



MEETING MINUTES #4

LOCATION: San Diego Community College District, Room 245
MEETING DATE: November 17, 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
Bobby Glaser

SDCCD Staff:

Damon Schamu
Raylan Bulow
Constance Carroll
Bryan Adams
Bob Garber

Gafcon - COC Consultant:

Rhonda Lockwood
Jack Miller

Parsons – Prop S Program Manager:

Jim Clark

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

PREPARED BY: Rhonda Lockwood, Gafcon, Inc.
619.231.6100, ext. 258

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
<p>1. Roll Call and Introductions</p> <p>Meeting commenced at 4:00 pm. Roll was taken and recorded by Rhonda Lockwood. Federico Castro, Ronald Saathoff and Roberta Spoon had informed the Chair they would be unable to attend the meeting and were excused.</p>	
<p>2. Approval of COC Meeting Minutes #2, May 12, 2003</p> <p>Moved to approve meeting minutes with the following corrections:</p> <p>5/12/03 Correction 1: A correction to the spelling of Bobby Glaser's name. It had been incorrectly recorded as Glasser.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Approval of COC Meeting Minutes #3, September 22, 2003</p> <p>Moved to approve meeting minutes with the following corrections:</p> <p>9/22/03 Correction 1: Addition of Bob Garber, attendee present from Miramar College.</p> <p>9/22/03 Correction 2: Barry Newman was not present, but had an excused absence due to a schedule change and calendar difficulties.</p>	<p>Jack Miller to revise May 12 meeting minutes. Minutes approved with changes.</p> <p>Jack Miller to revise September 22 meeting minutes. Minutes approved with changes.</p>
<p>3. Final Design Reviews Bryan Adams, Architect, Facilities Management, SDCCD</p> <p>Mr. Adams reported on four projects, which are either completed, or under construction. Reduced size Architectural handouts were distributed for each project. Mr. Adams discussed Architectural floor plans, site plans and elevations and further reviewed project amenities, square footage, cost and progress of each building as follows.</p> <p>a. Mesa College Humanities, Languages, and MultiCultural Studies Building.</p> <p>Mr. Adams gave the Committee a presentation of the recently completed three-story Humanities, Languages, and MultiCultural Studies Building. The building was outlined to consist of approximately 46,000 square feet with a project cost of approximately \$8,878,000. The floor plans for all three floors were presented and discussed, as were various amenities, site plans and exterior elevations.</p> <p>Additionally, Damon Schamu informed the Committee the Building was designed to include various design elements and themes from the recently completed LRC building. Damon noted it was important to reflect some of the design elements from the LRC to make the entire campus really look like a college upon completion of all work.</p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>Fat: How many square feet and how much per square foot for this building?</p> <p>Schamu: Almost \$9 million dollars for 46,000 square feet. Less than \$200 per square foot for a turnkey project.</p> <p>Fat: Generally how much does it cost, on average, for these types of educational facilities? Is \$200 good? I just need to have some form of relationship when we go over these things.</p> <p>Schamu: It is relatively low for this kind of quality facility. Building costs are a function of the kind of space required. Chemistry labs cost more than general-purpose classrooms. \$200 per square foot is a very good price for this type of general-purpose facility.</p> <p>Adams: It is also important to note lighting and room size can also change the cost. For example, small spaces within buildings for densely constructed faculty offices require more lighting, partitions, air conditioned space, additional controls and other systems, which will increase the cost per square foot. A warehouse, for example, would cost much less. This project was under budget.</p> <p>b. Mid-City Center Building</p> <p>Mr. Adams gave the Committee a presentation of the recently completed three-story Mid-City Center Building. Located at the intersection of Fairmont and Wightman, the facility is complete with an underground parking structure and contains approximately 61,000 square feet of total parking and facility space. The project cost is approximately \$8,764,000. The floor plans and site plans for the parking structure and for all three floors were presented and discussed, as were various amenities such as disabled parking, administrative offices, a library and a bookstore. Mr. Adams concluded his presentation with discussions regarding the exterior elevations.</p> <p>Schulze: I highly recommend visiting both the Mesa College and Mid-City Center buildings. The buildings are dynamite and everyone should go look at them.</p> <p>Fat: How many square feet and how much per square foot for this building?</p> <p>Schamu: As you can see through a simple square footage calculation this project was actually less per square foot at approximately \$150 per square foot and included the parking structure and the cost of the land.</p> <p>c. Miramar College Automotive Technology Career Instructional Building</p> <p>Mr. Adams gave the Committee a presentation of the nearly completed single story Automotive Building. The facility is nearing completion and has approximately 13,000 square feet in total. The floor plans and site plans for the facility were presented and outlined two general purpose classrooms, an eight</p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>stall auto bay lab, one clean room lab, one tool room, one library, five faculty offices and various support areas. Mr. Adams concluded his presentation with discussions regarding the exterior elevations and noted the project is currently on budget for a projected cost of \$2,334,000.</p> <p>Fat: How is each project put out to bid? Do you go out to General Contractors?</p> <p>Adams: Yes, for this project, however, we packaged two buildings into one bid for a more competitive price. The Automotive facility was packaged with the Science and Technology Building. The approach allowed the contractor to utilize one trailer for both projects at the Miramar site and gave him the ability to work from both sides of the staging and logistics area. It is turning out to be very efficient.</p> <p>Fat: When it's put out to bid, how do you decide who can bid?</p> <p>Adams: In this case they (referencing General Contractors) have to have a "B" license and be capable of obtaining a bond for the project.</p> <p>Fat: Is prevailing wage part of the projects?</p> <p>Schamu: As a State agency, prevailing wage has always been a requirement for the District.</p> <p>Schulze: The District has always had prevailing wage requirements. We have always had to deal with prevailing wage.</p> <p>Smith: I want to be sure that local sites have representation from their staff and that they have input on design, needs, and approval of projects at their campuses.</p> <p>Adams: We work with the campus on their design needs, programmatic requirements and require their input as we move forward through the various phases of design.</p> <p>Schulze: That is a very good question; all campuses are represented very well throughout the process. Everything is done and shared with representatives.</p> <p>d. Miramar College Science and Technology Building</p> <p>Mr. Adams gave the Committee a presentation of the Science and Technology Building, which is scheduled for a Spring 2004 completion. The facility was described as having approximately 41,800 square feet within two stories. All floor plans and site plans were reviewed and Mr. Adams presentation also outlined various science labs, science prep areas, faculty offices, service areas, classrooms and central core areas. Mr. Adams further noted the facility was designed for future modifications to convert core areas to science labs as the need arose in the future. Mr. Adams concluded his</p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>presentation with discussions regarding the exterior elevations and noted the project is currently on budget for a projected cost of \$8,781,000.</p> <p><u>Discussions/Questions/Concerns from the COC:</u></p> <p>Fat: By law, do you always go with the lowest bidder?</p> <p>Adams: The lowest responsible bidder. Everything within the bidding documents must be provided or they are disqualified for not meeting all requirements of the process.</p> <p>Fat: Do you have any leeway?</p> <p>Adams: No, if they qualify their bid or note something is not included in their price then they are considered non-responsive. We will look for these exclusions within a low bid if it comes in significantly lower than others.</p> <p>Fat: Do you ever do design-build? Is this a method to get the most bang for the buck?</p> <p>Schamu: Legislation has identified three design-build projects for California community colleges with another five to be announced later. The District may be able to be one of those five if there is an appropriate project. The law currently makes it hard to do design-build.</p> <p>Fat: Are more facilities trying to go design-build and thus making efforts towards changing the laws? Who is trying to change the laws?</p> <p>Schulze: Can you describe the difference between design-build and the current method?</p> <p>Schamu: The current method, Design-bid-build, is a project delivery strategy whereby an architect working with the user and possibly the Project Manager, designs the building and a set of specifications, which are then put out to the construction community for bid. There is a specific time for bid opening and the lowest responsible bidder is awarded the project.</p> <p>Design-build is a project delivery strategy in which an Architect / Contractor partnership takes on the project at the beginning of the process and designs the building as it is being submitted for plan approval, and finalizes detail drawings as it is being built. The concept is that the project is built faster and conceivably less expensive than if you traditionally put it out to bid. We are not entirely sold on the concept. In my opinion it is a function of the kind of building you are constructing, what your constraints are, what the site conditions are and what the timeline is. If the timeline is not a crisis, then design-build is not necessarily the way to go. Because the law has not allowed us to do this in the past we have not really done it, however, we are looking at it for our two parking structures assuming legislation allows. These two projects may lend themselves well to the design build process and hopefully these may end up as two of the five "to be</p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>named later" projects by the State.</p> <p>Adams: Energy conservations projects are allowed by law to be completed through a design-build approach. We have two of these projects under Prop S that we are looking at processing through the design-build process.</p> <p>Heiberg: Explanation was a good one; I agree with your analogy that it is contingent upon the type of project and your constraints. I also see value in having a consultant on board as you are designing a building for value engineering purposes, as the design goes forward. The consultant may have specific experience from a cost standpoint that will translate to savings to the District.</p> <p>Schamu: We will require the Construction Manager to assist the Architect and the Team with value engineering efforts prior to bid, as outlined within their contracts, and we will also require that they look at the plans from a completeness standpoint prior to a project going to bid.</p>	
<p>4 Project Status Checklist Presentation by: Jim Clark, Construction Manager, Parsons Commercial Technology Group, Inc.</p> <p>Mr. Clark presented the Committee with a draft Project Status Checklist as one of four preliminary project-tracking tools for Committee use. The document currently outlines the various high-level activity items on a project and the corresponding approval levels. The objective of the presented Project Status Checklist is to define the various levels of approval required by District Staff, the Citizens' Oversight Committee and the Board of Trustees as it relates to approvals of Project Scope, Land Acquisition, Site Analysis and Design, Contracting and Construction. Mr. Clark further outlined color-coding for the various approvals and noted all items are maintained within the single checklist.</p> <p><u>Discussions/Questions/Concerns from the COC:</u></p> <p>Schulze: The checklist and timeline information is in DRAFT format. Suggestions can still be made. The main reason we will be provided this checklist, timeline and budget reports, that Jim will be presenting later, is so we can track along with the District where projects are throughout their evolution within the bond program.</p> <p>Glaser: Does the color box indicate at what point each group will give approval?</p> <p>Clark: Yes, per the resolution, each group approves different items at different times. The Committee is responsible, under the resolution, to approve the Joint Use Facility Report, the review and acceptance of project scopes, and project design review, during the Site Analysis and Design Phase of a project. The different colors represent the three primary approval entities. Yellow represents the District Staff, green represents the Committee and blue represents the Board of Trustees.</p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>Heiberg: Is there not also something at the end of project review step for the Citizens' Oversight Committee? When the project gets completed, does a project come back to us in order that we may see that a project was under budget, over budget, over budget for these reasons and was built per the plans?</p> <p>Clark: There is not a requirement in the by-laws or in the resolution that there be an approval at the end. Monthly reports will be provided for review, and a completion report will be brought to the Committee at the end of the project for review. The completion report will be a compilation of everything that was being presented in the project monthly reports.</p> <p>Schulze: Per the voters, these are the three tasks (referring to items outlined in the Project Status Checklist) that the Citizens Oversight Committee will be held to. We are going to get monthly status reports and we have no authority to accept or reject a project.</p> <p>Heiberg: I understand that the Board of Trustees holds the power to approve or reject a project. I also want to make sure I understand that we will see a final report at the end of a project and reports during a project; and if there is a problem, the Citizens' Oversight Committee does have an opportunity to ask questions during the process if it sees something it questions.</p> <p>Schamu: We will be providing the Committee with reports on a monthly basis for every project. Other reports will also be available online.</p> <p>Clark: This checklist is primarily used to show the Committee when you have an opportunity to say "yes" or "no".</p> <p>Schamu: The checklist was really your request and this is our recommendation to make it easier for the Committee to read a simple matrix in lieu of a Gantt chart.</p> <p>Newman: Can you clarify the color placement on the chart? It appears that the Citizens' Oversight Committee is the only one participating in the review of the Joint Use Facility Report. The resolution speaks of the Board being a part of that process with direction to staff, where on this report does it show the Board direction to staff? It appears there is no involvement of the Board regarding the Joint Use Facility Report on this checklist.</p> <p>Clark: As I understand, the Board had delegated the responsibility for the review and acceptance of the Joint Use Facility Report to the Committee.</p> <p>Schamu: The checklist was really intended to show who has primary responsibility. Clearly there are several activities or projects, which will cross all entities. Staff is going to be involved in the Joint Use Facility Report because we are going to be the ones putting it together. What we tried to do on this checklist was to show which of the three entities have the primary responsibility for moving a project forward.</p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>Clark: We are currently preparing a joint use checklist and procedure to outline all the steps that the Architects must go through with District Staff.</p> <p>Newman: With apologies to Madame Chair, I raise the point simply because of the following reason. I would hope the Board does not think so little of the requirement that they authorize us to make the decision as to whether the report was well done or not and they consider it important enough, so that even though we may be given primary responsibility for reviewing it, that they have strong interests in whether or not it was done.</p> <p>Schulze: The Board has directed staff to look at the Joint Use Report, so I think we are okay with this item.</p> <p>Fat: With the green color-coding being in our court (referring to checklist) for project design review, is the Citizens' Oversight Committee responsible for the main review of plans?</p> <p>Schamu: Many groups are involved, but generally Campus users, Architects, and the facility managers, get the most input. The Board Of Trustees has not gotten involved typically with the plans, they delegate this function to us with the condition that it is built the way the campus wants it, built to the District's standards and it is on time and within budget.</p> <p>Schulze: The Committee should be sure the campus requirements are met and that the campus really gets what it wants.</p> <p>Schamu: Resolution language provides that if money were not available for a particular project, the Citizens' Oversight Committee would have some input in the process of discussing any necessary or proposed cuts. We hope none of our projects ever get to this point, but the intent of the final design and review language, within the resolution, provides the Committee with the opportunity to be involved in this type of process if necessary.</p> <p>Fat: I want to make sure that the Citizens' Oversight Committee does have the primary responsibility to make sure a project is within the resolution or the bond program.</p> <p>Clark: By the resolution and by the Bond Program, the Committee is tasked to make sure the District does what the voters voted for and not something else. My job, as tasked by the District, is to make sure you have the information to make that determination.</p> <p>Schulze: The Committee represents the voters. How does the Committee feel about the Joint Use Report? Are there any requested changes?</p> <p>Glaser: On the Joint Use report, I am comfortable leaving it the way it is. However, should a final approval line be added for Citizens' Oversight Committee for all projects?</p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>Schulze: The Committee will get monthly reports to review, for each project, and will make a final recommendation or suggestion to the board.</p> <p>Schamu: There may be a problem with timing. The Board meets monthly but the Committee meets every other month. My suggestion is a monthly report with a final report submitted to the Committee, but possibly after it has been sent to the Board in order to keep on schedule. There are a lot of issues regarding project completion, filing of notices, timetables for Ownership of a completed facility, stop notice time constraints for suppliers and subcontractors, etc. etc. These items should not be held up to accommodate Committee meeting schedules.</p> <p>Schulze: The Committee's main concern is that it sees reports as projects are progressing. I think the suggestion is fine.</p> <p>Schamu: A preliminary final report can be sent to the Committee for review prior to submission to the Board.</p> <p>Schulze: Confirms everyone is okay with that. No objections.</p> <p>Smith: The Committee will work with staff and with Parsons to keep things moving.</p>	
<p>5. Project Cost Report.</p> <p>Presentation by: Jim Clark, Construction Manager, Parsons Commercial Technology Group, Inc.</p> <p>a. Project Cost Report</p> <p>Mr. Clark presented a draft Project Cost Report. During the presentation, Mr. Clark outlined seven levels to the Project Cost Report with Level 1 as a report of the cumulative costs to date against available budgets. Level 2 shows the bond issuance and tracks each line item and requires District staff to identify each bond sale and the buildings/campuses they go with. Level 3 reflects project detail at the campus level for each campus. Level 4 provides phase level detail, by project, at each campus. Level 5 shows the schedules of the projects and corresponding phases. Level 6 and Level 7 give further detail at the project and phase level. The presented report provided Level 3 information in draft and sample format. Eventually, the same data may be available on the website for review. More information can be presented at the next meeting. These Level 3 reports will be provided on a regular basis. Additional levels of detail can be provided if the Committee so desires.</p> <p><u>Discussions/Questions/Concerns from the COC:</u></p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>Schulze: The Level 3 Project Cost Report does reflect the level of reporting the Committee wanted.</p> <p>Newman: Seems that from what you said earlier, a Level 5 or a Level 6 report is where all costs are shown for a particular project. Do I understand you correctly that the Level 3 report is reflecting amounts under a discrete bond issue? I would really like to know what the project cost, not what it cost under a particular bond issue. We need to see all costs associated with a particular project, not just under a certain bond issue.</p> <p>Schulze: All costs should be reflected in the Level 3 report provided to the Committee. Is it correct that this level combines all of the different issuances and their associated costs?</p> <p>Clark: Yes, Level 3 includes all expenses regardless of what Bond issue they were under. There are several levels and each level rolls up to the higher level within the report. Any report level requested by the Committee can be provided; I believe this Level 3 provides the appropriate level of information the Committee needs to see.</p> <p>Schulze: If Building A is designed under one issuance, built under another issuance, and outfitted under a third, then all costs will be in one report? That is what the Committee wants to see and I think that is combined within the Level 3 report. Is this correct?</p> <p>Clark: Yes.</p> <p>Heiberg: The report shows a good level of detail going forward once the project has been scoped out. Should there be more lines for land cost, soft costs, construction costs before the project gets approved? I would be interested in a deeper level at project acceptance, but would be fine with Level 3 reports on an ongoing basis after the project is approved.</p> <p>Schulze: We can try one report at a more detailed level to see if what's received is what is wanted by the Committee. We can make changes as we proceed through the program.</p> <p>Clarke Stoll: I think it would be very valuable to see how the construction at each site is going; I would like to see the projects progress on a report as well.</p> <p>Clark: Project schedules are the next two items I will be presenting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Project Timeline Report – Construction c. Project Timeline Report – Design <p>Mr. Clark presented draft timeline reports for Construction and Design. Additionally, Mr. Clark noted the draft reports are done on a project by project basis and further stated a third report will be generated for land acquisition. Monthly reports will be generated by</p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>project depending upon whether the project is in the land acquisition, design or construction phase. The reports are open for modification as requested by the Committee. Information outlined within the reports includes charted progress curves (<i>scheduled vs. actual</i>), preliminary cash flows, contract status information (<i>original contract, change orders, earned value analysis and estimate to complete</i>) and other general project status updates.</p> <p>Heiberg: The physical progress curve; is it a curve for the physical construction of the project?</p> <p>Clark: On the construction report, it is the physical construction of the project. On the design report it is the status of the design deliverables and the dollars spent to date on the design (drawings).</p> <p>Heiberg: When you have a construction loan, you have bank inspectors who go out and inspect the project at various phases to approve percentages of completion and make sure work in place is equal to payments due. Who provides the field inspection monthly?</p> <p>Clark: Consultant CM firms will provide this service on a monthly basis; Damon Schamu will be hiring the CM firms to provide this work. I am here to support Damon at the program level.</p> <p>Schulze: The Committee doesn't need to approve the reports, but any changes or questions can be submitted.</p> <p>Newman: Will cost and time implications with change orders show on the charted timeline? Right now it is only showing planned versus actual progress. Would there be any way to see if a change order created a two-month delay for instance?</p> <p>Clark: There would not be an indication on the charted timeline if there were a delay.</p> <p>Newman: Committee should be able to see a delay. I think you need to have a third line or color on the chart within the report that shows of any delays caused by a change order or other event. The Committee should be able to see any delays associated with change orders on the chart.</p> <p>Clark: I believe what you are looking for is not in the timeline chart, but is included within the upper right hand corner of the report in matrix format. You will see the schedule is identified by scheduled and actual completion dates.</p> <p>Heiberg: This is good information. I am still uncomfortable with what will be received, prior to acceptance, regarding budget and a deeper level breakdown of the costs prior to construction. What will be seen at that time (referring to prior to project acceptance)? What level will we be able to see?</p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
<p>Schamu: The ballot really only gives square footages of buildings and doesn't really provide costs for a project. As a project is further defined and scoped, initial figures will be provided to the Committee based on our historical experiences with similar buildings. The hope is that more detailed costs will be presented with the project scope and actual cost will be reflected during the project. We will also provide a range to bidding contractors' prior to bid so they are capable of ensuring they have bonding capacity for certain projects.</p> <p>Heiberg: That is what I am looking for, and we are sensitive to keeping costs hidden before we even go out to bid.</p> <p>Smith: Congratulates the COC and Madame Chair on their abilities and for having such a quality staff providing oversight and information.</p> <p>Schulze: Overall, this information does present what was requested although additional changes may be requested in the future.</p>	
<p>6. Deadline for Submittal of Agenda Items:</p> <p>Damon Schamu, Assistant Chancellor, Facilities Management, San Diego Community College District.</p> <p>One recommendation being made, in order to get the information to the Citizens' Oversight Committee at least two weeks prior to the meeting, is to limit submittal of items to the Friday two weeks before the meeting in order to allow time for document processing.</p> <p><u>Discussions/Questions/Concerns from the COC:</u></p> <p>Schulze: Unless there is a last minute emergency issue, the two-week deadline will be sufficient. This will give the committee 10 days to review the information prior to the meeting. If it is fine with the rest of the committee, the two-week deadline will stand.</p> <p>No objections.</p>	
<p>7. Legal Authority to Fund Completed Projects</p> <p>Schulze: The last thing on the agenda is we had been waiting to find out whether the District had the authority to fund the two completed projects prior to the passing of Prop S and whether they could be funded out of bond funds.</p> <p>Schamu: Bond Counsel, Mr. Casnocha, has given a written explanation for those projects being included in Prop S and a conference call can be held with him for additional information. Mr. Casnocha couldn't attend the meeting, but is waiting for the call if it needs to be made. It does answer the Committee's question as to how the District is able to include the two projects within Prop S.</p>	



AGENDA ITEM / MINUTES	ACTION
Schulze: This would have been for information only. We have the written explanation in our packets. No need to call Mr. Casnocha since no one has additional questions. The issue can be reviewed again later if anyone has any additional concerns.	
8. Next Meeting. January 12, 2004, 4:00 pm at the offices of San Diego Community College District.	
9. Public Testimony. No public testimony Evonne Schulze adjourned the meeting at 5:33 pm	