



Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

6191 Project Management Services

Project # 01C-1.5-6191

Bovis Lend Lease, Inc.

Tel: Fax:

Bond Advisory Meeting Meeting 31

Date	Start	End	Next Meeting	Next Time	Prepared By	Company
3/27/2006	03:33 PM	04:57 PM	4/3/2006	01:30 PM	Ron Purisima	Bovis Lend Lease, Inc.

Purpose	Location	Next Location	General Notes
Review of the Proposition A & AA program	Faculty and Staff Center	Faculty and Staff Center	

Attended By	Non-Attendees
-------------	---------------

- | | |
|--|---|
| Los Angeles City College - Jackie Ireland | Los Angeles City College - Lawrence Bradford |
| Los Angeles City College - Merrill Eastcott | Los Angeles City College - Shalamon Duke |
| Los Angeles City College - Mattie Moon | Los Angeles City College - Jane Melton |
| Los Angeles City College - Lillian Yamaoka | Los Angeles City College - Joyce Moore |
| Los Angeles City College - Michael Adams Jr. | Los Angeles City College - Vaughn Obern |
| Los Angeles City College - Myra Siegel | Los Angeles City College - Fleur Steinhart |
| Los Angeles City College - Diane Hayes | Los Angeles City College - Barbara Vasquez |
| Los Angeles City College - Maryanne Des Vignes | Bovis Lend Lease, Inc. - Sonia Anderson |
| Los Angeles City College - John Freitas | Los Angeles City College - Rebecca Tillberg |
| Los Angeles City College - Jan McEveety | Los Angeles City College - Tammy Robinson |
| Los Angeles City College - Steve Maradian | Los Angeles City College - Willie Richmond |
| Los Angeles City College - William Marmolejo | Bovis Lend Lease, Inc. - Don Robb |
| Los Angeles City College - Hayward Nishioka | Los Angeles City College - Karla Williams |
| Los Angeles City College - Jeremy Villar | Los Angeles City College - John Simpson |
| Los Angeles City College - Leanna Watts | Los Angeles City College - Rochelle Sechooler |
| Bovis Lend Lease, Inc. - Steve Yip | Los Angeles City College - Julio Huerta |
| Bovis Lend Lease, Inc. - Nancy Roberts | Los Angeles City College - Dean Arvidson |
| Los Angeles City College - Duke Russell | |
| Los Angeles City College - Dan Wanner | |
| Los Angeles City College - Betsy Regalado | |
| DMJM/JGM - Patrick Woods | |
| Bovis Lend Lease, Inc. - Ron Purisima | |
| Los Angeles City College - Don Seidel | |
| Los Angeles City College - Edward Vasquez | |
| Los Angeles City College - Dana Cohen | |
| Los Angeles City College - Maria Reich | |
| Los Angeles City College - Nancy Pierce | |

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
------	--------------------------	------	--------	----------	---------	-------

New Business

Note



Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
New Business						
031-0 01	H. Nishioka and BLL are recording the meeting. Bll will erase their recording upon approval of the related minutes.Info		Information			No
Agenda Item #1: Approval of Minutes						
031-0 02	M. Moon: 030-0-03 spelling correction: Holmes Hall was used as an example, not (and).					No
031-0 03	Dr. Ireland: 030-0-10 procedural correction: Requested that the main motions be highlighted in the minutes. The action that is taken should be recorded, easy to read, include the vote and not include the motions that are advanced ahead of time. The action is the important thing.					No
031-0 04	Dr. Maradian: 03-01-01 Noun/pronoun disagreement: Change shepherd to shepherds.					No
031-0 05	Dr. Ireland: 030-0-01: Those deemed to be project resources to the User Group may also speak when their project is on the agenda.					No
031-0 06	M. Moon: Requested that the minutes be corrected as noted and reissued at the next meeting.	Ron Purisima (BOVLEN)	Completed	4/3/2006 (Original: 4/3/2006)	4/1/2006	Yes
Agenda Item # 2: Report from the Executive Committee - Dr. Ireland						
031-0 07	The Executive Committee got together to discuss some issues and to correct obvious flaws in the (Bond Advisory Meeting) process					No
031-0 08	Reiterated the need to start meeting on time, 3:30pm and noted that we were getting better by starting at 3:33 PM.					No
031-0 09	There needs to be better adherence to Robert's Rules.					No
031-0 10	A member of the Prop A Advisory Committed will be asked to make a motion which will open the discussion for a recommendation. The recommendation will be followed by the appropriate resource individual and user group shepherd rather than have a member of the Prop A Committee be the presenter of the recommendation.					No
031-0 11	A time limit will be set for overall discussions, recognizing the pros and cons, and at the end of the time limit if there are individuals who feel there is more discussion needed then the chair would entertain a motion from a committee member to extend the debate on the motion.					No
031-0 12	The shortfall on the MLK Library appears to be more than the originally anticipated \$3.2m. Bids are due April 20th. The exact amount should be available for the Bond Advisory meeting on the 24th.					No
Project Shepherds for New User Groups (sub item of Agenda Item #2)						
031-0 13	Student Admissions / Student Services Center - Betsy Regalado.					No



Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
New Business						
031-0 14	Community Services - No need for a specific Shepherd because CS will be incorporated into some existing facility. Therefore it will be appropriate for a CS user group representative to be a part of those meetings rather than having a separate CS user group with a designated shepherd.					No
031-0 15	Central Plant - Willie Richmond.					No
031-0 16	Landscaping - we need representatives to be selected from the following Work Environment. Administrative Services, OSS, Art & Architecture, Student Government and Sheriff.					No
Agenda Item #3: PE User Group Recommendation						
031-0 17	Dr. Ireland: An initial thirty minute time limit will be set for the discussion of the PE Building user group recommendation. First a pro for the motion will be recognized and then a con for the motion and so on. Unless a member of the Prop A Advisory Committee calls for a vote today, a special meeting of the Prop A Advisory Committee will be requested for Monday April 3rd at 1:30 PM to vote on the motion from the PE user group recommendation. Further the Shared Governance Council will be requested to begin their meeting at 2:30 PM so that the recommendation can go directly from Prop A to Shared Governance on Monday without any delay in the process.					No
031-0 18	M. Moon: Asked if Rad Tech was going to be discussed today to which the Dr. Ireland replied, no.					No
Motion						
031-0 19	After amendment, a motion by L. Yamaoka was accepted for discussion, " that the Physical Education Facility be located at the original Monroe Street Site."		Opened for Discussion			No
031-0 20	Dr. Ireland set a 30 minute time limit for the discussion and asked for the first speaker in favor of the motion to speak.					No
Start of Discussion						
031-0 21	J. McEveety, representing the pro side stated that members of the PE Facility user group met with the members of the college administration, project architects DMJM, and BLL to review the diagrammatic site plans and the pros and cons of each location. Following that meeting, 9 of the 12 faculty members met again to vote and confirmed their recommendation to remain at the Monroe Street site. She went on to read the recommendation letter to the committee. Please refer to the hand out provided at the meeting and which is attached hereto for your convenience.					No
031-0 22	Dr. Eastcott, representing the con side, complimented the PE Department for working so diligently and for doing exactly what was asked of them by weighing the two options. When you put forth your recommendations it is your job to take care of your disciplines. He went on					No



Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
New Business						
	to explain that he is at a level where he has to look at things beyond each of the disciplines and therefore at this point has decided to oppose the motion.					
	The list presented by the PE user group contains inaccuracies that need to be addressed.					
031-0 23	Number one, the current Environmental Impact Report will need some modification. This does not take a new report. It takes an addendum. Addenda are done all the time and in fact we have already done an addendum for other things that we have changed in the master plan.					No
031-0 24	Number two, about the legality of moving the PE Building, there are no laws that dictate the position of buildings in the master plan process. So long as the proper process to change the master plan is followed, there should be no ramification for changing the plan. If you tie it back to what we asked the voters, we asked the voters for money to renovate the PE Facilities. We didn't even ask for new facilities so we are already beyond what we asked the voters. There is a process for changing master plans and if we follow the process, which we already have, we're on our second iteration of changing the master plan, so there is no legal ramification or consideration whatsoever.					No
031-0 25	Number three, we do have other uses for the Heliotrope area but if you look at it chronologically the temporary parking area will be long gone before we are able to break ground for the new PE Facility in either location.					No
031-0 26	Number thirteen, the statement that building on Monroe Street would be quicker is not true. The ribbon cutting would be approximately the same at either location. The being is because either site would have to be designed.					No
031-0 27	Number six, difference in design. Actually we don't have a design in either location. There will be two stories in either location, most likely, but we don't have a design. What is represented in the architect's diagrams that you were asked to evaluate is programmatic of what area needs to be included. The design with the users' input will be made to support the educational programming that needs to take place at either location.					No
031-0 28	Number 4, water table, there are mitigation issues at both locations. The water is nearer the surface at Heliotrope. It really isn't the water table. What we are finding up there is that it is not the water table but rather layers of clay that are forcing the water closer to the surface. It doesn't need to happen. It can be diverted. For cost reasons, no mitigation measures were taken to protect the tennis courts, causing the cracking. Mitigation measures will be required in either location. The poles out here (at the golf driving range) present a considerable mitigation issue that has to be taken care of on Monroe Street.					No
031-0 29	Number five, security is absolutely not a Faculty problem. Security is the Sheriff's responsibility and every building on this campus, every facility no matter where they are located will have adequate, appropriate security. We already have designed in to the track,					No



Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
------	--------------------------	------	--------	----------	---------	-------

New Business

cameras and full time monitoring at the Sheriff's station. I can't envision a faculty member sitting in his or her office looking at the monitor. Leave security up to the security experts and it will be done, and it will be done correctly.

031-0 Numbers six and seven kind of go together. We talked about he designs not really being designs. They are just programmable functions. Designs at either location will take care of the educational needs. Same with the 4,000SF or same with the classrooms, if they are needed they are more likely to be on Heliotrope than they are on Monroe. We still just have two floors at the Monroe facility. No

031-0 Numbers ten and eleven kind of go together. Yes, there was infrastructure work done already at the Monroe location. That infrastructure by the way was not paid for out of any of the Physical Education budget but was paid for out of project called Campus Wide Computer Network for Internet Access. It was SMO and TTIP funds. It had nothing to do with bond funds. While we dug the trenches we also installed the communications and electrical infrastructure. There's no heating down there, there's no cooling. That would have to come from Central Plant just like on Heliotrope. Along that way they are going to have an electrical loop go right by that anyway, that even if that is a vacant field used for nothing, we'll still have that infrastructure going by. The fact that we put PE up on Heliotrope, is not true that it would cost us more money in infrastructure. Either site has the same requirements regardless. No

031-0 Number twelve, statistics. Does not want to argue about the statistics showing an upward enrollment because you can use statistics to prove either side you want. Pointed out that PE activities, not including health, not including any lecture classes, but just PE activities, peaked three years ago and has been on a slight decline since then. The problem is not the department's problem, or fault, it's less facilities to use. The point is either location are going to meet the demand. There is no problem meeting the demand. No

031-0 I will vote my conscience. For these reasons, I will vote against the motion. No

031-0 H. Nishioka representing the pro side feels that the Physical Education Department is being singled out and forced to move against their wishes. No

Stated that PE lost \$56m.

Stated that less facilities makes it harder to carry on a good program. Also surrounding colleges that City competes against have large PE programs so that they can attract more students.

Referenced Sci Tech moved back and forth and Child Development Center moved when they were asked to. Why did PE have to go through this special process? Why were they singled out?



Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
New Business						
031-0 35	L. Yamamoka, representing the pro side, is very concerned about security on the athletic field.					No
	<p>Stated that Trustee Pearlman had hoped that the community would have access to the field and that lockers would be available to public for that use.</p> <p>Expressed concern that a small tear on the artificial turf could require replacing not just the small area of the tear but an even larger area.</p> <p>Dismayed that the Work Environment Committee was not included in the security design.</p>					
031-0 36	Dr. Ireland announced that the time period for the discussion had elapsed and asked for a motion to extend the time.					No
Motion						
031-0 37	A motion by Dr. Eastcott was adopted unanimously, "to extend the debate ten more minutes".		Motion Passed #,0,0			No
Continuation of Discussion						
031-0 38	L. Yamaoka continued expressing her concern about security.					No
	<p>Expressed her concern that the building on Heliotrope will be 5,000 sf less than the Monroe building.</p> <p>She further stated that the swimming pool is restricted at both sites. If the pool is located at one end of the building and the gym at the other end, she heard the architect state during the user group meeting that they would have to "destroy" the present women's facility locker room.</p> <p>She stated that the original application to DSA included the cost of the work for some infrastructure and the Monroe Street Mall.</p> <p>Lets all remember that we are talking about a \$3m cost savings.</p>					
031-0 39	Dr. Eastcott stated that not all security questions have been answered. At either location there are still security issues and it's time to take Jan up on her suggestion to talk about things like gates, hours of operation, when the community can use it, how we're going to monitor it, and that is again irrespective of the location. That has to be done regardless.					No
031-0 40	Dr. Maradian noted the apparent confusion regarding the square foot numbers being discussed. He went on to say that the architect told the user group during the presentation that one building is larger by square footage because of inefficiencies but the usable or assignable square footage is identical. Because not all of the voting members of the committee had an opportunity to see the presentation and if it would be helpful, he could try to facilitate a meeting with the architects to clear up any misconceptions.					No



Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
New Business						
031-0 41	L. Yamaoka stated two points of clarification. 1) The discussion of safety was merely for safety of the stadium and not the building itself. 2) That the design of the two story on Monroe included two areas that formerly were two other smaller gyms. Within that footage you would have at least four classrooms which would not have an impact on other projects. She further stated that when that question was posed to the architect regarding the Heliotrope site, they said no, that classrooms were not included. There is a possibility but they would have to discuss that.					No
031-0 42	J. McEveety felt bringing the architect to the Prop A meeting would be inappropriate. To the move, it is a division of the group and she feels very strongly that their facilities should be located next to each other for a number of reasons. We do not understand why there is such a force to have us move. This will delay our construction.					No
031-0 43	H. Nishioka said we need your help. Help us to do our job. Give us the tools to do it. Don't expect us to do it with shoddy facilities strewn all over the campus. Help us to have one site, one area, that we can concentrate our efforts and do the best job possible					No
031-0 44	Dr. Ireland announced that the time extension had expired and there was not another motion to extend. She then restated the recommended process for all projects. On Monday April 3rd, votes will be taken at 1:30pm in this room by the Votes will be taken by the Prop A Committee members on Monday April 3rd at 1:30PM in this room. The recommendation will then be forwarded at 2:30PM to Shared Governance Monday in the PCR.					No
031-0 45	Dr. Ireland asked if the voting committee members felt a need for any additional resource information to make their vote.					No
031-0 46	D. Hayes requested clarification on the question of classrooms at the two locations so that she can make an informed decision.					No
031-0 47	At the request of Dr. Ireland, R. Purisima stated that direction was given to the architect to give us equal program space at both sites. There is no design involved at the point, just equal programmatic area. They were told not to include health classrooms at either location at this time just so that we could compare apples to apples. Further, the difference in the size of the space on Monroe Street is strictly for circulation, because of the shape of the building. The programs are identical.					No
031-0 48	Dr. Ireland requested that BLL distribute the material, presented previously to the PE user group, to the voting members of the committee.	Ron Purisima (BOVLEN)	Completed	3/27/2006 (Original: 3/27/2006)	3/27/2006	Yes

Motion



Meeting Minutes

Detailed, Grouped by Each Meeting and by 'Old Business' and 'New Business'

Item	Meeting Item Description	Resp	Status	Due Date	Compl'd	Cls'd
------	--------------------------	------	--------	----------	---------	-------

New Business

031-049	A motion by M. Moon was adopted, "to adjourn."		Motion Passed #,0,0			No
---------	--	--	------------------------	--	--	----

Cc:	Company Name	Contact Name	Copies	Notes
-----	--------------	--------------	--------	-------

Proposition A/AA Committee Members: M. Adams - D. Cohen - M. DesVignes - M. Eastcott - D. Hayes - J. Ireland - M. Moon - M. Siegel - L. Yamaoka

The foregoing constitutes our understanding of the items discussed and the conclusions reached at this meeting. This report is thought to be a true and accurate account of this meeting unless notification of the contrary is received within 10 days.