

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER COLLEGE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT #512
COUNTIES OF COOK, KANE, LAKE AND McHENRY, STATE OF ILLINOIS

Minutes of the Special Board Meeting of Wednesday, March 13, 1996.

CALL TO ORDER: The Special Board meeting of the Board of Trustees of Community College District No. 512 was called to order by Chairman Moats on Wednesday, March 13, 1996 at 7:03 p.m. in the Board Room of the Administration Building, 1200 W. Algonquin Road, Palatine, Illinois.

ROLL CALL: Present: Members Barton (7:05 PM), Born, Gillette, Hess, Howard, Kolze, Moats; and Student Member Solarte

Also present: Paul Thompson, President; Ed Dolan, V.P. Academic Affairs; Bonnie Henry, V.P. Student Affairs; Vern Manke, V.P. Administrative Services; David McShane, V.P. Information Services; Larry Bielawa; Mike Brown; Harley Chapman; Jean Chapman; Lori Danaher; Dave Dluger; Jack Dodds; John Eliasik; Robert Getz; Jerry Gotham; Amy Hauenstein; Bill Howard; Mike Lackey; Carole Lissy; Dom Magno; Jeanne Pankanin; Duane Sell; Peter Sherer; Judy Thorson; Mary Jo Willis; and Laurie Wren - Harper College.

1994-95 SABBATICAL LEAVE COMPLETION REPORTS

President Thompson stated that eight faculty members were granted sabbatical leaves by the Board of Trustees during the 1994-95 academic year. He noted that each of the individuals was in attendance at the meeting to provide an overview of the activities and accomplishments of his/her sabbatical leave. The reports were given by Jack Dodds, Peter Sherer, Jean Chapman, John Eliasik, Michael Lackey, Carole Lissy, Dominic Magno and Duane Sell. In addition, the faculty members expressed appreciation to the Board and the administration for continued support of the sabbatical leave process. On behalf of the Board, Chairman Moats thanked the faculty members for sharing their experiences.

BUILDING W FACILITY

President Thompson summarized the activities of the March 7, 1996 Special board meeting. Representatives of Burnidge Cassell Associates submitted a new proposal for Building W at that time. It was the consensus of the committee and the Board members that the newly proposed location was the preferred choice in terms of

location and size. The proposal called for a 450-seat performing arts center and a 250-seat conference center. President Thompson and Vice President Manke subsequently met with Mr. Burnidge and Mr. Murphy to discuss the project.

Mr. Burnidge explained that the current proposal is referred to as Option #5. He noted that remodeling the kitchen area would be necessary to serve the new conference center. The plan calls for a parking lot with a capacity of 250 cars to be adjacent to the conference center. There would be a turn-around at that location which would be a covered access to the Conference Center.

Member Barton asked how much of Building A would be renovated. Mr. Burnidge stated that they have given cost information to remodel all three floors. However, they have not stated what is in these spaces because more direction would be necessary concerning the actual use of this area. The kitchen would obviously need to be remodeled, and there has been discussion regarding relocation of the Board room.

Member Barton asked how many additional parking spaces would be included with the performing arts center. Mr. Burnidge stated that there would be 80 additional parking spaces adjacent to a current lot for a total of approximately 580 parking spaces. He noted that the parking will change when the Algonquin Road project has been completed by IDOT.

Member Hess asked if any physical space is being taken away from Building A. Mr. Burnidge stated that the proposal does not take any space from Building A, but it does utilize the kitchen as a dual area. The present proposal will not change the south entrance to building A. The conference center would be on the northwest corner of Building A because 1) it offers an important access from Roselle Road and a possible access from Euclid as well; 2) the lake could be utilized as part of the aesthetic quality of the campus; 3) additional parking could be added here for dedicated use of the conference center; and 4) the food service area is in this location. Mr. Burnidge noted that no other location offered all of those opportunities. There was discussion regarding the location of the loading docks for the buildings, but no decision was made.

Mr. Burnidge stated that information regarding the square footage and cost information for the performing arts center has not changed from the material that was presented previously because the size is still planned for 450 seats. In response to questions from Member Barton, Mike Brown stated that this proposal would allow adequate room for set changes. The only difference in the cost is the addition of \$430,000 worth of items that were previously discussed. These are items that have to be built in at the time of the construction of the facility, such as the lift, the orchestra pit, and the thrust aspect of the stage. Member Barton asked if the lobby would be large enough to

accommodate 450 people at an intermission. Mr. Burnidge stated that it will be large enough to accommodate the people but small enough for intimate conversation.

Mr. Burnidge stated that they would like to begin development on these projects as soon as possible, and would like to have the same type of working relationship with the Board throughout the process that they have at this time. This dialogue would give Board members the opportunity to view the project and provide input as it develops.

The instructional conference center has evolved during meetings with the Board, staff and administration from a multi-use space with movable partitions to an auditorium-type conference center with break-out and support rooms that compliment the main area. The new proposal includes the addition of a dining area to accommodate 250 people. The overall square footage has been increased to accommodate the dining facility. The building construction cost is \$4,306,000. The site is more expensive because of the inclusion of larger parking lots to accommodate 250 cars. The total budget is \$4,906,000. The building is shown at 33,500 square feet on two floors. The architects felt that the conference center itself should not be more than two floors. Mr. Burnidge noted that the Board may want to consider a three-story building if other space is needed, as there are certain economies to building vertically. Thus, a figure for square footage costs has been included if a third story is desirable.

Member Born asked why there is a difference in square footage costs for different areas. Mr. Burnidge explained that they have assigned square foot costs to each area. The theater area is the most expensive, at \$230 per square foot, while the backstage area and conference center rooms are \$110 per square foot. Mr. Burnidge detailed the costs for some of the other areas and explained that the costs change because of the amount of detail necessary in a particular area. Member Born questioned why the conference center cost is not higher because of the sophisticated computer and communication equipment. Mr. Burnidge stated that the specialty equipment is an additional cost.

Mr. Burnidge addressed the remodeling of Building A, which includes the K wing. These are somewhat generalized figures, but are broken down to include areas such as the dock of the service court, the culinary art and food storage areas, the kitchen area, the offices and the entrance lobbies, as well as the second and third floors. Overall, there is 52,000 square feet on the three floors, or four if the basement is included. The average square footage cost is \$67.55. Mr. Burnidge noted that remodeling of the kitchen and dock area would be necessary to facilitate the conference center, and perhaps some other needs of the campus can be addressed in that remodeling that directly relate to the conference center.

Member Hess asked if Building A would remain primarily a student center. President Thompson stated that the building currently serves a number of different functions such as administration, student activities and business offices. The student lounge would probably remain in the same area. Mr. Burnidge stated that the conference center would include some classrooms as part of its programming.

Member Gillette asked which items on page 13 of the exhibit would be associated with only the conference center, and which ones were absolutely necessary. Mr. Burnidge stated that the dock and the service area must be addressed, interfacing with the culinary art support spaces, and the food service area would need modification. He noted that the floor levels would be even with the conference floors, and that some discussion may be needed regarding the relationship of these areas with the conference center.

Mr. Burnidge noted that the planning aspect of the project is approximately 65 percent of the architectural fees. The total costs are projected to be approximately \$19,955,000. The remodeling of Building A is estimated to be \$3.5 million, but is not necessarily all needed for the conference center.

Member Howard noted that some of the equipment that does not have to be built in at the time of construction could be budgeted for over a three-year period and phased in. Mr. Burnidge agreed with this assumption. He added that there are some essential components, such as lighting, that must be included. Some of the needs of the conference center would be paid for by the income from the conference center itself.

There was discussion regarding the cost range. Member Gillette felt that it would go as high as \$21.5 million if a third floor is added onto the conference center. Mr. Burnidge stated that the most important figure to begin with is the cost of the conference center and the performing arts center, which is \$11,408,000. Chairman Moats stated that the equipment needed to make the buildings operational is not included in that cost, and asked for a number which would accurately depict the lowest operational cost. Mr. Burnidge estimated that figure to be in the area of \$14 million-plus to open the doors for both facilities. This includes \$11,408,000 for the base buildings, \$1 million for specialty equipment for both buildings, \$1 million for quality furnishings in the conference center, miscellaneous costs and architectural costs. The furnishings for the performing arts center are already figured into the base price because these are built in.

Mr. Burnidge noted that in terms of their schedule, they have a commitment from the Capital Development Board (CDB) to have the programming complete on April 15. That is not possible because of the increased scope of the project. However, he felt that it will take an additional two months to complete the program if

decisions are made relatively soon on the direction. Therefore, if funding comes from the state, the project could go out for bids in early spring or late winter of 1997.

There was discussion regarding the CDB and their response to the expanded proposal. Chairman Moats felt that it is the role of the CDB to administrate what has been mandated to them by the state, so that they should not be concerned with how much money Harper has to pay for the additional space. Mr. Burnidge noted that they have kept the CDB project manager apprised of the changes in the project.

In reference to the equipment costs, Member Kolze asked if the three-year funding plan for \$14 million includes the \$1.5 million for equipment. Mr. Manke stated that it does and he felt that it is quite feasible, based on his experience with this same type of funding plan for other buildings on campus. He added that a plan of this type requires a great deal of cooperation and planning. Member Hess asked where the additional money beyond the \$6 million will come from. Mr. Manke stated that the College currently budgets in excess of \$1 million per year in the Operations and Maintenance Fund for capital equipment. Of that money, approximately \$400,000 to \$500,000 per year would be earmarked for this project. It was noted that the project is contingent on the College receiving the \$6 million from the state, which is not yet guaranteed.

Mr. Burnidge addressed Member Gillette's question regarding the part of the Building A remodeling that needs to be incorporated into the figures. He stated that the basement and kitchen remodeling would need to be included with part of it being used for student services. The total would be approximately \$1 million.

President Thompson addressed Member Hess' question regarding the source of additional funding. He stated that some of the fund balance from the Operations & Maintenance Fund (Restricted) would be used. In addition, there is \$2,710,000 that was originally allocated for the Performing Arts Center in the O&M (Restricted) Fund. There is also \$2,600,000 in the Operations & Maintenance (Restricted) Fund.

Member Born stated that the prospect of getting the money from the state is not encouraging at this time. She suggested that the College contact ICCB Chair Harry Crisp to assist in this matter. In addition, she encouraged the Board and faculty members to be proactive legislatively. Member Barton noted that Gary Davis and Mike Monaghan of the ICCTA are willing to work with the legislature to get the money for Harper. Chairman Moats stated that although the actual procurement of the money from the state is uncertain, the College made a commitment to go ahead with the plans and continue to work with the Legislative Affairs Committee. He suggested that the Board concentrate on the plans at this time rather than focus on the state funding.

Member Kolze noted that the \$1.5 million over three years is not on the projected funding list, but that it does include the \$2.6 million for future construction. Without the \$2.6 million, there will be roughly \$10 million. Member Kolze stated that he would favor not spending the \$2.6 million because that impacts plans that are already in place for upgrading other buildings. There was discussion regarding whether the Board needs to know the details of what is being given up to use that money for this new project.

Mr. Manke explained the total funding for the project and noted that it draws on resources from a number of different budgets, but that it will use up the Operation & Maintenance (Restricted) Fund money. The College has a commitment from the state for \$5.8 million, if and when that funding becomes available. There is a projected fund balance of approximately \$4.6 million as of June 30, 1997 in the O&M (Restricted) budget, and \$2.7 million of that amount was allocated for the performing arts theater back in 1990. If that amount is subtracted from the fund balance, it leaves a fund balance in the O&M (Restricted) Fund of approximately \$1.9 million. There is \$2.6 million in the Operations & Maintenance Fund that was restricted by the Board several years ago for future construction. This provides approximately \$11 million of available funds for basic construction. Mr. Manke noted that President Thompson had suggested preserving the \$2.6 million in the O&M Fund and instead using the \$1.9 million in the O&M (Restricted) Fund. Mr. Manke felt that it may be better to split those funds and leave some money behind in each. The equipment could be purchased over a three-year period by earmarking dollars in the O&M Fund. He also has considered a four-year plan. He noted that the College has been spending in excess of \$1 million per year out of the O&M Fund budget to equip other new facilities, which is a nonrecurring expense. Mr. Manke addressed the need for remodeling of Buildings A and C. Life Safety funding could be used for a portion of that project over the next three years. The proposed limited bond sale would provide another source from which to draw interest income for these projects.

Member Born asked Mr. Manke how he rationalizes this plan after telling the Budget Committee that the College could be in serious financial difficulty in three years and that the departments need to be fiscally conservative and to "tighten their belts". Mr. Manke stated that it concerns different funds, and the money in those funds are required by law to be spent in a particular way. Member Born felt that the general population, and students in particular, may not understand this rationale. Member Barton suggested that the College conduct a campaign to inform the public and the campus community about these issues.

Member Hess stated that many departments on campus have serious needs that should be addressed. Member Kolze agreed, and stated that it is for that reason that he would not want to use the \$2.6

million that is restricted for future construction. Mr. Manke agreed that when that money is depleted, the source of interest income is also depleted.

Mr. Manke summarized that the dollar amount that has been outlined in the projected funding sources for Building W is very feasible, as well as the projections for the equipment purchases. There are still questions regarding the amount of money that would be produced by the limited bond sale, but Mr. Manke projected it to be approximately \$10 million. Those funds could be used to generate interest income. Mr. Manke stated that Harper is in a good position to maneuver resources for maximum utilization to accomplish goals and to plan for the future. He cautioned, however, that the institution must set priorities and focus on planning.

Student Member Solarte asked what the effect would be on the remodeling of Building A if the money that is now earmarked for future construction is used for the new facilities. Mr. Manke replied that much of that answer relies on the bond sale.

Chairman Moats stated that there appears to be a significant shortfall in the amount of funds needed for the project. He agreed in part with Member Kolze's reluctance to use the \$2.6 million in the O&M Fund. He asked the architects how much money the College would lose if they went ahead with the designs and then did not follow through completely. Mr. Burnidge replied that proceeding with designs for the 450-seat auditorium and the 250-seat conference center and then paring the project back would be very difficult, if not impossible. Member Gillette asked if the CDB would allow the project to be built in two stages. Mr. Burnidge stated that the CDB has stated that both of the buildings have to be additions, and that they have to accomplish both of the objectives of the RAMP document. President Thompson stated that once they have a planning document in hand, they can show the legislators and the community that they are ready to proceed.

Member Howard moved, Member Barton seconded, that the Board direct the architects to proceed with the basic planning on the conference center, the theater, the planning for the art gallery, that portion of Building A needed in conjunction with the conference center, and the necessary changes in the parking lots and building entrances.

Member Howard noted that it has been the consensus of the Board, the faculty and the administration that this plan accommodates needs of the campus and the community for these facilities. The funding will depend on the state, but Member Howard felt that it will be easier to sell to the legislators and the CDB when there is a plan in place.

Mr. Burnidge stated that this is sufficient direction at this time because they will refine the dollars as they progress. They will relate their fees to the task, but they have a sense that the buildings will cost approximately \$11.4 million with \$1 million of remodeling costs in Building A, as well as additional costs for parking lots, art gallery, etc. for a total of approximately \$15 million. Mr. Burnidge noted that specialty equipment and furniture has not been addressed. Mr. Murphy stated that the fees would be \$635,000 to \$750,000 above the state money, based on the same rate that the state is paying the architects.

Member Kolze noted that Member Howard's motion is not intended to approve the funding but to merely continue with the planning. Member Gillette stated that the motion must include the funding of the fees for the plan. Member Howard agreed that the planning fees are included in the motion. Chairman Moats stated that the fee arrangement needs to be submitted more formally at a future Board meeting. The architects agreed to provide that information. Mr. Burnidge noted that in his experience, when the CDB dollars are released, they are more likely to fund projects with completed designs.

Member Kolze asked if the plans can be modified at a later date and scaled back to the range of \$10-\$11 million. Mr. Burnidge felt that the range would be too great, but that they will be able to create some alternates. Member Kolze stated that he was reluctant to be locked in at \$15 million. Mr. Burnidge noted that the \$15 million includes equipment and other costs beyond the building costs, and there are still choices that can be made in that regard. He stated that budget parameters need to be established for the design work. There can be alternatives included, but these could not result in a change of greater than 10 percent.

Member Howard pointed out that although the Board is committing only to the design and not to build, the consensus has always been that the project needs to be done right, even if construction must be delayed. She noted that it will be much easier to raise money for this project if there are plans to show people.

Member Kolze asked Mr. Manke how high a cost is feasible for this project. Mr. Manke felt that some of the numbers are too high, and he would work with the architects to build in alternatives that would not decrease the functionality or the beauty of the facilities. He noted that the parking lots probably would be fundable through the capital renewal grants. Mr. Manke also felt that the architects' estimates are high, but that they will be able to come into a range to meet the College's budget. That budget would be approximately \$11 million for construction, with equipment being another issue.

Member Kolze stated that he is reluctant to vote for this project without seeing a more detailed account of the funding sources and suggested delaying the vote until the March 21 Regular Board meeting. Mr. Burnidge stated that although it is important to keep the process moving ahead, the original schedule has been altered due to the fact that they have constantly been changing the plans. Member Gillette stated that although he does not want to move forward on this project without taxpayer support, he agreed with Member Howard that it should be planned and funded at a level sufficient to provide a quality result. Chairman Moats stated that he agrees with that, but echoed Member Kolze's observation that more information is needed regarding the funding.

In view of this discussion, Member Howard withdrew her motion with the understanding that she will make the same motion at the March 21 Regular Board meeting.

Member Kolze moved, Member Born seconded, that the motion be tabled and raised again at the March 21 meeting.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Barton, Born, Gillette, Hess, Howard, Kolze and Moats
Nays: None

Motion carried. Student Member Solarte voted Aye.

Member Gillette asked if Mr. Manke could provide a limitation of funding they are going to spend and the cost of the architectural fees.

President Thompson noted that the March 21 agenda will include the tabled motion and a recommendation for official approval of the architects' fees.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Member Kolze moved, Member Gillette seconded, that the Board adjourn into executive session for the purpose of discussing collective bargaining.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Members Barton, Born, Gillette, Hess, Howard, Kolze, Moats and Student Member Solarte
Nays: None

Motion carried and the Board adjourned into executive session at 10:10 p.m.

Following the executive session, the Special meeting reconvened.

ADJOURNMENT

Member Kolze moved, Member Born seconded, that the meeting be adjourned.

In a voice vote, the motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary