Abstract—This paper delves into the study and proposition of a Medium Capacity Rail System (MCS) model to tackle urban traffic issues, both in the immediate future and, more specifically, the public transportation challenges along the Pham Van Dong (PVD) route. Drawing from statistical surveys and an in-depth analysis of motorcycle traffic patterns at intersections during near-peak and peak hours in the morning and afternoon along PVD's main artery in the northeastern part of Ho Chi Minh City (HCMC), Vietnam. Moreover, this research explores the relatively new concept of MCS, which have gained traction in recent years due to their distinct advantages over existing systems. The findings in this article underscore the practicality of the proposal and provide a blueprint for sustainable, integrated urban transport development, improve traffic flow, reduce congestion, reduce environmental pollution and enhance a complete and modern urban railway network for Ho Chi Minh City or other similar global scenarios.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Urban transport is one of the urgent problems that need to be solved for all major cities in the world. Due to the raise in vehicle, the road is incapable of handling the traffic. The planning and building of road networks within expansive urban regions, featuring broad corridors, are aimed at ensuring adequate traffic flow capacity. However, the population growth rate and high population density in large cities have been too rapid in recent decades. Therefore, these avenues are quickly overloaded on the route and create local traffic jams at the intersections. There are many ways to solve the problem of traffic congestion and peak hour overload, such as traffic diversion [1], intelligent traffic monitoring, arranging signal installation [2], controlling, monitoring and managing traffic congestion [3–7], construction of steel solutions or even dividing office work time according to each group of subjects to divide the number of private vehicles participating on the roads [8–10].

However, this is not an effective solution to the problem of urban traffic and environmental pollution caused by private vehicles, especially in Hanoi and HCMC, Vietnam [11–14]. In order to solve this issue, there needs to be a solution that addresses the nature of the problem, which is to evaluate the traffic and limitations of personal vehicles. This means replacing it with a means of public transport with large transport capacity, efficiency, environmental friendliness, and sustainability, promoting more comprehensive urban development [12]. In the urban transport system, many types of services can meet the large transport capacity with high service frequency. The choice of type must be considered by many factors of the general development of urban transport, topography (routing), and characteristics of its superstructure and infrastructure [13–15]. However, properly assessing the situation and traffic needs is an important first step that needs to be clarified.

Urban Rail Transit (URT) is a driving force for the development of large cities. Moreover, the evolution of infrastructure and urban spatial organization directly impacts both the urban railway network and vehicle emissions [16]. The interplay between URT and urban space within large cities constitutes a complex spatial and sustainable urban system. The objective is to conserve energy, diminish emissions, and minimize travel time by devising a modern urban railway network that harmonizes with the evolving urban spatial dynamics [17–19]. The development of megacities is supported by urban rail transit, while alterations in urban spatial structure impact both the configuration of urban rail transit networks and the carbon emissions from vehicles [16]. The interaction between urban rail transit and urban space in megacities forms a sophisticated spatial networking system. Recently, there has been a growing importance placed on guiding cities towards low-carbon, energy-saving, and sustainable development through meticulous rail transit planning [17–19]. Experience of leading countries and regional countries with relatively close conditions shows that these have all developed and are planning to build a multi-purpose urban transportation system with types such as free bicycle loans, buses, bus
rapid transit, and urban railways such as trolleybus, tramway, Light Rail Transit (LRT) Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) and commuter rail, in addition to developing walking corridors [20–22].

In addition, the Medium Capacity Rail System (MCS) system has been introduced with outstanding advantages that can meet the traffic capacity range that bus rapid transit - BRT (from 5,400 passengers per hour direction - p/h/d to 10,800 (p/h/d) or LRT (from 18,000 p/h/d to 24,000 p/h/d) cannot meet the requirement or MRT (from 18,000 p/h/d to larger) with too expensive construction costs [23–26]. In this study, MCS is the proposed solution in the case study on the PVD route with a surveyed traffic flow of 29,595 motorcycles during peak hours in direction [8–10, 13].

II. MEDIUM CAPACITY RAIL SYSTEM
A. Introducing

An MCS is a rail transportation system that possesses a capacity greater than light rail but falls short of the capacity of a typical MRT. The definition of an MCS varies due to its lack of standardization. Inconsistencies in international definitions are even evident within individual countries. The exclusive right-of-way is usually provided similar to LRT class A and elevated segment subways. However, the biggest difference of MCS is that it can be built along roads without much impact on the current status.

MCS has a carrying capacity from 15,000 p/h/d to 32,000 p/h/d or even greater, depending on train structure and service headways. Typical trains of this type have from 2 cars to 8 cars per train, with a passenger capacity depending on the structure and size of a train, the smallest can be 200 passengers/train to 1,200 passengers/train, and service headways can be from 3 minutes/train/direction up to 1.5 minutes/train/direction with Communications-Based Train Control (CBTC) or even designed up to 72 seconds/train/direction for GoA4 standard – (unattended train operation (UTO)) [27–36].

The main reason for building MCS instead of regular subways is cost savings, mainly because the carriages are shorter and the stations are shorter in this system. The MCS systems have the potential to operate at higher speeds than MRT systems because of shorter dwell times at stations and faster acceleration and deceleration of lightweight trains.

The disadvantage is similar to other types, the route capacity is designed to be limited, meanwhile, the number of passengers is likely to increase in the future.

However, this limitation can be easily overcome through adequate forecasting for potential growth over the life of the MCS line when constructing station platform length, as well as forecasting capacity consumption.

B. Signal and Train Control

As per the IEEE 1474 standard, a CBTS system refers to a continuous and automatic train control (ATC) system that using high resolution train location determine, and independent of tract circuits. It features continuous, bidirectional train-to-wayside processors capable of executing Automatic Train Protection (ATP) functions, with optional Automatic Train Operation (ATO) and Automatic Train Supervision (ATS) functions.

Thus, to accommodate high carrying capacity in a streamlined system structure, MCS uses a CBTC system. CBTC, a railway signaling system, relies on communications between the train and track equipment for traffic management and infrastructure control. By enabling more precise knowledge of a train’s position compared to traditional signaling systems, CBTC enhances the safety and efficiency of MCS traffic management. MCS helps to decrease headways while still maintaining or even enhancing safety standards [37, 38].

Contemporary CBTC systems facilitate various levels of automation, known as Grades of Automation (GoA), which shall consist of three major components: ATS, ATO, and ATP. As per the specifications outlined in the IEC 62290-1 standard, this is the core technology that supports the purpose of operating MCS. The levels of automation available range from a manual protected operation (e.g., GoA1) to the fully automated operation (e.g., GoA4) [39].

C. Automatic Fare Collection System (AFC)

AFC is an indispensable requirement for MCS at PVD route. The AFC system comprises a central control server integrated with automatic gates and ticket vending machines at each station. In this option, a stable and integrated platform must ensure smooth passenger high flow during peak hours. Simultaneously, data can be collected to transmit to the center. The central control server simultaneously performs functions such as fare adjustments, managing contactless IC cards, calculating sales revenue, and generating Consolidated Reports.

D. Power Supply

Similar to MRT, the MCS system is supplied with power from the power stations, with voltage levels from 22 kV to 35 kV from 110 kV or 220 kV Grid Sub- Stations [35, 36]. Before being supplied to the power lines along the guideway, the 22kV AC power is converted to 750 V DC at the substation. Simultaneously, 22 kV AC power is reduced to 400 V AC three-phase and distributed through an uninterruptible power supply for the signaling and other equipments [25]. Regenerative Energy Storage Systems are installed at the stations and linked to the traction power circuits. As a train centers a station and slows down using regenerative braking, the energy fed back to the traction power supply system is stored in the batteries [40–50].

III. TRAFFIC SITUATION AND SOLUTIONS FOR THE PVD ROUTE

A. Traffic Situation on the PVD Route

In developing countries, motorcycles are a favored mode of transportation, particularly in Vietnam, where the proportion of two-wheeled vehicles is very high, accounting for 74% in HCMC, cars account for 1%, and
buses account for 4% [8, 15]. The market for public passenger transport within Ho Chi Minh city is assumed 15% to 20% of the needs of the passenger moving in 2020 [13–15]. It is expected to range between 20.5% to 26.6% by 2025 and 29.3% to 36.8% by 2030. Nevertheless, up to this point, HCMC public passengers transport has only fulfilled approximately 9% of the populace's travel requirements. In recent years, HCMC has directed substantial investments into buses, spanning from infrastructure to supportive policies such as interest-free loans for new vehicle purchases and the establishment of waiting stations. The number of bus passengers has shown a decline over the years. Currently, in comparing to the end of 2017, the bus network in HCMC has decreased by seven routes, comprising five subsidy routes (37, 40, 60, 95, and 149) and two non-subsidized routes (12 and 49).

Based on an analysis of the current state of urban traffic in major cities in Viet Nam such as Hanoi and HCMC. The research results reveal that the capacity values of urban roads with 2, 3, and 4 lanes per direction are 13,358, 21,725, and 24,335 motorcycles per hour, respectively [13]. Similarly, the results of research and survey on the PVD with 2 lanes to 4 lanes each way for motorcycles are the largest at the largest at the Giga Mall shopping center are 29,595 and 27,603 motorcycles/hour/direction at after midnight and past-morning (AM and PM), in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point station</th>
<th>Motorcycles/hour/direction</th>
<th>AM (hours)</th>
<th>PM (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7–8</td>
<td>8–9</td>
<td>5–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linh Xuan (LX)</td>
<td>7,834</td>
<td>10,425</td>
<td>8,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Binh (AB)</td>
<td>8,418</td>
<td>11,860</td>
<td>8,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linh Tay (LT)</td>
<td>9,625</td>
<td>13,089</td>
<td>9,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To N. Van (TNV)</td>
<td>10,368</td>
<td>14,590</td>
<td>11,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linh Dong (LD)</td>
<td>12,887</td>
<td>18,556</td>
<td>13,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiep Binh (HB)</td>
<td>15,014</td>
<td>24,529</td>
<td>18,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giga Mall</td>
<td>17,174</td>
<td>29,595</td>
<td>19,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binh Trieu (BT)</td>
<td>14,270</td>
<td>24,193</td>
<td>17,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of motorcycle traffic on the PVD route were surveyed statistically from February 2023 to July 2023, summarized in Table I. In this table, the largest value is shown in two rush hours (AM and PM), this is the time frame with the heaviest traffic on the route during the day. In the morning, traffic flows from the suburbs to the center in the direction of Linh Xuan (LX) intersection to Binh Trieu (BT) intersection and vice versa in the evening. Survey results show that motorcycle traffic through Giga Mall station is the largest at 29,595 motorcycles/hour/direction (m/h/d) and 27,603 m/h/d during peak morning and afternoon hours.

On the route, in Fig. 1, the flow of passenger traffic tends to gradually increase from the LX node to the Giga Mall node during morning peak hours (towards the center) and gradually decrease from the Giga Mall node to the LX node in the afternoon exit direction. In the inbound direction, passenger traffic increased significantly at Linh Dong intersection is 18,556 motorcycles/hour (8:00 AM to 9:00 AM), due to the traffic flow from To Ngoc Van intersection. At the same time, also at Linh Dong intersection is the merger of three traffic flows on PVD, Kha Van Can, and Linh Dong streets, this traffic flow will increase at Hiep Binh (HB) intersection, and traffic result is 24,529 motorcycles/hour, see Table I and Fig. 2. At the Giga Mall node, traffic increased due to a large number of traffic flowing in from HB street to PVD and flowing to the Giga Mall node, and the traffic value is 29,595 motorcycles/hour, see Table I and Fig. 3. On the contrary, in the afternoon exit direction, the flow at the Giga Mall node is due to the a large number of vehicle coming from Tan Son Nhat (TSN) airport and Highway 13 from Mien Dong Bus Station, these are two large flows that cause traffic increase traffic flow at this node, and the largest traffic volume is 27,603 motorcycles/hour at 6:00 PM to 7:00 PM, see also Table I and Fig. 4.
In addition, the largest motorcycle traffic during peak hours on weekdays from Monday to Friday is mainly on Monday mornings, traffic flow at the PVD-Giga Mall intersection on Mondays can increase by up to 2,870 motorcycles in a 5-minute peak period. On the remaining days, motorcycle traffic does not change significantly between weekdays during peak hours in the direction from LX to BT as shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. On the contrary, during evening peak hours, motorcycle traffic has almost no change between weekdays from Monday to Friday, the largest traffic is up to 2,748 motorcycles in a 5-minute peak period and gradually decreases from HB node is 2,684 motorcycles in a 5-minute peak period, as depicted in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5.

Survey results and description of the traffic situation on the PVD route show that this is a route with very high traffic density. Currently, with the existing number of lanes, traffic density on the route is relatively dense, with some local traffic jams at railway intersections during morning and evening rush hours such as at PVD and To Ngoc Van intersection due to railway traffic barriers. Furthermore, shortly, urban development will increase traffic capacity on the route. Therefore, solving traffic problems on the route needs to be researched soon and appropriate solutions will be found.

Capacity indeed increases with the number of urban lanes, however, the sustainable urban transport development plan cannot develop the number of lanes to keep up with the growth of motorcycles. There has been a recommended solution for HCMC urban traffic is to plan for an extensive public transportation system, which would include MRT and bus rapid transit corridors [38]. However, the above survey and analysis show that it is necessary to consider a MCS for the PVD route instead of comparing the bus rapid transit and MRT.

B. Line Planning

Based on approval of adjustment of HCMC transport development planning to 2020 and vision afterward and analysis of the current status of actual needs on the PVD route. The author proposes that it is necessary to plan an urban railway line to meet this need in the nearest possible future, Fig. 6 and Fig. 7. The construction of the MCS line also completes the missing transport network of HCMC.

Currently, the proposal for phase 1 of the route will have a route from LX intersection as the first station (ST.B) to BT intersection as the last station (ST.E). The final station will be an integrated station with line M3 at BT station. In the next phase, it will expand in both directions: from ST.B station to Di An City (Binh Duong Province) and from ST.E station to Gia Dinh Park. Also in this proposal, the ST.E station will be expanded to go through Gia Dinh station (integrated) of the M4 line, extending to TSN Airport and ending at Lang Cha Ca station (integrated) of line M5. The proposed MCS system for the HCMC urban railway network map will be more complete with the route from Di An passing through TSN Airport and ending at Lang Cha Ca station mostly along the PVD line. Therefore, the extension route 4B (Gia Dinh park-TSN airport- Lang Cha Ca) currently in the planning is not necessary and will be eliminated and replaced with the newly proposed plan, see Fig. 8.
The planning of stations along the route will prioritize convenient locations near intersections or junctions. If the above conditions are not met, the minimum distance is 500 meters/station and the furthest is 1,200 meters/station.

IV. OPERATION PLAN

A. Design of Service Capacity

The problem of the carrying capacity of the line on the planned schedule to meet the needs of passengers to use the subway is based on many mutually binding factors such as train capacity, service frequency and signal control system. From the service frequency point of view, the headway can be neither equal to every hour nor varying throughout the day, depending on the demand and capacity provided. This depends on the needs of train riders at each time frame of the day and the transport capacity of the largest possible capacity line. In terms of providing transportation services and operating most efficiently, the design must anticipate the maximum number of passengers using the train service when planning, which considers the need for future capacity development with the initial build system constraints.

The calculations for planning service provision on the route with the highest capacity for a system life cycle based on the control signal system are given below [51–55], and all variables of simulation calculations are defined as in Table II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Definition</th>
<th>Value/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$V_f$</td>
<td>maximum traffic flow value (library/month/direct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_f$</td>
<td>traffic actual flow (library/month/direct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF</td>
<td>peak hour factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>peak 5-minute train passenger load (library/5 minute/direct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>the times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>integer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>maximum traffic demand in each phase (person/hour/direct (p/h/d))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>traffic growth coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_b$</td>
<td>demand coefficient 0.9 to 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>person capacity (person/hour/direct (p/h/d))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{\text{cap}}$</td>
<td>line capacity (train/hour/direct (t/h/d))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>maximum person per train on each schedule (person/train)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_c$</td>
<td>number of the car 4–8 cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_c$</td>
<td>car interior length 20–25 meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{c_{\text{max}}}$</td>
<td>longest train length 120–200 meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_s$</td>
<td>longest station length meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_c$</td>
<td>person per meter of train length 4.0 to 13 persons/meters length</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Definition</th>
<th>Value/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>station headway (second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{\text{cap}}$</td>
<td>train separation (second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_b$</td>
<td>distance from the front of stopped train to the start of the station exit block (meter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_a$</td>
<td>station approach speed (meters/second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>maximum line speed (meters/second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{br}$</td>
<td>braking safety factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>separation safety factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{\text{br}}$</td>
<td>brake system reaction time (second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{\text{de}}$</td>
<td>dwell time (second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{\text{om}}$</td>
<td>operation margin (second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_i$</td>
<td>initial service acceleration rate (m/s²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_i$</td>
<td>service deceleration rate (m/s²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_{g}$</td>
<td>acceleration due to gravity (m/s²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_i$</td>
<td>grade into station (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_o$</td>
<td>grade outstation (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_v$</td>
<td>line voltage as percentage of specification 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_r$</td>
<td>positioning error-moving block (meter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{\text{br}}$</td>
<td>block safety distance-moving block (meter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum load and service capacity is determined by:

$$V_f = A_f \times \text{PDF}$$

$$D_{\text{max}} = V_f \times \text{PHF} \times k_b$$

$$C_{\text{max}} = T_{\text{cap}} \times C_{\text{max}}$$

$$T_{\text{cap}} = 3600 \frac{H_{\text{min}}}{H_{\text{max}}}$$

In Eq. (5), $H_{\text{min}}$ (station headways) is the minimum train separation determined with three types of control system.

Eqs. (6) and (7) determine the minimum station headway ($H_s$) and the minimum train separation ($T_{\text{cap}}$) in seconds with three aspects fixed-block signaling system, with (8) and (9) for cab signaling, (10) and (11) for moving block (MVB) with fixed stopping distance, and (12) and (13) for MVB with variable stopping distance:

$$H_{\text{min, opt}} = \sqrt{\frac{2(L_s + d_b)}{a_s} + \frac{L_s}{v_a} + \frac{100}{k_{br}} + B \left(\frac{v_a}{2d_f}\right)}$$

$$\frac{a_i t_{br}^2}{2v_a} \left(1 - \frac{v_a}{v_{\text{max}}}\right) + t_{de} + \sum t$$

Fig. 8. Proposed medium-capacity rail line PVD.
According to Table IV, for HCMC, the demand coefficient for calculating traffic capacity is 1.0, and load parameters are summarized in Table III. The simulation calculation method using MATLAB R2017b/Script and results for the operating plan are summarized in Table IV.

### Table III: Data Values for Simulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train length</td>
<td>120 m-200 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_p$</td>
<td>29.395 m/h/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>100%;150%;200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>2.4;1.2;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overspeed governor time</td>
<td>3 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerk limitation time</td>
<td>0.5 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling dwell time</td>
<td>30 s-45 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating margin time</td>
<td>15 s-20 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service acceleration rate</td>
<td>1.3 m/s²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>1.3 m/s²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_r$</td>
<td>6.25 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving-block safety distance</td>
<td>50 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_i$</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{max}$</td>
<td>27.8 m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2$</td>
<td>9.818 m/s²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table IV: Summarizes the Results of the Operational Plan Simulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHF</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{min-1}$ (Phase.1 100%)</td>
<td>23,676 (p/h/d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{min-2}$ (Phase.2 150%)</td>
<td>35,514 (p/h/d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{min-3}$ (Phase.3 200%)</td>
<td>47,352 (p/h/d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{min-1}$ (i)</td>
<td>60.2466 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{min-2}$ (ii)</td>
<td>48.3310 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{min-3}$ (iii)</td>
<td>35.0641 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{min-4}$ (iv)</td>
<td>30.2846 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{min-1}$ (i)</td>
<td>126.3713 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{min-2}$ (ii)</td>
<td>113.3310 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{min-3}$ (iii)</td>
<td>100.0641 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{min-4}$ (iv)</td>
<td>93.7184 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: three-aspect fixed-block (i), cab signal (ii), MVB fixed stopping distance (iii) and moving-block variable safety distance (iv)

### B. Result and Discussion

According to the survey, the average peak hour coefficient analysis result is 0.8 as depicted in Fig. 9.

In operation, to meet the expectation of a system with the largest carrying capacity of the same type in each phase. The characteristic of the MCS type is to operate with the highest service frequency. This research outlines and contrasts the separation capabilities of various types of rail transit train control systems, including three-aspect fixed-block (i), cab signal (ii), MVB fixed stopping distance (iii) and MVB variable safety distance (iv).

In Table IV, the necessary calculation results for the system to work with the highest service frequency. This research outlines and contrasts the separation capabilities of various types of rail transit train control systems, including three-aspect fixed-block (i), cab signal (ii), MVB fixed stopping distance (iii) and MVB variable safety distance (iv).

Based on the parameters of Table II, the necessary calculation results for the system to work with the highest service frequency. This research outlines and contrasts the separation capabilities of various types of rail transit train control systems, including three-aspect fixed-block (i), cab signal (ii), MVB fixed stopping distance (iii) and MVB variable safety distance (iv).
The results are also simulated, minimum train separation and station headway at the station for the PVD route according to capacity demand are compared with different types of signal control systems, as shown in Fig. 10 and Fig. 11.

The minimum total station travel time will correspond to the maximum service frequency or line capacity on the route according to each control signal type that can be provided. The results are: for the Three aspect fixed-block system it will provide 28.4875 trains/hour/direct; for the Cab signal system provide 31.7654 trains/hour/direct; for the MVB fixed stopping distance system provide 35.9769 trains/hour/direct and for the MVB variable safety distance provide 38.4129 trains/hour/direct, described in Table III. Note, the results $T_c$ (i...iv) in Table III are raw data that are not rounding because the $H(s)$ (i...iv) have not been optimized.

In the following phase, the train’s carrying capacity is determined by considering the length of each car, the number of cars in each train, and the number of passenger spaces per car length. The agency’s loading standard is based on peak-within-the peak condition, necessitating the use of a peak hour factor (PHF), previously calculated at 0.80. This factor accommodates lower passenger demand during the remaining time of peak hour, ensuring accurate forecasting of unused transport capacity for capacity demand in the design.

The next one is that the line’s capacity will be based on the train’s carrying capacity and the frequency of service that each train signal control system provides to solve the greatest traffic demand in each phase, rated according to comfort and flexibility (persons per meter length). In this operational design, the specified maximum each train consists of 5 cars, each car is 25 m length. In this operational design, the specified maximum train of five cars is 125 m length. The load level of train cars will gradually increase from 4 to 13 passenger per linear meter of train length. Aligning with peak service will result in the maximum carrying capacity of the route as follows.

- At the most comfortable level, from 4 to 7 passengers per meter of train, the capacity provided on the route during peak hours depends on each type of train control signal, and the results are shown in Table IV and Fig. 12. The results shown that, with a peak traffic demand of 23,676 passengers per peak hour direction (p/h/d), which two types of MVB systems (iii) and (iv) are 25,184 p/h/d and 26,889 p/h/d respectively, larger than 23,676 p/h/d capable of providing in phase 1 operation with 100% of traffic demand. Meanwhile, which two systems (i) and (ii), respectively 19,941 p/h/d and 22,236 p/h/d, are smaller than the peak traffic demand of Phase 1.

- The standard rush hour range of 8 to 11 passengers per meter of train length may cause passengers to feel less comfortable compared to the smaller range of 8 passengers per meter of train length. With a service frequency of 38.4129 trains per hour per direct (t/h/d), the MVB variable safety distance system provides capacity is 42,254 p/h/d, and similarly, it is 39,575 p/h/d for the fixed stopping distance system with service frequency 35.9769 t/h/d, which is enough to satisfy requirement peak traffic demand in Phase 2 with 35,514 p/h/d, see Fig. 13.
At higher levels during peak hours, ranging from 11 to 13 passengers per linear meter of train length, it corresponds to Asian standards where maximin and crush hour can reach to 7 or 8 standing passenger per square meter. The total number of passengers transported at peak hours that the system (iv) can provide is up to 49,937 p/h/d, which is greater than the expected demand growth of 200% in Phase 3. In Phase 3, only the MV variable safety distance system satisfies the requirement demand with a service frequency of 38,412 t/h/d and train capacity of 12.5 passengers per linear meter of train length, equivalent to 48,016 p/h/d, greater than the peak traffic demand 47,352 p/h/d, see Fig. 14. However, at a grade of 12.5 to 13 passenger per linear meter of train length, in peak-hour traffic services of rapid trains, the comfort satisfaction rating is still acceptable.

V. CONCLUSION

This article presents the findings of a study on an innovative urban railway transport system. The research delves into various contrasting traffic capacity cases, ranging from a gradual rise in traffic demand to the maximum capacity required for each future period. Furthermore, it explores multiple train control system options to thoroughly assess the selection of the signaling system for high-capacity operations. Research results also show the limitations of the two control signal systems Three aspects fixed-block and cab signal, compared to the superiority of the MV variable safety distance system used in MCS on the PVD route. Furthermore, the study of the new traffic model MCS applied on the PVD route, is a step forward in planning a complete and modern urban railway network for HCMC. From the perspective of providing transport capacity, the study also shows that MCS can solve the limitations that the BRT, LRT system cannot solve, and avoid wasting investment costs for the MRT system. Finally, this research can also be widely applied to the planning and design of routes with similar traffic demand around the world.
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