

**LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FACILITIES MASTER PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Educational Services Center
Board Room – First Floor
770 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90017
September 26, 2018
1:00 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.**

Committee: Ernest H. Moreno, Chair; Scott J. Svonkin, Vice Chair; and Steven F. Veres, Member

Chair Moreno called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

None

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Valley College – Energy Infrastructure Improvement Project Update

A document entitled, “Valley College – Energy Infrastructure Improvement Project Update” was distributed.

Charbel Sfeir, PMO Los Angeles Valley College Campus Project Director, presented on said project.

Mr. Sfeir gave an overview of the presentation with respect to the project scope, history, and budget. The project was originally awarded as a design build contract in 2015. The project update adds capacity to the existing central plant and utility infrastructure to support existing and new buildings at LAVC.

He continued with the presentation reviewing aspects of the project scope including the existing central plant equipment, site improvements, and proposed plan for a Thermal Energy Storage tank (TES). Since the original contract award the open-book bid design and construction cost has increased.

The majority of the delay of the project and added costs are related to the testing of the soils. The geotechnical report determined that the soils were not able to support the TES tank on a mat foundation without excessive settling. Therefore, the following items including cast-in-drilled-hole piles w/drilling, rebar cages, and export of spoils as well as an escalation in material costs were identified during the California Geological Survey (CGS) and Division of the State Architect (DSA) reviews. With respect to the proposed location of the TES tank, it was noted that its placement near Burbank Boulevard is the most viable location. Given this location, there was a brief discussion as to its beautification.

Before agreeing to move forward with the plan Trustee Veres sought confirmation that the cost increase is only for the additional work plus escalation and does not include costs related to the management of the original contract award; confirmation was affirmed.

Motion by Trustee Veres, second by Trustee Svonkin, to approve the Valley College – Energy Infrastructure Improvement Project plan as presented.

APPROVED: 3 Ayes

Pierce College – Agricultural Education Center Project Update

Dr. Larry Buckley, Interim President, Los Angeles Pierce College (LAPC), introduced the following members from LAPC: Donna Mae Villanueva, Dean of Academic Affairs; Rolf Schleicher, Vice President of Administrative Services; and Charbel Sfeir, Regional Program Liaison, Build – LACCD.

A document entitled, “Pierce College – Agricultural Education Center Project Update” was distributed. Dr. Buckley gave a presentation with respect to the project scope and benefits, project history, project status and requested analysis, and alternative location considerations.

In response to a concern that the Agriculture Education Center is not conveniently located in relation to the campus core, the Committee was presented with three alternative locations for the project. The first alternate location is at De Soto Ave/El Rancho Drive. The second alternate location is at Mason Avenue/Victory Boulevard. The third alternate location is at Olympic Drive. Of the three alternate locations, option three is preferred by the College as it offers the lowest cost, has reduced utility infrastructure costs, and is in good proximity to the campus core with parking access that is adjacent to lot seven.

The Committee gave comments on the project update with respect to making the space flexible for multi-use (i.e. lecture/classroom/conference room) and program sustainability.

Move by Trustee Veres, second by Trustee Svonkin, to approve the LAPC Agricultural Education Building Project Update Alternative Location Option Three: Olympic Drive.

It was noted that in forwarding the item to the Board of Trustees, staff must be prepared to discuss the reason for reducing the size to a smaller space.

APPROVED: 3 Ayes

Staff Augmentation Update

Mr. David Salazar, Chief Facilities Executive, reviewed a handout entitled, “Staff Augmentation Update”. He reviewed the agenda which includes the fundamental considerations with respect to staffing models, the existing Multiple Award Task

Order Contract (MATOC) Structure, FMP&OC recommended option for College Project Teams (CPTs) staff augmentation, the advantages and disadvantages of both models, decision scenarios, and the procurement timeline.

In summary, the Committee is being asked to consider either continuing with the existing MATOC model for college project teams and PMO or adopting an Agency CM Hybrid for the college project teams.

Mr. Salazar reviewed the differences between decentralized and centralized models noting that primary considerations for either model is to maximize opportunity for Local Small Emerging and Disabled Veterans (LSEDEV) firms, maintaining consistency of the College Project Directors (CPDs), and ensuring performance oversight.

With regards to performance oversight, Chancellor Rodriguez noted that the primary consideration is efficiency. He explained that either model should help to support efficiency by ensuring that we are maximizing the use of public dollars while safeguarding against pitfalls from the past all in the interest of this body.

Discussion continued with regards to performance, ensuring fairness, and motivating LSEDEV firms within a future model.

Trustee Moreno articulated that he'd like to set standards to motivate the employment of a larger number of emerging firms and have better control in terms of the colleges spending without limitations.

A robust question and answer session was conducted with respect to the advantages and disadvantages of the existing MATOC structure and the Agency CM Hybrid model.

Trustee Moreno polled the Committee members' preferences concerning the model they would like to recommend to the full Board for approval.

Trustee Veres recommended that the Hybrid Agency CM model as presented be selected over the current MATOC model. He stated that this would give the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Bond Construction Program status as the preferred client with premium firms.

Trustee Svonkin discussed the benefits of staying with the current MATOC structure with respect to the LSEDEV firms' participation, greater District & PMO control of the selection process and performance structure, and the staff augmentation contract with 8 prime firms on a bench and more than 150 subcontractor firms.

Trustee Moreno articulated that the Bond Construction Program has spent millions of dollars and it needs to be in a controlled environment that can be readily managed. He entertained a motion to recommend to the full Board to continue utilizing the current Bond Program MATOC Structure and that rules be incorporated

to mandate that there be a higher distribution to the smaller firms than what is currently transpiring.

Motion be Trustee Svonkin, seconded by Trustee Moreno, to recommend to the full Board to continue utilizing the current Bond Program MATOC Structure and incorporate rules that mandate there be more distribution to LSEDV firms.

APPROVED: 2 Ayes (Moreno and Svonkin)

NO: 1 (Veres)

PMO Semi-Annual Report (for receive and file only)

Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.

Active Construction Projects Status Report (for receive and file only)

Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.

Summary – Next Meeting

Trustee Svonkin commented on concerns regarding major purchases of equipment. As such, he requested the following items for future FMPOC meetings:

- Inventory of large equipment by campus
- Cleanliness on campuses – standards and staffing
- Issue that seven of nine campuses are overbuilt
- List of projects with change orders that are over budget over the past two years
- Report to the full Board of the status of the small business advisory group-activities, frequency of meetings, recommendations, etc.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.