



# MINUTES

Los Angeles County  
Metropolitan  
Transportation  
Authority

## RAIL CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION (RCC) MAY 24, 1993 MEETING

818 West Seventh Street  
Suite 300  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

213.623.1194

### MEMBERS PRESENT

ROBERT KRUSE, CHAIRMAN  
ROBERT ARTHUR, ALTERNATE TO DEANE DANA  
ERNEST CAMACHO  
JOHN MURRAY  
EVAN ANDERSON BRAUDE  
RAUL PEREZ, ALTERNATE TO EVAN ANDERSON BRAUDE

### STAFF PRESENT

EDWARD McSPEDON, EXECUTIVE OFFICER, CONSTRUCTION & PRESIDENT, RCC  
WILL SANCHEZ, DIRECTOR, RCC CONTRACTS  
MIKE BACA, MANAGER, PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS  
JESSICA CUSICK, DIRECTOR, ART-FOR-RAIL PROGRAM  
JOEL SANDBERG, PROJECT MANAGER, METRO RED LINE, SEG. 2  
AL THIEDE, VICE PRESIDENT, ENGINEERING  
ENRIQUE VALENZUELA, ACTING DIRECTOR, PUBLIC AFFAIRS  
LAURENE LOPEZ, MANAGER, PUBLIC AFFAIRS, METRO GREEN LINE  
DENNIS MORI, FACILITIES ENGINEERING MGR., METRO RED LINE, SEG. 3  
MERCY MENESES, ASSISTANT BOARD SECRETARY  
MELISSA SCHIAVO, SECRETARY

### OTHERS

AUGUSTIN ZUNIGA, COUNTY COUNSEL  
CHARLES SAFER, MTA CO-COUNSEL  
NICK PATSAOURAS, MTA BOARD MEMBER  
MARTY RUBIN, EMC  
K.N. MURTHY, EMC  
TIM SMIRNOFF, EMC

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 P.M.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the May 10, 1993 and May 14, 1993 meetings were approved as submitted.

3. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

The Chairman deferred to the President for his remarks.

4. PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Mr. McSpedon reported the following:

- Last Wednesday, the MTA met and approved staff's recommendations on RCC items with the exception of:

1. METRO RED LINE, SEGMENT 3 - CONTRACT NO. E0070  
EMC, AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE WITH FIRMS FOR  
STATION DESIGN SERVICES

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

2. METRO RED LINE, SEGMENT 2 - CONTRACT NO. B710  
ESCALATORS AND ELEVATORS FOR SEGMENTS 2 & 3  
RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD

This item was deferred until resolution of the protests, received subsequent to the RCC Board's recommendation to approve, are completed. One specific protest filed, by the second low bidder, with the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) contends that the low bidder did not comply with the federal "Buy America" requirements. In staff's judgement, the low bidder has met the federal requirements in its bid via submittal of a "Buy America" certificate. The more detailed questions raised by the second bidder in its protest fall within the purview of FTA who will review and decide on the merits of the protest.

In addition, the MTA approved the following three previously deferred contract award items:

1. METRO PASADENA AND GREEN LINES - CONTRACT EN031  
WASTE HANDLING SERVICES  
RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD
  2. METRO RED LINE, SEGMENT 3 (EAST AND WEST EXTENSION)  
CONTRACT EN032 - WASTE HANDLING SERVICES  
RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD
  3. METRO GREEN LINE - A-R-T FOR RAIL  
RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD
- Parts for the first tunnel boring machine at the Hollywood tunnel began arriving at the site last week. The parts were delivered via 24 separate trucks and assembly of the machine is near complete. The remaining machines will begin arriving over the course of the next 45 days.
  - Last Thursday, the "kick-off" meeting took place for the Citizen's Advisory Committee on construction mitigation in Hollywood. A committee Chair and Vice-Chair were elected and two project tour dates for the committee were set. It was a very productive and positive meeting.
  - On another positive note, last weeks' quarterly FTA meeting went very well. Mr. McSpedon briefed the FTA on Mr. Franklin White's recent presentation to the MTA Board on his analysis of the MTA's 30 Year Plan. Mr. McSpedon conveyed to the FTA that the Metro Red Line is a top priority and that the MTA remains fully committed to meeting its local funding matching requirements in support of the federal investment in the Metro Red Line.
  - Mr. McSpedon updated the Board on the status of the Job Development and Training Program. Mr. Rubin provided a presentation on the EMC's role in helping to implement the program.

Mr. Patsaouras stated that in December 1992, the MTA approved a Job Development and Training Program policy. The adopted policy, which established that every direct-labor contract, no exceptions, shall be subject to a 3-5% set aside for the program, is simple and should be easy to implement. Mr. Patsaouras stated that an implementation plan should have been promptly finalized for immediate application of the program to all pertinent contracts. Mr. Patsaouras stated that this

did not occur and many RFP's have gone out without application of the policy.

Mr. McSpedon stated that the RCC has not had any large construction contracts go out in the last several months but added that several are coming up on Metro Red Line, Segment 2 and definitely the program will be incorporated into these contracts. Mr. McSpedon noted that there are some challenges in applying the policy to construction contracts due to existing labor and training agreements and it will take time to work through these issues. Mr. Patsaouras acknowledged these facts and agreed that we are not yet in a position to incorporate an MTA jobs provision in construction contracts but urged that we move immediately to incorporate the program into all professional services contracts.

Mr. McSpedon also stated that there are a few significant contracts already in place, e.g., Construction Management Services on the Metro Red Line, that are being revisited to explore ways that the program can be implemented on existing major contracts. Staff is also working with the EMC to work out an amendment to their on-going contract to incorporate a provision for the program.

Mr. Patsaouras asked why the policy was not applied to the recent RFP for Construction Management Services for the Metro Pasadena Project. Mr. Rubin stated that although perhaps Mr. Patsaouras is of the opinion that the program should have been implemented immediately following the MTA's approval of the policy, the generally held understanding is that a centrally controlled implementation plan must first be developed before moving forward. This implementation plan is in the final stages of development and legal review.

Following considerable further discussion, Mr. Kruse stated that the RCC is working diligently towards implementing the policy.

#### STANDING INFORMATION REPORTS

##### 5. FORECAST OF UNEXECUTED PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT CHANGES OVER \$200,000

The RCC Board received this status report.

6. FORECAST OF UNEXECUTED/PROCUREMENT CONTRACT  
CHANGES OVER \$200,000

The RCC Board received this status report.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Camacho moved, Mr. Murray seconded, to approve the Consent Calendar items.

Mr. Patsouras inquired whether the proposed technology in Item 7 has been used before. Mr. McSpedon stated that the technology is not new. It was noted that this technology was applied by the City of Los Angeles on the NORS Project.

Mr. Braude asked if there are any below-surface conditions that ground detection radar would not detect. Mr. Murthy stated that the radar will not detect gases such as methane gas. The impulse radar scanning will detect uncharted oil and gas well casings made of wood and sheet metal, which are likely to be found on the Vermont/Hollywood tunnel contract in the vicinity of the former Los Angeles City Oil Field on Vermont Avenue south of Beverly Blvd.

Mr. Murthy stated that he is confident that this a reliable and effective alternative method of detection. Mr. McSpedon added that although utilization of this alternative method will realize a cost and time savings, safety will not be impinged upon.

Motion to approve the Consent Calendar was approved.

7. METRO RED LINE, SEGMENT 2 - CONTRACT B251  
VERMONT/HOLLYWOOD TUNNEL, VALUE ENGINEERING CHANGE  
MAGNETOMETER PROBE ALTERNATIVES

The RCC Board recommended that the MTA authorize staff to proceed with the negotiation of the Value Engineering Change Order, Magnetometer Probe Alternative.

8. METRO RED LINE, SEGMENT 2 - BID NO. B219  
WILSHIRE/VERMONT SITE DEMOLITION (611 SHATTO PLACE)  
NOTICE OF ADVERTISEMENT

The RCC Board authorized staff to proceed with the advertisement and solicitation of Invitation for Bid No. B219.

## REGULAR CALENDAR

### 10. METRO RAIL PROJECTS - CONTRACT NO. E0070 EMC, AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE WITH FIRM FOR SYSTEMWIDE SIGNAGE AND GRAPHICS DESIGN SERVICES

Mr. McSpedon stated that this contract was originally initiated late last year but was not approved by the LACTC and instruction was given to staff to re-procure these services.

Mr. Patsaouras requested that this item be tabled because there is another contract that is currently in progress whereby a consultant has been asked to develop an RFP for advertising and advanced communication systems for all stations. Mr. Patsaouras stated this item would likely duplicate the contract currently in progress.

Mr. Patsaouras asked Ms. Cusick to respond. Ms. Cusick stated that her understanding is that the consultant hasn't actually been given a contract. Rather, two consultants are looking at options for structuring an RFP to address all station communication needs. Ms. Cusick stated that should a contract be developed as a result of the consultant effort, both these contracts would need to closely coordinate.

Mr. Braude asked why this item was rejected by the MTA. Mr. Patsaouras stated that it was rejected because there wasn't enough local participation. Mr. Braude stated that although there should be some coordination between contracts, he's not sure this item should be tabled.

Mr. Kruse stated that his understanding is that a policy does need to be established for electronic advertising but that this item is for signage that directs patrons to where they are going to go. Mr. Kruse asked Ms. Cusick to comment. Ms. Cusick stated that this contract is to take a global look at the overall system signage for trains as well as interface for buses and Metrolink. This item includes the issue of electronic signage as well as static signs, vicinity maps and ticket vending machines that may be improved upon from the current system. This contract also would include the consideration of the use of symbols for international communication. The other consultant contract referenced by Mr. Patsaouras is specifically to take a look at the combination of advertising and electronic information delivery systems; there may be some overlap as suggested by Mr. Patsaouras. From a staff point of view, it is felt that the overlap can easily be coordinated since the consultant work being done hasn't evolved into a contract yet.

Mr. Patsaouras stated that he has a problem spending money to do this proposed work, when consultant work is in progress to study and make recom-

mendations on a universal and comprehensive signage system...especially because of the imminent 250 employee layoff that is expected any day now.

Mr. Kruse asked Mr. Sandberg to comment on how this work flows into station construction. Mr. Sandberg stated that Metro Red Line, Segment 2 will not be ready to accept any signage for approximately a year and a half. Mr. McSpedon added that Metro Green Line, however, will very soon be ready to accept signage.

Mr. McSpedon stated that there is no doubt that we need some overall signage guidelines and that is what this item attempts to do. Mr. McSpedon stated that he agrees with Mr. Patsaouras that advertising sponsorship electronic information is the wave of the future and may even be a potential source of income for the MTA. We must and will eventually find a way to do this. Mr. McSpedon stated that he has relied on staff with a broader view, namely our marketing department, to implement this broader vision. Seeing as this hasn't been done and our stations will soon be ready for some basic directory signage, it is obvious we are out of sync. Mr. McSpedon stated that he certainly would not want to move forward with signage for the Metro Green Line to find out that it does not conform with a universal signage system that may be developed in the future. Mr. Braude stated that unless he hears that this work will be out of sync with a universal system, he will make a motion to approve this item. Ms. Cusick stated that she does not believe that it is out of sync, since the other contract has not been let.

Mr. Arthur asked when this item will come before the Board and MTA. Ms. Cusick stated that the MTA's Planning and Programming Committee actually hired the consultants to work on the RFP and they are expecting an update in June 1993.

Mr. Camacho asked what the percentage of overlap is on these items. Mr. Rubin estimated the overlap at 10%. Mr. Patsaouras stated that this agency may have the internal capability of accomplishing much of what is proposed via this contract because SCRTD produced its own maps for the Metro Blue Line.

Mr. Arthur inquired if staff has estimated the cost of this work yet. Mr. Thiede stated that the total cost projections have not been developed yet. Mr. Thiede stated that what is known is that five months have already been lost by having to re-bid this item and, in addition, an enormous amount of in-house staff time has been spent repackaging this contract. Mr. Patsaouras requested that, in the near future, staff provide him with an estimate of what it cost to repackage this contract.

Mr. Arthur asked, as did Mr. Ray Grabinsky in 12/92, how much it has cost the agency to rebid this contract and if the same contractor is awarded the bid, how much has been lost in terms of time and dollars. Mr. Thiede stated that the time, to date, is five months and that staff will have to report back on the costs to date.

Mr. Kruse stated that it seems to him that there is some urgency to this item because of the Metro Green Line signage needs. He inquired whether the Metro Green Line portion of the signage in the contract could be separated for approval and with direction to staff to coordinate with the Planning and Programming Committee on the balance of the work. Ms. Cusick stated that she does not believe that it would be effective to break out the contract. Ms. Cusick stated that signage for the Metro Green Line has been developed along the guidelines of existing signage and this contract would only be effective if viewed as an evaluation of the entire system and to use it as an opportunity to emphasize what the problems are with an integrated system approach.

Mr. Arthur stated that he would have to abstain from voting on Mr. Braude's motion because due to late receipt of this item he has not had adequate time to thoroughly review the report especially in light of all of the issues raised.

Mr. Kruse stated that lacking a second to Mr. Braude's motion, he directs staff to return with a comprehensive report which addresses all the issues raised today. The report should include a coordination plan and identification of the lead staffperson/s.

Mr. Patsaouras requested that staff speak with the consultant charged with developing the RFP to understand where overlaps exist. In addition, Mr. Patsaouras requested that staff communicate with former SCRTD staff at the MTA who may be able to produce some of the work in-house.

The Board heard comments from Mr. John Walsh.

Mr. Arthur moved, and it was seconded, to defer this item to the next RCC Board meeting with a full report on a coordination plan. Motion was approved.

#### 11. METRO RAIL PROJECTS - POLICY FOR RAIL STATION NAMING

Mr. McSpedon provided some brief background on this item.

The Board heard comments from Mr. Bill Doebler, City of Downey, who indicated that although the City of Downey is supportive of this policy, provisions for exceptions should be incorporated in the policy. Mr. Doebler

asked the Board to consider the example of the Lakewood Blvd. I-105 Station which will primarily serve the cities of Downey, Paramount and Bellflower. Regardless of the official name of this station, the station will probably be commonly known as the Lakewood station. However, the City of Downey's concern is that Lakewood is actually several miles from the station and this unintentionally obscures the communities that the station will primarily serve. For this reason all three communities have previously asked the MTA to include prominent secondary signage that acknowledges the communities that the station serves.

Mr. McSpedon stated that staff's general approach has been to view this primarily as a transit design issue and not a community issue. The primary reason for these names is to help riders navigate the system. However, staff recognizes that where there are stations within jurisdictions, the cities have a legitimate interest and special consideration will be given on a case-by-case basis and exceptions to the policy may be made if merited.

Mr. McSpedon stated that staff's recommendation today is to consider the adoption of the policy, and if also approved by the MTA, then staff will return to the Board with approval of case-by-case exceptions.

Mr. Camacho moved, Mr. Arthur seconded to approve this item. Motion was approved.

1. The RCC Board recommended that the MTA adopt the following Station Naming Policy based on the existing informal policy:
  - Geographic Designation: Transit stations are intended as travel destinations and, therefore, should be identified by their geographic locations as closely and accurately as possible.
  - Primary Name: Rail stations will normally be named after their street or freeway intersections.
  - Secondary Name: Where stations are located in close proximity to significant, generally-recognized landmarks, such landmarks could be added as secondary station names, e.g. Pico/L.A. Convention Center, 7th Street/Metro Center.
  - Restrictions: Stations shall not be named after corporate entities.

- Acknowledgement of Contributions: Private or public contributions to a rail station can be acknowledged in ways other than inclusion in station names such as a commemorative plaque installed in the station wall or city identifier at or near the station.
  - Name Adoption: Station names will be adopted by the MTA Board.
  - Local Notification: Local jurisdictions in which rail stations are located will receive notification of this policy and of proposed station names in their communities prior to the adoption of station names by the MTA Board.
  - Policy Coverage: This policy applies to all light and heavy rail projects constructed by the MTA and is not intended to apply to commuter rail lines (i.e., Metrolink). An overall station signage policy is expected to be adopted by the MTA Board in the future.
  - Policy Modifications: The MTA Board reserves the right to modify this policy by 3/4 majority Board vote.
2. That the RCC Board recommend that the MTA adopt the following names for the Metro Green Line stations (no secondary names are being recommended at this time):

Primary Name:

- 40. I-605 / I-105
  - 41. Lakewood Blvd. / I-105
  - 42. Long Beach Blvd. / I-105
  - 29. \*Imperial/Wilmington Ave.
  - 43. Avalon Blvd. / I-105
  - 44. Harbor Freeway / I-105
  - 45. Vermont Ave. / I-105
  - 46. Crenshaw Blvd. / I-105
  - 47. Hawthorne Blvd. / I-105
  - 48. Aviation Blvd. / I-105
  - 49. Mariposa Ave. / Nash St.
  - 50. El Segundo Blvd. / Nash St.
  - 51. Douglas St. / Rosecrans Ave.
  - 52. Marine Ave. / Freeman Blvd.
- \*Transfer Station

13. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Kruse called for public comments out of order.

The Board heard comments from Mr. Antonio Allah.

12. METRO RED LINE, SEGMENT 3 - MODULAR STATION DESIGN

Mr. McSpedon provided some brief background and deferred to Mr. Murthy who provided a presentation on this item.

Mr. Patsaouras asked what the status is on the design of the Hollywood/Highland station. Mr. Murthy stated that the preliminary engineering was done and the section designer is proceeding with a final design. A design concept is anticipated in 45 days. Mr. Patsaouras inquired whether the station entrance location issue has been resolved. Mr. Murthy stated that it has and deferred to Mr. Mori for elaboration. Mr. Mori stated that the staff has been working closely with the Area Teams and Joint Development Planning staffs and that the current entrance design is in accordance with the location presented to the Joint Development Ad Hoc Committee as part of the Master Planning Compatibility Study Report which was concluded last year. Mr. Patsaouras stated that the Joint Development Committee must reconvene as soon as possible to reexamine this issue.

Mr. Patsaouras asked if the subway "restroom" policy issue was ever resolved. Staff knowledgeable on the policy was unavailable to provide clarification. Mr. McSpedon stated that staff will follow-up and report back.

13. PUBLIC COMMENT - Continued

The Board heard comments from Mr. Tut Hayes.

14. BOARD MEMBER REQUEST FOR FUTURE ITEMS

Mr. Braude questioned whether his previous request for the feasibility of cellular phone access on Metro Red Line, Segment 1 has been addressed. Mr. McSpedon stated that staff will follow-up and report back.

## CLOSED SESSION

The Board adjourned to Closed Session to discuss:

Actual Litigation - G.C. #54956.9 (a)

- Case No. BC067368 (Granite Construction)
- Case No. BC062249 (Eric and Sophie David, David Jewelers Inc., dba Wilshire Jewelers)

Potential Litigation - G.C. #54956.9 (b)

- Contract No. C0100 (Steve P. Rados, Inc.)

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

Submitted by:



BONNIE VERDIN  
RCC Board Secretary

{a:\wp51\brdmtgs\052493.min}