Table of Contents

Click on date to view agenda and minutes

February 3 - Agenda & Minutes (unofficial)
March 3 - Agenda & Minutes
March 17 - Agenda & Minutes
March 31 - Agenda & Minutes
April 21 - Agenda & Minutes
May 5 - Agenda & Minutes
May 19 - Agenda & Minutes
October 6 - Agenda
October 20 - Agenda & Minutes
November 3 - Agenda
November 17 - Minutes
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
February 3, 2014
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Constituent Members

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

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the December 16, 2013 minutes

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

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Combining Safety/Facilities Committee
   b. Meditation Room
   c. Utility Box Painting Project (Art Club)

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Update to Education Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan
   b. Tree Removal on Laswell for Safety Reasons
   c. Landscape Master Plan Update/Preliminary Arborist Report
   d. Facilities Charge
   e. 300 Wing
   f. Motorcycle/Bicycle parking
   g. Student VTA Bus Passes
   h. Solar Panels
   i. MG 2010 funding - P.E./Athletics Bldg.
   j. Renovate Theater
   k. Total Cost of Ownership – All projects
   l. Room to Room survey in buildings

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Facilities Updates

AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS SHOULD BE SENT TO THE COMMITTEE MEMBER OF YOUR CONSTITUENCY.
Meeting called to order: 2:10 p.m.

I. Approval of Agenda

Due to lack of quorum the agenda wasn’t approved.

II. Approval of December 16, 2013 meeting minutes

Due to lack of quorum the minutes weren’t approved.

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

Bruce requested to add Committee Status Report to the next meeting (March 3rd) agenda.

Joe asked about the fence along Kingman. He thought it was going to be “no access”. He has seen that one of the gates has been open continuously.

Steve mentioned that during the break someone had stolen a bunch of evaporator and condenser copper that had been taken apart from bro A/C units that were broken down in the Applied Science area.

Leslie Rice expressed that she’s sad to see the gates around campus and can’t wait for them to come down. She hopes it was discussed in the minutes so she can review them. She also expressed her concern with the generator that was built outside her office. She doesn’t feel it’s necessary and is oversized. She’s requesting information on when there will be something placed around the building to make it more appealing. She explained to the committee that she would be doing something about her concerns. She’s disappointed and feels it’s a waste of taxpayers’ dollars. The old building was fine.
IV. ACTION ITEMS:

Due to lack of quorum action items will be discussed, no action will be taken.

a. Combining Safety/Facilities Committee –

Seher handed out the first version of the charge for the combining of the Safety and Facilities Committee. Seher asked the committee to review it and give feedback at the next meeting. An electronic version will be emailed to the members to make modifications. She stated that it’s only the first version and that nothing is concrete. Stephen asked how the Safety Committee would dissolve. What is the process and who dissolves a standing committee. He thinks it’s very important for Strategic Planning and the Accreditation process that while merging and dissolving a standing committee that we don’t just do it without going through a process. He requested that we find out who overlooks the dissolving of a standing committee (Academic Senate, College Planning Council, etc.). Seher believes the reporting order for both committees is through CPC who make recommendations to the President. If the President advises that the merging be reviewed and CPC agrees to allow the Facilities Committee to review the merge then that would be the first step. It hasn’t been defined process yet on how it will happen. She thinks the first step would be to combine the charges and then approach CPC to see if they support it. Stephen questioned whether there is language to dissolve standing committees. He just wants to make sure that a thorough job of encompassing the proper direction and not miss anything that might come back and get us with Accreditation. Seher will request CPC to review their charge to see if there’s any language that would state how to dissolve a committee.

b. Meditation Room –
   Deferred

c. Utility Box Painting Project (Art Club) –
   Deferred

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Update to Education Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan –

Seher feels with the issues she’s seen in the past few months that the first step to get back on track would be to update the Educational Master Plan which would lead to another effort by the campus to update the Facilities Master Plan. Once this begins the campus can have a transparent discussion through shared governance on what’s appropriate and what should be on the master plans. Seher would like to have this as an action item for the next meeting agenda so it can be taken to CPC and made as a recommendation to the President. Right now is the time to take the step to revisit the master plans so that everyone can come back to the common goal of a clear Facilities Master Plan that everyone agrees on, based on an Educational Master Plan that everyone agrees on. Novella asked what version of the plan would be worked off of; the original master plan or the revised version of 2011. She doesn’t believe the 2011 version was legitimized by everyone. Stephen has a concern because what he heard Scott Jewell explain at the CBOC (Citizens Bond Oversight Committee) meeting was that
the MAC and Vocational buildings were a go and then the Ad Hoc committee heard something different. He feels until we have solid information on what’s going on with the District, how can the committee move forward with the revision of the master plans. President Breland explained that there are a lot of processes to go through before we can make a public announcement about going in a different direction. By the time Stephen heard the discussion at the CBOC meeting the campus was still in communication with Gilbane as to what was going to happen. The campus needs to take into account the finances, the contracts, direction from the Chancellor and the Board. All these pieces hadn’t been put in play yet, before President Breland spoke to the Ad Hoc committee. He explained that this is currently still going on. President Breland went back to the discussion of the Educational Master Plan. He asked if this is something that the Facilities Committee can see to support right now. From his perspective, we have a very different education environment now than what we had two years ago, with information about manufacturing and information about adult education. There’s $250 million coming through the system. We also have a different budget format, we’re basic aid now. There are a lot of different pieces and some of this is going to impact our external community in terms of the programs that we’ll offer and the question of a Theater, etc. All these things can come out if we just have a discussion, if we are to revise the master plan. President Breland asked Scott, in general terms, what the process would look like if the campus was to go through a revision of our Educational Master Plan. Scott explained that the Educational Master Plan is usually the first piece; the Facilities Master Plan is usually a function of the Education Master Plan. Normally, Gilbane’s involvement is to help facilitate the Facilities Master Plan. The Educational Master Plan is usually done before Gilbane comes to campus. In this case it was done in 2010; MAAS Company supported the District to do the Educational Master Plan. The District had a Facilities and Educational Master Plan that was together. The facilities component of that plan was pretty light. It didn’t have maps and didn’t show a lot of details in terms of orientation of different things. The update to the master plan component attempts to provide a little more detail and vision to what the campus would look like in the year 2025. That piece of the plan is a function of getting the right people involved and how fast can you get input. He thinks if we fast track it, it could be accomplished possibly in six months if assuming that the Educational Master Plan is complete. He explained the components of bringing the Educational Master Plan together. Stephen explained the time and effort it took in 2010 to gather information and input and then to have the revision done in 2011 and none of the information gathered was included. The revision never went through shared governance which is where the complaint has currently been. Novella added that the 2010 plan was also communicated to the public in a monthly newsletter. Seher asked the committee if she can place it on the next meeting agenda as an discussion/action item, to see if the Educational Master Plan supported as a recommendation as an update to the Educational Master Plan because then the committee can see the changes that were made and if they were so drastic that the committee would need to back and look through the Facilities Master Plan. Stephen asked who did the revision of the Educational Master Plan in 2012. Scott explained that the Educational Master Plan was never updated. He clarified that in 2010, the plan was named Educational and Facilities Master Plan. Most of that document is actually the Education Master Plan. There’s not a lot of documentation for the Facilities Master Plan in the Educational Master Plan. In 2011, the process began to update just the Facilities Master Plan component of the Educational and Facilities Master Plan. That updated document is only facilities, it’s not
educational. Novella clarified and Scott agreed that it was an update to the Facilities and a revision to the original master plan in terms of facilities. Seher explained again that she would like to place the Educational Master Plan on the next meeting’s agenda as discussion/action item as an update and recommendation to CPC that the committee should undertake that process. From there, based on what the committee gets from the Educational Master Plan the college can reassess if a Facilities Master Plan update needs to occur. Stephen thinks it’s a good idea because it will give the committee members time to go back to their constituency groups and get feedback. It places responsibility on the committee members to read through the Educational Master Plan and then going back to the departments on what it is they want to do. He also thought that the permits had to be purchased for MAC Construction last week. Scott explained that it’s not when the permit is issued but when the building is submitted for DSA. It was submitted before the deadline which ties in to the date of the code. If the code changes after its submitted you’re bound to the code that was in place when the plans are submitted. President Breland added that as much as it brings up the feelings and thoughts about the MAC versus VoTech, it’s broader than that. This is about our campus programs, moving into the future and job growth. When going back to talk to your constituency groups it’s about total cost of ownership changes, it’s about changes in forecast of our student needs. It’s a about a bigger picture for the Educational Master Plan and the Facilities Master Plan. He wants the members to look at it that way when going back to pull from their constituency groups. Stephen explained that for the most part those of them on the committee, the Educational Master Plan is beyond them. It’s more inclusive of things that they don’t see or work within their realm. Stephen agrees that there are a lot of new things coming on and the committee is more than willing to help. He looks forward to this process to move forward. He doesn’t think he’s going to be able to enrich all the people who should be talked to with an inclusive packet on what is to be said and what is to be answered. President Breland agreed.

b. Tree Removal on Laswell for Safety Reasons –

The committee was given a copy of the preliminary Arborist Report before the meeting. In the report, the Arborist identified trees that’ll need to be removed based on the wellness of the trees, location along with health and safety of the trees. The eucalyptus trees on Laswell Avenue are identified in the report to be removed for health reasons. They’re in poor condition and there are concerns about the safety of the students and personal property. There have been huge limbs that have fallen from the trees. The campus is in the process of looking into having the trees removed for safety reasons. She’s asking that this item be placed as an action item at the next meeting. Stephen concurred that by his own experience with eucalyptus trees they can be dangerous. Joe mentioned that there is no irrigation in that area for the eucalyptus trees. He also mentioned that after reading the report that he noticed that there are diseased trees around campus which are contaminating health trees. He believes that along with removing the eucalyptus trees that the campus should remove all diseased trees too. Charlene asked how many trees were on Laswell Avenue to be removed. Seher explained there were around 20 trees. Bruce asked if our Grounds Department do the removal of the diseased trees. It can be offered to the Grounds Department as a “right of first refusal”. Evergreen Valley College can assist the department and they have their own Arborist who can facilitate the process. The college will ask if they’d like to do it and if they refuse the college will contract the work out. Novella had a concern about
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pulling all the trees at once. The campus needs to look at it from an esthetic point of view and also making sure it doesn’t interfere with students getting to class. Seher explained that the work would be done very early in the morning or on weekend. She also mentioned that in the Landscape Master Plan there is a phase process for removal of trees. President Breland went back to what this item was about; safety. Esthetics is important, safety is more important. This was brought to the committee out of courtesy so that the constituency groups can be informed. The campus is looking at moving forward with the removals as soon as possible in engaging in this process to remove trees for safety concern. Novella asked if any of the diseased trees are ones that were planted as memorials. Seher explained that she won’t be able to identify the trees until she has a visual map to view but they’ll be taken into consideration. When a removal plan is completed, it’ll be brought back to the committee to review. This will be brought back to the next meeting as an action/discussion item so it can be discussed on how to specify based off the Arborist Report.

c. Landscape Master Plan/Preliminary Arborist Report –
   Already discussed in previous item.

d. Facilities Charge –
   Already discussed in previous item.

e. 300 wing –

   Due to the issues are being seen with the swing space because of the needs of Sears and the Iron Workers Program, Stephen would like the committee to consider not demolishing the 300 wing. During talks with Sears and his department, the area they’re asking for is ¼ of what they need. The numbers are high for the people they plan on bringing through for the program. If the Iron Workers Program comes to the campus, the Air Conditioning Program doesn’t have a double lecture classroom to accommodate them. A/C will need to go to the B Building and they can’t bring their equipment with them, it’s too far away from their labs. They need something adjacent to their labs so they have some equipment there. President Breland asked what the status is for the 300 wing. Scott explained that it’s scheduled to be demolished in June, breaking ground and do site preparations for the MAC building.

f. Motorcycle/Bicycle parking –

   Stephen feels that there needs to be more parking spaces for motorcycles and bicycles. Currently, there’s only parking near the 100 building. In the 2010 plan, the Facilities Committee had voted to try their best to make the campus use more mass transient which included using motorcycles and scooters but we don’t have enough parking to accommodate them. Seher added that the campus is working on a grant to purchase more bike racks on campus. Charlene suggested bike cages similar to what they have at San Jose State University. The grant that Seher is speaking about only allows for bike racks.
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g. **Student VTA Bus Passes** –

Stephen brought this up to President Breland and is hoping there’s some form of discussion currently going on. President Breland said they hadn’t made a lot of head way on the topic as of right now.

h. **Solar Panels** –

Stephen has been speaking with Alex Morrison from Gilbane because of the 100/200 buildings being used for solar panels. He’s asking that the campus not lease the panels that we should buy them. The department has been asking as per their renovation they put solar panels. We want to look at it as a Total Cost of Ownership for the campus and when it comes to utility bills we should be fighting the best we can to do that. The idea is if we can put solar panels on and the Total Cost of Ownership says that it’ll work, he thinks we should really look into it.

i. **MG 2010 funding – P.E./Athletics** –

If there’s a change to the master plan from the MAC, it may be a consideration that we finish up what’s necessary to do for P.E. This would be the Applied Health building, the swimming pool and the loss of the tennis courts. More business is promoted at golf, tennis and swimming. The idea is the campus needs to do some attraction similar to the Big Bone Game. Why not build a venue where we can attract outside funding. Seher said she would go with what was on the Education Master Plan and we can ask that this be looked at and see if it’s a need. Stephen asked if you can take 2010 funding and move it to 2004 funding. Scott said that you can’t move funding from one program to another, but you can move scope. In order to do this it would have to be in the Facilities Master Plan, which would need to be in the Education Master Plan.

j. **Renovate Theater** –

President Breland confirmed that he met with Chuck Hunter and George Forrester regarding the Theater. Stephen is hoping that the campus realizes the heritage of our Theater. There’ve been numerous historical people who’ve spoken in the Theater. He feels the outside buildings can go but keep the Theater. Seher feels this is something that can be put onto the Education Master Plan. Donna feels that the outside building would need to be renovated too, without those rooms the Theater would be consider a lecture hall. Stephen hopes to see an Ad Hoc from Facilities to help look at if this is what we want to do in our new Education Master Plan.

k. **Total Cost of Ownership – All Projects** –

Already discussed in previous item.

l. **Room to room survey in buildings** –

Stephen had a discussion with the locksmith and he doesn’t know what’s behind what doors. Stephen hopes it’s done quickly. Seher updated the committee that the campus
has received preliminary approval to go with Onuma Software. This will lay on top of our fusion and being able to help with our Total Cost of Ownership and calculations for Accreditation. Right now the campus is working on getting more information about that software. Novella mentioned that she read a string of emails from former Vice President Greg Nelson to numerous people; including the author of Onuma. It looked to her like it could be a slight conflict of interest because the former VP was taken out to lunch by the representatives of Onuma, in San Francisco. She asked what was Gilbane’s role and relationship with Onuma. The Gilbane Project Manager at Ohlone College was emailing VP Nelson and EVC’s Vice President, Henry Gee, suggesting that they go with Onuma. In the email, Novella believes there was a lot of pressure to go with Onuma. Scott clarified that Gilbane has no relationship with Onuma. There are no contracts between Gilbane and Onuma. Recently, Gilbane was hired by Marin College (were former VP Nelson is employed) to install Onuma which Onuma had been chosen before Gilbane was hired. This is the only experience Gilbane has with Onuma. Scott explained in generality, the District Office (Gail Mathis, former Facilities Manager), contacted Gilbane and asked what type of Facilities Management software systems were available. Gilbane looked at about 15 vendors. Henry Gee had a license for a system called Archibust, which they thought they could add and expand on to that existing license. A year ago, that was the direction that the Executive Administration was looking at going. Novella explained that in the string of emails it clearly shows that there were no bidders. It was confirmed by Seher that it never went to that point and it never went to bidding. Seher explained that she found out about Onuma through an ACBO (Association of Chief Business Officers) Conference. At the conference, there was another college (not Ohlone) that had a break out session about Onuma. Seher came back and did some research of her own and concluded that Onuma is breaking forward as the leader in the industry for this type of fusion software. Joe mentioned that he was just introduced to the software and feels it’s going to make his department’s job much more efficient. Novella mentioned that she heard that the software was lacking a component which was a major flaw. She asked if that component has been added to the software. She also mentioned that there would be a slight problem in the process of purchasing the software. Scott pointed out that the main reason that most Districts are looking to Onuma is that they’ve partnered with the State Chancellor’s Office. Currently, Onuma is the only system that connects to the fusion database. There are some economies of scale built in to that operation that no competitor can touch. Also, Onuma has priced that system at such a low point, it’s almost as if they’re non-profit. The cost of purchase, the cost to maintain and the connectivity with the State Chancellor’s Office are the three main factors that are resulting in Onuma being implemented state-wide. Seher reiterated that no decisions have been made, but that the District is looking at it for the reasons that Scott just explained. Scott explained based on Novella’s assumption of a “lack of component” is that it doesn’t have the Preventative Maintenance component. There’s a variety of other software out in the marketplace. He explained that the PM can be programmed separately and can be program to be tied to Onuma. Other colleges (i.e. Marin College) selected School Dude, which is a very modest, low-end price, PM system. Charlene asked if someone could give an example of how the program works to better utilize a department. Joe explained that if you have a smart phone you can log onto the software and you submit a work order which will go directly to the employee that is handling that area. Novella asked if this is going to be purchased for the District, is there a ball-park figure of the cost and would it be approved through the Facilities Committee and CPC. Seher explained that she doesn’t
have a total amount of cost because it’s tied to how much data is put into the software. Seher explained that nothing has been approved but rather she received a verbal support from Vice Chancellor Doug Smith that he’s on board to support the college’s decision.

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Facilities Update –

- At the next board meeting, they’ll have an award for a contractor, for Phase II MEP (HVAC and plumbing for SJCC).
- They’re working through some issues in terms of some discrepancies with the bids that came in. Not 100% sure which bidder they’re going with yet.
- Boiler Plant Project – complete, ready for occupancy
- Fencing Project – complete
- Physical Security – Working through a RFP phase to get the cabling and wireless access points installed.
- Campus Site Improvements – Landscape Master Plan which is an element of the project. Joni Janecki, Landscape Architect, is working on the draft. Once the draft is complete, it’ll be shared by the committee for comments.
- Energy Efficiency Project – The funding for Prop 39 is going to help with funding for parking lot lighting (LED). Needs to be spent by June 2014.
- CTE Renovation of 100/200 – Got bids in from the contractor, working on the contract. Bids came in over the expected budget. Alex is working on a memo to send out to all the user groups. Within that base contract they were able to get a couple of building enhancements.

Meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m.
I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the February 3, 2014 and December 16, 2013 meeting minutes

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

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Review the Combining Safety/Facilities Committee Charge  S. Awan
   b. Meditation Room  J. Campbell
   c. Utility Box Painting Project (Art Club)  J. Campbell
   d. Educational Master Plan  S. Awan
   e. 300 Wing  S. Mansfield

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Committee Status Report  B. Geer
   b. Boiler Room  S. Mansfield
   c. Adjacent Batting Cages  S. Mansfield
   d. Renovation of the Basketball Building  S. Mansfield
   e. Ad Hoc for Facilities Master Plan  S. Mansfield
   f. P.E./Athletics Construction Timeline and Funding  S. Mansfield
   g. 100 Wing Renovations  S. Mansfield

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Facilities Update  Gilbane
Meeting called to order: 2:05 p.m.

I. Approval of Agenda
   Approval of Agenda: J. Andrade/2nd T. Paiz,
   Motion to amend agenda: S. Mansfield/2nd B. Geer

II. Approval of December 16, 2013 meeting minutes
    Approval of Minutes: B. Geer/2nd J. Campbell,
    Motion to amend minutes: S. Mansfield/2nd J. Campbell

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

    Stephen requested a report on the Racquetball Building for hygienist report because he thought there was mold in the building. He has yet to see any reports from his first request in the fall. He also feels there should be a review on why the college is spending the funds on the building without seeing if it fits the criteria of the 50% rule for earthquake standards.

    Jeff announced that the ASG is currently in the planning stages to host a SACNAS Regional Conference, "Leadership Development through the Art of Networking", at SJCC. The event will take place August 22-33, 2014, with a target of 250 total guests from local High Schools, Community Colleges, 4 year colleges and professional from the STEM fields.

IV. DISCUSSION ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Review the Combining Safety/Facilities Committee Charge –

      Seher explained that she has received some feedback on version 1 of the combined draft charge. She would like to have a cutoff date of April 1st so she can come up with version 2 of the draft charge. All feedback should go directly to Seher. Stephen stated that since the committee knew the combining of the committees was going to happen and because the Safety Committee doesn’t meet that often, the combining of the committees should happen. He suggested a two phase plan that would consist of voting to accept the committee to be a joint committee and then coming up with a charge. He
feels that if the committee can bring it up as a motion just to see if the committee agrees or disagrees. If it’s voted in to combine the committees then the next step would be to close the Safety Committee through CPC. Seher is also open to it if there’s a motion on the table.

S. Mansfield: Motion to combine both Facilities and Safety Committees.
2nd B. Geer

Yes – 7  
No – 0  
Abstain – 0

Motion passed

DISCUSSION:
Jeff had a concern that the committee would have to take on back logged agenda items from the Safety Committee by adding their agenda items it would lengthen the current meeting time. Seher explained that the Safety Committee mainly was being used as a platform for discussions related to safety. Since the committee couldn't make quorum there was never the ability to take action on agenda items. Joe, current Safety Committee member, stated that agenda items on the Facilities agenda were usually duplicated on Safety’s agenda. Seher did suggest that it would be a good idea to review the college’s safety plan, EOC training and ALICE training. Bruce’s concern was when the item was brought to the CPC it was mentioned that CERT and other types of trainings. Joe also shared that concern when seeing the classified representative from CPC mail out a copy of the combine charge that had the name Facilities, Safety and Emergency Preparedness Committee. Seher is in acceptance with changing the name since the only action that has come up is combining the charge. Stephen would like to review the last charge for the Safety Committee, the charge prior to that and then the most recent revised charge. He’d like to see if CERT and other trainings went through the proper channels and was voted on which would assist the committee in knowing if that is a part of the Safety Committee. The committee concluded that they’ll continue to edit the charge along with CPC. Stephen would like CPC to work on documentation for how to close a standing committee.

b. Meditation Room –

Jeff confirmed with the committee that the Director of Student Activities was aware and supported the overseeing of the meditation room if it’s approved.

Jeff Campbell: Motion to approve the converting of the old arcade room into a meditation room.
2nd: D. Medoza

Jeff Campbell: Move to amend original motion from meditation room to quiet room.

Yes – 6
No – 0
Abstain – 1

Motion passed
DISCUSSION:
Stephen has a concern with the title of the room, meditation room. It conjures up some kind of thinking that if you’re in there to meditate and another person doesn’t appreciate the way you’re meditating, that you should have to leave. A suggestion was made to change the name to quiet room. Stephen suggested that the proper paperwork (fire, occupancy, evacuation map) be placed in the room. Seher explained that the room is a small area within the student lounge. All paperwork would be included in the original paperwork of the student lounge. Stephen explained that if the committee is changing the name of the room it becomes its own identity, if it has its own identity it would need its own proper paperwork.

c. Utility Box Painting Project (Art Club) –
Deferred

d. Educational Master Plan –
S. Mansfield – Motion to do a new Educational Master Plan
2nd: J. Campbell

DISCUSSION:
Stephen had a concern on how the plan would be done (internally/externally). Seher explained that it does go externally. The campus uses the bond funding that is set aside to pay for this type of work.

Amended – As a review of the previous Educational Master Plan.
2nd: B. Geer

Yes – 7
No – 0
Abstain - 0

Motion passed

DISCUSSION:
Stephen explained that some of the information in the existing Educational Master Plan was taken from another college. Stephen found the wording (general data) from another college in Southern California. He hopes when the plan is being revised that the college actually uses our own demographics. Seher will take the recommendation to CPC and if approved the recommendation will go to the President. Stephen requested that once a final decision is made at the President’s level if it can come back to the committee with feedback on the President’s decision. President Breland thinks that’s a fair request.
e. 300 Wing –

S. Mansfield – Motion to not demolish the 300 wing.

Y – 2
N – 4
Abstain – 1

Motion didn’t pass

DISCUSSION:
Stephen explained with the possibility of Sears and the Iron Workers Program and their need for space and looking around and not seeing any swing space, it would be best to keep the 300 wing. He requested again that if it reaches the President he would like to have feedback as to what the President’s decision would be. The reason he explains is that the 2010 bond showed the removal of the wings, the Jaguar (Main) Gym, and the Racquetball Building. So far, the gym was remodeled with 2010 bond. The Racquetball Building is going to be done but he’s never seen a survey completed to see if it fits into the 50% rule on earthquake standards or the value of what it’s going to cost if less than 50% to not remodel it, rebuild it. Stephen explained that if we were held to less than 50% rule on value, by dollars, for the 100 wing and we have to incorporate that less than 50% into both wings. He’d like us to standardize what we’re doing on the campus. If we’re held to a standard that we have to fit the 50% rule to do what we do on the 100/200 wings and we don’t fit the rule to what we do with the Jaguar Gym and Racquetball Building. He asks what’s this campus is doing. He’s starting to object when he sees that one side does one thing and another side done another way. He wants to stop the demolishing of the 300 wing until a new Educational Master Plan says differently. He thinks that wing leaves a lot of potential. It’s in the best shape of all three wings. Seher explained that she respectfully disagrees. Based off of the master plans that she’s seen, the 300 wing would go away regardless because that is centrally located. It was the future site of a number of new buildings (G.E., MAC, VoTech, etc.). She’s seen numerous buildings go in that area on different versions of the master plan. She would oppose not demolishing it because in the future it will be a place for a new building. Bruce thought that over the years all three of the wings had been considered to be demolished and then at one point it was considered to be remodeled. He thought this was already a final decision to take the 300 wing down. Bruce asked for Stephen’s rationality with not demolishing the 300 wing. Stephen explained that for the A/C-FMT Department they’ve got to go into the B Building, second floor to do a double classroom. They have two classes that meet at the same time. Their department needs a double size room. The classrooms are too far away from their building. Everything that is done in their class is done by mouth and imagination. They can’t bring any equipment. Stephen requested a double size room in the renovation of the 100/200 wings to supplant that need, which they were unable to do in the design. The only place that’s left that’s even relative to them is the 300 wing. He doesn’t want to try to bring equipment into the B Building classrooms because it will get dirty, as are most vocational classes. He’d like to keep the classroom within the boundaries of were their dirt is located. If Sears is as solid as he believes, in coming to the campus, their numbers are going to be substantial. They’re going to need a room of a rather large
size. The room they’re currently looking at is the 207A & B is nowhere close to fitting their needs. It’s also takes away from the Sheet Metal class which is very small. There are too many sharp tools for two different departments to be working so close together. This is why he asked for the 207A & B, with the exception of the area where the old Campus Police office used to be located, to have that renovated for the Sheet Metal class. The Solar class is in 207A & B even though there’s no class is done. They’ll move whenever renovations get started on the ends of the 100/200. He can’t find a place for Sears unless the committee decides to go with moving them to possibly the old warehouse. If they can’t go there then the only other place would be the 300 wing.

Point of clarification, Seher stated that currently the Sears Program is on hold. Workforce doesn’t understand that the amount of utility needed for any space, regardless of where it’s going to be located, would be costly. There’s no classroom space that is dedicated outlets that are at the right voltage, they need sewer and drainage. She wouldn’t want to make a decision based solely on the Sears Program since it’s not definite. Stephen asked if there are going to be changes to the Educational Master Plan, were would swing space go. Seher said it can be discussed. It was clarified by Scott that the 300 wing is scheduled to be demolished this June/July. Joe doesn’t understand the concept of swing space when we should just do like other colleges and build the building, move the departments into it and then tear down the old building. Originally, the swing space was need for the departments whose buildings were being remodeled. Seher explained that at this point VoTech is in the process of being renovated and there has been movement. In the summer, as far as she understands, there won’t be any more talk of remodeling. It’ll be all new construction which means it wouldn’t be necessary to have the swing space. Stephen and his department were told to move out of the 100 wing on the east end for Laser. They were told they were going to go through a process of renovating that space so they can get back in which he believes hasn’t started yet. Seher explained that there have been delays at the board. This concerns Stephen because if they move out of their area and they’re delays, where would they go once the semester begins. Scott mentioned that they’ve been working closely with the contractor on the schedule. It’s going to be a little difficult for the contractor but it’s a date certain. They understand the urgency to have it complete before the semester begins. Randi asked if the delay of the demolishing of the 300 wing happens, her understanding is that SONA has already talked to the neighborhood adjacent to the building about how the demolish process is going to work. Any delay may open up the door to other things. She doesn’t agree with the idea of swing space. Her concern would be the impact of any construction delay of that type would have on the surrounding neighborhood. She feels it extends the impact of the construction movement vehicles and traffic in that neighborhood. Jeff asked Scott if there are any penalties in the contract with the contractor if they don’t finish on time. Scott explained that their contract hasn’t been approved by the board yet. Their contract is written with liquidated damages in the contract. The incentive is avoiding liquidated damages. Scott explained that any contractor is going to look at the incentive and make a business decision on whether the cost for being late less than the cost for the company to accelerate the work. Gilbane does everything they can to set things up in management expectations. Part of that is the method that Gilbane used in selecting the contractor. The contractor is a high performance contractor. They have a lot of pull with the subs. A lot of the issues that are seen on jobs that are out to bid, you won’t have with these types of projects. Scott addressed Stephen’s concern regarding phase 1. The wings were separated into two phases; the east side and the west side. The east side is
starting a little bit later and might finish a little bit later. The west side is being held. The second phase is being held in place, which the contractor is aware of the situation. The amount of time for Stephen’s area hasn’t changed. The start and end date are the same. The start date for phase 1 has changed and possibly the end date might change. Scott explains that it’s irrelevant because it overlaps with phase 2 and they have the whole entire building for the summer. Stephen understands but is looking at it in reality; it may or may not be ready. Randi objects to the waiting of the review of the Educational and Facilities Master plan because could take a couple of years.

f. Tree Removal –

J. Andrade: Motion to approve the removal of the trees that are being presented as indicated on the map.

2nd: B. Geer

Y – 7
N – 0
Abstain – 1

DISCUSSION:

Seher brought a map of the trees that have been identified as dead, dying or are a safety concern. Teresa asked if Seher was able to find out if any of the trees that are identified to be taken down are the memorial trees. Seher stated that it isn’t marked on the map. It will be explained that for future building sites the arborist/Landscape Designer will be notified that the memorial trees are to remain. The trees will be removed as soon as possible. The committee requested that Seher bring back a round 2 of trees that are of safety concerns. Jeff asked if the two for one policy means that one of the new trees will go in the same location as the tree that was removed. Seher explained that it doesn’t mean they’ll be place in the same area but that the college will find other areas to plant a new tree based on location. Randi asked that when doing the two for one replacement of trees, she’d like the college to look outside of the campus. She suggested if we can take some of the new trees and put them in tree wells around Leigh Avenue, which is missing trees. She also suggested replacing the Liquid Ambers on Moorpark Avenue. Seher explained that the Arborist and the Landscape Architect are both working on a plan to show to show the committee on what trees they think should be planted. Once the plan is presented it can be discussed. Stephen would like to have the 2 for 1 tree plan brought back for discussion at the next meeting. He is opposed to the plan. He would rather see a plan for maintenance and safety. He’s for a plan were the college can have someone who has knowledge about the right type of trees to plant. Seher explained that she doesn’t know if we can do anything about the 2 for 1 plan because it’s already in the Environmental Impact Report which the college has to abide by the report. It may not be something that we can choose not to conform, but we can let it be known what we don’t want planted on campus. Randi believes that the EIR didn’t state that when removing a tree that another one needs to plant right away. When doing the Educational and Facilities Master Plan updates, we’ll redo the EIR. She’s willing to send letters out stating that SONA would love to see replacement trees in adjoining neighborhoods. The idea is to create an urban tree canopy, not a forest.
Stephen hopes in the long term irrigation landscaping is identified. Stephen will forward a list to Seher of trees that the city arborist suggested for his home.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Committee Status Report –

Seher apologize for forgetting the reports in her office. She explained that the report is not official and is only a report that the President requested a summary of the work that was done last year, for standing committees. She’ll email the committee members a copy of the report. Stephen believes this is good because if we do pass it on, the committee will know that at the end of the semester we’ll have the information for the next report that’ll be due at the end of the spring semester. This should be an action so it can be sent to CPC. Seher stated that she had heard that the chairs are being asked to give a presentation similar to what’s on the report, to CPC. She hadn’t received an invitation to do a presentation but has heard that other chairs have given presentations. If an invitation is requested she’ll notify the committee.

b. Boiler Room –

Stephen mentioned his concern with the room and people being housed in that area. He’s asking how that room is a safety hazard. He would like to see the Total Cost of Ownership on the building. What did it accomplish? How much did it cost? How effective is the building in actually doing the work it’s supposed to do in the new venue? Joe mentioned that the boiler is still in use. It is running the Auxiliary Gym and locker rooms, primarily. Scott stated that it’s supposed to be relocated when those structures are torn down. The boiler will be relocated to the central plant. Stephen asked if it is encumbered by six walls and is vented. Joe stated that it’s better vented than it was before. It’s been designed to current code, the District has also had Environmental and Safety people come and inspect it more than once. The building is receiving the benefit of scrutiny on several different levels in terms of safety.

c. Adjacent Batting Cages –

Stephen is asking how we show TCO on the completed projects. Is the college supposed to come up with the TCO? Did it do what it was designed to do? Scott’s understanding of the TCOs is focused forward. It’s a tool to make sure that as an entity that you understand the demands that your facility is going to have, going forward. It gives you the opportunity to plan and budget for those needs, going forward. It’s so you can make decisions and prioritize. It’s not uncommon for your needs to exceed your means. Those means need to be planted and focused on a priority bases. If you don’t have plan, you’re just spending your resource with whatever comes up next. When something that was planned comes up you won’t have the means to address it. Stephen asked Scott if something is done similar to the current projects (Boiler Room, Batting Cages, the model on the 100/200 east side, etc.) shouldn’t we offer a final document that shows the expectations, needs and accomplishments, that looks and follows the Educational/Facilities Master Plan. Scott doesn’t believe that’s a question for him but he doesn’t know if it’s an official requirement. Scott explained that the District is exploring some facilities management systems to put in place. This will help the District
plan and track the Total Cost of Ownership by allowing it to be used for Custodial and Maintenance, including initial costs. Stephen asked once the total cost of the money has been applied to the above projects, all of these funding’s have been applied. Stephen feels that the committee should expect some kind of a final document review. Bruce asked what is happening with the batting cages. Scott explained that there is a switch gear that was installed. The rest of the area is opened and covered area for Maintenance to use for storage. Stephen reiterated that he thinks it’s the responsibility of the membership of the committee to review.

d. Renovations of the Basketball Building (Jaguar Gym) –

Stephen passed out a copy of the Measure G – 2010 Summary Report. The committee reviewed the reported budget of the gym. It was pointed out that the title change and budget increase ($3.1 MIL) from March 2013 to December 2013. These changes weren’t supposed to happen on 2010 bond funding. Where did the $3.1 million come from? Why didn’t it go through the committee? Scott explained that anytime a project name or budget changes Gilbane will do a bond list revision which then goes through the Board of Trustees. In the past, these revisions have never had to go through the Facilities committees. That is a college process and should be determined by the college. In reference to it not supposed to happen through the 2010 bond; the Jaguar Gym renovation was included in the master plan as a project and is also on the bond list. It does meet the criteria for being on the 2010 project. As far as what happened from a budget perspective based on what Stephen is questioning, Gilbane looked at this project and tried to figure out exactly how they would actually implement it. Scott explained that from the beginning everything that was envisioned by the campus was set up individually as a different project (i.e. demolishing of the locker rooms, demolishing the Auxiliary Gym). As they moved forward and planned on how to execute the work, they started to combine projects to what made sense. If you look at the site on the handout (Jaguar Gym, locker rooms, swimming pool, A Gym, etc.) it showed they were all being demolished. Gilbane understood that once all those buildings were demolished it would be the actual Jaguar Gym with open structure. It made sense that it would be one project. It was one project and one contractor would have the contract to tear all that down and then to fix the gym. It questions what we do with that entire site now that all these buildings would be demolished. A lot of the funding that can be seen under the Jaguar Gym came from the Site Improvement project in terms of all the necessary landscaping that would need to be done. It came from the demolishing of the Auxiliary Gym, the locker room and swimming pool which were all combined with it. It was not new scope; it was scope that was already in different places. Another big piece of it was schedule maintenance. There are a bunch of items in the assessment of the gym that need to be addressed in terms of air flow, heating, cooling and other things that haven’t been completed yet. Gilbane did do a couple of things (floor, bleachers, painted, etc.) early on because former Vice President, Greg Nelson, requested it as a high priority so that the gym could look good. Scott explained that can see a consolidation of scope that represents how the project would be executed. Bruce was under the impression that both gyms would be demolished in order to build the new gym. Scott stated that the Facilities Master Plan shows that the Jaguar Gym is there. There were other earlier versions of the FMP that did show that both gyms would be gone. Stephen expressed his concern that there’s over $900,000 in the gym that was used by MG 2010 funds but when he suggested moving MG 2010 funds over to PE/Athletics and finish the Health
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Sciences in which he was told that couldn’t happen. He asked if it’s the gym went through an evolution of accounting. Does it fit the 50% rule? Stephen feels that we seem to be throwing money at things. We need to be more responsible with bond money. Scott explained that if you pull up the bond list revision it’ll show you were the dollars were originally allocated.

e. Ad Hoc for Facilities Master Plan –

Stephen asked if the committee votes to pass the Educational Master Plan is the committee going to look at the Facilities Master Plan. Stephen informed the committee that he sent out an email to the faculty regarding this topic and didn’t receive any comments back. Stephen would like to know if the President is asking or speaking with the Deans for a possible change in the Facilities Master Plan. If we’re going to do an EMP, which was just voted on, a Facilities Master Plan would follow suit. Seher mentioned that the President is in support of updating the EMP. She believes once the update to the EMP is complete it would be prudent to review the FMP. At this time, it’s too early to start preparing to move in that direction until the committee has factual data to support any changes to the FMP. Jussi Rajna asked if the Vice President of Academic Affairs will be the lead in reviewing and updating the EMP. Seher explained that consultants will be hired as it is too much work for just one person to take upon. The consultants will work with the college community for input and suggestions.

f. P.E./Athletics Construction Timeline and Funding –

Stephen would like to have Scott Jewell during his Facilities Update to give an update on the P.E./Athletics Construction Timeline and Funding since it’s under the MG 2004 bond.

g. 100 wing Renovations –

This item was already covered under item ACTION ITEM, item e.

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Facilities Update –

- P.E./Athletics Construction
  - It’s at the design development level currently.
  - Brought on the contractor to assist with the design effort.
  - Expecting the design to be ready to go to DSA (Division of the State Architect) in about eight months.
  - Construction would be around summer 2015.

Meeting adjourned at 3:44 p.m.
I. Approval of Agenda
II. Approval of the March 3, 2014 meeting minutes
III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)
IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Annual Goals  S. Awan
   b. Facilities Master Plan  B. Geer
   c. Committee Status Report  B. Geer
   d. Projects – Renovated/New  S. Mansfield
   e. Boiler Room  S. Mansfield
   f. Adjacent Batting Cages  S. Mansfield
   g. Ad Hoc for Facilities Committee  S. Mansfield
   h. P.E./Athletics Construction Timeline and Funding  S. Mansfield
   i. 100 Wing  S. Mansfield
V. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Facilities Update  Gilbane
Facilities Committee Meeting – Minutes for 3/17/2014

Membership Attendance

MSC – Seher Awan, Joe Andrade
Faculty – Stephen Mansfield, Donna Mendoza, Phil Crawford
Classified – Bruce Geer, Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman
Associated Student Body – Charlene Lilie, Roland Bough
Guests – President Breland, Scott Jewell (Gilbane), Jussi Rajna (SONA), Randi Kinman (SONA), Lamel Harris, Novella Simonson, Kathryn Mathewson

I. Approval of Agenda

Approval of Agenda: R. Bough/2nd T. Paiz

II. Approval of March 3, 2014 meeting minutes

Approval of Minutes: B. Geer/2nd R. Bough
Motion to amend minutes: R. Bough/2nd T. Paiz

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

Kathryn Mathewson, owner of Secret Gardens, spoke to the committee in regards to the arborist report. She requested the tree removal plans because the tree removal plans on the arborist reports doesn’t show details. She didn’t receive the plans. She feels the best way to review the plans is to see them in a larger view. She feels the best way to understand the report is to have the plans at a readable amount so that you can walk around the campus and see what the arborist is saying in the report. She thought the report was poorly done from that perspective. She also thinks that the report in terms of how they decided on what is to be removed and even with what they talked about the trees was very weak. She wrote up a two-page write up on the problems in the report which she can send to the committee if they would like to see it. The report is lacking in a wide perspective she thinks the major problems with the trees on campus is the way they are planted and maintained. If this doesn’t change she suggests we do not plant more trees. She suggested if we do remove it would be better to remove gradually because then you can create spaces for new trees. This will create shade for new plants to do better. She mentioned that she walked the campus and had posted her comments on her two-page write up. There are a lot of trees in the wrong places. There are a lot of wrong species and a lot of native plant species missing. Shrubs are used instead of trees. There are a lot of tall understory trees and shrubs that could be better than a tree.

Randi Kinman congratulated the campus on the great coverage we received for the new Veterans Resource Center. Whoever reached out and did the public relations did an awesome job. She thinks the campus on behalf of the community.
Stephen Mansfield mentioned that he sent three emails out to the president and Seher regarding the gates being locked during the weekend. There are no signs indicating which entrants can be used to access the campus. Stephen also sent in the email pictures of a mattress and TV at a location on campus. There’s also some broken up concrete that needs to be fixed. He hopes the committee will pursue a proactive review of these areas that need improvement. He also suggested the committee took a walk around these perimeters and see what needs attention before someone trips and hurts himself.

IV. DISCUSSION ACTION ITEMS:

a. Annual Goals –

Seher stated that the committee needs to start looking at annual goals for the academic year. She’d like the committee to identify goals they’d like to work towards. Once the list has been created with the goals, the committee can vote on them officially. Stephen mentioned that the committee charge states what the committee should be doing. Based on what the charge indicates the committee should try to fabricate some goals. Then the committee is held to a process of weather the committee achieved those goals or not. He’s not sure what the annual goals are supposed to mean to the committee. Through the committee he would suspect that we would be held by the charge and what needs to be done by the charge with the ongoing evidence of what happens through the facilities on campus. Seher explained that these goals would be short term annual goals. This is being done by all the committees on campus. The goals would be under the umbrella of the charge and also general discussion of the duties that the committee should be doing. Some of the questions that should be answered in the goals are what the committee is trying to accomplish this year. Are there items that need to be identified and addressed? The Landscape Master Plan could be one of the annual goals the committee is working towards. The College Planning Council is asking for the committees to define their purpose. Defining goals will keep the committee focused. Stephen stated that if CPC is requesting this information, they should be down streaming more information on what they would like to see from the committees. Seher suggested that the committee at least start a discussion on what they would like to see accomplished this year as tentative goals. She’ll work with CPC to get more information on what they would like to see from the committees, in the meantime. Stephen mentioned that action items would be goals completed by the committee. Seher will go back to CPC and specifically ask the council what it is that they want from the standing committees. This item will be tabled for the next meeting. Donna asked Seher to communicate back to CPC what specific language in what they want. Her concern about annual goals is if you set a goal and don’t achieve it, it may be that it’s too vague. Bruce, as a CPC member, doesn’t recall the discussion of annual goals. Roland, CPC student member, does recall the discussion of goals. Phil stated, as a goal, he’d like to address the eminence of career pathways, funding and the need for resources for the vocational and technical education. He stated there’s a $250 million grant that the district is applying for that’s likely going to have an impact on facilities. There are a lot of things happening in the CTE (Career Technical Education) area. The committee really needs to
have as a goal to accommodate the needs and resources, which are rapidly expanding. Stephen added that he’d like to see as an over line goal discussion items that don’t lead to an action item but there’s consensus from the committee to hold onto the idea, that it not be taken off the table completely.

b. Facilities Master Plan –

Bruce mentioned that what he understood about the Facilities Master Plan (FMA) was a subset of the 2025 Educational Master Plan (EMP). At the CPC meeting it was reported that the Facilities Committee wants the EMP to be renewed a year earlier. Seher explained that the committee approved at the last meeting that a recommendation to the CPC to update the EMP. Technically, the committee wouldn’t be doing the update a year early since there would be a process done which would put the committee right on the five year mark. She indicated that the committee is going to be updating the EMP and not the FMP. Once the update is completed to the EMP it will lead to update the FMP. President Breland asked Bruce if putting this item on the agenda was basically just to answer a question. Bruce explained that at the CPC meeting, the way it was presented, it was hard to understand that the Facilities Committee wanted the FMP completed immediately and in order to do this the EMP needs to be done a year ahead of time. Seher reiterated that the FMP isn’t open for discussion at this time. Stephen mentioned that he’d like to see the FMP changed. He feels that the committee should be looking at its FMP because he sees new things coming up (i.e. annual goals). He’s asked the committee to take into consideration to having the FMP placed as a discussion item to lead to an action item. President Breland explained that the EMP opens up first which will lead to the FMP. The FMP can’t be looked at on its own with an Ad Hoc Committee before updating the EMP. One has to precede the other. Stephen feels that it would be remissive for the committee to not give consideration of what they feel should be the direction of the FMP because from all constituency members are going to go back to their groups to start discussion in their areas. If the constituency groups wait for the EMP to be the dominate factor on how the FMP is, and nothing is done, where is the transparency in it. Seher explained that the EMP update is supposed to be an inclusive participatory governance process. Faculty, staff, students and Administrators would be a part of that process when the update happens. The transparency would be established throughout the process, leading to the FMP update. The concern she has with Ad Hoc Committees is 1) how can they make educational decisions if the EMP isn’t completed yet with the new data showing that there’s certain trends or needs that need to addressed. 2) Her observations have been that sometimes silos happen where the information stays within one place when the participatory governance process here with the committee. The committee is part of that process in addition to whoever wants to be involved when the committee starts the EMP update. The transparency is guaranteed because it’s happening here with the committee. The committee is supposed to be sharing that information with their constituency groups. Stephen states that it sounds as if the EMP will start its process and five or six months into it we’ll report in the direction of the way we want it to go which basically dominates the position that the FMP is going to go. President Breland explained it
should go that way because that information is going to be used to build on as the committee develops the FMP. Stephen wants the departments to start discussions with their deans on the updated development of the EMP. Phillip is concerned about timing and length of time. He’s hoping as our institutional needs change that there’s some way to fast track those needs through both education and facilities master planning. He feels there are opportunities arising were the college needs to be more flexible on making changes. Seher feels getting the process started is important. Having buy-in and everyone being included in the process will assist in streamlining it.

c. Committee Status Report –

Bruce mentioned that over the last couple of meetings that it was concluded that the complaint was that this report wasn’t given to the committee members to give input. For future reports he suggested that the committee be able to participate. The “Challenges” part of the report seems to be more of an individual’s opinion. Seher explained that the request for the report was sent to her in January. The committee wasn’t functioning during that month. The President sent it to the chairs with the request to give him a summary on the last few meetings. All information on the report with the exception of the “Challenges” part was word for word from the committee’s meeting minutes. The “Challenges” are subjective based on the challenges she observed. Stephen acknowledged that the committee has received a copy of the report and that this is something that the committee can live with as the committee moves through each semester. He asked that the committee look at the report and accumulate what the committee thinks should be on the report. This is good because it’s needed for Strategic Planning and Accreditation. These reports will be semi-annual (due at the end of each semester). Phil hopes in the process that it comes through the committee, regardless of who’s requesting it, to provide input. Stephen suggested that the committee not wait until the end of the semester but rather start looking at it now so that they can compile suggestions on what should be on the report. President Breland stated that he wanted this form from the chairs of the standing committees to inform him on how the committees are doing, from their perspective. If the committee membership wants to provide feedback we’ll give that opportunity too. President Breland explained that if you look at all the committee’s agenda items and all the action items, there might not be a direct flow to an outcome. He explained how he brought this up to the committee a few months ago regarding how are committees need to have an output that’s related to our Educational Master Plan, our charges, something that’s tangible. He’s not seeing tangible work coming from our committees. He’s not seeing that all our items are relating to our charge were we come up with something that flows into a required output for the college. Stephen explained that he brings a lot of items to the agenda that he believes are facilities related. He understands flow portion, which makes a lot of sense. He thinks that’s why the committee needs an interim block that tables items that were discussed but haven’t gone anywhere. He places a lot of items because he feels that the committee has a lot to review. His concern is if there are too many agenda items then what is the process and what is the charge? Are there some things the committee shouldn’t
discuss or concern themselves with as a committee? He’s concerned that if he brings up things of facilities and if members are told that only certain things should be brought forward to be focused on it goes back to the first agenda item about annual goals. President Breland explained that a lot of this has to do with Accreditation. It could be in the order of how the agenda is done. Some items seem to go around in circles and the committee needs to focus on getting things accomplished. The committee needs to have a role in producing something for Accreditation. We haven’t been following those specific recommendations or criteria’s that are outlined in the ACCJC (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges). Bruce suggested that the form be more detailed. Stephen suggested that the chair contact the members a month before the end of the semester so that each member can give input.

d. Projects – Renovated/New –

Stephen stated about the boiler room, racquetball building and the main gym doesn’t seem to have any apparent information brought forward to the committee that shows that there’s been an analysis completed. He asked how much money the college is planning on investing. Does it go on the 50% principal or not? The Applied Science department is held to 50% standard. This has been a standard that has been grandfathered in through this District for decades. He seen the funding, almost $5 million, that’ll go into the main gym. He asks how much the building is worth. He stated that if it’s worth more than $10 million, than the $5 million is fine. He then stated that if the building is only worth $5 million, then why we are putting $5 million in it when we can build a new building. He also asked the same questions regarding the racquetball building. If the college is going to $1.3 million into the building to start when there may be more funding. This is why he requested the report on the mold analysis. These types of evaluations hopefully will come to the committee so the members could see that it has been taken care of through Gilbane. The committee currently isn’t seeing these types of reports. As part of the transparencies is that if one building is treated differently than the other buildings, then there aren’t transparencies. What he’s asking for is if one building is being held to certain standards, then all buildings should be held to those same standards equally. Seher clarified that the 50% rule was strategically made by the college with VoTech upgrades. Those buildings aren’t set to be kept for a long time. They’re set to be demolished with new buildings going up in the future. The college extended the life of those buildings under the 50% rule. They didn’t extend them with the intent to keep them for a long time. It’s different for the Jaguar Gym in that it’s being kept so that if they go over the 50% rule it would be ok since the college plans to keep the building. If the seismic upgrades are required they’ve invested that time since the building isn’t going anywhere. Scott followed by stating that the 50% rule is a criteria that’s imposed on all the colleges by the (DSA) Division of State Architects. The DSA says if you’re going to invest in a facility up to 50% of the replacement costs then the college needs to bring the entire facility up to current code. It’s not just seismic but the seismic part is the big part of it. The strategy around the renovations of the 100/200 buildings was developed around extending the life of the buildings in marginal amount since they do show
to be demolished in the FMP. There comes a point when you hit the 50% that the cost goes well up. The administration made the decision that they didn’t want to spend that much money on buildings that weren’t intended to be around for too many more years. Stephen indicates that in the 2010 FMP that was voted for by the facilities committee to demolish the buildings (wings, main gym, A-gym, etc.).

e. Boiler Room –
Stephen requested that this be a table item that he can bring up at other meetings. The reason for his request is he asked for a total cost of ownership final sheet by the members that are going to be inside that room. He wants to know how they’re being affected by it.

f. Adjacent Batting Cages –
Stephen requested that this be a table item that he can bring up at other meetings.

g. Ad Hoc for Facilities Committee –
Done – Discussed in another agenda item.

h. P.E./Athletics Construction Timeline and Funding –
Stephen has seen the new timeline and funding. It looks like it’s going to be the 2004 bond funding. The completion date looks like it’s going to be around January 2017. He asked Scott if he’s correct in assuming that they’ll be looking at completion of the building around fall of 2016. Scott stated that Gilbane is trying to bring it back a little bit and it’s still too soon to have an actual date. Phil mentioned that there is a lot of concern in the faculty about community access. The fencing around the campus is keeping the community from using the facilities. He doesn’t feel it’s desirable considering it’s the tax payer’s money that the college is using to pay for these types of things. Joe reminded the committee that there’s always been a fence and that this is just a new and updated fence. Seher explained that the track is classroom space and not a city park. There are safety concerns and the college is responsible for anyone who steps foot on the field. If something happens to someone, the college is liable.

i. 100 wing –
Stephen is asking when the renovations are completed he would like to see a total cost of ownership evaluations brought to the committee. He wants to know if the target of the impact of the renovations (good and bad). He would also like to see this for the batting cages and the Boiler Room.
V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Facilities Update –

- 100/200 Renovations – There’s a perimeter fence up around the site. Scott reminded the committee that the real estate is now leased to a contractor. Any access through that area needs to be through the contractor. The contractor is strict about having visitors sign in and have protective equipment on themselves. Gilbane has worked with the surrounding neighborhood to orchestrate a plan to get equipment in and out of the site. Construction notices have been sent out to the campus community on how to get in and out of that area.

- Gymnasium Project – an architect has been chosen, LPAS. They’ve selected a lease/lease back contractor, Sundt Construction. Sundt and the architectural firm are working closely to go through the design and reconcile their estimates of cost so they can move forward with building. They been working closely with the user group over the last several months so they can re-evaluate the program.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
March 31, 2014
2:00 pm – 4:00 p.m.

Members

MSC (3) – Joe Andrade, Seher Awan (chair)
Faculty (3) – Donna Mendoza, Phillip Crawford
Classified (3) – Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman, Bunnie Rose
Associated Student Body (1/1) – Jeff Campbell, Charlene Lilie, Hossein Ebrahimi

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the March 17, 2014 meeting minutes

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

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. LRC Building Signage
   S. Awan

b. Annual Goals
   S. Awan

c. Community Auto Fair
   S. Awan

d. Combining of Facilities/Safety Charge, Version 2
   S. Awan

e. Landscape Plan
   C. Lilie

V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Facilities Update
   Gilbane
I. Approval of Agenda

Approval of Agenda: E. Chapman/2nd P. Crawford

A motion was made to move item e (Landscape Plan) to the top of the agenda. The committee unanimously approved the change.

II. Approval of March 17, 2014 meeting minutes

Minutes were not prepared. The minutes will be approved at the next meeting.

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

Randi requested that someone contact the neighborhood before any event where the noise level is elevated.

IV. DISCUSSION ACTION ITEMS:

a. Landscape Plan –

Kathryn Mathewson, owner of Secret Gardens, spoke to the committee regarding the arborist report. A handout was given out in regards to sustainable landscape plan thoughts. Kathryn went on to express the way in which the college was doing the report and landscaping plan, which in her opinion, wasn’t in the right order. She believes that the vision of the campus should be discussed before contacting an arborist. In her opinion, the master plan should come before the arborist report. The campus needs to think about how the landscape can help courses, the students and the environmental education of the students. She mentioned that the plant bio-diversity and plant native trees are missing. There needs to be discussion on campus first then you tell what the vision would be to your designers. The master plan is supposed to take what you have and create spaces. It uses what you have and makes spaces for outdoor classrooms; it solves the problems the college has like wind issues from the freeway which come through the buildings. It appears that there are a lot of trees that have no reason to be where they are and are not the right species. There are a lot of wrong trees for foundation plants. She asked why this happened. She feels that the arborist plans were not readable and the only other plans need to be
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placed on the board to see. In order for the committee members to understand those plans you need to walk the plans while having some documentation with you. Then the members are able to vote based on site and plan and not desk to the plans on the report. She mentioned that she has a client whose husband taught at the college. The corner redwood grove is named after her husband. The wife would like to donate money to the campus to improve the grove. Kathryn thinks there might be other people in the community who would also like to donate. She mentioned that if you walk to the campus you can notice that most of the trees are poorly pruned. She feels the reason that limbs are breaking off are because the limbs are too heavy on the tips. The tree tops are too heavy which light can’t come through. The trees aren’t receiving proper attention. You don’t remove plants based on them being poorly maintained. Charlene asked Kathryn what type of plants would be good for the grassy area between the Library and Student Center. Kathryn suggested good shrubs from the ground up around the area of the on ramp from the freeway. It would help to keep the wind out of the campus. Once that can be done, the Timber trees around the area that Charlene referred to needs to have the edges greened. Good foundation plants will also help make it more pleasant. When this is done you can address the lawn space with benches and tables. Jeff (a student) had attended the Associated Student Government meeting and had heard about the issue. He explained the democratic process that needs to be followed at these types of standing committees. This process will help the college to follow through with its objectives. Pat Space asked Kathryn to address a portion of her handout. It explained the importance of picture windows and the sense that the buildings are placed in the right location of the land. The building described in the part of her personal report indicates that the Student Center entrance from the parking lot has an unattractive view and can be softened with trees and plants. Randi Kinman stated that she thought the committee and college was at the beginning stages of the landscape master plan. She thinks it would be helpful if everyone was on the same page as to where the committee is at in the process. She feels that some people have moved ahead of the planning. She’d like for everyone to be aligned and on the same page. Seher explained that she requested that we hold off on these types of discussions until the meeting where the arborist and landscape architect can be in attendance. However, the request for the landscape plan was still requested to be on the agenda. The report is the first draft of their landscape master plan. Seher reiterated this is a phase process. The college is not yet at that phase where we would review plans since the committee doesn’t have anything to go on. On April 21st, the committee is scheduled to discuss the first landscaping master plan will be presented. The committee does go through a democratic process. This is the committee’s unit to do democratic process for the college, this is a shared governance committee and decisions are made as a collective unit. When the plan is presented at the meeting the committee will begin to see if any changes need to be made. Charlene explained that she wanted to have this on the agenda so the committee members can start to thinking about ideas for the plan. Phil mentioned that the committee has discussed the landscape plan in regards to removing trees. He’s confused as to what the committee is
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doi\ng or not doing with plants and landscape. He understands that the Educational Master Plan has to be completed then we’ll revisit the Facilities Master Plan. Seher explained that the Landscape Master Plan will be based on the current Facilities Master Plan. These documents are all living documents and can be changed. Phil suggested that maybe the committee needs a subcommittee on landscaping where we can invite the public. He would like to welcome Kathryn and other community members to participate in the process. Seher’s concern with subcommittees is that it becomes somewhat like a silo where information doesn’t get shared. The committee, which is a shared governance committee, is the committee that is responsible for these types of decisions. Phil also stated that he has a concern that other people with expertise haven’t been given a chance to bring their own input. Jeff asked if there’s another avenue that community members can go through to make donations. Seher explained that would be through the Foundation. Kathryn asked where the vision statements are for the committee to give to the landscape architects so they can use it towards their plans. The architects can’t come up with a plan without the college’s information and needs. It was explained to Kathryn that there isn’t a written document and that there have been meetings with the arborist including the Grounds Department and other members of the college. Randi stated that she’s been following the college’s process for the last few years. She asked the committee to keep going with following the process. The committee should wait to review the plans. She is someone who goes back to the community and incorporates these discussions, and she feels there’s a lot of side chatter going on and it should wait until we have a plan to review.

b. Learning Resource Center Signage –

A request has been made to add signage to the outside of the LRC building. This would help students and the public with the location of the Library, LRC and other programs in the building. Bob Wing, Librarian, explained that there are some people that aren’t aware that the Library is located on the second and third floor of the Learning Resource Center. The clear signage and any documentation stating the location of the departments and programs in the building will be helpful. Phil suggested that it would be helpful to place signage for the location of the elevators, especially for disabled students. Phil mentioned that there’s been concerns about people who are not students accessing the building. Bob reminded everyone that the Library is open to the public. It has been suggested that we give the students a login and password for the computers because non-students are coming into the Library to use the computers. Jeff asked if the signage would be part of the way finding signs project through the bond funding. Seher explained that it wouldn’t be part of the bond funding.

c. Annual Goals –

This item has been tabled to the next meeting.
d. Community Auto Fair –

Seher shared with the committee that the college has been approached by a company that is trying to do a new community auto fair. The public can bring their car to the fair and have it registered to be sold. There is other colleges in that have started to do this on their campus. The college would partner with the company and receive revenues from the car sales. Since there isn’t a pre-determined amount, the college wouldn’t be charging them a flat rate as normally done with other facility rentals. It would be flexible to assist the company in getting started and creating a relationship with the company. Seher was considering using the revenues as a way to help pay for safety initiatives on campus. The college is looking at giving the fair parking lots B (in front of the General Education building) and lot S (in front of the Science Complex). The fair would take place on Friday afternoon, all day Saturday and Sunday.

e. Combining of Facilities/Safety Charge, Version 2 –

Seher passed out a second version of the combined Facilities and Safety charge. This is still a work in progress. She has been receiving feedback from the first version, which she’s added to the second version. Based on the feedback, she worked on the changes and the name of the committee. She’s worked on the part that described the emergency preparedness. The feedback she received was that the committee shouldn’t be solely responsible for the emergency preparedness on campus. She changed the wording so that it mentioned that the committee would review it yearly. Seher made minor changes to the membership in regards to the actual names of the constituency groups. There was a some concerns about the College Safety Officer, Health Services Director, Chief of Police and Facilities Manager shouldn’t be voting members. Currently, they’re all Safety Committee voting members and serve on the committee when it does meet. They represent their area of expertise as a subject matter expert. At this point, she’s kept them as voting members. She didn’t see a reason why they wouldn’t be especially if they bring in subject matter expertise. She used the same model that is being used for Facilities such as chair and vice-chair since it’s been working well. She acknowledged the changes that Charlene gave her but didn’t have a chance to put them into version two. She’ll review them and place them in version three along with any other feedback. She’s open to more feedback since it is a work in progress. Charlene explained to the committee that the change she would like to add is under Guiding Principles bullet #3 The Committee reserves the right to replace members who fail to attend three consecutive committee meetings. Charlene would like to add The Committee reserves the right TO ASK THE CONSTITUENT GROUPS to replace members who fail to attend three consecutive committee meetings. Jeff pointed out that under the membership it states that students are appointed by the Associated Student Government. Seher understands that Charlene wants to make sure it’s clarified in the
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charge. Phil requested that these documents be given to the committee before the meeting so the members have time to review them in more details rather than at the meeting. Phil suggested that the sentence should include “unexcused” absences from the meetings. It’s important that there are alternates when one member is unable to make it. This will help with keeping quorum. Seher requested that all feedback be in to her by May 1st so she can work on the third version and have it ready by the May 5th meeting.

V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Facilities Update – Presented by Andrew Spiller (Gilbane)

- Site Improvements
- Campus Signage
- Tree Management
- Security Project – Currently in process
- Parking lot lighting –
  - Currently in process
  - drawings are almost complete
  - request for proposal has been issued
- Various Schedule Maintenance Projects – Varying between in designs which will begin in the summer semester.
- CTE Renovation –
  - Project has begun
  - Demolish work and abatement is under way.
- Media Arts Project – Currently in design
- P.E. Gym – Currently in design and programming

President Breland asked for clarification under CTE Renovation “demolishing and abatement is under way”. Andrew explained that he meant the site has been fenced for proceeding with the demolishment. Charlene asked if the building that is in the process of being demolished is the one that Stephen Mansfield requested that it not be demolished. Seher explained that in the March 3rd meeting minutes it states that there was a motion made by Stephen Mansfield that the college hold off indefinitely in removing the 300 wing. That motion didn’t pass. Andrew explained that the comment on the demolishing and abatement work refers to the 100 and 200 wings, not the 300 wing.

Jeff asked if the way signage project will be discussed again. Seher explained that it’s part of the landscaping plan. We’ll need to get through that process first and once that’s been done through shared governance, we can start working on it. We can’t take action on it until it’s approved through CPC. Seher’s hoping that by the fall semester it’ll be done going through the shared governance.
Adjourned 3:00 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
April 21, 2014
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Members

MSC (3) – Joe Andrade, Seher Awan
Faculty (3) – Donna Mendoza, Phillip Crawford
Classified (3) – Bunnie Rose, Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman
Associated Student Body (1/1) – Jeff Campbell, Charlene Lilie, Hossein Ebrahimi

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the March 17 and March 31, 2014 meeting minutes

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

IV. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Vice-chair election
   b. Learning Resource Center Signage

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Landscape Architect Presentation
   b. Campus Map Update
   c. Annual Goals
   d. Committee Self-Evaluations
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I. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve agenda: T. Paiz / 2nd J. Andrade

II. Approval of March 17, 2014 meeting minutes

Motion to approve 3/17/14 minutes: C. Lilie / 2nd T. Paiz

Approval of March 31, 2014 meeting minutes:

Motion to approve 3/31/14 minutes: J. Andrade / 2nd D. Mendoza

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

Jamie Castaneda, a student, addressed the committee to discuss the installation of water bottle filling stations on campus. It’s his understanding that there may be some funds allocated towards this already and the Associated Student Government supported the idea. If so, he would like to know how much was allotted and if any thought of where to place the stations have been made. He also addressed the committee regarding the drought preparation on campus. Has there been any talks of water saving landscape alternatives such as flushless urinals, water saving toilet installations, and fixing existing showers and faucets that leak year around. The committee will discuss both issues at the next meeting.

Charlene announced that she had Pest Control books for sale for $25 which can help the college and at your home.

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

a. Vice – Chair election

Seher explained that the committee needed to vote for a new Vice-Chair to replace former Vice-Chair, Bruce Geer. Jeff Campbell nominated Joe Andrade and he accepted.

J. Campbell / 2nd T. Paiz / 1 Abstention - Motion to approve Joe Andrade as Vice-Chair. Unanimously approved

MOTION PASSED
b. Learning Resource Center Signage –
   Tabled

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Landscape Architect Presentation –
   Joni Janecki & Associates, the college Landscape Architects, gave a presentation on the proposed site improvements. A draft of the proposed specific design improvement projects within the campus was handed out to the committee and audience. A brief history of the firm was explained. The firm has been working with the college for about 15 years on numerous projects as the campus first started taking on their landscape change. The firm has worked with Joe Andrade and the Grounds Department. They’ve worked on sustainability guidelines for the campus and the District. In 2010, the firm started to work with HMC Architects on the new 2025 Facilities Master Plan. They’ve been tasked to do a landscape study for the campus that bridges the 2025 FMP with the current bond funding. In the presentation the committee reviewed the goals through the 2025 FMP through evaluation of the existing site improvements. The landscape improvement projects shall use the guidelines outlined in the Landscape Typologies section of the proposal for the purpose of creating a cohesive campus environment. By taking a conceptual look at the design of the areas, the campus community can assess general costs and prioritize future campus improvements. Randi Kinman expressed her gratitude for the suggestion of eliminating the entrance on Bascom Avenue and the design work for the pedestrian near the Science Complex. Jeff Campbell had a concern about connecting both parking lots around the Technology Building as there’s a high amount of foot traffic in that area. A suggestion was made to do a traffic/circulation study around the campus. Randi suggested closing off the Leland exit. It’s very hard to see and could eliminate the problems of pedestrian cross traffic. She asked if Leland Avenue is still a public street or does the District own that property. Seher wasn’t sure but would look into it. Jussi Rajna suggested a map that shows how many people are in each building. This could be done with the circulation study. Kathryn Mathewson asked were the promenade idea came from which seems to be forcing it on the campus. Particularly it’s forced at the Science Complex it comes into the area where there’s a lot of trees. The other problem she noticed in the plans is how it’s going to connect into the very ugly view coming out of the Student Union. Kathryn also mentioned that it seems like there’s more interest in the pedestrians and the cars than it is creating spaces, rooms and picture windows from the campus. Kathryn explained that all the benches on campus have no shade, no protection and no sense of room or enclosure. There’s no ability to have outdoor classes. What plans are being made to address these issues? It was stated that, those were great points. There’s a whole part in the plans where it explains that along the pathways there would be areas and spaces where you can sit under the trees or have open classrooms. What the firm and the college is leaning towards is in making spaces that support the internal curriculum outside of the classroom. This way if you’re learning about native plants in the classroom you can go
outside of the classroom and see that same model as part of the space that you’re learning in. Kathryn explained that she doesn’t see any of this in the plans that were handed out. It was suggested to Kathryn to take a look at the firm’s documents on typologies that refer to plazas and courtyards. It was explained that the presentation is only a big picture of everything and doesn’t have the specific details of the plan since it’s a 30 minutes presentation. In the plans there are more details. Kathryn asked if the firm has spoken to instructors about their classes and the landscape. It was confirmed that they had spoken to some instructors while working on the landscape outside of the Science Complex. The firm is aware that it is important to the instructors. Kathryn asked if the firm had spoken in specifics about the landscape plan because she has spoken to some instructors who mentioned they hadn’t been approached by the firm. Kathryn reiterated about her question regarding the promenade. It was explained that the promenade was part of the 1999 plan and at this stage it is important for the campus to complete the promenade. It would be a poor choice to leave it incomplete. Kathryn explained that there is one area where the promenade doesn’t work because there are too many mature trees. It was suggested that it should be addressed in the Arborist Report. The firm isn’t looking at it specifically in this stage of planning. The firm explained that the document is only 95% complete and needs to go through an internal review before the final draft is released. Donna asked about the area near the Theatre where the plan shows drop-off areas. She mentioned that this area is currently the loading dock area for the Theatre. The firm noted and thanked her for that important information. It’s important for them to know these specifics when completing the plan. Kathryn explained that there is currently no continuity to the existing trees on Moorpark and everywhere else on campus. There are trees that are lifting up the concreted and are located in very narrow spaces which doesn’t give them space to grow. It was noted that in the Arborist Report a matrix was completed and trees were rated based on their long-term health. That was how the firm looked at specific trees. If there are trees that are unhealthy or being girdled (girdling roots), concrete that’s damaging them causing them to become long-term health, safety or maintenance issue), then they are listed on the trees to be addressed. Kathryn asked about street trees along the street. The firm is not proposing to add additional trees along Moorpark Avenue frontage. They’re introducing them in planting areas in the parking lot, inside the campus. This is so you’re opening the space a little bit more along Moorpark Avenue and putting trees in an appropriately size planter in the parking lot. This way they’ll have a more room and you can have a better growing environment. Along Moorpark it is a challenge to put street trees along the street. This is how the firm has been addressing that area. The sidewalk should be widened and they should prioritize pedestrian safety. Kathryn asked about wind breaks on the campus. The firm agrees that there are wind and sounds breaks coming from the freeway. The moving of the street trees inward would give a wind break to the campus. Randi had a concern with the firm’s plan of new fencing along Moorpark. She requested that the plan be to hold the fence inward to the internal side of the parking lot, not on the street side. She also thought it would be useful in the long-term planning to use identify the structures
that’ll be there rather than structures that are going to be gone. It’ll help to know where some tree planting can occur. Randi also suggested under the area that shows reinforce accent plantings at main entry, to not plant anymore trees in that area. This wouldn’t be necessary since the long-term plan shows that the entry will be changed completely. Charlene suggested that in walking the campus it would be nice to have shade along the walk areas. Charlene had a concern on Moorpark for students who do walk on the sidewalk. The shade would be taken away if the trees are removed. Kathryn felt it was important to know that the grove of redwoods on the corner of Moorpark and Leigh is named after a former instructor. The family of the former instructor would like to donate money to keep up the maintenance on those trees. Kathryn also brought up the poor maintenance of pruning the trees. We shouldn’t plant more trees if we can’t keep up with the maintenance. Charlene asked if the campus can hire a full-time Arborist. It was explained that the District has a full-time Arborist but that this would have to be discussed at the Human Resources level. The committee can’t make that decision. Bunnie reminded everyone that we’re supposed to be asking general questions instead of specific questions. Charlene asked if redwood trees require a lot of water. It was confirmed that redwoods do require a lot of water. Randi asked if she heard correctly that trees will be removed around the Athletic fields. It was explained that there was a request to add more trees for shade along the Leigh Avenue side near the multipurpose field. There are currently some trees that were planted right up against a sound wall and have become a maintenance issue. It was asked to prune that area out a bit, not remove the trees. Charlene asked to clarify what was meant by pruning the trees on Leigh. Would it be to prune or take every other tree out? It was explained that the firm was asked to look at quality and quantity around the south side area of the multipurpose field. The trees are too close together and they need to look at long-term maintenance concerns. The firm also reiterated there’s a comprehensive Arborist Report for every tree on campus and its criteria, health and long-term planning for those that have specific concerns or questions. Cody Mowbray (student) asked about the area around the promenade and the future site of the P.E. building, if all the deconstruction would be done with the trees before the building was complete. It was explained to Cody that this plan is done in phases and that those areas with the trees would be done during the construction of the new building. Charlene expressed a concern about the upcoming drought and the possibility of putting new grass. Grass needs a lot of water to maintain it. The firm stated when there’s a proposal for turf grass, water conserving drought tolerance sod choice would be made. There’s a campus standard for it. They use a low water use sod. Their objective is to streamline the irrigation to make sure it’s running off of a weather station, which is tracking what the external weather is like so on rainy days the sprinklers aren’t running. Michael Divinia mentioned that he had looked at the Arborist Report and Kathryn Mathewson’s printed comments and still feels that there is a lot of input that needs to be done during this process. Michael shared a concern for his fellow instructor, Peter D’Eliscu, instructor of Marine Biology, who brings his students on a campus walks to view the campus trees and the shrubs. If some of the trees are removed it would be crucial to Peter’s class
walk. Michael explained that we haven’t utilized the expertise on campus or in our neighborhood, into the process. We should have something where the campus community could give input or have a suggestion box. He mentioned that the campus was promised a Jacaranda tree when it was removed from the old library. They still haven’t re-planted the Jacaranda tree. He feels the Mimosa tree would be a great tree to plant on campus. Michael related a message from Peter D’Eliscu stating that a tree shouldn’t be removed unless it’s absolutely necessary. There should be more than one Arborist looking at the trees that are scheduled to be removed. Michael thinks a lot of good work has been done to keep inventory of the trees on campus. He feels more input should be done before removing any trees on campus. The firm has opened themselves up for suggestions, emails and calls from anyone who would like to communicate with them. The information is included in the documents that they handed out to the committee and public.

b. Campus Map Update –

Seher updated the committee on the revision of the campus map. A low flying plane will be flying over the campus to take pictures of the campus. This will create a realistic map rather than the “stick figure” map that has been used in the past. Seher will send out a construction notice when the actual date is set for the plane to come over the campus. It was asked if the map will be ready for the summer semester. Seher is hoping that it’ll be ready by summer semester. Jeff expressed that he would like to see a more current map rather than the maps with outdated buildings on them.

c. Annual Goals –

The committee requested that Seher go back to the College Planning Council to get more information on what type of annual goals they wanted form the committee or to give examples. Seher hasn’t received more information from CPC as of yet. She should have information from CPC at some point and will bring it back to the committee as soon.

d. Committee Self-Evaluations –

A copy of the self-evaluation spreadsheet template was handed out to the committee. Seher would like to committee to begin working on it as a group. The template talks about how the committee will evaluate itself throughout the year and if the goals set from last year were accomplished. The committee worked on the self-evaluations form. Some suggestions for goals:

- Goal #1 – Landscape Plan
- Goal #2 – Combined Committees
- Goal #3 – Vice Chair Model
- Goal #4 – Security Master Plan
- Goal #5 – More 30 minutes parking spaces
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Seher will type up the form and bring it back to have the committee review it before it’s sent off to CPC.

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Gilbane Updates –

• 100/200 Renovation Project – The area is now all fenced off. Gilbane is open to hear back from anyone with concerns regarding safety.
• Past Projects – Gilbane is finishing up on some of the projects that have been going on since last summer.
• Campus Safety – Phase 1, installation of the Talk-A-Phones and the security cameras were approved by the board last month.
Student success is a commitment to ensuring that students are able to establish and achieve their educational goals: degree, certificate, transfer, career advancement and lifelong learning experiences. The success of our students is a shared responsibility by all members of our college community.

Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
May 5, 2014
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Members

MSC (3) – Joe Andrade, Seher Awan
Faculty (3) – Isai Ulate, Donna Mendoza, Phillip Crawford
Classified (3) – Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman, Bunnie Rose
Associated Student Body (1/1) – Jeff Campbell, Charlene Lilie, Hossein Ebrahim

I. Approval of Agenda
II. Approval of the April 21, 2014 meeting minutes
III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)
IV. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Combined Safety/Facilities Charge/Version 3
V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Landscape Master Plan
   b. Water Saving Landscape Alternatives
   c. Water Bottle Filling Stations
   d. Renaming Old Boiler Central Plant
   e. Committee Structure
VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:
   a. Gilbane Updates
      • ASG - SJCC SACNAS Regional Conference August 22-23, 2014

“Student success is a commitment to ensuring that students are able to establish and achieve their educational goals: degree, certificate, transfer, career advancement and lifelong learning experiences. The success of our students is a shared responsibility by all members of our college community.”
Facilities Committee Meeting – Minutes for 5/5/2014

Membership Attendance

MSC – Seher Awan, Joe Andrade
Faculty – Phil Crawford, Donna Mendoza
Classified – Bunnie Rose, Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman
Associated Student Body – Charlene Lilie, Jeff Campbell, Hossein Ebrahimi
Guests – Scott Jewell (Gilbane), Michael Divinia, Pat Space, Virginia Scales

I. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve agenda with modifications: B. Rose /2nd J. Andrade

II. Approval of April 21, 2014 meeting minutes

Motion to approve minutes: D. Mendoza/2nd B. Rose

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

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

a. Combined Safety/Facilities Charge-Version 3

J. Andrade/2nd H. Ebrahimi - Motion to accept combined Safety/Facilities charge. Unanimously approved

The charge will go into effect in the fall when the committees officially combine.

MOTION PASSED

b. Renaming Old Boiler Central Plant

This item was moved over from Discussion Items to Action Items so that the committee could vote on a name for the building that houses Facilities and Operations.

Joe Andrade mentioned that his department would be moving into the old Boiler Central Plant. There’s no room numbers on the door and the building doesn’t have a name. A name needs to be considered for deliveries and to identified on the campus map. Elaine mentioned that it’s not been assured yet but she could be moving into the building too.

J. Andrade/2nd P. Crawford – Motion to name the old Boiler Central Plant building to Facilities Maintenance & Operations (FMO) Building. Unanimously approved

MOTION PASSED
c. **Landscape Master Plan (LMP)** –

This item was moved over from Discussion Item to Action item.

Seher felt that due to the discussions that have gone on in the last few meetings regarding the LMP, she needed to give a broader explanation on the definition of the LMP. Seher explained that the LMP doesn’t go into specific details as what’s been discussed in the last few meetings. The LMP is a living document that serves as a broad general plan for the campus. The LMP is based off of the Facilities Master Plan (FMP). It doesn’t give specifics as to what or where types of trees should be planted. When the campus begins implementing the LMP, there’ll be discussions that can go into specifics and details. At this current time the LMP will guide the college in its choices of landscape. The amount of detail that has been going on in the committees discussions is not appropriate for a LMP. Seher asked the committee if there are any unanswered questions. She would forward them to the arborist and the landscape architects. Seher mentioned that she did try to get both the arborist and landscape architect to attend today’s meeting but due to scheduling conflicts neither could attend. Seher would like the committee to vote on the LMP by the next meeting because this was a task requested by President Breland to be accomplished before the end of the semester. She emphasized that the arborist report is separate from the LMP and is a completely separate document that doesn’t affect the LMP. It was a tree survey, which had recommendations for the architects with details to assist them with the LMP.

Jeff asked about the completion of a ring road in the LMP. He doesn’t see the purpose of it and asked for clarification on it. Seher explained that at this time the campus doesn’t have the funding for it. The ring road serves the purpose of traveling within the campus internally instead of having to use the city streets. Scott added that this piece was very important to the surrounding community.

Charlene was concerned about traffic within the campus. She feels that having more cars on campus would make it a safety concern. She prefers to see more space for outside areas for students.

Scott mentioned that the loop road isn’t an element of the LMP but rather of the Facilities Master Plan. To have further discussions on the loop road would need to be discussed when the committee discusses the updating of the FMP.

Charlene feels that the committee should wait on approving the LMP until the fall. She’s concerned about trees being removed over the summer. Seher explained that the committee already approved the removal of the trees that are dead, diseased or a safety hazard. These trees will be removed regardless if the committee approves the
LMP this semester or in the fall. Seher reiterated that the President requested that the committee’s task was to review and vote on the LMP before the end of the spring semester. Seher mentioned that the campus would be coordinating an open forum to discuss the trees, on May 19th. Charlene wanted the committee to wait on moving forward until Michael Divinia could be at the meeting. Bunnie mentioned that Michael isn’t a part of the committee and the meeting should move forward. There’ll be an open forum for the campus community to discuss the LMP.

Joe requested that the committee not wait until the next meeting to vote on the LMP, but rather vote at today’s meeting.

J. Andrade/2nd P. Crawford – Motion to approve the Landscape Master Plan.
Yes – 4
No – 4
Abstain – 1
*Chair vote based on tie - No

MOTION FAILED

DISCUSSION:
Phil pointed out that an item placed on the agenda as a discussion item and moved to action item doesn’t give the public time to be notified. The exception to this is only in emergencies based on the Brown Act. Jeff would like some time to review it before voting on the item. Charlene mentioned that part of the reason why the trees limbs are falling off would be due to the lack of maintenance on the trees. If this isn’t corrected there’ll be more issues with the trees. She also feels strongly that the campus should receive a second opinion from another arborist.

Charlene would like to see an amphitheater for the students. Seher explained that this would need to come through the Facilities Master Plan, not the Landscape Master Plan. Currently, there’s no funding for an amphitheater but it can be placed on the FMP as a preference. Charlene asked what types of plants can be placed in the areas that have big wind control. The area between the Student Center and the Library is one of the places that receive a lot of wind which makes it hard for students to sit around that area. Charlene asked what type of trees would be best for shading.

President Breland requested that the committee move on with the agenda and thanked Charlene for her questions.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Water Bottle Filling Stations –
Due to lack of funding, the committee couldn’t take action on this item at the next meeting. Seher mentioned that it can be included to a wish list for site improvements. This can be considered once funding becomes available at a later time.
b. **Renaming Old Boiler Central Plant**  
Moved to ACTION ITEMS

c. **Committee Structure** –

A request was made to clarify the committee’s structure, the roles of the committee members along with the procedures on how the campus community goes about placing agenda items on the agenda. The committee serves as a representative to each of the campus’ constituency groups (Administration, Faculty, Staff and Students). A member serves on the committee for the good of the campus and not for personal agendas or preferences. It’s the committee member’s responsibility to report back all information pertaining to the committee, to their constituency group. If someone outside of the committee wants to have something placed on the agenda it needs to go through the committee members. The members are to assess if the discussion items are an appropriate item to bring to the committee and if it pertains to the charge. The committee isn’t authorized to make decisions for the college but rather give recommendations to the College Planning Council. CPC will either agree to forward the recommendation to the President or not.

Phil had a concern that he doesn’t see how the community could get involved. He feels that the committee does make big decisions and doesn’t see the committee as a sub-committee of the college. Seher reminded the committee that community members do participate in the committee. Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Association (SONA) has members who come to the meetings and Seher attends their community meetings with updates from the college. Phil suggested that we include community members as part of the membership of the committee.

Charlene suggested that we invite more community organizations other than SONA. Seher explained that SONA is the constituency group for the community.

Jeff explained public comments are the most appropriate way for the community to be heard.

d. **Committee Self-Evaluations** –

A copy of the draft self-evaluation spreadsheet was handed out to the committee. Seher included what the comments and suggestions that were discussed at the last meeting. Seher asked if there were any changes that needed to be made to the form. The committee is ok to keep the form as it remains.

Phil requested if the chair could email the form and other forms to the committee ahead of the meeting so it can be reviewed before the meeting.
e. **Water Saving Landscape Alternatives** –

This item was placed on the agenda per discussion at the April 21st meeting. A student had spoken during Public Comments with regards to Water Saving Landscape Alternatives and the Water Bottle Filling Station (Item a). The student didn’t return for discussion. Seher announced that the Landscape Architect did mention in the presentation at the April 21st meeting that there was some handouts on water saving along with the presentation that she gave at the meeting. The information is on the Facilities Committee page on the college website.

http://www.sjcc.edu/faculty-staff/committees/facilities-committee

Charlene mentioned a few other water saving ideas.

f. **Landscape Master Plan (LMP)** –

Moved to Action Items

VI. **INFORMATION ITEMS:**

a. **Gilbane Updates** –

- 100/200 CTE Renovations Project – Still underway
- Getting ready for summer projects
- Mechanical and electrical projects went to bid and were awarded based on the Board approval last month.
- Gym projects – Reconciling scope and budget.

Discussion was geared towards the 300 wing. President Breland asked Scott to give a short history on the 300 wing and how we got to this process of having the 300 wing demolished, what infrastructure has already been done and how the 300 building was the connectivity point for the campus. Scott explained that a lot of the original buildings were connected to the 200/300 wings from a utilities perspective. Gilbane put together a strategy development for the bond program based on the Facilities Master Plan. The FMP originally called for all three wings to be demolished but 100/200 wings were deferred because there wasn’t enough money in the current bond program to replace the space. A project was conceived of and designed to extend the life of the 100/200 wings for 10-20 years until funding could be available to replace the buildings. The 300 wing needed to be demolished because there’s a new building program for that site. The major utility project that was done last summer was done to isolate the 300 wing. It was done to redistribute the utility connections to other more appropriate places so that 300 can be demolished.

- ASG – SJCC SACNAS Regional Conference August 22-23, 2014
Facilities Committee Meeting – Minutes for 5/5/2014

- Jeff requested this agenda item so that he could coordinate with Steve on upcoming construction projects that may be taking place during the time of the proposed conference. It was suggested that he meet with Seher and Joe to discuss any concerns regarding construction projects as Seher is updated on them.

Meeting adjourned: 3:20 p.m.
Facilities Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
May 19, 2014
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Members

MSC (3) – Joe Andrade, Seher Awan
Faculty (3) – Isai Ulate, Donna Mendoza, Phillip Crawford
Classified (3) – Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman, Bunnie Rose
Associated Student Body (1/1) – Jeff Campbell, Charlene Lilie, Hossein Ebrahimi

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the May 5, 2014 meeting minutes

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

IV. ACTION ITEMS:
   a. Landscape Master Plan
   b. LRC Signage

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Tree Removal and Pruning
   b. Memorial Tree Process
   c. Location of flags
   d. Safety Update
   e. Student Center and Tech Center Interior Upgrades

“Student success is a commitment to ensuring that students are able to establish and achieve their educational goals: degree, certificate, transfer, career advancement and lifelong learning experiences. The success of our students is a shared responsibility by all members of our college community.”
Facilities Committee Meeting – Minutes for 5/19/2014

Membership Attendance

MSC – Seher Awan, Joe Andrade
Faculty – Phil Crawford, Donna Mendoza, Isai Ulate
Classified – Bunnie Rose, Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman
Associated Student Body – Charlene Lilie, Jeff Campbell, Hossein Ebrahimi
Guests – Scott Jewell (Gilbane), Michael Divinia, Pat Space, Virginia Scales, Randi Kinman (SONA), Leslie Rice, Michael Divinia, Amy West (Joni L. Janecki & Associates, Inc.)

I. Approval of Agenda
Motion to approve agenda with modifications: B. Rose /2nd D. Mendoza

P. Crawford/2nd I. Ulate: Motion to add Bike Patrol to ACTION ITEMS.
Y – 5
N – 1
MOTION PASSED

C. Lilie/P. Crawford: Motion to table Landscape Master Plan until 3:00 p.m.
Y – 5
N – 2
MOTION PASSED

J. Andrade/B. Rose: Motion to table Landscape Master Plan until 2:30 p.m.
Y – 3
N – 2
Abstain – 2
MOTION PASSED

II. Approval of May 5, 2014 meeting minutes
Motion to approve minutes: J. Andrade/2nd I. Ulate

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)
Hossein Ebrahimi explained that the two elevators in the student parking garage are in need of cleaning. He would like to see them cleaned at least 1-2 times a week.

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

a. LRC Signage

   B. Rose/2nd J. Andrade - Motion to approve the LRC signage.
   Y – 7
   N – 0
MOTION PASSED

DISCUSSION:
A handout was given to the committee presenting the areas where signs were needed based on the conversation Seher had with the LRC staff. Seher will begin working on obtaining signs for the outside of the building.

b. Bike Patrol
P. Crawford/2nd E. Chapman: Motion to approve a community style of policing for the District and a bike patrol component.
Y – 7
N – 1
Abstain – 1

DISCUSSION:
Phil stated that the Safety Committee had already brought the program to the attention of the District Police. The District Police and Academic Senate are in favor of the program. It would be nice to have this in place when a new Police Chief is chosen. This will mean engaging the various aspects of the college community with the District Police to work in cooperation to solve problems on the campus (lighting, escorts to cars, outside engaging with students, faculty and staff). Members of the Bike Patrol will attend meetings (Academic Senate, ASG, etc.) to get feedback on the program. The program has a 15 year history of trying to student cadets to the bike patrol program. The District Police is now going to a CSO (Community Services Officer) type of officer, which will be an unarmed officer that’ll do a number of tasks (general patrolling, dead battery jumps, etc.). The first group of cadets will start either in the summer or fall. Phil encouraged a bike patrol component with uniformed officers on campus, particularly in the evening. Phil stated that he doesn’t feel it should be a class and that it an academic matter better handled with the Academic Senate, IPCC (Instructional Policies & Curriculum Committee) and Deans.

Randi asked if the budget already has a Community Service model included in it or if Phil is encouraging the campus community to look at this as a component that he wants to have happen.

Bunnie mentioned that the District Police is a District shared department. Anything that comes out of the department needs to be done district-wide. She feels these needs to come from a district level and not from the committee.

Charlene asked if students could do the program through the Work Study Program?

Virginia Scales mentioned that the program was approved at one time and was in operation.

Corinne asked if the program was up and running, why it was shut down so quickly. What were the reasons the program initially wasn’t successful.
c. Landscape Master Plan

P. Crawford/2nd J. Andrade: Motion to approve the Landscape Master Plan
Y – 8
N – 1

DISCUSSION:
Members of the committee had questions regarding different aspects of the plan. Amy West from Joni Janecki & Associates was on hand to explain the plan to the committee and answer questions. Seher clarified to the committee that the motion is to approve the Landscape Master Plan which is a living document. The document can be continuously updated. The amount of details that has been discussed in the past few meetings doesn’t pertain to the plan itself. The discussed details would be more appropriate for the Urban Forest Project Plan, which goes into details about how we should take care of the trees. This is the first step in getting things done on the campus that relates to landscaping. During Amy’s last visit with the committee she had taken notes regarding recommendations to the Landscape Master Plan draft that she presented. Out of the recommendations, there were only three that pertained to the LMP (the Theater dock, possible entrance changes and raised crosswalks).

Leslie Rice expressed her concern that the campus should be highlighting areas and educating the public by demonstrating how to manage your landscape during a drought. Seher explained there’s a section (Landscape Typologies) in the LMP that explains what natural species should be used.

Phil suggested that the plan should emphasize on a drought resistance plan and compiling information from our own resources in our campus community (Michael Divinia, Kathryn Mathewson) to assist the college in meeting the 20% goals of decreasing our water usage. Joe confirmed that the college hasn’t been enforced by the city on its water usage.

Charlene would like to add to the LMP pruning mulch and natural composting. She pointed out that the Arborist recommended that the college shouldn’t use rubber mulch but rather use natural mulch. She opposes the approval of the LMP until the adding of natural mulch and not placing electrical boxes near trees are added to the plan.

Randi stated that as a member of the community and someone who represents the taxpayers; it concerns her that committee members want to delay the plan based on small details that can be worked on farther down the line. She would like the committee to approve the LMP so that the committee can move forward.

Scott pointed out that the details are not relevant to the plan. They’re good ideas that need to wait until after the plan is approved. Scott mentioned that in regards to the comment about the electrical box near the tree; that every construction project includes a set of specifications that have requirements for what’s to be done when you encounter tree roots of certain diameters. The designers try to avoid trenching next to trees. Sometimes with utilities you don’t necessarily have control over where they go because other utilities limit your flexibility.
Amy West reassured the committee that she’s here to receive all their comments and feels the same way about the mulching and composting. Her company was tasked to look at the LMP project at a planning perspective. The April 21st presentation that she gave was an abbreviated version of the LMP. Some of the suggestions that were noted from the presentation are in the actual plan. In the LMP, there’s an Irrigation Master Plan included as an appendix which talks about water preservation. They also wrote up specifications for the District that address how to protect trees during construction.

Charlene requested to see the more detailed plan and to wait until fall before approving the LMP.

**Point of information** – Phil Crawford asked if the committee approves the LMP, would it affect the trees that are scheduled to be removed. Seher explained that the committee already voted on the tree removal back in March. The voting of the LMP would not stop the trees that are scheduled to be removed.

Since the committee has approved the LMP, the next step will be to work on the Urban Forest Management Plan with HortScience. All comments and recommendations will be forwarded to the HortScience for when they do the Urban Forest Management Plan. Sub-projects can now start to happen, based on funding.

**V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

a. **Tree Removal and Pruning**

The tree removal that was approved by the committee in March is moving forward. As the tree removal begins there’ll be intense pruning being done. Moving forward with the Urban Forest Management Plan, it will lay out a pruning schedule for all the trees on campus. The details that have been discussed in the past few meetings will be able to be tied into this scope of the project. We’re hoping to partner with Evergreen Valley College Grounds staff to assist in the project of the landscaping around our campus. The project is scheduled to start in mid-summer.

Phil mentioned that he had a report from a member of the college community that is very knowledgeable. It’s stated in the report that some of the trees that are scheduled to be removed don’t necessarily need to be removed. Seher explained that a few years ago that these concerns came up about not removing these trees. These are the same trees and they are still diseased or dead and need to be removed. The tree removal report was done by a certified arborist who was the same arborist who did reports the last couple of times.

Charlene stated that not all the trees are in danger of having falling limbs. The reason they’ve got to the condition that they are currently in is due to lack of pruning or having someone work on them that’s not an arborist. Seher agreed and stated that the college is contracting out for an arborist to do the updating pruning. Charlene asked if the
money we’re using to contract out an arborist can be used to hire a permanent one. Seher explained that the bond is paying for this project. Bond funding can’t be used to hire employees. Charlene mentioned that she some trees have raised beds (dirt being added to the tree line) that aren’t good for the trees. She also pointed out more specific things that have assisted in the decline of the trees and how they can be redirected now to save them.

Randi doesn’t see a reason to hire a full-time arborist when the city has an arborist. We need to get to a point where a plan is in place.

Phil doesn’t agree with stopping the tree removal all together but rather halt on the couple of trees that are in question. He suggested that the three people that are questioning the couple of trees that are being considered for removal should write a letter to the arborist with their concerns.

Charlene would like to look at the irrigation procedure to see if things are being handled correctly. Seher suggested that this be an agenda item for the fall.

Bunnie asked to confirm that the arborist report has been reviewed more than once. In two years it’s been confirmed by the arborist what trees need to be removed due to being diseased or safety reasons. She doesn’t understand why it’s still being discussed if it’s already been approved.

b. Memorial Tree Process

It was brought to the committee’s attention about the memorial trees that were planted in the past. Seher feels there isn’t a define process to follow with planting of memorial trees. The committee is discussing the topic in hope of bringing it back in the fall so that it can be an action item. She feels the trees should be planted in areas based off the Facilities Master Plan, so that they aren’t planned on future building sites. She suggested there be a memorial grove where trees can be planted in memory of someone. Seher opened the floor for discussion.

Phil stated that the report he had received from the three concerned employees stated that some of the memorial trees are missing their plaques.

Charlene asked if there was a master list of the memorial trees.

Randi suggested other alternatives for memorials (benches, etc.)

Seher suggested that for future memorial planting to make sure they’re within the appropriate species and looking at the age of the trees. Should a process be done through the District or just on campus? The committee can continue the discussion
when they return in the fall. It was asked if committee members could have access to the landscape documents previously mentioned. Seher suggested that members take a look at some of the current landscape documents on the college website. Some of the attachments are too big to send through email.

Below is a link to the site on the SJCC website.  

c. **Location of Flags**

Stephen Mansfield requested that the committee discuss the location of the American flags. The current location near the Technology Building keeps snagging on the tree branches. There have also been some complaints from the community because the flag pole is too close to the tree. The flag has since been taken until the pruning can start on the trees the flag will be returned to its original location. Seher suggested the committee work on a new location for another flag pole.

Teresa suggested putting a flag pole in outside of the Student Center, near Campus Police. Another suggestion would be in the circular area between Cosmetology and Reprographics.

d. **Safety Update**

Seher updated the committee on facilities safety.
  - Alice Training – June 13\textsuperscript{th}
  - Mandatory Alice Training on fall PDD
  - Updating National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS), Emergency Response Program – Mid-July
  - Prep EOC (Emergency Operation Center) Simulation
  - Currently working on the RFP for the pilot safety cameras.
  - Nine emergency phones
  - Pilot locking system
  - Security Master Plan goes to the College Planning Council in early fall.

Randi suggested that the campus inform the community of the different drills.

e. **Student Center and Tech Center Interior Upgrades**

Seher informed the committee that upgrades to both the Student Center and Technology Building will be done during the summer. There’ll be replacements of the carpet (upstairs only in the Student Center) and ceiling tiles.
VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:

- 100/200 Renovations

Small Summer Projects:

- Mechanical Electrical Plumbing Projects
- Tree Project – out to bid
- Site Improvement Projects (signage, tree management, walkways, etc.)

Charlene requested some time to speak about the management of the trees. Seher brought it to the committee to vote on whether to continue the discussion on trees. Phil felt this was a matter outside the scope of the committee. Some of the other members wanted to take a break before returning for the forum on the trees.

The committee voted to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned: 3:45 p.m.
Facilities and Safety Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
September 15, 2014
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Committee Members:
- MSC (3) – Joe Andrade (co-chair), Seher Awan (chair)
- Faculty (3) – Isai Ulate, Donna Mendoza, Phillip Crawford
- Classified (3) – Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman, Bunnie Rose
- Associated Student Body (1/1) – Jeff Campbell, Charlene Lilie, Hossein Ebrahimi

Upcoming Fall Semester Meetings:
- October 6
- October 20
- November 3
- November 17
- December 21

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the May 19, 2014 meeting minutes

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

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. ALICE Training Updates

b. Landscaping Updates

c. Santa Clara County Office of Education – new trailer

d. New Athletics/PE Building Update

e. Batting Cage Roof

“Student success is a commitment to ensuring that students are able to establish and achieve their educational goals: degree, certificate, transfer, career advancement and lifelong learning experiences. The success of our students is a shared responsibility by all members of our college community.”
 Facilities & Safety Committee Meeting – Minutes for 9/15/2014

**Membership Attendance**

- **MSC** – Jorge Escobar (ex-officio), Joe Andrade
- **Faculty** – Phil Crawford, Janet Chang
- **Classified** – Bunnie Rose, Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman
- **Associated Student Body** – Kulwaran Sandhu (proxy)
- **Guests** – Scott Jewell (Gilbane), Randi Kinman (SONA), Larry Harris, Debbie Huntze-Rooney, Andrew Spiller (Gilbane), Thais Del Castillo (LPAS-Landscape Architect) and Troy Pennington (LPAS-Project Manager)

I. **Approval of Agenda**
   Motion to approve agenda: P. Crawford/2nd T. Paiz:

II. **Approval of May 19, 2014 meeting minutes**
    Motion to approve minutes: T. Paiz/2nd E. Chapman
    Motion to add Charlene Lilie’s additions to the May 19th minutes
    J. Andrade/2nd P. Crawford

    Yes – 1
    No – 3
    Abstain – 1

    **Motion Denied**

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

IV. **ACTION ITEMS:**

a. **Elect a chair and co-chair**

   Janet Chang nominated Joe Andrade as chair. Joe Andrade respectfully declined.

   Phil Crawford nominated Jorge Escobar as chair and Joe Andrade as co-chair. Both Jorge and Joe accepted the nominations.

   Motion to approve Jorge Escobar as Chair and Joe Andrade as Co-Chair.

   Yes – 6
   No – 0
   Abstain – 0

    **Motion Approved**
Facilities & Safety Committee Meeting – Minutes for 9/15/2014

Jorge thanked the committee for the nomination. He thanked the committee for the work they have done in the past. He is looking to being more progressive and at the same time very encompassing of the actual nature of the committee which now represents two sections; the facilities and safety areas.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

b. & c. Review of Facilities & Safety Charge

Phil suggested that the committee have equal numbers of members from each constituency groups. Joe explained that the last four bullets of the membership indicated an Administrator and a Faculty member which would add up to an equal amount of membership for each constituency group. This was decided by the committee last semester when the combine charge was being reviewed. Phil’s stated that Academic Senate may have a concern if one of their members is assigned to the committee by default rather than by appointment from the Senate. He feels that anyone that’s on the committee by default should be an ex-officio.

Janet explained that in the past on the Safety Committee, they had always had representation from Campus Police. She would like for the committee to request if there’s an officer that is assigned to be on campus during the time of the committee meetings, that they attend. It is important to have the voice of Campus Police on the committee. Jorge explained that currently the department is short staffed and for now, as the Safety Officer, he’ll represent the department and provide information to the department and committee.

Phil reiterated that he would like to see the following members be placed as ex-officio based on their positions.

- College Safety Officer
- College Director of Health Services
- College Facilities Manager
- District Chief of Police

Janet feels that the committee needs to move forward with the membership as it’s described in the since it was worked on for a year and recently approved. The charge was taken to the Academic Senate and to the College Planning Council where it was reviewed. The committee can go back to review it at a later time. Phil stated if the Senate had it passed it through then he’s fine with it. Randi Kinman stated that this process was completed last year. Currently this is what the committee has to work with and if the committee is seeking to make changes it needs to be brought forward again to the constituency groups.

a. LPAS Presentation – P.E. Complex

Andrew Spiller, Gilbane Project Manager, is currently working on the P.E. project. Andrew introduced Thais Del Castillo, LPAS Landscape Architect and Troy Pennington, LPAS Project Manager. LPAS presented to the committee a presentation on the current floor plans of the P.E. Complex. It was explained to the committee the process LPAS has taken to include the user groups (Kinesiology/Athletics Department) to receive input.
Facilities & Safety Committee Meeting – Minutes for 9/15/2014

The committee was told that the project has been on the books for a while now. They believe the project has gone through three or four renditions based on funding and discussion on how the space would be used.

The presentation was completed and the committee was able to ask questions. Phil stated that a couple of years ago it was promised to have a pool placed in the new P.E. Complex. Phil asked if there were any current plans to bring a pool back on campus. Scott explained that the pool is still in the master plan but there wasn’t enough funding to build a new one. It still shows in the master plans that the pool would be placed where student parking lot P is located.

Janet asked when there’s a new building in design if the end users are being asked for their feedback regarding their offices. She asked if the P.E. Complex has been approved by the end users (Coaches, Athletic Director, etc.). Thais explained that the LPAS has had continuous conversations with the end users up to this point. The end users have given feedback and have approved the design presentation that was shown to the committee. Troy explained that LPAS has met with the Kinesiology/Athletics Department to discuss how the each individual room would function (layout, storage, square footage, etc.).

Jorge requested that they give an explanation on the process that was followed and to explain to the committee on what the next step would be. Secondly, Jorge asked if they could describe the functions that are inside of the building. Andrew explained when the project was re-started when it went through an initial phase of program validation, in which, the architects met with the representatives from the college and the District. Looking at the program and establishing what the current needs were for the building. They went through a process of validating the assignments, the program itself and the square footage. This helps in comparing with the budget to see what can be afforded. Once the process is completed they can start into the schematic design phase, which they use the document program requirements that have been established to translate into physical space. There are two main elements of the project; the new building which is what the committee is looking at in the presentation and the renovation of the existing racquetball court. Throughout the process they’ve been working with the Kinesiology/Athletics Department, representatives from the college and District along with President Breland. Recently, they’ve completed the schematic design phase of the project. It’s been reviewed by the college and the District representatives. It was approved to go to the next step, which is the design development stage. Once it’s completed they’ll review the documents with all the representatives. The next phase will be the construction documents where the design will be translated into very specific documents in preparations for the construction phase.

Jorge asked that in the design development phase, what options are there for modifications? What he would like to do is have a clear delineation of the parameters of what’s possible and what’s not possible anymore at this point in the phase. Andrew explained that at this point is the location and position of the building. The size of the building (square footage) and the major program spaces within building have been established. Moving forward now they’re starting to look at detail requirements for each of the rooms which include the quality of space, lighting and materials, finishes and what’s required based on what the usage is of that particular space. As they move
through the design development phase it becomes more detailed. In terms of changes, for the overall design of the building, it’s already established. As they move from the design development to the structure documents it becomes more detailed in terms of the type of information required to building the building. At this point the types of decisions that are being considered have to do with the finish materials (furniture, fixtures, etc.) and the quality of the interior space. Not necessarily the size and location of the spaces or building itself.

Jorge asked if the buildings are definite to be the shapes that they are currently appearing in the designs. Andrew confirmed that they are definite at this point in the phase. Jorge is asking so that it is clear to everyone on where they’re at in the design process.

Phil asked the Kinesiology staff if the building is meeting Title IX standards and programs. What is the staffs comfort level with it? Debbie explained that the department is working within the perimeters on how much money was given to the project, based on that the size of the building was designed. They would’ve loved to have more space and a swimming pool but they’re working with what they have and with what were given. They’re making the best of it. As far as Title IX, the current sports will still remain. They’re not losing any sports teams, they’re adding to their Kinesiology and Athletics overall. Lamel explained that even in regards to accessibility and Title IX if one sport gets something, the other sport will receive it too.

Randi asked what the architects are doing to enhance and to make it safer for pedestrians. Once you get pass a certain point there’ll be a combination of vehicle traffic and pedestrians that isn’t safe near the new building and areas around it. Thais explained that the service drive is supposed to be used for only service vehicles, from their understanding. What they’ll be doing as part of their project, in front of P.E. Complex to the area around the softball diamond and to the internal campus drive, they’ll be creating a more pedestrian experience closer to the building. There’ll be a sidewalk directly in front of the building for pedestrians along with landscape planters along the parkway strip. It will lead down towards the parking garage. Scott suggested based on the concerns that Randi had, that they do a pedestrian survey to study the pedestrian flow. It needs to safer for more visible for pedestrians. She also recommended not planning too many trees without looking at the Landscape Master Plan first. They are coordinating with the Landscape Architect and are using the guidelines for the Landscape Master Plan.

Joe Andrade asked why they’re saving the Crown Point Pine tree. It was explained that it was requested to keep it. Unless there’s a building being built in the location, they’re trying to work around the trees. Jorge asked if Joe saw a problem with the tree and Joe was curious as to why we would keep it since it keeps dropping limbs. Joe also asked what the total square footage was for the new P.E. Complex and the Racquetball Court. The P.E. Complex is 39,304 square feet; Racquetball Building is 5,839 square feet totaling both at 45,143 square feet.

LPAS ended their presentation with a 3-D viewing of both floors of the P.E. Complex.
VI. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Gilbane Update –

1. P.E. Complex -
   • Start construction in Fall 2015
   • Completed in Early 2017

2. Media Arts/CTE Project (renovation of 100/200 wings) -
   • Finishing up the first phase.
   • There wasn’t a good building turn over.
   • Working closely with Contractors, Architects, Staff, Instructors and Administrators.

3. Campus Site Improvement Project -
   • Some fencing done over the summer.
   • Planning the rest of the Landscape Master Plan.

4. President halted Construction of the Media Arts Center -
   • The building won’t be constructed using the current bond program funding.
   • Finishing the design, it will be shelved.
   • When the Education and Facilities Master Plans are reviewed and updated, they’ll see if the process validates the need for the building. If it does, it’ll be ready to go to the construction phase. If not, there’ll be a significant amount of money that was saved.

5. College is looking at recommended priorities for funding on campus -
   • Lots of competing priorities on the list.
   • Jorge will take the lead on this part.

6. Smaller projects (Scheduled Maintenance) -
   • Ceilings, closets, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, utility upgrades.
   • Awarded the projects to improve these smaller jobs.
   • Effort on the planning of the remaining Schedule Maintenance funding.

Meeting adjourned at 3:22 p.m.
Facilities and Safety Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
October 6, 2014
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Committee Members:

MSC (3) – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar
Faculty (3) – Isai Ulate, Donna Mendoza, Phillip Crawford,
Janet Chang
Classified (3) – Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman, Bunnie Rose
Associated Student Body (1/1) –

Upcoming Fall Semester Meetings:

October 20
November 3
November 17
December 21

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the September 15, 2014 meeting minutes

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

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

   a. Charge & Membership

   b. Electronic Sign on Bascom Avenue

V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

   a. Gilbane

“Student success is a commitment to ensuring that students are able to establish and achieve their educational goals: degree, certificate, transfer, career advancement and lifelong learning experiences. The success of our students is a shared responsibility by all members of our college community.”
Facilities and Safety Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
October 20, 2014
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Committee Members:

MSC (3) – Joe Andrade (vice-chair), Jorge Escobar (chair)
Faculty (3) – Phillip Crawford, Donna Mendoza, Isai Ulate, Janet Chang
Classified (3) – Elaine Chapman, Teresa Paiz, Bunnie Rose
Associated Student Body (1/1) – Kulwaran Sandhu

Upcoming Fall Semester Meetings:

November 3
November 17
December 21

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of the September 15, 2014 meeting minutes

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

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Charge & Membership

b. First Aid kits

c. Emergency Response Training

d. Electronic Board on Bascom Avenue

e. Football Stadium Noise Level

f. Security in Technology Building

V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Gilbane Update

“Student success is a commitment to ensuring that students are able to establish and achieve their educational goals: degree, certificate, transfer, career advancement and lifelong learning experiences. The success of our students is a shared responsibility by all members of our college community.”
Facilities & Safety Committee Meeting – Minutes for 10/20/2014

Membership Attendance

MSC – Jorge Escobar (ex-officio), Joe Andrade
Faculty – Phil Crawford, Janet Chang, Donna Mendoza, Isai Ulate
Classified – Bunnie Rose, Teresa Paiz, Elaine Chapman
Associated Student Body – Kulwaran Sandhu
Guests – Randi Kinman (SONA), Layne Kulwin (SONA), Jussi Rajna

I. Approval of Agenda
   Motion to approve agenda with additions: D. Mendoza/2nd I. Ulate

II. Approval of September 15, 2014 meeting minutes
   Motion to approve minutes with revisions: J. Chang/2nd J. Andrade

III. Public Speak – (3 minute limit per speaker)
   a. Randi thanked the college for keeping the volume control down during the last two weekend’s events and closing the gate near Mansfield.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:
   a. Charge & Membership –

      It was thought that the discussion was settled at the September 15th meeting. The committee wasn’t sure why it returned to the agenda. Janet emphasized the importance of combining the Facilities and Safety committees last spring. The combined charge went through the shared governance process and was approved by the College Planning Council in May.

      Phil came late to the meeting and brought the discussion of the faculty membership to the committee. He explained that he brought the charge to the Academic Senate and they were not in favor of having the third faculty membership being institutionalized. They would rather have faculty appointed to the committee. Jorge feels the committee can discuss it but that the charge will remain as proposed. Jorge welcomed the Academic Senate to come the meetings to continue with the discussion of the membership. It was suggested to bring the discussion back to the next meeting.

   b. First-Aid Kits –

      Janet reported that we are back on track with our first-aid kits after many years of not having them updated. Everyone now has their kits. Janet informed the committee that the HVAC and Construction department have larger kits because of the possibility of injury due to the nature of their areas. Health Services will be sending out notices every other Monday to let the departments know that they can bring in their kits to have
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them refilled. New buildings and programs will also receive notices to pick up their kits. Janet thanked Business Services for providing the funding for the kits. Jorge mentioned that the 100/200 wings will need the first-aid kits. Janet will work with Jorge on getting the kits ready for both buildings.

c. Emergency Response Training –

Health Services has a concern with the incoming of new staff that they may not be aware of whom to contact during an emergency. She wants to reiterate that Health Services cannot respond to emergency. The Police should be contacted directly since they’re the first responders. Janet would like to purpose with the support of the committee of a team that can do training on campus. She would like to pair with Scott Miller, EMT Instructor, to assist in the training. There would need to be some type of financial support and she’ll need the assistance of the committee to receive it. Jorge requested that Janet create a proposal and that he can see about having it financially come out of his office.

d. Electronic Board on Bascom Avenue –

Elaine has been approached by staff about the sign on Bascom Avenue. It’s an eye sore and doesn’t work. It was confirmed that this has been brought to the committee attention more than once. Randi explained that it’s part of the Facilities Master Plan upgrade. There’s a sign component of the plan. This hasn’t been brought to the committee in a while on where that component of the plan stands now. Once that part of plan is approved, then the campus should be able to move forward with removing the sign and replace. Jorge followed up that the FMP was approved last week by the College Advisory Council (formerly the College Planning Council). Now that the plans have been approved the campus can move forward to have it brought forth to the Board of Trustees. Jorge hasn’t seen a comprehensive plan for the replacement of the sign as of yet. Randi explained that the signage plan was approved by the Facilities Committee already. Jorge will find the plans and bring them to the next meeting. Janet asked if it was possible to take the sign down now since it’s an “eye sore” to the campus. Jorge will bring the topic up at the meeting he has with Gilbane.

e. Football Stadium Noise Level –

This topic was discussed during public comments.

f. Security in the Technology Building –

Scott Miller, EMT Instructor, has asked that the committee discuss the lack of security in the Technology Building. He currently had his office broken into and had items stolen. He had proposed if the building doors facing the corner of Bascom and Moorpark Avenue be egressed only. He feels that this will lower the amount of homeless people coming in and out of the building. Joe mentioned that he also gets complaints from his Custodial staff about the homeless that come into the building and are in the stairwells. It was questioned weather to move it forward as an action item and send it as a recommendation to CAC.
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Jorge feels it should be looked at as replicated throughout the campus to other buildings. He sees that there are other options to try than just the one option that was brought to the table. He feels this could be a task that his office, Facilities Department and Gilbane can do.

Randi doesn’t see this situation as a campus wide issue but rather an isolated issue to the one building. The building sees an exceptional amount of negative traffic coming through with negative use. She suggested piloting a program for the building and keeping a record as to how many times this building has these problems. Jorge will ask the Chief of Police to come and speak with the committee so that he can give an overview as to what is going on around campus.

Janet requested that the door issue be brought back to the committee as an action item to recommend to the CAC.

Layne Kulwin suggested placing a camera by the door. If anything else is placed there he feels anybody (public or students) can circumvent it. He feels that there should be somewhere on the website where crimes on campus are recorded so that the public can view it. He feels it’s a concern that these documents aren’t open and available to the public. Jorge will look into ways of promoting transparencies with the public on the information regarding crimes on campus and seeing if it’s possible to have some community members can be placed on the campus ENS (Emergency Notification Systems) list.

g. Landscape Taskforce –

The committee was given a proposal that was done by instructor Michael Divinia to have an advisory group that reports back to the Facilities and Safety Committee. Jorge feels if the group is here to help with the work of the committee to bring ideas and suggestions, he is happy to have it. A challenge that the committee will have by breaking into silos and taskforces is the isolation of ideas and the complexity of the buy-ins and proposals.

Randi stated that the campus is on course already with the Landscape Master Plan that’s required by law and includes the work that the proposal shows for the group. She doesn’t see the need for the committee to create more work that’s already in the plan to be done.

Janet feels that it's redundant; however, she does recognize that there are people that want to know about the process of the work. She suggested providing non-committee members a link to see what the committee is doing in the meeting.

Jorge handed the committee a Tree Assessment Map to review. Phil stated that these issues have come up repeatedly last year. Phil feels that the advisory group could be helpful if moved forward. He feels that faculty has a lot of expertise and advice. Jorge thanked everyone for their input and it was suggested that the item be forwarded as an action item to the next meeting where it can be voted.
V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Updates –

The Landscape and Security Master Plans were approved by the College Advisory Council. The committee can now start work in regards to these plans. Jorge will share with the committee at the next meeting; the SMP framework that he developed to work with the District Office. The framework can be used for future committee work.

The contract with consultant, Cambridge West, was approved by the Board of Trustees to develop the new Educational and Facilities Master Plan. A new Facilities Master Plan will be created from the EMP. A selection committee was created to review 10-12 proposals that came from multiple vendors. The District selected Cambridge West as the provider. The vendor will start setting up meetings with the campus community to gather input and encompass an assessment of eternal and external factors that are affecting education, growth and the future. The EMP will be visionary with components of safety, security and growth in different fields and disciplinary.
“Student success is a commitment to ensuring that students are able to establish and achieve their educational goals: degree, certificate, transfer, career advancement and lifelong learning experiences. The success of our students is a shared responsibility by all members of our college community.”
I. Approval of Agenda
   Motion to approve agenda with additions: D. Mendoza/2nd T. Paiz

II. Approval of November 3, 2014 meeting minutes
   Motion to approve minutes: B. Rose/2nd E. Chapman

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

   Michael LaRocca mentioned that members of the SONA board would like the campus to consider having cameras are placed on campus that some be pointed out towards the neighborhood.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

   a. SJCC Safety Concerns and Issues –

   The committee discussed the recent emails and suggestions from the campus community regarding safety and the lack of police presents on the campus. Some of the campus community feels there’s a lack of notification of crimes on campus. Campus Police is short staffed but it was confirmed that there is currently a screening committee for the Chief of Police and two openings for police officer positions.

   Janet suggested working with programs on campus (Administration of Justice, EMT, etc.); she feels that the committee needs to explore possibilities using the resources that we currently have on campus.

   Joe asked Kulwaran what the student’s perspective on campus was about safety. Kulwaran mentioned that the students are aware of the property thief and assaults that have taken place on campus.

   Jussi suggested that the committee should have one uniform officer on the committee. It was explained that due to short staff at Campus Police it’s not possible to have an officer on the committee.

   Some of the committee members discussed their own experiences leaving campus during the evening.
Janet proposed that the committee follow up with the concerned faculty who’s already spoken with President Breland. She suggested extending an invitation to the faculty member and President Breland and gathers suggestions and possibly creates a sub-committee. Once this is completed she’d like to see it brought to the new Chief of Police. Bunnie mentioned that any plan created would have to be district-wide. She thought it would be a good idea to have both Presidents meets with the new Chief of Police. Joe believes that creating of a sub-committee should be done by the College Advisory Committee who can then recommend it to the President.

The committee will continue discussion at the next meeting.

b. Membership (Faculty) –

This item has been on the agenda numerous times. Phil Crawford has been absent for the past couple of meetings attending the State Board of Governs on behalf of ASCCC and the sub-committee on Accreditation for ASCCC. The committee has decided to stop discussion on this agenda for now.

c. Associated Student Government Custodial Resolution –

Kulwaran handed out a resolution from the ASG regarding the hiring of two additional Custodial staff members. He read the resolution to the committee. The committee suggested that Kulwaran take the resolution back to the ASG and have the wording changed to reflect that they are aware of the hiring of two new Custodial Staff members from the reorganization and are requesting two additional staff members. Kulwaran will bring the resolution back once the wording has been revised.

V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Gilbane Update –

Andrew Spiller came to the committee to give an update on construction on campus.

- 100/200 wing (VoTech) – Completing some punch list items. The contractor is currently addressing a series of items that were not originally in the scope of work. Work should be completed by the end of the year.
- Technology Building/Student Center – Interior finish upgrades have started (flooring materials, carpet tiles, VCT, small amount of ceiling tiles). Completion should be Dec. 15th in Technology Building. Work starts in the Student Center December 5th and goes through January. The work will be done in the evening so that there aren’t any conflicts during the day.
- Physical Security – Notification boxes are up and are operational. The installations of cameras have been completed. They’re not operational due to a need for a dedicated server to back up all the information that is captured. There isn’t a timeline as of yet as to when they’ll be operational. Prop 30, which is a replacement of the exterior light fixtures around campus and converting them to LED. This project has been completed. Gilbane is double checking on the programming to make sure it’s finely tuned.
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- P.E. Complex – Completed the design development phase. There are three main components to the design phase (schematic design phase, design development and construction documents). These phases are prior to the bidding and starting construction. They’ve just completed the second phase with the construction document being completed by the end of the year.

Meeting adjourned