

Riverside Community College District
Facilities Working Group Meeting

*Thursday, February 21, 2018 – CAADO, Conference Room 334A
8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.*

AGENDA

- I. Welcome and Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes
- III. Updates
 - A. Master Project List/Calendar
 - B. Proposition 39 Projects
 - C. Scheduled Maintenance Projects
 - D. Facilities Master Plans
 - E. Capital Projects Status Report
 - F. Cash Flow Projection for Future Measure C Projects
 - G. 2019 DSA Valuation Threshold Updated
 - H. Quote Thresholds for Construction/Commodities/Professional Services
 - I. Request for Proposals (RFP): Engineering, Testing, Inspector of Record (IOR)
- IV. Maintenance and Operations
 - A. Key/Access Control Upgrade - Update
- V. Reporting
 - A. Capital Program Executive Summary Report to the Board
- VI. Other
 - A. Sustainability Projects
- VII. Meetings
 - A. Future Meeting Dates:
 - March 26, 2019
 - April 26, 2019
 - May 29, 2019
 - June 26, 2019

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Facilities Working Group

February 21, 2019
CAADO – Conference Room 334A
8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Aaron Brown	(District)
Majd Askar	(District)
Bart Doering	(District)
Myra Nava	(District)
Michael Collins	(Norco College)
Steven Marshall	(Norco College)
Robert Beebe	(Moreno Valley College)
Mehran Mohtasham	(Riverside City College)
Martin Morozowsky	(Riverside City College)
Evelyn Ault	(Recorder)

Members Not Present

Chip West	(Riverside City College)
Nathaniel Jones	(Moreno Valley College)

I. CALLED TO ORDER

A. By Aaron Brown

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Motion to Approve January 31, 2019 Meeting Minutes by Mohtasham. Seconded by Beebe.

III. PROJECT UPDATES

A. Master Project List/Calendar

1. Askar stated the Capital Summary Form was sent by email after the last meeting. In the email, Nava requested an update to projects. The update was completed and the list is up to date with bid summary forms. The forms were forwarded to Purchasing to determine a timeline. All of the pertinent information is there to begin the bid process. The form helps Purchasing schedule projects or track the DSA approval process.
2. Brown stated the form is an interim tool to keep an inventory and manage the bid process and scheduling of projects. It will be a priority for the new AVC for Facilities Planning and Development to facilitate the transition to a more beneficial tool.
3. Brown inquired how the schedule and the bid process looks for the remainder of the fiscal year.

4. Askar stated the projects with bid summary forms are being bid now. Information is still needed on some of the projects on the list. Some are pending DSA approval. Scheduling is on track.

B. Proposition 39 Projects

1. Askar stated the colleges were receiving Prop 39 funds from the State. The projected rebates were being included in the budget, but the funds were not coming in. Lisa Hannaman with Southern California Edison (SCE) provided invoices that can be used to track what has been posted. The rebate NC and MVC received was possibly switched. The State consultant, Luis Cecco of the Willdan Group, stated his numbers are not reconciling to Budget's numbers, possibly due to the certifications that were submitted to the State over the past four years. The certifications show how much was spent; however, they are not matching Budget's books. It looks like more is being spent than what was reported. If a report was submitted to the State, it never came to the Budget office for verification. It is unclear who was reviewing those reports, but more expenses are showing in the system.
2. Brown stated they will reconcile Budget's information to the information that was provided from the State to determine the differences and devise a strategy on how to address that. This is time sensitive because the program ends June 30, 2019.
3. Askar stated Carlos Montoya, the Director of Facilities at the Chancellor's office sent Budget a close-out amount and requested a close out for Year 4 projects at MVC and NC to determine what the balances are. That close-out amount was provided to the colleges. There are some pending expenses he is waiting for. Askar stated she will forward that email to the colleges.
4. Beebe stated MVC provided Carlos with everything and inquired what expenses Carlos was referring to.
5. Askar stated Carlos is waiting for a close-out of the MVC Lighting Project.
6. Mohtasham stated he sent Carlos a copy of all of the invoices and that his calculations for some of them were wrong.
7. Askar stated she asked Carlos what his balance is, Carlos replied he cannot tell until the project is closed out. Askar suggested RCC should resubmit the invoices.
8. Mohtasham stated he will email Carlos today and copy Askar.
9. Brown inquired when Budget will have the reconciliation.
10. Askar stated they need one week to finish budget clean-up. They will start on the reconciliation after that.
11. Beebe stated Jones indicated Year 5 would be a \$400,000 project. Beebe sent the bid summary report to Nava and Askar on February 5, 2019 but has not heard anything about it. Beebe inquired when the project can go to bid.
12. Askar will check with Purchasing to see what dates were posted as the timeline. Askar inquired if the project is a formal bid over the threshold.
13. Beebe stated it is a formal bid over the threshold. The college is prepared to purchase the lights from Gone LED.
14. Askar stated Jones was informed that Budget will proceed with the \$400,000 but Jones should be aware that it may be less than that. If the State is indicating there is \$400,000 left for MVC it could actually be \$200,000 because some expenses were

not reported. Askar asked Jones if he was willing and ok to back that up and discussed with him the possibility of the college or the District spending their own money rather than returning money to the state. Jones committed to that at the January 31, 2019 Facilities Working Group meeting.

15. Brown inquired if a funding source has been identified in case that doesn't happen.
16. Askar believes Jones intends to use an alternate funding source but she will follow up in an email before proceeding with the project to make sure a secondary funding source is secured in case the \$400,000 is not received from the State.
17. Marshall inquired who the SCE point of contact is for pre and post inspections for rebate confirmations.
18. Mohtasham stated each college should have an SCE representative to provide invoices and a signed DSA form.
19. Askar inquired if Lisa performed an inspection at MVC.
20. Beebe stated he has not seen her yet.
21. Askar stated Marshall should speak to Ron Beeler to coordinate with SCE regarding a representative for NC. Askar will provide Lisa's contact information.
22. Collins stated NC has two projects in progress, Year 5 LED lighting installation and the HVAC project. The HVAC project was just approved by DSA and will be ready to bid.
23. Marshall stated the pre-bid walk on the HVAC project is scheduled for February 28, 2019.
24. Askar stated NC's Year 1-4 projects are closed.
25. Collins confirmed that information.
26. Nava arrived and introduced herself. She stated that she handles changes to the college's Scheduled Maintenance Project Funding Proposals (PFPs) that are reported to the State, the Master Project List that tracks new projects and updates to current projects when the colleges submit the Capital Project Summary form, and manages the Space Inventory once a year. Nava stated she received a request for an update to the Capital Project Summary form, when those changes are made the updated form will be uploaded to the share drive.
27. Askar stated items on the Capital Project List are all projects regardless of the funding source.

C. Scheduled Maintenance Projects

1. Collins stated the roofing project at NC is on track. It is a summer project. NC met with GRD to go over the specification, it is being changed to allow for the DSA exemption. The roof will be metal but will look like a clay tile roof. The weight will be significantly lower, within the 5% tolerance. Once the meeting with Garland occurs the project timeline will be finalized.
2. Askar inquired if the NC roofing project is funded from two fiscal years, 15/16 and 16/17 PFPs, and if the college emailed the State to advise them of the issue and request an extension.
3. Collins stated it was 16/17 and 17/18, and the State was advised of the issue.
4. Doering stated RCC's 15/16 Scheduled Maintenance project is ahead of schedule and the pedestrian logistical issues have been resolved. The District is working with

- NC and MVC on their ADA projects. Plans have been reviewed and approved by the colleges. The projects are scheduled to begin in June 2019.
5. Beebe stated Jones wants the MVC project to begin in July or August 2019 to be in the next fiscal year.
 6. Doering stated once the plans are DSA approved he will work with MVC on the bid date, then the project will be ready to start. The budget is between \$70,000 and \$90,000.
 7. Brown inquired if MVC has any other projects happening.
 8. Beebe stated the rest of the projects are elevator modernizations. The architect is developing specifications for three elevators. The college is trying to slow the project to be able to use two fiscal years simultaneously for funding.
 9. Brown inquired if the District can help facilitate that process.
 10. Beebe stated RCC and MVC are using the same architect for elevator projects and can consolidate. The job walk would occur in May 2019.

D. Facilities Master Plans

1. Brown stated that RCC's Facilities Master Plan (FMP) is completed and programming has begun.
2. Mohtasham stated RCC's Phase I will have an architect by May 2019 to design three or four buildings. The only other project is the Greenhouse which will be moved back to its original location by the Community Garden. Abatement on the North Hall building will begin the first week of February, AQMD requires a two week notice before the abatement begins. Demolition will be scheduled when abatement is complete. Abatement and demolition are being paid out of General Funds. The Greenhouse project is \$350,000 in Measure C funds.
3. Askar inquired if the project is under the bid threshold?
4. Mohtasham stated yes.
5. Brown inquired if the Greenhouse and the North Hall demolition projects are being considered as two separate projects.
6. Mohtasham stated yes.
7. Brown stated they will have to take them to the Board once the college's plans are firm so the Board can approve the allocation of Measure C funds.
8. Brown stated NC and MVC are in the middle of their Facilities Master Plans and received an invitation for MVC's meeting next week.
9. Beebe stated there are several meetings with each individual group. MVC has met with the consultant which included a utilities walk.
10. Collins stated NC has had meetings with campus groups and received feedback. Information regarding data, space planning requirements, and infrastructure were provided at the meetings. The consultant will be back in March 2019 for more campus integration, developing more planning documents. They will return again in April 2019.
11. Brown inquired if a Board update is being planned.
12. Collins and Beebe stated it will be done in May 2019. Collins stated NC and MVC are staying together and going to the same Board meetings.

13. Collins stated a meeting schedule with the consultant will be provided to Brown and Askar.

E. Capital Projects Status Report

1. Brown indicated he will be meeting with NC on the Veterans Resource Center (VRC) project today.
2. Collins stated once the final geotechnical report is received it will go to the architect to get a better cost estimate related to the site work. The site work expenses are close to the cost of the building. The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) issue may have been remedied.
3. Doering stated the plan was provided to DTSC, it should be returned by the end of February 2019.
4. Brown inquired if that is only for the VRC project.
5. Collins stated yes, it is an exclusion for the Use Covenant that the college has with DTSC.
6. Brown inquired if anything will be submitted related to the Early Childhood Center (ECC).
7. Collins stated no, the college is looking for opportunities but the project is on hold until the FMP is done. It will help drive the siting of the building and what can and cannot be done.
8. Doering reported on the following:
 - a. MVC Welcome Center project: The project is in Design Development phase. The college is meeting with the furniture vendor, Goforth & Marti Business Interiors. Doering is meeting with Indian tribes and still receiving requests for more information from additional tribes related to the CEQA documents.
 - b. MVC Ben Clark Training Center Platform project: A check was given to the water district January 30, 2019 for the Fire Flow. The project is on schedule, however, a little behind on some of the DSA requirements.
 - c. MVC Makerspace project: DSA is not happy with the way the ceiling attachment is. The architect is going to DSA on February 1, 2019 to get some items resolved. Once that issue is resolved the advertising and the cost proposals for Inspector of Record (IOR) and Special Inspections can occur and be awarded at the same time.
 - d. RCC Network Operations Center: The architect and contractor met on January 30, 2019 to review processes. The contractor has everything for the submittal process. The project was originally scheduled to be in line in eight months, the new schedule is two months. Information Technology (IT) must be contacted to clear their items from the area that is needed for the project's storage space.
9. Brown requested an update to the timeline relative to the Five Year Capital Construction Plan for the State, and what the colleges have heard regarding the process.
10. Nava stated the State sends a call letter to the colleges around March of each year. Nava will contact the colleges to begin preparations and will contact Eric Mittlestead, Facilities Planning and Consulting, Inc. to set up conference calls. July 1 is the typical deadline for the District to submit the Initial Project Proposals/Final

Project Proposals (FPP/IPPs), however, the deadlines prior to that date need to be met.

11. Brown stated the State is likely to change the categories in the scoring potentially impacting the college's projects. Hopefully the consultant has knowledge of those changes. Because the change is coming so late in the year it seems that the submission deadline should be delayed. The last Association of Chief Business Officials (ACBO) meeting was cancelled so the District has not seen any new information. The Community College's representatives on the Facilities Task Force were not able to communicate anything regarding their progress. The Chancellor's office wants to weigh in on the latest proposal. Brown communicated the latest proposal to the Facilities Working Group, it is basically down to renovation projects and growth projects. The State is trying to align the point system with the Vision for Success goals; equity, success, depressed regions (the Inland Empire is one), local match, and shrinking the categories to accommodate the additional success goals. Brown stated the colleges should not lose momentum and will make adjustments as the final rankings are received.

F. Cash Flow Projection for Future Measure C Projects

1. Brown stated he received the projections from RCC and MVC, and NC is providing an updated projection. Brown stated that NC doesn't really have any Measure C projects but the District is also using the projections as a planning tool for the next Bond issuance. The next issuance is needed to ensure the District does not run out of cash. The plan is to get everything ready and approved by the BOT for the next issuance in June, then look at where the market is and where the cash flow needs are for a possible issuance in September or early fall. Brown stated Doering looked at the cash flow as far as the use of cash, which is what it is driven by. There is \$5.5 million cash on hand but we don't want to get into a significant project and run out before doing the last issuance. There is a timing issue as far as the expenditure of funds, and a 3 month expiration date on the credit rating. The District doesn't want to go out too early and wants to do the issuance when there is an actual need.

G. Quote Thresholds for Construction/Commodities/Professional Services

1. Askar stated she emailed the thresholds Board Policy to the colleges, feedback regarding the changes was requested. The District's thresholds are different than construction, the District is Uniform Construction Cost Accounting. Purchasing often receives questions regarding requests for quotes, some exceptions can be made, but the changes will encourage the colleges to get more competitive quotes. The changes will stay in place if the colleges agree.
2. The group agreed to the changes as is.

H. Request for Proposals (RFP): Engineering, Testing, Inspector of Record (IOR)

1. Askar stated the qualified list is over five years old. A new group of Engineers is needed. An RFQ has been sent out for the IOR. One RFQ will include qualifications for environmental services, geotechnical, engineering, civil engineering and

surveying services, Inspector of Record, Special Inspections of Materials and Soils testing.

2. Brown inquired if the RFQ will include topographical.
3. Morowsky inquired if the RFQ will include GIS.
4. Askar stated the RFQ was drafted, it will be issued by March 12. The timeline and the schedule will be sent to the group today allowing 2 weeks for review. During the review period the group can provide suggestions for additional services. Those suggestions would then be incorporated into the RFQ. The plan is to take a qualified list to the May BOT for approval. Once approved, the colleges can obtain requests for proposals from the list.

IV. MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

A. Key/Access Control Upgrade

1. Collins stated the actual keys are the main issue. Each door has individual keyways. The system has to be revamped.
2. Beebe stated MVC has the same issue. RCC, NC and MVC were working on the issues with IT during the FootPrints upgrade but the upgrade will not include a module for keys while the colleges look for a better solution that will include a District policy. The issue is key collection, keys are not collected when individuals leave, or keys are lost. Losing Grand Master keys will become a security problem and there are no answers to the questions.
3. Collins stated the security of the campus is a major concern and it seems that the policy has been allowed to go this way. Electronic access control will only be in new buildings, so a solution needs to be figured out. NC needs to change out cylinders to a universal cylinder that will key all classrooms the same. But that doesn't change the fact that keys are not being turned in. The policy issue has to be remedied first which may never happen because it is a contractual issue with faculty. The college cannot hold their paycheck or any punitive issues.
4. Brown stated we should not presuppose that that would be the outcome. If an issue has been identified it is our responsibility to bring it forward with a recommendation on how to resolve the issue. Where it ends up is a matter of negotiations. Because the issue is similar on all three colleges we should work together to come up with a similar plan on how to address the issue and develop a policy.
5. Collins inquired if the three colleges should stay on the current systems.
6. Brown stated it would be best to work on one issue at a time. The short-term goal is to determine the most immediate need to be addressed, which is security. The long-term goal could be that all colleges get on the same system. Identify short, medium, and long-term objectives to begin fixing the problem. The colleges are empowered to take immediate steps to secure the campuses but should run on parallel paths to work on the policy issue, which will require a broader audience and include all of the representative groups.
7. Marshall suggested the three colleges could work with the FootPrints programmer.
8. Beebe stated they were working with IT to implement a drop-down menu in FootPrints to select the appropriate approver. It isn't a Facilities issue and should not

be a Vice President's issue about who is getting a key. In previous positions campus safety determined who gets a key.

9. Brown indicated each of the colleges has safety committees and there is a District-wide safety committee. There needs to be a mirroring of the two to work on this issue. However, if the plan is to change procedures then all groups must be included.
10. Marshall stated NC has already received pushback.
11. Collins suggested putting together a team to begin looking at the short and long-term goals as well as the design standards for new construction.
12. Brown stated the principals need to be identified to justify the direction and the key to the success of the changes needed. Engaging the right groups will mitigate a lot of the resistance to making the change.
13. Askar inquired what the purpose of changing out the cylinders is.
14. Collins stated it will help with the amount of keys to manage. All part-time and full-time Faculty will receive the same key in the general assignment classrooms regardless of the subject being taught. This excludes biology labs, chemical labs, computer labs, stockrooms, all areas with security issues.

V. REPORTING

A. Capital Program Executive Summary Report to the Board

1. Brown stated an updated Capital Program Executive Summary (CPES) report goes to the BOT every month. The colleges can see what their Measure C allocation balances are. Updates will be taken a couple times a year for project close-outs. Once a year related income such as interest income earned will be posted.
2. Askar stated the last CPES report was taken to the BOT in February 2019, it included close-outs. The colleges will see disencumbered funds and some new income on encumbered Board approved projects. If the project is closed that disencumbers the remaining balance.
3. Brown stated disencumbering a project adds to the college's bottom line. For instance the Greenhouse project is not reflected on the CPES any longer, it is not a commitment yet. Once the BOT approves the project you will see it on that listing.

VI. OTHER

A. Sustainability Projects

1. Brown stated there is nothing to report. Once the AVC is on board District-wide Sustainability Projects will be looked at.

B. Contractor Certification

1. Mohtasham inquired about an email that was previously sent regarding roofing contractors. Does the contractor need to obtain a special certification?
2. Askar stated yes, so there is no conflict of interest. Askar stated she will send the form. Whoever is preparing the specifications for the roof must fill out the certification form.

3. Mohtasham inquired if the certification is required if the college is doing the inspection in-house for minor roof repairs and will outsource the repairs to a qualified company.
4. Askar stated no.
5. Marshall inquired if NC will be using a Garland product for their roofing system, or is there a District standard.
6. Beebe stated there is no District standard.
7. Mohtasham stated as long as you match with the existing roof.