

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

*Friday, April 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:
    - May 29, 2019
    - June 26, 2019

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
**Facilities Working Group**

April 26, 2019  
CAADO – Conference Room 334A  
8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Members Present:**

Aaron Brown	(District)
Hussain Agah	(District)
Majd Askar	(District)
Bart Doering	(District)
Myra Nava	(District)
Steven Marshall	(Norco College)
Nathaniel Jones	(Moreno Valley College)
Robert Beebe	(Moreno Valley College)
Chip West	(Riverside City College)
Mehran Mohtasham	(Riverside City College)
Martin Morozowsky	(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 March 26, 2019 Meeting Minutes by Beebe. Second by Jones.

**III. PROJECT UPDATES**

**A. Master Projects List/Calendar**

1. Askar stated the Capital Project Summary Form that Nava receives from the colleges is being updated on the Master List so that Budget, Facilities Planning & Development and the colleges can track the projects.
2. Agah introduced himself and encouraged all members to attend the monthly meetings to collaborate, communicate any issues, and keep each other up to date. Agah inquired if the current version of the capital form (handout provided) was uploaded to the server the week before this meeting. Nava stated no, the old version has been uploaded.
3. Nava explained the changes to the form.
  - i. “District Category” was updated to match recent State revisions according to their Capital Outlay Project Categories. Category definitions are listed on the back of the handout. The online form provides category definitions and descriptions in a pop up when you hover over the dropdown arrow.

- ii. "Project Manager (requester)" line is no longer just the Project Manager who is requesting the project.
  - iii. "Managed By (office)" line to shows if the project is a district or college managed project and provides the point of contact for the project.
  - iv. "Project Name" In the future naming a project will become a more standardized process to avoid the name being changed and allows a more detailed description of the project. Agah stated this can be discussed at a later time.
  - v. The check boxes on the new form have been standardized.
  - vi. "Add/Deduct Alternates Included?" was added to the Bid Information
  - vii. Two signature lines have been added at the bottom of the form. Signatures acknowledges that the form has been reviewed. Signatures are required prior to the form being submitted to Nava. A digital signature, which includes a time and date stamp, will be accepted to avoid having to print, sign and scan the form and allows all parties to be aware of the progress and to move the document to the next step. Askar stated the signature requirement is a result of projects coming directly from departments without involving the college's Facilities department.
4. Askar inquired if the form requires a signature from both the college and the District.
  5. Nava stated the requirement would be to have one signature from the college and one signature from the District office, a signature from both individuals at both locations is not required.
  6. Askar stated that nine of fifteen projects that Purchasing is bidding are new and were never on the Master Project List. That causes problems with staffing and year end procedures. Planning was the idea behind the Capital Project Form.
  7. Agah suggested providing a simple milestone in the "Current Status / Notes" section of the form to help with planning ahead, as well as providing proposed dates for services such as GeoTech, CM, etc. to help with the procurement of professional services on the project.
  8. Nava inquired if a form will be required for every contract for a single project.
  9. Askar stated a form will be required for each different classification.
  10. Nava stated the project name on the forms will be the same and inquired if the colleges need to specify the type of contract within the project name in the Notes or somewhere on the form.
  11. Askar stated that having a title will help. The description on the form is used to determine what is being asked for and determines if any portion of the request is a separate contract.
  12. Marshall stated having a check box on the form for soft services would be helpful, especially for DSA projects.
  13. Nava inquired that when a separate form is received for architectural, construction, etc. will that become a separate project on the Master List?
  14. Askar stated yes. That will put the request in the queue and determines what resources are needed to put a proposal out.
  15. Nava stated an additional column might need to be added to the list.
  16. Jones stated the form should indicate the initiation of a project and identify what services are being procured.
  17. Nava stated there is available space under Bid Request Type.
  18. Agah stated he is hearing two different options. The first is the initial form that can be updated for different services for the same project or incorporating the services on the same form. Agah stated incorporating the services on the same form would be a good procedure.
  19. Askar inquired if a dropdown list of services can be incorporated within the Bid Request Type box.
  20. Nava stated she will complete that change and requested a list of all of the services to put in the dropdown.
  21. Agah stated those are the reasons he is proposing that the form allows for all of the information needed such as the project description, the services with descriptions in the timeline to show when the services need to occur.
  22. Marshall suggested having different Capital Project Summary forms specific to Design or Construction and stated the design element has many different components that could be hard to capture on one form.

23. Mohtasham referenced the list of approved architects and inquired if the colleges could contact three or four through the job walk and select an architect without filling out the Capital Project Summary Form. The college would issue a purchase order and begin working with the selected firm allowing the colleges to have the bid documents ready and forward them as a package to Purchasing to send out for the construction bidding.
24. Askar stated if the architectural services are under the \$92,600 threshold the colleges request the quote from architects on the approved list. A purchase order can be submitted for projects under \$10,000. Purchasing is flexible with that amount, a purchase order can be submitted for projects that are \$20,000, which will be the college's call. The Board of Trustees wants to see proposals over \$10,000. If the services are over the threshold it has to go to the Board for a formal Board approval. Askar stated she will send the guidelines to the colleges.
25. Nava inquired when the colleges would be submitting a new form.
26. Mohtasham stated the form would be submitted when the project is over the \$92,600 threshold.
27. Agah indicated FP&D will continue to work on the form. He inquired if the group has any objection of looking into the details of the form. The group agreed to review the form.
28. Beebe stated the colleges know that departments do projects without the Facilities' knowledge. A department had gone through the proposal process and submitted a purchase order. The vendor, Total Plan, arrived with the modular furniture but there was no power in the location.
29. Askar stated Purchasing will sometimes ask for a bond. Askar reviews it to see if it needs a bond, reviews it to determine if it is simply putting tables and chairs together, or determine if anything is being attached to the building. She determines if the project is Public Works, if it has Prevailing Wage. Askar inquired if the college VP's need to send an email to the college departments to relay the processes for new projects or furniture purchases and inform them that they need to go through the Facilities departments first to assess the requirements. Askar stated if a project is flagged the colleges will be informed of it.
30. Doering stated that in the past anything that is made at the manufacture does not require Public Works or Prevailing Wage. However, if the furniture is assembled on site rather than being assembled at the manufacture this falls under Public Works and requires Prevailing wages.
31. Askar stated in that situation it is Public Works in terms of Prevailing Wages but her office does not require Department of Industrial Relations (DIR). Knowing if a project is Public Works is important because her office reports every project, over \$15,000 for maintenance and \$25,000 for new construction, to the State. The departments are not expected to know if a project is Public Works or Prevailing Wage.

## **B. Proposition 39 Projects Updates**

1. Agah provided a handout: Proposition 39 Project Close-Out Extension Request letter. Agah stated some Prop 39 projects may be hard to close by June 30, 2019, however, if they are not closed the money will have to be returned to the State.
2. Askar stated that the residual is due to bidding, resulting in lower prices than expected.
3. Agah stated that the letter is just a request to the State Chancellor's Office and that Hoang Nguyen remarked that the extension should be granted, but there are no guarantees. One thing to keep in mind is the Project Installation date of July 12, 2019 and the Form J or F that needs to be filed with Luis Cecco at the State.
4. Askar stated the forms will not be submitted by June 30, 2019 due to the lead time, the ordering, and the UCCAP bid.
5. Agah stated for example that Form B was filed with an estimated overall cost of \$300,000 but the project came in less. Agah recommends developing the bid documents with add alternates 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and indicate the project is \$300,000 and start adding the alternates to make sure all of the money is captured.
6. Askar stated the reporting on Form B was different than what was in the District's financial system. The Prop 39 money became available in year 13/14. Initially the colleges were filling out and submitting Form B but they were not capturing the soft costs, only reporting the construction costs so that the actual expenses were being understated. The State thought there was more money than there was so Budget has been trying to reconcile. It looks bad if the money is returned so it

has to be spent, and it is coming out of the District's money due to overspending in previous years. RCC reconciled, but NC and MVC have a delta they have to pay out of some other funding source. Askar offered to explain it better to NC and MVC at another time. At this time all of the forms should be sent to Agah to be reviewed.

### C. Scheduled Maintenance Projects Updates

1. Doering:
  - a. MVC: Accessibility, ADA Upgrades, Parking Lot B project was approved by DSA on Thursday, April 25, 2019. The architect needs to send the DSA plans back.
  - b. RCC: The ADA project #15 & #16 is approximately 95% complete. Signage is being worked on and some concrete in the Quad area has to be removed then striping completed.
  - c. NC: ADA Scheduled Maintenance, Parking Lot B&D project plans are at the Division of the State Architect (DSA) for review and approval. The construction timeline has been moved from June 4, 2019 to August.
2. RCCD Gomez ADA:
  - a. Askar requested that Doering discuss what the RCC Gomez ADA project balance is.
  - b. Doering stated the Gomez ADA project is 75% complete. The project needs \$800,000 to complete which will possibly be pushed to the 2021 Bond. Doering stated Michael Simmons, Risk Management, was going to inquire with the courts to ensure there are no issues with waiting for new funding. The architect will not be doing the design work in the event that codes change. Future projects will not be approved until this project is resolved.
  - c. Askar inquired if RCC is ok to wait until 2021.
  - d. West stated yes, they are ok with that.
3. Agah stated that he and Doering have been discussing the project reporting for District managed projects. Doering has about 15 projects to report on so a new reporting format has been proposed, the Project Status Update (copies provided). The form includes all of the college's projects with a general description about each one and includes a section for any issues on the project. Agah has proposed to use the form as a milestone schedule, not necessarily for small projects but for large ones to help plan ahead.

### D. Facilities Master Plans Updates

1. **MVC:** Jones stated MVC has their last open house on Thursday, April 25, 2019. The draft plan is in final modifications and they anticipate taking the project list and site plan to the June Committee and Regular Board meetings along with MVC.
2. **NC:** Marshall stated NC met with DLR on April 16, 2019. The Facilities Master Plan is in progress, the presentation will be ready at the end of April. The comment section is nearly done and will be reviewed with Dr. Reece.
3. **RCCD:** West stated RCC is done with their Facilities Master Plan and are beginning Programming. There are seven projects in the first phase of the Master Plan. They are the FPPs that have been submitted to the State: Business CIS; Fine and Performing Arts Program; Infrastructure Chiller Loop, Centralized Plant; Applied Technology; Football Stadium project; 91 Freeway Marquee sign; and STEM Engagement Center. RCC will be using one-time money from budget savings to hire multiple architects in the summer of 2019. If the bond goes in March 2020 the one-time money will be put back to the college's funds in the same fiscal year. If the bond moves to November 2020 the projects will hold a little longer. Strategic Planning is being conducted in consultation with the District. A ten person committee was put together to facilitate agreements on certain projects. The committee includes Faculty, students and staff.

## E. Capital Projects Status Report

Doering reported on the following:

### 1.RCC:

- i. Greenhouse project: The first meeting with staff occurred on April 25, 2019 to review the project's concepts and ideas. Doering requested to meet with West to discuss the results of the meeting.
- ii. Fire Suppression and Replacement project: The project at the Caesar Chavez Building is complete and operational. RCC Facilities staff have been trained, stickers have been placed on the device to avoid shutting the Halon system down in error.

### 2.MVC:

- i. Student Services Welcome Center project: Design Development is being completed and will go into CDs soon. There were discussion meetings regarding the Geotechnical and the utilities. It was not part of the original scope of work. The district is waiting for the cost of that to come in. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) AB 52 issues are still being resolved.
- ii. Makerspace project: The bid process is complete and was awarded to Torga Electric, however, they are having an issue with their bond. They were reminded to get the bond done before they run out of time and that they are still responsible for the bid. A notice of non-performance will be issued if they do not get that resolved.
- iii. BCTC Platform Project: The project is in CD review. The CM, Tilden Coil, will begin reviewing the documents when their agreement is finalized. The status of that agreement is unknown at this time.

### 3.Norco:

- i. Veterans Resource Center project: Comments from Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) were received regarding the initial testing requirements that they want for soils and soil vapors. If a partial sample is done they will continue to add costs. Dudek provided the cost proposal which was forwarded to NC along with a draft board report for review and approval by Dr. Collins. Marshall has requested to be the CM on the project to save cost. Doering offered help with any questions Marshall may have. The project is in the CD phase. Doering stated he has not downloaded the plans for review and inquired if Marshall has done that yet. Marshall indicated he has begun to review them and are at 75% CD. The plan is to go to DSA in less than two months, however, there may need to be an addendum to DSA due to the incomplete CEQA document. The project requires additional funds. Marshall indicated that Brown, Agah and Dr. Collins are working on that issue. Doering stated it is a Grant funded project, he worked with Budget to determine where the additional \$1,000,000 is.

## F. Five (5) Year Capital Construction Plans

1. Agah stated the 5 Year Capital Construction Plans are due to the State on July 1, 2019.
2. Doering stated that information is being collected from the colleges.
3. MVC has engaged Alma Strategies, LLC, a sub of DLR Group. Alma Strategies has been given access in FUSION with a May 15, 2019 deadline to provide the reports the District.
4. NC is waiting for changes from Dr. Collins that will add funding. Agah stated NC will re-submit the Cosmetology FPP with a 50% matching.
5. Agah reiterated that the colleges are required to finalize the 5 Year Capital Construction Plans by May 15, 2019. FP&D must submit the reports to Brown by May 17, 2019 to be on the agenda for the June 4, 2019 Committee Board meeting and the June 11, 2019 Regular Board meeting.

### **G. Cash Flow Projection for Future Measure C Projects**

The colleges previously submitted their reports to Brown. There was no further discussion.

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

1. Askar stated the RFP required an addendum to include Structural Engineering. The request closes soon. Questions were answered as they were received. There are at least 30 firms that have asked for the RFP. Askar inquired if the colleges want to qualify all of the companies that submitted an RFP, or do interviews. Jones stated if the colleges reviewed the proposals and evaluated the strength of each and agreed to include a certain number of them on the qualified list without conducting interviews. Askar stated she will scan and send the proposals to the colleges for review and completion of a scoring matrix.

## **IV. MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS**

### **A. Key/Access Control Upgrade – Update**

1. Marshall stated the FootPrints12 Key form is being developed. Feedback has been received and the plan has been approved to develop a new keying hierarchy for all 3 colleges and the District office. NC is dedicating \$75,000 to do the re-key and re-core. As the other colleges identify funding they can begin the process as well. There is a consensus that there is a need to regain security and control of the colleges keying systems.
2. Beebe stated there is little or no key control at all three colleges. There is no process as a district to collect keys as employees leave, or how to approve a key request. The process has been handled differently at each college. IT provided a flow chart that will need to be approved. It is a challenge if the plan that Norco has devised is enacted before a process for collection is in place. The new keying upgrade and hierarchy will fail.
3. Askar inquired if the upgrade is an HR issue.
4. West stated it is an HR issue as well as collective bargaining related to workplace conditions.
5. Askar inquired if the colleges can use card access.
6. West stated card access cannot be done in older buildings and it is very costly. West stated the new program will have many challenges but if it will succeed anywhere it will be at NC due to a lower involvement of CTA as RCC does.
7. Marshall stated they hope some of the challenges can be mitigated through the new hierarchy structure. A lot of the challenges are with the part-time Faculty. In reality they will have a lab or classroom key specific to a building, however, the building will have to be opened with a separate key. If they come in during off hours they cannot get in the building.
8. West recommended having conversations with HR. The safety issue will be a key factor during discussions.
9. Beebe stated on May 1, 2019 FootPrints12 rolls out, except for the key module. There will be no way to request keys. The identification of the process for approvals is holding up the project.

## **V. OTHER**

### **A. Sustainability Projects**

1. Mohtasham stated RCC is doing the organic food waste program, they pick-up from the Culinary and the cafeteria on campus.
2. Askar stated last year an RFP for waste pick-up was started, it includes all waste and hazardous materials with one company for all locations.

3. Nava stated there is a territorial issue, each city has their own company. However, there may be a way to work it out as far as commercial deals.
4. Beebe stated recycling can go anywhere because it is considered a commodity.
5. Askar inquired if the colleges need recycling pick-up and if it has to be tracked. Beebe stated no. Nava indicated the State requires CalRecycle reporting from the school districts every year. It was not required this year but the State still requires the reports to be tracked.
6. Agah stated Sustainability is a big umbrella and it seems like Dr. Isaac wants to create a District-wide Sustainability Master Plan and initiative. There will be a lot of meetings and colleges participation to come up with the Master Plan. It would include sustainable projects, recyclable waste management, and transportation. West mentioned RCC's Facility Master Plan (FMP) touched on Sustainability but did not go in depth. West replied that RCC's FMP included the Chiller Plant project. Agah inquired about MVC and NC's FMP and if it has any component for sustainability initiatives. Beebe and Marshall replied no.
7. Mohtasham stated RCC also has three Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations in the Aquatics parking lot, four more will be added.
8. Askar stated the State Chancellor's office may have a contract.
9. Mohtasham stated he has contacted their office and is working on a project for solar panels. At this time the college has the funding to add another four EV charging stations. Since August 2018 643 gallons of gasoline were saved by using the charging stations.

End of Meeting Minutes-



### Capital Project Summary Form

Project Information			
Request Type	Select One...	Campus	Select One...
District Category	Select One...	Building	
Priority	Select One...	Targeted Start Date	
Project Manager (requester)		Managed By (office)	Select One...
Bid Request Type	Select One...	Managed By (name)	
		Project Cost Estimate	

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Project Description/  
Justification

Are Plans/Drawings and Specs Necessary to Bid this Project? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <i>If yes, attach plans to request</i>	
Does this Project have/need DSA Approval? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Need/Pending	
If Pending DSA Approval, what Date is Approval Expected? _____	
Will this project change the current A.S.F or TOPS codes? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure	
Will a Construction Manager be Utilized? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <i>(if yes, please indicate contact name, company and phone number)</i>	Name: _____
	Company: _____
	Phone: _____

Job Walk Information			
Is Pre-Bid Job Walk Mandatory?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Date	Time
<i>(if yes, please indicate date and time)</i>			
Job Walk Starting Location: _____			

Bid Information			
Amount Per Day of Liquidated Damages:		Allowance(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Contractor License Classification:		If yes, provide amount of allowance: _____	
Are there Add/Deduct Alternate(s) Included? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			

Funding Information			
Funding Source	Select One...	FY Funding Allocation	Select One...
Project Budget Code(s): _____			
Are State Funds Applicable Requiring Labor Compliance Monitoring? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			
Estimated Completion Date:		Construction Duration: (Total calendar days)	

Current Status / Notes

Project Reviewed By: \_\_\_\_\_

- College Vice President of Business Services
- Director of Facilities Maintenance & Operations

- AVC, Facilities Planning & Development
- Facilities Development Director

# Master Capital Project List Guidelines

*All Capital Projects are to be added to the Master Capital Projects List to provide adequate time for all entities to plan capital projects.*

## To add a new project to the Master Capital Project List

- a. Fill out as much information as currently possible on the Capital Project Form
- b. Have form electronically signed by the VP of Business Services or Director of Facilities AND either the AVC of Facilities Planning & Development or the Facilities Development Director
- c. Send form via email to Myra Nava at [myra.nava@rccd.edu](mailto:myra.nava@rccd.edu) and copy Majd Askar, cc: [majd.askar@rccd.edu](mailto:majd.askar@rccd.edu)
- d. In the Subject Line please state that this a new project to be added to the Master Capital Project List
- e. You will receive confirmation that your form has been received
- f. Purchasing will notify you once the list has been updated and ready to view

## When updating project information on the Master Capital Project List

- a. Fill out the necessary fields on the Capital Project form and attach plans/drawings and specs if available, be sure to select Request Type as **Revised**
- b. Have form electronically signed by the VP of Business Services or Director of Facilities AND either the AVC of Facilities Planning & Development or the Facilities Development Director
- c. Send form via email to Myra Nava CC: Majd
- d. In the Subject Line – please state **REVISED** - [insert project name]
- e. You will receive confirmation of form received & Purchasing will follow up with you

---

### District Category Definitions

**Category A-1:** Projects that address imminent dangers to the life or safety or building occupants. Each proposed solution is to be the least cost permanent solution and provides for no change in program function and no increase in site capacity.

**Category A-2:** Projects that provide equipment funding to complete previously state-funded construction projects. State-funded projects are to be equipped to the extent there is expansion space created for existing programs or space is created that enable the site to offer a new program.

**Category A-3:** Projects that address seismic deficiencies or potential seismic risk in existing building. Each proposed solution is to be the least cost permanent solution and provides for no change in program function and no increase in site capacity.

**Category A-4:** Projects that address the repair or replacement of infrastructure in existing building or on existing sites that is subject to immediate failure. Each proposed solution is to be the least cost permanent solution and provides for no change in program function and no increase in site capacity.

**Category 1:** To increase instructional capacity or institutional support services capacity.

**Category 2:** To modernize instructional space or institutional support services space.