



MEETING MINUTES #3

LOCATION: San Diego Community College District, Room 245
MEETING DATE: September 22, 2003
MEETING TIME: 4:00 pm

Attendees / Distribution:

Committee Members:

Thomas N. Fat

Rev. George Walker Smith

Barry I. Newman

Vincent Nicholais

Roberta Spoon

Jim Ryan

Christopher Pearson

Walter Heiberg

Evonne Schulze

Federico Castro

Ronald Saathoff

Catherine Clarke Stoll

Kimbrally Zillgitt Gibbens (in part)

Bobby Glaser

SDCCD Staff:

Augie Gallego

Damon Schamu

Raylan Bulow

Dr. Constance Carroll

Terrance Burgess

Patricia Kerr

Gafcon - COC Consultant:

Larry Goshorn

Diane Eggleston

NOTE: Names in **bold** indicate those present at meeting.

PREPARED BY: Larry Goshorn, Gafcon, Inc.
619.231.6100, ext. 209

The recipients of these notes are asked to inform the writer of any errors and/or omissions. Otherwise, these notes will be presumed correct as written. All participants at the meeting are asked to take down notes and take action on items discussed at the meeting.

Information received regarding meeting minutes corrections will be filed with meeting minutes and will be considered record documents.

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
-----------------------	--------

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>1. Roll Call and Introductions</p> <p>Meeting commenced at 4:08 pm. Roll was taken by Diane Eggleston.</p>	
<p>2. Approval of COC Meeting Minutes, May 12, 2003.</p> <p>Bob Glaser commented that meeting minutes should be expanded to include Board discussions in detail i.e., who moved, who seconded, etc. May 12th minutes did not include Bob Glaser on distribution list and Board discussions relative to Item 9 Green Building, Item 7 Joint Use discussions not covered as well as the discussion regarding maintenance budgets was not noted. Evonne Schulze and Water Heiberg concurred with Bob Glaser. Approval of May 12th meeting minutes continued pending revisions.</p> <p>The Board discussed and suggested that the meeting be recorded. Damon Schamu to arrange to have recording device at every meeting.</p>	<p>Larry Goshorn to revise May 12th meeting minutes and resubmit to Board for Approval</p> <p>Damon Schamu to work with SDCCD staff to supply recording device at every meeting.</p>
<p>3. Revised Bylaws.</p> <p>Damon Schamu stated that the Board of Trustees approved the revisions of the Bylaws as recommended by the Citizens' Oversight Committee (COC). Copies of the approved Bylaws were passed out. The COC thanked Damon Schamu and the Board for approving the revisions.</p>	
<p>4. Mesa College/San Diego Unified School District Joint Facility Project Presentation by Constance M. Carroll, Ph.D., President Mesa College</p> <p>Dr. Constance Carroll reported on the Joint Use project and distributed a handout. Dr. Carroll stated that since 1989, Mesa College had been trying to acquire existing K-12 school located between the student parking lots numbered 2 and 3 on the site plan attached to the handout. The San Diego City Schools' Board of Trustees approved a plan for a long-term joint-use agreement that would result in shared operations in a joint facility.</p> <p>While no final decisions have been made, Dr. Carroll explained as to how the four general parameters for the joint-use facility would be incorporated. The facility would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House a maximum of 400 students, • Be located at the southeast portion of Mesa College, near the current Child Development Center, • Be jointly operated by SDCS and Mesa College, and • Follow on programs and functions to be determined. <p>Dr. Carroll presented options currently being considered for the joint use</p>	<p>Information Only</p>

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>facility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An early college program, • A middle college program, with specialty areas such as multimedia, or • A 6th unit of Kearny High School, which is currently being organized into 5 smaller schools or institutes, each with a different theme such as a Construction Academy. <p>Mesa College goal has no priority other than determining what will meet community needs. The college's goal is to resolve the current parking shortage.</p> <p><u>Discussions/Questions/Concerns from the COC:</u></p> <p>A general discussion followed concerning the small student capacity of the proposed school facility, educational concepts regarding smaller high school sizes, and the cost/ efficiency of building smaller schools. Augie Gallego responded to a comment, questioning if these recommendations would produce real results by explaining that in this case there was funding available to implement the concepts being considered. Dr. Carroll explained that there were efficiencies in the shared use of the facility, high school use during the day and college use in the evenings. The college was also looking at gaining between 300 and 600 parking spaces depending on whether surface parking or a parking structure would be built. Walter Heiberg encouraged appropriate planning to provide for future expansion. Ronald Saathoff questioned the purpose of the presentation, and questioned if it was intended to meet the requirement for a joint-use project. Evonne Scholzed stated that the presentation was informational only, and Damon Schamu responded that there would be a future joint-use report for this project. The COC thanked staff for the presentation and commented that the proposal provided the SDCS an opportunity to replace a run-down school while providing Mesa College needed facilities.</p>	
<p>5. Status of Proposition S Projects. Presentation by Damon Schamu, Assistant Chancellor, Facilities Management, San Diego Community College</p> <p>Damon Schamu presented proposed Board Docket, No. 840.1, dated September 25, 2003 recommending project consultants for Phase I, Proposition S projects. Parsons will serve as Program Manager providing community outreach, pre-qualification of bidders, labor compliance program and cost, schedule monitoring and reporting systems. Damon Schamu stated that there is currently no mechanism for reporting, however, Parsons will develop a reporting system which will track Prop S projects on a project by project basis. This reporting system should be available by next COC meeting scheduled for November 17th.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p><u>Discussions/Questions/Concerns from the COC:</u></p> <p>Schulze: Is Parson's in charge of all the construction managers? Will communication be a problem?</p> <p>Schamu: The organization is multiple construction management teams reporting to Parsons. We are confident that this organization will work. If not, we have the flexibility to change it.</p> <p>Ryan: Most bond projects are organized this way.</p> <p>Castro: Problems can stem from a lack of communication.</p> <p>Heiberg: Clarified that Parsons will be responsible for putting reporting systems in place to prevent problems. How do we know that projects are per bond measure? For instance, parking for Mesa is one on the list of projects, but a new high school is not.</p> <p>Castro: Damon must present what we are doing and why it complies with the bond measure.</p> <p>Schamu: Reported project budgets are approximate as to what is to be provided. We anticipate that a joint use facility will fit within the description of bond measure projects. Heiberg: Concern is that there is a process for evaluating or determining that the projects fit within the bond measure.</p> <p>Fat: Question: With 5 construction management firms selected, is there a duplication of services?</p> <p>Schamu: Construction Management firms will work with selected architects and contractors to keep individual projects on track. The selected firms will also be looking for alternative delivery methods such as design-build. SDCCD will also expect the teams to contribute and make financial commitments. Parsons will work on umbrella efforts that span all projects.</p> <p>Schulze: Concern that Parson will provide the resources necessary to help SDCCD staff manage the projects.</p> <p>Schamu: Other districts are paying more than SDCCD.</p> <p>Stoll: What authority does Parsons have?</p> <p>Schamu: They will put accurate reporting systems together.</p> <p>Castro: Our concern is accountability.</p> <p>Heiberg: Clarification that Parsons is an extension of SDCCD staff. Use Parsons so not everyone reports to you.</p> <p>Schamu: Parsons will be used to meet changing demands in SDCCD staff.</p> <p>Fat: Shocked to hear that SDCCD has limited staff of 7 to run projects</p> <p>Schamu: Actually reduced from 9 to 6 staff members.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>Fat: Can Proposition S funds be used to hire staff?</p> <p>Saathoff: No. It is in the statute.</p> <p><u>Status of Projects:</u></p> <p>Damon Schamu distributed status reports of Phase I Proposition S projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> San Diego Centers for Education and Technology completed, funded with debt financing and debt paid with Proposition S funds. <p>Saathoff: Read from Propositions S Bylaws, "COC is to review plans..." My concern is how can COC review projects for compliance if project is already completed? Should the COC review project retroactively?</p> <p>Stoll: Suggested that Damon Schamu show the COC that this project is kosher.</p> <p>Schamu: Clarified that it was approved with legal bond counsel.</p> <p>Heiberg: The COC would expect you come back at next meeting with information indicating that this was in compliance. Additionally, this project should be included in the new reporting system prepared by Parsons.</p> <p>Schamu: Provided project by project status, covering projects under construction, projects in design, and projects starting design.</p> <p>Fat: How does this all add up to the bond amount. We should also try to acquire property as soon as possible to save district money.</p> <p>Schamu: We will be sharing project budgets after we refine them. These are working budgets and further refinements should be expected as projects progress.</p> <p>Heiberg: Requested that the projects should relate back to the original sequence of projects listed in Proposition S document.</p> <p>Schamu: Illustrated that each project listed in the status report contained a reference number back to the original Proposition S project listing. I will continue to place the projects in order for convenience.</p> <p>Heiberg: Please list projects with estimated budgets that total to available funds.</p> <p>Glaser: Requested that a list of projects indicating milestones.</p> <p>Saathoff: Suggested producing Gant chart.</p>	
<p>6. Next Meeting. November 17, 2003, 4:00 pm at the offices of San Diego Community College District.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
7. Public Testimony. No public testimony Evonne Schulze adjourned meeting at 5:52 pm.	