

## AMES TRANSIT AGENCY BOARD OF TRUSTEES

AMES, IOWA

May 24, 2010

The Ames Transit Agency Board of Trustees met on May 24, 2010 at 4:30 p.m. in the CyRide Conference room. President Anders called the transit board meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. Trustees in attendance were Anders, Choi, Wacha, Schainker, and Madden. Absent: Trustee Pinegar.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the transit board meeting held on April 29, 2010 minutes were not completed at the time of this meeting and will be available for the transit board's approval at the June 10, 2010 meeting.

**BUILDING EXPANSION PRESENTATION – URS:** Director Kyras briefly provided an update of the April 29, 2010 Transit Board of Trustees discussion regarding the building expansion as follows:

- Fleet size prediction of 91 vehicles (total of 25 additional large vehicles over the next 20 years with a fleet size of 85 large buses and 6 small buses)
- Discussion on types of maintenance performed on site as opposed to contracted out
- CyRide's existing site constraints

Director Kyras turned the meeting over to Bill Troe and Peter Styx, with URS, to present alternatives for the building options including square footage for various functions. She indicated that the goal of this meeting was to view the options presented and agree on two to three of these options to develop further.

Bill Troe began by explaining the constraints of the site and building needs based on the agreed upon fleet size. The identified recommended need for bus storage for 91 vehicles is 120,000 sq. ft. plus circulation space for the buses to travel through the building. He further explained that the consulting team had come to the conclusion that not all space requirements can be met on the site unless multiple levels are constructed. However, he further explained that it may not be a reasonable option due to the high construction cost of more than one level.

Trustee Pinegar arrived.

Bill Troe explained Diagram 1, which illustrates space currently allocated to existing uses and unused areas of the site.

- Area A, the existing building of 67,000 square feet.
- Area B is the Cooling Towers buffer area that is part of the CyRide site, but it is not a useable area.
- Area C is the area for inbound queuing for vehicles.
- Area D is the staging area for outbound vehicles.
- Area E is the circulating or recirculation area for buses in front the of the facility

- Area F indicates the driveways for entering or exiting onto University Blvd.
- Area G shows the employee/visitor parking spaces.
- Area H is the Green Space, between University Blvd. and the employee parking.

It was noted that areas G and H (area that could accommodate additional building structures) consist of 61,000 square feet versus the need for 120,000 sq. feet.

The consultant noted that in previous discussions with Cathy Brown, ISU Facilities Planning and Management, the University would desire a 25 foot buffer or set back from University Boulevard. This leaves approximately 37,000 square feet of undeveloped area at this site for development. The 24,000 square feet of employee parking could be considered and relocated to another area. There is approximately 61,000 square feet of property for additional expansion at this site. He further explained that this did not mean that a 61,000 square foot building could be constructed, but that all functions of additional space needs would need to share this area such as bus circulation lanes.

The consultants asked if everyone had a reasonable understanding of the land constraints URS dealt with at this site. The consultant reiterated that a building cannot be constructed within the cooling tower buffer because of air circulation and overspray issues from the cooling towers. Trustee Schainker inquired if a structure or canopy for protection for employee vehicles could be considered and still allow construction in this area. Cathy Brown indicated that idea had not been explored as vehicle damage was a large concern.

The next discussion centered on the issue of what the minimum need was to meet the anticipated bus fleet of 91 vehicles through the year 2030. Peter Styx explained that it is critical to accommodate adequate storage, queuing and circulation space within the building. He indicated that a minimum of 54,000 additional square feet is needed to complete this program to support the larger vehicles, additional maintenance bays, and additional operations and administrative staff anticipated to accommodate the larger fleet size. He indicated that the two bus entrances into the building on the west side provide adequate queuing and entrance space into the building, but does not provide enough space to accommodate the turning radius required for buses inside the building.

The consultant indicated the unique character of the existing building in not having a circulation isle for vehicles internal to the building. This is not typically done in the industry and usually not allowed for fire safety reasons. He further explained the challenges with this configuration such as the inability to access the maintenance area for large portions of a day.

The consultant explained that the only way a 120,000 square foot facility could be built at the existing site was if the existing building were demolished and replaced with a new design. The Transit Board then considered the eleven building design options presented by URS. The consultants identified the pros and cons for each of the alternatives and pointed out what was accommodated with the option compared to the original program requirements. The options included variations as follows:

- Some designs would have parking decks, and some would incorporate parking into the building
- Some designs would have bus recirculation on the site and some would incorporate exterior circulation on University Boulevard
- Some designs would leave the maintenance area at its existing locations where others would move maintenance to a new section of the building where they were more accessible.

Actual minimum land requirement needed is 61,000 square feet and not all of the land at this site is useable space. The 24,000 square feet for parking would need to be added back into the plan at some point. For each alternative, there were both positives and negatives therefore the consultants developed evaluation criteria to compare each option. The first criterion was whether the options met the space requirements. The consultant explained that none of the options provides the minimum space requirement for the larger fleet size (64,000 square feet), but that 25 additional vehicles can be parked within the area in a consistent pattern.

The next criterion discussed was safety, defined as internal circulation, collisions within the building, and the possibility for loss of life. The consultants explained that a transit facility needed reasonable vehicle circulation and that off-site circulation on University Boulevard was not optimal or functional.

Another criterion is the Federal Transit Administration perspective on the building expansion in light of their concerns with floodplains.

The criterion for each option was rated from very poor to very good. URS has written a memo that provides the definitions of these ratings.

Peter Styx removed options that would not or could not be considered for expansion. It was suggested that options 3 and 4 be eliminated since they utilized the green space buffer and some included crossing the CyRide driveway. It was discussed that these options restricted the power plant operations and could only be considered short-term solutions.

Trustee Madden proposed Options 7 and 10 be eliminated as well. From the Universities perspective and given Iowa State's \$900 million utility line investment and expansion of the Iowa State coal plant, he could not see moving forward with these options.

Director Kyras also pointed out that if CyRide built on the University's land in options 3, 4, or 6, and if the University desired to use this land for another purpose in the future that the FTA investment was demolished and that CyRide would need to repay FTA their share of its construction costs.

Options 3, 4, 7 and 10 were eliminated and the consultants continued with their overview of the other seven options and answered questions or concerns related to the remaining options.

- Option 1 keeps all functions on the current site and recirculation onto University Blvd.
- Option 2, the same as Option 1, only addressing parking on the roof of the facility. This option would be at a higher cost. Queuing and staging stays the same as today, internal to the site.
- Option 3 was eliminated as parking was moved off-site to the west.
- Option 4 was eliminated.
- Option 5 allows external circulation on site, pulling the building out and gaining a wide enough access into the new maintenance area. This would be a very difficult design for queuing, storage, and internal circulation.
- Option 6 pulls maintenance outside of the interior of the building as the original building accommodated. Works well as a phased project. Visitor parking would be near the courtyard with parking against the building, which would allow for a recirculation lane within the site. Employee parking off site in this option.
- Option 7 was eliminated.
- Option 8 is a variation of option 6, but adds the 2- 3 story parking ramp. This option would be difficult to design an efficient ramp and would be a more expensive option, but cleans up the circulation/parking conflicts, its flow through the site is good, and provides adequate bus storage space.
- Option 9 is a variation of other options and has parking on the roof, which would be a more expensive option.
- Option 10 was eliminated.
- Option 11 uses the soccer field to the south and the existing site allows movement between the two sites for maintenance and storage. The possibility of internal circulation does exist in this option. A challenge with this option is the inclusion of the historic trees in a design. This option has a second storage barn separate from the existing facility.

The discussion turned to the possibilities and challenges of Option 11. The challenges discussed were:

- The soccer field site would need to be raised 8 ft.
- Bike/pedestrian path would need to be moved further south.

The board members and Cathy Brown further discussed issues with moving the bike/pedestrian path. It would be difficult for pedestrians to walk the additional distance and most likely individuals using the path would find their own way around the building.

Concerns were raised about the higher building site and flood-proofing of this area with FEMA/FTA. Director Kyras indicated this discussion has not taken place with the FTA. It was pointed out that wherever the expansion is constructed (existing site or soccer site), the new building will be in the floodplain. It was also discussed that if the soccer fields are displaced, CyRide could be looking at a major investment to move the soccer fields.

The board then discussed the bus-bike/pedestrian conflict on the path with buses traveling north-south across it. Locations for this crossing were discussed and ways to reduce this conflict such as parking vehicles in this building for the summer and not using them until fall.

The next discussion was on employee parking. The board discussed the challenges with moving employee parking such as the need for a shuttle to get employees to the building and the expense that would be incurred; parking on the roof is expensive as well. Ideas on how to combine portions of options together such options 6 and 1 and 8 and 11 were offered.

Following the highlights and pros and cons, options 6, 9, and 11 were selected and will be taken to the next level of design for the next transit board meeting including an estimate of the capital and operating cost. Considerations such as the additional cost to circulate onto University Boulevard to refuel and wash the bus will be included. Other non-financial considerations will need to be addressed such as pedestrians creating more conflict with transit vehicles on the site.

**POSSIBLE FEDERAL AND STATE DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROJECTS:** Director Kyras referred to the April transit board meeting and the discussion on the possibility of applying for six additional grants and the recommendation to apply for four grants. At that meeting the board had asked for an overall picture of the local match commitment for these grants at their May meeting.

The transit board's consensus was to apply for four grants: Federal TIGER II, State Intercity Funding Program, Federal Clean Fuels Grant, and the Federal State of Good Repair – Bus and Bus Facilities. Director Kyras explained that the goal for these grants is to reduce CyRide's bus fleet age, upgrade technology for customers – more user-friendly, and fund additional pieces of the Intermodal facility.

Director Kyras explained that the goal was to try and get additional pieces of the Intermodal facility funded prior to bidding the project in January. To accomplish this the two signals at Sheldon and Hayward at Lincoln Way would be used as local match for the Intercity Funding program and TIGER II if CyRide's request for Public Transit Infrastructure (PTIG) funding was turned down. If PTIG funding were received, these additional dollars could allow an additional ½ parking deck or the bike path through the

Arboretum to be constructed. The PTIG grant is pending and staff should know by mid July if \$880,000 additional funding would be provided possibly funding 37 more parking spaces and requiring no local funding.

October 1, 2010 is the deadline for the State Intercity Funding that would serve the intercity carriers. This program could replace TIGER I funds for the project allowing these funds to be spent in other areas of the facility such as the bid alternate for the bike path in the ISU Arboretum. If the PTIG grant is not funded, CyRide will submit the State Intercity Funding grant application for \$316,000 using one signal, the Hayward signal as local match. Director Kyras indicated that decisions on these grants would be made before the anticipated Intermodal bid date in January 2011.

Director Kyras pointed out that there are 399 parking spaces in the currently designed facility, the ½ deck adds an additional 37 parking spaces, which is not included in the 399 car count, and the full deck would add an additional 99 spaces.

There is a potential for TIGER II for the Intermodal project and Director Kyras explained that a preliminary budget had been developed by the project committee. She indicated that the funding requires a minimum of \$10 million in federal funding and the project must provide a 20 percent local match. The land could be used as local match with an estimated value of \$2,227,500. This value was estimated based on a preliminary comparables review by the City Assessor; however, a formal land appraisal must be completed to determine the land value. The federal funds of \$10,290,577 for TIGER II would allow the second parking structure and an additional level on the Phase I structure to be built adding 177 additional spaces; CyRide's shuttle from the facility to campus and throughout the community; automatic vehicle location (AVL) equipment for CyRide; bike path to be extended through ISU's Arboretum; and twelve additional bike lockers.

Director Kyras indicated that with the land value and CyRide's local match for the buses, that the project was currently \$120,000 short of the required 20% local match. She also indicated that if other grants using the signals as local match were not funded, they could be used for the TIGER II grant, which would provide the additional dollars needed for the grant. The transit board members discussed the grant plan and local dollars needed to match these grants. Trustee Madden indicated that he was supportive of applying for the TIGER II grant and that if needed he felt the community could come up with \$120,000 if it were to receive \$10 million in federal dollars.

Director Kyras also stated that in order to apply for the TIGER II grant, that technical assistance would be needed in several areas: land appraisal/reappraisal, consultant assistance in developing technical information and economic forecasting. The project team's best estimate for the cost of this assistance would be approximately \$24,000 that would be needed immediately to proceed. She also indicated a hesitancy to fund this cost with CyRide's closing balance, which is now at 8.4% after funding other pieces of the Intermodal project. Director Kyras asked the transit board if there was a possibility that the City and the University could fund the planning costs. Trustee Pinegar mentioned the possibility that GSB could pay the cost, but it was discussed that the GSB does not meet

during the summer and this matter needs to be finalized before then. Cathy Brown indicated that the land appraisal/reappraisal cost estimate was likely too high and the consensus was that a total of \$20,000 would be needed to support this effort. The idea of the City and University equally contributing \$10,000 was discussed.

Following discussion of this matter, Trustee Madden motioned that the University and City, following City Council's approval, would fund the cost to prepare the grant application. Trustee Pinegar seconded. (Ayes 6; Nays 0. Motion carried unanimously.)

For Buses, CyRide has two grants for the transit board to consider for new vehicles. CyRide could apply through the State of Good Repair grant for ten biodiesel buses, five each year. Currently CyRide relies on earmarks and in a good year can possibly fund 3-40' buses. If this grant were approved, CyRide would be assured of more than the normal amount of buses for the next two years. Also, the funding could be at 90% federal dollars as opposed to the typical 83%.

The second bus grant is the Clean Fuels application and is due at approximately the same time as the previous bus grant. This grant request would be for two 60' biodiesel buses and would replace three 40' buses.

The last grant opportunity is the Iowa Clean Air Attainment Program (ICAAP) which could assist CyRide in its technology improvement by funding scheduling software requiring a local share of \$40,000. This project is included in the Capital Improvement Plan for 2012, but could be moved forward if funded under a grant.

CyRide staff explained the local share requirement for all of these grants combined. Director Kyras explained that the best-case scenario, if everything is funded, is \$40,000 in 2012, \$335,700 in 2013, and \$400,000 in 2014. She further explained that CyRide annually budgets between \$600,000 and \$700,000 per year in capital local match. She also explained that if all grants were approved, CyRide would not ask for funding under the State of Iowa's bus earmark.

Two grants that need the transit board's approval are the Clean Fuels and State of Good Repair. The TIGER II and ICAAP can be discussed prior to their submittals.

Trustee Madden made a motion to for approval of the Transit Director to file and execute the Clean Fuels Program for a total of \$1,396,640 and the State of Good Repair for a total of \$4,120,000. Trustee Pinegar seconded the motion (Ayes: 6, Nays: 0. Motion carried unanimously.)

**DUMP THE PUMP PROMOTION:** Director Kyras provided the board with information on the national Dump the Pump event on June 17. She indicated that CyRide staff recommends participating in this event once again to raise awareness of the environmental benefits CyRide provides to the Ames community. Activities CyRide would complete to support this event are: Carbon Footprint Calculator, website

information, public education and encourage “all” CyRide employees to ride the bus, bike or walk that day.

CyRide would again like to offer free fares June 17. She indicated that the loss of farebox revenue for this day is estimated between \$350 – \$400.

Trustee Madden made a motion to approve the promotion of the national Dump the Pump Day, June 17 with activities and elimination of fares for that day. Trustee Choi seconded the motion. (Ayes: 6, Nays: 0. Motion carried unanimously.)

**FY2010 FEDERAL FORMULA GRANT APPLICATION:** Director Kyras indicated that staff annually requests approval to submit a federal Section 5307 federal formula grant support its operating and capital budget. She indicated that federal support increased this year by 3.4 %. She explained that the growth was due to increased funding in the Small Transit Intensive Cities funding.

Trustee Madden made a motion to authorize the Transit Director to execute and file Section 5307 grant application in the amount of \$1,490,918 to the Federal Transit Administration. Motion seconded by Trustee Wacha. (Ayes: 6; Nays: 0. Motion carried unanimously.)

**FY08 FEDERAL EARMARK – GRANT APPROVAL:** Director Kyras explained that CyRide was fortunate to receive several direct earmarks in the last SAFETEA-LU Transportation Bill, which expired September 30, 2009. The FY08 earmark for CyRide will expire in September 2010 and must be placed in a grant in June in order to not lose this funding for the building expansion. Previously funds had not been placed in a grant as a site is required before a grant can be approved. Director Kyras also explained that with the options presented earlier by URS, each option included some level of expansion on the current site so that she felt comfortable in recommending that this funding (\$434,720) be spent on the existing site. Trustee Schainker asked for a clarification of this recommendation. Director Kyras indicated that in option 6, 8 and 11 each contained some construction on CyRide’s existing site that would total more than the earmark amount.

Trustee Wacha made a motion for staff to file and execute a federal Section 5309 grant application for use of the FY08 federal earmark totaling \$434,720. Motion seconded by Trustee Pinegar. (Ayes: 6; Nays: 0. Motion carried unanimously.)

**QUARTERLY OPERATION’S REPORT:** Director Kyras explained that due to the length of the meeting she would not walk the board through this report, but that she would be glad to answer any questions for the Trustees. She further indicated that there were no usual trends appearing in the performance measures except for the high ridership CyRide had been experiencing all year. There were no questions from the Trustees.

**TRANSIT DIRECTOR’S REPORT:** Director Kyras highlighted the following items for the Trustees:



- Intermodal Facility Update – She provided information on the status of the project that indicated the agreements were approved by FTA; however, one change at the end of the discussions added 20 vanpool/carpool spaces at no monthly parking fee. She indicated that the agreement stated that this can be renegotiated if the revenue/expense projections do not balance. She further indicated that the Facility design fee was currently being negotiated.
- Federal Drug and Alcohol Audit – Director Kyras indicated that CyRide had been chosen by the FTA for a periodic Drug and Alcohol audit which would be completed on June 21 and 22.
- Dial-A-Ride Contract - Director Kyras stated that the current Dial-A-Ride contract would be expiring in June and that she would have the new bid/contract ready for the June Transit Board meeting.
- Des Moines Buses – Director Kyras indicated that CyRide had been able to purchase nine buses as opposed to the 11 originally planned and were in the process of using these buses as parts and to refurbish for use this next school year.

**TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING:** June 10, 2010 at 8:00 a.m. in the CyRide Conference Room.

**ADJOURN:** Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

---

Robert Anders, President

---

Joanne Van Dyke, Recording Secretary

Discussion on the additional \$20,000 funding for the TIGER II grant application for additional parking spaces and CyRide shuttle service for the Intermodal facility. Trustee Madden made a motion to split the funding of \$20,000 between Iowa State University and City of Ames