

**North Orange County Community College District
Citizens' Oversight Committee
December 7, 2016**

APPROVED MINUTES

Roll Call: Present: Chuck Allen, Michael Cooper, Paul Jewell, Michael Miller, Leroy Mills, Mike Oates, Mark Pavlovich, Louis Raprager, Rhonda Shader, and Phil Wendel. Absent: Chris Meyer, Elena Reyes, Mark Saucedo.

Other Employees/Guests Present: Karen Cant, Eduardo Escobedo, Rodrigo Garcia, Cheryl Marshall, Valentina Purtell, Susan Rittel, Craig Rush (DSA), Greg Schulz, Bob Simpson, Kai Stearns-Moore, Kashmira Vyas, Fred Williams, Rick Williams.

Call to Order: Acting Chair Chuck Allen called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m., and Member Mike Oates led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Public Comments: None.

September 7, 2016, Meeting Minutes: The September 7, 2016, meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

Division of the State Architect Presentation:

- ❖ Introduction:
 - DSA Headquarters are located in Sacramento and is responsible for statewide programs, inspector program, the laboratory (LEA) program, code development and policies.
 - Regional Offices are located in Oakland, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Regional Offices are responsible for project plan review and approval, construction oversight, project inspector approval, and project certification.
- ❖ Scope of DSA Authority:
 - Approval of Design for Code Compliance: structural safety, fire & life safety, and accessibility.
 - Construction Oversight for Code Compliance: structural safety, fire & life safety, accessibility.
- ❖ Project Categories Requiring DSA Approval: Schools (K-12, community colleges). Essential Services Facilities (state-owned or occupied). Accessibility only: UC & CSU; State Facilities.
- ❖ Project Types Requiring DSA Approval:
 - New construction
 - Additions
 - Alterations
 - Relocation
 - Off Campus Work Requires DSA Access Approval but Not Structural or Fire Approval
 - Garages
 - Bus Barns
 - District Office
 - Other Miscellaneous Buildings
 - Temporary structures
 - Reconstruction (repair of damage)
 - Rehabilitation (non-conforming structures)
- ❖ My Project is Approved, Now What?
 - Approval expires in one year but can be extended yearly up to four years;

- Before construction, the District or the architect must submit a DSA Form 5 for inspector approval and a DSA Form 1021C to obtain inspection cards;
- All changes to or affecting the structural, fire & life safety or accessibility systems must be approved by DSA;
- The District must hire a DSA approved lab if material testing is required;
- Construction must be fully compliant with the DSA approved plans;
- All required scope must be constructed;
- The inspection cards must be kept current;
- Verified reports must be submitted to DSA;
- The project must be DSA-certified upon completion of construction.

❖ Tips for Success

- | | | |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| ➤ Knowledge | ➤ Preparedness | ➤ Relationships |
| ➤ Ownership | ➤ Expectations | |
| ➤ Requirements | ➤ Accountability | |

Committee Questions and Comments:

- Do you provide the checklist to architects or do they go through that themselves before they submit them? Mr. Rush said “absolutely and the checklist is self-expanding”; you describe your project and the checklist changes and becomes longer and longer the bigger the project is.
- How much time do we need to allow in the schedule for DSA review? Mr. Rush responded that it depends on the size of the project, but it takes four weeks from the time the project is submitted to DSA, determined to be complete, to the beginning of the plan review. So for smaller projects, projects that are \$5 million and less, you should consider about one week per million dollars. So \$5 million would take the four weeks for us to recognize it as a project and then five weeks for us to review it. DSA staff look at every single mark on a set of plans. It is a very rigorous plan review because these are essential facilities.
- How do you establish the queue, first-in, first-out? “First complete” was Mr. Rush’s response. When a project comes in, we make sure the money is correct, if it is not, we cannot accept it. Once accepted, intake is by submittal date.
- If there’s some discrepancy and everything’s not complete do you go to the back of the line? Mr. Rush responded with “yes, that’s correct, you go to the back of the line”. You start your four-week time all over.
- How does DSA get paid? Mr. Rush shared that DSA is paid based on a percentage of the construction cost. If there are change documents that happen during construction, we will be paid \$215 an hour to review those change documents.
- Where does that money come from? Mr. Rush noted that the money comes from the school district. It comes from your bond/program/funds. The fees are a rough number; the total percentage may be 1.5% as there are separate fees for structural, fire/life safety, and access.
- You stated you begin with a financial review of the project; what are you looking for? Mr. Rush shared that DSA wants to make sure the fees owed to DSA are correct.

- Are you looking for prepaid fees? Mr. Rush responded by stating that yes we get paid before we do the work and that the fees get split with 70% going to plan review and 30% going to construction oversight.
- It sounds like a lot of what DSA does is the same thing a city planning department does; do you coordinate with each of the different cities? Mr. Rush responded that public school construction is exempt from city building ordinances so we do not coordinate at all with the city. He further stated that Districts could find themselves exempt from city planning ordinances if they pass a Board resolution. However, if you were building something off-site then you would need to comply with the city planning ordinances.
- Does DSA look at any environmental issues? Mr. Rush stated that DSA does not look at EIRs or any other environmental issues. However, if he receives a phone call regarding a complaint, he will contact the District and advise them of the complaint, but DSA does not have any authority to take action.
- Will the DSA presentation be available online? Mr. Fred Williams said it would be available online.

Mr. Rush concluded his Q&A by stating that DSA is an open and transparent operation and you are welcome to call or visit the office at any time.

Mr. Fred Williams asked the committee if we could move item No. 9 (Community Progress Report) up because Ms. Kai Stearns-Moore needs to leave by 5 PM and we should review the report before she leaves). With no objections from committee members, Ms. Kai Stearns-Moore reviewed the Community Progress Report.

Community Progress Report: Ms. Kai Stearns-Moore reviewed the annual progress report stating that we do not have too much to report on other than the planning pieces. We highlighted 2015-16 accomplishments and the projected projects for the first six years. The report also included the new official Measure J logo.

Committee Questions and Comments:

- When did you stop sending the Progress Report? Ms. Stearns-Moore responded that for Measure X we stopped sending it out at the end and that it is available online which is the quickest way to report out the information. This is the first report for Measure J and we thought it was important to mail it to all residents within a one-mile radius of our campuses.
- Would it be possible to put a date on the Community Report so that we know that when somebody picks it up they know the timestamp? Ms. Stearns-Moore said she will add a date and noted that we do have the 2015 – 16 date on the front of the annual report.
- Does it need to be voted on here? Mr. Fred Williams stated that at the last meeting the committee approved the release of the Progress Report; we thought it had been mailed but it was not so we are sending it out now.
- Is once a year sufficient? Ms. Stearns-Moore believes an annual report is sufficient because the Measure J website is updated and it is the quickest way to get updates or critical issues out to the community.
- Are we able to put renderings of the buildings in the report? Ms. Stearns-Moore replied that we would add renderings when available because it helps people see what is happening.

Ms. Stearns-Moore added that she expects the process to be a lot smoother next year and reminded the group to contact her so that she can help you get information out in a way you want to. (Kai Stearns-Moore, Director, Public & Governmental Affairs, 714-808-4829, kstearnsmoore@nocccd.edu.)

Committee Report to the Board: Mr. Fred Williams shared that we missed giving a Measure X annual report to the Board of Trustees. We will be providing a report to the Board and we will speak with Chair Meyer and ask him if he wants to participate or if he wants staff to present the report to the Board on behalf of this Oversight Committee.

Committee Questions and Comments:

- *Is this a report that is from the Oversight Committee?* Mr. Fred Williams replied that it is a report from the Oversight Committee.

Measure X Update: Mr. Rick Williams shared the following information:

- We are completing the punch list on the first floor warehouse conversion project; high-density storage is being installed for the District offices and documents will begin moving into that area in the new year;
- Conversion of the 7th & 10th floors was just submitted to DSA; hoping for plan check from DSA in four weeks.

Committee Questions and Comments:

- *Is \$4 million remaining on Measure X?* Mr. Fred Williams stated there is a little over \$7 million for the 7th, 10th, and 1st floor projects. If you'll remember, these projects needed to be sequenced and we've already submitted the plans and design work for the 10th floor which will be the area for the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services & Technology and staff; the 7th floor will be used by the School of Continuing Education. The goal is to spend all of Measure X and close it out.

Measure J Update: Mr. Fred Williams asked Ms. Karen Cant to begin the discussion.

Cypress College

Ms. Karen Cant, CC Vice President, shared the following progress:

- At the December 13 Board meeting we are requesting the Board certify the Final EIR for the Cypress College Master Plan Projects; we had no issues from neighbors. This EIR process identified four original buildings and along with our 50th anniversary being historically significant means it is going to be a more bureaucratic process to make alterations on existing buildings.
- The first project is the Science, Engineering, & Math (SEM) building. Since we last met, we selected Sundt Company as the Construction Manager at Risk. We launched the schematic design phase and began meeting the day after Board approval; we are looking at completing that phase in early March.
- We are about to have our kick-off meeting for program validation for the Veterans Center/Student Activities Expansion; we may end up calling this the Veteran's Complex and Student Activities. We are hiring a fundraising consultant to launch a fundraising campaign to pay for furniture, fixtures, and the memorial bridge that is in the Master Plan; we hope to raise \$2 million for the project. User groups will begin the program validation, which will go through the month of January before going into design and construction.
- We completed a parking feasibility study. The purpose for the study is to add new parking spaces within the existing space before construction begins on the SEM building. This will result in re-aligning

the spacing in Lot 9 (north side of campus) and will add 50 stalls. In addition, the Master Plan includes a parking lot plan for the southeast portion of the campus; it is temporary and in a location where we tore buildings down. This area will require grading at a cost of approximately \$1.5 million and give us 250 more parking spaces. We are working on the specifications and will get a bid in the spring to get that work done.

- The District is in the process of looking at cash flow funds so until that is resolved and we are comfortable we have resources available to move onto the next project, we are holding on progressing on the LLRC, which is why it is “to be determined”.
- There is a line item project called “infrastructure upgrades” but at this point, what that really represents is a District-wide project to upgrade the network. After assessment, we expect a recommendation on upgrades and cost.
- Utility mapping and assessment will be complete in July of next year.
- Because laws have changed, a District-wide assessment was conducted to address ADA issues. For Cypress College, this resulted in about 4,000 items that need to be addressed many of which are not significant. We are reviewing the document to identify high-risk items that need to be taken; the high priority is addressing access issues, signage is secondary. We will be finished mid-January so we will have the information for the Board meeting.

Mr. Fred Williams added a little bit about the Library Learning Resource Center (LLRC) and why we have a “to be determined” on that project. The bond was approved for \$574 million but we also told the taxpayers that we were not going to exceed \$14.90 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation for any one year so we are confined to those parameters and it limits the amount of cash that we can bring in. Originally, we were looking at a 15 - 20 year program and the assessed valuation estimate that we used in all of the planning was about 3.25%. Over the last three years we have seen a little over 4% growth in the assessed valuation so we have access to a little bit more money than we originally thought. We were expecting to get \$100 million every three years until we exhausted the \$574 million. As of right now, we have access within the first six years to \$232 million. As additional information comes in, we need to decide whether we can go forward because we do not want to start a project that we cannot finish because of cash flow so we are constantly assessing those dollars.

Mr. Fred Williams reminded the group that at the last meeting we talked about leveraging resources. Proposition 51 passed and although we are not sure when the Governor is actually going to add it into the state budget, we are on the approved list for the 300 & 500 project at Fullerton College in year one. We expect funding for one project (Fine Arts) at Cypress College in year two.

Committee Questions and Comments:

- Did Mr. Rush say anything that surprised you? Ms. Cant responded that nothing surprised her and that DSA has done a good job trying to streamline. Where they get into trouble is when everybody is passing a bond at the same time and we are all trying to get in the queue that is when it gets a little bit longer. It is important to establish and maintain a relationship with DSA and hope that you get more favor on your project because of that relationship.
- How did you select the construction company, who was involved? Ms. Susan Rittel responded there was a two-step process that the District put together; there are very specific requirements. They were to submit a Request for Qualification (RFQ) and in that RFQ they put in their financials, any litigation issues, experience, qualifications. A committee was formed and included the

District Director of Facilities Planning and Control (Rick Williams), the CC Vice President of Administrative Services (Karen Cant), the CC Director of Physical Plant (Albert Miranda), and the CC Campus Projects Manager (Susan Rittel). The committee met and assessed the submitted RFQs and created a short list. The second process is a Request for Proposal (RFP). During the process, they must provide very specific information, which includes fees, how long it is going to take, how many people they will have on board, who is involved on their team. Once they meet that minimum qualification, we go to the interview process. The interviews included the committee members plus the Dean of Science. In addition, non-voting members included MAAS (program manager) and LPA (architect). A reference check was included.

- Did more than one apply? Ms. Cant responded that, yes, more than one applied. We started with a mandatory meeting to orient them to the process; approximately 26 companies showed up. Nine submitted proposals; five of those nine were qualified for interviews and one withdrew because they had a lucrative offer on a commercial construction project in LA.
- Provide an Update on what were some difficulties and challenges in negotiating with OCTA. Ms. Cant said we had an experience leasing buildings or property from other public agencies for a token dollar per year and we were looking at OCTAs unused railway corridor, so I contacted them and let them know CC was interested in using that space for long-term temporary parking. I asked if we could set up a contract for a 10-year period and pay \$1 per year with a year termination period. There was no feedback from OCTA that they had any issue with our request. Their final contract requested \$1.50 per square foot, a renewable one-year lease, and a 30-day termination period. We abandoned the idea because it would cost \$250,000 to lease vs building permanent parking for \$2 million. Through this process, we got a property line extension of 10 - 20 feet. We do not know how it is going to be useful but we own a piece of land we did not know about before and we may decide to fence around it and perhaps do some landscaping.
- Regarding parking, what is your thinking about using slanted parking versus perpendicular? Ms. Cant explained that we are told we will get more space by doing the perpendicular parking. She believes it has to do with the lane the passing space.
- If it's designed for two-way traffic you could do slanted parking because there's multiple benefits, e.g. you can drop down to a single lane of traffic. Ms. Cant said that we want to get as much space as possible and we are trying to free up and protect the interior campus. The study did say perpendicular parking gives more space but she can't remember the justification at the moment.

Fullerton College

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia, FC Interim Vice President, noted that FC is also wading through the assessment on the ADA Transition Plan. Projects planned at Fullerton College include:

- Plan to build the parking structure (a 4-story, 840-stall structure) at the same time as we build a New Maintenance & Operations (M & O) building that will be located just west of the parking structure next to the high school baseball field.
- Currently in the middle of the Environmental Impact Report but hope to have it finalized by the summer of 2017. We had our first scoping meeting last month; over 100 community members attended this informational meeting.
- Currently working with the campus architect, DLR, to submit a proposal for the development of bridge documents for these two projects we are evaluating using the design-build delivery method.

- Construct a new instructional building to consolidate all classrooms and staff offices into one building; our biggest division (Humanities) is currently scattered into every building on campus.
- Working with engineers to assess the existing chiller plant capacity and determine whether to expand on the chiller or build thermal energy storage. We need to have this completed and online before bringing the instructional building online.
- A horticulture lab is “to be determined” because of the same cash flow issues discussed earlier. We would like to have new buildings for the Horticulture department as well as the Childcare lab school.
- We expect to have the new instructional building online before the renovation of the 300 & 500 buildings begin. Since the 300-500 project is a matching state project, we are not allowed to spend one dollar until we receive the funds from them. The plan is to renovate the Humanities (500) building and the Business (300) building; if we consolidate Humanities into the new instructional building, we would be able to add temporary swing space by utilizing the permanent instructional building. We would be able to sequence renovating the 500 building since Humanities would be moved out and then renovate the 500 building to possibly move the 300 building in there. Currently, the 500 building houses the Veterans’ and Umoja programs and we are considering whether to expand the existing space or move it into the 300 building, and/or in the future add the Welcome Center.
- Completed interviews for the Campus Capital Projects Manager; we hope to have the candidate on board by February 1, 2017.

Anaheim Campus

Mr. Fred Williams reported that the first portion of the Anaheim Campus is related mostly to Measure X funding; the 1st, 7th & 10th floors. He then asked Ms. Valentina Purtell, Provost, to talk about SCEs planning processes and priorities for their programs.

Ms. Purtell shared that the 7th floor is being designed to accommodate both ESL program offices and two additional classrooms. Other projects include:

- Repurposing one of the 5th floor lecture-style classrooms into a CTE lab specifically to become accredited to offer a full electrical trainee program. It is a short-term vocational program and to be fully accredited we need to have a hands-on lab environment. Preliminary conversations with R2A Architects resulted in a plan that would accommodate both lecture style classes and interactive lab activities in the same space.
- Two counseling offices and a Career and Assessment Center are on the 2nd floor. We hope to build an additional Assessment Center on the 7th floor and repurpose the smaller Assessment Center into several more counseling offices where students will be able to meet one-on-one for counseling and planning sessions.
- We would like to redesign the outdoor patio to include a cover that would extend over the entire patio; the furniture could use upgrade as well. This space would become an outdoor gathering space that would be used year-round. Mr. Fred Williams commented that we are looking at the outdoor patio area from a sustainability standpoint and the possibility of using solar cover.
- Ms. Purtell commented that we would like to repurpose some of the current areas on the 3rd and 4th floors to maximize storage and to centralize a location for the information technology team.

The technology team is scattered throughout the 4th floor and we would like to have one location for more efficiency and better workflow.

- Mr. Fred Williams asked if there were any other questions related to the report. There were no questions and the committee moved on to the next agenda item.

Future Agenda Items: Acting Chair Allen called for items to be added to the next agenda. Mr. Fred Williams stated that at the next meeting there will be a presentation of the Measure X and Measure J audit reports. We are happy to report that there are no adjustments, no material finding reported, and the performance audit does not have any exceptions. We are going to the Board next Tuesday, December 13, and will post the audits on the website after that meeting.

Committee Member Comments: Acting Chair Allen called for additional comments on today's discussion. There were no additional comments.

Future Meeting Dates: The next meeting is scheduled for March 1, 2017, at the Anaheim Campus, Room 105.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:28 p.m.