

Fehr & Peers response to follow up questions in City email of 4/9/2018

1. The City does not have any up-to-date traffic counts. All proposals must assume that the consultant will take new traffic counts for the base condition to validate and calibrate the model. If counts are already included in your proposal, please note how many counts are budgeted for. If counts are not currently included in your proposal, please provide a scope and cost for providing this service and indicate how many counts are budgeted for.

The Fehr & Peers proposal includes a budget for up to 150 count locations (24-hour segment counts on a typical weekday).

2. Culver City has a strategic goal of no overall growth in citywide ADT while enhancing traffic safety. To enable analysis of overall citywide ADT, the model must be able to track trips with an origin in the city, a destination in the city, trips contained within the city, as well as by-pass traffic. Please confirm that your proposed approach includes these trip types.

Our proposed approach includes the ability to track these trip types.

3. Are TDM measures, bicycle facilities, transit, and pedestrian travel factored into the model to arrive at VMT? Can the model evaluate the effectiveness of specific TDM and TSM measures? If the existing scope and cost includes these functions, please describe how it does so. If a separate sketch model/VMT calculator is required, please provide a scope and cost.

The existing scope and cost includes the incorporation of TDM/TSM. The model framework proposed will account for automobile, transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel when determining VMT. Regarding the TDM/TSM measures, this will depend on the measures the City decides to test and apply. Some TDM measures can be applied in line within the TDFM framework through the use of elasticities (e.g., parking policy, trip reduction strategies, and transit strategies) while others may have to be applied off line and evaluated outside of the model. To the extent that these affect person or vehicle trip making, the model inputs can be modified to accommodate TDM measures.

TSM measures, ATSAC, ATCS and cameras could be factored into the model by adjusting capacity. Recognize that these types of measures could increase, not decrease, VMT.

We have incorporated these types of measures in citywide models for the Cities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, West Hollywood, Santa Monica and Glendale.

A separate sketch model is not required for this purpose.

4. One of the tasks is to prepare new traffic study guidelines for the City. The work shall include a development review fee structure for City staff review time, maintaining and updating the model, and to access big data. If the existing scope and costs accounts for this, please describe how it does so. If not, please add this service and provide an updated scope and cost.

The new traffic study guidelines task was included as part of our proposed scope of work, but developing a new review fee structure was not. We are currently in the process of assisting the City of Los Angeles with updating their development review fee structure as part of their traffic study update process.

The following scope of work and fee is proposed to address this task for the Culver City:

Fehr & Peers will develop a transportation review fee to recover the staff costs for project-level review and TDM monitoring and enforcement. The fee will also be set to account for periodic updates to the City's travel demand model, acquisition of additional mobile device ("big") data, or other elements of the transportation review procedures that are necessary to perform adequate project-level VMT impact analysis.

Cost Estimate: \$7,470

5. Culver City participated in Metro's Countywide Arterial Performance Baseline Conditions Analysis; an effort to collect speed and volume data throughout the county that will feed into the performance measurement of an analytical tool that is being evaluated by Metro. All the key arterials in Culver City were included in this analysis. Please confirm if this information is or should be included in the model approach and if it allows for any cost savings.

Fehr & Peers will review the Metro study and determine whether any of the data can be used in the model calibration/validation. If the data is appropriate for use, this may reduce the number of count locations required. If the number of locations are reduced then there would be proportionate cost savings.

6. The model must be easy enough for traffic and transportation consultants and City staff conducting traffic impact analysis studies for development projects to assess VMT impacts. If not already included, please identify how the proposed model interface would allow for this level of functionality.

The model can be used to assess VMT for development projects. However, this is size dependent. For example, the model can be used to assess the VMT impacts of larger land uses such as shopping malls or studios. Travel demand forecasting models such as the proposed citywide model are less sensitive to smaller land uses and are not recommended for these types of projects. In terms of functionality for City staff or other transportation consultants, the TDFM will employ a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to run the various steps in the model. The model will then output data, some of which can be used directly and other data that requires post processing (typically in Excel).

Based on the fact that there are a variety of land uses (and sizes) that are not recommended for VMT impact assessment in the model, we included an optional task (see page 33 of the proposal) for a project level VMT calculator. We are currently in the process of finalizing a similar VMT calculator for the City of Los Angeles and also recently developed one for the City of San Jose.

Here is the scope language we included in our proposal (page 33):

Optional Task: Project-Level VMT Calculator

As an optional task, Fehr & Peers could develop a spreadsheet based tool that could be applied to project level review of transportation projects in the City of Culver City. While we have already developed and used multiple spreadsheet and web-based tools that perform VMT estimates, this project provides an opportunity to refine or build new tools that incorporate recent research about VMT effects of land use and TDM actions. The tool would incorporate trip length data and demographic data from empirical sources and the citywide travel model, validated through the most recent California Statewide Travel Survey, to calculate project-level VMT impacts. The appropriate geographic scale (TAZ, Census area, or other boundary) of the model inputs would be determined during the model calibration process. The tool would account for the VMT benefits of transit

proximity, mixed land uses, urban design, and TDM measures. The quantification of some of these benefits would be linked to the available data on mode share, trip generation and CAPCOA research. Through consultation with the Culver City staff, the strategies identified (by the City's TDM consultant) to reduce a project's VMT impact on the environment would be determined and incorporated into the sketch model. The cost to conduct this optional task is not included in the fee proposal but a fee could be provided if desired by the City.

Cost Estimate: \$49,800

7. The availability and pricing of parking is an important factor in determining development projects' VMT. If in the future the City decides to modify its parking strategies, how will this be reflected in the model's and/or sketch/VMT calculator VMT projections?

There are a variety of options available to the City regarding the evaluation of parking strategies. Research has shown that one of the greatest influences on development project VMT is how parking is treated. This is both on the supply side and how it is priced. The types of strategies that have proven to be very effective at reducing VMT and GHG are:

- Limiting Parking Supply
- Unbundling Parking
- Workplace parking
- On Street Pricing Policies
- Preferential Parking Permits

Both the travel model (and the optional VMT calculator) can apply research results and parameters from the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) study within their frameworks. The main difference in application of the TDM measures in the model versus the VMT calculator is the scale of application. The model allows application at a TAZ, group of TAZs or City level. The VMT calculator applies the measures at a project or parcel level.

The CAPCOA data is the most robust and legally defensible information available at this time.

8. The City is interested in establishing project-level VMT impact fees. The timing of this optional task likely would be dependent on the General Plan Update and land use element alternative scenarios analysis, which is anticipate to begin around 2020. Please provide a separate scope and cost memorandum for the preparation of a VMT-based nexus study as a follow up task to modeling services.”

Fehr & Peers has recently been involved in the preparation of two local trip fee programs in adjacent sections of the City of Los Angeles: the Coastal Transportation Corridor Fee Program and the West Los Angeles Fee Program. Both are VMT-based fee programs and were recently approved by the Los Angeles City Planning Commission. A typical scope of work for this would include the following tasks:

- Community engagement/outreach
- State of the practice review of VMT fee programs
- Development of a project list
- Conceptual planning level cost estimates
- Nexus analysis and travel forecasting (existing deficiencies, through traffic, new trips/VMT generated in Culver City)

- Impact fee calculations
- Economic review (prepared by an economist)
- Documentation and fee ordinance
- Impact fee adoption

Depending on the level of detail of the aforementioned tasks, the cost to complete a VMT nexus analysis is typically in the range of \$70,000 to \$100,000.

As part of our scope and fee estimate, we are happy to advise the City in regards to the technical content and legal considerations around a citywide VMT based traffic impact fee.

Hefner, Ashley

From: John Muggridge <J.Muggridge@fehrandpeers.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2018 6:36 PM
To: Purchasing
Subject: RE: City of Culver City: RFP #1830 - Follow-Up Questions

Thank you for your question. Please see the breakdown of PIC and PM hours by task below:

		Fehr & Peers Labor Hours	
		PIC	PM
BASE TASKS			
A. Project Management & Coordination		4	20
B. Project Initiation		2	6
C. Build TDFM			
Develop & validate TDFM		14	82
SB743 VMT metrics & threshold options		6	26
District-level trip generation rates (1 District)		2	6
Task C Subtotal		22	114
D. Technical Support for GPU Mobility Element		2	10
E. Prepare Traffic Study Guidelines		6	14
F. Hearings, Meetings & Events			
13 internal meetings		6	20
13 public meetings/events/hearings		12	40
GPU Transportation TAC meetings (as needed)			
Task F Subtotal		18	60
G. Assist TDM Consultant on Evaluation of TDM Strategies		2	10
H. Estimate for Ongoing TDFM Operations & Management		2	6
Total Hours		58	240

If you have any other questions please let me know.

John Muggridge, AICP
Principal

FEHR & PEERS

Los Angeles

600 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel: (213) 261-3064

From: Purchasing [mailto:purchasing@culvercity.org]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 1:30 PM
To: John Muggridge <J.Muggridge@fehrandpeers.com>
Subject: City of Culver City: RFP #1830 - Follow-Up Questions

Good Afternoon, John:

We thank you for your proposal to the City of Culver City in response to RFP #1830 – Travel Demand Forecast Model.

Pursuant to the terms of the RFP, “The City reserves the right to make such investigations as it deems necessary to determine the ability of the Proposer to provide services meeting a satisfactory level of performance in accordance with the City’s requirements.” As such, we are sending this follow-up questionnaire for your completion to assist in our evaluation of your organization.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTION(S):

1. Please provide a breakdown of PIC and PM hours by task.

We are asking for you to submit your response(s) no later than close of business, Monday, April 2, 2018.

Thanks,
Purchasing Division | Finance Department
City of Culver City
9770 Culver Boulevard | Culver City, CA 90232-0507
voice: 310-253-6550 | www.culvercity.org

The City of Culver City keeps a copy of all E-mails sent and received for a minimum of 2 years. All retained E-mails will be treated as a Public Record per the California Public Records Act, and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the terms, and subject to the exemptions, of that Act.