

**PSWS 2026 Transportation Design**  
**Rules Addendum #1: Q&A**

The following are answers to Requests for Information (RFI's) received from participating ASCE student chapters:

- 1) *Can you specify further what is expected of teams for this project?*
  - a. Answer: Your product will be conceptual plans to improve pedestrian and cyclist connectivity to the broader transportation network. Following the symposium, your report might be shared with public agencies, which could include elected officials and ultimately the general public. Therefore, consider preparing materials that are readily understood by a lay audience, while also being able to support your recommendations' feasibility to the judging panel at the symposium.
- 2) *Are teams expected to create striping plans? For example when implementing a Class IV bike lane would you want a striping plan as well?*
  - a. Answer: A striping plan might be helpful in establishing the physical feasibility of your recommendations.
- 3) *When creating ramps for this project, are teams expected to give lengths/heights/grades of ramps?*
  - a. Answer: Your team could decide how best to depict lengths, heights, and grades for ramps in the report and presentation.
- 4) *Are plan drawings, figures, and CAD-generated layouts included within the 20-page limit for the written report?*
  - a. Answer: Yes.
- 5) *If included, is there an expected or recommended balance between narrative content and graphical content within the 20-page limit, or any guidance on how drawings should be incorporated?*
  - a. Answer: The balance is to provide a report with recommendations that are understandable to a potential lay audience, while also supporting statements regarding their feasibility to the symposium judging panel.
- 6) *According to the rules, our team is to design the pedestrian and bicycle connections onto the redesigned 710 arterial. The city of Alhambra is responsible for the redesign of the 710 corridor north of the 710/I-10 interchange, which includes pedestrian and bicycle elements. For this project, are we using the City of Alhambra's design for the redesigned 710 arterial, or are we given control to design the 710 arterial ourselves?*
  - a. Answer: Your recommendations could enhance or supersede the City of Alhambra's own design concepts.

- 7) *There are some elevation differences between certain parts of the project, such as the CSULA Transit Center being at a higher elevation than the 710, or Hellman Avenue being above the 710. Do we consider and include the elevation and grades in our proposed design, or should we assume our proposal is on flat ground?*
- a. Answer: Elevation differences might be one of the key challenges your team should address in this competition.
- 8) *Are there specific Cal State LA policies, plans, or guidelines that should be considered when proposing pedestrian or bicycle connections to the campus or its transit hub?*
- a. Answer: Cal State LA would support any recommendations that enhance transportation access to its campus as long as its own operations are not impacted by unmitigable modifications to its facilities.
- 9) *Are there known physical constraints on Cal State LA–owned or leased parcels near Valley Boulevard or West Front Street (such as elevation changes, retaining structures, or restricted access areas) that would limit ADA-compliant pedestrian or bicycle connections?*
- a. Answer: Assume Cal State LA would be receptive to proposals to its owned or leased parcels if the result enhances transportation access without unmitigable impacts to its facilities or operations.
- 10) *Is Cal State LA open, in principle, to future pedestrian and bicycle connections linking off-campus facilities to the campus transit hub, assuming such connections remain within public rights-of-way?*
- a. Answer: Yes. Furthermore, assume that Cal State LA would be open to connections that encroach into the campus boundaries, as long as they do not have unmitigable impacts to its facilities or operations.
- 11) *Are there preferred access points or areas where pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to the campus is encouraged or discouraged?*
- a. Answer: Currently the campus is not fenced and gated. Assume that will remain the case if your recommendations are implemented.
- 12) *Are there existing or planned campus projects that could affect future pedestrian or bicycle access in the vicinity of the 710 South Stub corridor?*
- a. Answer: Assume that no planned campus projects will be implemented that affect its perimeter roads.
- 13) *For potential crossings of I-10 or the Union Pacific Railroad, are conceptual grade-separated facilities (such as pedestrian or bicycle bridges or underpasses) acceptable at a planning level without requiring structural calculations or detailed structural design?*
- a. Answer: Yes.

*14) For the Cost-Benefit Analysis section, should teams provide high-level planning cost estimates (such as typical unit costs applied to approximate lengths or areas), or are more detailed, itemized cost quantities expected?*

- a. Answer: The cost-benefit analysis should be high-level planning cost estimate. The methodology is left up to your team.

*15) The 710 Arterial Street Concept is provided as part of the project background. May teams modify this concept plan to better support their proposed bicycle and pedestrian connections (for example, adjusting lane configurations, medians, or roadway geometry), or should it be treated strictly as a fixed reference concept?*

- a. Answer: Answer: Your recommendations would be an alternative to others prepared earlier, such as those by the City of Alhambra.