

MINUTES
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
FACILITIES COMMITTEE
September 9, 1986

The District's Facilities Committee met on Monday, September 9, at 7:30 a.m. in the LTD Operations Conference Room.

Present:

Board Members:	Janet Calvert Janice Eberly Gus Pusateri
Staff Members:	Phyllis Loobey Mark Pangborn Stefano Viggiano Ed Bergeron Eileen Mugglewortz, Recording Secretary
Chamber Representatives:	Jim Ivory Bruce Hall
Consultant:	Eric Gunderson

Janet Calvert brought the meeting to order. Janet moved for approval of the minutes; Jim Ivory seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, told the Facility Committee that most of today's meeting would center on discussion of agenda item #4, the schematic design review. He gave an update of the current status of the project and the direction in which the Committee would be working, how the new facility would function, and the site plans/floor plans of the building. He stated that there was plenty of time before major decisions needed to be made, and showed an outline of the schematic design phase, explaining the outline of what had been completed and what needed to still be done. Stef explained to the Committee that staff had worked with Eric on design alternatives and came up with a preliminary design, which was again reviewed by staff for input. A preliminary cost-estimate has also been developed, and comments were gotten from bus operators. Value Engineering has been conducted by CH₂M Hill, and staff are reviewing those recommendations. A peer group had been formed from staff from transit properties that have recently been involved in designing and building new facilities. The group included Mr. Tom Lee, Santa Clara County Transit, San Jose, California; Mr. Mark Stanisich, Pierce Transit, Tacoma, Washington; Tom Brush, Contra Costa Community Transit, Concord, California; and Michael Hubbell, San Mateo County Transit District, South San Francisco, California. Stef stated that both the peer group review and the value engineering review had proven very useful, providing many recommendations.

to consider and possibly implement. He further explained that, at this point, there is no design recommendation, but he wanted to bring the Facility Committee up to date and to have an opportunity to discuss extensively the schematic design and preliminary project budget. The Facility Committee will then review the design in early October and, after a Facility Committee recommendation, the design will be submitted to UMTA for review. The intent is to submit the proposal to UMTA and then seek Board approval in November.

Stef explained that there are several options for the October Facility Committee meeting (either a breakfast, lunch, or dinner meeting), but about a three-hour work session will be needed. Stef stated that this could be decided at the end of this meeting.

Janet Calvert asked if any decisions had been made about land selection for the new facility. Stef explained that land appraisers around the State have been very busy. The District had hoped to have the appraisal completed by now, but it appears that the appraisals will not be done until early or mid-October, and final agreement on the purchase is not expected until late November or early December.

Gus Pusateri asked whether the property appraisers being used would be from this area. Stef told the Committee that local appraisers had been asked, but the District needed appraisers qualified in commercial property. There are three in the area that were asked to submit proposals, but only two responded. It is the District's intent to go with a local appraiser, while trying to mitigate delays. One way to do this is to go ahead with the design process on areas that are not site-specific. In this way, funds would not be wasted if the site should change.

The Committee and staff then discussed Agenda Item #3: Open vs. Closed Offices. Stef explained that the Facility Committee had requested that staff evaluate open versus closed office space. The reasons for this request was that it was felt that open space would be more cost-effective, provide more flexibility for movement, and would increase staff interaction. Stef stated that from the original program sheet distributed to the Committee, it had been difficult to tell how many staff would have private offices and how many would be in open areas. Upon review, the distribution of office space was 28 private offices and 36 open offices. Stef told the Committee that site visits of other public offices and agencies were conducted and, while the open/closed mix of offices varies a great deal from site to site, the trend at two local agencies has been toward private offices. Stef discussed the detailed price analysis of open versus closed, and stated that it was a fairly complete analysis. The net result was that the open office is \$1,441 less than a private office. Stef explained that the discussion had revolved around 5-6 positions proposed for private offices at an estimated total cost of \$7,900. The issue of flexibility was also discussed. He told the

Committee that one site visit occurred at SpectraPhysics, where it is necessary to change the layout every few months, depending upon the type of projects being worked on. He explained that LTD is very unlikely to need any major changes for the first 20 years. The design has all of the private offices the same size, enabling people to move between offices and allows flexibility if movement were necessary. At this point, changes could be made; inside walls are not load-bearing and could be moved relatively easily. With the predominant amount of open office space, additional open office spaces could create too much interaction. It would not be possible to unplug the phone, close the door, and work.

Janet asked the Committee if they had any questions. She stated that she has noted that in private offices, doors are often open until intense work is necessary. Stef stated that this is now true at LTD.

Gus Pusateri stated that he had talked with a Lane County employee involved in computer work and set up in open office space. She had stated that she would like a closed office because of less distractions and interruptions. Gus stated he would like to see a 50/50 mix and asked if this would be the maximum number of private offices in projections for the year 2005, 20 years from now. Stef stated that the amount of private offices would not increase, as the office space would not all be filled when the District moves into the new facility.

Jim Ivory stated that he would concur with a mix of both open and closed office space for the obvious reason of productivity, and thought that, from the layout, there was ample flexibility. He stated that the mix of open and closed space worked very well in his office.

Eric Gunderson responded to Janet Calvert's question of whether it was necessary to make a decision at this time. He stated that it would be easier to make changes soon, as there were other considerations to review, such as office size. This issue had been recommended by both the peer group review and the value engineer. Gus Pusateri asked if all of the offices were the same size, and Stef responded that all but 4 were the same size.

Janet Calvert made a motion, and Janet Eberly seconded, that the Committee accept the open vs. closed office plan as listed on page 6 of the agenda packet. The motion passed unanimously. Gus Pusateri asked about the cost per square foot of the offices. Eric Gunderson stated that the cost was approximately \$60 per square foot, which included everything except furniture.

The Committee and staff then discussed Agenda Item #4: Schematic Design Review. Stef explained to the Committee that Eric Gunderson would go through the information with the Committee and discuss the conceptual

layout of the site and each of the buildings. This detailed information on the design provides the Committee with more accurate construction cost estimates. Stef told the Committee that staff plan to spend a considerable amount of time with the Committee on the cost estimate, explaining what the increases resulted from and what the effect of reducing costs would be. He further explained that both the schematic design and the budget will eventually be presented to the full Board for their review.

Eric Gunderson distributed to the Committee a publication prepared by Wilson Bryant Gunderson Seider entitled Preliminary Schematic Design & Cost Estimate, September 1986. Eric stated that his intent at today's meeting was to go through the publication with the Committee, as had been done with staff, reviewing the development, the budget, and the recommended changes for the new facility. He explained that the packet also included a budget update based on the preliminary design; this figure was approximately \$2.4 million more than the original, conceptual design, and this new figure was much more accurate. This amount, however, does not include changes that will be going on as the design is examined and modified.

Eric told the Committee that we are at a very early stage of the project, allowing for generous opportunities for review and input. He stated that he felt the process had been excellent, and he had been very involved with District staff trying to incorporate the functional and operational needs of the District in the designs. He then elaborated on the information presented in the publication distributed to the Committee, and explained the reasons for the proposed revisions to the site plans.

Janet Calvert commented that she felt the design included a great deal of employee parking spaces, and asked how many parking stalls would be provided. Eric responded that 225 stalls were planned for employees, to address the parking needs of preceding and subsequent work shifts.

Stef added that many bus operators do not have the option of taking the bus to work. This option is being encouraged at the new facility by putting a sidewalk around the walk area from Franklin Blvd. and Henderson to the new facility.

Jim Ivory stated that he thought the design was beautiful; he loved the amount of daylight provided in the facility, thought the design was great and stated that it appeared to be very functional. He stated that he especially liked the bus washer set-up.

Gus Pusateri asked how long it took the buses to go through the bus washer. Eric replied that it took approximately 3 minutes. Stef added that the Value Engineers have recommended putting in two bus washers,

concerned that a "stack-up" may occur with the fueling-in-place that is proposed. However, Stef stated that this whole fueling concept is being reviewed, since the fueling-in-place costs are substantially higher than using a fueling island, as the District currently uses. Janice Eberly asked if the fueling island would not be quite cumbersome, and Stef replied that significant changes would have to be made in the site plan if this change were implemented. One of those changes would be modifying the size of the bus parking stalls from 14' to 12'. Mark Pangborn told the Committee that the Value Engineers had pointed out operating problems with the fueling-in-place concept, and that long-term operating costs could actually be reduced by using a fuel island.

Janet Calvert stated that a great deal of valuable information had been presented for the Committee to "digest." Eric stated that all that had been discussed at today's meeting was summarized in the booklets distributed to Committee members and staff.

Janice Eberly commented that it would be necessary to talk about the cost estimates of the proposed site plan fairly soon. Stef explained the necessity of having a rather long meeting the next time the Committee meets to address this topic. Janice asked if the Value Engineers' work was completed. Stef replied that they were waiting for LTD's response to their suggestions and would then provide the District with a final report.

Facility Committee members were polled to see what was preferred in planning the next meeting date.

Janet Calvert commented that this was an interesting and exciting process, and that it was nice to see the drawings rather than just a long report.

Janice Eberly asked whether the facility designs allowed for expansion. Eric stated that there was ample room in the design to allow for expansion; there is 60' of property available between the proposed building site and the property line, and the maintenance facility could add two or more bus bays along the side of the building if it were necessary. He added that by providing adequate space needs to accommodate two shifts helped in itself to eliminate expansion problems. Phyllis stated that the District currently runs three work shifts.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.


Recording Secretary