**High Frequency Transit Corridors Study**

**Hypothetical Scope Outline**

**Evaluation Purposes Only**

The lump sum total will be used for scoring. This scope is only for evaluation purposes and does not bind the proposer or WTA to actual scope performance or pricing. WTA is using this to gain a fair comparison for pricing to equally evaluate all proposers. Proposers are instructed to use their best efforts using ONLY the information provided within this outline, information available online, and their experience on previous HFTC Studies. WTA staff may not be used as a resource.

Study Goals

* Identify and analyze the feasibility of transit infrastructure improvements to improve the speed and reliability of transit along key high frequency corridors
* Assess alternatives and identify a Locally Preferred Alternative for potential bus rapid or rapid bus system
* Prepare work and documentation that would enable WTA to obtain local, state and federal funding, including entering into the FTA’s Project Development phase for a possible Capital Investment Grant (Small Starts) (Purpose and Need, Alternatives, LPA, etc.)

Key High Frequency Transit Corridors

Two corridors have been identified for future capital improvements and may be candidates for bus rapid transit:

* Alignment of the Gold Go Line (Route 331) - ~7 miles
* Alignment of the Green plus Blue Go Lines (Route 232 and Route 190 serving Western Washington University between Downtown and Lakeway) – ~6 miles

Ideally, the study would assess the viability of improvements in both corridors and the potential for BRT in each. However, given the need to focus the effort, the priority should be placed on the corridor with the best potential for improvements and future rapid bus or BRT. An initial screening effort could identify the best candidate for the study. Results from a focused effort could be made applicable to the second candidate corridor and other existing and future high frequency transit corridors.

Key Issues and Opportunities

Due to increasing degradation in travel times, WTA has made significant investments in operations to ensure schedule adherence on routes 232 and 331. Growth in congestion and other challenges will make continual operational investments unsustainable. Transit Signal Priority exist on most signals, but this tool has limited ability to appreciably affect travel times.

Existing transit service is constrained by limited rights-of-way. The existing arterial and collector street layout outside of the downtown area does not provide many options for alternative running ways. On-street parking is present in many areas, but removal is a sensitive topic. In some areas, there are pinch points that hamper efficient movement. In other areas, a middle turn lane is present, and there may be opportunities for additional queue jump lanes (one is present at Alabama and James).

Bellingham has shown strong support for transit and transit supportive development. Development is rapidly occurring in the designated Urban Villages, located along key transit corridors. While Bellingham is experiencing densification, much of the existing development pattern is low-density single-family residences or auto oriented commercial development. Western Washington University generates the highest ridership demand of any destination in Bellingham.

General Scope Tasks & Notes

WTA expects to have close involvement in all aspects of the study work and ongoing check-ins with other WTA contractors.

1. Would work closely with WTA (primarily the Planning Division and Marketing Manager) to define a stakeholder engagement process. The roles during the process would generally include Proposer as a presenter and as a provider of content. WTA would handle logistics and facilitate meetings as necessary.
2. Baseline conditions: document existing service, land use context and socio-economic projections, legally binding affordability restricted housing, parking supply and cost, and corridor characteristics, particularly constrained areas.
3. Given that corridor alternative alignments are limited, suggest focusing on alternative capital investment strategies (while noting where variations in alignment could occur). The strategies could include enhanced bus, rapid bus and bus rapid transit. The study would identify components of each. E.g., bus stop features, intersections/signals, running way, branding, operational characteristics, fare collection, signage, etc.
4. For the BRT, the study would specifically identify whether the alternative could accommodate a fixed guideway or would be developed as a corridor-based project as defined under FTA requirements, with each type containing the required core bus rapid transit elements.
5. Project goals: evaluate alternatives against project goals, such as travel times, ridership, etc.
6. Study needs to identify feasibility of various infrastructure improvements based on specific corridor characteristics.
7. Include high level O&M costs.
8. Identify next steps & funding opportunities. Specifically, the study will define a task list and timeline for further work to qualify for funding including the environmental review process. Furthermore, it will identify steps and a timeline to identify and secure funding for project development and construction work from local, state and federal sources.
9. Equity goals & assessment will be important to include.

Data Collection (Not provided for this cost proposal)

WTA has a robust library of resources and will be responsible for providing raw or processed data for analysis. WTA has readily available information on route and stop level ridership (boardings only), travel speeds and trip running time, dwell times, on-time performance, TSP activation, and others. WTA does not currently use APCs. The most recent boarding and alighting data is from 2018.

WTA also has an in-house ridership projection model (TBEST). It has been validated to the base year. WTA also has a subscription to REMIX, use of which can be shared with the consultant for the sole purposes of the project.

The City of Bellingham is also a source of data for this effort.

We do not expect proposer to conduct any original data collection. The scope should identify any needed data collection including surveys, etc.

Stakeholder Engagement

The City of Bellingham is a major partner in this effort, and its endorsement of the findings will be key to the success of the study. Other significant partners will include the Whatcom Council of Governments, WSDOT and Western Washington University. Other key stakeholders will include WTA Executive Staff, other WTA staff, including operators; riders; the Citizens Transportation Advisory Group (CTAG); residents and businesses along the key transit corridors; WTA’s social and health partners; and the Walk-Bike-Bus advocacy group.

We recommend forming a Technical Advisory Committee to provide feedback at key milestones.

WTA will handle internal and external communications, including website, social media, mailings, etc.

Proposer should budget for several Board and Executive staff check-ins, TAC meeting facilitation/participation and a public meeting. Travel reimbursement is outlined in RFP Part 5.C.

Deliverables

* Corridor study document with robust graphics. Potential content:
	+ Project Goals
	+ Purpose and Need statements
	+ Study assumptions
	+ Alternatives identification and analysis
	+ Components of transit alternatives
	+ Evaluation of goals/criteria
	+ Estimation of benefits, costs & impacts
	+ Recommendations & Locally Preferred Alternative
	+ Next steps/implementation/phasing
* Study content (such as the list above) provided at key milestones, for review, discussion and approval of WTA staff
* Presentation and community engagement graphics & content

Timeline

WTA desires to begin work in fall 2022 and completion by the end of 2023.

Resource Materials

* WTA 2040 (in progress) ([WTA2040.org](http://www.wta2040.org))
* Transit Guide (June 13, 2021) ([www.ridewta.com](http://www.ridewta.com))
* WTA Route Profiles (<https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/d5286729b20b4094b43d83c13ed2f753>)
* City of Bellingham Comprehensive Plan (<https://cob.org/services/planning/comprehensive-plan>)
* City of Bellingham Alabama Street Corridor Feasibility Study & Safety Improvements and Telegraph Road Multimodal Improvements (<https://cob.org/services/planning/transportation-planning/transportation-studies>)

RFP 2021-260 PART 3.G “Submission Package Contents”

* FEE SCHEDULE

Supporting cost data shall consist of the following level of detail:

1. Lump sum hourly rates for assigned staff: Rates will include all Direct and Indirect costs including, but not limited to wages, benefits, overhead, licensing, taxes, etc. These rates will be used to determine Task Order price reasonableness.
2. Subcontracts: Identify any sub consultant rates and any mark-up planned.
3. Other charges: These include Computer Assisted Design, printing, and any other costs or fees assessed in the execution of any task order if not covered by the other categories above. Refer to Part 5.C for information about travel cost reimbursement.

Proposers will provide an estimate of the total cost, breaking out different positions, level of effort, hourly rate, and total cost per position. Task descriptions may vary based on proposers best estimate on how to complete this sample task. FOR EXAMPLE ONLY:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Title* | Principal | Project Manager | Admin | SUB |
| **Task** | **Description** | **$150.00** | **$125** | **$50** | **$175** |
| **1** | **Project Management and Outreach Strategy** | 2 | 15 | 15 |  |
| **2** | **Public Involvement**  | 2 | 30 |  |  |
| **5** | **Alternatives Analysis** | 4 | 20 |  | 10 |
| **7** | **Identification of Funding Strategies** | 1 | 10 |  | 5 |
| **8** | **Draft and Final Plan Development** | 2 | 35 | 10 |  |
|  | **Labor Total Hours** | 19 | 110 | 25 | 15 |
|  | **TOTAL PER POSITION** | $2,850 | $13,750 | $1,250 | $2,625 |

 **Total Budget: $20,475**

The amount that will be evaluated for the proposal is the “Total Budget” amount of $20,475