Physical and Life Sciences buildings: We held an open forum on 10-14-2014 to discuss old buildings, particularly the physical and life sciences buildings. It was noted that the College must spend money to maintain these facilities even if they are not used. The extra space actually hurts our chances for future state bond funding because our space utilization report includes all this vacant space. These costs drain dollars away from other needs. The physical and life sciences buildings are not good candidates for conversion to rental space as major work would be needed to convert to office space. There is not much demand to rent the labs in their current state and there may be legal issues with renting to other schools. Comments included support for demolishing the structures and returning the property to green space.

If the BPC recommendation is to demolish the buildings, then there is $750,000 currently allocated in Measure Q for this work. We would work with an architect to develop a firm cost estimate. The work would include:

- Hazardous materials abatement.
- Contractor will salvage and sell wood and other stuff that has positive sales value to reduce the amount of landfill waste and reduce the overall project cost.
- Make arrangements for any services such as network cables, electrical lines, etc. that are located in these buildings but that also serve other campus buildings.
- Having an architect draw up plans for the utility arrangements, abatement, and demolition plans.

Stadium bleachers: Following is an update provided at the 10-7-2014 Board meeting:

Open Forums Update:

A well-attended open forum was held to solicit feedback on the PE fields project, the gym project and plans for the community stadium. Many students and others attended the meeting and several voiced their opinion on the projects. The meeting was cordial and the students acted in a professional manner and made good points. Most comments related to the PE fields. It was noted that work on the fields relates to life safety and ADA compliance remediation. The District is in receipt of a study by its insurance carrier which identifies deficiencies, which is available on the BPC website. STV-VBN architects is preparing plans and drawings with preliminary plans expected shortly. Commenters noted that the fields need work, and some noted specific problems with the fields. Several commenters want to see the project move forward more quickly.

The community stadium was discussed due to a safety study conducted by our insurance carrier citing the poor condition of this facility and many hazards and deficiencies. A preliminary analysis by administration finds that the stadium would need several million dollars of code upgrades to bring it into compliance. For example, the existing overhanging roof would need to be removed or reworked as it is not seismically compliant. However, the District cannot use local bond funds for stadium upgrades, and the State will not provide funds for stadium projects. Due to the life safety risks and the high cost of code compliance, the plan is to demo the existing stadium. As a result, temporary aluminum bleachers have been installed, and the plan is to replace the stadium with a larger set of aluminum bleachers and a new press box. No comment in opposition to this plan was received,
but a few comments were received in support of the aluminum bleachers. Also, a commenter expressed concern that spending money on the old stadium would pull funds away from other needed projects.

The gym project was discussed as a request for State bond funds. An engineering firm is completing seismic testing and the preliminary results show that the State needs to provide funds to replace this building. This type of request would be categorized as a high priority “A3” request by the Chancellor’s Office. If instead, the final determination is that the building passes seismic testing, then a State bond request will still be made. However, then it will be a normal priority State project request to complete costly code upgrades, building strengthening, and life safety and ADA remediation. Only a few comments were received on the building project, related to moving forward as quickly as possible due to the already long timeline.

It was agreed that once preliminary plans for the fields are received, coaches and others will be able to review and comment on the preliminary plans. Then, the architect will be provided a summary of the feedback on the preliminary plans.

This plan helps the District meet Accreditation Standards, including III.B.1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources…. This plan helps the District meet Accreditation Standards, including III.B. Physical planning is integrated with institutional planning, and III.B.2.a. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

The BPC needs to make a recommendation, one way or the other, to the President on the stadium bleachers. If the recommendation is to demolish the stadium bleachers, it is estimated to cost about $375,000 to demo the roof and remove all the structure down to the bare concrete. Measure Q funds may be used to demolish the structure due to the life safety issues. BPC would need to allocate funds from the amount that is currently unallocated. Timeline: This project could likely go out to bid within 45 days of the BPC recommendation and the project might start within 90 days.

At this time, we have a smaller set of temporary replacement bleachers in place. A larger set of aluminum bleachers with a new press box would need to be funded from other funds, such as auxiliary and general fund at about $350,000. The temporary bleachers could then repurposed to replace old bleachers at another of our fields. If the BPC recommends moving forward, then funds would need to be allocated for the new bleachers. If the project is deferred then a temporary pressbox, such as a lift that is used by other community colleges, might be used. Timeline: Funding for this project would need to be identified in next year’s budget, so the project could start in late summer.

**Del Norte Science Lab Update:** We held an open forum with the architect to review and discuss some preliminary plans. One option is to build a modular lab and the other is to build a “stick-built” lab. The cost of both options is coming in high, so we’ll get a more solid estimate from the modular manufacturers. Also, we discussed using some instructional equipment funds over two years to purchase the lab equipment, and we discussed repurposing some equipment from Eureka to DN to help reduce costs. Next steps do not include any more open forums. At this point, we will be to email out to various Eureka and DN folks the next set of plans which
will be close to the final plans for DSA review. Then, we’ll get more feedback to the architect just before the plans go to DSA. Timeline: Very optimistic timeline would be for work to occur late spring and summer with lab ready for fall term. More realistic timeline is that the lab will be ready for next Spring term.

**Technology and Facilities Master Plan Updates:** Both plans would benefit from an interim update at this time. The College is in the beginning phases of updating the Education Master Plan and consolidating the Ed Master Plan and Strategic Plan into a single document. It might be suggested that the committees should wait until this work is done before updating the plans. However, it might be a good idea to do interim updates to the Facilities and Tech plans, so that there are timely and relevant plans to reference during the Ed Master Plan update process. Then, Facilities and Tech plans can be updated again after the Ed Master Plan is complete, but it will be easier to update more current documents.

If BPC recommends an interim update, then we will start new drafts right away. If BPC prefers to wait for the Ed Master Plan, then we’ll continue with the current plans.