

PM260013.13

Prepared by: Kimley Horn



Appendices



Appendix A: SAC Presentations and Sign-in Sheets



SAC Meeting #1





















10V	er Sy	/stem	Ехр	ans	on Stork Order #GF	tudy	MP O
Ja	nu	lary	/F	e	orua	ary	/
			5				
Began	Technology	Size (miles/Fleet)	Expansion	Aprex)/	/	
Began operation 1986/1994	Technology Bombardier Innovia 100	Size (miles/Ficet) 4.4 miles	Expansion Tre, is 1994 true 13 mile, seet and town.	Apprex. Ridership 9.5 m annully 75,000 monthly)/		
Began operation 1986/1994 2010	Technology Bombardier Innovia 100	Size (miles/Fleet) 4.4 miles	Departision This is 1994 from 13 million and mode.	Approx. Ridership 9.5 m annually 775,000 monthly 31,000 daily 000	2/		
Began operation 1986/1994	Technology Bombardier Innovia 100	Size (miles/Reet) 4.4 miles 2.4 Miles / 14 velicles	Expansion Tean tright here and each.	Apprex. Ridership 3.5 m anmaily 775,000 monthly 31,000 daily hourly)/		
Began operation 1986/1994 2010	Technology Bombardiar Innoria 100 Bombardiar Innoria 100	Size (miles/Fieet) 4.4 miles 2.4 Miles / 34 vehicles 4.9 miles / 19 vehicles	Expansion Expansion Texts 18 date, soft and none. Not Text 19 date, Specific Texts 19 date	Approx. Refership 9.5 m annually 775,000 mathy 725,000 mathy 1,000 hourly 51,000 ho)/		
Began operation 1566/1394 2010 1599 1599/1399	Technology Bombardier Innovia 100 Bombardier Innovia 100 Bombardier Innovia 100 Bombardier Innovia 100 Bombardier Steerijensky Mit, technology changed a a part of expension	Size (miles/Fient) 4.4 miles 2.4 Miles / 34 vehicles 2.5 miles / 1/2 vehicles	Expansion Transmis	Apprex. Ridership 9.5 m annually 775,000 Balay 775,000 Balay 51,000 51)		
Began operation 1598/1394 2010 1599 1598/1399 2002	Technology Bombardiar Innorka 100 Bombardiar Innorka 100 Bombardiar Bombardiar Innorka 100 Bombardiar Innorka 100 Bombardiar Bombardiar Innorka 100 Bombardiar I	Size (miles/Fient) 4.4 miles 2.4 Miles / 14 webides 2.5 miles / 19 webides 2.5 miles / 19 webides	Expension Texa a 184 mm 184	Apprex. Ridership 5.5 m annully 775,000 31,000 3000 hourly 51,000 daily 2,000 daily 2,000 daily	2/		
Began operation 1586/1994 2010 1999 2002 2002 2004	Technology Bombardier Innovia 100 Bombardier Innovia 100 Bombardier Bo	Size (miles//Teed) 4.4 miles 2.4 falles / 54 4.5 miles / 54 vehicles 2.5 miles / 18 vehicles 4.5 miles / 18 vehicles	Expension Expension Research Rese	Approximation of the second se	2/		

:P	essment _ Anril						
	.55						
ure		ints	u		Walkability	ment	ⁿ efits
a mirastruct	Traffic Impacts	Geometric Constr _a	Ease of Constructi	Land Use	Pedestrian Realm _/	^E conomic D _{evelop}	Socioeconomic B _e
utral	Good	Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Good	Neutral
bod	Very Good	Good	Good	Neutral	Good	Very Good	Poor
oor	Neutral	Good	Very Good	Neutral	Good	Poor	Good
utral	Bad	Fatal Flaw	Neutral	Good	Very Good	Good	Good

Work Order #GPC V-16











Metromover System Expansion Study





















Other Study Findings

 Recommended Port*Miami* and Bayshore Drive Anticipated Omni/Brickell Loop Closures (2040)

Signage/Lighting/Other Refurbishments (TDP) Trolley Connections – Coral Way/Brickell Trolley

CTS Kimley











Work Order #GPC V-16





SAC Meeting #1, January 24, 2014



nover System Expa	nsion Study Work Order #GPC V-16	MP
Options		
rickell		
tion ension n		
		nlev-Horn

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

MEETING ATTENDANCE

	roject: Wuthnmover Exponsion	ct: SAC#1	ion: MIQUNI KHA OTACE	Attendees Company/Department Phone	
Date:	KHA Project:	Subject:	Location:	Atte	

 			6								 	
Address or E-mail Address	NVS & Mianidadle AN	aigh yassin & dot state . fl. US	donie. Ciclandon @ d. Shek. R. w	ingle Quinidua com	todriguer a prismicour com	SALLUE CTSEINC. COM	rimenemanidade. gov	Wilson Miamidade. you	Jull.capelli @ kumley-hov n.com			
Phone	305/375-2835	305-470-5227	305-470-5292	3)579 6675	3) 46 1020	305-599-8698	205 375 56 61	305 375 1886	954-535-5107			
Company/Department	MOC- REP	FDOT ISDO	FIDT 25/2	Mianni DOA	City of Midmi	CTS ENA, The.	Putto m	NO MPR	KH1			
Attendees	Wapplen SUMUTA	Aidh Yassin	Dione Richarden	Shidh Inde	THOMA TLODANGURS	Clinesh Alla	Rolando Jumenez	Wilson Fernander	JIII Capeller	-		

The meeting adjourned at: 12,000

1221 Brickell Avenue - Suite 400 - Miami, Florida 33131 voice: 305.673.2025 lexy.kaptaine@kimley-horn.com



This Page Intentionally Left Blank



SAC Meeting #2























	Metromover System Expansion Study					
Mode	Modes To/From Metromover					
	Mode	Access Percent	Egress Percent			
	Walk Only	368 (41%)	411 (46%)			
	Metrorail 226 (25%) 209 (23%)					
	Bus 187 (21%) 175 (19%)					
	Car/Taxi	65 (7%)	60 (7%)			
	Bicycle	10 (1%)	10 (1%)			
	Other	42 (5%)	33 (4%)			

















mover System Expansion Study
nmary
/letromover add
64) over Expansion:
Beach/Miami Beach/South Beach (59%) Midtown (24%) South Extension (7%) North Extension (7%) Dadeland (4%)
Kinley-Horn











Sign-In Sheet

Name	Phone Number	Emai	il
Jill Cap	Delli 954-535)-5107 jii	11. Capelli@ Kumley - horn . com
IAN RAIR	(DEN 954-535	5-5139 IA	N. RAIRDEN & KIMLEY - HEVRN. COM
EACE	Hel 305 57	9 6675	riel@mizmiddz.com
THOMAS	REDRIGUES 305 9	16 1020	Trodrigues & Mismi Govicom
Polando	Jiménez Jr 3053	37556B1	rjimenemiamidade.gov
Douglas	Robinson 786. 41	69-5248	dKre miamidale -gov
Sarah.	Ingle 305 30	222614	ingle@miamidla.com
JAVIER K	EANCOULT 3/5	79-6675	Detancourte Miamidda.com
MARK	- DORSEY 305	375 2835	DORSFLYSCIMIANIDADE.GOV
Wilson	Fervandez 305	375 1886	wilson@miamidade.gov
Aiah	lassin 305-	70-5227	- aiah, yassin @ dot. State flus
Nate N	Valnum 402.	706-1111	nate, Walnum & Komley-norn. com
Dionine	Richardson .	305-470-529	2 dronne. richardism Colist. Stafk. A. W



This Page Intentionally Left Blank



SAC Meeting #3

Work Order #GPC V-16











Metromover System Expansion Study

Kimley **»Horn**

Work Order #GPC V-16











Metromover System Expansion Study

Kimley **»Horn**

Work Order #GPC V-16











Metromover System Expansion Study



Kimley »Horn

3

Work Order #GPC V-16











Kimley »Horn











nover	Systen	n Expa	Ansion S Work Order	Study	MPO
ng		Q N	ualitative letrics	9	
istructure istraints	Geometric Constraints	Construct -ability	Pedestrian Friendly Environment	Total Weighted Points	Ranking
4	4	4	5	3.3	1
3	2	3	2	2.0	2
1	3	1	2	1.6	3
2	5	1	3	1.3	4
nstraint 7.5%	Constraint 7.5%	Constraint 10%	Benefit 5%		
0.0	+:f:				
en		ec			
Te	rm	Ρ	roj	ec	t
			Kiml	ev≫H	orn











Work Order #GPC V-16











Metromover System Expansion Study

Budget	Schedule
\$8M	2 years
\$45M	2 years
Market Price	2-3 years
\$215M	2-3 years
\$270M	8 years
\$6M/year	Annual

Kimley » Horn









This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Sign-In Sheet

Name **Phone Number** Email JIII Capelli 954-535-5107 jill. capelli@ kimley-horn.com Eric Riel 305 579 6675 nel D'mizmidde com Wilson Fernandez (305)375-1886 wilson@miamidade.gou TITENDER 305-375-1735 RAMCHANDANI JRAMCHACMIAMIDADE. GOU Aigh Yassin 305-470-5485 aigh, yassin@dot.state.fl.us KEDE ARLDREETA 305-470-5141 REDE. AZLDREETA ODT. STATE. FL. US Noch Stillings 305-375-2835 stillin @ mizmidade, Jour THOMAS ROD Riburg 305436 1020 tradigues & mismitarcom) Carlos Cruz 3. 416 1092 ccruz-casese minigov.com Kelly Copper 305/3753275 Kcopper c milandade.gov Doug Robinson 786,469,5245 der e miamidale. Jas 305-470-5292 denne actorden eder Donne Richardson dunce a bordson ealer. State. Al. W.



This Page Intentionally Left Blank



Appendix B: TPC Presentation

Work Order #GPC V-16











Metromover System Expansion Study

Kimley **»Horn**











Metromover System Expansion Study

Kimley »Horn
Work Order #GPC V-16





Metromover System Expansion Study Survey Summary – East Zone • Largest movement east to west (39%) • East to north also high (33%) • Small percentage remains "in zone" (9%) STATION SERVING SINGLE STATION SERVING MULTIPLE STATION WITH ART EN ROUTE Kimley » Horn METRORAL





Metromover System Expansion Study

- Largest percentage remains "in zone" (50%)
- Smallest movement south to
- Relatively balanced between east and west

Kimley » Horn

Work Order #GPC V-16











Work Order #GPC V-16











Work Order #GPC V-16











Metromover System Expansion Study

Kimley » Horn

Metromover System Expansion Study Work Order #GPC V-16





Metromover System Expansion Study Work Order #GPC V-18				
Item	Estimated Cost			
Guideway Construction	\$96.5M			
Station Construction	\$22.5M			
Demolition	\$9.5M			
Vehicles	\$12.5M \$66.0M			
Other System Costs				
Sub-Total	\$207.0M			
25% Contingency and Soft Costs	\$51.8			
Total Capital Costs	\$260M			
Additional O&M Costs	\$6M/year			
	Metromover S Costs Item Guideway Construction Station Construction Demolition Vehicles Other System Costs Sub-Total 25% Contingency and Soft Costs Total Capital Costs Additional O&M Costs			





nover System Expan	sion Study
ion Plan	
PA	
a Stock	
IY SLUCK	
	Kimley »Horn

Work Order #GPC V-16









Metromover System Expansion Study

Budget	Schedule		
\$8M	2 years		
\$45M	2 years		
Market Price	2-3 years		
\$215M	2-3 years		
\$270M	8 years		
\$6M/year	Annual		

Kimley **»Horn**



Appendix C: Beach Corridor Assessment Memorandum

Kimley *Worn*

MEMORANDUM

То:	Wilson Fernandez, Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organization
From:	Jill Capelli
	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Date:	August 31, 2014
Subject:	Metromover Analysis of Beach Corridor Connection

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (KH) was retained by the Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning Organizatino (MPO) to perform a review of the finding and results of the Miami Beach Corridor studies including.

- Bay Link Phase 2, Miami-Miami Beach Transportation Corridor Study, 2004
- Beach Corridor Transit Connection Study, 2013

Using these findings, KH was tasked with completing a high-level analysis of using Metromover in lieu of the currently proposed streetcar technology for the Beach Corridor. The following sections summarize the analysis and recommendations.

Route Summary

The Bay Link Phase 2 study identified a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). During the ongoing Beach Corridor Transit Connection Study, the LPA was refined. The current Direct Connection (DC) Alignment for refined LPA is shown in **Figure 1**.

For purposes of this analysis, the Metromover alignment was assumed to travel from Miami Beach along the DC Connection route, but terminate at the Museum Park station. The resulting route length is approximately 5.4 miles long. This additional length more than doubles the existing 4.4-mile length of the Metromover system. The new alignment includes eight new stations and a modification to the Museum Park station to accommodate the new extension and transfers to the existing Metromover routes. It was also assumed that this system operates independent of the existing Metromover System. There is a joint station at Museum Park, but passengers will be required to transfer from the Beach Corridor Metromover system to the existing Metromover system.



Figure 1: Direct Connection Route, Alignment and Operating Plan (Source: Beach Corridor Transit Connection Study, PEC Meeting Presentation, April 2, 2014)

Level of Service

The Beach Corridor Transit Connection Study identified an operating plan of five-minute headways for peak periods and ten-minute headways for off-peak periods. To achieve the five-minute headway, 12 trains must pass each station during the peak hour traveling in each direction and six trains must pass each station during the off-peak hours.

The overall route length (both directions) is 10.8 miles. The resulting round trip travel time is approximately 25 minutes assuming the following:

- average travel speed of 40 miles per hour (since newer APM technologies can reach higher cruise speeds of 50 mph, which is twice that of the existing Metromover vehicles),
- 30 second dwell at each stop, and
- 16 stops along the route (two end of line stations with one stop, and seven intermediate stations with a stop for trains traveling in each direction).

To accommodate the five-minute peak hour headway with the 25 minute round trip travel time, five trains are needed in the system. These fleet size requirements are estimates based on the available planning level information. Refinements in the design process could potentially reduce the system requirements substantially.

The Bay Link Phase 2 LPA Report (dated September 2004) projected 20,075 daily boardings (Year 2025) for the Beach Corridor. The peak hour was assumed to comprise approximately 20% of the daily boardings, or 4,015 boardings per hour. Each Metromover vehicle has a capacity of approximately 100 passengers. To accommodate the peak hour boardings and meet the 5-minute headway, four-car trains are required. This results in a capacity of 400 people per train, for a total peak hour capacity of 4,800 people. An alternative to the four-car trains is running additional, two-car trains with an increased service level (i.e. shorter headways). With an increased service level, the ridership may further increase resulting in a future need for longer trains. Again, the design process would evaluate these requirements in more detail and may substantially reduce the system requirements and corresponding costs.

The trains will connect to the Metromover Station at Museum Park. To accommodate this connection additional passenger accumulations may be required, especially if the headways are not consistent between the Beach Corridor and the existing Omni Loop. This will result in the need for an expanded Transfer Station at Museum Park. In addition, if four-car trains are implemented the stations will need modification to accommodate the longer train length. A separate station for the new system with a short connecting walkway between stations is envisioned to accommodate both the old and new technologies. The modified Museum Park station could be modified vertically with the new station directly over the existing Museum Park station.

Capital Costs

Based on the proposed route, budgetary capital costs were developed and are summarized in **Table 1**. The construction costs summarized within this table are based on recent construction costs for APM projects with similar technologies for projects within the US and represent conceptual, high-level costs for planning purposes. A description of each of the cost categories follows the table summary. These costs are conservative and consistent with information available at this planning stage. Refinements in the design process could substantially reduce the system requirements and corresponding capital costs.

Table 1: Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate, Preferred Concept

ltem	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Demolition				
Guideway and Columns Demolition at Museum Station	500	LF	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,500,000
Demolition at Column Locations	368	EA	\$ 50,000	\$ 18,400,000
Future Station Location Demolition	8	EA	\$ 250,000	\$ 2,000,000
Guideway				
Foundations and Columns	368	EA	\$ 150,000	\$ 55,200,000
Elevated Guideway – Difficult Construction at Water Crossings	5,900	LF	\$ 40,000	\$ 236,000,000
Elevated Guideway – Average Construction	22,500	LF	\$ 15,000	\$ 337,500,000
Reconstructed Guideway at Museum Station	1,000	LF	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000,000
Guideway Storm Drainage	368	EA	\$ 50,000	\$ 18,400,000
Stations				
5,000 sf Station with Escalator, Elevator, Utilities, Communications/Security, Site Improvements	8	EA	\$ 7,500,000	\$ 60,000,000
Modified/Expanded Museum Park Station	1	EA	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000
Vehicles				
New Four-Car Trains (including spares)	7	EA	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 35,000,000
Other Costs				
Maintenance Facility	1	EA	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 25,000,000
Propulsion Power Substation	6	EA	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 24,000,000
Traffic Control	28,400	LF	\$ 500	\$ 14,200,000
Miscellaneous: Utility Relocations, Landscape, Power/Communication Conduits and Cable, Security, Lightning Protection, Roadway Improvements	28,400	LF	\$ 2,500	\$ 71,000,000
System Costs (Automatic Train Control, Running Surface, Guide Beams, Communication, Power, Switch Gear, etc.)	57,300	LF	\$ 5,000	\$ 286,500,000
Sub-Total				\$ 1,200,000,000
25% Contingency and Soft Costs				\$ 300,000,000
Total				\$ 1.5B

DEMOLITION COSTS

The demolition costs consist of three, separate components: future station demolition, existing station demolition, and column demolition. Demolition will be required at each of the new stations. In addition, limited demolition will be required to modify the existing Museum Park station. An estimate of 500 linear feet of guideway demolition was included to account for the reconfiguration.

The final demolition cost is associated with the columns to support the elevated guideway throughout the new sections. The number of columns was estimated based on assumed 80 foot spacing between columns for the new guideway. It was assumed that one column support could support the dual guideway, but there will likely be some additional places where additional columns are required. Each column will require demolition of the footprint area to accommodate the new column.

GUIDEWAY COSTS

New double track guideway is required for the 5.4-mile extension to Miami Beach. In addition, the proposed route includes two water crossings that will increase the guideway costs. A small amount guideway was also included to accommodate the modifications at the existing Museum Park Station. The costs also include the individual column construction for guideway support and storm drainage at each column location to accommodate storm water run-off.

STATION COSTS

As shown in **Figure 1**, eight new stations are proposed with the route. Consistent with the existing Metromover stations, the stations were assumed to be open-air stations sized approximately 5,000 square feet each. The station costs include estimates for elevators and escalators, as well as other general station amenities. An estimate for the modified Museum Park station was also included.

VEHICLE COSTS

A total of seven new Metromover trains were anticipated for the proposed Beach Corridor. It is assumed that five, four-car trains will be in operation, with two spares provided. The estimates for vehicle costs are based upon the recently completed MIA Mover cited in a previous MPO Study¹ but were increased to account for four-car trains versus two-car trains.

¹ Transit Options to Port Miami Feasibility Study, Miami-Dade MPO, June 2013

OTHER COSTS

A series of other, miscellaneous costs were also tabulated. These other costs include a new maintenance facility and propulsion power substations. The new substations are anticipated based on the additional guideway length being added. A line item cost is also included for traffic control along city streets throughout the construction zone, often called Maintenance of Traffic (MOT). This is a conservative estimate that accounts for the dense urban environment that exists along the corridor. Because of the busy environment, extensive MOT may be required to accommodate construction.

A line item for system costs was also added. These system costs are based on a linear foot of new guideway track being added and include automatic train control costs. The 57,300 quantity is based on dual guideways along 28,400 linear feet plus the 1,000 feet of modified guideway at the Museum Park Station. Finally the miscellaneous line item accounts for additional items such as landscaping, utility relocations, security, communications, etc.

ALLOWANCES

A 25% allowance was added for soft costs (design, permitting, construction engineering and inspection, etc.) and contingency.

COMPARATIVE COSTS

The overall alignment for the proposed Beach Corridor Connector is 5.4 miles. As a point of comparison, the length compares well to the Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport APM system, the PHX Sky Train, with an ultimate length of 5 miles and a full build out construction cost of \$1.6B. The first phase of the PHX Sky Train is now in operation.

The \$1.5B capital cost estimates well exceed the capital cost estimates of \$532M associated with the DC Connection (Source: Beach Corridor Transit Connection Study, PEC Meeting Presentation, April 2, 2014).

O&M Costs

A 2011 Peer Review Study² provided annual O&M costs data for 2004 through 2010. Using this data, an average, annual operational cost of \$4.77M per mile and an average, annual maintenance cost of \$2.57M per mile was determined. This results in an average, annual O&M cost of \$7.34M per mile. The additional O&M costs for the 5.4-mile proposed extension are estimated to be approximately \$39.5M per year based on this O&M estimate. This exceeds the O&M estimates of \$22M associated with the DC Connection (Source: Beach Corridor Transit Connection Study, PEC Meeting Presentation, April 2, 2014).

General Constructability

An elevated guideway improves the constructability with respect to at-grade traffic compared to streetcar type technology. An elevated guideway crosses over the traffic and intersections with the footprint impact limited to the columns as shown in **Figure 2**. Along the proposed corridor, the location for guideway columns is a challenge, but there are some locations with existing medians that can accommodate the center columns. Due to the dense environment there may also be utility impacts and some larger spans associated with the intersection crossings, such as at Washington and 5th.

The alignment is long, but this could lead to some potential cost savings with economy of scale. Most of the guideway alignment could be built using common size support columns and guideway beams that could be pre-fabricated and installed on site (rather than constructed on site) which has the potential to reduce overall costs. Except for the water crossings, the profile should remain relatively flat so column spacing could also be uniform. Pre-fabricated steel columns and guideways may be more cost competitive than concrete, although special care of steel members would be required due to the marine environment of the area.

Public Perception is a potential disadvantage. Such a long extension of the Metromover may not be supported by the local residents. There may be concerns about the blocked views associated with the aerial alignment or the change in the beach environment associated with the corridor.

² An Analysis of Miami-Dade Transit's Operating Cost Efficiency; Volume One, Peer Review, Center for Urban Transportation Research, November 7, 2011

Kimley *Whorn*



Figure 2: Alignment Rendering (Source: Kimley-Horn)

Summary

In summary, although a Metromover extension for the Beach Corridor may have some constructability benefits, the significantly higher capital and O&M costs make the Metromover a less feasible option than the currently proposed streetcar. However, traffic congestion may be a significant factor in efficient streetcar operations and travel times, with grade separated transit providing higher reliability of travel times and higher passenger service levels. If fares are involved, then higher levels of passenger service of a grade separated system may be worth an additional fare to the average person.



Appendix D: Scanned Workshop Concept Alternatives



North Workshop Concept Alternatives

































South Workshop Concept Alternatives














Bus Ridership . . Metromover Stations Metromover Route Metrorail Stations Orange Green Metrorail \diamond

101 - 250

1 - 100

251 - 500

Bus Routes

Orange/Green

501 - 1259



Legend

	Metromover Stations	Bus F	Ridership
1 T	Metrorail Stations	•	1 - 100
	 Metromover Route 		101 - 250
Metr	orail	•	251 - 500
	 Green 	•	501 - 1259
	 Orange 		Bus Routes
	Orande/Green		

es



Legend





East Workshop Concept Alternatives























West Workshop Concept Alternatives

Metromover System Expansion Work Order # GPC V-16



Metromover System Expansion Work Order # GPC V-16





Metromover System Expansion Work Order # GPC V-16







Appendix E: Photo Log

Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 1: East-West Platform at Government Center



Photo 2: East-West Platform at Government Center



Photo 3: East-West Platform at Government Center



Photo 4: Financial District Metromover Station







Photo 5: Financial District Metromover Station



Photo 6: Financial District Metromover Station

Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 7: Financial District Metromover Station, Surrounding Area



Photo 8: Financial District Metromover Station, Surrounding Area



Photo 9: End of Line, Financial District Station



Photo 10: Financial District Station







Photo 12: Financial District Station



Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 13: Financial District Station



Photo 14: SE 14th Street



Photo 15: SE 14th Street



Photo 16: SE 14th Street



Photo 17: SE 14th Street



Photo 18: Jade at Brickell Bay

Miami-Dade MPO





Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 19: SE 14th Street, East Terminus



Photo 20: Jade at Brickell Bay Seawall



Photo 21: Jade at Brickell Bay Seawall



Photo 22: Brickell Bay Drive





Photo 24: Brickell Bay Drive





Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 25: Dade Heritage Trust, Historic Preservation



Photo 26: Brickell Bay Drive



Photo 27: Brickell Bay Drive



Photo 28: Brickell Bay Drive



Photo 29: Brickell Bay Drive



Photo 30: Brickell Bay Drive







Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 31: On-Street Parking, Brickell Bay Drive



Photo 32: Brickell Bay Drive

TATA

Photo 33: Brickell Key Drive



Photo 34: Brickell Key Drive





Photo 36: Brickell Key Drive



Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 37: Brickell Key Drive



Photo 38: Trolley



Photo 39: Brickell Key Drive



Photo 40: Decorative Crosswalk



Photo 41: Decorative Crosswalk



Photo 42: Brickell Key Drive







Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 43: Decorative Crosswalk



Photo 44: 8th Street Metromover Station



Photo 45: Brickell Key Drive



Photo 46: Brickell Key Drive





Photo 47: NW Corner of Brickell Avenue and Brickell Key Drive



Photo 48: Guideway South of 8th Street Metromover Station

Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 49: 8th Street Metromover Station



Photo 50: 8th Street Metromover Station



Photo 51: 8th Street Metromover Station



Photo 52: 8th Street Metromover Station





Photo 54: Metromover



Photo 53: 8th Street Metromover Station

Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 55: NW 14th Avenue



Photo 56: NW 14th Avenue



Photo 57: End of Line, School Board Metromover Station



Photo 58: End of Line, School Board Metromover Station





Photo 60: NW 2nd Avenue



Work Order #GPC V-16



Photo 61: Overhead Utilities



Photo 62: Wynwood



Photo 63: Rail Crossing



Photo 64: Narrow Street



Photo 65: Design District



Photo 66: Wynwood







Appendix F: ALPS Information
ADVANCED LAND TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE SIMULATION







Advanced Land Transportation Performance Simulation (ALPS)

Kimley-Horn formulates the right technical solutions to fit your situation, based on a thorough understanding of your needs and goals. The multi-faceted capabilities of the ALPS software can meet your needs for modeling and simulation of complex multi-modal environments.

ALPS ALLOWS YOU TO



Person-Trip Modeling Across Multiple Modes at Varying Levels of Detail

- Multi-modal assignment
- Multi-modal trip distribution
- modal options
- assignment
- simulation



- Meso-micro link interfaces
- » Variable time steps



Simulate Future Conditions for Detailed Alternatives Analysis

- » Regional planning







- Thousands of times faster than microscopic-only simulation
- Run 10x more case studies



ALPS Meso and Micro Simulation Capabilities Speed

- Integrated genetic algorithm calibration tool
- Automated case study manager

Integrated Performance Analysis Tools for Rapid Case Study Comparisons

- Time-dependent route assignment for a 24-hour day
- "Pivot table" report capability
- Dynamic 2-D and 3-D animations
- Integrated graphs, charts, and summary statistics
- Delays, throughput, transit metrics, and traveler trip times





Analyze Transit Systems from A to Z

- ∞ Vehicle performance modeling ∞ Fixed and moving

Comprehensive Airport Landside Simulations Driven by Flight Schedules

- Terminal operations
- Parking shuttles and rental cars

Inter-terminal transit

- Security lines
- Baggage and ticketing systems
 Methods also applicable to rail,
- ∞ Curbside pick-up/drop-off
- ferry, and cruise terminals





S

0 R

٩

2

Centers

∞ Stadiums

S

 \simeq

- Convention centers



Evaluate Alternative Strategies for Transportation Facilities at Major Activity

- Entertainment venues
- Evacuation analysis
- Parking strategies
- ∞ Transit access
- Pedestrian usability

Person Trips are Tracked from Origin to Destination

- Dynamic pedestrian routing at 🛛 🛛 Vertical circulation intersections
 - Baggage and carts
- Conflicts with vehicles
- Linkage to modal trips
- Congestion effects
- Source Strate Strat









- Light and heavy rail transit

- » Automated guideway APM/PRT





Analyze Fixed Guideway Systems of Any **Design and Complexity**

- ➡ Failure impacts/recovery
- Passenger and freight railroad Meadway-based operations
- Fixed and moving block control Schedule-based operations
 - » Platform passenger densities

Evaluate Parking Facilities and the Search for Parking

- Dynamic search for closest lot 🛛 🛛 Parking circulation on ramps
- 🗴 Drivers can dynamically change 🗴 Integrated with multi-modal lot choice when full
 - person trip modeling







Mesoscopic and Microscopic Modeling of Vehicle Traffic and Mixed-Mode Operations

- Car following, lane changing, and gap acceptance algorithms
- Transit priority
- Stop-controlled intersections



Vehicles of Every Type and Class

- » Cars, light trucks, and vans
- » Performance characteristics by class Large trucks and double trailers
 - Interactions with pedestrians







Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport

- Bigginary Evaluated multiple roadway/ configuration alternatives
- Identified solutions for traffic choke points on-airport which were subsequently fixed
- Evaluated vertical circulation problem areas in existing facilities
- related to introduction of new APM system platform Analyzed potential traffic congestion reduction (on- and off-airport) due to installation of APM system



Minneapolis Target Field Pedestrian and Transit Simulation Modeling

- Evaluated game-day conditions for the ballpark patrons' pedestrian and transit experience
- Simulated all roadways, parking facilities, pedestrian environments, and transit operations
- Modeled the effect of urban context with mixed-used development and new intermodal transit station
- Analytically and visually assessed alternative facilities, configurations, and operating plans





New York Jamaica Station at Kennedy International Airport

- Analyzed pedestrian a major intermodal rail
- Train schedules and patterns drove pedest operations at station

activity at	»»	Evaluated vertical circulation,
station		corridor and boarding platform
traffic		capacity
trian		Assessed AirTrain service
		headways and station passenger
		densities



Houston Downtown Light Rail System

- » Analyzed trip generation and travel path assignment for pedestrians and street traffic
- ALPS synthesized turning movement patterns for additional traffic analyses with other tools
- Malyzed 24/7 pedestrian activity for LRT station platforms, crosswalks, and queuing areas
- Modeled pedestrian interactions with traffic, LRT, signals, and underground pedestrian tunnels





San Antonio Downtown Bus and Pedestrian Operations

- Analyzed 165,000 pedestrian trips through the multi-modal system over the day
- Simulated 40 converging bus routes through downtown street grid

» Evaluated boarding, alighting, and transfer activity at shared bus stops Compared pedestrian densities for alternative scenarios of bus route configurations



Las Vegas CityCenter — Harmon Place Porte-Cochere

- Malyzed complex front door operations in a combined traffic circle/curbfront for two hotels
- » Modeled valet pick-up and drop-off with platooning (valet holding) operations
- Evaluated private automobile and taxi/limo curbfront operations
- Detailed simulation of taxi and valet vehicle queuing

C

ALPS hybrid models incorporating integrated macroscopic, mesoscopic, and microscopic modeling processes can be applied to cover large-scale multi-modal systems.

» 200,000+ pedestrians

 \boldsymbol{Z}

- 200+ square city blocks of signalize intersections/street traffic
- 200+ discrete transit lines/routes w hundreds of trains, streetcars, and



Large-Scale Multi-Modal Transportation Systems

ed	623	100+ miles of freeways, highways, and arterials in one animated analysis
vith buses	₩.	Entire region over 24-hour day with cascading traffic congestion operations over successive time intervals
	X	RXA











Copyright © 2012, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. ALPS is a Trademark of Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.



This Page Intentionally Left Blank