



Citizens'
Oversight
Committee

MEETING MINUTES #9

Issue Date: November 30, 2004

MEETING DATE: Monday, November 8, 2004
MEETING TIME: 4:00 P.M.
MEETING LOCATION: San Diego Community College District
 3375 Camino del Rio South, San Diego
 Board Room #245, Second Floor

Attendees* / Distribution:	* Indicates those present at this meeting.
Committee Members:	Board of Trustees:
Castro, Honorable Federico	Zschesche, Peter *
Clarke Stoll, Catherine	
Fat, Thomas	S.D.C.C.D. Staff:
Gibbons, Kim*	Adams, Bryan
Glaser, Bobby*	Burkhart, Richard *
Heiberg, Walter*	Carroll, Constance
Newman, Barry*	Davis, Terry*
Nicholais, Vincent	Dexheimer, Carol*
Pearson, Christopher*	Garber, Bob*
Ryan, Jim	Rogers, Darrell
Saathoff, Ronald	Schamu, Damon*
Schulze, Evonne*	Parsons-Proposition "S" Program Staff:
Smith, Rev. George Walker*	Bradshaw, Charles*
Schneeberger, Ryan*	Clark, Jim*
Spoon, Roberta*	Sevilla, Yolanda
	Visitors/Speakers
	Gerber, Christopher - Architect*
	Hanna, Randy - Architect*
	Seierup, Nick - Architect*

Prepared by: Yolanda Sevilla, Parsons, Phone 619/687-0400 (Office) 619/515-5105 (Direct Line)

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

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



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: Requested everyone identify themselves, for the record, before speaking and for ease of transcribing minutes.</p> <p>Gave a quick synopsis of San Diego Community Colleges tour conducted last Friday. It was excellent. District staff was well prepared and answered a lot of questions for Committee members. She thanked all the campuses that were involved.</p>	
2. Approval of Minutes of September 13, 2004 C.O.C. Meeting:	
<p>Schulze: Asked for a motion for approval of the minutes.</p> <p>Glaser: Mentioned one correction: On page 8, he was erroneously credited for certain comments.</p> <p>Clark: Will have the minutes corrected.</p> <p>Schulze: Asked if there were any other corrections. Hearing none, she asked for a motion for approval of the minutes. The minutes were approved.</p>	<p>Clark: Correct 9/13/04 Minutes and post to web site.</p>
3. Review Final Design of City College Project IV-1, Renovate "L" Building	<p>Presenter: Randy Hanna, AIA, from Hanna & Gabriel Wells Architects</p>
<p>Schamu: The Committee is tasked to review the final design of projects. This project is a renovation of one of the existing buildings at City College. The "L" building was the library before the new Learning Resources Center was built on the corner of the college campus. The "L" building is located at the center of the campus. An academic success center is planned to occupy approximately two floors of the building. Mr. Schamu then introduced Randy Hanna.</p> <p>Hanna: The original library is being transformed into the Academic Success Center, which is essentially a center for student tutoring to aid them in their college studies. The location of the Academic Success Center is based on the college's master</p>	<p>❖ Burkhart: Prepare and give joint-use report for City College Project IV-1, "L" Building Renovation.</p>



plan. The original building is located halfway between the library and the Learning Resources Center. It has a multitude of uses and includes classrooms and offices. It is a concrete building, with concrete sheer-walls that cannot be relocated. It was originally built to have another story on top. The roof is potentially another floor. The lower level plan is similar and includes renovation of classrooms, which are intended to remain. This construction work must be accomplished during the summer months so as not to impact availability of classroom space. The rest of the entire building will be gutted, including the mechanical, electrical, stairs, elevators (everything except the concrete is going to be new).

The core plan includes a tutoring center, an English center, a math center, a testing and assessment center, and a large reception area in the new upper floor. The design includes some curved walls throughout the building referred to as "Success Walls" on which will be posted interesting displays, such as pictures of students and quotes encouraging students to succeed.

The upper floor includes a number of interesting programs, such as Trio Aspire, EOPS, Puente, and New Horizons Program, which include areas where students can receive free books and grant money.

The facility provides an area for first generation minority college students where they can get support and mentoring to help them through college. There are classrooms, a conference center, multi-purpose rooms, and new restrooms for the facility.

Some of the interior elements include the addition of skylights above the stairs, enlargement of the existing windows, and tiling of a hallway in the motif of an old subway with sayings in the tiles to help motivate students.

All the offices will be glass partitioned to encourage interaction and to increase the amount of ambient light in the building. All interior lighting will be high efficiency. Design sustainability concepts include operable windows for natural ventilation. The project will completely replace the mechanical equipment, including the boiler, chillers and cooling towers.

The project cost is approximately five million dollars.



Schulze: Opened the discussion for questions.

Spoon: Does natural ventilation mean no air conditioning?

Hanna: No, it is in addition to air conditioning. We found in many studies that if people have control of their own environment, they are happier. So, if the offices on the outside have a window that can be opened, people will feel much better psychologically. Natural ventilation was included in a recent library project for the City of San Diego, which has 80% operable windows. This is also a commercial office trend; going back to operable windows. Our San Diego environment sure calls for it.

Newman: You (Hanna) mentioned in the second or third slide that the building was originally designed for a third floor. Is that design capability still possible?

Hanna: No, that would not meet today's code. The building was built in the 1970's and there would be a lot of structural retrofit that would have to be done to support a third floor.

Glaser: Does that include using the third floor as an outdoor patio area with no load?

Hanna: That is something that could be considered. There would have to be some modifications for guardrails and the mechanical equipment on the roof would have to be relocated. There is a great view up there.

Schulze: Noted that Kimberly Gibbons and Ryan Schneeberger just arrived. Are there any further questions or comments?

Heiberg: Observed the landscaping that goes around the building, which makes it just as pleasant as the building, itself was not mentioned. Is that part of the retrofit?

Hanna: The formal landscaping, trees, green lawn, and some rosebushes, which go all the way up to the entryway, will remain in place.



Heiberg: One of the things we always talk about is the joint use of all of these buildings. You (Hanna) did not touch on this issue.

Hanna: Richard Burkhart is working on that report and will probably have it for you for the next meeting.

Schulze: It has been noted at Mesa College that there is a big expense in keeping the windows clean. Is there an easy way to keep this expense down?

Hanna: Actually in this building it is very easy because, as opposed to some buildings that have curtain wall windows, this is an old-fashioned building that has punched open windows. The windows are only about nine feet tall and one could easily stand on something to clean the top. There are arcades that surround the floors so no catwalks are needed.

Schneeberger: Gave student perspective: the "L" building is the only place where they can move heavy equipment from one side of the campus to the other because of the elevator and the concrete walls. Is there any thought to making the elevator larger? A series of ramps on the side of the building would also help.

Hanna: The building has an entry at one level on one side and at the lower level on the other side. The building splits the grade and there is no other way to get to the lower portion of the campus.

Schamu: We will look at it in the master plan, although as you know, City College is a very vertical campus and that creates extra challenges.

Schulze: One of the things we noticed at City College was the lack of ADA accessibility to the building. Will it be easier with the new design?

Hanna: The elevator, stairs, corridors, doors, and restrooms will be ADA compliant. There will also be automatic doors for access to the building.

Newman: I am unclear as to the joint use of the building. The engagement of the architect was to provide design of this building,



which is what was just presented. Thereafter, joint use is going to be considered.

Schamu: No. We normally hire a construction manager (CM) who works in concert with the architect on the initial, conceptual, and preliminary design, before we ever get to this stage. In this case we did not hire a CM. It was one of the first projects we took on, so our office took on the joint-use responsibility. The data has been collected and the report has been completed. We just didn't have time to get it ready to present to you at this meeting. The joint use study was conducted concurrently with the design.

Newman: It was my understanding that the process would be a determination of whether there was any joint use potential; and if there was, to run it through the various steps, both through this Committee and the Board, and then the design would flow from that determination. Even if your report should show that there is no potential for joint use, it seems to me that we have taken it out of sequence because that report should have been submitted to us for concurrence, acceptance and ratification before it goes to the Board, which makes the final conclusion.

Schamu: You are right.

Newman: Secondly, was the cost of a third floor considered? Would it have been something that might have been appropriate for this Committee to look at?

Schamu: It would have been cheaper to tear the whole building down and rebuild it, than it would be to try to add a third story.

Newman: I understand, but my question is, with finite space, with growth that is going to be continuing, in at least a straight line not a compounded line, was that not something that ought to be considered?

Schamu: We did consider it. With the concepts included in the master plan that is being completed for this campus, we will have adequate space. We are buying additional land and planning new buildings as part of the Proposition "S" Construction Bond Program, that are more vertical, perhaps four or five stories. We



don't think the space is going to be a problem. What we were really after with this project was a program and a concept and it seemed to fit very well. It's actually a replication of a program that has been successful in the Denver area. The Metro Center is a partnership between the community colleges of Colorado; University of Colorado; and the University of Denver. Mr. Hanna and San Diego City College toured the Center, and the concept and program fit perfectly into our space. The library, being in the very center of the campus, just seemed to be a perfect fit for it. The need for expansion of City College will better be met by building new buildings or by expanding buildings through the master plan process.

Schulze: Any further questions?

Spoon: When will the design be completed?

Schamu: Late first, or early second quarter of next year, depending on the campus schedule. The unknown is the approval by the State Architect.

Schulze: It is important to understand that even through we are using Proposition "S" funds, approval from the State Architect is still required. That difficult step is not eliminated.

Mr. Hanna was thanked for his presentation.

Schulze: Asked for a motion for final acceptance of the design plan. A motion was voiced and seconded. All in favor. Newman opposed.

Newman: My opposition is not on the basis of the plan, it is on the basis of the absence of the process. This is at odds with our charter.

Schulze: It really isn't. This Committee only approves the final design. They have already gone through all of the questions you asked. That is how the final design is developed. Our job is to ensure that what is brought before us meets the criteria of the Bond (Proposition "S").



Schamu: Ms. Schulze's comments are appreciated. Mr. Newman's comments are right in that the joint-use report should have been presented sooner. We will try to do a better job with those; however, we have to move these projects forward. If we don't, we are going to have some problems. The reports were completed. They are just being finalized and we will have them here for the next meeting.

Schulze: The point is, which is Mr. Newman's concern and all of our concerns, that the joint-use study was done before this. It is just that the report was not prepared on time for this meeting.

Newman: I do not want to belabor this, but that is not the point. I do not believe that our job is simply to determine that staff has done their work. I have just as much respect for staff as you do. I have just as much respect for the architect as you do. This committee was created by State law and by action of the Board of Trustees to determine that joint use, which is a State requirement, is, first, considered prior to the design, and secondly, that the funds are spent most efficiently and effectively. The two questions that I asked, while both of them have been answered, are absolutely, in my view, within the purview of this Committee, within the fiduciary responsibility of this Committee.

Schulze: How were they answered?

Newman: They were answered by first saying that my question was not answered, and we didn't do it in the timeline it was supposed to be done, but it will be done. We have done it. So, as a practical matter, it was not done. That was supposed to be before us and we were supposed to pass it on to the Board of Trustees. That is State law!

So my only concern is that if we are here simply to recognize the talent of staff, and the designer, and the contractors, I'm willing to say right now that I am very comfortable with what they are doing. If we are here because we have a fiduciary responsibility, then I want that responsibility met. That's all, Madam Chair. That is what we are here for.

Schulze: So noted. It has been approved and we will move on.



<p>4. Review Final Design of Miramar College Project II-1, Health Education Facility</p>	<p>Presenter: Christopher Gerber, LEED AP, Carrier Johnson Architects</p>
<p>Schamu: That is the official name of the project. It is actually the Field House, and the third phase of Hourglass Park. To remind everyone, Hourglass Park is the joint City of San Diego park that is physically located on the Miramar College campus. The first phase included 25 acres of turf and lighted ball field. The second phase was the swimming pool complex, which is also complete. This project is the third phase. This park is shared 50/50 with the City of San Diego and all of its programs. The City's programs occupied exactly half, but what has happened is that the College decided they needed larger space on some of their side. We offered that to the City, as well, if they could come up with the money. They declined.</p> <p>Christopher Gerber, the architect of record for this project, will make this presentation.</p> <p>Gerber: The Miramar College Field House is an athletic facility in joint use by the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Dept. and Miramar College. It is a 50,000 sq. ft. facility. The schematic design was completed over a period of about four years; preliminary design in about three months, and we are now at about 20% completion on the construction-document stage. We anticipate having the construction documents done by April 1st for submission to the State Architect. It should take about six months for DSA to review. The construction start date is targeted for January 1st, 2007.</p> <p>Schulze: Mentioned they drove through the project during the college tour.</p> <p>Gerber: There is an existing cul-de-sac, which allows access to the auditorium and aquatic center. The ball fields, gymnasium, facilities building, classrooms, and activity rooms were described. Half the gymnasium belongs to the City and they each have independent entrances. There is a lower level that is dedicated to the College for storage, and at the bottom is the mechanical room. On the main level are the gymnasiums: City side, in blue and the</p>	<p>❖</p>



College side in gold. There is a portable partition which can be lifted to create one 30,000 sq. ft. room.

Schulze: Are basketball courts on the sides when the partition is lifted?

Gerber: There is a marquis court in the center and we do have seven diagrams of the striping for badminton, volleyball, basketball, because they are on the same surface, and on two sides, which sometimes merge. It gets complicated.

There are locker rooms and on the lower level there are weight, and cardio rooms, as well as the physical therapy dept. There are three activity generators: City dance aerobics, College dance aerobics and also an activity center, which tend to triangulate the space around a sunken amphitheater.

On the lower level: single-story buildings for arts & crafts, multi-purpose rooms, a small kitchen, a gymnasium, and ancillary spaces, e.g. electrical room, laundry facilities, were described. On the upper level there is a two-story building, which contains two large lecture halls, a multi-purpose classroom and some offices.

Elevations showing the building as a horizontal structure were presented

Schulze: Why are there separate spaces? Don't we share the offices and the classrooms?

Schamu: There is enough activity to warrant separate spaces; however, it comes down to scheduling. Everything has to be scheduled. Each one will have its core space; however, when it is not being used the other can use it. Other special activities are also scheduled, like national or statewide events where the divider is lifted and the whole gymnasium is used.

Schulze: Is it large enough for a graduation?

Schamu: Yes, we planned for that. It started out as a 20,000 sq. ft. project and has grown to a 60,000 sq. ft. project. We are accommodating that with a \$12.67 million dollar budget. The



District's share of the cost will be covered by Proposition "S" and the City's share (about \$4 million) will come from GBG funds.

Walker: Will there be cost sharing in the maintenance of the facility?

Schamu: Yes, utilities and maintenance will be shared at the same ratio, prorated by the square footage.

We like to think it is a good deal for the taxpayer, because we have a facility that will literally be used seven days a week. This is already one of the nicest parks in San Diego.

Heiberg: Who owns this facility? Does the College own it, with a share of the building leased by the City?

Schamu: Correct. They (City) are leasing the park for 99 years.

Heiberg: So the College is responsible for the development of the project? Obviously with City input.

Schamu: As Christopher mentioned, the City has offices on the second floor, overlooking their side of the gym, because they have teams who want to play (compete) each other. All they need to do is oversee, as where we have instructors in the gymnasium teaching the students. This procedure works; however, if and when the City stopped occupying this building, we could go in and utilize that space ourselves.

Heiberg: So with the lease goes the operating agreement of who is using what, and I would hope that the City, since it uses it on the weekends, has more of an oversight ability. In other words, they are managing it on the weekends.

Schamu: We are not sure how that is going to work out. The College is starting to develop their athletic program, so they may have more activity on the weekends. For instance, water polo is becoming very popular and the water polo team uses the pool during the week and occasionally on the weekend. We think the same thing will happen in the gymnasium complex. So it won't be exclusive City use on the weekend, but primarily that is when the



community wants to use park facilities.

Heiberg: We just need to ensure that the entire facility is used when needed and that part of it is not off-limits because it belongs to the College.

Schamu: We went into the first two phases of the park with a "share everything and not design it for that:" attitude. It didn't work. We learned a lot from that. So this time we designed it to have separate programs going on at the same time, but also for the combined or joint use of each other's facilities for expanded opportunities.

Schamu: Hourglass park is a completely shared facility.

Gibbons: Is this the first time you have done a combined CBG?

Schamu: The first phase of this project was funded by FBA (Facility Benefit Assessment), not GBG, however, the City paid for almost all of the improvements in phases one and two.

They are also adding another \$900,000 for additional parking. Because the City parking area that was set aside is not adequate, community members are parking on the College property and taking the risk of getting a ticket.

Glaser: Is there any concern about the City's budget crisis and problems in regard to them being able to purchase equipment and pay staff in order to utilize these facilities?

Schamu: Each year we develop a joint budget based on the usage, including maintenance and utilities, and so far the City has funded it because of the park's popularity. I don't know how they are managing to do it because their budget, especially for parks and recreation, continues to be cut.

One of the things we did when we developed this agreement was to use College gardeners and maintenance so we could keep it to our standards, which are higher. So far they have reimbursed us.



<p>Gerber: A new central plant, the Co-Gen facility, is going to be built, that will also directly lower the operational costs for this building. They would have been twice as much, because of the existing mechanical system. So from the City's operational budget standpoint, it will cost less. We didn't touch on the sustainability design program of this project, but it was a major factor, along with water and energy use.</p> <p>Schamu: The waste-heat from the Co-Gen unit will be used to heat the pool. So the whole park is going to benefit from the unit, not just this facility.</p> <p>Schulze: Asked for a motion to accept the design, as presented for final review?</p> <p>A motion was made, accepted; all were in favor and the motion was passed.</p>	
<p>5. Miramar College Site Design</p>	<p>Presenter: Nick Seierup, AIA, Perkins & Wills Architects</p>
<p>Schamu: Chancellor Carroll asked that we bring this to the Committee so you could understand the thinking that we are putting into each of our three colleges' master plans' development. This subject will be presented to the Board of Trustees on Thursday. First some history: When we started Proposition "S", the master plans were 10 to 12-years old. We wanted to update each master plan, which is a 1^{1/2} to 2-year process, and from that, develop a list of projects. We didn't have the time or the money to do that before Proposition "S" was passed, so we did it afterwards. We are now seeing some changes to some of these projects and some of the ballot lists.</p> <p>We will use Miramar as an example of one of the three colleges' master plans and how it is impacting Proposition "S". This includes more than just Proposition "S", as it should. It is a master plan for the future. It is based upon the educational master plan of the campus. You will see several buildings and improvements, which are not on the Proposition "S" list, and this is intentional. We are hoping that there will be money, in the future, to complete these campuses.</p> <p>Nick Seierup of Perkins & Will Architects was introduced to make</p>	<p>❖</p>



the presentation.

Seierup: This is the first component of the master planning. It was started last April, and we are presenting it to the Board later this week. We are working very closely with the District and the campus to develop a new vision for what Miramar College might be when it reaches its ultimate build-out of 20,000 students. The current phase of work, which we are currently doing, will finish sometime at the end of the year.

The first stage is to understand what needs to happen for Miramar College to continue its growth process, to integrate the Proposition "S" building funding to project the needs of a thriving community college beyond Proposition "S", and the resultant strategy for making it into a campus with a sense of place.

The second phase that we are working on now is specific guidelines: an architectural guideline, a landscape guideline, a sustainable design guideline and a way-finding guideline, to pull the whole thing together.

We started by showing the way campuses are historically planned. There are a number of ways buildings and spaces can be organized. We looked for different references in understanding the College's needs. From the University of Virginia, originally designed by Thomas Jefferson with a very clear axial relationship between buildings, to the University of Washington where there is a concentric series of rings, which allow the campus to have a central core and surrounding rings as the campus grows over the course of 100 years. There are some interesting alignments of buildings toward sight lines and Mt. Rainier can be seen in the distance.

We looked at Foothill College, in Los Altos (CA), which is a recent campus built in the 1960's. This campus is built around a series of clustered courtyards, each of which is a separate department. There are a series of outdoor spaces that are linked with a pathway system.

The fourth example we reviewed is in Parc de la Villette, France. It is a hybrid of a number of different strategies, all operating at the



same time.

We also did a historical study of the development of Miramar College. As you can see from this 1958 aerial photo, the name "Hourglass Field" comes from the original Navy field, an hourglass configuration, which was on the site at that time. If we look at this 1973 photo, you can still see the imprint of the hourglass, and the beginning of the freeway, and the first building the seed of Miramar College. The former airfield is now a small farm plot. Looking at a 1979 photo, the original buildings have now expanded into the north. The hourglass imprint can still be seen. The baseball diamonds and Black Mountain Road now appear. The freeway is coming. In 1996, the development around the campus has really taken off, and the number of new buildings continues to emerge to the north. The facilities shared with the City are now in place and, like many community colleges, Miramar has grown in a haphazard fashion. Each building has been designed as an individual structure with no thought as to an organizational structure that ties one building with the other.

What we have today is not dissimilar. There is a new District building and a new science & technology building in another location. We did a site analysis and looked at the former imprint of the hourglass; the path of the sun across the site; a view corridor that might be created to Black Mountain, which has a looming presence on this campus; and a ten-minute walk circle, which demonstrated that we could link all of the buildings in a reasonable walk.

We did some research into the existing agencies that have work going on close to Miramar College, such as SANDAG. We did a transportation analysis. From all of this we developed four different approaches that we presented to the District and the Campus, which looked at ways of organizing the buildings and the outdoor space.

The first, which we call the Black Mountain Axis, looked at developing a line from the original part of the campus and creating spaces, and aligning buildings to define those spaces. Right now there is really no sense of place here at Miramar College. It is sprawled without any defining organization.



Another theme, we called Hourglass Campus, where we tried to utilize the imprint of the hourglass as an organizing element for placement of the buildings. We created some interesting linear spaces with the new structures, still creating a strong pedestrian access back to Black Mountain, all the while looking to develop a new entryway off of West View Parkway and Hillary, in addition to the existing Black Mountain entry.

The third theme we call the Cluster Quad, which is a series of clusters with buildings defining them, where people can move in zigzag between them.

The fourth theme is the Diagonal Axis, which is the design selected for the campus. This design takes advantage of the existing buildings that are on a 45-degree bias, including the utility plant building, the library, and the transportation technology building, and utilizes them as an organizing element which will then come into a central quadrangle, anchored by a new building, and two classroom buildings. The goal is, at the end of the Proposition "S" build-out to have what feels like a campus. Even if no other funding were made available, we would have the foundation for a very nice space.

There will be several parking structures because this campus is going to become quite dense, which will be the result of increased enrollment and the changes in the demographics in this part of the City. All of the existing or future buildings will be either two or three stories. The parking structures will be six stories a combination of underground and aboveground.

We took this concept and separated it into three phases, over the course of 10 or 15 years. On the slide presentation, the green buildings are Proposition "S" buildings; the salmon-colored buildings are existing buildings that will remain; and the red buildings will be torn down.

The first phase includes the completion of the new Library and Learning Resource Center, maybe in four years. We have a number of things happening: the construction of the Co-Gen plant, which is in addition to the existing utility building. We already have



the new science & technology, the transportation technology building, and the District buildings. The Field House project was just presented. There is discussion that the Police Academy will move to an off-site location. The C.E.T. program, which is currently off-site, will be moved on-site. There is a new security facility, which is called the College Police Substation, which will be a way finding and a gateway to the campus, and will also have security personnel for the campus.

The start of the development of a circulation system can be seen, to the Quad, with a landscaping scheme that provides trees to shade the perimeter, then the Library/Learning Resource Center as an anchor to that access. It is in a very prominent visual location to the outer community, which will become a symbol of the campus.

The large area of the northwest corner of the campus site is home to a number of vernal pools. Those vernal pools are home to a number of fairy shrimp, which are an endangered species. As a result of that finding, if the District wanted to build on that site, they would have had to purchase new land to move the pools with the endangered species of shrimp.

Schulze: Are they a 24/7 concern?

Seierup: No. They only come alive after a heavy rain. Last year, when there was no rain they only found one. We can't argue with that. It is environmental law.

What we have done as a response to that is develop a campus plan that saves that part of the site and does not build on it. What we are proposing is that it actually become an environmental preserve that gets restored back to the original fauna and flora native to this region. In that sense, we can save the vernal pools. We can save the fairy shrimp. We can create a park-like setting that is a natural view. This might become part of the Biology and Environmental Sciences teaching program. It could also be used to bring children from the elementary school across the street into a nature-trail kind of learning experience.

Newman: Have we priced what substitute land would cost and



where it would be located, and whether that might be a lot cheaper than what we would have to spend 10-15 years from now?

Schamu: Yes, and the answer is it may not be available at any cost. That is the dilemma. This campus is our largest 125-acres, ultimately 20,000 - 25,000 students, the concept is to grow vertically. Instead of the one or two-story buildings southwestern style, to build three and four-story buildings. So yes, there is more than enough land. We have some acreage to the north we are thinking of for shared use.

Seierup: This is land that is being banked for future use. It is eminently buildable. It is in close proximity to the circulation systems that lead into the heart of the campus. It could be developed in the future as a campus building as the need arises or it could be developed into a joint-use facility as Damon mentioned before. At the end of the day, there are still buildable sites on the campus, so we will not be bursting at the seams when we finish building.

This second phase takes us to the end of the Proposition "S" build-out. There are new classroom buildings, a new lecture hall, which is a Proposition "S" project associated with the Science & Technology Building. There is an addition to the technology program, which is as yet unfunded, which will be a joint-use project. There is a transportation hub, which is being planned by the local bus service, on the campus. It is a part of the circulation system planned, which might link-up with the freeway. It would be a way of bringing public transportation onto the campus. The new entry can be seen off of Hillary, leading directly into the main Quad. There is a bus stop right outside on Black Mountain that will be developed as a pedestrian-way into the main Quad. At the convergence of the two lines of circulation at the ceremonial tower, anchoring the heart of the campus, there could be an information center to be used for any number of activities.

The red buildings will be torn down to make way for a new loop road, coming down off Black Mountain Road into a drop-off area, continuing to the back side of the campus, and linking back up with the other entry point. It would link the two parking systems, without having to go back out of the campus.



We are developing a pedestrian way-finding system that gives a sense of movement along the 45-degree line into the Quad, connected by two points of entry. There are smaller connecting sidewalks that lead to the Field House and the field and to the historic part of the campus.

The phase three build-out is the ultimate build-out for 20,000 students. You can see the density compared to what we have now. Most of the buildings are in yellow, because they do not currently have funding. The large lots are parking structures - three of them. There will be two performing arts facilities. They are being considered for shared use with the City and other organizations. They will be located close to the art classroom building so that it will create an art courtyard, with a culture garden on the path leading into the campus. They will have a very visible face out to Black Mountain.

Schulze: Is there a theater currently in the plan?

Seierup: No, but there will be and it will be in one of the two new performing arts facilities. There is a new campus center with strong connections with the activities in the Quad, and another outdoor stage, which we are calling The Greens. This is a more formal stage, more collegiate. It is a flat-faced stage for job fairs, rallies, or concerts, where you might have the noise that you would not want in the center at the Quad.

We studied the pedestrian system as it moved through the campus and developed a walkway system that relates to the traffic and the amount of traffic, and the kinds of traffic, seeking to minimize the loop-roads. Once in the parking structure you walk directly into the heart of the campus and the loop-road only has to be crossed if you are coming into the southern part of the campus. Otherwise, once inside the campus, it is a pedestrian zone.

We studied the servicing strategies for all of the buildings, again trying to keep the service vehicles out of the lines of pedestrians and minimizing those conflicts. We identified key places for trash and recycling pick-up.



We did an analysis of the parking needs and capabilities of the campus. We determined three structures, a number of surface lots, and a number of parking facilities related to the playing fields.

This is the plan. This is what it will finally look like when it is completely built-out. As you can see, there is quite a bit of detail going into the development of the open spaces between the buildings, both in formal and informal ways. This is being called The Leave a Legacy Plaza, for those who want to be memorialized on the campus. It is a fund-raising opportunity.

There are discussions about creating other entrances to the campus. Seierup presented some artist renditions of what the campus might look like and discussed different access designs.

Schulze: Are there any questions?

Heiberg: Can the master plan be paid out of Proposition "S"?

Schamu: Yes, but per our Proposition "S" legal counsel, we had to connect the first building to the site analysis master plan because we did not know where the first building should be placed until we completed the master plan.

Heiberg: Can parking, walking and landscaping be covered by Proposition "S" funds?

Schamu: Yes, and a more specific landscaping plan will follow the design of each building.

Heiberg: It seems that the transit center should be on Black Mountain Road where it is closer to the bus routes and more central to the campus.

Schamu: The transit center will be moved to coincide with a planned new freeway off-ramp.

Heiberg: I still suggest we consider moving the transit center to Black Mountain Road. My last question is, on phase 2 there are no parking structures, then on phase 3 there are a lot of them being built. Why?



<p>Seierup: I didn't mention that one parking structure is being built in phase 2.</p> <p>Glaser: In what phase will we protect the vernal pools?</p> <p>Schamu: Those will be protected from the beginning. No work is being done in that area as of yet. It has to stay as natural habitat. We will be hiring a biologist, an expert, who will tell us what to do. The cost to move this space would be millions of dollars.</p> <p>Glaser: There are developers who might want to put money into enhancing this space. They could come in and fund the restoration of this area. At this time there is some off-road activity and we should protect the area now, as stewards.</p> <p>Schulze: That was a wonderful presentation. Please let us know when you pursue this restoration project and request funding.</p> <p>Seierup: How many acres of vernal pools are there?</p> <p>Schamu: My guess would be that it is 10 acres.</p>	
<p>6. Progress Report - Pre-Qualification of General Contractors</p>	<p>Presenter: James I. Clark, P.E. Parsons Program Mgr</p>
<p>Clark: The Contractor Outreach Pre-qualification Program was started with announcements in August and September 2004. We hosted two mandatory conferences in September and October for contractors who wished to be pre-qualified. As a result of those activities, we had a total of 47 general contractors, including three specialty trades contractors, who attended the meetings and expressed interest. Of the 47, we distributed 36 packages of questionnaires. We have received 25 acceptable packages back from the contractors.</p> <p>Acceptable means the questionnaires met basic legal criteria that were previously set - things that the contracting authority would want to see, such as bonding and insurability. Besides the 25 that are acceptable, there are two still under review.</p> <p>Parsons is now completing due diligence, verifying the information</p>	



<p>on the applications.</p> <p>A five-member team has been appointed to do the evaluation of the questionnaires. Each member of the team will evaluate each one of the questionnaires this week. Next week the team will meet to compare their evaluations. There are five pass/fail questions at the beginning. If the contractor does not pass those five questions, the contractor is automatically rejected. We will correlate the determinations made by the five evaluators and develop a recommended pre-qualification list of contractors. If the five-member team cannot come to an agreement on a specific contractor, Damon (Schamu) will decide whether that contractor will be included for consideration.</p> <p>Questions?</p> <p>Heiberg: You said something about quarterly?</p> <p>Clark: Yes, the procedure we developed at the District's request calls for opening the pre-qualification process quarterly and any contractor requesting to be included will be given the opportunity. At the end of the year we will evaluate contractors for continuing pre-qualification.</p> <p>All of the contractors that were previously pre-qualified will only need to certify that no previous answers have changed on their questionnaire, or advise us of any changes. We want to make sure we have qualified, responsible, and responsive contractors bidding on these projects. That is the goal.</p>	
<p>7. Tentative 2005 Meeting Schedule</p>	
<p>Schulze: Presented a schedule for the 2005 meetings and asked to be notified if anyone had a problem with any of the dates proposed. The meetings are scheduled for the 2nd Monday of every other month.</p>	
<p>8. Open Forum</p>	
<p>Schulze: Opened the open forum and, hearing no requests to address the committee, closed the forum.</p>	
<p>9. Adjournment</p>	



Citizens'
Oversight
Committee

MEETING MINUTES #9
Issue Date: November 30, 2004

Page 23 of 23

<p>Schulze: Thanked everyone for their presentations and for the college Tour. Adjourned the meeting at 5:30 P.M.</p>	
--	--