Connect Transit Administration and Maintenance Facility Plan

Texas City Urbanized Area



August 2014





С

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Chapter I – INTRODUCTION

| Background | .1-1 |
|--|------|
| Ridership Data | .1-2 |
| Need for New Administrative & Parking Facility | .1-2 |
| Need for New Maintenance Facility | .1-3 |
| Report Organization | .1-5 |

Chapter 2 – SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

| Overview | 2-1 |
|--|------|
| Evaluation Criteria | 2-2 |
| La Marque Site Assessment | 2-4 |
| La Marque Site Analysis | 2-5 |
| La Marque Site Analysis Results | 2-7 |
| Mall of the Mainland Assessment | 2-8 |
| Mall of the Mainland Site Analysis | 2-9 |
| Mall of the Mainland Site Analysis Results | 2-10 |
| Texas City Location Analysis. | 2-11 |
| Texas City Site Analysis | 2-12 |
| Texas City Site Analysis Results | 2-14 |
| Deadhead Analysis | 2-15 |
| | |

Chapter 3 – SITE LAYOUT

| Site Layout | 3-1 |
|---|-------|
| Administration Facility Building Program | 3-2 |
| Administration Facility Layout/Expansion and Lease Opportunities | 3-4 |
| Maintenance Facility Building Program | 3-6 |
| Maintenance Facility Layout | 3-7 |
| Site Access | 3-8 |
| Traffic Impact Items | 3-9 |
| Site Access & Area Traffic Signalization | .3-10 |
| Analysis of Existing Road Conditions & Potential Facility Impacts | .3-11 |

Chapter 4 – CAPITAL & OPERATING COSTS

| Overview | 4-1 |
|--|-----|
| Construction Costs For Administrative & Maintenance Facilities | 4-2 |
| Costs of Bus Parking | 4-3 |

| Recommended LCI Pedestrian Transit-Access Improvements4 | í- 4 |
|---|-------------|
| Operating Costs for Administration Building | í -7 |
| Operating Costs for Lease | í-8 |
| Operating Costs for Maintenance Building | í-9 |
| Operating Costs Summary for Entire Project | 10 |

Chapter 5 – BENEFITS

| Background | |
|--------------------------|--|
| State of Good Repair | |
| Economic Competitiveness | |
| Livability | |
| Sustainability | |
| Safety | |
| Conclusion | |

Chapter 6 – FINANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION

| Impact for Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century | 6-1 |
|--|-----|
| Qualifying Costs | 6-4 |
| Five-Year Project Implementation Plan | 6-5 |
| Project Implementation Timeline | 6-7 |

Appendix A – La Marque Location Appraisal

| Appendix B – Texas City Location Environmental Documentation |
|---|
| Appendix C – Schematic Design Documents |
| <i>Appendix D</i> – Connect Transit Facility Maintenance Plan |

Figures

| Fig. 1.1 - Mainland Transit Routes | 1-1 |
|--|------|
| Fig. 1.2 – Mackey Building Land Use | 1-3 |
| Fig. 1.3 – Mackey Building Parking | 1-3 |
| Fig. 1.4 – Location of Mackey Building Maintenance Facilities | 1-4 |
| Fig. 2.1 – Site Locations | 2-2 |
| Fig. 2.2 – La Marque Location | 2-4 |
| Fig. 2.3 – Mall of the Mainland Location | 2-8 |
| Fig. 2.4 – Texas City Location | 2-11 |
| Fig. 3.1 – Texas City Location – Conceptual Site Layout | 3-1 |
| Fig. 3.2 – Satellite Image of Texas City Location | |
| Fig. 3.3 – Administration Facility Layout | |
| Fig. 3.4 – Maintenance Facility Layout | |
| Fig. 3.5 – Site Access and Area Traffic Signalization | |
| Fig. 4.1 – Connect Administration Facility Individual Components | |
| Fig. 4.2 – Connect Administration Facility LCI ½ Mile Area | 4-5 |
| Fig. 5.1 – Short Term Job Creation | 5-5 |
| Fig. 5.2 – Height-to-Width Ratios | 5-14 |
| Fig. 5.3 – Context Sensitivity | 5-14 |

| Fig. 6.1 – Project Implementation Timeline | 6-7 |
|--|-----|
|--|-----|

Tables

| Tab. 1.1 – Connect Transit Ridership Growth | .1-1 |
|--|--------------|
| Tab. 2.1 – La Marque Site Analysis | .2-5 |
| Tab. 2.2 – Mall of the Mainland Site Analysis | .2-9 |
| Tab. 2.3 – Texas City Site Analysis | 2-12 |
| Tab. 2.4 – Deadhead Analysis | 2-15 |
| Tab. 3.1 – GCC/Connect Transit Building and Lot Sizes | .3-2 |
| Tab. 3.2 – Administration Facility Building Program | .3-3 |
| Tab. 3.3 – Maintenance Facility Building Program | .3-6 |
| Tab. 3.4 – Analysis of Existing Road Conditions and Potential Facility Impacts | 3-11 |
| Tab. 4.1 – Construction Costs: Administration Facility | .4-2 |
| Tab. 4.2 – Construction Costs: Maintenance Facility | .4-2 |
| Tab. 4.3 – Construction Costs: Bus Parking | .4-3 |
| Tab. 4.4 – Construction Costs: Pedestrian-Transit Access Infrastructure | .4-6 |
| Tab. 4.5 – Operating Costs: Administration Facility | .4-8 |
| Tab. 4.6 – Average Conceptual Annual Cost – Connect Transit Maintenance Facility | .4-9 |
| Tab. 4.7 – Operating Costs: Administration and Maintenance Facilities4 | í- 10 |
| Tab. 4.8 – Construction Costs: Entire Project4 | í- 11 |
| Tab. 5.1 – Long-Term Job Creation | .5-5 |
| Tab. 5.2 – GCC Annual Cost Savings | .5-7 |
| Tab. 5.3 – Emission Reductions | 5-11 |
| Tab. 6.1 – Federal/Local Share by Project Component | .6-5 |
| Tab. 6.2 – Project Phasing By Component, Year, and Funding Source | .6-6 |

Acronyms

Chapter

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
|--|---|
| GCC – The Gulf Coast Center | 1 |
| SBCT – Southern Brazoria County Transit | 1 |
| MoM – Mall of the Mainland | 1 |
| VL – Victory Lakes | 1 |
| FTA – Federal Transit Administration | 1 |
| EDC – Economic Development Corporation | 2 |
| P&R – Park and Ride | 2 |
| EA – Environmental Analysis | 2 |
| CE – Categorical Exclusion | 2 |
| CIMU – Commercial/Industrial/Mixed Use | 2 |
| EM – Emergency Management | 3 |
| ROW – Right-of-Way | 3 |
| LOS – Level of Service | 3 |
| ADT – Annual Daily Traffic | 3 |
| TxDOT – Texas Department of Transportation | 4 |
| LCI – Livable Communities Initiative | 4 |
| ADA – American Disabilities Act | 4 |
| TOD – Transit Oriented Development | 5 |
| EPA - Environmental Protection Agency | 5 |
| | |

| HUD - Housing and Urban Development | .5 |
|---|----|
| SCP - Sustainable Communities Partnership | .5 |
| SGR – State of Good Repair | .5 |
| CEA – Council of Economic Advisers | .5 |
| ARRA – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act | .5 |
| APTA – American Public Transportation Association | .5 |
| SCP – Sustainable Communities Partnership | .5 |
| TE – Transit Enhancements | .5 |
| BLOS – Bus Level of Service | .5 |
| CPTED – Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design | .5 |
| FDOT – Florida Department of Transportation | .5 |
| PLOS – Pedestrian Level of Service | .5 |
| VMT – Vehicle Miles Traveled | .5 |
| NOx – Nitrogen Oxide | .5 |
| VOC – Volatile Organic Compounds | .5 |
| CO – Carbon Monoxide | .5 |
| H-GAC – Houston-Galveston Area Council | .5 |
| MAP-21 – Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century | .6 |
| FHWA – Federal Highway Administration | .6 |
| TCSP – Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program | .6 |
| STP – Surface Transportation Program | .6 |
| NHS – National Highway System | .6 |
| MPO – Metropolitan Planning Organization | .6 |
| NAAQS – National Ambient Air Quality Standards | .6 |
| CMAQ – Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality | .6 |
| RTP – Regional Transportation Plan | .6 |
| TAP – Transportation Alternative Program | .6 |
| TIGER – Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery | .6 |
| UZA – Urbanized Area | .6 |
| TDCs – Transportation Development Credits | .6 |
| LONP – Letter of No Prejudice | .6 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



Connect Transit (Connect) is the public transportation component that operates under the umbrella of The Gulf Coast Center (GCC). Operating in Galveston County (Mainland Transit) and Southern Brazoria County since 1985, Connect offers the following services:

- Demand-response service in Galveston (through an inter-local agreement with Galveston County Transit District) and Brazoria counties (excluding the City of Galveston);
- Fixed-route service provided by Connect Transit's Mainland Transit and Southern Brazoria County Transit (SBCT) systems; and
- Commuter bus service accessible from Mall of the Mainland (MoM) and Victory Lakes (VL) Park & Rides

Connect's fixed-route service began in 2008 with three core routes in Texas City and La Marque and has steadily expanded to include a larger multi-city regional system. The Mainland Transit system now includes routes in Dickinson and San Leon/Bacliff, which also serve as connectors to Texas City. In total, Connect serves seven municipalities spanning two discrete urban areas and the rural unincorporated communities of San Leon/Bacliff in Galveston County (Figure ES.1)



Figure ES. I – Mainland Transit Routes

Need for a New Administration and Parking Facility

Connect's Galveston County administrative offices are currently housed within the Mackey Building, located at 4352 Emmett F Lowry Expressway in Texas City, Texas. The building houses approximately 10 full-time administrative staff, as well as a fleet of 26 vehicles and their drivers. This fleet is representative of all Galveston County operations. As Connect's service area has expanded, staff and fleet size have grown proportionally. As such, Connect has outgrown the Mackey Building in terms of both the amount of fleet storage and workspace available.

The Mackey Building, an approximately 12,000 square-foot facility built in 1985, lacks dedicated space for drivers to eat, change, store their belongings, and prepare for their shifts. Therefore, conditions before and after shifts are extremely cramped for both drivers as well as for administrative staff. *Figures ES.2* and *ES.3* depict the fleet storage area when the majority of the fleet is in service. Even when the fleet is in service, it is evident that space for visitor and staff parking is still extremely limited.



Figure ES.2 – Mackey Building Land Use

Figure ES.3 – Mackey Building Parking



Need for a New Maintenance Facility

Connect currently contracts all maintenance out to local vendors located in Texas City and La Marque. On a monthly basis, approximately five vehicles are sent to Shep's Automotive, located approximately 2.7 miles away at 3725 Highway 1765 in La Marque. Approximately another nine vehicles are sent a month to Five Star Automotive located at 4502 FM 1765 in Texas City, approximately 2 miles away. During a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) triennial review in December 2013, it was noted that Connect had grown large enough to warrant the investigation of the development of a dedicated maintenance facility. The development of such a facility will be critical in improving Connect's ability to accurately track and document vehicle maintenance on FTA funding vehicles. The Mackey Building does not have the space required to allow for the addition of the structures or equipment necessary to conduct maintenance in-house.

In addition to a lack of facilities for all necessary personnel, the Mackey Building and site lacks many modern features common to most other transit facilities, as follows:

- Limited/protected access and security features for entry and within the structure;
- Fleet/Facility monitoring systems;
- Dedicated fleet parking/storage areas;
- Dedicated fleet ingress/egress; and
- Secured and monitored area for farebox counting/storage.

In early 2012, as the need for additional space and modernized facilities became extremely evident, Connect began to seriously discuss the need for a new administration facility with room for expansion, as well as expanded parking for buses and a future maintenance facility. Quarterly discussions held at Galveston County Transit District meetings were helpful in allowing Connect to become aware of three potential site opportunities for facility development in partnering communities.

This report will describe the process Connect used to investigate each opportunity, rank them, and decide upon a preferred alternative. In addition to the designation of a preferred alternative, this report will also outline a conceptual site layout and building program, delineate project costs, quantify associated benefits, and project a phased strategy for funding and implementation.

SITE SELECTION

Through comprehensive discussions held at quarterly Galveston County Transit District meetings, Connect Transit became aware of three potentially available parcels owned by local government partners. Noting the benefits available by relocating within a partner community, and building on a piece of land owned and donated by a local government entity, Connect began an in-depth investigation of the opportunities available to determine what the best location available would be, and if any of the locations had an apparent fatal flaw. The locations studied are as follows:

- La Marque Site 1205 S. Oak Street La Marque, Texas
- Mall of the Mainland Site 10000 Emmett F. Lowry Expressway, Texas City, Texas
- Texas City Site 1401 33rd Street, Texas City, Texas

Each site was evaluated using the following 11 criteria in order to determine the best potential site for a future administration and fleet storage facility. While not numerically scored, the information gathered provided enough information for Connect to determine which site was the preferred alternative. This was largely a result of the identification of fatal flaws for the two unselected alternatives.

Texas City Location Analysis – 1401 33rd Street, Texas City, Texas

After a thorough site assessment and selection process, documented in the 2013 Texas City Park &Ride and Pedestrian-Transit Access Master Plan, Connect began discussions with Texas City regarding a city owned parcel of land located at 1401 33rd St.

Texas City agreed to donate the entire parcel for use as a Connect Park and Ride facility and a Connect administration and fleet storage facility. This ground lease was executed by the Gulf Coast Center on January 29, 2014. To further demonstrate their support of the project, Texas City also agreed to commit the 20% local share required to fund this advance planning report in order to further explore the feasibility of the location for an administration and fleet storage facility.

Figure ES.4 – Texas City Location



The Texas City location offers Connect the best opportunity for future development. The ability to utilize a valuable parcel for \$1 a year and leverage the true value of the land will allow Connect to leverage \$3M in federal funding that it otherwise would need to find local cash to use. Texas City has agreed both in principle and by council action to the land donation.

Additionally, the site meets all other criteria, with no fatal flaws identified. Other benefits include use of excess night-time/weekend parking as spill-over parking for the adjacent Carlos Garza Park, the potential identification of compatible uses to be used by Texas City in the immediate future while preserving its use for future Connect expansion, and suitable surrounding land uses and roadways.

SITE LAYOUT AND BUILDING PROGRAM

The Texas City site has ample room for an administration facility that suits Connect's current and future needs. There is also room for a maintenance facility on the west end of the parcel. The northern portion of the site is planned for a future Texas City Park & Ride, as summarized in the *Texas City Pedestrian/Transit Access Master Plan*. The administration and maintenance facilities are depicted in *Figure ES.5*, along with ample parking for automobiles and buses.





Figure ES.5 depicts the administration facility in red, located on the southeast corner of the site. There are 57 parking spaces associated with the administration facility to serve staff and visitor parking needs. The future maintenance facility, depicted in blue, will have 44 spaces. The site will also accommodate parking for 50 buses, which will allow for the fleet to grow from its current size of 26. *Table ES.2* summarizes the space program for the prescribed uses.

| Table ES.2 – GCC/Connect T | ransit Building | and Lot Sizes | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | Admin. Facility | |
| | Lot Size | Size | No. of Parking |
| Facility | (Sq. Ft.) | (Sq. Ft.) | Spaces |
| Administrative Facility Lot | 38,898 | 12,526 | 57 |
| Bus Parking Lot | 63,744 | - | 50 |
| Maintenance Facility Lot | 30,992 | 4,539 | 44 |

Building Program

Administration Facility

The administration facility is conceptualized as a two-story facility, with offices, reception, conference room, visitor waiting area, lunch room, restrooms, cubicles, IT room, storage, and elevator. The entire first floor will be designed to meet all of Connect's current operational and administrative needs. The second floor, which is roughly equivalent in square footage to the first floor, will provide ample room for Connect to expand their operations when necessary. The added space also provides Connect the opportunity to generate revenue to a potential lease tenant. The entire facility totals approximately 12,526 sq. ft.

Maintenance Facility

The maintenance facility, which will serve to maintain Connect vehicles, is conceptualized on the western portion of the site layout depicted in *Figure ES.5*. The building program depicts a 4,539 sq. ft. facility with open bays, an office, break room, bathrooms and lockers.

CONCEPTUAL CAPITAL & OPERATING COSTS

The report includes the capital costs for construction and implementation of the Connect administration/maintenance facility along with associated bus and automobile parking lots. Conceptual costs for streetscape improvements within a ½ mile of the site are also included.

Figure ES.6 – Connect Administration Facility Individual Components



Figure ES.7 shows the one half mile Livable Communities Initiative (LCI) area (within the yellow circle) that can be federally protected, generated from the proposed Administration and Maintenance Facility.



Figure ES.7 – Connect Administration Facility LCI ½ Mile Area

The following corridors are included as eligible LCI projects that serve the facility complex (depicted on Figure 4.2, above):

- 34th Street N. Orange Avenue to FM 1764 (east side) 1,607 LF
- 34th Street N. FM 1764 to 9th Ave. N. 2,550 LF
- 33rd Street N. Magnolia Ave. to FM 1764 (east side) 1,099 LF
- 32nd Street N. FM 1764 to 7th Ave. N (east side) 1,085 LF
- 31st Street N. FM 1764 to Danforth Memorial Dr. 3,337 LF
- Magnolia Ave. 34th St. N. to 29th St. N. (south side) 2,977 LF

Conceptual Operating Costs Summary – Entire Project

Table ES.3 below summarizes the conceptual annual operating costs associated with the Administration and Maintenance Facilities:

| Table ES.3 - Operating Costs: Administration and Mainte | enance Facilities |
|---|-------------------|
| Project Component | *Annual Cost |
| Administration Facility Operating Costs | |
| (based on Mackey Building utilization) | \$75,000 |
| Lease Operating Costs | |
| (based on percentage of projected lease) | \$12,600 |
| Maintenance Facility Operating Costs | |
| (based on peer system examination) | \$729,900 |
| | |
| TOTAL OPERATING COSTS | \$817,500 |
| | |
| *Rounded to the nearest 100 | |

Conceptual Capital Costs Summary – Entire Project

Table ES.4 below summarizes the capital costs associated with the Administration and Maintenance Facilities.

| Table ES.4 - Construction Costs: Entire | e Project |
|--|--------------|
| Project Component | *Annual Cost |
| Administration Facility | |
| Structure | \$3,131,500 |
| Lot | \$171,000 |
| Total Administration Facility | \$3,302,500 |
| | |
| Maintenance Facility | |
| Structure | \$680,900 |
| Lot | \$144,000 |
| Total Maintenance Facility | \$824,900 |
| Total Bus Parking Lot | \$225,000 |
| | |
| Pedestrian-Transit Access Infrastructure | \$614,500 |
| | |
| Total Capital Project Costs | \$4,966,900 |
| | |
| PE (2%) | \$99,400 |
| Design (PS&E) (8%) | \$397,400 |
| Administration (7%) | \$347,700 |
| Contingency (10%) | \$581,100 |
| TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS | \$6,392,500 |
| | |

*Rounded to the nearest 100

BENEFITS

Several benefits are included in each criteria and the report will provide a qualitative description, a quantified analysis and/or a monetized benefit. Each monetized benefit is supplemented with a description of the methodology used to quantify the benefit.

Job Creation

The proposed project would generate economic impacts and create jobs. These economic impacts are quantified according to DOT guidelines for short- and long-term impacts, as follows:

• <u>Short-term jobs</u> are created during construction of the project.

Long-term jobs are created and expenditures made as a result of the operations and maintenance of the project. There typically are three distinct effects — direct, indirect, and induced — during the analysis of economic impact. The total economic impact is the sum of the direct, indirect, and induced effects.

| Table ES.5 – Long-Term Job Creation | |
|---|-------------|
| Annual Operations and Maintenance Cost | \$102,000 |
| Average Hourly Wage for Maintenance Level Work | \$10.52 |
| Benefit Percentage | 35% |
| Wage and Benefit Rate | \$14.20 |
| Calculation of Hours Worked (\$102,000 / \$13.12) | 8,159 hours |
| Annual Full-Time Equivalent Hours - Definition | 2,020 hours |
| Number of FTEs Created | -3.5 FTEs |

Transit Cost Saving/Revenue Stream

The construction of the new Connect Transit Administration and Maintenance Facility in Texas City will benefit GCC by saving money on outsourced services and creating a revenue stream through lease space.

Table ES.6 below summarizes GCC's annual cost saving through implementation Connect Transportation Administration and Maintenance Facility.

| Economic Benefit for GCC | Annual Reduction | Monetization Factor |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Decrease in Rent & Utilities | \$11,600 | \$960 per month |
| Decrease in Training Facility Rent Cost | \$3,000 | Annually |
| Leasing Revenue | \$50,000 | *6,282 sq. ft. @ \$10 sq. foot |
| Bus Storage | \$3,000 | Annually |
| Total Savings | \$67,600 | Annually |
| *Figures based on area comps in Texas City | | |

Table ES.6 – GCC Annual Cost Savings

Reduced VMT and Emission Reductions

The development of the proposed Connect Transit Administration and Maintenance Facility will reduce 7,000 miles of bus miles annually. Using an average of 12-hour 2018 emission factors provided by H-GAC, Table ES.7 presents the calculations for emission reductions. The resulting annual reduction of harmful air pollutants totals approximately 0.028 tons.

| Table ES.7 – Emis | sion Reductions | | | | l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l |
|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Emission | Bus Emission Factors ² (grams/mile) | Annual Bus Grams Added | Annual Net Grams Reduced | Annual Conversion to Pounds Reduced -0.0022 | Annual Conversion to Tons Reduced -0.0005 |
| NOx | 2.352 | 16,466 | 16,466 | 36 | 0.02 |
| VOC | 0.368 | 2,575 | 2,575 | 6 | 0.00 |
| СО | 0.928 | 6,498 | 6,498 | 14 | 0.01 |
| Total | | 25,539 | 25,539 | 56 | 0.03 |
| ² Emission factors for | r Class 8a Heavy-Dut | y Diesel Vehicl | les - 100% arter | ial travel at 25 mph | combined |

Reduction in Fuel Consumption

The U.S. dependence on oil is ever increasing as vehicle miles traveled increase. By enhancing implementing an administrative and maintenance facility in closer proximity to the core operations, the proposed project is estimated to reduce annual VMT by 7,000 in year 5 of operations. The Pennsylvania Transportation Institute (http://146.186.225.57/buses/367) reports the average bus miles per gallon is 6.43. Using 6.43 MPG, the proposed administrative and maintenance facility is estimated to reduce fuel consumption by approximately 1,100 gallons per year.

FINANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION

The Gulf Coast Center or the City of Texas City may pursue funding to support LCI projects, facilities for non-motorized transportation, transit capital projects and public bus terminals and facilities through the following "flexible funding" programs:

- CMAQ Improvement Program
- STP
- Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
- Discretionary Funding Opportunities (ARRA, TIGER)

In addition to competitive funding opportunities, Connect also has access to FTA formula funding. Funds that can be used towards the projects within this document include:

- 49 U.S.C. 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program
- 49 U.S.C. 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program
- 49 U.S.C. 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Program

FTA may fund up to 80 percent of qualifying costs associated with the prescribed improvements. Qualifying costs can include preliminary engineering, design, value engineering, mobilization, and construction (including administration and management). Conversely, the local commitment for qualifying costs is normally 20 percent and 100 percent for non-qualifying costs. Total costs include 17 percent soft costs (including design and administrative costs) and a 10 percent contingency.

Table ES.8 describes project implementation over a five-year timeframe and describes the sources of funding that may be applied towards each phase. Funding sources are listed in order from most likely/applicable to least likely/applicable.

| Table ES.8 - Projec | ct Phasing By C | omponent, Year, a | and Funding Source | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Component | Phase | Calendar Year of Implementation | Potential Federal Funding Source(s) | Potential Local Funding Source(s) |
| Administration Facility and Parking | Design/PE | 2014-2015 | Ladders of Opportunity, STP, 5307 | Land Value |
| Administration Facility and Parking | Construction | 2015-2016 | Ladders of Opportunity, STP, 5307 | Land Value |
| Bus Parking | Design/PE | 2014-2015 | Ladders of Opportunity, STP, 5307 | Land Value |
| Bus Parking | Construction | 2015-2016 | Ladders of Opportunity, STP, 5307 | Land Value |
| Maintenance Facility | Design/PE | 2018-2019 | STP, Ladders of Opportunity, 5339 | Texas City Local Commitment |
| Maintenance Facility | Construction | 2020 | STP, Ladders of Opportunity, 5339 | Texas City Local Commitment |
| Pedestrian/Transit Access | Design/PE, Construction | 2020 | CMAQ, 5310 | Texas City Local Commitment |

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND AND PROJECT HISTORY



Connect Transit (Connect) is the public transportation component that operates under the umbrella of The Gulf Coast Center (GCC). Operating in Galveston County (Mainland Transit) and Southern Brazoria County since 1985, Connect offers the following services:

- Demand-response service in Galveston (through an inter-local agreement with Galveston County Transit District) and Brazoria counties (excluding the City of Galveston);
- Fixed-route service provided by Connect Transit's Mainland Transit and Southern Brazoria County Transit (SBCT) systems; and
- Commuter bus service accessible from Mall of the Mainland (MoM) and Victory Lakes (VL) Park & Rides

Connect's fixed-route service began in 2008 with three core routes in Texas City and La Marque and has steadily expanded to include a larger multi-city regional system. The Mainland Transit system now includes routes in Dickinson and San Leon/Bacliff, which also serve as connectors to Texas City. In total, Connect serves seven municipalities spanning two discrete urban areas and the rural unincorporated communities of San Leon/Bacliff in Galveston County (*Figure 1.1*). Demand for fixed-route service has been dramatic as well, with ridership rapidly increasing annually since implementation (*Table 1.1*).





From 2009 to 2012, fixed-route ridership across Connect's Mainland and Southern Brazoria County operations has exploded from 15,740 trips per year to 214,903 trips per year. This presents an increase of 199,163 trips (over 1,000%) over a five year period.



Table 1.1 – Connect Transit Ridership Growth

Connect's Mainland Transit service operates from 6:00 a.m. to 6:25 p.m., operating from 45 to 60minute headways, depending on the route.

Need for a New Administration and Parking Facility

Connect's Galveston County administrative offices are currently housed within the Mackey Building, located at 4352 Emmett F Lowry Expressway in Texas City, Texas. The building houses approximately 10 full-time administrative staff, as well as a fleet of 26 vehicles and their drivers. This fleet is representative of all Galveston County operations. As Connect's service area has expanded, staff and fleet size have grown proportionally. As such, Connect has outgrown the Mackey Building in terms of both the amount of fleet storage and workspace available.

The Mackey Building, an approximately 12,000 square-foot facility built in 1985, lacks dedicated space for drivers to eat, change, store their belongings, and prepare for their shifts. Therefore, conditions before and after shifts are extremely cramped for both drivers as well as for administrative staff.

Figures 1.2 and *1.3* depict the fleet storage area when the majority of the fleet is in service. Even when the fleet is in service, it is evident that space for visitor and staff parking is still extremely limited.



Figure 1.2 – Mackey Building Land Use

Figure 1.3 – Mackey Building Parking



Need for a New Maintenance Facility

Connect currently contracts all maintenance out to local vendors located in Texas City and La Marque. On a monthly basis, approximately five vehicles are sent to Shep's Automotive, located approximately 2.7 miles away at 3725 Highway 1765 in La Marque. Approximately another nine vehicles are sent a month to Five Star Automotive located at 4502 FM 1765 in Texas City, approximately 2 miles away. During a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) triennial review in December 2013, it was noted that Connect had grown large enough to warrant the investigation of the development of a dedicated maintenance facility. The development of such a facility will be critical in improving Connect's ability to accurately track and document vehicle maintenance on FTA funding vehicles. The Mackey Building does not have the space required to allow for the addition of the structures or equipment necessary to conduct maintenance in-house.





In addition to a lack of facilities for all necessary personnel, the Mackey Building and site lacks many modern features common to most other transit facilities, as follows:

- Limited/protected access and security features for entry and within the structure;
- Fleet/Facility monitoring systems;
- Dedicated fleet parking/storage areas;

- Dedicated fleet ingress/egress; and
- Secured and monitored area for farebox counting/storage.

In early 2012, as the need for additional space and modernized facilities became extremely evident, Connect began to seriously discuss the need for a new administration facility with room for expansion, as well as expanded parking for buses and a future maintenance facility. Quarterly discussions held at Galveston County Transit District meetings were helpful in allowing Connect to become aware of three potential site opportunities for facility development in partnering communities.

This report will describe the process Connect used to investigate each opportunity, rank them, and decide upon a preferred alternative. In addition to the designation of a preferred alternative, this report will also outline a conceptual site layout and building program, delineate project costs, quantify associated benefits, and project a phased strategy for funding and implementation.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

Chapter 2 – Site Suitability Assessment – provides an in-depth evaluation of the three sites considered by Connect Transit for a new administrative and fleet storage facility.

Chapter 3 – Site Layout and Building Program – outlines a conceptual site layout and building program based upon current and future needs of Connect's Mainland Transit Operations. This chapter also includes a maintenance plan for the future facility.

Chapter 4 – Capital & Operating Costs – breaks out preliminary engineering, final design, construction, and long term maintenance/mortgage/rent costs associated with the construction of the facility. Chapter 4 will also summarize conceptual operations costs to maintain the facilities.

Chapter 5 – Quantification of Benefits – defines how the implementation and use of the prescribed facility will provide benefits to Connect Transit, riders, partner communities, and the region in general.

Chapter 6 – Funding and Implementation – identifies a funding strategy using formula and discretionary sources to meet the project costs developed in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER TWO: SITE SELECTION



Through comprehensive discussions held at quarterly Galveston County Transit District meetings, Connect Transit became aware of three potentially available parcels owned by local government partners. Noting the benefits available by relocating within a partner community, and building on a piece of land owned and donated by a local government entity, Connect began an in-depth investigation of the opportunities available to determine what the best location available would be, and if any of the locations had an apparent fatal flaw. The locations studied are as follows:

- La Marque Site 1205 S. Oak Street La Marque, Texas
- Mall of the Mainland Site 10000 Emmett F. Lowry Expressway, Texas City, Texas
- Texas City Site 1401 33rd Street, Texas City, Texas

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Each site was evaluated using the following 11 criteria in order to determine the best potential site for a future administration and fleet storage facility. While not numerically scored, the information gathered provided enough information for Connect to determine which site was the preferred alternative. This was largely a result of the identification of fatal flaws for the two unselected alternatives.



Figure 2.1 – Site Locations

Deadhead Analysis

Each potential location was evaluated on the basis of deadhead reductions/additions from the existing route network. Locations that create additional costs through added deadhead are viewed negatively, and locations that provide cost savings through time/fuel reductions are viewed positively.

Architectural Analysis

Any existing structures on the site were evaluated to determine their potential for future use or cost for demolition. Low cost options are viewed most favorably.

Environmental Site Assessment

Each site was evaluated on the basis of its potential to receive environmental clearance from the FTA. Some sites had a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment completed to determine the full scope of the impacts. The identification of any environmental issues is viewed negatively.

Surrounding Land Use

The surrounding land use was evaluated to determine if the creation of an adjacent transit facility would have negative impacts. Residential uses in close vicinity are viewed negatively.

Traffic Impacts

The adjacent roadway network was evaluated to determine the suitability for a relatively high frequency of bus traffic. An adjacent network of roads functionally classified as collector and above is viewed positively.

Potential for Compatible Use

The potential for shared use is evaluated to determine if Connect can take advantage of existing extra structural space or if other positive opportunities can be identified. Identified opportunities for a compatible use beneficial to Connect is viewed as favorably.

Expansion Potential

Connect's explosive growth makes evaluation for expansion a prime consideration. Sufficient space for growth is viewed favorably.

Historical Significance

Parcels and any associated structures are evaluated on their historic significance to determine if any historic clearance or mitigation actions are required. Locations that do not feature a historic or potentially historic structure are viewed favorably.

Availability and Ownership

Any parcel or structures evaluated must be able to be available at a reasonable cost to Connect. Locations available at a low or no cost are viewed favorably.

Site Equity Analysis

An FTA recipient is required to complete a Title VI site equity analysis during the facility planning stage with regards to where project tis located to ensure that the location is selected without regard to race, color, or national origin.

Appraisal Value

If the parcel can be donated to Connect for use as a transit facility, the value of the property can be used to leverage federal formula or discretionary funds. A higher value is viewed favorably.

Funding Feasibility Analysis

The global feasibility of Connect Transit coming into ownership of the property and constructing a facility is considered. The criterion serves to identify any fatal flaws for implementation.

La Marque Site Assessment (1205 Oak Street, La Marque, Texas)

The La Marque Site features two vacant structures on 2.6 acres of property owned by Galveston County. At one time these structures housed the operations of the Galveston County Health District. No longer actively used, Galveston County expressed interest in transferring the ownership of these structures to the City of La Marque.

Figure 2.2 – La Marque Location



After an initial tour of the site and existing structures, Connect commissioned a feasibility study that included: a deadhead analysis, site assessment, architectural/engineering analysis, environmental analysis, appraisal of the existing facility, and an analysis of the funding framework involved. *Table 2.1* presents a summary of the results of each individual component analyzed.

| Table 2.1 – La Marque S | Site Analysis |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Analysis Item | Finding |
| Deadhead Analysis | A La Marque facility location would result in an approximate overall savings of \$370, due to a daily reduction of approximately 1.5 miles of deadhead. The La Marque site features direct connectivity to SH 3 which provides excellent access to IH 45 and SH 1764. |
| Architectural Analysis | An architectural analysis was commissioned for both structures. It was completed by by Schwarz-Hanson Architects and Baird, Hampton, & Brown Inc. Engineering in March 2013. The analysis revealed that both existing structures would need to be substantially remodeled in order to be feasible for use as an administration facility. Estimated costs for renovation of the structures are \$1.5 million. |
| Environmental Site Assessment | As the site had been used as a County Health Facility in the past, it was determined that a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment should be conducted to ensure that the site did not contain any environmental fatal flaws. Therefore, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was conducted by Terracon Consultants, Inc., which revealed no evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the property. |
| Surrounding Land Use | Land use adjacent to the proposed facility is primarily low to medium density multi-family residential. One example of such a use is located across Spruce St. to the north from the proposed facility location. The close proximity of Connect's fleet storage to these residential uses may result in the need to employ some type of noise mitigation strategy. This type of land use generates concerns related to potential noise pollution, and site access issues. An ideal location would be in an industrial or commercial setting. |
| Traffic Impacts | The La Marque site features direct connectivity to SH 3 which provides excellent access to IH 45 and SH 1764. However, direct access to the site would require regular use of Ross, Holly, and Spruce streets. All three are two-lane local roads. Although capable of handling large vehicles, local traffic would likely be disrupted during a.m./p.m. hours when the majority of the fleet would be departing and arriving to the facility. |
| Potential for Compatible Use | It was determined that Connect would not be able to utilize all of the usable space on the property. A portion of one building or one entire building could be dedicated towards another use as determined/needed by the City of La Marque. |

| Expansion Potential | The property had ample expansion room for both administrative staff as well as for fleet storage. Regardless of whether or not either existing facilities could be re-used, a new concrete parking pad would have to be constructed in order to handle on-site fleet traffic. |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Historical Significance | The current structures (constructed in the 1970s) are not old enough to be considered potential historic structures. |
| Availability and Ownership | The parcel is owned by one owner (Galveston County) who has a strong willingness to donate the property through a long term (30-40 year) ground lease to the City of La Marque. |
| Site Equity Analysis | No analysis was completed on this property as the fatal flaw was identified prior |
| Appraisal Value | A baseline value of the property was established via the Galveston County Appraisal District website. The website listed a value of \$1.5M. To verify that value, a summary appraisal was conducted by Scott Stephens Associates, and a review appraisal was conducted by APEX Appraisals. The June 2013 estimated value of a 30-year land lease was determined to be \$120,000. This appraisal value was much lower than originally anticipated. |
| Funding Feasibility Analysis | The Goodman Corporation worked with the City of La Marque and Galveston County in order to determine the most advantageous method of allowing Connect Transit to construct the necessary improvements on the site. A framework was assembled as described: an inter-local agreement would be put into place that would arrange for Galveston County to transfer ownership of the property to the City of La Marque. La Marque would then enter into a long-term ground lease with the Gulf Coast Center (Connect Transit) in order to allow use of the structure. The value of this ground lease (determined by an appraisal) then would be used as the local match requirement for FTA Section 5307 funding (or other discretionary, if available), which would be used to pay for the rehabilitation of the existing structure. No formal transfer of ownership occurred. |

La Marque Site Analysis Results

In August 2013 it became apparent that the utilization of the La Marque site was in jeopardy due to the much lower than anticipated value of the ground lease. When this analysis began the property was determined to be worth (as evidenced by the Galveston County Appraisal District) approximately \$1.5M. However, an actual appraisal resulted in a much lower than anticipated property value (\$120,000). This property value equates to \$600,000 in federal 5307 funds, using a standard 80% federal/20% local funding arrangement. An excerpt of the appraisal is available in Appendix A.

The engineering work completed estimated that a renovation or new construction alternative would cost approximately \$1.5M to construct. The land match contribution would yield less than half of that amount. In an attempt to allow the project to continue moving forward the City of La Marque and the La Marque Economic Development Corporation (EDC) were given the opportunity to contribute additional funding to allow the creation of this administration and fleet storage facility in La Marque. However, both the EDC and La Marque were unable to provide the substantial amount of local funding required. As such, the La Marque location was abandoned as a potential alternative.

Mall of the Mainland Assessment (10000 Emmett F. Lowry Expressway, Texas City, TX)

Concurrent with the assessment of a potential La Marque location was discussion revolving around the utilization of a portion of land located at the Mall of the Mainland. The Mall of the Mainland (MoM) is located just east of the intersection of IH-45 and the Emmett F. Lowy Expressway. Established in 1991, the mall has only three active businesses (Sears, Cinemark Theatres and Palais Royal) remaining. As such, Texas City has expressed an interest in purchasing the mall from the current owner and repurposing the site. Texas City expressed an interest in working with Connect to purchase a portion of the mall to be used for a Connect Transit facility. In order to investigate this opportunity further, Connect performed a preliminary analysis of the location.





| Table 2.2 – Mall of the | Mainland Site Analysis |
|-------------------------|---|
| Analysis Item | Finding |
| Deadhead Analysis | The MoM facility location would result in \$475 in annual savings due to a |
| | daily reduction in approximately 1.8 miles of overall deadhead miles |
| | travelled. The location also offers convenient access to the Emmett F. Lowry |
| | Expressway and IH-45. |
| Architectural Analysis | No architectural analysis was completed. Utilization of this location was predicated on the construction of a new building separate from the actual mall structure. Using information obtained through the La Marque architectural analysis, a new facility was estimated at approximately \$1M-\$2.5M depending upon the type of fleet maintenance and fueling facilities built. This estimate is lower than other estimates provided in this report due to the ability of Connect to utilize the existing concrete surface parking lot. |
| Environmental Site | The retail uses associated with this site would not necessitate the use of an |
| Assessment | environmental site assessment. However, prior to any construction activities |
| | an environmental analysis in support of a categorical exclusion would be |
| | sought. No such analysis has been performed. |

| Surrounding Land Use | The MoM property is fairly isolated inside of a retail complex. There are |
|--|---|
| | residential uses located approximately one guarter mile to the east and west. |
| | At one point the MoM generated significant traffic and noise as a result of |
| | general retail activities. As such, it is unlikely that any Connect use would |
| | disrupt any surrounding land uso |
| | disi upt any surrounding land use. |
| Traffic Impacts | The MoM site was originally designed as a large retail center. As such, the |
| Traine impacts | the Motor site was ongrinary designed as a large retail center. As such, the |
| | |
| | a large amount of traffic. The use of that infrastructure by Connect vehicles |
| | will not cause any additional stress on local circulation. Additionally, the |
| | large amount of space available on the site itself would allow for a desirable |
| | site circulation plan. |
| Potential for Compatible | The incorporation of a shared use would be possible due to the large amount |
| Use | of space available. Potential opportunities would be discussed further with |
| | the City of Texas City. |
| Francis Detential | |
| Expansion Potential | I ne amount of space available at this location makes expansion potential |
| | only limited by the amount of funding Connect has available to put into a |
| | potential facility. |
| | |
| Historical Significance | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. |
| Historical Significance | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15,414. Sears (an appendix) |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for a portion of the property. The ability for Texas City to make this purchase is |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for a portion of the property. The ability for Texas City to make this purchase is contingent upon the MoM asking price to fall drastically. The difficulty in |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for a portion of the property. The ability for Texas City to make this purchase is contingent upon the MoM asking price to fall drastically. The difficulty in negotiating and navigating such a large transaction make it difficult for an |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for a portion of the property. The ability for Texas City to make this purchase is contingent upon the MoM asking price to fall drastically. The difficulty in negotiating and navigating such a large transaction make it difficult for an agreement to be reached. |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership Site Equity Analysis | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for a portion of the property. The ability for Texas City to make this purchase is contingent upon the MoM asking price to fall drastically. The difficulty in negotiating and navigating such a large transaction make it difficult for an agreement to be reached. |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership Site Equity Analysis | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for a portion of the property. The ability for Texas City to make this purchase is contingent upon the MoM asking price to fall drastically. The difficulty in negotiating and navigating such a large transaction make it difficult for an agreement to be reached. |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership Site Equity Analysis | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for a portion of the property. The ability for Texas City to make this purchase is contingent upon the MoM asking price to fall drastically. The difficulty in negotiating and navigating such a large transaction make it difficult for an agreement to be reached. No analysis was completed on this property as the fatal flaw was identified prior |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership Site Equity Analysis | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for a portion of the property. The ability for Texas City to make this purchase is contingent upon the MoM asking price to fall drastically. The difficulty in negotiating and navigating such a large transaction make it difficult for an agreement to be reached. No analysis was completed on this property as the fatal flaw was identified prior |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership Site Equity Analysis | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for a portion of the property. The ability for Texas City to make this purchase is contingent upon the MoM asking price to fall drastically. The difficulty in negotiating and navigating such a large transaction make it difficult for an agreement to be reached. No analysis was completed on this property as the fatal flaw was identified prior The site is currently on the market for \$15.4M. As no land would be |
| Historical Significance Availability and Ownership Site Equity Analysis | The MoM opened in 1991 and has no historic significance. The MoM is currently owned by Pacific Western Bank and has been on the market for several months at an asking price of \$15.4M. Sears (an anchor location) retains ownership of their building and will not be part of any ownership change. Connect does not have the need or ability to purchase the entire property. At one point it was envisioned that Texas City would attempt to purchase the property with Connect contributing an amount for a portion of the property. The ability for Texas City to make this purchase is contingent upon the MoM asking price to fall drastically. The difficulty in negotiating and navigating such a large transaction make it difficult for an agreement to be reached. No analysis was completed on this property as the fatal flaw was identified prior The site is currently on the market for \$15.4M. As no land would be donated in this scenario, no appraisal would take place. |

| Funding Feasibility | Use of this site would necessitate that the Connect contribute \$1M towards |
|---------------------|--|
| Analysis | the purchase of the MoM site. This would necessitate the selling of the |
| | Mackey Building (Connect's current facility) in order to generate the |
| | necessary funds. While theoretically possible for Connect to generate the |
| | necessary funding, the lack of a land donation component would make it |
| | extremely difficult (if not impossible) for Connect to acquire the necessary |
| | amount of local match required to leverage the 5307 funds necessary to fund |
| | the construction of a new facility. |

Mall of the Mainland Analysis Results

The MoM site offers an interesting opportunity for Connect in terms of being in a suitable location and offering ample space. However, the cost outlay required by Connect (\$1 million) in order to buy into the location as well as to construct a new facility (an additional \$1-2 million) prohibits the location from being a suitable site for a Connect facility.

Texas City Location Analysis – 1401 33rd Street, Texas City, Texas

Concurrent with the search for a new administrative and fleet storage facility, an independent effort was concurrently underway in order to define a site for a new Connect Park & Ride (P&R) facility. After a thorough site assessment and selection process, documented in the *2013 Texas City Park &Ride and Pedestrian-Transit Access Master Plan*, Connect began discussions with Texas City regarding a city owned parcel of land located at 1401 33rd St.

Texas City had an interest in developing the vacant lot and agreed to donate a portion of the parcel to Connect for use as a Park and Ride facility.

In those conversations Connect also expressed their ongoing efforts to find a suitable location for a new administrative facility. Texas City agreed to donate the entire parcel for use as a Connect Park and Ride facility and a Connect administration and fleet storage facility. This ground lease was executed by the Gulf Coast Center on January 29, 2014. To further demonstrate their support of the project, Texas City also agreed to commit the 20% local share required to fund this advance planning report in order to further explore the feasibility of the location for an administration and fleet storage facility.

Figure 2.4 – Texas City Location



| Table 2.3 – Texas City Site Analysis | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Analysis Item | Finding | |
| Location/ Deadhead | The selected site in Texas City would result in a total deadhead savings of | |
| Analysis | 22.7 miles per day. This equates to an annual savings of \$7,062. | |
| | | |
| Architectural Analysis | As part of this advanced planning effort, a conceptual architectural analysis | |
| | has been completed. Utilization of this location is predicated on the | |
| | construction of a new structure for use by Connect. It is anticipated that a | |
| | new shared use facility would cost approximately \$2.5-\$5.6M dependent | |
| | upon if a maintenance facility is constructed, if compatible use space is built, | |
| | and the level of treatment desired. These costs include preliminary | |
| | engineering, final design, and contingency. | |
| Environmental Site | As the location previously housed an industrial use, it was determined that a | |
| Assessment | formal ESA was necessary. It became apparent that a Phase II had been | |
| | conducted in 2004. In order to validate the previous findings a new Phase II | |
| | was conducted in 2011 by the City of Texas City. The Phase II, which | |
| | included five soil borings, was conducted by Live Oak Environmental | |
| | Consultants. The report concludes that the results of the borings and | |
| | accompanying analysis do not present a significant risk to the property, | |

| | human health, or the environment. No further investigation is necessary. |
|--------------------------|--|
| | As part of this advanced planning effort, an environment analysis (EA) was completed in pursuit of a categorical exclusion from FTA. The EA did not |
| | reveal any significant findings. It is expected that FTA will award a |
| | Categorical Exclusion (CE) upon review. |
| Surrounding Land Use | The surrounding land use are mixed and predominantly composed of open space. There are scattered commercial uses located to the south and southeast of the lot. The parcel to the east is currently vacant. Parcels to the west are separated by a drainage canal. A large baseball complex (Carlos Garza Park) featuring seven baseball fields are located to the northeast. Texas City and Connect have discussed using a future Connect parking lot as spill- over parking for the ball fields. All parties are agreeable to this idea. |
| | The official Texas City Zoning Map defines the parcel as being partially zoned A-1 (single family residential) and partially zoned E (general business). |
| | It will be necessary to rezone the parcel to CIMU |
| | (commercial/industrial/mixed use) in order to comply with the current |
| | zoning ordinance. Texas City nor Connect anticipate this to present an |
| | issue. |
| I raffic Impacts | The ingress/egress road for the facility would likely be 33 rd St. to the east. |
| | 33° has a current width of ~35 ft., which while currently distribut, is equivalent to a 3 lane road. The businesses to the east of 33^{rd} generate a small |
| | amount of on-street parking which would likely necessitate being prohibited |
| | to allow ease of traffic flow for buses at the a.m. / p.m. peak ingress/egress |
| | periods. 33 rd provides access to a signalized intersection at FM 1764 to the |
| | south and Magnolia Ave. to the north. Beyond limiting on-street parking on |
| | 34 th street, no roadway modifications are anticipated. |
| Potential for Shared Use | The parcel has ample room for a shared uses. Current considerations include |
| | building sufficient space to host Galveston County Transit District Meetings (the District does not surrently have a regular meeting space) and sufficient |
| | space for Connect expansion, to be used by Texas City in the interim period |
| Expansion Ability | The 9.498 acre parcel will allow ample space for expansion. |
| | |
| Historical Significance | The parcel is currently vacant and is of no historical significance. |
| Availability and Ownership | The parcel is currently owned by the Texas City Economic Development Corporation. On January 29, 2014 the Gulf Coast Center and the City of Texas City agreed to a long term (40 year) ground lease for \$1 annually between the two parties. |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Site Equity Analysis | The site equity analysis was completed as part of the Environmental Justice documentation included with the request for a Categorical Exclusion (CE). FTA granted the CE request, indicating that the site was selected without regard to race, color, or national origin. Documentation related to the CE request is available in <i>Appendix B</i> . |
| Site Appraisal | The parcel is listed as Property ID# R175556 with the Galveston Central Appraisal District. The District currently lists the value at \$212,590. In order to verify this number, a formal appraisal was completed on April 1, 2013. The appraisal revealed the "as is" market value of the entire 9.3612 acre parcel to be \$530,000. The value of a 40-year ground lease is \$760,000. Another appraisal will be conducted prior to an executed grant with the FTA. |
| Funding Feasibility Analysis | As Texas City has already expressed a willingness to donate the parcel to be used as a park & ride facility and a Connect transit administrative facility/fleet storage facility. Using the 40-year ground lease value, \$760,000 will leverage an additional \$3,040,000 in FTA formula funding (for a total project cost of \$3.4M) that can be used toward design and construction costs. |

Texas City Analysis Results

The Texas City location offers Connect the best opportunity for future development. The ability to utilize a valuable parcel for \$1 a year and leverage the true value of the land will allow Connect to leverage \$3M in federal funding that it otherwise would need to find local cash to use. Texas City has agreed both in principle and by council action to the land donation.

Additionally, the site meets all other criteria, with no fatal flaws identified. Other benefits include use of excess night-time/weekend parking as spill-over parking for the adjacent Carlos Garza Park, the potential identification of compatible uses to be used by Texas City in the immediate future while preserving its use for future Connect expansion, and suitable surrounding land uses and roadways.

Finally, the deadhead analysis performed for all locations *(Table 2.4)* reveals that the Texas City location will provide the most annual savings from a reduction in fuel costs as well as vehicle depreciation.

| Table 2.4 – Deadhead Analysis | | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------|------------|----------|--|
| | | | Miles from | Miles | |
| | Miles from | Miles from | the | Texas | |
| | Existing Connect | La Marque | Mainland | City | |
| Route | Facility | Location | Location | Location | |
| Texas City Orange – East (1 bus) | 4.9 | 5.9 | 0.4 | 0.2 | |
| Texas City Orange – West (1 bus) | 4.5 | 4.9 | 8.2 | 2.8 | |
| Texas City Green (1 bus) | 1.6 | 2.3 | 5.2 | 0.1 | |
| Texas City / Tanger (1 bus) | 2.0 | 1.1 | 4.7 | 3.0 | |
| Texas City / Dickinson (1 bus) | 7.5 | 8.2 | 4.3 | 2.7 | |
| San Leon-Bacliff (1 bus) | 8.0 | 9.7 | 12.1 | 6.0 | |
| La Marque (1 bus) | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 4.2 | |
| Dickinson (1 bus) | 7.6 | 8.2 | 4.4 | 8.7 | |
| Total Deadhead Mileage (Two Way) | 82.0 | 80.6 | 80.2 | 55.3 | |
| Annual Deadhead Mileage ¹ | 21,320 | 20,956 | 20,852 | 14,368 | |
| Annual Fuel Cost (6.43 mpg ² at \$3.96 | \$13,130 | \$12,906 | \$12,842 | \$8,848 | |
| per gallon ³) | | | | | |
| Annual Deadhead Vehicle | \$8,528 | \$8,382 | \$8,341 | \$5,747 | |
| Depreciation ⁴ | | | | | |
| Total Annual Deadhead Cost | \$21,658 | \$21,288 | \$21,183 | \$14,596 | |
| ¹ 260 days per year | | | | | |

² Pennsylvania Transportation Institute (http://146.186.225.57/buses/367)

³ US Energy Information Administration (http://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/pet_pri_gnd_dcus_nus_a.htm).

⁴ Based on 200,000 mile life expectancy and a new Goshen price of \$80,000.

CHAPTER THREE: SITE LAYOUT



The Site Suitability Assessment in Chapter 2 demonstrates that the Texas City location is the most appropriate site for the new Connect Transit Administration Facility. Chapter 3 will focus on the conceptual site layout and building program for the facility.

SITE LAYOUT

The Texas City site has ample room for an administration facility that suits Connect's current and future needs. There is also room for a maintenance facility on the west end of the parcel. The northern portion of the site is planned for a future Texas City Park & Ride, as summarized in the *Texas City Pedestrian/Transit Access Master Plan.* The administration and maintenance facilities are depicted in *Figures 3.1 and 3.2*, along with ample parking for automobiles and buses.



Figure 3.1 – Texas City Location – Conceptual Site Layout

Figures 3.1 depicts the administration facility in red, located on the southeast corner of the site. There are 57 parking spaces associated with the administration facility to serve staff and visitor parking needs. The future maintenance facility, depicted in blue, will have 44 spaces. The site will also accommodate parking for 50 buses, which will allow for the fleet to grow from its current size of 26. *Table 3.1* summarizes the space program for the prescribed uses. A full conceptual layout, including dimensions, is available in Appendix C.





| Table 3.1 –GCC/Connect Transit Building and Lot Sizes | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | Lot Size | Admin. Facility Size | No. of Parking | | |
| Facility | (Sq. Ft.) | (Sq. Ft.) | Spaces | | |
| Administrative Facility Lot | 38,898 | 12,526 | 57 | | |
| Bus Parking Lot | 63,744 | - | 50 | | |
| Maintenance Facility Lot | 30,992 | 4,539 | 44 | | |

BUILDING PROGRAM

Administration Facility

Several meetings with Connect staff were conducted to determine current and future facility needs. *Table 3.2* describes the building program for the administration facility developed through feedback provided by Connect staff.

| Table 3.2 – Administration Facility Building Program | | | | |
|--|-------|---|-------|--|
| First Floor – Connect Transit (Sq. Ft.) | | Second Floor – Connect Transit/Lease Space (Sq. Ft.) | | |
| Elevator Waiting Area | 292 | Elevator/Stairs | 193 | |
| North Office 1 | 167 | North Office 1 | 133 | |
| North Office 2 | 167 | North Office 2 | 133 | |
| North Office 3 | 167 | North Office 3 | 133 | |
| North Office 4 | 133 | North Cubicle | 338 | |
| Waiting Room | 166 | North Office 4 | 157 | |
| Entryway | 209 | Women's Restroom | 87 | |
| Reception | 135 | Men's Restroom | 235 | |
| Conference | 411 | South Office 1 | 133 | |
| Driver Room | 653 | South Office 2 | 133 | |
| Locker Room | 226 | South Cubicle | 338 | |
| Driver's Women's Restroom | 87 | Storage | 157 | |
| Driver's Men's Restroom | 87 | Conference Room | 2825 | |
| Admin Women's Restroom | 87 | | | |
| Admin Men's Restroom | 87 | | | |
| Storage | 292 | | | |
| Machine IT Room | 133 | | | |
| South Office 1 | 133 | | | |
| South Office 2 | 133 | | | |
| South Office 3 | 314 | | | |
| South Office 4 | 133 | | | |
| Lunch Room | 411 | | | |
| | | | | |
| Total usable space | 4,623 | | 4,995 | |
| Hall/Common Space/Unusable Space | | | | |
| Total Facility Size 12,526 | | | | |

The administration facility is conceptualized as a two-story facility, with offices, reception, conference room, visitor waiting area, lunch room, restrooms, cubicles, IT room, storage, and elevator. The entire first floor will be designed to meet all of Connect's current operational and administrative needs. The second floor, which is roughly equivalent in square footage to the first floor, will provide ample room for Connect to expand their operations when necessary. The added space also provides Connect the opportunity to generate revenue to a potential lease tenant. The

entire facility totals approximately 12,526 sq. ft. *Figure 3.3* presents a layout of the facility according to the building program presented in *Table 3.2*.



Figure 3.3 – Administration Facility Layout

Expansion and Lease Opportunities

As previously mentioned, the administration facility concept depicted in Figure 3.3 includes a second floor which gives Connect the ability to expand their operations in response to a continued growth in service as described in *Chapter One*. It is important that a new administration facility, with the potential for future federal funding investments, be designed with extra space to accommodate future growth. The additional space could also be leased to a public or private entity, generating a revenue stream for Connect and Gulf Coast Center. The most desirable tenant would be a "transit-

compatible" entity which could provide a complimentary benefit to Connect's service and vise-versa. The following entities and types of entities could be a desirable fit as a tenant in the administration facility:

- Texas City Emergency Management The City of Texas City, while being a project partner in the development of the administration facility, has expressed interest in leasing space from Connect to house the City's Emergency Management (EM) department. Texas City EM plays an important role in disaster planning and evacuation in coordination with the Galveston County Office of Emergency Management. EM's primary goal is to prepare the City and surrounding area to respond to and to recover from the effects of disasters and emergencies. Due to Texas City's prime location in Galveston County, and their positioning near key arterials such as highways 146, 6, 3 and IH45, a new emergency management operations center located within Connect's facility would be well positioned to serve the public in the event of an emergency. There are many other benefits to having Texas City EM located at the Connect facility:
 - Large Lot Size In the event of an evacuation, Texas City EM would be coordinating the staging, embarking and disembarking of multiple vehicles with the ability to carry between 45 and 80 people at a time. EM could quickly utilize the entire lot, including the adjoining future park & ride lot, to evacuate local area residents.
 - Location near SH146 If EM occupied the lease space in Connect's facility, they could quickly direct emergency and evacuation vehicles to outlet to Highway 146, only a block away from the facility. Both surrounding streets Palmer Hwy. (1764) and Magnolia Ave. directly access Highway 146.
 - Use of Connect Transit Facilities and Vehicles Texas City EM currently has standing agreements with several charter bus carriers for bus provisions in the event of an evacuation. Given Connect Transit's local area services, EM and the Gulf Coast Center could potentially enter into an agreement for the provision of buses and to utilize the maintenance facility before an exodus of buses takes place in the event of a disaster.
 - Designation in Galveston County Evacuation Plan Emergency planning documents have designated Texas City as an "embarkation hub" for evacuees from Galveston Island. Currently, the Doyle Center serves as this facility. The ability to utilize a much larger facility and lot would be beneficial to overall evacuation efforts from the Texas Gulf Coast.

- Additional Transit-Compatible Entities Additional entities and businesses could occupy the lease space on the 2nd floor of the Administration Facility. There could be several types of non-profit entities that could directly benefit Connect Transit's operations or service level. Entities such as a disability training center for Connect Transit's operators and drivers, "Meals on Wheels" that could utilize Connect's services as part of their operations, and offices for the Galveston County Transit District have a direct relationship to Connect's transit services. Fit-out costs associated with accommodating such entities may be eligible for federal reimbursement. Other entities that may not have a direct relationship to transit, but would serve as a compliment include the following:
 - o Child Daycare
 - o Dry Cleaner
 - o Coffee Shop
 - o Restaurant
 - o Convenience Store

Maintenance Facility

The maintenance facility, which will serve to maintain Connect vehicles, is conceptualized on the western portion of the site layout depicted in *Figure 3.1*. The building program depicts a 4,539 sq. ft. facility with open bays, an office, break room, bathrooms and lockers. *Table 3.3* below shows the maintenance facility building program, while *Figure 3.4* provides an image.

| Table 3.3 – Maintenance Facility Building Program (Sq. Ft.) | | | |
|---|-------|--|--|
| Office 1 | 157 | | |
| Break Room | 262 | | |
| Bath 1 | 204 | | |
| Bath 2 | 204 | | |
| Lockers | 120 | | |
| Hall | 147 | | |
| Open Bays | 2220 | | |
| Storage | 813 | | |
| Total | 4,127 | | |
| Hall/Common Space | 412 | | |
| Total Facility Size | 4,539 | | |





Site Access

The Texas City site, at full build-out, will be utilized by onsite workers and visitors at the administrative facility and maintenance facility. In addition to the onsite workers, the location will be utilized by all Mainland Transit service. The Site is bound by Magnolia Ave, FM 1764 and 33rd and 34th St. All intersections in close proximity to the site on Magnolia Ave. are regulated by all way stop signs and intersections along FM 1764 are signalized.

Onsite workers at the administrative facility will both ingress and egress the facility along 33rd St. The majority of traffic generated will presumably feed into FM 1764 at the signalized intersection and travel either east into Texas City or west towards the interchange at SH 146. The minority of traffic will travel north to Magnolia Ave. and continue along collector and local roads to their final destination. Ingress to the facility will be through 33rd St. from FM 1764 or Magnolia Ave.

Onsite maintenance facility workers will ingress and egress the facility depending on which exit is built first, the one along 33rd St. or along Magnolia Ave. If along 33rd St. the traffic pattern will be similar to that of the administrative facilities. If along Magnolia, a car going east/west would proceed to FM 1764 via 33rd or 34th St. respectively. Workers with northern destinations may choose to travel along Magnolia Ave. westbound to the SH 146 feeder road, or proceed northbound on 34th St. Ingress to the Magnolia entrance/exit will be from FM1764 via 33rd or 34th St. additional traffic may come from the SH 146 feeder road into Magnolia Ave.

Bus access to and from the site will vary with the location of the exits, the route in question, and modifications in route alignments. For this reason, it is not necessary to discuss the specifics of ingress and egress points. Instead, general observations of traffic impact items and potential facility impacts to traffic will provide more useful long term information.

Traffic Impact Items

- On 33rd Street, the street with the highest planned influx of traffic, the current right-of- way (ROW) consists of 2 lanes of traffic and 2 lanes of on street parking. The current drive lanes are sufficient but, to add clarity, increase driver safety and decrease delays two options should be considered; either removing both sides of on street parking or only removing the west side of parking and adding striping to the road. These options will be evaluated in conjunction with Texas City and the local businesses as to limit the negative effects of this change.
- 34th St. will potentially see an increase in traffic, though not as significant as 33rd or none at all if the entrance/exit is placed along 33rd St. The road is currently at a level of service (LOS) that is sufficient for current usage, and adding less than 2% of the current annual daily traffic (ADT) should not decrease that level. The increase in traffic may mean that future rehabilitation plans for 34th St may need to be moved up as it needs to maintain that LOS as traffic continues to grow.
- FM 1764 will be relatively unaffected as all relevant intersections have designated turning lanes to limit the back up and delay to through traffic and are signalized so a small increase in traffic will not increase turning wait times or hinder through traffic.
- Magnolia Ave. will be relatively unaffected with new traffic flows, though depending on the location of the entrance/exit the all way stop signs at the intersections on 33rd and 34th St. may need to be reevaluated.



Figure 3.5 – Site Access and Area Traffic Signalization

| Table 3.4 - Analysis of Existing Road Conditions and Potential Facility Impacts | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Street - Classification | Existing Road Conditions. | Additional Observations | Potential Facility Impacts | |
| Magnolia Ave - Urban Local | Two lane un-striped local road with a ROW for 3 lanes. No on street parking. In a state of good repair (SGR) (new paving). Traffic regulated by all-way stop signs. No listed AADT or ADT available. However, roadway is not significant and has a low V/C ratio. | Minimal traffic, minimal delays at intersections, wide lanes, and ability to adjust ROW if needed. Recent rehabilitation with new pave. | Facility would generate increased traffic flow towards 33rd and 34th St. The all-way stop sign intersections may need to be examined depending on the time of use (impact on 34th St traffic) | |
| 33 rd St Urban Local | Two lane un-striped local road with on street parking on both sides. In a SGR. Traffic regulated by stop signs at Magnolia intersection and intersection is signalized at FM 1764. Designated turning lanes at FM 1764 intersection. No listed AADT or ADT, but based on surrounding street ADT's it can be assumed the roadway is not significant and current volume to capacity (V/C) ratio is low. | Minimal traffic, minimal delay at Magnolia intersection, minimal to slight delay at FM1764, wide lanes and minimal impact from parked cars with current usage. | Increase in traffic from Admin. Facility as well as from the bus/maintenance lot. Current conditions are well over current needs and the road should be able to maintain a high LOS with the inflow of new traffic. Should work with business owners and Texas City to remedy the increased traffic and possibly discuss the removal of on-street parking completely or removal of the west side and striping the road. | |
| 34 th St Urban Collector | Two lane striped collector road, no on street parking. In a SGR but not new paving. Traffic regulated by stop signs at Magnolia intersection and intersection is signalized at FM 1764. Designated turning lanes at FM 1764 intersection. ADT estimated at 4,980 (2011) on the north side of FM 1764. | Minimal traffic, minimal delay at Magnolia. Designated turning lanes reduces queue time at FM 1764, higher density demand for cars with a smaller ROW than 33 rd St. | Road should not see significantly more traffic, Because of all way stop sign and signalization at FM 1764 new traffic should not be concentrated along the road. While 34th St is in a SGR but without new paving, the increase in usage and demand of the road may require acceleration of future rehabilitation plans. | |
| FM 1764 - Urban Principal Arterial/Multilane Highway | Seven lane principal arterial road with a turning lane between 3 lanes of traffic. Signalized intersections with turning lanes. AADT of 26,000 (2012). High LOS. | Congestion at intersections by SH 146 interchange, slight traffic and large ROW. Cars turning off of and onto FM1764 do not affect through traffic because of designated turning lanes and signalization. | Because the intersections at 33rd and 34th St. are signalized and designated turning lanes exist entering and on FM 1764 traffic generated by the facility will not affect through traffic flow on FM 1764. While it will increase the AADT slightly it should be insignificant compared to the traffic the road already handles. | |
| SH 146- Urban Principal Arterial | Principal arterial road with four lanes of traffic and a median. AADT 24,000 north of the FM 1764 interchange, AADT 27,000 south of the FM 1764 interchange (2012) | High capacity limited access highway with a high LOS. | AADT will increase slightly but not significantly. It should remain at the same LOS, as there are no significant impacts from the facility directly on SH 146. | |

Gulf Coast Center - Texas City Urbanized Area Connect Transit Administration & Maintenance Facility Plan 2014

CHAPTER FOUR: CAPITAL & OPERATING COSTS



The following chapter depicts the capital costs for construction and implementation of the Connect administration/maintenance facility along with associated bus and automobile parking lots. Conceptual costs for streetscape improvements within ¹/₂ mile of the site are also included.

Chapter 3 shows a conceptual site plan and building program for administration and maintenance facilities, associated parking, bus parking, and pedestrian-transit access infrastructure around the site. Capital costs are developed through an examination of peer facility construction and infrastructure costs, Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) unit bid prices¹, and the application of appropriate inflation factors. The following unit costs were used in determining the conceptual costs for the project:

- **\$250 per square foot** for construction costs associated with the administration facility.
- **\$150 per square foot** for construction costs associated with the maintenance facility.
- \$3,000 per space (9'x17') for construction costs associated with automobile parking.
- \$4,500 per space (13'x43') for construction costs associated with bus parking.
- Various unit construction costs associated with basic pedestrian/transit access infrastructure improvements

The following sections summarize the costs for each project component based on the above unit pricing.

¹ http://www.txdot.gov/business/letting-bids/average-low-bid-unit-prices.html

Administration Facility

Costs to construct the administration facility were derived from recent capital projects in the Houston-Galveston region². The following summarizes the capital costs needed to construct the administration facility:

| Table 4.1 - Construction Costs: Administration Facility | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| Structure | \$3,131,500 | | | |
| Lot | \$171,000 | | | |
| Subtotal | \$3,302,500 | | | |
| PE (2%) | \$66,100 | | | |
| Design (PS&E) (8%) | \$264,200 | | | |
| Administration (7%) | \$231,200 | | | |
| Contingency (10%) | \$386,400 | | | |
| Total Administration Facility | \$4,250,400 | | | |

*Rounded to the nearest 100

Maintenance Facility

The costs from recent regional maintenance facility projects were considered when formulating the capital costs for the Connect maintenance facility. The following cost breakdown is associated with construction of the maintenance facility:

| Table 4.2 - Construction Costs: Maintenance Facility | | | | |
|--|-------------|--|--|--|
| Structure | \$680,900 | | | |
| Lot | \$144,000 | | | |
| Subtotal | \$824,900 | | | |
| PE (2%) | \$16,500 | | | |
| Design (PS&E) (8%) | \$66,000 | | | |
| Administration (7%) | \$57,700 | | | |
| Contingency (10%) | \$96,500 | | | |
| Total Maintenance Facility | \$1,061,600 | | | |

*Rounded to the nearest 100

² City of Conroe Park and Ride (2014), City of Galveston Transit Terminal (2013), Sterling Ridge Park and Ride (2011)

Bus Parking

The following summarizes the costs needed to construct the on-site dedicated bus parking:

| Table 4.3 - Construction Costs: Bus Parking | | | |
|---|-----------|--|--|
| Lot | \$225,000 | | |
| PE (2%) | \$4,500 | | |
| Design (PS&E) (8%) | \$18,000 | | |
| Administration (7%) | \$15,800 | | |
| Contingency (10%) | \$26,300 | | |
| Total Bus Parking Lot | \$289,600 | | |

*Rounded to the nearest 100

Figure 4.1 – Connect Administration Facility Individual Components



Pedestrian Transit – Access Improvements

Basic costs for pedestrian-transit access improvements adjacent to the facility are included as part of the project costs. The following section discusses the justification for the improvements as per the FTA Livable Communities Initiative (LCI) Program as well as the identified LCI corridors and associated capital costs.

FTA Livable Communities Initiative Program

The FTA Livable Communities Initiative (LCI)³ program provides a framework for streetscape improvements that enhance pedestrian access to transit facilities and services. Improvements such as sidewalks, hike and bike trails, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant ramps, pedestrian amenities (i.e. benches and trash receptacles), pedestrian-oriented lighting, and transit shelters are considered federally eligible for FTA funding if occurring within one half mile of transit stop or station. ⁴

Recommended LCI Pedestrian Transit – Access Improvements

The following recommended pedestrian-transit access improvements will be implemented in order to support increased access to the facility. Each block face on the selected corridors will include the following basic pedestrian-transit access infrastructure where needed:

- Sidewalks Standard 5-foot sidewalks are needed on every block face within each selected LCI corridor and will be included in the LCI enhancement scheme. The construction of sidewalks on the selected LCI corridors will greatly facilitate access for pedestrians to transit.
- ADA Ramps Each intersection along the LCI corridors and between each block face will include ADA ramps where safe crossing is needed for disabled pedestrians. ADA ramps are necessary for seamless connectivity between sidewalks at all intersections. Connecting up sidewalks with ADA ramps will greatly facilitate access to buses and the facility complex. Every block face should have a maximum of four ADA ramps to serve pedestrians at each intersection crossing where applicable.
- Crosswalks and stop bars Each block face should have a maximum of four crosswalks to serve pedestrians at each intersection crossing where applicable. Crosswalk and stop bar striping can increase protection to pedestrians from automobiles at each intersection.
- Curbs If needed, curbs will be included as an added protective barrier between pedestrians and automobile traffic. The block faces that already have sufficient curb infrastructure will not be included in the LCI enhancement scheme.

³ "Livable Communities Initiative." <u>National Transportation Library</u>. Gordan J. Linton. Accessed 6 Oct. 2012 http://ntl.bts.gov/DOCS/livbro.html

⁴ Final Policy Statement on the Eligibility of Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Under Federal Transit Law." <u>Federal Register / Vol. 76, No. 161 / Docket No. FTA-2009-0052 /Friday, August 19, 2011</u>. Accessed 6 Oct. 2012 http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-08-19/pdf/2011-21273.pdf

Costs for the construction of pedestrian-transit access improvements include all of the previously mentioned elements. Costs were derived from recent local area projects and TxDOT average low bid unit pricing.

Figure 4.2 shows the one half mile Livable Communities Initiative (LCI) area (within the yellow circle) that can be federally protected, generated from the proposed Administration and Maintenance Facility.



Figure 4.2 – Connect Administration Facility LCI $\frac{1}{2}$ Mile Area

The following corridors are included as eligible LCI projects that serve the facility complex (depicted on Figure 4.2, above):

- 34th Street N. Orange Avenue to FM 1764 (east side) 1,607 LF
- 34th Street N. FM 1764 to 9th Ave. N. 2,550 LF
- 33rd Street N. Magnolia Ave. to FM 1764 (east side) 1,099 LF
- 32nd Street N. FM 1764 to 7th Ave. N (east side) 1,085 LF
- 31st Street N. FM 1764 to Danforth Memorial Dr. 3,337 LF
- Magnolia Ave. 34th St. N. to 29th St. N. (south side) 2,977 LF

The following table details the pedestrian-transit access improvements included in the project.

| Table 4.4 - Construction Costs: Pedestrian-Transit Access Infrastructure | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|-----------|--|--|
| Corridor | Units | Cost | Total | | |
| 34th Street | | | | | |
| 5ft. Sidewalks (LF) | 4,157 | \$34 | \$140,299 | | |
| Curbs (LF) | 3,022 | \$18 | \$54,396 | | |
| ADA Ramps (EA) | 7 | \$1,200 | \$8,400 | | |
| Crosswalks (EA) | 6 | \$500 | \$3,000 | | |
| | | | \$206,095 | | |
| 33rd Street | | | | | |
| 5ft. Sidewalks (LF) | 1,099 | \$34 | \$37,091 | | |
| Curbs (LF) | - | \$18 | \$0 | | |
| ADA Ramps (EA) | 3 | \$1,200 | \$3,600 | | |
| Crosswalks (EA) | 2 | \$500 | \$1,000 | | |
| | | | \$41,691 | | |
| 32nd Street | | | | | |
| 5ft. Sidewalks (LF) | 1,085 | \$34 | \$36,619 | | |
| Curbs (LF) | 814 | \$18 | \$14,652 | | |
| ADA Ramps (EA) | 2 | \$1,200 | \$2,400 | | |
| Crosswalks (EA) | 2 | \$500 | \$1,000 | | |
| | | | \$54,671 | | |
| 31st Street | | | | | |
| 5ft. Sidewalks (LF) | 3,337 | \$34 | \$112,624 | | |
| Curbs (LF) | 3,037 | \$18 | \$54,666 | | |
| ADA Ramps (EA) | 20 | \$1,200 | \$24,000 | | |

Gulf Coast Center - Texas City Urbanized Area Connect Transit Administration & Maintenance Facility Plan 2014

| Crosswalks (EA) | 10 | \$500 | \$5,000 |
|--|----------|----------|-----------|
| | | | \$196,290 |
| Magnolia Avenue | | | |
| 5ft. Sidewalks (LF) | 2,977 | \$34 | \$100,474 |
| Curbs (LF) | - | \$18 | \$0 |
| ADA Ramps (EA) | 9 | \$1,200 | \$10,800 |
| Crosswalks (EA) | 9 | \$500 | \$4,500 |
| | | | \$115,774 |
| | | Subtotal | \$614,500 |
| PE (2%) | | | \$12,300 |
| Design (PS&E) (8%) | | | \$49,200 |
| | \$43,000 | | |
| Contingency (10%) | | | \$71,900 |
| Total Pedestrian-Transit Access Infrastructure | | | \$790,900 |

*Rounded to the nearest 100

Conceptual Operating Costs

Along with the capital cost of construction and implementation of the Administration and Maintenance Facilities, Chapter 4 provides conceptual operating expenses associated with each facility. This section briefly summarizes operating costs for the Administration Facility, the potential leasable space, and the Maintenance Facility.

Operating Costs: Administration Building

To develop costs associated with the Administration facility, a review of the GCC's 2013 budget was necessary. GCC attributes approximately 11,600 sq.ft. of their existing facility, the Mackey Building, to administration for Connect's transit services. GCC costs attributed to administration operations include bonding, insurance (windstorm insurance making up the bulk of the costs), janitorial, grounds maintenance, and other miscellaneous costs. Based on previous fiscal year costs, GCC estimates that approximately \$68,000, or just under \$6 a square foot, is attributed to the cost of operating Connect Transit administrative services annually. Table 4.5 below summarizes the estimated annual operating costs for the conceptual 12,526 sq. ft. Administration Facility in Texas City, which is calculated at approximately \$75,000.

| Table 4.5 - Operating Costs: Administration Facility | | | | | |
|--|--------|-----------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | Sa Et | Cost por Sal Et | Total Estimated Annual | | |
| | | | | | |
| Administration Facility | 12,526 | \$6.00 | \$75,000 | | |
| | | | | | |

Operating Costs: Lease

Operating costs associated with maintaining a lease can vary depending on the type of tenant, but the general "rule of thumb" is that a building owner should expect to spend up to 20% of the annual cost of a commercial lease on lease operating costs. Lease operating costs include basic building management, accounting, audit and attorneys' fees applicable to the management of the lessee during the normal course of business.

Without knowing the type of tenant that will occupy the lease space in the Administration Facility, comparable commercial lease properties were examined in the surrounding areas within Texas City. Based on nearby comparable properties and consultation with a local area office leasing agent, Connect Transit can expect to lease their space at a rate of \$10.00 per sq. ft. provided that the entire 6,282 sq. ft. is leased in its entirety. This would mean an annual lease of \$62,000 of which **\$12,000** would be needed for lease management for a gross revenue of \$50,000.

Operating Costs: Maintenance Building

Since Connect Transit does not currently have its own dedicated maintenance facility, conceptual maintenance operating costs must be derived from an analysis of peer systems annual expenses attributed to the repair and maintenance of their existing fleets. Table 4.6 below summarizes the average cost of peer systems that maintain less than 200 vehicles.⁵

⁵ Derived from the National Transit Database (NTD); RY 2012 data on systems with less than 200 vehicles: http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/data.htm

| Table 4.6 - Average Conceptual Annual Cost - Connect Transit Maintenance Facility | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------|--|
| | Fixed- | | |
| Labor (Average Per Peer Vehicle) | Route | Demand Response | |
| Other salaries and wages | \$17,400 | \$4,000 | |
| Fringe Benefits | \$10,500 | \$2,300 | |
| Services | \$2,800 | \$1,700 | |
| Labor - Per Vehicle | \$30,700 | \$8,000 | |
| Materials and Supplies (Average Per Peer Vehicle) | | | |
| Fuel and lubricants | \$700 | \$300 | |
| Tires and tubes | \$100 | \$100 | |
| Other materials and supplies | \$12,700 | \$3,000 | |
| Casualty and Liability Costs | \$2,900 | \$900 | |
| Miscellaneous Expenses | \$400 | \$0 | |
| Materials and Supplies - Per Vehicle | \$16,800 | \$4,300 | |
| | | | |
| Total Modal Expenses - Per Vehicle | \$47,500 | \$12,300 | |
| Number of Connect Vehicles in Galveston County | 12 | 25 | |
| Total Modal Expenses - Per Connect Vehicle | \$570,000 | \$307,500 | |
| Total Conceptual Operating Costs for Maintenance | \$729,900 | | |

Table 4.7 above calculates a total annual operating cost for maintenance as **\$307,500** for 25 demand response Type III vehicles that will be operating in Connect's Galveston County service area.

Conceptual Operating Costs Summary – Entire Project

Table 4.7 below summarizes the conceptual annual operating costs associated with the

Administration and Maintenance Facilities:

| Table 4.7 - Operating Costs: Administration and Maintenance Facilities | | | |
|--|--------------|--|--|
| Project Component | *Annual Cost | | |
| Administration Facility Operating Costs | | | |
| (based on Mackey Building utilization) | \$75,000 | | |
| Lease Operating Costs | | | |
| (based on percentage of projected lease) | \$12,600 | | |
| Maintenance Facility Operating Costs | | | |
| (based on peer system examination) | \$729,900 | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL OPERATING COSTS | \$817,500 | | |
| | | | |
| *Rounded to the nearest 100 | | | |

Conceptual Capital Costs Summary – Entire Project

Table 4.8 below summarizes the capital costs associated with the Administration and Maintenance

Facilities.

| Table 4.8 - Construction Costs: Entire Project | | | |
|--|--------------|--|--|
| Project Component | *Annual Cost | | |
| Administration Facility | | | |
| Structure | \$3,131,500 | | |
| Lot | \$171,000 | | |
| Total Administration Facility | \$3,302,500 | | |
| | | | |
| Maintenance Facility | | | |
| Structure | \$680,900 | | |
| Lot | \$144,000 | | |
| Total Maintenance Facility | \$824,900 | | |
| | | | |
| Total Bus Parking Lot | \$225,000 | | |
| | | | |
| Pedestrian-Transit Access Infrastructure | \$614,500 | | |
| | | | |
| Total Capital Project Costs | \$4,966,900 | | |
| | | | |
| PE (2%) | \$99,400 | | |
| Design (PS&E) (8%) | \$397,400 | | |
| Administration (7%) | \$347,700 | | |
| Contingency (10%) | \$581,100 | | |
| TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS | \$6,392,500 | | |

*Rounded to the nearest 100

CHAPTER FIVE: BENEFITS ANALYSIS



Background

The proposed Gulf Coast Center (GCC) Connect Transportation Administration and Maintenance Facility, along with nearby pedestrian/transit access improvements, can enhance the ability of Connect Transportation to expand commuter and local transit services offered to residents, employees, and visitors. In addition, bringing the proposed improvements to Texas City will enhance overall livability both locally and regionally. The FTA encourages recipients of federal transit funds to enhance pedestrian access to transit and/or stops, create Transit Oriented Development (TOD), participate in joint development, enhance the effectiveness of mass transit projects, and increase coordination between mass transportation and other modes of transportation. The FTA supports favorable access conditions that provide a community-oriented, well-designed, safe, and secure environment for the transit user, which in turn, will increase ridership and confidence in the transit service.

The DOT, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) established the Sustainable Communities Partnership (SCP) or Livability Partnership in 2011. In part, the partnership intends to integrate planning and investment, provide a vision for sustainable growth and develop livability measures and tools.¹ These three agencies are poised to help guide and encourage smart growth throughout the nation.

The benefits analysis examines how the project improves the following criteria:

- State of good repair
- Economic competitiveness
- Livability
- Sustainability
- Safety

http://www.epa.gov/dced/partnership/index.html

¹ "HUD-DOT-EPA Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities" -

Several benefits are included in each criteria and this chapter will provide a qualitative description, a quantified analysis and/or a monetized benefit. Each monetized benefit is supplemented with a description of the methodology used to quantify the benefit. The various benefits have been studied by a variety of nationally recognized authorities, including the Transit Coordination Research Program, the Transportation Research Board, the National Research Council, and the Governmental Accountability Office, where methods have been developed for predicting and monetizing the ridership benefits associated with these types of improvements.

STATE OF GOOD REPAIR (SGR)

Ensuring that the United States is maintains its critical infrastructure is a top priority for the FTA and U.S. DOT.² Three considerations were evaluated to determine the impact the proposed Connect Transportation Administration and Maintenance Facility's ability to enhance the Center's transit SRG.

Age

As the transit asset ages so does it maintenance needs. The existing administration facility was constructed in 1985, which is near the end of its useful life. Initially a provider of only demand response service, Connect Transit has dramatically increased its transit offerings in recent years. Fixed route service has exploded from 3 routes in 2008 with annual ridership of 15,740 trips to 13 fixed routes in 2013 with annual ridership of 214,903 trips. This represents ridership growth of over 1,000% in a 5-year period. As the agency's transit services have grown, so have its office space and fleet storage needs. In addition to a lack of space, the facility also lacks many modern features common to most other transit facilities, such as:

- a.) Limited/protected access and security features for entry and within the structure
- b.) Fleet/facility monitoring systems
- c.) Dedicated fleet parking/storage areas
- d.) Dedicated fleet ingress/egress
- e.) Secured and monitored area for fare box counting/storage

The constraints associated with operating from a 30-year old facility are currently hindering Connects ability to operate as efficiently as possible, and will prevent the agency from being able to further expand and serve more of the public in the future. The proposed Connect Transportation

² U.S. Department of Transportation of Transportation. 2013 Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions and Performance. August 2014.

Administration and Maintenance Facility will provide the agency with updated and new facilities that will be constructed to accommodate the needs of the agency for the next 30 to 40 years.

Deferred Maintenance

The existing facility is energy inefficient, lacks sufficient insulation, and has foundation issues. Old T-12 lighting with ballasts must be replaced on an ongoing basis. The septic system requires periodic repair and converting to the City of Texas City's system is cost prohibitive. The proposed Connect Transportation Administration and Maintenance Facility will not require significant maintenance for several years.

Improved Maintenance, Condition of Fleet and/or Other Assets

Relocating the fleet to the heart of Connect Transit operations will provide daily deadhead savings of 22.7 miles, resulting in increased vehicle life, fuel savings, and overall improved condition of the fleet.

Construction of the proposed facility is also the first step toward improving the agency's maintenance practices. Connect currently contracts all maintenance out to local vendors in Texas City and La Marque. However, the agency has now grown large enough to warrant the development of an in-house maintenance facility. The existing fleet storage area does not have adequate space to add such a facility. Constructing the new administrative facility will set the stage for the second phase of the project, which will be the maintenance facility. This will enhance fleet maintenance of FTA-funded vehicles and improve Connects ability to accurately track and document service.

ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

The DOT encourages major transit investment projects *to enhance the economic competitiveness of a community through timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services and other basic needs and expanded business access to markets – largely through increased accessibility and mobility choices.*³ The City of Texas City desires to retain and maintain a competitive business climate for both national and locally owned businesses. However, Texas City must resolve several important mobility-related issues in order to continue to expand its housing base, namely improved regional transit services from Connect Transit.

³ U.S. Department of Transportation. Frequently Asked Question, Livability. March 2013. http://www.dot.gov/livability/faqs#There%20is%20a%20lot%20said

The following categories were examined to evaluate the economic impact of the development of the proposed Connect Transit Administration and Maintenance Facility:

- Job Creation
- Improved Business Climate
- Transit Cost Savings / Revenue Stream

Job Creation

The proposed project would generate economic impacts and create jobs. These economic impacts are quantified according to DOT guidelines for short- and long-term impacts, as follows:

<u>Short-term jobs</u> are created during construction of the project.

Long-term jobs are created and expenditures made as a result of the operations and maintenance of the project. There typically are three distinct effects — direct, indirect, and induced — during the analysis of economic impact. The total economic impact is the sum of the direct, indirect, and induced effects. These effects are defined as follows:

- **Direct effect** represents the initial expenditures (e.g., construction expenditures) received by businesses located in the study area.
- Indirect effect represents the impact of the additional business spending generated as these businesses sell more output and, in turn, purchase additional inputs from their suppliers (e.g., machinery manufacturers).
- Induced effect represents the increase in economic activity, over and above the direct and indirect effects, associated with the increased labor income that accrues to workers and is spent on household goods and services purchased from area businesses.

Short-Term Jobs

The methodology used was developed by the White House Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) for estimating jobs for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009.⁴ The method applies a value of one job-year per \$92,000 in expenditures. For every \$92,000 spent, 64% of the job-years represent direct and indirect effects and 36% of the job-years are induced effects. Figure 5.1 shows the total short-term jobs created from the capital cost expended on the proposed project.

⁴ Executive Office of the President, Council of Economic Advisers, "Estimates of Job Creation from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009," Washington, D.C., May 11, 2009. Pg. 7





Long-Term Jobs

Long-term employment benefits were calculated to measure the job-creation impact of ongoing maintenance and operation needs for the proposed administration and maintenance facility and associated pedestrian improvements. Table 5.1 presents the calculation of the number of long-term jobs created by the proposed project. Benefits were estimated using an annual cost factor for operations and maintenance and an average hourly wage.

Operations and Maintenance costs are estimated at \$6 per sq. ft. for a total of 17,065 sq. ft. (Administration Building-12,526 sq. ft. and Maintenance Facility 4,539 sq. ft.)

The Bureau of Labor Statistics set the 2014 average hourly wage for maintenance, cleaning and grounds keeping for the Houston-Baytown-Huntsville region at \$10.52.⁵

| Table 5.1 – Long-Term Job Creation | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| Annual Operations and Maintenance Cost | \$102,000 | | | |
| Average Hourly Wage for Maintenance Level Work | \$10.52 | | | |
| Benefit Percentage | 35% | | | |
| Wage and Benefit Rate | \$14.20 | | | |
| Calculation of Hours Worked (\$102,000 / \$13.12) | 8,159 hours | | | |
| Annual Full-Time Equivalent Hours - Definition | 2,020 hours | | | |
| Number of FTEs Created | ~3.5 FTEs | | | |

Improved Business Climate

A report by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) supports the principle that investment in transit infrastructure yields benefits from increased property and sales taxes. The report, *The Benefits of Public Transportation: Building Investment Value in Our Economy and Marketplac,e* studied not only the large urban markets such as Portland, Oregon, and Dallas, Texas, but also smaller markets, such as Corpus Christi, Texas, and Tampa, Florida:

⁵ Bureau of Labor Statistics, http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_26420.htm#37-0000. Accessed August 11, 2014.)

Corpus Christi, Texas: Investment in the Regional Transportation Authority's Six Point Station has spurred occupancy in empty store fronts and development of new high-quality retail and business services in an economically diverse neighborhood. Commercial property valuations have risen from \$5 million to \$8 million.

Tampa, Florida: The HARTline bus system coordinated development of its new University Area Transit Center in a chronically depressed neighborhood with development of a nearby community center and renovation of a major mall. The result was over \$75 million of development near the transit center, higher land values and increased tax revenue to the area.⁶

Results from these cities and others are promising. On average, property values that are within a 5minute to 10-minute walk from high-quality transit infrastructure developments are being valued for 20 percent to 25 percent more than comparable properties farther away. However, the mix of elements that fueled these successes encompasses more than just transit, and it is this subtle formula that must be tailored to each specific context.

The proposed project would create a safe, convenient, walkable, and state-of-the-art transportation infrastructure that will help connect transit to major residential areas, essential services, and jobs. Enhancing transportation infrastructure Texas City and within the Connect Transit service area would result in maintaining and building a strong business climate.

Transit Cost Saving/Revenue Stream

The construction of the new Connect Transit Administration and Maintenance Facility in Texas City will benefit GCC by saving money on outsourced services and creating a revenue stream through lease space. The following factors will have a significant positive economic impact on the transit district in a variety of ways:

- Decrease in Rent & Utilities (Opportunity Cost) The proposed facility would provide approximately 11,600 sq. ft. of office space. The Mackey Building could either be sold or rented to a third party of approximately \$10 per square foot. GCC would otherwise rent office space for approximately \$10 per square foot for its needs. GCC will be saving approximately \$960 a month in rent through 100% ownership of the Multimodal Facility.
- Decrease in Training Facility Rent Cost Because the Administrative Facility has integrated a training room into the facility design, GCC will be saving \$3,000 annually

⁶ American Public Transportation Association. The Benefit of Public Transportation: Building Investment Value in Our Economy and Marketplace. www.apta.org. Accessed 9-8-05.

in outsourced training fees.

- Leasing Revenues from Mixed-Use Space GCC conservatively estimates that is will charge \$10 per square for the 6,282 sq. ft. of mixed use space. The net revenue will be approximately \$8 per square foot or ~\$50,000 annually.
- Reduction in Bus Storage Costs Because the new Administrative Facility will have ample bus storage, Gulf Coast Center will not need to pay to store buses, thereby saving ~\$3,000 annually.

Table 5.2 below summarizes GCC's annual cost saving through implementation Connect Transportation Administration and Maintenance Facility.

| Economic Benefit for GCC | Annual | Monetization Factor | |
|--|-----------|--------------------------------|--|
| Economic Denem for Gee | Reduction | | |
| Decrease in Rent & Utilities | \$11,600 | \$960 per month | |
| Decrease in Training Facility Rent Cost | \$3,000 | Annually | |
| Leasing Revenue | \$50,000 | *6,282 sq. ft. @ \$10 sq. foot | |
| Bus Storage | \$3,000 | Annually | |
| Total Savings | \$67,600 | Annually | |
| *Figures based on area comps in Texas City | | | |

Table 5.2 – GCC Annual Cost Savings

LIVABILITY

In June 2009, the current administration created the Sustainable Communities Partnership (SCP). The Livability Partnership brings together the EPA, HUD, and DOT to plan for communities that are efficient consumers of housing, transportation, and energy use. The City of Texas City, in partnership with the Gulf Coast Center, has an opportunity to leverage this focus on smart development to improve its overall livability, provide better transit connectivity, develop more inviting streets, and create a sense of place.

The Livability Partnership has adopted six principles to guide its mission, as follows:

- Provide more transportation choices
- Promote equitable and affordable housing
- Enhance economic competitiveness
- Target resources to existing communities

- Coordinate and leverage federal policies and investments
- Value unique characteristics of communities, no matter their size

Transit Livability Elements

The Livability Partnership also emphasizes the importance of transportation choices — whether that is bus, biking, walking, or rail. The FTA has created key transit elements that are encouraged under the FTA's participation in the Livability Partnership. These key elements include the following:

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD): TOD aims to develop mixed-use high-density communities that are oriented near transit facilities. By design, TOD encourages pedestrian and bicycle activity and supports a high level of transit use. The proposed facility project could likely be a catalyst for future TOD.

Joint Development: Where transit facilities are to be constructed, project stakeholders may have an opportunity to construct space for other transit-compatible uses. The capital cost to construct space for compatible uses can be funded, in part, with federal funding administered by the FTA. The Connect Transit Administration Facility was designed to include shell space that could potentially host a transit-compatible entity. Joint development could be a potential component for this facility given the right tenant.

Intercity Bus: Intercity bus services typically connect rural areas with larger regional transit systems and/or national transit systems. Intercity bus services are essential for non-urbanized residents to connect with essential services, such as specialized healthcare facilities. The proposed facility complex could have the ability to accommodate intercity bus carriers, but is unlikely to attract intercity bus service.

Transit Enhancements: Areas within ½ mile of a transit stop or transit terminal are eligible for FTA funding for transit enhancements (TE). Eligible improvements include repair and/or construction of sidewalks, curbs, ramps, driveways and crosswalks. Landscaping and installation of street amenities, such as transit shelters, pedestrian-oriented lighting, benches, bike racks, and waste receptacles also are eligible for funding. The project includes pedestrian enhancements that would create a safe, inviting connection from the surrounding development to public transportation, detailed on Chapter X.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Enhancements: Much like the TE policies, FTA provides funding for bicycle enhancements (e.g., bike racks and lockers); however, the eligible area has increased to 3 miles from a transit stop or terminal. The proposed facility complex would provide a route stop and a future maintenance facility for Connect Transit buses with bus racks that accommodate cyclists.

Art in Transit: This element supports the design and placement of art in and/or near transit facilities. The FTA encourages the participation of local artists. The proposed Connect Transit Administration and Maintenance Facility final design will consider art and/or art concepts from artists in the final design.

The proposed project would help meet most of the principles outlined in the Livability Partnership with the addition of the proposed facility, mixed-use development, pedestrian streetscape and other related improvements, leveraging local dollars, and enhancing the community's identity. The proposed project focuses on key transit elements outlined by the FTA, which include joint development, transit improvements, and bicycle and pedestrian enhancements.

Pedestrian/Transit Access

Knowing the existing conditions of the pedestrian infrastructure and the bus level of service (BLOS) is important in selecting priority projects, both pedestrian and transit; however, the relationship between the pedestrian infrastructure and the BLOS directly affects ridership and environmental benefits. A report prepared for the Transit Coordination Research Program, TRB, and the National Research Council, in association with TTI, states the following:⁷

The passenger point of view, or quality of service, directly measures passengers' perception of the availability, comfort, and convenience of transit service. There are a number of factors that measure pedestrian and transit quality of service:

- Service coverage (near one's origin and destination)
- Pedestrian environment
- Scheduling: frequency of service
- Amenities
- Transit information
- Transfers
- Total trip time
- Cost
- Safety and security
- Passenger loads
- Appearance and comfort

⁷ Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual, Kittelson and Associates, Inc.

Reliability

Of the factors listed above, the following items address pedestrian quality of service.

Pedestrian Environment – Even if a transit stop is located within a reasonable walking distance of one's origin and destination, the areas around the transit stop must provide a comfortable walking environment for transit users. The proposed project would enhance the pedestrian environment surrounding the project area.

Amenities – The amenities that are provided within the walking distance of transit stops and stations help make transit more comfortable and convenient for transit users. Typical amenities include benches, shelters, informational signage, and waste receptacles. Amenities that will be beneficial to pedestrians will be included.

Safety and Security – Passenger perception of safety must be considered in addition to actual conditions. Transit corridors and stops must be well lit. Planting strips and/or on-street parking can provide barriers between pedestrians and vehicles. Development of the proposed facility would use a multidisciplinary approach to deterring criminal behavior through environmental design, which is also known as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), as well as other best practices.

Appearance and Comfort – Having aesthetically pleasing and comfortable transit stops with amenities, pedestrian lighting, and landscaping improves transit's image, which is especially important when trying to attract choice riders, who are riders that choose not to drive. The proposed facility development will include amenities, lighting, and landscaping.

The relationship between an improved pedestrian environment and its contribution to a better transit service and increased ridership has been documented in several studies nationwide. The most recent research is included in the 2009 *Quality and Level of Service Handbook*, prepared by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). The handbook addresses the relationship between the pedestrian environment, which is measured in pedestrian level of service (PLOS), and the bus service performance, which is measured in BLOS. The handbook presents evidence of a positive relationship between the quality of the pedestrian environment and the quality of the bus service.

Similarly, the proposed facility will enhance transit access from adjacent land uses, thereby increasing transit ridership and improving BLOS.

SUSTAINABILITY

The EPA has classified the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria area in severe nonattainment of the 8-hour ozone standard. In other words, the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria air quality does not meet federal air quality standards. This investment in transit infrastructure would produce environmental benefits due to decreased automobile use, which will reduce air pollutants, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and traffic congestion, which is important to the region's future growth.

H-GAC models the following harmful air pollutants: nitrogen oxides (NOx), volatile organic compounds (VOC), carbon monoxide (CO). In addition to a reduction in harmful air pollutants, the proposed facility would result in reduced fuel usage and lower automobile costs.

Reduced VMT and Emission Reductions

The development of the proposed Connect Transit Administration and Maintenance Facility will reduce 7,000 miles of bus miles annually. Using an average of 12-hour 2018 emission factors provided by H-GAC, Table 5.3 presents the calculations for emission reductions. The resulting annual reduction of harmful air pollutants totals approximately 0.028 tons.

| Table 5.3 – Emission Reductions | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Emission | Bus Emission Factors ² (grams/mile) | Annual Bus Grams Added | Annual Net Grams Reduced | Annual Conversion to Pounds Reduced -0.0022 | Annual Conversion to Tons Reduced -0.0005 |
| NOx | 2.352 | 16,466 | 16,466 | 36 | 0.02 |
| VOC | 0.368 | 2,575 | 2,575 | 6 | 0.00 |
| СО | 0.928 | 6,498 | 6,498 | 14 | 0.01 |
| Total | | 25,539 | 25,539 | 56 | 0.03 |
| ² Emission factors for Class 8a Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles - 100% arterial travel at 25 mph combined | | | | | |

Reduction in Fuel Consumption

The U.S. dependence on oil is ever increasing as vehicle miles traveled increase. By enhancing implementing an administrative and maintenance facility in closer proximity to the core operations, the proposed project is estimated to reduce annual VMT by 7,000 in year 5 of operations. The Pennsylvania Transportation Institute (<u>http://146.186.225.57/buses/367</u>) reports the average bus miles per gallon is 6.43. Using 6.43 MPG, the proposed administrative and maintenance facility is estimated to reduce fuel consumption by approximately 1,100 gallons per year.

Annual Decrease in Fuel Consumption = 1,100 gallons
Annual Deadhead Vehicle Deprecation

The reduction of 7,000 annual vehicle miles will result in the reduction of vehicle deprecation. Assuming the a vehicle useful life of 200,000 miles with a capital cost of \$80,000, then the reduction of vehicle deprecation is \$2,780

Annual Savings from Reduced Deprecation = \$2,780

SAFETY

Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

CPTED guidelines will be part of the final design of the proposed facility.⁸ According to the National Crime Prevention Institute, CPTED is "the proper design and effective use of the built environment which may lead to a reduction in the fear and incidence of crime, and an improvement of the quality of life." CPTED is a concept that relates certain elements of good urban design to reducing the incidence of crime. In some communities, where CPTED has been successfully implemented, criminal activity has decreased by as much as 40 percent. CPTED involves four broad strategies:

- **Natural Surveillance** A design concept directed primarily at keeping potential offenders easily observable. Promoted by: features that maximize visibility of people, parking areas, and building entrances; doors and windows that look out onto streets and parking areas; pedestrian-friendly sidewalks and streets; front porches; and adequate nighttime lighting.
- **Territorial Reinforcement** Physical design can create or extend a sphere of influence. Users then develop a sense of territorial control, which discourages potential offenders who perceive this control. This is promoted by features that define property lines and distinguish private spaces from public spaces through the use of landscape plantings, pavement designs, gateway treatments and fences.
- **Natural Access Control** This is a design concept that attempts to decrease criminal opportunity by denying access to targets and creating a perception of risk in potential offenders. This is achieved by designing streets, sidewalks, building entrances and neighborhood gateways to clearly indicate public routes and by discouraging access to private areas through the use of structural elements.

⁸ *Source:* <u>www.cpted-watch.com</u>

• **Target Hardening** – This design principle recommends the installation of features that prohibit entry or access to high-risk entryways, such as window locks, dead bolts for doors and interior door hinges.

These strategies can be implemented in slightly different ways depending on the land use (i.e., single-family residential, multi-family residential, office, retail, industrial, parking). Specific guidelines for implementation are widely available from the International CPTED Association and other organizations.

Context Sensitivity

Street design should be appropriate to its context (rural, rustic, urban, and suburban), the relationship with buildings, adjoining uses, and open spaces, as well as other considerations. As

development becomes denser, context will become more important because the potential conflicts between different uses and building forms may become more intense and require better design solutions. A deeper understanding of the context helps identify when it is appropriate to blend in with the surroundings or when to stand out.

The proposed project, if successfully implemented, would reflect design excellence. It would add to the identity, durability, connectivity, and walkability of Texas City. For example, pedestrianoriented lighting and appropriate landscaping would increase overall safety of pedestrians and define the local character through the use of contextappropriate materials.

Texas City has its own identity, and as a result, context sensitivity is important in relation to the improvements. ITE's report, *Recommended Practice, Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major*



Figure 5.2 – Height-to-Width Ratios





Urban Thoroughfares for Walkable Communities, set guidelines for pedestrian design. The principle of context sensitivity supports urban design that ensures the comfort and safety of all users of a particular corridor, regardless of transportation mode (i.e., automobile, bicycle, or walking).

As shown in Figure 5.3, the area between the curb and the buildings has several zones. These zones include areas for landscaping and/or street furniture, sidewalks, and setbacks between the edge of the public right of way and the face of the building, which property owners may use as they want. Ideally, the sidewalk would be wide enough to ensure maximum comfort for pedestrians. Adjustments to the zones can be made as needed, such as foregoing curbside landscaping in order to accommodate on-street parking.

Another important factor in context sensitivity is building scale in relation to the street. Figure 5.2 illustrates building height-to-street width ratios of 1:2 and 1:3. These ratios create a "human" scale on the street that fosters a comfortable environment and encourages walking. Where feasible, the proposed project will adhere to the recommended height-to-width ratios.

Conclusion

The proposed Connect Transportation Administration and Maintenance Facility would achieve national, state, and local transportation policy objectives as articulated by the Livability Partnership. The proposed facilities would increase quality of life by improving transit LOS, walkability, safety, and sense of place.

The proposed improvements would conservatively support an in increase in 69 short-term jobs and 3.5 full time equivalent jobs. The facility will increase annual rental revenues by \$50,000, which will offset the operating cost for the facility. Additionally, the facility will located in the heart of the GCC operations and thereby saving fuel and deprecation costs.

Overall, the proposed Connect Transportation Administration and Maintenance Facility would greatly benefit the community and would encourage public transit use by making the experience safe, enjoyable and attractive.

CHAPTER SIX: FINANCE & IMPLEMENTATION



The following chapter describes the timeline and funding program in order to implement the Connect administration facility in an expeditious timeframe.

Impact of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21)

In July 2012, President Barack Obama signed a new transportation bill, MAP-21, into law. On the highway side of MAP-21, there were significant changes to programs and funding administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). "Flexible funding" programs, which allow funds to transfer from FHWA to FTA, were relatively unchanged except for the Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program (TCSP), which was repealed.

The Gulf Coast Center or the City of Texas City may pursue funding to support LCI projects, facilities for non-motorized transportation, transit capital projects and public bus terminals and facilities through the following "flexible funding" programs:

- Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP): STP provides flexible funding that can be used by states and local governments for all projects eligible for funding under current FHWA and FTA programs including projects on any federal-aid highway, the National Highway System (NHS), bridge projects on any public road, transit capital projects, and intra-city and intercity bus terminals and facilities. STP is the largest FHWA flexible funding program, which means highway dollars can be transferred to FTA for use in local transit-related projects. The program is funded on an 80 percent federal and 20 percent local basis. Funding typically becomes available in conjunction with a "Call for Projects" through the regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program: The purpose
 of CMAQ is to fund transportation projects or programs that contribute to the attainment
 or maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone and
 CO. The construction of transit facilities, such as bicycle and pedestrian facilities, park &
 rides, and terminals, are eligible for CMAQ funding along with up to three years for
 operating assistance in non-attainment areas. CMAQ funded projects, like STP, are selected
 on a competitive basis by the regional MPO. H-GAC has historically reviewed and ranked

CMAQ project requests based on a variety of factors, including air quality benefits (cost per pound of pollutants reduced), system connectivity, environmental justice, and regional significance. Project readiness, which includes prior inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), local share commitment and completion of preliminary engineering, environmental analysis, and right-of-way acquisition, is a prerequisite for full consideration. CMAQ is traditionally funded on an 80 percent federal and 20 percent local basis. The air quality benefits detailed in *Chapter 5* demonstrate eligibility for CMAQ funds for associated pedestrian/transit access improvements.

- Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP): The goal of TAP is to encourage diverse modes of travel, increase community benefits from transportation investment, strengthen partnerships between state and local governments, and promote citizen involvement in transportation decisions. To be eligible for consideration, all projects must demonstrate a relationship to the surface transportation system through either function or impact and go above and beyond standard transportation activities. Activities within TAP that can be applied towards aspects of this facility include:
 - Construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation, including sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming techniques, lighting and other safety-related infrastructure, and transportation projects to achieve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.Landscaping and other scenic beautification
 - Construction, planning, and design of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities to access daily needs.

Funding obtained through these programs would be applied for as part of the Houston-Galveston Area Council's (H-GAC) Transportation Improvement Program process. It is anticipated that the next funding opportunity will occur in late Summer/early Fall 2014. Another opportunity for discretionary funding is through the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) program.

Currently available on an annual basis, TIGER funding can be used to reimburse investments in projects that involve road, rail, and transit-related improvements that are designed to achieve national objectives of sustainability. Historically, the TIGER program has been a highly competitive discretionary grant program that has generally been used for larger projects. The minimum project

size is \$10,000,000 and the grantee needs significant local and congressional support for success. In addition, most successful applicants provide more than 20 percent local match.

In addition to competitive funding opportunities, Connect also has access to FTA formula funding. Funds that can be used towards the projects within this document include:

- **49 U.S.C. 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program** This program provides grants to Urbanized Areas (UZA) for public transportation capital, planning, job access and reverse commute projects, as well as operating expenses in certain circumstances. The Texas City UZA receives an annual allocation of approximately \$1.3M.
- 49 U.S.C. 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program – This program is intended to enhance mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities by providing funds to serve the special needs of transit-dependent populations beyond traditional public transportation services and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit services. Capital projects that improve access to fixed-route service and decrease reliance by individuals with disabilities on complementary paratransit (such as sidewalks), are also eligible for funding under this program. As Texas City is considered a "small" urbanized area, TxDOT administers the funding for this program and the formula funding is typically administered through a competitive process.
- 49 U.S.C. 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Program Provides capital funding to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities. Funds are eligible to be transferred by the state to supplement the Urbanized Area Formula Grant Program. As Texas City is considered a "small" urbanized area, TxDOT administers the funding for this program and the formula funding is typically administered through a competitive process.

All of the above opportunities can also be used in conjunction with a Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) in order ensure that all eligible project activities can be reimbursed. An LONP is an innovative federal tool that allows FTA to grant pre-award authority to a grantee in advance of the receipt of federal funds. Connect has utilized (and will continue to utilize) LONPs extensively in order to ensure all activities are reimbursed.

Qualifying Costs

FTA may fund up to 80 percent of qualifying costs associated with the prescribed improvements. Qualifying costs can include preliminary engineering, design, value engineering, mobilization, and construction (including administration and management). Conversely, the local commitment for qualifying costs is normally 20 percent and 100 percent for non-qualifying costs. *Table 6.1* shows estimated capital costs of project improvements and the federal and local fund share based on 80/20 split, respectively. Total costs include 17 percent soft costs (including design and administrative costs) and a 10 percent contingency.

| Table 6.1 - Federal/Local Share by Project Component | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Component | Estimated Cost | Federal Share (80%) | Local Share (20%) | | |
| Administration | | | | | |
| Facility and | | | | | |
| Parking | \$4,250,400 | \$3,400,320 | \$850,080 | | |
| Maintenance | | | | | |
| Facility | \$1,061,600 | \$849280 | \$212,320 | | |
| Bus Parking | \$289,600 | \$231,680 | \$57,920 | | |
| Pedestrian/Transit | | | | | |
| Access | | | | | |
| Improvements | \$790,900 | \$632,720 | \$158,180 | | |

Five-Year Project Implementation Plan

The most urgent priority for Connect is the design and construction of the administration facility, its associated parking, and bus parking areas. Current and future FTA 5307 funding is planned to be used towards the preliminary engineering, design phase, and construction of this project. However, if additional competitive or discretionary funding opportunities are identified, these will be pursued in place of 5307. One potential example of replacement funding is FTA Ladders of Opportunity funding, which recently became available in June 2014.

As Texas City is donating the property to the Gulf Coast Center, the local match will be provided in the form of the value of a long term ground lease. Last appraised in April 2013, a 40 year ground lease is valued at approximately \$760,000. This local match will allow Connect to leverage more

than \$3M in federal funding to use towards the development of these facilities.

STP, CMAQ, and TAP funding will be pursued for construction phase activities associated with the administration facility. TIGER funding may also be pursued, dependent upon future grant criteria. 5307 funding will be used to provide additional funding as necessary.

The maintenance facility and pedestrian/transit access improvements will be implemented as additional funding opportunities are identified and/or the 5307 allocation increases. These improvements will also have the opportunity to be phased in if Texas City wishes to increase their local participation in the project. An opportunity for a strong partnership with Texas City exists in regards to the maintenance facility. If the facility will also partially be used to service Texas City vehicles, it would provide an incentive to provide a local contribution towards the project.

Table 6.2 describes project implementation over a five-year timeframe and describes the sources of funding that may be applied towards each phase. Funding sources are listed in order from most likely/applicable to least likely/applicable.

| Table 6.2 - Project Phasing By Component, Year, and Funding Source | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Component | Phase | Calendar Year of Implementation | Potential Federal Funding Source(s) | Potential Local Funding Source(s) |
| Administration Facility and Parking | Design/PE | 2014-2015 | Ladders of Opportunity, STP, 5307 | Land Value |
| Administration Facility and Parking | Construction | 2015-2016 | Ladders of Opportunity, STP, 5307 | Land Value |
| Bus Parking | Design/PE | 2014-2015 | Ladders of Opportunity, STP, 5307 | Land Value |
| Bus Parking | Construction | 2015-2016 | Ladders of Opportunity, STP, 5307 | Land Value |
| Maintenance Facility | Design/PE | 2018-2019 | STP, Ladders of Opportunity, 5339 | Texas City Local Commitment |
| Maintenance Facility | Construction | 2020 | STP, Ladders of Opportunity, 5339 | Texas City Local Commitment |
| Pedestrian/Transit Access | Design/PE, Construction | 2020 | CMAQ, 5310 | Texas City Local Commitment |

| Figure 6.1 – Project Impler | nentation | Timeline | | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Admin. Facility & Parking: PE/ Design | | | | | | | |
| Admin. Facility & Parking: Construction | | | | | | | |
| Bus Parking: PE/Design | | | | | | | |
| Bus Parking: Construction | | | | | | | |
| Maintenance Facility: PE/Design | | | | | | | |
| Maintenance Facility: Construction | | | | | | | |
| Ped./Transit Access: Design/PE, Construction | | | | | | | |
| | CY2014 | CY2015 | CY2016 | CY2017 | CY2018 | CY2019 | CY2020 |

Figure 6.1 below provides a project implementation timeline.

The Goodman Corporation

consulting firm possessing a wide range of planning skills complemented with a unique understanding of the governmental processes for funding and implementing complex publicly sponsored transportation and land use initiatives. Since 1980 TGC has specialized in assisting public and private clients in planning, funding, and implementing land use and mobility projects. In addition to a strong reputation in innovative planning, TGC is accomplished in leading multi-disciplinary teams to prepare various planning products to support successful development and redevelopment initiatives. Public involvement is the cornerstone of TGC's approach to transportation and urban planning. TGC is exceptionally adept at engaging elected leadership, staff, and the community-at-large to actively participate in the planning process. TGC is very aware of how strong community support can be a catalyst for securing available public funding resources.

is a nationally recognized transportation and urban planning

Members of TGC staff directly involved in the publication of this report include the following:

Greg Goodman, Vice President Jim Webb, Senior Associate Ting Chen, Senior Associate Robert McHaney, Technical Program Manager Elise Sydora, Staff Intern

3200 Travis Street, Suite 200 • Houston, Texas 77006 • 713-951-7951 • www.thegoodmancorp.com

Connect Transit Administration and Maintenance Facility Plan

Texas City Urbanized Area

Appendices



August 2014





SCOTT STEPHENS & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Real Estate Appraisers - Consultants



12723 Woodforest Boulevard Houston Texas 77015 Phime: (713) 451-3600 Fax: (713) 451-3300 www.scottstephensandassociates.com

Scott P. Stephens, MAL Prasident Terence J. O'Rourke, MAL Vice President Bob Powell, Vice President Roan Dagley, Proc President

May 29, 2013

The Goodman Corporation 3200 Travis Street Houston, Texas 77006

Attn: Mr. Jim Webb

Re: 1205 and 1207 Oak Street, La Marque, Galveston County, Texas 77568

Dear Mr. Goodman:

A summary real estate appraisal of the above referenced property has been conducted. The market value opinion for the fee simple estate as of May 28, 2013 is as follows:

"As Is" Market Value \$120,000

A summary real estate appraisal of the above referenced property has been conducted. The market value opinion for the annual lease rate appropriate for the **subject site** as of May 28, 2013 is as follows:

Current Annual Lease Rate (Years 1-5) \$9,600 annually

Current Market Value of Hypothetical 30-year Ground Lease \$120,000



January 20, 2014

Mr. Robert Patrick FTA Regional Administrator Federal Transit Administration Region VI 819 Taylor Street, Suite 8A36 Fort Worth, TX 76102

Attn: Donald Koski

Subject: Gulf Coast Center/Texas City Connect Transit Administrative Facility Categorical Exclusion Environmental Analysis

Dear Mr. Koski,

In June 2013, The Goodman Corporation on behalf of Gulf Coast Center (GCC) prepared an environmental review document in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act for a proposed park and ride facility in Texas City. The Federal Transit Administration determined the project meets the requirements for a Categorical Exclusion (Exhibit A). There are no changes to the park and ride program, however GCC in partnership with Texas City have a desire to utilize the site's expansion potential. The GCC park and ride site encompasses approximately 10 acres. As previously planned, six of those acres will remain allocated for park and ride use, while the other 3.5 acres will support a new 12,000 square foot facility for GCC Connect Transit administrative operations and shell space for future tenants. An environmental analysis conducted as part of the park and ride advanced planning effort revealed no environmental concerns associated with the 10 acre site. Moreover, the proposed project is consistent with conditions for a Categorical Exclusion under Section 771.118(c)(9)(10).

Additional project information is provided in Exhibits A-D to assist you in your environmental review. If you have any questions please contact me any time at (512) 236-8002 ext. 301.

Sincerely,

Wendy O'Brian Chief of Operations Enclosure: Exhibit A – FTA Categorical Exclusion, Texas City Park and Ride Exhibit B – Categorical Exclusion Checklist Exhibit C – Texas Parks and Wildlife Comment Letter Exhibit D- SHPO Comment Letter

EXHIBIT A



REGION VI Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas 819 Taylor St., Suite 8A36 Fort Worth, TX 76102 817-978-0550 817-978-0575 (FAX)

November 5, 2013

Mr. James Hollis, M.A. Transportation Director Gulf Coast Center/Connect Transit 4352 E. L. Expressway Texas City, Texas 77591

> Re: Gulf Coast Center/Texas City area -Park-and-Ride Lot/Transit-Pedestrian Access/ Streetscape Improvements

Dear Mr. Hollis:

This letter is to inform you that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has completed review of the environmental document for the proposed park-and-ride/transitpedestrian access/streetscape improvements for construction activities in the Texas City area. On the basis of that documentation, the FTA has determined that the proposed project is a Categorical Exclusion environmental class of action, in accordance with 23 CFR Part 771, the regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act.

As noted in the environmental document submitted, mitigation efforts would be considered in the course of the design and construction phases of the transit infrastructure and improvements project activities, as necessary to ensure that significant impacts do not occur.

The environmental review process has been completed, in accordance with 23 CFR Part 771.118 (d). With FTA's determination, there are no historic properties affected, based upon the Section 106 assessment of impacts, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800 4(d). For future reference, the date of this letter is the environmental finding.

If you have any questions regarding the FTA's environmental determination and finding, please call Ms. Pearlie M. Tiggs, at (817) 978-0567.

Sincerely Robert C. Patrick

FTA Regional Administrator

cc: Greg Goodman, The Goodman Corporation

EXHIBIT B

INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR PROBABLE CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (SECTION 771.118)

Description of Proposed Action

Connect Transit has significantly shifted its operating model from one that was rooted in demand response service to one that is increasingly focused on providing local fixed route and park and ride services. Since 2009, Connect Transit has operated Mainland Transit, a fixed route service within the cities of Texas City and La Marque. Within Southern Brazoria County the cities of Lake Jackson, Angleton, Clute, and Freeport are served by Southern Brazoria Transit Service. More recently, through a partnership with Island Transit, Connect Transit has implemented park and ride commuter services (Island Connect) connecting Texas City to UTMB and the City of Galveston, in addition to the express park and ride service operating from the Victory Lakes/UTMB campus, located within League City.

While this evolution of Connect Transit services has generated increased ridership, it has also highlighted the need for a new facility to improve existing and future administrative and operations efficiencies. Since Connect Transit has outgrown its current location, Gulf Coast Center proposes to design and construct a new 12,000 square foot facility in Texas City. The proposed project will be developed on the south half of a 10 acre parcel selected for the Texas City Park & Ride, located on the southwest corner of 33rd Street N. and Magnolia Street.

The site is located near the Carlos Garza Sports Complex and is owned by the Texas City Economic Development Corporation (EDC). There are no improvements. The parcel is unpaved and is used as overflow parking for events at the Carlos Garza Sports Complex.

The Connect Transit administrative and operations facility program will include approximately 6,000 square feet of office and shared space for Connect Transit employees and visitors, and 6,000 square feet of shell space for future tenants (Figures 1 and 2). Additional facility program details include:

Space Needs

- Administrative offices for Director of Transportation, Transit Manager, Road Supervisor, Technical Assistant and Safety Officer
- Dispatcher, Scheduler and Reservations offices
- Common areas (reception, conference, training, restrooms, break room, locker room)
- Lobby
- General space (file room, printer/fax/mail room, IT, farebox)
- Restrooms
- Mechanical, electrical, janitorial room

• Shell space for future use

Requirements for Maintenance

This site will accommodate a separate maintenance building for light maintenance activities. The building will accommodate two cutaways and one 40 foot bus at a single time.

Traffic

Ingress and egress points for bus traffic are at 16th Avenue N and 33rd Street N. Private vehicles will have access to the site from 33rd Street N.

Parking Needs

The facility will be designed to accommodate 76 employee and visitor parking spaces which will be separate from bus traffic. The bus yard will support 50 parking spaces.



Figure 1 – Option 1 Connect Transit Administrative and Operations Facility Site Layout



Figure 2 - Option 2 Connect Transit Administration and Operations Facility Site Layout

Land Use and Zoning

Surrounding uses near the project site include vacant land and the Carlos Garza Sports complex to the north, commercial to the south and single family residences to the west and east. The project site is zoned A-1 (General Business and Single-Family Residential), which is consistent with the proposed uses according to the City Engineer.

Land Acquisition and Displacement

The Texas City Economic Development Corporation will donate the project site. The value of this land will be used as local match. No displacement will occur as a result of the proposed action.

Air Quality

The proposed project will not contribute to the addition or reduction of harmful air pollutants.

The proposed project will be included in the 2013-2016 TIP for the Houston-Galveston Transportation Management Area and Statewide Implementation Plan (SIP). The TIP conforms to air quality standards in accordance with the SIP.

Noise

The proposed project will not contribute to increased noise levels.

Water Quality

The nearest water feature is a narrow channel to the west of the project site approximately 42 feet in distance. This water feature will be undisturbed. Water quality will not be affected. Any construction-related impacts to water quality will be sufficiently managed by Best Management Practices (BMP). BMPs may include the use of storm water management controls.

Wetlands

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory mapper, there are no federally or state delineated wetlands located within or near the project study area. Therefore, the proposed project will not impact these resources.¹

Flooding

A review of Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) insurance rate map reveals the proposed project is located in Zone X5. This area is designated as outside of "Special Flood Hazard Area" and is therefore not subject to provisions under Chapter 58 Article II of the City's Code of Ordinance. The project area like most coastal areas is within a 500-year floodplain.

Texas City's code of ordinances (Chapter 58 – FLOODS) has established development standards for areas of "special flood hazard" for the purpose of mitigating the impact due to flood conditions.

"Area of special flood hazard means the land in the floodplain within a community subject to a one percent or greater chance of flooding in any given year. The area may be designated as zone A on the flood hazard boundary map (FHBM). After detailed ratemaking has been completed in preparation for publication of the FIRM, zone A usually is refined into zones A, AE, AH, AO, A1-99, VO, V1-30, VE or V."

While the proposed project areas are in Zone X5 and not subject to the same general standards as "special flood hazard" zones, no structure or land can be altered without full compliance of the terms of this Article, which includes application for a development permit presented to the floodplain administer. Coordination with the City engineer will occur to ensure design of the proposed projects is above the flood elevation. The proposed project will also be designed to ensure flood-carrying capacity within the altered area is maintained. Further review and approval by the floodplain administer will ensure all mitigation measures are in place to prevent any adverse impact as a result of the proposed project. As a result, the impact is considered generally not significant to floodplain values.

¹ Source: http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html

Navigable Waterways and Coastal Zones

The eastern most portion of the proposed project is 0.50 miles west of Galveston Bay. The proposed project lies within the Galveston-Houston area of the Texas Coastal Zone Management Program (TCZMP). TCZMP objectives include improving the management of the coastal natural resource area and ensuring the long-term ecological and economic productivity of the coast. The goals and policies reflect Texas priorities in balancing resource protection with economic development and provide guidelines for coordinated management of the coast. All of Texas City is in the Texas Coastal Zone as determined by the TCZMP, which delineates the boundary. The TCZMP contains 21 policy categories and this proposed project would be included under Policy Category 16, Transportation. The project will comply with the policies as follows:

- Pollution prevention procedures will be used during construction to minimize or prevent any pollutants from entering coastal waters
- Project location in an extensively developed downtown area will preclude any direct impact by construction on coastal resources.
- As previously addressed, no wetlands will be affected.
- Construction will not require impounding or draining of coastal wetlands.
- There will be no impact on recreational uses of Coastal National Resource Areas.
- No U.S. Coast Guard or Corps of Engineers permits are required.

This project does not affect any sensitive resource areas protected by the TCZMP and is not located close enough to any bodies of water to cause any usurpation of riparian rights granted by state or federal law. In conclusion, there would not be any impacts on navigable waterways and coastal zones.

Ecologically Sensitive Areas and Endangered Species

The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department has issued a comment of no significant impact for the project site (Exhibit C).

Traffic and Parking

The proposed project will have minimal impact on traffic volumes. Adjacent streets have adequate capacity to accommodate traffic to and from the site.

The proposed project will provide parking therefore no impact to existing parking exists.

Historic Resources

Section 106 review by the State Historic Preservation Office confirms that no historic properties exist on the project site (Exhibit D).

Parkland

No Section 4(f) resources will be utilized in connection with the proposed project, therefore no impact exists.

Construction

The proposed action will result in some minor short-term construction impacts. These can all be easily mitigated. Specific categories considered for potential construction impacts are as follows:

NOISE - Noise related to construction can be a major factor resulting in annoyance. Although annoyance cannot be quantified, it is of major concern, as is evident from the complaints of groups and individuals in communities affected by construction projects. Much of the surrounding land is buffered by roadway features thus, there are minimal sensitive noise receptors nearby. Adjacent residents far enough away from the primary construction area to be only minimally affected by construction noise. Construction hours would be controlled to minimize noise at nearby residences during the day and eliminate noise at night. Construction noise created by the proposed action will be caused by the following construction phases:

- Ground clearing
- Excavation and grading; and
- Finishing, including grading and cleanup operations.

The noise from these phases of construction is a transient problem. The source activity is rarely in any one location for an extended period of time, and, depending upon the duration and complexity of the project, it may be considered a temporarily offensive noise source.

Control of construction noise levels can be achieved by the use of one or a combination of the following general methods:

- Installation of noise reduction devices on equipment;
- Enforcing operation time control;
- Use of alternative, quieter equipment; and
- Use of shielding or screening devices on or around equipment. Where feasible, some or all of the above-mentioned abatement techniques would be used to reduce construction noise impacts on surrounding areas, especially residences.

DISRUPTION OF UTILITIES - No utilities will be affected except for minimal time to tie into electric, water, and sewer services.

DISPOSAL OF DEBRIS AND SOIL - Excavated material will be disposed of at approved nearby sites or in conjunction with needs of other construction projects.

WATER QUALITY AND RUN-OFF - Construction will not result in excessive erosion or introduction of sediments, wastewater, or chemicals into adjacent bodies of water. Requirements of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's NPDES stormwater permitting program for construction will be followed.

ACCESS AND DISRUPTION OF TRAFFIC - The proposed action will not require any long-term street or lane closures or other major interference with the traffic flow. All adjacent streets and alleys may encounter brief delays from equipment entering or leaving the site as well as during associated utility work. Primary construction will be on-site, out of traffic flows. No traffic will be diverted through a residential area. No access to any land use will be disrupted.

AIR QUALITY AND DUST CONTROL - Construction activity has short-term impacts on air quality. The only significant air quality impact from this construction project is generation of dust by clearing, grading, and hauling of materials. Particulates and dust control will be carefully monitored. Applicable mitigating measures to control particulates are the following:

- Use water or suitable chemical to control dust during clearing and grading;
- Cover dust-generating materials carried in open-bodied trucks;
- Control dust from unpaved surfaces used for access to construction sites and/or parking; and
- Clean streets as needed to remove soil tracked onto public roads during construction.

SAFETY AND SECURITY - All normal and reasonable contractor measures to promote safety during construction would be required. These will include the use of barriers, flaggers, securing of equipment after hours, and other measures commensurate with the level of activity and types of construction equipment to be used.

DISRUPTION OF BUSINESS - No nearby business will be disrupted during construction due to restriction of access or creation of inconveniences for patrons.

Aesthetics

There are no distinguishing features or characteristics within the project area, therefore proposed project will not contribute to or diminish to existing aesthetics.

Safety and Security

The proposed project will be designed and built to ensure a safe and secure environment for GCC Connect Transit staff and visitors. Adequate lighting will be installed around the facility.

Secondary Development

No secondary development is expected. The proposed project will utilize remaining acreage of the 10 acre parcel.

Consistency with Local Plans

The proposed project is consistent with the City and GCC's desire to develop the proposed project. The City has entered into an interlocal agreement with GCC in support of advanced planning efforts to create an acceptable level of project readiness for federal transit funding.

Hazardous Materials

A Phase II performed in 2011 cleared the project site for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons, Volatile Organic Compounds, and RCRA Total Metals. Accordingly, existing surface and subsurface soil and ground water conditions do not present a significant risk to the property, human health or the environment.

Seismic Hazard

According to a USGS Texas Seismic Hazard Map, Texas City is in a region that has low potential for seismic activity.²

Environmental Justice

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires federal agencies to evaluate potential impacts of actions on minority and low income populations with an affected project area. According to 2010 U.S. Census data 15.07 percent of Texas City's population is living below the poverty level while its minority population is about 58 percent. It is anticipated that no businesses or households would be substantially impacted by construction or operation of the proposed project, therefore no significant or disproportionate impact would be experienced by disadvantaged population.

Direct/Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would have no direct/indirect and cumulative effect on any natural, historic, and/or cultural resource or population. No residences or businesses would be displaced. Widespread changes to development patterns or local comprehensive plans would not occur.

²http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/states/texas/hazards.php

EXHIBIT C



February 6, 2013

Kathy Boydston Habitat Assessment Program Texas Parks and Wildlife 4200 Smith School Road Austin, TX 78744 Texas Parks & Wildlife Dept. FEB 0 8 2013 Wildlife Habitat Assessment Program

Re: Texas City Pedestrian-Transit Access Master Plan and Park and Ride Study

Dear Ms. Boydston:

The Gulf Coast Center proposes to complete preliminary engineering, design and construction of a park and ride facility in Texas City. A site selection analysis evaluated four possible park and ride locations. The analysis considered location, size, ownership, local share value, land use, environmental, and visibility, among other criteria. After ranking each site, the property located at 33rd and Magnolia received the highest score due in part to accessibility, cost, excellent connectivity, and visibility among other considerations. The project site is triangular in shape, encompasses 10 acres and is vacant. The site currently serves as overflow parking for a nearby sports complex. The park and ride will include 299 spaces, a small terminal with restrooms, indoor and outdoor waiting areas, an office, and storage. Bus activity will be separate from automobile traffic. Up to three buses can stage at a time and will be accessible on the northeast side of the terminal

The project would also take advantage of federal provisions that support development of pedestrian/transit access enhancement improvements within a one-half mile radius of any bus stop and/or terminal. Gulf Coast Center operates three fixed routes along FM 1764 and 6th Street. Since a transit trip begins and ends on foot, transit will be a more viable option if a person can walk to the terminal and surrounding uses. The addition of a hike and bike trail to connect with an existing hike and bike pathway will also be implemented. The trail system provides north south access between FM 1764 and 5th Avenue. Studies have demonstrated this multimodal approach is important to a communities overall livability. Affected corridors will include:

- FM 1764 Street between 6th Street and 31st Street
- 6th Street between FM 1764 and Texas Avenue
- 6th Street between 12th Street and 18th Street

Recommended improvements will vary depending on level of need but may include six foot sidewalks, curbs, striping, pedestrian lighting, landscaping, bus shelter amenities, bus signs, and



culverts. Improvements along 6th Street between FM 1764 and Texas Avenue and FM 1764 between 6th Street and 14th Street will be limited to landscaping.

Based on a site assessment no habitats were observed. The proposed action is expected to have a beneficial land use impact by improving the physical pedestrian environment. There are no ecologically-sensitive areas located within or near the proposed project site. To assist in your determination of endangered species impacts, I have attached a map of the project location. If you have any specific concerns, suggestions or recommendations pertaining to this project please let us know by responding to the address listed below.

Please submit your comments or concerns at your earliest convenience to:

The Goodman Corporation 1715 E. 6th Street, Ste. 112 Austin, TX 78702

or

Email: wobrian@thegoodmancorp.com

Thank you in advance for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Wendy O'Brian

Enclosures: Figure 1 – Project Area Figure 2 – Land Use Map List of Endangered Species in Galveston County Photos of Project Area (CD)



EXHIBIT D

| REQUEST FOR SHPO CONSULTATION PROJECT NAME: 1401 33rd Street | Texas City Park and Ride Texas City | Galveston County |
|--|---|--|
| Identification of Historic Properties: Archeology | | |
| Does this project involve ground-disturbing activity? Yes (Please complete this section) | ☐ No (Skip to next se | ction) |
| Describe the nature of the ground-disturbing activity, The proposed project will include construction of a terminal parking spaces for park and ride users. Some minor short-to | including but not limited for bus passengers, three b erm construction impacts wi | o depth, width, and length. Is spaces fronting the terminal, a Il occur but can be easily mitigate |
| Describe the previous and current land use, condition The proposed project site will utilize land that is currently un events at the nearby Carlos Garza Sports Complex. No know | ns, and disturbances. Indeveloped. The 10 acre par wn disturbances existed prev | cel is used as overflow parking fo riously. |
| Identification of Historic Properties: Structures | | |
| Does the project area or area of potential effects inclu features (such as parks or cemeteries) that are 45 ye | ude buildings, structures, ars of age or older? | or designed landscape |
| Yes (Please complete this section) | No (Skip to next se | ction) |
| Is the project area or area of potential effects within o eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic F | or adjacent to a property of Places? | No Unknow |
| In the space below or as an attachment, describe each project area or area of potential effect that is 45 years ADDRESS | ch building, structure, or l s of age or older. DATE OF CONSTRUCTION | SOURCE FOR CONSTRUCTION DAT |
| ADDRESS | DATE OF CONSTRUCTION | SOURCE FOR CONSTRUCTION DAT |
| ADDRESS | DATE OF CONSTRUCTION | SOURCE FOR CONSTRUCTION DAT |
| Attachments | For | SHPO Use Only |
| Please see detailed instructions regarding attachmen Include the following with each submission: | ments. | |
| Project Work Description | | |
| Maps | | |
| Identification of Historic Properties | | |
| Photographs | | |
| | | |
| For Section 106 reviews only, also include: | | |
| For Section 106 reviews only, also include: Consulting Parties/Public Notification | | NO HISTORIC |
| For Section 106 reviews only, also include: Consulting Parties/Public Notification Area of Potential Effects | | NO HISTORIC PROPERTIES AFFECTED |
| For Section 106 reviews only, also include: Consulting Parties/Public Notification Area of Potential Effects Determination of Eligibility | | NO HISTORIC PROPERTIES AFFECTED PROJECT MAY PROCEED |
| For Section 106 reviews only, also include: Consulting Parties/Public Notification Area of Potential Effects Determination of Eligibility Determination of Effect | by | NO HISTORIC PROPERTIES AFFECTED PROJECT MAY PROCEED |
| For Section 106 reviews only, also include: Consulting Parties/Public Notification Area of Potential Effects Determination of Eligibility Determination of Effect Submit completed form and attachments to the address below. Faxes and email are not acceptable Mark Wolfe | by for Mark State Hi Date Track# | NO HISTORIC PROPERTIES AFFECTED PROJECT MAY PROCEED Millin A. Mont Wolfe storic Preservation Officer 9/17/12 |



MEMORANDUM

TO: Pearlie Tiggs

FROM: Wendy O'Brian

DATE: March 28, 2014

 SUBJECT:
 Addendum to Gulf Coast Center/Texas City Connect Transit Administrative

 Facility Draft Categorical Exclusion Environmental Analysis Report

Attached is additional information for the above referenced project as requested by your office. If you have any questions regarding the Addendum please feel free to contact me at (512) 236-8002 ext. 301 or by e-mail at wdotsian@thegoodmancorp.com.

ADDENDUM

Gulf Coast Center/Texas City Connect Transit Administrative Facility Draft Categorical Exclusion Environmental Analysis Report

Prepared on March 28, 2014 **FTA Comment**: The environmental document indicated that the land for the proposed project is owned by Texas City and will be donated for the project site. Has there been an appraisal of the land? It was also noted that the value of the land will be used as local match....

A summary real estate appraisal was conducted on March 28, 2013. The "as is" market value opinion for the fee simple estate is \$530,000. The market value opinion for the annual lease rate is \$42,400 (Years 1-5) and the current market value of a hypothetical 40-year Ground Lease is \$760,000. The City of Texas approved entering into a lease agreement with Gulf Coast Center.

FTA Comment: Regarding the "Noise" element on the checklist, how do you validate or substantiate that the proposed project will not contribute to increased noise levels as noted in the document?

- Are there intervening structures/buildings present, in the vicinity or within proximity of the project area that would reduce noise sounds?
- ➤ Is the project site within 300 feet of a noise-sensitive receptor or receptors, with intervening structures/buildings, that would reduce noise?
- If the surrounding land use is zoned mixed use with commercial/industrial, there's generally no need for a noise analysis. This needs to be discussed and validated in the "Noise" element of the document.

Surrounding uses near the project site include vacant land and the Carlos Garza Sports complex to the north, commercial to the south, and single family residences to the west and east. The residential uses are the only noise-sensitive receivers in the project area. The Federal Transit Administration has established noise and vibration thresholds for mass transit projects. According to the Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment report the residential uses are outside of 350 foot screening distance listed for a "storage and maintenance with buses" by over 500 feet.

The frequency of noise generated by bus traffic will be restricted to business hours. Gulf Coast Center utilizes mid-size buses which are typically quieter compared to large over the road coaches. Moreover noise associated with light maintenance and administrative activities are expected to be not significant. In fact there are several commercial businesses near the project area that specialize maintenance type activities.

FTA Comment: The environmental justice element does not provide a sufficient level of details or information to make an EJ determination of disproportionate burden vs non-EJ populations affected by the proposed project. Small area Census data such as blocks and block-groups are generally more appropriate for project-level EJ assessment and analysis of projects and

local planning activities. You may find it helpful to use data developed that also reflect graphs and tables, through the metropolitan planning process for small local projects – use the most appropriate level of Census data based on the project and the area. The EJ analysis report should also include public participation information...

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires federal agencies to evaluate potential impacts of actions on minority and low-income populations with an affected project area. To effectively address foreseeable social, economic, and environmental effects on minority and low-income populations the following data was reviewed.

The 2010 U.S. Census defined the following population characteristics for the whole City of Texas City:

- 41% White,
- 29.2 % African American
- 0.3% American Indian
- 1% Asian
- 27% Hispanic
- 1.5% Other

The project site is located:

• In Census Block 2038, Block Group 2, Census Tract 7219

Within ¼ mile of the project site are the 19 Block Groups in Census Tract 7219 as shown below.



Since the 2010 U.S. Census does not provide income and origin data at a Block Group level for Texas City, a summary of income characteristics for Census Tracts is provided:

| Census Tract | Median Income |
|--------------|---------------|
| 7262 | \$34,344 |
| 7220.01 | 72,009 |
| 7220.02 | 56,596 |
| 7212.02 | 85,956 |
| 7222 | 26,656 |
| 7223 | 30,771 |

APPENDIX B - Gulf Coast Center - Texas City Urbanized Area Connect Transit Administration & Maintenance Facility Plan 2014

| 7221 | 57,424 |
|------|--------|
| 7227 | 41,859 |
| 7226 | 29,211 |
| 7218 | 51,204 |
| 7231 | 45,492 |
| 7206 | 83,377 |
| 7216 | 41,293 |
| 7219 | 46,705 |
| 7233 | 72,750 |
| 7211 | 49,091 |
| 7209 | 46,779 |
| 7210 | 59,375 |
| 7217 | 48,158 |
| 7238 | 83,244 |
| 7239 | 64,250 |

The average median income in Texas City is \$51,206. The project site is located in Census Tract 7219 where the average median income is \$46,705.

Census Tract 7219 has a population of 8,613 and a minority population of 0.63 percent or 54 persons.

A public meeting was held in association with the project site on April 24, 2013 related to the park and ride. A future public meeting to discuss the administrative and operations facility will be scheduled in the coming months. The public meeting will be held at a time and location that will allow environmental justice populations to attend. However since there are few minority

and low-income populations in the project area, the addition of an administrative and operations facility will have no potential adverse effects on environmental justice populations.

APPENDIX B - Gulf Coast Center - Texas City Urbanized Area Connect Transit Administration & Maintenance Facility Plan 2014



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration REGION VI Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahomo, Texas 819 Taylor St., Suile 8A36 Fort Worth, TX 76102 817-978-0550 817-978-0575 (FAX)

June 17, 2014

Mr. James Hollis, M.A. Transportation Director Gulf Coast Center/Connect Transit 4352 E. L. Expressway Texas City, Texas 77591

Re: Gulf Coast Center/Texas City area -Administrative Transit Facility

Dear Mr. Hollis:

This letter is to inform you that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has completed review of the environmental document for the proposed administrative transit facility for construction activities in the Texas City area. On the basis of that documentation, the FTA has determined that the proposed project is a Categorical Exclusion environmental class of action, in accordance with 23 CFR Part 771, the regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act.

As noted in the environmental document submitted, mitigation efforts would be considered in the course of design and construction phases of the transit facility, as necessary to ensure that significant impacts do not occur.

The environmental review process has been completed, in accordance with 23 CFR Part 771.118 (d). With FTA's determination, there are no historic properties affected, based upon the Section 106 assessment of impacts, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800 4(d). Upon FTA's review required by 49 U.S.C. Sec. 303 (also known as Section 4(f)), which is implemented by the regulation at 23 C.F.R Part 774, there are no Section 4(f) resources that will be used or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, FTA finds the provisions of Section 4(f) will not come into play as a result of the proposed Administrative Transit Facility. For future reference, the date of this letter is the environmental finding.

If you have any questions regarding the FTA's environmental determination and

finding, please call Ms. Pearlie M. Tiggs, Community Planner at (817) 978-0567.

Sincerely, Ke^d Robert C. Patrick FTA Regional Administrator

cc: Wendy O'Brian, The Goodman Corporation

APPENDIX C - Gulf Coast Center - Texas City Urbanized Area Connect Transit Administration & Maintenance Facility Plan 2014








THE GULF COAST CENTER REQUIRED INSPECTIONS AND PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE TO OWNED AND LEASED FACILITIES

- 1. **HVAC Heaters:** Inspection annually at least one month before colder winter weather by appropriate service authorities.
- 2. HVAC Air Conditioners: Inspection annually at least one month before warmer weather by appropriate service authorities.
- 3. Electrical: Inspection annually by a City Electrical Inspector or a licensed electrician for electrical safety.
- 4. Gas Line Pressure Test: Annual test by a licensed plumber along with City inspection and Certificate for facilities utilizing natural gas to detect leaks or weak points in gas lines.
- 5. **Pest Control Treatment:** A minimum of quarterly treatment by a licensed pest control exterminator.
- 6. Janitorial Services: Defined scope and frequency of cleaning, including a minimum of annual carpet extraction, annual strip and wax and semi-annual window washing inside and out.
- 7. Fire Marshall's Inspection: Annual inspection to assure compliance with the most recent edition of the National Fire Protection Association's Life Safety Code.
- 8. Fire Alarm Control Unit: Annual inspection by appropriate service authorities of the fire and smoke alarm system.
- 9. Safety Hazard Inspection: Annual inspection by Center representative to assess overall facility and grounds safety. Also, the Center's Safety Officer will conduct ongoing inspections including assessment for compliance with ADA accessibility requirements.
- 10. Facility Maintenance Inspection and Review: Annual inspection by Center's Facility Support Manager to assess facility and grounds operational condition and to determine needed preventive maintenance, repairs and improvements.

All inspections are to be documented in writing.

Needed repairs discovered as a result of the various inspections are to be completed in a timely manner.