

# INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL REPORT

January 4, 2012

Los Angeles Community College District's  
Building Program – Measures A, AA and J

Table of Contents

- I. Preliminary Statement ..... 3
- II. Overview of the Panel’s Work ..... 3
- III. The Chancellor’s Charge to the Panel ..... 5
- IV. Panel’s Approach to the Chancellor’s Charge ..... 6
- V. Panel’s Review and Recommendations to the Chancellor and to the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District ..... 7
  - A. Preliminary Points Regarding the Panel’s Conclusions and Recommendations ..... 7
  - B. The Panel’s Conclusions and Recommendations ..... 8
    - 1. Impose a Moratorium on New Projects and Board Directives .. 8
    - 2. Planning and Control: Modify the Building Program Management Structure to a more Centralized Model ..... 8
    - 3. Program Cost at Completion and Program Reserve ..... 14
    - 4. Audit and Update to Financial Reporting ..... 16
    - 5. Change Orders: What the Data Suggests ..... 16
      - A. Changes under the Design Bid Build Delivery Method ... 17
      - B. Changes under the Design Build Delivery Method ..... 18
      - C. Energy Program Change Orders ..... 19
      - D. Reasons for Change Orders ..... 20
    - 6. Proper Role of Shared Governance in the Building Program... 22
    - 7. Energy Program: Observations ..... 23
    - 8. District-Wide Technology Initiatives ..... 25
    - 9. Design Management ..... 25
    - 10. Construction Management ..... 28
    - 11. Hard v. Soft Costs ..... 28
      - A. Comparison of Costs ..... 28
      - B. Hard Cost and Soft Cost Ratios ..... 29
    - 12. Compliance with Proposition 39 ..... 32
    - 13. District Citizens’ Oversight Committee ..... 33
    - 14. Facilities Executive Director Position ..... 35
    - 15. The Building Program Manager ..... 35
    - 16. Impact of New Facilities on Long Term Operating Budgets .. 37
    - 17. Ethical Considerations ..... 39
- VI. Conclusion ..... 39

The District does have data regarding the cost of maintaining and operating their facilities. However, it is not evident if these costs are reasonable and how they compare to other community colleges. Further, there seems to be wide variation between individual colleges in these metrics. Numbers for “square feet per student” and “M&O costs per student” vary widely and should be cause for management to take a much closer look at these numbers and plan appropriately. These costs need to be benchmarked against other community colleges. The American Physical Plant Association (APPA) (<http://www.appa.org>) provides a benchmarking tool called, Facilities Performance Indicators (FPI), where higher education facilities organizations can benchmark their costs.

### **Recommendations:**

a. District Staff should prepare a brief for the Board of Trustees on the costs and sources of funds needed to support M&O and appropriate capital renewal requirements to insure the new program facilities will perform their intended function into the future. With every new or renovated building proposed to the Board of Trustees, a total cost of ownership analysis should be included that projects the District’s budgeted operating costs for M&O, capital renewal, and staffing.

b. District Staff should direct and oversee the transfer of funds from Utility accounts to M&O accounts to reflect savings at each college. If college M&O staff does not see energy savings materialize, then added funds will need to be identified from other sources.

c. District Staff should participate in the APPA FPI survey that is done annually to benchmark M&O costs in higher education.

d. District Staff should establish a maintenance funding floor; a minimum level of maintenance funding that each college president is required to spend on M&O, with fenced money that cannot be diverted for other non-facilities expenses.