I. ROLL CALL

II. PUBLIC SPEAKERS*

III. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

   A. Community Economic Development / Labor Compliance Report
   B. KPMG Performance Audit
   C. Revised Legal Fees and Cost Report - LACCD Bond Program - January 1, through June 30, 2017
   D. Active Construction Summary

IV. SUMMARY – NEXT MEETING......................................................... Ernest H. Moreno

V. 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.
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• Partnership and Collaboration
• Upcoming CED Program Goals
Project Labor Agreement

• JACOBS is committed to adhering to the specifications of the PLA.

• The CED Program contract specification is an attachment to the PLA to ensure contractor compliance with the provisions set forth in the LWHP and LSEDV Program.

• The Labor Compliance Department utilizes LCPtracker—an online certified payroll system, to monitor compliance with prevailing wage laws and to generate real-time local hire performance reports.
Local Worker Hiring Program (LWHP)

- The LWHP is incorporated in the Project Labor Agreement to further reinforce the pathway to union apprenticeship.

- The program provides district-wide access to pre-apprenticeship construction training with a direct pathway to union apprenticeship in partnership with contractors, unions, college campuses, and community based organizations.

- The LWHP placed (129) new apprentices who graduated from LATTC and local pre-apprenticeship programs.

  - Applies to all bond-funded projects and some non-bond funded projects
  - Increased Local Worker hiring target to 35% from 30%
  - Increased Disadvantaged Worker hiring target to 10% from 6% including hiring of Veterans
  - PLA requires that LATTC students to be employed on LACCD projects.
Local Worker Hiring Performance
As of October 27, 2017

Project Labor Agreement (PLA), amended July 8, 2015, established 35% local worker hiring goal.

Local Worker Participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Workers</th>
<th>Non-Local Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Worker Participation (Old PLA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Workers</th>
<th>Non-Local Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Worker Participation by Hours***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Worker Hours</th>
<th>Non-Local Worker Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: District Wide Local Hire Performance Ranking Report 10.27.17
* Cumulative local worker participation since inception of amended Project Labor Agreement on 7/8/15; local hire goal is 35%.
** Cumulative local worker participation since Oct 2014 for remaining projects covered under old PLA; local hire goal is 30%.
*** Cumulative local worker participation by hours since Oct 2014 for projects covered by either amended and old PLA.
Local, Small, Emerging, Disabled Veteran-Owned Business (LSEDV) Program
As of October 2017

Board Rule 7103.17, ‘Opportunities for Local, Small and Emerging Businesses, established a 30% LSEDV participation goal that applies to all Build-LACCD contracts. The participation goal is measured by the dollar amount paid directly to LSEDV prime contractors/prime consultants or by Non-LSEDV prime contractors/prime consultants to LSEDV subcontractors/sub-consultants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Award $</th>
<th>Expended $</th>
<th>LSEDV paid</th>
<th>LSEDV %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$286,578,588</td>
<td>$100,396,568</td>
<td>$42,897,334</td>
<td>42.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATOC</td>
<td>$77,825,299</td>
<td>$77,825,299</td>
<td>$37,626,914</td>
<td>48.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$28,381,319</td>
<td>$21,082,110</td>
<td>$16,220,078</td>
<td>76.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$364,403,887</td>
<td>$178,221,867</td>
<td>$80,524,248</td>
<td>45.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cumulative report*
LSEDV Program Small Business Boot Camp

For many small contractors, the Small Business Bootcamp is their first introduction to Public Works and have no knowledge of public contracting and requirement. The Boot Camp teaches the contractor the following:

- How to Bid and get Pre-Qualified
- Labor Compliance and Project Labor Agreement
- Bonding, Certification, and Access To Capital
- Public Contract Law and Government Regulations
- Safety
- Estimating and Scheduling
Jacobs Internship Program Commitment

• Jacobs will provide **15 internship opportunities on an ongoing basis** that give LACCD college students an opportunity to engage and learn about STEM careers in the design and construction industry and incorporate the ACES program.

• JACOBS will communicate with VP of Administrative Services at each college to garner recommendations of students as well as CPTs.

• Professional development workshops for PMO interns to maximize value of internship experience, improve work habits, develop professional quality resume and interview skills, introduction to construction and design technology, and chart STEM career trajectory.

• Currently, there are five (5) interns working at the Build Program earning $12.00/hour. Two (2) students are working at the PMO, one in the Design and one Labor Compliance department; and three (3) students are working at Harbor and Pierce Colleges.
Partnership and Collaboration

• LACCD Build hosts the Los Angeles Regional Workforce Manager Transformation Group; a collaborative effort among public agencies, community-based organizations, and the contracting community to track workers throughout the life cycle of the his or her career, and to measure local economic impact as a result of public infrastructure investment. The data collected will be across all projects the worker may be employed on, regardless of agency or workforce program.

• Currently, the participating public agencies are creating a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to establish the guidelines for data sharing and developing the technical specification requirements for the next phases of system development, which includes significant input from partners such as:
  - City of Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti’s Office
  - Los Angeles County
  - LA Metro
  - Los Angeles World Airports
  - Emerald Cities Collaborative
  - Flintridge Center
  - YouthBuild
Upcoming CED Program Goals

• LACCD’s Build Program will work with CFE to re-establish the Small, Local, Emerging and Disabled Veteran Owned Business Outreach Advisory Council.

• Local Worker Hiring Program will work with LATTC and hire LAX Apprenticeship Readiness Program participants at Southwest College for job placement on LACCD projects.

• Internship Plan will be updated in the Build LACCD’s Standard Operating Procedures (SOP’s) and includes Jacobs new work flow of on-going interns at the PMO and Build LACCD’s construction sites.

• Partnerships, programs and events will be organized and promoted to public consistently.

• Creation of communal calendar where events will be noted.
Thank You
With You Today

- Tracy Hensley, Partner
- Erika Alvord, Managing Director

Scope of Engagement

- Performance Audit of the construction bond program for the year ended June 30, 2017, for projects covered by Proposition A, Proposition AA and Measure J bond proceeds. No expenditures were made under Measure CC during the period under audit.

Objectives of a Performance Audit

- Performance audits seek to assess the effectiveness, economy and efficiency of the bond program and provides an objective analysis for management and those charged with governance and oversight to use to improve program performance and operations, reduce costs, facilitate decision making by parties with responsibility to oversee or initiate corrective action, and to contribute to public accountability. A performance audit does not opine on the internal controls structure of BuildLACCD or LACCD. In addition, our performance audit did not include testing of internal controls to determine if the internal controls are operating as designed. Our approach to evaluating the District’s Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) is limited to the processes included with KPMG’s methodology and approach as described in our report.

Scope of FY16-17 Performance Audit

**Risk Management** – Our audit included evaluating the risk management process for the bond program including identification, assessment, quantifying, tracking, reporting, and closing of project risks.

**Baseline Budget/Forecasting** – Our audit included evaluating the project budgeting process including original budget, current budget, analysis and reporting of budget changes, budget transfers, and estimated costs at completion (EAC).

**Project Closeout** – Our audit included evaluating the procedures for District project closeout activities including operation and maintenance (O&M) manuals, warranties, commissioning, financial and contractual closeout, and project document archiving.

**Controls Assessment** – Our audit evaluated compliance with the District’s Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and key internal controls for the following key processes: risk management, budgeting, closeout, invoice process, change order process, and contingency management.

**Project Management Information System (PMIS)** – Our audit evaluated the integration of relevant process workflows with the District’s project management information system (PMIS) for the following key processes: risk management, budgeting, closeout, invoice process, change order process, and contingency management.

Legend for Observations:

**High Priority** - The recommendation pertains to a significant audit finding. Due to the significance of the matter, near term management attention and appropriate corrective action is warranted.

**Medium Priority** - The recommendation pertains to a moderately significant or potentially serious audit finding. Reasonably prompt corrective action should be taken by management to address the matter.

**Low Priority** - The recommendation pertains to an audit finding of relatively minor significance or concern, yet should be addressed. The timing of any corrective action is left to management's discretion.
Summary Results of Performance Audit

Baseline Budget/Forecasting Observation (High Priority)

Observation: Project budget estimates, including changes to cost estimates and budget transfers, are not consistently documented and supported by the College Project Teams (CPTs).

Effect: Project budgets and estimated final costs may be inaccurate, and reasons for budget overages or project delays may not be understood or anticipated. Additionally, the PMO may be unaware of potential project issues that may need to be addressed in a timely manner to mitigate additional costs and/or delays.

Invoice Process Observation (Medium Priority)

Observation: The current PMIS does not include adequate tracking of invoices, from receipt of invoice to payment, and should take additional steps to ensure timely payment is made to vendors.

Effect: Since the current PMIS payment process does not have a strong process for tracking invoices from receipt to payment, there is a risk that vendor payments may be late by contract or by law, possibly resulting in penalties and performance delays by vendors.

Project Closeout Observation (Medium Priority)

Observation: The closeout process for several projects finished prior to April 2013 have not yet been completed and on a few occasions, project close-out requirements promulgated by the SOPs are not met.

Effect: Critical project documents related to the closeout process may be incomplete, missing, or stored in an unknown location. In the event where project documents may need to be accessed to demonstrate compliance and/or completion, the inability to locate relevant information could expose the program to additional financial risks and penalties.

Project Management Information System (PMIS) Observation (Medium Priority)

Observation: There is limited integration between the various PMIS platforms (SharePoint, Proliance, DocView, ProjectWise, P6), causing each program to operate largely independently.

Effect: By not having a well-connected and highly integrated PMIS to effectively and efficiently manage projects, excessive costs could be incurred by the PMO to manually gather information and the identification of project risks may be delayed.

Risk Management Observation (Low Priority)

Observation: Project risk registers are not always completed in accordance with the SOP’s.

Effect: When risks are not thoroughly evaluated and monitored on a regular basis the success of the Program/project is exposed to uncertainty including costly change orders, schedule delays, rework, and reputational harm.

Change Order Observation (Low Priority)

Observation: SOP requirements related to the change order process are not always followed. Additionally, the SOPs do not provide requirements for changes to Professional Service Master Agreements, Professional Service Task Orders for Specialized Services, and Professional Service Multiple Award Task Order Contracts for amendments to the agreements.

Effect: Without well defined and consistently followed change order procedures, the District may incur costly and/or unnecessary charges for change order work. Additionally, agreements that do not reflect all agreements between the parties are subject to risk of dispute, which could further cause unexpected costs and/or project delays.
CONSTRUCTION COUNSEL’S REPORT

Build-LACCD Bond Program Legal Fees Update  
January 1, 2017 through June 30, 2017  

September 27, 2017  
(Revised October 5, 2017)
I. INTRODUCTION

This Report is an Executive Summary prepared for the Chancellor, General Counsel, Facilities, and the Board of Trustees. It provides an update to the February 2017 report submitted by the Bond Program’s Construction Counsel, John P. Dacey, Esq., of Bergman Dacey Goldsmith, PLC. The February 2017 report contained the results and observations by the Bond Program’s Construction Counsel regarding Legal Fees and Cost expenditures from near inception of the Bond Program through December 31, 2016, as well as a summary of 2016 Legal Fees and Cost expenditures.

This current report provides Legal Fees and Costs expended for the Bond Program from January 1, 2017 through June 30, 2017 (“Report”).

The data contained in this Report in Section II below is divided into the following two sub-sections: (II A) Bond Program Legal Fees and Costs from January 1, 2017 through June 30, 2017; and (II B) Active Bond Program Litigation, Arbitration and Claims matters for the Bond Program.

Regarding the results and observations set forth in this Report, specific supporting detail can be provided upon request.

II. DATA REPORTED

A. Bond Program Legal Fees And Costs from January 1, 2017 Through June 30, 2017

In the February 2017 Report, we reported on the Legal Fees and Cost Data as of December 31, 2016. That report tracked Legal Fees and Costs from Calendar Year 2005 through December 31, 2016. It reported that a total of approximately $38,040,000.00 in Legal Fees and Costs had been paid to outside legal counsel firms against a Total Budgeted Amount of $49,245,395.00 through December 31, 2016 for Proposition A/AA and Measure J projects.

1 Legal Fees and Cost Data include legal fees and costs paid to outside law firms, including Construction Counsel. Costs are defined as claim, arbitration and litigation costs such as arbitrator costs, arbitration fees and costs, mediator costs, mediation fees, deposition reporter costs, consultant and expert costs, etc. “Costs” do not include settlement money paid or received.

2 The Legal Fees and Costs in this Report are “rounded” for simplicity in presentation. Specific numbers are available upon request.

3 The February 2017 Report set forth Legal Fees and Costs from 2005 through December 2016. Data from the Office of General Counsel for Legal Fees from 2001/2002 through December 2004 was not available at the time of producing the February 21 2017 Report or this Report. The Legal Fees and Costs expended, and the Total Budgeted Amount are for A, AA and J projects. It should be noted that with the addition of $3.3 Billion in Measure CC bond funds into the Bond Program, additional money
As previously reported, after Measure “J” was passed in 2008 where Legal Fees and Costs were $880,000.00 for that year, the Legal Fees and Costs began a very vertical upward spiral reaching $7.58 million by the end of Calendar Year 2013 (up from $4.62 million in Calendar year 2012), a $2.6 million increase from 2012 to 2013.

The Chief Facilities Executive and the Program Management Office (“PMO”) instituted some new processes, practices, and procedures after being given oversight of all Bond Program legal matters in or about December 2012, and upon the start of the Bond Program’s Lead Construction Counsel position in July 2013, additional processes, practices and procedures were instituted. These helped to flatten the upward trend, with Legal Fees and Costs being $7.97 million for Calendar Year 2014 up from $7.58 million 2013, only a $390,000.00 increase from 2013 to 2014.

As all of these new these processes, practices, and procedures began to even more firmly take hold in the Bond Program, Legal Fees and Costs then began to drop very significantly. From $7.97 million in Calendar Year 2014, the Legal Fees and Costs dropped to $4.03 million in Calendar Year 2015, a drop of just under $4 million from 2014 to 2015.

In Calendar Year 2016, Legal Fees and Costs dropped once again from $4.03 million in 2015 to $3.33 million in 2016, a drop just shy of $700,000.00.

The chart on the next page below illustrates these points.

[Please go to the next page]
In Calendar Year 2015, Legal Fees and Costs ran at an average of approximately $327,500.00 per month.

In Calendar Year 2016, Legal Fees and Costs ran at an average of approximately $277,534.50 per month (about $50,000.00 per month less than the year before).

Through June 30, 2017, Legal Fees and Costs are averaging approximately $275,428.97 per month (about $2,105.53 less than the 2016 monthly average).

But see footnote 4 below as such monthly averages are anticipated to drop even more per month for the second half of 2017.

Should we not experience any new litigation and/or arbitration filings during the second half of 2017, and barring any increased trial and/or arbitration preparation fees and costs, Construction Counsel is predicting that overall Legal Fees and Costs for the Bond Program for Calendar year 2017 could

---

4 However, with the recent Board approved settlement of the Mission College Media Arts project matter which eliminated a $9 million dollar plus claim against the District with no new money paid, and with the potential resolution of the Universal Metro matter at City College where the District will receive in excess of $300,000, the resolution of both of these Legacy Matters should reduce the Monthly Bond Program Fees and Costs by approximately $125,000 per month thereby further reducing overall Legal Fees and Costs for the Bond Program over the last half of 2017.
approximate $2.6 million for Calendar Year 2017. This would represent an approximate reduction of $700,000 for such costs in Calendar year 2017 from the 2016 Calendar Year total of $3.33 million.

The Chart below depicts the fees and costs for the first six months of 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>MONTHLY TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>$288,462.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>$299,949.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>$314,436.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>$232,119.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>$265,506.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>$252,098.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,652,573.83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another dramatic downward trend to note is the reduced volume of Stop Notices filed on projects, which started in 2014 and continues till today. This positive development is also attributed to the aforementioned processes, practices and procedures implemented by Chief Facilities Executive, the PMO, and the Bond Program’s then Lead Construction Counsel. **Attachment 1** to this Report further illustrates this movement and shows the Stop Notice data overlaid with the Legal Fees and Costs graphic to demonstrate the relationship between the two.

Construction Counsel will continue to monitor Bond Program Legal Fees and Costs and will provide an update once all 2017 totals are known. It should also be noted that the 2017 Legal Fees and Costs to date are driven predominantly by a few remaining “Legacy” matters\(^5\), which are outlined in II. B. below.

More can and is being done to continue to reduce Legal Fees and Costs in the Bond Program. Further detail regarding recent, past and current efforts will be provided in a future report.

\(^5\) “Legacy” matters are matters that existed at the time Facilities took over handling of the Bond Program Legal Matters.
B. Active Bond Program Litigation, Arbitration And Claims

The number of open Bond Program legal matters has been reduced from 79 in 2013 to just 6 as of the date of this Report. A Settlement, subject to Board approval, of another “Legacy” matter has been reached and is being finalized, hopefully to be presented at the November 2017 Board Meeting on the Closed Session Agenda. If approved by the Board, the total number of open Bond Program legal matters would be reduced to just 5.

Additionally, one of District’s outside panel counsel was recently successful in greatly reducing the number of causes of action against the District in another long standing civil action (Legacy Matter), which should lead to a more expeditious resolution, and, thus, further curtail related legal fees and costs.

Moreover, the District was named as a defendant in only 3 matters in the last 3 1/2 years (i.e., two lawsuits and one arbitration), all of which were assigned to outside panel counsel firms.

The breakdown of currently open matters, by type, is as follows:

1. Three Active Litigation Matters
   
   • *FTR International, Inc. and Nizar Katbi v. LACCD, et al.* (Legacy Matter)
   
   • *Thomas O’Brien v. LACCD*
   
   • *National Sign & Marketing Corporation v. LACCD*

2. Two Active Arbitration Matters
   
   • *Los Angeles Community College District v. Universal Metro, Inc., et al.*\(^6\) (Legacy Matter)

---

\(^6\) An agreement to resolve this matter was reached during a recent mediation. This proposed settlement is anticipated to come before the Board for approval at its November 2017 Closed Session meeting.
• Allegheny Casualty Company v. Suffolk Construction Company, Inc., Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland, LACCD.

[End of Report]
In 2011 legal fees and costs incurred represented 1% of the total construction costs incurred for the same year ($257,869,088); in 2012 legal fees and costs incurred represented 2% of the total construction costs incurred for the same year ($305,741,310); in 2013, legal fees and costs incurred represented 4% of the total construction costs incurred for the same year ($174,434,446); in 2014, legal fees and costs incurred represented 6% of the total construction costs incurred for the same year ($146,644,312); in 2015, legal fees and costs incurred represented 2% of the total construction costs incurred for the same year ($169,066,093); and in 2016, legal fees and costs incurred also represented 2% of the total construction costs incurred for the same year ($162,482,793).
## Active Construction Project Status Report for FMP&OC

### (Prop A, Prop AA, Measure J)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Original Construction Contract Value</th>
<th>Aggregated 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># of Calendar Days Extended to Date by Mutual Agreement</th>
<th>Revised Substantial Completion Date</th>
<th>Current Forecasted Substantial Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01C-108.00</td>
<td>Da Vinci Hall</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>$17,668,179</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$17,668,179</td>
<td>$17,668,179</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02E-222.05</td>
<td>Science Career &amp; Mathematics Building G8 (Earth Sciences)</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>$5,132,987</td>
<td>$8,485,673</td>
<td>$13,618,660</td>
<td>$13,908,688</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03H-350.03</td>
<td>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>$16,655,687</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
<td>Mar-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03H-350.01</td>
<td>S.A.I.L.S. - Student Union</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>$39,809,201</td>
<td>$12,184,979</td>
<td>$51,958,179</td>
<td>$52,778,472</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03H-338.01</td>
<td>Campus Wide ADA Transition</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>$785,207</td>
<td>$664,188</td>
<td>$1,449,395</td>
<td>$1,199,394</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40J-302.01</td>
<td>Harbor - Transportation and Accessibility Improvements</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>$2,022,457</td>
<td>$83,369</td>
<td>$2,105,826</td>
<td>$2,113,518</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04M-405.00</td>
<td>Media Arts Center</td>
<td>Compl./Ready for Use</td>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>$31,174,042</td>
<td>$4,317,681</td>
<td>$35,491,723</td>
<td>$23,902,780</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04M-406.00</td>
<td>Student Services/Admin Building (Pasha Street)</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>$4,842,705</td>
<td>$2,167</td>
<td>$4,844,871</td>
<td>$4,389,824</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40J-402.01</td>
<td>Mission - Transportation and Accessibility Parking &amp; Roadway, Walkway, Grounds, and Parking Lot (RWGPL)</td>
<td>Sub. Compl.</td>
<td>PQSP</td>
<td>$748,400</td>
<td>$24,161</td>
<td>$772,561</td>
<td>$685,498</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>North of Mall (NOM) - Phase #1 (8 Projects)</td>
<td>Compl./Ready for Use</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>In claims</td>
<td>In claims</td>
<td>In claims</td>
<td>In claims</td>
<td>In claims</td>
<td>In claims</td>
<td>In claims</td>
<td>In claims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05S-535.05</td>
<td>SLE Community Services / Agriculture Science Building Renovation</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>$3,626,647</td>
<td>$152,118</td>
<td>$3,778,765</td>
<td>$5,279,139</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05S-527.01</td>
<td>Physical Education Facilities - General (DSA Corrections)</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>PQSP</td>
<td>$197,000</td>
<td>$13,494</td>
<td>$210,494</td>
<td>$197,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Aug-16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Aug-16</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06S-615.03</td>
<td>Transit Centers</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>$964,232</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$964,232</td>
<td>$1,220,046</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07T-706.03</td>
<td>Upgrade Child Development Center Weatherproofing</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>PQSP</td>
<td>$551,460</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$551,460</td>
<td>$582,901</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07T-714.03</td>
<td>Construction Tech Yard and Storage Building</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>PQSP</td>
<td>$740,246</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$740,246</td>
<td>$1,009,987</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40J-702.01</td>
<td>Trade - 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>$4,968,055</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COST DD 01-Sep-17 2,4

#### PROJECT CHANGE ORDER DD 01-Sep-17 2

#### SCHEDULE DD 01-Sep-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Original Construction Contract Value [A] 3</th>
<th>Aggregate Approved Change Order Amount to Date [B] 3</th>
<th>Current Revised Contract Amount to Date [C = A + B] 3</th>
<th>EAC (Construction Only) 4</th>
<th>Physical % Complete</th>
<th>Original (Contract) Substantial Completion [I]</th>
<th># of Calendar Days Extended to Date by Mutual Agreement [J=K-I]</th>
<th>Revised Substantial Completion Date [K]</th>
<th>Revised Substantial Completion Date [L]</th>
<th>Current Forecasted Substantial Completion Date [L]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles Valley College</strong></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>08V-801.00</td>
<td>Valley Academic &amp; Cultural Center (VACC)</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>$77,818,793</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$77,818,793</td>
<td>$78,502,641</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Dec-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dec-18</td>
<td>Feb-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>08V-840.02</td>
<td>Parking Lot D - Stormwater Implementation</td>
<td>Compl./Ready for Use</td>
<td>PQSP</td>
<td>$159,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$159,750</td>
<td>$151,763</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>40J-809.00</td>
<td>Storm Water Implementation - Valley</td>
<td>Compl./Ready for Use</td>
<td>PQSP</td>
<td>$1,917,323</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,917,323</td>
<td>$1,873,609</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Los Angeles College</strong></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>09W-948.00</td>
<td>Plant Facilities Center</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>$2,337,469</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,337,469</td>
<td>$2,501,030</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>40J-909.03</td>
<td>Storm Water Project Phase 2 - Pave Lot 7</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>$355,670</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$355,670</td>
<td>$355,670</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Construction Projects Total</strong></td>
<td>15</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recently Completed Projects Total</strong></td>
<td>12</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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Contract Type: DBB = Design-Bid-Build       DB = Design-Build       LLB = Lease Leaseback     PQSP = Prequalified Service Providers      DBB-P = Design-Bid-Build - Prequalified
2. Columns [A], [B], and [C] are based on values for the prime general contractor solely.
3. Total Change to Date values excludes notice of changes and Change Order Proposals.
4. Design EAC is included only for Design-Build contracts.
5. Construction EAC includes the total of new construction and renovation hard costs.
6. Project totals include both projects listed by Line # and bundled projects (8 projects for NOM - Phase 1 at Pierce College).