STAFF REPORT
SAUSALITO CITY COUNCIL

MEETING DATE: January 28, 2020

AGENDA TITLE: Sausalito Ferry Landside Improvements

LEAD DEPARTMENT: Public Works

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt a resolution of the City of Sausalito approving and authorizing the City Manager to execute the professional services contract with BKF Engineers to develop the design for the “No-Change Alternative” of the Ferry Landside Improvement Project, “No-Change Alternative”.

SUMMARY
1. Request for Council direction and guidance on whether to move forward with the Sausalito Ferry Landside Improvements Project as currently presented.
2. Authorizing the City Manager to execute the professional services contract with BKF Engineers to develop the design for the “No-Change Alternative” of the Ferry Landside Improvement Project.

BACKGROUND
Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD) leases the Sausalito Ferry Landing from the City of Sausalito. The ferry dock system for the Sausalito Ferry is in need of reconstruction and GGBHTD has procured grants from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to reconstruct their facility. A portion of those grants, $2,400,000, will be utilized by the City of Sausalito to develop a long range design and improvements of the Landside areas which serve the Sausalito Ferry Terminal and other vital areas of the downtown area. Acquisition of this funding is memorialized in Resolution #6670, passed by the Sausalito City Council on October 10, 2017.

Sausalito Ferry Terminal Vessel Boarding Rehabilitation Project,
At this time, GGBHTD has developed detailed plans for the work and have developed an application for various permits including but not limited to the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). GGBHTD anticipates advertising their construction project in the spring of 2020 with award of their construction shortly thereafter.
**Sausalito Ferry Landside Improvement Project**

As part of the Sausalito Ferry Terminal Improvement Project, managed by GGBHTD, improvements are necessary on the system of parking lots, sidewalks, and other areas that are utilized by patrons of the ferry system including ticket vending and wayfinding. Based on the Agreement with GGBHTD, the City of Sausalito is taking the lead to make improvements to the landside portion of the Sausalito Ferry Landing. The design and improvements are supported by a pass through Federal Transportation Association (FTA) grant from GGBHTD.

In June 2018, the City of Sausalito entered into an agreement with Robert Hayes & Associates to assist the City with managing the Ferry Landside Improvements. It was found that the procedures followed with regard to this procurement process did not comply with the FTA requirements, and therefore the City had to terminate this contract.

On June 7, 2019, the City of Sausalito issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Planning and Design Services for the Sausalito Ferry Landside Improvements Project. The RFP invites qualified proposers to submit a response to the request for one or both scopes of work. This procedure will comply with the FTA requirements.

- **Package A**
  Visioning and schematic design (30%) for the project

- **Package B**
  Visioning and a full design (100%) for the project

Having the two packages noted above was recommended through the grant process and allows a firm who is primarily familiar with planning aspects to provide a proposal if they do not have expertise to develop the detailed design.

On July 18, 2019 the City received a total of three proposals to provide services for the Sausalito Ferry Landside Improvement Project. On September 11, 2019 interviews City and GGBHTD staff, and members public, interviewed three professional engineering and architectural firms to assist the City with the Ferry Landside Improvement project.

**ANALYSIS**

At this time, a total of $2,500,000 is available for visioning, design, construction and construction management of this project. Staff reviewed the total amount available and extrapolated the approximate cost for design, construction, and construction management based on standard percentages of other similar projects as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>12.5% of Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,850,000</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>15% of Construction – May be reduced as design details are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>8% of Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000 FTA Grant, $400,000 GGBHTD contribution, $100,000 City contribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These estimated costs do not include the visioning component.

Following the original interviews staff, Staff may only open the cost proposal from the highest rated applicant and negotiate with that applicant only and may not open the other cost proposal until those negotiation are proved unacceptable. Staff initially opened the original cost proposal from Harris and Associates. Their cost for Package A was $672,113 and $1,428,900 for Package B. Staff proceeded to negotiate with Harris and associates to reduce their costs to be more in line with the project budget as specified above. Unfortunately, Harris could not reduce their cost to a range that met the budget of approximately $230,000 for Package B.

Staff proceeded to open the second cost proposal from BKF Engineers which equated to $498,256 for Package A and $324,565 for Package B. Both of these proposals exceed staff’s estimate of just the design phase. Staff proceeded to open communication with BKF Engineers who reduced their proposal cost to $246,450; however, this reduction in cost has a significant impact on the scope of services. BKF proposed a modified scope of services which included the following:

- Initial visioning is limited to only two public meetings to gather information for future work with a presentation to Council on the parking areas and access west of Lot #1.
- Construction is limited to the “No Change Alternative” as described in the October 30, 2018 presentation to Council. Additional modification cannot be supported by the funding available.
- Minimal Traffic analysis since the no change alternative is being pursued.
- Categorical exemption is anticipated for this option.

Staff has made an effort to work closely with the first two consultants. However, the initial proposal costs far exceed staff’s approximate estimate of costs of design. In negotiating with the professionals, a significant decrease in scope is identified such that seeking Council’ guidance on whether to proceed with a decreased scope is requested.

Council’s original direction was to pursue a professional services contract that would develop a vision for this area of Sausalito as well as initiate the design of the Ferry Landside Improvements. The intent of the Visioning is to seek out public input to improve this central area of Sausalito by improving circulation of pedestrians, vehicles, bicycle travel, transit as well as provide area that conveys the character of the community which is uniquely Sausalito.
Unfortunately the pass-through grant and funding for this project is limited to $2.5 million which includes a Federal Transportation Agency grant pass to the city through GGBHTD. This grant has specific requirements for improvements such that if we utilize this funding is obligated to install improvements noted in the original documentation.

Robert Hayes’s presentation report to Council outlined the minimum required to satisfy the pass through grant as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Plaza Improvements</th>
<th>Pedestrian Circulation, signage and reorganize the Ticket Kiosk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Sidewalk to Bus Staging</td>
<td>Modify to address capacity and eliminate vehicular conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Bus Staging</td>
<td>Signage and pedestrian queuing improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Pedestrian Walkway to Parking Lot 3</td>
<td>Walkway extension, crosswalk and signage improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Bicycle Staging Area</td>
<td>Signage, capacity and internal circulation improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot 1 Improvements</td>
<td>Access, lighting, circulation other improvements needed to this parking lot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robert Hayes’s presentation included a total to three alternative in his initial review of the area. Each of these addresses the minimum requirements of the grant; however, options 2 and 3 addressed alternative approaches to circulation.

Upon discussing this project with the proposed professional services consultants, a significant amount of the cost for their services was dedicated to addressing the Visioning and the Circulation analysis elements. In order to decrease their cost to match the budget, the consultants have suggested that the Visioning and the analysis of alternative circulation elements for this project should be reduced significantly if not eliminated such that their proposal is to approach the design as described in Robert Hayes’s Option 1 “No Change Alternative”. The term “No Change” may be an incorrect term since this option does address all the requirements of the grant. The term “No Change” basically refers to no significant circulation or geometric changes to the parking lots. Modifications to access and other elements noted in the table above are addressed.

If the Council decides to move forward with the development of the design, improvements will need to be developed with the intent of not blocking or impeding future improvements on the adjacent parking lots or with access improvements in the area. This may be difficult without some future planning of this area; however, anticipating that the main access areas will align with existing road right of ways should be sufficient to address this future concern. In addition, as funding becomes available, developing a Visioning for this area should be a high priority.
**FISCAL IMPACT**
At its meeting on Tuesday, **April 3, 2018**, the City Council approved a supplemental appropriation of $100,000 toward the Sausalito Ferry Landside Improvements project. This appropriation makes the City of Sausalito eligible for $2,000,000 in Federal Transit Administration funds and $400,000 from the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District. The City has expended approximately $50,000 to date on this project which is not refundable through the grant.

Staff anticipates that approximately $230,000 is available for Visioning and Design of the Ferry Landside Improvement Project simply based on the total project cost of $2,500,000. This amount can vary slightly; however, other portions of the project such as construction and construction management may need to be reduced in order to not exceed the budget allocated. Additional construction costs may influence the project scope as the project develops. Keep in mind that this area has a long history and any underground work may require additional funding to address hazardous materials and older ferry systems that may be buried in this area.

Staff has reached out to representatives from GGBHTD requesting that additional funds be allocated to this project; however, no additional funding for this project or allocation has been identified by GGBHTD at this time. Staff will continue to work closely with GGBHTD to identify funding.

**ALTERNATIVES:**
At this time there may be several alternatives that the City Council may want to consider:

1. Address the improvements of this area in a phased approach. The first phase being the pursuit of improvements adjacent to the Sausalito Ferry which are required as part of the grant. These improvements will need to anticipate future improvements on adjacent parking lots. In addition, the design and construction of this project should not exceed the $2.5 million currently allocated.

   Future phases would be related to identifying funding to address the Visioning and Improvements on adjacent parking areas and circulation in the area.

2. Council may want to prioritize a funding allocation to support the Visioning effort at this time. This would help to support the intent of the improvements in the area and help to align future improvements with what is proposed to be installed. This effort could also be reduced in scope to address a specific budget.

3. Allocation of additional funding to support a full Visioning and design effort may be pursued. BKF Engineers proposal for Visioning and schematic drawing was just less than $500,000.
There may be other alternatives that the City Council may want to consider which are not noted above; however, Staff is recommending moving forward with a phased approach for improvements and utilizing the $2.4 million of outside funding. This may not be what the community was anticipating but utilizing a phased approach to address improvements in this area appears to be the best solution at this time.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Authorizing the City Manager to execute the professional services contract with BKF Engineers to develop the design for the “No-Change Alternative” of the Ferry Landside Improvement Project.

**ATTACHMENTS**

a. Professional Services Agreement  
b. Exhibit A - Proposal from BKF Engineers  
c. Exhibit B – Fee Proposal from BKF Engineers  
d. October 30, 2018 Presentation from Robert Hayes Preliminary Design Report
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