

FACILITIES & EQUIPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

August 11, 2014

A Facilities and Equipment Committee Meeting was conducted at 1:18 p.m. on August 11, 2014 at the Area Transportation Authority in Johnsonburg, PA.

Attendees at the meeting were:

Ken Wingo, Facilities and Equipment Committee Member
Harry Whiteman, Facilities & Equipment Committee Member

Michael E. Imbrogno, ATA Chief Executive Officer
Coletta Corioso, ATA Chief Financial Officer
Yvonne Woleslagle, ATA Administrative Secretary

ATA Board Chairman Ken Wingo called the meeting to order and then asked Coletta Corioso to give a presentation of the agenda items to the Committee.

Consolidated Capital Grant Application (CCA):

At the last Facilities and Equipment Committee meeting, the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) was presented and the Committee was informed that its intention was to request funds to finance the first year of the four year TIP in the Consolidated Capital Application (CCA).

ATA completed a Consolidated Capital Application and submitted it to PennDOT on July 31, 2014. The local match resolution was not requested to be adopted by the Board earlier because the financing was not known at the time of the last Board meeting. PennDOT controls all of the capital money and it is difficult to know how much local match will be needed until PennDOT informs us what amount of money will be awarded and what funding source will be used. We were informed by PennDOT that any balances of PTAF and Section 1517 (dedicated capital) showing as available in the CCA was required to be obligated to projects before requesting any federal or state funds. Coletta stated that in the CCA she applied 80% in federal money, state money at 19.355%, and the remaining percent in local match. A local match resolution is presented today, which if approved, will be adopted by the Board and forwarded to PennDOT.

There are nine specific projects that were included in the Consolidated Capital grant application. There are:

1. Preliminary Engineering for the Coudersport terminal
2. Land Acquisition and Construction of a DuBois Joint Transit Facility

3. Capitalized Asset Maintenance for unanticipated maintenance projects that \$5,000 or more in estimated costs. This is budgeted because now any project over \$5,000 has to be identified as a capital project and operating money cannot be used to fund the project.
4. Facilities Improvements – includes canopies for both Saint Marys and Punxsutawney transit centers; furniture replacements; building repairs; replacement of office and pole lighting with LED; Johnsonburg Bus/Exit driveway improvement; bus wash/bus wash bay for Bradford ; parking lot paving; garage door/garage door openers; HVAC replacements; insulation for Kane garage; pressure washer; and emergency generator equipment.
5. Garage Equipment – man lift and electric pallet truck
6. ITS Technology Upgrade – replacement of Transview software and associated hardware and additional technologies.
7. Vehicle Rehabilitation Projects including three (3) New Flyers and thirteen (13) Sprinter vehicles.
8. Replace Johnsonburg Service Vehicle Truck
9. Vehicle Replacements including one (1) Sprinter and nine (9) Body-on –Chassis (BOC)

The total value of the projects requested is \$10,179,100. A spreadsheet is attached identifying the individual project costs and anticipated sources of funds. Coletta reviewed the spreadsheet and what funding sources will be used to fund the projects and the of amount local match required.

The total local cash match for the FY 2014/2015 Consolidated Capital Grant application is \$48,214 for Section 1514 Discretionary and \$1,613 for Section 1514 Bond funding. The local cash match for PTAF money is \$4,513. Local match resolutions were provided for PTAF funds in the year that the funds are allocated and therefore are not included in the local match required by PennDOT.

There is no local match requirement if we use Community Transit (Section 1516) and Section 1517 (Capital) money. As a result of applying these funds to projects, ATA saved \$6,266 in local match.

PennDOT also requires that ATA submit its priorities for the projects. Obviously all projects are needed, but were rated with a priority level from 1 to 3 (1 highest). Based on whether a project was considered a safety risk, the equipment or the subject's condition or urgent need, the following items were identified as having the highest priority (in no particular order):

1. Replace Furniture
2. Bus Driveway/ Exit Improvements

3. Bradford Facility Improvements – Additional garage doors/replace garage door openers, HVAC, and pressure washer (if bush wash is not approved)
4. ITS Technology Upgrade
5. Vehicle Rehabs for both New Flyer and Sprinters
6. Vehicle Replacements – Sprinter and BOC's

The items with the least priority, while needed, in relation to the other projects, could be delayed if necessary because it did not pose a significant threat to ongoing operating include:

1. Emergency generator for Bradford
2. Service truck for Johnsonburg
3. Insulating the Kane garage
4. Man lift for the Johnsonburg facility.

The remaining projects were identified as having a secondary priority.

A local match resolution will need to be adopted by Board at the August 20th Board meeting to fund the FY 2014-2015 Consolidated Capital grant application. Only state money needs to be identified in the local match resolution.

Purchase Body-on-Chassis Vehicles:

Coletta gave an update on the procurement of the six Body-on-Chassis vehicles. The ATA has a contract for the purchase of six Body-on-Chassis vehicles for which it was seeking approval of performance based specification procurement. PennDOT would not approve the performance based specification procurement and requires that ATA purchase vehicles under the DGS contract. This was felt to be an inferior process because of unknown adherence to certain FMVSS certifications and the limitation of change orders to \$10,000.

The budget for the purchase of these vehicles is \$448,067. The source of funds for this project are federal 5309 (earmark grant of \$358,454); State bond funds of \$86,723; and \$2,890 in local cash. The federal funds were obligated in 2010, but because of lack of transportation funding bills, the state delayed approval of the state bonds that had been authorized for the purchase of buses.

The Board approved the local cash match of \$2,890 in May of this year, after the state agreed to provide the state bond funds.

At the last Board meeting, staff indicated that they were releasing the procurement and would return with recommendations for purchase once the procurement was completed.

ATA submitted a request for approval of the performance based procurement package, but PennDOT would not approve it. The Department indicated that all buses funded with any federal or state funds under their control were required to be purchased under the DGS contract.

As indicated above, the Authority was not certain that the vehicle met FMVSS requirements because information about the FMVSS certifications was not available on PennDOT's website. After meeting with ATA, the department provided documents on the FMVSS certification. Once this was determined, ATA began to work with Rohrer (the supplier of the Body on Chassis vehicles to the DGS) on pricing the vehicle.

The DGS contract also has a threshold of \$10,000 that transit authorities cannot exceed. In our understanding of competitive procurements, if a vehicle cannot be priced within the limitation of the DGS contract, a separate procurement would be needed to meet competitive procurement guidelines. However, the Department indicated in correspondence to staff that it would not authorize the purchase of any equipment not on the state DGS contract and that any excess over the threshold would have to be paid 100% by the transit authority. We may price the vehicle without certain options in order to stay under the threshold. These options could be procured from another source less expensively. The major items here being removed from the specification include painting, graphics/detailing and a camera system.

The negotiated cost for these vehicles is as follows:

Description	Units	Unit Price	Extended
23' Transit Bus, Ford - 14,500 lb. GVWR w/ delivery	6	\$64,048	\$384,288
OEM Manuals – CDROM	3	\$350	\$1,050
Total			\$385,338

The balance of available grant funds is \$62,679

The staff is recommending the purchase of the units under the DGS contract for a price not to exceed \$385,388 as indicated above.

Staff recommends using the balance of funds to procure painting, detailing, cameras and any capital asset maintenance inventory items that can be purchased for future maintenance use.

A resolution authorizing the purchase of the six (6) Body-on-Chassis vehicles will need to be adopted by the Board at the Regular Board meeting to be held on August 20, 2014.

Capital Project Updates:

Gillig Repair Project - Four (4) Gillig Phantom Vehicles. Two (2) vehicles were sent to MTB Transit Solutions to begin repair work. When starting the repairs, there were other structural damage to the vehicles that was not anticipated. The Director of Fleet Maintenance, Charlie Shilk, was asked to go up their facility in Ontario, Canada, to inspect and get an assessment of what they found. There isn't any additional money left in the budget and we may have to ask PennDOT for more funding to repair these vehicles.

Monroe Township Vehicle - Coletta stated that we have worked out the details for the pricing of the vehicle. ATA was listed as a named option under the Red Rose Transit Authority contract for the procurement Gillig vehicles. Charlie Shilk is getting a final build sheet and we are in budget to purchase this vehicle. Board approval was given at the May 20, 2014 meeting to purchase this vehicle.

DuBois Facility – Coletta stated that she called Bob Sharp at PennDOT this morning regarding this project. She told him that she is meeting with the Committee and would like to give an update on this project at the meeting. He told her that he is still waiting for the Comptroller's final approval for the environmental and that this shouldn't take very long. When she asked for a time frame, he said he didn't know.

At 2: 18 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.