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Monte E. Perez, College President Liaison
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Agenda
(Items may be taken out of order)

I. ROLL CALL

II. PUBLIC SPEAKERS*

III. ITEM WITH MOTION REQUIRED

Report on the Student Housing Request for Qualifications process.

IV. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. Measure CC Implementation Efforts to date.

B. Report on Internships with BuildLACCD.

C. Presentation of the BuildLACCD Dashboard - mobile version.


E. Active Construction Summary.

V. SUMMARY – NEXT MEETING ................................................................. Mike Eng
ADJOURNMENT

*Members of the public are allotted three minutes time to address the agenda issues.

If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternate formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Section 12132), and the rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. The agenda shall include information regarding how, for whom, and when a request for disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting. To make such a request, please contact the Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees at 213/891-2044 no later than 12 p.m. (noon) on the Tuesday prior to the Committee meeting.
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 25, 2017

To: Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee:
   Mike Eng, Chairperson; Ernest H. Moreno, Vice Chairperson; Mike Fong,
   Member, Scott J. Svonkin, Alternate

From: Thomas Hall, Interim Chief Facilities Executive

RE: May 31, 2017 Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMP&OC)
   Meeting

Please find attached the following Background Materials for Items listed on the May 31,
2017 Agenda:

III. ITEMS WITH A MOTION REQUIRED

   Request to approve the design of the Expanded Automotive and Central Plant
   Expansion projects at Los Angeles Pierce College.

   • Memorandum on the Student Housing Request for Qualifications
     process.
   • LACCD Request for Qualifications – Student Housing.

IV. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. Measure CC Implementation Efforts to date.

   • Print of PowerPoint presentation: Proposed Measure CC
     Implementation Plan.

B. Report on Internships with BuildLACCD.

   • Memorandum on the BuildLACCD Internship Program.

C. Presentation of the BuildLACCD Dashboard - mobile version.

   • Print of PowerPoint presentation: New Mobile Dashboard Reporting

E. Active Construction Summary.

- Charts with the status of active construction projects funded through the Bond program District-wide.

I will be joined by staff at the meeting to discuss these items. Please feel free to call me at (213) 891-2119 if you have any questions.

cc: Dr. Francisco C. Rodriguez, Chancellor
Paul Steinke, Program Director, BuildLACCD Program Management Office
Date: May 24, 2017

To: Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District

From: Bryan Payne
Director, Contract Administration
LACCD Program Management Office

Subject: Status of Procurement
Request for Qualifications #DW-07-17-RFQ
Public-Private Partnership for Student Housing

This memorandum details the chronological events associated with the Public-Private Partnership for Student Housing Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Procurement #DW-07-17-RFQ.

**Request for Qualifications Issued:** May 1, 2017

The RFQ was issued via the Online Vendor Portal (PlanetBids) to 725 vendors.

The RFQ was also advertised through the Daily Journal and the following outreach newspapers: Eastside Sun, Southwest Wave, La Opinion, Chinese Daily News, The Korea Times, Los Angeles Sentinel, Our Weekly.

PlanetBids indicates that 105 vendors viewed or downloaded the procurement documents.

The RFQ includes several factors that may result in disqualification of a firm:

- Bankruptcy of an officer or director of the firm
- Insufficient insurance
- No workers’ compensation insurance
- Inability to provide a performance bond or irrevocable letter of credit per Ed. Code 81390
- The firm’s professional license has been revoked in the last 5 years
- The firm’s assets have been attached or frozen by a government entity in the last 5 years
- An owner, officer, or director of the firm has been convicted of a crime involving the award of a government contract in the last 5 years

The evaluation factors as stated on Page 13 of the RFQ are summarized below:

- The Development Team’s General Qualifications: 0 to 200 points
- The Development Team’s Financial Strength: 0 to 200 points
- The Development Team’s Past Experience: 0 to 250 points
- Local Worker and LSEDV Business Participation: 0 to 100 points
  750 points maximum

The SOQs will be reviewed by an evaluation panel of five (5) members, including District and Program Management Office staff. The scores will be compiled and graphed to determine what the cutoff point should be. There is not a specific cutoff stated in the RFQ, but the cutoff is
determined where a major break in the scoring curve occurs. The short list of firms will be those firms above the major score break. Generally, a short list is limited to 3-5 participants. However, if there is no break in scores warranting a cutoff, more participants may be allowed.

**Addendum #1 Issued:** May 8, 2017

Addendum #1 confirmed the location of the pre-bid meeting (time and date was previously identified and remained unchanged) and posted the forms to be completed by those firms interested in submitting their Statements of Qualification.

**Pre-bid Meeting Held:** May 10, 2017

The pre-bid meeting was held at the Program Management Office in Monterey Park. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the scope of the RFQ and to familiarize the firms with the procurement documents and provide instruction on how to complete the required forms. 37 firms attended the pre-bid meeting. Examples of questions asked by the vendors included:

- Is it the District’s intent to select only one winning team for this RFQ, or will multiple teams be selected given the extensive scope of potentially developing housing on 9 campuses?

- Will the District purchase proposed off-campus parcels, and then ground lease them to student housing developer? Has District determined how many student housing units will be needed at each campus location?

- Should the developer acquire land adjacent to the campus to build student housing facilities, is the intent of the District and/or the individual campuses to sign a master lease for the facilities?

- Could the RFQ submittal date of May 22, 2017 be extended, suggesting May 31st, based upon final RFQ questions anticipated to be published May 17th and due to the extensiveness of the RFQ requirements?

**Addendum #2 Issued:** May 11, 2017

Addendum #2 posted the sign-in sheets from the pre-bid meeting.

**Addendum #3 Issued:** May 17, 2017

Addendum #3 answered firms’ questions posted to PlanetBids, re-opened the question and answer period for two (2) days, and extended the deadline for submission of SOQs by four (4) days from May 22, 2017 to May 26, 2017.

At the pre-bid meeting most of the 37 participating firms noted how short the RFQ tender period is and that the short tender period may prevent them from submitting a timely SOQ.

PMO Contracts received two (2) formal Requests for Clarification requesting more time and multiple informal requests from participating firms for more time.

Two (2) vendors informed PMO Contracts that they will not participate due to the short procurement period.

In the interest of increasing competition and affording the firms the maximum opportunity to participate, we gave the firms four (4) additional days to submit their SOQs.

**Statements of Qualifications Due:** May 26, 2017 (extended date)

After the short list of firms to proceed to the Request for Proposal is determined, the firms will be invited to participate in a short scoping process to contribute to the final form of the Request for Proposal.
Attendees to the Pre-SOQ Meeting:

1. Amcal Equities
2. Arup
3. Awi Builders
4. Berg-Berg Enterprises
5. Brightview Design Group
6. CA Student Living
7. CABD Construction
8. Carmel Partners
9. Chris Stepan
10. College Town International
11. Comet Electric
12. Consensus, Inc.
13. DPR Construction
14. Englekirk
15. EYRC Architects
16. Gonzales Goodale Architects
17. Harper Construction
18. Holmes Structures
19. HPI Architecture
20. KTGY Group, Inc.
21. Ledcor Construction
22. Multiplicity
23. NAC Architecture
24. PFIC
25. PGAL
26. Psomas
27. QDG Architects
28. Roshanian
29. Scion
30. Servitas
31. Suffolk Construction
32. SVA Architects
33. Swinerton Builders
34. Symphony Developers
35. Torti Gallas + Partners
36. Valentino Dewalt Train Associates
37. Westgroup Designs
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I. INVITATION TO SUBMIT QUALIFICATIONS

The Los Angeles Community College District (“LACCD”/“District”) intends to enter into a Public-Private Partnership (PPP) and related agreements (“Agreements”) with a private company (Developer) for the purpose of developing student housing at various sites owned or to be owned by the District (“Property” or “Site”).

This procurement process will take place in two steps:

1. the instant Request for Qualifications step (“RFQ”); and

2. a subsequent Request for Proposal step (“RFQ”).

Upon receipt and evaluation of: (i) the Statements of Qualifications (“SOQ’s”); (ii) a proposal containing development concepts and visions for the Site(s) (“Development Concepts and Vision Proposal”); and (iii) other documents to be submitted as described herein below, the SOQ’s and other documents will be scored, evaluated and ranked with the District selecting three to five Applicant firms (which number can be increased or decreased), designated as “Finalists”, to receive RFP’s.

In the RFP portion of the procurement, the Finalist’s Proposals submitted in response to the RFP will also include a financial proposal and a more detailed proposal for the development for the Property. The Proposals will be scored and evaluated and a successful Applicant Firm identified for award of the project using a qualitative method of selection. The District reserves the right to increase or decrease the number of firms in the Finalist group, at any time in the procurement process, if it determines it is in its own best interests to do so. The selected developer as part of this process will be selected based upon, without limitation, the District’s authority pursuant to: Education Code sections 81390 et. seq.; applicable District policies regarding professional service procurements; and other applicable law.

The Program Management Office (“PMO”) is the District’s Authorized Representative for conducting this Request for Qualifications (RFQ), the subsequent RFP process, and for administering and enforcing the contract(s) awarded by the District’s Board of Trustees pursuant to this RFQ and subsequent RFP.

All information submitted to the District shall become property of the District.

There are no expressed or implied obligations for the District to reimburse responding firms for any expense incurred in preparing their response to this RFQ and subsequent RFP or for any Request for Services issued after award.

The District reserves the right to reject any or all of the submitted responses to this RFQ (“Statement of Qualifications” or “SOQ’s”) at any time if it deems doing so to be in its own best interests.

The District reserves the right to reject any or all of the submitted Proposals at any time if it deems doing so to be in its own best interests.
II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION – DISTRICT & BOND PROGRAM

A. About the District

The District’s construction program is the largest and most ambitious community college capital improvement program in the nation.

Organized in 1969, LACCD is the largest community college district in the nation, with nine (9) colleges serving more than 250,000 students. The District is part of the statewide California Community College system. It is governed by an elected seven (7) member Board of Trustees, each of whom serves a four (4) year term.

The mission of the District is to provide comprehensive lower-division general education, occupational education, transfer education, counseling and guidance, community services, and continuing education programs that are appropriate to the communities served and that meet the changing needs of students for academic and occupational preparation, citizenship, and cultural understanding.

The District is serves thirty-six (36) cities an area encompassing 882 square miles in the greater Los Angeles area. The District extends from Agoura Hills in the west San Fernando Valley to the City of San Fernando in the north and Monterey Park to the east. The service area includes Culver City on the west side of the greater Los Angeles basin; Monterey Park and San Gabriel on the east side as well as Palos Verdes Estates and San Pedro to the south.

The District’s nine (9) colleges and two (2) satellite campuses, which range in size from twenty-two (22) to over four hundred fifty (450) acres, include:

- Los Angeles City College
- East Los Angeles College
- Los Angeles Harbor College
- Los Angeles Mission College
- Los Angeles Pierce College
- Los Angeles Southwest College
- Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
- Los Angeles Valley College
- West Los Angeles College
- LACCD Van De Kamp Innovation Campus
- ELAC South Gate Campus

On October 17, 2001, the Los Angeles Community College District (“LACCD”) Board of Trustees established a Community Economic Development Program (“CED Program”) to
maximize local economic benefits generated by the LACCD Bond Program. This was subsequently reaffirmed on June 25, 2003 and January 15, 2014. The CED Program includes four key elements:

- **Community Business Enterprise Program** geared to encouraging the use of local, small, emerging and disabled-veteran owned businesses neighboring the colleges;

- **Local Hire Program** geared to involving local residents living in the areas neighboring the colleges in trade and non-trade opportunities;

- **College Internship Program** geared to involving District students at each college; and

- **Special Opportunities Program** geared to involving the socio-economically disadvantaged and others in training and job opportunities.

On January 15, 2014, in order to continue and further its mission to the economic development of the community, the Board of Trustees reaffirmed Board Rule 7103.17 “Opportunities for Local, Small, and Emerging Businesses” (“LSEB Policy”) and increased the participation goal from 28% to 30%.

The 30% goal has recently been increased again by the District’s adoption of an Amended Project Labor Agreement on July 8, 2015 (“APLA”). The District has now established, as an integral component of its current Community Economic Development Program, a goal of 35% of all skilled trade positions (journeyman and apprentices) employed on Project Work (as defined in the APLA) on each campus be workers residing within the zip codes specified for a particular campus (or for the District as a whole, as described in the APLA), and that 10% of such local resident hires be Disadvantaged Workers and/or Veterans (as defined in the APLA). The APLA became effective on August 13, 2015 and applies to this procurement.

The APLA establishes the labor relations policies and procedures for the District, contractors and craft employees engaged in the Build Program. The APLA prevents work stoppages or slowdowns, encourages contracting with LSEDV businesses, facilitates the hiring of local and disadvantaged local workers, veterans, etc., provides a sufficient supply of skilled craft workers, facilitates and provides a pipeline to union apprenticeship, and establishes standardized grievance/dispute resolution procedure(s) when matters arise, among other things. The existing APLA pertains to the Projects under this procurement. Related information may be accessed at: [http://www.buildlaccd.org/ced/labor-compliance](http://www.buildlaccd.org/ced/labor-compliance)

**B. About the Bond Program**

The District’s Bond Funded Construction Program (“Bond Program” or “Building Program”) is managed centrally by the PMO. The PMO oversees all nine (9) colleges and all activities and professional services in relation to the Building Program on behalf of the District, with the exception of a limited number of contracts. The PMO contract was awarded to AECOM in April 2013.

The Building Program involves the modernization and improvement of the District’s nine (9) colleges to ensure Los Angeles’ residents are properly trained to fill the highly-skilled jobs of the 21st century. The Building Program is one of the largest public sector sustainable building
efforts in the United States, spending $6 Billion in voter-approved funds. The types of contracting used and/or to be used in the Building Program include Design-Build, Design-Bid-Build, Lease-Leaseback, Private Public Partnerships, and other construction delivery methods.

Each of the nine (9) colleges is supported by a College Project Team (“CPT”) who manages construction activity and provides field level management at each campus. Each CPT firm is comprised of a team that includes a project director, several project managers, schedulers and various support staff. The CPTs report to the PMO.

The Bond Program must operate within the parameters of Proposition 39 and the District’s Administrative Regulation B-30 (Los Angeles Community College District Proposition A/AA and Measure J Cost Principles): [http://laccd.edu/About/Documents/AdministrativeRegulations/B-30.pdf](http://laccd.edu/About/Documents/AdministrativeRegulations/B-30.pdf). Any costs not within the parameters of Proposition 39 and the District’s Administrative Regulation B-30 will be disallowed.

### III. THE OPPORTUNITY

The District is seeking a qualified developer interested in developing approximately [to be proposed by Developer] gross acres at the following locations: [to be proposed by Developer] (“Property” or “Site”). The selected developer will enter into a long-term Joint-Occupancy Ground Lease (“Lease”) with the District and related agreements (“Agreements”). The Lease will be unsubordinated for no more than 66 years. The goal of the housing program is to assist the District’s students. Student housing helps students graduate and complete programs at higher rates than students that do not live on campus.

California Education Code Section 81390 et. seq. provides the authority and methodology by which the District may enter into leases and agreements with private parties for real-property and buildings to be used jointly (“Joint-Occupancy Code”). The Joint-Occupancy Code requires, among other things that the lease with the private party not exceed 66 years and that the private party construct or provide for the construction thereof of space for the District and charge no rent fees to the District.

The project developed on the Site (“Project” or “Proposed Project”) should be primarily a housing project and must provide [to be proposed by Developer] Square Feet of Field Act Compliant space to provide student housing, for no cost, rent or fees to the District or the College (“Joint-Occupancy Space”).

Development teams (“Developer”) able to demonstrate development experience, property management expertise, and financial resources/capacity to fully develop and operate the Project are encouraged to respond. Developers will be responsible for ALL aspects of design, financing, entitling, permitting, construction, operation and maintenance of the Project and will bear the complete financial, entitlement and market risk. The District will not subsidize the development of the Project in any form.
A. District’s Objectives for the Site

The District’s objective is to provide for high-quality and well-planned development of on-campus student housing based upon the following:

1. Provides the District with affordable Student Housing with no capital or operational investment by the District.
   a. Base monthly rent to be proposed by the Developer. Evaluation of base rent cost vs. local market rate rent for similar housing units will be part of the evaluation criteria for the RFP step of this procurement.
   b. Developer to propose how they will approach providing affordable rental rates for low income students. This can include offering a portion of units at below market rate. The number of these units offered and the amount that they are below market rate will be given priority weighting in the evaluation of the Developer’s proposal for the RFP step of this procurement.

2. No public Bond funds will be used in the development, construction or operations of the housing.

3. All construction to be performed by union labor.

4. Maximizes the potential financial value to the District through:
   a. the Long-term ground-lease between the Developer and the District for siting the project College property. The duration of the ground lease (not to exceed 66 years) and amount of remuneration to the District for this lease to be proposed by the Developer;
   b. the Guaranteed revenue per year shared by the Developer and the District generated by housing; and
   c. Other options for participation in economic growth including but not limited to proposed services, retail, etc. to be provided on the project..

5. Exemplifies design that is compatible and functionally similar to other LA area college student housing.

6. Successfully implements a strategy the Developer has used on prior PPP projects to secure financing, obtain entitlements, complete construction, attract tenants and manage the Project according to agreed terms:
   a. Developer must have a qualified operator of the housing;
   b. Developer must have a plan for obtaining occupancy of housing, including:
      i. Priority to be given to full time students;
      ii. Developer must have a plan for recruiting international students;
iii. Consideration to be given to students who are Veterans and students who are Emancipated youth;

iv. Should housing not fill with students, the Developer shall offer housing to District faculty or staff at market rate; and

v. Other points as the Developer may wish to propose.

7. Developer to propose additional on-site student services including, but not limited to, internet access, individual and communal study space, recreation space, etc.

8. Developer to enhance student success by creating opportunities for internships, training and jobs.

B. Field Act

The [to be proposed by Developer] square foot Joint-Occupancy Space must meet the requirements of Field Act per Education Code Section 81130-81149. The Joint-Occupancy Space will consist of [to be proposed by Developer] Square Feet of student housing space.

C. Stakeholders

The District is seeking Developers who understand the importance of working closely with the City and the stakeholders (including but not limited to: campus stakeholders; Home Owners Associations; business organizations; property owners; etc.) and is committed to do so in order to successfully develop the Project. Adjacent residential property owners have expressed interest in ensuring the Project considers height, noise, light, reflectivity, and shade and shadow impacts, as well as traffic circulation near shared boundaries and location of parking both during construction and operation.

D. Two-Step Selection Process – General Overview

The selection of the Developer will be a two-step process.

D.1 Request for Qualifications

Through this Request for Qualifications, interested Applicant Firms will submit a Statement of Qualifications and other required documents and information as set forth below. The Applicant Firms will be selected based on, including without limitation, the following criteria:

1. development team’s qualifications;
2. financial strength;
3. past experience; and
4. development concepts and visions for the Site(s).
D.2 Request for Proposals

From the Applicant Firms, the District will select a group of Finalist Firms, projected currently at 3 to 5 firms. The District will issue a Request for Proposals to the Finalist Firms. The firms invited to respond to the RFQ will be asked to submit a financial proposal and much more detail about their proposed project, which must evolve from the concepts presented in response to this RFQ.

The RFP may request at a minimum the following:

1. Detailed development program, including the Joint-Occupancy component;
2. Renderings and elevations of proposed project;
3. Strategy for entitlements and permitting process;
4. Identification of financing sources (financial commitments if possible);
5. Operating Plan and performance for at least the first 10 years of operation;
6. Target tenants (tenant commitments if possible);
7. Market assessment supporting projected rents;
8. Project schedule;
9. Additional references, financial or otherwise;
10. Financial proposal to District including term of lease, holding rent, base rent (as improved) and proposed methodology for rent increases, additional/percentage rent, participation in sale or refinancing of Project;
11. Additional details on strategies for collaboration with District, the College(s), and its/their students.

The firm selected from the RFP process will be invited to execute a 60-day Exclusive Negotiation Agreement in order to finalize the terms of the related agreements which may include a Development Agreement and Ground-Lease.

IV. RFQ SCHEDULE - KEY DATES AND EVENTS

A. Tentative Procurement Schedule

The tentative dates for the procurement of the services sought by this RFQ are as set forth below. The District reserves the right to change any dates in its sole discretion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request for Qualifications Issuance (start step 1)</td>
<td>1 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-RFQ Conference and Site Walk #1*</td>
<td>10 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-RFQ Conference and Site Walk #2*</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for RFQ Requests for Clarifications</td>
<td>15 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for District to issue last Addendum</td>
<td>17 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline for Submission of Qualifications</strong></td>
<td>22 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Finalist Firms</td>
<td>31 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Request for Proposals to Finalists (start step 2)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Each Pre-RFQ Conference and Site Walk location and time will be issued by addendum.

Applicant Firms MUST attend the entire Pre-Proposal Conference and Site Walk in order to respond to this Request for Proposals (RFQ).

B. Deadline for Requests for Clarifications

Requests for Clarifications (“RFCs”) during the RFQ process are encouraged. All questions and issues regarding the RFQ process, requirements, criteria, and/or information, should be ONLY be submitted electronically via the Online Vendor Portal (PlanetBids) to the following location:


All responses to Requests for Clarifications will be done only through written addendum issued via the Online Vendor Portal (PlanetBids) to all Applicants. No other changes are authorized.

No questions will be received or responded to after: **15 May 2017 at 2:00 p.m.**

It is the responsibility of the Applicant Firm to ensure that the District has the correct name, address, phone number, and e-mail address of the contact person(s).

C. Deadline for Submitting Statements of Qualifications (“SOQ”) and Other Documents to be Submitted with the SOQ.

Applicant Firms shall carefully read the information contained in this RFQ and all Attachments hereto. An incomplete Statement of Qualifications may be considered non-responsive and subject to rejection. However, the District reserves the right to seek clarifications and accept information provided after the submission of an SOQ if the District determines it is in the District’s best interests to do so.

Submit: one (1) original SOQ; ten (10) hard copies of the SOQ; and one (1) electronic copy on a USB drive. The foregoing shall all be placed in a sealed envelope addressed to:

**Bryan Payne, Contracting Officer**
LACCD Program Management Office
1055 Corporate Center Drive, 5th Floor
Monterey Park, California 91754

On the outside of the envelope write:

“Public-Private Partnership for Student Housing, Various Locations

PROCUREMENT NUMBER DW-07-17-RFQ”

All Proposals must be received **no later than 2:00 p.m. on 22 May 2017.**
Any SOQ received after this deadline may not be considered. Faxed or e-mailed SOQs may not be accepted. The District will evaluate the SOQs in accordance with the selection criteria specified in the RFQ.

V. **HOW TO PACKAGE YOUR SOQ**

This Section describes the requirements for submitting your Proposal in response to the RFQ.

**A. General Description and Requirements of SOQ**

The SOQ shall be printed on letter-size (8-1/2" x 11") paper and assembled in a three-ring binder, or with staples. Only Drawings depicting the Project may be printed on 11”x17”.

All SOQs should be prepared simply and economically, providing a straightforward, concise description showing the team’s ability to finance, develop and operate a viable Project. Emphasis shall be on the quality, completeness, clarity of content, responsiveness to the requirements, and an understanding of the District's objectives for the Site(s).

**B. Specific Contents Required In Your SOQ**

This section sets forth the specific order that your SOQ should follow.

SOQs should be well organized and demonstrate both the Applicant Firm’s qualifications and its ability to follow instructions. The SOQ to be submitted electronically must be in PDF format. Lengthy narrative is discouraged. SOQ Tab Numbers should correspond with the following paragraph/section numbers below (i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, etc.)

Please compile/assemble your SOQ consistent with the instructions provided herein.

**B.1 Cover Page**

The Cover Page should state:

Proposal from

[Insert name of your Company]

for

Public-Private Partnership

for Student Housing, Various Locations

PROCUREMENT NUMBER DW-07-17-RFQ

Proposal Submission Date: TBD, 2017

**B.2 Table of Contents**

The Table of Contents should identify all component parts of your SOQ as submitted and reference the Page Number or Tab Number where the particular item will be found.
B.3 Cover Letter/Letter of Interest.

The Cover Letter/Letter of Interest must be no more than two (2) pages and must be **SIGNED** by a representative(s) of the Applicant Firm with authorization to bind the Applicant Firm. The letter should include:

a. the name(s), address(es), telephone number(s), and fax number(s), of each of the Applicant Firm’s main offices, if the Applicant Firm is more than a single entity;

b. a statement describing why your team should be selected;

c. identification (name, address and telephone number) of the Development Firm, and in the case of a Joint Venture (“JV”) or Partnership, the identification (name, address and telephone number) of each of the firms joining in the submission of the Joint Venture or Partnership;

d. name, title, address, telephone number and email address of a contact person on behalf of the Applicant Firm for the duration of the RFQ process; and

e. **SIGNATURE** of a person authorized to bind the Applicant Firm to the terms of the RFQ and to negotiate contract terms and make binding decisions in all matters relating to this RFQ and future RFQ Documents and related agreements.

B.4 Pre-Qualification Questionnaire

The Pre-Qualification Questionnaire Form (Attachment 1 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm’s authorized individual. Carefully review Attachment 1 as it contains further specific instructions and requires you to submit additional documentation with your SOQ, such as Audited and/or Reviewed Financial Statements for the last three years.

Your SOQ must contain this Pre-Qualification Questionnaire.

B.5 Applicant Firm Information Form

The Applicant Firm’s Information Form (Attachment 2 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm authorized individual. If the Applicant Firm is a JV or Partnership, all Firm Information shall be identified.

Your SOQ must contain this Applicant Firm Information Form.

B.6 Applicant Sub Consultant Information Form

The Applicant Firm’s Sub-Consultant Information Form (Attachment 3 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm authorized individual.

Your SOQ must contain this Applicant Sub-Consultant Information Form.
B.7 Acknowledgement of Addenda Form

The Acknowledgement of Addenda Form (Attachment 4 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm’s authorized individual.

Your SOQ must contain this Acknowledgement of Addendum Form.

B.8 CED Certification Form.

The Community Economic Development (“CED”) Certification Form (Attachment 5 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm’s authorized individual.

Your SOQ must contain this CED Form.

B.9 Conflict of Interest Certification Form.

The Conflict of Interest Certification Form (Attachment 6 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm’s authorized individual.

Your SOQ must contain this Conflict of Interest Certification Form.

B.10 Non-Collusion Declaration Form.

The Non-Collusion Declaration Form (Attachment 7 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm’s authorized individual.

Your SOQ must contain this Non-Collusion Declaration Form.

B.11 Non-Discrimination Declaration Form.

The Non-Discrimination Declaration Form (Attachment 8 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm’s authorized individual.

Your SOQ must contain this Non-Discrimination Declaration Form.

B.12 Authority to Release Information Form.

The Authority to Release Information Form (Attachment 9 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm’s authorized individual.

Your SOQ must contain this Authority to Release Information Form.

B.13 Confidentiality Agreement Form.

The Confidentiality Agreement Form (Attachment 10 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm’s authorized individual.

Your SOQ must contain this Confidentiality Agreement Form.
B.14 Applicant Firm’s Representations and Certification Form

The Applicant Firm’s Representations and Certification Form (Attachment 11 to the RFQ) filled out as required by the instructions set forth therein and signed by the Applicant Firm’s authorized individual.

Your SOQ must contain this Applicant Firm’s Representations and Certification Form.

B.15 Development Team’s Qualifications.

Each SOQ shall include a section devoted to describing, as stated below, the qualifications for the Development Team that highlight why the team is the highest qualified to develop the proposed project:

1. Make-up of development team and ownership structure or proposed ownership structure if not yet in place;

2. District’s primary contact with development team;

3. Each team member’s qualifications and how they speak to the ability to successfully deliver the proposed project:
   a. Provide a table with the name of each member and the role they will have in ensuring the success of the proposed project for each step of the process, from design to operation;
   b. At a minimum, the following team members must be identified:
      i. Principal
      ii. Developer
      iii. Designer
      iv. Project Manager
      v. Other team members or consultants
   c. Provide resumes for each team member.
d. Describe if and how the team has worked together in the past.

All firms must have a business license from the State of California. California business license refers to licenses or permits or tax registration certificates issued by California cities. Corporations must be registered with the California Secretary of State. The District will verify the status of the business entity online on the Secretary of State “California Business Portal.” A copy of the license must be included in the SOQ.

B.16 Development Team’s Financial Strength.

Each SOQ shall include a section devoted to describing, as stated below, the financial strength of the Development Team that highlights the team’s current financial strength and its ability to finance, raise debt and equity, etc. at all stages of the development project:

1. Provide a narrative indicating how your team typically finances projects similar to the one proposed.

2. Provide a narrative demonstrating your team’s financial strength and ability to develop and operate the Project.

3. Submit evidence of your team’s financial strength by providing the following:
   a. Certified financial statements for the last 3 years (as part of Attachment 1);
   b. financial reports and ratings;
   c. financial references; and
   d. additional information as you deem necessary.

4. Describe your team’s relationships with financial and lending institutions that demonstrate a strong likelihood that your team will obtain the required financing

B.17 Development Team’s Past Experience

Each SOQ shall include a section devoted to describing, as stated below, the Development Team’s past experience that highlights its ability to successfully implement and execute all aspects of the proposed project:

1. Your team’s experience in successfully developing and operating projects similar to the proposed project and in a setting similar to the Site;

   3-5 projects that best demonstrate your team is able to successfully develop and operate the proposed project. Among other relevant facts, for each past project include the following:
   a. Location
   b. Development team and structure
c. Relationship to the land and asset
   i. Ground lessor/lessee, owner-user, fee-developer, etc.
   ii. Hold/sell/refinance
   iii. Public Private Partnership

d. Narrative of development’s program
   i. Description: Use mix, square footages, etc.
   ii. Complexity of project
   iii. Schedule
   iv. Site constraints
   v. Design
   vi. Environmental conditions
   vii. Entitlement Process: complexity and outreach

e. Financing strategy
   i. Debt and equity sources
   ii. Financial Partners

f. Stabilization and lease-up strategy

g. Operations strategy

h. Ability to remain on schedule

2. Your team’s experience in partnering with public agencies on similar projects

3. Your team’s experience in handling environmental contamination issues

4. References: Applicant Firm shall provide at least one references for each project submitted for this section/paragraph 16 above. References shall be, directly familiar with the project and have worked with the same individuals who form part of the Development Team. Each reference must include, at minimum, the following information:

   a. Contact Information:

   Contact Name and Title

   Street Address

   City, State, Zip Code
b. Narrative of relationship to Reference

The District may perform a performance risk evaluation based on the past performance of the Applicant Firms and their team and proposed sub-consultants as it relates to the probability of successfully developing the project. In conducting the performance risk evaluation, the District may use data provided by the Applicant Firm, references submitted by the Applicant Firm, and data obtained from any other source the District has available to it. While the District may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate, and complete past performance information rests with the firm.

B.18 Development Team’s Concepts and Vision

Each SOQ shall include a section devoted to describing, as stated below, the Development Team’s preliminary concept and vision for the Site.

Provide the following:

1. Narrative and optional illustrative depiction (Concept Plans will suffice) of the team’s development concept to understand the following:
   a. Description and duration of market and demand study to be conducted by the Developer
   b. Vision for the Site (Including College or Colleges to be considered)
   c. General character of Project including the number of housing units, room types and density to be provided.
   d. General development program
   e. Joint-Occupancy Space (Field Act Compliant)
   f. Entitlement strategy and process
   g. Design approach

2. Financing strategy for proposed Project
   a. Potential debt and equity sources
   b. Occupancy assumptions
   c. District encumbrances or participation

3. Narrative of why the Project is a good fit with the surrounding area and why it will be successful
4. Long-term strategy: will team develop and sell, lease-up and sell, develop and occupy, hold for length of lease, etc.

5. Narrative of the opportunity to collaborate with District or selected College students

**B.19 Local, Small and Emerging Business Opportunities.**

Applicant Firms will be evaluated as to whether they meet or exceed the participation **goal of 30%** as defined in Board Rule 7103.17 for by Local, Small, Emerging, and Disabled Veteran firms (“LSEDV”). The evaluation will consider whether you meet or exceed the goal based upon your own employees, or whether you do so through a teaming arrangement with a partner, and/or affiliation with a sub-consultant(s). See section 5 of the Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (Attachment 1 to this RFQ) for further instructions.

**VI. THE SELECTION PROCESS**

**A. General.**

This is a qualitative selection process and Applicant Firms will be evaluated on the basis of demonstrated competence and its qualifications to complete and operate the Project.

**B. Evaluation Committee.**

An Evaluation Committee (the “Committee”) consisting of District, PMO and/or outside experts will review, analyze, and evaluate all Proposals found to be responsive. The evaluation criteria are set forth below.

**C. Evaluation Criteria for the Proposals.**

SOQs will be evaluated based on, including but not limited to, the following:

1. Development Team’s Qualifications;
2. Development Team’s Financial Strength;
3. Development Team’s Past Experience; and
4. Development Team’s Concept and Vision

**Order of importance:**

- Items 1 & 4 are equally and most important
- Items 2 & 3 are equally important and less important than 1 & 4
- Items 5 & 6 are equally important and less important than 2 & 3

Internal Scoring by the Evaluation Committee will be based on the written SOQs.
VII. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFQ PROCESS

A. Generally.

The District expressly reserves the unqualified right to undertake any of the following if advantageous to the District:

1. Accept or reject any or all of the submitted SOQs;

2. Waive or decline to waive any and all defects as to form, content, informalities, technical inconsistencies and/or irregularities in any Proposal, or in the RFQ process;

3. Terminate the RFQ process at any time;

4. Modify and/or suspend any and all aspects of the RFQ;

5. Re-issue the RFQ;

6. Extend the time frame for submission of the SOQs, and/or any other time frames and/or dates set forth in the RFQ, by notification to the parties known to District to have received a copy of the RFQ;

7. To accept amendments (if requested by the District) to a SOQ after expiration of the deadline for receipt of the SOQs, but only if requested by the District;

8. To request clarification of information submitted, or to request additional information, from any or all Applicant Firms;

9. Hold all SOQs for a period of ninety (90) days after the deadline for receipt of Proposals;

10. Decline to enter into a contract(s) with any Applicant Firm; and

11. To conduct personal interviews and/or negotiations with any or all Applicant Firms during the RFQ process before making a final selection.

B. Specifically.

1. The SOQs submitted in response to this RFQ will become the property of the District and may be used by the District in any way it deems appropriate.

2. While the information submitted in your SOQ will become a public record after selection of developer, the reviewed and audited financial information submitted by a Applicant Firm will remain confidential and not disclosed in response to any Public Record Act Request or similar request for information, unless required by law, ordered by a Court, or until after notice to a Applicant Firm. District will use these documents as part of the basis of rating a Applicant Firm for future development projects. District reserves the right to verify and check information submitted from all other sources available to District.
3. Acceptance of any SOQ will take into consideration the reliability of the Applicant Firm, past documented performance of the Applicant Firm, and all of its proposed officers, directors, employees, team members and sub-consultants, and the appropriateness of the information provided. The District will, in the exercise of its discretion, be the sole judge in the determination of the quality and appropriateness of a SOQ. The District's decision will be final.

4. All costs for preparation, submission and/or delivery incurred by the Applicant Firm are the sole responsibility of the Applicant Firm and will not be paid by the District. The District will not be liable for any costs incurred in the preparation of a SOQ or incidental to the preparation and presentation of SOQs either orally or in writing. Any costs incurred in the preparation of the SOQ, in the submission of additional information, and/or in any other aspect of the SOQ before the award of a contract will be borne by the Applicant Firm.

5. SOQs that are submitted with conditional clauses, alterations, items not called for in the RFQ, or irregularities of any kind, are subject to rejection by the District, at its option.

6. By submitting a SOQ, the Applicant Firm acknowledges that it has investigated and satisfied itself as to the conditions affecting the Site and the proposed project. The District shall not be responsible for any conclusions or interpretations made by a Applicant Firm of the information made available by the District.

7. The submission of a SOQ shall be prima facie evidence that the Applicant Firm has full knowledge of the opportunity presented and the condition of the Site as well as the challenges associated with the proposed Project. The receipt by the District of a SOQ will indicate that the Applicant Firm understands the same.

8. The District reserves the right to require that the Applicant Firm demonstrate that it has the skills, financial wherewithal, personnel, equipment, and other resources, necessary to satisfactorily perform the nature and magnitude of the Project.

9. The Applicant Firm shall furnish the District with such additional information as the District may reasonably require.

10. The District will require the selected Developer to have all required business licenses and appropriate valid professional licenses. Evidence of appropriate insurance and/or bonding coverage/capacity must be provided when the Applicant Firm/Developer is selected to enter into lease and related agreements with the District.

11. SOQs received after the time and date specified, whether delivered or mailed, may not be considered and may be returned to the Applicant Firm unopened, at the sole discretion of the District. It is the sole responsibility of each Applicant Firm to ensure that its SOQ arrives at the required location before the time and date specified.
12. No individual or firm responding to this RFQ shall obtain any claim or cause of action against the District by reason of any aspect of the RFQ process, defects or abnormalities contained herein, defects or abnormalities in the selection process, the rejection of any SOQ, the acceptance of any SOQ, any statements, representation, acts or omissions of the District, the exercise of any discretion by the District in connection with any of the foregoing, or any and all other matters arising out of all or any of the foregoing. No Applicant Firm shall rely and cannot rely on any verbal communication received from anyone representing and/or purporting to represent the District in connection with this Procurement, all of which are hereby disclaimed and disavowed.

13. All references in this RFQ to Firm, Contracted Firm, Developer, Development Team, Applicant Firm, and/or other person or persons, are intended only as generic terms and shall be interpreted to apply to any number and any gender, as applicable.

14. Summaries contained in the RFQ documents covering matters expressly addressed in more detail elsewhere in the RFQ documents are for the convenience of the Applicant Firm and in all such instances the more specific, detailed provisions shall govern.

15. Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding paragraph, in the event of a conflict between the terms of the RFQ Documents and any term or condition in the Exhibits and Attachments thereto, the latter shall govern.

16. Applicant Firms are solely responsible to satisfy themselves as to the suitability of any information related to the Site or Property such as title reports, well reports, environmental reports, market studies, estimates, projections, budgets, design concepts, technical criteria, reports, surveys, test data, and other information provided by the District. Nothing contained in the RFQ Documents, or in any other information provided by the District, shall be construed as implying the creation or existence of any warranty, express or implied, on the part of the District with respect to the completeness, accuracy, or sufficiency thereof.

17. Applicant Firms shall not, before issuance of a Notice of Intent to Award resulting from the RFQ, communicate, either verbally or in writing, with any of the following persons (other than the person designated in this RFQ for the purpose of seeking clarification regarding the requirements of the RFQ documents or the selection process: (1) any member of the Evaluation Committee; (2) any employee of the District involved in the RFQ process; (2) any consultant or professional retained by the District for the purpose of providing the District advice or professional services in respect to any aspect of the RFQ process; or (3) any trustee, officer, employee, or representative of the District. Unauthorized communication by a Applicant Firm in violation of the foregoing constitutes grounds for disqualification. Doing so is immediate grounds for disqualification from this Procurement process.

18. Except as otherwise provided elsewhere in the RFQ documents, all procedures and proceedings provided for by these Instructions shall be closed to the public.
19. Applicant Firm shall sign and submit all required Attachments with its SOQ in the quantity specified in Section V., entitled “How to Package Your SOQ”. The District reserves the right to determine, in its sole and absolute discretion, whether any circumstances constitute a conflict of interest that may disqualify a Applicant Firm from participating further in the RFQ process.

20. The District shall have the right to make all determinations and interpretations relating to the RFQ documents or the qualification process, including, without limitation, any Applicant Firm’s compliance with the RFQ documents or its qualifications to participate in the RFQ process, and all such determinations shall be final and binding.

21. Nothing stated in the RFQ Documents and no action by the District taken in connection with the RFQ process shall constitute, or be interpreted as, creating any legal obligation on the part of the District to enter into a contract(s) with any Applicant Firm.

22. Any Applicant Firm who at any point in time during the qualification or Procurement process is determined by the District, in the exercise of its sole and absolute discretion, to be unable to deliver and operate the proposed project may be declared disqualified from the process by the District and in such case will not be allowed to participate further in the process.

23. The District shall have the right, but not the obligation, before, during, or after scoring the SOQs, to disqualify on the grounds of non-responsiveness any Applicant Firm who submits a SOQ that does not comply with the requirements of the RFQ.

24. District shall have the right, but assumes no obligation, to investigate the facts or circumstances of any response or information provided by a Applicant Firm. The District has no obligation to afford any Applicant Firm the opportunity to respond to any adverse information that may be received as a result of such investigation or that comes to the attention of District by other means. In addition to the foregoing, the District shall have the right, but not the obligation, at any time to designate auditors to perform audits or reviews of the books or accounts of any Applicant Firm and in such instances the Applicant Firm shall make provision for, and is responsible to ensure full and prompt cooperation with, such audits or reviews, at no cost to the District.

25. Unless requested by the District in a RFQ Addendum or Request for Clarification, a Applicant Firm shall not have the right after the deadline for receipt of SOQs, to submit new or additional information or supplement its SOQ. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the District reserves the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, but assumes no obligation, to request, receive, evaluate, and consider, as part of its evaluation of a SOQ, any additional or supplemental information received from any source, including, without limitation, information received after the deadline for receipt of SOQs. Nothing stated herein shall be interpreted as limiting the District’s right to seek additional information from a Applicant Firm pursuant to Clarifications, Discussions, or Negotiations, if any are held.
26. A determination that a Applicant Firm’s and/or SOQ is not “responsive” and/or “disqualified from further participation in the RFQ process” does not constitute a determination by the District that the Applicant Firm is not a responsible Applicant Firm and in no way should be taken to reflect on the competency and/or character of a Applicant Firm. Conversely, a determination that a Applicant Firm’s and/or SOQ is “responsive” and/or “permitted to continue in further participation in the RFQ process” does not constitute a waiver of the District’s right to make a subsequent determination, based on new information not considered as part of the qualification evaluation process and/or RFQ process, that such a Applicant Firm is not responsive and/or not qualified to satisfactorily perform the required services or work sought by this RFQ.

27. The rights, powers, and discretion expressly conferred upon the District under the RFQ documents are not intended to be exclusive but are cumulative and in addition to, and not a substitute for, every other right, power, or discretion existing or available to the District under the RFQ documents or Applicable Laws.

28. The District, in the exercise of its sole and absolute discretion, may make available, for those unsuccessful Applicant Firms requesting it, an opportunity for a debriefing. If conducted, debriefings will be conducted after the selection of Developer pursuant to the RFQ. At the debriefing, Applicant Firms will be provided with: (1) a summary of the District's evaluation of significant weaknesses or deficiencies in: (a) the Applicant Firm’s SOQ; (b) performance during the RFQ/RFQ process, and/or (c) the SOQ; (2) the overall rating of the Applicant Firm Firm's responses on the selection criteria in the RFQ/RFQ process; and (3) the overall ranking of all SOQs and Applicant Firms and overall ranking of all SOQs and Applicant Firms. However, copies of competing SOQs and SOQs and evaluation work sheets of the RFQ/RFQ Evaluation Committee will not be provided. Debriefings shall not include a point-by-point comparison of the de-briefed SOQ with other SOQs or the debriefed SOQs with other SOQs. Debriefings shall not include disclosure of any information prohibited from disclosure by Applicable Laws or exempt from release under Applicable Laws pertaining to release of public records, including, without limitation, information constituting trade secrets or other proprietary information.

29. **Ongoing Obligation to Update the District Regarding Information.** If at any time during this RFQ Process, any information submitted by a Applicant Firm becomes inaccurate, incomplete, and/or untrue, the Applicant Firm must immediately notify the District representative identified herein and immediately provide updated accurate information in writing, under penalty of perjury.

30. District reserves the right to waive any irregularities and omissions in the information contained in a SOQ, to make all final determinations, and/or to determine, at any time, that the selection process for the Procurement should be abandoned. Each Applicant Firm assumes all risks and/or consequences of an incorrect delivery or an untimely delivery of a SOQ. Applicant Firm assumes any and all financial risk of
loss in participating in this process and the District shall not, under any circumstance, 
be liable for any cost, expense, loss, or damage sustained by an Applicant Firm 
participating in this process.

31. Information provided as part of this procurement is provided as a courtesy only and 
the District does not guarantee its accuracy, the Development team must make its 
own due diligence with regards to all aspects of the Site, property and proposed 
project.

VII. DOCUMENTS COMPRISING THE RFQ

The following Chart indicates the various documents that form the RFQ at time of its issuance.

The following Chart also indicates the order in which the documents forming the RFQ are 
assembled and issued.

The following Chart is provided as a courtesy and convenience only to the Applicant Firms to 
assist and/or help in the Applicant Firms’ understanding the format and content of the RFQ.

RFQ DOCUMENTS CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Attachments to RFQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pre-Qualification Questionnaire – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Firm Information Form – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sub-Consultant Form – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of Addenda Form – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CED Certification Form – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conflict of Interest Certification Form – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Non-Collusion Declaration Form – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Non-Discrimination Declaration Form – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Authority to Release Information Form – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Confidentiality Agreement Form – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Applicant Representations and Certification Form – To be issued via Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORMS 1 THROUGH 11 MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH YOUR SOQ.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following Attachments below all contain terms, conditions and provisions of the RFQ. 
These Attachments are not to be turned in with your SOQ, BUT should be taken into careful 
consideration in submitting your SOQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Attachments to RFQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Joint Occupancy Lease (with Exhibits) (Sample) [to be provided with the RFP]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Development Agreement (with Exhibits) (Sample) [to be provided with the RFP]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 1: Contractor SOQ [with RFQ Attachments 1-10] (place holder) 
Exhibit 2: Community Economic Development Policy (See Attachment 14)
Availability of the RFQ and its Documents.

This RFQ and all documents forming a part thereof are available at:


Vendor registration is required prior to downloading the RFQ documents.

END OF RFQ DOCUMENT
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I. Propositions A/AA & Measure J Program Reserve Release
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I. Propositions A/AA & Measure J Program Reserve Release
### Program Reserve Release Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Original Contribution Percent</th>
<th>Original Contribution Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>$18,946,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>$22,175,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$15,217,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>$14,760,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>$21,259,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>$13,694,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>$19,709,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>$20,656,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>$13,579,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$160,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Release of Program Reserve Funds based on:**

- Current estimated risk from Propositions A/AA and Measure J to be covered by Measure CC funds;
- College pro rata portion of contribution;
- Reserve to be committed based on priority needs.
## I. Propositions A/AA & Measure J Program Reserve Release

### Program Reserve Release Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Original Contribution Percent</th>
<th>Original Contribution Value</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Draws</th>
<th>Available for Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>$18,946,450</td>
<td>$2,368,306</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16,578,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>22,175,933</td>
<td>2,771,992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,403,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>15,217,573</td>
<td>1,902,197</td>
<td>1,041,000</td>
<td>12,274,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>14,760,179</td>
<td>1,845,022</td>
<td>6,828,933</td>
<td>6,086,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>21,259,263</td>
<td>2,657,408</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,601,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>13,694,842</td>
<td>1,711,855</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,982,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>19,709,971</td>
<td>2,463,746</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,246,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>20,656,131</td>
<td>2,582,016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,074,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>13,579,658</td>
<td>1,697,457</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>9,582,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$160,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,169,933</strong></td>
<td><strong>$129,830,067</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \( A = B - C - D \)
- \( B = A \times 20M \)

**Original Program Reserve Value**
- $160M

**Total Draws**
- $30M

**Total Remaining**
- $130M

---

*BuildLACCD*

*Building for tomorrow’s leaders*
Commitment of Program Reserve funds to be applied based on the following priorities:

**PRIORITY 1**
- Current active Propositions A/AA and Measure J projects without adequate funding;
- No College initiated change orders

**PRIORITY 2**
- Previously deferred projects;
- High priority on College project list

**PRIORITY 3**
- New project that is consistent with needs identified on College prioritized project list
I. Propositions A/AA & Measure J Program Reserve Release

Process for Colleges to Request Release of Program Reserve Funds

1. Review Conditions for Use of Released Program Reserve Funds;

2. Create Released Program Reserve Funds ("RPFR") Project Request (otherwise known as a White Paper) documenting:
   - Support criteria for application of the funds;
   - Changes to Project Prioritization List; and
   - Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate supported by a Project Estimate Worksheet (PEW) for each eligible project.

3. Circulate RPRF Project Request for necessary approvals from College, PMO & District;

4. Budget transfer to be executed to commit appropriate funds after RPRF Project Request is approved.
II. Measure CC Implementation Plan
II.a Background

- July 2016 presentation to Board: “Facilities Needs Overview”;
- November 2016 passage of Measure CC for $3.3B of funds;
- Numerous **stakeholder discussions** regarding Measure CC Implementation Plan:

**District**
- Chancellor and Executive Staff;
- Interim Chief Facilities Executive;
- Lead Construction Counsel

**College**
- All 9 Presidents and respective staffs;
- Respective student, faculty, administrative, and employee stakeholder groups;

**Committees**
- Updates to the District Citizens Oversight Committee;
- Bond Steering Committee;
- Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee

- Refinement of College Project Lists identifying:
  - Remaining Propositions A/AA and Measure J funded projects;
  - Deferred Propositions A/AA and Measure J projects;
  - Proposed new Measure CC projects by each College;
  - Priority of Projects
II.b Goals of the Proposed Approval Process

Overall goal of Bond Program - to create first class learning facilities that support current enrollment and increased enrollment in the years to come.

1. Develop project approval framework:
   - Develop complete list of prioritized projects by Colleges;
   - Categorize projects so like projects may be evaluated against applicable criteria;
   - Develop “needs and data based” project review criteria for each category;
   - Develop project submittal process to allow each College to demonstrate how proposed projects meet applicable criteria.

2. Develop a Phased Approach for release of funds:
   - Prevent over commitment of funds to just a few Colleges;
   - Prevent a “rushing to the gate” for the funds;
   - Ensures every College receives funding.
Approval Framework
## II.c Proposed Framework for Project Approvals

### Project List Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Square Footage or other Units</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of proposed project; Identification of New or Modernization.</td>
<td>Based on College ranking.</td>
<td>Classroom; Student Support; Labs; Infrastructure; Demolition</td>
<td>Size of proposed project; Size of existing structures to be demolished</td>
<td>Estimated costs; To be validated for hard and soft costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.c Proposed Framework for Project Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>College Specific Projects - Four Categories</th>
<th>District-wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Instructional Space</td>
<td>• New classroom or lab space</td>
<td>• Site and cyber security;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports education master plan</td>
<td>• Health &amp; safety;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernize Instructional Space</td>
<td>• Renovation of classroom or lab space</td>
<td>• Improved space utilization;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports education master plan</td>
<td>• Technology infrastructure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services (&quot;Whole Campus</td>
<td>• New or renovation of core student support</td>
<td>• Accessibility (ADA);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept&quot;)</td>
<td>services including:</td>
<td>• Storm water;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student union;</td>
<td>• Water conservation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Food service;</td>
<td>• Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Child care;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Athletic program;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sheriff Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services (Operational)</td>
<td>• Campus operational elements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data center;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Central Plant improvements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Review Criteria Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Programming:</th>
<th>Growth:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Primary use of space</td>
<td>• Full Time Equivalent Students (&quot;FTES&quot;) Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education Plan</td>
<td>• Capacity Load Ratios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Support market demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Changes driven by student and employer demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supported by Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning:</th>
<th>Space:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Education Master Plan</td>
<td>• Net Square Footage Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>• Improved Space Utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Planning (CEQA &amp; EIR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition:</th>
<th>Cost:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Facility Condition Index (&quot;FCI&quot;)</td>
<td>• Expended Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace Non-Permanent Structures</td>
<td>• Life Cycle Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Total Projected Costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five Primary Review Questions For Proposed Projects

1. Does the proposed project align with the Ballot Language?

2. Is the proposed project a District-wide project or College Specific project?

3. If the proposed project is College Specific, which Category does it fit within?

4. How does the proposed College Specific project support the Category Prioritization Criteria?

5. Has the sum of the requested College Specific projects exceeded the College Funding Threshold (See slides 23-24)?
### II.c Proposed Framework for Project Approvals

#### Top Priority Measure CC Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LACC</td>
<td>Demolition and Replacement of Cesar Chavez Administration Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAC</td>
<td>New Public Service Bldg. (AJ, Fire Tech, Forensic Lab, Gen. Lecture, Classrooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAHC</td>
<td>SPS Health Center (Student Health Veteran Center Disabled Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMC</td>
<td>Student Services, Administration Building and Emergency Safety Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPC</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Academic and Workforce Education Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASC</td>
<td>Student Union Building and an upgrade and expansion of Central Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATTC</td>
<td>Construction Technology Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVC</td>
<td>Demolition and Replacement of Campus Center Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLAC</td>
<td>Heldman Learning Resource Center (HLRC) - Replacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.c Proposed Framework for Project Approvals

Top Priority Measure CC Projects

LACC - Demolition and Replacement of Cesar Chavez Administration Building

• Previously deferred project that provides:
  – Additional medium and large capacity classrooms to assist with enrollment and room scheduling efficiency;
  – Improved operational efficiency of the administrative spaces regarding access and support to students.

ELAC - New Public Service Building (AJ, Fire Tech, Forensic Lab, General Lecture, Classrooms)

• Administration of Justice (Police/Fire Technology) serves over 3,500 FTES annually;
• Prepare students for vocational and career jobs in the public service sector;
• Includes removal of temporary portable bungalows by December 2019;
II.c Proposed Framework for Project Approvals

Top Priority Measure CC Projects

LAHC – Special Programs and Services (SPS) Health Center

- Facilitate specific programs and functions related to student success (i.e. assessment, counseling, student health, mental health, and special services for students with disabilities, and veterans affairs);
- New facility will enable removal of all modular/portable buildings;
- Current program facilities suffer from heating/cooling issues and substandard space including ADA compliance and restroom issues.

LASC – Student Union Building and an upgrade and expansion of Central Plant

- The proposed Student Union Building meets the intent of Measure CC priorities by ensuring that students will have a place to study, obtain healthy food choices, and a place to meet for co- and extracurricular activities that we now have to host off campus due to the lack of adequate facilities. By upgrading our Central Plant, we will have increased Central Plant capacity for our new School of Science and the proposed Student Union building.
Top Priority Measure CC Projects

LAPC – Multi-Purpose Academic and Workforce Education Building

- Project would construct classroom technology facilities that would replace 4 existing wood framed structures that are over 50 years old. The existing structures would be demolished thereby removing lead /asbestos and provide for new gas, sewer and water lines that would have required repair at the existing structures.

LATTC – Construction Technology Building

- The Construction Technology Building project will construct a new state-of-the-art building to house our Construction, Maintenance & Utilities (CMU). The educational programing of this building supports the largest pathway of the College (approximately 3,000 students each semester) and will prepare students/veterans for work and will allow us to expand our special populations programs; all programs in the CMU have an AA degree/transfer opportunity;
II.c Proposed Framework for Project Approvals

Top Priority Measure CC Projects

LAVC – Demolition and Replacement of Campus Center Building

- The Campus Center building FCI is 52% and needs significant code and ADA enhancements. The cost to renovate the building is almost two-thirds of what it would cost to replace the building. There are significant changes to building codes that would have to be addressed with a renovation. The building includes lecture and lab classrooms, faculty offices, psychological services, and our much-used large gathering space, Monarch Hall.

WLAC – Heldman Learning Resource Center (HLRC) - Replacement

- A multiple-purpose four/five-story building that will house flexible classroom space to meet the instructional needs of our allied health programs (including dental hygiene, the only baccalaureate degree in the LACCD) as well to provide an IT data center, learning resources center, and student support offices (including a student union). This construction will replace cumulatively, 19 structures and will result in a net reduction of approximately 58,000 gross SF.
II.c Proposed Framework for Project Approvals

Top Priority Measure CC Projects

LAMC – Student Services, Administration Building and Emergency Safety Center

• The Student Services Building will significantly contribute to student success, transfer, and veterans resources by providing LAMC a whole campus whereby all academic and student support services are in one location.
• The Emergency Safety Center will contribute to campus safety and security by locating the LAMC Sheriff station in the vacated building once the Student Services Building is completed. The City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Department is scheduled to locate a Valley Emergency Operations Center (EOC) next to the LAMC Sheriff’s Station. The EOC will provide public safety training for police officers, firefighters, and emergency medical technicians.
Phased Approach
II.c Proposed Framework for Project Approvals

Phased Approach for College Specific Projects

**Phase 1**
(Every College Receives $XX M)
- Each College receives equivalent minimum floor funding

**Phase 2**
(Consideration of College Specific Thresholds)
- Establish threshold for each College for remaining available funding;
- Threshold based on consideration of FCI and FTES values.

**Phase 3**
(Consideration of Program Reserve)
- Release Program Reserve as risk decreases.
II.c Proposed Framework for Project Approvals

### Phase 2 – College Specific Thresholds [FCI × FTES]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>FCI&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>FTES&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>FCI × FTES</th>
<th>% of [FCI × FTES] to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Southwest College</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>5,703</td>
<td>39,180</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6,723</td>
<td>38,657</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Harbor College</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>7,079</td>
<td>126,926</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles College</td>
<td>27.95</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>229,302</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Trade-Tech College</td>
<td>43.52</td>
<td>13,477</td>
<td>586,519</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Valley College</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>13,572</td>
<td>348,529</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City College</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td>13,151</td>
<td>292,873</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Pierce College</td>
<td>28.93</td>
<td>15,885</td>
<td>459,553</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles College &amp; Southgate</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>25,161</td>
<td>817,733</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,939,271</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
(1) Based on the state FUSION Assessment Report - FCI Report dated January 11, 2017 (California Community Colleges FUSION).
(2) FTES is based on Attendance Accounting projections for 2016-17 as included in the "Projection of Instructional Load by College, 2016-2023" report.
• Semi Annual Program Risk Update
• As risk decreases, program reserve funds released for new projects
• New projects to undergo review in accordance with Framework Approval process prior to allocation of Program Reserve funds
Proposed Next Steps
II.c Proposed Next Steps

• **College Specific:**
  – Refine phased release approach:
    • Set minimum floor funding;
    • Define threshold for remaining available funds (currently FCI x FTES percentage);
    • Define release methodology for Program Reserve as risk decreases.
  – Refine criteria and develop weighting, scoring, and submittal template for project approvals;
  – Refine project cost estimates.

• **District-wide:**
  – Identify if District-wide standards exist for needed work scopes;
  – Develop minimum standards and scopes of work needed to bring each campus up to minimum standards for the District-wide project category;
  – Engage design and other consultants to review, assess and evaluate current status and needs at each College relative to District-wide projects (built under Propositions A/AA and/or Measure J and what’s needed under Measure CC);
  – Develop cost estimates for the required projects.
To: Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee
From: Paul Steinke, Program Director
Subject: BuildLACCD Internship Program
Date: May 23, 2017

The BuildLACCD Internship Program provides students and recent graduates of the Los Angeles Community College District a meaningful, ten week, paid internship that provides each participant the opportunity to bridge the gap between their academic studies and the practical world of technology, engineering, architecture, and construction management. Since 2013, under the auspices of the Program Manager AECOM, the BuildLACCD Internship Program has been given greater importance. The number and variety of internships available has increased: more than 130 applicants have received internships through BuildLACCD. There are currently 22 BuildLACCD student interns with location assignments that include the College Project Team offices and the Program Management Office as well as at other AECOM project sites.

Application

Those interested in being considered for a BuildLACCD internship must complete and file an application available on the BuildLACCD web site. Adhering to specified deadlines for the internships, applicants provide information about their academic and career interests. Qualified applicants are interviewed in person. Those selected for an internship are required to follow the established AECOM onboarding process and must review, accept, and adhere to the BuildLACCD Code of Conduct.

Opportunities

AECOM recognizes the importance of an educated workforce to meet the needs of the local economy. For this reason, as the Program Manager for BuildLACCD, AECOM has focused additional energy and resources on the BuildLACCD Internship Program and encourages all firms participating in BuildLACCD also participate in the Internship Program.
BuildLACCD Landing Page - Desktop

LASC - School of Career and Technical Education

Program Facts
- $9.59 Billion total
- $4.19 Billion to obligate
- 630 Projects completed
- 189 Projects remaining
- 4 Bond measures
- 9 Colleges
- 250,000 students annually

632 Projects Completed
$5.01 Billion Expended
$4.19 Billion To obligate
$5.39 Billion Contracted

Interested in Doing Business with LACCD?
Register with PlanetBids to view and download bid documents.

www.buildlaccd.org/reports
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Program Dashboard Report

APR 2017 Dashboard
APR 2017 Program Summary Dashboard

Long-Range Facilities Master Plans

City College
City College Long Range Facilities Master Plan Update (Sept. 2008)

East LA College
ELAC Facilities Master Plan Site Plan (April 2009)
ELAC Facilities Master Plan FMP&OC presentation (April 2013)
ELAC Draft Update to Facilities Master Plan 2012-18 (March 2015)

Harbor College
Harbor Facilities Master Plan Site Plan Update (May 2008)
Harbor First Amendment to the 2010 Facilities Master Plan (Aug. 2013)

Mission College
Mission Facilities Master Plan Update (July 2015)
Mobile Dashboard Program Level Summary
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FUND SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
<th>Current Funding</th>
<th>Contracted</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Funding Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop A</td>
<td>$1,360,674,775</td>
<td>$1,335,843,925</td>
<td>$1,323,726,061</td>
<td>$1,357,933,831</td>
<td>$2,740,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop AA</td>
<td>$1,084,503,840</td>
<td>$1,016,321,111</td>
<td>$1,006,436,509</td>
<td>$1,047,245,209</td>
<td>$7,258,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure J</td>
<td>$3,429,734,884</td>
<td>$2,734,815,113</td>
<td>$2,381,448,619</td>
<td>$3,415,514,881</td>
<td>$14,219,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure CC</td>
<td>$3,500,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,500,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Local/Fed</td>
<td>$314,401,102</td>
<td>$306,659,000</td>
<td>$304,264,694</td>
<td>$314,762,957</td>
<td>($381,555)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Reserve</td>
<td>$120,871,067</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$120,871,067</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,590,185,448</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,393,865,149</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,015,874,473</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,435,456,877</strong></td>
<td><strong>$154,728,571</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUND ALLOCATION OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE PROJECTS</th>
<th>Current Funding</th>
<th>Contracted</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Funding Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles College</td>
<td>$663,701,210</td>
<td>$653,459,020</td>
<td>$616,317,743</td>
<td>$663,701,210</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City College</td>
<td>$580,440,910</td>
<td>$551,040,461</td>
<td>$483,204,682</td>
<td>$580,440,910</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Harbor College</td>
<td>$450,111,780</td>
<td>$437,617,883</td>
<td>$402,702,065</td>
<td>$451,452,780</td>
<td>($1,041,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>$445,480,643</td>
<td>$426,214,708</td>
<td>$418,465,427</td>
<td>$445,480,643</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Southwest College</td>
<td>$405,093,672</td>
<td>$392,902,556</td>
<td>$376,376,293</td>
<td>$405,093,672</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Trade-Tech College</td>
<td>$550,455,065</td>
<td>$520,514,020</td>
<td>$469,052,764</td>
<td>$550,455,065</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Valley College</td>
<td>$811,302,668</td>
<td>$870,887,820</td>
<td>$106,015,405</td>
<td>$811,302,668</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce College</td>
<td>$626,832,413</td>
<td>$507,711,145</td>
<td>$472,240,250</td>
<td>$626,832,413</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles College</td>
<td>$399,150,600</td>
<td>$364,106,583</td>
<td>$560,238,543</td>
<td>$399,150,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,782,849,457</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,376,173,296</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,094,619,151</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,763,890,457</strong></td>
<td><strong>($1,941,000)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Current Funding</th>
<th>Contracted</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Funding Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles College</td>
<td>$505,701,210</td>
<td>$505,486,020</td>
<td>$516,317,743</td>
<td>$505,701,210</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City College</td>
<td>$450,411,792</td>
<td>$457,017,683</td>
<td>$452,702,006</td>
<td>$451,452,785</td>
<td>$(1,041,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Harbor College</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>$400,000,000</td>
<td>$390,000,000</td>
<td>$370,000,000</td>
<td>$400,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Southwest College</td>
<td>$500,455,355</td>
<td>$500,455,355</td>
<td>$500,455,355</td>
<td>$500,455,355</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Trade-Tech College</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Valley College</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce College</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles College</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Summary Dashboard:
- COLLEGES
- SubProject
- CURRENT FUNDING
- CONTRACTED
- EXPENDED
- ESTIMATE AT COMPLETION
- FUNDING VARIANCE

Legend:
- COMPLETED
- CANCELLED
- ACTIVE
- OBDB

Rollup:
- Science and Technology Building
- Family Life Science
- Maintenance Facilities
- Cesar Chavez - Admin Building Modernization
- Cesar Chavez - Hall Modernization
- East West Hall Modernization
- Franklin Hall Modernization
- Jefferson Hall Modernization

Funding Variance:
- $0
- $(1,041,000)
Questions?
Industry Recognition Awards received by BuildLACCD 2016—2017

PROGRAMMATIC AWARDS
Liberty Mutual Insurance, the insurance underwriter for the workers compensation and general liability program that covers the construction companies on BuildLACCD projects, recognized the District with four construction safety awards:

1. 2016 Commendation Award for Outstanding Safety Performance
For construction and modernization projects throughout the District.

2. 2016 Gold Safety Award for Outstanding Safety Performance
Awarded for construction projects at Los Angeles Mission College, where the lost time accident frequency rate was 80 percent better than the construction industry average as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

3. 2016 Gold Safety Award for Outstanding Safety Performance
Awarded for construction projects at Los Angeles Pierce College, where the lost time accident frequency rate was 80 percent better than the construction industry average as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

4. 2016 Silver Safety Award for Exceptional Safety Performance
Awarded for construction projects at East Los Angeles College, where the lost time accident frequency rate was 60 percent better than the construction average as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
5. Construction Management Association of America - Southern California Chapter: 2017 Creating Opportunities for Diversity and Equality (CODE) Award for Outstanding Community Outreach Program

The LACCD was the first recipient of the CODE award which recognizes outreach efforts and training workshops focused on increasing government contracting participation of Local, Small, Emerging, and Disabled Veteran-owned businesses.


Honors the extraordinary work of government projects that used Bentley Systems Building Information Modeling/Geographic Information System (BIM/GIS) software to advance infrastructure design, construction, and operations throughout the world.

7. GREENBUILD 2016 International Conference and Expo - Official Tour Site

Los Angeles Harbor College hosted Expo participants from around the world and showcased the unique design and sustainability features recently completed throughout the campus.
PROJECT AWARDS

Ernest H. Moreno Language Arts & Humanities, East Los Angeles College
Community College Facility Coalition, 2016 Award of Honor
This award recognized the importance of this project towards the implementation of the College's curriculum and educational efforts.

Student Union (Monarch Center),
Los Angeles Valley College

1. Community College Facility Coalition, 2016 Professional Design Award of Excellence
This award recognized the importance of this project to the College's educational efforts.

2. Design-Build Institute of America, 2016 Design-Build Project/Team Award
This award recognized the use of Design-Build best practices.

3. Engineering News Record (ENR), 2016 California's Best Projects, Higher Education/Research: Award of Merit
This award recognized the project as one of the region’s best Higher Education construction projects.
Science Complex, Los Angeles Harbor College

1. **US Green Building Council - LA Chapter: 2016 Project of the Year Award**
   This award recognized commitment to a sustainable built environment.

   This award recognized the project’s innovations and approach to protecting the environment.

3. **US Green Building Council - LA Chapter: 2016 Innovation in Design Merit Award.**
   This award recognized the project’s innovative use of sustainable design practices.

   This award recognized the building as designed because its operation consumes only as much energy as is produced from clean, renewable resources.
### Los Angeles City College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Original Construction Contract Value</th>
<th>Aggregate Approved Change Order Amount to Date</th>
<th>Current Revised Contract Amount to Date</th>
<th>EAC (Construction Only)</th>
<th>Physical % Complete</th>
<th>Original (Contract) Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Revised Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Current Forecasted Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01C-173.03</td>
<td>RWGPL - Traffic Mitigation (Red-Line)</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>$5,397,000</td>
<td>$385,360</td>
<td>$5,782,360</td>
<td>$6,355,276</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>Potential cost risk due to differing site conditions and inaccurate as-built drawings as well as the City inspector has noted that the width of the sidewalk is not per code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>01C-176.00</td>
<td>Da Vinci Hall Modernization</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>$18,488,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$18,488,300</td>
<td>$17,088,179</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Dec-18</td>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### East Los Angeles College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Original Construction Contract Value</th>
<th>Aggregate Approved Change Order Amount to Date</th>
<th>Current Revised Contract Amount to Date</th>
<th>EAC (Construction Only)</th>
<th>Physical % Complete</th>
<th>Original (Contract) Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Revised Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Current Forecasted Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ESE-302.06 - Science Career Mathematics Building (Sb) (Earth Sciences)</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>$5,191,425</td>
<td>$4,380,163</td>
<td>$18,711,583</td>
<td>$13,304,025</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40J-202.01 ADA Compliance Phase 1 - Exterior</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DBB-P</td>
<td>$4,164,092</td>
<td>$229,502</td>
<td>$4,393,593</td>
<td>$4,393,594</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>Potential cost risk due to requested redesign of Transit Plaza by Metro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40J-209.01 East Stormwater-West and Central Section of Campus</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,133,158</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>Schedule risk due to the discovery of transite pipe. CPT is currently assessing impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Los Angeles Harbor College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Original Construction Contract Value</th>
<th>Aggregate Approved Change Order Amount to Date</th>
<th>Current Revised Contract Amount to Date</th>
<th>EAC (Construction Only)</th>
<th>Physical % Complete</th>
<th>Original (Contract) Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Revised Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Current Forecasted Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S3H-350.03 S.A.I.L.S. - Infrastructure Land &amp; Hardscape Security</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>$16,260,112</td>
<td>$(97,513)</td>
<td>$16,162,599</td>
<td>$16,655,887</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
<td>Potential time extension, due to inclement weather, to be determined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Los Angeles Mission College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Original Construction Contract Value</th>
<th>Aggregate Approved Change Order Amount to Date</th>
<th>Current Revised Contract Amount to Date</th>
<th>EAC (Construction Only)</th>
<th>Physical % Complete</th>
<th>Original (Contract) Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Revised Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Current Forecasted Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EBM-405.02 Media Arts Center</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>$17,923,281</td>
<td>$12,148,979</td>
<td>$11,998,188</td>
<td>$8,780,049</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Los Angeles Pierce College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Original Construction Contract Value</th>
<th>Aggregate Approved Change Order Amount to Date</th>
<th>Current Revised Contract Amount to Date</th>
<th>EAC (Construction Only)</th>
<th>Physical % Complete</th>
<th>Original (Contract) Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Revised Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Current Forecasted Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Various - North of Main (NOM) - Phase #1</td>
<td>In claims</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,388,647</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,388,647</td>
<td>$5,279,139</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>Cost risk due to subsurface conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>05P-527.01 Physical Education Facilities General</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>$197,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$197,000</td>
<td>$197,000</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Aug-16</td>
<td>Aug-16</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>Cost risk due to unforeseen conditions in half ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Los Angeles Southwest College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Original Construction Contract Value</th>
<th>Aggregate Approved Change Order Amount to Date</th>
<th>Current Revised Contract Amount to Date</th>
<th>EAC (Construction Only)</th>
<th>Physical % Complete</th>
<th>Original (Contract) Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Revised Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Current Forecasted Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Los Angeles Trade Tech College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Original Construction Contract Value</th>
<th>Aggregate Approved Change Order Amount to Date</th>
<th>Current Revised Contract Amount to Date</th>
<th>EAC (Construction Only)</th>
<th>Physical % Complete</th>
<th>Original (Contract) Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Revised Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Current Forecasted Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>07T-706.03 Upgrade Child Development Center Weatherproofing</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>PQSPI</td>
<td>$551,460</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$551,460</td>
<td>$551,460</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>07T-709.65 Temporary Restrooms</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>$102,634</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$102,634</td>
<td>$133,004</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Apr-17</td>
<td>Apr-17</td>
<td>Apr-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>07T-714.03 Construction Tech Yard and Storage Building</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>PQSPI</td>
<td>$740,246</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$740,246</td>
<td>$740,246</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>40J-702.01 ADA Transition and Accessibility Requirements</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DBB-P</td>
<td>$3,820,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,820,000</td>
<td>$3,855,699</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Project #</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>Contract Type</td>
<td>Original Construction Contract Value</td>
<td>Aggregate Approved Change Order Amount to Date</td>
<td>Current Revised Contract Amount to Date</td>
<td>EAC (Construction Only)</td>
<td>Physical % Complete</td>
<td># of Calendar Days Extended to Date by Mutual Agreement [I]</td>
<td>Revised Substantial Completion Date [K]</td>
<td>Current Forecasted Substantial Completion Date [L]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>08V-801.00</td>
<td>Media &amp; Performing Arts Center (VACC)</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>$78,218,598</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$78,218,598</td>
<td>$78,208,100</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Dec-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dec-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>08V-940.02</td>
<td>Parking Lot G - Stormwater Implementation</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>PQSPI</td>
<td>$76,959</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$76,959</td>
<td>$76,959</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>40J-809.00</td>
<td>Storm Water Implementation - Valley</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>PQSPI</td>
<td>$1,917,323</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,917,323</td>
<td>$2,058,680</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>09W-979.34</td>
<td>Central Plant Phase 2</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>PQSPI</td>
<td>$1,038,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,038,500</td>
<td>$1,062,080</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Jan-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Contract Type: DBB = Design-Bid-Build, DB = Design-Build, LLB = Lease Leaseback, PQSPI = Prequalified Service Providers, DBB-P = Design-Bid-Build - Prequalified.
2. Change Order Amount to Date is based on values as of 01-Mar-17 for all colleges with the exception of Los Angeles Trade Tech College. Total Change to Date values for Los Angeles Trade Tech College are as of 30-Nov-16. Total Change to Date values excludes notice of changes and Change Order Proposals.
3. Design cost included only for Design-Build contracts.
4. Construction costs includes construction new and renovation hard costs only.
5. Current cost and schedule risk colors and comments are updated on a weekly basis based on current project progress and events.
6. Current schedule risk is forward looking risk relative to Academic Occupancy.