



Executive Summary

# Moving Toward the Efficiencies of Synergy

**Phase II: Operating Plan and Financial Analysis for a Coordinated Transit Maintenance and Dispatch Facility**



**Final Draft Report**

Presented by



June 7, 2006

**San Luis Obispo  
Council of Governments**





## PHASE II: COORDINATED MAINTENANCE AND DISPATCHING FACILITY STUDY

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF FIGURES _____	I
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY _____</b>	<b>1</b>
BACKGROUND _____	1
OPERATIONS PLAN _____	3
SITE SELECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS _____	9
FINANCIAL PLAN _____	12
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN _____	21

### TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Current RTA Facility _____	3
Figure 2: Memorandum of Understanding _____	4
Figure 3: Phased Approach _____	5
Figure 4: Site Specification Table _____	7
Figure 5: Site Checklist _____	10
Figure 6: Potential Site _____	11
Figure 7: Summary of Order of Magnitude Estimated Costs _____	13
Figure 9: Summary of Cost Benefits _____	17
Figure 8: Successful Coordination of Dispatching _____	19





## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### BACKGROUND

***PHASE II OF THE  
COORDINATED  
MAINTENANCE &  
DISPATCHING FACILITY  
STUDY EXPANDS AND  
REFINES THE FINDINGS  
FROM PHASE I.***

This is the second phase of a two part study to determine the feasibility of a coordinated maintenance and dispatching facility for the public operations in the San Luis Obispo area.

*Phase I* was completed in August 2002 by Transit Resource Center and Lea + Elliott. *Phase I* assessed the near-term potential to consolidate some or all maintenance wash, fueling and dispatch functions and estimated the total space required to accommodate a joint facility. Phase I also examined key implementation issues and components of joint operating agreements and attempted to develop a long term vision.

*Phase I: Coordinated Transit Maintenance and Dispatch Facility Study* concluded that a significant opportunity exists to consolidate the maintenance functions for San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (RTA) and Ride-On Transportation, the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) and possibly other transit operations, such as San Luis Obispo Transit (SLO Transit). The first phase did not determine any near-term opportunity to consolidate dispatching operations between the two demand-response services, Ride-On and Runabout since each serves distinct client needs and has separate dispatching personnel, equipment and radios.

While the *Phase I* report included proposed site specifications and costs, a detailed operations plan, financial review, and cost/benefit analysis were not presented.

*Phase I* laid the foundation for a Coordinated Maintenance And Dispatching Facility; however, several areas required additional refinement before the project could advance to the next level.



*Phase II: Coordinated Transit Maintenance and Dispatch Facility Study*

was required to determine if and to what degree consolidation of the various operators' maintenance and dispatching functions is feasible and beneficial to transit services in the San Luis Obispo region. To accomplish this purpose, *Phase II* has three goals:

1. *Assess the pros and cons of key issues;*
2. *Determine costs and benefits by efficiency and effectiveness standards;*
3. *Gauge the readiness of the region and the operators to proceed.*

The development of *Phase II* was a year long process and included three meetings with transit operators and San Luis Obispo Coastal Unified School District (SLCUSD) to explore how or even if the maintenance and dispatching functions of the various operations could be coordinated to achieve greater efficiency and cost savings.

Working with the transit operators and school district the following criteria were developed and used in developing *Phase II*:

- **Lower overhead** and management costs;
- **Cost savings** through volume purchasing of fuel, parts, equipment, etc.;
- **Permanent facility** for operators who now rely on leased or contractor-provided facilities;
- **Improved reliability and flexibility in meeting demands;**
- **Mechanism to resolve any conflict** in setting priorities among the different operators;
- **No loss of control** by the individual operators;
- **Avoidance/resolution of union versus non-union issues;**
- **Determination for liability/responsibility issues if something goes wrong;**
- **No decrease in performance efficiency, including deadhead time and miles.**

---

***THE 3 MOST IMPORTANT  
CRITERIA FOR A  
COORDINATED FACILITY  
ARE COST SAVINGS,  
PERMANENT FACILITY,  
AND RELIABILITY AND  
FLEXIBILITY OF  
MAINTENANCE SERVICE.***

---



The following plan delineates what can be realistically accomplished by coordinating maintenance and dispatching functions of those operators amenable to participating in a joint facility. The plan was structured to be implemented in phases to meet both immediate and long-term facility needs and provide a foundation for addressing the more complex issues involved in coordinated dispatching.

*Phase II* is divided into four sections:

**Section 1. Operations Plan;**

**Section 2. Site Selection and Environmental Issues;**

**Section 3. Financial Plan;**

**Section 4. Implementation Plan.**

## OPERATIONS PLAN

The **Operations Plan** resulted from an analysis of the operator's current maintenance and dispatching operations and participation from the operators in making key decisions during a series of three meetings with City of San Luis Obispo (SLO Transit), San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (RTA), Ride-On and San Luis Coastal Unified School District (SLCUSD).

Ride-On and RTA confirmed they both wanted to move forward with the Coordinated Maintenance & Dispatching Facility program. Ride-On and RTA both lease maintenance facilities, which are not consistent with recommended industry standards in meeting each agency's current operations and insufficient for projected growth.

SLO Transit and SLCUSD prefer not to go forward at this time, although both indicated that they may be interested in specific services in the future. Both SLO Transit and SLCUSD have maintenance facilities adequate for their immediate needs.

An agreement was reached that the initial participants in a coordinated facility plan would be San Luis Obispo RTA and Ride-On Transportation. The participants would collaborate on a



**Figure 1: The current RTA and Ride-On facilities are leased, and can not be expanded to meet current and future requirements..**



**Figure 2: A Memorandum of Understanding** *between Ride-On and RTA should be implemented early in the process to ensure commitment of both organizations to the completed project.*

*Memorandum of Understanding* (MOU) between them to establish terms for working with a maintenance vendor as the provider of maintenance services. The project is divided into three sectors:

1. **Functional Continuum** defines how the operation of the coordinated maintenance facility will be structured. The preferred structure was a joint contract using an outside maintenance contractor.
2. **Facility Continuum** defines the type of facility which will be acquired. The availability and suitability of potential structures and land will govern the approach. RTA has recently identified a potential site with approved new construction, which could possibly be modified to meet the specifications of a Coordinated Maintenance and Dispatching Facility.
3. **Dispatching Continuum** is more complex. The tasks involved with dispatching demand-response services is different from fixed-route and requires substantially more integration of the operations and bringing together complex technology and systems.

The development of the Operations Plan required several assumptions:

- **Timeframe:** The timeframe for this project is strategic (three to seven years), which is required to secure funding and possible construction; however, both RTA and Ride-On have current facility needs.
- **Need for office space:** Ride-On and RTA both indicated they would like to house their office staff and dispatching staff within the facility.
- **Optimal size & specifications:** The primary specification is for eight service bays, which appears sufficient for both Ride-On and RTA's immediate needs and allows for ample growth.



Figure 3: A phased approach is recommended to enable both immediate and strategic needs to be met for both RTA and Ride-On.

- **Functions and services:** Preventive Maintenance Inspections (PMIs) and all routine functions will be performed in-house. Technicians are expected to develop considerable expertise in servicing the vehicles in the fleet.
- **Use of satellite locations:** To minimize deadhead time, it is assumed satellite locations will continue to be used for minor maintenance and inspections.
- **Availability of land and facility:** A critical assumption is that the needed land and/or facility can be obtained in a central location for a reasonable price.

Because both RTA and Ride-On had short-, medium-, and long-term maintenance and dispatching needs, we have separated the implementation of the Plan into three phases:

- Phase I:** Near-term implementation of a joint program with certain steps being taken within a one-year timeframe to initiate the process. The major elements of Phase I includes the following:
- **Memorandum of Understanding** between Ride-On and RTA;
  - **Request for Proposals (RFP)/Contract for Services** to secure a maintenance vendor;
  - **Short-term facility** for maintaining both Ride-On's and RTA's fleets;
- Phase II:** Mid-range solution (two to three years), and may provide an alternate solution if funding is not available to implement Phase III or may be deleted in favor of maintaining Phase I coordination until Phase III can be implemented. The major element of Phase II is the coordination of the dispatching function.
- Phase III:** A long-term strategy, during which funding would be sought for a new structure and longer-term collaborative agreements would be negotiated. This is



the final Phase which would result in RTA and Ride-On sharing a coordinated maintenance and dispatching facility.

A draft ***Policy and Procedures Manual*** for the proposed facility was developed in a template format so that RTA and Ride-On could develop the manual to be consistent with their existing operations.



**SITE SPECIFICATION TABLE**

	MINIMUM CRITERIA			MAXIMUM CRITERIA		
	SPECS	#	SPACE REQUIRED (SQ FT)	SPECS	#	SPACE REQUIRED (SQ FT)
<b>BUILDING REQUIREMENTS</b>						
OFFICE SPACE	145 to 240 sq. ft.	16	2,475	145 to 240 sq. ft.	30	4,500
DISPATCHING	400 sq. ft.	1	400	600 sq. ft.	1	600
MONEY-COUNTING	400 sq. ft.	1	400	500 sq. ft.	1	500
CONFERENCE/STORAGE/MISC.			1,175			2,200
<b>TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE</b>			<b>4,450</b>			<b>7,800</b>
SERVICE BAYS	55 ft. by 20 ft.	6	6,600		17	18,700
PARTS STORAGE			600		1	1,200
MATERIALS STORAGE, EQUIPMENT			800		1	1,500
<b>TOTAL BUILDING REQUIREMENTS</b>			<b>12,450</b>			<b>29,200</b>
<b>PARKING AREA/GROUNDS</b>						
40 FT. COACHES	45 ft. by 15 ft.	10	6,750	50 ft. by 20 ft.	15	15,000
CUTAWAYS	35 ft. by 15 ft.	30	15,750	40 ft. by 20 ft.	40	32,200
VANS	20 ft. by 10 ft.	23		25 ft. by 12 ft.		
SHUTTLE VANS	20 Ft by 10 ft	19	4,560	25 ft. by 12 ft	25	7,500
EMPLOYEE PARKING	20 ft. by 10 ft	38	9,120	25 ft. by 12 ft	50	15,000
FUELING	120 ft. by 50 ft.		6,000	150 ft. by 50 ft.		7,500
DRIVEWAYS, AISLES	50% of area		27,960	100% of area		113,900
DRIVE-THROUGH BUS WASH	50 ft. by 15 ft.		750	50 ft. by 15 ft.		7,500
<b>TOTAL PARKING AREA</b>			<b>70,620</b>			<b>198,600</b>
<b>TOTAL AREA REQUIREMENT</b>			<b>83,070</b>			<b>227,800</b>
			<b>1.9Acres</b>			<b>5.2 Acres</b>

Figure 4: Site Specification Table outlines the anticipated minimum and maximum site requirements. This is an estimate only. The actual requirements will depend to a large degree on the specific site selected.





## SITE SELECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

The Coordinated Maintenance and Dispatching Facility is envisioned to house all administration, operation, and maintenance activities for both RTA and Ride-On Transportation. Land requirements are determined, to a large degree, by the need to provide parking for approximately half RTA's and the majority Ride-On's non-commuter vehicles. Both agencies provide transportation service throughout San Luis Obispo County and will continue to have some offsite parking.

### SITE SELECTION

A checklist, which lists and ranks considerations in selecting a site for a Coordinated Maintenance and Dispatching Facility, was developed to assist RTA and Ride-On in choosing a site that will meet their current and future requirements. The most important criteria for the site were determined to be:

- **Location** — Within one mile of the San Luis Obispo City Limits;
- **Access** — Safe and easy access for 40-foot coaches is required;
- **Existing Building** — If a suitable building is found that can meet at least the short-term requirements without major remodeling, with suitable access and adequate waste disposal, it would simplify the development of the project;
- **Other** — **Lot size, zoning and legal requirements** can be deal breakers; **Topography, geology, and ecology** may impact the environmental evaluation.



PHASE II: COORDINATED TRANSIT MAINTENANCE AND DISPATCHING FACILITY STUDY  
 SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
**SITE SELECTION CHECKLIST**

CATEGORY	CRITERIA	WEIGHT (1 TO 5)	POINTS (1 TO 10)	TOTAL	MAXIMUM
<b>SITE</b>	Location	5			50
	Lot Size	4			40
	Zoning	4			40
	Best Use	1			10
	Access	5			50
	Condition	2			20
	Topography	4			40
	Geology	4			40
	Ecology	4			40
	Neighborhood	2			20
	Utilities	3			30
	Legal	4			40
	Existing Building	5			50
Cost	3			30	
<b>SITE TOTAL</b>					<b>500</b>
<b>STRUCTURE</b>	Modifications Required	5			50
	Location	3			30
	Size	3			30
	Building type	2			20
	Construction type	3			30
	Age/condition	2			20
	Floors	2			20
	Ceilings	2			20
	Architecture	3			30
	Suitability	3			30
	Access	4			40
	HVAC	1			10
	Insulation	1			10
	Sprinkler	3			30
	Existing Facilities	3			30
	Fueling	3			30
	Insurance	3			30
Waste disposal	4			40	
<b>STRUCTURE TOTAL</b>					<b>500</b>
<b>BUILDING SITE<sup>1</sup></b>	Size/Suitability	50			<b>500</b>

<sup>1</sup> Building Site will only be considered if the existing structures cannot be refurbished or remodeled to meet the long-term goals of the project.

**Figure 5:** A checklist was developed and is recommended for reviewing potential sites and ensuring all requirements are addressed.



Commercial properties in the San Luis Obispo area range from 8,000 square feet to more than ten acres. However, our review indicated that medium-sized parcels (two to five acres) zoned as either Commercial-Service (C-S) or Manufacturing (M), which is required for a vehicle maintenance yard, are not readily available. Industrial land, which meets the specifications and is listed for sale, is virtually nonexistent. This also applies to retail and office land. Locating a suitable property may require investigating properties that are not actively on the market.

According to the *San Luis Obispo County Economic Outlook 2006*, as detailed in the *University of California at Santa Barbara Economic Forecast 2006*, soaring building materials and labor costs have made newly constructed buildings affordable to only the financially healthiest of entities. While owners of existing buildings have experienced significant equity gains, market rents have not kept pace with the costs of building.

The Airport area appears to be the most suitable for a maintenance facility. Properties currently owned by SLCUSD or the City of San Luis Obispo (SLO Transit) were evaluated along with several properties on the market at the time of the site selection review. Neither SLCUSD nor SLO Transit indicated a willingness to move forward with a Coordinated Maintenance and Dispatching Facility, which minimized the value of these existing properties. Properties on Prado, Aerovista, and Zaca Lane were also inspected. Since the time of the review, property on Cross Street is now being considered.



**Figure 6:** A potential site on Cross Street between Tank Farm Road and Suburban has been identified for further negotiations.

A potential site has been identified on Cross Street, between Suburban and Tank Farm Road. The 2.7 acre site is ready to begin construction (permits approved) on a building shell of approximately 22,801 square feet.



## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

A number of governmental rules and regulations may have an effect on site planning. In addition to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requirements, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA), Clean Water Act (CWA), and Environmental Protection Act (EPA) regulations need to be considered in the site planning process.

Prior to the FTA allotting funding for facilities, a prescribed process must be followed. The FTA mandates facilities planning should take place before a major decision is made by an agency to construct a site. Therefore, one of the first and major steps is the selection of a suitable site. A careful approach to ensure environmental regulations and requirements are followed is essential to securing FTA funding. The environment is a primary consideration.

## FINANCIAL PLAN

A detailed *order of magnitude* cost estimate was prepared based on a mid-range of the criteria. The cost estimate covers construction costs; equipment and furnishings required for both administrative and maintenance areas; estimates for site requirements such as parking and including *special conditions* that may need to be addressed on the site such as drainage, landscaping and noise abatement; and *soft costs* of design, engineering and project management both preparatory to and during construction.

Total project costs, including land, and all costs listed above, are **estimated at \$12.2 million** (see *Figure 7: Summary of Order of Magnitude Estimated Costs*), including a representative cost for a four acre parcel. The team's estimate is not dissimilar from those of prior studies.

The current site being considered is \$4.3 million for a 2.66 acre site with a shell building. The preliminary sale price is \$4.3 million, with lease and purchase options. This appears to be in range with



the similar properties in San Luis Obispo and consistent with the *order of magnitude estimate*. However, caution is advised in using this or any *order of magnitude* estimate, which is **not** site specific. A number of site-specific factors, such as site layout, utilities, geology/drainage, etc., can greatly increase or decrease the actual incurred costs. The development of a conceptual plan and related cost estimate specific to the proposed site must be generated to determine the true projected costs.



**SUMMARY OF ORDER OF MAGNITUDE ESTIMATED COSTS**

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM ITEM	AREA (SF)	BLDG. UNIT COST (\$)	BLDG. COST	EQUIPMENT	FURNISHINGS	TOTAL COST
<b>BUILDING COSTS</b>						
ADMINISTRATIVE AREA	7,800		\$1,138,800	\$40,500	\$53,500	\$1,232,800
DRIVER ASSEMBLY AREA	\$2,664		\$388,944	\$4,000	\$6,000	\$398,944
EQUIPMENT & SERVICE AREA	5,689		\$830,565	\$875,000		\$1,705,711
MAINTENANCE BAYS (8)	8,800	\$146	\$1,284,800			<u>\$1,284,800</u>
<b>TOTAL BUILDING COSTS</b>						<b>\$4,622,255</b>
<b>SITE COSTS</b>						
REVENUE VEHICLE PARKING	76,000	\$12	\$912,000			\$912,000
EMPLOYEE PARKING (SPACES)	45	\$4,000	\$180,000			\$180,000
ACCESS ROAD	500	\$1,080	\$540,000			\$540,000
SPECIAL CONDITIONS <sup>1</sup>		BASED ON %				<u>\$339,983</u>
<b>TOTAL SITE COSTS</b>						<b>\$1,971,983</b>
<b>LAND PURCHAS<sup>2</sup></b>	174,240	\$20				<b>\$3,484,800</b>
<b>SOFT COSTS<sup>3</sup></b>						<b>\$2,116,598</b>
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>						<b>\$12,195,635</b>

**Figure 7: Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate<sup>4</sup>** provides detail cost estimates based on the assumptions delineated in the previous sections (see Figure 12).

<sup>1</sup> Special conditions include specific items for a particular site, outside the building. Special Conditions include signage, drainage, noise mitigation, fencing, and traffic control costs.

<sup>2</sup> One acre equals 43,560 square feet; the proposed land purchase is 4.0 acres.

<sup>3</sup> Soft costs include professional service costs for design, engineering, construction management, Environmental Impact Report, and so forth. These costs are estimated as a percentage of construction costs, according to industry standards.

<sup>4</sup> Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates are calculated based on cost engineering standards for the area and may be assumed to include all environmental and permitting costs required for building construction and installation of fuel tanks.





---

***THE MOST PROBABLE  
FUNDING SOURCE IS A  
CONGRESSIONAL EARMARK  
FROM FEDERAL TRANSIT  
ADMINISTRATION FUNDS.***

---

A clear understanding of the various state and federal funding sources will be required to identify potential funding for the proposed joint facility. The FTA is likely to be the primary source of funding to purchase or construct a Coordinated Maintenance and Dispatching Facility. While it may be possible to leverage FTA (and local share) dollars through issuing bonds or certificates of participation, the need for significant federal participation remains. Possible funding sources include the following federal and state funds:

**FEDERAL**

- **FTA 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program;**
- **FTA 5311 Formula Funds Program for Non-Urbanized areas;**
- **FTA 5310 Formula Program for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities;**
- **FTA 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Program (earmark);**
- **FTA 5317 New Freedom Program;**
- **Surface Transportation Program (STP);**

**STATE**

- **State Transit Assistance (STA);**
- **State Transportation Bonds;**
- **Public Transportation Account (PTA);**
- **State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP);**
- **Local – TDA Local Transportation Funds (LTF).**

**OTHER**

- **Tax advantaged financings, such as a lease-leaseback;**
- **Certificates of Participation (COPs);**
- **Build/Operate/Transfer (BOTs), possibly using private financing;**
- **Revenue bonds.**



## COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

In determining the cost/benefit, ongoing costs must be compared to costs without a coordinated facility. Savings in operational costs were considered in

- **Personnel/labor;**
- **Facility maintenance;**
- **Management and overhead;**
- **Outside contractor;**
- **Parts and inventory.**

Cost/Benefit Analysis is carried out using financial costs and financial benefits and by assigning a financial value on intangible costs and benefits. Without specifically identifying the property and receiving proposals from potential contractors, quantifiable savings could not be calculated with any accuracy. A true cost comparison would need to assume both RTA and Ride-On would independently obtain maintenance facilities and personnel to meet the calculated minimums.

The present mode of operations, while not uneconomical, may not be sustainable given the increasing demands on services in the region. The question becomes how to best address future demands. In summary, many of the benefits of a combined facility are the same as those of two improved separate facilities, but without cost inefficiencies. If a sizable investment is to be made in new facilities, it makes sense to make it in a single facility. If the region is successful in obtaining a federal earmark, any investment of local funds is leveraged, strengthening the cost benefit.

Providing these *ideal facilities and staffing levels* for each operator separately would require duplicative expensive equipment, such as bus washing and fueling facilities. Some savings and revenue increases would be achieved, with the estimates as detailed above totaling approximately \$200,000 annually. If the facilities were purchased or constructed with grants, a combined lease savings of \$162,000 annually would be obtained. These savings

---

***SEPARATE FACILITIES TO  
MEET THE GROWING  
NEEDS OF BOTH TRANSIT  
OPERATORS WOULD  
REQUIRE DUPLICATIVE  
EQUIPMENT AND  
EXPENSES.***

---



would be offset by higher lease costs, if facilities were rented, and potentially, higher utilities, staffing, and contract costs. In total, an annual, estimated value of the benefits and **savings of \$524,000** (including hard and soft benefits) could be realized (*see Figure 9: Summary of Cost Benefits*).

In comparison, a combined facility provides the benefits desired in a more cost-effective manner, as well as some additional savings and service improvements. A combined facility would, in addition to the above benefits, provide:

- **Economies of scale in equipment;**
- **Economies of scale in facilities;**
- **Economies of scale in maintenance;**
- **Economies of scale in dispatching;**
- **Economies of scale in service.**


**ESTIMATED FINANCIAL BENEFITS**

CATEGORY	(INCREASE)/ SAVINGS
TECHNICIANS	(\$16,000)
SUPERVISION	(\$4,700)
CLERICAL	(\$28,704)
<b>FACILITY MAINTENANCE COSTS</b>	
JANITORIAL SERVICE	(\$5,200)
BUS WASHING - RIDE-ON	\$16,600
BUS WASHING - RTA	\$35,300
<b>OPERATIONS</b>	
ON-SITE FUELING	\$54,000
TRAVEL TIME SAVINGS	\$10,000
CONSISTENT OVERSIGHT	\$105,000
IMPROVED RELIABILITY	\$56,000
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>\$222,296</b>
CONSOLIDATE DISPATCHING	\$150,000
ELIMINATE LEASE PAYMENTS	<u>\$162,000</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$534,296</b>

**Figure 8: Summary of Cost Benefits** *includes both tangible and intangible cost savings.*



## IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The implementation plan is divided into the three phases identified in the Operations Plan.

### PHASE I: SHORT-TERM COORDINATION

- Step 1:** Structure Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between RTA and Ride-On.
- Step 2:** Investigate and evaluate site locations, considering both short-term and strategic needs.
- Step 3:** Determine availability and requirements of proposed funding and required budget based on site-specific requirements.
- Step 4:** Identify criteria for an RFP to provide maintenance services for both RTA and Ride-On.
- Step 5:** Develop vendor list and visit other vendor operations.
- Step 6:** Issue Maintenance RFP to qualified maintenance vendors.
- Step 7:** Evaluate RFP and contract with selected vendor, which can meet both Ride-On's and RTA's requirements.
- Step 8:** Prepare for transition to the maintenance vendor from the current contractor (RTA) and in-house (Ride-On) operations.
- Step 9:** Evaluate retention of current employees.
- Step 10:** Establish lines of communication between Ride-On, RTA, and the maintenance vendor.
- Step 11:** Institute rules for setting priorities, policies, and procedures.
- Step 12:** Continue use of satellite locations and establish vendor protocols for providing service to operations outside



**Figure 9: Successful coordination of dispatching** *is complex and requires attenuation of technology and protocols.*

the service area for the Coordinated Maintenance Facility.

### PHASE II: MID-TERM COORDINATION

- Step 1:** Secure facility appropriate for housing both Ride-On and RTA administrative and contract personnel.
- Step 2:** Coordinate dispatch functions, which may need to be done in phases as technological and functional differences are addressed.
- Step 3:** Identify and remove institutional barriers.
- Step 4:** Coordinate technology to be used in dispatching.
- Step 5:** Establish protocols and rules for assigning rides.
- Step 6:** Verify maximum ride times.
- Step 7:** Implement shared rides with Ride-On and Runabout clientele where permitted.
- Step 8:** Upgrade communication systems.

### PHASE III: LONG-TERM COORDINATION

- Step 1:** Initiate process for securing FTA funding.
- Step 2:** Include project in regional planning process: (Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP — may not be required<sup>5</sup>), and Federal Transportation Improvement Plan (FTIP).
- Step 3:** Release Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Architectural/Design/Engineering firm, experienced in the design of transit maintenance facilities.
- Step 4:** Release Request for Qualifications for Project

<sup>5</sup> Inclusion in the STIP is not required if the project is not funded by the STIP or does not have an STIP component.



---

*LONG-TERM  
COORDINATION INCLUDES  
THE STEPS REQUIRED FOR  
A SUCCESSFUL  
APPLICATION FOR FTA  
FUNDING*

---

- Step 5:** Develop detailed cost estimate based on the selected site, preliminary design and layout.
- Step 6:** Request for Authorization to Proceed with Preliminary Engineering (PE) for FTA funding (RTA may prefer to complete the PE phase with local funds).
- Step 7:** Complete field review and Preliminary Environmental Study (PES).
- Step 8:** Approve final design by both RTA and Ride-On.
- Step 9:** Execute Master Agreement and/or Program Supplement Agreement with the Caltrans Division of Local Assistance.
- Step 10:** Complete Technical Studies, if required (No technical studies are expected).
- Step 11:** Obtain National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Clearance.
- Step 12:** Request for Authorization to Proceed with Construction.
- Step 13:** Submit award Information.
- Step 14:** Ongoing Coordination.