

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

*Tuesday, March 26, 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. 5 Year Capital Construction Plans
  - F. Capital Projects Status Report
  - G. Cash Flow Projection for Future Measure C Projects
  - H. Request for Proposals (RFP): Engineering, Testing, Inspector of Record (IOR)
- IV. Maintenance and Operations
  - A. Key/Access Control Upgrade - Update
- V. Other
  - A. Sustainability Projects
- VI. Meetings
  - A. Future Meeting Dates:
    - April 26, 2019
    - May 29, 2019
    - June 26, 2019

*RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT*  
*Facilities Working Group*

*March 26, 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)
Nathaniel Jones	(Moreno Valley College)
Robert Beebe	(Moreno Valley College)
Mehran Mohtasham	(Riverside City College)
Evelyn Ault	(Recorder)

Members Not Present

Chip West	(Riverside City College)
Martin Morozowsky	(Riverside City College)

I. CALLED TO ORDER

A. By Aaron Brown

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Motion to Approve February 21, 2019 Meeting Minutes by Michael Collins. Seconded by Beebe.

III. PROJECT UPDATES

A. Master Project List/Calendar

1. Nava:

- a) No new updates to the Master Project List.
- b) Capital Summary Form update complete, will be submitted to the share drive when approved.
- c) IT work order submitted for college's share drive access, has not been completed at this time.

2. Askar:

- a) Four new projects were not added to the Master Project List.
- b) Requested the colleges complete the process so her office can plan for staffing and to keep up with the projects.
- c) When the colleges are using grant funding or other funds for a project, they aren't contacting Facilities and projects do not get on the list.

3. Brown:

- a) Colleges need to require that their departments go through their Facilities department for construction projects so they can be placed on the list.

B. Proposition 39 Projects

1. RCC:

- a) Met with the District Budget Office to review the remaining budget. RCC, the Budget Office and the consultant have different numbers.
- b) Remaining amount: \$225,634 plus \$34,115 rebate, total \$259,749. RCC shows \$250,000, a \$9,749 difference.
- c) Waiting to hear from the Budget Office about where that difference comes from.

2. Askar:

- a) District Budget Office contacted Luis Cecco. The Budget Office is reconciling Luis' numbers to the Galaxy numbers. The result: Possible items like soft costs or small expenses in Galaxy were not picked-up or different SPP lines in Galaxy were used. Not all expenses were submitted to the Chancellor's Office on form B. The Budget Office will consolidate RCC's Year 5 into one SPP.
- b) On March 25 the Budget Office spoke to Luis Cecco. Some issues were identified. Askar stated they are close to making sure all the rebates were posted correctly.
- c) A reconciled list will be sent to the colleges that will show where there is a disconnect and the amount each college submitted to the Chancellor's Office.
- d) Overall the difference is \$164,000 over the last five years.
- e) Luis Cecco stated that an unofficial extension of Prop 39 funding to August 2019 has been granted. There is no official extension date yet. When the reconciliation is complete, a proposal will be submitted with a justification for the request for an extension.
- f) The Chancellor's Office stated the rebates are part of the project cost, the colleges should not be waiting, and the funds have to be spent by the deadline.

3. Brown:

- a) The District Budget Office will strategize regarding approaching the Chancellor's Office to request approval to re-submit based on the current information. If unsuccessful Business and Finance will regroup to decide how to proceed further.

- i. Mohtasham inquired if the four or five function numbers used for the past five years be consolidated to one budget line to spend the entire amount?
- ii. Askar stated that yes that can be done. She will talk to Budget staff about it.

4. Brown:

- a) Business & Finance will need one week to contact the Chancellor's Office and make a decision. The colleges will then be informed of exactly how much is available.
- b) Based on what the colleges think they have available Brown inquired if the projects are ready to start once the exact amount is identified and the amount each college has available to spend to close out the project.
  - i. RCC stated their project is ready to start.
  - ii. MVC's balance after encumbrances is \$145,000. The final Year 5 project is in progress.
  - iii. Norco's balance is \$46,000 after encumbrances.

C. Scheduled Maintenance Projects

1. Doering:

- a) RCC ADA Project #15 & #16: The project is 60% complete, work is being scheduled during Spring break. The football field portion of the project will have a significant impact.
- b) NC and MVC ADA Project: The documents were sent to DSA for approval. The architect indicated issues with the ADA path of travel. NC start date is projected for June 4, 2019. MVC start date is July or August 2019. Doering is waiting for confirmation from the college. Bidding will take two weeks.

D. Facilities Master Plans

1. Brown:

- a) Requested Facilities Master Plans updates from NC and MVC and requested a project list and preliminary scoping from RCC.

2. Collins:

- a) NC consultant is DLR.
- b) First review concepts will be received soon and will be presented to the campus community.
- c) Educational Master Plan is in the second of three draft phases.
- d) List of projects and an Executive Summary should be received by May 2019 and hope to present it at the June 2019 BOT meeting.

3. Jones:

- a) MVC consultant is DLR.
- b) Three concepts were presented to the campus on March 21, 2019. Good staff, faculty, and community turnout and good feedback. Feedback was posted on

MVC's Master Plan website. Ideas from the feedback sessions will be presented to Cabinet this week or next. The next open house/forum is April 25, 2019 where the integrated plan will be presented.

- c) Development of the project list and costs will begin. They are hoping to have it done in late May 2019, and go to the June 2019 BOT meeting.

4. Mohtasham:

- a) RCC consultant is Gensler. In summer 2019 RCC will have each phase completed with a separate architect to provide detail design and get the stakeholders involved. The plan is to move forward, after January or February, using bond money. Then move forward with construction.
- b) Gensler will provide the Facilities Master Plan, project list and scope this week and will post it on RCC's website.

E. 5 Year Capital Construction Plans

1. Brown:

- a) The colleges were forwarded the timelines from the Chancellor's Office.
- b) On the 2020/2021 project funding the cut off was 123 points. RCC Life Science/Physical Science is on the list for funding. MVC Library Learning Center had 103 points, NC Center for Human Performance & Kinesiology had 117 points. Those projects did not make the list and did not get funded, primarily because there was no match component. If there had been a match component they probably would have been funded. Every other FPP for consideration has a local match.
- c) Colleges will have to have a local match going forward per the communication from the Chancellor's Office. The new rules next year require a minimum of a 25% match, otherwise it won't be considered unless there is a hardship. A hardship component is if the college went out for a bond once or twice and are unsuccessful.
- d) Since the District is actively going out for a bond issue Brown suggested the colleges put in a local match on the assumption that we will put in for a local bond. The risk is if the project is approved but the bond doesn't pass we have to notify the Chancellor to let them know we don't have the local match, and the project could be moved back to an IPP status.
- e) Brown will need concurrence from the Vice Presidents to do this and needs the decision quickly.
- f) The IPPs sent out by the Chancellor's Office are MVC Library Learning Center and the Center for Human Performance; NC Library Learning Resource Center and the Center for Human Performance and Kinesiology; RCC Cosmetology Building and the MLK Renovation.

2. Nava:

- a) The SAM Narrative came back with new additional items for the 2018/19 FPP submittals. The Department of Finance is requesting additional details. Nava provided a handout for the colleges to be prepared to provide the information.
- b) Eric Mittlestead will require the information in order to compile all of the necessary reports. NC will be sent confirmation of the phone conference with Eric. MVC declined a conference call with Eric and will be using a different consultant to complete their 5 Year Capital Outlay Construction Plan.
- c) Clarification has been requested from the State Representative, it will be forwarded to the colleges.
- d) Items being required:
  - i. More detailed information regarding student enrollment
  - ii. Faculty and Staff
  - iii. Numbers per the program having do with the building being submitted
  - iv. District assessed valuation per student

## F. Capital Projects Status Report

### 1. Doering:

- a) RCC Greenhouse: College reviewed the architect proposals and selected Westberg+White.
  - i. Brown stated the colleges should formally engage an architect if they are performing services to do preliminary scoping. If a company is doing work they should be paid for that work.
  - ii. Brown inquired if a final decision has been made for the greenhouse project.
  - iii. Mohtasham stated yes. It will take 1/3 of the existing Community Garden and should be complete before the end of summer. Demolition costs are being requested. North Hall will be demolished and a new Community Garden put in its place.
- b) RCC Fire Suppression Replacement: The project is 99% complete. Training for the college is scheduled for April 11, 2019. IT will plan a complete shutdown during Spring break to confirm everything is working correctly.
- c) MVC Welcome Center: A meeting with HPI is scheduled for next week. The project is in Design Development and scheduled to go through in 3 months. The overall project budget is \$14M. Construction Management (CM) interviews are scheduled for March 27, 2019. Doering is still working on the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) AB52 documents with the local tribes.
- d) MVC Makerspace: Bids will be opened this week.
- e) MVC Ben Clark Training Center (BCTC) Training Platform Project: The documents are still at DSA, there are some questions to be answered. When the plans are received from DSA a copy will be sent to the County of Riverside. Meetings will be scheduled with the County to review the plans. A hard schedule will then be given to the college.
  - i. Brown inquired what the next steps are since the BCTC Ground Lease is done.
  - ii. Jones indicated an RFP has been sent to Askar to hire an architect. Once an architect is hired the project will move more into design.

- f) NC Veterans Center: Waiting to hear back from the architect who indicated they have been communicating with the college on the schedule and other small items like the schedule. DTSC letters stating the Land Use Covenant will be revised to focus just on the Veterans Center project site, not the entire campus. The CEQA AB52 document process has to be closed out, it will be part of the DSA document requirements. It will not delay the design component but possibly some of the digging and trenching.
    - i. Collins stated they met with the architect and received a revised cost estimate. The project is about \$750,000 short funded due to the site work and the utility drive. DSA approval should be in about six weeks, we should break ground in the fall and are working on identifying the funding.
- G. Cash Flow Projection for Future Measure C Projects
- 1. Brown:
    - a) There is no need to go for another issuance until fall with an actual issuance in January/February timeframe. If anything comes up in the interim that will have to be reassessed.
- H. Request for Proposals (RFP): Engineering, Testing, Inspector of Record (IOR)
- 1. Askar:
    - a) The RFP was sent to the colleges for review, feedback was received.
    - b) Seven types of services were included. It was recommended to include Structural Engineering, however, the RFP was already sent out. An addendum can be done to extend the RFP and add that category. Askar spoke to Doering and inquired if it was necessary to add that service. Doering indicated it is a category not often used unless new construction is being done.
    - c) Without a qualified list a combination of RFQ/RFP would be used if over the \$92,600 threshold. If the quote is under the threshold, informal proposals would be received and would include the Structural Engineer's qualifications.
      - i. Doering stated cost can still be obtained for future projects.
      - ii. Collins stated NC uses Structural Engineering when dealing with load-bearing issues that could potentially be DSA related.
      - iii. Brown inquired what the delay be in the Structural Engineer was included.
      - iv. Askar stated there is no pressing time for this RFP. The qualified list can be sent to the next BOT meeting.
      - v. Brown inquired why it is not included if there is no pressing timeline.
      - vi. Askar stated she will include it.
    - d) The RFQ was published in the newspaper. Seventeen companies indicated they want to receive a package. Seventeen was not enough so the package was sent to the District's list of registered companies and to the previous year's Bond list. Askar will sent the colleges the entire list of companies that received a package and asked the colleges to send her any company's information that could also be sent a one.

#### IV. MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

##### A. Key/Access Control Upgrade

###### 1. Marshall:

- a) The colleges met to review the keying issue and will meet again in April to discuss the development of the FootPrint process to include requests for keys.
- b) NC would like to move forward in revising the keyway to devise a new key system while developing the hierarchy to encompass all campuses and the District Office. If any campus wishes to re-key they can.
- c) The group discussed identifying the approvers, Directors, VPs, and work with Human Resources to write the policy.
- d) District IT will attend the April meeting to determine if there is the ability to incorporate the different keyways and build it into FootPrints.

###### 2. Brown:

- a) Suggested the group could look at a district that already has a policy in place.

#### V. OTHER

##### A. Prevailing Wage

###### 1. Askar:

- a) Purchasing sent a link to the group regarding a free seminar on Prevailing Wage to be held at the Mission Inn. The second day is a Contractor Seminar, the link for that was sent to individuals on her entire database.
- b) Her office receives a lot of requests for prevailing wage certified payroll, it is good for the Colleges to know the process.
- c) Purchasing submits all of the PWC-100 forms to the State for Public Works projects. Using the form the State can do a download to look at the certified payroll.