

MEETING MINUTES #14

Issue Date: September 28, 2005

MEETING DATE: Monday, September 12, 2005
 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:
Castro, Honorable Federico*	Burkhart, Richard*
Fat, Thomas N*	Carroll, Constance*
Gibbens, Kim*	Cepeda, Rita*
Glaser, Bobby*	Dexheimer, Carol ²⁾
Heiberg, Walter	Garber, Bob ³⁾*
Newman, Barry*	Heske, Fred ¹⁾
Pearson, Christopher *	Hsieth, Patricia*
Ryan, Jim	Kastelic, Rudy*
Schulze, Evonne*	Manzoni, Ron*
Smith, Rev. George Walker (excused)	Rogers, Darrell*
Spoon, Roberta*	Schamu, Damon*
Stoll, Catherine Clarke*	Schlegel, John*
Board of Trustees:	Parsons-Proposition "S" Program Staff:
	Ballard, Yvonne*
	Bradshaw, Charles*
	Clark, Jim*
	Pollard, Bran*

Representing:

- 1) Cepeda, Rita, Mesa College
- 2) Burgess, Terry, City College
- 3) Hsieh, Patricia, Miramar College

Prepared by: Yvonne Ballard, Parsons Phone (619) 515-5106

Note: Please inform the writer of any errors or omissions to these minutes; otherwise, they will be presumed correct as written. Meeting participants are asked to take notes and take applicable action on items discussed at the meeting.

Meeting Minutes #14
Issue Date: September 28, 2005

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
The meeting was called to order by Evonne Schulze at 4:05 P.M.	
1. Roll Call and Introductions	
<p>Clark: Took roll call. A quorum was present.</p> <p>Schulze: Welcomed everyone and announced that Barry Newman and she attended the ribbon cutting ceremony at Miramar for the new Cogeneration Plant. The College was presented a check for \$555,000 from the San Diego Regional Energy Office as part of the Self-Generation Incentive Program.</p> <p>Schulze also asked Schamu to look into placing a sign on project construction sites indicating the work was funded with Proposition “S” Bond monies.</p>	
2. Approval of Minutes, Citizens Oversight Committee Meeting #13, July 11, 2005	
<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. (Glaser moved, Stoll seconded) Unanimous approval.</p>	
3. Citizen’s Oversight Committee Term Limitations (Reappointment Following Absence)	Damon Schamu, Vice Chancellor Facilities Management
<p>Schamu: Indicated that Counsel’s opinion on member term limits includes a requirement for member to be off the committee for at least one term of two years before being eligible to be reappointed to the Committee for two, two-year terms.</p> <p>Schulze: Introduced new President of Miramar College, Patricia Hsieh and new Interim President for Continuing Education, Rudy Kastelic.</p> <p>Newman: Requested agenda item for next meeting “How Gulf Coast Disaster Impacts Proposition “S” Program”. Has heard frightening reports of the impact on building materials and timing and all the other issues involved.</p> <p>Glaser: Inquired if the District has facilities on the Gulf Coast.</p> <p>Schamu: Indicated District does not own any facilities in the area of hurricane damage.</p>	Include as agenda item for November 14 meeting.
4. Presentation of Project Descriptions	Richard Burkhart,

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
	Construction Manager Facilities Management
<p>Burkhart: Board of Trustees has approved an additional eight projects in the Proposition “S” Bond Program. The attachment to the Committee’s agenda includes the Board docket item including the list of projects and associated operational costs which must be set aside before the projects can begin. The operational cost issue was one of the requirements of the Bond Resolution.</p> <p>City College project for Renovation of 15,000 square feet of space at ground level beneath the “R” building to provide classrooms, faculty office space, and meeting rooms.</p> <p>A Mesa College project will provide for remodel of the Visual Arts Program area where additional space is needed for exhibits, storage and lecture rooms.</p> <p>A second Mesa College project will provide for renovation and construction of a Student Services Facility currently housed in the I300 building and I400.</p> <p>Miramar projects include a 30,000 square foot Technology Building to house economic, accounting, and business administration classrooms, and computer business, computer information, and mathematic labs; a 30,000 square foot Arts and Humanity Building to house fine arts, dance, speech, theatre, music and foreign languages; and a “Leave a Legacy Plaza” that is a relatively small landscape project of roughly two acres. Concurrently, the College is working on a program to sell bricks for the Plaza to create additional funding for the project.</p> <p>The list includes two Continuing Education projects. The first provides for consolidation of the Cesar Chavez and Center City facilities into a new facility to be built at the current Cesar Chavez location. Following completion of the consolidation, City College will take possession of the current Centre City facility to support ESL, business information and computer labs, GED prep classes, parenting classes and a certified nursing assisting course.</p> <p>Schamu: Explained that the District will acquire land from the existing facility to the corner of Cesar Chavez Parkway and will provide off-street parking at the facility.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>Stoll: Inquired if any Continuing Education classes will remain at the Centre City facility.</p> <p>Schamu: Explained that most programs would move to the Cesar Chavez facility, but there will be some programs kept at the Center City facility because of the nature and the need for the Programs.</p> <p>Burkhart: The second project involves consolidation of the North City Career Center and the Clairemont Campus facility into a single facility of about 50,000 square feet to be built in or near the Kearny Mesa area. The advantage of consolidating these facilities includes saving money on property acquisition, construction cost, and operational costs.</p> <p>Schamu: One of the current programs is housed in District-owned bungalows that do not meet the program needs. The other program is located on the other side of Kearny Mesa in leased facilities. The consolidation will eliminate the lease costs.</p> <p>Schulze: Inquired if Proposition “S” funds would be used for the land acquisition.</p> <p>Schamu: Explained that use of Proposition “S” funds would be appropriate for land acquisition on both projects.</p> <p>Fat: Recalled from previous meeting that Committee asked for a running account of Proposition “S” expenses which are currently about \$62 million. Again requested staff keep the Committee apprised of the Proposition “S” expenses at each meeting of the Committee.</p> <p>Schamu: Explained that the first bond issue was for just over \$100 million, which will be spent very shortly. The second bond issue is now pending and will be for an additional \$250 million. The website provides an accurate running total of funds spent to date.</p> <p>Fat: Raised a question concerning the Committee’s discretion on design and project priorities. He feels the Committee is being presented new projects and the only thing the Committee can do is rubber stamp them. He also</p>	<p>Include agenda item for November 14 meeting advising of project costs to date.</p>

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>asked about Committee’s input on LEED Certification.</p> <p>Schamu: Confirmed the Committee has involvement with the LEED process. Design of the West City Center / Point Loma Campus and the ECC Skills Center are virtually complete. The architects will present the LEED design information and certification level to the Committee for review as previously agreed.</p> <p>Newman: Addressed role of the Citizen’s Oversight Committee. He believes the Committee is a resource to both the District staff and to the public, but these projects were brought to the Committee after the Board of Trustees already acted on them. The question becomes, what is the Committee’s role in these issues. These project changes are being made, and he believes the Committee would have been much more comfortable with the process if it was brought to the Committee before going to the Board of Trustees.</p> <p>Stoll: Made the point that the Committee is an “Oversight” Committee.</p> <p>Schulze: Agreed they are an oversight committee. Clarified that their roles are not to be designing the buildings. That comes from shared governance at the colleges.</p> <p>Schamu: Explained that project requirements are developed through shared governance in the development of the educational master plan. The campuses are planning new programs, and that in turn dictates the need for certain facilities. Then those projects are brought forward through the Chancellors cabinet and presented to the Board of Trustees.</p> <p>Newman: Commented that the committee is a resource and it is not being used as a resource. Not to design projects, but to make comments, simply reflecting the various disciplines that are on the Committee.</p> <p>Castro: Commented that it all boils down to what are the Committees’ responsibilities and what is the Committee supposed to be doing. If the Committee is doing overview, than it isn’t for the Committee to determine what buildings are going to be built and how they are going to be built. The</p>	

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>Committee must ensure that projects are built according to the specifications that are required.</p> <p>Schulze: Stated that the Committee’s job is to be sure the money is spent as it has been designated.</p> <p>Newman: He is not suggesting that the Committee look at design. His concern is that current events in the world have to have an effect on the Program’s availability of funds, and the Committee has to look at priorities as a resource, not as a discussion maker. His concern is the \$685 million, the multi-year program, and project priorities.</p> <p>Schamu: Explained the dollar figures on the Board docket are the maintenance and utility dollars, not construction dollars. When the board approves a project to proceed, they must set aside utility and maintenance costs, in this case totaling \$1.8 Million.</p> <p>The Board has also authorized the sale of \$245 million of additional bonds, not only for these projects, but also for completion of the first projects. The law requires expenditure of bond funds within three years of bond sales. Projects often take longer than three years to complete, especially if there is property acquisition involved. As long as the funds are part of the \$685 million though, it is really just a technicality.</p> <p>Schulze: Inquired about interest earned on bond monies deposited in a bank. Can the interest be used on Proposition “S” projects?</p> <p>Schamu: Explained that the interest can be used, but there are costs associated with the sale of bonds such as bond counsel, underwriter, etc. The interest is used to offset these costs.</p> <p>Stoll: Asked if there would be more projects authorized.</p> <p>Schamu: Explained that there may be a project proposed for the City College Child Development Center and perhaps renovation of the existing gymnasium.</p>	
<p>5. Presentation of State Scheduled Maintenance Plan and Local Scheduled Maintenance Plan</p>	<p>Darrell Rogers, Facilities Manager Facilities Services</p>

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>Rogers: Described the packet of four different documents included with the meeting agenda. These include Future Projects, Completed Projects, District Deferred Maintenance, and Proposition “S” and State Capital Projects. The lists are created each year and involve a six year projection. In the past four or five years, the District was required to put up 50/50 match with the state for Future Projects.</p> <p>The second document includes Scheduled Maintenance, both not completed and work that has been done.</p> <p>The third document involves work that the District does in addition to the States’ scheduled matching funds. The major work included here is carpet replacement.</p> <p>The last document addresses the ongoing costs that are associated with either Proposition “S” or state-funded projects.</p> <p>Glaser: Asked if the operations costs on future projects included building repair.</p> <p>Rogers: The operations costs are the on-going cost of maintaining the building after it is built.</p> <p>Glaser: Questioned there is no allocation or sinking fund for carpet replacement or roof replacement.</p> <p>Schamu: Explained there is a separate District fund for carpets and roofs. The campuses also have some discretion on money for facilities work. The State schedule is primarily for groups of utilities and major types of maintenance.</p> <p>Glaser: Recalled hearing during the Proposition “S” process that several of the campuses claimed to have roofs and walls that have water damage and the promise was made that the maintenance will be planned in with all of the projects.</p> <p>Carroll: Explained that buildings previously toured were slated to be demolished under Proposition “S. The District demonstrated the poor condition of buildings built in the Sixties that were chronically leaking and not insulated. The</p>	

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>goal was not to re-roof them year after year, but to tear them down and replace them with buildings that don't have that problem. For the buildings that are permanent and on-going, the District has the funds necessary to maintain them, but other buildings that need to be replaced will be totally replaced.</p> <p>Schamu: Explained that the District feels very comfortable with the Program. He contended the District is in better shape than most districts, in terms of the physical plant, and with those continuous dollars the District is able to stay ahead of the curve.</p> <p>Rogers: Explained the District has worked to get roof repairs to where it is very manageable. There are a couple roofs in the program, but roofs are not a big issue because they are mostly only five or six years old. The next highest priority is HVAC with only twelve to fifteen year life-spans.</p> <p>Glaser: Concluded that the Committee's real task is to look at the Proposition "S" projects and review that the required maintenance is planned ahead.</p> <p>Schamu: Commented on the design of the buildings to include elements that require minimal maintenance. Restrooms take a lot of wear and tear, but by using ceramic tile they not only last longer and look nicer, but they are much easier to maintain. So the life cycle costs are less. The District is trying to do the same with roofs.</p> <p>Schulze: Suggests placing a foot note on the back page of the report explaining it includes a twenty-year maintenance program.</p> <p>Schamu: Suggests that the report be modified to identify the Proposition "S" projects and forecast maintenance needs over a fifteen to twenty year period.</p>	
<p>6. Distribution of New Cover for Citizen's Oversight Committee Handbook</p>	<p>Richard Burkhart Construction Manager Facilities Management</p>
<p>Burkhart: Distributed new handbook covers and spines to Committee members.</p> <p>Stoll: Noted that the handbooks are getting full.</p>	<p>Provide second binder to each Committee member.</p>

Meeting Minutes #14
Issue Date: September 28, 2005

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	❖ ACTION
<p>Burkhart: Agreed to provide a second binder to each Committee member. Also, agreed to provide all documents to members pre-punched for their three-ring binders.</p> <p>Burkhart: Noted the Committee's Annual Report had been passed out to Committee members. The Report will be posted on the website tomorrow.</p> <p>Schamu: Announced that the Report would be distributed throughout the District and the community. Contact Burkhart for additional copies.</p>	
7. Open Forum	
<p>Schulze: Announced the next meeting will be on November 14, 2005 at 4:00 pm.</p>	
8. Adjournment	
<p>Schulze: Adjourned the meeting at 5:00 P.M.</p>	