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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

The Golden Glades Multimodal Transportation Facility siting concepts developed during a previous DMJM Harris (reference report dated October 2001) were studied during October 14-15 and February 11, 2004 Value Engineering (VE) Workshops. The project is located in the southeast quadrant of the Golden Glades Interchange where State Road (SR) 826, Interstate (I)-95, SR 9, Florida's Turnpike and the South Florida Rail Transit Authority's commuter rail converge near North Miami Beach, Florida. The intent of the project is to move people and goods more expeditiously through the region at the Golden Glades Multimodal Center.

The VE team consisted of the FDOT District 6 VE Coordinator, PMA Consultants LLC, Miller Consulting, Inc., Bergmann Associates, and the major stakeholders representatives from Miami-Dade County, North Miami Beach, Congressman Kendrick Meek's office, South Florida Rail Transit Authority, Miami Transit Authority and potential developers.

1.2 Study Analysis

The VE team followed the SAVE International and FDOT recommended Value Engineering Job Plan in conducting the team's work for these creative idea sessions. After gathering information on the current FDOT District 6 plans for the Golden Glades Center. The facilitation team discussed some creative ideas and concepts on the first day of Workshop No. 1 and introduced the ideas and a visual virtual reality simulation model of the concept locations during a discussion with the FDOT Statewide District Value Engineers meeting held October 15, 2004. During the presentation and discussion many objectives and comments received were incorporated into the facilitators presentation for Workshop No. 2 that was held February 11, 2004, as an information-sharing meeting with major stakeholders in the area. During the February stakeholders' meeting the team and stakeholder panel determined several ideas that should be investigated further. The FDOT D6 plans to use the ideas generated during these sessions to optimize the Golden Glades Center and potential planned improvements.

1.3 Ideas Generated

The creative ideas that were generated at the two workshops are shown in Sections 5 and 6. These ideas would improve the value of the current Golden Glades Center Siting process. These ideas appear to be an effective way to potentially improve the method of providing the functions necessary for the Golden Glades Center for the transportation system. Some of the ideas can be combined with others.

1.4 The Process

The workshop process that brought participants to the site and the project visual simulation model was well received by the members of the workshops, because the three dimensional model allowed the groups to see what the proposed improvements would look like and visual ingress and egress for the site. A summary of the feedback from participants is included in Section 7.
VALUE ENGINEERING METHODOLOGY

2.1 General
This section describes the value analysis procedure used during the VE study. A systematic approach was used in the VE study and the key procedures involved were organized into three distinct parts: 1) preparation, 2) VE workshops, and 3) post-study.

2.2 Preparation Effort
Pre-study preparation for the VE effort consisted of scheduling study participants and tasks; reviews of documents; gathering necessary background information on the process; and compiling project data into a level of effort model. Information relating to the process is important as it forms the basis of comparison for the study effort. Information relating to funding, project planning, design, operating needs, systems evaluations, basis of cost, soil conditions, environmental, right of way (R/W) estimating, pond siting land acquisition and construction of the Golden Glades siting process was also a part of the analysis.

2.3 Value Engineering Workshop Effort
Conduct Value Engineering Mini-Study to determine Functions

PMA Consultants, Miller Consulting, Inc, and Bergmann Associates prepared the information materials used during the subsequent stakeholder meetings. They provided Co-Team Leadership during the 4-hour mini-study round-table discussion with FDOT in Orlando, Florida during October 15, 2003 to obtain feedback from the group prior to making a formal February 11, 2004 planned presentation to Golden Glades project personnel regarding functions for the interchange development.

2.1 Initial phase
Review documents for the project and prepare mini-study function analysis notebook for rehearsal at the October 15, 2003 meeting with others in Orlando, FL. A partial day meeting was held during October 14, 2003 to discuss the planned functions, brainstorm new ideas and prepare an approach for presentation to the Golden Glades team in February.

2.2 Prepare Draft Report
Based on the findings obtained during the October 15, 2003 meeting the team prepared a draft report of options and prepared for a presentation to the Golden Glades project stakeholder team the major functions to be discussed at the February 11, 2004 one-day meeting in District 6.

2.3 Presentation Meeting with Golden Glades Team
A one-day presentation made to the Golden Glades stakeholder team confirmed and solidified the functions to be improved. The team also partially developed major ideas to improve the Golden Glades Center site.
2.4 Prepare Final Report

After the February 11, 2004 meeting with the Golden Glades Center siting team to confirm the major functions in the project areas, this report was prepared and describes the findings of the mini-study.

2.5 Post Mini-Study

At this time work assignments have not been planned for work after the initial mini-study. The report prepared by this assignment will be used for future VE and design study teams for the Golden Glades Interchange projects.
3.1 Participants

The Value Engineering Workshops team participants are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 14 Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Johnson, PE</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>PMA Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Younker</td>
<td>Team Co Leader</td>
<td>PMA Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Hixon, III</td>
<td>Simulation Model</td>
<td>Bergmann Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Morales, Jr., PE</td>
<td>Simulation Model</td>
<td>Bergmann Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Miller, PE</td>
<td>Technical Creative Ideas</td>
<td>Miller Consulting, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15 Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Bright, PE</td>
<td>FDOT District Value Engineer</td>
<td>FDOT District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbi Goss</td>
<td>FDOT District Value Engineer</td>
<td>FDOT District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Lieblong, PE</td>
<td>FDOT State Value Engineer</td>
<td>FDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky DePrimo, PE</td>
<td>FDOT District Value Engineer</td>
<td>FDOT District 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Timp</td>
<td>FDOT District Value Engineer</td>
<td>FDOT District 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. T. Waller</td>
<td>FDOT District Value Engineer</td>
<td>FDOT District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Smith, PE</td>
<td>FDOT District Value Engineer</td>
<td>FDOT /Turnpike/PBSJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Bass</td>
<td>FDOT District Value Engineer</td>
<td>FDOT District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dovel</td>
<td>FDOT District Value Engineer</td>
<td>FDOT District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All attendees from the October 14, 2004 Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 11, 2004 Meeting</td>
<td>Planner/Design</td>
<td>DMJM - HARRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Francis, PE</td>
<td>Planner/Design</td>
<td>DMJM - HARRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Heidrich, PE</td>
<td>Planner/Design</td>
<td>DMJM - HARRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Mahn</td>
<td>Planner/Design</td>
<td>DMJM - HARRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Gonzalez, PE</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>FDOT District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Bravo, PE</td>
<td>Department Manager</td>
<td>FDOT District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dovel</td>
<td>FDOT District Value Engineer</td>
<td>FDOT District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie LaPlant</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Miami-Dade Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Roberson</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>South Florida Rail Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Wohlforth</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>North Miami Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade Jones</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Miami-Dade County Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Williams</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Congressman Kendrick Meek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dante Starks</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Miami-Dade County Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hazelwood</td>
<td>Potential Development</td>
<td>Pilot Travel Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. G. Whatley</td>
<td>Potential Development</td>
<td>Whately Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Kelahan</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Miller Consulting, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All attendees from the October 14, 2004 Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Project Information

The purpose of the initial October 14, 2003 meeting, in addition to being an integral part of the Information Gathering Phase of the VE Study, was to bring the VE Team “up-to-speed” regarding the overall project. The team developed a listing of major functions, generated some creative ideas and reviewed presentation concepts that were applicable to the project.

3.3 List of VE Study Material

1) MEMO REPORT – BEST PRACTICES FOR IMPROVING “LOCAL GOVERNMENT INPUT TO DESIGN” SATISFACTION RATINGS dated, August 14, 2003

2) Golden Glades Multimodal Transportation Facility Implementation Plan by DMJM Harris, dated October 2001

3) Golden Glades Executive Summary prepared by Miller Consulting, Inc

4) Three-dimensional Visualization Simulation of the sites under consideration and potential options as prepared by Bergmann Associates developed from September 2003 to February 2004

3.4 Summary Of General Project Input - Objectives, Policies, Directives, Constraints, Conditions & Considerations

The following is a summary of general project input, including the goals, objectives, directives, policies, constraints, conditions and considerations presented to the study team. Any “element” specific input is indicated by parentheses around the elements, disciplines and interests, e.g., (right-of-way, roadway, buildings). Representatives from the FDOT Planning and Environmental Management Division provided a project background on August 18, 2003.

3.4.1 Project Functions, Goals & Objectives (what the project should do):

1. **Goal:** Streamline and improve the Golden Glades Center Siting locations through public information discussion meetings held in October 2003 and February 2004. Assist with providing jobs for the region. Develop a multimodal transportation system that satisfies the intent of the project and needs of the region to efficiently move people and goods.

2. **Objectives:**
   1. Obtain stakeholder input for optimum site selection locations for further study during a detailed design.
   2. Streamline the process allotted by FDOT for design and construction to bring the facility online as soon as practical.

3. **Strategies:**
   1. Gain understanding of the options available.
   2. Through public stakeholder meetings discuss and refine the optimum solutions.
   3. Continue to work with stakeholders and potential developers to develop the optimum solution for the Golden Glades Center siting.

3.4.2 Project Policies & Directives: (documented things the project must or must not do)

1. Comply with FDOT and stakeholder commitments
2. Comply with Environmental and other regulations
3.4.3 General Project Constraints: (unchangeable project restrictions)

1. State Law requirements to acquire Right-of-Way
2. Project Production schedules
3. Permit requirements
4. Environmental regulations
5. Funding
FUNCTION ANALYSIS AND F.A.S.T. DIAGRAM

A Function Analysis System Technique (FAST) Diagram was developed to define the requirements for the overall Golden Glades Center and regional transportation system and to ensure that the Study Team had a complete and thorough understanding of the functions (basic and others) needed to satisfy the center’s requirements. The development of a FAST diagram helped to stimulate team members to think in terms of required functions, not just normal solutions, to enhance their creative idea development. The project’s primary tasks, the critical path functions, the project’s primary basic functions and other required functions that must be satisfied were shown on the attached Figure 4.1 - 1.

A Functional Analysis was prepared to determine the basic function of the overall Project and each area shown in the function-listing model. Functional Analysis is a means of evaluating the functions of each element to see if the function level of effort for those elements actually provide the requirements of the center plans, or if there are disproportionate amounts of effort spent on support functions or may occur at a less than optimum time or less than optimum location in the available space in the interchange. Functions with disproportionate amounts of effort may add effort to the final product.

During the February stakeholder meeting the functions and importance of each function was discussed and a revised function FAST diagram is shown on the next page.

F.A.S.T. diagrams were developed to further display the critical function path of the overall Center siting process basic and required functions follows in Figure 4.1 - 1.
Figure 4.1 – 1 FAST Diagram

F.A.S.T. Diagram
Golden Glades Multimodal Concepts
STAKEHOLDERS MEETING AND FINDINGS

The February 11, 2004 meeting began with a brief introduction of the project by Jose Gonzalez, FDOT Project Manager, followed by the design consultant, DMJM-HARRIS, Inc., who made a presentation to the group to explain and describe the Project Development & Planning (PD&E) process and the Alternatives that were developed for the project on the current site. The PD&E Report identified two Alternatives on the current site, one would reconstruct the Multimodal Center on the existing footprint with some improvements and road widening for the existing roadway network. The other Alternative would move the Center closer to the railway and realign SR 9 and reconfigure the local roadway network. They also provided a brief discussion of the facility and joint development aspect of the project. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is in the Appendix. This was followed by a question and answer session.

Mr. Craig Miller, PE with Miller Consulting, Inc. then presented historical background for the Golden Glades Interchange and some of the options that were generated at the October 14 and 15, 2003 Workshops. He was followed by Mr. Rick Johnson, PE, CVS who described the Value Engineering Methodology and presented the findings of the functional analysis and the FAST Diagram that was prepared for the project.

The remainder of the session consisted of discussions and collection of ideas, concepts and issues of importance from the stakeholders. This work session was conducted by Mr. Del Younker, CVS who captured the feedback on display flip charts.

The items below were collected on the flip charts under specific headings of importance. The headings are shown in bold with ideas, information and issues listed under them:

What are we trying to do at the GGC facility?
1. Improve the existing GGC facility
2. Improve traffic flow
3. Utilize property available as much as possible
4. Attract private developers

Transit Needs
1. Central Transition with good connections to existing roads
2. Too many buses and not enough bus bays at the existing facility
3. Increase number of parking spaces for future users
4. Incorporate passenger information improvements into new project
5. Amenities need to be provided
6. Food facilities and restrooms are needed
7. Explore new potential routes for multimodal transit uses
8. Integrate bus and rail route schedules as each train runs every 20 minutes and each bus runs every 2½ minutes (express and local)
9. Passengers should not be required to pass active roadways at the facility

Potential Travel Center
1. Travel Center would require 12-14,000 SF of facility space
2. Facility would include restaurants and convenience stores
3. Gas station would include eight diesel truck lanes
4. Parking spaces are anticipated for 200-250 trucks
5. Car/trucks parking would be separated
6. Greyhound buses could use the facility (may be decoupled from Multimodal center or nearby)
7. Need a 10-12-acre site or 18 acres with a Greyhound Bus Terminal
8. Provide space for “Idle-Air” for trucks to use while parked
9. Two similar facilities are near Ft. Pierce, Florida
10. A buffer should be allowed between the residents and the Travel Center. A connection should be provided though
11. A Travel Center could provide the region with 125 new jobs
12. Need to review other sites nearby for a Travel Center

Multimodal Center Improvement Ideas
1. Need amenities
2. Keep good connections to surrounding areas
3. Look at other available sites (green areas shown on the 3D model shown)
4. Provide a concrete surface for the bus bays
5. Integrate center with pedestrian traffic that exists within surrounding communities that would use the facility
6. Move community functions into Center i.e., residential (condos, apartments)
7. Pedestrian overpasses need to connect areas across the interchange
8. Local shuttle passengers to/from GGC instead of or in addition to way to move pedestrians to the site
9. Come up with a separate session to create new financial ideas to fund the GGC and joint developers
10. Add a “smart kiosk” and integrate into the existing transit systems with updates into convenient locations
11. Integrate parking garage with joint developers needs
12. Utilize a moving sidewalk instead of relocating the roads (provided the costs are beneficial)
13. Locate private developer(s) to help with relocating SR 9
14. Revenue sources-
   a. Variable message signs
   b. Kiosks
   c. Ticket sales
   d. Parking
15. Consider another nearby site for GGC location with access improvements
16. Transit rail spur to ProPlayer stadium-review with Miami-Dade MPO North Line
17. Provide better restrooms in the interim such as rented trailers
18. Add pedestrian crossing to Sunshine Industrial Park across the railroad from current site

Traffic Flow Improvements
1. Consider relieving I-95 look at SR 9 and a reliever Central Parkway connection (not yet built)
2. Fix I-95 SB to 163rd Street (E) Could have 163rd St to I-95 ramp SB if provided (see sketch)
3. Reroute 826 and eliminate ramp and reinstall ramp from 826 to Turnpike south (see sketch)
   This is an option for SR 9 to relieve I-95
4. Improve Sunshine Industrial Park and pave over the existing railroad to provide cross connections under Turnpike connecting NW and SW quadrants under the Turnpike
5. Avoid tight curve on SR 9 relocation noted on the Exhibit 7.2 by DMJM
6. May need more parking spaces
7. Fix 826 to I-95
   a. Widen ramps
   b. Flyover to GGC then route around GGC to provide a better weave distance downstream
8. Provide ramp to GGC without a signal
9. Study cost to add a flyover (see #7 above)

Potential Options to Attract Developers
1. Give the developers the flexibility to respond to the RFP
2. Provide a thorough Performance – Functional/Qualification based RFP
3. Provide interested developers with a video/presentation package to review the various options for these sites
4. Utilize entrepreneurial spirit
5. FDOT should prepare the evaluation criteria for analyzing the proposals from developers (in advance of receiving the proposals)
6. Utilize the Market study summary being prepared to formulate plans for the RFP
7. Partner with developer(s)
COMPARISON OF THE SITES

The results of this VE session include ideas generated for further consideration as the FDOT develops the Request for Proposal for this project site. The following table indicates a comparison of advantages and disadvantages indicated for the sites considered during the work session. The two sites that were compared were the current facility’s site where the bus and rail terminal and the Park-n-Ride lot is located and an alternate site that is north of the Tri-Rail tracks, west of Florida’s Turnpike, east of the Palmetto Expressway and south of NW 167th Street.

Table 6.1 – COMPARISON OF SITES ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GGC Current Facility (DMJM)</th>
<th>GGC Proposed Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing rail station</td>
<td>MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to I-95 and all points</td>
<td>Constructability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No DOT R/W needed</td>
<td>Easier to observe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established traffic patterns</td>
<td>Can free up a 6-acre site on the current site for future development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community accepts this option</td>
<td>Better access to Sunshine Ind. Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is larger</td>
<td>Slightly better access for Broward Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for Joint Development</td>
<td>Less Construction time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less utility impacts</td>
<td>May need building demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access to residences</td>
<td>Less incentive for developers at site, but may be able to locate nearby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to two local roads</td>
<td>Less potential for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less initial cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

After the February 11, 2004 workshop a questionnaire was sent to the stakeholders to obtain feedback to determine the effectiveness of the format, whether the work session was beneficial and if the graphics and virtual reality visual simulation was helpful. The VE Team sent questionnaires to the six representatives from government and government agencies and four responses were received. In general the work session was perceived to be beneficial and the virtual reality visual simulation was very well received. The location was not viewed as favorable, due to difficulty in finding the building. The questionnaire responses are included in the back of the Appendix.
Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:15</td>
<td>Introduction/Announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 – 9:20</td>
<td>General Discussion/Past Efforts to PD&amp;E (JG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20 – 9:30</td>
<td>Brief Presentation on PD&amp;E process and current project (CF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 9:45</td>
<td>Discuss Facility &amp; Joint Development Aspect of Project (RH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 10:45</td>
<td>Q&amp;A Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 – Noon</td>
<td>VE Requirements (VE staff presents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon – 1:00 PM</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 2:00 PM</td>
<td>VE Requirements (VE staff presents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# GOLDEN GLADES MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITY

## KICK-OFF MEETING
FEBRUARY 11TH, 2004
ATTENDANCE SIGN-IN SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Del Younger</td>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>407-497-9131</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dlyoungger@pmahome.com">dlyoungger@pmahome.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Johnson</td>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>(407) 351-7016</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rjohnson@pma-e2.com">rjohnson@pma-e2.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Miller</td>
<td>Miller Consulting</td>
<td>(352) 979-4799</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mteam1@bellsouth.net">mteam1@bellsouth.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Keahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hixon</td>
<td>Bergmann Assoc.</td>
<td>585/325-8368</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chixon@bergmannpc.co">chixon@bergmannpc.co</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Morales</td>
<td></td>
<td>904/363-3133</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emorales@bergmannpc.co">emorales@bergmannpc.co</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Francis</td>
<td>Dreyer, P.C.</td>
<td>352-444-8341</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carlos.francis@dreyerp.c.com">carlos.francis@dreyerp.c.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:alex.martin@p.c.com">alex.martin@p.c.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade Jones</td>
<td>Comm. Betty T. Ferguson Office</td>
<td>(805) 770-3115</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wade.jones@monterey.gov">wade.jones@monterey.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Williams</td>
<td>Congressman Cannon, Mark Meek</td>
<td>(305) 690-5905</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anthony.williams@hawkeye.gov">anthony.williams@hawkeye.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dante Starks</td>
<td>Comm. Appropriations Office</td>
<td>(805) 694-2779</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dstantz@mondap.gov">dstantz@mondap.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Harellson</td>
<td>Pilot Training Center</td>
<td>805-538-7488</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harellson@pilottraining.com">harellson@pilottraining.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulises R. Foster</td>
<td>DOT Maintenance</td>
<td>505-440-0279</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harellson@pilottraining.com">harellson@pilottraining.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wallery</td>
<td></td>
<td>305-653-2790</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lsw@spqupt.com">lsw@spqupt.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**ATTENDANCE SIGN-IN SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jose R González</td>
<td>FDOT DG</td>
<td>(305) 470-5308</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jose.R.Gonzalez@dot.state.fl.us">Jose.R.Gonzalez@dot.state.fl.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Bravo</td>
<td>FDOT D6</td>
<td>305-470-5201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alice.bravo@dot.state.fl.us">alice.bravo@dot.state.fl.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzie LaPlant</td>
<td>MDT</td>
<td>305-632-3753</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laplant@MiamiDade.gov">laplant@MiamiDade.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Robinson</td>
<td>SFRTA</td>
<td>954-788-7958</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rebenj@sftrt.fl.gov">rebenj@sftrt.fl.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Heidrich</td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>305-644-9937</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richardheidrich@home.com">richardheidrich@home.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Wofford</td>
<td>No M LGBT</td>
<td>305-948-2963</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garywofford@cityofmiami.com">garywofford@cityofmiami.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Continue the table with other attendees' information...
GOLDEN GLADES MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITY

Project Development & Environment (PD&E)

Kick-Off Meeting
February 11th, 2004

---

GOLDEN GLADES MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITY

Project History

- FDOT Park & Ride (1970s) - 1,300 spaces
- FDOT PD&E Study (1980s) - $450 million
- MPO Study (1990s) - GG Multimodal Feasibility
- FDOT (2001) - Golden Glades Multimodal Facility Planning Study
- FDOT - Golden Glades Multimodal Facility PD&E (current study)

---

GOLDEN GLADES MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITY

PD&E Study

- Collect Regional Information
  - Existing Facility
  - Geometric
  - Traffic
  - Safety
  - Environmental
- Gather Public Input (Kick-off Meeting & Att. Workshop)
- Develop/Analyze Alternatives
- Recommend Preferred Alternative
Existing Conditions
- Large Parking Lot / Poor Connectivity
- No Organizational Control of Facility
- Confusing Access / Exits
- Tri-Rail Station on Other Side of I-9
- No Significant Amenities
- Security, Landscape, Lighting

- Public Kick-off meeting scheduled
  February 26th, 2004 at 6:00 PM
  - Brickyard Railfan Civic Association
  - 15000 N Miami Avenue
  - North Miami, FL

- Public Alternative Workshop - To be scheduled June 2004
- Public Hearing - To be scheduled September 2004

Golden Glades Multimodal Transportation Facility

Goals
- Attract Transit-Oriented Development
- Comfort, Convenient, Safe & Secure
- Minimize Walking Distances
- Separate Vehicle & Pedestrian Flows
- Integrate Bicycles & Pedestrians
- Passenger Amenities
- Address Program Requirements
- Comparative Analysis
- Consideration of Costs
- Consequence of Costs
- ROW Rights
- Social & Neighborhood Impact
- Economic & Employment Impact
- Environmental Considerations
- Traffic Service
- Safety
- Access Management
- Maintenance of Trains
- Compliance with Local Land Use Policies
- Functional Relationships with Transportation Network
- Receive FHWA approval February 2003
THE GOLDEN GLADES MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION CENTER

Purpose - This report is intended to serve as an overview of the proposed Golden Glades Multimodal Transportation Center. This document is based, in part, on the October, 2001, study by DMJM/Harris, and the August, 2002, Study by Consultech/BHA.

The efforts summarized in this report are directed toward providing graphical and visual representation of possible concepts that could emerge, in stages, over the next 5 to 10 years. Value engineering suggestions are also incorporated herein, for comment and discussion purposes.

Project Location and Study Area - The proposed project is located in the Golden Glades Interchange in north Miami-Dade County, Florida, as shown in Figure 1.

Within the Golden Glades Interchange, the specific study area, is confined, to a degree, to the area shown in Figure 2. This area includes the current park-ride lot (Lot “B”) and the previous (now closed) park-ride lot “A”. In addition, the Whatley property and FDOT property, immediately northeast of the park-ride areas is included in the study area.
The existing operational park-ride lot includes a bus terminal and pedestrian overpass to the Tri-rail Station on the CSX railroad, just north of State Road 9, which bisects the park-ride lot from the rail line.

**Objectives** - The existing passenger amenities are minimal for bus, rail and/or carpool patrons of the existing facility. This is one of the primary objectives of the current planning effort:

1. To create a "seamless" and attractive environment for multimodal transfers.

2. Make traffic flow improvements to bottlenecks in the Golden Glades interchange to improve accessibility for all users. The Consultech/BHA study recommended several things to improve the operation of the Golden Glades Interchange, like widening certain ramps to increase capacity. Examples are shown in the before-and-after Photoshop™ images below.

...one of the primary objectives of the current planning effort: to create a "seamless" and attractive environment for multimodal transfers."
"There are also strong locational/geographic linkages between the elements."

The yellow and green highlighted ramps are the connectors between I-95 (north) and SR 9 (south). The green areas are the only places where these connectors drop from two (2) lanes to one lane. In order to create a 2-lane connection, 3 bridges (six spans, minimum must be modified to create the 2-lane system.

The original park-ride lot "A" is no longer in use as a park-ride facility. It has become an eyesore and a storage yard for construction and maintenance activities.

3. Implement an ITS plan including ITS kiosks, Advanced Traveler Information Systems, Advanced Public Transit systems, closed circuit TV, Sunguide, etc.

4. Improve multimodal station amenities, including food facilities, restrooms, newsstands, security facility, dispatcher/management facility, landscaping, etc.

5. Minimize impediments for transfers between intercity buses, local/express buses, park-ride, HOVs, and rail passengers.

6. Preserve the HOV flyover access to I-95.

7. Provide adequate, convenient public parking.

8. Provide for tandem truck operations.

"The HOV flyover is too expensive to move, and must remain where it is."

The first objective is 100% in the public needs sector, and, therefore, takes priority over the second objective which involves privatization.

A second objective of this effort is to attract private investment to the general study area for the combined purposes of job creation, economic growth, and putting valuable public property to productive use.

To achieve this objective, several suggestions have been made:
Locational Considerations - There are also strong locational/geographic linkages between the elements of the public-sector subsystems. For example, the location of the Tri-Rail station "drives" the location of the bus terminal which must be nearby. The bus parking area must be close to the bus terminal, and the bus terminal and the public parking area must be close to the bus parking (and terminal). The amenities and ancillary facilities should also be located inside the bus terminal or immediately adjacent to it. The HOV flyover is too expensive to move, and must remain where it is.

Value Engineering Considerations - A value engineering suggestion also emerged when reviewing the DMJM report: The wisdom of relocating the SR 9 connections to assemble a larger development parcel was questioned. The VE suggestions are: 1) make the private sector say they need this done, first, then include some, or most of it in their costs; 2) don’t move SR 9 for any reason, to preserve a possible (not currently planned) future connection to the Central Parkway, thereby "bleeding off" significant traffic from I-95 and vitalizing Opa Locka.

Privatization Possibilities - The second objective deals with privatization or, more likely, public-private partnerships. Several possible private development scenarios have been suggested. These include office and/or hotel developments and ancillary facilities (small-scale commercialization/franchising or...
The private office possibility might be enhanced if some state/local government tenants can be found and pre-construction leases signed. As a corporate policy, Cracker Barrel restaurants want to locate near interstate highway interchanges, where they "capture" a percentage of "passerby" traffic. Possibly the best chance for private development would be a truck stop, with restaurants, hotel facilities, vehicle fueling facilities, vehicle parking, truck wash/repair, and showers/restrooms. This might not be the most appealing possibility to local residents, but, in view of the surrounding industrial uses and declining hotel uses on NW 167 Street, a truck stop may be the most economically promising alternative. Conversations with Pilot Travel Centers confirmed their continued interest in this project. They also expressed that their "Travel Centers" are now catering to 4-wheel vehicles, as well as 18-wheelers, and they are considerably more upscale than most perceptions.

Alternative Arrangements/Concepts - There are two possible locations of the Tri-Rail Station, which "drives" several other location decisions. The existing station location is probably the front-runner, however relocation to the Whatley yard area is another possibility.
Conclusions - This report has illustrated several possibilities relative to the development and enhancement of the Golden Glades Interchange and its multimodal assets. The Golden Glades Interchange consists of valuable, “centrally” located property that is currently underutilized. Before any new developments are approved, traffic flow in the vicinity must be improved. Also, the existing multimodal amenities must be improved or replaced as part of the overall project.

A private investment/development could, among other things, create jobs, stimulate economic growth, and better utilize valuable public property. Improvements to the surrounding roadway network could not only attract private developers, but encourage utilization of multimodal transportation amenities in Miami-Dade County.

For additional information, please contact Jose Gonzalez, PE, FDOT (305) 470-5308.
Golden Glades Multimodal Center
Value Improvement Workshop

Date of Workshop: February 11, 2004

Workshop Questionnaire

Wade Jones, Miami-Dade Commission Representative

Please answer the following questions regarding the VE Workshop held February 11, 2004.

1. In your opinion is the project that was presented and discussed at the Workshop a worthwhile project? Yes
2. Was it beneficial to hold the meeting within the Golden Glades interchange to physically see project features? Yes
3. In your opinion was the material covered during the Workshop too long or too short in length? Too Long or Too Short Appropriate time allowed
4. Were the professionals in attendance sufficient for getting input to improving the project? Yes
5. Did you feel the format used was beneficial in obtaining your opinions or in obtaining feedback from the group? Yes
6. Did the meeting meet or exceed your expectations? Yes
7. Were the graphics and virtual simulations that were used beneficial to you for understanding and conceptualizing the project? Yes

Suggestions: ____________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

8. Other observations, comments or suggestion that you may want to add that you thought of after the meeting concluded?

   Include more potentially affected parties at the next meeting

9. Suggestions for this group to use when considering this format for future value improvement sessions. Include truckers, municipalities, area businesses, etc.
Golden Glades Multimodal Center
Value Improvement Workshop

Date of Workshop: February 11, 2004

Workshop Questionnaire

Suzie LaPlant, MDT

Please answer the following questions regarding the VE Workshop held February 11, 2004.

1. In your opinion is the project that was presented and discussed at the Workshop a worthwhile project? Yes or No

2. Was it beneficial to hold the meeting within the Golden Glades interchange to physically see project features? Yes or No - we didn’t see anything except the inside of a warehouse.

3. In your opinion was the material covered during the Workshop too long or too short in length? Too Long or Too Short OK in length Workshop itself was too long, but it was mostly due to a late start.

4. Were the professionals in attendance sufficient for getting input to improving the project? Yes or No Other comments. Needed BCT

5. Did you feel the format used was beneficial in obtaining your opinions or in obtaining feedback from the group? Yes or No

6. Did the meeting meet or exceed your expectations? Yes or No

7. Were the graphics and virtual simulations that were used beneficial to you for understanding and conceptualizing the project? Yes or No

Suggestions:

8. Other observations, comments or suggestion that you may want to add that you thought of after the meeting concluded?

Waiting 1 1/2 hours for reps from elected officials was absurd. Computerized graphics were really impressive.

9. Suggestions for this group to use when considering this format for future value improvement sessions.

Hold it closer to civilization. If you were so dependant on getting input from elected officials, you should have it at a time & location convenient to them.
Golden Glades Multimodal Center
Value Improvement Workshop

Date of Workshop: February 11, 2004

Workshop Questionnaire

Gary Wohlforth, City of North Miami Beach

Please answer the following questions regarding the VE Workshop held February 11, 2004.

1. In your opinion is the project that was presented and discussed at the Workshop a worthwhile project?  Yes

2. Was it beneficial to hold the meeting within the Golden Glades interchange to physically see project features?  Yes

3. In your opinion was the material covered during the Workshop too long or too short in length? Too Long or Too Short OK in length

4. Were the professionals in attendance sufficient for getting input to improving the project?  Yes

5. Did you feel the format used was beneficial in obtaining your opinions or in obtaining feedback from the group?  Yes

6. Did the meeting meet or exceed your expectations?  Yes

7. Were the graphics and virtual simulations that were used beneficial to you for understanding and conceptualizing the project?  Yes

   Suggestions:  Visual simulations should be used at public meetings

8. Other observations, comments or suggestion that you may want to add that you thought of after the meeting concluded?

9. Suggestions for this group to use when considering this format for future value improvement sessions.  BBQ chicken should arrive sooner
Golden Glades Multimodal Center
Value Improvement Workshop

Date of Workshop: February 11, 2004

Workshop Questionnaire

Jonathan Robertson, SFRTA

Please answer the following questions regarding the VE Workshop held February 11, 2004.

1. In your opinion is the project that was presented and discussed at the Workshop a worthwhile project? Yes or No

2. Was it beneficial to hold the meeting within the Golden Glades interchange to physically see project features? Yes or No

3. In your opinion was the material covered during the Workshop too long or too short in length? Too Long or Too Short

4. Were the professionals in attendance sufficient for getting input to improving the project? Yes or No

5. Did you feel the format used was beneficial in obtaining your opinions or in obtaining feedback from the group? Yes or No

6. Did the meeting meet or exceed your expectations? Yes or No

7. Were the graphics and virtual simulations that were used beneficial to you for understanding and conceptualizing the project? Yes or No

Suggestions:

8. Other observations, comments or suggestion that you may want to add that you thought of after the meeting concluded?

9. Suggestions for this group to use when considering this format for future value improvement sessions.

Terrible meeting location, perhaps a more visible location in the future.