



ITEM 2

**RAIL CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION
MINUTES OF JANUARY 17, 1992 MEETING**

MEMBERS PRESENT

ERNEST CAMACHO, CHAIRMAN
ROBERT KRUSE, VICE CHAIRMAN
DAVE ANDERSON
JUDITH HOPKINSON
DON MC INTYRE
JOHN W. MURRAY
JAMES POTT

STAFF PRESENT

EDWARD MC SPEDON, PRESIDENT/CEO
ROD DAWSON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
CHARLES STARK, PROJECT MANAGER, METRO RED LINE-SEG. 1
CLYDE GARRISON, DEPUTY P.M., CONSTRUCTION, METRO RED LINE-SEG. 1
BARBARA GATEWOOD, CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR
JEANNE KINSELL, CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR
LINDA MC CAFFREY, SR. CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR
ABDOUL SESAY, MANAGER, RISK MANAGEMENT
AL THIEDE, V.P. ENGINEERING
ROBERT CASHIN, DIRECTOR, SOUTH BAY AREA TEAM
BONNIE VERDIN, BOARD SECRETARY

OTHER

AUGUSTIN ZUNIGA, COUNTY COUNSEL

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 2:07 p.m.

Mr. Camacho announced that the Negative Declaration item on today's calendar will be rescheduled and re-noticed.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the January 6 meeting were approved with the following corrections:

- Page 4, Item #11, Metro Red Line Environmental Assessment/ Initial Study, and Draft Negative Declaration for Consolidated Excavation Site, Mr. Pott moved that consideration of this matter be held over to the January 17 meeting. Motion was seconded and approved.

Mr. Anderson requested that in addition to Mr. Camacho's directive for staff to work with the Los Angeles Unified School District and the Los Feliz School over the next two week period to see if a resolution can be arrived at that protects the children at that school, staff also return back on the haul route issues that have been put before the Board. The Los Angeles Department of Transportation's concerns about several of the routes identified in the Negative Declaration, together with the concerns of the Los Feliz residents about that particular route, and taking into account the statements that there is a need for more than one route indicate that we are down to a very small number of acceptable routes and he would like to understand staff's position on how we are going to move the required volume of material in and out of the site.

Mr. Anderson further stated that the Los Angeles Department of Transportation made some very specific points about the ingress and egress from the Barnsdall Park site and Mr. Anderson wants to know from staff whether the suggestions offered by the Department of Transportation are acceptable to staff and whether the volume of anticipated truck traffic can move in and out of the site with the Department of Transportation's proposed restrictions on the ingress and egress locations.

Mr. Pott stated that he concurs with Mr. Anderson's statements and emphasized that as he reads the law, in order for the Board to make a finding on a mitigated Negative Declaration, the Board needs to be persuaded that there is no substantial evidence that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment. Mr. Pott stated that it is not enough for staff to say that they will look in to it. If the Board is to take action on January 17, the Board needs to know exactly what the proposed mitigation measures are and what they do to the environmental concerns expressed so that the Board can conclude that there is no potential significant impact.

Mr. Mc Intyre inquired whether there is any merit to a focused Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which looks at specifics of an issue as opposed to a full EIR. The issues being presented here do not appear to warrant a full EIR,

which is a major, time-consuming undertaking. A focused EIR may be less time consuming. One of the specific issues presented is the dust issue. Mr. Zuniga stated that there may indeed be other alternatives and perhaps a solution is somewhere in between a full EIR and and focused EIR.

Mr. Camacho inquired whether all of the concerns expressed in the Public Hearing will be addressed. Mr. Zuniga stated that staff is required to address each concern expressed at today's hearing and will be part of the process.

Mr. Camacho inquired whether staff will meet the January 17 deadline to make a recommendation to the Board. Mr. Mc Spedon stated that that is the objective because of the importance to move ahead.

Mr. Murray stated that he was particularly struck by what was represented as the rather short time frame with which the School District was contacted. Mr. Murray stated that the School District itself is involved in a \$600 million building program and is no doubt sensitive to construction issues and the need to move ahead and complete the project. On the other hand, because of the School District's charge relative to the safety, health and well-being of the students, the District clearly is an important party in these discussions. Mr. Murray stated that there is a need to have a strategic plan between the appropriate governmental agencies. In this particular case, it would involve Mr. Horton, who represents the particular school district, John Ferraro and Councilman Mike Woo. Mr. Murray stated that he would like for staff to develop a strategic plan that will ensure that these parties are contacted for input during this two week period.

- Page 2, Item 6 (President's Report)...On December 27, the SCRTD concluded negotiations with Guy F. Atkinson & Company...
- Pages 5 and 6, Item #13, Transit Bond Guarantee Program - Audit Findings, additional dialogue:

Mr. Choi stated that the purpose of the Audit was to ascertain the financial integrity of collateral made by the City of Los Angeles and the LACTC and to determine what happened to the interest income. Also of interest were bank accounts that the administrators were responsible for as well as the administrators cost.

Mr. Polep cited the first page of the audit report which reflects a total of 28 DBE's that went through the program. Expenditures from April, 1988 to October, 1991 totaled \$1,700,348. The expenditures were tested and compared to salary records. No exceptions were noted. Bank accounts were confirmed and determined that balances were correct.

Mr. Mc Intyre inquired whether the corporate management fees were part of the \$1,700,638 in expenditures. Mr. Polep affirmed this and stated that these are part of the overhead.

Mr. Camacho inquired whether the Transit Bond Guarantee Program (TBGP) is a joint venture with either Sedgewick James or MTIA. Mr. Choi stated that it is not a joint venture. Mr. Choi stated that MTIA is a separate entity established to manage the TBGP and they are not part of the OCIP. Mr. Choi stated that the confusion in the past was that the administrative fees were paid in one check that was made out to MTIA and MTIA would then pay the TBGP. Mr. Choi stated that he does not believe that MTIA was taking part in TBGP's fees.

Mr. Mc Intyre inquired who controls, and where is, the interest revenue that came from the funds in the TBGP. Mr. Polep stated that the LACTC and The City of Los Angeles just about equally share the revenue interest. Mr. Mc Intyre inquired who disbursed the \$1,700,348 in expenditures. Mr. Polep stated that the TBGP did. Mr. Mc Intyre inquired whether the distribution was 50/50 to the LACTC and City of Los Angeles. Mr. Briggs stated that initially the program was set up by the SCRTD and the SCRTD paid these fees. Then within the last year or so it was transferred to the LACTC and the Commission paid the fees to the City of Los Angeles.

Mr. Anderson stated that he has trouble finding the recommendations on this item. Mr. Polep stated that the recommendations are implied. There are some people that are still authorized on the letter of credits that need to be taken off. Also, that as of this date, there is no person at the LACTC having direct responsibility for the TBGP and there should be.

Mr. Pott stated that in three and one half years, there was an expenditure of \$1,700,348 million dollars for 28 packets of paper which represents \$60,700 per packet of paper. Mr. Pott stated that he views the expenditure of \$1,700,348 to collateralize \$5.9 million dollars as a very high expen-

diture rate to collateralize so little; it's about 29%. It appears to be a situation where no one is responsible for anything. What is needed is a response from LACTC and RCC as to the what the administrative response is to some of the implied recommendations made in the audit and what the future in the program should be. It makes no point to spend \$5 million dollars a year to do so little. Should the program be dissolved or should it be developed into something of value to the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Community rather than to continue to perpetuate the \$5 million dollars expense a year for so little.

Mr. Anderson inquired whether there is a Committee or other appropriate vehicle that can address this issue. This has been before the Board for several months now and the problem appears to be worsening instead of better. The administrative fees continue to be paid yet there is no activity whatsoever.

Mr. Camacho called upon Mr. Porter and inquired whether this area is still under his domain. Mr. Porter indicated that it is not entirely clear. The program is still in transition from SCRTD to LACTC. He agreed to take responsibility for it, however, and to return to the Board in 30 days with recommendations regarding the future of the TBGP.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no requests to speak at this time.

4. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

Mr. Camacho deferred to the President for his report.

5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Mr. McSpedon reported on the following:

- The Disputes Review Board on the claim on Contract A165, Granite Construction Company, was kicked off this past Monday. Mr. Mc Spedon sat in on the opening discussions. Mr. Mc Spedon stated that it started off slowly but it now appears to be progressing well and is continuing through today. Another session will be scheduled with the Board. Everyone feels optimistic and are on an approach that will bring about a fair and expeditious resolution of the claim. The overall general attitude of the contractor, staff and consulting panel is positive and constructive.

- Mr. Mc Spedon presented an award from Senator Art Torres to Travis the Owl, Safety mascot of the entire Metro Rail and Metrolink systems.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Items 6, 7 and 8 were pulled for discussion.

CONSENT CALENDAR - DISCUSSION ITEMS

6. METRO RED LINE, SEGMENT 1 - CONTRACT A167
TUTOR SALIBA CORPORATION, CHANGE ORDER NO. 218

Mr. Pott stated that he knows the Board took an action some ago to try to get these tactile strips uniform in the program. The report on this item indicates that it costs about \$435 a square foot. Mr. Pott stated that he is curious as to whether it is necessary to retro-fit to comply with the legal requirements. If it is necessary, in lieu of \$435 a square foot, Mr. Pott questioned whether there is some other way to deal with this issue.

Mr. Dawson asked Mr. Stark to comment on the alternatives there are to correct the problem. Mr. Stark stated that the main reason for putting the concrete pavers in the 7th & Metro station was to make the the tactile sensation that the passengers would have consistent with those of the Blue Line. The 7th and Metro station is the only station that actually had the granite pavers installed, as it was finished early to open the Blue Line. Originally there were smooth granite pavers at both the Red and Blue Line platforms. The decision was made to make the system compatible. Granite was not installed at the remaining Red Line Stations. They were concrete to begin with. The Red Line portion was changed to make it compatible, not only with the Blue Line, but with the rest of the Red Line. After the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) came out, the way the act reads, the pavers that are installed on the Blue Line and the Red Line at this point do not strictly comply with the ADA act. As a result, the Blue Line was removed from the change order rather than to put in an intermediate step which then eventually would possibly have to be changed on the entire system. That is the reason for the change order as it stands.

Mr. Pott stated that as he understands it, the change order is for the Red Line. Mr. Stark affirmed this. Mr. Pott stated that as he understands ADA, there is a need to come

up with a plan on a retro-fit basis with priorities. Mr. Pott inquired whether, absent a priorities plan, this really needs to be done and if there is another way. Mr. Pott further stated that as he understands it, the pre-cast concrete pavers may not make it under the provisions of the ADA either. Mr. Stark stated that this is correct. Mr. Stark stated that the decision to retro-fit 7th & Flower was made and the work had been substantially done before the ADA came out. Therefore, the RCC was not able to instantly react to the Act. At the present time, RCC is examining the ADA and plans to petition the federal government for permission to leave the tactile concrete pavers as a permanent solution. Mr. Stark stated that RCC does not have a solution yet developed to make the Blue and Red and all future lines compliant with the ADA.

Ms. Hopkinson inquired why we would proceed with the work if it may not meet the requirements of the ADA. Mr. Stark stated that at the time the Blue Line was specified and the decision was made to make the Red Line compatible, it was the belief of RCC/LACTC that the tactile strips being installed would in fact meet the government regulations. Mr. Hopkinson inquired whether the work is already done. Mr. Stark stated that the work is substantially done. Ms. Hopkinson inquired how it happens that work gets done before the Board gives approval. Mr. Camacho inquired whether this is a case where the paperwork is catching up to a decision. Mr. Stark affirmed this. Mr. Stark stated that this work was critical on the Red Line because the edge pavers are the last thing on the platform next to the train. If the edge pavers are not installed by the time of rail activation, it becomes very critical.

Mr. Kruse stated that he thinks the question is why change something that is already in if we're not even sure they're going to be done and why wasn't the Board be appraised of a change of this magnitude.

Mr. Stark stated that the work on the LRT portion of the system, which was the work the change order addressed, was started well before the ADA. By the time the ADA came out, work on the Blue Line portion of the station had not been started and work was immediately stopped. Mr. Stark reiterated that the RCC is actively seeking approval from the government to use the existing concrete pavers in the change order and for the rest of the system. If successful, it would realize a tremendous cost saving to the LACTC. It would mean, however, that the LRT portion would have to be changed to what's on the rest of the system.

Mr. Murray stated that the basic issue is what this Board is charged to do. If staff goes out and makes field approved change orders and then comes back to the Board as an afterthought, for mere rubberstamping on something that someone else has already made a decision on, then the Board's authority is being usurped. The whole issue of cost containment and authority is a basic issue that is going to be raised on Item 6, Item 7 and Item 8.

Mr. Murray further stated that the fundamental question is why this went forward if there is no assurance that it will meet with the ADA requirements but more importantly, why this was approved in the field before it came to the Board for approval.

Mr. Mc Spedon stated that this was actually based on a decision made by the Board to reduce the cost of the granite to have the same seam edge strips. The Board decided that the Red Line was going to be changed to be compatible to the Blue Line because the Blue Line was already in service. We had already purchased the granite, and were considering how the granite might be put to other use.

Mr. Camacho stated that obviously the work has been completed and someone is owed money for work completed. The fundamental issue, however, is the need to come to the Board before work is done. Mr. Camacho stated that he understands that there may be circumstances where in fact a field change order may be needed to accomplish these things under limited circumstances. As a general practice, he hopes that this will not be a common practice. Mr. Camacho stated that this issue needs to be moved and the supplier must be paid. Mr. Anderson concurred but he stated that he finds it difficult to believe that this issue would qualify as an emergency. Mr. Anderson further stated that he does not recall the Board having taken action to replace the granite with concrete but he will accept staff's statement.

Mr. Anderson stated that he assumes that staff did not give a cost estimate for the replacement of granite with concrete. Mr. Anderson stated it may necessary each time something is approved in theory, to quality to staff to develop a plan for implementation and if its going to cost money, to come back for Board's approval.

Mr. Mc Spedon stated that it was fairly clear that when the Board gave its approval for replacing granite with concrete, it only involved five stations. The change to concrete is unquestionably going to save money on the entire Metro

system. It may cost some more on Metro Red Line, Segment 1 because it was already into a granite design and the material had already been purchased. Mr. Mc Spedon stated that the Board knew the facts and he will guarantee the Board that this change will ultimately save money for the rest of the system. Mr. Mc Spedon stated that he was certain the consensus was to have a consistent platform edge for blind or other sight impaired people in the community.

Ms. Hopkinson stated that while it may be true that the Board gave its approval, this does not mean that staff is given carte blanche and that staff needn't come back for approval.

Mr. Murray stated that if Board action was taken on this item with an appropriate Board report, this should be a matter of record. It seems that a gentlemen's agreement is being arrived as to how these types of issues will be handled. Mr. Murray does not believe, however, that this is how a multi-billion dollar train system should be built. It seems that a policy is needed with regard to the approval of change orders. Mr. Camacho stated that a policy does exist. Mr. Murray inquired whether the policy has then been violated. Mr. Camacho stated that it has. Mr. Camacho stated that what makes it difficult for Board and staff, however, is the fact that meetings are held only twice a month as opposed to once a week.

Mr. Murray stated that staff should not be allowed to get out so far ahead of the Board that the Board inherits issues. The Board as decision makers should have control. Mr. Murray proposes for staff to, at a minimum, place telephone calls to the Board members to keep them apprised of issues affecting their decision making process.

Mr. Kruse stated although the Board is merely rubberstamping this item, at least a clear procedure will develop as a result of this issue. Mr. Kruse requests that staff return before Board with original Board action change order together with a complete history, including date, on this issue.

Mr. Camacho stated that there is a policy in place and it ought not be violated. If, in fact, there are occasions where immediate reaction is needed on an item, then phone calls should immediately be placed to the Board members apprising them of the issues.

Mr. Kruse stated that he is a proponent for having RCC staff build this project. Decisions have to be made now for this

project to be built and he in no way wants to impede this. The Board should be an asset to the process. Mr. Kruse would simply like to see the process improved upon.

Mr. Pott stated that to provide emphasis, he moves that this matter be held over until the next meeting. Mr. Camacho disagreed indicating that the contractor's money should not be held up.

Ms. Hopkinson stated that although she is sympathetic to Mr. Pott's motion to hold this item over, Ms. Hopkinson moved, Mr. Mc Intyre seconded to recommend that the Commission approve Change Order No. A-167-CO-218 in the amount of \$371,500.00. This amount represents the costs associated with the removal and replacement of the granite platform edge on the MRT platform only. The LRT platform will be addressed separately at a later date.

Motion was approved with Mr. Pott voting no.

Mr. Mc Intyre requests that the 5/6/91 meeting action relative to this issue simply be attached to this item.

7. METRO RED LINE, SEGMENT 1 - CONTRACT A-167
TUTOR SALIBA CORPORATION, CHANGE ORDER NO. 226

Mr. Murray stated that the same principles discussed in Item #6 apply. Mr. Murray further stated that all major change orders are of concern for cost containment purposes.

Ms. Hopkinson inquired what role the designer played in not providing for seismic activity and what liability exists for the designer. Mr. Mc Spedon stated that a major problem discovered on Metro Red Line, Segment 1, was that the design approach for the stations was in two stages. Stage one of the contract provided for digging a hole and putting the concrete shell in. The follow up contract provided for all the finishing work. There are tremendous amounts of misfits and contractor overlays, etc. Contract A-167 is a stage two contract and suffered all of these type of impacts.

Mr. Anderson moved, Mr. Kruse seconded to recommend that the Commission approve Change Order No. A167-CO-226 in the amount of \$230,318.00. This amount represents the total cost associated with the material supply and installation of the redesigned Hanger System for the Supply Air Ducts in the MRT train room.

Motion was approved.

8. METRO RED LINE, SEGMENT 1 - CONTRACT A 640
COMMUNICATIONS, COST PLUS CHANGE NOTICE NO. 224.01

Ms. Hopkinson stated with regard to the "revised technical provisions which provide current design..." statement in this item, she does not understand what changed. Mr. Stark stated that the current design is based on the change to control the fire and emergency management system to the current design. Mr. Stark stated that change was made necessary by experience during the 7th & Metro start-up. Mr. Stark stated that the change represents a fundamental change in equipment used in to control the fire and emergency system. There was a very complex ventilation system in the Red Line Stations. There was a complicated list of instructions followed by firemen and emergency personnel. During the start-up experience SCRTD (operator), RCC and the Fire and Life Safety Committee determined that people would not be able to follow a such a rigorous set of instructions under emergency conditions. The design was changed to make the start-up of emergency procedures easier.

Ms. Hopkinson moved, Mr. Mc Intyre seconded to recommend that the Commission approve Cost Plus Change Notice A640-CPCN-224.01 with a not-to-exceed amount of \$1,000,000.00 increasing the total contract value to \$48,483,508.

Motion was approved.

Mr. Kruse stated that the fire regulations affecting the design of this underground system far exceeds any other system in the world. It is a complex system and must be redesigned. Mr. Kruse inquired whether it is a fair assumption to say that after we have been through this process, that regulations will not continue to change on us. Mr. Kruse inquired whether RCC is totally at the mercy of outside agencies. Mr. Mc Spedon stated that RCC is bound to meeting changing regulations. Regulations are constantly changed, therefore the system will undergo changes throughout its life.

Mr. Pott inquired whether DBE's are involved. Mr. Stark stated that DBE's are definitely involved. Bechtel is at the head of the contract.

10. METRO RED LINE, SEGMENT 1 - AWARD CONTRACT A190
ANCILLARY CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

Ms. Hopkinson stated that this appears to be a unit price contract therefore she's having a hard time understanding

why it was given to a low bidder. Mr. Mc Spedon stated that the basis for award used estimated quantities. Experience on these projects has shown that at the end of a job there are odds and ends that need to be done and these are best done by small companies rather than a big contractor.

Ms. Hopkinson stated that the DBE goal could be higher on this type of work and does not understand why it's only 10%. Ms. Hopkinson furthermore stated that she is uncomfortable with the \$50,000 reserve and doesn't quite understand why, addition to the 10%, \$50,000 is needed.

Ms. Gatewood stated that in reference to the 10% goal on this contract, since the work has not been pre-determined, this contractor hired various sub-contractors to do the work as it was identified. The contractor has the obligation to meet the 10% DBE goal. Mr. Camacho inquired how the 10% goal is arrived at. Ms. Gatewood stated that the intent is to avoid setting a goal that may be unachievable. Mr. Mc Spedon stated that the goal may actually be exceeded, however. Mr. Mc Spedon stated that this is a clean-up contract and work will be issued on a task-ordered basis as work is identified.

Mr. Pott stated that there is an opportunity here to finesse this DBE issue along the lines of Commission policies to segregate contracts as necessary in order to achieve greater DBE participation rather than aggregating a contract and then making it a percentage.

Ms. Hopkinson inquired whether there is any way to get the DBE participation goal up. She would like to see participation as high as 30%. Ms. Gatewood stated that there is a possibility that the goal may be substantially exceeded.

Mr. Camacho inquired whether the goals were set up by Ms. Gatewood or John Mack. Ms. Gatewood stated that although she participated in the process, the goals were established by Contract Compliance. Mr. Camacho stated that he prefers to err on the high side of DBE goal setting.

Mr. Murray inquired that if the scope of work is estimated, then why not estimate or anticipate DBE participation as well. This does not appear to have been done here. The justification for that anticipated level of DBE participation is the fact that the scope of, or type of, work to be performed from the universe of DBE's available to do the work, is estimated. To set higher DBE participation goals gives the contractor a realistic goal to achieve. If low

goals are set, then you will be lucky to get 10%. Mr. Murray stated that he feels the Board report was deficient as it did not do this extra work.

Ms. Hopkinson inquired whether the work is critical. Mr. Stark stated that the station contractors are due to finish work by the end of February. To continue to use these large contractors for the pick-up work will result in large extended overheads. Ms. Hopkinson recommends re-evaluating the DBE goals and to come back with better or more optimistic DBE participation goals. Mr. Zuniga cautioned that if this is done, the contract will have to be re-bid.

Mr. Murray stated that if this has gone out to bid on a set of specifications, then it should not be re-bid on new specifications. Ms. Hopkinson stated that then there is no reason to defer making a decision on this until February.

Mr. Kruse moved approval contingent upon staff returning before the Board with an assumption of DBE goals. Mr. Mc Intyre seconded the motion.

Ms. Hopkinson stated that one of her questions remains unanswered and it pertains to the \$50,000 Disputes Review Board Allowance. Mr. Anderson inquired why there is a separate reserve for the Disputes Review Board. Mr. Mc Spedon stated that this is the cost of the Board. Ms. Kinsell stated that the \$50,000 is an estimated sum put into the contract cost. The share of the Disputes Review Board is shared with the contractor. Ms. Pott inquired why it is segregated from the 10% contract reserve fund. Ms. Kinsell stated that bonds and taxes are not paid on the \$50,000 Disputes Review Board.

Mr. Anderson inquired why two separate contingency funds are required. One for a 10% contract reserve and one for a possible Dispute Review Board. Mr. Anderson inquired why there couldn't be just one contingency fund. Mr. Anderson stated that he thinks that if this was intended to be the beginning of two separate contingencies on every contract, he would be against it.

Mr. Murray stated that he requests that staff conduct this sort of discussion among themselves prior to coming before the Board.

Mr. Kruse amended his motion to approve this item excluding the Disputes Review Board allowance. Mr. Mc Intyre seconded the motion. Motion was approved.

11. METRO RED LINE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/INITIAL STUDY, AND DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR CONSOLIDATED EXCAVATION SITE

This item was deleted from the calendar.

12. PAYMENT FOR PRE-CONSTRUCTION SURVEY SERVICES

Mr. Murray inquired whether this is a change order for work that has already been done. Mr. Camacho affirmed this. Mr. Murray inquired whether this was previously approved by the Board. Mr. Camacho stated he did not believe so.

Mr. Sesay stated that this was a sub-contract to OCIP administrator on the MTIA Contract. The contract expired June, 1991. The Commission now has contract oversight on pre-construction activity. Mr. Sesay stated that he is trying to close-out the contract now. In fact, a new RFP has been distributed to alleviate any future programs from asking for authorization to pay for work that has already been done.

Mr. Murray inquired whether this Board authorized this work to continue. Mr. Sesay stated the Board did provide authorization approximately September, 1991. Mr. Camacho inquired whether this represents a final payment. Mr. Sesay stated that it does and that a new RFP is out. He will be coming back to the Board sometime in March with a recommendation.

Mr. Mc Intyre moved, Ms. Hopkinson seconded to recommend that the Commission increase the Authorization for Expenditure in order to close out the work performed under the previous MTIA contract. Authorize an additional \$350,000 for Contract No. 3504.

Motion was approved.

13. METRO GREEN LINE - NORTH COAST ALIGNMENT OPTIONS

Mr. Thiede provided briefing.

Mr. Mc Intyre inquired who will pay for the people mover. Mr. Thiede stated that it is yet to be determined. However, presumably RCC/LACTC would fund the regional portion and the Airport would pay for the people mover.

Mr. Pott inquired that for planning purposes, what type of technology will be used on the People Mover. Mr. Thiede stated that this is an open issue. However, for planning purposes the assumed technology was AEG Westinghouse-type technology. Miami and Detroit have systems very similar to this technology.

Mr. Pott inquired what power source is planned. Mr. Thiede stated that this has not yet been determined.

Mr. Kruse inquired whether three separate Environmental Impact Reports will be required. Mr. Thiede stated that an umbrella EIR can be done.

The Board heard comments from Mr. John Walsh and Mr. Bryan Allen.

BOARD REQUEST FOR FUTURE ITEMS

1. Mr. Pott requested the Station Design Policies Report.
2. Mr. Pott requested the Revised Budget for the Green Line.
3. Ms. Hopkinson requested a report/briefing on the Budgeting Process and Allocation of Costs.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Bonnie Verdin

Bonnie Verdin
Acting Board Secretary

{c:\wp51\brdmtgs\11792.min}