US-1 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE FEASIBILITY STUDY FINAL REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2024

PROJECT STUDY LIMITS

COCONUT GROVE, DADELAND NORTH & DADELAND SOUTH METRORAIL STATIONS

Miami-Dade County, Florida

TPO GPC VIII - Work Order No. 34



Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization The Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) complies with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which states: No person in the United States shall, on grounds of race, color, or national origin, sex, age, disability, family, or religious status be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. It is also the policy of Miami-Dade TPO to comply with all requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). For materials in accessible format, please call (305) 375-1881.

The preparation of this document has been financed in part from 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 (Title 23, U.S. Code §505), and Miami-Dade County, Florida. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of USDOT.

Prepared for:



TPO Project Manager: Kevin Walford Prepared by:



Consultant Project Manager: Stephanie Romero, PE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 1.0 | INTRODUCTION | 11 |
|-----|---|----|
| 2.0 | METHODOLOGY | 12 |
| 3.0 | TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 1: LITERATURE REVIEW | 13 |
| 3.1 | Research Documents | 14 |
| 3.2 | Findings | 27 |
| 3.3 | Purpose and Need | 28 |
| 4.0 | TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 2: MULTIMODAL ACCESSIBILITY & DATA COLLECTION | 29 |
| 4.1 | Traffic Volume Review | 30 |
| 4.2 | FDOT Level of Service Review | 31 |
| 4.3 | Coconut Grove Metrorail Station | 32 |
| 4 | I.3.1 Pedestrian and Bicycle Traffic Volume Findings | 35 |
| 4 | I.3.2 Crash Data | 37 |
| 4 | 1.3.3 Improvements to the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station | 38 |
| 4.4 | Dadeland North Metrorail Station | 39 |
| 4 | I.4.1 Pedestrian and Bicycle Traffic Volume Findings | 42 |
| 4 | I.4.2 Crash Data | 45 |
| 4 | 1.4.3 Improvements to the Dadeland North Metrorail Station | 46 |
| 4.5 | Dadeland South Metrorail Station | 48 |
| 4 | I.5.1 Pedestrian and Bicycle Traffic Volume Findings | 51 |
| 4 | I.5.2 Crash Data | 53 |
| 4 | 1.5.3 Improvements to the Dadeland South Metrorail Station | 54 |
| 5.0 | TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 3: CONNECTIVITY ASSESSMENT & CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT | 52 |
| 5.1 | Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge Footprint | 58 |
| 5.2 | Coconut Grove Metrorail Station | 59 |
| 5.3 | Dadeland North Metrorail Station | 64 |
| 5.4 | Dadeland South Metrorail Station | 71 |
| 6.0 | TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 4: RECOMMENDATIONS & IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT | 79 |
| 7.0 | PROJECT COORDINATION OVERVIEW | 83 |
| 8.0 | CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS | 86 |

APPENDICES

| APPENDIX A: Traffic Data Sheets | A |
|---|---|
| APPENDIX B: Conceptual Design for Short Term Improvements | В |
| APPENDIX C: Public Meeting Information | C |
| APPENDIX D: Cost Estimate | D |
| APPENDIX E: Recommendations Matrix | E |



TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 1-1: Project Location Map | 11 |
|--|----|
| Figure 2-1: FDOT Graphic | |
| Figure 3-1: Top 20 Most Dangerous States for Pedestrians (Dangerous By Design 2022) | |
| Figure 3-2: Pedestrian Deaths by Race & Ethnicity (Dangerous By Design 2022) | |
| Figure 4-1: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Location Map | |
| Figure 4-2: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Field Visit Images | |
| Figure 4-3: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic | |
| Figure 4-4: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Location Map | |
| Figure 4-5: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Field Visit Images | 41 |
| Figure 4-6: Dadeland North Metrorail StationTraffic Volume Data Collection Graphic | |
| Figure 4-7: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Location Map | |
| Figure 4-8: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Field Visit Images | |
| Figure 4-9: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection | 51 |
| Figure 5-1: University Metrorail Station Pedestrian Bridge over US-1 | |
| Figure 5-2: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Intersection at US-1 and SW 27th Avenue Existing Conditions | |
| Figure 5-3: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 1 Bridge Location | 60 |
| Figure 5-4: Proposed Underline Plan View at US-1 and 27th Avenue | 61 |
| Figure 5-5: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 2 Bridge Location | |
| Figure 5-6: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 3 At-Grade Improvements | 64 |
| Figure 5-7: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 1 Bridge Location | |
| Figure 5-8: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 2 Bridge Location | 66 |
| Figure 5-9: Proposed Underline and Existing Glass Wall Location | 67 |
| Figure 5-10: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 3 Bridge Location | 68 |
| Figure 5-11: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At-Grade Improvements at SW 84th Street | 70 |
| Figure 5-12: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At-Grade Improvements at SW 68th Street | 70 |
| Figure 5-13: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 1: Pedestrian Bridge a Dadeland Boulevard | 71 |
| Figure 5-14: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 2: Pedestrian Bridge at Datran Drive | 73 |
| Figure 5-15: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 3A | 74 |
| Figure 5-16: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 3A | 75 |
| Figure 5-17: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At Grade Improvements at Datran Drive | |
| Figure 5-18: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At Grade Improvements at Dadeland Boulevard | |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 3-1: Literature Review Summary Matrix | |
|--|----|
| Table 4-1: Metrorail Station Intersections | |
| Table 4-2: FDOT Traffic Data for the Metrorail Station Intersections | |
| Table 4-3: Motor Vehicle Arterial Generalized Service Volume Tables | |
| Table 4-4: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and SW 27th Avenue | |
| Table 4-5: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and SW 88th Street | |
| Table 4-6: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and SW 68th Court | |
| Table 4-7: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and SW 84th Street | |
| Table 4-8: Dadeland South Metrorail Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and Dadeland Boulevard | 51 |
| Table 4-9: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and Datran Drive | 53 |
| Table 5-1: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At Grade Improvements at Dadeland Boulevard | |
| Table 8-1: Summary for All Alternatives | |



1.0 INTRODUCTION

On March 3, 2022, the Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Governing Board adopted resolution #08-2022 authorizing the TPO Executive Director to conduct a feasibility study for the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian bridges across US-1 at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North, and Dadeland South Metrorail stations as depicted in Figure 1-1.

The US-1 corridor is a high-volume multi-modal thoroughfare featuring an established rapid transit guideway, a shared multi-use path, and a heavily traveled six-lane arterial road prone to substantial vehicular congestion. The heavy traffic congestion makes it very difficult and unsafe for pedestrians to cross the six-lane, heavy-traveled corridor. Bicycle/pedestrian bridges are designed to separate pedestrians and bicyclists from vehicular traffic, thus allowing for safe, uninterrupted pedestrian and bicycle flow. The proposed placement of bicycle/pedestrian bridges at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North, and Dadeland South Metrorail stations located along the US-1 corridor will seek to provide pedestrian/bicyclists with safer mobility options. It will promote transit use by providing greater pedestrian/bicyclist accessibility to the Metrorail system, which is more critical with the current and future development of high-density mixed-use projects along the US-1 corridor. Three bicycle/pedestrian bridges currently exist over US-1 at the Vizcaya, DouglasRoad, and University Metrorail stations. There have also been previous studies on the concept of a bridge by the South Miami Metrorail station. This study will provide the necessary information to determine the feasibility of implementing bicycle/pedestrian bridges at the identified locations.



Figure 1-1: Project Location Map



2.0 METHODOLOGY

The methodology used for this feasibility study is based on a planning analysis of the study area, providing pedestrians and bicyclists with safer mobility alternatives to at-grade roadway crossings, discussing state-of-the-art mobility methods, and above all, consistent communication at various levels in the community to ensure consensus. The ending result will create a system of bridges that connect bicyclists and pedestrians across US-1 for the interaction of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

This study analyzed the existing conditions at three (3) Metrorail Stations and intersections crossings over US-1 in order to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety by providing countermeasures and improving conflict points. Pedestrians and bicyclists are defined as Vulnerable Road Users by Florida Statute 316.027 due to Station lack of protection in the event of a crash. Our goal is in line with the Miami Dade Vision Zero Framework to provide ZERO traffic fatalities by 2040. Refer to **Figure 2-1: FDOT Graphic**.

Reasons to review installation of a pedestrian bridge at the Metrorail Station locations:

- Heavy pedestrian and bicycle traffic along the existing crosswalks between Metrorail Stations and the other side of US-1.
- Poor bicycle and pedestrian safety at the three (3) locations.
- To improve safety and serious bodily injuries.

As part of this feasibility study, both short-term (at-grade improvements) and long-term (pedestrian bridges) improvements were proposed. These alternatives will provide guidance in planning, designing, and constructing safer infrastructure at and over US-1.



Figure 2-1: FDOT Graphic



3.0 TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 1

LITERATURE REVIEW



| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|--|------------------|---|
| | Overview/Purpose | This report aims to draw attention to the high number of pedestrian fatalities and injuries in the United States and advocate for policy changes prioritizing pedestrian safety. |
| 14. | General Findings | Between 2010 and 2019, 53,435 people were struck while walking throughout the United States with approximately 14 pedestrians daily. The number of people struck and killed yearly has grown by forty-five (45) percent between 2010 and 2019. Dangerous by design has produced this report for over a decade, and the problem has only worsened. Several groups of people are at higher risk of dying while walking, including older adults, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native People, and people walking in low-income communities. COVID-19 pandemic impacted daily travel in the early stages of the lockdown in 2020 because it was reported that fewer cars were transiting. As a consequence, drivers tended to speed more often. Nine (9) out of the twenty (20) most dangerous Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) are in Florida. Forty-nine (49) out of fifty (50) states have become more unsafe for people to walk since the last edition of Dangerous by Design. |
| Dangerous By Design Pedestrian Fatalities Maps (2021) | lssues | Policymakers have focused more on moving cars at high speeds than safety. There are more people driving trucks and SUVs There are better data on the street conditions where fatalities occur and the demographics of the victims. The disability data reported by the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) is incomplete since standards for better race and ethnicity data during crashes are needed. Slip lanes increase the distance required to cross a street, putting people walking into spots with the worst visibility for drivers. The most dangerous states for pedestrians in the United States (in the same order) are Florida, Alabama, New Mexico, Mississippi, Delaware, Louisiana, Arizona, South Carolina, Georgia, and Texas. |
| | Recommendations | Designing streets for slower speeds to improve safety and reduce deaths Eliminating right turn "slip" lanes in favor of right lane turns produces safer and slower turns, and shortens crossing distance for pedestrians. Revising motor vehicle safety standards to protect pedestrians better as recommended by the National Transportation Safety Administration (NTSA) in 2018. Setting performance targets to reduce the number of pedestrians killed while funding projects to make it happen. Providing engineers with the most up-to-date training and education on implementing Complete Streets, while updating policies to support Complete Streets in every State. |
| | Overview/Purpose | This report aims to follow up with several recommendations on previous editions that require remodeling or changing the approach to address bicycle and pedestrian safety to avoid future crashes, and reduce the number of pedestrians struck or killed in crashes. |
| | General Findings | More than 6,500 people, or nearly 18 per day, were struck or killed while walking in 2020, a 4.7 percent increase over 2019. Pedestrian fatalities are up 62 percent since they steadily rose in 2009 following years of improvement. |
| 1B. Dangerous By Design Pedestrian Fatalities Maps (2022) | lssues | The number of pedestrian fatalities have increased over the past decade. Pedestrian fatalities are disproportionately concentrated in certain states. There is a lack of pedestrian infrastructure. High-speed limits Dangerous street's design There is poor lighting There is a lack of public transportation The existing crosswalks are faded or invisible. Additionally, sidewalks also have obstructions (utility poles, boxes, etc.) |
| | Recommendations | Prioritizing vulnerable communities, including low-income areas and communities of color. Investing in complete streets. This report recommends that states and local governments invest in Complete Streets, designed to accommodate for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists. Improving data collection and analysis, including data on the race and ethnicity of the victims, while ensuring that crash reports include information on the speed and design of the roadway. Increasing funding for pedestrian safety initiatives in addition to improving public transportation. |
| | Overview/Purpose | The complete streets collaborative report seeks to provide safe policy and design guidelines for all users, including pedestrians, motorists, and transit riders. |
| 2. DTPW Complete Streets Collaborative Report | General Findings | The collaborative report would orient governmental agencies, consults, private developers, and community groups to prepare safer and more accessible streets for all users. Additionally, an inventory of existing bridges obtained from the Engineering, Planning and Development Division of the Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW) comprise data from the following sources: • Roadway Pedestrian Bridges • Transit Pedestrian Bridges • County Pedestrian Bridges |
| | Issues | N/A |
| | Recommendations | N/A |



C

| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|------------------|--|
| | Overview/Purpose | This report looks forward to using the recorded data of existing bicycle and pedestrian bridges along US-1 to maximize the future capacity along this corridor. |
| 3. Existing Bike- Ped bridges along US-1 by Metrorail Stations | General Findings | The Miami Dade Transit's BIKE & RIDE program allows transit riders to bring their bicycles onto the rack-equipped Metrorail train cars and Metrobus fleet. Additionally, bicycles are also allowed on all Tri-Rail trains. An inventory of existing bridges obtained from the Engineering, Planning and Development Division of the Miami-Dade County DTPW comprise data from the following sources: • Roadway Pedestrian Bridges • Transit Pedestrian Bridges • County Pedestrian Bridges |
| | lssues | N/A |
| | Recommendations | N/A |
| • | Overview/Purpose | The goal of this report is to show the existing bicycle and pedestrian bridges over major roadways throughout Miami Dade County, while seeking options to improve transportation for pedestrians and cyclists. |
| Existing Bike- Ped bridges over major roadways throughout | General Findings | The county maintains approximately 5,500 miles of dedicated public roads and around 195 pedestrian bridges. An inventory of existing bridges obtained from the Engineering, Planning and Development Division of the Miami-Dade County DTPW comprise data from the following sources: • Roadway pedestrian bridges • Transit pedestrian bridges • County pedestrian bridges |
| County | lssues | N/A |
| | Recommendations | N/A |
| | Overview/Purpose | The Bicycle Connectivity Assessment is meant to serve as a foundational proposed network since it is intended to create collaborative and continuing conversations with all concerned organizations. In Miami-Dade County, this assessment discovers links that raise the equity, connectivity, accessibility, and safety of bicycles. |
| | General Findings | The long-term goals of this assessment include the following: Striving towards Florida's Target Zero. Allowing visitors and residents to bicycle to any destination. Ensuring that residents who require an alternate mode of transportation can rely on bicycle infrastructure as a remedy. Shifting the culture of the County to a more bike-friendly environment. |
| 5. FDOT District | lssues | Fewer people are likely to bicycle on highways or roadways because of the varying stress levels from traffic. Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) is an approach that quantifies the discomfort people feel when they bicycle close to traffic. According to a survey for Bicyclist Design User Profiles, 51-56% of the population are often uncomfortable with bicycle lanes, and may cycle on sidewalks even if bicycle lanes are provided. Another 5-9% of people prefer more separated facilities but are comfortable riding in bicycle lanes or on paved shoulders. Only 4-6% of the population is comfortable riding in traffic and will use roads without bicycle lanes. |
| o Bicycle Connectivity Network Assessment | Recommendations | Developing an online interactive map available for anyone to access with a detailed view of the baseline bicycle network data, aspirational proposed projects documented from the literature review, political boundaries, and community fixtures. Setting a criteria of requirements for on-street cycling facilities without separation such as: Roadways with 30 mph or fewer speed limits. Roadways with Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) of 9,000 or less. Roadways with 1 thru lane in each direction. Roadways with estimated available Right-of-Way (ROW) Roadways with no on-street parking or dedicated spaces, with a width of 12 feet or broader. Establishing a Greenway Selection Prioritization that include: |

Table 3-1: Literature Review Summary Matrix



| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|------------------|--|
| | Overview/Purpose | To develop viable short- and long-term conceptual alternatives that improve accessibility, connectivity, and mobility of bicyclists and pedestrians to available or potential transit services across the Golden Glades Interchange and between surroundings neighborhoods. |
| | General Findings | This study focuses on a broad area to understand the existing challenges and opportunities across the Golden Glades Interchange (GGI), with a density of approximately 4,000 to 6,500 people per square mile. The study limits are SR-860/ NW 183 Street/Miami Gardens Drive to the north, SR-9 and the Biscayne Canal to the south, North Miami Avenue to the east, and NW 22 Avenue to the west. |
| 6. FDOT Golden Glades Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Study (2018) | lssues | Existing highway transportation facilities (including many interconnecting ramps) result in adverse impacts on bicycle and pedestrian travel due to a lack of connectivity and accessibility, primarily because of the limited travel distances natural to these active modes of transportation. There is a lack of connectivity between bicycle and pedestrian routes across major roadway facilities, which isolates neighborhoods. Existing conditions indicate that high-intensity areas are underserved by bicyclists, pedestrians, or transit infrastructure, and that there are opportunities for congestion management. Increasing mobility options should be encouraged for vulnerable and disadvantaged populations. Protecting the safety of vulnerable roadway users should be a priority. First- and last-mile connections to public transit and ridesharing need to be improved. Interconnected bicycle and pedestrian networks are needed. |
| | Recommendations | For the study focus area, the ideal bicyclist travel distance should be no more than a 2-mile radius, and the ideal pedestrian travel distance should be 1/2-mile radius to facilitate walking and bicycling activities in the selected areas. Providing a non-motorized network to increase pedestrian access to the Golden Glades Multimodal Transportation Facility (GGMTF). First & Last Mile connections to public transit service need to be provided, particularly for specific segments of the population that may not have easy access to motorized modes of travel. Providing safe options for bicycles and pedestrians to travel to and from all public transportation stops or stations to support a sustainable transportation network and provide equitable mobility. *These recommendations have been identified through field visits and research. |
| | Overview/Purpose | Florida's safety vision is to eliminate all transportation-related fatalities and serious injuries for all modes of travel. This priority focuses on motor vehicle safety and includes pedestrians, bicyclists, motorcyclists, micro-mobility device users, transit users using the roadway system, as well as connections between the roadway system and other modes of transportation. |
| | General Findings | The personal and societal costs of traffic crashes in Florida today are unacceptably high. More than 3,000 Floridians and visitors die in traffic crash each a year, and an average of 16,000 are seriously injured in Florida. Crashes involving fatalities, serious injuries, and property damage also take a toll on our quality of life and economy, while impeding the efficiency and reliability of our transportation system. The 2021-2025 Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) provides a framework for how Florida's traffic safety partners will move toward the vision of a fatality-free transportation system during the next five years. This plan is a call to action for public, private, and civic partners to identify collaboration, investment, and innovation areas. |
| 7. FDOT Highway Safety Plan | lssues | Distracted driving Older drivers Occupant protection and child passenger safety Pedestrian and bicycle safety Police traffic services Speeding and aggressive driving Teen drivers Work zone safety |
| | Recommendations | Hosting a Vision Zero Workshop, with the Safety Subcommittee for safety coalition meetings, partner briefings, and social media outreach. Having FDOT's State Safety Office execute subgrants, identified in this annual HSP, in areas with a high frequency of fatalities to increase. Implementing preventative measures such as enforcing traffic laws, education campaigns about traffic laws and safety practices, providing and educating regarding alternate transportation methods, as well as public traffic safety outreach. Having FDOT and NHTSA fund the Florida Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL) program to reduce traffic-related fatalities and injuries by working with law enforcement agencies across the state to increase safety belt use, reduce impaired driving, and encourage the implementation of other traffic safety initiatives. Heightening traffic safety awareness to support enforcement efforts by aggressively marketing state and national traffic safety campaigns. |



| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|------------------|---|
| | Overview/Purpose | The Department requested a conceptual and feasibility analysis to identify, evaluate, and recommend potential alignments for a non-motorized overpass on US-1 across Bird Road. This conceptual analysis consisted of: A typical section analysis Horizontal and vertical geometric analyses Traffic control analysis |
| 8. FDOT Non- Motorized | General Findings | Existing conditions are summarized below: This skewed intersection is approximately 0.60 miles southwest of the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station. There are designated pedestrian access points with pedestrian signals There are high visibility pedestrian crossings on the south approach of US-1, and on the approach of SW 40 Street Onsite pedestrian facilities provide sidewalks and extensive non-motorized facilities (M-Path). However, there are no bicycle lanes on the roads and arterials corridors. |
| Study: US-1 across Bird Road (FM 41053-3-12-01) | lssues | There is a 5-foot clearance from the drip edge of the Metrorail structure to the proposed overpass structure. There is a 750kV electrified third rail next to the Metrorail tracks. The noise level from Metrorail will be significant to pedestrians and bicyclists. Therefore, further noise analysis will be required The proximity of the existing Metrorail foundations to the proposed overpass foundations requires that any construction near those foundations to be restricted from 1:00 AM to 4:00 AM only to avoid disrupting train services. |
| | Recommendations | The following are proposed: A 2-3 % grade, closed box bridge (Gateway) with a 12-foot clear walkway width. Retaining walls, where the grade separation is greater than 5 feet. Gravity walls were accessed ramps elevations are less than 5 feet. Adding a Type 3 Sunshine Infill Panel to protect pedestrians and bicyclists on the south side of the Metrorail's alignment. This will include using the Metrorail's ROW (215,428 sf from Miami-Dade County)." |
| | Overview/Purpose | Perform field-review existing conditions, analyze existing ROW maps and surveys, as well as develop a concept alternative including a typical section, plans, and profile. Additionally, FDOT requested a conceptual and feasibility analysis to identify, evaluate, and recommend potential alignments for a non-motorized overpass. This conceptual analysis consisted of the following: A typical section analysis Horizontal and vertical geometric analyses Traffic control analysis |
| | General Findings | This skewed intersection is adjacent to the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station. There are designated pedestrian access points with pedestrian signals There are high visibility pedestrian crossings in all directions. Onsite pedestrian facilities provide sidewalks and expansive non-motorized facilities (M-Path). A fence along US-1 prohibits/channelizes pedestrians traffic from crossing US-1 mid-block. There are no bicycle lanes on the streets and arterials directly accessing the station." |
| 9. FDOT Non- Motorized Overpass Study: US-1 across SW 27 Avenue (FM 421053-3-12-03) | lssues | There is a 5-foot clearance from the drip edge of the Metrorail structure to the proposed overpass structure. There is a 750kV electrified third rail next to the Metrorail tracks. The noise level from the Metrorail will be significant to pedestrians and bicyclists. Therefore, further noise analysis will be required The proximity of the existing Metrorail foundations to the proposed overpass foundations prompts that any construction near their foundations is restricted from 1:00 AM to 4:00 AM to avoid disruption to the train service." |
| | Recommendations | A 1260-foot, non-motorized pedestrian and bicycle prefabricated overpass or closed box bridge (gateway), with a 3% grade and a 12-foot effective walkway width. Minor re-alignment to the US-1 southbound approach to the intersection of SW 27 Avenue. Minor widening, reconstruction of curb and gutter, traffic separator, minor drainage, milling and resurfacing, signing, as well as pavement markings. Construction of retaining walls where the grade separation is greater than 5 feet, or gravity walls where access ramps elevations are less than 5 feet. Type 3 sunshine infill panels to protect pedestrians and bicyclists placed on the south side of the Metrorail's alignment. Due to physical constraints and to meet vertical clearance criteria, the bridge needs to be extended west of the limits of the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station. The bridge's lateral offset will be mitigated by providing barrier and guardrail protection to bridge piers and retaining walls since there is no ROW acquisition is proposed. |



| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|------------------|---|
| | Overview/Purpose | The purpose of this letter is to request an amendment to the Miami Urbanized Area's FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to transfer funds originally programmed for pedestrian overpasses along US-1. *NOTE: The project does not show as dropped, but per the Miami-Dade TPO Resolution #36-2010 (from October of 2010) the project funding was requested to be moved to the University Metrorail Station's Pedestrian Bridge Project. |
| 10. FDOT Capital Grant | General Findings | This request sought to amend FY 2011-2015 TIP to transfer funds to the University Metrorail Station's Pedestrian Overpass from similar overpasses at Dadeland North, Dadeland South, and the South Miami Metrorail Stations. Former Board Member Carlos A. Giménez moved the preceding resolution's adoption. The motion was seconded by former Board Member Maritza Gutiérrez, and it was then put to vote. |
| Pedestrian Overpass at Dadeland North Metrorail Station (FM 420792-1-94-01) | lssues | The \$1,931.000 in Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) flex funds that were initially requested for the Dadeland North Metrorail Station's Pedestrian Overpass project were transferred by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on September 2, 2008, and are currently available. However, Miami-Dade Transit (MDT), under Miami-Dade County DTPW, could not proceed with this project because it did not meet the screening criterion to justify the need for a pedestrian overpass at this location. Consequently, MDT proposed to transfer these funds to be used for the University Metrorail Station's Pedestrian Overpass project. |
| | Recommendations | Three overpass projects for which FTA funds were programmed are no longer feasible. Hence, it would be in the best interest of the public to delete these projects and transfer the funds, which will become available upon deletion of the projects, to a single Pedestrian Overpass at the University Metrorail Station (FM 4180841-94-02/03), which has already programmed in state funding for FY 2010/2011 and FY 2012/2013 in the amount of \$951,098. |
| | Overview/Purpose | The purpose of this letter is to request an amendment to the Miami Urbanized Area's FY 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to transfer funds originally programmed for pedestrian overpasses along US-1. *NOTE: This project was dropped by the Department, again see Resolution 36-10. |
| 1. | General Findings | This request sought to amend FY 2011-2015 TIP to transfer funds to the University Metrorail Station's Pedestrian Overpass from similar overpasses at Dadeland North, Dadeland South, and the South Miami Metrorail Stations. Former Board Member Carlos A. Giménez moved the preceding resolution's adoption. The motion was seconded by former Board Member Maritza Gutiérrez, and it was then put to vote. |
| FDOI Capital Grant Pedestrian Overpass at Dadeland South Metrorail Station (FM 420790-1-94-01) | lssues | 1. MDT requested \$431,000 in Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds initially programmed for the Dadeland South Metrorail Station's Pedestrian Overpass project be transferred and used for the University Metrorail Station's Pedestrian Overpass project (FM# 418084-2-94-01). These funds are available as they have been rolling forward in the FDOT District Six' Five-Year Work Program. 2. MDT could not move forward with the Pedestrian Overpass project at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station because it needed to meet the screening criterion to justify the need for a pedestrian overpass at such location. MDT asked for the Dadeland South Project to be deleted, and the available funds to be added to the funds for the University Metrorail Station's Overpass project. |
| | Recommendations | Approving this action will enable the construction of the much-needed University Pedestrian Overpass project, which is expected to improve pedestrian safety near and around the University Metrorail Station on US-1. The project is also supported by the City of Coral Gables and the University of Miami, as this location was the scene of an accident in 2005 that resulted in the death of a student attempting to cross US-1. |
| | Overview/Purpose | To present the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) for Florida. The SHSP is a comprehensive, data-driven approach to improving highway safety in Florida, intending to reduce fatalities and severe injuries on the state's roadways. |
| 12 EDOI Stratonic | General Findings | The economic cost of crashes in Florida in 2019 was estimated to be over \$43 billion. In 2019, there were 401,851 crashes in Florida, resulting in 236,157 injuries and 3,185 fatalities. The number of traffic fatalities in Florida increased from 2,444 in 2014 to 3,185 in 2019, representing a 30% increase over five years. In 2019, there were 1,490 alcohol-confirmed traffic fatalities and injuries in Florida. The report identifies six focus areas for improving highway safety in Florida such as distracted driving, impaired driving, aggressive driving, vulnerable road users (e.g., pedestrians and bicyclists), speeding, and intersection safety. The report aims to reduce fatalities and severe injuries on Florida's roadways by 50% by 2035, using 2015 as a baseline. |
| Highway Safety Plan | lssues | Distracted driving Impaired driving Vulnerable road users Aggressive driving Work zone safety Teen drivers Older drivers |
| | Recommendations | Increasing law enforcement efforts Enhancing infrastructure design and maintenance Improving data collection and analysis Promoting public awareness and education campaigns |



| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|------------------|---|
| | Overview/Purpose | To provide recommendations for state and local agencies to track and evaluate the effectiveness of their efforts to improve walking and biking conditions. |
| 13. FHWA Guidebook for Developing Pedestrian & Biogelo | General Findings | The importance of creating performance measures: to monitor development, develop efficient solutions to demands, and rank needs and investments. Prioritization is an aim for some performance measures. For instance, a local authority could use bike Level of Service (LOS) to determine which bicycle routes most urgently require improvement. State agencies may also utilize performance measures to benchmark yearly advancements toward statewide policies and objectives. For example, to track pedestrian fatalities to see if state-level regulations enhance sofety. The need for standardized performance measures: Standards like the volume-to-capacity ratio and automobile level of service should be developed to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Other standards supporting pedestrian and bicycle performance include system completeness or pedestrian/bicycle delays statistics. The importance of considering diverse user groups: Low-income and minority neighborhoods are less likely to have access to a car, so access to walking or biking facilities is crucial. Breaking out population or household data by income level and race is vital. The need for data-driven decision making: Before making any transportation decision, it is critical to consider different ways of collecting data, such as: Sales tax data would track how much spending takes place within a given study area. Customer survey data can disclose access mode preference and the demand for walking/biking infrastructure. Mobile Smartphone applications collecting data on trips and time traveled; GIS analysis techniques. Transportation Performance Management (TPM) uses performance data to support decisions to execute desired performance outcomes. |
| A Dicycle Performance Measures | lssues | There is limited data availability Lack of data quality and consistency: data quality varies across states and MPOs. However, data for walking or biking is less prevalent, making it easier to create policies and improve these facilities with sufficient data. Some factors to consider when collecting data include U.S Census demographic data (income, poverty levels, zero-car households, seniors, and children). Another factor is the GIS transportation network for all modes, including existing and proposed pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. There is a lack of consensus on appropriate performance measures Lack of sidewalks, bike facilities, multi-use paths, roadway shoulders, and bike lanes. Project impact assessment: some regional planning entities are involved with assessing the impacts of development, often in partnership with local and State agencies. Florida's regional planning agencies play a role in growth management and are moving toward multimodal performance measurement. |
| | Recommendations | Developing specific, measurable goals Standardizing performance measures Considering diverse user groups Using data to inform decision making Tracking multiple performance measures Regularly evaluating and updating performance measures |
| | Overview/Purpose | The purpose of this article is to provide guidance and recommendations for designing streets that are safe, accessible, and equitable for all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and drivers. The guidebook provides information on design principles, such as incorporating sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and transit facilities, as well as recommendations for addressing issues such as traffic calming, parking, and accessibility. The ultimate goal of the guidebook is to support the implementation of Complete Streets, which can help improve mobility, safety, and quality of life for all residents and visitors of Miami-Dade County. |
| 14. Miami-Dade County Complete Streets Guidelines | General Findings | Complete Streets are designed to accommodate all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and drivers. Complete Streets prioritize safety for all users, with features like traffic calming measures, improved lighting, and protected bicycle lanes and pedestrian crossings. Complete Streets can help reduce traffic congestion by encouraging alternative modes of transportation like cycling and transit. Complete Streets can help improve public health by promoting physical activity and reducing air pollution from motor vehicles. Complete Streets can support economic development by improving accessibility and mobility for businesses and residents. Complete Streets can help address social equity concerns by improving access to transportation options for low-income communities, people with disabilities, and other underserved populations. |
| | lssues | There are some challenges and considerations that are commonly associated with implementing Complete Streets, which include: 1. Funding constraints 2. Limited public support 3. Technical challenges 4. Limited space 5. Concerns about traffic congestion |

Table 3-1: Literature Review Summary Matrix



| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|------------------|---|
| | Recommendations | Adopt a Complete Streets policy that prioritizes the needs of all street users. Engage stakeholders, including community members, advocacy groups, and transportation agencies. Conduct a context analysis Prioritize safety Accommodate all modes of transportation, including pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and drivers. Consider equity, including accessibility for people with disabilities, access to transit for low-income communities, and addressing historical disparities in transportation infrastructure. |
| | Overview/Purpose | The article aims to provide a framework for implementing Vision Zero, a strategy to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries on roadways. The "Vision Zero Framework Plan: Eliminating Traffic Deaths and Severe Injuries on Miami-Dade County Roadways" report was developed by the Miami-Dade County DTPW. |
| | General Findings | Miami-Dade County has experienced increased traffic fatalities and severe injuries in recent years. Pedestrians and bicyclists are particularly vulnerable to traffic crashes and comprise a significant proportion of fatalities and severe injuries. Vision Zero is a data-driven traffic safety approach focusing on engineering, education, and enforcement to reduce traffic fatalities and severe injuries. The Vision Zero Framework Plan includes a set of strategies and actions to be implemented over time, including data analysis, infrastructure improvements, public awareness campaigns, and policy changes. The success of Vision Zero will depend on collaboration between government agencies, community organizations, and other stakeholders. |
| 15. Miami-Dade County Vision Zero Plan | Issues | There have been high traffic fatalities cases and severe injuries in recent years, with vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and bicyclists being particularly at risk. There is a disproportionate impact on low-income and minority communities resulting in traffic fatalities and severe injuries disproportionately affecting low-income and minority communities in Miami-Dade County, where access to safe and reliable transportation options may be limited. There needs to be more infrastructure to support safe mobility. Hence, more infrastructure is required to support safe mobility for all users, including crosswalks, bicycle lanes, and transit stops. Insufficient data and analysis: the Miami-Dade County crashes data set should be expanded to include crashes involving people using active and emerging mobility, more accurate Signal Four Analytics should be provided, and hospital crash data should be combined with police incident reports to address the data gap with pedestrian and bicycle crashes. Also, it is essential to ensure transportation safety data is publicly available for local agency staff and elected officials and launch a safety dashboard with integrated crash data. Lastly, it is crucial to use a Complete Crash Dataset as crash data for the analysis documented in this report is based only on police reports. However, police reports do not accurately report crashes for people walking or biking, nor do they have classification to input collisions related to micro-mobility and other emerging mobility solutions. Additionally, communities of color and low-income communities usually have low police reporting rates. Limited resources include funding, staff time, and political support. |
| | Recommendations | Developing a comprehensive data collection and analysis system to track traffic crashes and identify patterns and trends. Conducting safety assessments of high-risk locations to identify opportunities for infrastructure improvements. Implementing engineering treatments to improve safety that include adding protected bicycle lanes, pedestrian crosswalks, and calming traffic measures. Educating the public on safe behaviors and raising awareness of the importance of traffic safety. Strengthening enforcement efforts to deter unsafe behaviors like speeding and distracted driving. Partnering with community organizations and other stakeholders to build support for Vision Zero, and engage the public in the implementation process. Allocating dedicated funding for Vision Zero implementation, and establishing metrics to track progress towards eliminating traffic deaths and severe injuries. |
| 16. | Overview/Purpose | The purpose of this manual is to create a more comprehensive approach to transportation planning that considers the needs of all road users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, public transit riders, and motorists. The manual aims to provide a framework for designing streets that are safe, accessible, and convenient for all users, regardless of their mode of transportation. |
| Miami-Dade MPO Complete Streets Manual | General Findings | Complete Streets improve safety and reduce traffic fatalities and severe injuries. Complete Streets enhance mobility and accessibility for all users, including people with disabilities, children, and older adults. Complete Streets can boost economic development and support local businesses by making streets more attractive and inviting to pedestrians and bicyclists. Complete Streets can help reduce traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging alternative modes of transportation, such as walking, biking, and public transit. |



00

| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|--|------------------|--|
| | lssues | The dominance of automobile traffic: There needs to be more viable transportation modes and choices. Sixty-five percent (65%) of the shortest trips are now made by automobiles because streets are incomplete and separate land uses, making it dangerous for other modes of travel. Walking and biking decrease automobile dependence, improving air quality and our environment's overall health. Inadequate infrastructure for non-motorized transportation: Creating infrastructure for non-motorized transportation and lowering automobile speeds by changing road conditions can improve economic conditions for business owners and residents. Complete Streets also helps improve the economy by increasing property values because people are generally willing to pay to live in walkable communities. Limited access to public transit: Improving access to public transit is vital for increasing ridership and promoting a multi-modal approach to transportation. Complete Streets promote more active forms of transportation, such as walking, biking, and public transit. Safety concerns: Some safety concerns include delays with striping, increasing police enforcement of speeds, and enforcing proper use of the center turn lane. Often, Complete Street treatments include traffic-calming techniques, which typically reduce vehicular rates and alert drivers to the presence of their road users, such as pedestrians and bicyclists. |
| | Recommendations | Adopting a multimodal approach to transportation planning Improving pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure Prioritizing public transit Encouraging transit-oriented development (TOD) Creating safe and accessible streets Encouraging public participation in the planning process |
| | Overview/Purpose | Trends in pedestrian and bicycle travel growth in Miami-Dade County and its municipalities are used to inform programs and prioritization for improving and expanding pedestrian and bicycle network facilities. This study aims to capture current bicycle and pedestrian travel trends, with implications for increased non-motorized travel potential for unlinked and first- and last-mile trips to transit stations. The importance of the growth in pedestrian bicycle travel will show the economic, ecological, and social sustainability of urban mobility impacts. |
| 17 Miami-Dade | General Findings | Locations chosen for three-period counts included representative locations on: Dense urban areas that are predominantly office use (Miami CBD north of Miami river). Dense urban areas that are a mix of office, residential, and evening entertainment (Brickell Area). Tourist areas with a combination of retail, entertainment, and residential uses. Recreational trails in densely populated areas (Atlantic Trail sites on Miami Beach and the Turnberry Trail in Aventura). |
| IPO 2018 Bicycle and Pedestrian Data Collection Report | lssues | Based on the data collected during the study, the report provides insights into problems between pedestrians and bicycles in Miami-Dade County. Some potential issues include: 1. Conflicts at intersections, which were the most common location for pedestrian and bicycle conflicts. 2. Sidewalk riding, which was shown to be a common practice potentially creating conflicts with pedestrians. 3. Wrong-way riding, also a common practice as this study found that many bicyclists were riding the wrong way on streets and sidewalks, which can increase the risk of collisions with pedestrians. 4. Limited visibility, which is a significant issue for pedestrians and cyclists, especially at night. |
| | Recommendations | Implementing more bike lanes and pedestrian crosswalks. Improving lighting and signage. Increasing public education and awareness of campaigns Strengthening enforcement of traffic laws. Conducting ongoing data collection and analysis |
| 18. | Overview/Purpose | This article aims to present the Miami-Dade 2045 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, which outlines a comprehensive strategy for improving bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, safety, and accessibility in Miami-Dade County over the next 25 years. The plan aims to create a safer, more connected, and more equitable transportation system that prioritizes walking, cycling, and other forms of active transportation by enhancing accessibility, safety, public health, social equity, environment, and overall quality of life. |
| Miami-Dade TPO 2045 Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan | General Findings | Miami-Dade County has a high rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, with an average of 75 pedestrian and ten bicyclist fatalities per year between 2013 and 2017. To make walking and biking safer and more convenient, there is a need to improve the existing network of sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and trails in Miami-Dade County. Many residents and visitors are interested in using active transportation, but there are concerns about safety, connectivity, and accessibility that need to be addressed. Active transportation can provide significant health, environmental, and economic benefits to Miami-Dade County, including reduced congestion, improved air guality, and increased physical activity. |



IC

| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|------------------|--|
| | lssues | Congestion: Some of the goals for the 2045 bicycle-pedestrian plan include reducing traffic and parking congestion in Miami Dade County, especially in the following areas: South Miami Dade, Key Biscayne, City of Miami Beach, Village of Palmetto Bay and the Central Business District (CBD) often referred to as "Downtown, Miami." Limited Transit Options: The Miami-Dade Communities of Concern represent most transit-reliant populations within the County; therefore, maximizing mobility options is essential and would improve equity in Miami-Dade's transit system designs. Areas with the largest concentration of transit dependants include Downtowntown Miami, US-27/Okeechobee Road, the northern section of South Beach, Opa-Locka, Florida City, and Homestead. Safety risks for cyclists and pedestrians include traffic volume, posted speeds, size of the roadway (Number of Lanes), volume of large vehicles, and frequency of intersections. Limited active transportation infrastructure: High traffic speeds and inadequate infrastructure (not designed for all road users such as pedestrians and cyclists) in low-income communities impede active transportation, making walking, biking, and public transit unsafe and increasing collisions between pedestrians and cyclists. |
| | Recommendations | Establishing a countywide bicycle and pedestrian network Improving bicycle and pedestrian safety Providing access to transit Encouraging active transportation Creating more public spaces that are friendly to bicyclists and pedestrians, such as plazas and parks, while improving the connectivity of these spaces with the surrounding neighborhoods. Incorporating innovative design features such as protected bicycle lanes, pedestrian plazas, and green streets to improve safety and promote active transportation. Implementing a comprehensive evaluation process to track progress and ensure the plan's goals are met over time. |
| 19. Miami-Dade TPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan | Overview/Purpose | The Miami-Dade County 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) aims to provide a vision for the future of transportation in the county and guide transportation investments over the next 25 years. The plan was developed through a comprehensive and collaborative process that involved input from the public, stakeholders, and technical experts. |
| | General Findings | The population of Miami-Dade County is expected to continue growing over the next 25 years, which will put increasing demands on the transportation system. The county faces significant congestion, safety, and equity challenges, which must be addressed through a comprehensive and integrated approach to transportation planning. The Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) identifies several critical goals and objectives for improving mobility, safety, accessibility, sustainability, and resiliency in the transportation system. The 2045 LRTP Goals are: Maximize Mobility Choices Systemwide Increase the Safety of the Transportation System for All Users Increase the Security of the Transportation System for All Users Support Economic Vitality Protect and Preserve the Environment and Quality of Life and Promote Energy Conservation, Enhance the Integration & Connectivity of the System, Across & Between Modes, for People and Freight, Optimize Sound Investment Strategies for System Improve and Preserve the Existing Transportation System. To achieve these goals, the LRTP proposes to make improvements to public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure enhancements, expand managed lanes on highways, as well as adopting new technologies to improve transportation system performance. The LRTP also emphasizes the importance of engaging the public in the transportation planning process, and ensuring that transportation investments reflect the needs and priorities of all stakeholders. |
| | lssues | Miami-Dade County is one of the most congested areas in the country, and traffic congestion is a significant issue that impacts mobility and economic competitiveness. Miami-Dade County has many traffic fatalities and serious injuries, particularly among vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and bicyclists. There are significant disparities in access to transportation and mobility options across different communities countywide, which can negatively impact social and economic opportunities. The transportation system is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, such as flooding and sea level rise, which can disrupt mobility and increase maintenance costs. |



| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|------------------|--|
| | Recommendations | Expanding and upgrading public transportation: Locating areas where it is available and where it is needed. Respondents want to see public transit receive the highest amount of investment, according to a significant result from the Civic Dinner. Civic dinner is a forum that brings together a small group of diverse people to engage in dialogues about issues that are significant to them. Improving safety by making the transportation system safer for all users (with and without motorized vehicles). Some safety performance measures are the Number of Fatalities, Fatality Rate over 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), Number of Serious Injuries, Serious Injury Rate per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), and Number of Combined Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries. Improving equity: Providing outreach materials in English, Spanish, and Creole and emphasizing populations targeted such as Minorities, Low Income, millennials, Gen Z, Communities of concern, and the Aging population. |
| | Overview/Purpose | The Strategic Miami Area Rapid Transit (SMART) Plan is an infrastructure investment program focused on improving transportation mobility throughout Miami-Dade County to support economic growth. With the metropolitan area of Miami becoming a major international freight, passenger, and cargo hub, the Miami-Dade TPO Governing Board declared the advancement of the SMART Plan as the top priority for Miami-Dade County, supported by public and private sector partners, residents, and elected officials. The SMART Plan will expand transit options in Miami-Dade County along six (6) critical corridors, impacting an estimated 1.7 million people. |
| | General Findings | 20 proposed SMART Trail connections to population areas and practical destinations 14 miles of new active transportation facilities 6 shared-use path bridges \$62 million in SMART Trails investment |
| 200 Miami-Dade TPO SMART Trails Master Plan | lssues | Beach Corridor: Highest tourist demand in the region with major employment centers. East-West Corridor: Heaviest commuter travel for international, state, and local businesses. Kendall Corridor: One of the most congested arterial roadways with the highest demand. North Corridor: Key regional mobility linkage for access to jobs, stadiums, and educational facilities. Northeast Corridor: High transit demand and part of a critical regional corridor stretching to Palm Beach County. South Corridor: Experiencing the fastest population growth in Miami-Dade County. |
| | Recommendations | Proposed Project #1: Ludlam Trail to Dadeland North Metrorail Station/ Underline/Kendall Corridor 1A. Route A, which includes a proposed shared-use pathway and a bridge west of SW 70 Avenue 1B. Route B, which includes a proposed shared-use path south of Snapper Creek Expressway 1C. Useful destination as it will provide access to Dadeland Mall. Proposed Project #2: Snapper Creek Trail to Kendall Corridor 2A. A shared use pathway on the north side of SW 88 Street/Kendall Drive from SW 98 Court to SW 94 Avenue as shown in the Snapper Creek Trail Segment "A" planning study 2B. Modifications are needed under the Don Shula Expressway at Kendall Drive. 2C. Useful destinations such as access to the Boys and Girls Club of Miami, SW Langer/Kendall Unit, and K-Land Park. Five Evaluation Criteria that the proposed projects shown above must have are: 1. Connectivity: Providing access to population areas and valuable destinations. 2. Gap Analysis: Filling in strategic gaps in the non-motorized network. 3. Constructability: Concept to be incorporated into the existing facility without significant impacts and right-of-way is generally available. 4. Low Stress: Utilize low-volume and low-speed roads 5. Stakeholder Input: Considers stakeholder agency and public feedback. |
| 21. South Miami Metrorail Station Pedestrian Bridge (TPO 2027 List of Program Priorities) | Overview/Purpose | According to the FDOT's correspondence dated May 18, 2021, FDOT, in collaboration with the TPO, has concluded the selection process for the FY 2021 Transportation Alternatives (TA) Application Cycle. On June 17, 2021, the Miami- Dade Transportation Planning Organization's Governing Board passed Resolution #28-2021, approving the 2021 Transportation Improvements Plan's (TIP) List of Program Priorities (LOPP). This LOPP includes the South Miami Pedestrian Bridge for \$400,000 for the Construction Engineering Inspection (CEI) phase in FY 2027. *NOTE: This project was also originally funded under FM 413238-4. However, that project was dropped because of Resolution #36-2010. A TA grant was awarded to the City of South Miami for FY 2027 as shown in the 2021 TIP's LOPP under FM 447986-1 for the construction of a pedestrian bridge in the vicinity of the South Miami Metrorail Station between SW 57 Avenue and Sunset Drive. The design of that project has started, and construction is scheduled to start in late FY 2024. |
| | General Findings | On January 28, 2021, the Miami-Dade TPO's Governing Board adopted Resolution #02-2021, approving as an amendment to the 2021 TIP to add FTA Section 5307 Program funding, and the transfer of FHWA funds for use by Miami-Dade County DTPW for the Miami Springs - Okeechobee Metrorail Station SMART Trail Connector project. However, on August 9, 2021, the City Council unanimously adopted a motion opposing this project, and requested that all applicable governmental agencies ended said project. |



C

| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION | | | |
|---|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | lssues | his project was also funded initially under FM 413238-4. That project was dropped because of the Miami-Dade TPO's esolution #36-2010. A TA grant was awarded to the City of South Miami for FY 2027 as shown in the 2021 TIP's LOPP under FM 447986-1 for constructing a pedestrian bridge near the South Miami Metrorail Station between SW 57 Avenue and Sunset Drive. The design of that project has started, and construction is scheduled to begin in late FY 2024. | | | |
| | Recommendations | On September 20, 2021, the Transportation Planning Council (TPC) recommended the approval of an amendment to the FY 2021 TIP to remove the Miami Springs - Okeechobee Metrorail Station SMART Trail Connector project, FM #446747-1. | | | |
| | Overview/Purpose | The Underline will transform the land below the southern half of Miami's Metrorail into a 10-mile signature linear park, urban trail, and living art destination, well-connected to transit, promoting a healthy lifestyle as a gateway to the adjacent communities. | | | |
| | General Findings | The Underline will also encourage a healthier lifestyle. Over half of Miami residents don't exercise the recommended 20-30 minutes daily. The numerous proposed recreation features, from the walking/running and biking trails, basketball courts, soccer fields, outdoor gyms, and related programming, will attract residents and tourists alike to enjoy an active lifestyle, a proven prescription to defend against chronic diseases and enhance longevity. | | | |
| 22. The Underline Site Plan Documents for the three Metrorail stations in this study | lssues | Dadeland South: No intersection work Road work for Datran Boulevard and Dadeland Boulevard under the Dadeland South Metrorail Station scope of work The Underline stops at the kiss-and-ride facility north of the station. Dadeland North: the intersections of SW 70 Avenue and SW 84 Street adjacent to the Underline are to be improved. Coconut Grove: the intersection of SW 27 Avenue adjacent to the Underline is to be improved. | | | |
| | Recommendations | For a major intersection 1. Considering grade-separated crossing at the highest volume intersections and crossings with unavoidable constraints. 2. Exploring strategies for significant path re-alignment associated with tactical opportunities. For medium intersection 1. Maintaining straight approach path alignment across the intersection 2. Providing early indicators for approaching pathway users 3. Providing tabled crossing or lift grade of roadway to provide smooth crossing while notifying motorists of the crossing 4. Widening crosswalks and curb openings to 18 feet in width (minimum). For minor intersection 1. Re-aligning the pathway approach to improve visibility and orientation. 2. Providing early indicators for approaching pathway users 3. Considering no-turn-on-red for cross-street right-turn movement 4. Providing leading pedestrian interval (LPI) for underlined crossing | | | |
| 23. US-1 Multimodal and/or Roadway Intersection Analysis between SW 27 Avenue and SW 72 Street (TPO ongoing study) Underline | Overview/Purpose | This study aims to conduct a traffic analysis to assess vehicular and pedestrian crossing access along and across US-1 from SW 72 Street to SW 27 Avenue, and provide recommendations to maximize the capacity of this corridor via multimodal and roadway improvements. *NOTE: The draft of this report was circulated for comments by the Miami-Dade TPO in January 2023. From that draft, long- and short-term recommendations were included for SW 57 Avenue, Granada Boulevard, SW 42 Avenue, as well as operational modifications for other intersections along the corridor. None of these improvements seem to have been brought up to FDOT by Miami-Dade County or local municipalities for funding programming. | | | |
| | General Findings | The study focused on six areas that were identified to be transportation deficient and congestion hot spots for the corridor based on previous studies, available data, and guidance from the Study Advisory Committee (SAC). These six (6) focus areas are listed below: Focus Area 1: SW 57 Avenue/SW 72 Street Focus Area 2: S Alhambra Circle Focus Area 3: Granda Boulevard Focus Area 4: SW 42 Avenue/Blue Road/Grand Avenue Focus Area 5: SW 37 Avenue/SW 40 Street Focus Area 6: SW 27 Avenue | | | |



| DOCUMENT NO. & TITLE | ATTRIBUTE | DESCRIPTION |
|--|------------------|--|
| | lssues | Income along the corridor varies Areas with better pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure and mixed land uses have higher rates of walking, biking, and using transit Study area residents are diverse in age, with concentrations of millennials in certain areas 106,500 jobs areas located in the study area Most US-1 trips do not travel the entire length of the study area Majority of intersections are operating over capacity Existing street lighting is auto-focused Dadeland South Metrorail Station has the highest Metrorail ridership Park-and-ride are heavily used in some areas (Dadeland South Metrorail Station has exceptionally high demand) Only 5.5% of study area trips are made by transit Stakeholders expressed a desire for improvements to accommodate sustainability and mitigate sea-level rise Drivers attributed causes from left-turn queue spillbacks to signal to time as contributing to traffic build-up. *None of these improvements issues seem to have been brought up to FDOT by the Miami-Dade County or local municipalities for funding programming. |
| | Recommendations | For US-1 and SW 57 Avenue: Short-term recommendations include extending the pavement at the intersections to shorten the pedestrian crossing distance, adding high-emphasis crosswalks, adding pavement to the medians to create pedestrian refuges, staggering the stop bars for vehicles, and implementing The Underline. Long-Term Recommendations include an elevated bicycle pathway consistent with the Friends of The Underline concept. This includes pedestrian walkovers across US-1 and SW 57 Avenue. |
| 24. FHWA's Moving to a Complete Streets Design Model | Overview/Purpose | This article aims to report on implementing the Complete Streets policy across the United States, and to provide recommendations for improving implementation efforts. The report provides general findings on the state of Complete Streets implementation in the country, and it identifies areas where progress has been made, and more work is needed. |
| | General Findings | Many states and local governments have adopted Complete Streets policies and are progressing towards implementing them. There is a need for better data collection and analysis to assess the effectiveness of Complete Streets policies. Many implementation challenges remain, including securing funding, overcoming political resistance, and addressing concerns about parking and traffic flow impacts. Collaboration between transportation agencies, public health agencies, and community organizations is essential to successful Complete Streets implementation. There is a need for continued education and outreach efforts to increase public awareness and support for Complete Streets. |
| | lssues | Lack of uniform data collection Inadequate funding Implementation challenges due to varying political and community support levels and technical as well as institutional barriers. There is a need to address equity in Complete Streets planning and implementation, as historically marginalized communities often lack access to safe and accessible transportation options. Coordination among agencies and jurisdictions often leads to more consistent implementation of Complete Streets policies and investments. |
| | Recommendations | Improving data collection and analysis to track progress better, and assess the effectiveness of Complete Streets policies. Increasing federal, state, and local funding for Complete Streets projects. Encouraging collaboration and coordination between transportation agencies, public health agencies, and community organizations to support Complete Streets implementation. Providing technical assistance and training to transportation professionals and local officials on Complete Streets design and implementation. Continuing education and outreach efforts to increase public awareness and support for Complete Streets. |



3.2 FINDINGS

Walking and biking are considered vital transportation options in all communities especially in those locations that are near premium transit stations such as the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North and Dadeland South Metrorail Stations. After performing the Literature Review, the following findings were identified:

• One of the most dangerous states for pedestrians in the United States is Florida. It is classified as the 2nd most dangerous state for pedestrians according to Dangerous by Design 2022. Policymakers have focused more on moving cars at high speeds than safety. Our study will focus on improving safety along US-1 at the intersections near the three Metrorail stations. Refer to **Figure 3-1: Top 20 Most Dangerous States for Pedestrians.**

• Miami-Dade County has experienced increased traffic fatalities and severe injuries in recent years. Pedestrians and bicyclists are particularly vulnerable to traffic crashes and comprise

THE TOP 20 Most dangerous states for pedestrians (2016-2020)



a significant proportion of fatalities and severe injuries. US-1 is an important northsouth corridor that links many residential communities, businesses, and schools in Miami-Dade County, where pedestrian and bicyclist safety is a major concern.

• The costs of traffic crashes in Florida today are unacceptably high. The economic cost of crashes in Florida in 2019 was estimated to be over \$43 billion. More than 3,000 Floridians and visitors die in traffic crashes each year, and an average of 16,000 are seriously injured in Florida according to FDOT's FY 2023 Highway Safety Plan. Crashes involving fatalities, serious injuries, and property damage also take a toll on our quality of life and economy, while impeding the efficiency and reliability of our transportation system.

• The number of pedestrian fatalities has

Figure 3-1: Top 20 Most Dangerous States for Pedestrians (Dangerous By Design 2022) increased over the past decade. The conditions people face when they want to walk or bike whether to work or for recreation—are not the same for all users. Low-income communities are significantly less likely to have access to safe recreational walking and are less likely to have sidewalks, marked crosswalks, and street design to support safer, slower speeds. There is a disproportionate impact on low-income and minority communities resulting in traffic fatalities and severe injuries disproportionately affecting low-income and minority communities in Miami-Dade. It is vital that the County provide safe and reliable infrastructure and transportation options for vulnerable communities.

• The ultimate goal of Miami-Dade County is to improve mobility, safety, and quality of life for all residents and visitors. We envision a County that is healthy, prosperous and resilient for all people who live, work and visit no matter where you live.



3.3 PURPOSE AND NEED

Study Purpose

The purpose of this study is to provide enhanced pedestrian and bicyclist access across US-1 at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North and Dadeland South Metrorail Stations to maximize safety, mobility and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing US-1.

Need

There is a need to improve bicycle/pedestrian routes around major roadways in Miami-Dade County. US-1 is a 6-lane arterial that experiences high traffic volumes and congestion that contribute to poor bicycle and pedestrian safety at the three Metrorail Station location crossings. Providing safe infrastructure over US-1 will open opportunities to reduce crashes, maximize transit use, increase neighborhood livability and recreation, while reducing congestion.

According to Dangerous By Design 2022, the COVID-19 pandemic perpetuated existing disparities in terms of who is most likely to be struck and killed while walking nationally. Although people of all ages, races, income levels, and abilities are affected by dangerous street design, certain populations bear the brunt of the burden. People of color, low-income residents, and older adults are much more likely to die while walking, and the many people who exist at the intersections of these identities are even more vulnerable. People of color, particularly Native and Black Americans, are more likely to die while walking than any other race or ethnic group, as illustrated **Figure 3-2: Pedestrian Deaths by Race & Ethnicity.** Despite making up a smaller proportion of the population in the United States, people of color are overrepresented in the percentage of pedestrian deaths.





Figure 3-2: National Pedestrian Deaths by Race & Ethnicity (Dangerous By Design 2022)



TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 2

MULTIMODAL ACCESSIBILITY & DATA COLLECTION



4.0 MULTIMODAL ACCESSIBILITY AND DATA COLLECTION

MULTIMODAL ACCESSIBILITY AND DATA COLLECTION

The Project Team collected data as part of the feasibility study in order to provide mobility recommendations and build an implementation assessment. Existing and proposed facilities were identified at the three Metrorail Stations and adjacent park-and-ride lots, along with amenities for the non-motorized access modes (walk, bicycle, etc.). The mode of ingress and egress was assessed along with the activity at transit generator areas. The plans/improvement concepts were also obtained from transportation partners for each Metrorail Station. Close attention was paid to the latest technologies and financial feasibility.

4.1 TRAFFIC VOLUME REVIEW

Six intersections serve the three Metrorail Stations as shown in **Table 4-1** below. Traffic data was collected from available resources at the following locations:

| Station | Intersection | Intersection |
|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| Coconut Grove Metrorail Station | 1 | US-1 and SW 27th Avenue |
| Dadeland North Metrorail Station | 2 | US-1 and SW 68th Court |
| | 3 | US-1 and SW 84th Street |
| | 4 | US-1 and SW 88th Street |
| Dadeland South Metrorail Station | 5 | US-1 and Dadeland Blvd/ SW 72nd Court |
| | 6 | US-1 and Datran Drive |

Table 4-1: Metrorail Station Intersections

Traffic data includes Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) data obtained from the Florida Department of Transportation's FDOT Traffic Online Tool for the year 2021 for the intersections shown in **Table 4-2** below:

| Station | Intersection | Intersection | AADT (Vehicles per day) Intersection Leg | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|---|--------|--------|--------|
| | NO. | | West | East | North | South |
| Coconut Grove Metrorail | | | | | | |
| Station | 1 | US-1 and SW 27th Avenue | 80,500 | 83,500 | 25,500 | 16,800 |
| Dadaland North Matroral | 2 | US-1 and SW 68th Court | N/A | N/A | 40,500 | N/A |
| Station | 3 | US-1 and SW 84th Street | N/A | N/A | 78,000 | 40,500 |
| station | 4 | US-1 and SW 88th Street | 36,500 | 7,100 | 40,500 | 42,500 |
| Dadaland South Matrorail | | US-1 and Dadeland Blvd/ SW | / | | | |
| Station | 5 | 72nd Court | 10,200 | N/A | 42,500 | N/A |
| sidilori | 6 | US-1 and Datran Drive | 5,600 | N/A | 42,500 | N/A |

Table 4-2: FDOT Traffic Data for the Metrorail Station Intersections



4.2 FDOT LEVEL OF SERVICE REVIEW

The traffic volumes derived from Florida Traffic Online database were used to perform motorized Level of Service (LOS) analysis. Motor Vehicle Arterial Generalized Service Volume Tables from the FDOT 2023 Multimodal Quality LOS Handbook are shown in **Table 4-3** below:

| T | | В | С | D | E |
|----------------------|--------|---|--------|--------|--------|
| | 2 Lane | * | * | 17,600 | 24,000 |
| | 4 Lane | * | 24,400 | 36,100 | 40,800 |
| | 6 Lane | * | 44,700 | 56,800 | 60,400 |
| (C4-Urban | 8 Lane | * | 52,300 | 66,900 | 70,900 |
| General) | | | | | |
| TTI | | В | С | D | E |
| LUL L | 2 Lane | * | * | 13,900 | 21,800 |
| HI | 4 Lane | * | 26,100 | 38,300 | 43,000 |
| [I] | 6 Lane | * | 28,400 | 53,900 | 62,800 |
| (C5-Urban Center) | 8 Lane | * | 58,800 | 71,900 | 73,600 |

 Table 4-3: Motor Vehicle Arterial Generalized Service Volume Tables

 (Reference: FDOT 2023 Multimodal Quality LOS Handbook)

The context classification of US-1 at the three locations are described below (Reference: FDOT Preliminary Context Classification open data hub for State Roads). US-1 at the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station falls into an FDOT C4 Urban Area Context Classification. The Dadeland North and Dadeland South Metrorail Stations fall into a FDOT C5 Urban Center Context Classification.

The FDOT LOS Handbook indicated the following:

Intersection 1: US-1 (6 Lane going East and West) and SW 27th Ave (4 lanes going North and South)

- The AADT on US-1 East and West of SW 27th Avenue is 80,000, which translates to LOS F.
- The AADT on SW 27th Avenue (North) is between 24,400 and 36,100, meaning it falls into LOS D, and the AADT on SW 27th Avenue (South) is 16,800, translating to at least LOS C.

Intersection 2: US-1 (6 Lane on North leg) and SW 68th Court

- The AADT on US-1 (North) is 40,500, which translates to LOS D.
- No AADT available for SW 68th Court.

Intersection 3: US-1 (6 lanes on North and South) and SW 84th Street.

- No AADT on SW 84th Street
- The AADT on US-1 (North leg) is 78,000, which translates to LOS F.
- The AADT on US-1 (South leg) is 40,500, which translates to LOS D.



Intersection 4: US-1 (6 lanes on North and South) and SW 88th St (4 lanes on East and West)

- The AADT on SW 88th Street (West) is 36,500, which translates to LOS D.
- The AADT on SW 88th Street (East) is 7,100, which translates to LOS C or better.
- The AADT on US-1 (North leg) is 40,500, which translates to LOS D,
- The AADT on US-1 (South leg) is 42,500, which translates to LOS D.

Intersection 5: US-1 (6 lanes on the North leg) and Dadeland Blvd (4 lanes on the West side):

- The AADT on Dadeland Boulevard (West leg) is 10,200, which is equivalent to a LOS C or better.
- The AADT on US-1 (North leg) is 42,500, which translates to LOS D.

Intersection 6: US-1 (6 lanes on the North leg) and Datran Drive (2 routes on the West leg)

- The AADT on US-1 (North leg) is of 42,500, which translates to LOS D,
- The AADT on Datran Drive (West leg) is 5,600, which translates to LOS C or better.

For additional traffic data information refer to Appendix A: Traffic Data Sheets.

4.3 COCONUT GROVE METRORAIL STATION

The Coconut Grove Metrorail Station is in the center north part of Miami, Florida's Coconut Grove neighborhood. It is located at the crossroads of South Dixie Highway (US-1) and West 27th Avenue/Grapeland Boulevard (SR 9). Refer to **Figure 4-1: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Location Map.**

Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Address: 2880 SW 28th Lane, Miami, FL 33133



Figure 4-1: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Location Map



The Coconut Grove Metrorail Station has two tracks served by an island platform, with a parking lot just north of the platform. A site visit was performed on March 30, 2023, and a summary of the existing conditions related to pedestrian and bicycle use around the Metrorail Station are identified below. Originally, a 0.25-mile radius was used to evaluate the traffic generators, however we observed that major traffic generators were within 1-mile of the Metrorail Station. Existing station amenities, infrastructure, and land uses include the following:

- Average Bicycle Count: 13
- Bike Racks Present: 9
- Bicycle Lockers Available: 28
- Bicycle Lockers Rented: 12
- Lockers Damaged/ Not Rentable: 18/15
- Comments: Insufficient rack capacity; 2 inverted U racks
- Recommended Short Term Parking Needs (Rack Capacity): 12
- Recommended Long Term Parking Needs (Locker Capacity): 20
- Pedestrian attractors around station:
 - CocoWalk is an outdoor shopping center near Coconut Grove Metrorail Station (approximately 0.8 miles from the station) including restaurants, cafes, and bars.
 - Monty's Raw Bar (approximately 0.6 miles from the station),
 - Greenstreet Café (approximately 1 mile from the station), and
 - Peacock Park.
- ADA facilities are available at the following locations:
 - Coconut Grove Metrorail Station,
 - Barnacle Historic State Park, and
 - CocoWalk.
- Major Land Uses: Blanche Park, Lincoln Park, David T. Kennedy Park, Little Apple Learning Center, Douglas Park, and the Home Depot.

Some observations from our field visit to the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station are shown in **Figure 4-2: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Field Visit Images.** Some of the items identified are described below:

1. Security Hazards: There is a lot of congestion and construction in the area (Grove Central, a

mixed-use development is under construction, which will be a future traffic generator):

- Grove Central will provide 172,000-square feet of retail space as well as 402
- residential units, including 60 work-force housing units (future traffic generator).
 Grove Central will connect with The Underline, a 10-mile linear park, transforming the
- land below Miami's Metrorail into an urban trail and living art destination.
- 2. There is no lighting in the walkway in front of the rail,
- 3. There is a bicycle repair station but no parking available. There are no bike lanes or trail. We identified a total of 9 bike racks.
- 4. There is elevator access inside the station for ADA purposes,
- 5. There are no bicycle lockers or bike lids available,
- 6. Speed limit is 45mph but driver behavior is fast/ aggressive (qualitative),
- 7. There are no scooters at this station,
- 8. Traffic generators include:
 - Cafes: Greenstreet Cafe & Mary's Café.
 - <u>Parks</u>: Peacock Park & Barnacle Historic State Park (located near the station). Barnacle
 Park is wheelchair accessible and there are parking spots for individuals with disabilities.



- Hotels: Hampton Inn by Hilton Miami-Coconut, Grove/Coral Gables.
- Schools: Mater Grove Academy and Coconut Grove Montessori School.
- Churches: Church of Scientology of Florida & Miami Church.
- <u>Restaurants:</u> Flanigan's Seafood Bar and Grill & Coral Bagels, and Monty's Raw Bar.

















Figure 4-2: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Field Visit Images



Technical Memorandum No. 2 - Multimodal Accessibility And Data Collection US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges Feasibility Study

4.3.1 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRAFFIC VOLUME FINDINGS

As part of the data collection effort the Project Team gathered bicycle and pedestrian activity and counts, as well as crash data. Refer to **Figure 4-3: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic** for Traffic Volume Counts. The counts are also summarized in **Table 4-4: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Counts.**



Figure 4-3: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic

(See follow page for detailed view)

Intersection: US-1 at SW 27th Avenue

| Crosswalk | Mode | AM Peak | Midday Peak | PM Peak | Nighttime Peak |
|-----------|------------------|---------|-------------|---------|----------------|
| Leg | | Hour | Hour | Hour | Hour |
| East leg | Pedestrian Count | 23 | 7 | 46 | 2 |
| | Bicycle Count | 6 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| West leg | Pedestrian Count | 338 | 58 | 373 | 36 |
| | Bicycle Count | 45 | 4 | 25 | 6 |
| North leg | Pedestrian Count | 19 | 4 | 31 | 4 |
| | Bicycle Count | 14 | 5 | 19 | 0 |
| South leg | Pedestrian Count | 21 | 3 | 29 | 0 |
| | Bicycle Count | 21 | 1 | 4 | 1 |

Table 4-4: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and SW 27th Avenue



4.3.1 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRAFFIC VOLUME FINDINGS



Figure 4-3: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic



Figure 4-3: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic (detailed view)



4.3.2 CRASH DATA

The main goal of the crash data analysis was to examine the causes of crashes throughout a five-year period. This analysis served as a guide to providing potential at-grade improvements. Below is a description of the data analysis performed:

US-1 and SW 27th Ave Data Analysis:

A total of fifteen (15) bike-pedestrian crashes were observed within the last five (5) years. Based on the safety analysis, below are some of the findings:

- 2 out of the 15 crashes occurred within the west leg crosswalk of the intersection which
 experienced higher demand compared to the other crosswalk due to the north part of
 the crosswalk connecting to the station,
- Out of the 12 crashes that occurred on the west leg,
 - 7 crashes involved bike-pedestrians not yielding to vehicles driving along US-1 or S Dixie Highway,
 - 2 of these crashes were serious bodily injuries (SBIs),
 - In the 2 other crashes, it was unknown who had the right-of-way.
- A serious injury occurred with southbound left-turn vehicle (did not yield) colliding with bicycle on the east leg crosswalk,
- 3 out of the 15 crashes involved southbound right-turning vehicles colliding with bicyclists:
 - 2 crashes with southbound right-turning vehicles (during right turn on red phase) unable to stop before the crosswalk colliding with the bicyclists riding on the north leg crosswalk,
 - 1 crash occurred with southbound right-turning vehicle not yielding to bicyclist on the west leg crosswalk, during green for SW 27th Avenue vehicles.
- 7 out of the 15 crashes 47% occurred during dark and lighted conditions, which is higher than the Districtwide average of 27%.





Technical Memorandum No. 2 - Multimodal Accessibility And Data Collection US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges Feasibility Study

4.3.3 IMPROVEMENTS TO THE COCONUT GROVE METRORAIL STATION

Project 1: Grove Central

- **Description:** Grove One Plaza is a Transit Oriented Development adjacent to the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station. The property was an on-grade parking lot with a large unused plaza to the East. The spaces filled up quickly for people riding for the most part north, into Downtown and Civic Center stations.
- Location: 2780 SW 27th Court, Miami, FL 33133

• Bike-ped facilities:

- Polishing of stainless steel; and additional bike lockers.
- Grove Central will also connect with The Underline, a 10-mile linear park, transforming the land below Miami's Metrorail into an urban trail and living art destination.
- BikeLids will be provided to enable people to secure their bike using their own padlock and offering covered protection, (it would be free on a first-come, first-served basis). Note: BikeLids are not provided at this Metrorail location.
- Grove Central will provide 172,000-square feet of retail space as well as 402 residential units, including 60 work-force housing units.
- ADA facility: refurbished elevator and escalator.

• Transportation benefits:

- Better mobility with ease of movement.
- Higher foot-traffic for commercial businesses.
- Reduced household spending on transportation.
- Improved the hardscape and landscape between the new development and the station.
- Upgraded lighting.
- Increased transit parking: Five levels of parking with approximately 1,270 parking spaces.

Proposed innovations:

- New bus shelters with a continuous canopy to the station
- Painting of existing structure
- Real-time arrival and departure display at the covered connection to Grove Central.





4.4 DADELAND NORTH METRORAIL STATION

The Dadeland North Metrorail Station is a stop within the Metrorail Rapid Transit System, located in the Dadeland District of Glenvar Heights, Florida. Positioned at the crossing of South Dixie Highway (US-1) and SW 83rd Street along the Snapper Creek, the station is located two blocks north of Kendall Drive and two blocks south of the junction between US-1 and the Snapper Creek Expressway (SR 878). Refer to **Figure 4-4: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Location Map.**

Dadeland North Metrorail Station Address: 8300 South Dixie Hwy, Miami, FL 33143



Figure 4-4: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Location Map



Technical Memorandum No. 2 - Multimodal Accessibility And Data Collection US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges Feasibility Study The Dadeland North Metrorail Station has two tracks served by an island platform, with a parking lot just north of the platform. A site visit was performed on March 29, 2023, and a summary of the existing conditions related to pedestrian and bicycle use around the Metrorail Station are identified below. A 0.25-mile radius was used to evaluate the traffic generators. Existing station amenities, infrastructure, and land uses include the following:

- Average Bicycle Count: 11
- Bike Racks Present: 1
- Bicycle Lockers Available: 2
- Bicycle Lockers Rented: 2
- Lockers Damaged / Not Rentable: 0
- Comments: Insufficient rack capacity; lockers do not need replacement, but more lockers are needed
- Recommended Short Term Parking Needs (Rack Capacity): 16
- Recommended Long Term Parking Needs (Locker Capacity): 8
- Pedestrian attractors around station:
 - Dadeland Mall: Restaurants, Department stores, and the AC hotel.
 - Downtown Dadeland: Orange Theory Fitness, salons, a Publix, and Ghee Indian Kitchen.
 - Dadeland Station Shopping Center: Located directly off the Dadeland North Metrorail Station. This shopping center includes stores like Target, Best Buy, and Dick's Sporting Goods.
 Note: These are popular sites for UM students.
- ADA facilities are available at the following locations:
 - A network of escalators and pedestrian and cart elevators.
 - Signage throughout the Dadeland Mall to help direct both arriving vehicles and transit system users to their destinations.
- Major Land Uses: Dadeland North shopping center, Hampton Inn Miami Dadeland, Miami Marriot Dadeland, Gulliver Prep Upper School Campus, Gary Matzner Park, Dadeland Mall, Xceed Preparatory Academy Kendall/ Pinecrest

Some observations from our field visit to the Dadeland North Metrorail Station are shown in **Figure 4-5: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Field Visit Images.** Some of the items identified are described below:

- 1. Security Hazards: There is a need for dedicated bike lanes and crosswalks, specially a need to cross over US-1 since there are no push buttons.
- 2. There are streetlights and station lighting but some of the lights around the station are not working.
- 3. Parking availability: micro-mobility parking is available. Bicycle racks are available in front of the station and in the northside. No motorcycle parking is available at the station.
- 4. No bicycle lockers or bike lids available
- 5. There are pedestrian ramps, a bike trail/path, and elevator access for disabled. Future improvements on additional elevators and special ADA ramps are needed.
- 6. Hazards for a blind person: Manhole cover.
- 7. There is a drop-off pick up zone available.
- 8. Speed limit: 45 mph and driver behavior is regularly slow/patient.
- 9. Scooters present at the station.
- 10. Traffic generators include:
 - Malls: Dadeland Mall and Dadeland Station Shopping Center.
 - <u>Gym:</u> Orange Theory Fitness.



- <u>Restaurants:</u> Ghee Indian Kitchen and The Big Cheese of Miami.
- <u>Stores:</u> Target, Best Buy, Dick's Sporting Goods.
- Schools: Gulliver Preparatory School.



Speed limit: 45 mph Driver's behavior: slow/patient Traffic generators: mall & shopping center, hotels, a school &restaurants.













Figure 4-5: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Field Visit Images



OC gineerin

4.4.1 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRAFFIC VOLUME FINDINGS

As part of the data collection effort the Project Team gathered bicycle and pedestrian activity and counts, as well as crash data. Refer to Figure 4-6: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Graphic for Traffic Volume Counts. The counts are also summarized in Table 4-5: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Counts at US-1 and SW 88th Street, Table 4-6: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Counts at US-1 and SW 68th Court, and Table 4-7: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and SW 84th Street.



Figure 4-6: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic (See follow page for detailed view)



4.4.1 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRAFFIC VOLUME FINDINGS



Figure 4-6: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic



Figure 4-6: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic (detailed view)


Intersection 1: US-1 at SW 88th Street

| Crosswalk Leg | Mode | AM Peak Hour | Midday Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | Nighttime Peak Hour |
|------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| East leg | Pedestrian Count | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| | Bicycle Count | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West leg | Pedestrian Count | 10 | 3 | 23 | 3 |
| | Bicycle Count | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| North leg | Pedestrian Count | 11 | 5 | 28 | 0 |
| | Bicycle Count | 10 | 1 | 12 | 1 |
| South leg | Pedestrian Count | 16 | 8 | 31 | 5 |
| | Bicycle Count | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

Table 4-5: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and SW 88th Street

Intersection 2: US-1 at SW 68th Court

| Crosswalk Leg | Mode | AM Peak Hour | Midday Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | Nighttime Peak Hour |
|------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| East leg | Pedestrian Count | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Bicycle Count | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West leg | Pedestrian Count | 146 | 28 | 241 | 12 |
| | Bicycle Count | 10 | 5 | 12 | 2 |
| North leg | Pedestrian Count | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| | Bicycle Count | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South leg | Pedestrian Count | 5 | 7 | 16 | 2 |
| | Bicycle Count | 3 | 1 | 7 | 2 |

Table 4-6: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and SW 68th Court

Intersection 3: US-1 at SW 84th Street

| Crosswalk Leg | Mode | AM Peak Hour | Midday Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | Nighttime Peak Hour |
|------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| East leg | Pedestrian Count | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Bicycle Count | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West leg | Pedestrian Count | 146 | 28 | 241 | 12 |
| | Bicycle Count | 10 | 5 | 12 | 2 |
| North leg | Pedestrian Count | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| | Bicycle Count | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South leg | Pedestrian Count | 5 | 7 | 16 | 2 |
| | Bicycle Count | 3 | 1 | 7 | 2 |

Table 4-7: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and SW 84th Street



4.4.2 CRASH DATA

The main goal of the crash data analysis is to examine the causes throughout a five-year period, which can provide an overview of potential at-grade improvements. Three (3) crashes occurred in total during the five years:

- At SW 68th Court mid-block crossing: A pedestrian was crossing US-1 about 250 feet away from the available mid-block crossing at SW 68th Court. This was a serious injury and occurred during the nighttime.
- At SW 84th Street, a couple of crashes were observed within the intersection:
- In one crash, a vehicle was driving south on SW 84th Street attempting to make a right-turn to drive west on US-1 (the light was red for the southbound approach). To make the right turn on red, the vehicle drove slightly onto the crosswalk, looking left for the vehicles on US-1 and collided with the bicyclist on the north leg crosswalk. The driver was cited for not yielding to bicyclists.
- In another crash, that occurred during the green for southbound vehicle, the right turning vehicle collided with a bicyclist on the west leg crosswalk. Similar to the previous crash, the vehicle did not yield to the bicyclist in the crosswalk.





4.4.3 IMPROVEMENTS TO THE DADELAND NORTH METRORAIL STATION

Project 1: The Pedestrian Bridge Proposal

- Description: The plan is to build a bridge to connect the Metrorail Station to the nearby Dadeland Mall.
- Location: The intersection of North Kendall Drive and North Dixie Highway.

• Bike-ped facilities:

- The proposed bridge would be approximately 1,000 feet long and would span the busy intersection and accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists with separate lanes for each.
- It would feature elevators and escalators, making it accessible for people with disabilities.

• Transportation benefits:

• The bridge would provide a safer and more convenient route for pedestrians, allowing them to cross busy roads without having to navigate traffic.

• Proposed innovations:

- Elevated and safer design
- Elevators and escalators for ADA facilities
- Aesthetically pleasing design
- Separated lanes for pedestrians and bicyclists.



4.4.3 IMPROVEMENTS TO THE DADELAND NORTH METRORAIL STATION

Project 2: The Underline

- **Description:** A 10-mile linear park underneath the Metrorail elevated mass transit tracks from the Miami River south to Dadeland.
- Location: It is located underneath the Metrorail's elevated tracks, running from Miami River to Dadeland South Metrorail Station in South Miami.

• Bike-ped facilities:

- The project will include bike and walking paths, landscaping and connections to other transit and parks.
- Green space
- Community Gathering Area
- Public art installations

• Transportation benefits:

- Active transportation: biking paths would reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality in the area.
- Improved connectivity: it would be easier for different neighborhoods and destinations in the area to get around without a car.
- Transit oriented development: It would encourage people to use public transportation.
- Multi-Modal Transportation: pedestrians, bicyclists, scooters and electric bikes would be accommodated on the linear park.

Proposed innovations:

- Stormwater Management
- Solar Panels
- Public Art Installations
- Educational Signage: Park's history, ecology, and sustainability features promoting environmental awareness.





4.5 DADELAND SOUTH METRORAIL STATION

The Dadeland South Metrorail Station is located in the Dadeland District of Kendall, Florida. This station serves as a transfer point within the Metrorail's rapid transit system. It is located close to the crossing of Dadeland Boulevard (9150 Dadeland Boulevard) and Datran Boulevard, and near South Dixie Highway (US 1). The station is located three blocks southwest of Kendall Drive and Dadeland Mall, and is situated just east of the junction between US-1 and the Palmetto Expressway (SR 826). Refer to Figure 4-7: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Location Map.

Dadeland South Metrorail Station Address: 9150 Dadeland Boulevard Miami, Florida 33156



Figure 4-7: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Location Map



Technical Memorandum No. 2 - Multimodal Accessibility And Data Collection US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges Feasibility Study The Dadeland South Metrorail Station has two tracks served by an island platform, with a subterranean parking lot located adjacent (south side) of the platform. A site visit was performed on March 28, 2023, and a summary of the existing conditions related to pedestrian and bicycle use around the Metrorail Station are identified below. A 0.25-mile radius was used to evaluate the traffic generators. Existing station amenities, infrastructure, and land uses include the following:

- Average Bicycle Count: 12
- Bike Racks Present: 0
- Bicycle Lockers Available: 18
- Bicycle Lockers Rented: 9
- Lockers Damaged/ Not Rentable: 8/6
- **Comments:** Insufficient rack capacity.
- Recommended Short Term Parking Needs (Rack Capacity): 16
- Recommended Long Term Parking Needs (Locker Capacity): 16
- Pedestrian attractors around station:
 - Hospital: American Access Care of Miami.
 - School: Xceed Preparatory Academy-Kendall/Pinecrest.
 - Bank: Bank of America.
 - Salons: Drama Salon and Riudi Salon.
 - Hotels: Miami Marriot Dadeland.
 - Supermarket: Publix.
 - Gym: Orange Theory Fitness.

• Major Land Uses: Dadeland Mall, Dadeland Animal Hospital, Flagler Grove Park, True North Classical Academy Dadeland, Saint Andrew Greek Orthodox Church

Some observations from our field visit to Dadeland South Metrorail Station are shown in **Figure 4-8: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Field Visit Images.** Some of the items identified are described below:

- 1. Security Hazards: Parking entrance needs pedestrian signs for cars to yield. No speed limit signs visible. Push button present and crosswalks need maintenance.
- There are streetlights and station lighting but some of the lights around the station are not working.
- 3. Parking entrance at Datran Center needs pedestrian signs for cars to yield. No speed limit signs visible.
- 4. No bicycle lockers or bike racks available. Only 6 bike lids are present, and bicyclists dismount at Datran Drive.
- 5. There are pedestrian ramps, a bike trail/path and elevator access for disabled. Future improvements on additional elevators and special ADA ramps are needed.
- 6. There are push buttons at Datran Drive
- 7. Drivers' behavior is fast/aggressive.
- 8. Crosswalks need maintenance.
- 9. There are scooters available.
- 10. Traffic generators include:
 - Hospital: American Access Care of Miami.
 - <u>School:</u> Xceed Preparatory Academy-Kendall/Pinecrest.
 - Bank: Bank of America.
 - <u>Salons:</u> Drama Salon and Riudi Salon.
 - Hotels: Miami Marriot Dadeland.
 - Supermarket: Publix.
 - Gym: Orange Theory Fitness.





Figure 4-8: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Field Visit Images



4.5.1 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRAFFIC VOLUME FINDINGS

As part of the data collection effort the Project Team gathered bicycle and pedestrian activity and counts, as well as crash data. Refer to **Figure 4-9: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic** for Traffic Volume Counts. The counts are also summarized in **Table 4-8: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Counts at Dadeland Boulevard.** and in **Table 4-9: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Counts at Dateran Drive.**



Figure 4-9: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data

Collection Graphic (See follow page for detailed view)

Intersection: US-1 at Dadeland Boulevard

| Crosswalk Leg | Mode | AM Peak Hour | Midday Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | Nighttime Peak Hour |
|------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| East leg | Pedestrian Count | 22 | 8 | 23 | 2 |
| | Bicycle Count | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| West leg | Pedestrian Count | 0 | 4 | 17 | 2 |
| | Bicycle Count | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| North leg | Pedestrian Count | 59 | 24 | 70 | 9 |
| _ | Bicycle Count | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| South leg | Pedestrian Count | 43 | 22 | 74 | 6 |
| | Bicycle Count | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

Table 4-8: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and Dadeland Boulevard



4.5.1 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRAFFIC VOLUME FINDINGS



Figure 4-9: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic



Figure 4-9: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Volume Data Collection Graphic (zoomed-in)



Technical Memorandum No. 2 - Multimodal Accessibility And Data Collection US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges Feasibility Study

Intersection: US-1 at Datran Drive

| Crosswalk | Mode | AM Peak | Midday Peak | PM Peak | Nighttime Peak |
|-----------|------------------|---------|-------------|---------|----------------|
| Leg | | Hour | Hour | Hour | Hour |
| East leg | Pedestrian Count | 4 | 5 | 15 | 0 |
| | Bicycle Count | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| West leg | Pedestrian Count | 9 | 17 | 16 | 1 |
| | Bicycle Count | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| North leg | Pedestrian Count | 14 | 41 | 39 | 6 |
| | Bicycle Count | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| South leg | Pedestrian Count | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| | Bicycle Count | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 4-9: Dadeland South Metrorail Traffic Volume Count at US-1 and Datran Drive

4.5.2 CRASH DATA

The main goal of the crash data analysis is to examine the causes throughout a five-year period, which provide an overview for the potential at-grade improvements. Four (4) crashes occurred in total during the five years:

- At Datran Drive, a couple of crashes occurred where the vehicles were driving south on Datran Drive attempting to make a right-turn to drive west on US-1 (the light was red for the southbound approach). To make the right turn on red, the vehicle drove slightly onto the crosswalk, looking left for the vehicles on US-1 and collided with the bicyclist on the north leg crosswalk. In both the cases, drivers were cited for not yielding to bicyclists.
- At Dadeland Boulevard, a couple of crashes were observed within the intersection:
- One crash occurred with a southeast bound (Dadeland Boulevard to US-1 east) vehicle making a left-turn and collided with a pedestrian who was crossing US-1 in the north-south direction away from the available crosswalk on the east leg.
- Another crash occurred with a motorcycle riding southwest bound on US-1 and collided with a pedestrian on the east leg crosswalk. The vehicle had the green light and the pedestrian did not yield to the vehicle.





4.5.3 IMPROVEMENTS TO THE DADELAND SOUTH METRORAIL STATION

Project 1: South Dade Transitway

- **Description:** The Project includes improvements to the existing Dadeland South Metrorail Station to provide better weather protection, reconfiguration of the drop-off/pick-up area, and improvements to existing amenities.
 - The SMART Initiative is a strategic and expansive vision for our region that uses technology at the highest levels to leverage existing infrastructure to build a network of numerous mobility options. The program supports projected increases in employment and population.
 - South Dade Transitway under construction which will provide Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service from Dadeland South to SW 344 Street Transit Terminal.
- Location: The South Dade TransitWay extends from the Dadeland South Metrorail Station to the SW 344th Street Park-and-Ride/Transit Terminal, and it provides a mobility connection between the Miami Central Business District and the Village of Pinecrest, the Village of Palmetto Bay, Town of Cutler Bay, City of Homestead, and Florida City.

• Bike-ped facilities:

- Surface Park and ride lot north of the station area
- Dedicated lanes with multi-layered service lines, BRT will also offer improved safety features and other modifications on the TransitWay.

• Transportation benefits:

- Connects numerous municipalities which represent some of the fastest growing communities in Miami-Dade County.
- Sets new efficiency standard for public transportation.
- Viable solution for future transportation demands.
- Improvements to the existing amenities include facility technologies, barrier and security systems, bicycle amenities, lighting, landscape and hardscape elements, climate control systems, wayfinding signage, and vertical circulation elements. Also, site improvements to adjacent roadways, signalized.
- Through lane for buses not stopping at BRT stations
- Off-Board fare collection
- Traffic Signal Preemption (TSP) technology to keep BRT vehicles moving through intersections.
- Gate arms at intersections for added safety.

• Proposed innovations:

- The design and construction of canopies.
- This project is targeting LEED for Transit Stations "Silver"- level certification.
- When fully operational, BRT will have iconic stations, rail-like journey times, level boarding through all doors, and pre-paid fees for quick access.
- Air-conditioned vestibules
- Center platform loading
- Wi-Fi inside stations
- CCTV cameras & 24-hour security
- Improved lighting at and around stations
- ADA compliant level boarding platform
- Real-time bus arrival display





4.5.3 IMPROVEMENTS TO THE DADELAND SOUTH METRORAIL STATION

Project 2: Dadeland South Intermodal Station Preliminary Design

• **Description:** This project will significantly improve and enhance the infrastructure, operations, and safety at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station, a core transit hub. The station is the southern terminus of the existing Metrorail system and is the northern terminal station of the South Dade TransitWay, which was selected to operate as the County's first Bus Raid Transit (BRT) program by the County's Transportation Planning Organization in 2018. Upon project completion, the Station shall seamlessly integrate the BRT operations with the existing transit services (Metrorail and local bus). The project is a continuation of and complementary to the South Corridor of the SMART Program. The specific scope of work includes the design and construction

of: (1) various canopies to provide better weather protection for transit riders on the BRT platform, Metrorail platform and connecting elements between the Metrorail platform and the drop-off/ pick-up area; (2) the drop-off/pickup area north of the Station for easier vehicular and pedestrian access; (3) an at-grade bike path connecting to the County's Underline project and the South Dade Trail; (4) improvements throughout the station to the existing amenities such as barrier and security systems, bicycle infrastructure, lighting, landscape and hardscape elements, climate control systems, wayfinding signage and vertical circulation; and (5) the Metrorail guideway structural and drainage improvements and site improvements to adjacent roadways, signalized intersections and



the surface park-and-ride lot north of the Station area. It is anticipated that the construction work will have a minimal impact on bus and rail service for transit riders. Plans include a phased approach to ensure continuity of service throughout the project, with short-term service adjustments as needed (e.g., temporary relocation of bus drop-off/pick-up zones). The project is also aiming to qualify for LEED for Transit Stations Silver-level certification.

- Location: The South Dadeland Metrorail Station between Datran Drive and Dadeland Boulevard in Kendall, Florida.
- **Transportation benefits:** The proposed improvements will have a positive impact for transit users and riders.



4.5.3 IMPROVEMENTS TO THE DADELAND SOUTH METRORAIL STATION

Project 3: Two Connected Transit-Oriented Mixed-Use Towers; Ocean Dadeland, LLC.

• **Description:** The legendary Shorty's Barbecue, located on US-1 across the street from the Dadeland South Metrorail Station, is being replaced by two (2) transit-oriented community towers. The project calls for two connected mixed-use towers of 20 and 25 stories that would collectively yield 780,703 square feet of space, including 500

multifamily residential units, 4,851 square feet of ground-floor retail, and 668 parking spaces. The towers would rise 318 and 280 feet. The two towers will be connected by a bridge designed to provide a free flow of light and air from the east to west towers. The property comprises two parcels of land that sit north and south of Dadeland Boulevard, between South Miami-Dade Busway and South Dixie Highway. The north parcel is the smallest of the two, spanning 12,382 square feet and currently improved with an auto service center. The south parcel spans 32,220 square feet and is home to Shorty's BBQ restaurant. The transit-oriented community assemblage sits adjacent to the Metrorail Dadeland South Metrorail Station and is within the Core subdistrict of the Downtown Kendall Urban Center.

- Location: 9180 & 9200 S Dixie Hwy, Miami, FL 33156
- **Transportation benefits:** Improves mobility and options for residents and riders around the South Dadeland Metrorail Station.





TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 3

CONNECTIVITY ASSESSMENT AND CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT



5.0 CONNECTIVITY ASSESSMENT AND CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT

The Project Team performed a feasibility analysis to identify, evaluate and determine the best suited bicycle and pedestrian connectivity improvement recommendations at the three Metrorail stations crossing over US-1. As part of the connectivity assessment, the Project Team assessed travel volumes and connection points for the origin and destination of pedestrian and bicyclists' travel and proposed concepts for bicycle/pedestrian overpasses and other safety enhancements to improve accessibility at each of the three Metrorail stations.

The placement of bicycle/pedestrian bridges at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North and Dadeland South Metrorail stations located along the US-1 corridor would seek to provide pedestrians and bicyclists with safer mobility options and would promote transit use by providing greater pedestrian/bicyclist accessibility to the existing Metrorail system. This is made more critical with the current and future development of high-density mixed-use projects along the US-1 corridor. Three bicycle/pedestrian bridges currently exist over US-1 at the Vizcaya, Douglas Road and University Metrorail stations. The following section is based on the assumption that the project will propose a pedestrian bridge similar to the existing bicycle/pedestrian bridge footprint located at the University Metrorail Station.



Figure 5-1: University Metrorail Station Pedestrian Bridge over US-1

5.1 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS FOOTPRINT

The University Metrorail Station Pedestrian bridge footprint is comprised of the following:

- The footprint of each tower is approximately 275 square feet (20-ft. 8-in length by 13-ft. 4-in width).
- The footprint of each staircase accounts for a width of 5-ft. with the orientation of the steps set to accommodate conditions at each tower location.
- The width of the bicycle/pedestrian bridge is set to 13-ft. 4-in.



5.2 COCONUT GROVE METRORAIL STATION ALTERNATIVES

To understand the existing bicycle or pedestrian accessibility and connectivity issues around the Metrorail station, available data was collected and analyzed to understand bicycle and pedestrian conditions. The existing conditions of the intersection at US-1 & SW 27th Avenue consist of 10-ft. crosswalks, lighting, mast arms, CCTV Cameras, and Drainage inlets. Refer to Figure 5-2: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Intersection at US-1 and SW 27th Avenue Existing Conditions.



Figure 5-2: Existing Conditions at Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Intersection at US-1 and SW 27th Avenue

Based on the goals and objectives supporting the Purpose and Need of the Feasibility Study the following alternatives have been identified at the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station:

- 1. Alternative 1 Second Level Pedestrian Bridge Over US-1 & SW 27th Avenue
- 2. Alternative 2 Third Level Pedestrian Bridge Over US-1 & SW 27th Avenue
- 3. Alternative 3 At Grade Improvements at US-1 & SW 27th Avenue



5.2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 – SECOND LEVEL PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE OVER US-1 & SW 27TH AVENUE



Figure 5-3: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 1 Bridge Location

Proposed Bridge

Considering the need for safety, connectivity, and to minimize impacts to existing conditions, the optimal location for a bicycle/pedestrian bridge for access to the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station is west of SW 27th Avenue over US-1. Refer to Figure 5-3: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 1 Bridge Location. The placement of the bridge shown allows for bicycle and pedestrian traffic to cross US-1 by entering the South Tower (C), crossing the approximately 102- ft. span bridge (B) to arrive at the North Tower (A), and exiting the North tower to arrive directly at the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station. Below are the proposed bridge characteristics:

- West Tower (A) located in front of Metrorail Station
- 102-ft. Bridge Span (B) to span over US-1
- East Tower (C)
- Tower Height = 40-ft.



Impacts

The following impacts have been identified for Alternative 1:

• Due to the confined area (Approx. 21.5 ft. from Southbound US-1's curb face to Metrorail superstructure) placement of the North Tower (A) will require alteration of the existing M-Path and future Underline 10 ft. bicycle path and the removal of the landscaping that is within the building and staircase footprint. The available length of 21.5 ft. allows for a 4 ft. clearance from face of curb to the North Tower, and a 4 ft. clearance from the North Tower to the Metrorail Superstructure. Refer to **Figure 5-4: Proposed Underline Plan View at US-1 and 27th Avenue** below:



Figure 5-4: Proposed Underline Plan View at US-1 and 27th Avenue

- Placement of the South Tower (C) will require purchasing of approximately 1,800 square feet of right-of-way from the privately owned parcel occupied by the Shell Gas Station. Cost of ROW is approximately \$200,000.
- The existing conditions are such that the placement of the South Tower on this parcel will allow the
 existing sidewalk to remain in place, and a minimum of 12 ft. will be maintained from curb face to the
 structure footprint.

Additional considerations for impacts caused by the placement of the bicycle/pedestrian bridge in the location shown are as follows:

- The structure will impact existing stopping sight distances and hinder drivers' line of sight to signalization for vehicular traffic travelling northbound on US-1.
- The placement of the South Tower **(C)** carries risk of conflict with underground utilities and facilities under use by the Shell gas station.

Alternative 1 is considered a viable long-term recommendation. It involves the construction of a second-level truss bridge over US-1, just west of SW 27th Avenue. Given the high volume of pedestrian crossings, the number of crashes, and existing safety concerns, along with feedback from the Project Working Group, further evaluation of this bridge option is strongly recommended for future planning.

Opinion of Probable Cost Range for Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 1: \$5M-\$10M



5.2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 – THIRD LEVEL PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE OVER US-1 & SW 27TH AVENUE



Figure 5-5: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 2 Bridge Location

Proposed Bridge

The placement of the bridge shown in **Figure 5-4: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 2 Bridge Location** is an additional alternative for cycle and pedestrian traffic to cross US-1 by entering the South Tower (C), crossing the approximately 135- ft. third level span bridge (B) to arrive at the North Tower (A), and exiting the North tower to arrive directly at the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station. Below are the proposed bridge characteristics:

- West Tower (A) located between rail tracks
- 135-ft. Bridge Span (B) to span over the Metrorail rail line.
- East Tower (C)
- Tower Height= 65-ft.

Upon reaching the West Tower (A), pedestrians will take one flight of stairs down, onto the Metrorail platform. Note that the tower height for this Alternative is 65-ft. compared to 40-ft. for the typical footprint in all proposed concepts.



Impacts

The following impacts have been identified for Alternative 2

- The East Tower (C) requires purchase of approximately 1,800 square feet of ROW from the Shell gas station lot. Cost of ROW is approximately \$200,000.
- Risks present a conflict with underground utilities at the Shell gas station lot.
- Spanning over the Metrorail rail line will require coordination with DTPW and increase complexity and risks in construction.
- Proposed foundations for the bridge towers are in conflict with existing Metrorail Foundations.
- Proposed bridge footprint directly impacts the future Transit Oriented Development, Grove Central, as there is no available space to accommodate the proposed bridge.
- Stopping sight distances.
- Drivers' line of sight to signalization, is impacted.

Alternative 2 is feasible as a long-term recommendation. Like Alternative 1, it proposes a third-level truss bridge spanning US-1 just west of SW 27th Avenue, and is recommended for further study. Given the high volume of pedestrian crossings, the number of crashes, existing safety concerns, and input from the Project Working Group, a detailed evaluation of this bridge option is advised for future planning.

Opinion of Probable CostRange for Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 2: \$5M-\$10M

5.2.3 ALTERNATIVE 3 – AT GRADE IMPROVEMENTS AT US-1 & SW 27TH AVENUE

Providing safe, convenient, and efficient options for bicycles and pedestrians to travel to and from all public transportation stations is vital to support a sustainable transportation network. Considering that Alternatives 1 and 2 were not feasible, further evaluations were considered. As such, at-grade improvements were identified through field visits, research, and review of the study area. Some of

these improvements include potential improvement to signal timing, No Turn on Red for Southbound right turning movement, tightening the turning radii in the NW corner and EB median, providing high emphasis crosswalks, and moving the stop bar on the EB approach on US-1. A summary of the proposed recommendations over US-1 at SW 27th Avenue attempt to provide connectivity to the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station, and are listed below:

- Implement Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) at the intersection for the east and west leg crosswalks which provides head start to bikes-pedestrians in the east-west crosswalks and provides visibility of them to the vehicles.
- Install No Right Turn on Red (RTOR) blank out sign during AM and PM peak hours for the southbound
 right turning vehicles. With the implementation of No RTOR during peak hours, drivers tend to stop
 prior to the stop-bar, since southbound right turning vehicles do not have to look for the vehicles to
 their left side, and will not block bicyclists or pedestrians in the north leg crosswalk.
- Provide pedestrian refuge on the west leg crosswalk. This improvement may require auto turn analysis to confirm there are no issues for northbound left turning vehicles. In addition, it is recommended to review reducing the curb radius in the northwest corner in order to reduce the turning vehicle speeds of southbound right turning vehicles.
- Furthermore, based on the feedback from project working group (PWG), it is recommended to widen the west leg crosswalk to provide back-to-back crosswalks to separate bike and pedestrian paths.
- FDOT performed lighting retrofit improvements recently (based on FDOT's comment), hence no lighting improvements are proposed.

Alternative 3 is feasible for immediate implementation as a short-term improvement, though Alternatives 1 and 2 will not be dismissed and will undergo further evaluation in a future study. Due to the potential challenges faced by Alternatives 1 and 2, Alternative 3 is being prioritized at this time. Given the high pedestrian counts and the number of crashes at the intersection, this interim recommendation is necessary. The proposed improvements include wider, high-visibility crosswalks, expanded pedestrian curb ramps, a realigned median to accommodate the new crosswalk width, and the implementation of a No Right Turn on Red policy.

Opinion of Probable CostRange for Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 3: \$200K-\$260K





Figure 5-6: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Alternative 3 At-Grade Improvements





5.3 DADELAND NORTH STATION ALTERNATIVES

Based on the goals and objectives supporting the Purpose and Need of this Feasibility Study the following alternatives have been identified at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station:

- 1. Alternative 1 - Pedestrian Bridge west of SW 84th Street
- 2. Alternative 2 Pedestrian Bridge west of SW 84th Street Modified
- 3. Alternative 3 Pedestrian Bridge east of SW 70th Avenue SW 84th Street
- 4. Alternative 4 At-Grade Improvements across US-1 between SW 68th Court and SW 84th Street at landing adjacent to Snapper Creek Canal and Bomnin Chevrolet.

5.3.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 – PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE WEST OF SW 84TH STREET



Figure 5-7: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 1 Bridge Location

Proposed Bridge

Considering the need for safety, connectivity, and to minimize impacts to existing conditions, the optimal location for a bicycle/pedestrian bridge for access to the Dadeland North Metrorail Station is shown above. Refer to Figure 5-7: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 1 Bridge Location. The placement shown allows for bicycle and pedestrian traffic to cross US-1. Below are the proposed bridge characteristics:

- West Tower (A) at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station
- 129-ft. span bridge (B) over US-1
- East Tower (C) adjacent to Bomnin Chevrolet Dadeland



Technical Memorandum No. 3 - Connectivity Assessment And Concept Development US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges Feasibility Study

Impacts

The following impacts have been identified for Alternative 1 at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station:

- Placement of the West Tower (A) will require removal of the landscaping and glass fencing that is within the building and staircase footprint. The available length of 33-ft. from face of curb to the Metrorail superstructure allows for a 4-ft. clearance from face of curb to the West Tower, and an 8-ft. clearance from the West Tower to the Metrorail superstructure. Further, the available length will allow for the existing M-Path to remain in place.
- Placement of the East Tower (C) will require purchasing of approximately 2,200 square feet of right-ofway from the privately owned parcel occupied by the Bomnin Chevrolet Dadeland business. This ROW acquisition is approximately \$240,000. The existing conditions are such that placement of the East Tower on this parcel will allow the existing sidewalk to remain in place and connect directly to the staircase that provides access to the bridge.
- As this location is near the Snapper Creek Canal, coordination with the South Florida Water Management District will be required. In terms of constructability, placement of the East Tower in this location will require the construction of a bulkhead wall to support the soil beneath the structure beside the Snapper Creek Canal.
- The structure will impact existing stopping sight distances. As the structure will be located approximately 360 ft. from the nearest traffic signal for Northbound vehicular traffic, placement at this location will have lesser impacts on driver visibility to signalization.
- Placement of the East Tower (C) carries risk of conflict with underground utilities shown attached to the Northbound bridge crossing the Snapper Creek Canal, and the drainage systems that outfall into the canal.

Alternative 1 is feasible, but it falls short of fulfilling the study's goals to enhance safety, mobility, and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing US-1. Because the proposed bridge location is distant from where most pedestrian crossings occur, it is recommended that after implementing the short-term improvements, a Tier 2 Planning Study be conducted at this site to assess and improve the existing bike network. This study would aim to establish a connected bicycle route in front of the station, as complete and integrated bike networks are known to boost transit ridership and enhance safety for all road users. To create a seamless and comfortable bicycle network, it will be essential for the community—including Miami-Dade County and the Village of Pinecrest—to evaluate the current network quality and set future goals.

Opinion of Probable CostRangefor Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 1:\$7M-\$10M

5.3.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 – PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE WEST OF SW 84TH STREET (MODIFIED)



Figure 5-8: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 2 Bridge Location



66

Alternative 2 is at the same location as Alternative 1, however the bridge lands further north to avoid impacting The Underline. **Refer to Figure 5-8: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 2 Bridge Location.** Therefore, the bridge span is longer, and one of the landing towers lands closer to the elevated railway on one side going over the 11-ft. wide Underline path with the other side of the bridge landing in the Bomnin Chevrolet Dadeland's parking lot on the other side of US-1. Glass block wall along the width of station needs to be coordinated with Alternative 2. Below are the proposed bridge characteristics:

- West Tower (A) at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station over the proposed Underline closer to the elevated railway
- 152-ft. span bridge (B) over US-1
- East Tower (C) adjacent to Bomnin Chevrolet Dadeland



Figure 5-9: Proposed Underline and Existing Glass Wall Location

The impacts of Alternative 2 are similar to the impacts identified for Alternative 1. ROW acquisition costs are the same as alternative 1, approximately \$240,000.

Alternative 2 is feasible and has fewer impacts than Alternative 1; however, it still does not fully meet the study's objectives to enhance safety, mobility, and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing US-1. Because the bridge would be located away from the primary pedestrian crossings, it is recommended that, after implementing the short-term improvements, a Tier 2 Planning Study be conducted at this site. The goal of this study would be to assess and improve the existing bike network, ensuring a connected bicycle route in front of the station. Such a complete and integrated bike network is essential for increasing transit ridership and enhancing safety for all road users. To achieve a seamless and comfortable bicycle network, the community—comprising Miami-Dade County and the Village of Pinecrest—will need to evaluate the current network quality and set future goals accordingly.

Opinion of Probable Cost Range for Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 2: \$7M-\$10M



5.3.3 ALTERNATIVE 3 – PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE EAST OF SW 70TH AVENUE SW 84TH STREET



Figure 5-10: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 3 Bridge Location

Proposed Bridge

The placement of the bridge shown in **Figure 5-10: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 3 Bridge Location** encourages cyclist and pedestrian traffic to cross US-1 by entering the South Tower **(C)** located east of SW 70th Avenue intersection, crossing the approximately 148- ft. span bridge (B) to arrive at the North Tower (A), and exiting the North tower to arrive directly at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station. Below are the proposed bridge characteristics:

- West Tower (A) located west of the Metrorail Station
- 148-ft. Bridge Span (B) spanning over US-1
- East Tower (C) that lands at the Ross Shopping Plaza

Upon reaching (A), pedestrians will continue to Dadeland North Metrorail Station. Approximately a 525-ft. walk.

Impacts

The following impacts have been identified for Alternative 3 at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station:

- The East Tower (C) requires purchase of approximately 1,800 square feet of ROW from the Ross Shopping Plaza lot. ROW acquisition costs are approximately \$385,000.
- Stopping sight distance impacts
- Drivers' line of sight to signalization are impacted

Alternative 3 is feasible; however, given the current at-grade infrastructure, including the mid-block crossings, the addition of a pedestrian bridge is not recommended at this time. Instead, it is advised that following the implementation of short-term improvements, a Tier 2 Planning Study be conducted at this location. This study should focus on assessing and enhancing the existing bike network to establish a connected bicycle route in front of the station. Comprehensive and integrated bike networks are crucial for boosting transit ridership and improving safety for all transportation modes. To develop a well-connected and comfortable bicycle network, the community—consisting of Miami-Dade County and the Village of Pinecrest—will need to evaluate the current network quality and set future objectives.

Opinion of Probable Cost Range for Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 3: \$7M-\$10M



5.3.4 ALTERNATIVE 4 – AT-GRADE IMPROVEMENTS ACROSS US-1 BETWEEN SW 68TH COURT AND SW 84TH STREET AT LANDING

ADJACENT TO SNAPPER CREEK CANAL AND BOMNIN CHEVROLET.

Considering that Alternatives 1 and 2 were not feasible, further evaluations were considered. As such, at -grade Improvements were identified through field visits, research, and review of the study area. Some of these improvements include potential improvement to landscaping, lighting, widen sidewallks, No Right Turns on Red, and implementing leading pedestrian intervals. A summary of the proposed recommendations at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station are listed below:

- Improvements at SW 68th Court mid-block crossing include:
 - Provide landscaping as a barrier within the available median between SW 68th Court and SW 70th Avenue in order to restrict people to cross away from the available midblock crossing,
 - Improve lighting at this location,
 - Widen the existing crosswalk.
- Improvements at SW 84th Street include:
 - Provide No Right Turn on Red for the southbound right turning vehicles,
 - Provide pedestrian refuge on the west leg crosswalk,
 - Implement leading pedestrian interval for the east and west leg crosswalks.

Similar to the SW 27th Avenue intersection, the traffic operations were reviewed at the intersection of SW 84th Street using the County's Underline Phase 3 Study. County proposed the following improvements as part of the study:

- Leading pedestrian interval for the east and west leg crosswalks,
- No Right Turn on Red for the southbound right turning vehicles (SW 84th Street southbound to US-1 westbound),
- No Right Turn on Red for the southwest bound right turning vehicles (from US-1 west to SW 84th Street north),
- Conversion of left-turn phasing from protected-permissive to protected only phase for the US-1 northeast bound to SW 84th Street.

This feasibility study is proposing the first two improvements and no changes to the:

- US-1 westbound right turning vehicles and
- Eastbound left-turn phasing at the intersection since no crashes occurred in a way where left-turn vehicles from US-1 northeast bound did not collide with bikes-pedestrians during the permissive phase.

The results from this study showed that the intersection is projected to operate at level of service 'C' and 'D' in the AM and PM peak hours after implementing the proposed improvements. In the PM peak hour, the delay increases by 50% but still operates at LOS 'D' which is acceptable. In addition, since this feasibility study does not propose the conversion of left-turn phase and no RTOR for westbound vehicles from US-1 to SW 84th Street, the delay will remain closer to the existing conditions. So, the proposed improvements of LPI and No RTOR along with signal timing optimization will be feasible operationally. **Refer to Figure 5-11 and 5-12 for Dadeland North Metrorail Station At-Grade Improvements**.

Alternative 4 is feasible and will be implemented as an interim improvement. The evaluation of the Dadeland North Station included two intersections: US-1 at SW 68th Court and SW 84th Street. Traffic data revealed a high volume of pedestrian crossings over US-1. To enhance safety at this location, the following interim at-grade improvements will be introduced: new pedestrian signals, upgraded pedestrian curb ramps, a new pedestrian refuge area in the median, combined high-visibility crosswalks with bicycle crossings, enhanced pavement markings, a No Turn on Red signal, and improved lighting.

Opinion of Probable Cost Range for Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 4: \$420K-\$546K





Figure 5-11: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At-Grade Improvements at SW 84th Street



Figure 5-12: Dadeland North Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At-Grade Improvements at SW 68th Street



Technical Memorandum No. 3 - Connectivity Assessment And Concept Development US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges Feasibility Study

5.4 DADELAND SOUTH METRORAIL STATION ALTERNATIVES

Based on the goals and objectives supporting the Purpose and Need of this Feasibility Study the following alternatives have been identified at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station:

- 1. Alternative 1 Pedestrian Bridge a Dadeland Boulevard
- 2. Alternative 2 Pedestrian Bridge west of Datran Drive
- Alternative 3A Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ -Bridge Connection directly into South Tower of proposed development.
- **4.** Alternative **3B** Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ-Bridge Connection West of South Tower of proposed development.
- 5. Alternative 4 At-Grade Improvements

5.4.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 – PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE A DADELAND BOULEVARD



Figure 5-13: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 1: Pedestrian Bridge a Dadeland Boulevard



71

Proposed Bridge

Considering conditions for safety and connectivity, the optimal location for a bicycle/pedestrian bridge for access to the Dadeland South Metrorail Station is shown above. The placement shown allows for bicycle and pedestrian traffic to cross US-1 by entering the East Tower **(C)**, crossing the approximately 138' span bridge **(B)** to arrive at the West Tower **(A)**, and exiting the West tower to walk approximately 170', crossing the South Miami-Dade Busway, to arrive at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station. Below are the proposed bridge Characteristics:

- West Tower (A) located east of Dadeland Boulevard and west of the Auto Perfection
- 38-ft. Bridge Span (B) spanning over US-1
- East Tower (C) that lands at the Burger King

Impacts

The following impacts have been identified:

- Placement of the West Tower (A) will require purchasing of approximately 1,400 square feet of right-of-way from the privately owned parcel occupied by the Auto Perfection business, this right-of-way acquisition is approximately \$330,000. The existing conditions are such that placement of the West Tower on this parcel will allow the existing sidewalk to remain in place and a minimum of 8-ft. will be maintained from curb face to the structure footprint.
- Placement of the East Tower (C) will require purchasing of approximately 2,400 square feet of rightof-way from the privately owned parcel occupied by the Burger King, this right-of-way acquisition is approximately \$590,000. The existing conditions are such that placement of the South Tower on this parcel will allow the existing sidewalk to remain in place and a minimum of 13.5ft. will be maintained from curb face to the structure footprint.
- The structure will impact existing stopping sight distances and hinder drivers' line of sight to signalization for vehicular traffic travelling southbound on US-1.

The location for Alternative 1 is not feasible, as it does not offer the safest crossing to optimize safety, mobility, and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing US-1. The current connectivity to the Dadeland South Metrorail Station is congested and may not provide the safest conditions for pedestrian crossings. Implementing this alternative will require coordination with landowners and adjacent business owners to secure the necessary right-of-way--For more details, please refer to Table 5-13, which covers the Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 1 - Pedestrian Bridge at Dadeland Boulevard.

With a proposed development planned in the near future, it is recommended to consider constructing a pedestrian bridge over US-1 at the site of the new development. The existing streets lack safe pedestrian crossings, and based on this evaluation, anticipated post-construction conditions, and input from the Project Working Group, it is advisable to explore the option of a pedestrian bridge that directly connects to the new development. Two different alternatives will be further evaluated during the design phase.

Opinion of Probable Cost Range for Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 1:\$8M-\$10M





5.4.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 – PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE WEST OF DATRAN DRIVE



Figure 5-14: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 2: Pedestrian Bridge at Datran Drive

Proposed Bridge

Considering the need to minimize impacts to existing conditions, the alternative location for a bicycle/pedestrian bridge for access to the Dadeland South Metrorail Station is shown above. The placement shown allows for bicycle and pedestrian traffic to cross US-1. Details of the proposed bridge include:

- East Tower (C) on the South Side
- A bridge Span of 133-ft. (B) over US-1
- West Tower (A) on the North Side

Upon crossing US-1 and exiting the West tower users will walk approximately 713-ft. crossing Datran Drive and the South Miami-Dade Busway, to arrive at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station.

Impacts

The following impacts were identified for Alternative 2:

• Placement of the West Tower (A) will require purchasing approximately 2,300 square feet of right-of-way from the privately owned parcel occupied by the 9350 Building, this right-of-way acquisition is approximately \$492,000. The existing conditions are such that placement of the West Tower on this parcel will allow the existing sidewalk to remain in place and a minimum of 13' will be maintained from curb face to the structure footprint.

• Placement of the East Tower (C) will require purchasing of approximately 2,000 square feet of right-of-way from the privately owned parcel occupied by the Dadeland Plaza, this right-of-way acquisition is approximately \$250,000. The existing conditions are such that placement of the South Tower on this parcel will allow the existing sidewalk to remain in place and a minimum of 16' will be maintained from curb face to the structure footprint.

• The structure will impact existing stopping sight distances and hinder drivers' line of sight to signalization for vehicular traffic traveling northbound on US-1.

Similar to Alternative 1, the location for Alternative 2 is also not feasible as it does not offer the safest crossing to enhance safety, mobility, and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing US-1. The current conditions for connecting to the Dadeland South Metrorail Station are congested, making it less than ideal for pedestrian crossings. To prioritize and mitigate impacts on the existing conditions, this alternative offers less value than Alternative 1 in terms of connectivity and safety. Additionally, Alternative 2 involves more crossings and results in a longer walk for cyclists and pedestrians accessing the station--For detailed information, refer to Table 5-14, which covers the Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 2 - Pedestrian Bridge at Datran Drive.

Given that a new development is expected in the near future, it is recommended to consider constructing a pedestrian bridge over US-1 at the location of the new development. The existing streets currently lack safe pedestrian crossings, and based on this evaluation, the new conditions post-construction, and input from the Project Working Group, it is advised that a pedestrian bridge directly connecting to the new development be explored. Two different alternatives for this bridge will be further assessed during the design phase.

Opinion of Probable Cost Range for Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 2: \$8M-\$10M



5.4.3 ALTERNATIVE 3A – PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE

TO ACCOMMODATE NEW DEVELOPMENT AT 9300 PLAZA & SHORTY'S BBQ – BRIDGE CONNECTION DIRECTLY INTO SOUTH TOWER



Figure 5-15: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 3A: Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ – Bridge Connection directly into South Tower

Proposed Bridge

While evaluating surroundings to minimize impacts to existing conditions, another alternative location for a bicycle/pedestrian bridge for access to the Dadeland South Metrorail Station is shown above. The placement shown allows for bicycle and pedestrian traffic to cross US-1 directly into the South Tower. Details of the proposed bridge include:

- Bridge Connection (A) to South Tower of Development
- 132' Bridge Span (B)
- East Tower (C)
- Pedestrian Access Opening (D)

Upon reaching (A), pedestrians will need immediate access to exit the South Tower property limits and continue to (D). Approximately 136-ft. walk. Refer to Figure 5-14: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 3A: Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ – Bridge Connection directly into South Tower.

Impacts

The following impacts were identified for Alternative 3A:

- East Tower (C) requires purchase of approximately 1,800 SF of ROW from the Trader Joe's lot. ROW acquisition costs are approximately \$405,000.
- Bridge Connection to South Tower of Development (A) requires coordination with the developer of the lot as
 well as the need for pedestrians to have access to building exits. This will impact garage and retail space of
 the south tower. If connection is desired to the north tower, this will impact residential space. We estimate that
 ROW acquisition at the connection to the south tower is approximately 3600 SF. The assumption is
 conservatively assuming we will acquire some ROW at two levels of the development. ROW acquisition costs
 are approximately \$810,000.
- Stopping sight distances impacts Drivers' line of sight to signalization are impacted as well.

Alternative 3A is identified as a feasible solution for long-term improvements, though its implementation will require ongoing collaboration with developers. In light of the upcoming development planned for the near future, constructing a pedestrian bridge over US-1 at the new site is strongly recommended.



Currently, the surrounding streets lack safe crossing options for pedestrians, and based on this evaluation, anticipated post-construction conditions, and feedback from the Project Working Group, establishing a pedestrian bridge that directly connects to the new development would significantly enhance safety and accessibility. During the design phase, both Alternative 3A and 3B will be examined to determine the most effective approach.

Opinion of Probable Cost Range for Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 3A: \$8M-\$10M

5.4.4 ALTERNATIVE 3B – PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE

TO ACCOMMODATE NEW DEVELOPMENT AT 9300 PLAZA & SHORTY'S BBQ – BRIDGE CONNECTION WEST OF SOUTH TOWER



Figure 5-16: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 3B: Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ – Bridge Connection directly into West of the South Tower

Proposed Bridge

An alternate location for a bicycle/pedestrian bridge for access to the Dadeland South Metrorail Station is shown above. The placement shown allows for bicycle and pedestrian traffic to cross US-1 an exit west of South Tower. Details of the proposed bridge include:

- West Tower (A)
- 132' Bridge Span (B)
- East Tower (C)
- Pedestrian Access Opening (D)

Upon reaching (A), pedestrians will continue to (D), which is approximately a 380-ft. walk. Refer to Figure 5-16: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 3B: Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ – Bridge Connection West of the South Tower.

Impacts

- East Tower (A) requires purchase of approximately 1,600 square feet of ROW from the 9300 Plaza lot. ROW
 acquisition is approximately \$342,000.
- East Tower (C) requires purchase of approximately 1,600 square feet of ROW for City Furniture lot. ROW
 acquisition is approximately \$342,000.
- Pedestrians and bicycle traffic will have a longer path to the Pedestrian Access Opening.
- Stopping site distances impacts.
- Drivers' line of sight signalization is impacted as well.



Alternative 3B is also considered a viable option for long-term improvement. However, future coordination with developers will be necessary to determine the optimal location for the proposed bridge. Given the upcoming development in the area, it is advisable to construct a pedestrian bridge over US-1 at the new development site. The existing streets currently lack safe pedestrian crossings, and based on this evaluation, anticipated post-construction conditions, and feedback from the Project Working Group, a pedestrian bridge that directly connects to the new development is recommended. Both Alternative 3A and 3B will be further evaluated during the design phase to identify the best solution.

Opinion of Probable CostRangefor Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 3B: \$8M-\$10M

5.4.5 ALTERNATIVE 4

AT-GRADE IMPROVEMENTS AT DADELAND BOULEVARD AND DATRAN DRIVE

Considering that Alternatives 1 through 3 are not feasible at this moment, further evaluations were considered. As such, at -grade Improvements were identified through field visits, research, and review of the study area. A summary of the proposed recommendations near the Dadeland South Metrorail Station are listed below:

At Datran Drive:

- Improve pavement markings,
- Install curb ramps (ADA compliant),
- Additional improvement for consideration Close the box (install the crosswalk on south leg to cross US-1).

Refer to Figure 5-17: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At Grade Improvements at Datran Drive.



Figure 5-17: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At Grade Improvements at Datran Drive





Proposed recommendations at Dadeland Boulevard include the following:

- "Use Crosswalk" signs at the intersection,
- Review lighting conditions and improve as needed.

Refer to Figure 5-18: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At Grade Improvements at Dadeland Boulevard



Figure 5-18: Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 4: At Grade Improvements at Dadeland Boulevard

Alternative 4 is feasible and recommended as a short-term improvement. The Dadeland South Metrorail Station spans two key intersections: Datran Drive and Dadeland Boulevard at US-1. Pedestrian counts and crash data support the future construction of a pedestrian bridge at this location, particularly after the new Ocean Dadeland, LLC development, which includes two mixed-use towers at the current Shorty's BBQ site, is completed. In the interim, it is recommended to implement upgrades such as enhanced pavement markings, reconstructed ADA-compliant pedestrian curb ramps, and "Use Crosswalk" signs.

Opinion of Probable Cost Range for Dadeland South Metrorail Station Alternative 4: \$100K - \$130K





5.4 COST ESTIMATES

Opinions of Probable Costs were prepared for the bridge alternatives based on the University Pedestrian Bridge Construction Cost. Factors were applied to adjust for inflation. The Actual Cost value is based on a dollar value from the year of completion of the Pedestrian Bridge at University Station. Inflation must be calculated from 2017 (Base Dollar Value = \$1.00) to 2023 (Dollar Equivalent = \$1.23) Cost Estimates include costs for ROW, construction, permitting and scheduling associated with construction adjacent to a Metrorail Station. In Table 5-1, there is a summary of all the Cost Range estimates or each proposed alternative developed:

Source: https://www.usinflationcalculator.com/)

| Alternative No. | Alternative Description | Opinion of Probable Cost | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|
| | | | |
| 1 | Second Level Pedestrian Bridge Over US-1 & SW 27th Avenue | \$5M-\$10M | |
| 2 | Third Level Pedestrian Bridge Over US-1 & SW 27th Avenue | \$5M-\$10M | |
| 3 | At Grade Improvements at US-1 & SW 27th Avenue | \$200K-\$260K | |
| | Dadeland North Station | • | |
| 1 | Pedestrian Bridge west of SW 84th Street | \$7M-\$10M | |
| 2 | Pedestrian Bridge west of SW 84th Street Modified | \$7M-\$10M | |
| 3 | Pedestrian Bridge east of SW 70th Avenue | \$7M-\$10M | |
| | At-Grade Improvements across US-1 between SW 68th Court and | | |
| | SW 84th Street at landing adjacent to Snapper Creek Canal and | | |
| 4 | Bomnin Chevrolet. | \$420K-\$546K | |
| Dadeland South Station | | | |
| 1 | Pedestrian Bridge a Dadeland Boulevard | \$8M-\$10M | |
| 2 | Pedestrian Bridge west of Datran Drive | \$8M-\$10M | |
| | | | |
| | Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza | | |
| 3A | & Shorty's BBQ – Bridge Connection directly into South Tower | \$8M-\$10M | |
| | | | |
| | Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza | | |
| 3B | & Shorty's BBQ – Bridge Connection west of South Tower | \$8M-\$10M | |
| 4 | At-Grade Improvements at Dadeland Blvd and Datran Drive. | \$100K - \$130K | |

Table 5-1: Summary of all the Cost Range estimates for proposed alternatives



78

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 4

RECOMMENDATIONS


6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Public Outreach activities along with the engineering analysis performed helped compare and contrast the performance of each alternative in meeting the needs of the study, and identifying any impacts to the existing infrastructure for the proposed improvements. After comparing the alternatives, costs, impacts, and the extent to which alternative met the need of the study, the feasible alternatives were selected for each station and are listed below:

Station No. 1: Coconut Grove Metrorail Station

- Alternative 1-Second Level Pedestrian Bridge Over US-1 & SW 27th Avenue
- Alternative 2-Third Level Pedestrian Bridge Over US-1 & SW 27th Avenue
- Alternative 3-At-Grade Improvements at US-1 and SW 27th Avenue

Station No.2 : Dadeland North Metrorail Station

- Alternative 3- Pedestrian Bridge east of SW 70th Avenue
- Alternative 4- At-Grade Improvements across US-1 between SW 68th Court and SW 84th Street at landing adjacent to Snapper Creek Canal and Bomnin Chevrolet Dadeland.

Station No. 3: Dadeland South Metrorail Station

- Alternative 3A- Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ – Bridge Connection directly into South Tower
- Alternative 3B- Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ Bridge Connection west of South Tower
- Alternative 4- At-Grade Improvements at Dadeland Boulevard and Datran Drive

1. COCONUT GROVE METRORAIL STATION:

Based on the review of the crash data, below are the recommended potential shortterm countermeasures proposed at the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station at the intersection of US-1 and SW 27th Avenue:

- Implement Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) at the intersection for the east and west leg crosswalks, which provides a head start to bikes and pedestrians in the east-west crosswalks and visibility of them to the vehicles,
- Install No right turn on red (RTOR) blank out sign during AM and PM peak hours for the southbound right turning vehicles. With the implementation of No RTOR during peak hours, drivers tend to stop prior to the stop-bar, since southbound right turning vehicles do not have to look for the vehicles to their left side, and will not block bicyclists or pedestrians in the north leg crosswalk,
- Provide pedestrian refuge on the west leg crosswalk. This improvement may require auto turn analysis to confirm there are no issues for northbound left turning vehicles,
- In addition, it is recommended to review reducing the curb radius in the northwest corner in order to reduce the turning vehicle speeds of southbound right turning vehicles,
- Furthermore, based on the feedback from project working group (PWG), it is
 recommended to widen the west leg crosswalk to provide back-to-back crosswalks to
 separate bike and pedestrian paths,
- FDOT performed lighting retrofit improvements recently (based on FDOT's comment), hence no lighting improvements are proposed.

It has to be noted that the proposed improvements of LPI and No RTOR will have operational impacts at the subject intersection of US-1 at SW 27th Avenue. Although operational analysis was not part of the scope of services of this feasibility study, the preliminary operational analysis performed by County as part of their Underline Phase 3 was reviewed. The County proposed the following improvements as part of the study:



80

- Leading pedestrian interval for the east and west leg crosswalks,
- No right turn on red for the southbound right turning vehicles (southbound SW 27th Avenue to westbound US-1),
- Conversion of left-turn phasing from protected-permissive to protected only phase for the northeast bound of US-1 to SW 27th Avenue.

This feasibility study proposes the first two improvements but no changes to the left-turn phasing at the intersection since no crashes occurred in a way where left-turn vehicles from northeast bound of US-1 did not collide with bikes and pedestrians during the permissive phase.

The results from the County's Underline Phase 3 study showed that the intersection is projected to operate at level of service (LOS) 'D' and 'E' in the AM and PM peak hours after implementing the proposed improvements. In the PM peak hour, the delay increases by 5% but the LOS remains 'E' in both the existing and proposed conditions. Since the conversion of the left-turn phase from a protected-permissive to a protected only phase for the northeast bound left turning vehicles was not proposed, the delay should remain closer to the existing conditions. So, the proposed improvements of LPI and No RTOR along with signal timing optimization may be feasible operationally.

Although there may be a slight increase in delay during the PM peak hour, it has to be acknowledged that the implementation of leading pedestrian interval will reduce the vehicle S^V pedestrian crashes by 19% based on the Crash Modification Factor clearing house database.

Refer to Appendix B for Conceptual Design Plans

2. DADELAND NORTH METRORAIL STATION:

Based on the review of the crash data, below are the recommended potential shortterm countermeasures proposed at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station:

- At SW 68th Court mid-block crossing:
 - Provide landscaping as a barrier within the available median between SW 68th Court and SW 70th Avenue in order to restrict people to cross at the available mid-block crossing
 - Improve lighting at this location,
 - Widen the existing crosswalk.
- At SW 84th Street:
 - · Provide No right turn on red for the southbound right turning vehicles,
 - · Provide pedestrian refuge on the west leg crosswalk,
 - Implement leading pedestrian interval for the east and west leg crosswalks.

Similar to the SW 27th Avenue intersection, the traffic operations were reviewed at the intersection of SW 84th Street and US-1, using the County's Underline Phase 3 study. The County proposed the following improvements as part of the study:

- Leading pedestrian interval for the east and west leg crosswalks,
- No right turn on red for the southbound right turning vehicles (southbound SW 84th Street to westbound US-1),
- No right turn on red for the southwest bound right turning vehicles (from westbound US-1 to northbound SW 84th Street),
- Conversion of left-turn phasing from protected-permissive to protected only phase for the northeast bound of US-1 to SW 84th Street.

This feasibility study is proposing the first two improvements and no changes to the:

- Westbound US-1 right turning vehicles and
- Eastbound left-turn phasing at the intersection since no crashes occurred in a way where left-turn vehicles from northeast bound of US-1 did not collide with bikes and pedestrians during the permissive phase.



The results from this study showed the intersection is projected to operate at level of service 'C' and 'D' in the AM and PM peak hours after implementing the proposed improvements. In the PM peak hour, the delay increases by 50% but still operates at LOS 'D' which is acceptable. In addition, since this feasibility study does not propose the conversion of left-turn phase and no RTOR for westbound vehicles from US-1 to SW 84th Street, the delay will remain closer to the existing conditions. So, the proposed improvements of LPI and No RTOR along with signal timing optimization will be feasible operationally.

3. DADELAND SOUTH METRORAIL STATION:

Based on the review of the crash data, below are the recommended potential shortterm countermeasures proposed at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station:

- At Datran Drive:
 - Improve pavement markings,
 - Install curb ramps (ADA compliant),
 - Close the box which involves installing the crosswalk on the south leg to cross US-1.
- Dadeland Boulevard:
 - "Use Crosswalk" sign at the intersection,
 - Review lighting and improve as needed.

4. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY:

This feasibility study was conducted pursuant to a TPO Governing Board Resolution #08-2022, to create a framework for implementing bicycle and pedestrian bridges across US-1 at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North, and Dadeland South Metrorail Stations in collaboration with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW), area municipalities, and private developers.

The implementation plan developed for the US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study is to provide at-grade improvements as short-term Improvements at the three Metrorail station locations. These alternatives were identified as the best options to improve connectivity as quickly and affordably as possible while still maintaining an urban environment. The short-term improvements are recommended within the next three to five years to provide fast solutions for improved safety and connectivity. The placement of bicycle/pedestrian improvements at these three stations along the US-1 corridor will provide pedestrians and bicyclists with safer mobility options.



All other pedestrian bridge alternatives are recommended as long-term improvements and are recommended to be further evaluated in the future. The following is the general recommended framework for the further development and implementation of these improvements:

- Miami-Dade 2045 LRTP The Miami-Dade 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) has specific sources of funding which can be utilized for projects within its planning process. The LRTP includes \$105 million in set aside funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects for the next 21 years (2025-2045).
- Additional Stakeholder Coordination and project sponsors It is recommended that
 additional coordination is conducted with the appropriate agencies and developers within the
 area to identify project sponsors who can take the recommendations identified in this study,
 and further develop them through the identification of potential funding sources for the design
 and ultimate construction of these improvements.
- **Project Prioritization** Once the relevant Project Sponsors are identified, improvements identified in this study can then be prioritized as part of the development of the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) List of Program Priorities (LOPP) for federal funding opportunities. The LOPP cycle for their inclusion will depend on various factors, including the timing of the coordination with the various sponsors and the extent of the available funding anticipated.
- Additional Design and Public Outreach Once the projects have been programmed in the work programs of the respective project sponsors, additional design of these improvements will need to be conducted to quantify constraints, and mitigate potential impacts in preparation for implementation. Early public outreach is recommended as part of this phase to ensure that the feedback from likely affected constituents is appropriately considered as part of the design of the improvements.



7.0 STUDY COORDINATION OVERVIEW

Throughout the course of the feasibility study, the Project Team conducted several meetings describing the alternatives of the project. The purpose of the meetings was to share project information with agencies and stakeholders to collect feedback in regard to the proposed improvements and determine how best to advance this project. In cooperation with the TPO, a Project Working Group was formed to provide guidance to the study team as concepts were developed. The US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Feasibility Study involved coordination with several agencies and stakeholders through the participation of three (3) Project Working Group Meetings. The following agencies and municipalities actively participated throughout this study:

- Miami-Dade County Transportation Planning Organization (TPO)
- Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
- Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW)
- Miami-Dade County Parks Recreation and Open Spaces (PROS)
- Miami-Dade County Regulatory and Economic Resources (RER) Planning Department
- The Village of Pinecrest
- The City of South Miami

The Project Team also participated in one (1) FDOT Workshop, (1) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting and one (1) Transportation Aesthetics Review Committee (TARC) Meeting to discuss the feasibility study and proposed improvements.

Based on the feedback received, the most prevalent alternatives were considered, analyzed and selected for each of the three Metrorail stations. Refer to **Appendix C: Public Meeting Information** for all public involvement presentations and meeting minutes.

Key recommendations and preferences were made at each meeting that provided significant direction towards the concept development at each of the Metrorail Stations. The following summarizes the observations and comments made at each of the meetings:

7.1 PROJECT WORKING GROUP MEETING NO. 1

Project Working Group Meeting No. 1 was held on May 4, 2023. During Project Working Group Meeting No. 1, the Project Team provided background information regarding the three study areas, as well as a briefing on previous studies and trends. The Project Team highlighted field review findings as well as the crash data findings. The traffic issues and critical points for each station were identified and feedback was received from the Project Working Group. It was concluded that US-1 was a vulnerable crossing at all proposed locations for pedestrians and cyclists and that any proposed improvements needed to address some specific traffic trends. Vision Zero locations were also discussed and included as part of this study.



7.2 PROJECT WORKING GROUP MEETING NO. 2

Project Working Group Meeting No. 2 was held on September 7, 2023. During this meeting the Project Team discussed the Project Need, Connectivity Assessment, Concept Development, Project Schedule, and next steps. Preliminary concepts were discussed, and alternative graphics were presented. The following feedback was received:

- At the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station, the PWG emphasized that they would like to see No Turn on Red at this location, eliminate the center island, suggested bringing the crossings as close as possible to US-1, include flashing beacons, and additional signage.
- At the Dadeland North Metrorail Station, the PWG stated that The Underline, which is a shared use path of 11 ft., is proposed near the proposed bridge landing. The Project Team is to consider the

11-ft., width and a glass block wall along the width of station when refining concepts. It was suggested by DTPW to move the bridge further North. If the bridge is moved towards SW 84th Street, there is some more space for the bridge landing. However, this will impact ROW and should be clearly stated.

 At the Dadeland South Metrorail Station, DTPW awarded a contract for a Design Builder to remodel and enhance Dadeland South Metrorail Station. The Underline ends at the northern end of the kiss-and-ride facility and there is a South Dade Trail bicycle connection to South Miami-Dade Busway. DTPW also suggested that the Project Team evaluate the new development at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station where Shorty's is currently located. Shorty's BBQ and the 9300 Plaza business area are being developed, and two mixed-use towers will be constructed.

7.3 PROJECT WORKING GROUP MEETING NO. 3

Project Working Group Meeting No. 3 was held on November 1, 2023. During this meeting the Project Team reviewed the connectivity assessment and crash data for each Metrorail station. All following alternatives were presented and discussed briefly:

- Coconut Grove Metrorail Station:
 - Alternative 1 Second Level Pedestrian Bridge Over US-1 & SW 27th Avenue
 - Alternative 2 At Grade Improvements at US-1 & SW 27th Avenue

The PWG recommended that a third level bridge be evaluated at the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station landing between the Metrorail rail lines. Project Team agreed to evaluate this alternative.

- Dadeland North Metrorail Station:
 - Alternative 1 Pedestrian Bridge West of SW 84th Street
 - Alternative 2 Pedestrian Bridge West of SW 84th Street (Modified)
 - Alternative 3 At-Grade Improvements

The PWG recommended that a pedestrian bridge be evaluated closer to SW 70th Avenue, landing in the ROSS Shopping Plaza west of US-1.



- Dadeland South Metrorail Station:
 - Alternative 1 Pedestrian Bridge a Dadeland Boulevard
 - Alternative 2 Pedestrian Bridge West of Datran Drive
 - Alternative 3A Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ – Bridge Connection directly into South Tower
 - Alternative 3B Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza &
 - Shorty's BBQ Bridge Connection West of South Tower
 - Alternative 4 At-Grade Improvements

7.4 FDOT WORKSHOP

The FDOT Workshop was held on November 7, 2023. This workshop was to brief the FDOT on the proposed At-Grade Improvements that will be provided at the Metrorail Stations. In general, FDOT provided feedback on the designs provided, which includes the following:

- Lighting Analysis was performed at Coconut Grove Metrorail location, however it has not been provided at the other two Metrorail station locations.
- Wider sidewalks are to be evaluated.
- Signal timing to be reviewed.
- All proposed improvements shall be coordinated with traffic operations.

7.5 BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC) MEETING

The BPAC was held on November 7, 2023. During this meeting, the Project Manager briefed the committee on the proposed Improvements. The following feedback was received:

- At Coconut Grove Metrorail Station, user activity is high and the crossings can be improved. BPAC does prefer to keep users at ground level. They would like to see enhanced signage in the area.
- Project Team to review crosswalk criteria for Improvements.
- The committee is in favor of an active urban environment. They are in favor of non-bridge improvements.
- Dadeland South Metrorail Station is the only location where a proposed bridge may be feasible.
- Dadeland South Metrorail Stations proposed bridge can be coordinated with Developers to help finance the project.
- Resolution was to propose At-Grade Improvements.

7.6 TRANSPORTATION AESTHETICS REVIEW COMMITTEE (TARC) MEETING

The TARC Meeting was held on November 15, 2023. During this meeting, the Project Manager briefed the committee on the proposed Improvement alternatives. The presentation demonstrated the Pedestrian Bridge Alternatives and At Grade Improvements for each station.



8.0 CONCLUSION

The primary focus for the US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study is to improve safety crossings along US-1 near the Metrorail Stations. After identifying this area, high pedestrian and traffic fatality cases and severe injuries in recent years, several alternatives were evaluated. It is a priority to implement pedestrian infrastructure and connectivity improvements. To provide these improvements as soon as possible, short-term improvements were selected. The total cost for short-term improvements is approximately half of million dollars. Other alternatives, which can be considered as long-term Improvements have been identified and can be studied further in the future. Table 8-1 shows a summary of all the alternatives evaluated divided into short-term and long-term improvements:

| Alternative No. | Alternative Description | Opinion of Probable Cost | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Short-term Improvements | Trobable cost | | | | | | | | |
| | Coconut Grove Station | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | At Grade Improvements at US-1 & SW 27th Avenue | \$200K-\$260K | | | | | | | | |
| | Dadeland North Station | | | | | | | | | |
| | At-Grade Improvements across US-1 between SW 68th Court and | | | | | | | | | |
| | SW 84th Street at landing adjacent to Snapper Creek Canal and | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Bomnin Chevrolet. | \$420K-\$546K | | | | | | | | |
| | Dadeland South Station | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | At-Grade Improvements at Dadeland Blvd and Datran Drive. | \$100K - \$130K | | | | | | | | |
| | Long-term Improvements | | | | | | | | | |
| | Coconut Grove Station | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Second Level Pedestrian Bridge Over US-1 & SW 27th Avenue | \$5M-\$10M | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Third Level Pedestrian Bridge Over US-1 & SW 27th Avenue | \$5M-\$10M | | | | | | | | |
| | Dadeland North Station | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Pedestrian Bridge west of SW 84th Street | \$7M-\$10M | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Pedestrian Bridge west of SW 84th Street Modified | \$7M-\$10M | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Pedestrian Bridge east of SW 70th Avenue | \$7M-\$10M | | | | | | | | |
| | Dadeland South Station | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Pedestrian Bridge a Dadeland Boulevard | \$8M-\$10M | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Pedestrian Bridge west of Datran Drive | \$8M-\$10M | | | | | | | | |
| 3A | Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ – Bridge Connection directly into South Tower | \$8M-\$10M | | | | | | | | |
| 3B | Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at 9300 Plaza & Shorty's BBQ – Bridge Connection west of South Tower | \$8M-\$10M | | | | | | | | |

Table 8-1: Summary for All Alternatives.



APPENDICES



TRAFFIC DATA SHEETS



| conut Grove Metrorail Station Traf | fic Data | a | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------|---|---------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|------|-------|----------------------|-------|
| | | File Name: Start Date: Start Time: | TMC-1 U 3/9/2023 | IS-1 at SV | V 27th Av | enue | | | |
| | | US-1 US-1 SW 27th Avenue SW 27th North Leg South Leg East Leg Wei | | | | | | th Avenue est Leg | |
| Sta | art Time | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes |
| 6:0 | 0:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 6:1 | 5:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 6:3 | 0:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 6:4 | 5:00 AM | 4 | 1 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:0 | 0:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:1 | 5:00 AM | 2 | 1 | 24 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:3 | 0:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 37 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 7:4 | 5:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 46 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| 8:0 | 0:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| 8:1 | 5:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 33 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8:3 | 0:00 AM | 3 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 8:4 | 5:00 AM | 7 | 1 | 33 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 1:0 | 0:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 1:1 | 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 1:3 | 0:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1:4 | 5:00 PM | 4 | 0 | 28 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | |
| 4:0 | 0:00 PM | 7 | 0 | 35 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 4:1 | 5:00 PM | 4 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:3 | 0:00 PM | 1 | 1 | 39 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:4 | 5:00 PM | 1 | 5 | 38 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 5:0 | 0:00 PM | 2 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 5:1 | 5:00 PM | 8 | 1 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| 5:3 | 0:00 PM | 8 | 1 | 44 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| 5:4 | 5:00 PM | 2 | 2 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| 6:0 | 0:00 PM | 1 | 1 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6:1 | 5:00 PM | 2 | 2 | 32 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 6:3 | 0:00 PM | 5 | 0 | 33 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 6:4 | 5:00 PM | 5 | 0 | 32 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 9:0 | 0:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:1 | 5:00 PM | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:3 | 0:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 9:4 | 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Traffic Data

| | US-1 and SW 27T | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------|----|--|
| Time | Direction | Bikes count | | |
| Peak A.M | From 6 am- 8:45 am | | | |
| | North Leg | 23 | 6 | |
| | South Leg | 338 | 45 | |
| | East Leg | 21 | 21 | |
| | West Leg | 19 | 14 | |
| Mid-day | From 1:00 pm-1:45pm | | | |
| | North Leg | 7 | 0 | |
| | South Leg | 58 | 4 | |
| | East Leg | 3 | 1 | |
| | West Leg | 4 | 5 | |
| Peak P.M | From 4:00 pm-6:45 pm | | | |
| | North Leg | 46 | 15 | |
| | South Leg | 373 | 25 | |
| | East Leg | 29 | 4 | |
| | West Leg | 31 | 19 | |
| Nighttime | From 9:00 pm-9:45 pm | | | |
| | North Leg | 2 | 1 | |
| | South Leg | 36 | 6 | |
| | East Leg | 0 | 1 | |
| | West Leg | 4 | 0 | |





Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Data

File Name: TMC-3 US-1 at SW 84th Street Start Date: 3/9/2023 Start Time: 6:00:00 AM

| | US-1 | | US-1 | | SW 84t | h Street | SW 84th Street | | |
|------------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|--------|----------|----------------|-------|--|
| | North Leg | | South Leg | | East | Leg | Wes | t Leg | |
| Start Time | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | |
| 6:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | |
| 6:30:00 AM | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6:45:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | |
| 7:00:00 AM | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 7:15:00 AM | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | |
| 7:30:00 AM | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | |
| 7:45:00 AM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8:00:00 AM | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| 8:15:00 AM | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | |
| 8:30:00 AM | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 8:45:00 AM | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 1:00:00 PM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | |
| 1:15:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| 1:30:00 PM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | |
| 1:45:00 PM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 4:00:00 PM | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | |
| 4:15:00 PM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | |
| 4:30:00 PM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | |
| 4:45:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | |
| 5:00:00 PM | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| 5:15:00 PM | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | |
| 5:30:00 PM | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | |
| 5:45:00 PM | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| 6:00:00 PM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | |
| 6:15:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | |
| 6:30:00 PM | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | |
| 6:45:00 PM | 7 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 9:00:00 PM | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9:15:00 PM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | |
| 9:30:00 PM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 9:45:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |

Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Data

| | US-1 and SW 84t | | |
|-----------|----------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Time | Direction | Pedestrian count | Bikes count |
| Peak A.M | From 6 am- 8:45 am | | |
| | North Leg | 79 | 0 |
| | South Leg | 7 | - 1 |
| | East Leg | 7 | 6 |
| | West Leg | 19 | 12 |
| Mid-day | From 1:00 pm-1:45pm | | |
| | North Leg | 15 | 0 |
| | South Leg | 1 | 0 |
| | East Leg | 10 | 2 |
| | West Leg | 13 | 5 |
| Peak P.M | From 4:00 pm-6:45 pm | | |
| | North Leg | 72 | 1 |
| | South Leg | 8 | 5 |
| | East Leg | 19 | 5 |
| | West Leg | 31 | 20 |
| Nighttime | From 9:00 pm-9:45 pm | | |
| | North Leg | 19 | 0 |
| | South Leg | 0 | 0 |
| | East Leg | 3 | 1 |
| | West Leg | 3 | 1 |



Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Data

| File Name: | TMC-4 US-1 at SW 88th Street |
|-------------|------------------------------|
| Start Date: | 3/9/2023 |
| Start Time: | 6:00:00 AM |

| 50 | an rime. | 6.00.00 | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|---------|------------|-------|------|--------|--------|----------|-------|-----------|
| | U | S-1 | US Cout | S-1 | SW 6 | 9th Ct | SW 88t | h Street | SW 88 | th Street |
| Ctart Time | Dede | Bikee | Bada | Bikaa | Dede | Bikee | Dada | Bikee | Dede | Bikee |
| Start Time | reus | Dikes | reus | DIRES | reus | DIRES | reus | Dikes | reus | Dikes |
| 6:00:00 AM | - 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 6.15.00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | U | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | U | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | U | 1 | 0 | U | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | U | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 8:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| 1-00-00 DM | 0 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1.00.00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | - 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 1:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 1.45.00 PW | U | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4.13.00 PM | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 4:45:00 PM | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| 6:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | n | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 6:15:00 PM | n | n | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | n |
| 6:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 6:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 5. 10.00 F M | ~ | , v | , v | | | | | - v | - | , v |
| 9:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:30:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 9:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | , , | | | | | | L Š | L ů | L Š |

Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Data

| | US-1 and SW 88t | | |
|-----------|----------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Time | Direction | Pedestrian count | Bikes count |
| Peak A.M | From 6 am- 8:45 am | | |
| | North Leg | 1 | 3 |
| | South Leg | 10 | 4 |
| | East Leg | 16 | 1 |
| | West Leg | 11 | 10 |
| Mid-day | From 1:00 pm-1:45pm | | |
| | North Leg | 0 | 0 |
| | South Leg | 3 | 1 |
| | East Leg | 8 | 2 |
| | West Leg | 5 | 1 |
| Peak P.M | From 4:00 pm-6:45 pm | | |
| | North Leg | 3 | 0 |
| | South Leg | 23 | 5 |
| | East Leg | 31 | 2 |
| | West Leg | 28 | 12 |
| Nighttime | From 9:00 pm-9:45 pm | | |
| | North Leg | 1 | 0 |
| | South Leg | 3 | 0 |
| | East Leg | 5 | 1 |
| | West Leg | 0 | 1 |





Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Data

File Name: TMC-2 US-1 at SW 68th Ct Start Date: 3/9/2023

| otan bato. | 0/0/2020 |
|-------------|------------|
| Start Time: | 6:00:00 AM |

| | US North | S-1 n Leg | US Sout | S-1 h Leg | SW 6 Eas | SW 68th Ct East Leg | | t (Drive Way) st Leg | |
|------------|-------------|--------------|------------|--------------|-------------|------------------------|------|-------------------------|--|
| Start Time | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | |
| 6:00:00 AM | 0 | - 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8:30:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8:45:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 1:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 31 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5:45:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 9:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |

Dadeland North Metrorail Station Traffic Data

| | US-1 and SW 68th | | |
|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Time | Direction | Pedestrian count | Bikes count |
| Peak A.M | From 6 am- 8:45 am | | |
| | North Leg | 2 | 1 |
| | South Leg | 146 | 10 |
| | East Leg | 5 | 3 |
| | West Leg | 0 | 0 |
| Mid-day | From 1:00 pm-1:45pm | | |
| | North Leg | 0 | 0 |
| | South Leg | 28 | 5 |
| | East Leg | 7 | 1 |
| | West Leg | 0 | 0 |
| Peak P.M | From 4:00 pm-6:45 pm | | |
| | North Leg | 1 | 0 |
| | South Leg | 241 | 12 |
| | East Leg | 16 | 7 |
| | West Leg | 6 | 0 |
| Nighttime | From 9:00 pm-9:45 pm | | |
| | North Leg | 0 | 0 |
| | South Leg | 12 | 2 |
| | East Leg | 2 | 2 |
| | West Leg | 0 | 0 |



Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Data

File Name: TMC-6 US-1 at Datran Drive Start Date: 3/9/2023 Start Time: 6:00:00 AM

| | US-1 US- North Lea South | | S-1 h Lea | 1 Datran Drive Leg East Leg | | | Datran Drive | | |
|------------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------|--------------------------------|------|-------|--------------|-------|--|
| Start Time | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | |
| 6:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:45:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7:15:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7:45:00 AM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | |
| 8:00:00 AM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 8:15:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 8:30:00 AM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8:45:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 1:00:00 PM | 9 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | |
| 1:15:00 PM | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | |
| 1:30:00 PM | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 | |
| 1:45:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 4:00:00 PM | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 4:15:00 PM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| 4:30:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 4:45:00 PM | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | |
| 5:00:00 PM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | |
| 5:15:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| 5:30:00 PM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | -1 | 0 | |
| 5:45:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6:00:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6:15:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:30:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6:45:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | • | |
| 9:00:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 9:15:00 PM | 2 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9:30:00 PM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9:45:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Data

File Name: TMC-5 US-1 at SW 72nd Ct (Dadeland Blvd) Start Date: 3/9/2023 Start Time: 6:00:00 AM

| | U | 5-1 | U | S-1 | SW 7 | 2nd Ct | SW 7 | 2nd Ct |
|------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|----------|------|--------|
| | Nort | n Leg | Sout | n Leg | Eas | t Leg | vves | t Leg |
| Start Time | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes | Peds | Bikes |
| 6:00:00 AM | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:15:00 AM | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:30:00 AM | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 19 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 3 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30:00 AM | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45:00 AM | 1 | 0 | -4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | <u> </u> | | |
| 1:00:00 PM | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 1:15:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1:30:00 PM | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1:45:00 PM | 1 | U | 5 | U | U | U | 1 | 0 |
| 4:00:00 PM | 10 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 8 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 3 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:00:00 PM | 11 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 6:15:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:30:00 PM | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 PM | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 9:00:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:15:00 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 9:30:00 PM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:45:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |



C

Dadeland South Metrorail Station Traffic Data

| Dadeland Sou | th Count Summary | US-1 and Datra | an Drive | US-1 and Dadeland Boulevard | | | |
|--------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------|--|--|
| Time | Direction | Pedestrian Count | Bikes Count | Pedestrian Count | Bikes Count | | |
| Peak A.M | From 6 am - 8:45 am | | | | | | |
| | North Leg | 14 | 2 | 59 | 7 | | |
| | South Leg | 0 | 0 | 43 | 1 | | |
| | East Leg | 4 | 2 | 22 | 2 | | |
| | West Leg | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Mid-day | From 1:00 pm-1:45pm | | | | | | |
| | North Leg | 41 | 0 | 24 | 0 | | |
| | South Leg | 4 | 0 | 22 | 0 | | |
| | East Leg | 5 | 3 | 8 | 1 | | |
| | West Leg | 17 | 1 | 4 | 0 | | |
| Peak P.M | From 4:00 pm-6:45 pm | | | | | | |
| | North Leg | 39 | 0 | 70 | 0 | | |
| | South Leg | 2 | 0 | 74 | 2 | | |
| | East Leg | 15 | 5 | 23 | 3 | | |
| | West Leg | 16 | 0 | 17 | 2 | | |
| Night Time | From 9:00 pm-9:45 pm | | | | | | |
| | North Leg | 6 | 2 | 9 | 1 | | |
| | South Leg | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | | |
| | East Leg | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | |
| | West Leg | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | |

 \bigcirc

FDOT DISTRICT 6 EXPECTED VALUES ANALYSIS

| | | | | Number of Crashe | | | Mean Crashes Per | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------|------|------------------|------|------|----------------------|------|-----|--|
| US-1 and SW | / 27th Ave | | | Year | | | 5 Year Total Crashes | Year | % | |
| | | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | | | | |
| Total Cr | ashes | 1 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 3 | - | |
| | Rear End | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7% | |
| | Angle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | |
| | Left Turn | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13% | |
| | Sideswipe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | |
| CRACH TYPE | Right Turn | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 27% | |
| CRASH TYPE | Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | |
| | Off Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7% | |
| | Pedestrian | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 40% | |
| | Bicycle | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 60% | |
| | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | |
| | PDO/Possible Injury | 1 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 73% | |
| SEVERITY | Serious Injury | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 27% | |
| | Fatality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | |
| | Dawn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | |
| | Daylight | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 53% | |
| LIGHTING CONDITIONS | Dusk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | |
| Eleritine compilions | Dark - Lighted | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 27% | |
| | Dark - Not Lighted | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | |
| | Dark - Unknown Lighting | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | |
| | Dry | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 80% | |
| SURFACE CONDITIONS | Wet | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 20% | |
| | 0.1 | 0 | | | | â | | â | | |



C

THE OF PLOTO

FDOT DISTRICT 6 EXPECTED VALUES ANALYSIS

Mean 5 Year US-1 and SW 84th St Total Crashes % Crashes Per Year 2019 **Total Crashes** 3 3 3 Rear End 0 0 0% 0 1 1 1 33% Angle 0 Left Turn 0 0 0% Sideswipe 0 0 0 0% Right Turn 1 1 1 33% CRASH TYPE Head On 0 0% 0 0 Off Road 0 0 0 0% 2 2 2 67% Pedestrian 1 33% Bicycle 1 1 Other 0 0 0 0% PDO/Possible Injury 1 1 1 33% 0 0 0 0% SEVERITY Serious Injury Fatality 0 0 0 0% 0% 0 Dawn 0 0 100% 3 3 3 Daylight LIGHTING Dusk 0 0 0 0% CONDITIONS 0 0 0% Dark - Lighted 0 Dark - Not Lighted 0 0 0 0% Dark - Unknown Lighting 0 0 0 0% Dry 3 3 3 100% SURFACE Wet 0 0 0 0% CONDITIONS 0 0 0 0% Other



EXPECTED VALUES ANALYSIS Number of Crashes 5 Year Mean US-1 and Dadeland Boulevard Total Crashes % Year Crashes Per Year 2018 **Total Crashes** 2 2 2 Rear End 0 0 0 0% 0 0 0 Angle 0% Left Turn 1 1 50% 1 Sideswipe 0 0 0 0% 0% Right Turn 0 0 0 CRASH TYPE Head On 0 0 0 0% Off Road 0% 0 0 0 2 2 2 100% Pedestrian Bicycle 0 0 0 0% Other 0 0% 0 0 PDO/Possible Injury 2 2 2 100% 0 0 0 0% SEVERITY Serious Injury Fatality 0 0 0 0% 0 0% Dawn 0 0 Daylight 1 50% 1 1 LIGHTING Dusk 0 0 0 0% 50% CONDITIONS Dark - Lighted 1 1 1 Dark - Not Lighted 0 0 0 0% Dark - Unknown Lighting 0 0 0% 0 Dry 2 2 2 100% SURFACE Wet 0 0 0 0% CONDITIONS Other 0 0 0 0%

FDOT DISTRICT 6



| STE | F FLOR |
|---------|-----------|
| | 107 · z |
| EPART | |
| SHENT O | F TRANSPO |

COUNTY: 87 - MIAMI-DADE

FDOT DISTRICT 6

EXPECTED VALUES ANALYSIS Mean 5 Year US-1 and Datran Drive Total Crashes % Crashes Per Yea 2018 2019 **Total Crashes** 1 1 2 1 Rear End 0 0 0 0 0% 0 0 0 0 0% Angle Left Turn 0 0 0 0 0% Sideswipe 0 0 0 0 0% Right Turn 1 0 1 1 50% CRASH TYPE Head On 0 0 0 0 0% Off Road 0 0 0 0 0% 1 2 1 1 100% Pedestrian Bicycle 0 0 0 0 0% Other 0 0 0 0 0% PDO/Possible Injury 1 2 1 100% 1 0 0 0 0 SEVERITY Serious Injury 0% Fatality 0 0 0 0 0% 0% 0 Dawn 0 0 0 0 50% Daylight 1 1 1 LIGHTING Dusk 0 0 0 0 0% CONDITIONS Dark - Lighted 0 50% 1 1 1 Dark - Not Lighted 0 0 0 0 0% 0 0 0 0 0% Dark - Unknown Lighting Dry 1 1 2 1 100% SURFACE Wet 0 0 0 0 0% CONDITIONS 0 0 0 0% 0 Other

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| YEAR | AADT | DIRECTION 1 | DIRECTION 2 | *K FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 2021 2020 2019 2018 2017 2016 2017 2016 2017 2016 2017 2016 2013 2010 2009 2008 2007 2006 | 83500 C 22000 C 83500 C 81500 C 85500 C 85500 C 82500 C 83000 C 98000 C 97000 C 105500 C 105500 C 92500 C | M 43000 N 11000 N 41500 N 4500 N 45500 N 45500 N 43000 N 43000 N 48500 N 48500 N 48500 N 50500 N 50500 N 52000 N 52000 N 49000 | <pre>\$ 40500 \$ 11000 \$ 42000 \$ 42000 \$ 44000 \$ 44000 \$ 44000 \$ 41500 \$ 38500 \$ 38500 \$ 49500 \$ 44500 \$ 50000 \$ 50000 \$ 51500 \$ 48500 \$ 43500 \$ \$ 43500 \$ 100</pre> | 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 | 55.00 56.00 54.30 54.00 57.40 59.30 59.70 58.20 58.27 59.96 66.31 63.12 58.66 | $\begin{array}{c} 2 & -9 & 0 \\ 2 & 9 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 7 & 0 \\ 5 & 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 & 0 \\ 5 & 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 & 0 \\ 5 & 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 5 & 0 \\ 4 & 3 & 0 \\ 4 & 3 & 0 \\ 3 & 5 & 0 \\ 8 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{array}$ |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SIMTH YEAR ESTIMATE; X = UNRNORN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES





| COUNTY: STATION DESCRIM START I START 1 | : PTION: DATE: FIME: | 87 5201 SR 5/U 06/22/2 0000 | 5-1, 200 2021 |)' N SW | 27 AV/\$ | SR 9 | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|-------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| TIME | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 0100 0200 0300 0500 0500 0700 0900 1000 1200 1300 1400 1500 1400 1500 1500 1200 2000 2200 2200 | 167 98 60 44 59 330 552 612 601 552 589 616 627 601 547 397 361 292 212 | 133 82 60 46 57 176 475 679 690 690 690 597 565 563 622 608 591 610 641 554 412 328 313 227 | 116 66 48 53 77 622 601 712 604 621 584 621 584 621 584 621 597 624 611 665 597 624 8359 338 296 194 | 107 63 47 78 280 633 711 682 629 523 588 597 610 593 630 652 587 442 335 287 442 335 287 257 | 523 309 215 191 271 860 2633 2806 2535 2301 2249 2381 2381 2381 2381 2414 2362 2555 2402 2402 2402 2402 2402 2402 1503 1332 1181 790 | | $\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 13 \\ 152 \\ 87 \\ 58 \\ 73 \\ 256 \\ 573 \\ 2468 \\ 603 \\ 555 \\ 5534 \\ 579 \\ 6559 \\ 6559 \\ 6559 \\ 6559 \\ 6525 \\ 6674 \\ 411 \\ 3227 \\ 324 \end{array}$ | 200 141 92 2548 566 418 543 543 552 571 616 606 640 552 571 616 606 640 365 365 365 365 | 191 102 73 369 5369 5380 580 580 580 583 585 531 506 607 648 640 4827 372 322 322 | 190 104 63 92 225 534 638 561 516 516 536 536 536 536 536 536 536 536 536 5478 605 478 307 296 242 | 794 499 315 296 300 2310 2027 2190 2155 2155 2155 2216 2301 2421 2421 2421 2421 2421 2421 2421 24 | $\begin{array}{c} 1317\\ 808\\ 530\\ 467\\ 571\\ 1395\\ 34711\\ 4823\\ 5116\\ 4562\\ 4491\\ 4404\\ 4597\\ 4787\\ 5025\\ 5123\\ 5123\\ 5123\\ 5123\\ 5123\\ 2798\\ 2492\\ 1922\\ 1922\end{array}$ |
| 24-HOUI | R TOTALS | 5: | | | 40805 | | | | | | 39340 | 80145 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DII HOUR 745 1630 745 | RECTION | : N DLUME 2835 2564 2835 | P | EAK VOLU DIJ HOUR 745 1715 1715 | UME RECT | INFORM ION: S VOLU 20 20 20 | 4ATION 5 31ME 387 503 503 | C | DMBINED HOUR 745 1715 745 | DIRECT VOL 5 5 | IONS UME 222 132 222 |

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P

TP

C

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P

| START START | DATE: TIME: | 06/23/2 | 2021 | 0 1 54 | 27 117,1 | 510 5 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| TIME | 1ST | DIR 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 0100 0200 0300 0400 0550 0660 0700 0800 1000 1200 1200 1300 1400 1500 1400 1500 1500 1400 1500 2100 22100 2200 | 144 68 39 27 40 378 620 717 721 607 594 623 623 624 621 621 625 742 625 742 625 742 9 310 286 | 109 53 31 133 50 196 491 737 619 629 636 637 630 637 630 643 709 697 643 709 697 634 403 403 403 403 403 403 403 403 403 4 | 95 75 32 64 276 624 7651 669 591 622 578 654 601 596 511 601 596 511 601 592 381 307 | 75 52 37 42 85 314 621 725 68 620 566 618 599 593 619 667 637 544 450 357 302 281 | 423 248 142 134 239 922 2114 2842 2773 2629 2384 2452 2452 2452 2452 2602 2565 2462 2602 2565 2462 2602 2577 1571 1257 | | $\begin{array}{c} 200\\ 539\\ 458\\ 25439\\ 4567\\ 4568\\ 4562\\ 5564\\ 5564\\ 557\\ 556\\ 575\\ 13\\ 25\\ 456\\ 591\\ 25\\ 45\\ 556\\ 591\\ 25\\ 45\\ 32\\ 6\\ 59\\ 45\\ 32\\ 6\\ 59\\ 45\\ 32\\ 6\\ 59\\ 45\\ 59\\ 59\\ 45\\ 59\\ 59\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50$ | 162 86 63 38 44 104 327 559 551 550 594 592 630 605 561 564 605 561 564 605 547 454 454 454 388 | 179 94 60 43 53 139 572 578 578 578 578 578 578 573 631 573 631 573 637 651 651 457 457 457 457 9343 | 140 70 49 53 231 497 476 628 602 605 543 598 623 602 623 602 623 602 623 602 873 387 393 314 | 682 350 227 164 195 542 1526 2278 2217 2217 2217 2217 2217 2217 2228 2288 228 | 1105 598 3699 298 434 1464 3640 4862 4976 4601 4791 47714 4718 4792 5024 4905 5261 5057 4107 3323 2855 2533 |
| 24-HOU | R TOTALS | | | | 41790 | | | | | | 39693 | 81483 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DIR HOUR 715 1715 715 | RECTION | N 2939 2689 2939 | P | EAK VOLU DIJ HOUR 845 1700 1700 | UME RECT | INFOR ION: VOL 2 2 2 | MATION S UME 337 659 659 | c | OMBINED HOUR 730 1715 1715 | DIRECT VOL 5 5 5 | IONS UME 102 266 266 |

COUNTY: 87 STATION: 5201 DESCRIPTION: SR 5/US-1, 200' N SW 27 AV/SR 9 START DATE: 06/23/2021 START TUBE: 0000

Appendix | A

| COUNTY: STATION DESCRIP START D START T | : TION: ATE: IME: | 87 5201 SR 5/U 06/24/2 0000 | 5-1, 200 2021 |)'NSW | 27 AV/S | 5R 9 | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| TIME | 1sT | DIRI 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1st | DIRH 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 0100 0220 0300 0400 0500 0500 0500 0500 0500 1000 1200 12 | 134 84 39 42 112 343 621 566 575 576 576 575 576 575 576 575 576 575 576 575 576 575 576 575 575 | $\begin{array}{c} 141\\ 77\\ 46\\ 82\\ 502\\ 720\\ 716\\ 686\\ 577\\ 576\\ 609\\ 625\\ 99\\ 633\\ 667\\ 589\\ 524\\ 633\\ 333\\ 296\\ 333\\ 296\\ 333\\ 239\\ \end{array}$ | 92 67 41 36 292 582 569 569 569 564 565 564 562 674 567 671 306 517 306 340 | 83 61 277 50 91 299 579 549 593 6437 549 595 572 594 627 647 589 627 647 325 3225 3225 3225 | $\begin{array}{c} 450\\ 289\\ 148\\ 174\\ 267\\ 885\\ 2007\\ 2821\\ 2821\\ 2821\\ 2714\\ 2249\\ 2285\\ 2344\\ 2286\\ 2446\\ 2481\\ 2605\\ 2446\\ 2481\\ 2605\\ 2359\\ 2048\\ 1550\\ 1349\\ 1276\\ 855\\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 220\\ 108\\ 82\\ 61\\ 44\\ 59\\ 237\\ 505\\ 5560\\ 494\\ 464\\ 482\\ 535\\ 556\\ 535\\ 509\\ 625\\ 6857\\ 6656\\ 494\\ 464\\ 431\\ 330\\ 285\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 187\\ 108\\ 700\\ 65\\ 27\\ 104\\ 335\\ 521\\ 597\\ 508\\ 506\\ 4533\\ 610\\ 564\\ 5738\\ 644\\ 5738\\ 644\\ 5738\\ 644\\ 5738\\ 4503\\ 523\\ 523\\ 4503\\ 523\\ 523\\ 523\\ 523\\ 523\\ 523\\ 533\\ 4003\\ 523\\ 533\\ 4003\\ 523\\ 533\\ 4003\\ 523\\ 533\\ 4003\\ 523\\ 533\\ 4003\\ 523\\ 535\\ 535\\ 535\\ 535\\ 535\\ 535\\ 53$ | $\begin{array}{c} 154\\ 105\\ 48\\ 55\\ 453\\ 424\\ 524\\ 485\\ 553\\ 556\\ 568\\ 571\\ 587\\ 627\\ 602\\ 456\\ 434\\ 314\\ 313\\ 277\\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 119\\ 80\\ 62\\ 242\\ 54\\ 228\\ 484\\ 85\\ 55\\ 569\\ 522\\ 656\\ 656\\ 656\\ 658\\ 656\\ 668\\ 590\\ 489\\ 450\\ 235\\ 344\\ 270\\ \end{array}$ | 680 401 262 223 1700 524 1480 2228 2149 2228 2197 1964 2056 2190 2331 2192 2311 2533 2192 2311 2533 2192 2311 2531 2478 1962 1798 1933 1394 1193 | $\begin{array}{c} 1130\\ 690\\ 410\\ 397\\ 1409\\ 3487\\ 4970\\ 5059\\ 4691\\ 4534\\ 4538\\ 4638\\ 4638\\ 4638\\ 4638\\ 4638\\ 201\\ 5201\\ 5201\\ 4010\\ 3348\\ 2682\\ 2670\\ 2048\\ \end{array}$ |
| 24-HOUR | TOTALS | 5: | | | 41215 | | | | | 38407 | 79622 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DIJ HOUR 715 1700 715 | RECTION | : N DLUME 2901 2605 2901 | P | EAK VOLU DI HOUR 745 1700 1700 | JME INFOR RECTION: 2 2 2 2 2 | MATION S 302 596 596 | c | DMBINED HOUR 730 1700 1700 | DIRECT VOL 5 5 5 | IONS UME 177 201 201 |

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P



Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization

| COUNT STATI DESCR START START | Y: ON: IPTION: DATE: TIME: | 87 5120 SR 9/S 07/28/ 0000 | W/NW 27 2021 | AV, 20 |)0' N SR | 5/US-1 | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|---------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| TIME | 1st | DIR 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1sT | DII 2ND | RECTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL | | | |
| 0000 0100 0200 0300 0500 0600 0700 0800 1100 1200 1300 1400 1500 1500 1500 1500 2000 2100 2200 | $\begin{array}{c} & & 57\\ & 32\\ & 31\\ & 13\\ & 19\\ & 26\\ & 47\\ & 127\\ & 200\\ & 176\\ $ | 42 23 9 11 13 34 44 212 174 156 198 173 156 198 173 178 169 149 107 8 3 3 64 | 26 22 12 6 9 52 102 152 207 192 164 160 182 164 208 184 208 184 219 193 211 167 119 57 | 222 14 10 11 23 47 7 122 192 189 178 207 197 185 185 185 185 177 135 145 177 135 104 9 90 90 90 90 944 | $\begin{array}{c} 147\\ 91\\ 46\\ 41\\ 74\\ 159\\ 340\\ 615\\ 808\\ 722\\ 695\\ 689\\ 740\\ 705\\ 676\\ 676\\ 676\\ 776\\ 721\\ 721\\ 725\\ 628\\ 575\\ 575\\ 437\\ 346\\ 260\\ \end{array}$ | 44 15 15 11 11 17 16 66 206 211 225 227 211 182 225 227 211 182 225 277 211 192 206 215 225 275 275 275 275 275 275 27 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 266 111 100 111 277 499 1199 2133 2355 2015 212 2188 2411 1966 2411 1966 2411 2488 2488 2488 2488 2188 2066 1551 1400 757 878 218 218 218 218 218 219 219 213 241 241 241 241 241 241 241 241 241 241 | 26 13 12 10 55 125 125 125 125 125 237 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 24 | 140 60 47 43 93 167 422 841 852 841 852 841 852 841 859 916 950 950 950 954 784 647 532 341 247 | 287 151 93 84 167 326 762 1425 1547 1502 1566 1466 1605 1692 1713 1671 1709 1412 1222 969 687 507 | | | |
| 24-но | UR TOTAI | ,S : | | | 11817 | | | | | 13939 | 25756 | | | |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY TRUCK | DI HOUF 745 1600 745 PERCENI | RECTION V | : N OLUME 811 791 811 .38 | F | PEAK VOL DI HOUR 815 1715 1715 | UME INFO RECTION: VC | RMATION S DLUME 930 999 999 999 | c | OMBINED HOUR 800 1630 1630 | D DIRECT VOI 1 1 1 1 16.3 | TIONS JUME 730 749 749 | | | |
| | | | | CLAS | SIFICAT | ION SUMM | IARY DAT | ABASE | | | | | | |
| DIR N S | 1 2 13 573 29 1075 | 3 4 2816 2 2173 | 422 75 | 5 2703 272 | 6 19 112 | 7 8 6 5 104 33 | 9 94 24 92 69 | 10 5 17 | 11 0 0 | 12 0 0 | $ \begin{array}{cccc} 13 & 14 \\ 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 \end{array} $ | 15 19 2 | TOTTRK 3235 983 | TOTVOL 11817 13939 |
| GENER | ATED BY | SPS 5.0 | .57P | | | | | | | | | | | |



GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| COUNTY | : 87 - MIA | AMI | -DADE | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--|--|---------|---|---|--|-----|---|---|---|
| SITE: | 5120 - SR | 9/: | SW/NW | 27 AV, 2 | 00'N SH | R 5∕US−1 | | | | | | |
| YEAR | AADT | | DI | RECTION | 1 DI | IRECTION | 2 | *K FACTC | R D | FACTOR | т | FACTOR |
| 2021 2020 2019 2018 2017 2016 2015 2014 2013 2012 2011 2010 2009 2008 | 25500 19100 32000 31000 34500 29500 24000 24000 27000 27000 27000 27000 | 000000000000000 | n N N N N N N N N N N N | 12000 9100 14000 15000 15500 14500 14500 14500 14500 14500 14500 14500 14500 14500 14500 14500 14500 | | 13500 10000 18000 13500 16000 19000 16000 15000 14000 13000 13000 13500 12000 | | 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 | | 55.00 56.00 54.30 54.00 57.40 59.30 59.70 58.20 58.27 59.96 66.31 | | $\begin{array}{c} 16.90\\ 6.00\\ 4.40\\ 6.50\\ 3.50\\ 8.30\\ 4.10\\ 4.90\\ 4.80\\ 4.40\\ 3.30\\ 3.30\\ 3.10\\ 3.10\\ 3.10\end{array}$ |
| 2006 | 20800 | c | N | 11000 | 2 22 | 9800 | | 7.3 | 9 | 58.66 | | 8.00 |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; X = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| SITE: | 8134 - GRA | APEI | AND BL | VD/27TH AVE | , 20 | 0' SOUTH OF | US-1 | | |
|-------|------------|------|--------|-------------|------|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| YEAR | AADT | | DIR | ECTION 1 | DI | RECTION 2 | *K FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 2021 | 16800 | C | N | 8800 | S | 8000 | 9.00 | 55.00 | 17.50 |
| 2020 | 14000 | T | N | 7100 | S | 6900 | 9.00 | 56.00 | 10.40 |
| 2019 | 15700 | s | N | 8000 | ŝ | 7700 | 9.00 | 56.00 | 11.00 |
| 2019 | 15000 | F | N | 0100 | C | 7900 | 9.00 | 54 20 | 12 10 |
| 2010 | 13300 | 1 | 14 | 0100 | 0 | 1000 | 5.00 | 54.50 | 12.10 |
| 2017 | 17800 | C | N | 9100 | s | 8700 | 9.00 | 55.70 | 12.60 |
| 2016 | 18300 | F | N | 9600 | S | 8700 | 9.00 | 56.10 | 13.50 |
| 2015 | 18600 | С | N | 9800 | S | 8800 | 9.00 | 57.40 | 13.70 |
| 2014 | 15400 | s | N | 8300 | S | 7100 | 9.00 | 59.30 | 17.40 |
| 2013 | 15500 | F | N | 8400 | ŝ | 7100 | 9.00 | 58.90 | 16.20 |
| 2012 | 15500 | ĉ | N | 8400 | S | 7100 | 9.00 | 59.70 | 16.00 |

COUNTY: 87 - MIAMI-DADE

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; A = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES



| COUNTY: STATION DESCRIP START D START T | : TION: ATE: IME: | 87 8134 GRAPELA 11/04/2 0000 | AND BLVI 2021 | 0/27тн | AVE, 200 |)' SOUTH (| OF US-1 | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| TIME | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | SCTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 0100 0200 0200 0400 0500 0600 0700 0800 1000 1200 1200 1200 1400 1500 1600 1700 1500 1600 1200 2200 2200 2200 | 34 15 11 13 3 9 38 75 177 133 155 144 145 169 171 193 199 164 194 197 26 105 | 28 14 14 10 20 29 105 154 138 147 140 168 196 194 164 164 168 178 141 115 90 90 90 861 | 25 14 12 10 5 23 54 120 148 157 149 194 194 194 191 201 189 179 170 130 109 9 11 9 75 44 | 26 8 4 7 11 34 85 152 140 152 143 159 1832 155 128 80 9 807 749 | $\begin{array}{c} 113\\ 55\\ 41\\ 40\\ 29\\ 86\\ 206\\ 631\\ 568\\ 564\\ 661\\ 656\\ 674\\ 771\\ 785\\ 667\\ 667\\ 437\\ 352\\ 663\\ 325\\ 325\\ 325\\ 9\end{array}$ | 31 11 3 5 17 48 119 143 216 141 149 137 137 151 148 148 148 148 148 148 148 148 148 14 | 26 92 7 8 19 500 182 175 110 147 147 142 165 158 152 155 162 135 101 8 8 60 38 | 17 9 5 5 9 22 88 139 181 127 116 145 171 156 143 147 130 85 64 54 | 18 10 5 7 8 27 115 218 134 138 134 158 142 158 142 142 142 142 142 162 1177 83 63 63 42 | 92 39 32 30 85 301 579 579 579 5612 574 612 574 612 574 619 541 365 317 317 279 | 205 94 64 62 59 171 3507 1355 1220 1210 1226 1345 1400 12210 1235 1400 1305 1240 1305 1400 1307 1254 1254 1254 1254 1254 1254 1254 1254 |
| 24-HOUR | TOTALS | 3: | | | 10308 | | | | | 9347 | 19655 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DII HOUR 800 1515 1515 | RECTION | N DLUME 631 791 791 | P | EAK VOLU DIJ HOUR 815 1415 815 | JME INFORM RECTION: S VOLU | MATION 5 JME 797 520 797 | co | MBINED HOUR 815 1515 1515 | DIRECT VOL 1 1 1 | IONS UME 384 403 403 |

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| COUNT | Y: 87 - MI# | MI- | DADE | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------|-----|--------|-----------|---------|-----|--------|---|-----------|---|--------|---|--------|
| SITE: | 5200 - SR | 5/U | s-1, 3 | 200' S SV | V 27 AV | //s | R 9 | | | | | | |
| YEAR | AADT | | DII | RECTION : | L I | DIR | ECTION | 2 | *K FACTOR | D | FACTOR | т | FACTOR |
| 2021 | 80500 | C | N | 39500 | | 3 | 41000 | | 9.00 | | 55.00 | _ | 2.90 |
| 2020 | 16000 | č | N | 8600 | 2 | 5 | 7400 | | 9.00 | | 56.00 | | 2.90 |
| 2019 | 83500 | С | N | 41000 | 2 | 5 | 42500 | | 9.00 | | 56.00 | | 2.40 |
| 2018 | 78000 | С | N | 35500 | 5 | 5 | 42500 | | 9.00 | | 54.30 | | 2.30 |
| 2017 | 89000 | С | N | 45000 | \$ | 5 | 44000 | | 9.00 | | 54.00 | | 2.00 |
| 2016 | 91000 | С | N | 46500 | 2 | 5 | 44500 | | 9.00 | | 56.10 | | 2.90 |
| 2015 | 73000 | С | N | 34500 | 2 | 5 | 38500 | | 9.00 | | 57.40 | | 3.70 |
| 2014 | 88000 | С | N | 47000 | \$ | 5 | 41000 | | 9.00 | | 59.30 | | 3.40 |
| 2013 | 87500 | С | N | 47000 | 2 | 5 | 40500 | | 9.00 | | 58.90 | | 5.00 |
| 2012 | 99500 | С | N | 49500 | 2 | 5 | 50000 | | 9.00 | | 59.70 | | 5.10 |
| 2011 | 89500 | С | N | 45000 | 2 | 5 | 44500 | | 9.00 | | 58.20 | | 3.90 |
| 2010 | 97000 | С | N | 50500 | 2 | 5 | 46500 | | 7.87 | | 58.27 | | 4.30 |
| 2009 | 92500 | С | N | 47500 | 2 | 5 | 45000 | | 7.98 | | 59.96 | | 4.90 |
| 2008 | 78500 | С | N | 39500 | 2 | 5 | 39000 | | 8.07 | | 66.31 | | 3.70 |
| 2007 | 94500 | С | N | 50000 | \$ | 5 | 44500 | | 7.90 | | 63.12 | | 3.50 |
| 2006 | 89500 | С | N | 47500 | \$ | 5 | 42000 | | 7.39 | | 58.66 | | 8.00 |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; X = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES





| STATION: DESCRIPTIC START DATE START TIME | DN: 5: 5: | 87 5200 SR 5/US- 06/08/20 0000 | -1, 20 021 | 0's sw | 27 AV/\$ | SR 9 | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| TIME 1s | зт | DIREC 2ND | CTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1sT | DI 2ND | RECTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 1 0100 0 0200 0 0300 0 0400 0 0500 3 0700 5 1000 5 1100 5 1300 5 1400 5 1700 5 1800 5 1900 5 2000 3 22000 3 22000 3 22000 3 | 151 79 654 41 35025 524 5548 5528 5548 5528 5549 5549 5549 5522 5549 55227 5549 55227 55307 55227 533077 2226 | $\begin{array}{c} 146\\ 62\\ 48\\ 33\\ 49\\ 157\\ 448\\ 602\\ 640\\ 595\\ 522\\ 536\\ 548\\ 555\\ 569\\ 555\\ 569\\ 516\\ 603\\ 7481\\ 271\\ 271\\ 164\\ \end{array}$ | 113 58 68 2564 643 663 660 5658 5371 546 5031 577 516 503 4977 516 316 340 316 340 3173 | 98 62 41 79 534 645 599 618 523 559 618 521 545 521 545 521 545 521 434 336 274 434 336 276 | 508 261 200 164 237 780 1920 2393 2527 2427 2427 2427 2427 2427 2101 2149 2133 2168 2144 2073 2203 2091 2091 1940 1421 1284 1155 726 | 23 15 11 7 6 25 43 58 56 51 55 52 61 62 69 67 44 41 36 30 29 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} 156\\ 129\\ 88\\ 84\\ 82\\ 198\\ 475\\ 563\\ 544\\ 560\\ 544\\ 560\\ 540\\ 507\\ 565\\ 581\\ 600\\ 601\\ 623\\ 630\\ 621\\ 623\\ 630\\ 216\\ \end{array}$ | 811 530 355 298 264 528 1525 2074 2162 2277 2178 2133 2253 2318 2453 24543 2553 2318 2463 2578 2578 2578 2578 2678 2578 2678 2578 2678 2578 2678 2559 2551 255 255 255 255 255 255 255 255 25 | $\begin{array}{c} 1319\\ 791\\ 555\\ 462\\ 501\\ 1308\\ 3445\\ 4497\\ 4234\\ 4407\\ 4234\\ 4402\\ 4402\\ 4403\\ 4481\\ 4661\\ 4681\\ 4681\\ 4661\\ 262\\ 2644\\ 2384\\ 1782\\ 2644\\ 2384\\ 1782\\ 2644\\ 2384\\ 2784\\ 2844$ |
| 24-HOUR TO | TALS | : | | | 37221 | | | | | 39452 | 76673 |
| F A.M. P.M. 1 DAILY | DIR: HOUR 745 1715 745 | ECTION: VOI | N LUME 2573 2220 2573 | P. | EAK VOLU DIJ HOUR 845 1700 1700 | JME INF RECTION V | ORMATION : S 0LUME 2261 2678 2678 | a c | COMBINEL HOUR 745 1715 1715 | D DIRECT VOL 4 4 4 | IONS UME 758 883 883 883 |
| GENERATED | BY S | PS 5.0.! | 57P | | | | | | | | |
| COUNTY: STATION: DESCRIPTIC START DATH START TIME | ON: E: E: | 87 5200 SR 5/US 06/09/2 0000 | -1, 20 021 | 0's sw | 27 AV/ | 5R 9 | | | | | |
| TIME 1s | ST | DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | N 4 TH | TOTAL | 151 | DJ 2ND | RECTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 1 0100 0200 0200 | 114 54 40 | 111 63 36 27 | 74 61 32 | 68 55 33 | 367 233 141 | 19 12 7 | 7 202 3 84 1 60 | 2 154 4 90 0 53 | 117 77 57 | 670 374 241 | 1037 607 382 |

-----BINED 0TAL -----382 314 489 3782 4846 4958 4846 4958 4249 3782 4249 4435 4255 4249 4435 4410 4497 4776 4733 4410 4497 4776 4733 4740 3994 3347 2729 1911 1367 1367 5306 5529 5513 5592 5527 5527 5527 5527 66327 6658 4355 333 3555 334 0400 0500 0700 0800 0900 1000 1200 1200 1300 1400 1500 1400 1500 1700 1800 2000 2200 2200 2300 16509935564874888486200 55555555555555555388848020 24-HOUR TOTALS: 78372 38367 40005
 PEAK VOLUME INFORMATION

 DIRECTION: S

 HOUR
 VOLUME

 745
 2509

 1730
 2667

 1730
 2667
 DIRECTION: N HOUR VOLUME 715 2639 1500 2306 715 2639
 COMBINED
 DIRECTIONS

 HOUR
 VOLUME

 730
 5093

 1700
 4917

 730
 5093
 A.M. P.M. DAILY

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P



| COUNTY STATIO DESCRI START START | : N: PTION: DATE: TIME: | 87 5200 SR 5/U 06/10/ 0000 | 5-1, 200 2021 |)' S SW | 27 AV/ | 5R 9 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| TIME | 1st | DIR 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 0100 0200 0400 0500 0500 0700 0800 1000 1200 1200 1400 1400 1400 1400 1500 1400 1400 1500 1400 1500 1200 2100 22100 2200 | $\begin{array}{c} 126\\ 77\\ 43\\ 29\\ 34\\ 124\\ 376\\ 648\\ 547\\ 549\\ 537\\ 536\\ 521\\ 4536\\ 521\\ 463\\ 425\\ 3582\\ 463\\ 425\\ 3582\\ 75\\ 3275\\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 101\\ 64\\ 45\\ 38\\ 142\\ 453\\ 598\\ 646\\ 564\\ 559\\ 540\\ 5533\\ 583\\ 597\\ 533\\ 597\\ 533\\ 597\\ 534\\ 509\\ 405\\ 513\\ 509\\ 405\\ 5250\\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 112\\ 59\\ 355\\ 42\\ 71\\ 235\\ 591\\ 656\\ 602\\ 535\\ 549\\ 535\\ 549\\ 557\\ 529\\ 557\\ 529\\ 557\\ 529\\ 557\\ 533\\ 366\\ 531\\ 333\\ 313\\ 3220\\ \end{array}$ | 74 56 38 44 71 645 557 535 555 555 555 555 555 555 555 55 | 413 256 161 153 234 803 2021 2508 2206 2188 2206 2188 2181 2117 2120 2182 2015 2181 2017 1540 1294 1294 1297 927 | $\begin{array}{c} 198\\ 126\\ 65\\ 72\\ 45\\ 56\\ 565\\ 556\\ 556\\ 556\\ 556\\ 558\\ 558$ | 176 99 68 45 46 90 3355 54 574 509 574 509 574 509 554 505 54 505 54 505 54 505 54 803 483 463 389 3453 423 285 | $\begin{array}{c} 177\\ 89\\ 71\\ 54\\ 156\\ 455\\ 602\\ 602\\ 605\\ 538\\ 571\\ 490\\ 8529\\ 3349\\ 494\\ 466\\ 386\\ 287\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 143\\ 87\\ 69\\ 9\\ 48\\ 50\\ 222\\ 471\\ 565\\ 574\\ 5928\\ 532\\ 5522\\ 446\\ 649\\ 346\\ 649\\ 346\\ 527\\ 451\\ 409\\ 332\\ 331\\ 238\end{array}$ | 694 401 273 215 534 1521 2181 2181 2314 2339 2179 2207 2128 1964 2251 1964 2255 1516 557 1968 1784 1469 1434 1455 | 1107 657 424 439 1337 3542 4750 4779 4847 4375 4375 4375 4375 43847 4385 4385 4385 33857 33857 33857 33857 33857 33857 33857 32701 2122 |
| 24-HOU | R TOTAL | s: | | | 37738 | | | | | 37067 | 74805 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DI HOUR 715 1230 715 | RECTION | N 2592 2193 2592 | P | EAK VOL DI HOUR 815 1600 1600 | JME INFOR RECTION: VOL 2 2 2 | MATION S UME 343 565 565 | co | DMBINED HOUR 715 1515 715 | DIRECT VOL 4 4 4 | IONS UME 906 603 906 |

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| COUNT | Y: 87 - MI# | AMI-I | DADE | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------|-------|--------|-----------|--------|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| SITE: | 0163 - SR | 5/U | s-1, 2 | 200' S SR | 878/SN | APPER CREEK | EXPWY | | |
| YEAR | AADT | | DII | RECTION 1 | DI | RECTION 2 | *K FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR |
| 2021 | 40500 | C | | 22500 | S | 18000 | 9.00 | 55.00 | 2.90 |
| 2020 | 41000 | č | N | 19500 | s | 21500 | 9.00 | 56.00 | 2.90 |
| 2019 | 53500 | c | N | 25500 | ŝ | 28000 | 9.00 | 56.00 | 2.40 |
| 2018 | 47500 | C | N | 26000 | S | 21500 | 9.00 | 54.30 | 2.30 |
| 2017 | 55000 | C | N | 27000 | S | 28000 | 9.00 | 54.00 | 2.00 |
| 2016 | 53500 | С | N | 28000 | S | 25500 | 9.00 | 56.10 | 2.90 |
| 2015 | 52000 | С | N | 23000 | S | 29000 | 9.00 | 57.40 | 3.70 |
| 2014 | 52000 | С | N | 26000 | S | 26000 | 9.00 | 59.30 | 3.40 |
| 2013 | 51000 | С | N | 21500 | S | 29500 | 9.00 | 58.90 | 5.00 |
| 2012 | 67000 | С | N | 33500 | S | 33500 | 9.00 | 59.70 | 5.10 |
| 2011 | 64000 | C | N | 33500 | S | 30500 | 9.00 | 58.20 | 3.90 |
| 2010 | 58000 | С | N | 29500 | S | 28500 | 7.87 | 58.27 | 4.30 |
| 2009 | 53000 | С | N | 26000 | S | 27000 | 7.98 | 59.96 | 4.90 |
| 2008 | 56000 | C | N | 27500 | S | 28500 | 8.07 | 66.31 | 3.70 |
| 2007 | 56500 | С | N | 28500 | S | 28000 | 7.90 | 63.12 | 3.50 |
| 2006 | 53500 | С | N | 26000 | S | 27500 | 7.39 | 58.66 | 8.00 |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; X = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES





| START I | : N: PTION: DATE: FIME: | 87 0163 SR 5/US 10/26/2 0000 | -1, 200 021 | 'S SR | 878/SNA | PPER CREE | K EXPWY | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| TIME | 1st | DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1sT | DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 0100 0220 0300 0400 0500 06500 06500 06500 06500 06500 0700 0800 1000 1200 1200 1200 1200 14000 1500 1500 1500 1500 1200 2200 2200 2 | 38 21 19 24 24 353 354 450 354 450 354 411 323 380 370 370 351 329 329 329 329 329 329 329 329 329 329 | 42 27 19 44 178 398 3217 403 383 370 421 408 421 408 421 393 393 393 393 321 332 278 187 187 187 187 | 31 18 20 56 50 202 432 410 370 377 375 366 396 396 380 352 352 361 338 2322 177 51 | 26 20 21 28 101 250 428 261 369 391 344 419 442 442 442 433 3329 332 282 282 282 155 52 | $\begin{array}{c} 137\\ 86\\ 80\\ 90\\ 228\\ 733\\ 1601\\ 1138\\ 1594\\ 1594\\ 1594\\ 1594\\ 1594\\ 1597\\ 1584\\ 1597\\ 1429\\ 1584\\ 1597\\ 1489\\ 1365\\ 1282\\ 1028\\ 730\\ 472\\ 253\\ \end{array}$ | 59 29 26 14 13 32 100 173 239 299 287 302 368 324 348 378 302 337 339 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 289 28 | 57 39 24 15 14 44 109 273 255 274 346 373 327 306 373 327 306 374 382 328 328 328 328 328 99 95 | 38 30 18 10 17 47 134 255 308 260 290 324 324 322 34 322 34 327 357 384 329 373 285 192 126 104 81 | 45 23 19 25 68 155 268 308 269 321 383 326 383 377 334 362 256 362 256 362 257 130 77 | 199 121 87 52 69 191 498 874 1128 1083 1172 1355 1430 1299 1384 1486 1400 1456 1155 1456 1456 1456 1456 1551 786 599 3551 | 336 207 167 142 297 924 2099 2012 2664 2677 2598 2925 3084 2883 3008 3083 2802 2889 28821 2433 1814 1324 871 604 |
| 24-HOUF | R TOTALS | 3: | | | 24697 | | | | | 19967 | 44664 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DII HOUR 815 1430 615 | RECTION: VO | N LUME 1641 1661 1708 | F. | DIF HOUR 815 1445 1445 | ECTION: S VOLU 11 14 | ME .88 .92 .92 | co | MBINED HOUR 815 1430 1430 | DIRECT VOL 2 3 3 | IONS UME 829 143 143 |
| GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.55P COUNTY: 87 STATION: 0163 DESCRIPTION: SR 5/US-1, 200'S SR 878/SNAPPER CREEK EXPWY START DATE: 10/27/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GENERAT COUNTY: STATION DESCRIP START I START 7 | TED BY (N: PTION: DATE: TIME: | 87 0163 SR 5/US 10/27/2 0000 | -1, 200 021 |)' S SR | 878/SN# | APPER CREE | K EXPWY | | | | |
| GENERAT STATION DESCRIM START I START 7 | TED BY S N: PTION: DATE: TIME: 1ST | 87 0163 SR 5/US 10/27/2 0000 DIRE 2ND | -1, 200 021 | ' S SR N 4TH | 878/SNP | 1ST | CK EXPWY DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | S 4тн | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| COUNTY: STATIO DESCRII START I START I | EED BY 5 EIN: TTION: DATE: TTIME: 1ST 40 314 18 40 314 18 40 314 18 42 42 42 342 342 342 342 342 3 | 87 0163 SR 5/US 10/27/2 0000 DIRE 2ND 37 37 30 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 38 180 417 427 385 397 327 385 391 327 391 394 394 394 394 394 394 417 77 77 | -1, 200 021 | 9' S SR 4TH 255 300 226 474 474 474 474 474 474 474 47 | 878/SNF TOTAL 125 115 60 80 1683 1729 1641 1621 1575 1661 1575 1661 1399 1598 1430 1399 1599 1599 1599 1599 1599 1599 1599 | APPER CREE 18T 62 38 62 38 90 143 200 260 260 260 260 203 233 128 86 93 | 2K EXPWY DIRE 2ND 72 40 13 14 35 112 2266 208 219 254 278 278 278 278 278 278 278 278 278 278 | CTION: 3RD 41 19 466 128 187 187 283 283 293 322 283 322 293 337 322 293 337 322 293 327 327 293 327 327 293 327 327 293 327 327 293 327 327 293 327 293 327 327 327 293 327 293 327 327 293 327 327 293 327 327 293 327 327 293 327 327 293 327 293 327 327 293 327 293 327 293 327 293 327 293 327 293 327 293 327 293 327 293 327 293 327 293 327 295 295 295 295 295 295 295 295 295 295 | S 4TH 36 22 15 15 128 166 6 6 283 265 217 300 324 273 300 324 275 127 68 | TOTAL 211 119 55 55 176 62 176 61 103 103 1103 1103 1103 1103 1103 11 | COMBINED TOTAL 336 234 116 125 2420 2459 2459 2459 2456 2380 2703 2750 2750 2750 2750 2750 2750 2750 2751 2413 2413 18259 1259 886 636 |
| COUNTY; STATIO DESCRII START I START I | TED BY 4 TIME: TIME: TIME: TIME: TIME: 1ST 407 34 18 422 107 34 18 422 107 34 34 422 34 34 34 34 34 35 422 39 4315 363 374 357 357 357 357 357 357 357 357 | 87 97 98 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 97 | -1, 200 021 | 9' S SR N 4TH 255 30 13 27 90 2266 474 474 474 474 474 474 474 4 | 878/SNF TOTAL 125 115 60 80 231 730 1683 1729 1448 1621 1492 1341 1575 1647 1601 1412 1399 1518 1660 1337 1071 758 502 309 25244 EAK VOLU | APPER CREE 15T 62 38 17 17 13 29 90 143 169 217 220 240 275 275 275 275 290 323 299 314 290 233 128 86 93 128 129 129 129 129 129 129 129 129 | 2K EXPWY DIRE 2ND 72 40 13 72 14 35 112 199 226 208 219 226 208 219 226 208 219 226 208 219 226 208 219 226 208 219 226 209 13 314 313 262 294 314 313 262 294 314 291 333 262 291 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20 | CTION: 3RD 41 19 46 128 128 196 284 255 292 3322 352 277 197 197 197 197 197 197 197 1 | S 4TH 366 128 22 215 19 16 666 128 2257 241 2217 241 2217 241 2307 307 300 324 307 300 324 302 241 25 26 26 27 26 27 26 28 30 27 24 19 26 22 25 27 24 19 26 22 25 26 21 27 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 22 24 20 24 20 24 20 20 24 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 | TOTAL 211 119 55 62 176 4591 843 838 964 1039 1128 1103 1198 1266 1262 1229 13301 1076 750 501 389 327 7 17042 | COMBINED TOTAL 336 234 116 135 293 906 2141 2459 2456 2380 2703 2750 2799 2661 2747 2761 2761 2761 2761 2761 2761 2761 276 |

Appendix | A





| COUNTY STATIO DESCRI START I START I | : N: PTION: DATE: FIME: | 87 0163 SR 5/U 10/28/2 0000 | 8-1, 200 2021 |)'S SR | 878/SN | APPER CREE | K EXPW | Z | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| TIME | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | SCTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 0100 0200 0400 0500 0600 0500 0600 0700 0800 1000 1200 1200 1200 1200 1200 12 | 45 23 16 23 20 346 440 342 350 381 352 375 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 259 214 130 62 | 45 25 19 21 35 152 400 474 409 386 410 386 401 386 401 386 390 333 262 263 145 51 | 34 35 18 204 455 365 257 373 365 257 373 365 257 373 365 257 373 365 257 373 365 257 374 365 257 374 365 257 374 365 257 374 365 257 374 365 257 374 365 257 374 365 257 375 356 257 375 365 257 375 365 257 375 365 257 375 365 257 375 365 257 375 356 257 375 356 257 375 356 257 375 356 257 375 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 356 257 357 356 257 357 356 257 357 356 257 357 357 357 357 357 357 357 357 357 3 | 36 28 26 23 107 258 476 399 370 379 370 379 371 385 373 418 344 343 310 252 252 252 252 252 252 274 74 | $\begin{array}{c} 160\\ 111\\ 79\\ 88\\ 715\\ 1671\\ 1681\\ 1496\\ 1508\\ 1496\\ 1562\\ 1543\\ 1486\\ 1562\\ 1543\\ 1486\\ 1382\\ 1474\\ 1382\\ 1474\\ 1382\\ 1474\\ 1382\\ 237\end{array}$ | 55 38 33 7 14 22 55 157 163 228 224 355 367 341 343 367 341 345 285 224 355 234 408 386 285 234 179 129 139 | 54 21 18 12 12 11 28 88 156 184 217 319 347 425 389 377 306 437 425 387 307 425 387 307 425 387 307 425 387 307 307 90 | 40 25 21 10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 | 34 19 17 17 124 160 124 160 189 188 326 370 389 365 385 385 385 385 385 385 385 385 385 38 | $\begin{array}{c} 183\\ 103\\ 89\\ 0\\ 60\\ 140\\ 371\\ 653\\ 694\\ 139\\ 1441\\ 1571\\ 1579\\ 1469\\ 1694\\ 1571\\ 1579\\ 1469\\ 1694\\ 639\\ 639\\ 403\\ \end{array}$ | 343 214 168 288 855 2048 2334 2154 2238 2341 2547 2937 3031 3012 23180 2953 3053 2950 2357 1833 864 640 |
| 24-HOU | R TOTAL: | 3: | | | 24290 | | | | | 19411 | 43701 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DII HOUR 645 1415 630 | RECTION | N DLUME 1758 1579 1845 | P | EAK VOL DI HOUR 845 1500 1500 | UME INFORM RECTION: S VOLU 7 16 16 | ATION ME 31 94 94 | co | MBINED HOUR 645 1500 1500 | DIRECT VOL 2 3 3 | IONS UME 375 180 180 |

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.55P

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| COUNT | Y: 87 - MIA | MI-DA | DE | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------|-------|-----|---------|-------|-----|--------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| SITE: | 2002 - SR | 878/8 | NAP | PER CRK | EXPWY | , 5 | 00' W SR 5/1 | JS-1 | | |
| YEAR | AADT | | DI | RECTION | 1 | DI | RECTION 2 | *K FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR |
| 2021 | 24000 | C | E | 12000 | | W | 12000 | 9.00 | 65.00 | 2.60 |
| 2020 | 26500 | č | Ē | 12000 | | W | 14500 | 9.00 | 63.60 | 2.70 |
| 2019 | 25000 | C | E | 11500 | | W | 13500 | 9.00 | 66.00 | 3.10 |
| 2018 | 27500 | C | E | 12500 | | W | 15000 | 9.00 | 64.80 | 2.50 |
| 2017 | 25000 | C | E | 12000 | | W | 13000 | 9.00 | 76.00 | 2.90 |
| 2016 | 27000 | C | Ε | 12500 | | W | 14500 | 9.00 | 66.10 | 2.60 |
| 2015 | 27000 | C | E | 12500 | | W | 14500 | 9.00 | 66.80 | 2.90 |
| 2014 | 25500 | C | E | 11500 | | W | 14000 | 9.00 | 65.30 | 2.70 |
| 2013 | 24500 | C | E | 12500 | | W | 12000 | 9.00 | 63.90 | 2.30 |
| 2012 | 31000 | C | E | 15000 | | W | 16000 | 9.00 | 78.20 | 2.50 |
| 2011 | 24500 | C | E | 11000 | | W | 13500 | 9.00 | 76.00 | 2.30 |
| 2010 | 25500 | C | Е | 11500 | | W | 14000 | 11.38 | 74.34 | 2.00 |
| 2009 | 31000 | C | E | 14500 | | W | 16500 | 10.18 | 74.76 | 3.40 |
| 2008 | 30500 | C | E | 13500 | | W | 17000 | 10.31 | 74.73 | 3.60 |
| 2007 | 31000 | C | E | 13500 | | W | 17500 | 10.02 | 74.90 | 3.30 |
| 2006 | 30500 | С | E | 13000 | | W | 17500 | 10.06 | 56.25 | 1.50 |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; X = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES



| COUNTY: STATION DESCRIP START D. START T. | : TION: ATE: IME: | 87 2002 SR 878 03/09/ 0000 | /SNAPPE 2021 | R CRK E | XPWY, 50 | 00' | W SR 5 | 5∕us−1 | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| TIME | 1ST | DIR 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | E 4TH | TOTAL | | 1st | DIRE 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | W 4 TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 0100 02200 0300 0400 0500 0500 0500 0700 1000 1000 1200 1300 1400 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 1500 15 | 17 5 1 2 4 28 146 311 329 268 251 210 197 215 218 218 2172 172 172 172 172 172 172 172 172 17 | 6 5 4 5 7 40 311 257 186 186 186 186 187 187 187 187 187 187 187 187 188 382 38 32 28 | 12 2 7 5 5 32 2322 329 246 222 198 246 222 198 198 145 158 1451 166 90 64 28 19 18 | 5 4 1 9 76 284 332 266 332 227 179 179 176 192 155 176 152 74 4 64 49 24 17 | 40 16 13 16 35 176 831 1399 1301 1037 916 773 740 641 641 643 362 308 171 99 82 | | 29 16 11 7 5 16 34 112 174 180 151 149 150 158 185 229 158 185 229 1314 254 224 123 8 8 70 34 | 34 10 12 12 13 14 13 14 13 12 17 13 12 17 13 12 17 17 12 286 266 266 266 311 277 123 99 71 35 | 33 13 8 10 13 766 145 156 145 169 136 163 184 229 319 326 298 169 124 91 41 | 20 7 5 4 8 22 94 178 137 137 137 137 137 137 137 137 137 137 | 116 46 36 25 29 70 268 558 614 610 550 642 687 833 1071 1166 1266 1266 1266 1266 1266 1266 12 | 156 62 49 41 64 246 1099 1987 1986 1651 1526 1322 1382 1382 1382 1382 1332 1382 1333 1078 775 523 328 244 |
| 24-hour | TOTAL | S: | | | 12456 | | | | | | 12298 | 24754 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DI: HOUR 715 1415 715 | RECTION V | : E DLUME 1417 802 1417 | P | EAK VOLU DII HOUR 730 1700 1700 | UME | INFORM FION: V VOLU | 4ATION ₩ JME 591 266 266 | C | DMBINED HOUR 715 1700 715 | DIRECT VOL 2 1 2 | IONS UME 067 913 067 |

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P

| COUNTY: STATION DESCRIP START D. START T. | : TION: ATE: IME: | 87 2002 SR 878/ 03/10/2 0000 | SNAPPEF 021 | CRK E | XPWY, 50 |)0' W SR 5 | /us-1 | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| TIME | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | E 4TH | TOTAL | 1ST | DIRH 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | W 4 TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 0100 0200 0300 0500 0600 0700 1000 1200 1200 1200 1400 1500 1500 1500 1500 1200 1200 2000 22000 2200 2300 | $10 \\ 4 \\ 2 \\ 6 \\ 11 \\ 304 \\ 275 \\ 262 \\ 236 \\ 236 \\ 262 \\ 187 \\ 212 \\ 173 \\ 155 \\ 109 \\ 101 \\ 41 \\ 26 \\ 100 \\ 10$ | 7 5 2 4 5 37 362 336 257 235 182 206 163 152 206 163 153 152 206 163 153 25 20 25 | 10 1 5 7 47 223 283 274 188 148 148 149 133 100 66 50 24 14 | 64 4 1 6 288 3064 228 1678 214 2165 155 155 555 351 19 | 33 14 10 23 51 206 797 1311 1267 774 732 966 774 732 645 629 645 629 645 629 177 645 84 | 34 28 11 8 10 13 35 98 161 140 139 150 125 185 208 207 278 207 278 207 279 230 151 98 5 43 | 29 23 10 10 17 46 115 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 201 250 278 201 250 263 174 125 95 53 | 24 12 13 8 8 17 67 133 142 136 154 142 142 154 154 154 187 292 346 325 244 163 123 85 72 47 | 31 18 8 29 988 166 158 164 155 164 155 166 2366 310 310 310 237 175 99 67 62 41 | $\begin{array}{c} 118\\ 81\\ 45\\ 53\\ 76\\ 246\\ 534\\ 614\\ 548\\ 606\\ 587\\ 634\\ 730\\ 874\\ 1059\\ 1216\\ 1059\\ 12262\\ 1023\\ 743\\ 348\\ 345\\ 264\\ 184\\ \end{array}$ | 151 95 54 87 282 1043 1845 1881 1626 1572 1361 1366 1479 1696 1751 1861 1861 1861 1891 1604 1144 790 522 400 268 |
| 24-hour | TOTALS | : | | | 12470 | | | | | 12354 | 24824 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DIF HOUR 715 1400 715 | ECTION: VO | E LUME 1313 822 1313 | P | EAK VOLU DII HOUR 745 1630 1630 | DME INFORM RECTION: W VOLU 6 12 12 | ATION ME 36 87 87 | C | DMBINED HOUR 730 1630 1630 | DIRECT VOL 1 1 | IONS UME 914 921 921 |

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P





| COUNTY STATIO DESCRI START START | : N: PTION: DATE: TIME: | 87 2002 SR 878 03/11/ 0000 | /SNAPPE 2021 | R CRK E | XPWY, 5 | 00' W SR | 5/US-1 | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| TIME | 1ST | DIR 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | Е 4ТН | TOTAL | 1sT | DIRI 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | W 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| 0000 0100 0200 0400 0500 0600 0700 0800 0900 1000 1200 1400 1500 1500 1600 1700 1800 1800 1200 2200 2200 2200 2200 | 10 11 4 4 10 34 103 294 286 232 266 232 266 232 181 181 156 228 184 156 120 6 35 351 22 | $\begin{array}{c} 7\\ 5\\ 0\\ 4\\ 3\\ 3\\ 0\\ 266\\ 282\\ 179\\ 167\\ 167\\ 167\\ 167\\ 188\\ 180\\ 157\\ 136\\ 157\\ 136\\ 95\\ 766\\ 26\\ 23\\ 22\\ \end{array}$ | 7 8 5 4 4 222 246 211 126 214 126 214 126 148 228 140 157 167 178 114 37 38 25 11 | 14 4 5 6 199 98 260 302 252 240 179 187 160 145 8 2 47 38 29 10 | 38 28 14 18 206 745 1228 1002 672 671 671 671 658 614 785 658 614 1236 614 785 658 614 1236 65 | 45 23 13 7 6 11 40 207 180 143 143 143 143 143 177 169 247 288 280 278 280 278 277 77 77 41 | 33 14 5 4 6 15 15 131 109 151 158 152 211 244 2578 2578 244 2578 1516 799 55 36 | 26 13 11 7 00 22 70 8 158 145 158 145 158 145 158 143 143 162 212 225 295 295 238 185 62 68 62 68 43 | $\begin{array}{c} 25\\ 5\\ 4\\ 6\\ 6\\ 31\\ 102\\ 188\\ 168\\ 146\\ 154\\ 154\\ 166\\ 154\\ 166\\ 174\\ 216\\ 278\\ 262\\ 230\\ 158\\ 98\\ 98\\ 72\\ 61\\ 39\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 129\\ 55\\ 33\\ 24\\ 28\\ 79\\ 259\\ 642\\ 604\\ 610\\ 691\\ 671\\ 789\\ 995\\ 1089\\ 1106\\ 1024\\ 674\\ 1024\\ 431\\ 290\\ 220\\ 159\end{array}$ | $ \begin{array}{c} 167\\ 83\\ 47\\ 42\\ 69\\ 285\\ 1004\\ 1841\\ 1694\\ 1466\\ 1282\\ 1362\\ 1290\\ 1573\\ 1780\\ 1747\\ 1770\\ 1617\\ 667\\ 667\\ 667\\ 669\\ 224\\ \end{array} $ |
| 24-HOU | R TOTAL | s: | | | 11597 | | | | | 11878 | 23475 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DI HOUR 700 1415 700 | RECTION | E DLUME 1228 856 1228 | | EAK VOL DI HOUR 715 1730 1730 | UME INFOR RECTION: VOL 1 1 | MATION W UME 674 125 125 | C | OMBINED HOUR 715 1545 715 | DIRECT VOL 1 1 1 | IONS UME 896 790 896 |

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| COUNTY | Z: 87 - MIZ | AMI-DA | ADE | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--------|---------|--------|------|------|--------|--------|-----|-----------|---------|--------|--------|
| SITE: | 8660 - SW | 88TH | STREET, | 200' | WEST | r of | SW 57 | AVE (2 | 011 | OFFSYSTEM | CYCLE, | CL:636 |) |
| YEAR | AADT | | DIRECT | TION 1 | | DIR | ECTION | 2 | *K | FACTOR | D FACTO | DR I | FACTOR |
| 2021 | 7100 | F | E 36 | 500 | | W | 3500 | | | 9.00 | 55.0 | 00 | 3.50 |
| 2020 | 7500 | C | E 38 | 300 | | W | 3700 | | | 9.00 | 56.0 | 00 | 2.40 |
| 2019 | 7200 | т | E 31 | 00 | | W | 4100 | | | 9.00 | 56.0 | 00 | 2.90 |
| 2018 | 7400 | S | E 32 | 200 | | W | 4200 | | | 9.00 | 54. | 30 | 2.90 |
| 2017 | 8300 | F | E 36 | 00 | | W | 4700 | | | 9.00 | 59. | 30 | 2.70 |
| 2016 | 8500 | c | E 37 | 0.0 | | W | 4800 | | | 9.00 | 56. | 10 | 3.30 |
| 2015 | 9500 | Ψ. | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 9.00 | 57.4 | 10 | 5.30 |
| 2014 | 9600 | ŝ | | | | | | | | 9 00 | 59 | 30 | 7 50 |
| 2013 | 9700 | F | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 9 00 | 58 0 | a n | 16 20 |
| 2012 | 9800 | ĉ | E | õ | | W | ŏ | | | 9.00 | 59 | 70 | 16.00 |
| | 5000 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 5.00 | | | 10.00 |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; X = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| COUNT | Y: 87 - MI# | AMI-DA | DE | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------|--------|----|-----------|--------|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| SITE: | 0163 - SR | 5/US- | 1, | 200' S SR | 878/SN | APPER CREEK | EXPWY | | |
| YEAR | AADT | | DI | RECTION 1 | DI | RECTION 2 | *K FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR |
| 2021 | 40500 | C | N | 22500 | S | 18000 | 9.00 | 55.00 | 2.90 |
| 2020 | 41000 | Ċ | N | 19500 | S | 21500 | 9.00 | 56.00 | 2.90 |
| 2019 | 53500 | С | Ν | 25500 | S | 28000 | 9.00 | 56.00 | 2.40 |
| 2018 | 47500 | C | N | 26000 | S | 21500 | 9.00 | 54.30 | 2.30 |
| 2017 | 55000 | C | N | 27000 | S | 28000 | 9.00 | 54.00 | 2.00 |
| 2016 | 53500 | C | Ν | 28000 | S | 25500 | 9.00 | 56.10 | 2.90 |
| 2015 | 52000 | C | N | 23000 | S | 29000 | 9.00 | 57.40 | 3.70 |
| 2014 | 52000 | C | N | 26000 | S | 26000 | 9.00 | 59.30 | 3.40 |
| 2013 | 51000 | С | N | 21500 | S | 29500 | 9.00 | 58.90 | 5.00 |
| 2012 | 67000 | C | N | 33500 | S | 33500 | 9.00 | 59.70 | 5.10 |
| 2011 | 64000 | C | N | 33500 | S | 30500 | 9.00 | 58.20 | 3.90 |
| 2010 | 58000 | С | Ν | 29500 | S | 28500 | 7.87 | 58.27 | 4.30 |
| 2009 | 53000 | C | N | 26000 | S | 27000 | 7.98 | 59.96 | 4.90 |
| 2008 | 56000 | С | N | 27500 | S | 28500 | 8.07 | 66.31 | 3.70 |
| 2007 | 56500 | C | N | 28500 | S | 28000 | 7.90 | 63.12 | 3.50 |
| 2006 | 53500 | С | N | 26000 | S | 27500 | 7.39 | 58.66 | 8.00 |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; C = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES

| COUNTY: STATION DESCRIP START D START T | : TION: ATE: IME: | 87 0163 SR 5/US 10/26/2 0000 | 5-1, 200 2021 |)'S SR | 878/SN2 | APP: | ER CREI | SK EXPWY | ŗ | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|------|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| TIME | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | | 1st | DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL | |
| 0000 0100 0200 0400 0500 0600 0700 0800 1000 1200 1200 1200 1200 1200 12 | 38 21 24 27 27 27 27 343 353 354 459 354 353 354 353 353 380 376 376 323 351 330 351 330 7207 209 141 79 | 42 27 19 44 178 398 217 403 380 421 403 390 421 396 421 396 421 393 399 321 332 821 332 821 332 87 129 71 | 31 18 202 432 210 361 377 395 366 396 396 396 352 352 352 361 338 232 2177 1177 51 | 26 20 21 28 101 250 428 261 369 391 344 419 462 442 431 332 379 332 282 282 282 282 282 255 52 | $\begin{array}{c} 137\\ 86\\ 800\\ 900\\ 228\\ 733\\ 1601\\ 1138\\ 1536\\ 1594\\ 1426\\ 1594\\ 1426\\ 1594\\ 1426\\ 1584\\ 1624\\ 1584\\ 1624\\ 1597\\ 1400\\ 1489\\ 1365\\ 1282\\ 1028\\ 1282\\ 1028\\ 253\end{array}$ | | 59 29 26 14 13 32 100 173 239 299 299 302 302 302 302 302 302 302 302 302 302 | 57 39 24 15 15 196 273 274 373 306 374 374 373 306 374 328 328 328 228 190 95 | 38 30 18 17 47 134 255 308 260 324 334 322 347 384 362 347 384 362 126 104 81 | 45 23 19 15 25 250 308 269 321 383 355 326 383 377 334 376 362 256 157 130 85 77 | 199 121 17 52 69 191 498 874 1128 874 1128 1430 1299 1384 1436 1430 1299 1384 14400 14400 1384 1451 786 594 399 355 | 336 207 167 42 297 924 2099 2012 2664 2688 2988 3083 3083 3083 3083 3083 3083 3083 3 | |
| 24-HOUR | TOTALS | : | | | 24697 | | | | | | 19967 | 44664 | |
| DIRECTION: N HOUR VOLUME A.M. 815 1641 P.M. 1430 1661 DAILY 615 1708 | | | | P | PEAK VOLUME INFORMATION DIRECTION: S HOUR VOLUME 815 1188 1445 1492 1445 1492 | | | | COMBINED DIRECTIONS HOUR VOLUME 815 2829 1430 3143 1430 3143 | | | | |

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.55P





GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.55P

| Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization | þ |
|--|---|

| TIME | 1st | DIRE 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1ST | DIR 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINEI TOTAL |
|---------|---------|-------------|----------------|----------|----------|---------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------|--------|-------------------|
| 0000 | 45 | 45 | 3.4 | 36 | 160 | 55 | 54 | 40 | 34 | 183 | 343 |
| 0100 | 23 | 25 | 35 | 28 | 111 | 38 | 21 | 25 | 19 | 103 | 214 |
| 0200 | 16 | 19 | 18 | 26 | 79 | 33 | 18 | 21 | 17 | 89 | 168 |
| 0300 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 23 | 88 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 40 | 128 |
| 0400 | 28 | 35 | 58 | 107 | 228 | 14 | 11 | 21 | 14 | 60 | 288 |
| 0500 | 101 | 152 | 204 | 258 | 715 | 22 | 28 | 40 | 50 | 140 | 855 |
| 0600 | 346 | 400 | 455 | 476 | 1677 | 57 | 88 | 102 | 124 | 371 | 2048 |
| 0700 | 440 | 474 | 368 | 399 | 1681 | 126 | 158 | 209 | 160 | 653 | 2334 |
| 0800 | 342 | 367 | 372 | 379 | 1460 | 157 | 156 | 192 | 189 | 694 | 2154 |
| 0900 | 363 | 419 | 356 | 370 | 1508 | 163 | 184 | 195 | 188 | 730 | 2238 |
| 1000 | 350 | 401 | 365 | 379 | 1495 | 228 | 217 | 183 | 218 | 846 | 2341 |
| 1100 | 381 | 409 | 257 | 301 | 1348 | 224 | 319 | 330 | 326 | 1199 | 2547 |
| 1200 | 352 | 386 | 373 | 385 | 1496 | 355 | 347 | 369 | 370 | 1441 | 2937 |
| 1300 | 375 | 410 | 404 | 373 | 1562 | 367 | 357 | 356 | 389 | 1469 | 3031 |
| 1400 | 355 | 401 | 369 | 418 | 1543 | 341 | 380 | 383 | 365 | 1469 | 3012 |
| 1500 | 391 | 380 | 334 | 381 | 1486 | 383 | 437 | 422 | 452 | 1694 | 3180 |
| 1600 | 348 | 363 | 327 | 344 | 1382 | 367 | 425 | 394 | 385 | 1571 | 2953 |
| 1700 | 349 | 390 | 392 | 343 | 1474 | 408 | 389 | 397 | 385 | 1579 | 3053 |
| 1800 | 356 | 351 | 344 | 310 | 1361 | 386 | 377 | 392 | 404 | 1559 | 2920 |
| 1900 | 295 | 333 | 336 | 252 | 1216 | 285 | 306 | 284 | 266 | 1141 | 2357 |
| 2000 | 259 | 262 | 205 | 208 | 934 | 234 | 270 | 224 | 151 | 879 | 1813 |
| 2100 | 214 | 145 | 151 | 134 | 644 | 179 | 173 | 146 | 141 | 639 | 1283 |
| 2200 | 130 | 107 | 94 | 74 | 405 | 129 | 129 | 98 | 103 | 459 | 864 |
| 2300 | 62 | 51 | 54 | 70 | 237 | 139 | 90 | 106 | 68 | 403 | 640 |
| 24-HOUI | R TOTAL | S : | | | 24290 | | | | | 19411 | 43701 |
| | | | | P | EAK VOLU | IME INFORM | ATTON | | | | |
| | DII | RECTION | : N | | DII | RECTION: S | 5 | CC | MBINED | DIRECT | IONS |
| | HOUR | VC | JLUME | | HOUR | VOLU | JME | | HOUR | VOL | UME |
| A.M. | 645 | | 1758 | | 845 | i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i | 731 | | 645 | 2 | 375 |
| Р.М. | 1415 | | 1579 | | 1500 | 16 | 594 | | 1500 | 3 | 180 |
| DAILY | 630 | | 1845 | | 1500 | 16 | 594 | | 1500 | 3 | 180 |

GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.55P

| COUNTY: STATION DESCRIP START D START T | : TION: ATE: IME: | 87 0163 SR 5/US 10/27/2 0000 | -1, 200 021 |)'S SR | 878/SNJ | APPER CREE | K EXPWI | 2 | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| TIME | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1st | DIRE 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL |
| $\begin{array}{c} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $ | 40 34 14 42 107 362 487 422 342 342 342 342 343 374 357 357 347 357 347 357 347 357 347 357 347 357 347 357 347 357 347 357 347 357 347 357 357 357 357 357 357 357 357 357 35 | 37 30 13 13 38 180 417 385 327 391 327 391 327 394 391 394 394 394 394 394 394 394 394 394 394 | 23 21 20 22 61 217 430 375 342 403 370 266 403 370 266 420 414 332 360 395 338 349 260 199 107 62 | 25 30 13 27 90 226 474 407 285 369 395 285 405 414 4229 357 3857 3857 371 290 416 4 97 67 | 125 115 60 80 1683 1729 1448 1621 1492 1341 1575 1647 1601 1412 1399 1516 1647 1601 1337 1071 758 502 309 | 62 38 17 17 13 29 90 143 169 217 220 260 275 275 275 275 275 275 275 290 299 299 292 292 299 299 299 299 299 | $\begin{array}{c} 72\\ 40\\ 13\\ 7\\ 14\\ 37\\ 12\\ 199\\ 226\\ 208\\ 219\\ 226\\ 208\\ 278\\ 278\\ 275\\ 294\\ 314\\ 296\\ 291\\ 333\\ 2145\\ 145\\ 145\\ 140\\ 87\\ \end{array}$ | 41 19 11 12 128 128 128 223 196 284 255 292 283 293 322 337 322 337 322 277 122 86 6 79 | 36 22 15 19 16 66 128 162 225 217 241 270 283 267 321 320 320 320 320 320 320 320 7 330 320 320 567 320 7 320 66 66 66 66 66 66 66 128 9 7 9 7 66 66 66 66 66 66 66 66 225 5 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 247 | 211 119 56 55 62 176 458 69 1128 843 838 964 1039 1128 1103 1198 1262 1229 1301 1076 501 389 327 | 336 234 116 135 234 135 239 906 2141 2420 2456 2456 2456 2456 2456 2750 2750 2750 2750 2750 2750 2750 2750 |
| 24-HOUR | TOTAL | 3 : | | | 25244 | | | | | 17042 | 42286 |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | DII HOUR 645 1300 630 | RECTION: VC | N DLUME 1796 1647 1851 | P | EAK VOLU DII HOUR 815 1745 1745 | UME INFORM RECTION: S VOLUI 81 13 13 | ATION 4E 91 23 23 | c | DMBINED HOUR 645 1415 1415 | DIRECT VOL 2 2 2 2 | IONS UME 453 843 843 |

| Γ | Γ | | | A | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT COUNTY: 87 - MIAMI-DADE SITE: 2532 - SR 5/US-1, 200' S SR 94/KENDALL DR/SW 88 ST DIRECTION 2 YEAR AADT DIRECTION 1 *K FACTOR D FACTOR T FACTOR S 22500 S 24000 S 24000 S 24000 S 24000 S 24000 S 25000 S 27000 S 25000 S 27500 S 27500 S 27500 S 27500 S 27500 S 27000 S 27000 S 27000 20000 19000 21500 21500 23000 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 55.00 56.00 54.30 54.30 54.00 57.40 59.70 58.90 58.27 59.96 66.31 63.12 58.662021 $\begin{array}{c} 42500 \\ 38500 \\ 45500 \\ 45500 \\ 47500 \\ 48000 \\ 24500 \\ 53500 \\ 53500 \\ 53500 \\ 53500 \\ 54500 \\ 54500 \\ 54500 \\ 54500 \\ 54500 \\ 554500 \\ 55000 \\ 51500 \\ 51500 \\ 0 \\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 5.50\\ 5.10\\ 2.60\\ 2.80\\ 4.20\\ 4.30\\ 5.30\\ 5.90\\ 4.70\\ 4.70\\ 4.70\\ 4.70\\ 4.70\\ 3.60\\ 4.80\\ 4.40\end{array}$ NNNNNNNNNN 2020 2019 2018 2017 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 7.87 2016 2015 2014 2013 2012 24500 22500 22500 23500 26500 25000 25000 25000 24500 24500 25000 2011 2010 N N 2009 2008 2007 7.98 8.07 7.90 7.39 N N N 2006 Ν 4.00 AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITMATE; A = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES COUNTY: STATION: DESCRIPTION: START DATE: START TIME: 87 2532 58 5/US-1, 200' S SR 94/KENDALL DR/SW 88 ST 06/29/2021 0000 DIRECTION: N 2ND 3RD 4TH DIRECTION: S 2ND 3RD 4TH COMBINED TOTAL TIME 1st TOTAL 1st TOTAL 72 35 20 11 27 52 82 30 14 7 552 325 285 74 104 1296 3140 3200 4020 417 4697 488 3477 488 3477 2900 1527 90220 120 99 83 $\begin{array}{c} 100\\ 62\\ 29\\ 53\\ 143\\ 701\\ 1132\\ 1231\\ 1122\\ 1138\\ 1112\\ 1089\\ 1053\\ 1114\\ 1093\\ 1143\\ 1093\\ 1143\\ 1093\\ 1143\\ 1093\\ 649\\ 4791\\ 212\\ \end{array}$ 0000 0100 0200 0300 0400 0500 0500 0600 0700 0800 0900 1000 1100 25 15 17 41 52 27 18 22 45 77 171 285 294 318 3905 414 439 409 320 182 128 136 289 972 1628 2071 2223 2363 2471 2673 2703 2789 15 9 9 16 2388 330 269 283 300 264 287 267 309 311 285 263 15 29 259 308 281 271 272 269 263 266 283 316 $146 \\ 271 \\ 496 \\ 1101 \\ 1225 \\ 1359 \\ 1580 \\ 1675 \\ 1846 \\ 1865 \\ 1762 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 794 \\ 5794 \\ 488 \\ 347 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1204 \\ 1075 \\ 1004 \\$ 35 222 323 307 281 274 287 287 298 264 283 306 246 267 230 159 117 164 263 2991 367 390 404 417 464 484 406 295 288 219 148 130 104 1200 1300 1400 1500 1600 2939 3008 2967 311 273 219 159 131 103 74 294 259 223 160 127 2556 2303 1968 1443 1053 1700 1800 1900 2000 2100 2200 2300 211 152 95 89 43 85 39 83 54 879 559 74 18386 24-HOUR TOTALS: 22237 40623 PEAK VOLUME INFORMATION DIRECTION: S HOUR VOLUME 845 1201 1430 1921 1430 1921 COMBINED DIRECTIONS HOUR VOLUME 845 2325 1530 3056 1530 3056 DIRECTION: N HOUR VOLUME 715 1236 1615 1251 1615 1251 A.M. P.M. DAILY TRUCK PERCENTAGE 7.41 3.54 5.29 CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY DATABASE 12 0 1 DIR N S 1 2 3 4 128 14705 2184 233 74 19220 2156 61 6 97 152 7 6 39 9 63 56 10 24 109 11 0 0 13 12 10 14 0 0 15 TOTTRK TOTVOL 6 1363 18386 0 787 22237 8 5 5 679 265 249 94

Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P





FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSFORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| COUNTY: 87 - MIAMI-DADE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| SITE: 0683 - SR 94/KENDALL DR, 200' W DADELAND BLVD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| YEAR AADT DIRECTION 1 DIRECTION 2 | *K FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR | | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 9.00\\ 7.87\\ 7.98\\ 8.07\\ 7.99\\ 7.39\end{array}$ | 55.00 56.00 54.30 54.40 57.40 57.40 59.30 58.20 58.20 58.27 59.96 66.31 63.12 58.66 | $\begin{array}{c} 7.70\\ 3.90\\ 2.90\\ 2.20\\ 5.10\\ 3.90\\ 7.80\\ 6.20\\ 6.20\\ 7.80\\ 7.90\\ 7.40\\ 8.50\\ 6.60\\ 4.20\end{array}$ | | | | | | | | | |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; A = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES

| COUNI STATI DESCR STARI STARI | Y: ON: IPTION: DATE: TIME: | 87 0683 SR 94 08/24 0000 | /kendali /2021 | DR, 20 |)0' W DA | DEL2 | AND BLA | 7D | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|---------------|--|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| TIME | 1st | DI: 2ND | RECTION: 3RD | E 4TH | TOTAL | | 1ST | DIR 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | W 4TH | TOTAL | COMB TC | INED | | | |
| 0000 0100 0300 0400 0500 0600 0700 0800 1000 1200 1200 1200 1400 1500 1400 1500 1400 1500 1400 1200 2000 2200 2200 2200 | 79 23 19 11 14 25 211 288 267 285 339 303 326 292 323 315 274 259 204 259 204 153 153 | 58 26 26 26 20 225 264 236 236 236 236 236 236 236 236 236 236 | 41 24 23 13 26 54 58 288 262 279 301 303 291 303 291 338 307 308 309 300 253 3167 141 141 | 37 38 38 21 22 10 34 94 280 237 278 295 316 359 327 327 327 320 291 306 273 228 176 273 228 176 26 26 273 26 273 26 273 26 273 26 274 275 275 275 295 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 | 215 111 80 213 694 1012 1041 1021 1077 1166 1336 1338 1318 1225 1227 1127 1225 1227 1267 986 769 9561 552 324 | | 38 23 11 15 16 46 139 202 223 229 317 330 286 386 386 488 407 3286 386 488 407 3242 224 214 73 | 51 22 10 13 28 86 160 214 193 232 256 265 299 353 377 422 530 395 3076 202 202 202 202 202 68 | 29 21 15 35 224 216 35 224 216 24 216 24 249 291 359 384 387 493 369 301 244 161 118 55 | 28 14 14 10 203 271 251 344 337 348 349 451 426 319 321 205 152 152 155 57 | $\begin{array}{c} 146\\ 80\\ 80\\ 449\\ 52\\ 108\\ 321\\ 321\\ 858\\ 835\\ 929\\ 954\\ 1217\\ 1277\\ 1346\\ 1496\\ 1644\\ 1937\\ 1490\\ 1282\\ 977\\ 739\\ 477\\ 253\end{array}$ | | 361 97 142 321 015 709 899 856 0006 1200 553 5515 6654 723 869 1657 2268 746 3089 577 | | | |
| 24-HO | UR TOTA | LS: | | | 18658 | | | | | | 19212 | 37 | 870 | | | |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | D HOU 81 120 120 | IRECTIO R 5 0 0 | N: E VOLUME 1118 1336 1336 | 1 | PEAK VOL DI HOUR 815 1645 1645 | UME | INFORM FION: W VOLU 19 19 | ATION ₩ JME 379 962 962 | с | OMBINED HOUR 815 1645 1645 | DIRECT VOI 3 3 | IONS JUME 997 174 174 | | | | |
| TRUCK | PERCEN | TAGE | 4.16 | | | | 12.95 | 5 | | | 8.6 | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | CLA | SIFICAT | NOI | SUMMAR | RY DATA | BASE | | | | | | | |
| DIR E W | 1 0 152 14 147 | 2 3 83 259 84 192 | 4 8 215 7 243 | 5 443 492 | 6 36 554 | 7 14 14 | 8 42 952 | 9 27 159 | 10 0 73 | 11 0 0 | 12 0 0 | 13 0 0 | 14 0 0 | 15 0 0 | TOTTRK 777 2487 | TOTVOL 18658 19212 |
| GENER | ATED BY | SPS 5. | 0.57p | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

TP Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization





FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| COUNTY: 87 - MIAMI-DADE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|----|-----------|--------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| SITE: 2532 - SR 5/US-1, 200' S SR 94/KENDALL DR/SW 88 ST | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| YEAR | AADT | DI | RECTION 1 | DI | RECTION 2 | *K FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2021 | 42500 C | N | 20000 | S | 22500 | 9.00 | 55.00 | 5.50 | | | | | |
| 2020 | 38500 C | N | 19000 | S | 19500 | 9.00 | 56.00 | 5.10 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 45500 C | N | 21500 | S | 24000 | 9.00 | 56.00 | 2.60 | | | | | |
| 2018 | 45500 C | N | 21500 | S | 24000 | 9.00 | 54.30 | 2.80 | | | | | |
| 2017 | 47500 C | N | 23000 | S | 24500 | 9.00 | 54.00 | 4.20 | | | | | |
| 2016 | 48500 C | N | 24500 | S | 24000 | 9.00 | 56.10 | 4.30 | | | | | |
| 2015 | 48000 C | N | 22500 | S | 25500 | 9.00 | 57.40 | 5.30 | | | | | |
| 2014 | 46500 C | N | 23500 | S | 23000 | 9.00 | 59.30 | 5.90 | | | | | |
| 2013 | 53500 F | N | 26500 | ŝ | 27000 | 9.00 | 58.90 | 4.70 | | | | | |
| 2012 | 53500 C | N | 26500 | S | 27000 | 9.00 | 59.70 | 4.70 | | | | | |
| 2011 | 50000 C | N | 25000 | S | 25000 | 9.00 | 58.20 | 4.70 | | | | | |
| 2010 | 54500 C | N | 27000 | S | 27500 | 7.87 | 58.27 | 4.70 | | | | | |
| 2009 | 48500 C | N | 25000 | g | 23500 | 7 98 | 50 06 | 3 60 | | | | | |
| 2009 | 52000 C | N | 24500 | p | 27500 | 9.07 | 66 21 | 1 90 | | | | | |
| 2000 | 52000 C | N | 24500 | 20 | 27000 | 7.00 | 62 12 | 4.00 | | | | | |
| 2007 | 51500 C | 14 | 24500 | p c | 27000 | 7.90 | 53.12 | 4.40 | | | | | |
| 2006 | 53000 C | IN | 25000 | þ | 28000 | 1.39 | 58.66 | 4.00 | | | | | |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; L = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

COUNTY: 87 - MIAMI-DADE

| SITE: | 0110 - SR | 5/ | US−1, | 100' S S | R 826/P# | ALMETTO EX | PWY | | | |
|-------|-----------|----|-------|----------|----------|------------|-----|--------|----------|----------|
| YEAR | AADT | | DI | RECTION | 1 DI | RECTION 2 | *K | FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR |
| 2021 | 92500 | С | N | 45500 | S | 47000 | | 9.00 | 55.00 | 4.90 |
| 2020 | 78000 | С | N | 41500 | S | 36500 | | 9.00 | 56.00 | 5.10 |
| 2019 | 104500 | С | N | 54000 | S | 50500 | | 9.00 | 56.00 | 4.60 |
| 2018 | 87500 | С | N | 44000 | S | 43500 | | 9.00 | 54.30 | 4.80 |
| 2017 | 91500 | С | N | 45500 | S | 46000 | | 9.00 | 54.00 | 5.40 |
| 2016 | 95000 | С | N | 46500 | S | 48500 | | 9.00 | 56.10 | 4.70 |
| 2015 | 91500 | С | N | 45500 | S | 46000 | | 9.00 | 57.40 | 5.20 |
| 2014 | 99500 | С | N | 50500 | S | 49000 | | 9.00 | 59.30 | 5.80 |
| 2013 | 92000 | Е | N | 46000 | S | 46000 | | 9.00 | 58.90 | 5.40 |
| 2012 | 91000 | С | N | 45500 | S | 45500 | | 9.00 | 59.70 | 5.70 |
| 2011 | 92000 | С | N | 45000 | S | 47000 | | 9.00 | 58.20 | 6.10 |
| 2010 | 91500 | С | N | 46500 | S | 45000 | | 7.87 | 58.27 | 6.90 |
| 2009 | 91000 | С | N | 45500 | S | 45500 | | 7.98 | 59.96 | 6.30 |
| 2008 | 96000 | С | N | 48000 | S | 48000 | | 8.07 | 66.31 | 7.10 |
| 2007 | 93000 | С | N | 46500 | S | 46500 | | 7.90 | 63.12 | 8.00 |
| 2006 | 89000 | С | N | 45000 | S | 44000 | | 7.39 | 58.66 | 6.10 |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; L = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES


| COUNT STATI DESCR START START | DN: IPTION: DATE: TIME: | SR 5/US 07/13/2 0000 | 021 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| TIME | 1ST | DIRE 2ND | CTION: 3RD | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1ST | DIF 2ND | ECTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | CO | MBINED TOTAL | | | |
| 20000 2100 2200 2300 2500 2500 2500 2500 2500 25 | 96 52 300 44 63 226 03 756 593 795 6593 795 6744 923 9548 598 598 598 598 598 598 598 544 379 379 304 188 | 74 51 42 48 101 733 677 725 584 483 690 721 568 711 547 547 547 547 547 547 547 547 543 45 345 345 345 345 345 345 | 85 58 44 43 159 642 756 621 670 734 620 734 620 734 620 701 687 711 687 711 581 585 456 400 525 456 400 2881 225 | 63 48 35 63 168 621 850 625 709 5852 625 709 5852 682 585 682 595 389 358 255 389 255 282 284 | 318 209 151 198 491 1406 2599 3039 3015 2407 2349 2780 2780 2780 2780 2782 2407 2384 2454 2454 2454 2384 2384 2390 1904 1482 1202 1065 1182 2384 2390 2384 2390 2384 2390 2384 2390 2384 2390 2384 2390 2384 2390 2384 2390 2384 2384 2390 2384 2384 2384 2384 2384 2384 2384 2384 | 177 76 44 43 311 331 59 62 59 68 68 68 68 68 68 65 65 57 65 57 65 57 65 57 64 4 46 6 64 44 44 42 337 300 27 | $\begin{array}{c} 146\\ 74\\ 51\\ 59\\ 9\\ 375\\ 699\\ 624\\ 607\\ 653\\ 525\\ 632\\ 615\\ 692\\ 799\\ 445\\ 645\\ 349\\ 287\\ 277\\ 277\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 134\\ 65\\ 46\\ 184\\ 45\\ 58\\ 184\\ 458\\ 586\\ 757\\ 659\\ 668\\ 724\\ 425\\ 565\\ 626\\ 634\\ 729\\ 516\\ 838\\ 318\\ 236\\ 236\\ \end{array}$ | 90 48 44 205 249 631 597 626 702 699 444 583 653 654 771 711 522 394 281 281 281 281 281 | 542 266 205 1597 2253 2678 2508 2469 2570 2843 1881 2246 2570 2550 2916 3019 1943 1689 1338 1689 1338 | | 860 475 356 388 748 2065 5292 4196 5590 4915 4818 5487 5590 4648 5570 4675 4975 4975 4975 4975 4975 4975 4975 3847 3171 2540 2102 2102 2102 2102 2102 2102 2102 21 | | | |
| 4-HO | JR TOTALS | : | | P | 43355 EAK VOL | UME INFO | RMATION | | | 41334 | | 84689 | | | |
| .M. .M. DAILY | DIR HOUR 730 1345 730 | ECTION: VO | N LUME 3068 3011 3068 | | DI HOUR 815 1730 1730 | RECTION | S LUME 2715 3102 3102 | C | OMBINED HOUR 745 1215 745 | DIREC | TION LUME 5729 5599 5729 | ន | | | |
| RUCK | PERCENTA | GE 5. | 84 | | CTRTCAR | 5 | 05 | | | 5. | 46 | | | | |
| IR N S | 1 2 155 35576 141 32104 | 3 5081 6968 | 4 527 135 | 5 858 987 | 6 169 292 | 7 4 67 40 16 29 | 9 337 7 210 | 10 137 104 | 11 17 0 | 12 0 0 | 13 11 48 | 14 0 0 | 15 11 32 | TOTTRE 2532 2089 | TOTVOL 43355 41334 |
| OUNT | ATED BY S | PS 5.0. | 55P | | | _ | | | | _ | | | | | - |
| COUNT TATI TATI TATI TATI | ATED BY S V: ON: IPTION: DATE: TIME: | PS 5.0. 87 0110 SR 5/US 07/14/2 0000 DIRE | -1, 100 021 CTION: |)' S SR N | 826/PA | LMETTO 1 | XPWY | ECTION: | | | cc | MBINED | | | - |
| GENER. | ATED BY S ON: IPTION: DATE: TIME: 1ST 99 | PS 5.0. 87 0110 SR 5/US 07/14/2 0000 DIRE 2ND | -1, 100 021 |)' S SR N 4TH 76 | 2 826/PA | LMETTO 1 | DII 2ND 158 | ECTION: 3RD 96 | S 4TH 91 | TOTAI 538 | cc | MBINED TOTAL 846 | | | _ |
| COUNT STATI STATI STATI DESCR START DIOO D2000 D200 D2000 D2 | ATED BY S X: ON: IFTION: DATE: TIME: 1ST 99 64 64 38 277 98 242 242 628 82 242 628 82 941 812 744 709 710 537 591 510 477 591 510 477 591 510 477 591 510 477 591 507 591 100 507 591 507 591 100 507 591 100 507 591 100 507 591 100 507 507 507 507 507 507 507 5 | PS 5.0. 87 0110 SR 5/US 07/14/2 0000 DTRE 2ND 50 308 308 308 308 789 789 789 789 789 789 789 78 | -1, 100 021 -1, 100 CTION: 3RD -25 58 129 7059 719 7582 597 7582 597 7582 597 7582 597 7582 597 7582 597 704 523 523 523 523 523 523 523 523 | N 4TH 766 364 286 66197 4827 9533 7595 7453 7595 7453 6963 6965 5555 6366 2622 4803 3711 2700 1610 | 5 826/PA TOTAL 308 190 1300 524 1475 2455 3456 3110 2946 2926 2924 2494 2494 2494 2537 2514 2229 2075 1961 1474 1274 758 | LMETTO 1 1ST 9 9 6 3 3 4 8 3 0 50 59 64 67 7 1 67 7 9 85 82 86 87 7 71 61 44 43 300 | XPWY DII 2ND 158 63 50 46 67 156 545 545 643 661 705 705 825 901 886 825 901 886 835 705 886 835 705 835 84 90 354 276 | ECTION: 3RD 96 57 43 65 182 451 648 642 642 642 652 730 761 905 949 870 8866 840 655 481 424 368 220 | S 4TH 91 59 299 48 94 444 445 97 625 854 865 853 8853 8853 8853 8853 8853 8853 8 | TOTAI 533 277 177 251 251 251 251 251 251 251 251 251 251 | | MBINED TOTAL 846 463 393 797 2126 4558 5749 6225 5514 5514 5514 5514 5514 5514 5514 5 | | | |
| SENER. SOUNT STATI. SESCR TART TART 1000 000 100 1000 1 | ATED BY S N: PTION: DATE: TIME: TIME: 1ST 99 64 38 27 94 242 628 822 941 812 744 744 710 710 750 537 551 510 537 557 510 537 510 537 510 517 510 517 510 517 510 517 510 517 510 517 510 517 510 517 510 517 510 517 510 517 517 517 517 517 517 517 517 | PS 5.0. 87 0110 SR 5/US 07/14/2 0000 DIRE 2ND | -1, 100 021 CTION: 3RD 74 42 25 58 129 74 42 25 58 129 712 682 589 759 712 682 589 759 712 682 589 759 704 523 523 523 523 523 523 523 523 523 523 | 0' S SR 4TH 76 34 28 66 197 423 733 735 663 6795 745 663 663 663 6555 663 6555 663 6555 636 522 480 483 371 270 110 | TOTAL TOTAL 308 190 224 2945 3456 3476 2945 2942 2724 2942 2724 2514 2275 1961 1474 798 552 45515 | 19 19 19 6 3 3 4 8 30 50 50 64 61 61 61 61 87 71 61 85 82 86 87 71 61 44 43 30 | XPWY DII 2ND 158 63 50 46 415 545 545 668 620 641 55 545 668 620 641 55 545 668 620 641 55 545 661 705 725 901 886 877 835 78 835 901 887 835 901 886 877 835 901 886 877 835 901 886 877 835 901 886 877 835 901 886 877 835 901 886 877 835 901 886 877 835 877 835 877 835 877 835 877 835 877 835 877 835 877 835 877 835 877 877 877 877 877 877 877 877 877 87 | ECTION: 3RD 96 57 43 65 182 451 648 682 642 657 692 730 761 905 949 870 886 840 655 481 424 368 220 | S 4TH 91 59 424 224 444 597 657 762 858 853 885 885 885 885 885 885 885 885 | TOTAI 533 277 181 177 251 256 272 251 256 272 251 256 272 291 298 272 293 273 256 272 291 293 273 256 272 291 293 273 294 293 294 293 294 293 294 294 294 294 294 294 294 294 294 294 | cc | MBINED TOTAL 8466 4553 7977 21268 57493 5524 55514 55646 557468 55464 55746 55464 46283 3050 57468 46293 30503 22773 1563 94221 | | | |
| COUNT TIME 5TART 5 | ATED BY S X: OH: IFTION: DATE: TIME: IST 94 64 38 27 94 62 82 242 628 82 242 628 82 941 812 744 709 710 713 587 7501 510 477 591 510 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 500 477 591 170 501 170 170 170 501 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 1 | PS 5.0. 87 0110 SR 5/US 07/14/2 0000 DTRE 2ND 50 50 50 308 308 308 308 308 308 308 30 | -1, 10(021 | D'S SR N 4TH 766 34 286 661 973 745 745 745 636 555 636 555 636 555 636 222 480 371 270 110 P | 552 500 500 500 500 500 500 500 | LMETTO 1 1ST 9 9 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 3 3 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | XPWY DII 2ND 158 63 50 46 67 156 545 545 545 643 661 705 705 825 901 887 708 877 835 886 643 643 643 705 705 825 901 887 705 877 835 80 901 877 835 80 901 877 835 80 901 877 835 80 877 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 | ECTION: 3RD 96 57 43 65 182 451 648 642 642 642 652 730 949 905 949 870 886 840 655 481 424 368 220 C | S 4TH 91 59 48 29 48 226 653 697 762 806 858 865 853 8853 8853 8853 8853 8853 8 | TOTAI 533 276 517 257 257 256 257 256 201 256 343 355 343 355 343 351 355 343 351 355 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 | CC | MBINED TOTAL 846 4558 5749 6283 5514 5546 5554 5516 55746 55746 55746 5462 5773 6102 5945 55746 5468 3693 3050 2273 1563 3050 2273 1563 5574 5746 5746 5746 5746 5746 5746 5746 | | | |
| SENER. SOUNT T STATI | ATED BY S Y: ON: TPTION: DATE: IST 99 64 38 27 98 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 242 628 709 710 750 591 591 597 591 507 501 207 507 501 507 501 507 501 507 501 507 507 501 507 501 507 507 507 507 507 507 507 507 | PS 5.0. 87 0110 SR 5/US 0000 DIRE 2ND | -1, 10(021 CTION: 3RD 74 225 58 129 442 25 58 129 442 709 9599 712 658 758 758 758 758 758 758 758 758 758 7 | D'S SR N 4TH 76 34 28 66 197 4827 923 923 923 735 663 663 663 6555 6636 555 6636 555 6366 522 480 483 3711 270 110 P P | TOTAL TOTAL 308 190 224 2945 3456 2942 2942 2942 2942 2942 2942 2942 2942 2942 2942 2051 1067 1274 2051 1467 1274 2052 1467 1475 1552 TAL EAK VOL DIT HOUR 8155 1500 1500 1500 | LMETTO 1 1ST 19 9 6 3 4 8 30 50 50 64 61 67 71 69 85 86 87 71 61 44 43 30 UME INF RECTION V 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 | DI 2ND 158 63 50 46 67 156 415 545 545 545 668 620 641 545 545 668 620 641 545 545 668 705 725 901 886 877 835 58 901 887 835 83 58 661 705 725 835 83 | ECTION: 3RD 96 57 43 65 182 451 648 642 657 730 769 870 870 886 840 655 949 870 886 840 655 481 424 368 220 C | S 4TH 91 59 429 444 597 7627 7623 808 853 847 653 677 7663 808 853 847 6332 215 537 416 322 215 537 416 322 215 537 416 322 215 537 840 800 1445 800 | TOTAI 533 277 18: 177 251 291 255 272 251 2566 272 291 291 291 291 291 291 291 291 291 29 | CCC 3 | MBINED TOTAL 446 450 5740 5740 5514 5514 5514 5514 5514 5514 5514 55 | | | |



| TIME | 1st | DI 2ND | RECTION: | N 4TH | TOTAL | 1st | DI 2ND | RECTION: 3RD | S 4TH | TOTAL | COMBINED TOTAL | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 0000 0100 0200 0300 0400 0500 0700 0800 0900 1000 1100 1300 1400 1500 1600 1700 1800 1900 22000 2200 2300 | 85 42 35 83 2711 641 641 636 636 636 659 751 636 647 662 462 462 29 390 210 210 | 66 65 122 411 413 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 69 66 66 66 66 66 66 66 67 62 66 61 65 56 66 55 13 55 52 60 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 62 50 37 54 263 529 778 775 783 703 698 627 633 698 627 633 691 794 687 612 537 7413 450 254 150 | 282 173 141 211 665 3288 2831 2790 2627 2594 2627 2634 2607 2765 2634 2607 2765 2634 2549 2231 1914 1659 2634 2549 2731 2745 2634 2549 2731 2745 2634 2637 2745 2637 2755 2637 2755 2637 2755 2637 2657 2657 2657 2657 2657 2657 2657 265 | 235 106 66 306 306 489 653 644 663 644 6674 774 787 914 861 829 714 859 829 714 841 841 841 841 841 841 841 841 841 8 | 161 84 59 79 146 403 547 674 690 631 702 729 746 764 883 889 889 709 579 480 390 290 | 130 63 49 56 65 167 424 626 650 650 650 631 771 771 771 771 771 771 921 903 838 838 8661 567 435 435 | 114 69 59 40 92 204 451 648 641 623 696 694 682 891 694 682 895 779 772 633 482 429 347 248 | 640 322 233 196 279 623 1584 2594 2626 2526 2915 2965 3472 3602 3491 3298 2717 22717 2717 271798 1534 | $\begin{array}{r} 922\\ 495\\ 374\\ 407\\ 944\\ 2310\\ 4441\\ 5424\\ 5882\\ 5439\\ 5516\\ 5438\\ 5503\\ 5502\\ 5572\\ 6236\\ 6040\\ 5529\\ 4631\\ 3886\\ 2990\\ 2282\\ 1676\end{array}$ | | | |
| 24-но | UR TOTA | LS: | | | 44769 | | | | | 48714 | 93483 | | | |
| A.M. P.M. DAILY | С НОС 73 151 73 | IRECTIO R 0 5 0 | DN: N VOLUME 3371 2803 3371 | P | EAK VOL DI HOUR 845 1545 1545 | UME INFO RECTION: VC | RMATION S LUME 2625 3618 3618 | c | OMBINEI HOUR 730 1530 1530 | DIREC | TIONS LUME 5970 6403 6403 | | | |
| TRUCK | PERCEN | TAGE | 4.11 | | | 4. | 82 | | | 4. | 48 | | | |
| | | | | CLAS | SIFICAT | ION SUMM | ARY DAT | ABASE | | | | | | |
| DIR N S | 1 110 378 217 371 | 2 3 94 49 46 89 | 3 4 15 182 41 216 | 5 489 1390 | 6 419 187 | 7 8 126 20 16 25 | 9 0 262 0 162 | 10 145 71 | 11 3 0 | 12 0 0 | 13 14 14 0 54 0 | 15 10 64 | TOTTRK 1840 2346 | TOTVO 4476 4871 |

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| COUNT | Y: 87 - M | EAMI-DAI | DE | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|----------|---------|------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----------|------|------|---|--------|
| SITE: | 8573 - S | DADELAI | ND BLVD | 100 | FT E | OF SW | 73RD | PL, | KENDALL | | | | |
| YEAR | AAD: | C | DIRECT | ON 1 | D | IRECT | ION 2 | | *K FACTOR | D FA | CTOR | т | FACTOR |
| 2021 | 5600 |) S | N 280 | 0 | S | 28 | 0.0 | _ | 9.00 | 5 | 5.00 | _ | 2.40 |
| 2020 | 5800 | F | N 290 | 0 | ŝ | 29 | 00 | | 9.00 | 5 | 6.00 | | 3.10 |
| 2019 | 6500 |) C | N 330 | 0 | S | 32 | 00 | | 9.00 | 5 | 6.00 | | 3.50 |
| 2018 | 5400 |) T | N 310 | 0 | S | 23 | 00 | | 9.00 | 5 | 4.30 | | 3.10 |
| 2017 | 6100 |) s | N 350 | 0 | S | 26 | 00 | | 9.00 | 5 | 9.30 | | 3.40 |
| 2016 | 6200 |) F | N 360 | 0 | S | 26 | 00 | | 9.00 | 5 | 6.10 | | 3.00 |
| 2015 | 6300 |) C | N 370 | 0 | S | 26 | 00 | | 9.00 | 5 | 7.40 | | 3.40 |
| 2014 | 6500 |) s | N 330 | 0 | S | 32 | 00 | | 9.00 | 5 | 9.30 | | 4.40 |
| 2013 | 6500 |) F | N 330 | 0 | S | 32 | 00 | | 9.00 | 5 | 8.90 | | 16.20 |
| 2012 | 6500 |) C | N 330 | 0 | S | 32 | 00 | | 9.00 | 5 | 9.70 | | 16.00 |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; 8 = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES





FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT COUNTY: 87 - MIAMI-DADE SITE: 2532 - SR 5/US-1, 200' S SR 94/KENDALL DR/SW 88 ST DIRECTION 1 YEAR AADT DIRECTION 2 *K FACTOR D FACTOR T FACTOR $\begin{array}{c} \text{N} & 20000\\ \text{N} & 19000\\ \text{N} & 21500\\ \text{N} & 21500\\ \text{N} & 24500\\ \text{N} & 24500\\ \text{N} & 26500\\ \text{N} & 26500\\ \text{N} & 26500\\ \text{N} & 25000\\ \text{N} & 24500\\ \text{N} & 24500\\ \text{N} & 25000\\ \end{array}$ S 22500 S 19500 S 24000 S 24000 S 24500 S 24500 S 25500 S 27000 S 27000 S 27500 S 27500 S 23500 S 27500 S 27500 S 27500 S 27500 S 27500 S 27500 S 27000 2021 2020 2019 2018 2017 2016 2015 2014 2013 2012 2011 2010 55.00 56.00 54.00 54.00 54.00 57.40 59.30 59.70 59.70 58.20 58.27 59.96 66.312 58.66 $\begin{array}{c} 5.50\\ 5.10\\ 2.60\\ 2.80\\ 4.20\\ 4.30\\ 5.90\\ 4.70\\ 4.70\\ 4.70\\ 4.70\\ 4.70\\ 4.80\\ 4.40\\ 4.00\\ \end{array}$ 2009 2008 2007 2006 7.98 8.07 7.90 7.39 S 28000 AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SIVTH YEAR ESTIMATE; L = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES 87 2532 SR 5/US-1, 200' S SR 94/KENDALL DR/SW 88 ST 06/29/2021 0000 COUNTY: STATION: DESCRIPTION: START DATE: START TIME: DIRECTION: N 2ND 3RD 4TH DIRECTION: S 2ND 3RD 4TH COMBINED TOTAL TIME 1ST TOTAL 1STTOTAL 30 14 7 30 16 10 13 80 262 286 291 310 253 282 281 266 296 296 268 272 $\begin{array}{c} 72\\ 35\\ 20\\ 11\\ 27\\ 52\\ 82\\ 291\\ 367\\ 390\\ 404\\ 417\\ 464\\ 484\\ 4484\\ 406\\ 295\\ 288\\ 219\\ 148\\ 219\\ 130\\ 104\\ \end{array}$ 52 27 25 15 9 15 17 3 2200 1200 99 83 146 2711 496 840 1101 1225 1359 1584 1650 1675 1846 1865 1762 0000 100 62 29 53 701 1132 1231 1122 1138 1112 1089 1053 11143 1093 1143 1205 320 182 0100 0200 0300 0400 0500 0600 128 126 289 972 1628 2071 2223 2363 2471 2673 2703 2703 18 15 29 16 61 2368 3309 2683 3004 2687 2679 311 263 211 255 89 43 225 777 171 285 294 390 405 4390 405 4439 409 311 273 2199 1531 103 74 35 222 323 307 281 274 287 287 298 264 283 306 246 267 230 159 117 163 259 208 271 272 269 263 266 283 294 259 223 160 127 0700 0800 0900 1000 1100 1200 1300 1400 1500 1600 2939 3008 2967 1413 1204 1075 794 574 488 347 1143 1099 893 649 479 391 212 318 310 229 178 349 318 274 216 137 128 2556 2303 1968 1443 1053 1700 1800 347 318 294 200 158 127 1900 2000 140 134 2200 2300 85 39 83 54 879 559 90 79 76 24-HOUR TOTALS: 18386 22237 40623 PEAK VOLUME INFORMATION DIRECTION: S HOUR VOLUME 845 1201 1430 1921 DIRECTION: N HOUR VOLUME 715 1236 1615 1251 1615 1251 COMBINED DIRECTIONS HOUR VOLUME 845 2325 1530 3056 1530 3056 A.M. P.M. DAILY TRUCK PERCENTAGE 7.41 3.54 5.29 CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY DATABASE DIR N S 1 2 3 4 128 14705 2184 233 74 19220 2156 61 6 97 152 7 6 39 9 63 56 10 24 109 11 0 0 $\begin{array}{cccc} 12 & 13 \\ 0 & 12 \\ 1 & 10 \end{array}$ 14 0 0 15 TOTTRK TOTVOL 6 1363 18386 0 787 22237 8 679 265 249 94

TP Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization GENERATED BY SPS 5.0.57P







FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS OFFICE 2021 HISTORICAL AADT REPORT

| COUNT | Y: 87 - MIA | MI | -DADE | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------|----|-------|---------|----------|-----------|------|-----------|----------|----------|
| SITE: | 0110 - SR | 5/ | US-1, | 100'S S | R 826/PA | LMETTO EX | XPWY | | | |
| YEAR | AADT | | DI | RECTION | 1 DI | RECTION 2 | 2 | *K FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR |
| | | - | | | | | | | | |
| 2021 | 92500 | С | N | 45500 | S | 47000 | | 9.00 | 55.00 | 4.90 |
| 2020 | 78000 | С | N | 41500 | S | 36500 | | 9.00 | 56.00 | 5.10 |
| 2019 | 104500 | С | N | 54000 | S | 50500 | | 9.00 | 56.00 | 4.60 |
| 2018 | 87500 | C | N | 44000 | S | 43500 | | 9.00 | 54.30 | 4.80 |
| 2017 | 91500 | C | N | 45500 | S | 46000 | | 9.00 | 54.00 | 5.40 |
| 2016 | 95000 | С | N | 46500 | S | 48500 | | 9.00 | 56.10 | 4.70 |
| 2015 | 91500 | C | N | 45500 | S | 46000 | | 9.00 | 57.40 | 5.20 |
| 2014 | 99500 | С | N | 50500 | S | 49000 | | 9.00 | 59.30 | 5.80 |
| 2013 | 92000 | Е | N | 46000 | S | 46000 | | 9.00 | 58.90 | 5.40 |
| 2012 | 91000 | C | N | 45500 | S | 45500 | | 9.00 | 59.70 | 5.70 |
| 2011 | 92000 | С | N | 45000 | S | 47000 | | 9.00 | 58.20 | 6.10 |
| 2010 | 91500 | Ċ | N | 46500 | S | 45000 | | 7.87 | 58.27 | 6.90 |
| 2009 | 91000 | С | N | 45500 | S | 45500 | | 7.98 | 59.96 | 6.30 |
| 2008 | 96000 | C | N | 48000 | S | 48000 | | 8.07 | 66.31 | 7.10 |
| 2007 | 93000 | C | N | 46500 | S | 46500 | | 7.90 | 63.12 | 8.00 |
| 2006 | 89000 | Ĉ | N | 45000 | S | 44000 | | 7.39 | 58.66 | 6.10 |

AADT FLAGS: C = COMPUTED; E = MANUAL ESTIMATE; F = FIRST YEAR ESTIMATE S = SECOND YEAR ESTIMATE; T = THIRD YEAR ESTIMATE; R = FOURTH YEAR ESTIMATE V = FIFTH YEAR ESTIMATE; 6 = SITH YEAR ESTIMATE; L = UNKNOWN *K FACTOR: STARTING WITH YEAR 2011 IS STANDARDK, PRIOR YEARS ARE K30 VALUES









| COUNTY | Y: 87 - MIAMI-DJ | FLORIDA I TRANSPC 2021 ADE | DEPARTMENT OF TRA RTATION STATISTI . HISTORICAL AADT | NSPORTATION CS OFFICE REPORT | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| SITE: | 8241 - DADELANI | D BLVD, 200' SOU | JTH OF KENDALL DR | | | | |
| YEAR | AADT | DIRECTION 1 | DIRECTION 2 | *K FACTOR | D FACTOR | T FACTOR | |
| 2021 2020 2019 2018 2017 2016 2015 2014 2013 2012 | 10200 S 10800 F 12200 C 12200 C 13400 F 13600 C 8600 S 8600 S 8600 C | N 5100 N 5400 N 6700 N 7500 N 4300 N 4300 N 4300 N 4300 | 5 5100 5 5400 5 6000 5 5300 5 6000 5 4300 5 4300 5 4300 5 4300 | 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 9.00 | 55.00 56.00 54.30 59.30 57.40 59.30 57.40 59.30 58.90 59.70 | 17.50 10.40 11.00 12.10 13.50 13.50 13.70 17.40 16.20 16.00 | |
| | AADT FLAGS: (* *K FACTOR: S | C = COMPUTED; E S = SECOND YEAR V = FIFTH YEAR F FARTING WITH YEA | = MANUAL ESTIMAT ESTIMATE; T = TH STIMATE; 6 = SI R 2011 IS STANDA | E; F = FIRST IRD YEAR ESTI XTH YEAR ESTI RDK, PRIOR YE | YEAR ESTIMAT MATE; R = FO MATE; X = UN ARS ARE K30 | E URTH YEAR ESTIMATE KNOWN VALUES | |





CONCEPTUAL DESIGN FOR SHORT TERM IMPROVEMENTS





Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Existing Conditions







Coconut Grove Metrorail Station Proposed Conditions







Dadeland North Metrorail Station at SW 84th Street Existing Conditions





Dadeland North Metrorail Station at SW 84th Street Proposed Conditions





Dadeland North Metrorail Station at SW 68th Court Existing Conditions





Dadeland North Metrorail Station at SW 68th Court Proposed Conditions







Dadeland South Metrorail Station at Datran Drive Existing Conditions







Dadeland South Metrorail Station at Datran Drive Proposed Conditions





Dadeland South Metrorail Station at Dadeland Blvd. Existing Conditions





Dadeland South Metrorail Station at Dadeland Blvd. Proposed Conditions



PUBLIC MEETING INFORMATION



AGENDA



PROJECT INFORMATION

Feasibility Study Scope

- Coconut Grove Station
- Dadeland North Station
- Dadeland South Station

• US 1 Characteristics

- High vehicular volume
- 6-lane corridor
- Considerable congestion

Bike/Ped Bridges

- Safer mobility
- Promote transit use and accessibility to Metrorail system and to the Underline







PROJECT WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK

slido

- Join at slido.com
- Poll Code # 393611

Product Solutions Pricing Resources Enterprise Caroers Contact sales Log in Sign Up

The easiest way to make your meetings interactive

Engage your participants with live polls, Q&A, quizzes and word clouds — whether you meet in the office, online or in-between.

Get started for free Schedule a demo

Question No. 1: Do you use any of the 3 Metrorail Stations under this study?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Findings:

- 1. High pedestrian and traffic fatalities cases and severe injuries in recent years
- 2. Prioritizing vulnerable communities:
 - Minorities
 - Low-income communities
 - Older adults
 - 2018 survey from National Aging and Disability Transportation Center
 - Teen Drivers









LITERATURE REVIEW

Needs:

- Improving bicycle/pedestrian routes around major roadways
 - Florida is the most dangerous state for Pedestrians (Dangerous By Design 2021)
- Lack of Pedestrian infrastructure and connectivity to public transportation



2010-2019 Pedestrian Danger Index

LITERATURE REVIEW

Safety Hazards:

- 1. High Speed/Aggressive Drivers
- 2. Dangerous Roadway Designs
- 3. Traffic congestion
- 4. Driver behavior: Distracted & Aggressive



National Traffic Safety Board (2017) Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes Involving Passenger Vehicles Available from: https://www.ntsb.gov/safety/safety-studies/Documents/SS1701.pdf

PLANS/PROPOSALS:

Most dangerous states for pedestrians (2010-2019)

- 1. Equity and Complete Streets Proposal
- 2. Vision Zero

THE TOP 20

- 3. The Underline
- 4. The SMART plan





PROJECT WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK

- Join at slido.com
- Poll Code # 393611 .





Question No. 2:

If you use any of the Metrorail stations, do you cross US-1 to access the stations? What issues have you had crossing US-1 and at which locations? What are your main concerns regarding ped/bike safety along this corridor?

THREE STATIONS – TRAFFIC & SAFETY REVIEW

| | | | AA | DT (Vehio Intersec | cles per c tion Leg | lay) |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|---|-------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Station | Intersection No. | Intersection | West | East | North | South |
| Coconut Grove Metrorail Station | 1 | SW 27th Avenue and US-1 | 80500 | 83500 | 25500 | 16800 |
| | 2 | US-1 and SW 68th Court | N/A | N/A | 40500 | N/A |
| Dadeland North | 3 | US-1 and SW 84th Street | N/A | N/A | 78000 | 40500 |
| Wettorall | 4 | US-1 and SW 88th Street | 36500 | 7100 | 40500 | 42500 |
| Dadeland South | 5 | US-1 and Dadeland Blvd./ SW 72nd Court | 10200 | N/A | 42500 | N/A |
| Metrorail | 6 | US-1 and Datran Drive | 5600 | N/A | 42500 | N/A |

AADT Volume table from FDOT LOS handbook

| Con Basses | | в | C | D | E |
|------------|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | 2 Lane | * | * | 17,600 | 24,000 |
| | 4 Lane | * | 24,400 | 36,100 | 40,800 |
| | 6 Lane | * | 44,700 | 56,800 | 60,400 |
| (CA-Urban | 81ano | * | 52 200 | 66 900 | 70 900 |
| General) | o Lane | | 52,500 | 00,500 | 10,500 |
| General) | o Lane | | 52,500 | 00,500 | , 0,500 |
| General) | o Lane | B | C | D | E |
| General) | 2 Lane | B * | C * | D 13,900 | E 21,800 |
| General) | 2 Lane 4 Lane | B * | C 26,100 | D 13,900 38,300 | E 21,800 43,000 |
| General) | 2 Lane 4 Lane 6 Lane | B * * | C * 26,100 28,400 | D 13,900 38,300 53,900 | E 21,800 43,000 62,800 |







Coconut Grove (Intersection 1)

COCONUT GROVE STATION – FINDINGS



Speed limit: 45 mph Driver's behavior: fast/ aggressive Traffic generators: Cafes, parks, hotels, school, church, home depot & restaurants.

Amenities:

- 1. Security Features/Hazards: Traffic congestion, adjacent construction and staging areas (Grove Central); no push button or security booth available, broken fencing along US-1
- 2. Lighting: Lack of lighting in walkway in front of Metrorail station.
- Bike/ped facilities: Bicycle repair station and elevator access inside station (ADA) available, minimal parking near station, no dedicated bike lanes or trail, a total of 9 bike racks; no bicycle lockers or bike lids available. No scooters' station available.
- 4. Bus pick up area: A lot of cracks in the sidewalks



Figure A: Bike Racks and Bike repair station located on West of Station*

10





Appendix | C



COCONUT GROVE STATION – CRASH DATA



PROJECT WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK

- Join at slido.com
- Poll Code # 393611





Question No. 3:

Providing a Pedestrian Bridge at the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station location may require ROW acquisition that will be further evaluated during the study. . Identify recommendations that you suggest can be implemented to improve safety in the corridor. (Mid-Block Crossings, Special Crosswalks, etc.)



DADELAND NORTH STATION – FINDINGS



Amenities:

- 1. Lighting: Streetlights and Station lights present. Some lights around station are not working.
- Security features/hazards: The need for dedicated bike lanes and crosswalks, the need to cross over US-1, no push button. Bike/ped facilities: No motorcycle/scooters parking, no bicycle lockers or bike lids available. micro mobility, pedestrian ramps, bike trail/ path, bicycle dismount and bike racks available.
- **3.** Bus pick up area: Drop-off pick up zone available.
- 4. Future improvements on additional elevators.









DADELAND NORTH STATION – CRASH DATA

PROJECT WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK

US-1 & SW 84th St OBSERVATIONS:

 3 crashes in total during the fiveyear period.

 Total crashes per year: 2019: 3

Join at slido.com

Poll Code # 393611





Question No. 4:

Providing a Pedestrian Bridge at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station location may require ROW acquisition that will be further evaluated during the study. The Dadeland North Metrorail Station location currently has midblock crossings. Identify recommendations that you suggest can be implemented to improve safety in the corridor.





DADELAND SOUTH STATION – FINDINGS



Amenities:

- 1. Lighting: Streetlights and Station lights present. Some lights around station are not working.
- 2. Security features/hazards: Parking entrance needs pedestrian signs for cars to yield. No speed limit signs visible. Push button present and crosswalks need maintenance
- 3. Bike/ped facilities: No bicycle lockers or bike racks available. micro mobility, pedestrian ramps, bike trail, bicycle dismount and 6 bike lids available.
- 4. Bus pick up area: Drop-off pick up zone available.

Figure C: Bike racks and bike lids located on West side of Station







DADELAND SOUTH STATION – CRASH DATA



- 2 crashes during the five-year period
- Total crashes per year:
 - **2018**: 1 **2019:** 1

https://signal4analytics.com/



US-1 & DATRAN DR:

- 2 crashes during the five-year period
- Total crashes per year: 2018: 2

20

PROJECT WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK

......

- Join at slido.com
- Poll Code # 393611



Question No. 5:

Providing a Pedestrian Bridge at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station location may require ROW acquisition that will be further evaluated during the study. Identify recommendations that you suggest can be implemented to improve safety in the corridor.



PROJECT NEEDS

- Implement pedestrian and bicyclist access across U.S. 1 at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North and Dadeland South Metrorail Stations
- Purpose: to maximize safety, mobility and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing U.S. 1.

PROJECT SCHEDULE



Figure : University Metrorail Station Pedestrian Bridge over US-1



NEXT STEPS

- (1)
- Connectivity Accessibility & Concept Development
- 2

Develop Recommendations and Implementation Assessment

- Project Working Group Meeting No. 2
- 4

Implement Revisions and finalize recommendations

- 5
- Project Working Group Meeting No. 3
- 6 Appro

Approval/Endorsement of Recommendations





QUESTIONS









Meeting Minutes

GPC VIII – Work Order No. 34

US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

Location: Teams Meeting Date and Time: May 4, 2023; 1:30 pm – 3:00pm

Attendees:

| NAME | ORGANIZATION | PHONE NUMBER | EMAIL |
|--------------|--|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Megan Echols | Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) | present | Megan. Echols@dot.state.fl.us |





GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

- Kevin Walford (TPO), the project manager, introduced this study's presentation with Stephanie Romero as his consultant Project Manager from BCC. Jesus Fuentes (TPO) will also be assisting the TPO in this project.
- 2. The project Team discussed the following items about the Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study:
 - a. Project information
 - b. Literature Review
 - c. Data Collection Information
 - d. Summary of Findings
 - e. Project Needs
 - f. Project Schedule
 - g. Next Steps
- 3. The study will concentrate on providing Pedestrian Bridges at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland South, and Dadeland North Metrorail Stations. These are high vehicular volume areas, especially during peak hours. They are composed of a 6-lane corridor and are considered congested.
- 4. As per the FDOT Guidelines, a Participation Survey is recommended to estimate the number of meeting participants. The Project Team will send out a survey regarding the Feasibility Study to assess the number of attendees and evaluate the public's preferences.
- 5. Poll questions were performed throughout different parts of the presentation. Some questions included their involvement with the pedestrian and cyclists' facilities and their opinion about adding a new Pedestrian Bridge. See attached Q&A interaction between Stephanie and the attendees.
- 6. After Project Manager Stephanie Romero introduced Literature Review graphics stating that Florida is the most dangerous state for Pedestrians (illustrations taken from Dangerous by Design pdf), Sandanasamy Vinod, Miami-Dade County ER, asked, "Stephanie, when you say Florida is #1, are you saying based on per capita basis or the number of accidents?" Stephanie clarified the number of accidents but will get back to him if more information is available.
- 7. Stephanie Romero mentioned some of the findings for Coconut Grove Station, including traffic generators, such as the new construction of Grove Central, security features, and bike-ped facilities. Then, Kevin Walford (TPO) pointed out that Coconut Grove station and the underline are part of underlying phase three and are expected to be completed in 2026. Then Ivan Jimenez TPO added: "There is currently a bicycle enclosure area in the station that will be removed by the underlying project so that those features will be reassessed and re-evaluated.



Page 2 of 12



GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

- 8. During Project working group feedback, Jesus Fuentes made the following recommendations to Stephanie:
 - a. Make sure the proposal was not proposed before.
 - Have information on that project because if there are more improvements in the same area (ongoing projects), connecting the underline and bridge might be hard.
 - c. Coordinate more and put projects together for funding.
 - d. Combine ideas with ongoing projects. Short-term and long-term proposals
- 9. After the Signal Four Data presentation, Collin Worth (Miami Dade County) mentioned, "A lot more crashes than identified. (Dadeland South: Around 100 crashes)". "This is a 5-year look in Signal 4 at this corridor," Stephanie said she will review Signal 4 Data since we are considering crashes in specific intersections such as Us-1 & SW 27th Ave, US-1 & SW 84th St., US-1 and Dadeland Blvd. and US-1 & Datran Dr.



Figure 2: Picture provided by Collin Worth when sharing screen

- Ivan Jimenez (DTPW) mentioned that US-1 and Dadeland Boulevard is more congested than US-1 and Datran Dr. because of restaurants, mall, and entertainment after A.M and P.M traffic was shown for both Metrorail Stations.
- 11. Jesus Fuentes asked Ivan the following:
 - a. Are you going to update the vision zero documents? The last data is from 2021.
 - b. Please send the most updated data for vision zero from 2022
 - c. Stephanie to provide help with collection.

12. Jesus said they could also provide extra information to Stephanie to help complete this study.

Page 3 of 12



GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

| Action Ite | ems: | | | |
|------------|---|----------------|-----|--------|
| ITEM | DESCRIPTION | ASSIGNED TO | DUE | STATUS |
| 1 | Elaborate more on how Florida is the most Dangerous state for pedestrians | Stephanie | N/A | Open |
| 2 | Confirm that proposal was not proposed before and find out about ongoing projects and further coordination. | Stephanie | N/A | Open |
| 3 | Confirm that Signal Four data is correct and the amount of crashes are accurate | Stephanie | N/A | Open |
| 4 | Update Vision Zero document. Last data is from 2021 | Ivan | N/A | Open |
| 5 | Provide extra information to complete study | Jesus | N/A | Open |

If anyone has a conflict with the accuracy of the information contained in these minutes, please contact the author within 5 business days of the submittal date.

Page 4 of 12




GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

APPENDICES:



Table of contents

- Do you use any of the 3 Metrorail Stations under this study?
- If you use any of the Metrorail stations, do you cross US-1 to access the stations? What issues have you had crossing US-1 and at which locations? What are your main concerns regarding ped/bike safety along this corridor?
- Providing a Pedestrian Bridge at the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station location may require ROW acquisition that will be further evaluated during the study. . Identify recommendations that you suggest can be implemented to improve safety in the corridor.
- Providing a Pedestrian Bridge at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station location may require ROW acquisition that will be further evaluated during the study. Identify recommendations that you suggest can be implemented to improve safety in the corridor.
- Providing a Pedestrian Bridge at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station location may require ROW acquisition that will be further evaluated during the study. Identify recommendations that you suggest can be implemented to improve safety in the corridor.

Page 5 of 12





GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study Open text poll Do you use any of the 3 Metrorail Stations under 007 this study? • No • Coconut Grove • Yes.... dadeland north • Yes • Yes • No • No Page 6 of 12





GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study Open text poll 0 0 8 If you use any of the Metrorail stations, do you cross US-1 to access the stations? What issues have you had crossing US-1 and at which locations? What are your main concerns regarding ped/bike safety along this corridor? (1/2) • I use the Dadeland North and a lot of facilities for pedestrians and University stations. I do not cross cyclists, and congestion and noise US-1. I see people using the wouldn't let ped/ cyclists feel safe midblock crossing at Adadeland and comfortable. North and bridge at University with • Theissue crossing US 1i s the length regular frequency. that folks have to travle and all of No. Some issues include traffic and the turning traffic issues associated aggressive drivers along US-1, • The signals take a long time to especially Dadeland South and activate for pedestrians and you can Coconut Grove. I think there are not spend Page 7 of 12



Appendix | C

GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study





GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study





GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study 0 0 7 Providing a Pedestrian Bridge at the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station location may require ROW acquisition that will be further evaluated during the study. . Identify recommendations that you suggest can be implemented to improve safety in the corridor. (2/2)including the TOD developer and bold solutions are needed The Underline. May consider going into the TOD building but may be limited due to height and length of trip. • Pedestrian bridge would be great, I don't believe it needs to occur at the intersection as long as it is safe and convenient. • no recommendations other than a bridge

Page 10 of 12



GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study Open text poll 0 0 5 Providing a Pedestrian Bridge at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station location may require ROW acquisition that will be further evaluated during the study. Identify recommendations that you suggest can be implemented to improve safety in the corridor. • May be a longshot but raise road / current information provided does over waterway and provide not seem to support the need for a pedestrian access underneath. bike/ped bridge Alternately improve midblock • The Village of Pinecrest is crossing. Crash data seems really considering purchase of the Dairy low for the location. queen property on the east side of Ped Bridge would be a useful and us 1 across from the station. safe infrastructure Have more Perhaps a JPA with the County Green time for Ped crossing would be feasible • Adjust timing / enhanced cross-walk • better lighting. painting Page 11 of 12



GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study Open text poll Providing a Pedestrian Bridge at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station location may require ROW acquisition that will be further evaluated during the study. Identify recommendations that you suggest can be implemented to improve safety in the corridor. (1/2)• this part of US-1 feels very wide and be willing to participate to have open, ped bridge seems like the patrons droped on their proerties in only option outside of making the exchange for a reduction ofparking road narrower space requirmente, et al. • i would suggest contacting the • For a six lane road, Ped bridge different mall owners regarding should be kind of essential for having a bridge abutment in their safety parking lot i think many would • Adjust timing / enhanced crosswalk painting / Open text poll Providing a Pedestrian Bridge at the Dadeland South Metrorail Station location may require ROW acquisition that will be further evaluated during the study. Identify recommendations that you suggest can be implemented to improve safety in the corridor. (2/2) information provided does not support bike/ped bridge need more bike amenities at the Station could support more bike use. Page 12 of 12





AGENDA





PROJECT INFORMATION

Feasibility Study Scope

- Coconut Grove Station
- Dadeland North Station
- Dadeland South Station

• US 1 Characteristics

- High vehicular volume
- 6-lane corridor
- Considerable congestion

• Bike/Ped Bridges

- Safer mobility
- Promote transit use and accessibility to Metrorail system and to the Underline



3

4

PROJECT NEED

- Implement pedestrian and bicyclist access across U.S. 1 at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North and Dadeland South Metrorail Stations
- **Purpose**: to maximize safety, mobility and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing U.S. 1.



Figure : University Metrorail Station Pedestrian Bridge over US-1



CONNECTIVITY ASSESSMENT

- Assessed Study Area
- Determined the best bicycle and pedestrian connection points
- Established travel volumes and connection points
- Identified existing bicycle and pedestrian access facilities
- Developed preliminary concepts for the bicycle/pedestrian overpasses
- Identified potential impacts to Parcels

| Station | Intersection | Intersection |
|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| Coconut Grove Metrorail Station | 1 | SW 27th Avenue and US-1 |
| Dadeland North Metrorail Station | 2 | US-1 and SW 68th Court |
| | 3 | US-1 and SW 84th Street |
| | 4 | US-1 and SW 88th Street |
| Dadeland South Metrorail Station | 5 | US-1 and Dadeland Blvd/ SW 72nd Court |
| | 6 | US-1 and Datran Drive |









CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT – BRIDGE CRITERIA

Existing Bridge Footprint Criteria:

- Two (2) Towers = 275 SF
- Staircase = 5' Wide
- Bike/Ped Bridge = 13'-4" Wide



Figure : University Metrorail Station Pedestrian Bridge over US-1

COCONUT GROVE STATION – PROPOSED BRIDGE



Proposed Bridge:

- (A) North Tower
- (B) 102' Bridge Span
- (C) South Tower
- Distance from staircase and building = 21.5' Clearance from North Tower to Metrorail Superstructure = 4'

. .

- M-Path
- Removal of Landscaping
- Purchasing 1,800 sf of ROW from Shell Gas Station (Approximately \$200k)
- Stopping Sight Distances
- Driver's line of Sight to signalization for NB on US-1
 - Underground utilities by the Shell Gas Station





PROJECT WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK

slido

Product

- Join at slido.com
- Poll Code #9588217



The easiest way to make your meetings interactive

Joining as a participant? # Enter code here

Contact sales Log In Sign Up

Ð

Pricing Resources Enterprise Careers

| | Get started for free | Schedule a demo |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| | Get started for free | schedule a demo |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| kine pat | | |
| umayat ut baak door Sido | | |
| nnese kat body doer Sido | | |
| Artus pet kur tondy does Sildo | What tools does Sido work with? | |
| nnu ya | What sools does Sildo wask with? | |
| Arme pet | What sools does Sildo werk with? | |
| Arma par | What Sools does Elido wark with? | |

Question No. 1:

The proposed Bridge at the Coconut Grove Station will have impacts to the Underline that is currently being constructed and may not be feasible. Any suggestions on how to improve? Any preferences?

DADELAND NORTH STATION – PROPOSED BRIDGE



Proposed Bridge:

- (A) West Tower
- (B) 129' Bridge Span
- (C) East Tower
- Distance from face of curb to Metrorail superstructure = 33'
- No Impacts to M-Path

Impacts:

- Removal of landscaping and glass fencing at West Tower (A)
- Clearance from face of curb to West Tower (A) = 4 ft.
- Clearance from West Tower (A) to Metrorail
- Superstructure = 8' East Tower (C) requires 2200 sf of ROW from Bomnin
- Chevrolet Dadeland (Approximately \$240K) Coordination with SFWMD – Snapper Creek Canal
- Construction of Bulkhead for Canal
- Impacts to Sight distance
- Impacts to underground utilities and drainage Systems



PROJECT WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK

- Join at slido.com
- Poll Code #9588217



The easiest way to make your meetings interactive

Joining as a participant? # Enter code here

Solutions Pricing Resources Enterprise Careers



Question No. 2:

The proposed Bridge at the Dadeland North Metrorail Station will have impacts and may not be feasible. What are your main concerns regarding the proposed bike/ped bridge at this Station? Any Improvements/ suggestions? Additional impacts not currently considered?

slido

13

Contact sales Log in Sign Up

DADELAND SOUTH STATION – PROPOSED BRIDGE (A)



Proposed Bridge:

- A) West Tower
- (B) 138' Bridge Span
- (C) East Tower
- West Tower (A) to walk 173' Crossing, to S Miami-Dade Busway to Station

Impacts:

- West Tower (A) placement requires purchase of 1400 sf of ROW to Auto Perfection (Approximately \$330k)
- East Tower (C) requires purchasing of 2400 sf of ROW from Burger King (Approximately \$590k)
- Stopping Sight Distances
- Driver's line of Sight to signalization
- Connectivity to Dadeland South Station are congested
- Coordination with landowners and adjacent businesses to obtain ROW



DADELAND SOUTH STATION – PROPOSED BRIDGE (B)



Proposed Bridge:

- (A) West Tower
- (B) 133' Bridge Span
- (C) East Tower
- West Tower (A) to walk 173' Crossing Datran Road and S Miami-Dade Busway

Impacts:

- West Tower (A) placement requires purchase of 2300 sf of ROW by 9350 Building (Approximately \$1.7M)
- East Tower (C) requires purchasing of 2000 sf of ROW from Dadeland Plaza
- (Approximately \$250K)Stopping Sight Distances
- Driver's line of Sight to signalization
- Connectivity to Dadeland South Station are congested
- Bicycle and Pedestrians will need to cross more roads with this option

15

PROJECT WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK Resources Enterprise Careers Contact sales Log In Sign Up slido Pricing Join at slido.com Poll Code #9588217 Joining as a participant? # Enter code here The easiest way to make your meetings interactive Engage your participants with live polls, Q&A, quizzes and word clouds — whether you meet in the office, online or in-between. Get started for free Schedule a demo **Question No. 3:** What are your main concerns regarding proposed bike/ped bridge at Dadeland South Station? Any preference Options? Any Improvements/ suggestions? Additional impacts? 16





NEXT STEPS

- Finalize Connectivity Accessibility & Concept Development including Cost Estimates for ROW Parcels
- Develop Recommendations and Implementation Assessment
- 3

1

2

- Project Working Group Meeting No. 3
- (4)

5

Finalize Recommendations

Approval/Endorsement of Recommendations







QUESTIONS



TPO Miami-Dade Transportation Planning Organization





Meeting Minutes

GPC VIII – Work Order No. 34

US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

Location: Teams Meeting Date and Time: September 7, 2023; 10:30 am – 11:30am

Attendees:

| NAME | ORGANIZATION | PHONE NUMBER | EMAIL |
|---|--|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Kevin C. Walford | Miami-Dade County TPO Project Manager | 305-375-2642 | Kevin.Walford@miamidade.gov |
| Jesus Fuentes | Miami-Dade County TPO Deputy Project Manager | 954-495-6341 | jesus.fuentes@exp.com |
| Stephanie Romero, PE | BCC Engineering, LLC Consultant Project Manager | 954-736-0177 | sromero@bcceng.com |
| Joan de La Rosa | BCC Engineering, LLC Structural Engineer | 305-670-2350 | jdelarosa@bcceng.com |
| Joel Sotolongo, El | BCC Engineering, LLC Structural Engineer | 305-670-2350 | jsotolongo@bcceng.com |
| Irene Hegedus, Architect | Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW) –Coordinator for Underline and South Dade Trail | 786-469-5395 | Irene.Hegedus@miamidade.gov |
| Raymond Freeman | Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) D6 – Multimodal Office | 305-470-5255 | Raymond.Freeman@dot.state.fl.us |
| Nelson Gomez | City of South Miami – Public Works & Engineering | 305-403-2078 | ngomez@southmiamifl.gov |
| Vinod Sandanasamy, AICP | Miami-Dade County RER Planning Department | present | Vinod.Sandanasamy@miamidade.gov |
| Jeannine Gaslonde | Miami-Dade County TPO Chief of Mobility Management and Implementation | | Jeannine.gaslonde@miamidade.gov |
| Dany (On behalf of David J. Mendez, PE) | Village of Pinecrest Public Works Director | 305-669-6916 | dmendez@pinecrest-fl.gov |
| Paola Baez, PE | Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works | 786-469-5204 | Paola.Baez@miamidade.gov |
| Author: Stephanie Romer | ro, P.E. | | |
| 6401 SW 87th Avenue, Suite 200, Miam | i. FL 33173 | | |

Page 1 of 5



GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

Purpose: The purpose of this meeting was to inform the Project Working Group (PWG) of the Progress of the feasibility study and request any feedback on the preliminary concepts. The following was discussed:

Kevin Walford (TPO), the project manager, introduced this study's presentation with Stephanie Romero as his consultant Project Manager from BCC. The Presentation Agenda includes the following discussion items: Project information, Project Need, Connectivity Assessment, Concept Development, Project Schedule, and next steps.

- Project Information This feasibility study is to implement safer pedestrian and bicyclist access over US1 at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North and Dadeland South Metrorail Stations.
- 2. Connectivity Assessment The project team assessed the study area and determined the best bicycle and pedestrian connection points. Travel volumes were established at several locations. Preliminary concepts and potential impacts to parcels were evaluated based on this data and analysis. The following intersections were evaluated:

| Station | Intersection | Intersection |
|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| Coconut Grove Metrorail Station | 1 | SW 27th Avenue and US-1 |
| Dadeland North Metrorail Station | 2 | US-1 and SW 68th Court |
| | 3 | US-1 and SW 84th Street |
| | 4 | US-1 and SW 88th Street |
| Dadeland South Metrorail Station | 5 | US-1 and Dadeland Blvd/ SW 72nd Court |
| | 6 D | US-1 and Datran Drive |

- 3. **Preliminary Concepts** The Project Team discussed the preliminary concepts at the three specific Metrorail locations as follows:
 - a. Coconut Grove Station A 102 ft. span bridge was proposed with a north and south tower. The north tower lands near the M-path and the south tower lands near the Shell gas station. The proposed bridge is not feasible at this location. The Project Team identified an alternate location further south on SW 28th Terrace behind an existing structure where M-Path turns in. The underline will be built along this location and is possibly impacted. Project Team to evaluate the limits of the Underline. FDOT is key at this intersection location. Through the Underline Project, traffic studies were performed. Project Team to evaluate these traffic studies. An intersection analysis was also performed. Signalization is currently 3 to 7 seconds, and the improvements are trying to improve the timing to 10 seconds. There are no flashing beacons at this location, there is minimal signage, including signage for the trail crossing. DTPW stated they would like to see No -Turn on red at this location. They would also like to eliminate the center island. They also suggested bringing the crossings as close as possible to US-1 so that lack of visibility is eliminated, and safety is addressed adequately. Improvements overall should include: Flashing Beacons, additional Signage, No-turn on red,

Page 2 of 5



GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

eliminating central Island, new crossing locations closer to US-1, and improved pedestrian Intervals for signalization. DTPW submitted 60% of the Underline documents for review to FDOT. Irene will send comments for the team to evaluate.

- A poll was provided for comments and suggestions on how to improve this intersection from the Project Working Group (PWG) and is attached to the meeting minutes. *Refer to Attachment A – Slido.com results.* At this location, Project Team will evaluate how easy it is to get back to 27th from US-1. They will look at connectivity between landing and 27th on the other side of US-1.
- b. Dadeland North Station A 129 ft. span bridge was proposed. This proposed bridge will require the removal of landscaping and fencing near the proposed West Tower. There is r/w acquisition costs for this alternative. Coordination with South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) will be required to discuss any impacts to the Snapper Creek Canal. Irene discussed the following items regarding the Underline at this location:
 - A shared use path of 11 ft. is proposed near where the preliminary concept proposes the bridge landing near Snapper Creek. Project Team to consider the 11 ft. width and glass block wall along the width of station when refining concepts.
 - Irene suggested moving bridge further North. If bridge is moved towards 84th Street, there is some space for the landing. However, this will impact r/w and should be clearly stated.
 - iii. A poll was provided for comments and suggestions on how to improve this intersection from the Project Working Group (PWG) and is attached to the meeting minutes. *Refer to Attachment B Slido.com results.*
- c. **Dadeland South Station** A pedestrian bridge could not be provided on the same block as the station. Two alternatives were developed as follows:
 - i. Alternative A A 138 ft. span bridge was proposed at Dadeland Blvd. Bridge tower landings would impact the Burger King and Auto Perfection parcels. This alternative results in r/w impacts and some r/w acquisition costs, impacts to business operations, impacts to stopping sight distances, and drivers line of sight to signalization.
 - Alternative B A 133 ft. span bridge is proposed west of Datran Drive. This bridge would not impact business operations so heavily. This alternative does require the purchase of r/w.
- d. Irene stated that the DTPW awarded a contract for a Design Builder to remodel and enhance Dadeland South Station. The Underline ends at the northern end of

Page 3 of 5



GPC VIII- Task Work Order No. 34 US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

> kiss and ride and there is a South Dade Trail bicycle connection to S Miami-Dade Busway. Irene also suggested the Project Team evaluate the new development at the Dadeland South Station where Shorty's is currently located. Shorty's BBQ and 9300 Plaza business area is being developed and a big tower will be constructed. In the future, this development will drive more pedestrians to the area. AECOM prepared Dadeland South Intermodal Station Project which needs to be coordinated with our proposed concepts. The proposed bridge may be coordinated with the new development.

- e. Project Team to coordinate with Lorin and include all Vision Zero locations in the area.
- 4. **Project Schedule** Next Project Working Group Meeting No. 3 will be on November 1, 2023. The Project Team will revise the concepts and discuss during this meeting.
- Next Steps The Project Team will finalize concepts, provide preliminary cost estimates, recommendations and have approval of recommendations for the beginning of November.

ACTION ITEMS

| ITEM | DESCRIPTION | ASSIGNED TO | DUE | STATUS |
|------|--|-----------------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1. | Provide additional documentation to Project Team regarding: AECOM Plans for Intermodal Station Project, NV2/ Stantec's DB project for the improvements to the station. | Irene | 10/01 | Closed |
| 2. | Project Consultant Team to reevaluate improvements at the coconut grove station as a bridge is not feasible. | Revanth | 10/01 | Open |
| 3. | Project Consultant Team to reevaluate proposed bridge location at the Dadeland North based om the proposed underline improvements. Improvements will also be evaluated. | Joel/Joan/ Revanth | 10/07 | Open |
| 4. | Project Consultant Team to reevaluate proposed bridge location based on improvements to station and new development at Shorty's. Improvements will also be evaluated. | Joel/Joan/ Revanth | 10/07 | Open |

Page 4 of 5





AGENDA







PROJECT NEED

- Implement pedestrian and bicyclist access across U.S. 1 at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North and Dadeland South Metrorail Stations
- **Purpose**: To maximize safety, mobility and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing U.S. 1.
- This feasibility study is a request from TPO Board Member Raquel Regalado



Figure : University Metrorail Station Pedestrian Bridge over US-1

COCONUT GROVE STATION - CONNECTIVITY ASSESSMENT 1.000 Pedestrian Count Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count West leg 45 North leg 19 Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count 14 LEGEND A.M. PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC -MIDDAY PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX P.M. PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX NIGHTTIME PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX PEDESTRIAN VOLUME AT CROSSWALK - 衣 BICYCLE VOLUME AT INTERSECTION - 💰





COCONUT GROVE STATION – CRASH DATA

CRASH DATA SUMMARY:

A total of 15 bike-pedestrian crashes were observed within the last five (5) years.

Based on the safety analysis, below are some of the findings:

- Most of the crashes occurred with bike-pedestrians not yielding to vehicles during 7 out of 15 crashes
 2 of these crashes were serious bodily injuries (SBIs),
 - In the additional 2 crashes, it was unknown who had the ROW.
- One of the SBI occurred with southbound left-turn vehicle (did not yield) colliding with bicycle on the east leg crosswalk,
- 7 out of 15 crashes (47%) occurred during dark and lighted conditions, which is higher than the Districtwide average of 27%

| Condition | Districtwide (2018 – 2022) | Miami-Dade County (2018 – 2022) | Monroe County (2018 – 2022) |
|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Nighttime | 27% | 27% | 22% |
| Wet Pavement | 11% | 11% | 7% |

 3 out of 15 crashes involved southbound right-turning vehicles colliding with bicyclists during Right Turn on Red (RTOR).

COCONUT GROVE STATION ALT. 1: PED. BRIDGE OVER US-1 & SW 27TH AVENUE



Proposed Bridge:

- (A) North Tower
- (B) 102' Bridge Span
- (C) South Tower
- Distance from staircase and building = 21.5'
- Clearance from North Tower to Metrorail Superstructure = 4'

Impacts:

- Directly impact existing M-Path/future Underline Placing Bridge Tower would be obstructing the 10' Bicycle Path
- Purchasing 1,800 sf of ROW from Shell Gas Station (Approximately \$200k)
- Impact Stopping Sight Distance
- Impact Driver's line of Sight to signalization for NB on US-1
- Impact to underground utilities by the Shell Gas Station

Alternative 1 is not feasible.



COCONUT GROVE STATION ALT. 2: AT GRADE IMPROVEMENTS

Proposed At Grade Improvements:

Potential improvement to signal timing (such as increase the walk time or FDW for pedestrians, Leading Pedestrian Intervals etc.),

| | | | | | | | nue | 7th Ave | t SW 2 | Dixie Hwy a | 182) = US-1/S | n #1 (Asset #2 | tersectio | In | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------|--------------------|------------|-------|------------------------|------------|------------|----------|-------------|---------------|----------------|------------|----------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Variables | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.5 fps | ian = | Spedestr |
| | Recommended (if not cleared) | | Substandard Checks | | | Current Calculated FDW | | Controller | Crossing | | 3 s | erval = | Buffer Int | | |
| Notes | | | FDW | FDW | | Scenario 2 | Scenario 1 | - | | Phase | Legs | - 2 | | | |
| | FUW | walk | Scenario 2 | Scenario 1 | walk | FDW | FDW | FUW | WALK | | | FDV /als | istance | Crossing D | Crosswalks |
| Increase EDW/hu 1 conto 36 co | 26 | - | Clear | Check | Clear | 23.0 | 26.0 | 25 | 7 | | West Leg | ken ker | 88 ft | C _{WEST} = | West Leg |
| Increase PDW by 1 sec to 20 se | 20 | | Clear | Clear | Clear | 22.0 | 25.0 | 25 | 7 | 4,0 | East Leg | - Na L | 85 ft | C _{EAST} = | East Leg |
| Increase FDW/builters to 20 a | 20 | | Clear | Clear | Clear | 26.0 | 29.0 | 29 | 7 | 26 | North Leg | | 101 ft | C _{NORTH} = | North Leg |
| Increase PDW by 1 sec to 50 se | 30 | - | Clear | Check | Clear | 27.0 | 30.0 | 29 | 7 | 2,0 | South Leg | | 102 ft | Course = | South Leg |

- Improve lighting in the area
- No Right Turn on Red (RTOR) for southbound right turning movement
- Tighten the turning radii in the NW corner and EB median hardened centerline (Auto Turn analysis required).
- Include High Emphasis Crosswalk.
- Move the stop-bar on the EB approach as far back as possible (distance between stop bar and signal should be less than 180 feet).



Contact sales Log In Sign Up

8

Alternative 2 is feasible.

- Join at slido.com
- Poll Code #1524130



Joining as a participant? # Enter code here

Product Solutions Pricing Resources Enterprise Careers

slido

The easiest way to make your meetings interactive

Engage your participants with live polls, Q&A, quizzes and word clouds — whether you meet in the office, online or in-between.



PWG Feedback Comment No. 1:

Please provide comments on proposed at grade improvements for the Coconut Grove Metrorail Station.



| Crosswalk Le East leg West leg North leg South leg | k Leg – SW 84 th St. Mode Pedestrian C Bicycle Coun Pedestrian C Bicycle Coun Pedestrian C Bicycle Coun | AM Pk Hr ount 79 t 0 ount Z t 1 ount 19 | Midday Pk Hr <u>15</u> 0 1 <u>0</u> | <u>РМ РК Нг</u> <u>72</u> <u>1</u> <u>8</u> г. | Nighttime Pk Hr <u>19</u> Q Q | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| East leg West leg North leg South leg | Pedestrian C Bicycle Coun Pedestrian C Bicycle Coun Pedestrian C Bicycle Coun | count 79 t 0 ount Z t 1 ount 19 | <u>15</u> <u>0</u> <u>1</u> <u>0</u> | 72 1 8 | 19 0 0 | |
| West leg North leg South leg | Bicycle Coun Pedestrian C Bicycle Coun Pedestrian Cc Bicycle Coun | Lt Q ount Z t 1 ount 19 | 0 1 0 | 1 8 | 0 0 | Tel Contraction of the second s |
| West leg North leg South leg | Pedestrian C Bicycle Coun Pedestrian C Bicycle Count | <u>t</u> <u>1</u> ount <u>19</u> | <u>1</u> <u>0</u> | 8 | 0 | 878 |
| North leg South leg | Bicycle Coun Pedestrian Co Bicycle Count | t <u>1</u> ount <u>19</u> | <u>0</u> | | | |
| North leg South leg | Pedestrian C Bicycle Count | ount 19 | | 2 | <u>0</u> | |
| South leg | Bicycle Count | | 13 | 31 | 3 | |
| South leg | | t <u>12</u> | 5 | 20 | 1 | |
| Hand State | Pedestrian C | ount 7 | 10 | 19 | 3 | |
| Hand States | Bicycle Coun | | 2 | 5 | 1 | |
| 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 100 | | | | | | |
| valk Leg – SW 68 th | | A | THE | PIC CONTRACTOR | | Alt. 1 Location |
| | 8 th Ct. <u>Mode</u> | AM Pk Hr Mi | dday Pk Hr PM Pk H | ir <u>Nighttim</u> | e Pk Hr | |
| | Pedestrian Count | <u>2</u> <u>0</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>0</u> | A | I.M. PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX |
| | | <u>1</u> <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | | AIDDAY PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX |
| 3 | Bicycle Count | 146 28 | 241 | <u>12</u> | 28 m | |
| | Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count | | 42 | 2 | | |
| g | Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count Bicycle Count | <u>10</u> <u>5</u> | 12 | | | |
| | Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count Picels Count | <u>10</u> 5 0 0 | <u>12</u> <u>6</u> | 0 | | IIGHTTIME PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX |
| g | Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count Bicycle Count | 10 5 0 0 0 0 | <u>12</u> <u>6</u> <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> 0 | N N | NGHTTIME PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX |

DADELAND NORTH STATION – CRASH DATA

CRASH DATA SUMMARY:

A total of 4 crashes were observed within the last five (5) years.

Based on the safety analysis, below are some of the findings:

- 3 crashes were observed at SW 84th Street
 - $\circ~$ EBT vehicle hitting SB biker on west leg crosswalk (vehicle did not yield)
 - SBR vehicle hitting the skater on west leg crosswalk (vehicle did not yield)
 - Worker hit by a vehicle within the station area
- 0 crashes at mid-block crossing/SW 68th Court,
- 1 crash (SBI), 250 feet west of the available midblock crossing





DADELAND NORTH STATION – ALT. 1 PED. BRIDGE WEST OF SW 84TH St



Proposed Bridge:

- (A) West Tower
- (B) 129' Bridge Span
- (C) East Tower
- Distance from face of curb to Metrorail superstructure = 33' No Impacts to M-Path

Impacts:

- Removal of landscaping and glass fencing at West Tower (A)
- Clearance from face of curb to West Tower (A) = 4 ft.
- Clearance from West Tower (A) to Metrorail Superstructure = 8 ft. East Tower (C) requires 2200 sf of ROW from Bomnin Chevrolet
- Dadeland (Approximately \$240K) Coordination with SFWMD – Snapper Creek Canal
- Construction of Bulkhead for Canal Impacts to Sight distance
- Impacts to underground utilities and drainage Systems

Alternative 1 is feasible however it **does not meet** the purpose of the study to maximize safety, mobility and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing U.S. 1.

DADELAND NORTH STATION – ALT. 2 PED. BRIDGE WEST OF SW 84TH St



Proposed Bridge:

- Location: Propose Pedestrian bridge further North
- Coordination with Underline Path
 - A shared use path of 11 ft. is proposed near where the preliminary concept proposes the bridge landing near Snapper Creek.
- Project Team to consider the 11 ft. wide Underline Path ٠
- Glass block wall along the width of station to be coordinated with Alternative 2.

Alternative 2 is feasible, and provides less impacts than Alternative 1, however it **does not meet** the purpose of the study to maximize safety, mobility and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing U.S. 1.



DADELAND NORTH STATION ALT. 3: AT GRADE IMPROVEMENTS

Proposed At Grade Improvements:

- At SW 84th Street:
- \circ $\;$ Move the stop bar on the EB approach (looks too close on outside lane),
- No RTOR on SBR approach.
- Provide pedestrian channelization barrier or landscaping so that people cannot wait and cross using the median (between SW 68th Ct and SW 70th Ave).
- Improve the crosswalk width at midblock crossing on SW 68th Ct
- Improve Lighting in the area
- Village of Pinecrest may purchase Dairy Queen on the east side of US-1 near SW 68th Ct and this
 provides opportunity to improve midblock crossing





Contact sales Log In Sign Up

PROJECT WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK

Alternative 3 meets the purpose of the study and is feasible.

- Join at slido.com
- Poll Code #1524130



Joining as a participant? • Etherocode here ③ The easiest way to make your meetings interactive

Product Solutions Pricing Resources Enterprise Careers

slido

Engage your participants with live polls, Q&A, quizzes and word clouds — whether you meet in the office, online or in-between.



PWG Feedback Comment No. 2:

Please provide comments on proposed at grade improvements for the Dadeland North Metrorail Station.





DADELAND SOUTH STATION - CONNECTIVITY ASSESSMENT

DADELAND SOUTH STATION – CRASH DATA

CRASH DATA SUMMARY:

A total of 4 crashes were observed within the last five (5) years.

Based on the safety analysis, below are some of the findings:

- Datran Drive Two (2) pedestrian crashes with both of them crossing Datran Drive and vehicles not stopping in time.
- Dadeland Blvd Two (2) pedestrian crashes
 - · Southwest bound vehicle collided with bicyclist on the east leg crosswalk (bicyclist did not yield)
 - Southeast bound vehicle collided with a pedestrian walking on the east leg away from the available crosswalk crashes at mid-block crossing/SW 68th Court,





DADELAND SOUTH STATION - ALT. 1 PED BRIDGE AT DADELAND BLVD



Proposed Bridge:

- (A) West Tower
- (B) 138' Bridge Span
- (C) East Tower
- West Tower (A) to walk 173' Crossing, to S Miami-Dade Busway to Station

Impacts:

- West Tower (A) placement requires purchase of 1400 sf of ROW to Auto Perfection (Approximately \$330k)
- East Tower (C) requires purchasing of 2400 sf of ROW from Burger King (Approximately \$590k)
- Impacts Stopping Sight Distances
- Driver's line of Sight to signalization
- Connectivity to Dadeland South Station are congested
- Requires coordination with landowners and adjacent businesses to obtain ROW

Alternative 1 is feasible but impacts adjacent businesses and requires ROW purchase of \$920K.

17

DADELAND SOUTH STATION – ALT. 2 PED BRIDGE WEST OF DATRAN DR



Proposed Bridge:

- (A) West Tower
- (B) 133' Bridge Span
- (C) East Tower
- West Tower (A) to walk 173' Crossing Datran Road and S Miami-Dade Busway

Impacts:

- West Tower (A) placement requires purchase of 2300 sf of ROW by 9350 Building (Approximately \$492K)
- East Tower (C) requires purchasing of 2000 SF of ROW from Dadeland Plaza (Approximately \$250K)
- Impacts Stopping Sight Distances
- Driver's line of Sight to signalization on US-1 and Datran Drive
- Connectivity to Dadeland South Station are congested
- Bicycle and Pedestrians will need to cross more roads with this option.

Alternative 2 is feasible however still impacts adjacent businesses and requires ROW purchase of \$742K. This alternative **does not meet** the purpose of the study to maximize safety, mobility and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing U.S. 1.



DADELAND SOUTH STATION – ALT. 3A PED BRIDGE TO ACCOMODATE NEW DEVELOPMENT AT 9300 PLAZA & SHORTY'S BBQ



Proposed Bridge:

- (A) Bridge Connection to South Tower of Development
- (B) 132' Bridge Span
- (C) East Tower
- (D) Pedestrian Access Opening
- Upon reaching (A), pedestrians will need immediate access to exit the South Tower property limits and continue to (D). Approximately 136' walk.

Impacts:

- East Tower (C) requires purchase of approximately 1600 SF of ROW from the Trader Joe's lot.
- Bridge Connection to South Tower of Development (A) requires coordination with the developer of the lot as well as the need for pedestrians to have access to building exits. This will impact garage and retail space of the south tower. If connection is desired to the north tower, this will impact residential space.
- Stopping sight distances
- Driver's line of sight to signalization

Alternative 3A is feasible however requires coordination with Developer. This alternative will also provide improvements to crossing over Datran Drive to meet the purpose of the study.

19

DADELAND SOUTH STATION – ALT. 3B PED BRIDGE TO ACCOMODATE NEW DEVELOPMENT AT 9300 PLAZA & SHORTY'S BBQ



Proposed Bridge:

- (A) West Tower
- (B) 132' Bridge Span
- (C) East Tower
- (D) Pedestrian Access Opening
- Upon reaching (A), pedestrians will continue to (D) Approximately 380' walk.
- Impacts:
- East Tower (A) requires purchase of approximately 1600 SF of ROW from the 9300 Plaza lot.
- East Tower (C) requires purchase of approximately 1600 SF of ROW from the City Furniture lot.
- Pedestrians and Bicycle traffic will have a longer path to the Pedestrian Access Opening.
- Stopping sight distances
- Driver's line of sight to signalization

Alternative 3A is feasible however requires coordination with Developer. This alternative will also provide improvements to crossing over Datran Drive to meet the purpose of the study.



DADELAND SOUTH STATION – AT GRADE IMPROVEMENTS

Proposed At Grade Improvements:

Datran Drive

- Improve pavement markings
- STOP for pedestrians in crosswalk sign on southbound approach,
- Install curb ramps (ADA compliant),
- Close the box (install the crosswalk on south leg to cross US-1) = People were seen crossing based on demand.
- Dadeland Blvd "Use Crosswalk" sign on the sidewalk within the intersection influence area.

These improvements will be provided with alternative 3A or 3B to meet the purpose of the study.



PROJECT WORKING GROUP FEEDBACK

- Join at slido.com
- Poll Code #1524130



Joining as a participant? e Enter code here

Product Solutions Pricing Resources Enterprise Careers

slido

The easiest way to make your meetings interactive

Contact sales Log In Sign Up

22

Engage your participants with live polls, Q&A, quizzes and word clouds — whether you meet in the office, online or in-between.



PWG Feedback Comment No. 3:

Please provide comments on proposed at grade improvements for the Dadeland South Metrorail Station.





NEXT STEPS



Finalize Concept Development and Cost Estimates



Finalize Recommendations



Approval/Endorsement of Recommendations











Meeting Notes

GPC VIII – Work Order No. 34

US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

Location: Teams Meeting Date and Time: November 1, 2023; 10:30 am – 11:30 am

Attendees:

| NAME | ORGANIZATION | PHONE NUMBER | EMAIL |
|----------------------------|--|--------------|----------------------------------|
| Kevin C. Walford | Miami-Dade County TPO Project Manager | 305-375-2642 | Kevin.Walford@miamidade.gov |
| Jesus Fuentes | Miami-Dade County TPO Deputy Project Manager | 954-495-6341 | jesus.fuentes@exp.com |
| Stephanie Romero, PE | BCC Engineering, LLC Consultant Project Manager | 954-736-0177 | sromero@bcceng.com |
| Joan de La Rosa | BCC Engineering, LLC Structural Engineer | 305-670-2350 | jdelarosa@bcceng.com |
| Joel Sotolongo, El | BCC Engineering, LLC Structural Engineer | 305-670-2350 | jsotolongo@bcceng.com |
| Revanth Katta | BCC Engineering, LLC Traffic Engineer | 305-670-2350 | Rkatta@bcceng.com |
| Henderic Mendez | BCC Engineering, LLC Design Engineer | 305-670-2350 | hmendez@bcceng.com |
| Irene Hegedus, Architect | Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW) –Coordinator for Underline and South Dade Trail | 786-469-5395 | Irene.Hegedus@miamidade.gov |
| Carlos Cejas, PE | FDOT District 6 Design Consultant Reviewer Multimodal Development Office | | <u>ccejas@dot.state.fl.us</u> |
| Edward Aparicio | Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) D6 – PLEMO Office Gannet Fleming | | <u>eaparicio@dot.state.fl.us</u> |
| Aurelio | City of South Miami – Public Works & Engineering | 305-403-2078 | ngomez@southmiamifl.gov |
| Ryan Benton | Miami Dade County PROS Greenway and Trails Planning Coordinator | | rbenton@miamidade.gov |
| Vinod Sandanasamy, AICP | Miami-Dade County RER Planning Department | present | Vinod.Sandanasamy@miamidade.gov |

6401 SW 87th Avenue, Suite 200, Miami, FL 33173

Page 1 of 4


US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

| Jeannine Gaslonde | Miami-Dade County TPO Chief of Mobility Management and Implementation | | Jeannine.gaslonde@miamidade.gov |
|---|--|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Dany (On behalf of David J. Mendez, PE) | Village of Pinecrest Public Works Director | 305-669-6916 | dmendez@pinecrest-fl.gov |
| Paola Baez, PE | Miami-Dade County Department of Transportation and Public Works | 786-469-5204 | Paola.Baez@miamidade.gov |

Author: Stephanie Romero, P.E.

Purpose: The purpose of this meeting was to inform the Project Working Group (PWG) of the Progress of the feasibility study and request any feedback on the proposed concepts. The following was discussed:

Kevin Walford (TPO), the project manager, introduced this study's presentation with Stephanie Romero as his consultant Project Manager from BCC. The Presentation Agenda includes the following discussion items: Project information, Project Need, Coconut Grove Station Analysis, Dadeland North Station Analysis, Dadeland South Station Analysis, Project Schedule and next steps.

- 1. **Connectivity Assessment** The project team assessed the study area and determined the best bicycle and pedestrian connection points. Travel volumes were established at several locations. Preliminary concepts and potential impacts to parcels were evaluated based on this data and analysis. The following intersections were evaluated:
- 2. **Analysis** The Project Team discussed the concepts at the three specific Metrorail locations as follows:
 - a. Coconut Grove Station 15 Bike Pedestrian Crashes
 - i. Alternative 1: Pedestrian Bridge Over US-1 was considered not feasible because the North Tower Landing would impact the current M-Path or future Underline. Right-of-Way Constraints are tight.
 - ii. Alternative 2: At-Grade Improvements would improve lighting in the area, eliminating Right-Turn-On-Red, Turning the turning Radii, include high emphasis crosswalks and moving the stop bar as far back as possible. This alternative is feasible after coordinating with agencies and meeting with the Project Working Group.
 - iii. The following feedback was received by the Project Working Group:
 - 1. FDOT Consultant provided the following:





US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

- a. A third level bridge that connects directly to the metro station platform should be evaluated. Another alternative was to span the bridge over the Metrorail. This alternative will require a separate fare station. DTPW is already adding new elevators in between rails at some stations. A third level bridge would require a 24 ft. clearance for electrical rail. If longer span is proposed, intermediate bents will need to be required. Project Team would have to investigate Truss bridges. Refer to Dadeland Skewed Bridge. This alternative may Impact the Underline.
- b. Traffic counts to be separated by transit users vs. people walking down from the street breakdown. If we know split, it may help determine who will be using at-grade improvements.
- c. Additional considerations: Refugee Islands, Speen Signs
- **b.** Dadeland North Station 4 Bike Pedestrian Crashes. It was concluded that improvements were needed near SW 84th Street and west of the Midblock crossing.
 - i. Alternative 1: Pedestrian Bridge West of SW 84th Street was considered however this alternative does not address the need. The most crossings were 68th Court. Maximum usage was at mid-block crossing.
 - ii. Alternative 2: Pedestrian Bridge West of SW 84th Street (modified) was considered and would span a little further north. This alternative still does not meet the purpose and need of the study.
 - iii. Alternative 3: At- Grade Improvements will provide no RTOR, improve crosswalk width and lighting. This alternative seemed like the most feasible.
 - iv. The following comments were provided:
 - 1. Bridge should be provided at the location where most of the crossings are occurring was recommended, however this alternative has no room for landing without impacting the busway.
 - 2. Propose another bridge further south. You can also acquire some ROW. East of US-1 you can fit it anywhere there. A lot of pedestrians are crossing from Dadeland Mall to Ross. If there is no building, things can be rearranged to have a proposed bridge lading and require some ROW acquisition. The Project Team would look at another alternative.





US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

- *3.* PROS stated that there are two proposed trails that may impact the proposed bridge locations:
 - a. Snapper Creek Trail, a trail on the north side of the snapper creek canal will be constructed and possibly impact the bridge crossing over Bomnin Chevrolet.
 - b. The Ludlam Trail, which ends at Southwest of near SW 80th Street. Private developers will construct the trail between SW 80TH Street and Snapper Creek Canal. Snapper Creek Trail plans are available. Ludlam Trail Plans are not available at this moment.
 - *c.* DTPW Senator Alexa Catayu encourages Departments to apply for Grants that connect pedestrians to trails.

c. Dadeland South Station – 4 Crashes

- i. Alternative 1 Pedestrian Bridge At Dadeland Blvd was considered. This alternative requires ROW acquisition, connectivity to Dadeland is congested and requires coordination with adjacent business. This alternative provides impacts to adjacent businesses.
- ii. Alternative 2 Pedestrian Bridge at Datran Drive This alternative is feasible however it does not meet the purpose and need as it moves the pedestrians further from the station and the need to cross more roads therefore minimizing safety.
- iii. Alternative 3A Pedestrian Bridge to Accommodate New Development at 9300 Plaza and Shorty's BBQ – Pedestrian bridge that ties directly into South Tower. Some ROW is required from Trader Joes, as well we coordination with future developers. This alternative is feasible but requires coordination with the developer. This alternative can also be combined to include At-Grade Improvements as well.
- iv. Alternative 3B Pedestrian Bridge to Accommodate New Development at 9300 Plaza and Shorty's BBQ (Modified) – Pedestrian Bridge that ties west of the South Tower. Some ROW is required from Trader Joes and City Furniture, as well as coordination with developers. The footprint of the development will take the entire block. This alternative landing may impact right where improvements for bicycle and pedestrians are being proposed so may not be feasible.
- v. Alternative 4 At Grade Improvement provides Improved signage and crosswalks.

Page 4 of 4







PROJECT NEED

- Implement pedestrian and bicyclist access across U.S. 1 at the Coconut Grove, Dadeland North and Dadeland South Metrorail Stations
- **Purpose**: To maximize safety, mobility and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing U.S. 1.
- This feasibility study is a request from TPO Board Member Raquel Regalado



Figure : University Metrorail Station Pedestrian Bridge over US-1

COCONUT GROVE STATION - CONNECTIVITY ASSESSMENT Pedestrian Count Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count West leg 45 North leg 19 Bicycle Count Pedestrian Count 14 LEGEND A.M. PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC -MIDDAY PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX P.M. PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX NIGHTTIME PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX PEDESTRIAN VOLUME AT CROSSWALK - 衣 BICYCLE VOLUME AT INTERSECTION - 💰





COCONUT GROVE STATION – SAFETY ANALYSIS



Issues:

- 1) Southbound right-turning vehicles (during red) unable to stop before the crosswalk,
- 2) 7 out of 12 crashes on the west leg crosswalk –
- Bikes/pedestrians did not yield to vehicles,
- 3) 2 crashes (during N-S green):
 - 1) Southbound left-turning vehicle did not yield to bicyclist on east leg crosswalk (Serious Bodily Injury),
 - 2) Southbound right-turning vehicle did not yield to bicyclist on the west leg crosswalk.
- 4) 7 out of 15 crashes occurred during dark and lighted conditions.

Potential Solutions:

- 1) No Right-Turn on Red (RTOR) blank out sign during AM and PM peak hours for the southbound right turning vehicles,
- 2) Widen the west leg crosswalk to provide separate paths for bicycle and pedestrians
 - Provide pedestrian refuge in the west leg crosswalk (if possible – short term),

3) Leading pedestrian Interval for the east and west leg crosswalks and reduce the curb radius in the northwest corner (reduce the turning vehicle speeds),

4) Improve lighting.

COCONUT GROVE STATION – OPERATION ANALYSIS



Preliminary Operational Results from Intersection Study (Underline Phase 3)

Proposed Improvements

Leading Pedestrian Interval (AM = 10 sec, PM = 3 sec)

No Right Turn on Red on Southbound Right approach

Conversion of Northbound Left-Turn Phase from Protected-Permissive to Protected only phase (Not proposed as part of the feasibility study)

Signal Timing Optimization

| | | | EXISTING | | | | | | | | | | PROPOSED | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|-------|----------|-----------------------------|------|-------|---|-------|------|---|-------|------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------------|------|-------|---|-------|------|---|------|------|-------|
| INTERSECTION | RESULT EASTBOUND (cross street) | | | WESTBOUND (cross street) | | | NORTHBOUND (US-1/Ponce De Leon Blvd/SW 37 Avenue) | | | SOUTHBOUND (US-1/Ponce De Leon Blvd/SW 37 Avenue) | | | EASTBOUND (cross street) | | | WESTBOUND (cross street) | | | NORTHBOUND (US-1/Ponce De Leon Blvd/SW 37 Avenue) | | | SOUTHBOUND (US-1/Ponce De Leon Blvd/SW 37 Avenue) | | | |
| | | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT |
| | V/C Ratio | 0.79 | 0.89 | 0.66 | 0.49 | 0.86 | 0.73 | 0.98 | 0.77 | | 1.14 | 0.91 | | 1 | 0.87 | 0.63 | 0.66 | 0.83 | 0.55 | 0.73 | 0.77 | | 0.8 | 0.93 | |
| | Movement Delay | 96.2 | 111.2 | 84.6 | 80 | 110 | 91.5 | 145.8 | 59.2 | | 166.3 | 32.6 | | 165.1 | 108.1 | 75.5 | 97.3 | 105.5 | 76 | 108.3 | 17.7 | | 69.3 | 43.6 | |
| | (s/veh) & LOS | F | F | F | E | F | F | F | E | | F | С | | F | F | E | F | F | E | F | в | | E | D | |
| #2 US-1/Dixle Hwy & | Approach Delay | | 100.7 | | | 100.5 | | | 64.3 | | | 40.6 | | | 107.1 | | | 94 | | | 23.1 | | | 45.1 | |
| SVV 2/01 AVE | (s/veh) & LOS | F | | | F | | | E | | | D 🌧 | | | F | | | F | | | с | | | D | | |
| | Intersection Delay | 62.3 | | | | | | | .3 | | | | 49.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (s/veh) & LOS | | | | | | | | E | | | | | D | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | V/C Ratio | 1.11 | 0.76 | 0.09 | 0.28 | 0.94 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.37 | | 0.29 | 0.26 | | 0.74 | 0.53 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.82 | 0.42 | 0.87 | 0.41 | | 0.35 | 0.38 | |
| | Movement Delay | 177.4 | 94.1 | 67.8 | 78 | 122.2 | 88.1 | 34.1 | 31.2 | | 14.5 | 16.9 | | 75.9 | 74.8 | 39 | 76.5 | 100.2 | 78.1 | 101.2 | 37.7 | | 41.3 | 44.4 | |
| HOLLO AND HE HAVE A | (s/veh) & LOS | F | F | E | E | F | F | С | С | | в | в | | E | E | D | E | F | E | F | D | | D | D | |
| #2 US-1/Dixie Hwy a | Approach Delay | | 108.7 | | | 108.9 | | | 31.8 | | | 16.6 | | | 68.4 | | | 91.8 | | | 50.9 | | 44 | | |
| SW 27th Ave | (s/veh) & LOS | | F | | | F | | | С | | | в | | | E | | F | | | | D | | D | | |
| | Intersection Delay | | | | | | 57 | .9 | | | | | | 60.4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (s/veh) & LOS | | | | | | E | | | | | | | | | | | | E | | | | | | |



COCONUT GROVE STATION – EXISTING CONDITIONS



COCONUT GROVE STATION - ALT. 2: AT GRADE IMPROVEMENTS



Proposed Improvements:

- No Right Turn on Red (RTOR) for southbound right turning movement
- Include High Emphasis Crosswalks
- New Curb Ramps
- Improve lighting in the area



| DELAND | NOR | HSI/ | ATION | - CONN | NECTIVI | IY ASSE | ESSMENT |
|--|-----------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Crosswalk Leg – SW 84 | th St. Mode | 1869. M. H. | AM Pk Hr | Midday Pk Hr | PM Pk Hr | Nighttime Pk Hr | |
| East leg | Pedestrian Co | ount | <u>79</u> | <u>15</u> | <u>72</u> | 19 | 1 and a start of the second |
| | Bicycle Count | t | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | 1 | 0 | |
| West leg | Pedestrian Co | ount | Z | <u>1</u> | <u>8</u> | 0 | 878 |
| | Bicycle Count | t | 1 | <u>0</u> | 5 | <u>0</u> | 1 3 4 4 4 5 Stan 14 |
| North leg | Pedestrian Co | ount | <u>19</u> | <u>13</u> | <u>31</u> | 3 | |
| | Bicycle Count | <u>t</u> | <u>12</u> | <u>5</u> | 20 | 1 | |
| South leg | Pedestrian Co | ount | <u>7</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>19</u> | 3 | |
| 2 | Bicycle Count | t | 6 | 2 | 5 | 1 | |
| | k | | | | International and Provide Astronomy | | |
| 20 | | A | | | | | Alt. 1 Location |
| <u>c Leg – SW 68^{crr} Ct.</u> | lode | AM Pk Hr | Midday Pk F | <u>Ir PM Pk Hr</u> | Nighttime | Pk Hr | A M PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - YY |
| Bi | icvcle Count | 1 | 0 | ± 0 | 0 | A Second | |
| P | edestrian Count | 146 | 28 | 241 | 12 | Jan. | MIDDAY PEAK HOUK I KAFFIG - XX |
| Bi | icycle Count | 10 | 5 | 12 | 2 | 13 1 | P.M. PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX |
| P | edestrian Count | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>0</u> | | NIGHTTIME PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC - XX |
| Bi | icycle Count | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | | |
| | odoctrian Count | 5 | 7 | 16 | 2 | V 1/2 | PEDE21KIAN VULUME AT CRUSSWALK - 3 |
| <u>P</u> | euestnan count | - | - | | - | 100 | |

DADELAND NORTH STATION – SAFETY ANALYSIS

Safety Analysis

2 Crashes:

- Southbound right-turning vehicle (during red) colliding with bicyclist on north leg crosswalk
 Southbound right-turning vehicle (during green) did
- not yield to bicyclist on the west leg crosswalk.



Issues:

1) Southbound through vehicle colliding with pedestrian crossing mid-block away from available crosswalk (serious bodily injury) - Nighttime,

2) At SW 84th Street:

- 1) Southbound right-turning vehicle (during red) unable to stop before the crosswalk,
- 2) During southbound green: Southbound rightturning vehicle did not yield to bicyclist on the west leg crosswalk.

Potential Solutions:

1) Provide landscaping within the available median between SW 70th Ave and available mid-block crossing at SW 68th Court

2) General - Improve lighting,

- 3) At SW 84th Street:
 - 1) No Right-Turn on Red (RTOR) blank out sign during AM and PM peak hours for the southbound right turning vehicles,
 - 2) Provide pedestrian refuge in the west leg crosswalk,
 - 3) Provide Leading pedestrian Interval for the east and west leg crosswalks.





| DADE | LAND |) N | OF | RTF | I STATI | ON | – SA | FETY | A | NA | LY. | SIS | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|-------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | Preli | minary Op | oerati | onal | Resu | ts fro | m Interse | ction | Stud | y (Underl | ine Ph | ase 3) | |
| | M Pk Hr. | - 41 | 🏷 | | | | Proposed Improvements | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wanan P | M Pk Hr. | - 55 | veh | | e sere | A L | | Lea | nding | g Peo | dest | rian | Interval | (AN | 1/PN | 1 = 9 sec |) | | |
| | | X | in the second | ee . | 1151 | | No R | light Tur | n on | Red | d on | Sou | thbounc 84 St) | l Rig | ht a | pproach | (fro | m SW | |
| | | | 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - | 100 A | SWR | | No Right Turn on Red on Southwest bound Right approach (from US-1) | | | | | | | | | | | (from | |
| | | | | | | C. | Co Perm | nversion issive to | n of I o Pro | Nort tect | hbo ed c fe | und only easit | Left-Tur phase (N pility stu | n Ph lot p dy) | nase prop | from Pr osed as | otect part | ed- of the | |
| | | | | | Contra tel ser | 80 | | | | Sig | gnal | Timi | ng Optir | niza | tion | | | | |
| | | | _ | | EX | ISTING | | | | | | | PROPOSED | | | | | | |
| INTERSECTION | | E/ (o | ASTBOUN | ND et) | WESTBOUND (cross street) | NOF (US-1/P Blvd/St | THBOUND once De Leon W 37 Avenue) | SOUTHBO (US-1/Ponce I Blvd/SW 37 A | UND De Leon wenue) | E (4 | ASTBOU ross stre | ND eet) | WESTBOU (cross stre | ND et) | NO (US-1) Blvd/: | RTHBOUND Ponce De Leon SW 37 Avenue) | SOI (US-1/I Blvd/S | JTHBOUND Ponce De Leon W 37 Avenue) | |
| #18 US-1/Dixie Hwy & SW 84th Street | V/C Ratio Movement Delay (s/veh) & LOS Approach Delay (s/veh) & LOS | 0.71 102.1 F | 0.71 102.1 F 99.1 F | 0.03 81.2 F | 0.9 0 254.1 97.6 F F 216.6 F | 0.12 0.2 A | 0.44 8.6 A 8.6 A | 0.11 0.4 6.9 18.4 A B 18.2 B | | 0.73 104 F | 0.73 104.4 F 100.2 F | 0.15 76 E | 0.03 131.4 F 122.7 F | 0.06 95 F | 0.45 113 F | 0.44 15.0 B 17.6 B | 0.12 9.8 A | 0.4 13.5 B 13.4 B | |
| #18 US-1/Dixie Hwv & | (s/veh) & LOS V/C Ratio Movement Delay (s/veh) & LOS | 0.17 82.2 F | 0.15 81.9 F | 0.04 80.3 F | 1.22 0.01 351.5 97.7 F F | C 0.72 79.4 E | 0.41 9 A | 0.13 0.71 6.7 25.4 A C | | 0.17 82.1 F | 0.15 81.9 F | 0.25 83.2 F | 1.18 324.7 F | 0.08 84.1 F | 0.04 137.8 F | 0.47 14 B | 0.15 16.3 B | 0.80 43.3 D | |
| SW 84th Street | Approach Delay (s/veh) & LOS Intersection Delay | tay 81.2 272.2 12.6 25.1 82.8 240.5 20 VS F F B C F F C 0 <td colspan="5">20.3 42.9 C D</td> | | | | | | | | | | | 20.3 42.9 C D | | | | | | |

DADELAND NORTH STATION – EXISTING CONDITIONS

SW 68TH COURT

SW 84TH STREET





DADELAND NORTH STATION ALT. 4: AT GRADE IMPROVEMENTS



DADELAND NORTH STATION ALT. 4: AT GRADE IMPROVEMENTS









DADELAND SOUTH STATION - CONNECTIVITY ASSESSMENT

DADELAND SOUTH STATION – SAFETY ANALYSIS



Issues:

- 1) At Datran Drive: Southbound right-turning vehicle (during red) unable to stop before the crosswalk,
- At Dadeland Blvd: Bike-Pedestrians not yielding to vehicles/walking away from available crosswalk.

Potential Solutions:

- 1) At Datran Drive:
 - 1) Improve pavement markings,
 - 2) Install curb ramps (ADA compliant),
 - Additional improvement for consideration -Close the box (install the crosswalk on south leg to cross US-1) = People were seen crossing based on demand.

2) At Dadeland Blvd:

1) Install "Use Crosswalk" sign.

3) General - Improve lighting.



DADELAND SOUTH STATION – EXISTING CONDITIONS

DATRAN DRIVE



DADELAND BLVD



DADELAND SOUTH STATION – EXISTING CONDITIONS

DATRAN DRIVE



DADELAND BLVD



17





DADELAND SOUTH STATION – ALT 4: AT GRADE IMPROVEMENTS







PROJECT SCHEDULE



*

BPAC Meeting

20

<u>Milestones</u>

Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting - November 7, 2023 TWO Completed - December 15, 2023

Estimated Total Duration







MIAMI-DADE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TPO OFFICES 150 WEST FLAGLER STREET SUITE 1900 – BOARD CONFERENCE ROOM MIAMI, FL 33130

- FINAL SUMMARY MINUTES -

MEETING OF TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2023, AT 5:30 PM

BPAC MEMBER ATTENDANCE:

Melissa Hege (Vice-Chair), Webber Charles, Dariel Fernandez, Matthew Gultanoff, Amanda Sherlock, Eric Tullberg, Robert Werthamer, Dr. Mickey Witte

BPAC MEMBERS ABSENT:

Charles Fischer (Chair)(Excused), Samantha Henry (Unexcused). Ginger Phillips (Excused), Hank Sanchez-Resnik (Excused)

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Kevin C. Walford, Miami-Dade TPO John McWilliams, Kimley-Horn Victoria Rodriguez, Kimley-Horn Isaac Pinckney, DTPW Thom Bell, Citizen Sheena Lewis, Citizen Stephanie Romero, BCC Engineering Jesús Fuentes, Miami-Dade TPO

I. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

Mr. Walford called the meeting to order with a quorum at 5:35 PM. As the Chair, Charles Fischer, was not present, the gavel was handed to the Vice-Chair, Melissa Hege. Mr. Walford introduced two new members, Amanda Sherlock and Robert Werthamer, who were appointed by TPO Board Members Christi Fraga and Keon Hardemon, respectively. Introductions around the room followed.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion for approval of the November 7, 2023 agenda made by Mr. Tullberg, seconded by Dr. Witte, and approved unanimously.

BPAC SUMMARY MINUTES: 11.7.23



III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion for approval of the October 10, 2023 minutes made by Mr. Tullberg, seconded by Dr. Witte, and approved unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Thom Bell and Sheena Lewis spoke about bike facilities and interactions with drivers in Wynwood.

V. US-1 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE FEASIBILITY STUDY

Stephanie Romero of BCC Engineering conducted a brief presentation highlighted by the following:

- Project Information
- Project Need
 - Implement pedestrian and bicyclist access across US-1 utilizing pedestrian bridges at the 3 Metrorail stations
 - Maximize safety, mobility and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing US-1
- Coconut Grove Station Analysis
 - Connectivity Assessment
 - o Crash Data
 - o Alternative 1 Pedestrian Bridge at SW 27th Avenue
 - o Alternative 2 At Grade Improvements
- Dadeland North Station Analysis
 - o Connectivity Assessment
 - o Crash Data
 - $\circ \quad \text{Alternative 1-Pedestrian Bridge west of SW 84^{th} Street}$
 - o Alternative 2 Pedestrian Bridge W of SW 84th St (closer to Snapper Creek Canal)
 - Alternative 3 At Grade Improvements
- Dadeland South Station Analysis
 - Connectivity Assessment
 - o Crash Data
 - o Alternative 1 Pedestrian Bridge at Dadeland Boulevard
 - Alternative 2 Pedestrian Bridge west of Datran Drive
 - Alternative 3A Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at northern end 9300 Plaza and Shorty's BBQ
 - Alternative 3B Pedestrian Bridge to accommodate new development at the center of 9300 Plaza and Shorty's BBQ
 - Alternative 4 At Grade Improvements
- Project Schedule
- Next Steps

BPAC member Dariel Fernandez arrived to the meeting at 6:12 pm.

BPAC SUMMARY MINUTES: 11.7.23



After the presentation, the Chair opened the floor to questions, concerns, and comments that Ms. Romero addressed. Dr. Witte proposed a BPAC resolution for crossing options other than pedestrian bridges. Mr. Walford will prepare the resolution and it will be brought to the BPAC at its December meeting for a vote.

VI. FDOT DISTRICT SIX: MONTHLY PROJECT UPDATE REPORT

John McWilliams of Kimley-Horn conducted a brief presentation highlighted by the following:

- 435501-4-34-01 The Underline from SW 19 Avenue to Dadeland South Metrorail Station
- 449946-1-52-01 Scoping Report SR A1A/Collins Avenue from 44 Street to south of Indian Creek Drive
- 446002-1-52-01 SR 953/Le Jeune Road/SW 42 Avenue from North Dixie Highway to north of Altara Avenue
- 450761-3-61-01 SR A1A at 5th Street Miami Beach Pedestrian Bridge
- 429286-6-32-01 SR 959/SW 57 Avenue at SW 62 Street
- 452428-1-21-01 Town of Bay Harbour Islands Broad Causeway Bridge PD&E Study
- 414052-4-32-01 SR 953/Le Jeune Road at Coral Way/Miracle Mile

After the presentation, the Chair opened the floor to questions, concerns, and comments that Mr. McWilliams addressed.

VII. DTPW ROAD TO ZERO GRANT UPDATE

Isaac Pinckney of DTPW conducted a brief presentation highlighted by the following:

- Program Goal
 - To end traffic fatalities and serious injuries by 2040
- Grant Overview
 - o To increase safe, reliable, sustainable, and equitable mobility for all
- Progress to Date
 - o Grant Funding Scope
 - Funded by National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)
 - Three Pillars of Road to Zero Strategy
 - Vision Zero Dashboard
 - Local Community Liaison Pilot Program
 - Budget
 - DTPW awarded \$150,000 in funding for its 2022 applications
 - o Scope of Work Development

BPAC SUMMARY MINUTES: 11.7.23



- Next Steps
 - Approval and Signing of Notice to Proceed (NTP)
 - November 7, 2023
 - o Launching in-house design of the Vision Zero Dashboard
 - 9 month implementation window

After the presentation, the Chair opened the floor to questions, concerns, and comments that Mr. Pinckney addressed.

BPAC member Amanda Sherlock left the meeting at 7:12 pm.

VIII. FDOT DISTRICT SIX: NW 36TH STREET MULTIMODAL CORRIDOR STUDY Jesús Fuentes of EXP conducted a brief presentation highlighted by the following:

- Description of the Area
- Steps Completed so Far
 - Technical Memoranda
 - Public Outreach
- Walking Audits
 - City of Miami Springs (9.15.23)
 - Village of Virginia Gardens (10.4.23)
- Elected Officials/Public Feedback Received
- Current and Recommended Conceptual Typical Sections and Alternatives
 - Section 1A SR 826/Palmetto Expressway to NW 72nd Avenue
 - $\circ \quad \mbox{Section 1B-NW 72 Avenue to Bridge over FEC Hialeah Railway Yard}$
 - Section 2 FEC Railway Bridge
 - \circ Section 3 NW 67 Avenue to NW 57 Avenue
 - Section 4 NW 57 Avenue to South Royal Poinciana Boulevard
 - Section 5 South Royal Poinciana Blvd to NW 37 Avenue (Iron Triangle)
 - Section 6 NW 37 Avenue to NW 17 Avenue
 - Section 7 NW 17 Avenue to NW 7 Avenue
 - Section 8 NW 7 Avenue to I-95 Underpass
 - o Section 9 NW 5 Avenue to North Miami Avenue
 - o Section 10 North Miami Avenue to SR-5/US-1/Biscayne Boulevard
- Other Recommended Analyses
- Next Steps
 - Nov BPAC, FTAC & CTAC meetings
 - Dec City of Miami Springs, Village of Virginia Gardens, and City of Miami Commission Meetings
 - o Dec Final Report
 - 2024 Including recommendation in the upcoming 2050 LRTP, 2026-2030 TIP, FDOT Work Program, as appropriate

After the presentation, the Chair opened the floor to questions, concerns, and comments that Mr. Fuentes addressed.

BPAC SUMMARY MINUTES: 11.7.23



IX. MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Tullberg's comments were provided via printed handouts to the BPAC members.

X. NEW/OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Walford mentioned that the 2024 meeting dates will be finalized soon. He also discussed that in January will be the next cycle for BPAC officer elections. The current chair, Charles Fischer, has mentioned that he will need to step down.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:41 PM. The next meeting will be on December 5, 2023.

*****MINUTES ARE IN SUMMARY FORM***** FOR AN ELECTRONIC COPY OF THE RECORDING OF THIS MEETING PLEASE CONTACT THE MIAMI-DADE TPO AT 305.375.4507

BPAC SUMMARY MINUTES: 11.7.23









MIAMI-DADE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TPO)

TRANSPORTATION AESTHETICS REVIEW (TARC) COMMITTEE

150 WEST FLAGLER STREET, SUITE 1900 MIAMI, FL 33130

FINAL SUMMARY MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2023

TARC MEMBERS ATTENDANCE:

Debbie Swain (Vice-Chairperson) Mark W. Bobb Karley Chynces Jorge Troitino

OTHERS PRESENT:

Oscar Camejo, TARC Coordinator, Miami-Dade TPO Stephanie Romero, BCC Engineering Bradley Woodson, Miami-Dade TPO





I. CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL AND QUORUM

Vice-Chairperson Debbie Swain introduced herself and called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm. Vice-Chairperson Debbie Swain, asked for the Committee Members and audience to introduce themselves and advised that there was a quorum present.

I. A. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Karley Chynces made a motion to approve the agenda, which was seconded by Mark W. Bobb. The motion passed unanimously.

I. B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Vice-Chairperson Debbie Swain requested that approval of September meeting minutes be moved to next TARC meeting since those present at the current meeting were not present at the September meeting. TARC members agreed.

II. ACTION ITEMS

N/A

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. US-1 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE FEASIBILITY STUDY

Miami-Dade TPO consultant made the presentation on the US-1 Bicycle And Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study. Consultant went over the project needs which included the recommended implementation of pedestrian and bicyclist access across US-1 at Coconut Grove, Dadeland North and Dadeland South Metrorail Stations. The purpose of the study is to maximize safety, mobility and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing US-1. The consultant went over the crash data summary, proposed potential bridge and at grade improvements alternatives at three Metrorail Stations studied. Consultant also went over the project schedule, major milestones, and next steps: finalize concept development and cost estimates, finalize recommendations, approval/endorsement of recommendations. The TARC members raised concerns on landscaping and accessibility issues, which consultant responded to the satisfaction of the TARC members.





IV. REPORTS

A. MEMBER REPORTS

None

B. STAFF REPORTS

TARC Coordinator, Mr. Oscar Camejo, distributed the TARC schedule of meetings to be held in 2024. Karley Chynces made a motion to approve the 2024 schedule, which was seconded by Jorge Troitino. The motion passed unanimously.

TARC Coordinator, Mr. Oscar Camejo shared images of the lighting underneath the SR 826/836 interchange which were all in working order. Mr. Oscar Camejo stated that the pictures were submitted by a previous TARC member and that TARC's correspondence with the Expressway Authority played an important role in getting the lights operational again.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Consultant offered to present the "Enhancing Safe Routes to School Program" to the next TARC meeting. TARC members were receptive to the recommendation.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments made.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:51 PM.

MINUTES ARE IN SUMMARY FORM

FOR AN ELECTRONIC COPY OF THE RECORDING OF THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE MIAMI-DADE TPO AT (305) 375-4507.





COST ESTIMATE



APPENDIX D

| 2 - Cost of comp | ponents of | f the existing | z bridge at U | niversity stati | on were calc | ulated, note a cons | truction bu | ffer is added. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------|--|
| | | | | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Number | Tower | Span | Bridge | | Assumed | Assumed | Total | Const. | Tot | al | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ofTowers | Cost | Length | Width | Bridge Cost | RoW Aq. | RoW Cost | RoW Cost | Risk | Cos | st | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station/Alterna | ative | | | (ft) | (ft) | | (sf) | (/sf) | | Buffer | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| University | | 2 | \$600,000 | 124 | 13.333 | \$1,157,333.33 | 2000 | \$250 | \$500,000 | 1.10 | \$2,433,0 | 066.67 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 - Cost Calcula | ated is ther | n compared | to actual tot | al cost of \$6 f | Million, and a | a factor is derived fi | om the com | parison | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calculate | ed Cost = | \$2,433, | 066.67 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Actu | ual Cost = | \$6,000, | 000.00 | Source: http | s://news.mia | mi.edu/stories/20 | 16/12/pede | strian-bridge | e-installed-over | r-us-1.html | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Actual Cost | t Factor = | 2.47 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | ote the actu | ual cost fact | or accounts f | or constructi | on costs rela | ted to performing | onstructio | n immediate | ly adjacent to t | he | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Me | etrorail, w | hich heavily | affects schee | luling and co | mplicates the | e construction pro | cess, leading | to increased | l costs. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | - The Actual Cost value is based on a dollar value from the year of completion of the Pedestrian Bridge at University station (2017). Inflation must be accounted for from 2017 to 2023. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 - The Actual C | Cost value i | is based on a | dollar value | from the yea | r of completi | on of the Pedestria | n Bridge at I | University sta | ation (2017). Ir | flation mus | be accounte | d for from 2017 to 20 | 23. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | _ | | | |
| 20: | 17 Dollar | Value (Base) | =\$1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 203 | 23 Dollar I | Equivalent = | \$1.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Sou | urce: http: | s://www.usi | nflationcalc | ulator.com/ | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | - | | | |
| 5 - A final factor | r superimp | posing the fa | ctors develo | ped in steps 3 | and 4 is crea | ated for the final ca | culations. | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | |
| Final | Factor = | 3.03 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Į | | | | | | | |
| C. Caller Barry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | |
| 6 - Gather Row | data for a | il alternativ | es. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 11-14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Unit | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Station | n | Prop | erty | Lot Size | Mar | ket Value | Market | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station | n | Prop | erty | Lot Size (sqft) | Mar | ket Value | Market Cost (\$/SF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station | n | Prop | erty | Lot Size (sqft) | Mar | ket Value | Market Cost (\$/SF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G | n irove | Prop Shell Ga | s Station | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 | Mar \$ | 6,155,498 | Market Cost (\$/SF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N | n irove North | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C | s Station | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 | Mar \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland N | n Grove North North | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C Ro | s Station heverolet | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 | Mar \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S | n Grove North North South | Prop Shell Ga: Bomnin C Ro Sho | s Station heverolet oss rtys | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 6 235 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland A | n Frove North North South North | Prop Shell Ga: Bomnin C Ro Sho Trade | s Station heverolet oss rtys r Joe's | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,032,871 | Market Cost (\$/\$F) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 225 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland N Dadeland N | n North North North North North | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C Ro Sho Trade 93 | s Station heverolet bss rtys r Joe's 00 | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,047,819 | Market Cost (\$/\$F) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S | n North North North North North South South | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C Ra Sho Trade 93 City Fu | s Station heverolet >ss rtys r Joe's 00 rniture rking | Lot Size (sqft) 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35 548 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,81 8,713,872 | Market Cost (\$/\$F) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S | n Frove North North North North South South South | Prop Shell Ga: Bomnin C Rc Sho Trade 93 City Fu Burge Auto Pe | s Station heverolet bss rtys r Joe's 00 rniture r King rfection | Lot Size (sqft) 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,866,189 | Market Cost (\$/\$F) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 234 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S | n irove North North North North South South South South | Prop Shell Ga: Bomnin C Ro Sho Trade 93 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 | erty s Station heverolet bss rlys rloe's 00 rniture er King rfection BLDG | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 234 \$ 234 \$ 214 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S | n irove lorth | Prop Shell Ga: Bomnin C Ro Sho Trade 93 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelat | s Station theverolet oss rtys r Joe's 00 rniture r King rfection BLDG od Plaza | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 234 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 234 \$ 214 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S | n korth korth korth korth korth korth south south south south | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C Sho Sho Trade 93 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar | erty s Station heverolet bss oo rritys 7 Joe's 00 rniture r King rfection BLDG hd Plaza | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,187 2,896,199 2,607,109 31,762,511 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 234 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S | n irove lorth lorth south lorth south south south south south south idge Cost f | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C Sho Trade 93 Oity Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelat Estimates. | erty s Station heverolet sss rtys r Joe's 00 rriture r King rfection BLDG dd Plaza | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 244 \$ 244 \$ 244 \$ 244 \$ 244 \$ 125 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S | n irove korth korth korth korth korth isouth isouth isouth isouth isouth isouth isouth isouth isouth | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C Rn Sho Trade 93 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar Estimates. | s Station heverolet sss rJoe's 00 rniture r King rfection BLDG nd Plaza | Lot Size (sqft) 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,37,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 106 \$ 106 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 244 \$ 245 \$ 245 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S | n Jorth Jorth Jorth Jorth Jorth Jorth Jorth South South South Jouth | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C Sho Trade 933 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar Estimates. | s Station heverolet sss rtys oo rniture r King rfection BLDG dd Plaza Tower | Lot Size (sqft) 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 Span | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 225 | Assumed | Total | Const. | Final | Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S | n irove North North South South South South South South South South | Shell Ga Bomnin C Sho Sho Trade 93 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar Estimates. Number of Towers | s Station heverolet sss rtys 7 Joe's 00 rniture r King rfection BLDG d Plaza | Lot Size (sqft) 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 Span Length | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 Bridge Cost | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 234 \$ 214 \$ 125 Assumed Row Aq. | Assumed RoW Cost | Total RoW Cost | Const. | Final | Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S T - Calculate Bri Station/Alterna | n irove North North North South | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C R Sho Trade 93 City Fu Burge 9350 Dadelar Estimates. Number of Towers | s Station heverolet 2555 r Joe's 00 miture r King rfection BLDG nd Plaza Tower Cost | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 Span Length (ft) | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,37,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 Bridge Cost | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 205 \$ 235 \$ 205 \$ 205 | Assumed RoW Cost (/sf) | Total RoW Cost | Const. Risk Buffer | Final Cost Factor | Total Cost | | | | | Nc | | | | | |
| Station Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Station/Alterna Coconut Grove | n irove North North North South South South South South South South A South Sou | Prop Shell Ga: Bomnin C Sho Trade 93 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar Estimates. Number of Towers 2 | s Station heverolet sss r Joe's 00 rriture r King rfection BLDG d Plaza Tower Cost \$600,000 | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 Span Length (ft) 103 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 31,762,511 Bridge Cost \$961,333.33 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 206 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 206 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 206 \$ 206 \$ 207 \$ 206 \$ 207 \$ 205 \$ 206 \$ 207 \$ 20 | Assumed RoW Cost (/sf) \$112 | Total RoW Cost \$201,530 | Const. Risk Buffer 1.10 | Final Cost Factor 3.03 | Total Cost \$5,820,717.00 | | | | | Nc | Dites | | | | |
| Station Coconut G Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Station/Alterna Coconut Grove | n irove North North South | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C Shon Trade 933 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar Estimates. Number of Towers 2 2 | s Station heverolet >ss rJoe's 00 omiture r King rfection BLDG dd Plaza | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,197 253,808 5pan Length (ft) 103 135 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,7138,72 2,896,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 Bridge Cost \$961,333.33 \$1,260,000.00 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 244 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 244 \$ 125 Assumed RoW Aq. (sf) 1800 1800 | Assumed RoW Cost (/sf) \$112 \$112 | Total RoW Cost \$201,530 \$201,530 | Const. Risk Buffer 1.10 | Final Cost Factor 3.03 | Total Cost \$5,820,717.00 \$9,241,194,71 | 20% added | to Const. B | uffer for Con | structabili | Nc ty Risks, Tow | otes rer Cost incr | reased for 3 r | d level bridg | e height_ | |
| Station Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S T - Calculate Bri Station/Alterna Coconut Grove Caconut Grove Dadeland North | n irrove iorth iorth iorth iorth iorth iorth iouth iouth iouth iouth idge Cost f ative | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C Shoh 7 Trade 93 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar Estimates. Number of Towers 2 2 2 2 | station heverolet sss rtys rJoe's 00 mriture r King rfection BLDG dPlaza Tower Cost S600,000 \$928,571 \$600,000 | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 Span Length (ft) 103 135 129 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,37,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 2,856,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 Bridge Cost \$961,333,33 \$1,260,000.00 | Market Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 202 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 215 \$ 218 \$ 125 \$ 128 \$ 128 \$ 128 \$ 128 \$ 128 \$ 128 \$ 128 1 | Assumed RoW Cost (/sf) \$112 \$112 \$106 | Total RoW Cost \$201,530 \$203,867 | Const. Risk Buffer 1.10 1.30 | Final Cost Factor 3.03 3.03 | Total Cost \$5,820,717.00 \$5,241,194,71 \$7,111,502.66 | 20% added t | to Const. Bu | uffer for Con | | Nc ty Risks, Tow d to canal | otes rer Cost incr | reased for 3 r | d level bridg | e height | |
| Station Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S S Cacoulate Pri Station/Alterna Station/Alterna Station/Alterna Coconut Grove Dadeland North | n irove North North North North South South South South South South South A South Sou | Prop Shell Ga Bornin C Sho Trade 933 City Fu Burge 9350 Dadelar Estimates. Number of Towers 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | station heverolet >ss rtys roe's 00 mniture r king rfection BLDG d Plaza Tower Cost \$600,000 \$928,571 \$600,000 | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 Span Length (ft) 103 135 129 152 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 3,607,1 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 214 \$ 125 Assumed RoW Aq. (sf) 1800 1800 2200 2200 | Assumed RoW Cost (/s1) \$112 \$112 \$106 \$106 | Total RoW Cost \$201,530 \$233,867 \$233,867 | Const. Risk Buffer 1.10 1.30 1.17 1.10 | Final Cost Factor 3.03 3.03 3.03 | Total Cost \$5,820,717.00 \$9,241,194,71 \$7,141,711,502.66 | 20% added to | to Const. B o Const. Const. B | uffer for Con fler for struc | structabilii | Nc Ly Risks, Towned to canal | otes | reased for 3r | d level bridg | e height | |
| Station Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S 7 - Calculate Bri Station/Alterna Coconut Grove Dadeland North Dadeland North | n irove iorove iorth ior | Prop Shell Ga Bornnin C Sho Traded 93 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar Estimates. Number of Towers 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | erty Station heverolet ss rtys rloe's 00 00 rfiction BLDG d Plaza Tower Cost \$600,000 \$928,571 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,382 12,197 253,808 Span Length (ft) 103 1355 129 152 148 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,7138,22 2,896,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 Bridge Cost \$961,333.33 51,260,000.00 \$1,204,000.00 \$1,204,000.00 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 224 \$ 214 \$ 125 Cost (\$/SF) 1800 1800 2200 2200 1800 | Assumed RoW Cost (/sf) \$112 \$106 \$106 \$214 | Total RoW Cost \$201,530 \$233,867 \$233,867 \$233,867 | Const. Risk Buffer 1.10 1.30 1.17 1.17 | Final Cost Factor 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 | Total Cost \$5,820,717.00 \$9,241,194.71 \$7,111,502.66 \$7,744,710.80.53 | 20% added to | to Const. B o Const. Bu | uffer for Coo | nstructabilli tures relate | Nc y Risks, Tow cd to canal | otes rer Cost incr | reased for 3r | d level bridg | e height | |
| Station Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland South | n sirove North North North South South South South South South South South South South A A A A A A A A A A A A A | Prop Shell Ga Bornin C Sho Trade 933 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar Estimates. Number of Towers 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | station heverolet ss rtys 10e's 00 miture r King rfection BLDG d Plaza Tower Cost \$600,000 \$502,571 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 Span Length (ft) 103 135 1299 152 148 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 Bridge Cost \$961,333.33 \$1,260,000.00 \$1,241,8666.87 \$1,381,333.33 \$1,270,333.33 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 234 \$ 245 \$ 234 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 234 \$ 214 \$ 125 Assumed Row Aq. (sf) 1800 2200 2200 3800 | Assumed RoW Cost (/sf) \$112 \$106 \$106 \$214 \$241 | Total RoW Cost \$201,530 \$233,867 \$233,867 \$384,750 \$384,750 | Const. Risk Buffer 1.10 1.30 1.17 1.10 1.10 | Final Cost Factor 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 | Total Cost \$5,820,717.00 \$9,241,194,71 \$7,111,502 \$7,444,710.80 \$7,777,805.33 \$9,108,249,18 | 20% added 7% added to Row Cost is | to Const. Bu o Const. Bu | uffer for Con figer for structure faverage | nstructabilin tures relate | Nc ty Risks, Tow d to canal | otes rer Cost incr | reased for 3r | d level bridg | e height | |
| Station Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Station/Alterna Coconut Grove Dadeland North Dadeland North Dadeland North Dadeland North Dadeland North Dadeland South | n irove lorth | Prop Shell Ga Bornin C Sho Trade 93 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 93500 Dadelan Estimates. Number of Towers 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | erty station heverolet ss rtys rtys rtys rection BLDG of Plaza frection BLDG of Plaza frection \$200,000 \$928,571 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 1,197 12,382 12,197 253,808 5 5 5 5 7 12,197 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 3,1,762,511 Bridge Cost 9961,333,33 \$1,260,000.00 51,248,666.67 51,381,333,33 \$1,277,333,33 51,227,733,33 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 244 \$ 245 \$ 245 \$ 245 \$ 245 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 245 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 125 Control (\$ 102 \$ 225 \$ | Assumed RoW Cost (/sf) 5112 \$106 \$214 \$214 \$173 | Total Row Cost \$201,530 \$233,867 \$384,750 \$915,776 \$741,913 | Const. Risk Buffer 1.10 1.30 1.17 1.10 1.10 1.10 | Final Cost Factor 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 | Total Cost \$5,820,717.00 \$9,241,194,71 \$7,111,502.66 \$7,744,710.80 \$7,747,805.33 \$9,108,249.18 \$6,425,181.44 | 20% added 7% added to Row Cost is Row Cost is | to Const. B o Const. Bu a weighted a weighted | uffer for Con ffer for Struc Laverage | nstructabilin tures relate | Nc ty Risks, Tow d to canal | otes | reased for 3r | d level bridg | e height | |
| Station Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S Dadeland S T - Calculate Bri Station/Alterna Coconut Grove Dadeland Nortt Dadeland Nortt Dadeland Nortt Dadeland Nortt Dadeland Nortt Dadeland Nortt Dadeland Nortt Dadeland Soutt Dadeland Soutt Dadeland Soutt | n irove irove iorth iouth iouth iouth iouth iouth iouth iouth idgeCost i/1 //2 h/1 h/2 | Prop Shell Ga Bornnin C Sho Traded 93 City Fu Burgg Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar Estimates. Number of Towers 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | erty Station heverolet ss rtys rloe's 00 00 rfiction BLDG d Plaza Tower Cost \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 5pan Length (ft) 103 1355 129 152 148 139 134 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 2,607,109 31,762,511 Bridge Cost 5961,333,33 51,220,000.00 51,418,666.67 51,318,133,33 51,229,7333,33 51,229,666.67 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 112 \$ 106 \$ 102 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 245 \$ 244 \$ 245 \$ 245 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 224 \$ 244 \$ 245 \$ 125 | Assumed Row Cost (/sf) \$112 \$106 \$214 \$241 \$241 \$241 \$225 | Total RoW Cost \$201,530 \$233,867 \$233,867 \$384,750 \$384,750 \$384,750 \$1,215,000 | Const. Risk Buffer 1.10 1.10 1.10 1.10 1.10 1.10 | Final Cost Factor 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.0 | Total Cost \$5,820,717.00 \$9,241,194,71 \$7,111,502.66 \$7,444,710.80 \$7,777,805.33 \$9,108,249,18 \$4,823,51,81.44 | 20% added 7% added to Row Cost is Row Cost is S% added to | to Const. Bu o Const. Bu a weighted o Const. Bu | uffer for Coo ffer for Struc faverage faverage | structabili tures relate | Nc ty Risks, Tow ed to canal | otes er Cost incr | reased for 3r | d level bridg | e height | |
| Station Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland N Dadeland S Dadeland Sout Station/Alterna Station/Alterna Coconut Grove Dadeland North Dadeland North Dadeland North Dadeland North Dadeland South Dadeland South | n sirove loop the second seco | Prop Shell Ga Bomnin C Sho Trade 933 City Fu Burge Auto Pe 9350 Dadelar Estimates. Number of Towers 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | erty station heverolet ss rtys loe's 00 rniture rking rfection BLOG d Plaza Tower Cost \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 \$600,000 | Lot Size (sqft) 54,979 275,977 247,125 32,220 64,199 32,907 49,005 35,548 12,382 12,197 253,808 5pan Length (ft) 1033 135 129 152 148 139 132 148 139 | Mar \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | ket Value 6,155,498 29,337,288 25,092,099 7,249,500 14,444,775 7,033,871 10,474,819 8,713,872 2,896,189 7,62,511 8ridge Cost \$961,333.33 \$1,260,000.00 \$1,2418,666.67 \$1,317,600.00 \$1,223,000.00 | Market Cost (\$/SF) \$ 102 \$ 106 \$ 225 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 244 \$ 245 \$ 214 \$ 244 \$ 245 \$ 214 \$ 244 \$ 214 \$ 245 \$ 225 \$ 214 \$ 225 \$ 226 \$ 2260 \$ 2200 \$ 2200 \$ 3800 \$ 3800 | Assumed RoW Cost (/sf1 \$112 \$106 \$214 \$241 \$173 \$224 \$173 \$225 \$214 | Total RoW Cost \$201,530 \$233,867 \$333,867 \$344,750 \$915,776 \$741,913 \$1,215,000 \$684,000 | Const. Risk Buffer 1.10 1.30 1.17 1.10 1.10 1.10 1.10 1.10 1.15 | Final Cost Factor 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.03 3.0 | Total Cost \$5,820,717.00 \$9,241,194,71 \$7,111,502.66 \$7,744,710.80 \$7,747,805.33 \$9,108,249.31 \$9,108,249.31 \$9,108,249.31 \$9,108,249.31 \$6,187,238.04 | 20% added 7% added to Row Cost is 5% added to 5% added to Row Cost is | to Const. Bu a weighter a weighter o Const. Bu a weighter | ulfer for Con ffer for Struc faverage Javerage | structabili tures relate | Nc ty Risks, Tow ed to canal | otes | reased for 3r | d level bridg | e height | |



RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX



Miami-Dade County E21-TPO-01 GPC VIII-34: US-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

Recommendations Matrix

| Location | Pedestrian Counts (Max Peak Hour) | Bicycle Counts (Max Peak Hour) | Total Crashes (Last 5 Years) | Pedestrian Fatalities/ (Serious Bodily Injuries) | Recommendations | Cost Range |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| Coconut Grove Metrorail Station | 373 | 25 | 15 | 0 | Short Term Recommendations: As a result of the high pedestrian counts and number of crashes at the intersection an interim recommendation is proposed. The interim recommendation are At-Grade Improvements including: wider high emphasis crosswalks, widen pedestrian curb ramps, realigned median to accomodate for new crosswalk width, and No Right Turn on Red. | \$200K - \$260K |
| | | | | (2) | Long Term Recommendations: A second or third level truss bridge is recommended to span over US-1 just west of SW 27th Avenue. Based on the total number of pedestrian crossings, total crashes, insufficient safety conditions and feedback from the Project Working Group it is recommended that the bridge alternative be further evaluated. | \$5 - \$10 Million |
| Dadeland North Metrorail Station | 241 | 28 | 3 | 0 | Short Term Recommendations: The Dadeland North Station has two different intersections that were evaluated (US-1 at 68th Court and 84th Street). As a result of the traffic data collection efforts, it was concluded that there was a high pedestrian count crossing over US-1. In order to improve the safety conditions at this location, it is recommended that the following interim At-Grade Improvements be provided: new pedestrian signals, new pedestrian curb ramps, new pedestrian refuge area in the median, combined high empahsis cross walks with bicycle crossing, upgraded pavement markings, No Turn on Red Signal and new lighting. | \$420K - \$546K |
| | | | | (0) | Long Term Recommendations: It is recommended that after the Short Term Improvements are provided a Tier 2 Planning Study be proposed at this location to identify and evaluate the existing bike network in order to provided a connected Bikeway. Complete, connected bicycle networks increase transit ridership and improve safety for all modes of traffic. In order to build a connected, comfortable bicycle network, the community (Miami-Dade County and the Village of Pinecrest) will need to assess the network quality in order to set future goals. | \$7 - \$10 Million |
| | | | | | Short Term Recommendations: The Dadeland South Metrorail Station encompasses two intersections; Datran Drive and Dadeland Blvd at US-1. The pedestrian counts and crash data justify providing a pedestrian bridge at this location in the future once the new development; Ocean Dadeland, LLC which includes two mixed-use towers located at the Shorty's BBQ are constructed. Interim recommendations include upgraded pavement markings, reconstructed ADA compliant pedestrian curb ramps, and "Use Crosswalk" signs. | \$100K - \$130K |
| Dadeland South Metrorail Station | 74 | 7 | 4 | 0 (0) | Long Term Recommendations: Considering that the proposed development will be primarily residential and that the pedestrian and bicycle counts will increase it is recommended that a pedestrian bridge be constructed over US-1 at the new development location. The existing streets currrently lack safe pedestrian crossings and as a result of this evaluation, new conditions after the construction and the input from the Project Working Group it is recommended that a pedestrian bridge that ties directly into the new development be considered. Two different alternatives can be assessed in the design phase. | \$8 - \$10 Million |