MEMO

Date: June 11, 2014

To: Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee:
   Steve Veres, chair; Scott Svonkin, vice chair; Ernie Moreno, member

From: James O'Reilly, chief facilities executive

RE: June 16, 2014 Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee

Please find attached background materials for the Facilities Master Planning and Oversight meeting to be held on June 16, 2014.

The documents include information regarding the Pierce College draft facilities master plan, the Connect LACCD feasibility study report, Valley College Media Arts and Performing Arts (MAPA) project business case analysis and an outline of the delegation of authority policy for change orders.

I will be joined by staff at the meeting to discuss the items on the agenda. Please feel free to call me at (213) 891-2048 if you have any questions.

C: Dr. Francisco Rodriguez, chancellor
   Dr. Adriana Barrera, deputy chancellor
   Dr. Kathleen Burke, president, Pierce College
   Alma Johnson-Hawkins, interim president, Valley College
   Thomas Hall, director, facilities planning and development
   Terri Mestas, director, LACCD bond program management office
   Ed Cadena, CPM director, Pierce College
   Hau-Wen Feng, CPM director, Valley College
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Pierce College

2014 Draft Facilities Master Plan Update

June 16, 2014

Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee
Purpose of Facilities Master Plan Update

- Maintain alignment with College Strategic Master Plan & Educational Master Plan.
- Optimize building utilization ratios and maximize student engagement.
- Balance planning with funding availability:
  - Reduce scope of Horticulture project*.
  - Reduce scope of Digital Arts & Media and integrate more shared, general-use classrooms.
  - Absorb Green Technologies programs into existing classroom capacity.
- Planning through 2019.

*Name change, from Horticulture / Animal Science Lab to Horticulture Project
Reference Documents

  - Developed and implemented by the College
  - Acted as guiding document for the development of:
    - Facility Strategic Plan
    - Technology Plan
    - Plan for Enrollment Management
  - Approved by College: April 2012
Reference Documents

• 2010 Long Range Facilities Master Plan (updated from 2002)
  - Reasons to Update Long-Range Facilities Master Plan
    • BOT rule 2605.1 / Admin Reg B-24 / Ed Code 70902
    • Update in response to Measure J opportunities
  
  - Developed with Sasaki Associates, Inc. and implemented by the College
  
  - Date Completed: 2010
  
  - Approved by Board of Trustees: 2010
  
  - CEQA Approval: August 25, 2010
  
  - Planning through 2015
Approved 2010 Facilities Master Plan Update

VICTORY BOULEVARD

DE SOTO AVENUE

14

ONNARD STREET

WINNETKA AVENUE

Legend & Status

1. Green Technology (unbuilt)
2. Digital Arts Media (unbuilt)
3. Library (complete 2013)
4. Auto / Tech (unbuilt)
5. M & O Facility (compl. 2012)
6. Perf Arts ADA (under reno.)
7. Stadium Upgrades (under renovation)
8. Infrastructure, Central Plant Extension (unbuilt)
9. Horticulture Renovation/Expansion (unbuilt)
10. North of Mall Renovation (under renovation)
11. Ag Sci Renovation (under renovation)
12. South of Mall Renovation (under renovation)
14. Ag Ed Master Plan (unbuilt)
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PIERCE COLLEGE
Educational Master Plan Growth Factors

LONG TERM ENROLLMENT GROWTH

Census Credit Headcount
Fall 1947 - Fall 2013

Data Sources: (CEN_RDB): WSCH_STUDENT, Enrollment Projections calculated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Data Retrieved: Annually following Census Date
Report compiled: Kate Astor, Research Analyst; AstorKH@piercecollege.edu, x4493
# Educational Master Plan Growth Factors

**PERFORMANCE AND COMPETITIVENESS**

## EFFICIENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College Baseline</th>
<th>District Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg Class Size in Credit Class</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost FTES (Annual)</td>
<td>$3946</td>
<td>$4149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TEACHING / LEARNING FOR SUCCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College Baseline</th>
<th>District Baseline</th>
<th>3 Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% New Student Cohort Completing 30 Units / 3 Years</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% New Student Cohort Completing 60 Units / 3 Years</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ACCESS / PREPARATION FOR SUCCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College Baseline</th>
<th>District Baseline</th>
<th>3 Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistence: Fall to Spring</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence: Fall to Fall</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Educational Master Plan Growth Factors

**SURROUNDING HIGH SCHOOLS SUCCESS RATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>2011-12 Graduates</th>
<th>% Meeting CSU/UC Reqmts</th>
<th>2011-12 CA HS Lang Arts Exam Pass Rate</th>
<th>2011-12 HS Math Exam Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>5944*</td>
<td>44% *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing High Schools</td>
<td>5247**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD</td>
<td>37,532</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Total</td>
<td>104,785</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>418,598</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes El Camino Real

**Does not include El Camino Real (partial data set)**

---

BuildLACCD

*Building for tomorrow's leaders*

Pierce College
Pierce College addresses Basic Skills, General Education, CTE, Stem, Transfer, and Noncredit needs of the San Fernando Valley, serving:

- Business
- Health Services
- Child Development
- Automotive Technology
- Agriculture
- Arts/Media Arts
- Computer Science/IT
- Performing Arts
- Sciences
- Veterinary Care/
- Animal Science
## Priorities & Changes

Aligns with budget recovery plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Horticulture</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>$7.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Campus Wide Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructural Support</td>
<td>$5.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Central Plant West Expansion</td>
<td>Infrastructural Support</td>
<td>$6.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Automotive &amp; New Technical Education Facilities</td>
<td>Infrastructural Support</td>
<td>$34.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Various Space Improvements</td>
<td>Lecture, Lab, Office,</td>
<td>$2.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure, Roadways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. South of Mall Classrooms</td>
<td>Lecture, Lab, Office,</td>
<td>$11.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking lots 4, 6 East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Digital Arts &amp; Media</td>
<td>Infrastructural Support</td>
<td>$37.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Campus Landscaping</td>
<td>Infrastructural Support</td>
<td>$5.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Agricultural Education Center</td>
<td>Infrastructural Support</td>
<td>$4.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Village Road and Pierce Lane</td>
<td>Infrastructural Support</td>
<td>$2.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $119 million

Red indicates changes to Approved 2010 Facilities Master Plan Update
## Priorities & Changes
Aligns with budget recovery plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SF IN 2010 MASTER PLAN UPDATE</th>
<th>SF IN 2014 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN UPDATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREEN TECHNOLOGIES</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOTIVE &amp; NEW TECHNICAL EDUCATION FACILITIES</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGITAL ARTS &amp; MEDIA</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>15,451</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary
Plan development reduced by 127,000 square feet, therefore no increase in student capacity from previous Facilities Master Plan.

Historical Resources
Quonset Hut has been determined not to be an historical resource.

Traffic Mitigation
Traffic mitigation at Victory/Winnetka is not necessary.
Horticulture Detail

**HORTICULTURE**
$7.8 Million

- Demolish Existing Greenhouse & Utility Buildings
- Clean site
- Renovate Horticulture Building
- Construct new Greenhouse

Legend:
- **Existing**
- **Demolition**
- **Renovation**
- **New Construction**
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Central Plant Expansion Detail

Central Plant Expansion
Existing Central Plant
Existing PE Building

Expansion of Central Plant to service new Measure ‘J’ facilities.

Central Plant Expansion
$6.3 Million

BuildLACCD
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PIERCE COLLEGE
2014 Facilities Master Plan Update / Changes

1. Horticulture
2. Central Plant Expansion
3. Automotive & New Technical Education Facilities
4. Digital Arts & Media
5. Green Technologies Building Deleted from Plan (programs re-distributed)

BuildLACCD
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Pierce College
Campus Space Utilization-Cap Load Ratio

Reference:
Fusion data as of January 2014
ConnectLACCD

LACCD identified a need to improve the infrastructure connecting its colleges, headquarters and satellite facilities.

A concept was developed to deploy a District owned fiber optic network using MTA* assets.

A project validation was conducted per the Build Program’s Standard Operating Procedures. This process is applied to all Build Program projects.

*Metropolitan Transit Authority
Project Objectives

ConnectLACCD Objectives:

- Support the data needs of students, faculty and staff for the foreseeable future

- Provide adequate redundancy such that the network will be only minimally affected by a disaster and can be quickly restored to support the educational process

- Use Bond funds to reduce operational costs
Project Validation Process

1. Document project goals
2. Review existing network documentation and usage statistics
3. Evaluate several strategies
4. Document technical requirements for the next generation network
5. Recommend a strategy to move forward
LACCD has a network that connects its 12 locations.

Consists of leased circuits, most of which are provided by the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC).

Most circuits are very fast (1000Mbps) and are backed up with a slower (45Mbps) line to each college.

*Megabits per second
Current Utilization Measurement

Current networks are 9% - 35% utilized

Pierce College 1Gbps* Link Utilization

- Typical LACCD circuit can handle 1,000 Mbps
- Typically LACCD is using less than 200 Mbps

*Gigabits per second
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## Today’s Usage Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Hub Site</th>
<th>B/W</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Utilization %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City</td>
<td>L3 Tustin</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>350 Mbps</td>
<td>400 Mbps</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles</td>
<td>L3 Tustin</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>300 Mbps</td>
<td>380 Mbps</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Valley</td>
<td>L3 Tustin</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>250 Mbps</td>
<td>350 Mbps</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles ESC</td>
<td>L3 Tustin</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>200 Mbps</td>
<td>250 Mbps</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Harbor</td>
<td>L3 Tustin</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>180 Mbps</td>
<td>260 Mbps</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Pierce</td>
<td>L3 Tustin</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>160 Mbps</td>
<td>200 Mbps</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Trade</td>
<td>L3 Tustin</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>150 Mbps</td>
<td>200 Mbps</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>L3 Tustin</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>120 Mbps</td>
<td>180 Mbps</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission</td>
<td>L.A.</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>100 Mbps</td>
<td>110 Mbps</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles SW</td>
<td>L3 Tustin</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>90 Mbps</td>
<td>110 Mbps</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circuit utilization April 2014 – Source: CENIC
Anticipated Growth

- LACCD’s growth drivers include new and upgraded systems
  - Student information system
  - Financial system
  - Distance learning
  - Video conferencing
  - Smart Buildings
  - Student wireless devices
  - Machine to Machine
  - Smart classrooms

- LACCD’s average growth rate is trending toward 50% per year.
- In 2018, LACCD’s bandwidth needs will begin to exceed its capacity
- Current network has several single points of failure
- Existing backup links cannot support current traffic levels
How much new capacity is needed?

Projections are based on multiple factors:

- Bandwidth used by each application and system
  - Student Information System (SIS), HR, Payroll, Financials, Etc
- Number of students, faculty, and staff at each college
- Assumed 4% student population growth (Fusion)
- Number of classrooms at each college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Bandwidth required by 2020 (Mbps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East LA College</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade-Tech</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District HQ</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming 50% CAGR*  

*Compound Annual Growth Rate
Solutions

- Several possible solutions:
  - Eliminate single points of failure
  - Connect data centers at ESC* and Valley
  - Expand network service from CENIC
  - Build a point-to-point wireless network
  - Lease dark fiber
  - Construct a private fiber optic network
  - Lease network services
  - Partner with another County agency

- The optimal solution may be a combination of some of the above

*Education Services Center
## Solutions – Four Potential Options

### Minimal Upgrade
- Continue to review usage and rate of growth for the next 12 months
- Fix single points of failure now
- Lease 10GB link between ESC and LA Valley College
- Cost: ~$80k for routers plus $1,600/month for service
- Time: September 2014

### Lease network services
- National and regional Telecommunications carriers have these services available
- Carriers have flexibility in their leasing options
- Cost: $13 million for five year lease at 10 Gbps; Bond funded
- Time: Less than 9 months
## Solutions – Four Potential Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner with another County agency</th>
<th>Construct a private fiber optic network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- PMO contacted LA County ITS* and LADPW**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They both use leased networks due to lower cost than constructing their own private fiber network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Master agreements with Verizon, AT&amp;T, TWC***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost: $6,850/month per 10 GBs segment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time: 180 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Draft MOU with MTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LACCD to install fiber cables in MTA pathways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MTA gets some of the unused fibers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost of easements unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost: &gt;$130 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time: 3-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Los Angeles County Information Technology Service
**Los Angeles Department of Public Works
***Time Warner Communications
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## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution option</th>
<th>Goal 1 – Support current and future needs</th>
<th>Goal 2 – Redundancy</th>
<th>Goal 3 – Use bond funds to minimize operational costs</th>
<th>Maint. cost</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Minimal Upgrade</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>$250k</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Leased Network</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$13M (5 yrs)</td>
<td>&lt;9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Partner with another Agency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes w/long term lease</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$6,850/month/link.</td>
<td>&lt;9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Private Network</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1.1M+/year</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$130M+ (25 yrs)</td>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Findings

• No immediate change to LACCD Network is required to meet capacity demands until 2018.

• Primary single points of failure should be eliminated.

• Network enhancement is needed around 2018.

• Private fiber network has significant issues such as capital cost, maintenance cost, operational staffing cost, training and risk.

• LADPW, L.A. County and MTA use leased services per their findings of being more cost effective than building their own network.

• Local vendor proposal for a 5 year lease: cost of approx. $13M, includes implementation, network management, O&M costs, and the ability to expand. Cost may be further reduced.

• A service provider’s network, such as AT&T, could be turned up in less than 25% of the time required for a private fiber network.

• Additional bandwidth from current provider could be sufficient for the expected growth through 2020 but would require each college to use operational funds.
**Recommended Next Steps**

- **Implement the minimal upgrade option**
  - Add new 10GB primary link between ESC and LAVC
    - Router investment: $80,000 from Measure J bond funds
    - Valley data center completion July 2014
    - ESC data center improvement completion September 2014
  - Resolve single points of failure in current network

- **Carefully monitor and document bandwidth usage for the next twelve months**

- **Define long term solution and implement:**
Los Angeles Community College District
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Valley College
Media & Performing Arts Project
Business Case Analysis

Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee

June 16, 2014
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AECOM
Proposed – MAPA Project History

- Programming: 2009
- Design start: June 2009 – May 2011
- DSA submission: May 2011
- Placed on the Moratorium: December 2011
  - Budget analysis
  - Space utilization and Lifecycle analysis
- DSA approved: May 2013
- Moratorium release request: June 2013
- Business case analysis completed: May 2014
Existing Conditions – Media & Performing Arts

- 53-year-old building
- ADA non-compliant
  ADA: American Disabilities Act
- OSHA non-compliant
  OSHA: Occupational Safety & Health Administration
- Environmental issues
- Fire / Life / Safety issues
- Severe termite damage
- Lack of area for growth
- Insufficient lighting and controls
- Antiquated technology
Existing Conditions – Media & Performing Arts

- Cost to Repair Deficiencies: $6 M – $7.5 M
- Time to Repair Deficiencies: 18 – 24 months
  - (Procurement thru Construction)
- Cost to Replace Building: $19.5 M
Business Case Analysis

- **Business Case Analysis**: Data driven analysis to confirm a way forward for the MAPA project.

- **MAPA Scope**: New media and performing arts facility with 4 separate theaters and shared program space for LAVC and the surrounding community.

- **Business Case Components**:
  - Validate the Program and look at other scenarios
  - Cost and schedule impacts
  - Cost of maintenance
  - Other project factors
Business Case – Scenarios Analyzed

Three Scenarios Analyzed

1. DSA-approved scenario
2. 2013 Independent Peer Validation (IPV) Program Scenario
3. 2014 Reduced Program Scenario

Scope Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSA-Approved Scenario (118,099 GSF)</th>
<th>2013 IPV Program Scenario (121,936 GSF)</th>
<th>2014 Reduced Program Scenario (63,140 GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 118,000 SF</td>
<td>• 121,936 SF</td>
<td>• 63,140 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assumed to be constructed per the</td>
<td>• New design based on the 2013 IPV</td>
<td>• Deletion of the Media Arts program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA approved construction</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>• Re-starts at the program phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documents with no further</td>
<td>• Facility that meets the current and</td>
<td>• Re-design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modification</td>
<td>future needs of LAVC</td>
<td>• Requires a completely new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>submittal to DSA for review and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Space Type Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DSA-Approved Scenario (118,099 GSF)</th>
<th>2013 IPV Program Scenario (121,936 GSF)</th>
<th>2014 Reduced Program Scenario (63,140 GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture/Lab</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Business Case – Program Validation

- Objective, independent peer validation (IPV) program approach undertaken to validate the needs of the LAVC users
  - Data Sources: Current/projected enrollment data, detailed curriculum analysis, BuildLACCD standards, industry/professional experience standards, best practices

- 2013 IPV Program & DSA-approved Program comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 IPV Program</th>
<th>DSA-Approved Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Arts Department</td>
<td>18,524</td>
<td>15,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Department</td>
<td>15,490</td>
<td>10,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Program</td>
<td>42,196</td>
<td>31,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other program areas not included a</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MAPA NET ASSIGNABLE AREA</td>
<td>76,210</td>
<td>63,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossing Factor b</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MAPA GROSS AREA</td>
<td>121,936</td>
<td>118,099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Room/areas in the DSA-approved plans that did not have a corresponding room/area in the 2013 IPV Program.

b The grossing factor for the DSA-approved design is derived by taking the gross area and dividing it by the net assignable area above.

Findings

- The 2013 IPV Program increases in area by 3,837 SF
- The DSA-approved Program still meets the current and future needs of these departments
## Business Case – Cost Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Hard Cost</th>
<th>Soft Cost a</th>
<th>FF&amp;E</th>
<th>Cost / SF</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSA Approved</td>
<td>$59,516,424</td>
<td>$17,912,118 b</td>
<td>$6,753,518</td>
<td>$503.95</td>
<td>$76,872,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118,099 GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 IPV Program</td>
<td>$72,760,967</td>
<td>$21,828,290</td>
<td>$6,753,518</td>
<td>$596.71</td>
<td>$101,342,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121,936 GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Reduced Program c</td>
<td>$51,353,042</td>
<td>$15,405,913</td>
<td>$5,135,304</td>
<td>$813.32</td>
<td>$71,894,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63,140 GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Soft Costs include: Construction Administration (Incl. AE Fees), CPM Fees, Inspection and Specialty Inspection costs, Testing, Lab of Record and Commissioning costs

b  Soft costs expended to-date total $7,309,225

c  Media Arts program excluded from scope

## Findings

- DSA program is $24.5M less that 2013 Program and $4.9 more than the 2014 program
- Cost per SF of the DSA-approved Program is the least
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Valley College’s Project Budget Status

- Funds set-aside for the MAPA project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget*</th>
<th>Contracted</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Remaining (Budget-Contracted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$93,669,762</td>
<td>$10,279,010</td>
<td>$7,452,153</td>
<td>$83,390,752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Contingent upon approval of College recovery/priority plan
Data based on Priority Plan dated 3.26.14

- DSA-approved Program scenario ($76M)
# Business Case – Schedule Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Programming</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>DSA Approval&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Total (Years)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSA Approved</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>22 Months</td>
<td>1 year, 10 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118,099 GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 IPV Program</td>
<td>5 Months</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>22 Months</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121,936 GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Reduced Program</td>
<td>8 Months</td>
<td>11 Months</td>
<td>16 Months</td>
<td>16 Months</td>
<td>5 years, 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63,140 GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Figures include selection of lease-leaseback team (approx. 6 months).

<sup>b</sup> Figures exclude closeout.

### Findings
- DSA program schedule is completed in least amount of time
- Other programs will take another 5 years from current date (Completion in 2019)
DSA Approved Program Facts

- Sustainability features
  - LEED™ Gold certification
    *LEED™: Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design*
  - Sustainable building finishes with low maintenance
  - Exceed Title 24 by 20% (i.e. green roof, LED lighting, daylight harvesting, building orientation, etc.)
  - Use of 60+ harvested trees (i.e., wood screen walls, seating)

- Multi-disciplinary environment and shared spaces

- Industry standard state-of-the-art technology

- Only local venue to house 4 separate theaters in one facility

- Newest local arts venue of its kind built within the last 4 years
# Business Case Analysis Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Cost ($M)</th>
<th>Cost Per SF</th>
<th>Time to Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSA Approved</td>
<td>118,099</td>
<td>$76.8</td>
<td>$504</td>
<td>1 year, 10 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 IPV Program</td>
<td>121,936</td>
<td>$101.3</td>
<td>$597</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Reduced Program</td>
<td>63,140</td>
<td>$71.8</td>
<td>$813</td>
<td>5 years, 5 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business Case Analysis Summary

- Existing facilities in poor condition – need to repair or replace
- Investment of 5 years into the DSA-approved design
- The spaces and functions designed to date are valid based on:
  - Educational Master Plan
  - Projected enrollment
  - Concurrency with Program needs
- **DSA-approved design is least cost and least time**
- Design is within the budget allocation for this project
- DSA-approved design is the most effective business case option
- Next step – move forward with DSA-approved design
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DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY - CHANGE ORDERS

Many community college districts, aware of the risks created by having a process and/or procedure that requires every change order to be processed by the board itself, have adopted a policy or rule that delegates such authority to an officer or employee of their District as permitted by law. This practice greatly reduces risk and minimizes claims and litigation.

Public Contract Code section 20659 gives the governing board of a community college district the authority to issue change orders to construction contracts.

Education Code §81655 provides that any power to contract that is provided to the board can be delegated to any officer or employee of the district.

Education Code §81655 also provides that a contract shall not be binding upon the district until the contract has been approved or ratified by the board.

In addition, Education Code §81655 provides that any official who acts wrongfully in contracting on behalf of the district under delegated authority is personally liable for any losses of the district paid out as a result of the officials wrongful actions.

The presentation will demonstrate why the LACCD Board should delegate its authority to approve change orders to the Chief Facilities Executive so that work in the Bond Program can progress without interruption. All such change orders would be brought to the Board for ratification on a routine basis (e.g., every 30 or 60 days).