

# **AMES TRANSIT AGENCY BOARD OF TRUSTEES CYRIDE CONFERENCE ROOM**

June 16, 2016

1. CALL TO ORDER: 8:00 A.M.
2. Public Comments
3. Election of Officers
4. System Redesign Study – Consultant Award
5. Transit Advertising Contract Extension
6. Transit Director's Review
7. Set Summer Semester Meeting Times and Place:
  - July 11, 2016, 8:00 AM
  - August 24, 2016, 8:00 AM
8. Adjourn

For those of you who wish to join the meeting via conference call, information is listed below.

Dial-In Number: 1-866-244-8528  
Participant Passcode: 576515

**CITY OF AMES, Iowa**

**MEMO TO:** Ames Transit Board of Trustees

**FROM:** Sheri Kyras

**DATE:** June 16, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Election of Officers

**INFORMATION:** In May or June of each year, the Transit Board of Trustees elects new officers as required by the Ames Municipal Code, Chapter 26A for the positions of President and Vice-President. The current President is John Haila and the Vice President position is currently vacant with the graduation of Hamad Abbas.

Trustee Haila has indicated an interest in continuing as President and Trustee Valentino has indicated an interest in the Vice-Presidency.

Nominations may be taken from the floor for these positions as well.

**CITY OF AMES, Iowa**

**MEMO TO:** Ames Transit Board of Trustees  
**FROM:** Sheri Kyras  
**DATE:** June 16, 2016  
**SUBJECT:** System Redesign Study – Consultant Award

**BACKGROUND:** The System Redesign Study Request for Proposal (RFP) was distributed on April 1, 2016, with proposals submitted on May 2, 2016. Three proposals were received from the following firms:

- Olsson Associates
- Nelson/Nygaard
- Connetics Transportation Group

Clarification of each proposer’s cost was completed on May 20, 2016, with selection of the study finalists narrowed to two firms – Nelson/Nygaard and Connetics Transportation Group. To complete the evaluation process, the finalists were asked to participate in web interviews the week of June 6, 2016. The System Redesign Study start date is anticipated on or around July 1, 2016.

**INFORMATION:** The attached memo details the process for, and results of, this RFP. In summary, once the final two firms were chosen for consideration, a broader evaluation team was assembled to participate in the finalists’ interviews, which included CyRide staff and board members, ISU and City/MPO representatives. The scoring/ranking results of the evaluation team are as follows:

<b>Interview Team Member</b>	<b>Nelson-Nygaard Score/Rank</b>	<b>Connetics Score/Rank</b>
1	43/1	37/2
2	41/1	35/2
3	43/1	38/2
4	49/1	46/2
5	45/1	37/2
6	39/1	30/2

The interview team unanimously scored and ranked the Nelson/Nygaard team the highest and recommends award to this firm. Their proposal was also the lowest cost finalists proposal as identified in the next section.

## **Cost Proposals/Budget**

The budget for the System Redesign Study was set at \$150,000, with \$100,000 secured from the Ames Area MPO, as approved in May 2016, and \$50,000 from CyRide's budget, as approved by the Transit Board in January 2016. However, through this process, it was discovered that the survey portion of the study (rider, non-rider and onboard counts) was very costly to implement and increased the cost of the study substantially. The cost proposals for the two finalists were as follows:

- Nelson/Nygaard - \$186,632
- Connetics - \$244,662

Both teams were asked in their interviews to provide information on how costs might be reduced to be closer to the \$150,000 budget originally proposed without impacting the success of the project. The Nelson/Nygaard team suggested reductions in the surveying tasks that would bring the costs "close to the \$150,000 budget." Connetics provided five reductions, which included elimination of several tasks (rider survey, peer review), as well as reductions in the survey process to bring the budget to approximately \$170,000. While both indicated a reduction could be possible, they also commented that the study could be enhanced with the larger, original scope.

Whichever firm is chosen to conduct the study, staff would recommend staff negotiations with the chosen firm to finalize the budget, based on modified tasks and board priorities for the project. As a result, approval of a firm, with a project cost of up to a specified dollar amount, will allow staff the latitude to complete these negotiations in a timely manner to begin the project in July 2016. Staff will report to the board at the July 11, 2016 meeting the outcome of these negotiations.

## **Remaining Questions**

Two concerns regarding the Nelson/Nygaard presentation were raised by team members through the interview process, upon which staff completed additional research. The first concern regarded one of the firm's references indicating unmet expectations with Nelson/Nygaard's subconsultant chosen to complete their public engagement process. Upon additional, questioning of the transit system representative, CyRide staff found that a different public engagement firm was used, Circlepoint versus the firm that would be part of CyRide's project, Community Design Group. Also, in the interview, the two firms (Nelson/Nygaard and Community Design Group) indicated that they had worked well together on other projects.

Second, through the interview process, the Nelson/Nygaard presentation did not provide a great deal of detail about their technical approach, while their methodology appeared sound. Staff contacted the firm's references to inquire about their satisfaction with the technical analysis of their study and received positive comments from all transit systems in this area, indicating that they were thorough, and exceeded expectations. One additional piece of

“advice” from one of the transit systems was to make sure that the Nelson/Nygaard team customized their approach for CyRide. She indicated that they “pushed back” with their initial analysis and were very pleased with the end result, as the team was very accommodating.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Approve award of the CyRide System Redesign Study to Nelson/Nygaard of Seattle, Washington, and direct CyRide staff to negotiate a budget up to \$180,000.
2. Approve award of the CyRide System Redesign Study to Connetics of Roswell, Georgia, and direct CyRide staff to negotiate a budget up to \$225,000.
3. Reject all proposals and reissue CyRide System Redesign Study RFP.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Transit Director recommends approval of Alternative #1 to award the CyRide System Redesign Study to Nelson/Nygaard. This firm demonstrated a passion for the study, solid technical capabilities and a creative civic engagement approach. This firm’s approach will allow the study to be soundly developed, with varied public interests, and effectively communicated within the community. Also, staff believes that the results of the additional research conducted after the interview process support the interview team’s recommendation to award the project to Nelson/Nygaard.

To: File  
From: Sheri Kyras  
Date: June 13, 2016  
Subject: CyRide System Redesign RFP Evaluation Process

**Evaluation Process**

CyRide prepared and distributed a Request for Proposal on April 1, 2016 for consultant services to conduct the System Redesign Study for the transit agency. CyRide received three proposals on May 2, 2016. The three proposals were from: Connetics Transportation Group, Nelson/NyGaard and Olsson Associates. Three CyRide staff then reviewed each of the proposals based on the general evaluation language contained in the RFP. Specifically the following criteria were used, based on this language, using a scale from 1 - 10.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Percentage Weight</b>
Technical Approach	25%
Demonstrated Understanding of the Project	15%
Past Performance	15%
Specialized Experience/Technical Competence	15%
Project Management/Firm Capability	10%
Price	20%

The three evaluators first reviewed the proposals based on the above criteria as documented in the attached “System Redesign – Evaluation Results – Technical and Price.” The evaluation team met on May 13, 2016 to review the tallied results and to further discuss each of the proposals. In reviewing the proposals, it was determined that the three firms had priced the project using different parameters. Therefore, Addendum #4 was distributed to each proposer, with the same baseline criteria from which to price their project, so that the price provided by each proposer was comparable for each firm. The price data was then added to the technical evaluation for each of the evaluators and a final score achieved for each evaluation as documented on the evaluation results form. The results were as follows:

- Nelson/Nygaard – 6.85
- Connetics Transportation Group – 6.30
- Olsson Associates – 6.03

As a result, the three-person evaluation team refined the consultant list to the two finalists with the highest combined scores –Nelson/Nygaard and Connecticut Transportation Group. Interviews were scheduled for the week of June 6, 2016 with the following agenda:

- Welcome/Introductions
- Overview of Firm’s Proposal
- Respond to Interview Questions to Firms (attached)
- Questions to/from Firm

A review team comprised of CyRide staff, ISU and City/MPO staff, and Transit Board members were present for the two web-based interviews. The attached evaluation sheet was completed by each participant. The result of this evaluation was the unanimous agreement of the interviewers that Nelson/Nygaard was the “best fit” for the project. Each team participated rated the firm as their first choice and their scores were the highest as evidenced by the table below.

<b>Interview Team Member</b>	<b>Nelson-Nygaard Score/Rank</b>	<b>Connectics Score/Rank</b>
1	43/1	37/2
2	41/1	35/2
3	43/1	38/2
4	49/1	46/2
5	45/1	37/2
6		

Based on the interview team’s recommendation, the Transit Board of Trustees considered awarding the contract to Nelson/Nygaard at the board meeting on June 16, 2016.

Interview Team Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Firm: \_\_\_\_\_

**CyRide System Redesign – Finalist Interviews  
Evaluation**

**Project Team Developed for Project - Rate from 1 – 15, with 15 being best** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Strength of and Comfort with Key Personnel and Subconsultants  
throughout presentation)

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Firm’s Proposal/Approach to the Project - Rate from 1 - 15, with 15  
being best** (Strength of and Comfort with Approach to CyRide project –  
agenda topic #2) \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Firm’s Response to Interview Questions 1-3 only (Technical Approach)** \_\_\_\_\_  
**- Rate from 1 - 10, with 10 being best** (Comfort with example project and  
approach for CyRide project on these questions)

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Firm’s Response to Interview Question 4 only (Financial Approach)** \_\_\_\_\_  
**- Rate from 1 - 10, with 10 being best** (How team proposes reducing  
project to match budget - ex. # of rider/non-rider surveys, counts  
provided, etc.)

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL Points (maximum 50 pts.)** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Ranking (“1” for first choice, “2” for second choice)** \_\_\_\_\_



**CITY OF AMES, Iowa**

**MEMO TO:** Ames Transit Board of Trustees  
**FROM:** Sheri Kyras  
**DATE:** June 16, 2016  
**SUBJECT:** Transit Advertising Three Year Contract Extension

**BACKGROUND:** CyRide currently has a contract with Houck Transit Advertising of Saint Paul, Minnesota to sell advertising space on the inside and outside of its buses. This agreement is a three-year contract that expires on June 30, 2016, but has a two year extension option.

CyRide’s existing contract provides the transit system with:

- 52% of the gross revenues generated from sales
- A minimum guarantee of: \$104,000 Yr. 1, \$105,000 Yr. 2 and 106,000 Yr. 3

Revenues generated from this contract have provided CyRide with \$130,000 to approximately \$150,000 annually. The existing contract has benefited CyRide by providing valuable revenue with minimal effort. Houck Advertising is responsible for all aspects of the advertising process, including placing and removing advertising on the buses. No CyRide resources are utilized for the advertising program.

**INFORMATION:** With the expiration of the contract shortly, CyRide contacted Houck Advertising to determine their interest in extending the existing contract. The attached email provides information regarding this inquiry, indicating a desire to extend the contract for the allowed period of two years. In light of this interest, CyRide conducted a review of transit advertising contract terms around the state and found the following:

<b>Transit System</b>	<b>% of Gross Revenues</b>	<b>Minimum Guarantee</b>
CyRide	52%	\$106,000
Cedar Rapids	50%	None
Waterloo	50%	None
Sioux City	No Non-City Advertising, Done In-house	
Coralville	No Advertising Allowed	
Des Moines	Info. Not Received	
Iowa City	Info. Not Received	

Based on this research, CyRide is receiving a larger percentage of revenues for transit systems that contract for this service and are provided a minimum guarantee that other transit systems do not have incorporated into their contracts, which indicates favorable contract terms under the existing contract.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Approve a two-year contract extension to Houck Advertising of St. Paul, Minn. to expire June 30, 2018.
2. Extend the existing contract for three months to Houck Advertising of St. Paul, Minn. and re-bid the contract to begin October 1, 2016.
3. Extend the existing contract on a month-to-month basis months to Houck Advertising of St. Paul, Minn. and re-bid the contract as soon as possible.
4. Direct staff to evaluate in-house transit advertising for potential benefits.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Transit Director recommends approval of Alternative #1 or #2, depending upon the Transit Board's comfort with extending the contract. With favorable contract terms and revenues well exceeding the minimum guarantees, extension of the contract would financially benefit CyRide.



June 8, 2016

Ms. Sheri Kyras  
CyRide  
1700 University Blvd.  
Ames, IA 50010

Dear Ms. Kyras,

I am writing to you to express our desire to exercise our option to renew the advertising contract for the additional two year term that the contract allows for.

In each of the last 3 years of the current agreement we have increased revenue every year to levels not seen before from the advertising program. By exercising the extension option for the additional two year period Houck Transit Advertising will be able to continue to provide excellent service and generate increased revenue for CyRide without interruption.

Sincerely,

Justin Houck  
President

Houck Transit Advertising  
[Justin@houckads.com](mailto:Justin@houckads.com)  
800-777-7290

# July

<i>Sun</i>	<i>Mon</i>	<i>Tue</i>	<i>Wed</i>	<i>Thu</i>	<i>Fri</i>	<i>Sat</i>
					<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>4</b> City/ University Holiday	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>11</b> TRANSIT BD MTG. 8:00 AM	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>31</b>					<b>2016</b>	

# August

<i>Sun</i>	<i>Mon</i>	<i>Tue</i>	<i>Wed</i>	<i>Thu</i>	<i>Fri</i>	<i>Sat</i>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>21</b>	<b>22</b> ISU Fall Semester Begins	<b>23</b>	<b>24</b> Transit Bd Mtg. 8:00 AM	<b>25</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>			
						<b>2016</b>