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Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center, SC-204
February 11, 2013
2:00 pm – 3:30 pm

I. Approval of Agenda – Discussion/Action

II. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

III. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Facilities Update

   b. Payphone removal on campus

   c. Replacing out of order faucets on campus

   d. Career Technology Building

      1. Fence to protect the dust collector
      2. Roof access ladder in CT yard

Members

MSC (3) – V/P Nelson (Chair), L. Martin, J. Andrade

Faculty (3) – C. Chiodo, P. Carr, J. Kauffman

Classified (3) – B. Geer, J. Green

Associated Student Body (1/1) - Michael Casas-President
Facilities Committee Meeting – DRAFT Minutes for 2/11/2013

Membership Attendance

MSC -- J. Andrade, L. Martin

Faculty – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield (proxy for J. Kauffman)

Classified – B. Geer, J. Green

Associated Student Body – M. Casas-President, C. Stevens, J. Campbell

I. Approval of Agenda – Discussion/Action
   a. Approved with additions – Motioned: C. Stevens/2nd B. Geer

II. Approval of December 3, 2012 meeting minutes
   a. Deferred – Corinne will get the 12/3/12 minutes from Greg Nelson.

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

Charlene Lillie (student) informed the committee that some of the bathrooms, specifically the new buildings, do not have hooks to hang bags. She feels it causes a health hazard when students are forced to leave their bags on the bathroom floor.

Derrin (student) wanted to show support on having an Espresso/Coffee machine on campus.

Patrick Loera (Student/City College Times) wanted to show support for public telephones on campus. He feels not having public phones for students could be dangerous.

Stephen Mansfield was interested in knowing how/when the Theater was approved by the Committee. He researched past minutes and agendas and can’t seem to find where it was approved. Was there a program review? Accreditation process needs to be followed.
IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. Facilities Update –

The committee was informed that the Multidisciplinary Building has received all furniture equipment.

The committee discussed the move by the METAS Office on their current and future location. Leandra explained that the move didn’t accrue any additional expenses.

Stephen Mansfield informed the committee that the 100/200 wing will not be demolished. The buildings will be renovated in four phases. The committee requested an update on this project at the next meeting.

b. Payphone removal on campus –

Charlene Lillie (student) spoke to the committee about the importance of having public pay phones on campus. She handed out copies of an email between herself, VP Greg Nelson and Denise Mai from County of Santa Clara. Denise Mai gave Charlene information on affordable pay phones for $50-$75 monthly for each telephone. These pay phones would need to generate enough monies to pay the monthly bill. Charlene would like to see if the college would reconsider bringing back at least three payphones on campus (Technology Bldg., Library and Student Center). She feels that the absence of public phones brings a safety issue to the campus for multiple reasons. It was explained that there are phones on campus for emergency use, for students. It seemed there were a lot of students on campus who were not aware of these phones. Mike Casas explained that he would bring this to the Board of Trustees meeting on February 12, 2013.

Motion by Chuck Stevens/2nd Jim Campbell:

To continue with the discussion of having three pay phones on campus

c. Replacement of out of order outside faucets –

Some of the bathrooms on campus have faucets that are not currently working. The committee suggested that the division that is housed in that building should place a work order with Maintenance. Stephen Mansfield suggested that the campus consider doing away with the faucets completely, put in refrigerated sets.
d. Career Technology Building issues –

1. Fence to protect the dust collector –
   This issue needs to be done through the division’s annual program review or through the Safety Committee.

2. Roof access ladder in CT yard –
   This issue needs to be done through the division’s annual program review or through the Safety Committee.

e. Tree near Science Greenhouse –

Leandra would like to see a deciduous tree be placed next to the Greenhouse to assist in bringing down the temperature during the summer, which would be energy efficient. This item should be addressed as part of the campus landscape master plan.

f. Signage booth –

The Associated Students would like to place a few signage booths around campus. The booths would be used to post club and college events. It was explained to the students that there was a resolution from a past meeting to use “way signs” with the idea of also being able to use it to post events too. Committee members raised concerns about the campus being “cluttered” and pointed out issues with the kiosk placed for the campus newspaper.

Adjourned: 3:15 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center, SC-204
February 26, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC (3) -- V/P Nelson (Chair), L. Martin, J. Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (3) – C. Chiodo, P. Carr, J. Kauffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified (3) – B. Geer, J. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body (1/1) – C. Stevens, J. Campbell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the February 11th minutes (Dec. 3rd minutes deferred to the next meeting)

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Total Cost of Ownership from 11-12
   b. Facilities/Bond Update

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Re-allocation of space for L-114
   b. Mass notification system on campus
   c. Security Camera Layout and Rollout
   d. Landscaping Master Planning

VI. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Pay Phones on Campus
I. Approval of Agenda – Discussion/Action  
   a. Approved with additions – Motioned: C. Stevens/2nd B. Geer

II. Approval of February 11, 2013 meeting minutes  
   a. Approved with additions – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd C. Stevens

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Total Cost of Ownership from 11-12 –

The committee review handouts by VP Nelson on total costs of ownership for buildings on campus. VP Nelson reference the cut off dates as May 2011 to May 2012.

- **TCO Calculations and Worksheets** –
  Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) calculator provides enterprises with a framework for comparing the cost of building a new application to that of buying a new software package. The document lists the various cost categories associated with the lifecycle of an enterprise application. The categories and items in this tool should not be taken as an exhaustive list; there are spaces within each section of the TCO spreadsheet to add additional costs as required.

- **TCO Calculations Assumptions** –
  The document represents totals divided by assignable square footage. The numbers are used for all buildings as it is not feasible to have them separated by building type. Per square footage units are used for payroll, energy and water usage. Payroll costs are annualized as of 2012.
• TCO Calculator Summary –

The summary sheets provide cumulative costs for the next five years for each building on campus. Those costs are broken down by Present value, current value of Existing Facility, Energy, Water Usage, Operating, Planned Maintenance and Repairs, Payroll (salary & benefits) and other known costs.

b. Facilities/Bond Update –

The committee reviewed the Executive Summary provided by VP Nelson, for the Media Arts Center, VoTech and General Education buildings. A detailed version of this summary will be sent out to the Design Committee along with the new Dean of Humanities and Social Science, on Friday, March 2nd.

Upcoming summer projects:
• Utility Project
• Wings - power gas sewage
• Old Boiler Plant hooked with fiber
• Relocation of Santa Clara County of Education (location in parking lot B)
• Iron Workers Apprenticeship Program (location in parking lot B)

May 25th – Re-roof of Main Gym will begin.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Re-allocation of space for L-114 –

L-114 was formerly housed with the METAS Program which has recently moved to the Multidisciplinary Building. Since the room is now empty there are some programs on campus that are interested in utilizing the space. VP Nelson and Gilkerson have been reviewing which program would benefit from the space. A suggestion has been made to move the Adjunct Faculty Center into the room so that the Early Childhood Education classes could use GE-119 (current Adjunct Faculty Center). The other programs that have expressed interest in L-119 are: ESL, Counseling (Veteran Affairs) and Tutoring. A decision has not been made on which program would house that location.

The committee will revisit this item at the next meeting
b../c. Mass Notification System on Campus/Security Camera Layout and Rollout –

The college Campus Master Plan allocated funds for cameras and mass notification equipment. VP Nelson is currently working with Talk-A-Phone on providing emergency poles and wall mounts around campus. Currently the campus has 15 emergency phones of which 8 are currently working. When installation begins the campus will start with the parking lots first. The Committee would like to meet with Chief Aguirre to make sure that he is on board with moving forward.

The committee reviewed a campus map provided by VP Nelson pointing out camera angles. The campus is working on a plan to display cameras around campus for safety issues. The cameras will be used for recording purposes only as the campus doesn’t have enough personnel to manage monitoring. All maintenance will come through the ITSS/CTSS department.

The committee will revisit this item at the next meeting.

d. Landscape Master Plan –

The Architect firm that’ll be working on campus will be updating the tree survey that was conducted in the past. VP Nelson mentioned that a couple of trees around the B Building will need to be removed due to damage to the building by the roots. The trees will be recycled in some capacity. Landscaping Master Plan will be presented to the committee once it’s completed. The committee asked if a Tree Tour could be put in place so that employees have an idea of how many trees are on campus.

VI. ACTION ITEMS:

a. Pay Phones on Campus –

VP Nelson addressed the issue about pay phones that were taken out last spring. The committee was informed that after VP Nelson decision to remove the payphones was due to the $3200 maintenance bill he received for the two payphones that had only generated $.52 in two years. The decision was made unanimously through the Executive Team. VP Nelson solution to assist those few students who need access to a phone was to place a few courtesy phones on campus.

Motioned B. Geer/2nd C. Stevens: To bring courtesy phones on campus.

Adjourned: 4:19 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Career Technology Building (CT-101)
March 4, 2013
2:15 pm – 4:00 pm

Members

MSC (3) -- V/P Nelson (Chair), L. Martin, J. Andrade
Faculty (3) – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield, J. Kauffman
Classified (3) – B. Geer, J. Green, P. Vu, D. Franklin
Associated Student Body (1/1) – C. Stevens, J. Campbell, A. Nguyen

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the February 26, 2013 meeting

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Santa Clara County of Education/Iron Workers Program Modular Unit location on campus
   b. District Design Standards

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Re-allocation of space for L-114
   b. Mass notification system on campus/Security Camera Layout and Rollout
   c. Landscaping Master Planning
Facilities Committee Meeting – DRAFT Minutes for 3/04/2013

Membership Attendance

MSC – V/P Nelson (Chair), J. Andrade,
Faculty – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield, J. Kauffman
Classified – B. Geer
Associated Student Body –
Guests – Chief Ray Aguirre, Michael LaRocca (SONA), Jussi Rajna

I. Approval of Agenda – Discussion/Action
   a. Approved with additions – Motioned: B. Geer/2nd S. Mansfield

II. Approval of February 26, 2013 meeting minutes
   a. Approved with additions – Motioned: B. Geer/2nd S. Mansfield

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Santa Clara County of Education/Iron Workers Program Modular Units –

   The Santa Clara County of Education Secondary School has been housed on campus for twenty years. Their lease will be expiring soon. The campus has agreed to house the department in two modular trailers while transitioning to their new location.

   The campus will also be housing two additional modular trailers to The Iron Workers Program. Two classrooms will be in the modular and an additional classroom will be housed on the second floor of building K. The Iron Workers Program is also interested in creating a program with the college for next year. The college is currently working on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The Iron Workers are requiring an erection yard for their program. VP Nelson has suggested to them that they use the old pool area.

   For both programs the modular will be provided with utilities hook up and custodial service.

   b. District Design Standards –
The District Design Standards committee is currently working on a new model. It will be done sometime in the fall. The last model was done informally through Aedis Architects.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Re-allocation of space for L-114 –

The committee revisited the discussion on the available space in L-114 (METAS former office). VP Nelson reiterated that goal was to continue discussing the options for the space. March 18th VP Nelson will be meeting with the Adjunct Faculty but also getting a collective side for all options. A decision will be made with the Executive Team in mid-April.

b. Mass Notification system on campus/Security Camera Layout and Rollout –

Chief Aguirre discussed his approval and anticipation to have the security infrastructure in place. Chief Aguirre explained to the committee that he has been working on the goal of mass notification and security cameras for the past ten years. He has been present for the demo that was done by Talk-A-Phone. He reminded the committee that the purpose of the security infrastructure is to provide for mass notification which he endorses and feels the college is taking steps in the right direction to complete the goal. VP Nelson explained that the bid for the project will be going out with a projected goal of awarding the job in July or August.

c. Landscaping Master Plan –

VP Nelson explained that the priority on campus once the Landscaping Master Plan starts, will be to do tree trimming around the B Building were a couple of redwood tree roots have started to cause structural damage. The campus will also surgically look at other trees that may be causing infrastructure. Stephen Mansfield suggested that he look at the “Chuck Hunter” tree and the Hybrid Sycamores near the Technology Building.

d. Walk-tru (Traffic Circle) –

The committee did a walk-tru near the traffic circle near the Bascom Avenue entrance. Jerry Kauffman expressed concerned about vehicles that are entering onto one-way streets in the wrong direction. The committee recommended that two arrows on both end of the roads be painted and extend the stop sign line so that it is more visible to drivers.

Adjourned: 3:57 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
April 1, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC (3) – V/P Nelson (Chair), L. Martin, J. Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (3) – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield, J. Kauffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified (3) – B. Geer, J. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body (1/1) – C. Stevens, J. Campbell, A. Nguyen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the March 4, 2013 meeting

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

   a. Space needs for Veterans Association
   
   b. Future location of M+O Space
   
   c. Funding of new Media Arts/VoTech Project
   
   d. Location of Santa Clara County and Iron Workers Apprenticeship Program
   
   e. Old Boiler Plant Remodel

V. ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Move of Adjunct Faculty Center

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:

I. Approval of Agenda – Discussion/Action
   a. Approved with changes – Motioned: C. Stevens/2nd L. Martin
   b. Move to defer Discussion Items c and d – Motioned: L. Martin/B. Geer

II. Approval of March 4, 2013 meeting minutes
   a. Approved with additions – Motioned: S. Mansfield/C. Chiodo

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

   Stephen Mansfield announced to the committee that he would need to leave the meeting early. He explained to the committee that he may not be able to follow through with the discussion items that he requested on the agenda.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

   a. Space needs for the Veterans Association –

      On behalf of a Veteran with the Veteran Student Club, Stephen Mansfield spoke to the committee about the importance of having a area designated for Veterans. The club would like to have a small office in the Student Center along with a quiet room for Veterans that need time away from the student body. Stephen has requested that this item be brought back to the next meeting agenda.

   b. & e. Future location of M+O space and Old Boiler Plant Remodel –

      Stephen feels that the Boiler Room move is not good. He feels that the area were the batting cages would be a better choice in moving M+O. The Boiler Plant isn’t for office space per OSHA. Stephen mentioned that the funding for the M+O was in the 2004
bond and historically wasn’t welcomed by all. Scott Jewell emphasized that the Boiler Plant is temporary and will only house a couple of people.

V. ACTION ITEMS:

a. Move of Adjunct Faculty Center –

VP Gilkerson explained to the committee the work that was done to notify adjunct faculty on the move of the Adjunct Faculty Center. Survey results were handed out to the committee showing responses from the Adjunct Faculty. The survey received a total of 39 responses. VP Gilkerson explained to the committee that she had met with the Faculty Association on the move.

Motioned L. Martin/2nd C. Stevens 2 Abstentions: To recommend the move of the Adjunct Faculty Center from GE119 to L114.

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:


Scott Jewell from Gilbane Construction explained that copies of the report will be sent out to the committee members. He asked that this item be placed back on the next meeting agenda.

Motioned B. Geer/2nd J. Campbell: Table Information Item to the next meeting

Adjourned: 3:57 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
April 15, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Members
MSC (3) – V/P Nelson (Chair), L. Martin, J. Andrade
Faculty (3) – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield, J. Kauffman
Classified (3) – B. Geer, T. Paiz, P. Romero
Associated Student Body (1/1) – C. Stevens, J. Campbell, A. Nguyen

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the April 1, 2013 meeting

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Iron Workers Program

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Future location of M+O Space
   b. Space Needs for Veterans Association

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Access Control Upgrades
   b. Physical Security Upgrades
   c. Board Presentation on MAC/VoTech Transitioning of Space
   d. US Bank Proposition on Space
   e. Prompt Report 2004 and 2010 Bonds (CBOC Report Presentation)
Facilities Committee Meeting – Minutes for 4/15/2013

Membership Attendance

MSC – V/P Nelson (Chair), J. Andrade
Faculty – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield, J. Kauffman
Classified – B. Geer, T. Paiz
Associated Student Body – C. Stevens
Guests – Michael LaRocca, Charles Heimler, Padma Manian, Kieron Connolly, Bill Campbell, Donna Mendoza, Joseph King, Anthony Vukelich, Virginia Scales, Novella Simonson

I. Approval of Agenda – Discussion/Action
   a. Approved with changes – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd J. Andrade

II. Approval of March 4, 2013 meeting minutes with corrections
   a. Approved with additions – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd B. Geer 1-Abstain

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

   A member of the public asked if the Facilities Committee minutes can be posted on the website.

   A concern was brought to the committee regarding the existence of the Bond Executive Committee and how it’s a part of the campus.

   Chuck Stevens informed the committee that the students may ask to have the pay phone issue brought back for discussion.

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Iron Workers Program –

   The committee continued the discussion of the Iron Workers Apprenticeship. Kieron Connolly gave an overview of the program and the benefit in the future of having students in the program that could earn an associate degree. Curriculum will need to be created for the program if it comes to the campus. Funds would be attached to the Glazier/Meat Cutters Program. Currently, the campus will supply the facility and collect revenue from the program. The pool area would be used as an erection yard. Charles Heimler asked why the topic hadn’t been discussed with the committee in the past in which the chair replied that it had been on the agenda more than once.
Motion: To approve the Iron Workers Apprenticeship Program
Motioned by: C. Stevens/2nd B. Geer
Unanimous vote

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Future location of M&O Space –

The committee re-visited the future location of the M&O space. Stephen Mansfield personally felt that the Boiler Plant wasn’t a good location. It was asked why there was a change in plans to keep the Boiler Plant when it was originally supposed to be gone.

b. Space needs for Veterans Association –

The committee discussed the need for a space for our students who were Veterans and a ready room. Ideally, a space in the Student Center, preferably on the second floor would work best. Stephen Mansfield felt that the Veterans need a room to be alone. The office would be manned by other Veterans as per their education plan. VP Nelson will speak to VP Burns if there is available space that can accommodate the Veteran students and will report back to the committee.

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Access Control Upgrades –

VP Nelson discussed with the committee about the new locking system that the campus will start having on the doors on campus. These wireless doors are manufactured to secure people in emergencies where the door will be locked from the inside by auto lock. A presentation at the Professional Development Day will give more information on the upgrades.

b. Physical Security Upgrades –

VP Nelson discussed the improving mass notifications that are in the process of being done on campus. The campus will be installing emergency phones and cameras as part of the security upgrades on campus. The first phase of cameras on campus will start in Admissions and Records in the Student Center. A member of the public said that more than the cameras, placing a security guard, might be more effective if lots of money is exchanged. Teresa Paiz felt it was a great idea and welcomed anyone who felt that it wasn’t a good idea to come visit their office and see how much money is exchanged between the employees and students. She feels that having the cameras present would avoid any criminal activity that could arise.
c. Board Presentation on MAC/VoTech Transition of Space –

VP Nelson gave a powerpoint presentation on the upcoming MAC/VoTech Transition of space to the committee. The committee was able to see the relocation of the housed programs in the 100/200/300 wings. Some of the committee and public questioned why less money was being spent on the VoTech buildings and programs than was originally promised. One member pointed out that $6 million is now deducted from the allocated money from VoTech and wanted to know where the money had gone. It was suggested that it went into the proposed new Theater building. The committee discussed the seismic value of the VoTech Building.

d. US Bank Proposition on Space

VP Nelson passed out a proposal from US Bank indicating their desire to have an on-campus bank branch kiosk with ATM services. Chuck Stevens felt that this would not be a good choice for students as some of the banks are not student-friendly.


A financial oversight was given by VP Nelson regarding the 2004 and 2010 Bonds. The committee and public had some concerns regarding the timeline of the Physical Education and Athletics building. VP Nelson mentioned that the campus is moving forward with the 2010 bond but indicated that there were still currently funds in the 2004 bonds. Questions were asked about why there was $60,000 left in the 2004 bond and why the PE building was being scaled down. Some feel that the change in Administration over the years has to do with these issues.

Adjourned: 3:55 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
April 29, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the April 15, 2013 meeting

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Access Control Upgrades
   b. Physical Security Upgrades
   c. Custodial Standards of Care
   d. Trash/Recycle Bins
   e. Public Phones
Facilities Committee Meeting – Minutes for 4/29/2013

Membership Attendance

MSC – V/P Nelson (Chair), J. Andrade
Faculty – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield
Classified – B. Geer, T. Paiz, P. Romero
Associated Student Body – C. Stevens, J. Campbell
Guests – Chief Aguirre, Charles Heimler, Lauren McKee, Virgina Scales, Novella Simonson, Charlene (student)

I. Approval of Agenda – Discussion/Action
   a. Approved with additions – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd G. Geer

II. Approval of March 4, 2013 meeting minutes with corrections
   a. Approved with corrections – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd T. Paiz

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

   It was brought to the committee’s attention that some of the campus bathrooms (specifically the Science Complex and Multidisciplinary Bldg.) are lacking hooks for students to put their book bags. The chair asked that they speak with Custodial Manager, Joe Andrade, after the meeting.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Access Control Upgrades –

   VP Nelson and Chief Aguirre spoke to the committee about the Access Control wireless locking system that’ll begin its initial phase in the Business Building. Campus Police will be able to remotely lock and unlock classroom doors in the case of an emergency. This topic was originally introduced six years ago. They have met with Evergreen for a pilot project. The costs of the locks will be low-cost compared to the Honeywell locks that are currently being used. The scheduled maintenance will be paid out of the bond. Chief Aguirre strongly suggested that District Police have full Administrator right to the server.

   To be brought back under Action Item for next meeting.
b. Physical Security Upgrades –
VP Nelson handed out the layout for the first phase of cameras that’ll be going up on campus. The first phase will start with ten cameras around and in the Student Center and parking garage. The cameras will be used for security purposes only and the date will be kept for thirty days. The cameras will only be placed in public areas and will not interfere with the privacy of employees. The cameras will be on 24 hours a day and 7 days a week.

c. Custodial Standards of Care –
Joe Andrade presented the Custodial Departments Facilities Standards of Care sheet. He explained to the committee what his current staff is doing and in what buildings. It was asked of the staff what level of care would they like for the campus based on the five levels that are common for Custodians in the educational system. Due to lack of staff, our level is extremely low.

d. Trash/Recycle Bins –
Jeff Campbell brought up the fact that he felt there weren’t enough trash cans or recycle bins on campus which he felt was contributing to the trash on the grounds. He asked if it was possible to bring in more bins to keep the campus cleaner. Joe Andrade, Custodial Manager, mentioned that the campus had over 350 bins on campus and that he felt a major issue with the trash on the grounds could be from the population of squirrels on campus.

e. Public Phones –
The committee revisited the previous item of having a pay phone on campus. It was noted by VP Nelson that the committee already discussed and voted against the item. Chuck said that the students were not happy with the committees or the College Planning Councils recommendation. The students gave the committee copies of what the A.S. President talked about at the Board Meeting along with a breakdown of cost for the students and the campus. The Associated Students are willing to cover the installation costs and are asking the campus to cover the monthly charge. VP Nelson explained to the students that they campus had already moved forward with the courtesy phones. The committee had a concern about the annual change in the A.S. Council. This may not be what the next council will want to continue to support.

f. Veterans Office Update –
VP Nelson updated the committee about the office space for Military Veteran students. The Vice President of Student Affairs had identified a space on the second floor of the Student Center. VP Nelson will be meeting with her to continue discussion on the office space.

g. Strategic Planning evaluations –
The Strategic Planning Committee is requiring each committee to complete a self-evaluation. The self-evaluation will need to indicate the goals for next year and how they align with Strategic Planning. The committee will receive the self-evaluation and will continue discussion at the next meeting.

Adjourned: 3:35 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
May 14, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Members

MSC (3) -- V/P Nelson (Chair), L. Martin, J. Andrade
Faculty (3) – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield, J. Kauffman
Classified (3) – B. Geer, T. Paiz, P. Romero
Associated Student Body (1/1) – C. Stevens, J. Campbell

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the April 29, 2013 meeting

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Adjunct Faculty Center

   b. Security Cameras

   c. Strategic Planning Evaluation

   d. Access Controls

   e. Mass Notification

   f. Veterans Association Space

   g. Decision Authority for Summer Term

   h. Payphone location
Facilities Committee Meeting – APPROVED Minutes for 5/18/2013

Membership Attendance

MSC – V/P Nelson (Chair), J. Andrade, L. Martin
Faculty – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield, J. Kauffman, V. Scales (proxy for J. Kauffman first hour)
Classified – B. Geer, T. Paiz, P. Romero
Associated Student Body – C. Stevens

I. Approval of Agenda – Discussion/Action
   a. Approved with additions – Motioned: L. Martin/2nd G. Geer
   b. Retract approval of agenda – Motioned: S. Mansfield/C. Stevens
   c. Approval of Agenda as amended - Motioned: C. Stevens/B. Geer

II. Approval of March 4, 2013 meeting minutes with corrections
   a. Approved with corrections – Motioned: L. Martin/2nd C. Stevens

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)
   a. Steve Mansfield asked why the Strategic Planning Evaluation was placed on the agenda as an action item. The chair responded that it was a time sensitive item that required immediate action for the Strategic Planning meeting on May 20th.
   b. Chuck Stevens requested that item “h” be placed at the top of the items since he needs to leave early. The committee amended the approved agenda.
   c. Virginia Scales commented on the proposed move of the Adjunct Faculty Center being moved to the Learning Resource Center. The current location works well for adjunct faculty.
   d. Stephen Mansfield read an email from Instructor Phillip Crawford opposing the move of the Adjunct Faculty Center. In his email he explains that he coordinated a survey to the Adjunct Faculty and had 16 responses that were opposed to the move and 1 response that was neutral. Instructor Crawford asked that the committee table the item until he could review all responses.
   e. Two students spoke on their opposition to having cameras placed on and in campus buildings. They felt it was an invasion on their privacy and that there was no indication that having them would prevent crimes from happening on campus.
   f. Chris Chiodo informed the committee that she had also received numerous emails from Adjunct Faculty members who were not happy about a possible move of the Adjunct Faculty Center.
IV. ACTION ITEMS:

h. Payphone location –
Chuck Stevens asked the committee to consider the location of the payphone that the Associated Students are paying to have installed and maintenance. The Business Service office will manage the financial part of the payphone. The college will only agree to sign a year to year contract with the vendor. The location would be next to the Library were the old payphone use to be located.

Motion: To place the payphone in front of the Library.

Yay – 3
No – 0
Abstained – 1
*Motion passed*

a. Adjunct Faculty Center –
VP Nelson referred to an email that President Kavalier sent to him requesting that the committee re-visit the move of the Adjunct Faculty Center to the Learning Resource Center. Originally the committee voted in recommendation to move the Adjunct Faculty Center but the College Planning Council recommended that the center stay where it originally is located, it was asked for the Facilities Committee to re-visit the item. The President asked that the committee taken into consideration three criteria’s in making the decision; 1) The move not be of cost to the campus 2) The move can’t interrupt program and 3) Has to take place during the summer. VP Nelson reiterated that the purpose of the move was to allow the Early Childhood Education classes that are currently housed in the back lot back to the main campus. Bruce Geer suggested two other rooms that he felt were suitable for the ECE class. VP Nelson explained that he had reviewed other rooms as an option but found that none of them accommodated the program as well as GE119. Stephen Mansfield asked why protocol wasn’t being followed. Why isn’t the College Planning Council going to review this item again? Stephen asks for more time for true responses to Instructor Crawford’s survey. Heather Jellison, Adjunct Faculty, expressed her concerns that the location wasn’t as safe as the current location of the Adjunct Faculty Center. She also felt that the survey that VP Gilkerson sent out to the Adjunct Faculty wasn’t very clear.

Motion: To move the Adjunct Faculty Center from General Education building (GE119) to the Learning Resource Center (L114).
b. Security Cameras –
The committee discussed the first phase of the cameras that will be installed in and around the Student Center, parking garage and parking lot P. The committee was given a layout of each area where the cameras will be installed. VP Nelson mentioned that the Safety Committee had suggested that one of the cameras that are being used to monitor the front counter of the Admissions and Records office be used to monitor the front counter of the Financial Aid office too. Teresa Paiz requested that at a later date if that camera that was originally for Admission and Records can be replaced.

Motion: To accept the installation of the first phase of cameras.

Yay – 7
No – 0
Abstained – 0
Motioned passed

Motioned Failed

c. Strategic Planning Evaluations –
VP Nelson reminded the committee that they need to complete their self-evaluation and submit it to the Strategic Planning Committee before their May 20th retreat. The committee will review the goals they submitted last year. Greg will email out to the committee last year’s self-evaluation for reference.

d. Access Control –
The committee discussed the pilot project that’ll take place in the summer in the Business “B” Building. The locking system is a keyless locking mechanism that’ll be controlled through the District Police. ITSS will handle all wiring.

Motion: To accept the wireless key pilot project in the Business “B” Building.

Yay – 7
No – 0
Abstained – 0
Motioned passed

e. Mass Notification –
VP Nelson passed out information on the Talk A Phone Emergency Phone Towers and wall mount stations that had been discussed at the previous two meetings. The tower and wall mount both have live or prerecorded audio messages. The tower has a 123
decibel radius and has a 360° coverage. The wall mount has a 118 decibel radius and has a 180° coverage. Both stations have are ADA compliant. Continuous testing of the machines will be done during the summer.

Motion: To approve the Mass Notification tower and wall mounts.

Yay – 7
No – 0
Abstained – 0
Motioned passed

f. Veterans Association Space –
VP Nelson announced to the committee that he and VP Burns were able to obtain office space for the Veterans Association. The new location will be in the Student Center (SC215). The committee requested that a phone be installed.

Motion: To accept the new location of the Veterans Association office in the Student Center (SC215).

Yay – 7
No – 0
Abstained – 0
Motioned passed

g. Decision Authority for Summer Term –
VP Nelson suggested that the committee try to meet at least once a month to review time sensitive items that need to be addressed. He prefers not to make the decisions without the input of the committee. It was suggested that at least one representative of each constituent group be present. Jerry Kauffman opposed the idea of meeting since he isn’t around during the summer and won’t be able to give his input.

Motion: To approve that the committee meet at least once a month or as needed during the summer break.

Yay – 6
No – 1
Abstained – 0
Motioned passed

Adjourned: 3:33 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
September 16, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the May 14, 2013 meeting

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Temporary move of Kinesiology Division Offices
   b. Review Facilities Committee Charge
   c. Review Facilities Master Plan
   d. UPDATE from Scott Jewell on current Facility work
   e. Boiler Plant Renovation
   f. Racquetball Building
   g. Landscaping (Trees)
   h. SJCC Perimeter Sidewalks
   i. Bascom Avenue signage
   j. P.E. Athletics Building/2004 Measure G Bond
   k. Baseball
   l. TCO – Total Cost of Ownership
   m. Visitor Parking (Lot C)
Meeting called to order: 2:01 p.m.

I. Approval of Agenda
   a. Approved – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd T. Paiz

II. Approval of May 18, 2013 meeting minutes
   a. Approved – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd J. Campbell/Abstain – D. Graham

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)
   a. Stephen Mansfield expressed his concerns to the committee regarding incomplete Measure G 2004 Bond project. He questioned why some projects were removed from the original Facilities Master Plan. He’s also interested in doing a survey to the community to see how aware they are of the projects taking place on campus. Scott Jewell gave some insight as to the changes in the projects on the Facilities Master Plan which was reviewed a couple of years ago.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Temporary move of Kinesiology Division Offices –
      It was explained to the committee that the Kinesiology Division Offices (Room 314) had become inhabitable. Currently, there is space in the Learning Resource Center were the Kinesiology staff can be housed until their offices are complete. Stephen Mansfield asked Duncan Graham if he would request a letter of explanation from President Breland explaining his decision on the move.

   b. Review Facilities Committee Charge –
      Stephen Mansfield explained to the committee that in the past it was standard for the committee to review the charge within the first couple of meetings to see if they want to amend the document. Duncan suggested that the committee consider having co-chairs, which would lead to revising the charge. Stephen Mansfield pointed out in the charge that the committee elects the chair which is explained in the current charge.
Joe Andrade pointed out in the Responsibilities section of the charge under #2 that it should be revised to indicate a spending amount limit (i.e. $100,000) which would need to come to committee only if it’s over the amount. He explained that this would assist in speeding up the process of lower budget projects. Joe Andrade also asked the committee to review #8 which indicated that the committee review and make recommendations concerning campus safety since a Safety Committee already exists. The committee discussed the revision of the wording under that responsibility. The committee decided they would revisit this item at the next meeting.

c. Review Facilities Master Plan –
Stephen Mansfield advised the committee that the Academic Senate’s Adhoc Bond Committee will begin to review the Facilities Master Plan. Scott Jewell explained that in 2011 the updated Facilities Master Plan was administered by the President, Vice-Presidents and Vice Chancellor. Gilbane facilitated the process. Stephen Mansfield expressed concern that he was unable to find the Facilities Committee meeting minutes that indicated that the committee was aware of the update. Stephen also expressed concern about the Maintenance and Operation Building being taken off the Facilities Master Plan when it was updated; which now leads to pigeon-holing the M & O staff in different locations. As Steve mentioned, the campus should reconsider the M & O building since it was approved by DSA and the M & O crew deserve better than finding various locations on a temporary basis. Scott Jewell explained that the updated Facilities Master Plan was presented to the Board in 2011 and at the time there was a concern of no shared governance which leads to the FMP being sent back to the constituency groups to review. It was requested that the recorder and Steve try to go back to the 2011-2012 minutes to find evidence of the review by this committee.

d. UPDATE from Scott Jewell on current Facility work –
Scott Jewell reviewed the current and completed projects that were done over the summer:

1. Completion of exterior painting for Technology & General Education Buildings.
2. Completion of Main Gym Roof
3. Upgrades to Jaguar Stadium bleachers and floor
4. Utility upgrade/improvements to water system (complete in December)
5. Ongoing project – Boiler Plant
7. Ongoing fencing project, working on layout with contractor
8. Media Arts Center – in design stage (60% complete)
9. Drawings completed for review of VoTech Center
10. Discussion on tree removals near location of VoTech Center. President Breland expressed concern on how to not affect the trees. Unfortunately, some trees are pressing against fence.

e. Boiler Plant Renovation –
The Boiler Plant is going to house the Maintenance staff. Concerns were expressed over the ventilation scheme and if the building met OSHA standards for personnel occupancy. Stephen Mansfield feels the building should be used for storage for the Maintenance & Operations division. It was noted that the building is not on the updated Facilities Master Plan. The 2010 Facilities Master Plan did have the building listed. Scott Jewell will look at what’s been done on the project and will report back to the committee.

f. Racquetball Building –
The committee questioned whether the building was in good condition and if the ventilation was up to code. Scott Jewell will have the ventilation checked and will email his findings. Scott strongly suggested re-using the building and is trying to check the possibility of having the building renovated. Scott explained that an Architect came out to assess the building and felt it was structurally sound. It was suggested by the Architect to do improvements to the sound, plumbing and possibly the roof. Steve Mansfield felt there were concerns on the North side of the racquetball building with the dirt level that looks to be above the foundation; which might allow rot and mold to develop. Also, he noted the mezzanine should not be used inside this building because of its level of decay.

g. Landscaping (Trees) –
The committee discussed the removal of trees on campus. Scott Jewell explained that there may be a need to remove trees when the VoTech Building begins as there are trees that are pressing against the fence. He explained that an Arborist came out and assessed the trees on campus and made suggestions of trees that were not appropriate for the location or should be removed entirely.

h. SJCC Perimeter Sidewalks –
Stephen Mansfield discussed the damaged and uneven sidewalks near and around the campus. He feels that if the campus is going through changes with new buildings that our sidewalks need to be fixed for student safety entering and exiting our campus. Scott Jewell explained that the sidewalks will be taken care of in the Landscaping Plan.

i. Bascom Avenue Signage –
A concern was made regarding the LED sign that was installed on the Bascom Avenue entrance a few years ago. The sign has never been used and has been vandalized and has become an eye sore. Scott Jewell explained that there was work to redesign all entrance signs on Moorpark, Bascom and Leigh Avenue.
j. P.E. Athletics Building/2004 Measure G Bond –
Stephen Mansfield expressed a concern regarding the 2004 Measure G Projects that weren’t completed and we are building and not completing projects; we still have more to construct and we are not doing so. The pool, allied health building and tennis courts were projects that still haven’t been completed. There was discussion on clarification regarding simultaneously erecting both the VoTech and P.E. Athletics Building. Scott Jewell explained that was actually the Media Arts and VoTech buildings.

k. Baseball –
Stephen Mansfield expressed his frustration over the baseball program that was told that it would be coming back. Steve discussed baseball might be better off at EVC but VPAA Graham mentioned the Title 9 issues that would be in conflict with EVC. If the location of a new field wouldn’t work on campus he feels the campus should begin discussions on moving the program to Evergreen Valley College. Randi Kidman, Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Association member, explained that SONA only brought to the District’s attention that the installation of the poles near Leigh Avenue was illegal. She clarified for the committee that SONA does support the Baseball Program. President Breland announced to the committee that he had met with the City Council and City Recreation to discuss how best to bring the Baseball Program back to the college.

l. TCO – Total Cost of Ownership –
A concern was brought up that a Program Review wasn’t included in the section of the Mid-Term Accreditation Report for Total Cost of Ownership.

m. Visitor Parking (Lot C) –
The committee discussed the concern over visitor parking in Lot C. Officer Tony Flores feels that an extension of visitor parking spaces would help in minimizing the problem of visitors parking in staff lots or blocking parking spaces while waiting for visitor parking spaces to open.

**Motion:** To send a recommendation to extend the visitor parking spaces in Lot C to the College Planning Council.

**Yes – 6**
**No – 0**
**Abstain – 0**

*The Committee requested that Chief Aguirre verify the approval of this request before bringing it to the College Planning Council.*

Meeting adjourned: 4:00 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
September 30, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the September 16, 2013 meeting minutes

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Facilities Committee Charge
   b. Visitor Parking (Lot C)
   c. Update on tree removal and proposed fence construction time period
   d. Educational and Facilities Master Plan
   e. M&O Building
   f. Laswell Stop Sign and Traffic Circle Marking Update

Members

MSC (3) -- J. Andrade, D. Graham, S. Awan
Faculty (3) – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield, J. Kauffman
Classified (3) – B. Geer, T. Paiz, P. Romero
Associated Student Body (1/1) –
Meeting called to order:  2:00 p.m.

The meeting was cancelled due to lack of quorum. The committee members that were in attendance stayed to discuss information items unofficially.

I. Approval of Agenda
   a. Due to no quorum the agenda was not approved.

II. Approval of September 16, 2013 Minutes:
   Due to no quorum the minutes were not approved

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)
   a. Duncan presented the request from Susan Castaneda in Cosmetology to have benches and tables placed in the quad area in front of their building. She indicated that the students have to sit on the cement during their breaks and lunches. Duncan took a walk to their building and counted 6 to 7 tables/benches that are within their area. He would like to ask the department to come up with a plan and budget for their request. Scott Jewell mentioned that the new media arts center will have improvements between media arts and the new fine arts building Plaza. He explained there might be a possibility to eventually have some improvements rolled into that area that might potentially address those issues. Stephen explained that the tables that used to be around their building were moved due to the heavy littering of cigarettes and smoke.

   b. Randi Kinman thanked the committee for keeping the noise level during football games down. The last few home games have been great with no problems.
IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. **Facilities Committee charge** –
   Deferred to the next meeting.

b. **Visitor Parking (Lot C)** –
   Duncan took this item to the College Planning Council meeting which was moved from information to an action item and voted as approved. Chief Aguirre is 100% behind the plan to put extra visitor parking spaces in Lot C. He thinks the committee needs to look at traffic flow and the issues with cars dropping off students on the roadway. In addition to the parking spaces, the campus should consider taking down existing signs in lot C and putting up signs that have clear verbiage that indicates the parking for visitors and the parking for staff. Right now, the signs in the parking lot are not clear which results in visitors parking in the staff lot which result in them receiving citations. Seher mentioned that she does have a quote for new updated signage.

c. **Update on tree removal and proposed fence construction time period** –
   Seher is currently going through the updated arborist report. Once she reviews the entire report she will put together a proposal to bring back to the committee. The fencing project has already begun with the exception of the Laswell area which is on hold due to surrounding trees.

   Seher explained that the eucalyptus trees on our campus were flagged as poor in the 2009 report. She reported that recently a branch fell almost hitting a car. The agreement for all our tree removal is that we do replace them two for one. Seher will come up with some options so that committee can initiate a discussion on it and move forward. Stephen Mansfield reported the trees on the south side of campus near Building K are either dead or have uprooted and have caused damage to the concrete. Seher explained there has been discussion in the bond meetings about presenting a plan in regards to the updated master plan and the corresponding landscaping plan that will include existing trees being removed when the new buildings go up. She would like to present a short term option that’ll work for the trees on Laswell. In the next 6 to 8 month period the campus will work on getting a landscape master plan together and then present it through the governance processes. This plan will allow the campus to have a model of where trees should appropriately be planted. The plan should tie in with the design standards for our District and Campus. She also explained there is a report being done by the arborist explaining what types of trees are appropriate for our campus. A question was asked if the arborist has done a new updated audit. Seher explained that the report is being updated currently. Stephen Mansfield also explained that we are out of compliance with the American flag in front of the Technology Building. The hybrid sycamore tree is touching the flag and needs to
be cleared at least 50 feet. Jussi Rajna suggested we look at placing small to medium-sized trees. A question was asked on whether the college was working with a city or contract arborist. It was explained this was a contracted arborist.

d. Educational and Facilities Master Plan –
Stephen Mansfield requested this agenda item but has since spoken with Corinne Salazar regarding missing minutes. She explained to him that the missing minutes are now in the public folders on the intranet. He explained to the committee that the Academic Senate’s Adhoc Committee has an action item on their agenda opposing the revised facilities master plan because it was not put through the constituency groups for review and approval. This is why he requested this item be put on the agenda and discussed. Due to no quorum he’s requesting that it be placed on the next meeting agenda.

e. M&O Building –
Stephen Mansfield feels that Maintenance and Operations are working in poor conditions and are being moved to another bad area. He mentioned that efforts were made before the facility master plan was updated to provide a building for Maintenance and Operations which was a one central location on campus. He doesn’t agree with what is currently being done for the department. Scott Jewell gave an update based on the discussion the committee had with the temporary location of Maintenance & Operations. The District had initiated an environmental health and safety review for the boiler plant regarding noise and air quality. The review was completed and there were no concerns for that building. Gilbane also had their Design Professional confirm that all codes were being met in which a letter was received confirming the building did meet all codes. Steve explained that he wasn’t involved with the M&O building. He did tell the committee that at one point in time there was an M&O building on the master plan before. An architect was hired to design it, it was designed and he believes it came out of DSA a couple of years ago. He did confirm that the M&O building was removed from the facilities master plan and is not on the bond list. If there is an effort to have a new dedicated M&O he suspects it will need to be rolled into the next master plan update to basically allow it to be built. He suspects there will be several things in the next master plan update that’ll be looked at and addressed. Typically, the master plan is updated every five years or as needed. The master plan was updated about a year and a half ago.

Randi Kinman commented from the public’s point of view that it had appropriate outreach which had improved greatly from the past. She remembers attending a meeting that took place on campus which she believed was the facilities committee meeting but she could be wrong. Her understanding was that it was brought out to the public and the college gave a PowerPoint presentations and presented diagrams. Former Vice President Greg Nelson also presented the update to SONA. SONA
members also attended the Board of Trustees meeting where the master plan was finalized. Scott Jewell indicated that the presentation went to the Board of Trustees twice. The first meeting there was some concern from the board that the updated plan hadn’t gone through the shared governance process and refused to act on it. The former Vice President of Administrative Services went back to the campus and did a number of presentations to the campus and the standing committees which should have been well documented. Stephen Manfield feels that policy and procedures should be followed through which was the means to create the ad hoc committee.

f. Laswell Stop Sign and Traffic Circle Marking update –
This item was placed on the agenda by Jerry Kauffman (absent). Stephen Mansfield explained that last spring semester the committee walked that area with the former chair of the committee. The painting on Laswell at the circle is confusing to people who come on our campus. It was suggested last semester to place big arrows pointing in the correct direction of the street so that cars would not go down the one way side of Laswell. Chief Aguirre reiterated how important it is to have signs near that circle.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.
## Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA

**Student Center (SC-204)**  
**October 14, 2013**  
**2:00 pm – 3:30 pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC (3) -- J. Andrade, D. Graham, S. Awan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (3) – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield, J. Kauffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified (3) – B. Geer, T. Paiz, P. Romero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body (1/1) – Jeff Campbell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Approval of Agenda

### II. Approval of the September 16, 2013 meeting minutes

### III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

### IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Security Master Plan regarding Public Safety Cameras on Campus

b. Educational and Facilities Master Plan

c. Landscape Master Plan

d. Signage – Allow for 20 minutes for design presentation from consultants

e. Urban Forest Management Plan/Tree Removal

f. Raquetball Building

g. Swing space for P.E. Athletics to the old storage room in the 100 wing

h. Wet Photo Lab

i. Measure G 2010 funding of Main Gym to Measure G 2004

### V. ACTION ITEMS:

a. M&O Building

b. Facilities Master Plan
Facilities Committee Meeting – Minutes for 10/14/2013

Meeting called to order: 2:05 p.m.

I. Approval of Agenda
   a. Approved – unanimously

II. Approval of September 16, 2013 meeting minutes
    a. Approved – Motioned: S. Awan/2nd S. Mansfield

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)
    a. Tait Rafat discussed the Kinesiology meeting that took place on July 24th with Greg Nelson regarding the current state of the department’s building. During this meeting the department was informed that they would temporarily utilize the 100 and 200 wings along with the racquetball court. During this meeting they were told that some square footage would be cut from the existing building and that they were $350,000 over budget which was well under the 1% for the project and Greg felt that they would easily be able to press forward as soon as permanent administrators could get on board. At the last board meeting and prior to this Facilities meeting the department were told that they are $1.6 million over. In that short period of time they are not sure how those figures have been inflated? Tait also pointed out that the Kinesiology/Athletics Department has a program review on file. He expressed his frustration that there have been six consultants on this project and it has not gone anywhere.

    b. Doug Robb, Kinesiology Instructor, spoke in regards to the presentation at the board meeting versus what was presented at Professional Development day, there were two different amounts given to the campus. He feels no one has consulted the department about the building.
c. Kathy Bruga, Kinesiology Instructor, expressed concerns about the old building and the racquetball court building in regards to asbestos and pest-control. The current area that she is using for her yoga class has a roach problem.

d. Bob Wing, Librarian, announced to the committee that a copy of the Facilities Master plan is available to the public in the library. He is requesting that a current copy of the plan be given to the library so that it can be placed for public use.

e. Debbie Huntze-Rooney, Kinesiology Instructor, commented that her biggest concern is lack of communication with the department and that the Athletic/Kinesiology project will be put on hold again. She feels there’s too much fighting going on and we need to remember this is for the students.

f. Chris Chiodo mentioned that the presentation that was done at the Board of Trustees meeting was, in her opinion, a managerial decision. Part of the frustration in the Kinesiology Department is there doesn’t seem to be communication with the end users. She understands that management has the right to make the decisions but in the past when bond projects were being coordinated the end users was able to give input. Her request is that Gilbane allow the Kinesiology, Athletics, P.E. and Adaptive P.E. department an opportunity to speak and address issues regarding the new facility. There needs to be communication between the Kinesiology Department and management so the department can assist in maximizing the utilization of the facilities for the students.

g. Stephen Mansfield mentioned that he tried to get on the agenda for the Board of Trustees meeting during the summer. He explained that he went on the district website to find directions on how to go about getting on the agenda and what he found was that you had to write a letter to the Chancellor and to the president of the Board of Trustees with supporting documentation on what you want to speak about. He was also told he needed to go back to the college and receive approval from his Dean, the VP of Academic Affairs and the President of the college which will finally go to the Chancellor. He suggested that there needs to be some type of procedure or policy in place regarding this matter. It took him three Board of Trustees meetings before he could present.
IV. **DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

a. **Security Master Plan regarding Public Safety Cameras on Campus** –

Chief Aguirre brought back to the committee the planned implementation of the pilot camera system on campus. Over the course of last year the Safety and Facilities committees were made aware and supported the move to slowly phase in the Public Safety cameras. When the topic got to the District Council, they felt as if it should be reintroduced to the campus so that everyone is clear and if there are any lingering misconceptions or concerns they can be addressed before the campus goes forward with the pilot program. He explained that Evergreen Valley College has a current pilot program in place involving about a dozen Public Safety cameras on campus. The success of the cameras at their campus has resulted in three suspects being arrested out of five known cases since the beginning of the program in June. He would like to see that same type of success here at San José City College. He explained that between both colleges SJCC needs the cameras more because the nature of the environment and the propensity for criminal elements that can come on campus. He urges the committee to support the program and the long-term Public Safety cameras implementation and assures the cameras will be nonintrusive. He’d like to see both campuses developing a general district policy of “dos” and “don’ts” on how far the cameras can go. As far as the police department is concerned in terms of public safety the cameras will be threefold: 1) to provide for information by video footage on potential crimes and suspects involved in crimes 2) to provide a sense of security that has been lacking on our campus and to serve as crime deterrent where a criminal will think twice about committing a crime once they see that we are monitoring through the cameras 3) to serve as forensic evidence when a crime occurs. Lastly he asked the committee to understand that the cameras aren’t here to spy on anyone. The cameras will not be installed in any areas that have an expectation of privacy. The cameras will be put in common areas where people congregate (Cafeteria, Library, Student Center, etc.), areas where staff handle money (Admissions & Records, Business Services, etc.) and in key areas where shooters will go to commit acts of violence on our student population. These areas are where we would want our cameras to be installed in the event the campus has an active shooter. It will easily assist campus police and outside agencies responding to these types of situations rather than running around not knowing where to locate the shooter. He again asked the committee to support the pilot program for SJCC so they may move forward since this is long overdue. Duncan Graham asked the Chief if there was a schedule of when the cameras would start to be installed. He mentioned there was a car theft committed recently in the parking garage. Chief Aguirre explained what he
understood was the first phase of the camera installation would be in the Student Center. Randi Kinman expressed how important it will be to have the surrounding community involved in reviewing and giving input on the Security Master Plan. The crimes committed on campus represent a cross over issue that the neighborhoods feel strongly about. Chief Aguirre explained that once the layout of the cameras are completed that there may be some that are monitoring parts of the neighborhood which he hopes will be acceptable by the neighbors. Randi welcomed it.

b. Education and Facilities Master Plan –
Duncan mentioned to the committee that the Academic Senate has created an ad hoc group to review the Facilities Master plan. Duncan and President Breland will be meeting with the group during the week. He feels the committee should meet to discuss results from that meeting. Stephen Mansfield reiterated on Bob Wing’s public comment regarding the updating of the Facilities Master Plan. He feels this is an opportunity to get all the updated information out to the public. Duncan suggested that the Facilities Committee create their own ad hoc group to review the findings from the Academic Senate’s group. He suggested that this be an action item and voted on at the next meeting.

c. Landscape Master Plan –
Seher Awan explained that a Landscape Master plan is currently being created which will involve tree removals and will be tied into the Facility Master plan along with campus signage. It isn’t ready for approval because there are parts that are still being worked on (signage, trees, etc.).

d. Signage –
Seher Awan introduced Ted Luthin from Ross Luthin Creative. Mr Luthin gave a presentation on signage and themes for the campus. Seher is hoping the committee can come together at the next meeting to discuss and vote on choices for the signage based on his presentation. This will tie into the Landscape Master plan. Some of the signage that was presented was around the Technology building at the corner of Bascom and Moorpark. Stephen Mansfield explained that, that area around the Technology Building has in the past posed a problem with the city of San Jose. Stephen also asked Mr. Luthin how long he has been working on this project. Mr. Luthin explained he had just started on this project about a month ago. Mr. Luthin was asked if a traffic study had been completed regarding this project. Mr. Luthin explained that he found a traffic study online from what he believes was 2011. Mr. Luthin asked the committee if the city of San Jose has jurisdiction over campus signage. Scott Jewell explained
the property that the Technology Building sits on is leased to the campus. Mr. Luthin explained that his company is up to date on San Jose codes and he will look into that area. Chris Chiodo mentioned that she didn’t read anything about a bid going out. She asked how much money is going towards this project. Mr. Luthin explained that there hasn’t been discussion on budget but that’ll be one of the first things they will be working on once a decision is made. Scott Jewell explained that Ross Luthin Creative are professional service providers and are selected similar to architects. They are working under an agreement to just do some programming and design work. The scope of the work as of right now isn’t clear and that the college is paying in parts until it is defined. Chris asked Scott if this company is a sub-contractor through Gilbane. Scott explained that Gilbane doesn’t hire contractors and that this is strictly through the district. Seher explained to Chris that the signage is through the site improvements on the 2010 bond. Chris asked about signage in and around campus for students. Mr. Luthin explained that part of their goal is working with the committee on what theme in the presentation the committee prefers and then to explore it at a smaller scale on campus. Chris explained that we need to focus more on in campus signage rather than signage out on the street. Seher explained to the committee that the presentation was meant to introduce themes to the committee and once that is in place we can look at the project as a whole which would include way signs on campus.

e. Urban Forest Management Plan/Tree Removal –
Seher Awan informed the committee that she wanted to link together the three agenda items and that the campus will need an Urban Forest Management Plan for the tree removals. This is in the process of being created and once the document is created it will be shared with the committee.

f. Racquetball Building –
Stephen Mansfield asked what he would like to see for the Racquetball Building through the Facilities Committee is a cost analysis on the building. He’d like to know how much it will cost to renovate and how much it will cost to demolish and redo the building. He’d also like to see an Industrial Hygienist report to make sure there’s no mold. Scott Jewell said at this point there’s no mold in the building but once everything is exposed and if that is the case it will be dealt with at that time. Chris Chiodo reiterated that in the master plan the racquetball court was scheduled to come down. She explained this is another issue that needs to be addressed with the Kinesiology Department because there’ll be a reduction in the square footage of the new fitness center due to the theater. She referred to Scott’s presentation at the Board of Trustees meeting regarding
changes to the Department. Scott explained that the presentation that he did for the Board of Trustees was the same presentation that Greg Nelson gave in the spring to the Kinesiology faculty. Chris explained that the faculty was not aware that these decisions were made even though Scott explained that the presentation Greg gave specifically was made for the department. He explained to Chris that decisions haven’t been made as she has indicated, they are only options. Scott explained that they are charges with trying to find a way to preserve as much of the program phase as possible. They came up with an option that included the one that was presented to the faculty by Greg Nelson. He believes Lamel Harris, Athletic Director, also presented it at a staff meeting.

No one is being forced into the Racquetball building or in the 200 wing if it is preferred but the department can go into a smaller building which will come out of the $3.2 million. As the faculty of the department they’ll be able to participate in that process of deciding where to be housed. Scott explained the reason that the presentation was given to the Board of Trustees was due to a comment that was made months ago as to why that projects was delayed. Gilbane was asked to come back to the board and give an overall as to where the project was currently. That same presentation was given to the Athletic Director and the President. He understands there’s a lot of confusion and there is a meeting with the department to go over the options. The fact is there is a fixed amount of money; we need to design whatever can be designed to that budget. They are moving forward, they have an architect on board, they’re hiring a contractor and once they have both together they are going to validate the program. Chris explained that there were no options in terms of the relocation of the weight room to the 100 wing it was just told by management that that’s where it was going even though the equipment can’t be housed there. She expressed her concerns regarding her adapted PE students and how it’ll affect them. She understands these are conceptual ideas but that they were never communicated to the department. The situation now is they don’t know the square footage of the new fitness center and the department should have the ability to look at the options. Lamel Harris, Athletic Director, explained that the department was presented with these options regarding the 100 and 200 wing by Greg Nelson and that he also repeated this in a staff meeting. He understands its not being well accepted but the information was presented and not as a final decision. Novella Simonson says that at the board meeting it was presented as decided which no one knew anything about. Lamel explained that he was at that meeting and he didn’t get the impression that this was a final decision. Seher also explained as a new staff member with Lamel that they are trying to be collaborative with the department. She reiterated that at the board meeting what was presented were options not the final decision and that they
were not board approved. They were only put on the agenda as an information item for an update. No decisions have been made and won’t be made without the end-users involved. They want to make sure that the department is a part of the process and she is asking that they give them a chance to try to work together. Novella Simonson responded by saying the way that Scott Jewell presents information is not participatory governance and isn’t how you get input from the constituency groups who have the right to give input before decisions are made. The decision that was presented at the board meeting about the racquetball/PE building being merged with the VoTech building was new information. She referenced AB 1725, which all the decisions must be made through shared governance. The way words are being used by saying “it was presented” is not the same as getting input.

g. Swing space for P.E. Athletics to the old storage room in the 100 wing –
   Deferred to the next meeting.

h. Wet Photo Lab –
   Deferred to the next meeting.

i. Measure G 2010 funding of Main Gym to Measure G 2004 –
   Deferred to the next meeting.

V. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. M&O Building –
      Deferred to the next meeting.

   b. Facilities Master Plan –
      Deferred to the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 3:40 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
October 28, 2013
2:00 pm – 3:30 pm

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the October 14, 2013 meeting minutes

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Signage Preference
   b. Security Master Plan
   c. Design Standards
   d. Construction Access (Gilbane)
   e. Accessibility/Use of PE Equipment for DSPS students
   f. M & O Building
   g. Program Review for new/renovated structures
   h. Campus recycle (AB 75)
   i. Student Center open area (Pavilion)
   j. Swing space for P.E. Athletics to the old storage room in the 100 wing
   k. Wet Photo Lab
   l. Measure G 2010 funding of Main Gym to Measure G 2004
   m. Benches near Theatre – Smokers

V. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Facilities Master Plan
   b. Public Safety Cameras

Members
MSC (3) -- J. Andrade, D. Graham, S. Awan
Faculty (3) – C. Chiodo, S. Mansfield, J. Kauffman
Classified (3) – B. Geer, T. Paiz
Associated Student Body (1/1) – Jeff Campbell
Meeting called to order: 2:00 p.m.

I. Approval of Agenda
   a. Approved – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd B. Geer

II. Approval of October 14, 2013 meeting minutes with corrections
    a. Approved – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd J. Andrade

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)
    a. Roland Montemayor, Dean of Counseling, reminded the committee that during the phases of construction on campus that there needs to be an awareness and accessibility for the disabled students on campus.
    b. Stephen Mansfield brought to the committee’s attention that he’s notice that wood has been placed in the trash. He asked if the college still has the debris box service which he was told that there was one by the 100 wing. He reminded the committee that the college is held to Assembly Bill 75. The bill is supposed to be 50% recycling with plastic, papers, cardboard, wood and steel. He explained to the committee that by the year 2020 we’ll need to do a 50% increase from 50% of our recyclability to 75%. The committee should keep in mind that this is coming up and focus on it now so that this doesn’t become a problem later.

Previously in the 2010 Facilities Master Plan, the committee was trying to put together a central plaza for the associated students. He doesn’t see that it’s in the current Facilities Master Plan. He would like to reiterate it and bring it to the attention of the committee and possibly move it forward as the committee
reviews the bond expenditures. Scott Jewell mentioned when picking vendors with debris box services, most of them can provide an in-house recycling program. They can take the recyclables away in bulk and separate them. When selecting waste removal vendors you can include a requirement that the vendor provide an annual recycle report that can be used to forward to the state at the end of the year. Stephen Mansfield suggested that the committee review those reports once they are available.

C. Charles Heimler announced that Jerry Kauffman has resigned from the committee and that he would be serving as a proxy until the Academic Senate can replace Jerry.

d. Charlene Lilie, introduced herself as the newly appointed Associated Student representative for the committee. She has requested and received the past Facilities Committee minutes from the recorder and will be reviewing them so she can be up to date with the committee.

She asked if the college is recycling toner cartridges. It was explained to her that Reprographics and Konica Minolta, copier vendor, are in charge of recycling the toners on campus. She mentioned a couple of issues in the women’s bathroom in the Student Center and Business Building. Joe Andrade suggested that she let Elizabeth Eckford, Associated Student Advisor, know of the issues so she can communicate with the Maintenance Department through work requests.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Signage Preference –

Joe Andrade added a request to add holes to the archway near Moorpark and Leigh Avenue, so that banners can be placed as he has received several requests. Scott Jewell mentioned that once design starts these types of requests can be coordinated. He reminded the committee that the discussion for the agenda item is to select or recommend a theme that a future designs. Charles Heimler asked why the committee is approving money and discussing new signage? It was explained to him that the committee is not approving money and that there was already a budget. Charles asked who decided to do new signage. It was explained that this item was discussed in the last meeting and that he can refer to the minutes from the October 14th meeting. Bruce Geer also explained that this topic had been discussed last semester. Charles would like to know where in the facilities planning process was it decided that the college would embark on a signage design. His understanding of planning is that these type of items need to come from a program review or some type of discussion. He feels the problem is
that somebody already decided that we have bond money so we’re going to go forward with paying for things like signage. He’s curious as to how the committee got to this point where it’s discussing new signs. He understands replacing signs but doesn’t understand why the committee is discussing new signage, way signs and paying a consultant designer large amounts of money. He doesn’t see how that has become a decision process that involved everyone on campus and in the community. He feels that no one may be able to answer his question because that discussion may not have occurred. Scott Jewell explained there’s a project on the bond list that is called Site Improvements. He thinks there is an original description that was written for that project which includes way finding. Signage is basically a way that we describe way finding. Charles asked how it gets on the bond list. Scott explained there was a project list established before Gilbane came aboard. It was explained that Seher Awan, who was unable to attend the meeting because she was at a conference, wanted to have the item on the agenda to be discussed and possibly choose a theme so that it can become an action item at the next meeting. Stephen Mansfield requested that the committee be given an electronic copy of the presentation that was done at the last meeting. If this is going to become an action item Stephen would like to disseminate it as much as possible to get an idea before voting. Andrew Spiller mentioned that at the last meeting the committee was given handouts of the presentation along with the guests that attended. Charles feels since there’s a request for information and since Seher is not at the meeting that the item be tabled and brought back as a discussion item at the next meeting when more of the information can be available. Charles asked again how the decision was made to do new signs on campus. He explained that the college is going through a process reviewing items that were not on the bond list. Joe Andrade recalled that the campus had a Town Hall meeting a few years back where the campus community was invited to review potential. Joe remembered that the suggestions and recommendations were then forwarded to the district. Scott said that signage was on the list and Charles said he doesn’t disagree that it may have been on the list but he’s asking to see the master plan because it sounds unsure. If it is on the bond list someone needs to explain what process took place to get it put on the list? Charles says these decisions may have been made 2-3 years ago and circumstances have changed. He explains that the college doesn’t want to be in the business of approving money just because something is on a list without being able to be accountable for the decisions that were made. Randi Kinman recalls participating in a meeting prior to the bond going out to vote. The categories and the specific projects were a set part of a ranking and rating system based on the notes she had from that
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meeting. Randi explains from the community’s perspective that they realize it takes a couple of years once the bonds been voted on and passes. She appreciates the efforts of placing way signs because it is difficult to find your way to and from the campus especially with entrance and structural changes. It was requested to place the item on the next meeting agenda for discussion/action, by the chair. Charles feels it needs more than a two week interim. There needs to be time for Academic Senate, Strategic Planning and the College Planning Council to give input. Stephen Mansfield would like to know the time table for this project and feels it should come back as a discussion item.

b. Security Master Plan –
Stephen Mansfield shared an email from the Faculty Association to the EVC President with questions that were asked regarding the Public Safety cameras being installed on their campus.

- Who is going to monitor a piece cameras and what training will they receive? How long will the video recordings be retained?
- Will any duplicate copies be made of the video recordings?
- Will there be any distribution of the video recordings outside of the Campus Police Department?
- Where are the cameras installed?

Chief Aguirre explained that the cameras will be used strictly for collecting evidentiary value information for ongoing criminal investigations. The pilot program will start off in the Student Center. The cameras will not be located in any locations that are deemed private in terms of private offices or restrooms. The cameras will be located where there is general congregation of the population of the campus community such as the cafeteria, Admissions and Records, Library and other locations where there’ll be money handling. The cameras will be for public safety only and not for personnel investigations. Charlene Lilie asked if there’s concern about safety why not install the cameras in the parking lot? Chief Aguirre agreed it’s a good idea and that nothing is set in stone as far as location is concern. Regardless of where the cameras go there’s a need for them because crimes are sporadic. As far as the technical aspect of having the cameras outside Chief Aguirre isn’t sure if there’s infrastructure that can support the cameras. He reiterated that his staff is unable to monitor cameras for their full shifts which mean cameras will not be monitored all the time. If there’s an emergency the camera can be used to focus in on the activity. Jeff Campbell explained when the cameras were brought to the committee last
spring, Greg Nelson was asked if the cameras could be installed in the garage which he explained it would be easier to start the pilot program in the student center because the fiber-optic had to be run outside the building which is why the parking lots would be last to have cameras installed. He explained that the committee was told one camera would be mounted on the parking structure facing the front door of the student center and that it’s a face recognition camera. Charles Heimler recalls going to a Facilities Committee meeting where a map was given out with locations of cameras. Charles is suggesting there may have been a decision already made, which seems to be what happens all the time. Another concern Charles had is whether the Security Master Plan was reviewed and approved by the Safety Committee. He’d like to see the meeting minutes showing that they did review the camera placement plan. The Academic Senate has not reviewed the plans even though they have requested to see them. Faculty does have concerns about cameras and how they impact the teaching situation on campus. Charles also requested to see the annual crime report for the campus. The last report he reviewed from the Campus Police office showed no significant increase in reporting of crimes. The argument that there’s an urgency to have these cameras due to the surge of crimes needs to be validated. Chief Aguirre explained to Charles that the annual security report that is required by the Federal Clery Act only requires data for crimes that they want the campus to report. All incidents that occur on campuses are not reported to Clery. The breakdown of the Clery Act only has crimes that the Department of Education wants us to report. In terms of all the incidents that occur on campus the Chief will provide Charles with data on what the trend has been year-to-year which will show an increase in crime. Chief Aguirre reiterated that he was asked to come back to the college by the Board of Trustees to make sure that everyone understands the direction the campus was heading towards in regards to the Security Master Plan and the Public Safety cameras. Duncan Graham requested that the committee be given the access to the Security Master Plan. This item will be brought back at the next meeting as a discussion item.

c. **Design Standards**

Scott Jewell introduced Heidi Rank who’s helping to coordinate the Design Standards at the district and college level. She’s working with the campus in compiling sets of documents that would layout performance criteria for certain buildings and components. A handout was given to the committee with the general guidelines of design standards. Heidi also passed around a binder with more details of design standards. The purpose of having design standards is to establish guidelines for projects and to makes it easier for designers to establish
consistency while working on projects. They want to do this at a district level but she understands each campus has their own identity. Design Standards include spaces (size and arrangements), products which include standard products (basis of design and performance specification) and propriety products (door hardware, locks, closers, exit devices, fire alarm, security systems, toilet accessories, etc.). This will help architects move forward more efficiently.

Stephen Mansfield asked if any of the information from the previous Design Standard Committee was integrated into the new plan. There was a draft design standards that was incorporated and used as a basis for the current work. Stephen also asked since we are in the LEED factor of building is this separated (i.e. floors, walls, etc.). She explained there is a sustainability component in the new standards.

d. Construction Access (Gilbane) –

Bruce Geer made aware to the committee that he had encountered a contractor with a safety vest on inside the CTSS office. When asked how he was able to get into the office the contractor told him he obtained a key from campus police. The contractor was told by campus police that the phone system that he needed to work on was located in their office. Bruce notified his supervisor of the incident. This was not the first time a contractor had been an office without notification to the staff as other staff had also told him of similar situations. He suggested the college needs to have more control and security over the contractor’s access to buildings and offices. Scott Jewell shared his concern as well and explained it shouldn’t have happened. Immediately after being notified of the incident Scott sat down with his team and they started to develop an access protocol for their contractors. Once the protocol is set in place Scott will review it with Seher and bring it to the committee for review. Part of the protocol will be to try to introduce the contractors to the staff so they are familiar with who’s coming in and out of the office. In the meantime, Gilbane staff is under direct orders to make sure that any access provided by contractors is preceded by notification to Seher and the staff. The committee had a concern that the contractors are given access to the office simply with a badge showing the company they work for but college staff has to be fingerprinted before they can start employment with the District. Charles explained that as employees of the college we have a responsibility to protect other people on the campus from physical crimes and accidents that may occur from the contractors that are here to work on campus. There have been people who’ve come on campus dressed as contractors stealing equipment. He wants Gilbane to start a protocol immediately having contractors meet at a central point on campus, identify
themselves and their company and show proof that they are not thieves or sexual predators. Charles also requested a date of when Gilbane’s protocol will be in place. He feels that the contractors should be fingerprinted the same as staff. Gilbane can’t provide this type of procedure and feels it should be done at the Campus Police level. Scott agreed to have a timeline of when the protocol will be completed by the next Facilities Committee meeting. Chief Aguirre explained to the committee that Campus Police has contractor keys that are checked out for the day. On rare occasions, a contractor may need them longer in which Campus Police works with Gilbane and the college administration. The procedure for contractors checking in with Campus police is by verifying their ID (driver’s license), writing down their contact information and asking where the location of the work will take place. Campus Police doesn’t have the resources to follow the contractors once they’ve checked in with their office. Stephen asked if the companies send a list of employees who’ll be working on projects at the campus. Campus Police doesn’t require a list but sometimes his office will receive notice from Gilbane and/or the Business Services office but it’s not always the case. Chief Aguirre explained that there are regular vendors (Protection Plus, etc) that are assigned keys to do work on campus which follows the same procedure. Stephen suggested that through the administration/the District that a policy needs to come out requesting a list from the companies of their employees that come on campus. Charles feels there’s a security gap between Gilbane and Campus Police on coordinating access to contractors. Stephen referred back to the design standards regarding security. He would like the committee to take the lead on security, making recommendations to the President and following it through to the district. President Breland will work with Chief Aguirre and Gilbane on the security issue to see what’s currently in place and see if there might be a gap or if there’s simply missing information that’s not being discussed. The President would like the committee to continue discussing this item. Joe Andrade reminded the committee that it’s not only Gilbane that brings contractors on campus but also our college departments. Chief Aguirre suggested that possibly some level of badging be in place for employees so people are aware of who’s staff and non-staff.

e. Accessibility/Use of PE Equipment for DSPS students –
Discussed in public comments.

f. M & O Building –
Stephen mentioned that he received an email from Seher Awan that indicated that there’s a centralization of M&O at a district level and a possibility of
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decentralization of M&O people. He doesn’t know how that works with his request to consider the M&O building to come back and be placed on the campus. Duncan suggested when we revisit the Facilities Master plan that the M&O should be reviewed.

g. **Program Review for new/renovated structures** –
Stephen would like to see a new Program Review policy started for the new and renovated structures. There was a policy that the committee was held accountable to, which no longer exists. He doesn’t believe a Program Review was created for the new Theater which is already scheduled to be built. By reviewing the Facilities Master plan and using Program Review it’ll give us the opportunity to make better decisions. Charles thinks that the college needs to do an environmental scan. Duncan agrees and sees that there’s a lot of misunderstanding and misconceptions. The time has come to put it all to rest and start building a solid foundation. Duncan suggested bringing back the Strategic Planning committee. We need to take the Integrated Planning manual and use it as a baseline for the Facilities Master plan and Educational Master plan. Program Review needs to be included and the process that’s established needs to be followed.

h. **Campus recycle (AB 75)** –
This was already discussed in public comments. Stephen reiterated that this is a high vocational focused campus with decades of recycling. He’d like to see educational/vocational classes in the recycling area. Stephen mentioned to the committee there should be collaboration between vocational and science classes to put together a recycle curriculum – this could be wind energy, soil and worm recycling for sewage management. He was wondering how the college is managing the recycling for wood and cardboard when these items are being thrown into the general dumpster for M & O. AB 75 mandates a 75% recycle by the year 2020. With six years to that date for a 50% increase of recycling, this campus should have some policy in hand so this target of 75% will be reached and achieved earlier than 2020. Why shouldn’t this campus be one of the frontrunners for recycling efforts? Charlene suggested taking the wood that was being thrown away and using it as mulch.

i. **Student Center open area (Pavilion)** –
Stephen discussed in the previous Facilities Master Plan from the Facilities Committee in 2010, there was to be a civic center area for the student body. This was to be a form of concrete stage area for public speaking with some
concrete sitting area at different levels and a grass berm area to sit down and listen. This was to be located near the center of the G.E. complex but must be coordinated with the existing trees donated by faculty and staff members.

j. **Swing space for P.E. Athletics to the old storage room in the 100 wing** – Stephen has heard that the 100 wing which is supposed to be a swing space for P.E. & Athletics has now turned into a permanent location. He has concerns that the college is taking 2010 Measure G bond funds and mixing it with Measure G 2004 bond funds. He was told that bond funds were not supposed to be mixed. He would like to see some type of confirmation that states what funding is being used and if it’s permanent. Scott Jewell explained its Measure G 2010 funding for the renovation of the 100 & 200 wings. There isn’t that much that’s going into those areas, they’ll just be wide open spaces. Legally, as to whether or not you can spend from P.E., it’s technically being spent on the renovation of the 100 & 200 wings. He doesn’t think it’s an issue but he can look into it and confirm with the committee.

k. **Wet Photo Labs**

Stephen asked about the wet labs and the source of funding (i.e. demo). Scott explained that Photo Lab is a separate project on the bond list. Stephen would like to see some type of template and accountability showing where the funds are coming from for projects. Lamel mentioned that Scott had communicated the plans at their department meetings. They haven’t heard that anything is final but they have heard that the 100 & 200 wings are a swing space. Some of their faculty has heard that it’s permanent. Lamel wants it noted that there’s ongoing communication with the department and Gilbane. Charles added that the campus needs to go back to having big Facilities meetings where the campus community can participate and everyone can be on the same page.

l. **Measure G 2010 funding of Main Gym to Measure G 2004** –

Stephen would still like to have a final answer about melting of funding. The purpose of his inquiry is due to a conversation between him and Greg Nelson. Stephen asked why they couldn’t finish P.E. and Athletics. Why can’t they take funds from Measure G 2010 to complete the Applied Allied Health and the swimming pool? His concern is the campus isn’t finishing projects. Charles pointed out that when we were demolishing the pool it was said that the campus was going to build a new pool when we float another bond. It was asked why we can’t use Measure G 2010 to finish Measure G 2004. It was said that you can’t mix bond funds but apparently now you can depending on the project? Scott
explains that when it’s said that you can’t mix money from bonds it means you can’t take funding from Measure G 2010 and funding from Measure G 2004 and put them into one pot and create one project. In terms of scope the two bonds are very similar but there are certain things that you can’t do in one bond that you can do in the other. Aside from that, as long as the scope that you’re doing is interpreted in the language of the bond you can spend the bond money on the project. There’s no reason from a bond perspective that you can’t do a project unless it’s excluded or unless you can’t interpret it. Bond language is typically flexible enough to be interpreted and it generally ties into the facilities master plan, this is because bond programs can take over 10 years to implement and priorities are going to change over time. It’s not intended to lock the college into whatever the thought was at that point in time. It lets you have a little flexibility in evolving over time. In terms of interpretation, District’s typically rely on their Legal Counsel. Generally it’s not untypical to have different components of scope if you have two different bonds going at one time. Stephen asks if you focus on something that you place on the bond and you put it in the bond language that this is what you’re supposed to do and you have it so your facilities master plan is going to follow it. If you’re looking at your facilities master plan and you have vocational as #1, and renovation of the theater at #17, you’re flipping back and forth. Scott explained that his explanation wasn’t on the process and that what he’s saying is that you have flexibility. How you come to these decisions is really a college issue and it's something that the college has processes in place for. From a bond and flexibility perspective you have a fair amount of flexibility in what you can use the bond funds for shy of a few things that you definitely can’t do.

m. Benches near Theatre (Smokers) –
Heidi Hoffman discussed the benches near the Theatre that are being used by smokers. There’s a path that leads to parking lot “T” were benches are located. Heidi’s concern is that she has to inhale their smoke whenever she goes to her car. In addition to that area there’s also the General Education quad were smokers are hanging out. Nothing is being done to enforce the college’s no smoking policy. Heidi is request that the benches be taken out near the Theatre. Chief Aguirre explained that they can’t cite students for smoking and not abiding by the policy. He explained that when the policy was put in place that Campus Police made it aware to the College Planning Council that they don’t have the manpower to follow smokers around and cite them. A suggestion was made to cite smokers for throwing their cigarette buds on the floor. In order for officers to cite they would literally have to be there when it happened.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
TUESDAY, November 12, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC (3) -- J. Andrade, D. Graham, S. Awan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (3) – S. Mansfield, C. Heimler (proxy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified (3) – B. Geer, T. Paiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body (1/1) – J. Campbell, C. Lilie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the October 28, 2013 meeting minutes

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Elect a Chair
   b. Security Master Plan
   c. Signage Theme
   d. Design Standards
   e. Public Safety Cameras
   f. M & O Building

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Fusion Data
   b. Campus Recycle
   c. Program Review for new/renovated structure
   d. Student Center open area (pavilion)
   e. Benches near Theatre – Smoker
   f. P.E./Athletics
   g. Review Facilities Master Plan
   h. Review Education Facilities Master Plan
   i. Vice Presidents reserved parking spots

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Landscape Master Plan
   b. Facilities Updates

---

**MSC**: Members

**Faculty**: Faculty

**Classified**: Classified

**Associated Student Body**: Associated Student Body
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC – Seher Awan, Joe Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – Stephen Mansfield, Jerry Kauffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified – Teresa Paiz, Bruce Geer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body – Jeff Campbell, Roland Bough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests – Scott Jewell (Gilbane Co.), Randi Kinman (Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Assoc.), Lt. Gilbert Torres, Andrew Spiller (Gilbane Co.), Jose Garza, Ted Luthin (Ross Luthin Creative), Jussi Rajna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting called to order: 2:00 p.m.

I. Approval of Agenda
   a. Approved – Motioned: J. Andrade/2nd T. Paiz

II. Approval of October 28, 2013 meeting minutes
   a. Approved – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd J. Andrade

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)
Jerry Kauffman clarified that he never resigned or requested a proxy as was explained at the 10/28/13 meeting. He explained that due to his class schedule he’ll have to miss meetings or come late. Next semester he will not be able to be on the committee. He will remain on the committee until the Academic Senate can find someone to replace him permanently.

IV. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Elect a Chair –
   Seher requested if the committee would elect a chair since Duncan Graham has been facilitating. Stephen stated that at the beginning of the semester he and Duncan had agreed to “keep it cool” for this semester and felt it is incorrect to have this as an action item when it hasn’t been discussed. Seher thought in the charge that it stated that the committee should have a chair for each semester. Bruce asked if it was still being considered to have co-chairs. Teresa asked what the reason was for having the committee “keeping it cool”. Stephen explained at the first meeting there was discussion that there was many difficulties with the committee in the prior semester that it was decided that during the fall semester it would be easier to not have a chair but rather a facilitator. Before the decision is made to vote for a chair, Stephen would like to have a better quorum since two faculties are absent. It was suggested that the
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committee elect a chair before spring semester meetings begin. The action item was tabled for the December 2nd meeting.

b. **Security Master Plan** –

It was explained to the committee that this action item was placed on the agenda so that the committee can vote for the existence of the Security Master Plan. The Security Master Plan is a live document and is being used to facilitate security upgrades on campus.

**Motion to vote: J. Andrade/2nd T. Paiz:**

To vote for approval of the Security Master Plan into existence.

Yes – 5
No – 2
Abstain – 0

MOTION PASSED

Stephen mentioned Barbara Hanfling’s email that was given to the committee at the prior meeting which requested a map be given out showing the exact locations of the cameras. SJCC was given examples and not specific locations. A question was asked if the vote was for cameras or is it a general plan documenting for all around security. It was explained that the Security Master Plan is a district document. The document does mention cameras as something that the campus needs to address. The information on where the location of cameras will go is not listed in the plan, that’s a separate initiative. Scott explained that the Security Master Plan is similar to the Facilities Master Plan. It allows you to move forward with procuring a consultant to design these initiatives. You’re basically hiring a consultant to design the camera systems under the approval of Security Master Plan. The Security Master Plan was sent out to the committee to review on three occasions (Oct. 24th, Oct. 25th & Nov. 5th). It was asked if this plan is different from the Emergency Operations plan. The Security Master Plan is a high level vision which talks about initiatives. The implementations of each of those initiatives would be a separate distinct project. That project would involve possibly a designer and the design process with stake holders involved in that design process. As the project is completed, a design would go out to bid or some procurement for a contractor would happen, then they would do the installation. Scott explained that the EOCs are typically a part of building renovation once it’s determined on where it will be set up. He’s not sure from the bond if there’s a specific project yet to do any upgrades or modifications for the EOC. Seher mentioned that the logistics for the EOC are separate from the Security Master Plan. The Security Master Plan is an initiative that consultants came in and identified the need for the college to improve our security. Stephen mentioned that in the 10/28/13 meeting minutes that it was noted that the facilitator requested that the committee be given the access to the plan and that it be brought back to the next meeting as a discussion item. He also feels as if the college is going to hire or allow
for someone to be hired. Stephen asks again if the committee is voting for some form of a Security Master Plan or is the campus planning on hiring someone from the outside to write the Security Master Plan. A consultant was hired over a year ago. It’s believed that this was handled though Chief Aguirre. The reason the plan is back at the campuses is because the district realized that they couldn’t move forward with the Security Master Plan without the support of the campus community. Stephen stated he’s against the Security Plan as an action item because he doesn’t feel that the committee has reviewed or has been given the plan. It was confirmed by the recorder that she had emailed the plan to the committee on a three occasions. Seher reiterated that she’s requesting that the committee vote the Security Master Plan into existence, that the committee acknowledges it as a District Security Master Plan. The initiatives that were addressed by a consultant needs to be looked at as a campus as we move forward to increase security. Stephen said he would vote against the motion because he wants the faculty to be made aware of it. Seher mentioned that it was sent to the Academic Senate President. Jose Garza, Campus Locksmith, stated that he has never seen the plan. It was explained that the plan does have sensitive information within it (Campus Police security plans) which is why it wasn’t put out to the public.

c. Signage Themes –
Ted Luthin with Ross Luthin Creative returned to the committee to re-present the themes that he presented on 10/14/13. Before the presentation, Seher read to the committee the 2010 bond verbiage regarding Site Improvements:

“Master Plan preparation and updates, environmental studies (including environmental investigation, remediation and monitoring), design and construction documentation, and temporary housing of dislocated District activities caused by construction projects. In addition to the projects listed above, repair, renovation and construction projects may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following: renovation of student and staff restrooms; landscaping; acquisition of land; construct maintenance and operations and physical education buildings; campus signage; repair and replacement of heating and ventilation systems; establish a capital improvement and deferred maintenance endowment: upgrade of facilities for energy efficiencies…”

Seher explained that the bond language clearly states that signage and landscaping are all included in the 2010 bond. This project is associated with Site Improvements. $5.7M of the bond funds were tied into Site Improvements which is adding on to the entire campus; all the landscaping, all of the signage and all of the finalizing of the buildings (tree shrub removing). The committee reviewed the three signage themes. The consultant has also given his own recommendation. Seher explained this would be the first phase in the Landscaping Master Plan phases. Mr. Luthin gave his presentation of the three themes:
#1 Theme – Face Forward

#2 Theme - Tech Campus

#3 Theme - On the Edge

Seher read a note from Sue Hager suggesting that the college logo should be used since it could change in the future. Randi Kinman felt that Theme #1, although she liked the “deco-ish” in the plan she feels it doesn’t tie in with any of the buildings or the campus visually. Theme #3 is extremely problematic for people who are using it as a way finding method or while driving by because it does a “shift” as you’re moving. #2 is the boldest and cleanest design and will go with almost anything if the campus makes changes in the future. Jerry expressed to the consultant that as he moves forward that SJCC needs to be emphasized in bigger letters more than the building name. The consultant agreed that at the corners of the campus it needs to make a statement and then the next layer will be the building identification.

Motion to vote:  J. Andrade/2nd T. Paiz: To vote for approval of Theme #2.

Yes – 7
No – 0
Abstain – 0

MOTION PASSED

Stephen asked how the contracts were given to the different entities when it hadn’t been cleared through any committees. Scott explained that there are numerous consultants that are hired through the bond program across the district. He’s not aware of a process were every contract is required to go through the Facilities Committee since they’re board ratified. Stephen explained that the committee had voted in 2008 for a $40,000 limit on project should be brought forth to the committee. He concerned and feels Gilbane is pushing the Facilities Committee. Scott explained that Gilbane’s job is to administer the bond and assist the colleges and the district in selecting, hiring and managing the firms. Seher explained that based off the master plan as well as the bond language, certain things have already been approved by not only the voters but also by the board. In that case, they go through the legal RFQ/RFP process. Scott mentioned there are certain committees that do review RFP’s that go over a certain amount. He also explained that it depends on the process they use to select. The approach Gilbane took on this bond program is you pre-qualify pools of firms in different disciplines so that way you can use those pre-qualifications going forward and they’re not constantly going through qualification processes. Gilbane doesn’t select or sit on any committees, they only facilitate the process. There were a couple of dozen firms that were selected district-wide in several different pools (Architecture, Structural Engineering, Geotechnical Engineering, Special Testing Inspections, Inspector of Record, etc.). Once the project has been initiated and Scott’s been given direction and the documentation that he has in terms of Gilbane’s end of pushing the project forward is all driven by a
committee staff that is interested in that project which is defined by the college. Stephen requested from Scott a copy of the list of the pre-qualified firms. Joe recalls serving on a panel with faculty and staff that went through books of projects which they scored individually. Afterwards, the panel met together and created a pool. Bruce recalls this as something that was done through the Facilities Committee and not as a separate panel. Scott mentioned that large capital improvement projects won’t use panels. They are large enough to justify their own selection process for that particular project. Stephen read an email from Dean Sean Abel which stated his confusion on the map which has a representation of a campus plan that isn’t either “no new Media Arts Building” nor “with the planned new Media Arts Building”; it is a completely new rendering from his (limited and new) perspective. He knows that the campus is coming together to resolve many issues and hopefully the committee would consider those possibilities as they look at the signage plan. Mr. Luthin explained that his team needed a map and they might’ve pulled out a context drawing which may have been outdated. They’ll pull a more current map with future buildings once the project starts.

d. Design Standards-

The committee received a presentation from Heidi Rank at the October 28th meeting in which she explained the purpose of having design standards established at the college level. Seher explained that the Design Standards are a living document. The committee was asked to vote so the document can be put in place as a living document, which will be able to be updated, and will be used for future construction. Stephen has a concern with the discrepancies within the report that is sent to the state regarding the campus facilities. Seher explained that the Design Standards don’t necessarily have a brand for all the products, just a few.

Motion to vote: J. Andrade/2nd T. Paiz: To vote for approval of Design Standards.
• One member left early and didn’t vote.
Yes – 5
No – 0
Abstain – 1

MOTION PASSED

e. Public Safety Cameras –

The committee revisited the topic of public safety camera pilot program in the Student Center. Chief Ray Aguirre attended a meeting where he discussed and answered questions in regards to the program. It was noted that the committee had already voted in the spring semester for the approval of the cameras but per the District it was asked to be re-visited so that all were aware of the installation of the program.

Motion to vote: R. Bough/2nd B. Geer: To vote for approval of the Safety Camera Pilot Program.
• One member left early and didn’t vote.
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Yes – 5
No – 0
Abstain – 1

MOTION PASSED

f. M&O Building –

Motion to vote: S. Mansfield/2nd B. Geer: To reinstitute the M&O Building back.
One member left early and didn’t vote.
Yes – 5
No – 0
Abstain – 0

Stephen would like to have the committee facilitate the M&O building that’s been sitting at the DSA be brought back and constructed on the campus. It’s been sitting at the DSA for so long that it isn’t valid anymore. He has pleaded with the Facilities Committee to try to have it completed. The DSA approved it but with new administration it wasn’t completed. He would like to have the M&O Building go through Facilities along with the College Planning Council so it can be built. It was on the Facilities Master Plan but has since been taken off. Seher said the first step would be to have it placed back on the Facilities Master Plan. Seher mentioned that she has been in talks with the President regarding identifying needs of the campus as a whole based off of the conversations with the Academic Senate’s Ad Hoc Committee.

Motion amended –Investigate through College Planning Council and the President, to see if the M&O Building is still valid with DSA.

Randi Kinman stated that once you’ve changed your Facilities Master Plan whatever DSA has in front of them is the most recent version of your plan. Scott explained that DSA did approve it in 2011 but there was a one year limit to start construction after their approval. If all other barriers were removed and the direction is to build a new M&O facility weather or not you can use that design, which you can, you would have to re-submit it to DSA. They would have to do another co-compliance review because certain codes may have changed. It can be submitted as a new project again assuming all the design work is done. Randi mentioned that the analysis that needs to be reviewed is if M&O department is being served by the current Facilities Master Plan. Seher’s concern is that the Maintenance is a District function. Our campus would be paying for a facility that hold a district department although she adds that there is plans to decentralize it based on the reorganization. Our needs as a college may have changed and she’s not sure if it would be wise to use the same plans. Stephen would like it to be brought up to the CPC and discussed so that there is a final answer.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Fusion Data –

The fusion data that was sent to the state at the previous Board of Trustees meeting has incorrect information in it. They have buildings that no longer exist in the report on the
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fusion data. It also shows the Construction Department is in labs 207L and 208L, which they’re not. The HVAC Department is missing. Stephen is asking if we have such inaccuracies in the fusion data at the college, he thinks it would be good to generate some kind of a review on all the buildings to see what else is in the fusion data that is incorrect. He suspects that the new buildings are correct. His main concern is the campus locksmith and if he can work through his security master plan if there are these types of mistakes. Joe also thinks that there are certain parts of the campus that are offline. When we report something offline it’s easy to say that we can go with one less Custodian or Groundkeeper because it looks as if we have less square footage. Seher mentioned that she knows the District as a whole is looking at the accuracy of the report and how it ties into Accreditation and our Total Cost of Ownership. The District is looking at different software programs that lie on top of fusion and work with fusion to help calculate and get a better accuracy of it. She will get more information and will bring it back to the committee.

b. Campus Recycle -

Stephen would like to see more efforts placed into some kind of documentation or process procedure for campus recycling. We are being held to a new standard by AB 75 come the year 2020. He’s not seeing too much recycling going on, on campus. He would like to see Santa Clara County Conservation Corps give the committee an annual report.

c. Program Review for new/renovated structure –

Stephen would like to see some type of policy or procedure that states that something that comes in front of the committee if it’s associated with space allocation towards education, that there is a policy or program review to warrant such discussion. Seher’s concern is that the committee only gives recommendations and not decisions. Stephen just wants to see that there is a program review and that it can be forwarded to the College Planning Council with a recommendation.

d. Student Center open area (pavilion) –

In 2010, with the Associated Student President, they had started discussing with Stephen a central location that could be an open venue for the Associated Students. Stephen doesn’t see it now with the Facilities Master Plan. He’s asking if the college has plans to do anything in the future for the Associated Students. Scott mentioned that when the A-gym, pool and locker rooms are gone that’ll open up a wide space. A couple of committees will be formed to assist in the design of that area. Whatever can be done with the funds that are available, Scott doesn’t see why something can’t be done. In the Facilities Master Plan it doesn’t mention anything specific so there’s room for ideas. Stephen mentioned the area near the General Education Building that shows who donated trees and he hopes that the committee can recommend to the College Planning Council the need to keep that out of respect. He also hopes that Associated Students become highly involved in the landscaping of that area.

e. Benches near Theatre – Smokers

The committee followed up with the agenda item that was presented at the last meeting by a staff member. Since it was told to the committee that this wasn’t a law
being broken there wasn’t much that can be done to the smokers. Stephen suggested designated areas and to keep the conversation going with the staff member who brought it to the committee. Lt. Torres was asked if there’s anything that can be done in a form of citations. Lt. Torres explained to the committee that there wasn’t much his department could do to enforce the policy. Lt. Torres reiterated the suggestion that there be designated areas even though he understands it goes against having the policy. Joe mentioned that at other colleges they’ve painted boundary lines were it indicates once you pass the line you can’t smoke. He also feels as an institution, we need to embrace the policy more. Randi Kinman brought up organizations that can assist in organizing the initiative with the campus community. Roland will speak to the ASG about an initiative.

f. **P.E./Athletics** –
   No discussion

g. **Review Facilities Master Plan** –
   Deferred

h. **Review Education Facilities Master Plan** –
   Deferred

i. **Vice Presidents reserved parking spots** –
   Padma Manian (no show) emailed the recorder to place the item on the agenda. Corinne read her email to the committee. It was explained that she received a warning citation for parking in the designated parking spot. Although she supports a designated parking spot for the President, she suggests that the four spots for four Vice Presidents parking spots be distributed among several parking lots so that faculty and staff who need to park in the GE lot can have more options. She believes that this was never brought to the Facilities Committee to vote on and was decided by the Administration. Corinne went back into the 2011-2012 minutes and recovered minutes from a Facilities meeting on September 23, 2011 in which the item was approved by the committee. Roland explained that a disabled student had received a citation for not being parked in a disabled spot which was a result of no disabled spots being available. He feels priority should be for the disabled. Stephen does recall that the committee did approve the VP parking spots but doesn’t recall if it went through the College Planning Council. Stephen suggested possibly moving two VP spots to another location so that it’s not taking up a group of spots. Scott mentioned that there’s usually an annual parking survey done. The committee is open to continue discussion with the disabled parking spots but doesn’t feel it’s necessary to move the VP’s spots because of one person personal agenda. Stephen doesn’t agree. Seher stated that she’s willing to keep up with the discussion of the disabled parking spots. She won’t address the VP’s parking anymore.

* Stephen requested a 10 minute extension to the meeting. The committee agreed.
VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Landscape Master Plan –
Seher thanked the committee for suggesting a signage theme which will assist in moving forward with the Landscape Master Plan. The next phase will be a Tree Removal Plan based on the arborist reports and construction that will take place on campus. Once that’s in place she’ll bring it to the committee for approval. The President is pushing to have the Landscape Master Plan completed as soon as possible because it’ll need to be tied into the Facilities Master Plan. The following phase will be the Replacement and Management Plan.

b. Facilities Updates –
Stephen mentioned that in the past the committee always had an item for Facilities updates on the construction projects. With all the upcoming projects and master plans that are being generated it would be good to include a standing agenda item for updates to the committee. Scott and Seher agree and will work on reporting back to the committee on updates.

Meeting adjourned: 4:09 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA  
December 2, 2013  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC – Joe Andrade, Duncan Graham, Seher Awan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – Stephen Mansfield, Jerry Kauffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified – Bruce Geer, Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body – Jeff Campbell, Charlene Lilie, Roland Bough (alternate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the November 12, 2013 meeting minutes

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Elect a Chair/Co-Chair

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Combining Safety and Facilities
   b. A/C noise in new Photography Build
   c. Accounting of the Racquetball Building/Theater
   d. Fusion Data by Campus
   e. Campus Recycle
   f. Program Review for new/renovated structure
   g. Student Center open area (pavilion)
   h. Benches near Theatre – Smoker
   i. P.E./Athletics
   j. Disabled Parking Spaces
   k. Converting Arcade into Meditation Room
   l. Drinking Fountains
   m. Wheelchair/handicap automated doors for bathrooms

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Facilities Updates (Gilbane)
   b. Facilities Updates (OPEN)
Meeting called to order:  2:14 p.m.

I.  Approval of Agenda with amendment

   a.  Approved – Motioned: S. Mansfield/2nd B. Geer

II. Approval of November 12, 2013 meeting minutes with revisions

   a.  Approved – Motioned: B. Geer/2nd J. Campbell

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

    Stephen mentioned the emails about the dust around the GE118. Under OSHA there’s a silica exposure situation under contractor contracts which should take care of this so that people aren’t exposed to the dust. He requested that this be addressed. Seher explained to the committee that steps have already been taken to write into the general contractor agreement to add green screens to keep the dust from overflowing. Seher also sent out an email to the campus and all concerned. In her email she stated the following steps would be made.

    1.  We will be placing green screen around the fencing perimeter that borders the GE building to shield the building from dust and debris.
    2.  We will be pushing the fencing perimeter out about 4 feet so that it is on the transition between the pathway and the lawn. This will provide a buffer to the construction area.
    3.  We will be moving the two concrete tables. They are currently set at an angle and against the fence. We will move them around the corner of the building temporarily so that they can still be used while construction is underway.

    The wall will take approximately two weeks to complete. Reconstruction of the wall will begin on Monday or Tuesday of the upcoming week.

    Stephen brought up the elevator in the GE building that has become an ADA (American w/Disabilities Act) issue. Joe Andrade mentioned that this is the responsibility of the Maintenance Department and has already been addressed to them. Joe mentioned that from what he understood was that due to the coldness in the morning, the hydraulic
fluid is freezing which is taking the elevator longer to activate. Bruce mentioned that he uses the elevator often and even during the afternoon the problem is the same. He also explained that the elevator doors aren’t shutting properly. Seher assured the committee that a contractor will be out to address the situation.

Stephen informed the committee that the ADA automatic door (facing Moorpark) in the Technology Building hasn’t been working properly. Joe stated that he has placed a few work orders into Maintenance to have the problem fixed. The college can’t afford an ADA lawsuit and it needs to be addressed.

Stephen informed the committee that there seems to be a District Bond Management Team and a Bond Executive Team that’s making the decisions for facilities at the college. He would like to know, and would like to have it brought back on to the agenda, who’s this team and who’s making these decisions. He has a suspicion that the District Bond Management Team and/or Bond Executive Team are the same people. He’s also requesting to see the minutes from these meetings. If the minutes reference anything to do with working within the facilities on campus, the minutes and the meeting should be open to the public.

The recorder requested that she would like to cut down on the paper usage for minutes and agendas by asking the members to please start bringing their own copies to the meetings. She’ll make available a few copies for the public. She would like to start this in the spring semester. She also asked for clarification on who she should be taking agenda item requests from; the members or from anyone on campus. Bruce believed it was only supposed to come from the committee members. Stephen explained that he doesn’t know where it’s written on how that procedure should be done but agrees it should come through the members from their constituency groups. Stephen suggested to Seher that she ask the recorder that when sending out the minutes that she remind the committee to bring their own copies and any requests for agenda items go through the constituent membership.

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

a. Elect a Chair/Co-Chair –
Seher would like to see if the committee would agree to go with the co-chair model that the College Planning Council has adopted since it seems to be successful. Stephen would like to see an election for the chair and asked that the co-chairs not be from the same constituency groups. Stephen stated past practices have been that standing committees elect the chairs. The charge will need to be updated if the committee decides to move forward with the co-chair model. President Breland explained that co-chairs are a partnership and if one can’t make it, the other will be able to step in to handle the responsibility. The item would be tabled until the charge can be revised stating co-chairs. Item will be placed on Action Items at the next meeting. Stephen
suggested if the VP is selected as chair then the co-chair position should be available once the charge has been amended and then have the election for the co-chair. It was mentioned that the chairs would need to understand that they’ll need to work with Accreditation and Total Cost of Ownership. Seher requested to have the item tabled until the next meeting so the charge can be amended. The committee will elect it’s co-chairs at the first meeting in the spring semester.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Combining Safety and Facilities –
At the College Planning Council a discussion item was presented to combine both Safety and Facilities Committees. President Breland explained to the committee that the idea is to look at all the committees to see how sufficient they’ve been. Safety and Facilities have similar agenda items that overlap. When the President brought it to CPC there was discussion and feedback from all the constituency groups, no decision was made. It’s in hopes that a move would be made sometime during the spring semester. President Breland explained that we have an Accreditation visit coming up in two years, which entails standard committees (Resources, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Leadership). President Breland would like to start a conversation about how the campus can respond to be accreditation standard. The Safety committee will discuss this item at their December 12th meeting. Seher explained that the Safety committee sometimes has issues making quorum. She researched the past few years and in conclusion it seems like the committee is being used as a forum to discuss issues rather than taking action. Stephen feels it’s a complex situation and asked who’s overseeing the standard committees? He’d like to see from CPC an ad hoc committee that can get involved in the discussion and help answer those definitions. What makes up a standard committee? Why is it important? Why are the charges so different? There’s no policy and without policy there can’t be procedure. Whichever way the vote goes as long as there is discussion it’s going to help us with Accreditation. Stephen suggested that the first step should be working on the new charge. He asked the President what it was that he saw with the old safety committee that was so apparent that it was non-functional. Based on what Stephen saw it looks like it’s about just merging the committee’s. Seher reiterated that the agenda item has been in discussion at CPC, Facilities and Safety committees. No decisions have been made. Stephen feels it was done backwards because the discussion started at CPC rather than starting with the standard committees. Normally, the standard committees give recommendations to CPC. President Breland explained that it was brought up to CPC. The Facilities committee like other committees has a structure laid out to report to CPC. President Breland took the item to CPC as a way to look at our efficiencies, which is his role as president, to be able to point out errors where he thinks the college can function more effectively. Looking at the actual data and issues going back to 2008, he’s wondering if a merger makes sense. These two committees seem to be the most similar. This is a part of a broader discussion that the institution needs to look at for Accreditation reasons. Right now we are not on target for Accreditation to be able to respond to Accreditation standards and to the commission. They are going to look at how come we haven’t done certain things, and it’s because we didn’t have the capacity to show up and do the work that we said we were going to do. There is a distinct difference between a standing committee, task
force and ad hoc committee. Seher mentioned she just recently placed on the college website the definitions and reporting structure of committees. This needs to continue to be discussed. On a smaller scale we need to look at a broader movement that needs to take place in the spring if we want to be ready for the next Accreditation visit. We’ve got to look at maybe forming another group that will make recommendations on all of our committees and charges. Whether we decided to merge both committees President Breland isn’t expecting it to happen by the end of this semester. There’s no rush the committees can continue doing what they’re doing but waiting until next fall will create problems. Seher believes CPC holds the standing committees responsible for updating their charges every semester. Joe commented as a member of the Safety committee that discussion started in regards to merging the committee’s as far back as last spring. Bruce asked if it’s necessary to have a safety committee. It’s necessary to have a committee that can address safety concerns on campus but that most colleges combine Safety and Facilities. Bruce reiterated that he meant if the Facilities committee can take on the items that are on the safety committee agenda. Yes, facilities committee is already discussing the same items that the Safety committee discusses. Jeff feels that merging the two committees would bring more membership which would be beneficial.

Stephen asked if the safety committee did their end of the year audit through Strategic Planning. He feels that, that would be the evidence needed to show if the committee is sufficiently working or not. Joe, who’s been on the committee for the past year, hasn’t seen an audit completed by the committee. Stephen would like to get feedback from the faculty and would like to see something from the CPC stating that evidence they’ve seen from the Safety committee has been null and void and needs to be reassessed. Seher will request from CPC a recommendation based off the information that the Facilities committee discussed to recommend the merge. Stephen requested that this go through the constituency groups first for accreditation. This item will be brought back to the next meeting as a discussion/action item.

Jeff Campbell requested to suspend orders of the day to move agenda item K as the next item on the agenda as the speaker/guest needs to leave early.

Committee unanimously agreed

k. Arcade Room changed to Meditation Room –

The Associated Students would like to change the room that once housed arcade games into a meditation room. It has already been approved by the A.S. There’ll be no need for funds unless they visit the idea of taking down a wall that separates another room adjacent to the room in question. Seher believes that the college can handle the carpet (already in lined to be replaced in the Student Center) and painting for the room. A suggestion was made to possibly turn the grassy area between the Student Center and Library into another place as an alternative for a meditation area. There was some concern that this shouldn’t be presented as a prayer room but rather as a meditation room. This way all students can feel it’s open for everyone. It does need to be examined as to what the occupancy would be for that room. The committee will continue discussion on the item at the next meeting in hope of possibly taken action.
b. **A/C noise in new photography building** –  
Stephen received an email from Dean Abel, that there was a conclusive meeting with some possible resolution to the issue. He asked why there weren’t any design and commissioning signatures on that job. He explained that whenever you do a job (renovation or brand new); you have to prove that whatever is in the design works as function as designed. When it’s designed and given to the mechanical engineer to put it in place, it needs to be commissioned that it works as properly designed. There’s usually a check off list, which is more integrated. He doesn’t know that this type of paperwork was in place for this job. He hopes that for future constructions, the facilities committee is assured that some kind of testing and commissioning goes on for this type of equipment. Andrew Spiller explained that being that this was a small project, he’s not sure if commissioning was part of the bid package. What Gilbane is doing is having a consultant come in and look at the space. The expectations were to get it down to what is was an acceptable level. The consultant did a sample testing and Kieron was satisfied with the resolutions that were offered and the facilities are being adjusted. There will be warranty on the work that was completed.

c. **Accounting of the Racquetball Building/Theater** –  
Stephen is requesting to see the accounting sheets for the theater. The paperwork for the theater should be somewhere with the paperwork that was left behind by the former Director of Facilities. The reason for his request is the new theater has no storage. It is illegal to use containers, DSA will not allow it. If DSA finds out storage containers are being used, they’re going to ask if storage was needed why it wasn’t put into the new building. There are venues within the theater (underground) were they can store their sets. Stephen asked if the campus will be doing a mold analysis in the Racquetball building. Andrew believes there was an environmental assessment done. He doesn’t recall if the assessment included a mold analysis. Stephen explained that a few years ago when football was using the building wet mold could be scented in the building. The reason Stephen feels that there might be mold is the landscaping on the left side of the building is several feet above the foundation. He asked if it is a wood stick building. Andrew explained that it is a wood stick building but there is concrete wall that sits around it. The way the landscaping comes up, that’s part of the concrete and the wood framing would sit on top of the concrete. Seher will find out what plan is in place.

d. **Fusion Data by Campus** –  
Seher updated the committee that the campus is looking at purchasing Onuma Software which is software that sits on top of fusion. She has spoken with Vice Chancellor Doug Smith about the desire to purchase the software and that everyone seems to be on board with the purchase. It is scheduled to be on the agenda to be discussed at the Executive Team meeting. The purpose of having to speak to the Vice Chancellor is he’ll need to make the final decision on the purchase since it’ll affect both campuses. Henry Gee, Evergreen’s president, is very receptive to the idea as it pertains to accreditation and total cost of ownership. If it’s approved the campus will contract out a firm to be able to update all of the fusion data and use the Onuma software for work orders and total cost of ownership as well as tracking. Leslie Rice asked what the cost of the software is and who’ll be covering the cost. The cost will probably be covered through the bond but only for the consultant, not the software (not a bond allowable expense). The cost will either be picked up by the District since it’ll be a district cost to cover both
campuses per accreditation purposes. Seher doesn’t have the logistics to give a total cost currently. Leslie Rice asked what committee will discuss it and from what program review will it be part of. Seher isn’t sure if it is part of program review but it is a part of accreditation because of total cost of ownership. If it’s a part of district function she doesn’t believe the district does program reviews. If they pick up the cost then it would be up to the district. Seher explained that this is currently just an idea in order to get the campus on track with fusion data and in compliance. Leslie looks forward to discussion related to another campus committee and linking it to the program review process. The District Office is also charged in proving through evidence and other measures as to whether things are needed or not. She’s concerned about money not going directly to the students.

e. **Campus recycling**
   Stephen would like to see in the near future what the campus is going to do with all its metals, woods, and plastics. He doesn’t see documentation that is part of AB 75. He would like to see the committee take the lead on making sure that the campus is generating the proper amount of recycling.

f. **Program Review for new/renovated structure**
   Stephen explained that in the past program review came in front of the committee. The committee didn’t oversee program review but was assured that it was completed for building that either was being renovated or was a new construction. This has fallen by the way side and Stephen would like to have it reinstated back to the committee. This needs to be continued for accreditation purposes. Seher explained two different views that she sees which the Education Master Plan which is updated and facilitates the new structures that are being built on the facilities master plan. Renovations are a different topic that relates to program review and necessary budgeting in order to do construction. She sees it as two different things; new construction for new buildings which should be tied into the education and facilities master plan. Then there are renovations that should be tied to program review. She believes it’s possible to request from Amber McCall, Program Review Coordinator, when the program reviews are ready in February to review them. The Finance Committee will also be looking at the program reviews as part of the budget resource allocation process. Leslie stated that program review should be the start of everything. The education and building facilities plan should come from program review. There’s a mix up on priorities. The importance of program review is critical and that’s were hiring a consultant should come from, which she isn’t in favor of doing. Novella Simonson mentioned that at the April 9th Board of Trustees meeting that Trustee Cruz and Fuentes specifically stated that everything needs to be tied to program review.

g. **Student Center open area (pavilion)**
   Seher mentioned that this is being looked at as part of the landscaping phases but it hasn’t been discussed yet. She believes it will become part of phase (3) three of the landscape master plan. She explained to the committee the steps she’s taking to have the landscape master plan put into existence.

h. **Benches near Theatre – smoker**
   Since the campus can’t be closed as a non-smoking campus then we’ll need to look at our landscaping plan to see what we can do with the people on campus that smoke. We
may want to re-direct those smokers to a designated area. Seher explained our campus is a non-smoking campus and smokers are not in compliance with our policy and should be asked to stop. She doesn’t think that we should be providing areas for them to smoke, it’s counterproductive. Stephen feels we shouldn’t just ignore the situation. He asked that something be put in the landscaping master plan.

i. P.E./Athletics –
Stephen is concerned about having two major construction projects going on at the same time. The entrances will be blocked by construction equipment and will cause issues for student parking. Seher explained that the Media Arts Center is schedule to start in summer 2014 and Athletics isn’t scheduled to begin for another year and half due to the fact that they are starting over with their programming. Stephen reminded the committee that the campus will be in trouble with starting that G2004 bond project late. Due to the tardiness of the 2004 bond and the time limits on the expenditure of the funding’s the campus may need to accelerate those projects and have two major construction projects going on at the same time. Seher agreed that could be a possibility but at this point it isn’t scheduled to be that way. The scheduled is set. Stephen asked if Seher knew who the end users were for the Racquetball Building. Athletics are working with the consultants through the programming process. Stephen heard that Esthetics was going to be going into that building. He also spoke with the softball coach and was told that P.E. wasn’t going into the building. It doesn’t seem like there is a specific end user that’s been focused on. Seher assured that Athletics is the end user that will be going into that building, no one else.

j. Disabled Parking Spaces –
Jeff spoke with several of his club members and disabled students who are finding it very difficult finding disabled parking space in any of the parking lots around campus. It’s more of an issue during the day rather than during the night. His idea was to look at the some of the parking lots to see if a couple of extra disabled parking spaces could be added. Seher spoke with Chief Aguirre about the disabled student who received a ticket and that problem was taking care of by Campus Police. The student shouldn’t have received a ticket because cars with disabled plaques can park in any parking lot on campus. She doesn’t know if it’s necessary to add more spaces but rather disabled students need to know that they can park in any parking space and parking lot on campus. A suggestion was made to contact the Disabled Students Program & Service office so they can assist in getting the word out to their students. Seher confirmed that the campus is in compliance with the number of disabled parking spaces in our parking lots. Dr. Breland expressed that it doesn’t mean since we’re in compliance that we can’t look at adding more spaces with the increase of disabled students we currently have on campus.

l. Drinking fountains –
Deferred to the next meeting

m. Wheelchair/handicap automated doors for bathrooms –
Jeff has noticed that some of the buildings, preferably the Multidisciplinary Building doesn’t have automated doors for those students in wheelchairs. He knows that it’s
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expensive to renovate the new building but is asking that the college consider any new buildings in the future have the automated doors for students and staff. Seher said she can ask that it be part of the minimum design standards for future buildings and thinks it’s a good idea. Jeff asked if the committee can make a recommendation as an action item for new and old buildings. He understands that we don’t have a budget for renovating the buildings that don’t have the automated doors. Seher explained that in some of the bond language has ADA compliance specifically in it stating that the campus can spends funds to do those types of changes. Since this is a discussion item it can be brought back to the next meeting as an action item for a recommendation to have automated doors installed. At the same time she doesn’t see that it’s going to happen right away since there are other renovations going on.

n. Tree removal –
Joe brought to the committee’s attention that the campus has an Ironbark Eucalyptus tree near a main gas line. He’s had an arborist take a look at the tree. He was told the tree has an abiotic disorder and at some point it will fall. If the tree falls it’ll fall on the main gas line. For safety purposes the tree will need to be removed. Seher mentioned that discussion has started with the Grounds department at EVC to have them do it on a early Friday when there are less people on campus. This tree was also identified in the arborist report that was conducted this year. Joe explained that there won’t be a stump grind that chemicals will be placed on the stump to help kill the roots because it’s too close to the gas line.

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Facilities Updates (Gilbane) –
• Electrical and Generator –
The electrical and generator is scheduled to be complete in the middle of December. They’re working on the enclosure for the generator. Depending on when the generator arrives they’ll stop work on the wall and then will continue once the generator is place inside. The whole project should be complete by the end of December.
• Refurbishing the boiler plant –
Should be finishing up in the next few weeks. Starting the punch list very soon.
• Batting Cages –
Completed the sidewalk, put gates on so it can be used for storage. Stephen asked if the speed bumps can be painted since he had tripped over one of the speed bumps. A work order will be placed with Maintenance to have the speed bump painted.
• Fencing –
The new fence has started to go up around the perimeter of the campus.

Meeting adjourned: 4:39 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
December 16, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Constituent Members

MSC – Joe Andrade, Duncan Graham, Seher Awan
Faculty – Stephen Mansfield, Jerry Kauffman
Classified – Bruce Geer, Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman
Associated Student Body – Jeff Campbell, Charlene Lilie, Roland Bough (alternate)

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the December 2, 2013 minutes

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Amendment of Facilities Charge for Co-Chair Membership
   b. Elect a Chair/Co-Chair
   c. Recommendation for Automated doors in bathrooms

V. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Combining Safety/Facilities Committee
   b. Meditation Room

VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Utility Box Painting Project (Art Club)
   b. Drinking fountain
   c. Tree Removal/Request for written notification
   d. Construction Vehicles parking on campus
   e. Motorcycle/Bicycle parking
   f. Student VTA Bus Passes
   g. Solar Panels
   h. Appliance Technician Program

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Facilities Updates

AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS SHOULD BE SENT TO CONSTITUENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS.
Meeting called to order: 2:04 p.m.

I. Approval of Agenda with amendment
   a. Approved – Motioned: J. Andrade/2nd P. Crawford
   b. Approved as amended – Motioned: B. Geer/T. Paiz

II. Approval of December 2, 2013 meeting minutes with revisions
   a. Approved – Motioned: J. Andrade/2nd B. Geer
   b. Amendments of minutes – Motioned: B. Geer/T. Paiz 2 abstentions

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)

   Bihama Vedaste, student, explained his frustration about the track being closed when the Kinesiology classes are not in session. He believes a college that promotes physical education should allow students to use the track for daily exercise. He’s requesting that the committee reconsider opening up the track to at least the students. Seher explained that the field is not open to the public and is only to be used for classes. The reason that it isn't open is due to insurance purposes were the college could be liable if someone is hurt on the track. Mr. Vedaste asked if there’s a way that people can sign a waiver stating that if they use the track that they’re responsible for themselves.

   Point of order: Phil Crawford informed the committee that during Public Comments it’s not appropriate for the committee to interact with the speaker but rather receive the information only.

   Seher explained that a question was asked and she is simply answering. She explained to Mr. Vedaste that she can look into waivers. This can be added to the agenda in the future were discussions can continue.

   Jeff Campbell suggested that meetings not be held during finals week as students who serve on committees are finding it difficult to come to the meeting. Seher mentioned on the charter that it shows one student one alternate. He mentioned that last year they had one person as a student and one as an Associated Student representative. Stephen suggested since the other constituent groups
have three that we should have three for the students. Student membership will be discussed during in the next item.

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

a. Amendment of Facilities Charge for Co-Chair Membership –

Motion: P. Crawford/B. Geer
To amend the Facilities Charge for Co-Chair Membership

Amendment of Motion:
To add student membership from one to three students.

Discussion:
The committee discussed revising the wording in the charge under MEMBERSHIP. Randi Kinman asked for clarification from the committee on whether it’s two co-chairs, two Vice-Chairs or a Chair and Vice-chair. The committee discussed who would be eligible to be Co-Chair. Phil specified that under Robert’s Rules of Order that whoever is chair can’t vote unless there’s a tie in the voting. It was clarified that the Vice-Chair would only serve as Chair if the Chair isn’t in attendance. If the Chair is in attendance the Vice-Chair will be able to vote. The committee declared that both the Chair and Vice-Chair must be within the membership of the committee and can’t be of the same constituent group. The following additions were made to the charge.

*The committee will elect a Chair and Vice-Chair who are current acting members of the Facilities Committee. Voting of Chair and Vice-Chair will occur at the end of every academic year.*

Under Membership for students the following change was made to the charge.

3 Students – Appointed by the Associated Student Council President

Point of information: Phil stated that if the committee makes changes to the student portion of the membership that we’ll need to include that proxies can serve. It was stated that it hasn’t been discussed in past meetings yet.

Discussion - The discussion was then turned to weather the Academic Senate needs to review and the charge. Seher explained that the committee reports to the College Planning Council for approval of their charge. Phil stated he wouldn’t be voting on the item if Academic Senate doesn’t have a chance to review it first. Stephen stated he had an issue when he originally noticed the topics (Amendment of charge and election of Chair/Co-Chair) on the agenda as an action item. He feels he needs to present this to his constituent group first. Seher asked for clarification on whether their job on the committee is to represent the constituent group and to take these back to their
constituent meetings to inform them. Stephen agreed but indicated that when he starts to see more items involved with the charge other than electing of the chairs and co-chairs and possibly talking about proxies, he hasn’t had the opportunity to speak to the Academic Senate. Phil explained that he doesn’t know what the A.S. would want him to do if he’s bringing it to them after it was voted. He feels it should be discussed before it’s voted on. It was pointed out that it had been on the agenda as a discussion item already. The discussion of proxies will be tabled until a later time. Charlene felt that the number of units for student membership shouldn’t be an added requirement for membership. She feels that the Associated Student Government should determine that eligibility, not the committee. Joe felt it should be changed as a benefit to keep students on track. Phil agrees with Charlene and would rather the ASG make that determination. Jeff also agrees and will go back to the ASG to discuss it at that level. The committee will continue with the amendment of the charge for membership for students and will table the discussion of unit requirements at a later meeting.

Motion to approve amended charge as stated. S. Mansfield/J. Andrade
APPROVED

b. Elect a Chair/Co-Chair –
The committee discussed how the committee had voted for chairs in the past. It was indicated that the committee put forward their nominated person and whom ever had the most nominations would be considered for chair if they so choose.

Joe – Nominated BRUCE GEER
Seher – Nominated herself
Phil – Nominated STEPHEN MANSFIELD, Stephen requested not to be nominated.

Motion to accept SEHER AWAN as chair and BRUCE GEER as Vice-Chair.
APPROVED

c. Recommendation for Automated doors in bathrooms –
Motion to discuss – J. Campbell/T. Paiz

Discussion – Jeff would like to see the automated doors be placed in the design standards on all new buildings. He would also like to see if the budget is there to retrofit back to the new buildings that don’t have the automated doors. Seher clarified that this would be for multi-occupancy restrooms. Seher indicated that in the bond language that American Disabilities Act compliance is discussed as a possibility to funding on. She also indicated that this isn’t an ADA issue because ADA doesn’t require it. It was questioned on which ADA requirements (Federal or California conflict each other) the ballot language refers to. Scott doesn’t think in this particular case that they either state or federal conflicts each other. He thinks that there are accessibility requirements for doors that can be met in a number of different ways. Scott pointed out that the
doors are compliant per ADA. This would be an optional measure to improve accessibility. Jeff explained that his main goal was to make it a design standard for the new buildings. Jose Garza, campus Locksmith, explained that even if we don’t have to have the automated doors that the campus should have them for students in wheelchairs who have problems with the doors that have the switch button to open them, which don’t always work.

**Point of information:** Phil stated that the California standards expand the federal ADA. Their more expansive and go beyond the federal standards.

Stephen asked Scott if it’s possible to bring in the information on the different ADA standards. As a member, he’s not that familiar with the roles and would like to look at the standards. Scott mentioned that depending on the nature of what Stephen or the committee is interested in, he can arrange to have someone address it. We would have to be specific since ADA is a huge area of information. Seher agreed that she’s comfortable in taking a vote to move forward with having this be a minimum standard.

**Motion to approve adding automated doors on multi-occupancy restrooms on campus as a design standard for future buildings and to look at the cost of retro-fitting existing multi-occupancy restrooms on campus for buildings in the future.**

**Motion to approve as amended.** S. Mansfield/P. Crawford

APPROVED

V. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. **Combining Safety and Facilities** –
   At the College Planning Council it was discussed of combining both Safety and Facilities Committees. President Breland explained to the committee that the idea is to look at all the committees to see how sufficient they’ve been. Safety and Facilities have similar agenda items that overlap. When the President brought it to CPC there was discussion and feedback from all the constituency groups, no decision was made. It’s in hopes that a move would be made sometime during the spring semester. President Breland explained that we have an Accreditation visit coming up in two years, which entails standard committees (Resources, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Leadership). President Breland would like to start a conversation about how the campus can respond to the accreditation standard. The Safety committee will discuss this item at their December 12th meeting. Seher explained that the Safety committee sometimes has issues making quorum. A fact sheet comparing both committees was given handed out and reviewed. Seher researched the past few years and in conclusion it seems like the committee is being used as a forum to discuss issues rather than taking any action. Stephen feels it’s a complex situation and asked who’s overseeing the standard committees? He’d like to see from CPC an ad hoc committee that can get involved in the discussion and help answer those definitions. What makes up a standard committee? Why is it important? Why are the charges so different? There’s no policy and without policy there can’t be procedure. Whichever way the vote goes as long as
there is discussion it’s going to help us with Accreditation. Stephen suggested that the first step should be working on the new charge. He asked the President what it was that he noticed with the old safety committee that was so apparent that it was non-functional. Based on what Stephen saw it looks as if it’s about just merging the committee’s. Seher reiterated that the agenda item has been in discussion at CPC, Facilities and Safety committees. No decisions have been made. Stephen feels it was done backwards because the discussion started at CPC rather than starting with the standard committees. Normally, the standard committees give recommendations to CPC. President Breland explained that it was brought up to CPC. The Facilities committee like other committees has a structure laid out to report to CPC. President Breland took the item to CPC as a way to look at our efficiencies, which is his role as president, to be able to point out errors where he thinks the college can function more effectively. Looking at the actual data and issues going back to 2008, he’s wondering if a merger makes sense. These two committees seem to be the most similar. This is a part of a broader discussion that the institution needs to look at for Accreditation reasons. Right now we are not on target for Accreditation to be able to respond to Accreditation standards and to the commission. They are going to look at how come we haven’t done certain things, and it’s because we didn’t have the capacity to show up and do the work that we said we were going to do. There is a distinct difference between a standing committee, task force and ad hoc committee. Seher mentioned she just recently placed on the college website the definitions and reporting structure of committees for reference and needs to continue to be discussed. On a smaller scale we need to look at a broader movement that needs to take place in the spring if we want to be ready for the next Accreditation visit. We’ve got to look at maybe forming another group that will make recommendations on all of our committees and charges. Whether we decided to merge both committees President Breland isn’t expecting it to happen by the end of this semester. There’s no rush the committees can continue doing what they’re doing but waiting until next fall will create problems. Seher believes CPC holds the standing committees responsible for updating their charges every semester. Joe commented as a member of the Safety committee that discussion started in regards to merging the committee’s as far back as last spring. Bruce asked if it’s necessary to have a safety committee. It’s necessary to have a committee that can address safety concerns on campus but that most colleges combine Safety and Facilities. Bruce reiterated that he meant if the Facilities committee can take on the items that are on the safety committee agenda. Yes, facilities committee is already discussing the same items that the Safety committee discusses. Jeff feels that merging the two committees would bring more membership which would be beneficial. Stephen asked if the safety committee did their end of the year audit through Strategic Planning. He feels that, that would be the evidence needed to show if the committee is sufficiently working or not. Joe, who’s been on the committee for the past year, hasn’t seen an audit completed by the committee. Stephen would like to get feedback from the faculty and would like to see something from the CPC stating that evidence they’ve seen from the Safety committee has been null and void and needs to be reassessed. Seher will request from CPC a recommendation based on the information that the Facilities committee discussed to recommend the merge. Stephen requested that this go through the constituency groups first for accreditation. This item will be brought back to the next meeting as a discussion/action item.
VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Jeff Campbell requested to suspend orders of the day to move agenda item K as the next item on the agenda as the speaker/guest needs to leave early.

Committee unanimously agreed

k. Arcade Room changed to Meditation Room
The Associated Students would like to change the room that once housed arcade games into a meditation room. It has already been approved by the A.S. There’ll be no need for funds unless they visit the idea of taking down a wall that separates another room adjacent to the room in question. Seher believes that the college can handle the carpet (already in lined to be replaced in the Student Center) and painting for the room. A suggestion was made to possibly turn the grassy area between the Student Center and Library into another place as an alternative for a meditation area. There was some concern that this shouldn’t be presented as a prayer room but rather as a meditation room. This way all students can feel it’s open for everyone. It does need to be examined as to what the occupancy would be for that room. The committee will continue discussion on the item at the next meeting in hope of possibly taken action.

d. Construction Vehicles parking on campus
Joe Andrade would like to see designated construction parking for any projects that are construction related. He’s spoken with Scott Jewell and he’ll come up with a plan so there’s less construction traffic going on, on campus. Location is still being determined.

a. Utility Box Painting Project (Art Club)
The Art approached the Associated Students about painting the utility boxes on campus. Jeff Campbell suggested that it could be a contest that the Facilities Committee can sponsor. He’d like to start the project with five utility boxes to see how it turns out. The project can be done by designs that be pre-approved by the Associated Student Government and the Facilities Committee. The ASG could possibly pay for the supplies. Randi Kinman asked for clarification on whether these were boxes on campus or on the sidewalk which would require a different process to go through. She explained from a neighborhood perspective she thinks the more they can do it, the better off it would be. Seher’s only concern would be is that she’d like to view the proposed plans and to make sure they’re approved before moving forward. The Art Club will work on the proposals during the break and will identify which utility boxes will be used for the first phase of the project. Seher requested a confirmation on whether the ASG will be paying for the supplies. Jeff will discuss it at the next meeting. This item will be placed on the agenda as a discussion/action item at the first meeting in spring. Phil suggested that Nelson Mandela be placed on one of the boxes. Charlene requested an informal vote by the committee so they can let the ASG know where the committee stands. The committee took an informal vote.

b. Drinking Fountains
Jeff expressed the concern about the inoperable drinking fountains on campus. He explained that there was a petition going around regarding them. There’s a possibility that ASG could pay for a couple of drinking fountains to be restored as filtered drinking fountains station for the students to refill their water bottles. Charlene passed out an
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article on addressing the issue of bottled water and its environmental effects. Phil suggested looking into grant funding and offered to assist in finding organizations that may be interested. This will become a future discussion item as more information is obtained. Charlene requested that it be put in the minutes that a lot of the Athletic clubs (i.e. YMCA, San Jose Athletic Club) are now getting filtered drinking fountains. Jeff asked Scott if there’s anything in the bond language about funding for filtered drinking fountains. Scott mentioned that there is a Scheduled Maintenance fund which is used to correct issues of that nature. There isn’t enough money to do everything. There are some high priorities that Gilbane is working constantly with the college to re-prioritize to make sure that the most important needs are met. If the college determined that this would be the highest priority then the likelihood would be for Gilbane to get something done. Bruce asked if it was feasible to add a filter to the drinking water itself. Scott explained that it is possible to filter water at any point in the distribution system that you’d want. The farther down the system, the more points you’re going to have in the cost to keep them maintained. There was further discussion on the difference between a large filter that would filter all the water versus the smaller filters for drinking fountains and the type of fountains that could be used. This item will be brought back as a discussion item when more information can be gathered.

c. Tree Removal/Request for written notification –
Charlene is requesting that in the future that there be questions answered in writing to the committee before approving of tree removals. Seher updated the committee on the tree removals on campus. She explained that currently there isn’t a Landscape Master Plan but one is in the process of being created. She’s waiting on the final Arborist Report which she feels will answer the questions that were given out at the meeting. Once the final Arborist Report is complete it will be made public. The Arborist is also working on a tree removal plan for the committee to approve. The second phase of the Landscape Master Plan will be the tree removal report which will show the reasons for the removal of trees (i.e. sickness, destruction of property, future building sites, etc.). The third part of will be the 2 for 1 Replacement Plan based off of the Environmental Impact Report. The last part will be to present an Urban Forest Management Plan. The college has so many trees on campus that it is considered somewhat of a forest. Charlene asked if the Arborist was certified, which it was explained that they were. The report will be shared with the committee so that they can make an educated decision regarding tree removals. Phil explained that when the trees were planted in around the General Education building, that was a ceremonial memorial planting. He hopes that the college takes into consideration those historical areas. Seher explained that once the report is final they can take a look at it if it does become an issue.

Charlene requested from Seher later in the meeting if this item could be placed on the next meeting agenda as an action item with her nine questions answered in writing. Seher agreed to bring the item back as a discussion item to be discussed when the Arborist Report is complete. The answers to the questions could be discussed but she felt it wasn’t necessary to add additional work by having it typed up.

e. Motorcycle/Bicycle parking –
Deferred
f. **Student VTA Bus Passes** – Deferred

g. **Solar Panels** – Deferred

h. **Appliance Technician Program** –
Kishan Vujjeni and Bill Dahl spoke to the committee about the proposed In-home Appliance Technician Program by the Workforce Institute. Bill explained the background of the program. About two years ago he noticed that a reoccurring notification was coming from Sears for the need of more Appliance Technicians. He contacted Sears six months ago to find out what kind of need there was for Appliance Technicians. Based on the conversation he was able to find out there was a tremendous need in the Bay Area. They started to discuss partnering up and exploring further. In-home Service Technicians salary pays about $40,000 a year and Appliance Technicians pay about $60,000-$70,000 a year and can do a career ladder from there. He also noticed on Salary.com that San Jose is listed as one of the top ten cities in the nation that has a need for this particular skill set. He’s checked with Sear’s Human Resources and asked what they anticipated when hiring and was told that they anticipate hiring at least 100 people a year for years to come. Sears is interested in partnering with Workforce in developing a program. Sears would be willing to provide the appliances needed for the program and assist in finding an industry expert trainer. Whirlpool has also showed interest in the program. They’re willing to provide curriculum and bringing in other industry experts to develop the advisory board and even host the advisory council. What Workforce proposes to do in developing a program would be to start a short term accelerated program for people who already veterans that already have the skill sets (mechanical aptitude, customer service, electrical skills, etc.). Adult that are already out of work who have the background would be a good match for the program. They can also do a short term accelerated program to start with, to get them placed within a job. Kishan mentioned that the next step would be finding the space for the program. Kishan has been working with some of the faculty in Applied Science to identify potential classroom space that’ll fit the requirements (infrastructure, power, etc.) for the program. He feels this program would be valuable to the college. The classrooms that they’ve located as a good match would be 207A and 207B. This program will be a fee based program with Workforce Institute. Once the program has been in existence for a couple of years, they’d like to see it accredited and brought over into the college. Kishan broke down the levels of the program that the student would go through in order to be certified. Kishan has spoken with Applied Science Instructors Mansfield and Connolly who are both on board for the program. It was asked by the committee what the potential start date would be for the program. Kishan is assuming if the space is ready to go that the program could possibly start in spring 2014. The space would need to be renovated first. Phil advised Kishan and Phil to bring the program to Academic Senate for their approval. Phil also asked what group trade represents these workers because there might be a labor affiliated with an apprenticeship program. Kishan and Bill don’t believe there’s a labor union affiliated with this type of work. Randi Kinman had a concern about people in the program walking out with a useable certificate and aligns with an existing accepted certification program. Kishan explained that there isn’t a formal certification by the industry in the area. It is backed by the industry that carries the skill level. There was also discussion
on the concern regarding people with criminal history who may not be able to utilize this program because of their background. It was made clear that the program wouldn’t block anyone out but rather it could be an issue when they look for a job. The proposal of this program will go to Academic Senate before returning to the Facilities Committee for a final recommendation on the location.

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Facilities Updates –

Facilities Upgrades:
- Rebuilding on the generator
- Series of electrical shut downs (200/300 building)
- Shutdown the power to the small Boiler Plant
- Patching up of lawn in different areas
- Concrete work outside of the 300 building; patching asphalt
- CTE/Media Arts –
  - Going through final process of DSA reviews. Going out to bid this week.
  - Finalizing contracts and construction starting in early 2014.
  - Phase 1 of 200/300 building
  - Media Arts still in design phase; starting in Summer 2014
- MEP (Mechanical, Electrical, Plumping) Project shut down 12/24 (7am)-12/30 (1pm)
- MEP II – Planned to go out to bid in early 2014, construction Summer 2014 ($250,000 estimate)
- Technology Building/Student Center Interior upgrades – In the design phase ($600,000 estimate), be out to bid in March 2014 and done by summer 2014
- Completion of Boiler Plan – Occupancy January 2nd
- Fencing – Completed by January 2nd
- Campus Security – Installation of infrastructure for emergency phones and cameras in early 2014
- Main Gym – Currently working through the contractor selection. Anticipating contract award for the contractor to go to the Board in February/March 2014

Meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m.