

Minutes
Board Planning and Development Committee
October 19, 2006
9 a.m.

The meeting was called to order at 9:45 a.m. Present were:

Committee Members

Mr. Christopher Zimmerman (Chair)
Mrs. Gladys W. Mack
Mr. Charles Deegan
Mr. Jim Graham
Mr. Raymond Briscuso
Mr. Dana Kauffman
Mr. Gordon Linton

Other Board Members Present

Mr. William Euille

Approval of Agenda

The Agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes

The Minutes from the September 21, 2006 meeting were approved as submitted.

Action Items

A. Approval Adjacent Construction Program

Mr. David Couch and Mr. Thomas Robinson sought to obtain the concurrence of the Committee and forward to the Board for approval the authority to recover adjacent construction project costs in accordance with the proposed fee schedule and continuation of dedicated staff to support compact jurisdictional projects.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the proposed fee schedule covered only adjacent construction projects and not joint development projects. The staff responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that when the Committee was here in May, staff originally brought this forward. He inquired if this was brought before the Jurisdictional Coordinating Committee (JCC). Mr. Robinson responded that jurisdictions were involved and invitations for the sessions were sent specifically to the jurisdictions.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if staff went to the jurisdictions and if so what was the feedback

and in what ways have staff adjusted the proposal in terms of the level of the charges, the nature of the charges and the procedural questions involved. Mr. Couch responded that WMATA's fees are considerably less than any of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Tangherlini stated that the last time staff met with the Committee they elaborated on the methodology of adjacent construction and the reputation of dealing with WMATA. Staff is trying to layout a very clear predictable process that can be built into project budgets and then be able to move forward. Currently, this does not apply to adjacent construction. Mr. Jim Haggins stated that staff tried to obtain this information from the community and conducted a workshop facilitated by Roger Lewis, a renowned architect and writer from *The Washington Post*. Mr. Lewis facilitated those discussions to make sure that we could get, through an independent source, any comments and opinions regarding the plan that we had put forth.

Mr. Zimmermann inquired about the period of time in which the plan had been out for comments. Mr. Haggins responded that the session was held in mid August 2006 and no comments had been received. Mr. Zimmerman asked if the fee schedule would apply to private development and not just member governments who are part of the Compact. Mr. Zimmerman inquired as to the period of the peer review cycle. Mr. Haggins responded that the peer review cycle would not be less than annually. Mr. Zimmerman stated that he agreed with the idea of having a review of the schedule on a regular basis.

Mr. Tangherlini added that this plan would be reviewed, updated and forwarded to the Board for approval as necessary. Mr. Zimmerman stated that he understands that staff may have to do some fine tuning on a shorter basis. Ultimately he assumes this would become part of the annual budget approval so every year the staff could review it. Mr. Tangherlini agreed and added that the regular review would not prevent the Committee from modifying the fee schedule if they saw fit to do so.

Mr. Kauffman asked how WMATA learns of adjacent construction. Mr. Couch responded that there are two primary methods: (1) from contractors who have previously dealt with the process and (2) observations from our train and bus operators who see construction starting adjacent to our property. Mr. Couch added that ideally there would be a standard process similar to the "Miss Utility Program."

Mr. Kauffman inquired if staff are assessing fees. Mr. Couch responded that the staff looks at the amount of work that is required on a project and develops an estimate based upon what is needed. Since WMATA is required to have the funding in advance of the project, staff sends out invoices in order to open up internal accounts and to track costs. Mr. Kauffman asked if the contractors were paying the costs. Mr. Couch responded that the majority of contractors have been paying associated costs.

Mr. Deegan asked who was invited to the workshops. Mr. Robinson responded that joint

developers, contractors, engineering firms and the jurisdictions were invited. Mr. Deegan asked if any of the developers or contractors had comments. Mr. Robinson responded that the developers were given a draft manual and an overview. They were very appreciative of the explanation and the manual's content. There was limited feedback, especially regarding insurance requirements. Participants expressed interest in having an explanation of the process. Mr. Deegan asked if the fee schedule applied to WMATA's joint development projects as well as adjacent projects. Mr. Robinson responded that the fee schedule would apply to adjacent projects only.

Mr. Deegan inquired about the expedited review premium and asked how many people would come in for the expedited permit and forego the regular process and what effect it would have on the regular process.

Mr. Tangherlini stated that WMATA designed a program that has a 30-day review period and WMATA can shift priorities if there is a need to do so. Mr. Couch stated that the other tool WMATA has is the use of the on-call Engineering Consultant. Mr. Tangherlini stated that the program is funded by the premium and cost is not passed on to WMATA. Mr. Briscuso asked staff if the cost would be viewed as a deterrent. Staff agreed that based on the workshops that it would be welcomed by all parties involved.

The Committee asked staff to elaborate on their direct review of the program with the jurisdictions and results of the workshops conducted.

Motion approved.

B. Platform Structural Rehabilitation

Mr. Joe Triolo and Mr. Ed Riley sought to obtain Committee concurrence and forward to the Board for approval the request to initiate and award a competitive contract for a pilot program to rehabilitate deteriorated platforms at Minnesota Avenue and Deanwood Stations. This would be achieved by replacing sections of the platform and changing the tile flooring standard design from hexagonal quarry tile to square porcelain tile for rehabilitation of these two stations, and all new and future rehabilitated Metrorail Stations.

Mr. Zimmerman reiterated the points in the presentation, stating that the first part of the request is the structural rehabilitation work being done at Minnesota Avenue and Deanwood Stations and also WMATA wants to change the standards overall that would govern the future request.

Mr. Briscuso asked what the life expectancy is for the current tile. Mr. Riley responded that the life expectancy of the tile is 20 to 30 years.

Mr. Riley stated that one of the main driving factors is not that the tile is falling apart but is

the slipperiness of the tile. Currently, the tile meets the coefficient of friction for the ADA in our specifications, however, over the years the tile gets smoother and becomes slick. Mr. Riley added that WMATA is looking for a tile that has a much higher coefficient of friction and this particular tile exceeded what was expected.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what the coefficient of friction is on the existing tile. Mr. Riley responded that the specifications call for .6 which are the ADA minimal requirements. WMATA's tiles are probably .6 or a little above.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what the coefficient of friction is on the porcelain tiles. Mr. Riley responded that the porcelain tiles are .7 to .8 and that contrary to what might be expected, the coefficient of friction goes up when these tiles are wet.

Mr. Tangherlini added that the life expectancy is dependent upon the environment. Mr. Riley stated that WMATA is more interested in the exact size of the tile to prevent water from reaching the platform slab. Mr. Riley added that WMATA is introducing a membrane for above ground stations that would go underneath the tiles to act as a second line of defense because this type of tile is more impervious to water than the current tile.

Mrs. Mack asked if this is the first time WMATA has replaced station tile. Mr. Haggins responded that WMATA continuously replaces tile as necessary, however the damaged tiles were replaced with the hexagonal quarry tile. This is the first time WMATA is proposing changing to the larger porcelain tile.

Mrs. Mack asked if the tiles being replaced will cost \$2.8 million. Mr. Haggins responded that the concrete sub-floor is also being replaced with pre-cast sections, constituting most of the cost.

Mr. Haggins added that there is only one quarry tile manufacturer remaining and there may be supply issues in the future. Staff is attempting to take advantage of other more readily available technologies.

Mrs. Mack inquired about the use of \$49 million budgeted for right-of-way structural rehabilitation. Mr. Haggins responded that WMATA uses these funds to handle structural projects over a three year period. Mr. Tangherlini stated that if the Committee is interested in hearing how WMATA proposes to spend the balance, staff can provide the Committee with that information. Mrs. Mack responded that the Committee would be interested in hearing that at a future Budget Committee meeting.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the terra cotta color samples could be made to match the existing tile on the platform. Mr. Riley responded that the manufacturer is in the process of fabricating new custom tile based on the color of WMATA's existing tile.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if there is any reason why the manufacturer can not cut the porcelain tiles in a hexagonal shape. Mr. Riley responded that WMATA asked the manufacturer to cut the tiles in a hexagonal shape; however the porcelain tile can only be produced in rectangular shapes. Mr. Tangherlini added that it is entirely possible that the manufacturer could find a way to cut the tiles in a hexagonal shape but cost would be a factor. WMATA is trying to develop an investment that balances durability, design and cost.

Mr. Deegan asked if the staff has shown the new porcelain tile design to the Riders' Advisory Council (RAC). Mr. Riley responded that the staff had spoken to the RAC but did not have the sample at the time. Mr. Riley added that WMATA just received the sample one week ago.

Mr. Kauffman stated that the Committee's real concern is that our visually impaired community be supportive of the change.

Mr. Graham asked if the porcelain tile would be included in other stations on an as needed basis. Mr. Haggins responded in the affirmative. Mr. Tangherlini added that if it was simply a tile that needed replacement then WMATA would replace it with the existing hexagonal tile. If, however, it was a broader issue associated with the platform, WMATA would program it for platform replacement and use the porcelain tile.

Mr. Graham asked how many stations would be in need of this rehabilitation. Mr. Triolo responded that WMATA is evaluating all the stations that were constructed before 1984 which is approximately 23 stations. The evaluation will be done by the end of the year. Mr. Triolo added that there are localized areas that have been identified in four of the stations. Mr. Riley stated that the biggest impact is the Dulles Project where the new porcelain tile will be used if approved.

Mr. Linton asked if there would be a cost difference if WMATA used the current tile to replace or re-do an entire station versus using the new porcelain tile. Mr. Tangherlini responded that if WMATA had used the porcelain tile initially the station would not be in need of rehabilitation now but the proposed replacement tile was not available 30 years ago. The existing hexagonal tile has contributed to the need for replacement because the wider joints allowed water to creep in and break up the concrete that now has to be replaced.

Mr. Kauffman formally asked that the specifications of this tile be passed along to the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transit for it to consider incorporating into the Dulles Rail extension.

Mr. Deegan asked what other stations need repairs. Mr. Triolo responded that the Rockville, Shady Grove, Takoma and Brookland stations have localized problems.

Mr. Deegan made a motion to move forward on phase one of the project which is obtaining Board approval for the initiation and award of the contract and defer phase two which is changing the tile flooring standard design, pending further information from the RAC and the Elderly & Disabled Committee (E&D).

After review with the RAC and the E&D Committee, the change of the tile flooring design will be brought back to the Committee for approval.

Motion approved.

C. Approval of Construction Agreement for Navy Yard Station Entrance Modifications

Mr. John Thomas sought to obtain Committee concurrence and forward to the Board for approval the authority for the General Manager to execute a construction agreement for the Navy Yard Station Modifications Project. This action is in conjunction with the Navy Yard Joint Development Project.

Mr. Tangherlini made reference to the Building Elevations slide on Page 35 of the presentation, stating that one of the quality elements of this approach is that people are actually queuing on the surface rather than queuing at the stairs. This was an issue at the Verizon Center and Stadium Armory and was the reason the Smithsonian station has to be closed on Independence Day. WMATA has also implemented use of a stair case instead of a new escalator as a way to move people from the mezzanine level down to the platform, thus getting extra capacity at a lower cost and delaying the maintenance, following the example of the Ballston West Station.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about the ground level to the mezzanine level because in the configuration on Page 35 he did not see stairs inserted. Mr. Thomas responded that the staff had originally hoped to put stairs in this area but budget constraints made adding stairs prohibitive.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that last week the Committee heard about the possibility of spending money to convert escalators to stairs and asked why stairs could not be built. Mr. Tangherlini responded that WMATA is using the existing escalator structure and the only place WMATA is adding stairs and an elevator is from the surface to the mezzanine or platform because this allows for ADA accessibility.

Mr. Graham stated that how we get people to the stadium and back home from a baseball game is a very critical issue. Mr. Graham commended Mr. Thomas on the way he briefed the Committee because he was aware of all the time and effort that had been required.

Mr. Graham asked Mr. Tangherlini how the Committee can be more assured that the April 2, 2008 deadline will be met and what language can be placed in the contract that would reinforce this deadline. Mr. Tangherlini responded that WMATA has included some penalties that involve the contractor providing transportation bridge service to the L'Enfant Plaza Metro station if the scheduled completion is not met. In addition there are severe financial and operational penalties for the developer if the station is not complete by April 2, 2008.

Mr. Graham asked if there is anything more WMATA can do. Mr. Thomas responded that WMATA can add liquidated damages adding that using Metro buses is not an option because the Metro buses are all fully utilized during rush hour so the developer would have to rent buses or provide a bus bridge.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the Committee has been paying very close attention to the deadline because it is key to making sure the Navy Yard Station construction agreement is successful.

Mr. Graham asked the staff to take a look at the budget information provided. The proposed budget is \$20 million; however, there is no mention of the fact that the Committee has an agreement from the District of Columbia to use Transit Infrastructure Investment Funds (TIIF) to the extent of the \$20 million in the event that there is no congressional appropriation. Mr. Graham asked whether something happened of which the Committee was not aware. Mr. Thomas responded that there was a parallel action that was going to the Board today which directly referenced the budget questions. Mr. Graham responded that this point should have been referenced because the Board should be assured that the bill is going to be paid.

Mr. Graham asked for clarification on the remaining budget of \$1.6 million. Mr. Thomas responded that the remaining funds are neither used nor obligated. Mr. Thomas added that WMATA has done some design work and current projected costs are \$18.4 million which means there is \$1.6 million remaining to pay for Metro project management costs and contingencies. Mr. Tangherlini added that unspent funds will be returned to the District of Columbia.

Mr. Graham made a motion to add to the agreement the provision for the General Manager to include incentives in the contract to ensure that the project can be completed within the schedule. Mrs. Mack requested the Board be informed of the parameters of the incentives.

Motion approved.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.