

MEETING MINUTES #19

Issue Date: July 21, 2006

MEETING DATE: Monday, July 10, 2006
 MEETING TIME: 4:00 P.M.
 MEETING LOCATION: San Diego Community College District
 3375 Camino Del Rio South, Board Room #245
 San Diego, CA 92108-3883

Attendees / Distribution:	*Indicates those present at this meeting
Committee Members:	S.D.C.C.D. Staff:
Antonio, Robert G. *	Backensto, David*
Fat, Thomas *	Burkhart, Richard*
Glaser, Bobby *	Carroll, Constance*
Goodfriend, Harvey J. *	Cepeda, Rita *
Heiberg, Walter *	Dexheimer, Carol ²⁾ *
Pearson, Christopher *	Hsieh, Patricia*
Schulze, Evonne *	Kastelic, Rudy *
Smith, Rev. George Walker *	Manges, Peggy *
Spoon, Roberta *	Montijo, Rosemary *
Stoll, Catherine Clarke *	Parker, Bob ⁴⁾ *
Zaharopoulos, Pat *	Perez, Ron ¹⁾ *
Board of Trustees:	Rogers, Darrell *
Block, Marty *	Schamu, Damon*
Grosch, Rich *	Presenters:
	Lau, Alberto URS *
	Schroeder, Paul, DWRB *
Parsons-Proposition "S" Program Staff:	
Clark, Jim *	Public Speakers:
Hickle, Marlene *	Krammer, Ed, Linda Vista *

Representing:

- 1) Cepeda, Rita, Mesa College
- 2) Burgess, Terry, City College
- 3) Hsieh, Patricia, Miramar College
- 4) Kastelic, Rudolph, Continuing Education

Prepared by: Jim Clark, Parsons Phone (619) 687-0400

Note: Please inform the writer of any errors or omissions to these minutes; otherwise, they will be presumed correct as written.

Meeting Minutes #19

Issue Date: July 21, 2006

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
The meeting was called to order by Evonne Schulze at 4:04 P.M.	
1. Roll Call and Introductions	
<p>Clark: Took roll call. A quorum was present.</p> <p>Schulze: Introduced new committee members: Harvey J. Goodfriend (San Diego Taxpayers Association); Robert G. Antonio (Senator, Associated Student Body, Mesa College); and Pat Zaharopoulos (Deputy Attorney General, California Department of Justice). Then recognized members of the Board of Trustees and District employees.</p> <p>Commented to new committee members regarding the success of the Committee and read a quote from a previous Committee member Mr. Barry Newman; “My only comment is that we sit on a host of oversight committees through the taxpayers association, and this is to my knowledge, the most qualified, the most representative oversight committee that exists and the capacity and potential of this body to serve both the Board, staff, and the public is limitless”.</p>	
2. Approval of Minutes, Citizens Oversight Committee Meeting #18, May 8, 2006 (Ref. Doc. COC-071006-02).	
<p>Schulze: Asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes. Hearing none, she asked for a motion for approval of the minutes. (Pearson moved, Smith seconded) Unanimous approval.</p>	
3. Presentation of Deferred Maintenance Plan (Ref. Doc. COC-071006-03)	<u>Darrell Rogers,</u> <u>Director, Facilities Services</u>
<p>Pearson: Are any Proposition “S” funds used for deferred maintenance?</p> <p>Rogers: No</p> <p>Rogers: Presented the Deferred Maintenance Plan. Discussed the five attachments to the Plan including: Attachment 1 indicates projects completed with state funds since 1998. The funds are always a 50/50 match between District and State. Attachment 2 indicates projects in progress. District will receive 50/50 match funding plus funds from energy incentive program. District will save about \$130K each year in deferred energy costs. Attachment 3 indicates schedule for projects in 2006 to 2010. Attachment 4 indicates fund set-aside projects. Attachment 5</p>	

Meeting Minutes #19

Issue Date: July 21, 2006

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>indicates new buildings formula for utilities, maintenance operations, maintenance personnel, etc. Business Services sets aside funds to cover the subsequent operational costs for these buildings. The District is in very good shape with regard to maintenance of buildings.</p> <p>Heiberg: Asked for confirmation of requirement for Proposition “S” Citizen’s Oversight Committee involvement in Deferred Maintenance Plan.</p> <p>Rogers: The Proposition “S” Resolution required that the District have a Maintenance Plan in place. The Citizen’s Oversight Committee is tasked to monitor annual updates to the Plan.</p> <p>Heiberg: Is the Citizen’s Oversight Committee to review all portions of the Plan, or just the Proposition “S” impact?</p> <p>Schamu: District thought it best to show the whole Plan to demonstrate the health of the program and how the District is using District funds to cover maintenance for all facilities, including those build through Proposition “S”,</p> <p>Glaser: The first four attachments seem to be about replacing portions of buildings, but wants a more detailed look at maintenance requirements 10, 15, or 20 years out, i.e., categorize longer term requirements.</p> <p>Rogers: As shown in Attachment 3, past funding has not covered all requirements. Therefore, the list looks 10 – 15 years out to include those projects on the list.</p> <p>Glaser: District is looking at the issue from a project basis; he wants District to look at all requirements and wants the requirements categorized in advance.</p> <p>Schamu: Agreed to bring examples of plans 15 – 20 years out including roofing and air conditioning. Noted that half of the future costs are in utilities.</p> <p>Heiberg: Plan should address buildings put into service and make a timeframe of 20 years of repair requirements showing Citizen’s Oversight Committee and citizens that we understand what the future costs may be.</p> <p>Carroll: Agreed District should sort by Proposition “S” buildings with each requirement mapped separately.</p> <p>Pearson: Will the District anticipate a high bubble to replace roofs in 2027?</p> <p>Schamu: Construction of the buildings is spread over time and</p>	<p>Schamu: Provide copies of Maintenance Plans for Committee’s information.</p>

Meeting Minutes #19

Issue Date: July 21, 2006

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>the roofs age differently. District does not anticipate a bubble in the future.</p> <p>Heiberg: Does the District assume a life expectancy for each new building?</p> <p>Schamu: Each is different. In fact, some at Mesa College have outlived their assumed life expectance.</p>	
<p>4. New Miramar College Project VI-2, Reprographic/Mailroom Relocation (Ref. Doc. COC-071006-04)</p>	<p><u>Richard Burkhart</u> <u>Construction Manager,</u> <u>Facilities Management</u></p>
<p>Burkhart: The Board of Trustees have approved a Board Docket to convert a Biolab at Miramar College into Reprographic (2,670 ASF) and Mailroom (400 ASF) areas. This project is presented to the Committee for their information.</p> <p>Heiberg: Inquired about difference between ASF and GSF.</p> <p>Schamu: Explained Assignable Square Feet as the usable area of the facility and Gross Square Feet as the total enclosed area of the facility.</p>	
<p>5. New City College Project VII-2, Modular Village</p>	<p><u>Richard Burkhart</u> <u>Construction Manager,</u> <u>Facilities Management</u></p>
<p>Burkhart: The Board of Trustees has approved a Board Docket to Construct a Modular Village (twelve modular buildings) at City College. The campus needs classrooms. They are losing some from the “L” Building Renovation project and gaining some from the “R” Building Construct Classrooms project. The net result is a loss which will be corrected by this project for a Modular Village. One of the modular buildings will be a restroom building. The Village will be sited on the parking lot south of the Child Care Center. Lost parking spaces will be replaced by a new 80,000 SF Parking Structure.</p> <p>Heiberg: The \$90K figure in the budget is for what?</p> <p>Schamu: That will be General Fund dollars for custodial and maintenance personnel. They are not Proposition “S” funds.</p>	
<p>6. Presentation of Joint Use Report, Mesa College Project I-3, Allied Health Center</p>	<p><u>Alberto Lau</u> <u>Project Manager,</u> <u>URS Corporation</u></p>
<p>Lau: Provided two handouts for the Committee’s information. The Report addresses lists of all organizations/agencies contacted regarding potential joint use of the facility. Only received two</p>	

Meeting Minutes #19

Issue Date: July 21, 2006

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>responses (CCDC and Price Charities). Both respondents declined participating in joint use.</p> <p>Schulze: Explained the joint use process and philosophy to the new Committee members.</p> <p>Goodfriend: Indicated the District was to be commended for pursuing joint use in such an orderly manner.</p> <p>Schulze: Indicated the Committee is always looking for additional organizations and agencies to contact.</p>	
<p>7. Presentation of Joint Use Report, Mesa College Project II-1, Parking Structure/Police Substation</p>	<p><u>Alberto Lau</u> <u>Project Manager,</u> <u>URS Corporation</u></p>
<p>Lau: The Parking Structure will contain about 1,000 parking spaces and a Police Station. The same list of agencies and organizations were contacted regarding joint use of the facility. The SDUSD responded that they wanted fifty parking spaces to support their Middle College/High School, but did not have funds to contribute to the cost of construction. The SDUSD provided a verbal response, but no written confirmation has been received.</p> <p>Fat: Suggested if the District were not going to require all 1,000 parking spaces, then possibly they could get some credit up-front from the SDUSD for future negotiations.</p> <p>Schamu: The District expects full usage of the 1,000 parking spaces.</p> <p>Fat: Inquired if there might be funds available from the SDUSD Proposition MM Bond Program.</p> <p>Schamu: All Proposition MM funds have been previously committed by the SDUSD.</p> <p>Glaser: Suggested that the SDPD might be interested in a “store-front” office in joint use with the District Police Department.</p> <p>Schamu: Indicated there are joint use agreements in place now with the SDPD.</p> <p>Glaser: Did the District do outreach to other medical facilities with regard to the Allied Health Facility?</p> <p>Carroll: There are agreements with numerous hospitals for student training. The Allied Health Facility is an instructional building which can not be made available to practicing doctors.</p> <p>Glaser: Thought hospitals might be interested in placing medical care centers in the Allied Health Facility.</p> <p>Heiberg: Suggested the Citizen’s Oversight Committee appoint a subcommittee to work with the District on joint use concepts.</p> <p>Schamu: The District is completing a survey on joint use and will make the results of the survey available to the Committee.</p>	

Meeting Minutes #19

Issue Date: July 21, 2006

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>Glaser: Wants the District to be creative on who might be interested in joint use.</p> <p>Schamu: The District staff does meet to look at identification of additional users. Suggested the Committee wait for the results from the survey and then can set-up a subcommittee if desired.</p>	<p>Schamu: Provide results of joint use survey to Committee.</p>
<p>8. Review Final Design of Mesa College Project II-1, Parking Structure/Police Substation</p>	<p><u>Paul Schroeder, AIA.</u> <u>DWRB</u></p>
<p>Schamu: Provided overview of the project. This is the number one priority project for the Mesa College campus. The District has investigated seven locations on campus and off campus. The site presented today has been selected as the best site for the Parking Facility and the Police Facility. The District has followed the project approval process through the applicable community groups, the planning committee, and the City of San Diego. Most of the community groups support the selected site for the structure. The Parking Facility will have multiple entrances and only two stories will be visible from the ground level. The project will be presented to the Planning Commission on Thursday, July 13th, and then to the City Council.</p> <p>Heiberg: What is the Planning Commission being asked to do?</p> <p>Schamu: Three actions: (1) validate the Community College's Entrance Drive, (2) take action to allow entry into the canyon, and (3) allow District to sell the property.</p> <p>Schroeder: Provided a power-point presentation of the Parking Facility / Police Station design. Indicated the parking Structure footprint will be about one acre and the location shown is the best location to place the structure.</p> <p>Goodfriend: Is there a bus terminal included?</p> <p>Schroeder: We are moving the location of one to the Parking facility and adding two more.</p> <p>Glaser: How much of the landscape shown is planned in the project?</p> <p>Schroeder: The landscape plan probably shows slightly more than will be actually installed. Also, this is a parking project, and entry project, and a traffic project, adding all together.</p> <p>Stoll: What percentage of the parking problem is going to be solved by building the structure?</p> <p>Schamu: During the first three weeks of the fall semester, it will probably not resolve much of the problem. During the rest of the year, it may provide sufficient parking on campus.</p>	

Meeting Minutes #19

Issue Date: July 21, 2006

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>Stoll: Expressed concern about on-street parking issues with the residents.</p> <p>Schroeder: There are about 3,100 existing parking spaces on campus. The parking structure and the Muir School site will increase that number to about 4,300. The structure also gives better parking access for the students.</p> <p>Carroll: Traffic will be routed from the existing entrance to the campus, but how many of the students will still park on the street to avoid the \$30 parking fee is unknown. Our goal is to continue to bring cost down for parking and make parking more accessible.</p> <p>Spoon: What is the impact on the Linda Vista side? How long will it take for the structure to become filled?</p> <p>Schamu: We are not sure, but this is being addressed through other consultants.</p> <p>Carroll: One of the largest problems on the Linda Vista side is pedestrian traffic stopping vehicle traffic – Coordination of the traffic signals will help resolve this problem.</p> <p>Schroeder: The major intersection will be controlled by traffic signals.</p> <p>Stoll: We also have kids going to school at Kearny Mesa High School and their crossing the street adds to the traffic delays.</p> <p>Schroeder: We may actually see reduced parking on the east side of the entry road which will reduce pedestrian crossing the street.</p> <p>Fat: What is the cost per car?</p> <p>Schamu: About \$17,000 per space, including the Field Act requirements.</p> <p>Fat: Will there be room for expansion?</p> <p>Schamu: Don't know if any expansion will be required. But, any expansion would have to be between the Allied Health Facility and the Middle College High School.</p> <p>Schroeder: Addressed environmental impacts through treating all storm water from the structure and storm drain into the canyon, replacing native vegetation and removing non-native palms (about 200).</p> <p>Goodfriend: What is the width of the stalls?</p> <p>Burkhart: Stalls will be 8' – 6".</p> <p>Schroeder: Design has incorporated sustainable design concepts for LEED certification including installing photovoltaic canopy</p>	

Meeting Minutes #19

Issue Date: July 21, 2006

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>on the roof to provide electricity for the Police Facility and to provide shade for cars parked on the roof.</p> <p>Schulze: Explained “Green” and “LEED” concepts to new Committee members.</p> <p>Glaser: Indicated new parking lot to the north will create two new intersections. Asked if District will station monitors there?</p> <p>Schamu: Monitors will be stationed there to direct traffic and the District will also install an electronic sign to indicate spaces available in the lot or if the lot is full.</p> <p>Krammer: Member of the Linda Vista Planning Committee. The Linda Vista Planning Committee voted to locate the Parking Facility elsewhere. They want the mesa to remain open space and are submitting their report today to the Planning Commission for consideration at the Thursday meeting. He challenged the cost of the Parking Structure and claimed it will cost \$32 million based on previous construction costs for a comparable structure. Their committee prefers a site on the north side for the Parking Structure as it is closer to the campus and would be better for the students. He then claimed that there were 400 plus spaces still available at the most critical time based on the District’s own traffic study.</p> <p>Schroeder: Reiterated that the consultant’s estimated cost of construction for the structure, infrastructure, and the police facility would be \$21 million.</p> <p>Schulze: Indicated the Oversight Committee has received reports continuously from their consultants regarding the increased costs of construction and are familiar with the situation.</p>	
<p>9. Review and Approval of COC Annual Report</p>	<p><u>Richard Burkhart</u> <u>Construction Manager,</u> <u>Facilities Management</u></p>
<p>Burkhart: Presented the draft Citizen’s Oversight Committee Annual Report for the Committee’s consideration.</p> <p>Fat: There is no LEED certification information included in the report. Wants the Committee to promote itself in the report regarding progress in LEED certification.</p> <p>Schamu: LEED information was included in the last Annual Report. Staff felt it more appropriate to address the many more projects underway this year. District has not finished a project under LEED program yet. Report also focused on master plans and major achievements.</p>	

Meeting Minutes #19

Issue Date: July 21, 2006

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>Glaser: Moved for approval of the report.</p> <p>Pearson: Seconded the motion.</p> <p>Stoll: Suggested adding one line to the “Chair’s” letter addressing LEED, and also suggested adding “Continuing Education sites have undergone” to the introduction to the Continuing Education section prior to the comments regarding the ECC.</p> <p>Vote on the motion was unanimous approval.</p>	
<p>10. Open Forum</p>	<p><u>Evonne Schulze</u> <u>Committee Chair</u></p>
<p>No topics were introduced.</p>	
<p>11. Adjournment</p>	<p><u>Evonne Schulze</u> <u>Committee Chair</u></p>
<p>Schulze: Announced the next meeting will be on September 11, 2006, at 4:00 p.m. The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 p.m.</p> <p>Tentative Future Meeting Schedule: All meetings at 4:00 p.m. at District Offices, Room 245.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">September 11, 2006</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">November 13, 2006</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">January 8, 2007</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">March 12, 2007</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">May 14, 2007</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">July 9, 2007</p>	