

# MINUTES



LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION 403 West 8th St., Suite 500, Los Angeles, CA 90014 (213) 626-0370

## RAIL CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE MINUTES OF MEETING JUNE 21, 1989

### MEMBERS PRESENT

JACKI BACHARACH  
CAROL STEVENS  
RAY GRABINSKI  
WALTER KING

### STAFF PRESENT

NEIL PETERSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
ED MCSPEDON, DIRECTOR, DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION  
AL SCALA, MANAGER OF CONTRACTS

### OTHERS

BOB NEWLAND, TRANSCAL II  
RON RYPINSKI, TRANSCAL

### CALL TO ORDER

**CLOSED SESSION: PENDING CONSTRUCTION CLAIMS AND CHANGE NOTICE**

Jacki Bacharach requested the closed session portion of the meeting be held first. With no objection the Committee went into a closed session to discuss pending construction claims and change notice.

**CONTRACT C435 - AERIAL STRUCTURES. CHANGE ORDER #24**

Al Scala presented staff's report on Change Order #24 in final settlement of impacts, acceleration and other costs. The Committee recommended that the Commission approve Change Order #24 in the amount of \$2,272,205. Also, the Committee recommended that the interim milestone dates be extended as listed in staff's report. Sufficient contingency remains within the current Authorization For Expenditure for this Contract.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF JUNE 22, 1989**

The minutes of the meeting of June 22, 1989 were approved as submitted.

**NORWALK/EL SEGUNDO RAIL TRANSIT PROJECT**

Ed McSpedon reported to the Committee on the review of the budget and cost estimates on the Norwalk/El Segundo rail transit project. Mr. McSpedon addressed the concerns expressed by the Committee at the June 22 meeting in Long Beach as follows:

1. Review ESEA's cost reduction proposal as to whether it is viable and realistic - have had 3 or 4 meetings with ESEA and have worked together to develop some additional cost reduction items that were not included in their cost proposal.
2. Meet with cities along the corridors to explain the differences and impacts of automation versus manual operation - these meetings were held the week of July 17-21.
3. Prepare a presentation on fixed-block versus moving block signal systems.
4. Examine the viability of all suggested cost reductions, i.e., deferral of Hawthorne Yard, station deferrals, canopy scale back, etc.

5. Re-examine engineering and construction management cost
6. Re-examine contingency and escalation assumptions.
7. Re-examine the estimated costs of purchasing new vehicles or modifying the LB-LA vehicles.
8. Prepare for the July 21 budget workshop meeting.

Bob Newland presented an overview on the three options (see attached):

1. Option #1 - Automated system with third-rail.
2. Option #2 - Automated system using overhead catenary system and modifying the LB-LA vehicles.
3. Option #3 - Manually operated system with 22 modified LB-LA vehicles.

Ron Rypinski reported on the Hawthorne Yard and the operation and impacts that could occur with and without deferring the yard during the peak, off-peak and system shutdown condition on the Blue and Green lines using 22 cars.

Mr. Peterson stated that Option #2 offers a reduction in cost and retains automation and that the Main Yard was built to accommodate future extensions to Pasadena as well as service growth. He stated that the Hawthorne maintenance facility was originally planned to accommodate the Coast Line going from Marina del Rey to Torrance and would accommodate the El Segundo line.

Mr. Grabinski stated his concerns that when we do defer anything, that any money deferred is not an absolute savings but only a temporary savings.

Walter King stated he had no problem with Option #2, but didn't feel the Hawthorne Yard should be deferred.

Carole Stevens expressed concerns on retro-fitting the LB-LA vehicles. Ed McSpedon spoke on the warranty issue on the retro-fitting of the vehicles. Staff has had discussions with the carbuilder who presented a preliminary proposal for modifying the cars. This proposal assumed a suspension of production at the 32nd car and retaining the remaining 22 cars in Japan while we engineer the automation design and then implement the automation in Japan. This proposal included an estimated cost for delay of about \$6 million, and an estimated cost of the work of another \$6 million, plus the cost of the automation equipment itself for which they have no estimate as it hasn't been designed. The contractor has also raised the issue of product liability.

An alternate approach would be to have all 54 cars completed in Japan, shipped here, delivered and accepted as manual cars, then initiate a retro-fit program on site in Long Beach for 22 of the cars. The estimated cost of this approach is significantly lower since the delay costs would be avoided, however, the retro-fit work itself could more difficult and costly to implement. If the cars are accepted here, the product liability issue still needs to be resolved. Having the carbuilder manage the retro-fit program here rather than having another entity assume the lead (i.e., a train control supplier) focuses 100% of the responsibility on one contractor thereby increasing the likelihood of negotiating an acceptable product liability agreement.

Bob Glines, General Railway Signal, responded to the Committee's question as to whether rail vehicles designed for manual operation have ever been retro-fitted for driverless operation. He stated that it has been done on freight operations (i.e., Canada). He stated that usually the responsibility and liability lies with the prime contractor.

Mr. Glines gave his opinion on the technical feasibility of modifying the LB-LA cars to run automated. He stated the car is equipped with automated train control. Two other elements needed are automated train operation that regulates the speed and automated train supervision. These are functions the driver would usually provide. One other element that this system would need is a control logic unit, which is a communications system.

Bob Newland reported on Green Line staffing levels with and without the Hawthorne Yard. He stated that without the Yard there would be a savings of about 16 staff which equates to roughly \$1 million a year.

Ed McSpedon reported on the meetings with Caltrans, ESEA and the cities along the corridor to give them a clearer picture of what the alternatives mean and to identify areas where they can help. He explained LACTC's reaction to the ESEA proposed cost reduction plan and stated how most of their proposed cost reductions would not yield tangible reduction in project cost. At the meeting staff presented to ESEA a list of tangible cost reduction actions that ESEA could adopt to help the Commission (i.e, provision of real estate, contributions toward station enhancements, provision of engineering services, and community relations services, sharing of proceeds from potential joint development in the El Segundo area, etc).

In these discussions, ESEA has agreed to help us in many of these areas. The total value of these contributions is roughly \$14 million. ESEA raised concerns regarding deferral of the Douglas Street Station.

Regarding Caltrans, staff has identified costs to this project that could be attributed to FHWA/Caltrans as freeway eligible costs. Mr. Peterson stated that staff has met with Caltrans on this issue. Mr. Peterson will be meeting with Congressman Anderson to further discuss this matter in Washington July 25.

Mr. McSpedon reported on the meetings with the cities in the corridor. Increased project contributions by the cities such as providing some of the costs of station enhancements, landscaping, etc. were discussed and some of the cities expressed a willingness to further explore such approaches.

Bob Newland briefed the Committee on the proposed Douglas Street Station deferral.

The Committee heard comments from the following:

Carl Jacobson, Mayor of El Segundo - expressed opposition to budget cuts or changes in automation, elevation and number of stations. He supports Option #2, but not deferring the Douglas Station. Mr. Jacobson stated that the City expects that Douglas St. will be extended by 1992 or before the line is open.

Don Camph, ESEA - explained the nature of the cost reduction plan submitted by ESEA and stated that since the submittal of the plan ESEA has had productive discussions with staff and have come together with an agreement and to enter into a partnership on the rail line. Mr. Camph stated ESEA will support Option #2 with the exception of the deferral of the Douglas Street Station as ESEA feels the need for service is there.

Scott Hart, representing Ferrostaal Corp. (Carbuilder, West Germany) - Offered assistance for analyzing options (cost and engineering analysis). Favored Option #1.

Lynn Harris, Director of Development Services, El Segundo - Supports inclusion of the Douglas Street Station. Stated that the City at the staff level and at the policy level were unaware that a decision has been made that the station is located at such a place where the pedestrian bridge would be necessary.

John Fisher, L.A. Department of Transportation - expressed concern on the LACTC's limiting its financial commitment to the Imperial Grade separation. Mr. Fisher recommended that LACTC not lock themselves into a \$8 million funding cap.

Jerry Saunders, Continental Development Corp. - supports ESEA position, no deferral of the Douglas Street Station

Rick Landell, LTK - spoke on the modifying of the LB-LA cars to full automation. He stated that inclusion of train control equipment is only one aspect of the effort. He stated that there are many other changes that need to be made and that the LB-LA car was never intended for automation. Mr. Landell stated that although the proposed modification is possible, it will probably be more difficult than has been assumed to date.

The Committee discussed the Options, Walter King stated he would prefer Option I. Carole Stevens favored Option II but expressed concern with deferring the Hawthorne Yard, Douglas St. Station and modifying the LB-LA vehicles.

Jacki Bacharach asked for information on the Vermont Station. George Swede stated that according to SCAG, this station is forecast to have relatively low ridership. The volumes from the Vermont Station could be diverted to Harbor Station. Jacki Bacharach asked if some of the additional monies we are now requesting from Caltrans will pay for the stations. Mr. McSpedon stated this is true and we would not have to defer the stations if this money is available. The Committee directed staff to contact the jurisdictions around the Vermont Station.

Carole Stevens offered a motion to conceptually approve Option 2 (go to overhead catenary power system, defer Hawthorne Yard), but to include the Douglas Street Station with direction to staff to return with a report on other funding available, provide more information on modifying the vehicles and cost of new vehicles, address the liability issues and contact the affected jurisdictions around the Vermont Station. The Committee also requested an interpretation of the Consent Decree and EIS for the Century project in relationship to the stations.

The Committee also directed staff to return to the Committee with budget numbers on Option #2 that reflect the changes made.

Walter King expressed concern that this report states reducing the budget when in actuality there never has been an adopted budget. The only aspects that are being reduced is the level of service, quality of service and the Hawthorne Yard.

The Committee voted on the motion. Passed unanimously with Walter King stating he does not concur with the concept of taking the cheapest, the least effective that will be good for the public.

Jacki Bacharach stated she would update the Commission on the NES scope and budget and report that no action is being taken by the Committee at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

bn-c  
RCC/min-7.21