

## August 30 Update Questions & Answers Coordinated Transit Center Study

### Question # 1

What were some of the factors or issues considered for the 2003 NARF Transit Center Project?

### Answer to Question # 1

1. Site characteristics
  - Site Dimensions
  - Desired setbacks
  - Height limits
  - Bus access
  - Routing efficiency
2. Bus bays
  - Minimum number of bus bays needed
  - Different sizes for various buses?
  - Is phasing/future expansion a consideration?
  - Effect of pulse system
  - Ease of transfer
  - ADA service
  - Kiss & ride
  - Trolley
3. Operations
  - General hours of operation
  - Maintenance – City? Consultant equipment?
  - Emergency vehicle access needed?
  - On-site transit services (customer service, pass sales, etc.)
  - Staffing
4. Other Uses
  - Retail; Small mobile retail; Flower shop; Coffee cart
  - Commercial office
5. Transit Amenities
  - Office
  - Police Substation
  - Public Toilet Rooms
  - Telephones
  - Places for waiting
  - Landscaped plazas
  - Security phones; Code blue phones; CCTV

- Hose bibs
  - Bike parking (long term/short term)
  - Telecommute area
  - Utility services/energy conservation
6. Entry/exits
- Preferred vehicle/pedestrian access locations
  - Locations to avoid
  - ADA pedestrian access
7. Preferences regarding architecture
- Ease of Maintenance
  - Materials
  - Structural design
  - Color
  - Landscaping
  - Special features?
  - Street level appearances
8. Signage/Information Systems
- City map
  - City event
  - Bulletin board
  - Interactive information kiosk
  - Clock
  - Advanced Public Transportation System (e.g. EDAPTS, other)
  - Bus bay designations
  - Alternative signage for ADA (e.g. audio)
  - Information phone
  - Information monitor
9. Lighting
- Desired light levels
  - Lighting type, e.g. high pressure sodium (yellow light) or metal halide (white light)
  - Solar powered?
  - Integration of pedestrian lighting
  - Is light spillage an issue?
  - Light shielding on neighborhoods
10. Communications
- Telephone service needed?
  - Data lines needed?
11. Neighborhood issues
- Proximity to residential areas
  - Noise mitigation issues
  - Visual screening requirements

- Pedestrian connections
  - Circulation impacts on neighborhoods
12. City requirements
    - Zoning code issues
    - Status of City planning review
  13. Relationship/interaction between transit and parking components

### Question # 2

Have the parking issues raised during the North Area Regional Facility 2003 study been addressed since then? Does the City still envision a future parking structure in the NARF study area?

### Answer to Question # 2

Our analysis is that our current revenues can only afford one more parking structure downtown. The location is at the corner of Palm and Nipomo which is on the other side of town than the NARF area. We have invested and been given Council approval to move forward at this location. We just hired an architectural firm to design and obtain entitlements for this structure. It is probably not going to be built right away; it is probably 5-10 years out. But this is the location we are moving forward with.

This is not to say that we cannot ever move forward with a structure in the NARF location. Currently, anywhere north of Santa Rosa is not part of the City's parking in lieu zone. Until that zone expands north of Santa Rosa or development begins to increase in that area, we would not look to providing a structure in that area. So in the short term there is no plan to build a structure in that location. In the long term I think it will have to be addressed due to expansion of the downtown. We would to figure out a new method of funding another structure in that location. It is not impossible but always difficult to find more funding. Structures do not pay for themselves on their own. They cost too much to build, operate, and finance.

### Question #3

Will a new City parking facility be part of this study?

### Answer to Question # 3

The Coordinated Transit Center Study focuses on developing a feasible location and suitable design for accommodating a regional transit center with accompanying passenger amenities.

While the City might consider the future option of adding a parking structure in the NARF area (See Answer to Question #2), such a long term capital investment would be separately funded from the contemplated transit facility. Parking-related costs and funding are outside of the scope of this study. In addition, there is prior work already done on candidate parking sites and conceptual design for a future parking facility and how it would interface with proposed transit centers. The 2010 transit study consultant can readily tap into those resources and address the compatibility between the new candidate transit center alternatives and the prior candidate parking options mainly as part of the environmental review (mostly operations, traffic and circulation) in Task V.

Question #4

Will any support facilities be part of this study (restrooms, driver lock room, snack shop etc...)?

Answer to Question # 4

Yes, support facilities will be part of this study; at the start of the project as part of Task III, the consultant will gather input from the study team as to “the range of elements to be incorporated into the future project”. A checklist of contemplated elements will be prepared as the basis for the Options Development. (Also see Answer to Question # 1 above for prior items considered or explored when the project had two components).

Question #5

What is the expected level of effort for the public outreach?

Answer to Question #5

The prospective bidder is responsible for developing a public outreach strategy well suited to this project by scoping activities and budgeting for an appropriate number of public workshops and focus groups.

Question # 6

The 2003 study outcome was the recommendation of Design Option B. Is the new study expected to define potential changes to that earlier option or to perform additional work for defining a different lay out?

Answer to Question # 6

There is no preconceived approach to this project. While there are many ideas in the prior concepts that still apply, there is still room for new ideas in bringing the concept up to date and potentially generating new ideas.

Question #7

Why is SLOCOG taking the lead for this study, while the 2000 and 2003 studies were led by the City?

Answer to Question # 7

This is a cooperative effort during which the City and the RTA will work in tandem and be equal partners. SLOCOG has the lead role as a facilitator; the consultant will be a key player in building consensus among the three agencies.

Question # 8

Was a traffic impact study of the 2002-03 transit center and parking conceptual design proposals done?

Answer to Question # 8

While there was a traffic impact analysis in the previous project work scope, the City Council had tabled the project before that work was done.

Question # 9

Is there a roster of Underutilized Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in the San Luis Obispo region? And should the DBE certification be with Caltrans?

Answers to Question #9

SLOCOG does not have a roster available of San Luis Obispo based underutilized DBE's. The DBE certification can be with Caltrans or any other state agency in California.

Question # 10

The RFP shows that you intend to award the project in mid October; for the proposal projected schedule, do you have an estimate of the Notice to Proceed (NTP) date?

Answer to Question # 10

The SLOCOG Board will meet on October 6, 2010. The projected NTP date is late October to early November.

Question # 11

The scope of work is well defined. Is there any issue with varying from the scope in the proposal?

Answer to Question # 11

SLOCOG is open to consultants' suggestions on how to sequence the tasks as well as to setting the relative levels of effort among the tasks (See Page 9), as long as all the elements identified in the RFP are covered.

Question #12

Is there a specific DBE percent participation goal for this project?

Answer to Question #12

SLOCOG has not identified a % DBE goal specific to this study. Agency wide, the overall goals are 1% (race neutral) and 0.1% (race conscious).

Question # 13

Is the NARF site at the Higuera and Santa Rosa location the only site to be studied or are there other potential sites and locations to be evaluated? And if so have any others been identified?

Answer to Question # 13

The Option B recommendation (Higuera/Santa Rosa) resulted from the 2003/203 review. At that time other sites in the same NARF study area had been identified (See <http://www.slocity.org/publicworks/documents>). During Task III (Options Development) this new study will examine how to update or refine the concepts for Option B as well as review other candidate sites within the NARF boundaries.