Impact Study concluded that the increase in trips caused by the developments will not have a significantly adverse impact on MacArthur Causeway. The congestion observed in the model cannot be attributed to the proposed development."

However, his summary ignores the full data collected for their studies.

"It is worth highlighting that the traffic impacts of both the 2004 approved development and the 2015 requested approval [the additional 140,000 SF] were analyzed; however only the additional 140,000 SF of retail is open for comment." (Emphasis added.)

## The Coalition's conclusions from the full set of data.

It is clear from the data regarding Flagstone's 2004 Plan, re-approved by the City of Miami from 2010 through 2014, already put at least one segment of the MacArthur Causeway into a traffic "failure" rating and that ignoring the impact of the planned structures violates adopted professional standards for traffic analysis.

To draw an analogy, the City Manager in effect chose to conclude that adding 10 cigarettes a day (the proposed additional 140,000 square feet) to a two-pack habit would mean the entire behavior would not be significant.

But even that conclusion is wrong because the studies show that just the incremental 140,000 sq. ft. of public space that Flagstone then requested from the

City of Miami *does have a significant impact* on MacArthur Causeway, especially when you consider the admission by the City Manager that the “congestion observed” -- meaning an existing problem -- can’t be attributed to the additional development approval requested. **It is unreasonable to accept *additional impacts to an overburdened roadway, without any mitigation or plan to offer relief for the current condition. At a minimum, addressing the existing issues should come before additional burden is accepted.***

The summary letter chooses to ignore the forest for the trees, or put another way, the highway for the driveway. The real result will be at the very least 4,000 and up to 7,000 extra trips a day – both “adverse” and “significant.” A technical play on statutory language that will hardly be appreciated by frustrated residents and visitors stalled in an extra 40 minutes of traffic.

Not only are travel conditions significantly impacted by the total proposal of this mammoth project, there is likely to be a deterioration of the tax base from the reduced value of the residences on the Islands off MacArthur, near the intersection of MacArthur and Alton Road, and “South of Fifth.”

Consider the implications of relying on the “summary” versus the full studies:

- The City of Miami Beach has failed as yet to enter discussions to mitigate according to State standards.
- The City of Miami Beach actually conducted two studies. The first study ignored the uniqueness of the economic health of the City and County and its dependence on the tourist industry. To be sure of its results, it conducted a second study by a different expert consulting firm.
- While there are differences, ***both* consultants *reached the same overall conclusions: the proposed Island Gardens mega-development does have significant impact to the Causeway, increases delays measurably and results in a “failing” segment on the Causeway. The only difference between the two studies is that the second is even stronger in its condemnation than the first.***



## **What if CACC is right?**

**The likely damage from not asking the City of Miami to address the increase of traffic** on MacArthur and Venetian Causeways created by the mammoth Flagstone project – either the 2004/7 Plan and the 2016 proposed modification is extensive.

### **The risks to health, safety and quality of life for Beach residents.**

- MacArthur Causeway is a direct route for most emergencies going from Miami Beach to Jackson Memorial Hospital. Gridlock endangers residents and visitors with individual or collective crises, such emergency responses for fire, police and ambulances who can't get to an accident, or evacuations. And even Coast Guard responses.
- Decline in property values on Islands off MacArthur Causeway, Alton Road, South of Fifth, West Avenue and Venetian Way. It has been informally estimated by real estate brokers that values could be negatively affected by between 3 and 10%.
- Decline in the Miami Beach tax base requiring an increase for residents and businesses in tax rates or a reduction in City services.
- Decline in the quality of life for Miami Beach residents who have less incentive to visit the mainland and its cultural, educational, sports and business offerings.
- Increases in the cost of travel on the Causeway, for commuter and tourist traffic and an increase in pollution from the increase delay and emissions.

### **The risks to the economies of both the City of Miami Beach and the entire Miami-Dade County.**

- Miami Beach depends, in part, on local visitors from other areas of South Florida, both for individual and family visits to the Beach and facilities, but also to attend major events. A change in those visits must be considered along with out-of-town visitors.

- Decline in the tourist trade will have extraordinary implications not only for the Beach community but for the entire County.
- According to the Greater Miami Convention and Tourist Bureau (GMVCB): “In 2016, visitors generated nearly \$25.5 billion in direct expenditures; however, if we used the industry accepted multiplier of 1.5, the direct and indirect impact of expenditures would exceed \$38.3 billion to the economy of Greater Miami.”

[For the GMCVB report, please go to:

<http://partners.miamiandbeaches.com/~media/files/gmcvb/partners/research%20statistics/annual-report-2016>]

- **Traffic** already tops the list of dissatisfaction by tourists. Tourists are attracted to our area to a large extent by the unique access to both sides of the Bay. Difficulties in crossing the Bay will, without doubt, reduce the appeal of the Miami area.

The GMCVB annual report for 2016 (published 4/29/2017) notes that 21.6% of travelers cite traffic as the “least liked” feature of their trip. That is more than half (54%) of all reasons given for dissatisfaction, up from 43% in 2014.

- Beach hotel occupancy will go down, or at least fail to grow as much as it could. The Miami area dropped to 7<sup>th</sup> place of the top 25 Hotel Markets in the US. Moreover, Miami has the 5<sup>th</sup> highest in room rates in the US.
- Restaurants and other entertainment venues will suffer.
- The all-important generators of business – meeting planners -- will shy away from booking locations where both sides of the Bay are not conveniently accessible. Major events, exhibitions, trade shows, industry or company conventions, and the like will suffer from a decrease in meeting planner support.

This was a precipitous decline in business visitors attending national/regional/corporate meetings or conventions from 2015, to levels below 2012.



Is the inability to travel across the bay causing a tipping point for the convention industry?

Art Basel's Miami representative warned City of Miami Beach elected officials about the consequences of gridlock.

One need look no further for a glimpse into the future than meeting planners' negative attitudes towards connecting Los Angeles with Santa Monica.

- There is another troubling trend: there is a decided shift away from "Definitely Likely to Return" to "Very Likely or Somewhat Like to Return." While it is not possible to correlate the decline specifically with traffic issues, the decrease from 2012 is 18 points.
- Small business owners will feel the impact of anything that reduces the number of visitors.
- Tax payments to the *City of Miami Beach alone* will decline, putting stress on the City's budget and either an increase in taxes or a reduction of services. 2016 taxes collected just through hotel and food and beverages reached \$84 million.
- Employment, especially at hotels and restaurants, will decrease. Leisure employment in the county reached 144,500 in 2016. The threat of decreased employment for Beach residents should not be underestimated.
- It is also likely that costs for employees and their employers will increase with the lengthening of time it takes for employees to get to the beach to work.

The research house "24/7 Wall Street" notes that Miami residents already "have the longest commute of any metro area in Florida."

- The impact of other major residential and commercial developments in both the cities of Miami Beach and Miami has already increased stress on cross-bay traffic: new condos and apartments on the Beach, the Brickell City Center, Miami World Center, several new residence towers just north and south of MacArthur Boulevard on and adjacent to Biscayne Boulevard.

- If a casino is built at Genting or the Fontainebleau, traffic will take another, significant upturn.

## **Conversely, what if the Coalition is wrong and the City is right?**

No big deal: wasted discussion with the City of Miami.

Shouldn't City of Miami Beach officials at least make a good faith effort on behalf of its voters, citizens, residents, visitors and businesses?

## **What is wrong with the First Study? (The Study Conducted by VHB)**

The City of Miami Beach actually authorized two studies. The first began in May 2015 and the second in April 2016.

To understand why the City made the right decision in conducting the second study, consider some of the problems identified with the directions given to the consultants for the first study.

### **Incorrect Scope of Services**

The City's Transportation Department made errors in the first project's design through its Scope of Services by calling for the use of standard national data ranges and applications. (When we learned of this, the Coalition pushed hard for a new study focusing on the uniqueness of Miami Beach.)

### **Failed City Administration Time Management**

While the City Commission authorized the study on January 14, 2015, the Scope of Services contract was not signed until May 8, 2015.

Because the critical period involving traffic for Miami Beach is November through April, the study was delayed to a less relevant seasonal impact. Nor could the study do a real-time traffic count on Venetian Causeway, as the Causeway was closed, *as known far in advance*, on May 1<sup>st</sup> for repair.

The City's Transportation Department failed to organize the study in a timely manner.



## **Wrong seasons, days and times**

Any city official responsible for designing this study should have known that traffic across the Bay varies by season, days of the week and times of the day. The study should have looked to capacity during relevant months, days and hours of use so as to avoid the situation where traffic can be so burdensome as to become a tipping point for the attractiveness of Miami Beach and Miami as destinations.

Both local and out-of-area tourists do not primarily travel across the Bay during business rush hours. They travel mid-to-late mornings, mid-afternoons, evenings, and especially on weekends. Events in either city depend on the ability of attendees to travel to the other side of the Bay.

For example, the local representative of Art Basel wrote to the Commission for its January 2015 deliberations that the traffic problem between Miami and Miami Beach was so severe, that if the problem were not adequately addressed, Art Basel would have to explore other communities for its US operations.

## **Wrong Measurements**

National standards for traffic studies should have been adjusted for the uniqueness of the relationship between the Cities of Miami and Miami Beach. Technical standards for measuring traffic flows in Omaha, for instance, simply do not apply.

(For technical data on the inapplicability of national standards, please refer to Annual average daily traffic (AADT) at

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Annual\\_average\\_daily\\_traffic](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Annual_average_daily_traffic))

or for Peak Hour Traffic Data at:

[https://sjnaavarro.files.wordpress.com/2008/08/highway\\_capacity\\_manual.pdf](https://sjnaavarro.files.wordpress.com/2008/08/highway_capacity_manual.pdf))

The City's Transportation Department failed to design a proper study.

**The Scope of Services for the first study also called for an evaluation of Miami's earlier studies, but it wasn't conducted.**

The first study's Scope of Services correctly stated: "In particular, Consultant shall evaluate the impact of the Project on vehicular traffic ... *both* (a) as currently approved by the City of Miami *and* taking into account the proposals submitted in 2014 and 2015 by Flagstone to the City of Miami to add approximately 140,000 square feet of retail/commercial space to the Project (*altogether, the "Study"*)."

The Scope of Services for the first study also sought an evaluation of the 2004 and 2013 Flagstone traffic studies for adherence to professional standards.

Despite best efforts subsequently reported by consultant VHB, *no evaluation of Miami traffic studies was in fact authorized*. The City's direction makes the result fatally flawed. Here's why.

- In 2004, Miami officials permitted the Flagstone developer to conduct its state-mandated study only at the point when *traffic had already exited MacArthur onto Watson Island and without measuring the impact on MacArthur Causeway, part of which is fed by a Federal highway*.
- No study was done when the project was completely renegotiated in 2010.
- In 2013, when the Miami Beach Commission unanimously expressed its opposition to a vast increase (300,000 square feet) of commercial space proposed by developers Jorge Perez and Steve Ross for the Flagstone project, they withdrew. A 2013 Miami study was not released at the time, despite public records requests.
- In 2014, then City of Miami Deputy City Manager Alice Bravo told the State Cabinet that she had in her hand a 2013 traffic study that met requirements and was acceptable.

Ms. Bravo misled both the Miami City Commission and the Cabinet about the 2013 Study. When subsequently questioned under oath, she stated that *she had received the study for the first time just an hour before the Cabinet meeting*.

In 2014, Ms. Bravo misled the City Commission by omitting that a required study did not exist and she misled the Cabinet by giving the impression that the 2013 Flagstone-conducted study had been in the possession of the City for several months and had been reviewed and approved by proper City officials.

We believe Ms. Bravo's statements and omissions violated the Truth in Government requirements of the County and City Charters.

Further, when it was finally obtained, it became obvious that the "2013" study did not meet standards set by the State. A persistent



question: whether the studies were ever reviewed by the FDOT to verify compliance with adopted standards for Interstate facilities, portions of which apply on the Causeway? The question needs to be asked because no public records request has brought such review to light.

## **What is wrong with the second study? (Conducted by FTE)**

As a result of the deficiencies in the City's design of the first study, the City ordered a "peer review second study."

The Transportation Department's Scope of Services for the second study *did not* include a requirement to review prior Miami studies, despite then available copies of those studies which showed they did not meet State standards by not including impacts on a neighboring jurisdiction or Interstate 395.

Miami Beach administrators did not raise this issue, despite a clear State Law (FS 163) which not only permits such issues to be raised, but stipulates that one jurisdiction should notify neighboring jurisdictions of any extra jurisdictional impact. Florida Law is designed to encourage those issues to be coordinated between jurisdictions. It does not appear that the Miami Beach Commission was given an option to do this.

- The *January* 2016 version of the Scope of Services for FTE included a required comparison of the new data to be collected to be *compared* to the 2015 study. The *April* 2016 revision of the Scope of Services omitted this requirement.

Sometime between these two Scopes of Service, someone in the City determined that the Commissioners and public should not see those comparisons.

- The summary "conclusions" of the second study referred to by the City Manager cleverly parse technical language to avoid the negative consequences when taken in a larger and proper context.

In reality, the additional traffic from the proposed increase in retail, when added to the current project design, puts even more stress on MacArthur Causeway, causing increases in delay and congestion on a projected

“failing” segment of the Causeway and further degradation in the level of service.

When FTE’s summary notes that: “The increase in development trips is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on the causeway and on 5<sup>th</sup> Street,” it is but a narrow and clever defense of what could have been a political decision, not a complete representation of the facts of the significant negative impact that will occur in that already-congested area.

## Actual findings of the Miami Beach studies

### Key findings of the first study conducted by VHB:

The **existing condition** (2015) of MacArthur and related areas *before any* planned construction by Flagstone showed the following:

- Most intersections studied operated at a Level of Service (LOS) score of D, E or F during critical hours.<sup>1</sup>
- The City of Miami Beach had previously adopted D as its minimum LOS. Thus, the Alton Road intersection does not meet the required standard.
- There are extensive queues on many approaches that impact the ability of traffic to access properties along the roadway approaches. This condition has a detrimental effect on the quality of travel and can impact the business economics on some corridors.

---

<sup>1</sup>All intersections studied, with the exception of A1A @ Alton Road operated at LOS D or better during the PM Peak Period; the exception was at LOS F. All intersections studied operated at LOS E or better during the AM Peak Period. The Alton Road intersection is at LOS E.



- In 2020, *without* the Island Gardens project, certain the segments of the Causeway are projected to be at failing conditions with average operating speeds at some times as low as 10 mph.<sup>2</sup>

**Buildout** of the Flagstone Project as designed in 2004 and without the most recent proposed retail additions would have the following impact.

- Approximately 17,100 additional trips would be added to MacArthur Causeway.<sup>3</sup>
- The increased traffic from the proposed development, along with general growth in background traffic will result in some failing causeway segments.<sup>4</sup>
- During certain times, service on the Causeway will drop to LOS E.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>In 2020, without the Island Gardens project, the segments of the Causeway between Fountain Street and east of Bridge Road are projected to be at failing conditions with average operating speeds in the PM Peak Hour as low as 10 mph.

<sup>3</sup>An additional 17,100 trips +/- would be added to MacArthur Causeway (portions to/from the east of Watson Island and others to/from the west – Miami Beach). Nearly 1,300 net new trips would be added to the Causeway during the PM Peak Hour.

<sup>4</sup>The increased traffic from the proposed development, along with general growth in background traffic during the AM Peak Hour results in failing Causeway segments between the Island Gardens/Watson Island on ramp and Fountain Street, in addition to the already failing segments between Fountain and east of Bridge Road.

<sup>5</sup>During the PM Peak Period, service on the Causeway west of the US 1 off-ramp drops to LOS E.

The additional retail space proposed by Flagstone is in association with some significant changes in the original land use that was previously proposed. These associated changes have been recently challenged by CACC and were changed from 140,000 of retail to 130,000 of undefined space.)

**Adding the 140,000 sq. ft.** would have the following impact:

- The LOS conditions shows **failures are projected to occur where they do not exist prior to any Island Gardens development.**
- The additional retail proposed is in association with some significant changes in the original land use that was previously proposed. These associated changes may be cause for reconsideration of the original “approvals”.
- The addition of the 140,000 sq. ft. of development would further reduce the average operating speed on the Causeway by up to 10 mph in certain locations. **In some instances, this is a drop in operating speed of over 40%.**
- The additional component would be responsible for nearly 4,000 new trips on the Causeway (distributed in both directions and to both Miami and Miami Beach).
- The study conducted by the City of Miami Beach for the additional 140,000 sq. ft. of retail does appear to underestimate the impacts as *the reductions for pass-by traffic may not have been properly calculated.*

#### **CACC’s conclusions after both studies.**

Results of the second study (FTE) found that the first study *underestimated* the impact of the Flagstone base project because of the study’s design by the City’s Transportation Department.

- The overall project does have significant impact on travel time and level of service on the MacArthur Causeway.
- Increased travel time with the addition of the requested retail and the other modifications results in an added 40 + seconds eastbound during



the weekday peak period. This is in addition to a 6 minutes 30 second increase in travel time associated with the original “approved” development.

- Reductions in the level of service from LOS D to LOS E or F violates the adopted standards for the City of Miami Beach.

**The City of Miami Beach should seek to mitigate the impact of the project as described in 2004 and subsequently changed, with or without the recent modifications proposed, because changes to externalities have had a deleterious effect on MacArthur and Venetian Causeways and the intersections in Miami Beach and beyond.**

Whatever project is allowed to move forward, the development should only be allowed in phases and monitoring required to determine when the project traffic “triggers” needed improvement that would otherwise have been unnecessary.

**Most importantly, to avoid disaster, mitigation for those needed improvements should be required before the project is permitted to advance into a future phase.**

**CACC’s recommends:**

**The City of Miami Beach should inform the City of Miami that the Flagstone Island Gardens project approvals should not have been given without the recognition of the impacts to Miami Beach and travel on the MacArthur Causeway east of Watson Island. Mitigation for those impacts, at a minimum, should be required before additional approvals are provided.**

**The City of Miami Beach should petition the City of Miami under Chapter 163 FS to openly discuss and mutually agree to an appropriate plan to mitigate the project impacts as the extra-jurisdictional impacts clearly open this option/requirement.**

**We ask that those negotiations be conducted in public so that Miami Beach Commissioners may earn the trust of their residents in the conduct of the process which poses a threat to their health, safety, quality of life and economic livelihoods.**

## Least Liked Features



More than 60% of all visitors reported that they did not dislike any features of their visit to the Greater Miami area.



We saw significant declines in visitors disliking prices and negative media between 2015 and 2016.



We began asking visitors about their concern about the Zika virus in late 2016, and only 1.6% of all visitors reported not liking that aspect of their visit.

Domestic and International Visitors – Least Liked Features					
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
<b>Total Visitors</b>					
Nothing Disliked	75.2%	55.7%	52.5%	62.8%	63.5%
Traffic	13.4%	25.4%	19.0%	19.7%	21.6% ▲
Prices	5.2%	7.1%	9.6%	6.7%	5.5% ▼
Weather	1.8%	0.6%	3.3%	2.6%	2.9%
Negative Media	0.8%	0.2%	14.0%	5.8%	2.8% ▼
Safety	0.9%	5.6%	0.9%	1.1%	1.9% ▲
Crowded/Developed	1.5%	3.9%	2.0%	1.2%	0.9%
<b>Domestic Visitors</b>					
Nothing Disliked	68.3%	47.9%	50.0%	58.4%	61.7%
Traffic	17.6%	30.3%	20.6%	20.8%	23.0%
Prices	7.3%	10.0%	13.0%	8.3%	6.6%
Weather	2.1%	0.3%	3.5%	3.2%	2.9%
Negative Media	1.0%	0.2%	11.5%	6.9%	2.3% ▼
Safety	0.9%	5.5%	0.9%	1.2%	2.2% ▲
Crowded/Developed	0.6%	3.4%	1.7%	1.6%	0.9% ▼
<b>International Visitors</b>					
Nothing Disliked	83.1%	64.5%	54.3%	66.5%	64.8%
Traffic	8.7%	19.8%	17.9%	18.9%	20.6%
Prices	2.8%	3.7%	7.1%	5.3%	4.6%
Negative Media	0.6%	0.2%	15.8%	4.9%	3.2% ▼
Weather	1.4%	0.8%	3.1%	2.1%	2.8%
Safety	0.9%	5.7%	0.9%	1.1%	1.7%
Crowded/Developed	2.5%	4.4%	2.2%	0.8%	0.9%

Q.15: What are the features of the Greater Miami area that you liked the least?

Select all that apply.

▼▲ Denotes significance at a **95%** confidence level vs. previous year. Since a decrease in a least liked feature positive, significant decreases are shown in green while significant increases are shown in red.