

Riverside Community College District
Facilities Working Group Meeting

*Tuesday, November 06, 2018 – CAADO, Conference Room 334A
1:30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.*

AGENDA

- I. Welcome and Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes
- III. Project 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. Space Inventory
- IV. Professional Services
 - A. Architect and Engineer RFQs - Update
 - B. Construction Management RFQs – Update
 - C. Process for using the list of Architect and Engineer and Construction Management to solicit fee proposals for project specific assignments
- V. Maintenance and Operations
 - A. Key/Access Control Upgrade - Update
 - B. Fire Alarm Systems – College Oversight and Contracts - Update
 - C. District-wide Product and Service Agreements - Update
- VI. Reporting
 - A. Capital Program Executive Summary Report to the Board
- VII. Other
 - A. Sustainability Projects
- VIII. Meetings
 - A. Future Meeting Dates:
 - December 7, 2018
 - January 31, 2019
 - February 21, 2019
 - March 26, 2019

Facilities Working Group Meeting

*Wednesday, October 10, 2018 – CAADO, Conference Room 334A
8:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.*

AGENDA

VIII. Meetings (cont'd)

- April 26, 2019
- May 29, 2019
- June 26, 2019

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Facilities Working Group

November 06, 2018
CAADO – Conference Room 334A
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Aaron Brown	(District)
Majd Askar	(District)
Bart Doering	(District)
Myra Nava	(District)
Nathaniel Jones	(Moreno Valley College)
Robert Beebe	(Moreno Valley College)
Michael Collins	(Norco College)
Javier Sierra	(Norco College)
Chip West	(Riverside City College)
Mehran Mohtasham	(Riverside City College)
Evelyn Ault	(Recorder)

I. CALLED TO ORDER

A. By Aaron Brown

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Brown - Motion to Approve October 10, 2018 Meeting Minutes with corrections, by West.

Seconded by Jones.

III. PROJECT UPDATES

A. Master Project List/Calendar

1. Nava provided an update on the Master Project List/Calendar. The location of the shared file was discussed and the decision made to use an existing location rather than create a new one. Brown indicated Nava will be the point of contact to make adjustments/additions/deletions to the list once it is completed. All colleges will have view access to it. A new Capital Project Form is being created that includes basic

project information and Askar's Bid Summary form. Askar's team will meet with Nava to work on a plan for intake, process and procedures, and guidelines. Combining the Bid Summary Form and the form Nava is creating allows Askar's office to complete the spreadsheet with critical timelines. Brown asked how that works for future projects that do not get bid summary forms. Nava will continue to meet with Askar's team to determine how they want to handle those situations. Brown states they would not need to fill out the full form because they won't have bid information. Nava confirmed that is correct and states the form will be a .pdf fillable form with no need to print it. A link to the form will be on the list and will be stamped 'received' when the district receives it. Brown asked if the form will have two submission points; one if a bid summary is needed and a project is going with it; and one for future projects to get it on our radar. Nava indicated yes, and that monthly reminders to the colleges with current status on projects, etc. is a possibility. Askar indicated that the form will not be complete until DSA approval is received; however, colleges can submit information until then. Brown indicated concern about bids, but more concern about getting some of the projects on the list with tentative start dates to start meeting milestones. Askar indicated some dates on the spreadsheet have already been missed, and some bid summaries have been added. Brown advised that estimated start dates need to be looked at again to see if they will be met. They are timed to have an orderly process for all of the milestones. If the milestones aren't being achieved then we need to reset the start dates and re-calendar all of the critical dates. West asked if Brown wants the colleges to go back through and reset, or will we use the form to do that? Brown asked about the timeline. Nava indicated the goal is to go live with the form by the first of

the year, which affords the time to work out the procedures and guidelines and to work with Askar's team. Brown indicated that was too long and requested it be ready by the next Facilities Working Group meeting on December 7. West asked if the goal is for the colleges is to update the list project by project as things change, or by a census date each month. Nava is working with Askar to formalize that process to make it consistent and explained that the process will start with the new form and the colleges will submit updates using the same form as projects move along. Brown stated that this is the first time he has heard that the bid summary information is going onto the project list and is not sure they have it all worked out. Collins states that it sounds like it will happen farther on in the process. Askar stated that there is a repository of projects now that can be worked with but they did not want to duplicate those forms in the future so it was discussed yesterday about combing the bid summary information and the project list. A procedure will be written for the colleges to follow. Brown requests that Nava provide something for review before the December 7.

B. Proposition 39 Projects Update

1. Norco College provided an update on the bid installation of the LED Retrofit. Collins indicated the installation is scheduled for December or January and it will be an informal bid. Sierra indicated it is the same situation with the A/C project.
2. Moreno Valley College indicated the existing LED Retrofit of Humanities is about 95% done and that specialty items on backorder are the only thing holding up the project. The electrical engineer is working on plans for the LED retrofitting of the Library and Student Services and are hoping to have the plans in about a week. These projects are on the Master Project List.

3. RCC has completed three years. They have submitted the savings reconciliation and are waiting to get the re-bids for year three on the baseball/softball projects. There was a lower cost so there is \$80,000 remaining. RCC is trying to get funding from year four and five together and come up with a new project.

C. Scheduled Maintenance Projects

1. RCC got approval on FY18/19 projects, submitted to the architects, submitted the purchase order, and are waiting for that to go through so the drawings can be completed. One of the manufacturers located in Canada has to come on site and look at the device because it is built in. The manufacturer in Canada is the only one they can provide. Projects for the rest of the year are completed. The only ones remaining are for elevators. They are waiting for a proposal from the architect to move forward with the bid and scope of work.
2. Doering provided an update on the ADA Scheduled Maintenance Project. They are finalizing project #15/16. Doering met with the architect last week. The new bid will have 7 additive alternates so the price will be broken down clearly and will include some design changes. Melissa Griffith met with the architect to make sure everything was ok. The two week advertisement will come out on Friday, November 9. Collins asked if there is an expected start date for the Norco College ADA project. Doering stated he does not have a date yet and is working with the architect to get the agreement in place. Brown asked what the timeline is. Doering stated it is less than 3 months for a complete design. Brown asked if there are any issues related to where the work is occurring. Collins stated no, just the timing of the project and they are anticipating it to be a summertime project. Doering stated it should be January or

February depending on the timeframes. Sierra indicated the location for the ADA project at Norco College is in the path of travel and will impact the college. Brown asked what an ideal timeline is for Norco and Moreno Valley Colleges. Collins replied summertime would be the best. The project will take out the front part of Parking Lot B at Norco College and they will need to talk about the schedule because the work is at the entrance of the campus. Jones stated the MVC project could have an impact at but it isn't as extensive as Norco's. They would also need to talk about the project timeline.

3. Moreno Valley College sent the Notice of Completion to the District Office for the FY17/18 HVAC Project. It will go to the November BOT meeting. An architectural proposal was sent to the District Office for the elevator projects.
4. Norco College indicated that the Library roofing project will be moved to the summer. A hydro test was completed, resulting in some repairs that were needed to the external rain gutter systems. The repairs will be made and then move forward with the new specifications to meet DSA standards for replacement "in-kind". The project will be completed in June or early July 2019. A new type of tile may have to be used. NC is having no success in finding a tile that does not increase the load of the roof deck by more than 5%.

D. Facilities Master Plans

1. Brown indicated that RCC took their Facilities Master Plan to the Board Committee. It was well received. Jones stated that interviews for the four architectural firms for the Moreno Valley College Facilities Master Plan are scheduled for November 19, 2018. They anticipate being ready to select before the end of the month to go to the BOT in

December. Askar stated that a draft agreement will be sent to the colleges today to provide to the firms and to get an early start on the process. Collins stated they are on target for early December to meet the BOT dates.

2. Brown stated Dr. Isaac is requesting an update on the colleges Facilities Master Plans in January to give the BOT to give them an idea what the colleges are looking at conceptually. The Norco College and Moreno Valley College Presidents expressed concern on its tight timeline. Dr. Isaac asked if February would work. Brown is not sure of the final decision.

E. Capital Projects Status Report

1. Doering described the status of several projects. The Noble Demolition project that has been closed out. DSA closeout after the last invoice from the engineer. A meeting is scheduled for next week to discuss the MVC Makerspace project. The plans are at 75% and a copy should be available next week. The Veterans Center project is still moving forward with the topographical and geological surveys being done. The cost proposals are expected back next Wednesday. The funding issue is still being worked on. Jones indicated the schematic design for the MVC Welcome Center is moving forward and the Ben Clark Training Center Corrections Platform project is moving forward as well. Jones requested the status of the Ben Clark Training Center Ground Lease. The question of the \$500,000 has not been answered. Doering indicated he has discussed this with Mr. Gilbert from the County of Riverside. Mr. Gilbert states he is still working on it and has not given a timeframe.
2. RCC indicated there is a meeting today to discuss the Greenhouse project. The location has changed. It will be located where North Hall and College House are. The existing

buildings will be demolished in the spring. A proposal is being requested to move the current network infrastructure.

3. Norco College will engage an architect to analyze Ingalls Hall on the prison property. This is to determine the feasibility of the site for a learning facility for the California Department of Corrections (CDCR). NC will work with Askar on a contract with the architect. Brown inquired if the architect is on the approved list. Collins stated yes.

F. Cash Flow Projection for Future Measure C Projects

1. Brown reported that the purpose of Cash Flow Projections are to get an idea of what the bond cash flow needs are over the next couple of years to be able to determine when the existing cash is going to be exhausted and the timing of the next issuance. In an ideal situation, a 3 month lead time is needed for another issuance. Since the CPES report is straightened out, now would be a good time to identify the projects in the planning stage so we can cash-flow them out and see what the needs are. Collins inquired if the projects being referred to are already established projects, and if there is no new money for additional projects? Brown stated that is not the case. Norco College is actually in the negative but there have been conversations about potentially accessing uncommitted funds. A plan has to be developed and it would be beneficial for the colleges Presidents to have that conversation with Dr. Isaac. Again, if that is coming in any particular timeframe in the next two years, then that is information that needs to be discussed. Brown requested this be put this on the college's lists to provide information in the next couple of months. Monthly cash flow for each of these projects from concept to completion needs to be looked at. The information has to be fairly accurate to get a good idea about timing, and sizing of the issuance. If we have miss-

match between projects that are going, and some that may be occurring later may have to split the issuance, but that will be more expensive. West inquired if Brown wants to create a new due date and the colleges can pull out the projects already submitted at look at them again? Brown requested that the colleges provide something by January 15.

G. Space Inventory

1. Nava reported the Space Inventory report is complete and has been submitted to the State.

IV. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

A. Architect and Engineer RFQs – Update

1. Askar stated the board report with the CM and Architect listing has been prepared for the November BOT meeting. The Committee agreed to move forward all twelve CM firms. Twenty-three architect firms submitted RFQ's. Based on the ratings and scores fourteen of the twenty-three were moved forward. The next step is to determine how to select firms from the qualified list once they are approved, and what the process is going to be in terms of the amount of proposals required to select from the list for specific projects. If the project requires a specialty firm based on the list, and there is justification, it is due diligence on the colleges part to get the best quotes with best pricing. But a lot of it has to do with the firm's expertise, so it will be a balance of both. Askar recommends getting three quotes when it is a basic job. Brown asked how Purchasing envisions this working when asking for three quotes and does Purchasing want to see them. Askar replied yes. Collins inquired if there will be interviews, or do the colleges only ask for proposals depending on the complexity of the project? Brown

indicated this is part of the discussion about how everyone would like to see the process work and asked if the colleges can provide recommendations. Askar stated she envisions it being more at the college level to set-up interviews, submit a requisition and indicate on the requisition, for example, that four interviews were scheduled, two proposals were requested. Board policy 6340 states that projects under \$10,000 can be a verbal quote. Projects from \$10,000 up to the threshold should have three written quotes. At the last Facilities Working Group meeting, the threshold was discussed. Purchasing is running informal uniform construction cost bids for projects over \$25,000.

2. Brown stated that there are two issues and requested the college's ideas on how to engage architects/engineers and construction managers on the approved list. It is understood that some projects may be unique and some of the firms may be better suited than others so the colleges can reach out to those. If there are less than three and there is justification that should be fine. The colleges can go through the interview process, ask for submittals and interview at the college. If the colleges want the District Office to be involved that is fine. If not, then the colleges need to inform the District Office accordingly. Collins asked if a rubric scoring for the proposals is acceptable. Brown stated that is ok for basic items and to modify the rubric if needed. Askar reminded the colleges of the need for Board approval for anything over the \$90,200 threshold, even when using the qualified list. Under \$90,200, a purchase order can be issued. Brown asked if there is a template for the rubric. West stated RCC has one that can be used. Collins stated each campus can use their own. Askar asked if these will be similar to the matrix that was sent out or will the colleges go into more

detail? West stated it will be similar but a little bit different. Askar asked when the colleges have it prepared to send it to her office. Collins stated the colleges can work together on it. Brown stated that once a decision is made, it will be brought back to the group to make sure everyone is in agreement.

3. On the other issue, Askar stated that uniform construction cost accounting for projects over \$25,000 are running through Purchasing due to the Government code for the bonds. Surety companies are not going to issue a bond without an agreement or a Notice of Award. Purchasing will not issue a purchase order until Purchasing has the bonds. Askar anticipated some issues that might occur if the colleges use this process. One would be the Detailed Terms & Conditions and the General Conditions that Purchasing attaches to the informal bid. The colleges will not have Liquidated Damages and Non-Collusion forms that have to be requested from the contractor, and Disabled Veterans Business Enterprise (DVBE) participation. All of those forms are included in bid packets. The other concern is that contractors are hungry for bids and the colleges have to be careful. Collins asked if the District Office will help to coordinate the process. Askar stated yes. Brown stated that Askar will send out pros and cons on the proposal. A decision was not made since RCC and MVC were not present at the last meeting. It is important that everyone is in agreement with how this will proceed. Askar asked if the colleges want to go down that path or keep it as it is being run now, whereby all projects over \$25,000 run through Purchasing. West indicated he doesn't believe RCC has the mechanism or infrastructure on their campus to manage the new process and that he would prefer going through Purchasing. Collins

and Jones agreed. Askar stated that based on the feedback the same process will continue.

V. MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

A. Key/Access Control Upgrade

1. The discussion on Key/Access Control was deferred until all were in attendance.

Mohtasham stated that RCC was working on a policy but Chief Gunzel has to be involved to approve it. If the policy is accepted, it can be expanded to be a District-wide policy. There might be changes for colleges that have different key card systems. West stated RCC has 3 different keying systems. Buildings built since 2010 will be converted to one system using CCURE, with the exception of the Quad. A few legacy buildings have infrastructure in them but no access control system. Funds are available to convert those buildings. There are legacy buildings on the Facilities Master Plan scheduled to be demolished and won't be re-keyed. Brown asked what RCC will do with their keying system. West indicated the Quad was rekeyed with hard keys using a campus locksmith. Collins and Jones stated Norco College and MVC do not have a campus locksmith. Collins stated they have four or five different keys with no patent control. West stated RCC does not have patent control either. Collins stated it will be cost prohibitive to hardwire legacy buildings and inquired if this would be a District-wide project or do the colleges re-key their buildings. Norco wants to move all newly constructed buildings to access control as well. West stated that RCC buildings built since 2010, as well as the District Office, are on their master key system. Sierra stated that the three campuses are connected by a third master key. Jones stated MVC still

has a lot of buildings on hard keys. Only a couple of buildings are on access control but they are not in the position to convert legacy buildings to the access control system. There has been no key management done. Brown deferred to the colleges regarding the question of a District-wide project to have a brass key system. West suggested having an outside group come in to do an assessment. Brown asked if there is an opportunity for RCC to share their locksmith. West replied yes. Beebe inquired about the issue of collection of keys. West stated HR is the collection point. There needs to be a conversation with Dr. Isaac. The colleges agreed. Brown requested the colleges form a task force to provide a plan showing how they would like to approach the brass key situation: address policy issue, bargaining issue to establish enforcement; what is the hierarchy and structure to be put in place; do the colleges want to hire a consultant or use internal resources.

B. Fire Alarm Systems – College Oversight and Contracts – Update

1. Collins stated there are multiple contracts. Brown asked if it needs to be an RFP. The group indicated they are ok with Apple Valley.

C. District-wide Product and Service Agreements – Update

1. Mohtasham indicated they are preparing a new elevator maintenance contract for RCC. Brown asked if response time is one of the issues. Sierra stated their service provider is very fast. Brown asked if the group wants to proceed with an RFP, or provide a recommendation. Mohtasham stated the service contract has the same kind of National Joint Powers Alliance (NJPA) agreement with the state, which can move forward without going out to bid. Brown stated the group can pursue whatever is needed in the interim until something else is in place.

VI. REPORTING

A. Capital Program Executive Summary Report to the Board

1. Brown stated the Capital Program Executive Summary (CPES) reports go to the Board every month. It is reconciled between the Budget department and Facilities Planning & Development department. The next update that will have significant changes will be in December 2018. It will bring in FY17/18 interest income and identify some projects that are closed out.

VII. OTHER

A. Sustainability Projects

1. Brown inquired about the solar panels included on the RCC Facilities Master Plan. He asked if there is something District-wide that can be looked at to be able to move forward regarding sustainability, or will that interfere with the Facilities Master Plans already in place or being developed. West indicated RCC is on Riverside Public Utilities (RPU) and the other colleges are on Southern California Edison. RCC tried to move forward with solar but there is nothing that can be done in partnership with them. West suggested looking at water conservation, drought tolerant landscaping or energy storage. Sierra suggested Smart Controls. Collins stated Smart Controls would be easy for the colleges to move toward. West inquired about the colleges doing something about food waste. Beebe stated that trash recycling is a huge issue and MVC is not in compliance with the State. Collins stated a District-wide RFP for waste was discussed at the last meeting. The different municipalities may have different exclusivity contracts. West stated smart irrigation, food waste and EV charging could be the right items to work on. Mohtasham stated RCC had an audit on food waste and composting.

The college has to be in compliance by January 1, 2019. A Burrtec consultant provided a couple of options but it is going to be costly and RCC does not have the physical resources to compost. Burrtec has a program in place and will provide two organic food waste containers. Pick-up will be two times a week. Training will be provided and the composting will be completed at their site. West stated RCC contracted with the Facilities Master Plan architect to look at the carbon footprint. The report indicated that RCC is one of the worst colleges in terms of carbon footprint and sustainability. Brown asked what Norco College and MVC are going to do to be in compliance. Beebe stated the State doesn't know how to enforce this yet. The government officials were requiring four tons of food waste a week, effective January 20, 2019. It changed to four tons of trash. Sierra indicated that the only thing that Norco College has done is to separate the metals from the oils, which had been a big problem. Now they deliver a container and they pick it up. Brown inquired if the colleges want to hold on this or move forward with an actionable plan. Collins stated the colleges have to meet the food compost demand.