

**31733**  
**APPROVED - BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NO. 508**  
**FEBRUARY 21, 2013**

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NO. 508**  
**COUNTY OF COOK AND STATE OF ILLINOIS**

**MINUTES**

**AD HOC CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**NOVEMBER 19, 2012**  
**DISTRICT OFFICE – 226 W. JACKSON BOULEVARD, ROOM 300**

Pursuant to provisions of the Illinois Public Community College Act, as amended of the State of Illinois, County of Cook, an Ad Hoc Construction Committee meeting of the Board of Trustees of Community College District No. 508 was held on November 19<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 a.m., District Office, 226 W. Jackson Boulevard, Room 300, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

**Attendees**

**Trustees**

Paula Wolff, Chair  
Ellen Alberding, Vice Chair  
Marisela Lawson

**Chancellor**

Cheryl L. Hyman

**General Counsel**

James Reilly

**Chief Advisor/Board of Trustees**

Olga Gutierrez

**Assistant Board Secretary**

Regina Hawkins

**Officers of the District**

Craig Lynch, Chief of Staff  
Diane Minor, Vice Chancellor  
Administrative/Procurement Services  
Laurent Pernot, Vice Chancellor,  
Institutional Advancement  
Joyce Carson, Vice Chancellor,  
Business Enterprise  
President Craig Follins, Olive-Harvey College  
JR Dempsey, Associate Vice Chancellor,  
Financial Managerial Reporting

**Other Attendees**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT</b>
<i>Rebecca McAlpine</i>	<i>Civic Federation</i>
<i>Roland Calia</i>	<i>Civic Federation</i>
<i>James Alexander</i>	<i>Illinois Action for Children</i>
<i>Alicia Berg</i>	<i>Columbia College</i>
<i>David Narefsky</i>	<i>Mayer Brown</i>
<i>Sara Hess</i>	<i>Mayer Brown</i>
<i>Julia Harris</i>	<i>PFM Group</i>
<i>Leticia Davis</i>	<i>PFM Group</i>
<i>Jim McLean</i>	<i>Jacobs Project Management Company</i>
<i>Mohammad Siddiqi</i>	<i>Jacobs Project Management Company</i>
<i>Jim Jankowski</i>	<i>Cannon Design</i>
<i>Eric Zachrison</i>	<i>Cannon Design</i>
<i>David Sanders</i>	<i>Deputy Chief Operating Officer</i>
<i>JR Dempsey</i>	<i>District Office</i>
<i>Katheryn Hayes</i>	<i>District Office</i>
<i>Michael Santangelo</i>	<i>District Office</i>
<i>Shawn Burnett-Whitaker</i>	<i>District Office</i>
<i>Willa Lang</i>	<i>District Office</i>
<i>Sharod Gordon</i>	<i>District Office</i>
<i>Meredith Sparks</i>	<i>District Office</i>
<i>Jeremy Gantz</i>	<i>District Office</i>

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Pursuant to the Open Meetings Act and posted in accordance with the Act’s requirements, Vice Chair Ellen Alberding called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Chair, Paula Wolff	Present (arrived 1:45 p.m.)
Vice Chair, Ellen Alberding	Present
Trustee Marisela Lawson	Present

**III. WELCOME REMARKS VICE CHAIR ALBERDING**

Vice Chair Alberding acknowledged, James Alexander- Illinois Action for Children, David Narefsky- Mayer Brown, Rebecca McAlpine and Roland Calia-Civic Federation, Julia Harris and Leticia Davis- PFM, Jim McLean and Mohammad Siddiqi-Jacobs Project Management Company and Jim Jankowski- Cannon Design. Vice Chair Alberding indicated that the topics of discussion for today’s meeting are the following:

- Review of financial advisor/draft final report
- Review of the planned development/vacation plan (including schedule and activities completed to date)
- RFQ/RFP plans
- Construction project jobs plan

- Jacobs update (including milestones and project status)
- Cannon update (including schedule and completed activities for program and space allocation)
- Olive-Harvey College interactive planning and visioning sessions

Vice Chair Alberding informed the committee that at the end of the meeting, there would be a closed session to discuss real estate matters.

#### **IV. CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS**

Chancellor Hyman remarked how earlier this year, Mayor Rahm Emanuel and she announced a five-year, \$524 million capital plan that would bring enhancements to all seven City Colleges. The plan would allow City Colleges to build state-of-the-art facilities to prepare the students with the skills they need to succeed in fast-growing fields and to address the nation's skills gap. The plan would include a new \$251 million campus for Malcolm X College, including an Allied Health Academy, and a \$45 million new Transportation, Distribution and Logistics Center at Olive-Harvey College, both to support the College to Careers effort.

The Chancellor informed the committee that it has been a year since City Colleges started work on how best to carry out the Malcolm X project. City Colleges' commitment from day one has been to weigh all options without prejudice. This was the basis for hiring advisors to help guide us through this decision-making process to select the option that will deliver the best facility for our students in the most cost-effective and efficient manner for taxpayers and the advisors are reporting back to us.

The Chancellor also remarked, as with most things in life, nothing is clear-cut, there is no slam-dunk but various approaches each carry advantages and disadvantages and today is the end of this comprehensive evaluation process, and the beginning of the committee and the Board's own deliberations now that the information will be in hand. The advisors have been thorough and creative in helping staff think through entirely new approaches and rethinking old ones.

The Chancellor stated that City Colleges' goal continues to be to provide the committee and the Board with the broadest possible range of options. The City Colleges team and Jacobs Project Management have been applying the stress test to the available approaches and in doing so, the team late last week and through the weekend worked around the clock to ensure no stone had been left unturned.

The result is that City Colleges is recommending a "hybrid" of the traditional design-bid-build approach and the design-build approach that has been discussed. Mr. Mohummad Siddiqi, who will be speaking for Jacobs from the construction perspective, will do a detailed walk-through of the project timeline and considerations for design-build as well as this hybrid approach. The Chancellor commented that while it is new to this conversation, it is a proven approach of which there are successful examples. This approach holds the potential to inject risk-mitigation into the so-called traditional design-bid-build method and while it borrows some of the best elements of design-build, it is a design-bid-build model that is fully doable under City Colleges' existing statutory authority. The Chancellor made it clear as to why City Colleges added it to the mix to provide additional factors as the committee takes today's information and begins its decision-making process.

The Chancellor recommended to the committee to use the research done by the advisors and work with the team to evaluate both the hybrid traditional approach and design-build methods. The committee and eventually the Board will need to weigh the trade-offs between such factors as the amount of risk our institution and taxpayers can and should assume the ability to adhere to timelines, and possible legal complications. The Chancellor remarked on the Olive-Harvey TDL project, how the team is working with the Illinois Capital Development Board to finalize the selection of a construction manager.

The Chancellor then acknowledged two people who have been working closely on this effort, who were not able to attend the meeting today, Jim Frankenbach, Chief Operating Officer, who is coping with a health challenge and is still making too many phone calls about this project and the CFO, Melanie Shaker, who is home after giving birth to her first child, a happy baby boy.

The Chancellor also thanked the rest of the team who have stepped in to support this project in Jim and Melanie's absence, especially Vice Chancellor Joyce Carson, Vice Chancellor Laurent Pernot and Chief of Staff Craig Lynch, who have helped keep things on track with the committed and steady hand of Deputy Chief Operating Officer David Sanders. The Chancellor turned over the presentation to David Sanders, Deputy Chief Operating Officer.

## **V. PRESENTATIONS**

<http://apps.ccc.edu/brpublic/2012/December/pg4.shtml#districtupdates>

Mr. Sanders thanked the committee, Officers of the District and all the partners and stakeholders for allowing City Colleges the opportunity to present the progress on the capital projects, both Malcolm X College and the TDL Center at Olive-Harvey College. Mr. Sanders turned the presentation over to Vice Chancellor Laurent Pernot, who began the discussion of the financial advisor report. Vice Chancellor Pernot per the Chancellor's request was asked to say a few framing words as a member of the broader team working with both sets of advisors within the last few weeks, which has been identified as a new model or the "Hybrid" Design-Bid-Build delivery model. This new model came together in the last three-four days. The new model was not reflected in the PFM report because the report was drafted before the new model was identified. Vice Chancellor Pernot discussed the issue of risk transfer and the long conversations with the committee for the last few months about design-build being one of the main ways you could transfer risk, which was one of the drawbacks of a design-bid-build. Vice Chancellor Pernot also explained how through the diligence of Jacobs Project Management team, City Colleges has identified a way to take a lot of the main advantages of the design-build approach and bring together the contractor and the design firm so that both can get familiar and comfortable with the design, but also have a say in the design, which will set the stage to have a price that is solid that can be taken to the bank, but will allow us to enter into contract on a maximum guaranteed price. Vice Chancellor Pernot remarked that the issue of guaranteed price was a big concern for City Colleges but we now have identified a delivery model that passes the muster with the legal team; in addition this was actually an approach that Jacobs has utilized successfully. Jacobs is about to break ground on a hospital project in California using that very same approach with a guaranteed maximum price and about three quarters of the way into a hospital project in Texas where they will be using a guaranteed maximum price as part of design-build-bid. Vice Chancellor Pernot also informed the committee that with this information it is important to take a fresh look at design-bid-build.

Mr. Sanders then introduced the financial advisor final report, which was presented by Ms. Julia Harris from PFM. Ms. Harris informed the committee that the role of PFM was to look at the affordability of City Colleges' capital plan, as well as the delivery models for Malcolm X College. The affordability plan in conjunction with City Colleges finance team, PFM has developed multiple scenarios based on different revenue and expense assumptions to determine the potential range of impact of the capital plan. There were two scenarios that Ms. Harris presented, the first scenario used conservative assumptions and does not reflect any internal expense control initiatives or potential savings from insourcing, but under the conservative assumptions at the end of the fiscal year 2020, the fund balance still will remain positive and this scenario would require no dramatic changes to City Colleges policy or any board action which would make operations remain status quo. Ms. Harris discussed scenario two with the committee that allowed PFM to look at a ten-year historical revenue and expense data. When this scenario was done, revenue growth was 6.5 percent and expense growth was 4.1 percent which did include during this time period, a tuition increase and some other one-time State funding windfalls and under this scenario City Colleges could end up with a very positive capital project fund balance at the end of 2020.

Ms. Harris referred to the power point presentation which identified the various options of tax exempt financing; one of the ways would be revenue bonds which City Colleges would be the issuer and would be supported by tuition and fees; no referendum or voter-initiated referendum would be required. Ms. Harris also addressed the true interest cost which is the estimate of cost to capital. The other alternative would be to do alternative bonds, which is a double pledge of tuition fees with an additional backup pledge of either property taxes or another revenue source. Under this scenario, there would be a need for a possible voter-initiated referendum which means 7.5 percent of voters would need to come together within 30 days of the public notice to require a referendum. City Colleges GO bonds would be all available revenues and the only issue would be the legal authorization and City Colleges would have to do a referendum. The other issue with doing GO bonds is the maximum term which is only 20 years, although it is a very low cost to capital, based on what PFM would think of City Colleges rating. Ms. Harris also commented that once PFM looked at all of City Colleges options, their recommendation would be that City College would do the alternate bonds for many reasons; one is the ease of implementation, because they are less expensive than many of City Colleges other alternatives and there is a 40-year term. Also, many of City Colleges' sister agencies: Chicago Public Schools and the Chicago Park District use this same method. Ms. Harris then asked if there were any questions before turning over the second part of the presentation to Ms. Leticia Davis from PFM.

Mr. Alexander asked in either scenario would PFM be expecting an additional tuition increase. Ms. Harris responded that under no scenario is a tuition increase expected. Mr. Alexander wanted to know how PFM would anticipate revenue growth under scenario two. Ms. Harris informed Mr. Alexander that PFM was just running a sensitivity analysis, but it is up to City Colleges as to how they plan on growing revenue or cutting expenses. Chancellor Hyman referred to page two of the power point presentation where PFM showed a balance sheet where it is strong enough that even if City Colleges' expenses grew and the revenue stayed the same, City Colleges would still have a lot of money, not a windfall. The Chancellor then addressed page three (the security source) addressing tuition and fees, which will remain steady and stable. City Colleges does not need to grow additional revenue, but City Colleges is in a strong financial position to make this happen.

Mr. Sanders also reminded Mr. Alexander that PFM looked at the tuition increase over last ten years. Mr. Alexander wanted to know was it correct that in scenario two, PFM looked back ten years and saw a growth, and then assumed that level of growth. Ms. Harris responded no and there were no changes in scenario one, but in scenario two PFM did a sensitivity analysis to show what City Colleges fund balance and the capital fund balance could be if City Colleges played with any of the levers. Chair Wolff

remarked that Mr. Alexander was inquiring whether when the sensitivity is done, was PFM factoring in historical tuition increase. Ms. Harris responded yes. Mr. Alexander asked Ms. Harris did PFM look at growth and then said project there is no growth? Ms. Harris responded yes. Chair Wolff asked that although the property tax logically would grow and the personal property replacement would logically grow, would this be the assumption? Ms. Harris responded that historically yes, PFM does not anticipate growing at all in the future, but when the scenarios were done; the first foot note on the presentation indicates that there is no intention to increase tuition or fees to pay for the project.

Ms. Leticia Davis from PFM addressed the Malcolm X College alternative project delivery models. PFM's analysis included the comparison of the traditional design-bid-build delivery model method and the design-build method. The analysis was focused on the traditional design-build-bid model as compared to the design-build methodology. The key distinguishers are the two criteria which involve the level of control and the amount of risk. Ms. Davis went into detail on the methodology—the delivery models are also distinguished primarily by the contracting and under design-build-bid, City Colleges has a multiple contract, one for design and one for construction. Under the design-build methodology, it is one contract where the two are combined and the process is collaborative from the beginning. The traditional design-build-bid process is a known procurement process and what is done traditionally in government projects. The considerations for this kind of delivery model are the risk of delay in the cost overrun stay and are maintained with the owner. Ms. Davis also explained that the full control of the design process is a benefit of the traditional design model methodology and City Colleges has design control during that entire process because of the way it is being procured and typically there is a longer delivery project schedule under that scenario. Also, flipping to a design-build process, City colleges now has a single contract for design and construction is being contracted together. There is an opportunity for cost savings as they collaborate simultaneously through the process, so the delivery and completion schedule risk moves to the team, the design-build team and away from City Colleges.

Vice Chair Alberding asked Vice Chancellor Pernot if he could give a quick parallel analysis for the hybrid. Chancellor Hyman responded that Mohammed Siddiqi would answer the question later in the meeting and he would go into detail. Ms. Davis went on to explain another component of the analysis that was the value for money which compared the cost of the design-build operating delivery models against the traditional models and making some assumptions about what the probability is of either of those items, construction costs, financial costs, operating maintenance cost, construction delay, cost overrun risk and change order rework risk. All of these risks have a probability of occurring and the job of PFM was to assign a cost and to determine what the advantages or disadvantages would be. Ms. Harris summarized her report by informing the committee how PFM looked at capital funding strategy, as well as delivery models for Malcolm X College and based on PFM's affordability analysis, City Colleges is able to implement its full capital plan including the \$251 million for Malcolm X College and this would not materially adversely affect City Colleges' financial position. PFM also recommended that City Colleges utilize the tax exempt financing market to fund the difference between the current cash balance to fill the gap of what is in the cash balance versus what is needed in the capital plan. Regarding the delivery of Malcolm X College, in either the PBI or the design-build scenario, City Colleges would have to secure new authority to implement the approach. Ms. Davis concluded that given what PFM knows about City Colleges and what City Colleges is trying to get out of leveraging the balance sheet, providing the opportunity for innovation and design, creating a mechanism for cost savings during the design and construction phase and providing an opportunity for more detailed specifications, PFM believes based on these considerations that a traditional or design-build approach may offer an acceptable path to achieving City Colleges' objectives.

Vice Chair Alberding thanked Ms. Harris and Ms. Davis for a well done report, which was helpful and to the point. Chancellor Hyman also added thanks and how this report from working with the leadership

team on Saturdays and Sundays was extremely informative and how the committee is able to review up-to-the-minute updates.

Mr. Sanders then introduced Mr. Mohummad Siddiqi from Jacobs Project Management Company who addressed the difference between the design-build and design-bid-build delivery options. Mr. Siddiqi thanked President Munroe and his team for striking a balance between the program need, cost and schedule. Mr. Siddiqi then referred to page nine of the power point which listed the main activity schedule for design-build project, and how it lists various key activities and their timelines. The programming is almost complete and the schematic design will be done March 4<sup>th</sup> or March 8<sup>th</sup>. The Planned Development (PD) application process has not started, but Vice Chancellor Minor will go into more detail, but there had been several meetings with city commissioners. Mr. Siddiqi also stated that Jacobs is starting the RFQ process under this scenario and they have developed an RFQ document which has gone through several reviews, which is scheduled to go out for bid on December 7<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Siddiqi explained to the committee how resolving the delivery model is critical and how Jacobs would have needed authorization, to have a design-build [or approved delivery model] done before the RFP is issued to ensure the timelines are maintained and to have an AE on board by completion of the Design Schematics scheduled for March 4<sup>th</sup>. Jacobs also took advantage of the onboard architect and explored the option of Cannon doing the foundation design to secure a new permit, which will gain about two months in construction time. This means that the time to construct the building will remain the same but we will be further along in the project timeline because the garage will be finished in September, if this route is explored. If City Colleges does not go this route, then the completion will be delayed by a couple of months, therefore it is extremely key to have the legislative authority to start the process. Mr. Siddiqi then addressed page ten of the power point presentation the design-bid-build project schedule and how CCC will now need to look for an architect engineer of record and bring the party on board to do the balance of the design. Once the schematic design is completed, the design goes into two distinct phases. The first phase is called design development; at the end of the design development, the overall design is about 50 percent complete. The next phase is called construction documentation that takes the design development and takes it to 100 percent complete construction document.

Mr. Siddiqi went on to explain that the Hybrid Design-Bid-Build model that the Chancellor and others have referred to, is a proven model that Jacobs has used on four of the recent projects that Vice Chancellor Pernot mentioned, and Cannon is doing that similar approach on a project in Chicago for DePaul University. The plan is to take the project to 50 percent completion during the design development level and then use that document to go out for bid and ask contractors for qualifications, as well as a target price. In-house experience lets Jacobs know that they should be able to get a plus/minus 10 percent or better bid. The additional safeguard that Jacobs is building in the design is internally doing cost estimates at the design development level, at 50 percent construction document level, so there will be three estimates during the course of design to ensure that the cost does not get out of hand. Once the documentation is done, the cost is within budget. Mr. Siddiqi informed the committee that in this new approach that has been described or the modified design-build-bid, CCC wants to select a contractor and bring the contractor on board at close to about two months before the construction completion. The contractor with a team of estimators, construction engineer and project manager would be able to participate both on constructability review, value engineering, as well as construction cost. When Jacobs is done with 100 percent of construction document, those documents will be issued to the selected contractor and we will ask them to provide a lump sum fixed bid or update his initial bid and the expectation is that the bid should be within 8 percent of what was initially provided. The benefit to City Colleges program requirement is 100 percent met, and there will be a lump sum bid, and although this

delivery model may take an additional two months, we still expect to complete the project by December of 2015.

Vice Chair Alberding asked for confirmation that this is a two-month delay compared to option one which assumes that you can actually get the legislative authority. Mr. Sanders confirmed that this was correct. Vice Chancellor Pernot addressed the sliding scale which shows delivery of September but that is assuming Jacobs is turning over schematic designs to the architect in March, so for every month it is delayed, it slides. Mr. Siddiqi commented that he believes that the second option that was described, design-bid-build, there is a better opportunity to translate 100 percent of City Colleges program requirement into construction document. Vice Chair Alberding asked Mr. Siddiqi what his view would be if there was going to be a case against it and what would he say? Mr. Siddiqi responded that there are certain things that City Colleges as a client will have to commit; one is a commitment to the scope. Once the schematic design is reached, everyone has to agree that this is the scope. Mr. Siddiqi recommended a Change Control Board and all changes to the project after the project is awarded go through the Change Control Board, which would probably consist of the Chancellor, Jim Frankenbach and Diane Minor. Vice Chair Alberding remarked to Mr. Siddiqi that one risk is that there may be changes that might happen anyway. Mr. Siddiqi responded that the changes would go for both models and changes could happen on any project regardless of the delivery model. Vice Chancellor Pernot commented that when you stick with this team, you see people with a look of horror on their face talking about things called change orders, which is an approach where you are indicating risk. Vice Chancellor Pernot also responded to Vice Chair Alberding's question, where is the catch?—the big difference is the safeguards that are in place and this is bringing together the contractor and the design team. City Colleges has colleagues who were here for and at the tail end of the Kennedy-King College construction process which was \$63 million over budget months behind schedule. Chancellor agreed but indicated the project was years behind schedule.

Chair Wolff asked about the design development construction documentation—what action is needed from the Board and from the time the Board acts how long before it gets to procurement. Mr. Siddiqi responded that the Board has to advise that this model is the model that City Colleges will use to execute the project and after speaking with Vice Chancellor Minor and the procurement staff at City Colleges, they believe that procuring the services of architect and engineer of record within this time frame is feasible. Chair Wolff wanted to know how long does the procurement take, Mr. Siddiqi responded that three months have been allowed for procurement and one month for contract—for AE firms to respond to the bid. The goal is to bring the architect and engineer of record on board by the time the schematic design is finished. Chair Wolff asked when this would happen and Mr. Siddiqi responded sometime in March.

Vice Chair Alberding asked if there was anything about the model that would make an AE firm more or less interested in the project? Mr. Siddiqi responded that Jacobs is not asking for anything extraordinary from the AE firm and both Jacobs and Cannon have done this under this model. Mr. Jankowski from Cannon design also commented that this is a traditional handoff point. Cannon has been on both sides of handing off and receiving the handoff, and this is a typical place that handoff is done.

Trustee Lawson inquired about the collaborative effort (“handoff” process) and if it determines who gets selected.

Vice Chancellor Pernot responded that the role of the CM and stepping up on our own internal resources will be important. He went on to mention, what is important is the eyes wide open factor that needs to be spelled out as City Colleges selects an AE firm. Mr. Jankowski also commented that the other important factor of keeping things on track is when “handoff” is mentioned it isn’t like we just toss in the drawings and say good luck. There is a lot of time put in, as the committee will see. Once we complete our analysis with the Malcolm X team to understand their programs and force them to think really hard about those programs (which they have done an excellent job), we will kind of run alongside the selected architect and engineer of record to make sure that there is a smooth handoff and they understand the program elements and then also review their drawing as they are developed so they benefit from the information that we learned as well.

Chair Wolff asked how do you get a foundation permit and start a permit before you know what the real design of the building is. Mr. Jankowski responded that the schematic design sets the major parameters for the building and Cannon are working hard with the Malcolm X team and with City Colleges to determine the shape of the building and locate all the rooms. The educational specifications define what goes in each room and somebody has to lay it all out, review it with the Malcolm X team and all those parameters are set, which is what sets the foundation design. Vice Chair asked if the hybrid model presentation was finished so the committee could move on to the next agenda. Vice Chancellor Pernot responded yes.

Chancellor Hyman commented that Vice Chair Alberding question was extremely important and everyone should understand. If someone was to argue against City Colleges, what could be said? On a design-build, people will say you have less control, but you also have less risk and in a design-bid-build, people will say you have far more control, but you take on more risk which means someone could possibly say, City Colleges is going to bear the responsibility of building this building themselves which puts more burden on their staff. We also have more control over the project, which is what City Colleges did not have in other projects like a design-build, so you could actually have more risk in a design-build. What is unique is that in the hybrid model City Colleges has figured out a way where if we do this as outlined by Mr. Siddiqi, we actually do take on less risk and we do hire the appropriate staff, we retain control. We have looked at what that additional staff would look like or what we need to make sure there is not a burden and the right expertise is there. Mr. Siddiqi remarked that one of the things that is a standard practice, whether it is design-build or design-bid-build, when we do a project, we gather a team of designers, constructor and we do a risk plan; we evaluate the project and say what are the risks. The next phase of that risk is a risk mitigation plan, so that risk mitigation plan will be developed whether we choose to go with design-build or design-bid-build.

Vice Chancellor Pernot also commented on what the Chancellor said: the big difference is the time, so under the design-build there was a projected completion of late September, which obviously assumes having authority in hand. Under this scenario we are looking at a December 31<sup>st</sup> timeline, which is the best case scenario; there is little room for delay and the role of the construction manager in having these internal resources allocated because you are working from that standpoint. Mr. Siddiqi commented that if you take a look at the two schedules in the design-bid-build, we have allowed 31 months, which is a four month cushion. There is a possibility that we may be able to bring the project completion back on

schedule from December to September because allowances have been made to allow more time in the design-bid-build, so there is a three or four month cushion. Mr. Sanders then presented the efforts that have been undertaken by direction of the Chancellor to address the Planned Development (PD) application schedule. Vice Chancellor Diane Minor addressed the application schedules. Vice Chancellor Minor informed the committee that there is a much expedited schedule for plan development, as well as construction. City Colleges is doing a PD with zoning changes because the parking lot isn't zoned for educational use. As a result, we have developed a schedule that gets us to June of 2013 by calculating the time to execute the PD application and rolling back from June of 2013, which means that to meet that timeline to continue the construction schedule moving forward, we need to have our PD application submitted by November 28<sup>th</sup>. What we did to start this process was to begin our outreach to various city departments involved in the PD process which includes meeting with the Commissioner of the Department of Housing and Economic Development. There have been meetings with the Commissioner of the Mayor's Office of People with Disabilities and we are scheduled to meet with the Commissioner of the Department of Transportation once our traffic study is completed, to introduce them to the project. We plan by November 27<sup>th</sup> to identify the properties that are around the current Malcolm X College footprint to ask the owners of those properties for their designated consent to include those properties in the PD application, which is a normal step. If City Colleges does not own the contiguous properties, we have to ask for a written consent, and we are working with them to get this done. There will be property acquisitions involved with the PD application and we will have those acquisitions completed by January 30<sup>th</sup>. The street and alley vacation application will be filed in February of 2011. By the end of February, we will also have our revised Planned Development application submitted, that will include the basic site design which will be taken to the Plan Commission and City Council. Vice Chancellor Minor concluded that the committee will be kept abreast as City Colleges goes through the process. City Colleges is also working closely with David Narefsky from Mayer Brown, as well as Jacobs, Cannon and our own in-house staff to put everything together to make sure that we meet the timeline. We have also engaged Jones Lang LaSalle to work with City Colleges in this process to obtain the designated consent for the designated properties, as well as doing due diligence in terms of appraisal if there are any property acquisitions that we need for the Malcolm X College campus.

Vice Chancellor Minor also stated that we can build this structure with the property that we own, but we are looking to see if there is any avenue for acquisition and we are looking for preliminary contact with property owners this week to begin. By November 27<sup>th</sup> we will have the designated consent; if we need to move forward with acquisition, we look to have it completed, priced and offers made by January 30<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Alexander asked what would the property be used for if it is acquired and is it needed to do the project? Vice Chancellor Minor responded stating that the acquisition are needed in terms of the design. Chancellor Hyman also remarked that some of the properties by Malcolm X College are not the best sites to see and not in good shape. There has been a desire expressed from a lot of the faculty and student meetings about common areas that people can come and study and take advantage of some outside spaces in the summer.

Mr. Sanders moved to the other presentation which was the construction advisor update, which was followed by Jim Jankowski who presented space allocation. Before the presentations Mr. Alexander asked if the committee was informed on the foundation permitting proposal. Vice Chancellor Pernet informed Mr. Alexander that Mr. Siddiqi addressed this issue. Mr. Siddiqi led the discussion regarding student participation and community participation, which Jacobs is looking at two different phases.

Jacobs plan to hire an intern for PMCM services and for the architect. Mr. Siddiqi met with the Dawson staff and interviewed three candidates. Cannon also interviewed the candidates that have been provided for the architecture internship and is looking to bring an architecture intern on board as well in a similar time frame. Mr. Siddiqi also discussed that in the long term, Jacobs wants to make sure that the City Colleges' students have an opportunity to participate as interns and apprentices in the actual construction contract, and that language would be provided in the RFP. Mr. Siddiqi spoke with the Dawson students, Dawson Dean and faculty and Jacobs is proposing that they make presentations to the bidders for the capabilities of Dawson students to make sure that both the community participation and student participation is fully covered under the contract language.

Mr. Jankowski from Cannon Design gave an update on design. Cannon has been working hard with the Malcolm X College team and City Colleges to get into all the details of the program. Mr. Jankowski acknowledged the work that President Munroe and his staff did, especially last week in terms of looking through every line item in the program and carefully considering all those aspects. The target is to be no more than 500,000 square feet. Cannon has looked at the efficiencies and how it can be handled. Malcolm X College and City Colleges has been pretty creative and open-minded about how to handle these items; paying attention to curriculum objectives, as well as space needs. Mr. Jankowski referred to page nineteen of the power point presentation and the activities Cannon has gone through as more and more details arise about the program. There will be more meetings, but Cannon is close enough in terms of the square footage, the basic pieces of the program and the approach. The Chancellor and their teams were working on delivery methods over the weekend; they kicked off their design effort starting Saturday with about a three-quarter day to start looking at building concepts and site usage. Mr. Jankowski also remarked on how Jacobs continued touring simulation labs and held a simulation workshop on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of November. The workshops were not only for health sciences faculty from Malcolm X College and other colleges, but there were also faculty members from the general education portion of Malcolm X College to show how they use simulation in the curriculum and in teaching in the future. There is also a traffic consultant who is conducting a traffic study and we are ready to begin the geotechnical analysis. Vice Chair Alberding asked what is geotechnical analysis? Mr. Jankowski responded soil borings, which is drilling to see what is underground to establish foundation design.

Mr. Sanders then led the discussion to have Vice Chancellor, Minor and President Follins to discuss the TDL Center at Olive-Harvey College. Vice Chancellor Minor informed the committee that City Colleges has been working very closely with the Illinois Capital Development Board since the last meeting to identify strategies that will bring the building in on time. Vice Chancellor Minor also spoke on key issues that were found with the site at Olive-Harvey College. We have good news because the land potentially designated for the building which is adjacent to the main building was zoned incorrectly. The city went back [reviewed their records] and realized it was zoned incorrectly and are now going to correct the information. Vice Chancellor Minor also spoke on what is being done to keep the project timelines with Olive-Harvey College and President Follins. There was a contract awarded not to exceed \$25,000 to FGM, who is the architect of record on this project. This was done to ensure interactive planning and visioning session are completed for Olive Harvey to bring the project timelines back in line. The first planning meeting was with FGM at Olive-Harvey College with the stakeholders and November 14<sup>th</sup> was the first teleconference on the CM, construction manager to be brought on board. In its first response the State rejected all the bidders as nonresponsive. The bid was released again and received eight responses, of which City Colleges selected four high-qualified candidates for oral presentation which will take place in Springfield. City Colleges will be on the evaluation team in Springfield to make a final recommendation; it will then go to the Capital Development Board for their approval, December 11<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Wolff asked Vice Chancellor Minor if she was comfortable with CDB declaring the received bids as nonresponsive. Vice Chancellor Minor responded yes. Vice Chancellor remarked on one last item that the jobs mentoring program that Mr. Siddiqi was overseeing, there were some very encouraging meetings

with elected officials to let them know this is what we would be doing and we will work through them to help augment the efforts of the team. Associate Vice Chancellor Gordon has to make sure that the residents are not only aware of the opportunities, but know that they can enroll in some of our classes at Dawson to become qualified for some of these jobs that will be available. Vice Chancellor Pernot also informed the committee that City Colleges has spoken with CI and had preliminary conversations with the Urban League to help not only publicize all bidding opportunities so that contractors are aware, but also to let residents know of the employment opportunities.

**VI     CLOSED SESSION**

Vice Chair Alberding called for a motion to hold closed session pursuant to the Open Meetings Act, Section 2C5, for discussion of real estate matters. Chair Wolff moved the motion and Trustee Lawson seconded. The motion was approved. There was no action in the closed sessions and the open meeting was not reconvened.

**VII    MOTION TO ADJOURN**

Vice Chair Alberding asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

<Motion> Chair Paula Wolff

<Second> Trustee Marisela Lawson

Meeting Adjourned 3:30 p.m.

Submitted By – Regina Hawkins, Assistant Board Secretary