

Recommendations Report  
of the  
SB 588 Working Group Advisory Committee

# Analysis and Recommendations for Changes in Plan Review Process for Capital Outlay Projects at California Community Colleges

---

Pursuant to Chapter 704, Statutes of 2008, Education Code Section 81054  
(SB 588, Runner)

December 2009

**Department of General Services**

David F. Thorman, AIA, State Architect - **Division of the State Architect**

**California Community Colleges**

Frederick E. Harris, Assistant Vice Chancellor of College Finance and Facilities Planning -  
**California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office**

**Associated General Contractors of California**

John Nunan, President - **Unger Construction Company**

**Professional Engineers in California Government**

Ted Toppin

Prepared on behalf of the SB 588 Working Group Advisory Committee by the

**Division of the State Architect 1102 Q Street, Suite 5100**

**Sacramento, CA 95811**

**916.445.8100**

**[www.dsa.dgs.ca.gov](http://www.dsa.dgs.ca.gov)**



## BACKGROUND

Since 1933, the Division of the State Architect (DSA) has been charged with enforcing the requirements of the Field Act (Education Code Section 81130-81149) to ensure that public school buildings are safe. DSA is a division of the Department of General Services (DGS). DSA provides plan review services to verify that the construction documents meet the applicable building codes and standards. Once the design of the building is approved, DSA monitors both the quality of construction and the performance of independent DSA-certificated inspectors. These functions are conducted in accordance with the Field Act.

### **Senate Bill 588**

Chapter 704, Statutes of 2008 (SB 588—Runner) provided for the development of alternative building standards that would apply to community college structures, and that can be used in lieu of the building standards applicable to the Field Act. Chapter 704 required the development of building standards specifically for community colleges. These standards are intended to align more closely with those standards governing the construction of other post-secondary school structures, while maintaining the same seismic safety performance levels as the Field Act. DSA will continue to review and approve all community college projects regardless of the building standards (Field Act or the new community college standards) used for design.

Chapter 704 also required the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) to analyze the length of time that DSA and community college districts take to perform their respective functions to complete community college construction and alteration projects. This report was completed in March of 2009.

Chapter 704 also required DGS, at the conclusion of the LAO study, to convene a working group advisory committee to analyze the LAO report and the current process. The Working Group Advisory Committee was tasked to develop recommendations for changes, if any, in the project development and review process to ensure public safety of community college facilities through a collaborative, consistent, cost-effective, and timely project development and review process.

### **Implementation of SB 588**

The implementation of SB 588 by DSA included the following major efforts:

- Consultation with SB 588 Work Group. This multidisciplinary group, including representatives from California community colleges, design professionals, the California Seismic Safety Commission, and other interested parties, provided general input on the scope and direction of the

- implementation effort. They met in November and December of 2008, and in August 2009. The SB 588 Work Group discussed traditional and collaborative project design and review processes, as well as the technical content of the California Building Code (CBC) as it is applied to community college projects. A roster of the SB 588 Work Group participants is attached in Appendix A. A technical subgroup of the SB 588 Work Group was formed to assist in the technical review of the CBC amendments and the collaborative process. This subgroup met regularly from January through June 2009. The functions of this group will be carried forward by a new Community Colleges Subcommittee of the DSA Advisory Board.
- Development of Community College Building Standards. DSA staff, in consultation with the SB 588 Work Group drafted building standards specifically applicable to community college buildings. This effort included a review of the building standards applicable to the California State University system. DSA staff reviewed each California code amendment for applicability to seismic safety performance. Amendments not impacting seismic safety performance levels were considered for repeal. Amendments relating to seismic safety performance levels were retained. In order to improve the usability of the community college building standards, amendments were proposed when the model building code or referenced national building standards were unclear or contradictory. The California amendments in the structural chapters were reformatted to improve usability. The community college building standards were submitted to the California Building Standards Commission for adoption in July, 2009 as part of the 2010 CBC, which will be published and available in July of 2010.
  - Development of the Collaborative Process. DSA implemented an informal collaborative review process in 2006. This provides community college representatives and the project design team an opportunity to meet with DSA staff during the design phase of the project, prior to the submittal of plans for review. At these collaborative meetings requirements regarding the California Building Standards Code, project scheduling, and plan review process are discussed. As a further development of the collaborative process, DSA staff, in consultation with the SB 588 Work Group, developed a formal collaborative plan review and approval process. In the formal collaborative review process, DSA provides consultation and review services at different milestones during the project design. Significant code deficiencies or questions are identified early in the design process, where they can more easily be corrected. The formal and informal collaborative

processes can produce potential savings of both design and review time, by reducing rework of the design.

## WORKING GROUP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In conformance with the requirements of SB 588, a Working Group Advisory Committee was formed, consisting of representatives from the following organizations:

- DGS
- Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (CCC)
- Associated General Contractors of California (AGCC)
- Professional Engineers in California Government (PECG)

### Representatives

- DGS is represented by David F. Thorman, American Institute of Architects (AIA), State Architect.
- CCC is represented by Frederick E. Harris, Assistant Vice Chancellor of College Finance & Facilities Planning, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.
- AGCC is represented by John Nunan, President, Unger Construction Company.
- PECG is represented by Ted Toppin.

### Advisory Work Group Committee Review Items

The Work Group Advisory Committee convened on November 18, 2009, to discuss the following items:

1. ***Plan Review for Capital Outlay Projects at the California Community Colleges:*** Legislative Analyst's Office, March 19, 2009

This report summarized the findings of the LAO on the plan review timeframes for community college projects. The report found that in Fiscal Year 2007/2008, the average time for DSA to complete plan review was 81 calendar days. The average time for the community college district and design team to correct the plans was 113 calendar days. The LAO also identified increased DSA review durations in the Los Angeles Regional Office, and recommended that the cause of this situation be analyzed.

2. **DSA Bulletin 09-07: Collaborative Process for Community College Projects**

This bulletin provides detailed information on implementing the collaborative process, including establishment of review schedules tailored to the individual needs of the client. It was originally issued in July, 2009 and was revised and expanded based on staff and SB 588 Work Group input in November, 2009.

3. **Proposed Building Standards - 2010 California Building Code Draft Express Terms (2010 CBC) and Amendment Review Matrix (2007 CBC)**

These documents, prepared for the technical subgroup, summarize the efforts of the SB 588 subgroup. The subgroup reviewed and considered each amendment for inclusion in the community college building standards code. Amendments relating to seismic safety performance were retained. Based on the input from the subgroup, DSA prepared the Express Terms for submittal to the California Building Standards Commission. The Express Terms present the proposed changes to the CBC which implement the new building code provisions for community colleges. The proposed standards add new sections to CBC Chapters 16, 19, 21, 22, and 23, which contain the California amendments to the national model building code necessary to maintain, for community colleges, the same seismic safety performance levels as the Field Act.

The community college amendments are identified by the acronym DSA-SS/CC, to distinguish them from Field Act amendments (DSA-SS). The proposed building standards are expected to be adopted by the California Building Standards Commission in January 2010, be made available to the public in July 2010, and become effective in January 2011.

4. **Overview Presentations: The Collaborative Process and 2010 California Building Code for Community Colleges**

The Advisory Work Group reviewed two presentations that summarize the collaborative process for community college projects, with a special emphasis on involvement of DSA during the design phase of the project, with a goal of identifying and resolving code issues as early in the process as possible.

The difference in plan review times between Regional Offices was discussed by the Working Group Advisory Committee. The LAO report found that the average review duration for community college projects in the Los Angeles DSA Regional

Office (Region 3) was 101 days, versus a range of 72 to 76 days for the other three DSA Regional Offices (Sacramento, Oakland, and San Diego). DSA has analyzed the available projects data and determined that increased review durations in the Los Angeles Regional Office were due to the high volume of projects received by that office during the 2007/2008 Fiscal Year, compared to the other three DSA Regional Offices.

The LAO report also found that community college districts in Region 3 took significantly longer on average to return corrected plans than community college districts in other regions. The average number of days for district reviews (response to DSA plan review) in Region 3 was 208 days, compared to 96 days in San Diego (Region 4), 74 days in Sacramento (Region 2), and 56 days in the Bay Area (Region 1).

Considering all project types requiring structural and fire/life safety review (including both K-12 and community college projects, and excluding Over-the-Counter reviews), the Los Angeles Regional Office received 750 projects. During the same period the number of projects received by the other Regional Offices ranged from 449 to 532. Therefore, the Los Angeles Regional Office received 41 percent more projects than the next busiest regional office. The mix of projects in the Los Angeles Regional Office included a higher proportion of smaller projects, compared to other Regional Offices. Smaller projects tend to require a higher level of review effort per construction dollar, compared to larger projects. The disparity in review times is being addressed by increased workload sharing between DSA Regional Offices.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The SB 588 Working Group Advisory Committee reached the following findings and recommendations:

### Findings

**1. The letter and intent of SB 588 have been met by the efforts described above.**

The SB 588 Working Group Advisory Committee determined, after review of the proposed building standards for community colleges and the collaborative review process, that the requirements of SB 588 have been met. The proposed building standards will provide community college buildings that are safe and cost effective. Buildings constructed to the community college standards will provide seismic safety performance levels equivalent to similar buildings constructed to the Field Act.

The collaborative process for design and review of community college projects should provide cost-effective buildings in a timely manner. The

method of determining review schedules collaboratively provides flexibility to respond to project and program needs, by tailoring the DSA review process to the schedule needs of the project. For example, a design and review schedule can be developed, based on the desired date to begin instruction in the building. For each collaborative process project, specific time frame commitments are made by all parties for review and response activities in support of the schedule negotiated with the community college.

**2. Timely completion of community college construction and alteration projects is a responsibility shared by the community college district, the design team, and DSA.**

The LAO report found, and the Working Group Advisory Committee affirms, that timely review and approval of community college projects is a responsibility shared among the community college district, the design team, and DSA.

**3. The new building standards for community colleges and the collaborative process for design review bring beneficial innovations to construction and alteration projects.**

The new building standards have been streamlined and reorganized to meet the unique needs of California community colleges, while improving clarity and usability. Prescriptive California amendments that tend to restrict designs and reduce design flexibility have been repealed. The new building standards incorporate the latest information available to correct and clarify current national model code provisions. The seismic retrofit provisions have been more closely aligned with those used for other post-secondary educational structures in California.

**4. The advisory working group believes that the new building standards and the collaborative process will be widely embraced by the community college districts and the design community.**

As of November 23, 2009, 11 significant projects are utilizing the collaborative process. Interest has been expressed by clients to allow use of the new building standards as early as practicable.

Recommendations

**1. Encourage the utilization of the new building standards and collaborative process for community college projects.**

The Working Group Advisory Committee recommends that the use of the new standards and processes be encouraged, through an active outreach to the community college and design communities.



**2. Continuously improve the community college building standards and collaborative process based on user experience.**

The Working Group Advisory Committee recommends that the community college building standards and collaborative process be continuously improved. The committee recommends that DSA seek input from a broad group of users and stakeholders, including DSA staff, the DSA Advisory Board, community college representatives, and design and construction professionals. The committee recommends that DSA develop qualitative and quantitative metrics to monitor the effectiveness of the collaborative process and identify possible improvements.

**3. Review the construction testing and inspection provisions applicable to community college projects.**

The Working Group Advisory Committee recommends that DSA review the testing and inspection provisions of the CBC, in order to further streamline the design and construction process.

**SB 588 Work Group**

\* Member of Technical Subgroup

<b>Name</b>	<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Dave Thorman	DSA	Division of the State Architect - Headquarters Office
Chip Smith*	DSA	Division of the State Architect - Sacramento Regional Office
Dan Levernier*	DSA	Division of the State Architect - Sacramento Regional Office
John Gillengerten*	DSA	Division of the State Architect - Headquarters Office
Joel McDonald	DGS/RESO	Department of General Services - Real Estate Services Division
James Lai*	DSA/AB	Division of the State Architect - Advisory Board
Fred Harris*	CCCCO	California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Harold Flood*	CCCCO	California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
John Hakel	AGCC	Associated General Contractors of California
Ted Toppin	PECG	Professional Engineers in California Government
Mark Whitaker	LAO	Legislative Analyst's Office
Chris Wills	CGS	California Geologic Survey
Ali Sadre*	SSC	Seismic Safety Commission
Kurt Cooknick	AIA/CC	American Institute of Architects - California Chapter
Colin Blaney*	SEAOC	Structural Engineers Association Of California
Doug Hohbach*	SEAOC	Structural Engineers Association Of California
Mike Bocchicchio	UC	University of California
Tom Kennedy	CSU	California State University
Chuck Thiel*	CSU	California State University - Seismic Review Board
Jeff Kingston*	CCD	Community College District – Chabot-Las Positas
Bob Bradshaw	CCD	Community College District – Citrus
Tom Hall	CCD	Community College District – Los Angeles
Dave Clinchy	CCD	Community College District – Los Rios
Ron Beeler	CCD	Community College District – North Orange County
David Liggett	CCD	Community College District – San Francisco
Steve Castellanos	CCD	Community College District – San Joaquin Delta
Jose Nunez	CCD	Community College District – San Mateo County
Art Ross*		Structural Engineer
Dave Younger		Architect – Lionakis, Sacramento
David Duff		Architect – NTD, San Dimas