Committee Meeting Report

Los Angeles City College
Emergency Shared Governance Council

Date
Monday, October 15, 2012

Participants: Paul Carlson, Daniel Cowgill, Daniel Marlos, Allison Jones, Renee Martinez, Dr. Lawrence Bradford, John Freitas, Sharon Hendricks, Dan Wanner, Glenda O’Neal Foster, Alex Lovett, Barbara Vasquez, Ricardo Illingworth, Kathleen Beckett, Christopher Dunne, Areli Chable

CALL TO ORDER: Dan Wanner, SGC chair, called the meeting to order at 12:35 PM.

Members and Resource Persons Absent: Mike Sundy, Kathleen Beaufait, Dr. Dan Walden, Juan Mendoza, Kevin Morrissey, Dr. Ed Pai, Christine Park, Maria Reisch, Jeffrey Nishimura, Sara Kim

Guest:

Status of Prior Meeting Action Items

Recommendation 36 (2012-2013) Recommendation approved by President

Meeting Objectives (attach agenda as appropriate)

Approval of Recommendation 36 for Student Services/Holmes Hall

Mr. Dunne presented to the Committee the following action item: to approve changing the project delivery method for the Student Services/Holmes Hall projects from a design bid build contract to a modified design build contract. Approved vote consensus. Mr. Dunne informed the Committee at the Bond Steering Committee meeting on 10-8-12, Mr. William Marmolejo (user group member Student Services) and Rochelle Sechooler (user group member Holmes Hall) provided the decision/motion to change the projects to modified design build and the motion was approved. Mr. Dunne informed the Committee the following are the pros of a modified design build: allows us to select design build team, where the price is only 40% of the criteria, eliminates need to go to the Board for change order on day 1 for escalation, the change order cap is a non issue with this delivery method, typically better contractors involved with design build than low bid, which should result in better quality building with less issues, construction typically quicker (Student Union $29M in 20 months as a design build and PE building $13M in 19 months as design bid build). Mr. Dunn e informed the Committee the following are the cons of a modified design build: since the price is only 40% of the equation, the contractor will have to be competitive, but not as competitive, we will get less of a building in this scenario (value engineering), we would not be able to start at least until Feb. 2013 due to the selection process, design build would require a design element. The user group will prioritize on the items for the value engineering.

Meeting Outcomes (to include assessment, evaluation, next steps/action items, anticipated and/or actual change/improvement)

LACC is an urban oasis of learning that educates minds, opens hearts, and celebrates community.

Approved by Shared Governance Council, November 2, 2009
Evidence Provided

Recommendation #36 (2011-2012): To approve changing the project delivery method for the Student Services/Holmes Hall projects from a design bid build contract to a modified design build contract.

Results: The Recommendation #36 (2011-2012) motion made, consensus

ADJOURNMENT: 2:15pm
STUDENT SERVICES BUILDING / HOLMES HALL
CONSTRUCTION PATH FORWARD

Basics:

Contract to Sinanian Development Approved by the Board of Trustees December 7, 2011; however, although signed, never issued to contractor, nor “Notice to Proceed” issued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Building</td>
<td>$24,310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Hall</td>
<td>$5,570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contract:</td>
<td>$29,880,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Services Building Removed from the Moratorium September 5, 2012

General Conditions of the Contract allow for escalation if the delay is due to the district

Contractor submitted delay claim in the amount of $1,627,307 (5% of Construction Contract)

We have negotiated the contractor down to a $1,000,000 (3% of contract) claim for escalation

Construction Contracts have been encumbered in accounting system

Construction Budget Balance Available is $3,264,885 (11%)

Change Order Cap Amount is $2,988,000 (10%), leaving $276,885 in excess capacity

Remaining Budget Balance for rest of project is $2,260,942

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$26,030 (0.1% of Const)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,509,668 (5.1% of Const)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ins/Test</td>
<td>$725,224 (2.4% of Const)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District still has a 10% Change Order cap for construction contracts; however, there is a resolution moving forward on the October 3rd board agenda to change the 10% cap to focus on Owner Requested Changes and Errors & Omission changes; not Unforeseen Conditions (the majority of the change orders at LACC are Unforeseen Conditions)

Path Forward

A. Issue Contract to Sinanian Development
B. Re-bid the job as a Design-Bid-Build, low bid contract
C. Change project to “Modified Design Build” contract
D. Change project to “Lease-Lease Back” Contract
A. Issue Contract to Sinanian Development

Pros
1. Contract is in place and could move forward immediately
2. Low bid contracting achieves the lowest pricing model

Cons
1. Would immediately submit a change order for owner requested changes $1M uses 3% of contingency before any work is in place.
2. Due to budget constraints, we would have to Value Engineer the job to recoup approximately $1M, this would result in 2nd owner requested change order in the amount of $1M, thereby using 6% of our change order cap, but freeing up contingency
3. Sinanian has shown a tendency to over run the change order cap across the district
4. The more value engineering that must be done, could result in DSA issues as we continue to de-scope items

B. Re-bid the job as a Design-Bid-Build, low bid contract

Concept not recommended due the following:
1. We already have a low bid contractor
2. Would add 3 months to the schedule to re-bid and re-start
3. We do not anticipate project savings, i.e. getting a project for a lower cost than $31M (original contract plus escalation), therefore we would have to provide deductive alternates in the bid to maintain budget
4. However, this would allow us to start over in terms of change order capacity

C. Change project to “Modified Design Build” contract

Pros
1. Allows us to select Design Build team, where price is only 40% of the criteria
2. Eliminates need to go to board with Change Order on day 1 for escalation, and the change order cap is a non issue with this delivery method
3. Typically better contractors involved with DB than low bid, which should result in better quality building with less issues
4. Construction typically will be quicker (Student Union $29M, 20 Months, PE Building $13M, 19 Months)
5. Can “buy” schedule if we switch to this delivery method

Cons
1. Since price is only 40% of the equation, the contractor will have to be competitive, but not as competitive, we will get less of a building in this scenario (value engineering)
2. We would not be able to start this project until February 2013 due to the selection process; and would require a design element, which could impact the schedule of Holmes Hall (not too much of an impact on Student Services)
3. In order to “buy” schedule (item #5 above), it would most likely require more value engineering items
D. Change project to “Lease-Lease Back” Contract

Concept not recommended due the following:
1. Allows for similar selection process as Design Build, with price being a 40% component and allows for other selection criteria to be used
2. Project still in “pilot” mode for district
3. Project couldn’t be started until February 2103 at the earliest (if everything goes without a problem)
4. Ideal for projects with cash flow issues, LACC does not have a cash flow issue, rather a budget/schedule issue
Background

History: This package was initially competed in the 3rd quarter of Calendar Year 2011 via a design bid build (low bid) process. The initial bid resulted in a number of protests requiring the re-bid by the same method. The second bid resulted in the Board approving award of the contract to Sinanian Development, Inc. (Sinaian). After award but prior to contract execution, the project was placed on hold pending resolution of the moratorium analysis. The project was removed from the moratorium in June 2012.

Status: In light of the extended period from award to approval to proceed with execution, the contractor was approached by the CPM as to its ability to proceed to perform the work for the original bid price. After consulting with its subcontractors, Sinanian indicated that they could perform the work for $1,000,000 more than the $30,000,000 awarded price, an increase of 3%. It was indicated that a pending negotiation between Sinanian and a sub regarding substitution may yield a $200,000 to $300,000 reduction of this amount, if the listed sub consents to such.

During the period of moratorium analysis, the CPM used the opportunity to conduct additional investigation of the Holmes Hall existing structure to further verify assumed structural conditions, and partially abate hazardous materials. This investigation revealed a condition that deviated from that in the Sinanian contract documents, and has required the re-design of associated portions of the structural work.

Budget: The additional cost for escalation and subsequently discovered structural modifications to the building will require a commensurate cost reduction exercise to comply with the project budget. The CPM and Architect of Record have endeavored in a preliminary value engineering and scope reduction exercise. The results of this will be reviewed with the College upon completion of feasibility and cost estimating, however none of the considered changes affect program space usage or functionality.

Project Delivery Options: There are three primary methods of proceeding with delivering this project package. The first option is to attempt to proceed with the Sinanian contract award. A second option would be to deliver the project via a Design Build contract. A third option is to utilize a Lease Leaseback Model to complete the work.

Option 1 – Proceed with Execution of Pending Contract

There is the possibility of proceeding with Sinanian under the submitted bid currently pending.
Challenges

As stated, Sianian has indicated the need to increase the base cost by $700,000 to $1,000,000 without any change in scope, which represents up to 1/3 of the total available legal change order capacity of the contract.

As also indicated, the budgetary limitations for the project require that this cost be accompanied by commensurate deletion of scope, which would bring the change order total to 2/3 of the limitation by statute. This leaves only 3 percent of the original contract value available for encountered unforeseen conditions (we are already aware of a needed change due to unforeseen conditions revealed by the subsequent destructive testing above), issues with the plans and specification, and any other necessary changes to the design.

The known unforeseen condition change as well as all the associated value engineering modifications will need DSA approval, which has an inherent duration which would likely delay construction on those items. The 10% limit concern is exasperated by the need to deduct scope to offset added scope. The feasibility of delivering the project within the 10% statutory limitation appears remote based on these factors.

All above modification would also be done on a negotiated basis, rather than a competitive basis, which can result in somewhat higher pricing for the work in the case of additive change, and undervalued pricing for deductive change. Deductive changes also follow the contractual provisions which may limit the amount of mark-up the District receives in the credit for the change.

Benefits

The primary benefit to this option is the ability to proceed immediately with the work, as no additional selection activity is required. As discussed however, the risk of exceeding the 10% limitation, which could lead to the requirement to recomplete the balance of the project, as well as the potential DSA delay (which can be performed during a new selection process and not causing contractor delay), could quickly exceed any preliminary activity of re-competition.

Option 2 – Update Design Package and Re-compete

As an alternative to Option 1 above, the project could be re-competed based on an updated design package which would include any necessary modifications for the discovered conditions or value engineering needs.

Challenges

The major disadvantage to this decision is the time associated to conduct another competition. Depending on the delivery method used, as discussed below, this may add approximately 90 to 120 days to the initiation of construction work. Given the need to receive DSA approval for the unforeseen conditions and the value engineering design changes, this time prior to award will be well used for these activities prior to award. In other words, the time it will take to recomplete will be used to update and finalize the design package.

October 1st, 2012
Benefits

A re-competition of the scope allows the known necessary changes (unforeseen condition discovery and value engineering changes) to be incorporated into the lump sum price of a contractor on a competitive basis, rather than a negotiated one. Based on contractual provisions on deductive change orders as well as the competitive dynamic, pricing for these changes in a re-competition should likely be lower than attempting to negotiate them. This, in turn, also avoids the concern about reaching the statutory maximum change order limit and causing an un-planned recompetition in case more unforeseen conditions, problems with the plans and specifications, or other reason to modify the design occurs.

Competitive Process Options

Re-competing the new package affords a re-visitation of the method in which the project is procured. The initial bid for this project utilized the traditional "Design-Bid-Build" method of competition, where the lowest bid wins assuming it is complete and the bidder meets a minimal threshold of qualification (only reasons such as a lack of license, debarment or other extreme defect contribute). Alternative methods, granted more recently by the legislature and adopted for use by LACCD, use what is called a "Best Value" selection process, which consider qualifications, references, experience and project work-plan, amongst other criteria, to determine the best selection for the project. These include Design Build delivery, where a single contract is executed between the District and a Designer/Contractor team, and Lease Leaseback, which utilizes an education code provision to conduct a best value selection process with a general contractor. While the latter is in a pilot phase for the LACCD, both can be considered together for purposes of best value delivery.

Design Bid-Build Challenges

This method incentivizes the use of the least expensive subs by a prime contractor who can bid the project the lowest, putting great pressure on both to minimize cost in the performance and construction of the project, and creating an environment which often leads to claims for additional compensation due to delay or changes in the work. With the profit and contingency buffer so constrained for a winning low-bid contractor, the ability to absorb and not pass on claims to the owner is minimal, and combined with the statutory limitation of 10% of the original contract value for change orders, this method often encounters difficulty in delivering projects as expected.

An additional challenge lies in the fact that, save the minimal considerations stated above, the selection process can only consider price as 100% of the selection criteria. Considerations about quality, project management, personnel, schedule opportunities, planning and site logistics and other critical consideration cannot be considered. This removes some of the critical management considerations from the owner in the award of construction projects.

Design-Bid-Build Benefits

First, this method is historically the most common delivery method for public institutions. Second, by forcing the issue of price as the only criteria, this method often results in the lower initial cost as compared with alternative delivery methods discussed below. Initial is the key to
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this observation, as final construction cost, and more so final total cost (including operation) is a different consideration and in most cases favors such alternative methods. This can be attributed to the cost encountered with claim related services, quality issues, and oversight and management intensity. Said another way, these projects tend to be litigated more, have more defective or under-functioning systems, and require more owner’s representation than their alternative delivery method counterparts. In this case, due to the need to modify some aspects of the design, the competition of the changes in the work would likely have the effect of mitigation any potential increase in cost by the function of competition, versus the negotiated means in Option 1.

Best Value Delivery Method Advantages

As stated, a best value delivery method affords the opportunity to consider the multitude of critical factors, including price, which constitute the most advantageous selection to the owner. By allowing the proposers to compete on more than the lowest price allows for other potential efficiencies in schedule, cost, performance and quality. In this particular case, it also allows the incorporation of the changes in the design prior to receiving a competitive cost proposal, hopefully mitigating the negotiated method’s premium. Also, the added duration and inclusion of modified work in the original contract documents would relieve the potential delay claims associated with the time for DSA approval and execution of the changed work.

As between the Design Build and Lease Leaseback methods stated above, either would address the issues presented herein.

Summary and Recommendation

The following is a comparison of the strengths of each option:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Suggests Option 1</th>
<th>Suggests Option 2 and Best Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely Lowest Initial Cost</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Lowest Final Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Start of Work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Completion of Work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Design Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of Delay Damages</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition of Design Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given both the benefits of the alternative delivery selection processes as well as the considerations specific to this project requiring somewhat extensive design modifications, Option 2 utilizing a Best Value delivery method is recommended.
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Student Services and Holmes Hall

Project Schedule Comparison for Proposed Project Delivery Methods.

Continue with Sinanian as Low-bld Contractor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTP</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Delays *</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Hall</td>
<td>10/15/2012</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td>3-4 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>10/15/2012</td>
<td>18 Months</td>
<td>3-4 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change Delivery method to Design-Build or Lease-Lease back

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Hall</td>
<td>10/22/2012</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
<td>2/6/2013</td>
<td>2/7/2013</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>10/22/2012</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
<td>2/6/2013</td>
<td>2/7/2013</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>3 months ***</td>
<td>13 months</td>
<td>3 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delays expected for Unforeseen conditions and compounded for DSA's FCD process.
** Demolition and abatement can start and run concurrent with Design phase
Construction Dur. Is assumed to start after Demolition and abatement
*** Foundation & Underground work should be able to start as such is already DSA approved and not changed by new Design elements
HOLMES HALL AND STUDENT SERVICES

Purpose: to mitigate cost increases due to moratorium delay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Alternate Bid Items:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holmes Hall:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt # 1 (partial) Lecture Hall</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt # 4 – Electronic door hardware</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt # 6 &amp; 7 – extended warranties</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt # 1 – PV system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt # 2 – IT/AV Equipment (Deferred budget impact)</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt # 3 &amp; 4 – extended warranties</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>1,205,000</td>
<td>1,761,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploratory Items:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass wall systems (partial)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Unneeded Data drops</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Canopy – Top of Bldg. (Steel, framing, metal panels)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtinwall skylight system</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized solar shade (at skylight)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete Aluminum sun shades</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal panel cladding at Elevator(s)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete metal panels on columns (lobby) leave painted</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Guardrail and SS H-rail at stairs</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete acrylic canopy at North Entry</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete metal panels at stairs</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change decorative light fixtures (in lobby) see desc.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealed Concrete in lieu of Terrazzo (250,000 / 275,000) see desc.</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR - Porcelain tile in lieu of Terrazzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queuing system</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance grills/walk off mats (LEED ?)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete roof Mech Screen wall (1/A801.4)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Planter &amp; Flatwork (defer to Lanscape project)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Security System (defer to another project)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace precast with brick (exterior elevations)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete Anti-graffiti coating</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Rubber floor with VCT</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Ceiling to 2'x4' ACT in lieu of Halcyon (partial)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change custom wall ('walltalkers') coverings to paint and decals</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete Whiteboards, replace with ???</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Building entrance signage</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>1,746,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"-" = items not included in DLR's list of potential VE items.
Scot Tedisco

From: Trigonis, Costa [ctrigonis@DLRGROUP.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2012 2:33 PM
To: Scot Tedisco
Cc: Royalty, Darcy; Amirdelfan, Kaveh; Cohen, Adrian; drew.bagdasarian@build-laccd.org; Cheng Leung, Yvonne; Villar, Mervin; Christopher Dunne
Subject: RE: LACC- SSB: Possible VE Items, with ROM
Attachments: 090715_cost comparison_Elevator Cladding.pdf

1. Opt-out of the Photovoltaic System Add Alternate. (Note: Omitting PV will preclude attaining LEED Platinum, but LEED Gold will still be possible regardless) $1,150,000.
2. Opt-out of the AV Equipment Add Alternate. $611,000. This number was provided by AV Vendors.
3. All flatwork and planter repair to be done by Landscape Infrastructure Project; only asphalt work to meet minimum ADA requirements retained. Remove all planters from scope of work. $450,000 deducted; and add miscellaneous AC paving for 50,000(?): $400,000(?) net.
4. Remove security system from scope of work; only conduit remains. $150,000.
5. Remove metal clad canopy on the top of the building. (Note: this will change the energy modeling and is a substantial design change.) $80,000 in structural steel; $236,000 in framing and cladding ($316,000 total)
6. Remove vertical portion of the acrylic panel canopy on exterior elevations. (This would be a substantial design/DSA change.) $175,000.
7. Remove 6” pre-cast profile on exterior; replace with brick. $50,000 net.
8. Remove anti-graffiti coating from scope of work. $10,000(?)
9. Remove aluminum sunshades from scope of work. (Note: this will change the energy modeling.) $90,000.
10. Remove skylight and motorized shade associated with skylight from scope of work. (This would be a major design/DSA change.) $225,000.
11. Rubber Flooring – replace with VCT. (Note: there will be a sacrifice in sound control.) $22,000 net
12. Terrazzo Flooring – replace with large format porcelain tile. (Note: there will be a sacrifice in cleanability. Also note that use of bare concrete has cracking issues, and is not recommended for this application.) $275,000 by deleting the Terrazzo, add $150,000 for tile: $125,000 net.
13. Dirtt Glass Wall – reduce amount of glazing, replace with solid wall and sidelight. (It will not affect LEED Points, but will greatly reduce the openness/light penetration shown in user and IC presentations, especially given the large floorplate of the building.) $50,000? Requires more study. Also, please note: use of demountable partitions are already 60k cheaper than using Aluminum Storefront for the same scope.
15. Lobby Large Decorative Pendant Light Fixtures – replace with a less expensive fixture. $10,000 net.
16. Custom Wallcovering – replace with accent paint & decal stencils. $5,000 net at best. Note: “Walltalker” marker board wall coverings are cheaper than framed white boards, and thus is not listed as a VE Item. However, elimination of “Walltalkers”/white boards (altogether) would be an additional $23,000 savings.
17. Remove metal panels at elevator walls. Remove $45,000 in panels and sheathing, add high-abuse gyp and graffiti resistant paint for $24,750; net 20,000. (Note: See attached spreadsheet for pros/cons. We decided to go with the metal panels for better durability and wayfinding.)
18. Replace smaller 3-form Signage (south entrance & Health & Wellness Center Entrance) with a more cost effective sign. $25,000 net.
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### PROJECT NAME:
New Student Services Center & Modernization of Holmes Hall - LACC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIV</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Bid Day COST</th>
<th>Current COST</th>
<th>Delta COST</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>GENERAL REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td>3,884,064.16</td>
<td>4,014,568.97</td>
<td>130,504.81</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>SITE WORK</td>
<td>1,006,271.00</td>
<td>1,064,415.00</td>
<td>58,144.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>CONCRETE</td>
<td>1,871,500.00</td>
<td>2,180,000.00</td>
<td>308,500.00</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>MASONRY</td>
<td>382,848.00</td>
<td>382,848.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>METALS</td>
<td>4,322,000.00</td>
<td>4,509,221.00</td>
<td>187,221.00</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>WOOD AND PLASTICS</td>
<td>809,251.00</td>
<td>832,251.00</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>THERMAL &amp; MOISTURE PROTECTION</td>
<td>1,190,265.00</td>
<td>1,200,225.00</td>
<td>9,960.00</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>DOORS &amp; WINDOWS</td>
<td>1,807,551.39</td>
<td>1,884,043.39</td>
<td>76,492.00</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>FINISHES</td>
<td>4,066,922.00</td>
<td>4,344,905.00</td>
<td>277,983.00</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>SPECIALITIES</td>
<td>983,341.62</td>
<td>988,953.58</td>
<td>5,611.96</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>251,747.00</td>
<td>251,747.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>FURNISHINGS</td>
<td>153,394.00</td>
<td>153,394.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>CONVEYING SYSTEM</td>
<td>631,000.00</td>
<td>631,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>MECHANICAL</td>
<td>3,697,400.00</td>
<td>3,796,650.00</td>
<td>99,250.00</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL WORK</td>
<td>5,037,118.00</td>
<td>5,487,758.00</td>
<td>450,640.00</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,094,673.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,721,979.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,627,306.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Meeting Report

Participants: Mike Sundy, Kathleen Beaufait, Dan Walden, Dr. Daniel Cowgill, Daniel Marlos, Christopher Dunne, Glenda O'Neal Foster, Allison Jones, Dr. Mary Callahan, Christine Tinberg, Kevin Morrisey, Ed Pai, Maria Reisch, Ricardo Illingworth, John Freitas, Dr. Lawrence Bradford, Jeffrey Nishimura,

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. John Freitas called the meeting in behalf of Dr. Dan Wanner, SGC chair, at 12:40 PM.

Members and Resources Absent: Dr. Dan Wanner, Paul Carlson, Christine Park, Juan Mendoza, Antoinette Simpson Momon, Dr. Bernadette Tchen,

Guests: Ken Sherwood, Robert Lam, Sharon Hendricks, AFT 1521 President

REVIEW OF THE July 2, MINUTES: Approved

Status of Prior Meeting Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation #</th>
<th>Recommendation #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #9 (2011-2012) Approved by the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #10 (2011-2012) Approved by the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #11 (2011-2012) Approved by the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Objectives (attach agenda as appropriate)

PRESIDENT’S REPORT: None

BOND STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT: Mr. Chris Dunne of Harris & Associates: Handout was provided for the Bond Steering Committee Reports for the month of July:

Bond Steering Executive Committee Meeting:
See Draft meeting minutes
Bond Steering Community Meeting #105 – July, 2012
A. Updates
   1. Approval of Minutes June 11, 2012 Meeting #104 - Action Item
   2. Acceptance of Bond steering Committee Annual Report- Action Item
   3. Building Management Systems- Action Item

LACC is an urban oasis of learning that educates minds, opens hearts, and celebrates community.
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4. Budget Update – Action Item
5. Moratorium Update – Information Item
   a. Cesar Chavez
6. Other/Questions

Mr. Dunne presented to the Committee the following action items: Recommendation #9 (2012-2013): To accept the 2011-2012 Bond Steering Committee Annual Report. Approved vote consensus. Recommendation #10 (2012-2013): To accept the Building Management Systems for a) MLK, Science & Technology Climatc in the amount of $48,300 and b) CDC & Central Plant- Trane in the amount of $42,704. The funds are within the contingency. Approved vote 11-1-0 Mr. Dunne informed the Committee the Building Management Systems is what controls the HVAC systems within the buildings however, LACC does not have a one system through out the campus. The following buildings that have different systems are Science and Technology, MLK, CDC, and Central Plant. Mr. Dunne informed the Committee the motion is for Climatc and Trane to provide the rights to use the software in order for it operate as one system for the campus which makes it easier to maintain, control the buildings, pin point the problems, and shut off from one system instead of multiple systems. Recommendation #11 (2012-2013): To accept the attached revised moratorium budget dated 7/9/12. Approved vote consensus. Mr. Dunne informed the Committee the District revised the additional paperwork for releasing projects. Mr. Dunne informed the Committee the paperwork for releasing projects from the moratorium, the M&O and Student Services projects were resubmitted to the District and if the Board approves the release of the Student Services and M &O project, the Learning Support Center project will be the only project on the moratorium.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS REPORT: Mr. Walden informed the Committee a retreat meeting for department chairs is scheduled on August 21. Mr. Walden informed the Committee the new Dean of Academic Affairs for IDWG 2. Dr. Todd Scott will join us in mid-August and his office will be AD 208A.

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT: Maria Reisch informed the committee the program review committee is working on the operating agreement and the next meeting program review is scheduled on Wednesday, August 8.

TECHNOLOGY STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT: Kathleen Beaufait informed the Committee the TSC is working on the Technology Collaboration Survey for planning purposes and updating the AUP form.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES REPORT: None

STUDENT SERVICES REPORT: None

FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT: None

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT: Ed Pai informed the Committee accomplishment of the College budget. Discussions were made on the budget.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS ORGANIZATION REPORT (ASO): None.
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BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT: None

STUDENT SUCCESS/BASIC SKILLS REPORT: None

A-TEAM REPORT: Mr. Walden informed the Committee the AACJ report is on progress and the goal is to have an approved report on the Fall.

STAFF AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEV. COMMITTEE REPORT: None

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (EPC) REPORT: None

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES and ASSESSMENT STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT: None

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM (EMT) REPORT: Mr. Walden informed the Committee EMT has not met and as of last week the FTE's are at .07% over last year.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS: Sharon Hendricks provided to the committee the a motion on review of Shared Governance Structure: that the SGGC establish a Task Force on SGC Committee Structure to review the Committee Structure of SGC/This task force is charged with reviewing the overall committee structure of SGC, reviewing the overall operations of the committees, including membership, and bringing forward recommendations on any charges to SGC. The task force shall complete its work in time to present its findings and recommendations at the September 10, 2012 meeting of SGC. Discussions were made and the motion was amended to change the deadline to October.

Meeting Outcomes (to include assessment, evaluation, next steps/action items, anticipated and/or actual change/improvement)

Evidence Provided

Recommendation #9 (2012-2013): To accept the 2011-2012 Bond Steering Committee Annual Report

Results: The Recommendation 9 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

Recommendation #10 (2012-2013): To accept the Building Management Systems for a) MLK, Science & Technology Climatetec in the amount of $48,300 and b) CDC & Central Plant- Trane in the amount of $42,704. The funds are within the contingency.

Results: The Recommendation #10 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote 11-1-0

Recommendation #11 (2012-2013): To accept the attached revised moratorium budget dated 7/9/12

Results: The Recommendation #11 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

ADJOURNMENT: 1:37pm
Committee Meeting Report

Participants: Mike Sundy, Kathleen Beaufait, Paul Carlson, Dan Walden, Dr. Daniel Cowgill, Daniel Marlos, Christopher Dunne, Glenda O’Neal Foster, Allison Jones, Mattie Moon, Dr. Jamillah Moore, Dr. Dan Wanner, Kevin Morrissey, Ed Pai, Christine Park, Maria Reisch, Ricardo Illingworth, John Freitas, Dr. Lawrence Bradford, Jeffrey Nishimura, Dr. Bernadette Tchen,

CALL TO ORDER: Dr. Dan Wanner, SGC chair, called the meeting to order at 12:30 PM.

Members and Resources Absent: Juan Mendoza, Antoinette Simpson Momon, Christine Tinberg

Guests: Ken Sherwood, Kathleen Becket (SEIU Local 99)

REVIEW OF THE June 4, MINUTES: Approved

Status of Prior Meeting Action Items

Recommendation #1 (2011-2012) Approved by the President
Recommendation #2 (2011-2012) Approved by the President
Recommendation #3 (2011-2012) Approved by the President
Recommendation #4 (2011-2012) Approved by the President
Recommendation #5 (2011-2012) Approved by the President

Recommendation #6 (2011-2012) Approved by the President
Recommendation #7 (2011-2012) Referred to Task Force
Recommendation #8 (2011-2012) Approved by the President

Meeting Objectives (attach agenda as appropriate)

PRESIDENT’S REPORT: Dr. Jamillah Moore provided to the Committee the final state budget deal report dated 7/2/12. Dr. Moore informed the Committee the final budget deal provides backfill but bigger cut exposure in 2012-2013.

BOND STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT: Mr. Chris Dunne of Harris & Associates: Handout was provided for the Bond Steering Committee

Reports for the month of June:

Bond Steering Executive Committee Meeting:
See Draft meeting minutes
Bond Steering Community Meeting #104 – June 11, 2012
A. Updates
   1. Approval of Minutes May 14, 2012 Meeting #103 - Action Item
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2. Athletic Track- add Service- Miyamoto $7,900- Action Item
   a. Alternate for Bid Docs to remove/replace
3. Student Union – Action Item
   a. Install Plaza Pavers - $2,800
   b. Install Carpet in Foundation in lieu of concrete stain- $25,000 (NTE)
   c. Install Cafeteria Walls- TBD (NTE)
   d. Install Integral Sound System - $30,000
4. Clausen Hall - ($21,000) – Action Item
   a. Delete Voluntary Bridge Seismic Upgrades - ($21,000)
5. Bridge Update – Informational Item
6. Moratorium Update – Informational Item
7. Other/Questions

Mr. Dunne presented to the Committee the following action items: Recommendation #2 (2012-2013): To request an add service for Miyamoto International to prepare alternate bid docs to remove or replace the track for the Athletic Track project in the amount of $7,900. The budget is within project contingency. Approved vote consensus. Recommendation #3 (2012-2013): To approve to install carpet in the foundation in lieu of stained concrete for the Student Union project, in the amount not to exceed $25,000. The funds are within the project contingency. Approved vote consensus. Recommendation #4 (2012-2013): To approve to install Cafeteria Walls for the Student Union project, in the amount not to exceed $110,000. The funds are within the project contingency. Approved vote consensus. Recommendation #5 (2012-2013): To approve the deletion of the Voluntary Bridge Seismic Upgrades in the amount of ($21,000) for the Clausen Hall project. Recommendation #6 (2012-2013): To accept the attached revised moratorium budget dated 6/11/12. Mr. Dunne informed the Committee that the Cesar Chavez modernization project was released from the Moratorium. Approved vote consensus. Mr. Dunne informed the Committee the District requested for additional paperwork from all the Colleges in order to release projects pending on the moratorium, LACC submitted the paperwork however; the District is waiting for the other colleges to submit the additional paper work in order, to proceed with the review process and release projects pending on the moratorium.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS REPORT: None

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT: Maria Reisch presented to the Committee the following recommendation: Recommendation 7 (2012-2013): To approve the revised membership of the Program Review Committee as follows: 3VP’s or designee, 1 Dean of IE, 1 Chair of Chairs, 1 Academic Senate President or designee, 1 VP of Academic Senate, 1EPC, Chair, 3EPC faculty representative, one of whom is from a CTE department*, 1 ASG representative, 1 Classified representative, AFT Chapter Chair or designee, 1 counselor*, 1 matriculation coordinator, 1 Staff Development Coordinator, 1 SLO Coordinator. A motion was presented to create a task force out of the committee to review the wording and titles of positions on the program review committee inspired by a request to add AFT local 1521A. The motion passes. Maria Reisch provided to the Committee the SGC Planning Report dated 7/2/12.

Technology Steering Committee Report: Kathleen Beaufait informed the Committee TSC will be working this summer on the AUP process. Kathleen Beaufait informed the Committee the Technology Collaboration Survey for planning purposes is actively in process and the survey results.
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ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES REPORT: Mr. Carlson informed the Committee he will be taking some time off at the end of July – August and Mr. Rolf will be replacing him temporarily.

STUDENT SERVICES REPORT: None

FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT: None

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT: Maria Reisch informed the Committee the Planning Committee is working on the Strategic plan and a recommendation is pending however, it’s been reviewed.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS ORGANIZATION REPORT (ASO): None.

BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT: Mr. Carlson informed the Committee the budget hasn’t changed and it’s at a 4.1M deficit, and it’s pending at the Board of Trustees (BOT). Mr. Carlson presented to the Committee the following action item: Recommendation 1 (2011-2012): To approve to accept the BSI & CTE prioritization for the 2012-2013 fiscal year.

STUDENT SUCCESS/BASIC SKILLS REPORT: Jeffery Nishimura provided reports to the Committee The Basic Skills dated 6/6/12 and Student Success Committee dated 5/21/12. Jeffrey Nishimura informed the Committee the prioritization basic Skills funding projects was submitted to VP’s for approval and was approved to the SGC budget.

A-TEAM REPORT: Dr. Jamillah Moore informed the Committee AACJC report

STAFF AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEV. COMMITTEE REPORT: None

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (EPC) REPORT: Mr. Marlos informed the Committee the EPC is scheduled to meet on the 3rd Wednesday of the Month due to the 4th of July Holiday.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES and ASSESSMENT STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT: Mr. Wanner informed the Committee and provided the SLO report dated 7/2/12 on behalf of Christine Tinberg. Mr. Wanner mentioned the following per Christine’s’ request in her research in the ACCJC Standard indicated that students must indicate their goals in purposes of programs enrolled and make sure all academic departments and student include the mission statement and program outcomes and update the website. The Administrative department to have their mission statement on the website.

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM (EMT) REPORT: Mr. Dan Wanner presented the Committee the following action item: Recommendation 8 (2011-2012): Accept the Annual Assessment of the Enrollment Management Team. Approved vote consensus.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS: Mr. Dan Wanner informed the Committee the SGC handbook updated 2009 needs to be revised. Mr. Dan Wanner requested from the Committee their operating agreements and requested to review them and upload them online. Mr. Wanner informed the Committee the August 6, 2012 SGC meeting will be held in the Staff and Faculty Center and provided the schedule for the 2012 SGC Meetings. Sharon informed the Committee a luncheon for Mr. Dan Walden (VP Academics Affairs) is scheduled on July 3, 2012 at 12pm-1pm. In the Staff and Faculty Center.

LACC is an urban oasis of learning that educates minds, opens hearts, and celebrates community.

Meeting Outcomes (to include assessment, evaluation, next steps/action items, anticipated and/or actual change/improvement)

Evidence Provided

Recommendation #1 (2012-2013): To approve to accept the BSI & CTE prioritization for the 2012-2013 fiscal years.

Results: The Recommendation #1 (2012-2013) motion made, approved by consensus.

Recommendation #2 (2012-2013): To request an add service Miyamoto International to alternate bid docs to remove or replace the track for the Athletic Track project in the amount of $7,900. The budget is within the project contingency.

Results: The Recommendation #2 (2012-2013) motion made, approved by consensus.

Recommendation #3 (2012-2013): To approve to install carpet in the foundation in lieu of stained concrete for the Student Union project, in the amount not to exceed $25,000. The funds are within the project contingency.

Results: The Recommendation #3 (2012-2013) motion made, approved by consensus.

Recommendation #4 (2012-2013): To approve to install Cafeteria Walls for the Student Union project, in the amount not to exceed $110,000. The funds are within the project contingency.

Results: The Recommendation #4 (2012-2013) motion made, approved by consensus.

Recommendation #5 (2012-2013): To approve the deletion of the Voluntary Bridge Seismic Upgrades in the amount of ($21,000) for the Clausen Hall project.

Results: The Recommendation #5 (2012-2013) motion made, approved by consensus.

Recommendation #6 (2012-2013): To accept the attached revised moratorium budget dated 6/11/12.

Results: The Recommendation #6 (2012-2013) motion made, approved by consensus.

Recommendation #7 (2012-2013): To approve the revised membership of the Program Review Committee as follows:

3VP’s or designee, 1 Dean of IE, 1 Chair of Chairs, 1 Academic Senate President or designee, 1 VP of Academic Senate, 1EPC, Chair, 3EPC faculty representative, one of whom is from a CTE department*, 1 ASG representative, 1 Classified representative, AFT Chapter Chair or designee, 1 counselor*, 1 matriculation coordinator, 1 Staff Development Coordinator, 1 SLO Coordinator.

Results: The Recommendation #7 (2012-2013) motion made, approved by consensus. Referred to Task Force.
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Recommendation #8 (2012-2013): Accept the Annual Assessment of the Enrollment Management Team.

Results: The Recommendation #8 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

ADJOURNMENT: 1:37pm
Memorandum

Date: January 28, 2013

Project: West Los Angeles College Building Program

Project Number: 1026

Regarding: Needs Assessment Process

Prepared By: Peter M. Mitsakos

Distribution: Steve Sharr

Memorandum

Date: January 28, 2013

Project: West Los Angeles College Building Program

Project Number: 1026

Regarding: Needs Assessment Process

Prepared By: Peter M. Mitsakos

Distribution: Steve Sharr

Process to Date

1. The inventory and description of all existing spaces on campus was verified
   A. Size and configuration of existing facilities were surveyed and documented
   B. Uses of all existing spaces were confirmed through site surveys and consultation with college deans and vice presidents
   C. Building plans and data bases were updated
      a. Room areas re corrected
      b. Room uses were brought into alignment with the California State Community College Board of Governors categorization scheme (FUSION)
   D. Updated data was provided to District consultant to align FUSION reports with current usage

2. Current utilization rates for all instructional spaces were confirmed
   A. Current enrollment data was utilized (Spring 2012 & Fall 2012) to assess utilization of available instructional spaces
   B. Independent studies by WLAC Academic Affairs Division and outside consultant concurred on enrollment figures for study periods
   C. Comparison of WLAC utilization rates, for the study periods, with California State Community College Board of Governors standards was completed and reported
   D. Review, discussion and approval by campus shared governance representatives (Facilities Committee) was completed December 5, 2012

3. Documentation and assessment of existing instructional support space functionality was completed
   A. Interviews with deans, division heads and staff representatives were conducted and documented
   B. Location and configuration of all support functions were observed and documented
   C. Analysis assessing current functional and space challenges were completed and reported, including:
      a. Adequacy of space allocation for existing, required functions
      b. Quality of space configurations to accommodate required functions
      c. Integrity of functional operations within allotted spaces (or not)
d. Quality of functional relationships with other departments and/or access by students

e. Absence of spaces for required but currently non-existent functions

D. Review, discussion and approval by campus shared governance representatives (Facilities Committee) of findings

Current Process

1. Develop consensus regarding overall average growth rate of the college to the approved maximum on-campus population (as documented in approved Supplemental Environmental Impact Report). Discussions were held with all academic division heads, deans and vice presidents to consider the following:
   A. Projections for available operational funding
   B. Demand for program offerings and administratively imposed limitations (if any)
   C. Relative contributions to growth of full time vs. part time students
   D. Relative contributions to growth of on-campus vs. on-line students

2. Determination of growth potential of each academic division
   A. Identification of growth drivers and limiters for each division, e.g.:
      a. Industry demand
      b. Support of other programs
      c. Removal of current limiters (e.g.: lack of facilities or funding)
      d. Administrative or policy limitations
   B. Assessment of division growth potential as: equal to, above or below average rate for the campus
   C. Alignment with mission and strategic goals outlined in College Educational Master Plan

3. Confirmation or amendment of all previous program instructional and support function requirements in response to:
   A. New input brought forward during current meetings in regard to growth
   B. Comments and corrections to previously distributed reports

4. Review, discussion, amendment and approval by College shared governance representatives (Facilities Committee)

5. Confirm documentation and assessment of all current support space functionality
   A. Interviews with deans, division heads and staff representatives
   B. Location and configuration of all support functions observed and documented
   C. Analysis assessing current functional and space challenges reported, including:
      a. Adequacy of space allocation for existing, required functions
      b. Quality of space configurations to accommodate required functions
      c. Integrity of functional operations within allotted spaces (or not)
      d. Quality of functional relationships with other departments and/or access by students
      e. Complete absence of spaces for required but currently non-existent functions
D. Review, discussion and approval by campus shared governance representatives (Facilities Committee) of findings

6. Once shared governance of the College approves the growth projections for instructional programs on campus, the following tasks will be undertaken:
   A. Establishment of administrative and support function requirements necessary to support projected growth, including:
      a. Administrative Functions
      b. Student Services
      c. Faculty and staff resources
      d. Campus Facilities, Maintenance and Operations
      e. Campus infrastructure
      f. Space for student organizations and activities.
   B. Conversion of verified program needs into an outline space program
   C. Incorporation of functional requirements developed as part of:
      a. Previous programming efforts for building projects
      b. Recent Needs Assessment and utilization studies
   D. Incorporation of agreed upon current deficiencies and projected growth

7. Develop alternatives to meet current deficits and projected growth for review by the College, including:
   A. Identification of expansion opportunities within existing facilities
   B. Proposals of alternative programming for previously identified building projects
   C. Assessment of probable construction costs for all components of proposed alternatives
   D. Phasing of expenditures for currently available and future funds

8. Review, discussion and amendment by College shared governance representatives (Facilities Committee)

9. Presentation of final, refined Construction Plan for approval by College shared governance representatives

   Plan will identify:
   A. All proposed new and renovated construction projects to meet verified needs and projected growth
      a. New and renovated Instructional spaces
         i. Specialized and highly specialized labs
         ii. Lecture Spaces
      b. New and renovated administrative and support spaces
   B. All infrastructure and support projects necessary to facilitate current and projected campus activities
      a. Paving and parking
      b. Storage
      c. Security and Lighting
      d. Utilities
      e. Data and telecommunications
C. Campus functionality
   a. Vehicular access, circulation and parking
      i. General
      ii. Emergency
      iii. Service
   b. Pedestrian and disabled access
   c. Campus open space, landscape and paving
   d. Phasing to allow expeditious construction and accommodate campus operations

10. Update of Campus EIR to account for modifications in campus plan, e.g.:
   A. Overall building area and massing
   B. Projected campus population
   C. Modifications to automobile traffic and on campus car counts
   D. Overall construction schedule
   E. Location and nature of specific construction operations
Committee Meeting Report

Committee: Shared Governance Council

Date: Monday, September 10, 2012

Participants: Mike Sundy, Pamela Atkinson, Paul Carlson, Dan Walden, Dr. Daniel Cowgill, Daniel Marlos, Christopher Dunne, Juan Mendoza, Dr. Dan Wanner, Renee Martinez, Kevin Morrissey, Christine Tinberg, Kevin Morrissy, Ed Pai, Maria Reisch, Ricardo Illingworth, John Freitas, Dr. Lawrence Bradford, Jeffrey Nishimura, Sharon Hendricks, Jwyanza Hobson, Christine Park,

CALL TO ORDER: Dr. Dan Wanner, SGC chair, called the meeting at 12:30 PM.

Members and Resources Absent: Antoinette Simpson Momon, Dr. Bernadette Tchen, Glenda O’Neal Foster, Allison Jones

Guests: Ken Sherwood, Robert Lam,

REVIEW OF THE August 6, MINUTES: Approved with the following changes Sharon Hendricks is a member and Morrissey last name two s.

Status of Prior Meeting Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation #</th>
<th>Recommendation #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #12 (2011-2012) Discussion item only</td>
<td>Recommendation #15 (2011-2012) Approved by the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #13 (2011-2012) Approved by the President.</td>
<td>Recommendation #16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28 (2011-2012) Approved by the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #14 (2011-2012) Discussion item only</td>
<td>Recommendation #29 (2011-2012) Approved by the President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Objectives (attach agenda as appropriate)

PRESIDENT’S REPORT: Mrs. Martinez informed the Committee of proposition 30 and online registration for voting is on October 17, 2012.

BOND STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT: Mr. Chris Dunne of Harris & Associates: Handout was provided for the Bond Steering Committee
Reports for the month of August:

Bond Steering Executive Committee Meeting:
See Draft meeting minutes
Bond Steering Community Meeting #106 – August 13, 2012
A. Updates
   1. Approval Meeting Minutes – Meeting #105 July 9, 2012 - Action Item
   2. Student Union Amendments – Action Item - $61,295
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a. Front & Rear Sidewalks at $21,010
b. Twenty (20) additional Data Ports in Multi-Purpose Room at $20,665 – motion tabled
c. Gas Company Connection from New Hampshire Street at $6,000
d. Smooth Finish Concrete Columns in 2nd & 3rd Floor Conference Rooms at $6,620
e. Interior Signage Revisions at $6,000
f. Re-flush Hydronic Lines at $45,954
g. Rear Fencing to Prevent Public Entry into Old Golf Driving Range at $10,300
h. Additional 220 volt receptacle in Bookstore to Charge Electric Fork Lift at $9,000- Motion defeated
i. Credit for Remaining Balance of Unforeseen Conditions Allowance at $(165,166)
j. Credit for Additional Laboratory Testing at $(8,152)
k. Credit to Omit New Driveway at Monroe & New Hampshire at $(5,907)
l. Credit to Omit Lobby Wall Graphics at $(6,687)
m. Credit to correct Contractor’s mark up for Change Orders 1&4 $(932)

3. Moratorium Demo Plan – Action Item
4. Budget Update – Action Item
5. Other/Questions

Mr. Dunne presented to the Committee the following action items:

Recommendation #16 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments a) Increase the width of the Front & Rear Sidewalks in the amount of $21,010. Approved vote 12-0-1

Recommendation #17 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments c.) Gas Company Connection from New Hampshire Street in the amount of $6,000. Approved vote consensus.

Recommendation #18 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments d.) Smooth Finish Concrete Columns in 2nd & 3rd Floor Conference Rooms in the amount of $6,620. Approved vote consensus.

Recommendation #19 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments e.) Interior Signage Revisions in the amount not to exceed $6,000. Approved vote 12-1-1.


Recommendation #21 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments g.) Rear Fencing to Prevent Public Entry into Old Golf Driving Range in the amount of $10,300. Approved vote 13-1-0


Recommendation #26 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments m.) Credit to correct Contractor’s mark up for Change Orders 1&4 $(932). Approved vote consensus.

Recommendation #27 (2012-2013): To accept Option 1: Construct Student Services & Holmes Hall as designed:

Include the demo of the Men’s Gym & Pool in the Learning Support Center Project.

Men’s Gym is $33,136 gross square foot(gsf) X$10 square foot (sqft) = $331,360

$331,360 to be added to the Learning Support Budget from Project Savings of the Student Union

LACC is an urban oasis of learning that educates minds, opens hearts, and celebrates community.
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Reduce budgeted $/sqft for Cesar Chavez from $181 to $175, creates savings of $500,000.
Use anticipated project savings from the South Gym, DaVinci Hall and others $189,473

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Union Project Savings</td>
<td>331,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Chavez Budget Reduction</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gym DaVinci/Other Project Savings</td>
<td>189,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,020,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved vote 12-0-1.

Recommendation #28 (2012-2013): To accept the attached revised moratorium budget dated 8/13/12. Approved vote 12-0-1.

Mr. Dunne informed the Committee the Student Services and M&O project were released from the moratorium however, the Student Services General Contractor (GC) requested for additional funds due to escalation in prices and the project might need to be re bid.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS REPORT: Mr. Walden informed the Committee the average class size has gone down by 6.8 percent compared to last Fall.

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT: Maria Reisch informed the committee Recommendation #15 (2012-2013): Approve the updates to the Program Review Committee operating agreement (see below) the recommendation was changed to changes to program review processes and program review handbook shall be brought to the academic senate and shared governance council for review and action. Change under staff: 1 Classified representative appointed by the AFT1521A and 1 Classified representative appointed by the 721. Approved vote consensus.

TECHNOLOGY STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT: None

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES REPORT: Mr. Carlson informed the Committee interviews are being held for the new ADP to replace Mr. Schleicher.

STUDENT SERVICES REPORT: None

FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT: Mr. Carlson presented to the Committee Recommendation #29 (2012-2013): Approve the Facilities Planning Committee Operating Agreement (See Below). Approved vote 11-0-1


ASSOCIATED STUDENTS ORGANIZATION REPORT (ASO): Mr. Hobson informed the Committee of the upcoming events for the ASO (ASG).

BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT: Mr. Carlson informed the Committee there are less students per section (classes) the deficit from 6M can increase to 7M due to the sections not having enough students.
STUDENT SUCCESS/BASIC SKILLS REPORT: None

A-TEAM REPORT: Mr. Walden informed the Committee the AACJ report is on progress and the goal is to have an approved report on the Fall.

STAFF AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEV. COMMITTEE REPORT: None

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (EPC) REPORT: None

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES and ASSESSMENT STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT: None

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM (EMT) REPORT: None

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS: Update from Task force on SGC Committee Structure to review the Committee Structure of SGC.

Meeting Outcomes (to include assessment, evaluation, next steps/action items, anticipated and/or actual change/improvement)

Evidence Provided

Recommendation #12 (2012-2013): Linking Comprehensive Program Review Results with Planning and Resource Allocation (approved by SGC Planning Committee 8/20/12)

Results: The Recommendation #12 (2012-2013) motion made, discussion item only

Recommendation #13 (2012-2013): Preliminary (Planning – Comprehensive Program Review- Annual Unit Plan- Strategic Master Plan Timeline (approved by SGC Planning Committee 8/20/12)

Results: The Recommendation #13 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

Recommendation #14 (2012-2013): In order to directly link the results of program review and college outcomes evaluation process to planning, the Planning Committee recommends that the College accept the following sources for the creation of unit goals in the college’s planning process.

Results: The Recommendation #14 (2012-2013) motion made, discussion item only

Recommendation #15 (2012-2013): Approve the updates to the Program Review Committee operating agreement (see below) the recommendation was changed to changes to program review processes and program review handbook shall be brought to the academic senate and shared governance council for review and action. Change under staff: 1 Classified representative appointed by the AFT1521A and 1 Classified representative appointed by the 721.

Results: The Recommendation 15 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus
Recommendation #16 (2012-2013): To accept the Building Management Systems for a) MLK, Science & Technology Climatec in the amount of $48,300 and b) CDC & Central Plant- Trane in the amount of $42,704. The funds are within the contingency.

Results: The Recommendation #16 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote 12-0-1

Recommendation #17 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments c.) Gas Company Connection from New Hampshire Street in the amount of $6,000.

Results: The Recommendation #17 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

Recommendation #18 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments d.) Smooth Finish Concrete Columns in 2nd & 3rd Floor Conference Rooms in the amount of $6,620.

Results: The Recommendation #18 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

Recommendation #19 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments e.) Interior Signage Revisions in the amount not to exceed $6,000.

Results: The Recommendation #19 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote 12-1-1

Recommendation #20 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments f.) Re-flush Hydronic Lines in the amount of $45,954.

Results: The Recommendation #20 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote 9-0-5

Recommendation #21 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments g.) Rear Fencing to Prevent Public Entry into Old Golf Driving Range in the amount of $10,300.

Results: The Recommendation #21 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote 13-1-0

Recommendation #22 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments i.) Credit for Remaining Balance of Unforeseen Conditions Allowance at $(165,166).

Results: The Recommendation #22 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

Recommendation #23 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments j.) Credit for Additional Laboratory Testing at $(8,152)

Results: The Recommendation #23 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

Recommendation #24 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments k.) Credit to Omit New Driveway at Monroe & New Hampshire at $(5,907)
Committee Meeting Report

Results: The Recommendation #24 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

Recommendation #25 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments I.) Credit to Omit Lobby Wall Graphics at $(6,687)

Results: The Recommendation #25 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

Recommendation #26 (2012-2013): Student Union Amendments m.) Credit to correct Contractor’s mark up for Change Orders 1&4 $(932)

Results: The Recommendation #26 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote consensus

Recommendation #27 (2012-2013): To accept Option 1: Construct Student Services & Holmes Hall as designed:
   Include the demo of the Men’s Gym & Pool in the Leaning Support Center Project.
   Men’s Gym is $33,136 gross square foot (gsf) X $10 square foot (sqft) = $331,360
   $331,360 to be added to the Learning Support Budget from Project Savings of the Student Union
   Reduce budgeted $/sqft for Cesar Chavez from $181 to $175, creates savings of $500,00
   Use anticipated project savings from the South Gym, DaVinci Hall and others $189,473

   Student Union Project Savings 331,360
   Cesar Chavez Budget Reduction 500,000
   South Gym DaVinci/Other Project Savings 189,473
   Total 1,020,833

Results: The Recommendation #27 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote 12-0-1

Recommendation #28 (2012-2013): To accept the attached revised moratorium budget dated 8/13/12.

Results: The Recommendation #28 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote 12-0-1

Recommendation #29 (2012-2013): Approve the Facilities Planning Committee Operating Agreement (See Below)

Results: The Recommendation #29 (2012-2013) motion made, approved vote 11-0-1

ADJOURNMENT: 1:45pm
MORATORIUM DEMOLITION PLAN

District has expressed concerns over unoccupied buildings on District property. Current projects are not being released due to this concern. In an effort to accommodate this concern options have been developed

Demolition Cost Shortfall:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>$/sqft</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men's Gym</td>
<td>33,126</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>331,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>22,540</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>225,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>37,137</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>371,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>92,803</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>928,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency @10%</td>
<td>92,803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,020,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPTION 1 Construct Student Services & Holmes Hall as designed. Include the demo of the Men's Gym & Pool in the Learning Support Center Project. Men's Gym is 33,136 gsf x $10/sqft = $331,360 $331,360 to be added to Learning Support Budget from Project Savings of Student Union Reduce Budgeted $/sqft for Cesar Chavez from $181 to $175, creates savings of $500,000 Use anticipated project savings from South Gym, DaVinci Hall and others $189,473

| Student Union Project Savings | 331,360 |
| Cesar Chavez Budget Reduction | 500,000 |
| South Gym/DaVinci/Other Project Savings | 189,473 |
| Total                          | 1,020,833 |

OPTION 2 Construct Student Services & Holmes Hall as designed. Cancel Learning Support Center for savings of $23,709,080 Demolish Men's Gym at cost of $364,386 Construct New IT Center in Cafeteria Building at 5,857,143 Fully modernize LS/Chem at cost of $5,200,000

Learning Support Center (23,709,080)
Demolish Men's Gym 400,825
New IT Center 5,857,143
Modernize LS/Chem 5,200,000
Remaining Budget (12,251,112)

The Remaining budget can be allocated to Contingency and used for projects in the future