



Expo

6.b

DATE: MAY 7, 2007

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**FROM: RICHARD D. THORPE
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

**ACTION: CONSIDER ADOPTION OF AN ALTERNATIVE DESIGN
CONCEPT FOR JEFFERSON, VERMONT AND AN OPTIONAL
USC/EXPO PARK STATION**

RECOMMENDATION

Consider alternative station designs submitted by USC/Expo Park stakeholders for the Jefferson and Vermont stations, as well as the optional Trousdale station should funding be identified for its design and construction, consistent with the Urban Design Policy adopted by the Board in January 2007.

SUMMARY

In January, the Expo Board adopted an Urban Design Policy to allow alternative urban design elements, including station design modifications for the Expo LRT Project. The Policy included a list of criteria to be considered when determining whether to grant approval to alternatives to the urban design elements already approved by the Expo Board. Upon adoption of that policy, USC and the Expo Park stakeholders initiated a process for the development of an alternative station design for the stations in their vicinity, which they deemed to be more consistent with the architecture of the USC campus and Exposition Park neighborhood. USC retained Zimmer Gunsul Frasca (ZGF) to develop the design and contracted with the Authority and its Design-Build Contractor, FCI/Fluor/Parsons (FFP), to facilitate and support the process. That process has been completed, resulting in the concept design presented today for consideration by the Expo Board.

The final alternative station design concept was presented to the Urban Design Committee at its March and April meetings and garnered support from a majority of the Committee members. USC and Expo Park stakeholders participated in the process and have endorsed the proposed alternative design

DISCUSSION

The Urban Design Policy adopted by the Expo Board in January of this year contained a list of criteria to be considered when determining whether to grant approval to alternative station design elements for this project. While the planning principles outlined in the FEIS/FEIR discussed a standardized station design which would provide continuity along the project, the policy adopted by the Board allows for alternative station designs to be considered if certain criteria are met. After the adoption of the policy, USC and Expo Park stakeholders held a series of design charettes to develop alternative station design concepts for the stations in the vicinity of the USC campus and Expo Park. The charettes enabled all parties to provide input into an alternative design which would incorporate the character of the USC campus and Expo Park neighborhood, while maintaining consistency with the planning principles for the Expo LRT Project established by the FEIS/FEIR. USC contracted with ZGF, an architectural firm which has done other work for USC and also served as the architect for the PE Phase of the Expo Project, to lead the design development. USC also contracted with the Expo Authority and its Design-Build Contractor, FFP, to facilitate and support the process, ensure the alternative design would meet project functional and construction requirements, and be consistent with the planning principles established by the FEIS/FEIR as required by the Urban Design Policy.

The Urban Design Committee does require that a majority of stakeholders surrounding the station area support the alternative station design concepts. USC and Expo Park stakeholders worked jointly to develop this alternative station design and have endorsed the concept being presented to the Board today.

The design process initiated and funded by USC has resulted in the design concept presented in Attachment A. A design narrative has also been provided by ZGF and is included as Attachment B. The proposed design is consistent with Project requirements and the Urban Design Policy. However, it does include some significant differences from the standard design adopted for the other Expo Project stations. While there is some continuity between the alternative design and the standard design, including station color, entry arches, station furniture, art panels and station pylons, the primary differences are in the canopy design, the use of trees on the platform for shade protection, and the incorporation of red brick on station walls and canopy foundations. Although the alternative canopy design is significantly different from the standard canopy, it does feature a contemporary design and use of similar materials.

The Urban Design Policy requires that any cost differential in the design, construction or maintenance of an alternative station design be completely borne by the requestor(s). After FFP has prepared a cost estimate for the design and construction of the alternative stations and if the Board approves this alternative station design concept, Authority staff will negotiate a legal agreement with

USC/Expo Park, to fund the differential in the design, construction and maintenance costs.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The alternative station design involves cost impacts for design, construction and maintenance relative to the standard station. The change from side mounted canopies to center supported canopies requires some redesign of the already designed station foundations, resulting in an additional design cost for the alternative design. The alternative canopy design is also more expensive to construct on a per foot basis, resulting in an overall construction cost increase. Maintenance cost impacts have yet to be determined, but are expected to be an additional cost. In accordance with the Urban Design Policy, USC will need to commit to paying all additional costs in order for the alternative design concept to be adopted and implemented.

NEXT STEPS

If the Board adopts the alternative design for the Jefferson, Vermont and optional USC/Expo Park Stations, USC will need to enter into a Legal Agreement to fund the additional design, construction and maintenance costs. This Agreement will need to be negotiated by the end of May, and sufficient funds deposited to cover the additional design costs, in order for the station designs to proceed without impact to the Project schedule.

If the Board declines to adopt the alternative design, the Design-Build Contractor will be directed to proceed with the standard station design as currently planned, and there will be no cost or schedule impact to the project.

ATTACHMENT(S)

- A. Proposed Concept Design
- B. Design Narrative