
LAND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Coast Community College District
Regular Meeting of the Land Development Committee**

Date: March 02, 2009 10:00 a.m.

**Board of Trustees Office Conference Room
1370 Adams Avenue, Costa Mesa, CA 92626**

- 1. Call to Order** – Chair Walt Howald called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.
- 2. In Attendance** – Trustee Walt Howald, Trustee Jerry Patterson
- 3. Public Comment**

There were no requests from the Public to Address the Committee.

- 4. Approval of Minutes**

The Committee approved the Minutes of the February 17, 2009 Land Development Committee meeting.

- 5. Sales & Due Diligence Follow Up-Coastline College**

Acting Chancellor Dr. Ding-Jo Currie noted that progress has been made and that the Monrovia project is currently in escrow. Dr. Currie commented on the overwhelming response to the RFQ for the architectural committee. She noted that interviews had taken place in the previous week. Mr. Kevin McElroy, Vice President of Administrative Services, noted that the architects had a description of the project and provided conceptual thoughts of what would be important for the type of facility that is being suggested. There were seven firms invited to be interviewed out of the applicant pool. Dr. Currie noted that given the large number of responses received, it was not an easy task to screen the applicants. Mr. McElroy discussed the applicants' abilities in working with community colleges, general overall experience, and understanding of LEED ratings/certifications. Mr. McElroy noted that which subcontractors were used was also part of the process.

Dr. Currie noted that many firms who applied were out of state. She also noted that it was important to have firms that would respond very quickly to the time constraints of the project. Trustee Jerry Patterson asked about the hourly rates that were provided. Mr. McElroy noted that they were not included in the proposals. Mr. Patterson suggested this be done in the future. Trustee Walt Howald noted that in his limited experience with architects, he has seen that they can respond very quickly no matter where they are. He would hate to see us eliminate too many good candidates based solely on location. Dr. Currie noted that there are only four candidates remaining at this time.

Mr. McElroy commented on the EIR. He noted that he has been working with the City of Newport Beach staff on the EIR process. He also noted that the college needs the tentative parcel maps and the phase one studies and then; an "Environmental Report Form" provided by the City of Newport Beach must be completed, having the architects on staff will be assisting. Mr. McElroy noted that a civil engineer, employed by the architect, is also part of the process. Mr. McElroy hopes that the Board will approve the architect on March 4, 2009 and noted that both Monrovia properties have Phase One studies. Mr. Howald confirmed that the studies must be updated for this new escrow process. Mr. Howald asked about the surveyor, whoever the architect selects, and that we must check with the City of Newport Beach, as it is overseeing the EIR. He also suggested that the staff check with Banning Ranch and other parties to get more information on who the surveyor is. Mr. Howald noted that we do not want to survey this project twice and, on the EIR, he also noted that we have used people to perform Phase One reports, in the District, and we should check our own records and see who we have had positive experiences with in the past. Mr. Howald noted that the Land Development Committee hopes to hear that there will be one architect by Wednesday, March 4, 2009. Mr. Howald noted that the committee would probably recommend the architect that Coastline College endorses. Mr. Howald noted that the Land Development Committee would not have had the chance to review the architect proposal. Staff confirmed that this architect would be the final architect for the entire project.

6. Orange Coast College Land Development Matters

Orange Coast College President Robert V. Dees provided documents to the committee related to several projects at the college. Mr. Dees commented on the student housing project and that it has been in the works for a long time. He noted that there has been a standing committee on the campus which has met several times to discuss the concept of student housing on the campus, and has been discussed with various committees and student groups. The question needs to be asked whether or not to go forward. The college had prepared to do a feasibility study, and that there could be direction provided as to the next step. Does it look like the college is the right kind of campus to host student housing, and what is required of the campus to make it effective. The college's goal is not to provide housing for the students. The goal is to make the college a leader in what they would call a "Living Learning Environment" for students. Mr. Dees noted that one can support a living and learning environment as part of this project. Mr. Dees also noted that international students really desire this. He thinks that the college has the resources to create a living environment that would make a major impact on student success. Mr. Dees noted that students like the idea, but is it the appropriate thing for the college to pursue at this time. Mr. Dees commented about a contract proposal to do the feasibility study, and after speaking to the Board President, Jim Moreno, Mr. Dees noted that the best thing to do would be to hold off, given statewide budget concerns. Mr. Dees commented that the study would cost \$57,000, as well as a significant amount of energy to pursue the study's recommendations. After the conversation with Mr. Moreno, Mr. Dees noted that the timing may not be right to take the next step. Mr. Howald and Mr. Patterson agreed with the delay in the process. Mr. Patterson noted that he liked the idea, and emphasized that again. He thought it would be better to bring the issue back when there is more information about the state of the economy.

Mr. Howald asked Mr. Christian Teeter, Manager of Board Operations, to bring back this issue in March 2010 for further consideration by the committee. Mr. Howald noted that the issue is the college's decision at the campus level. Mr. Howald wanted the campus to have the first input in the issue. Mr. Howald also noted that seniors, and international students, also want to have housing opportunities for campus housing.

Mr. Dees discussed the parking structure issue for the college. Mr. Dees noted that the Orange County Fair and Orange College balance out their needs, and do not overlap. Mr. Dees also noted that the college is looking at the parking issue. Mr. Patterson asked about who initiated the idea. Mr. Richard Pagel, Vice President of Administrative Services, noted that the Fair has brought this issue to the college's attention. Mr. Pagel noted that the total project would cost about \$59 million. The idea of a feasibility study recently came into light. Mr. Howald noted that the issue of a pedestrian bridge is a very good idea, but if we are trying to take advantage of the opportunity for demand of parking space: why should we build a whole new structure, why would we benefit if we use the parking anyway. Mr. Pagel also noted the City of Costa Mesa would also be interested. To defray the cost, there could also be a shuttle service provided for students. Mr. Howald asked if there had been an allocation model done. Mr. Pagel indicated that a model had not been built.

Mr. Dees noted that the college is concerned about the parking issues on the campus. Mr. Dees also noted that a lot of land is tied up in parking spaces. At some point, Mr. Dees noted that the college will need to address its land use and parking issues. Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services C.M. Brahmbhatt suggested that the Land Development Committee take a long term approach on this project, as it supports expansion of the college long term down the road. There are long term goals for the college to move beyond 20,000 FTES. Mr. Brahmbhatt noted that there were also discussions of having space used at the Fairgrounds property for the college: the issue is where to take the college ten to fifteen years from today.

Mr. Dees discussed the Equestrian Center at the Fairgrounds. Mr. Dees is not sure what is happening with the Equestrian Center and the proposed plans to update the facilities there.

Mr. Dees noted that the City of Costa Mesa is pleased with the proposed project for the structure.

Mr. Patterson agreed that taking a long term view is helpful to the college and District. Mr. Patterson also expressed support for the bridge proposal.

Mr. Dees segued to the update on the Orange Coast College Sailing Center. Mr. Brad Avery, Director of the Sailing Center, provided a plan sponsored by the Orange County Sanitation District. Mr. Avery noted that there would be a lot subdivision and that there would be four lots purchased as part of the Center's activities. Mr. Avery noted that 10,000 square feet of facilities would be added for the Center's programs. Mr. Avery noted that there is a joint venture with the Orange County Sanitation District. The District's station will be built first. The Committee reviewed the draft architectural plans for the project. Mr. Patterson asked if the project required Coastal Commission approval. Mr. Avery responded affirmatively. Mr. Avery also noted that CalTrans supported the project. Mr. Avery indicated that the Coast Commission has also been briefed on the project and had not expressed concerns to date. Mr. Howald asked about cost. Mr. Avery noted that bids have gone out and proposals are being fine tuned. Mr. Avery noted that the timeline is dragging out, and that they want to keep the project moving forward. The Committee asked where the funding was coming from: Mr. Avery confirmed that the funding was from the State Bond Fund, not the District's Measure C funding.

Mr. Howald asked for Mr. Avery to provide additional reports to the committee on the Sailing Center in the future.

President Dees discussed a proposed project for the Orange Coast College Planetarium. The cost would be approximately \$9.8 million. He noted that there is also a science center

being considered for the project by the faculty, which would be open to the committee. Mr. Dees noted that the Orange Coast College Foundation is starting a fund raising drive for the first \$1 million of the project. Mr. Dees also noted that the Associated Students of the College would be asked to make a contribution. Mr. Dees commented that the proposal has gone through various committees on the campus and that enthusiasm for the project remains high on the campus.

Mr. Howald noted his experience at Bakersfield College in working with Planetariums. He noted that there could be Federal monies available. He provided information to Mr. Dees about staff at Bakersfield College that could provide insight on the project. Mr. Howald noted that the project had issues with parking and facilities. Mr. Howald noted that local high schools provided many children opportunities to benefit. Mr. Howald suggested that Memoranda of Understanding could be established with local high schools to generate interest in the project.

7. Golden West College Land Development Matters

Update on Boys & Girls Club Project

Golden West College Vice President of Administrative Services Janet Houlihan has been having regular meetings with the Boys and Girls Club. There are issues with Division of State Architects (DSA) approval, and also with the soil at the job site. DSA has been reviewing this project since July 2008. This is a huge piece of it. There are also issues with the architect as well. The drawings were not to scale. The contract for the project provides various ways to address issues. Ms. Houlihan noted that the campus is eager for the project to be completed. There are three components: child development center, gym and after school program. Now, there are going to be only two phases. After the child development center is approved, the gym project will be submitted to DSA for approval. Mr. Howald asked about the overall timeline. Ms. Houlihan noted that there were many unknowns with DSA and noted that there are not confirmed dates given the review by DSA. She confirmed that the project timeline is pushed out a year. Mr. Howald asked if anything was needed from the Board in terms of approval, and what is the increase in cost as a consequence?

Ms. Houlihan noted that there is no increased cost to the District. Mr. Brahmhatt confirmed that the Boys and Girls Club is having difficulty raising additional funds to complete the project.

Mr. Patterson expressed concern about the day care center vis-à-vis the gym project. He noted that there was a problem at the college with child care issues. Mr. Patterson commented that the gym was an add-on to the project and now, this is being put in the reverse. As such, Mr. Patterson noted that this issue should come back to the full Board for consideration. Mr. Howald asked if the priority was changing, and if so, it was his understanding that the priority was to facilitate the day care. Ms. Houlihan confirmed that child development issues remained a prime concern.

Mr. Patterson asked about the three phases of the project. Ms. Houlihan noted that there is the child development center, the school age club, and the gym. The goal of the project is to do the last two items together.

Mr. Howald noted that on all projects, when we know of a problem, that we should provide it in writing, and that the Board should be provided a copy.

Mr. Patterson expressed concerns about possible additional costs for this project. Mr. Patterson indicated that ultimately the same common goal is to complete the project on time – everyone benefits. He advised that we should collaborate closely with the Boys and Girls Club to make sure that all phases are done as soon as possible.

Mr. Howald noted that the Land Development Committee would like to hear back in three months, in late May or early June. The Committee wants a timeline, projection on finances, and status of phases and; also, a variance on the bids that are coming in on the project and the variance with the proposed budget. Also, Mr. Howald noted that there should be a project report included to the full Board shortly after this. Mr. Howald also confirmed that the college should consider alternatives.

Update on CVS Pharmacy Project

On the CVS Pharmacy Project, Ms. Houlihan noted that the project is on target. They did take some trees out, box them out, and moved them to the campus. She is working with the Maintenance and Operations staff to adjust various details on the property to accommodate the project. She noted that the actual construction should start by March or April 2009. Mr. Patterson asked about an analysis from the District General Counsel, related to the easement of the project. Mr. Patterson noted that there are some deficiencies. He did not realize that the easement is given by deed to CVS. Mr. Brahmhatt responded affirmatively. Mr. Brahmhatt noted that this is common for most District properties.

Dr. Currie commented on the General Counsel's input. She asked if there could be additional time to delay the item, return the issue to a future Board meeting. Mr. Brahmhatt noted that the items were going to be presented back to the March 18, 2009 agenda to accommodate additional review. He noted that additional delays would affect city permit usage from the process.

8. Set Future Meeting Dates

The Committee set April 13, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. as the time for the next meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Chair Howald at 11:11 AM.