

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Tuesday, April 21, 1987
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.
LTD Operations Conference Room
1944 West 8th, Eugene

BOARD MEMBERS:

Janet Calvert _____ Janice Eberly _____ Gus Pusateri _____

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:

Bruce Hall _____ Jim Ivory _____

A G E N D A

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Action Item - Attachment)

Minutes from the March 31, 1987 Facilities Committee meeting are attached.

II. LAND ACQUISITION UPDATE (Information Item - No Attachment)

The Facilities Committee will be informed of significant developments, if any, on land acquisition. If necessary, the Committee may move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(e) to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

IIII. DESIGN DEVELOPMENT; COST ESTIMATE; SECTION 3 GRANT AMENDMENT (Attachment, enclosure)

Information on design development, associated cost estimate, and the Section 3 grant amendment is provided on the attached memorandum and in the booklet that is included with this packet. The Facilities Committee is asked to provide the Board with a recommendation for their April 29 meeting on the design of the facility and the Section 3 grant amendment.

V. NEXT MEETING TIME AND PLACE

The timing of the next meeting is dependant on progress with land acquisition. At this point, it is not possible to determine exactly when it will be held.

VI. ADJOURNMENT (by 1:30 p.m.)

MINUTES OF FACILITIES COMMITTEE MEETING
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

MARCH 31, 1987

Pursuant to notice given to the Register-Guard for publication on March 27, 1987, the Facilities Committee of the Board of Directors of Lane Transit District met on Tuesday, March 31, 1987, at 12:00 noon at the District offices at 1944 West 8th in Eugene, Oregon.

Present:

Board Members:	Janet Calvert Janice Eberly Gus Pusateri
Community Representative:	Bruce Hall
Staff Members:	Phyllis Loobey Stefano Viggiano Ed Bergeron Shannon Evonuk, Recording Secretary
Consultant:	Eric Gunderson
District Legal Counsel:	Richard Bryson

Absent:

Community Representative:	Jim Ivory
---------------------------	-----------

Ms. Calvert brought the meeting to order. She asked for approval of the minutes of the committee meeting on January 13, 1987. Mr. Hall questioned the placement of the introduction of the Executive Session section of the meeting as noted in the minutes. It was agreed that the words "EXECUTIVE SESSION" should be placed one paragraph further into the minutes, thereby being directly before the section noting the move into Executive Session. The minutes were then approved unanimously by the members.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

At this point, Mr. Pusateri moved that the committee adjourn to Executive Session, pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(e) to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions; and/or pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h) to consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to

current litigation or litigation likely to be filed. Ms. Eberly seconded the motion, which then carried by unanimous vote.

RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION:

After returning to regular session, Mr. Viggiano told the members he wanted to show them the recommended building designs at this meeting, but was not asking them to take any action on them. He said the designs were being made available to give committee members a chance to see what has been done so far with them--changes may yet be made on them. During the week of April 20, he said, committee members will be asked to recommend approval of the designs to the Board of Directors. In May, these designs will be submitted to the value engineers for their input. Mr. Viggiano said that cost estimator has been given copies of the designs, and must return an estimate of the cost by April 15.

On August 1, site work will, hopefully, have begun for the facility. To begin at that time would possibly save \$80,000 to \$100,000 in construction costs, compared to not completing site work this summer.

Mr. Gunderson began his explanation of the designs being shown to the committee members. He said that he has looked at a number of design options. Durability of materials, low cost, good work environment, and being a "good neighbor" were the four points kept in mind for the designs.

A sampling of different design alternatives was shown to the members. The alternatives included both a flat roof and a sloping roof design. The final design uses sloping roof lines. Mr. Gunderson explained that adding some sloping helped the buildings fit better into the surrounding neighborhood. He mentioned that daylighting for the interior of the building was being accommodated through the side designs, so daylighting alternatives did not need to be incorporated into the roof, although some skylights are proposed.

With two buildings--Administration/Operations and Maintenance--housing such different functions, there was some difficulty in trying to make them similar to each other in design. The use of similar building materials will help accomplish this. Brick will be used for the exterior of the buildings; metal will be used in place of steel for the roof. Mr. Gunderson said that, with new, long-wearing paints on the market, metal roofs now come with a 20-year wear guarantee.

A "light shelf" will be used on the exterior of the windows. It is a fairly economical device to use, and it helps shade the lower part of the window. The primary function of the shelf is to reflect light onto the interior ceiling, which, in turn, reflects it into the middle of the room--even as far as several feet. Mr. Pusateri asked if a special ceiling would be needed to aid in reflection. Mr. Gunderson replied that a standard acoustical ceiling, painted a light color, would suffice. Mr. Hall asked if the roof structure will be exposed at all. Mr. Gunderson

said that, in the Administration/Operations building, the roof structure will not be exposed.

Mr. Gunderson added that, in the ceiling, fiberglass insulation would be used instead of rigid insulation, with a cost savings of over \$10,000. Another saving would result from using a wood frame floor and a crawl space below the building, as opposed to a concrete slab construction. This space will also be used as part of a forced air system, rather than through a more complicated duct system.

Mr. Gunderson turned to a discussion of the Maintenance building. The two biggest concerns in the design for a building of this size were that: 1) although it is very easy to get light from daylighting rather than overhead lights, it poses a problem in insulation requirements; and 2) it is not feasible to have a sloping roof to coordinate with the Administration/Operations building--a flat roof would do a better job.

Mr. Gunderson said that there may be a small second floor area in the Maintenance building, to be used mostly for the storage of equipment. A second floor could be added later to the entire building if parts or other items are needed to be stored at a later date.

A gas-fired heating system will be used, and overhead radiant heat will be added in certain spots. A heating system using diesel fuel was considered because of the easy access to diesel fuel on the property, but it was found not to be cost-effective.

Mr. Gunderson said he felt good about the materials being used--brick and metal are not extravagant-looking, but are very useful. Mr. Pusateri wondered if the District would get some negative comments about not having used wood in the exterior design. Staff replied that this may be a possibility; however, Mr. Gunderson said that wood would be used quite a bit in the internal structure of the buildings. Ms. Loobey and Mr. Viggiano said they may want to have ready some responses to potential concern about this subject, such as showing how much wood is to be used throughout the building.

Mr. Viggiano said the cost estimate would be discussed at the next meeting. He added that committee members should contact him with any input or concerns they might have before that meeting. It was decided that the next meeting would be on Tuesday, April 21, at 12:00 noon at the District's offices. Committee members will be asked at that meeting for recommendations to the full Board on the designs and on the Section 3 grant application.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Pusateri moved to end the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Eberly and passed unanimously.

Recording Secretary

III. DESIGN DEVELOPMENT; COST ESTIMATE; SECTION 3 GRANT AMENDMENT

The Facilities Committee is being asked to review material and take action on the design resulting from the design development phase, the related cost estimate, and the associated Section 3 grant amendment. Information on each of these questions is provided in this memorandum and in the Design Development booklet which is included with this agenda packet.

Design

At the last meeting, the Facilities Committee reviewed the proposed design resulting from the design development phase. This design was used in developing the cost estimate that will be discussed at this meeting. Staff do not intend to present additional information on the design, but will be happy to answer any questions the Committee may have on the material that was presented at the last meeting. The booklet provides some additional information on the proposed design.

Approval of this design does not preclude future changes in the design. Currently, the design is only approximately 45% complete. In addition, the second phase of value engineering is to be conducted in May and there is ongoing staff review of the design. Thus, future changes to the design are likely. However, since the Section 3 grant amendment is based upon this design, changes in design that result in increases to the budget will be discouraged.

Cost Estimate

The Design Development booklet includes information on the construction costs only. Table 1 on the following page provides a look at the total budget, including all costs that are associated with the facility project and to be charged to the grant.

As the table indicates, the current cost estimate is, in total, almost exactly equal to the previous cost estimate developed after the schematic design phase last fall. Within individual categories, however, there is some variation. Land costs are estimated to be approximately \$126,000 higher than originally expected, owner furnished items are now estimated about \$100,000 above the previous estimate, and the market adjustment has increased by \$216,000. Overall, the construction costs estimate is \$322,000 below the previous estimate.

The current cost estimate indicates a construction cost of approximately \$79 per square foot for the administration/operations building and \$61 per square foot for the maintenance building. In comparison, the EWEB office building currently under construction is estimated to cost \$100 per square foot and the construction contract for the EPUD office building is approximately \$85 per square foot.

Table 1

	Schematic Est. November 1986	Des. Dev. Est. April 1987	Change
Consultants, Adm., Permits & Moving	\$ 855,724	\$ 905,244	\$ 49,520
Property Acquisition	507,000	633,250	126,250
Owner Furnished Items	167,351	267,330	99,979
Construction Contract			
Site Work	1,868,795	1,762,331	(106,464)
Maint, Fuel, & Wash	3,017,388	2,760,845	(256,543)
Office Building	1,545,790	1,779,048	233,258
Other Areas	292,234	398,736	106,502
Equip & Furnish	1,264,801	1,018,104	(246,697)
SAIF Adjustment	51,664	0	(51,664)
SUBTOTAL	\$9,570,747	\$9,524,888	\$(45,859)
Contingency	715,240	575,251	(139,990)
Inflation	256,916	225,981	(30,935)
Market Adjustment	266,783	482,822	216,039
TOTAL	\$10,809,686	\$10,808,942	\$ (745)

The following is a brief summary of the changes in each of the line items on Table 1. A more complete discussion will be provided at the meeting.

CONSULTANTS, ADM., PERMITS, MOVING: + \$49,520

The increases in this category result from some amendments to the design contract to cover changes in the scope of work, an amendment to the environmental assessment required by the change in site location, and an operating plan for the facility that was not previously budgeted.

PROPERTY ACQUISITION: + \$126,250

The offers made to the land owners are approximately \$80,000 more than the original estimate for land costs. Additionally, this budget includes the cost of the recently retained negotiator and \$40,000 in legal fees that may be necessary if litigation is required.

OWNER FURNISHED ITEMS: + \$99,979

The major increase in this category is \$102,000 for the installation of a water main that the District would contract for directly with EWEB. This water main replaces a submerged water storage tank and pumps that would otherwise be necessary in order to achieve adequate water pressure. There is a net increase in initial capital costs for the water line of approximately \$10,000. However, the life-cycle costs are expected to be

lower with the new water line. The storage tank and pumps which had been budgeted in construction site work have been deleted.

The other changes in this line item are \$9,600 for removal of asbestos from the large movie screen and \$25,000 which has been included for interior landscaping including plants and art work.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT: (\$321,608)

The overall construction cost is expected to be significantly lower than previously estimated, although some areas show increases. Discussion of the construction estimate will be provided at the meeting.

CONTINGENCY: (\$139,990)

As design work becomes more complete and detailed, the amount of "unknowns" in the design are reduced and necessary contingency for the project can decrease. The current estimate includes a contingency of approximately six percent overall, although the contingency of the individual categories varies. The previous estimate included an eight percent contingency.

INFLATION: (\$30,935)

The inflation factor was reduced from 3.0% to 2.8% to reflect the shorter period of time until the construction bid is let.

MARKET ADJUSTMENT: + 216,039

As a result of delays in some major local construction projects (most notable Sacred Heart Hospital and the University science buildings) it is expected that the bidding environment will be even less competitive next winter than previously believed. The current estimate includes a six percent market adjustment, compared to a three percent adjustment in the previous estimate. Additional information on this item is provided in the design development booklet.

Section 3 Grant Amendment

The District submitted a preliminary Section 3 grant for this project nearly two years ago. The grant amount was based on the original project estimate which was developed in April 1985. The grant must be amended to reflect changes in the cost estimate that have occurred since that time. Staff propose to submit a Section 3 grant amendment that is consistent with the current cost estimate as reflected in Table 1 above. A summary of the funding situation, including the initial grant amounts and the proposed grant application amounts based on the current cost estimate, is provided on an attached page.

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration has indicated that the grant amendment must be received in April if the money is to be available by this coming fall. UMTA has also stated that they would not look favorably upon any additional amendments to the Section 3 grant after this one.

Action Requested

1. Recommend to the Board of Directors approval of the design resulting from the design development phase; and
2. Recommend to the Board of Directors approval of a Section 3 grant amendment consistent with the current cost estimate.

FUNDING OF MAINTENANCE FACILITY

<u>Federal Grant</u>	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Local Share</u>	<u>Total</u>
Section 9			
FY 86	\$ 846,759	\$ 211,689	\$ 1,058,448
FY 87	523,382	130,845	654,227
FY 88	355,664	88,916	444,580
Section 18	<u>338,206</u>	<u>84,551</u>	<u>422,757</u>
Sub-Total	\$ 2,064,011	\$ 516,001	\$ 2,580,012
Proposed Budget Maintenance Facility (Estimated Cost)			<u>(\$10,808,942)</u>
Net Balance/Section 3 Grant	\$6,171,697	\$2,057,233	\$ 8,228,930
Original Section 3 Grant	<u>\$5,328,841</u>		
Increase in Section 3 Grant	\$ 842,856		