



Physical Resources Committee

Minutes

Tuesday, March 15, 2022

12:50-1:50 pm

Zoom

Zoom link: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/95923252354>

Meeting Attendance:

Chairs

- Charlie Richard (**Chair**)
- Robert Beebe (**Co-Chair**)
- Ismael Davila (**Co-Chair**)

Voting Members:

- Stephen Ashby – Classified
- Amber Casolari – Faculty
- Tonya Huff – Faculty
- Leo Truttman – Faculty
- Chris Williams – Faculty
- Vacant – Student Rep

Attendees:

- Scott Blair
- Megan Bottoms
- Leslie Brown
- Sean DiSalvio
- Todd Faux
- Shauna Gates
- Bobbie Grey
- Lin Howard
- Ron Kluth
- Jodi Julian

- Jessica Kelvington
- Juan Lopez
- Jim McCarron
- Stephen Sigloch
- Krystin Steranka
- John Taack
- Rebecca Turner (minute recorder)
- Chip West
- Jarrod Williamson
- Janelle Wortman

1. Call to Order 12:52 pm

2. Motion to approve March 15th Agenda and February 15th Minutes – Approved by Consensus

3. Action Items:

a) Create a Buy Nothing Group on RCC Campus – T. Huff

Tonya Huff discussed two proposals from the Sustainability Committee. The first, to create a “Buy Nothing” group on campus. Tonya shared that the proposal was brought forward to PLT who recommended this start in the Physical Resources Committee.

Tonya further explained that “Buy Nothing” is a worldwide movement to build community and promote gift economy by sharing unneeded items and talents. Nothing can be sold or traded, only given or shared. The usual platform for a “Buy Nothing” group is through Facebook. Tonya shared that the Sustainability Committee sent out a survey to students regarding this idea and found that students were excited about the group, however not about the use of Facebook. There have been conversations about utilizing Discord in place of Facebook. Should the PRC Committee wish to move forward, there would have to be agreement on establishing guidelines.

Questions/Comments:

Question: Jim McCarron inquired as to how this group will fit into what is being done with Physical Resources.

Response: Tonya explained that the idea behind this is to share and give away items instead of throwing things away, namely personal items like textbooks, school supplies and items or talents that may be useful to students/faculty/staff.

Question/Comment: Charlie Richard inquired if RCC will face any liabilities in providing a space to share, gift and request personal items. Charlie suggested that RCCD general counsel look into this to ensure RCC does not have any potential liability.

Comment: Stephen Ashby shared some concern with picking up items on campus with face-to-face interaction. There could be issues with items being misplaced or safety concerns as the Discord platform utilizes usernames that are not associated with a person's real name or identity.

Comment: Jim McCarron echoed Stephen's comment in respect to the safety aspect and agreed that legal guidance from the RCCD general counsel would be very insightful prior to voting on this proposal.

b) Share/Swap Bins on Campus – T. Huff

Tonya shared the second proposal which is to establish bin(s) or mobile bin(s) to collect donations and provide a pick-up place for those in need of such items. Tonya reiterated that guidelines would also have to be established with this proposal. Students, faculty, and staff would volunteer for a set amount of time each week to ensure the bins are orderly and free of any items falling outside of the set guidelines. Tonya also shared that ASRCC has expressed interest in helping with this project and potentially placing a bin near the Student Activities office.

Questions/Comments:

Comment: Robert Beebe voiced some concern with these bins potentially creating an issue with transients and an increase of danger to students, faculty, and staff.

Comment: Jim McCarron indicated that the bins would need to be staffed regularly throughout the day to ensure safety and that items outside of what is intended to be there are not placed within the bins causing additional liability to RCC.

Comment: Leslie Brown shared that the idea is great, so long as there is not a huge liability to the college and to ensure measures are in place to monitor and organize the bins.

The committee requested that both the "Buy Nothing" and Share/Swap Bin proposals go before the district's general counsel for review for potential liability prior to the committee making any formal decision on moving it forward.

Information Items:

4. Schedule Maintenance Project Updates – R. Beebe

Robert shared that there are no updates or new information on the scheduled maintenance projects at this time.

5. Other Projects

a. Mine Okubo Street Conversion

Robert shared that the Mine Okubo street conversion is still in the design phase.

b. Amphitheater Construction

Robert shared that the amphitheater construction project is also still in the design phase.

c. Throwing Sports Facility Project

Robert shared that the throwing sports facility project is still in design. At this time there are no new meetings scheduled. The architects will be coming back the first week of April to provide designs to be reviewed before going to DSA.

d. Football Field and Track Assessment

Robert shared that this is still in progress and asked Mehran Mohtasham to provide additional information. Mehran shared that three proposals for both a topographical and underground survey have been received. The dollar range on this is vast. The district office is in the process of confirming with the civil engineer that the proposals are all comparable in services/scope. Once this is confirmed, a requisition will be entered as a rush. Mehran also shared that as soon as feedback is received from Gensler, plans can be reviewed and options discussed for the football and track replacement.

e. Ceramics Elevator

Robert shared that bidding closed last night. The district does have a low bidder which is within the project budget. This project is currently in the notice of award phase.

Questions/Comments:

Question: Charlie Richard shared a past experience with the elevators being installed with counterfeit parts and inquired if there will be measures in place to ensure this does not happen again.

Response: Robert indicated that parts will be put in to spec and board policy, and there will also be an inspector or record on this project in addition to the architect being required to sign off on any payments issued.

f. Remodel of Old Financial Services Building

Robert shared that this is still in design and is set to go to DSA on March 20th.

g. Printing Services Electrical Upgrade

Robert shared that the notice of award has been issued to the contractor, and the district office is working on obtaining bonds for the notice to proceed.

h. 12KV Transformer Project

Robert shared that the college has secured a designer, the requisition has been entered into Galaxy, and we are now awaiting the purchase order.

6. New Business

a) IPP/FPP Submission

Robert discussed the intention behind sharing the IPP/FPP submissions at this meeting. This is being brought forward for discussion prior to next month's meeting where the committee will vote on submissions. Mehran provided the committee with information about the ranking matrix for the projects. The state issues funding for projects annually. In order to be a contend

for funding, Final Project Proposals (FPPs) need to be submitted to the state. Projects must begin as an Initial Project Proposal (IPP) in order to be submitted as and FPP. The IPPs are essentially place holders for projects and are subject to change based on the colleges' needs and what is in the Master Plan. Mehran shared the following documents:

2/25/2022

Districtwide Submitted IPPs and FPPs List (Submission Year in 2021) Update

RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE		2021 Total Project Score*	Estimated Raw Score for 2022 Submittal**	Estimated 2022 Score (with 50% Matching Local Fund)	Status	Project Category	2021 Total Project Budget***	2021 State Funds	2021 Local Fund (50% Split)
2021 FPP	Cosmetology - Resubmit	134	82	132	Submitted FPP	G	\$ 22,578,846	\$ 11,290,326	\$ 11,288,522
IPP-1	MLK - Resubmit	164	115	165	Submitted IPP	M	\$ 17,393,206	\$ 8,696,393	\$ 8,696,813
IPP-2	Visual Arts Complex (Phase I) - Resubmit	110	58	108	Submitted IPP	G	\$ 36,011,636	\$ 18,006,652	\$ 18,004,984
IPP-3	Advanced Technology + Central Plant - Resubmit	123	71	121	Submitted IPP	G	\$ 80,514,659	\$ 40,257,752	\$ 40,256,909

* 2021 Total Project Score reflect scores of project as submitted in the 2023-2027 SYCP in June 2021

**Estimated Raw Score for 2022 Submittal assumes 0% local contribution. Project scores assume a potential decrease in WSCH generation over the last year (equating to a 2 point decrease in Enrollment Growth scoring metric for Growth Projects). To be updated upon upload of new WSCH projections in FUSION.

***2021 Total Project Budget based on JCAF 32 submitted with IPP/FPP using CCI 7120/EPI 3843 for 2023-2028 SYCP in June 2021. Project budget to be finalized following completion of IPP/FPP forms.

2025-2026 IPP Typical Timeline		2024-2025 FPP Typical Timeline	
Fiscal Year	Phase	Fiscal Year	Phase
2025-2026	Preliminary Plans	2024-2025	Preliminary Plans
2025-2026	Working Drawings	2024-2025	Working Drawings
2026-2027	Construction	2025-2026	Construction
2026-2027	Equipment	2025-2026	Equipment
2029-2030	Occupancy	2028/2029	Occupancy

2023-2027 FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PLAN - PRIORITIZED PROJECTS LIST

PRIORITY	PROJECT	COLLEGE PRIORITY	FMP PHASE	CAMPUS	CATEGORY	FUNDING STATUS	Occupy Year	State Cost	District Cost	Total Cost	SECONDARY EFFECTS, DEMO, OPEN SPACE/INFRASTRUCTURE
4	LIFE SCIENCE/PHYSICAL SCIENCE RECONSTRUCTION	1	I	Riverside City College	M	FPP-APPROVED	2024-25	\$28,977,000	\$9,160,000	\$38,137,000	DEMO EXISTING BUSINESS EDUCATION
7	DIGITAL LIBRARY (STEM) PARTIAL RENOVATION	2	I	Riverside City College	M	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2023-24	\$0	\$4,814,315	\$4,814,315	N/A
11	COSMETOLOGY BUILDING	3	II	Riverside City College	G	FPP-Resubmitting	2027-28	\$11,290,325	\$11,288,521	\$22,578,846	DEMO EXISTING COSMETOLOGY
14	VISUAL ARTS COMPLEX PHASE I	4	I	Riverside City College	G	IPP-Resubmitting	2028-29	\$18,006,652	\$18,004,984	\$36,011,636	DEMO ARTS AND CERAMIC.
17	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY (APPLIED TECHNOLOGY)	5	II	Riverside City College	G	IPP-Resubmitting	2028-29	\$40,257,751	\$40,256,908	\$80,514,659	DEMO AUTO AND TECH A
21	MLK RENOVATION	6	I	Riverside City College	M	IPP-Resubmitting	2028-29	\$8,696,393	\$8,696,813	\$17,393,206	N/A
25	INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADES-PH. I	7	I	Riverside City College	G	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2030-31	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	N/A
28	STADIUM COMPLEX	8	II	Riverside City College	G	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2031-32	\$0	\$60,140,212	\$60,140,212	REMOVE PARKING LOTS
31	PERFORMING ARTS COMPLEX PHASE II	9	II	Riverside City College	G	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2032-33	\$0	\$86,236,241	\$86,236,241	DEMO LANDIES, MUSIC +STOVER DEMO HUNILET
34	KINESIOLOGY BUILDING	10	II	Riverside City College	G	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2033-34	\$0	\$46,156,549	\$46,156,549	GYM, POLICE, WAREHOUSE
37	STUDENT CENTER	11	II	Riverside City College	G	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2034-35	\$0	\$66,702,992	\$66,702,992	N/A
40	INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADES-PH. II	12	II	Riverside City College	G	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2035-36	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	N/A
43	PARKING STRUCTURE	13	III	Riverside City College	G	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2036-37	\$0	\$104,582,933	\$104,582,933	N/A
47	BRADSHAW RENOVATION	14	III	Riverside City College	M	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2037-38	\$0	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	N/A
50	CAMPUS SIGNAGE	15	III	Riverside City College	M	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2038-39	\$0	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	N/A
53	FACILITIES COMPLEX	16	III	Riverside City College	G	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2039-40	\$0	\$20,710,370	\$20,710,370	DEMO EXISTING FACILITIES BUILDINGS
56	POLICE STATION FACILITIES	17	III	Riverside City College	G	LOCALLY FUNDED OR FUTURE	2040-41	\$0	\$7,291,950	\$7,291,950	N/A

Questions/Comments:

Question: Charlie Richard inquired if it is feasible to bring additional projects forward to be considered for an IPP.

Response: Mehran indicated that yes, additional projects can be brought forward, however based on the ranking of the projects in the Master Plan and the projects that are already on board to move forward as shown in the image above, it does not serve at the point to add additional projects until FPPs are approved for funding by the state. Mehran also shared that there will likely not be any projects funded this fiscal year, for fiscal year 23-24 the state is likely to approve 5-6

projects that will require 50% local funding to be approved. Mehran further clarified that the state will not fund any projects that are revenue generating.

Question: Jessica Kelvington inquired if the ranking matrix takes into consideration the functionality and outward appearance of the building?

Response: Mehran indicated that the ranking matrix varies in points when life and safety are an issue. This will push the scoring matrix forward, however general disrepair of a building where life and safety are not a concern, will not prioritize the project above others.

7. Subcommittee/Task Force Reports

a. Safety

Krystin Steranka indicated that there are no updates at this time.

b. Sustainability

Tonya Huff indicated that there are no updates at this time.

c. Food

Megan Bottoms shared that the Food Committee will be surveying students, faculty and staff regarding meal plans, to identify if there is any interest/need.

d. Parking

Bobbie Grey indicated that there are no updates at this time.

Meeting Adjourned: 1:54 pm