

Riverside Community College District  
**Facilities Working Group Meeting**

*Friday, December 07, 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. 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. Notifying RCCD on DSA Closeouts
- IV. Professional Services
- V. Maintenance and Operations
  - A. Key/Access Control Upgrade - Update
  - B. District-wide Product and Service Agreements - Update
- VI. Reporting
  - A. Capital Program Executive Summary Report to the Board
- VII. Other
  - A. Sustainability Projects
  - B. S&L Credit Rating Update
- VIII. Meetings
  - A. Future Meeting Dates:
    - January 31, 2019
    - February 21, 2019
    - March 26, 2019
    - April 26, 2019
    - May 29, 2019
    - June 26, 2019

*RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT*  
*Facilities Working Group*

*December 7, 2018*  
*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)
Nathaniel Jones	(Moreno Valley College)
Robert Beebe	(Moreno Valley College)
Javier Sierra	(Norco College)
Chip West	(Riverside City College)
Mehran Mohtasham	(Riverside City College)
Evelyn Ault	(Recorder)

Members Not Present

Michael Collins (Norco College)

I. CALLED TO ORDER

A. By Aaron Brown

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Motion to Approve November 6, 2018 Meeting Minutes by Beebe. Seconded by Mohtasham.

III. PROJECT UPDATES

A. Master Project List/Calendar

1. Askar will re-send the Purchasing Shared Drive link to all attendees. The vendor/contractor list and prevailing wage forms for the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) are in a new folder on the drive. All Prevailing Wage projects (PWC) over \$1,000 had to be reported to DIR. The amount has been increased to \$5,000. The Purchasing department submits the form to DIR. All information is needed on requisitions to be able to log the contract in. The assigned DIR number is

available on DIR's website. Purchasing can provide that number if a contractor calls to request it.

2. Nava stated the guidelines regarding how and when to submit the Capital Project Form were provided to the group. It is now the new Bid Information Summary Sheet. Nava reviewed the form with the group and the District guidelines as they relate to the form.
3. Brown indicated that the "target start date" on the form is a critical date. The District will contact the colleges if the start date is not being met, a new start date will be discussed.
4. Jones inquired if that is a construction start date or project start date.
5. Brown stated it is both.
6. Askar stated a form for each component, each phase of the project, is required.
7. Brown stated the form is required for any project coming through Purchasing to manage and track all projects. Other tracking options will be explored in the future.
8. Nava stated 'Required' information must be provided. Currently, the list contains projects stating the funding source is 'Unknown'. A 'To Be Determined' category for the funding source will be added. Nava stated 'Fiscal Year Funding Allocation' on the form indicates what year the funding is from. The selection for Labor Compliance may or may not stay on the form.
9. Askar stated once the funding source is selected Purchasing will know what the Labor Compliance Monitoring requirements are.

10. Nava completed review of the form. The colleges were instructed to email the forms to Nava and copy Askar. Nava will send the form as a .pdf to all attendees to avoid possible issues on the Share Drive.
11. Jones inquired if the form will be transitioned to eForms.
12. Askar stated that is the intent but after other urgent forms are completed.
13. Nava will manually update information provided when forms are received and then forward the forms to Purchasing to input their information.
14. Askar stated that projects on the list with missed start dates will be deleted. When a revised form is received a project will be re-entered.
15. Brown indicated the colleges are to begin using the form immediately.

**B. Proposition 39 Projects**

1. Askar stated the Prop 39 project budget indicates the colleges receive anticipated rebates along with an allocation from the State. The State partners with the utility companies to calculate the rebates. The college is receiving very little or no rebates. Some Scheduled Maintenance money will be used to replace missing funds. The State was contacted, it was determine Prop 39 money can be moved over from a previous year.
2. Mohtasham stated the rebate is calculated based on how many kilowatts you will save on a particular fixture. If a fixture is changed and the savings is not what the State calculated there might be a different rebate. After receiving the “as-builts” the information has to be sent to the State’s consultant to re-submit the information to the city.
3. Brown inquired if the projects are being budgeted based on the anticipated rebates.

4. Askar stated “yes”, and that it was discovered that rebates were not received when MVC was trying to schedule their last project for year five. An analysis is being conducted now for Norco College and Riverside City College. Askar will schedule a meeting with Southern California Edison (SCE) to get copies of the rebate form. Future project funding will only be based on the actual or known budget.
5. RCC is working on the Project Close-out forms and are waiting to hear what the remaining balance is. Westco was contacted to send a sample of the sconces for the Quadrangle. A modern style cannot be used in an historical building. The sample will be presented to faculty and staff for their consideration.

#### C. Scheduled Maintenance Projects

1. NC issued a purchase order for the tile replacement on the Library roofing project. The installation will go out to bid using 2019 funds. The same funding will be used for the HVAC project.
2. MVC is working on the elevator projects and the ADA project.
3. NC is working on the DSA approved Library roof. It will go out to bid.  
Askar stated her office has not received the specifications and plans yet. Sierra stated he will inquire about them.
4. RCC is working on the 17/18 elevators with Amtech to change the specifications and make everything one brand. The specification will be sent to Purchasing. The engineer is working on the ECS HVAC drawings for Scheduled Maintenance 18/19. When the drawings are received from the engineer they will be sent to Purchasing.
5. Doering reported that ABNY came in as the lowest responsive bidder at \$850,000 for the District ADA (#15 & #16) Project-RCC Campus-wide Accessibility. The cost

will be reduced by removing the #1 Additive Alternate. It will go to the December 11, 2018 BOT meeting. The project is expected to begin in January 2019 with a timeframe of approximately 3 months. Westberg+White Architects recently received their executed agreement, and are beginning their process on both #15 and #16. Doering will meet with the colleges regarding construction start times once the design is DSA approved and received from the architect. Doering will provide the colleges with the project timelines.

6. Askar stated that a portion of MVC's 17/18 Schedule Maintenance funding of \$125,000 went into their budget. Jones stated they have approximately \$35,000 left. Depending on what the project budget is, the college will cover the difference and will determine at that time if they will use FY18/19 or FY19/20 funds.

#### D. Facilities Master Plans

1. Askar stated that NC and MVC Facilities Master Plans went to the BOT on December 11 and will be awarded to DLR Group. MVC has already begun gathering data for the process.
2. Brown stated that there was a discussion between the Presidents and the Chancellor about taking an update to the BOT and inquired if that is still happening?
3. Jones replied it is being considered. MVC is looking at possibly including a list of proposed projects in the 2020 Bond. That information was mentioned to the architect during the interview process.
4. Brown inquired what the timeline to go to the BOT will be.
5. Jones replied it will tentatively go in May 2019.

6. Brown indicated a bond consultant is being engaged. A meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, December 11, 2018 to include the Chancellor, the college Presidents, the three college VP's of Business, himself, and Lana Wilson from Foundation. The meeting will provide critical path timelines. The group will discuss the previous survey, the steps taken from that time period to now, and will plot out how to move forward. It is designed to get the process off the ground and provide information for the bond consultant on the next obligation bond, tentatively projected for March 2020 or November 2020. The college's Facilities Master Plans will be incorporated into a potential bond document. There will be a presentation to the BOT tentatively at the February Committee Meeting.
7. Jones inquired if there are any materials to be sent for the Tuesday meeting.
8. Brown indicated the college's Presidents have the materials.

E. Capital Projects Status Report

1. Doering stated he and Dr. West met with the architect regarding the RCC Greenhouse project to review the new location, and provided the college with the asbestos cost proposal.
2. Brown inquired what the decision is regarding the IT infrastructure that needs to be moved.
3. Mohtsham replied they are working with IT to relocate them.
4. Doering provided an update on the following projects:
  - a. Geotek will start working on December 10, 2018 on the MVC Welcome Center.  
The colleges were provided with the timelines.

- b. Ben Clark Training Center Platform project is scheduled for a DSA Pre-Application meeting on December 17, 2018, the DSA plan check for the architect is needed by December 14, 2018.
  - c. Coordination is occurring with the architect to go to DSA on the Makerspace project. It was delayed due to the holiday schedule and did not meet the November 17, 2018 deadline. The architect sent the plans but they have to go back in to review them. Doering indicated he will check on that.
5. Askar inquired if there is any information on the RCC Makerspace STEM bus project. Kristine DiMemmo emailed Purchasing a couple months ago. Purchasing did not do anything because they are waiting for specifications and plans.
  6. Mohtasham indicated it will be processed for funding but that RCC Facilities department is not involved.
  7. Brown indicated that MVC's STEM bus project encountered issues because Facilities was not involved. Grant managers were trying to navigate around what is essentially a moving facilities project. Brown suggested RCC Facilities department touch base regarding the STEM bus project and that Facilities can be the point of contact on the project, or help guide in the processes that go along with the project in the event of any issues. The MVC STEM bus project was delayed significantly due to lack of engagement with MVC Facilities and District Office.
  8. Askar stated a copy of the Makerspace bus specifications from Mt. San Jacinto College was obtained and sent to Dr. Graveen as a starting point for MVC's specifications.
  9. Doering updates continued:



- d. Doering sent an inquiry on the status of the Geo and Topo requisitions for the Norco Veterans Center. The delay in receiving the requisitions is delaying the architect.
- e. The Norco College ECC project is still on hold. Doering is working with Dr. Collins to contact Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) to get the approval for construction. NC is restricted in having a childhood center there due to the documentation with the land use covenant and DTSC. The documentation was forwarded to Dr. Collins, he is aware of the issue. Doering stated that working with DTSC takes a long time and reminded Dr. Collins of the timeline.
- f. The RCC Network Operations Center will tentatively start in January 2019. Doering will coordinate with the college and IT to provide timelines.

F. Cash Flow Projection for Future Measure C Projects

- 1. Jones stated MVC's financial summary in Galaxy showed the sum for the Wellness Center project at \$11 million, it should be the Board approved amount of \$14 million. Jones also requested that the Board approved \$11 million for the Phase I Educational Services building at BCTC be added in Galaxy. The Ground Lease will be going to the Board in January and the college will begin to spend money for the design after the first of the year.
- 2. Brown indicated MVC will need to submit a project proposal to the BOT to be able to spend Measure C funds on that project. The BOT only approved the modification of the Ground Lease.
- 3. Askar stated she will work with the college on that.

4. Brown indicated the need for the timing and requested the projection for spending Measure C funds. This information has not been received from MVC or NC. The projects will be on hold if the projections are not received.

#### G. Notifying RCCD on DSA Closeouts

1. Doering stated the District is required to file a DSA168 form for each project that has an architect involved. DSA notifies FP&D each time a project comes on board. The form can be provided to the colleges. If there are outstanding open projects, DSA may not approve plans for new projects that come up...district-wide.
2. Brown stated that Chancellor Isaac received a notice from DSA on the RCC Fire Alarm System project. Brown ensured the Chancellor that the matter would be taken care of. Brown indicated the need to have a good process in place to ensure these get closed out in a timely manner.

#### IV. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

##### A. Engineering and Inspector of Record (IOR) services

1. Askar stated the need to renew the Engineering and Inspector of Record (IOR) Professional Services list.
2. Brown inquired if the requests would be separate.
3. Askar stated they can be done as one Request for Proposals (RFP) then broken out into different categories. Previously an RFP was sent for testing, special inspection, and IOR.
4. Brown inquired on the timing of the RFP.
5. Askar stated it would be after January. They will begin sending out information, refine the scope of work, and select the categories. Once that process has begun an

outline of the proposed categories and scope of work will be provided to the Vice Chancellor for review.

B. College Elevators

1. Mohtasham stated a comparison of the Amtech contract to other agreement pricing from other providers shows Amtech as the lowest possible bid. The other proposals did not include the annual fire test. Adding those bring the total to \$3,000 to \$3,200 above Amtech, which will increase the contract. This was discussed with Dr. West, the college is not getting what is being asked for from Amtech.
2. Brown inquired if this should be looked at District-wide.
3. Askar stated an RFP was done as a District for elevator services over 5 years ago. Amtech was the lowest bidder. At the end of the 5 years a new RFP was discussed.
4. Beebe inquired if the contract has to be awarded to the lowest bidder in this category.
5. Askar stated it does not, the process was done with services and experience included, the committee awarded to Amtech. Askar stated the 5 year contract is coming to a close and inquired how the District and colleges want to proceed. The State of California, UCR, CalState, and the Community Colleges were consolidating the scope and going out to bid together. Askar was on the committee and requested the committee wait to see who the State awards to. That process was delayed. Askar stated she was leaving it up to the colleges to decide how they wanted to proceed. Askar notified them that they could find another company if they are not happy with Amtech, and could piggyback on an existing contract until more information from

the State is available. There are no term commitments when you piggyback on a contract.

6. Beebe stated they are working with Thyssenkrupp Elevators. MVC is working with an architect but are still using Amtech to provide recommendations to write the specifications. When the RFP goes out and is awarded MVC will begin looking at service contracts.
7. Brown inquired if it is worth it to wait for the State to go out to bid.
8. Askar stated Purchasing can go out for a consolidated RFP again but wanted to wait for the State because the three higher education entities are going to get better savings with the volume. Askar submitted the list from the colleges to the State and requested that it be included in their bid process.
9. Brown inquired when the CAADO elevator will be fixed.
10. Mohtasham stated the parts have been ordered and should arrive in 3-4 weeks.

## V. MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

### A. Key/Access Control Upgrade

1. Brown inquired on the status of the upgrade.
2. Mohtasham indicated the colleges worked on a procedure for when individuals ask where keys should go. When that is complete it will be sent to the VP's. If it is accepted they will work to get it in the new work order system.

### B. District-wide Product and Service Agreements - Update

1. Askar stated the last agreement being used as a District is Waxie. The District has a good contract that included the dispensers. There were no other commodities brought to her attention to do a District-wide bid on.

## VI. REPORTING

### A. Capital Program Executive Summary Report to the Board

1. Brown reminded the group that the Capital Program Executive Summary (CPES) report is being taken monthly to the BOT. It is being updated between the District Facilities and the Budget office.
2. Askar indicated a Project Close-out report is going to the BOT in December. If approved by the BOT the excess funding will go back to each college's Measure C budget. The Capital Project Summary Report will also be presented to provide an update on the approved budget.
3. Brown stated Dr. Isaac requested a review of the requests for allocation of centrally controlled funds. Dr. Isaac also requested the development of a methodology for requesting those funds. Brown will request input from the colleges.

## VII. OTHER

### A. Sustainability Projects

1. Brown indicated the colleges are incorporating the Sustainability Projects into their Facilities Master Plan processes and stated he will need to talk to Dr. Isaac more about his vision for Sustainability Projects. Whether it would be taking available funds for District-wide projects, engaging an energy consultant to do a comprehensive study to look at possibilities across the District, or have the colleges plan their own projects.

### B. S&P Credit Rating Update

1. Brown explained the credit rating agencies for the District's Obligation Bond requested an update. The District's underwriter and bond financial advisor worked to

gather the information, which was reviewed last week. The District's credit rating was affirmed by S&P as an AA rating. The bonds are protected by the property taxes that can be assessed to an unlimited amount to pay bond holders. The two main components that drive the rating are assessed property tax valuations within the District that taxes are assessed in, and the median income of the population in the District. The information is compared with similar organizations to increase the rating. Because Riverside Community College District is in the Inland Empire, it doesn't do well compared with areas like Orange County. Brown will send a copy of the report to the Facilities Working Group.