Facilities, Safety & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
February 5, 2018
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members:</th>
<th>Upcoming Spring Semester Meetings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (chair), Young</td>
<td>March 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio),</td>
<td>March 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Paiz (vice-chair)</td>
<td>April 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – Phillip Crawford, Janet Chang, Iyun Lazik</td>
<td>April 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified – Maria Avalos, Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco</td>
<td>May 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body – Joseph Heady, Maria Oriojas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of December 4, 2017 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

A) FACILITIES MASTER PLAN MEASURE X AND CLOSING OF G2010

- FMP review plan dates to meet the consultant

- Measure G2010 projects to complete & remaining funds

- Campus expansion update

- Child Development Center update

- CTE building design and timeline

- Update on PM/CM/Architects & need for FaST representatives

  Jorge
  Owen/Doug (if available)
  Jorge/Byron
  Jorge
  Owen/Jorge
  Owen

B) CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

- PE building issues: update from Athletics, update on progress

- Parking machines, Regulations & add’l parking machines

- Access control and Physical Security Phase II update

  Owen and Gilbane
  Chief of Police
  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."
C) SPACE UTILIZATION AND SPACE ASSIGNMENT

WFI move out timeframe – review of location layout: Owen/Doug (if available)

Candidates for moving in into WFI area: Jorge

CIMS lab update Owen/Doug (if available)

B107 remodel update

Art Gallery – Facilitron Linda

D) OTHER

Technology plan review of text and project list Young

Committee Charge Jorge

V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Gilbane Updates

"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."
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Committee Members:
MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (chair), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz (vice-chair)

Faculty – Phillip Crawford, Janet Chang, Iyun Lazik

Classified – Maria Avalos, Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco

Associated Student Body – Maria Riojas

Guests – Michael Amnino (District Police), Lucas Cantin, Ana Rosa Camacho, Ed Fregoso (Gilbane), Sandra Gonzalez, Dale Harris, Kim Hoopin garner, Owen Letcher, Dennis Meakin, Vanet Murawksy, JoAnn McGowan, Jodi Marvet, Edina Rutland, Doug Smith

I. Approval of Agenda: J. Chang/M. Avalos

II. Approval of December 4, 2017 minutes: M. Avalos/M. Riojas

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

Sandra Gonzalez, with Academic Support, expressed her concern with the access control program that was installed in the Business Building. The auto locks are problematic for the departments in the building. Office doors are left unlock when staff need to leave. Her office in particular has confidential paperwork and the staff is unable to lock their office door. The door automatically locks/unlocks on its own. She also mentioned that the access codes given to staff for the building alarms aren’t functioning. An incident had happen today where the alarm were going off and District Police were also unable to shut the alarm off with their access codes too. Sandra also mentioned that the new parking permits that were assigned by District Police do not work for her when she’s onboarding adjunct faculty, which she meets with periodically. She’s being told to direct them to MyWeb to order their parking permits, but these employees are being on boarded at the time of meeting her, so their employee identification numbers are not yet set up in the system. An employee identification number is required to set up your MyWeb account. She explained that adjunct faculty are allowed free parking per their contract. They shouldn’t have to worry about being ticketed when they’re coming to fill out their human resource paperwork.

JoAnn McGowan also shared the same concerns regarding the access control issue in their office. She mentioned that their personal items are also not secured.

Edina expressed her concern with limited amount of space for the Student Accessibility Services (SAS) office. Student Accessibility Services and Adapted Physical Education are located in two different building across campus from each other. The lack of space makes it difficult for their students and staff. The SAS office is starting to become inaccessible for people in wheelchairs. The lobby area is too small. Their office needs a better accessibility design. She’s asking for assistance in her area.

Maria Avalos also expressed her concern with the Business Building access control. She also mentioned that her office has items of confidentiality that are being compromised when people
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come into the office and leave documents on her desk in her absence. She mentioned the issue with her alarm code and District Police alarm codes, which were not working when the alarm went off this morning.

Lucas Cantin, Chemistry Instructor, expressed his and his Dean’s concern with a need for a Physical Science/Math/Engineering Center on campus. He mentioned that they had some room in the METAS area, which is small. He thinks if some of the programs had their square footage moved around or if programs can be condensed it may help in getting the additional square footage needed. He stated other community colleges in the bay area have these type of centers on their campuses and they’ve become hubs at their colleges.

Chief Morales introduced the Emergency Preparedness Coordinator Dale Harris. He’ll be helping the college out with evacuation maps and emergency drills. Chief Morales also introduced Officer Michael Annino, who’ll be joining the committee meetings as a visitor for the department.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

A) FACILITIES MASTER PLAN MEASURE X AND CLOSING OF G2010

FMP review plan dates to meet the consultant

The committee discussed the beginning of the work on reviewing the Facilities Master Plan (FMP). When the FMP was approved in 2015, there were some concerns that some areas (swimming pool, Child Development Center and additional space) weren’t included in the plan and the need to be have these items reconsidered for second review. At the time when the plan was approved there wasn’t any funding tied to it? With the approval of Measure X, the implementation of the plan is now a reality. There’s been a change in the prioritization of the projects with the CTE Building being the first to be built. This has cleared some of the other projects that were dependencies to the CTE project; demo of the 300 building and the construction of the Maintenance & Operations (M&O) building. There’s a lot of work that’ll facilitate the construction of these projects. The District has engaged the consultant that helped formulate the FMP in 2015. The plan is to have the consultant come back and reopen the FMP to answer questions, validate and obtain additional input. Jorge is proposing March 5th FaST meeting as the date to invite the consultant.

Measure G2010 projects to complete & remaining funds

Measure G2010 needs to be completed and closed by June 2019. In order to acquire the remaining money in the bond, the college needs to have a list of projects prepared. The college has met with Doug Smith, Owen Letcher and Ann Kennedy along with the college counter parts at Evergreen Valley College. Discussion on what projects can be completed in the next 18-19 months have begun. Some of the projects on the list are

- Construction of the Maintenance & Operations Building
- Demolition of college buildings
  - A Gym (lockers, restrooms, pool area)
  - 300 Building
  - K Building
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All the demolitions will be packaged together and will be done all at once. There’ll be an imposition on the campus with lots of safety concerns involving trucks coming in and off campus. In trying to do this all at once, it should minimize the day to day operations of the college.

Completion of Phase II (Wayfinding Signage) still needs to be completed. For the most part the signs that have already been installed have brought value to the college and students. Phase II includes monumental signage, which will help to promote the college by projecting the signage out to the street. Arches will be installed and placed at the main entrances this summer. Jorge has requested that a full structure survey be completed, so the college will know what’s located underground (utilities, electricity, sewer, water, etc.). Once the survey is complete the college will have documentation digitalized and used for multiple purposes. The cost is estimated at $250,000. The college has done a good job at documenting underground since 2004, but there are still buildings (i.e. 100,200,300 buildings) that still need to be documented.

Measure G2010 will be used to start the design of the Career Technology Education Building. This will consist of having an architect and going through the process of programming the design.

There are a lot of furniture, equipment and fixture purchases that still need to be done. This includes the renovation of classrooms and office spaces. There are a lot of requests for ergonomic adjustments to desks and chairs.

The college would also like to bring in modular buildings for the Child Development Centers (CDC).

It’s estimated that these projects could cost about $25-$30M that’s available to proceed. In order to do this, the infrastructure needs to be in place. The college needs project and construction management companies in place. The college has hired an initial project manager to work on these projects.

Phil asked who wants these plans (college, committee, etc.), were these plans in the MG 2010 plan and is this “left over” money that wasn’t used. Phil asked if the money is to be used based on the college’s needs and explained that there are some things that need to done. He mentioned that the 200 Building doesn’t have the right voltage for the welding machines. The machines have a 200 voltage and it needs to be 480 voltage. He’s asking who makes these recommendations. Jorge explained that most of these projects have already been on the list. The M&O Building was a MG 2010 project. The demolition of the A-Gym was part of the PE project plan. The wayfinding was cleared under phase I & II. The CTE design, utility survey and the Child Development Center modular are all new projects that Jorge has suggested. This doesn’t take away from immediate needs in certain areas of the college. Phil asked about the plans for the Child Development Center and if there’s going to be plans for them to be in an actual building. Jorge explained that the initial discussions were to have a Phase I for them to move into modular buildings in the K Building are with the idea that in the revision of the FMP there’ll be a permanent location for the Child Development Center. It’ll be a state of the art building including a lab, which is the ultimate goal. Janet wants to make sure this process includes the committee members. She also recommends that the department end users be a part of the layout and design. In the case of the CDC project, it should have a point of contact from the department and always include them for feedback and participation. Janet asked if there were any projects in Measure G2010 that haven’t been completed. Jorge explained that the Physical Security Phase II project, which is the implementation of the cameras, access points and upgrading of the emergency points on campus is still pending.

Doug explained that they are trying to plan an issuance around May. They’re trying to size according to how much they can complete in the three year timeline.
Campus expansion update

Jorge reiterated that there was a suggestion when the committee was considering putting portables on campus that we look out to the spaces on Bascom Avenue. Owen has started conversations and investigated who owns/leases the land and what are the limitations. Owen explained that the Technology Building (600 S. Bascom Avenue) was a project were land was leased from a family trust to Barry Swenson Associates. The District entered into an agreement with Barry Swenson Associates to build the building for the District. Once the building was built, the District paid off the lease with Barry Swenson Associates for the building itself, but the District still had the land lease with the family trust.

The adjacent single story property (650 S. Bascom Avenue) from the Technology Building is also land that’s from the same family trust. Barry Swenson Associates holds the lease on that building on the property, and has a lease with County Health Department for that building. The lease with Barry Swenson Associates is up in about two years and nine months. Barry Swenson Associates lease continues on. The College and District Administration have approached Barry Swenson Associates to see if there’s any opportunity there. Jorge will meet with representatives from Barry Swenson Associates to continue the discussion regarding options and possibilities. Meanwhile, the building heading south on Bascom Avenue (three story building) is owned by a different family. They currently are not interested because they have a long term lease with Valley Health. The building next to it is owned by a separate investment trust. This property fronts the SJCC driveway between Wendy’s Restaurant and the medical clinic. They may be interested in an agreement similar to what the District has done previously. This process is at first contact/discussion with the investment trust. From Wendy’s Restaurant and south of there, those are not currently available. The 650 S. Bascom Avenue property, which is adjacent to the Technology Building, has a traffic signal that aligns with Valley Medical. This could allow the college an opportunity to make a left hand turn from campus. This is currently the only area that the college can discuss an expansion of the campus footprint. There are some issues that could come with pursuing the expansion. Chancellor Budd has been in contact with West Valley/Mission Community College District Chancellor. They’ve in principal agreed to make a shift of our district boundary line. This decision would still have to go through ours and WVMCCD Board of Trustees for approval. This is in process and the District is working on it. Owen believes that the 650 S. Bascom Avenue property and the property adjacent to the SJCC driveway are real opportunities. It could possible add 1 ½ - 2 acres.

Jorge clarified that the college is going through its preliminary due diligence. When there’s an option on the table, it’ll be brought to the campus especially the FaST Committee and Academic Senate. It’ll need to be tied to an education program and the college will need to take that into consideration as the college reviews the FMP.

Child Development Center update

Jorge believes this will be a multi-phase project. He feels this project is going to be dependent on academics along with a strong academic footprint. It will require some thinking and putting together of some type of business plan. The plan needs to entail how the center will work and its financial sustainability. Also, how will the college program the classes and make the center suitable for students.
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Janet feels the CDC is about enrichment, having student’s children in a safe place and also an educational component for labs for Early Childhood Education (ECE) students. She feels that the ECE instructors will need support on how to do a business plan. They know what their needs are, but may have a problem articulating it into a business plan. The college needs to provide consultation and expertise to the ECE department so they can write out the plan.

Jorge explained that there’s a difference between having a child care center versus the child development center. An on campus child care isn’t fundable to the bond language. It has to be a child development center with a lab that’s integrated with instruction. It also needs to serve the students to proceed in their academic pathways. This will be a process that needs to be worked on with faculty, the business portion of it and the facility itself. This will be done using the subsidized contract with the state to assist in finding an operator that can do it. Phase II will be looked at as the committee starts to review the FMP.

Update on PM/CM/Architects & need for FaST representatives

Owen gave an update on the pool for the Project & Construction Management and Architects along with the need for participation on these committees. The committee members did a paper screening process and interviews in December. The work for the Program Management component is complete and a recommendation will go to the board on February 13th, for the hiring of a firm. The Construction Management (second portion) Committee is meeting, for SJCC, on February 15th. The first meeting will be to complete the paper scoring, identify and narrow down any questions that they want to ask. The goal is to have a recommendation to the board by the March 13th meeting. A request was sent out to the FaST Committee, Academic Senate and other committees, for assignment to the Architect Selection Committee. They’re publishing a Request for Qualifications and Proposals for Architects. This was done previously, but it was cancelled. The process has been started over again. The committee members will read and paper screen the Statement of Qualifications and then interview or ask questions. A list of prescreened architects, service providers and engineers will be created to use for interviews and selecting for projects.

Jorge asked for clarification on the committee’s deliberations about what was the best service model for SJCC. It was concluded that having one company that serves all roles (program management, construction management, fiscal, communications, etc.) has created problems over the past 5-6 years with no accountability. The committee decided this was one issue that neither colleges could afford to have by having the same company for both Program Management and Construction Management. The new program management company is Brailsford & Dunlavey (B&D), which will be onboard as soon as possible. Jorge feels that the transition from the old company to the new company is the biggest risk to the college. Secondly, there are three construction management companies that have been passed the committee’s paper screening. One of the three companies is Gilbane. Jorge will make sure as a representative of the committee that the committee is unbiased, knows what is best for the campus and that the best construction management company is picked for the college. The committee will be asking for proposals again to have the most suitable construction management company for the colleges. Jorge states this is an individual college decision, as before it was a district-wide decision. He explained that it was discussed that the colleges need to have that freedom to make the decision. Moving forward the construction management company will be one that the college selects. Based on his conversations that he’s had with different people, a construction management company will be chosen per project. For example, when they start on the CTE Building, they’ll do a Request for Proposal for a construction
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management company and an architect just for that particular project. This may require more work and progress, but he feels that the final outcome will be much stronger.

Iyun asked Owen how Ann Kennedy & Associates were involved. Owen explained that they are the District’s Finance and Communication group. They work with the Citizen’s Bond Oversight Committee (CBOC) and assist in the preparation of the documents with that committee. On the back end, they work with the district accounting staff regarding project (budget) tracking. This is based on a one year contract. Iyun agreed that it makes sense to her to hire different companies for different projects because one company might have expertise in one particular building construction, but not be versatile in others. The college would certainly want the best in each field.

Joe asked if B&D was selected by the District Office. Owen explained that the committee, which consisted of 5 representatives from SJCC, 5 representatives from EVC and 5 representatives from District Services, all selected the firm to be recommended to move forward to the board. He explained that it was broken down into individual and overall selection, which all came up with the same recommendation. Jorge also explained that although everyone selected the same recommendation, B&D will still report directly to SJCC. Joe asked where B&D will be housed. Owen explained that they would likely be in the K Building until a modular facility could be brought in for them. This will be the responsibility of the District Office to provide.

Jorge asked for the three options for construction management companies. Owen mentioned it was Gilbane, Cumming Corporation and Jenkins, Gales & Martinez. It was asked where the meeting for the selection of the project and construction management companies would be. Owen explained that the meeting on March 15th will be a combine meeting with District Services and SJCC committee members. It’ll be held on the first floor of the District Office. EVC committee members requested to do their meeting independently. After this is completed, there’s a recommendation to set a date for the committee members to have a formal/informal interview with the firm.

The SJCC representatives on the committee consisted of an SJCC student, Vice President of Administrative Services, President Breland (Dr. Norma Galviz represented the President), Janet Chang (FaST Committee Rep.), Jesus Covarrubias (Academic Senate). Phil Crawford will be added to the committee. The same representation will be needed for the Architect Selection Committee. The FaST committee will need to come up with two names for the committee.

The board approved the hiring of two people under Owen and they’ll be located at each campus. Susan Rittel was recently hired and for now will be sharing her time between SJCC and EVC. Her office will be located at the District Office. The hope will be to hire a second employee. Both positions will report directly to Owen. Ms. Rittel will be attending the remaining FaST meetings.

B) CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

PE building issues: update from Athletics, update on progress

Although the PE Building looks significantly completed, it’s missing a few items which are problematic. The Kinesiology Department and Jorge have decided that the facility won’t be used until it’s properly finish. They’re committed to making sure that they hold people accountable to deliver a quality building that the college has invested in. The floor has patches of different colors in the lobby, which doesn’t look complete. The concrete walls have different shades of the same color. The gym floor was nicely done, but the wood is
splitting. The installer and manufacture both feel the floor is acceptable. A floor forensic company will be brought in to give a third assessment. Also, the furniture in the offices are too big for the rooms. It’s impossible to have students meet with staff in the offices as they wouldn’t be able to sit down without hitting the desk. Jorge has suggested that the committee take time to look at these issues themselves. The college is trying to modify these things before the department moves into the building. This is going to be an additional expenditure to the college. There’ll need to be discussion to see who’s accountable for these issues.

Janet feels that the contractor needs to be accountable for their mistakes. The work wasn’t done to professional standards. If there’s that many visible issues, it’s not acceptable. The longer that it takes for the department to move into the building, the more it should be on the contractor’s dime.

Phil feels that there needs to be an independent, non-involved, expert to examine the work and show the college what’s not accurate. He doesn’t necessarily agree with not moving into the building. The college will need to show damages, which means it needs to be damaged to the point of not being able to use the building. If the building is habitable, the department should be able to move in. However, the college needs to document everything before moving into the building. Phil doesn’t believe that the contractor would want to go through litigation, because that type of litigation is the worst to go through. They may just turn it over to their insurance company to settle.

Iyun had heard that there was also a leak in the building. She is worried about moving in and then the District goes to litigation with the company. The end users may not get notification or communication as to the results of the litigation. This is similar to an issue that happened in the Science Complex. The end users were never made aware of what resulted from the litigation of that issue.

Parking machines, Regulations & add’l parking machines

Chief Morales addressed a couple of issues that were brought to the committee in the fall. On Moorpark Avenue, there are arrows that are pointing into the “C” lot. The lot now has “DO NOT ENTER” signs that were installed last summer. This causes confusion to drivers. The Chief has received confirmation from county to change the markings.

The other issues from the fall were automobiles that were at the Leland/Moorpark intersections and were illegally going through the intersection across the pedestrian walkway. Joe Andrade has placed barriers in the crosswalk to prevent this from continuing. The county said that this is the college’s property and that barriers can remain there.

The Chief mentioned that he has been working with the county for the last year to place parking restrictions on Moorpark to get rid of the motorhomes and big rigs that park on the street for long periods of time. Some of the people living in the motorhomes were also affiliated to the adjacent homeless camp nearby. Lt. Dziuba sits on a committee for the city homeless and had brought the issue to the committee. As a result he was able to have the encampment cleared. The vegetation was cleaned up and the fencing was fixed. The county is also going to change the parking regulations in their jurisdiction, which is from the east end of the Student Services building and across Moorpark and west to Bascom Avenue. The area has now changed to two-hour parking and no overnight parking.

Chief Morales informed the committee that there are now 16 fully operational parking permit machines on campus. There are four methods to pay (coins, dollar bills, credit cards and pay by app). The first three payment methods will produce a permit from the machine automatically. The “pay by
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app” method will not produce a permit. Enforcement officers will have the ability to look up the license plate to see if a permit was paid by app.

Chief Morales explained to the committee that his office has received multiple complaints regarding the staff parking lots being full. It was found that ITSS had opened up a gateway to allow student workers to obtain staff permits. As the Chief looked into this situation he discovered that there were about 170 permits issued to student workers. This gateway has since been closed. Chief Morales will work on getting back and retroactively get the permits back. He feels that this should help in freeing up the staff lots.

Chief Morales addressed the situation with having department visitors and students in non-credit classes on where they should be parking. Since the staff lots are limited in space, he’s asking that visitors park in the student lots after they receive their permits. Permits numbers will be assigned to the Vice President’s offices and should be requested through them. The VP’s offices will keep a log of the permits that are giving out. All permits from other colleges will be honored and will be able to park in the staff lots. District Police will work with the non-credit classes to assist their students. This is a work in progress, but he feels by the end of the semester his office should have a better understanding of the flow.

C) SPACE UTILIZATION AND SPACE ASSIGNMENT

WFI move out timeframe – review of location layout:

Owen gave the timeline for the move of the Workforce Institute to the District Office. It should be twelve weeks after the PO is completed. They’ll be moving into the 5th floor of the District Office. The network cabling is being installed this week. The painting of the offices will start next week followed by the flooring. WFI hasn’t ordered their furniture or computers yet. Furniture and partitions will remain in the old WFI offices. May is the project month that they’ll move into their offices.

Candidates for moving in into WFI area:

Phil suggested relocating the AFT/Academic Senate office out of the Student Center into the WFI offices to make more room for Student Services. In the case of space utilization, it may be a good idea to move AFT/Academic Senate to the WFI area. Both AFT/Academic Senate would probably not have an issue moving over there.

Jorge mentioned that there’s been a lot of interest in the first floor of the Technology Building. The college is looking at whomever moves in will need to be able to utilize the whole area properly. Jorge is requesting for ideas from the committee member, so the college can start planning.

CIMS lab update

An update was given on the CIMS lab that was located on the first floor of the Technology Building. Owen understood that the equipment related to the CIMS lab has been relocated to EVC’s Nursing Building.
Phil mentioned that a presentation at the Board of Trustee meeting was done to leave it for the Biology Department. He was under the impression that EVC wasn’t interested in the equipment because it wasn’t suitable for their purposes. Owen explained that EVC’s Nursing Program came to the office and tagged and moved all the items that they needed over to EVC. Jorge will seek confirmation from President Breland.

B107 remodel update

Jorge provided an update to the committee on the remodel of B107 in the Business Building. Seven workstations were installed. It took three weeks for the room to be fully reconfigured.

Art Gallery – Facilitron

Linda explained that there’s been a lot of issues with the Art Gallery. Eve Mathias and Jason Adkins use the room to display their art or art related items. It’s currently in Facilitron, the on campus facility rental program that’s used internally and externally. There’s been conflicts with internal events. It’s been asked who’s overseeing the facility. Jorge will deal with it with Byron offline.

Meeting adjourned
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### I. Approval of Agenda

### II. Approval of February 5, 2018 minutes

### III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

### IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. FMP review plan with consultants (45 min.)

   - Jorge

b. Find a solution to cars speeding between the 100 and 200 wing?  
   Safety concern for SAS students attending class. Options can include:
   a. Signage?  
   b. Repaint crosswalk?  
   c. Install speed bumps?  
   d. Close off entrance at the west end and force people to exit south of the 100 building.

   - Chief Morales

c. Follow up on cell phone connectivity issues with Sprint and Verizon through several areas of the campus. Safety concern for messaging of emergency notifications.

   - Chief Morales

d. Fencing near Building K (Mansfield Dr.)

   - Joe

e. P.E. & Athletics Promises/Needs Omissions

   - Phil

f. Committee Charge

### V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Other updates

---

"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 with additions

II. Approval of February 5, 2018 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

   N/A

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

   a. FMP review plan with consultants (45 min.)

   The committee was reminded that C.M. Brahmbhatt and a group of architects assisted
   the college in 2015 to shape the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) following a complete
   Education Master Plan (EMP) review. When the FMP was created, the college didn’t
   have funding. The FMP that we have serves as the foundation to quantify the bond,
   which led in to the approval of Measure X.

   C.M. explained that the firm started with the college and the District Office in November
   2014. They worked on the EMP first and once they were half way done, they started
   work on the FMP. The charge provided to the consultants was to make sure where the
   colleges were in terms of their EMP and what the needs for the college were to move
   forward in the next 10-15 years. For the EMP, it was about looking at the data and
   demographics for all surrounding community and academic achievements. They
   needed to know who these people were and what they’re gaining or not gaining from
   the college. The consultants were surprised to see that the population in the
   surrounding neighborhood had shown the least amount of people attending the college
   compared to other colleges. The EMP was provided as a document to look into the
   future within the 5 year frame of the next 15 years to see where the college’s programs
   were going. Based on these programs, the consultants also quantified the terms of
   what the college’s needs are for labs, classroom and offices.
The committee reviewed a handout of the Educational Master Plan — Facilities Master Plan Linkages. In the handout it showed different divisions and their needs at the time that the EMP was being created. C.M. pointed out that the two growing programs on campus are the Cosmetology and Dental Assisting programs. They’ll need more room in the future, because they’re drawing more students and are providing the skills for the jobs in the community. Humanities and Social Science also require four additional classrooms, because what they currently have isn’t enough at this juncture. Language Arts needs an additional 5 classrooms on top of what they currently have for their division. Math and Science need four additional classrooms with two additional science labs. C.M. explained that whatever the needs are for the academic plan should be driven by the FMP.

The FMP looks at 3 components: 1) Looking at what the college has now 2) What buildings are scheduled to be built in the next 2-3 years and 3) What are the needs for the future. Once they’re able to look at these components, they can try to figure out what recommendations to give to the college. They also look at facilities conditioning and as an example looking at the 100/200/300 wings that are past their useful life. At the time, the college didn’t have the funding and there wasn’t much done about it. The college could barely put enough funding in the plan for repairs and painting to get by for those buildings.

The committee reviewed the recommendations of new buildings, existing buildings and buildings to be demolished, on the FMP. One of the new buildings that’s already started from the FMP is the Maintenance and Operations (M&O) building, which is in the design phase and needs to go to the Division of State Architects. San Jose City College is landlocked, which means that the college can’t expand beyond its 61 acres unless the college can lease surrounding commercial property. The FMP will help identify what are the needs for the college in the next 15 years.

Phil mentioned that he read the minutes from 2016 when the FMP was approved and he said it was rushed through in order to get ready for the bond election. The academic community didn’t have input. He also stated that Reprographics shows to be part of the M&O Building. Reprographics is a District Services program, which should be paid from their bond funding, not SJCC. He asked if the District Office’s bond funding would be covering the cost of the portion that’ll be housed by that department. Owen explained that to his knowledge Reprographics serves SJCC only and that it’s scheduled to only be paid from SJCC’s bond funding. Phil feels that Reprographics is a million dollar program to run and with some instructors going green we should be focusing on phasing out the paper portion of the program. The college should consider going to electronic copies and not using paper. C.M. responded to Phil’s comment about the FMP being rushed by explaining that there were multiple meetings and a forum on campus at that time. He also mentioned that they did present to Academic Senate. The consultants would’ve never rushed a plan because their goal is to have the best interest of the students. Janet assured C.M. that this committee and the college community is ready to be heard and have their say in the upcoming projects.
The committee discussed the program of work on the FMP which included:

- New Buildings
  - Maintenance & Operations/Reprographics
  - Career Technical Education Building (CTE)
  - General Education/Business/Administration
  - Theater Arts – Drama Wing and Lobby
  - Parking Structure
  - Post 2030: 5 Potential building sites on the existing campus

Temporary space wasn’t mentioned on the FMP because the college doesn’t have the space for modulars. The consultants want to make sure that when moving from one building to another that there is the least amount of distraction to the student. If students are distracted by campus change they’ll go somewhere else and we’ll lose the student to another college.

The committee was shown a possibility of five new buildings that could be erected by 2030. The campus can’t build anymore 1-2 story buildings. The campus will need to build 3-5 story buildings. The consultants are recommending for the CTE building to be a 3-4 story building. This is the only way that the college can bring more parking on campus. The committee reviewed the south parking structure that’s on the plan. This will relieve a lot of parking for students that park on the street.

The committee next reviewed the Program of Work Cost. As of January 2016, the consultants provided the program costs based on the college’s growth square footage or assignable square footage. It was pointed out that the City of San Jose is the most expensive neighborhood to build a building in. The costs are calculated based on the Chancellor’s Office cost factors. They provide 17% premium on top of this because you can’t find good contractors to come and build. There’s so much work available in San Jose that some private companies spend 15-20% premium in order for them to hold a contract. Jorge followed up that the estimation is around 30% for the college to build. His concern is if there’s any delays in construction that the price escalation consumes the capital. If the college builds to early when the prices are too high or if steel is at a premium, then the college will pay a premium immediately. This has been a concern in the sense that in the allocation of the funding regarding Evergreen Valley College (our sister college) they’ve been able to continue developments over the past 10 years. Why hasn’t SJCC been able to do this? Jorge mentioned that constructing up is also expensive. These factors need to be taken into consideration when the committee discusses total allocation and needs.

C.M. asked the committee now that the college has Measure X, why isn’t the college looking into starting a major project already. There’s some worry that the college isn’t moving forward and starting work on their first project. He explained that the CTE and M&O buildings should’ve already been started and since they haven’t a year has been lost. He explained that every year the college isn’t constructing a building they’re
leaving $10M on the table. The sooner you start it and do better planning, the better off the college would be.

The committee reviewed the development schedule/phasing plan. C.M. explained that Maintenance needs to move out of the 300 wing in order to have the CTE building done. They are currently in the footprint of the construction site. The CTE could cost around $70M, which means that you would have to concentrate on this building only and not do other small projects until it’s complete. You want to make sure that the funding is there for a building of this size. Any delay on that building would affect everyone else. It will cause a domino effect.

Jorge explained that with the past behind them, they can move forward and start working with a new construction company. The campus will be on a pathway to complete the projects on time. The M&O building is in the design phase and the work is being done behind the scenes. The prints have been changed from a one level to a two level to make use of the footprint. The committee has also spoke about making the CTE building a priority. That building was aimed to start in 2022. It was moved up because there’ll be a footprint to build. This is a big building and will consume at least $100M of the bond. The college needs to make sure that it’s completed on time. Based on the conversations with President Breland, they’d like to have the project completed by 2021 so it can open for the college’s centennial anniversary. If we started now with the programming, design and going through approvals with the DSA along with construction, it would take 4 years.

Duane asked what the plan would be for the Main Gym. Jorge explained that when the FMP plans were being constructed, the college looked at using the Main Gym as a Student Union. What the current construction management company has told Jorge is that the utilities, underground services, air conditioning and heating will be too expensive to put into the building. For now, the plan is to maintain it until the college can make a determination on what to do with the building.

C.M. brought up the south parking structure, which is the last project to be completed on the list. The reason for it being at the bottom of the list was to see how the traffic would appear after the other projects are completed. Hyun thought the parking structure pricing was a little high for a structure that doesn’t have a lot of construction. C.M. explained that in California, parking structures can cost anywhere from $22,000-$25,000 per stall. Multiparking is expensive. Jorge mentioned that the college has had discussions with the City of San Jose regarding having a multi-use public parking facility that can be shared. The college is exploring new ways of stretching our dollars.

Tait asked for clarification that the FMP is still considered a “living document”. Jorge confirmed and explained that this is why the committee is revisiting the discussion of the FMP, not to re-do the plan, but to collect some input that may have been left out the first time. He wants to compile the information and get a process in place to invite the community for feedback. Should there be another open forum? Should there be separate sessions for faculty? Jorge asked the committee for suggestions so it can be compiled and see what the next step would be. C.M. agreed that the FMP is a “living
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document” because a lot of things can be changed. They usually recommend to their clients that they revisit the FMP every 5-6 years, because the student population, demographics and academic programs can change. The college should leave enough room open to change your program from time to time depending on where our academic programs are going. Jorge gave caution to the committee that the District has allocated to both colleges $319M. Whatever changes are made have to be within that amount.

Phil touched on a comment C.M. made regarding not being able to start on the CTE building without the Maintenance staff moving out of the 300 wing. The design phase could’ve started already. He asked why it hadn’t been done yet. Jorge explained that he’s asked for $3M of the Measure G 2010 funding to get the design phase started.

Jorge thanked C.M. for his presentation. He asked the public and committee to keep the comments coming and they’ll be collected and discussed. He reiterated on the items that were discussed.

- Swimming pool
- Baseball field
- Child Development Center
- Parking
- Student Union
- Tennis/Racquetball courts

The committee needs to determine what programs are they following, how they tie into the EMP and then how to make the best decision.

b. Find a solution to cars speeding between the 100 and 200 wing.
Safety concern for SAS students attending class.

Chief Morales explained that he was approached by Tait Rafat, APE instructor, regarding his students safety when they’re dropped off at his class between the 100/200 wing. Drivers aren’t paying attention to pedestrians and are speeding between the buildings. Tait explained that there’s a couple of crosswalks, one of which was retrofitted and doesn’t have a speed bump nearby. Drivers are speeding out of the parking lot, which is causing a safety issue. Tait has students who are visually impaired or in a wheelchair and are unable to move quick enough to get out of the way. Oversize vehicles are also using the road and are too big to see the students crossing. His suggestion is to place temporary speed bumps and vertical signage that informs drivers that they need to yield to pedestrians. He believes it would reduce the speed of the vehicles to 2-5 mph.

Edina reiterated the concern for SAS (Student Accessibility Services) students, which she’s brought up in the past. She also feels that students who are on bikes and skateboards pose a safety concern. She mentioned that there’s no signage prohibiting the use of bikes and skateboards on campus. She feels that it’s important that the college does something regarding this safety concern.
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Jorge believes that awareness and education needs to be done with the students. Jorge asked if a study should be done to understand the flow on campus or if the college should just pursue the idea of temporary speed bumps.

Chief Morales didn’t think a study would be worthwhile. He explained that there shouldn’t be any cars on campus other than the maintenance vehicles or District Police. He feels that the area in question is isolated and should be easy to address. He also suggested that drastic measure could be taken by closing off the exit that’s on the west side of the 100/200 wing. This way when drivers are exiting lot “J” would have to make a left turn, which would keep them from going through that area and clashing with other students.

Phil mentioned there was an apprenticeship program grant ($500k) that might work for the CSO Program. If the college looked into doing this grant, there would be a lot more interested in the CSO program. With more CSOs on campus, this could help in bringing down the issues in that area. Phil does agree with Chief Morales that in the interim, a speed bump would beneficial. He also mentioned crosswalks that light up when pedestrians walk through them. He thinks that this would be good for the college to invest in for the safety of students and SAS students.

Janet feels that the college has an opportunity to educate our student population on our students with disabilities.

Joe suggested having a patrol vehicle present during peak times to see if it makes a difference in slowing down fast drivers. Possibly giving out tickets to those who are not abiding by the speed limit. Joe was also curious as to why Tait’s students are using the back door rather than the front door to the APE site. He thought that might be helpful in elevating the issue. Tait explained that the front door isn’t accessible to his students. He also explained that the disability ramps that they put in during the retrofit are a ways down the sidewalk.

Jorge has asked the District Office to work with Maintenance Department to see about putting in the temporary speed bumps. There’ll be a follow up with an implementation plan. He also encourages ASG to reach out to the student body and possibly do some type of initiative.

Joseph suggested security camera signs around the parking lots and an empty police car to give the impression that drivers are being watched.

c. **Follow up on cell phone connectivity issues with Sprint and Verizon through several areas of the campus. Safety concern for messaging of emergency notifications.**

This is an ongoing discussion from the fall semester. Chief Morales explained that the main carrier is Verizon. He believes moving forward the college may want to look at contracting with Verizon since the service is poor. He feels this should be explored because of the mass notification that the District Police uses, there needs to be good service for the students and staff. Phil asked why there hasn’t been anything done so far. Jorge explained that the college doesn’t have cell towers. The District Office has a contract with service providers for their cell towers to be on the college property. This doesn’t mean that the college is getting better service. The towers are there to serve
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the community. Phil feels this is something that needs to be addressed now since student and staff are unable to receive good service on campus and it affects emergency notifications. He doesn’t want the fault to be on the college if there’s a hold up at the District Office. Jorge will follow up on the topic after the meeting. He asked Heather if there were any technical solutions to cell coverage. Heather explained that she’s met with Chief Morales and Owen Letcher regarding the cell coverage issues. They have a meeting set up next week with Jorge to discuss getting space on campus for a tower. She also mentioned that there are other providers that have towers on campus and the plan is to remove them. There is funding that can come back to the campus if they lease space to the providers. This is a process were the college and District will have to work with the providers to offer them space. Surveys will need to be done to figure out where the towers will be placed. She mentioned that T-Mobile and Sprint are on campus. She would like to work with the campus on this issue and try to collect revenue. Jorge explained that there was an issue with a tower on the Theater that wasn’t cleared through DSA. This has caused problems with clearing projects with DSA because the project was never approved. Jorge will report back to the committee after the meeting.

d. Fencing near Building K (Mansfield Dr.)

Jorge explained that there is a fence that has overgrown ivy and has become a home to rodents near Building K. The residence decided to trim the greenery on the fence, which wasn’t enough to solve the problem. The Grounds Department also trimmed back the ivy, which hasn’t solved the problem. There’s been illegal drug activity going on in the area. College funding will be used to fix the fence and has been estimated to cost around $150,000.

e. P.E. & Athletics Promises/Needs Omissions

There was a promise from the past administration that once the new Physical Education building was completed that the swimming pool would also be coming back. As far as Phil can see the pool has been taken off the plans. He’s not sure who made this decision. The service of having a swimming pool could be used to serve the community as well as the students. Phil mentioned that he can see a lot of projects that are being scheduled for the left over Measure G2010 funding, but what he’d like to do is have a motion to make the swimming pool also be on the list of projects to be completed immediately with Measure G2010 funding. Phil’s asked his colleagues to speak to the committee regarding their programs and the facility issues.

Lamel didn’t feel there was that much to add to the discussion. The college is currently working on the facility issues with the new P.E. Building. The Adapted Physical Education building is coming along nicely. There are a few punch items that still need to be taken care of along with equipment that needs to be finalized. He thanked Phil for his support regarding the pool. He felt there were multiple ways that the college could benefit from having a pool, which included the SAS students and student athletes. Involvement of the community could possibly bring revenue, which in return could help in keeping up with the maintenance of the pool.
Janet feels that the campus needs to make good on their promise to bring the pool back. Having a pool is serving the community.

Linda mentioned that she has been contacted multiple times by the community regarding the pool. She believes it would be a good revenue source.

Duane mentioned that the pool used to be utilized heavily by the baseball team in the past. He also remembers that the pool was used heavily in the morning by the students. He feels that it’s not good for a community college to be without a pool.

Michael Divina urged the committee to use the bond funds for the pool. Swimming is a life skill that the college could give to our students. He would also like to see the college bring back the baseball field. All the major parts needed for a baseball field are already there in the multipurpose field. He believes that the only thing needed would be a 30 foot fence, which wouldn’t require a need for an Environmental Impact Report. He believes that this should work because the type of bats that are currently being used are not as lively. The ball can only go about 375 feet. Conditions have changed since back in 2010. Michael would be willing to survey the surrounding discuss this with the neighborhood association.

Phil mentioned that existing football fields can also be expanded just enough to also be used as a soccer/multipurpose field.

Duane mentioned that in the past when the developers placed a baseball field out where the multipurpose field currently is located, that there were no issues from neighbors. This went on for about four years. There was live fall baseball games with no netting.

Tait explained that the past community involvement that the college used to have with the use of the pool, racquetball and tennis courts. In the early mornings there were a lot of students who were a part of the work force using the facilities before going to work stress-free. In the mention of the pool, it will flow into the Guided Pathways Initiative because you can water safety instruct, which would lead to an income source by becoming a life-guard. Tait also mentioned that the baseball program brought very diverse students from the east side and Milpitas. It brought a successful increase in our numbers for graduation and athletics. Tait also mentioned that the college is always looking for revenue sources and the multipurpose field could still be used as a facility rental field along with it being a baseball field. It’ll take some creative striping. It takes a little bit of vision.

Kathy Bruga explained that in Kinesiology they try to continuously build their curriculum, but it seems they keep losing ground with the loss of the pool and other facilities. She continues to keep writing courses in hopes that she can attract more students instead of
them going to West Valley and DeAnza College. Curriculum wise it’s important or else we’re going to lose students.

Joseph point out that as he was looking through community colleges in Region 4 there seems to be about 7 colleges that have pools. This is a core component for community colleges.

Doug Robb explained that numbers a baseball team has 30 full time students. 12 units are not enough for them to graduate and move on in two years. 15 units, which is beyond the full time minimum, is what they need to take in a semester. These many students in the spring can fill up some of our general education classes. In the fall, when there’s tryouts and the athletes are in class it can double. When the division goes to Academic Senate asking for classes, if they can bring in more students on a general basis, the validity as educators is even more so there.

Phil suggested that himself, Jorge and Lamel sit down and see about the feasibility to do something with the pool. In the long range plans, the college could certainly incorporate modifications to the field for the baseball program. Phil thought that there might be some quicker things that could be done for both the pool and baseball. There might be a possibility to make a great boost to what has been an amazing program.

Jorge thinks it’s a fantastic challenge, but it’s a challenge to put them all in the mix. He feels it’s important to understand the history. Based on all the descriptions from everyone who’s been here a long time, there was a great facility before. There’s a challenge but also a great opportunity to change the campus. There’s funding, which is limited, but the college community needs to come to a census of what it is that the college wants and have that vision for the next 15-20 years. The history showed that the former baseball program was a feeder school for the four year universities. The college was the recipients to the kids who played high school baseball. The chain was broken and it either needs to be rebuilt or determine that this isn’t a plan the college wants to follow. Jorge agrees to meet offline to discuss these topics.

f. Committee Charge

Deferred

g. Adjunct email

Phil explained that part-time faculty are having issues with their emails since they need to change their password periodically. If the task isn’t completed within a timeframe, the user will be locked out. He feels that ITSS needs to fix the problem and come up with a more rational plan. Heather gave an update on some of the projects that ITSS is currently working on. She mentioned a project called Single Sign-on, which is an effort to simplify sign-ons. She addressed the password resets and explained that the department went live with a soft launch this week for a password reset. This can be
Facilities, Safety, & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting – Minutes 3/5/2018

used from any internet connected computer. She mentioned that with Office 365 accounts, you have to change the passwords on campus through the infrastructure. This is the piece that ITSS is upgrading to a new product called PortalGuard. The process will be worked on for the next few weeks ahead.

h. **New Evac Map**

Chief Morales handed out a new evacuation map to the committee. The maps will replace the old evacuation maps around campus. The new map now shows the location of the Automated External Defibrillator (AEDs) and emergency phones.

i. **ASG Bulletin Board**

Joseph announced to the committee that the ASG is looking into possibly purchasing 70 inch screen in the Student Center. This will be a better system for ASG to get information out to the students. This would also consist of a motion camera and a small computer. They’ll be able to have a “hands free” control of the monitor, which will give the ability to have an interactive bulletin board. Jorge mentioned that there’s already a plan to add 20 information displays on campus. Young has already tested technology that’s working well in Milpitas and in the new PE Building. Young also mentioned that this system allows you to control the content and is cloud base. Young can further discuss with Joseph.

j. **New Case Manager**

Janet introduced Sophia De La Fuente, the new case manager for the college. Her responsibility is to taking care and providing assistance to students with mental health issues. She mentioned that Health Services has been developed a new model for providing psychological services to the students. They have a Ph.D. Supervisor that’ll come to campus to provide clinical supervision and ongoing therapeutic services to students. They currently have only one office. They are in need of three adjacent rooms in close proximity to provide a consistent and secure environment. The request will be placed on the list of space utilization requests for the college.

Meeting adjourned
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<tr>
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I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of March 5, 2018 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. Safety & Security meeting with District Services  
   Jorge
b. CM/PM Architectural Pool  
   Jorge
c. FMP Update Proposal - CTE Building Priority  
   Jorge
d. Committee Charge  
   ALL
e. Elevator  
   Phil
f. Funds for Swimming Pool  
   Phil

V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Other updates

"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."
Committee Members:

MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (chair), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz (vice-chair)

Faculty – Phillip Crawford, Iyun Lazik

Classified –

Associated Student Body – Maria Riojas

Guests – Duane Bozic, Cynthia Giesing, Dennis Meakin, Vanet Murawsky, Tait Rafat

I. Approval of Agenda with additions

II. Approval of March 5, 2018 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

- Iyun would like a timeline for the painting of the parking lots. Some of the lines are fading.
- Duane mentioned the Staff Lot “C” on Moorpark Avenue has white arrow turning towards the lot, which has warning signs stating DO NOT ENTER. An update will be given during the meeting.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. Safety & Security meeting with District Services -

There was a Safety & Security meeting that took place on Thursday, March 16th, which was a follow up meeting to one that took place in November of 2015. The first meeting was originated by the District Office to discuss the Security Master Plan and other initiatives. A list was compiled of items that needed to be discussed at the originally meeting. In the follow-up meeting it was seen that some items have made progress, but none have been completed. The meeting was initiated to discuss

- Access Control
- Active Shooter preparations
- Mass notification related to devices (emergency phones, limited cell phone coverage)
- Emergency Preparedness (training, who leads)
- Security Master Plan

In the discussion it was recognized that there’s minimal progress being done for these items. There’s no leadership and no one wants to take ownership of certain areas. As an example, Jorge spoke about the parking lot “C” situation and the street arrows that are currently pointing to the exit point that mentioned DO NOT ENTER. It was explained
that the college went with the suggestions of the consultant to turn the entrance into an “exit only” point. The DO NOT ENTER signs were installed and eventually were turned to face the oncoming traffic, so it was more visible. At this point, no one paid attention to the arrows on the street or no action was taken to remove the arrows. The contract was closed and the vendor completed and left the job site. The construction management company that was employed at the time is no longer with the District Office. This is now become an issue for the college to fix. The fixing of the arrows has now fallen on the county office. Jorge points this example out as being something that should be simple to fix, but behind closed doors it’s more complex.

Chief Morales explained that Moorpark Avenue had become an issue with the homeless encampments that were accumulating on the street. Lt. Michael Dzuiba was able to speak to a county homeless task force group that addresses these type of issues. The area was cleaned up in January. Chief Morales also worked with the County Supervisors to remove the recreational vehicles on Moorpark Avenue. The area of Moorpark Avenue between Bascom Avenue and Leigh Avenue has now been changed to have parking restrictions. This allows us to get rid of the recreational vehicles and cite any that are parked. In discussion regarding the street arrows, Chief Morales was told by the county that they would come out and correct the mistake once it’s voted and approved by the Board of Supervisors. Chief Morales is also working with the county council to see if an MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) can be established authorizing District Police to enforce parking in the above areas. From that point, the city will wait and evaluate to see what occurs with the county parking restrictions. He’s asking the city to mirror the same restrictions.

Jorge mentioned that the college does sometimes become aware of things that need to be completed, but behind the scenes there’s more effort that goes into working out some projects. In regards to Lyun’s comment about the parking stencil that needs to be updated. Chief Morales had already looked into this and was told that it would have to wait because there is a bigger project coming up. Jorge will speak with Anthony Jakubowski, Maintenance Supervisor, to see if anything can happen in the interim.

Tait asked if anything had been changed or if the street would be restriped regarding the situation that he brought up at the last meeting, which is between the 100 and 200 wings. Jorge explained that he hadn’t seen anything initiated yet, but understands that something needs to be done in order to reduce the speed by vehicles. Dennis mentioned that only 1/3 of the parking gets used, which is mostly by the Ironworkers Program. The remainder of the parking lot is hardly ever used with the exception of the Maintenance Department. He suggested putting in planters and signage that restricts the area to service and handicap vehicles. Joe mentioned that he had order some movable signage for the Adapted Physical Education department. Jorge will share the notes from the meeting with the FaST Committee once they’re approved by the group.
b. **CM/PM Architectural Pool**

Jorge announced that new companies have been hired. There’s a challenge with having new companies come in and having to learn the culture of our organization. The college wants to make sure that expectations are set and clear from the beginning. The construction company will be engaged and will understand that the committee has the ultimate say for facilities on campus. The company should provide the college/committee a level of reporting and information needed so the committee can make informed decisions. Jorge recognized Maria Rojas, Phil Crawford and Janet Chang as members of the selection committee. The committee had a lot of work that was done behind the scenes to get the company selected. Maria also mentioned that being a part of the selection committee was interesting. She felt that the unanimous decision by the committee to go with the company that they chose was based on their ability to hold themselves accountable for all stages of development.

c. **FMP Update Proposal - CTE Building Priority**

The committee reviewed the summary that was given to them by Cambridge West Partnership’s consultant, C.M. Brahmbhatt. The notes captured the interest of the college (i.e. swimming pool, tennis courts, etc.). The Facilities Master Plan (FMP) is in a good place for open for discussion. The committee owns the discussion, prioritization and the decision of what goes in/out of the FMP. Jorge feels that the committee has been asked to become accountable for the management of the bond. The committee is ready to start making decisions.

The Child Development Center has taken the college at least three years to get everyone on the same page by being supportive, having resolutions from the Academic Senate, the CDC Club and Associated Student Government. There’s state contracts for subsidized day care. Jorge is working with the Dean to get the academic side in place. In 2019, the modular will come on campus with the idea of having a completed Child Development Center in the year 2022. The committee needs to do their due diligence, design and discussion about the other project initiatives. The committee needs to think about how much money should be allocated, who’s going to do the work and possibly contract consultants to get this completed.

Phil has a concern of the delay in getting the PE Complex open. This is what’s bringing down the wings, which allows the CTE building to be built. According to the consultant, the college will expect an increase due to the delay. Phil asked why the college doesn’t sue the company that’s causing the delays through construction defects. There needs to be some accountability.

Jorge explained that the PE Building was scheduled to be open at the beginning of the spring semester and now the college is doing a soft opening after break. Jorge agrees that there’s a cost of opportunity with the bond. You lose purchasing power between
6%-30% a year with the cost of construction increasing every year the construction is delayed.

Phil understands that before the design of the CTE Building that there should be a user’s group established to talk about the needs of the department. Why hasn’t this been done already? The designing phase should be after the user’s group come up with a list of needs first.

Jorge announced that next week there’ll be a meeting with the Chancellor and the Cabinet to discuss issuance of the first trench of Measure X. He also mentioned that there’s a company called KH, which is a consulting group, doing some initial discussions with the CTE staff. The company was brought in to review the Educational Master Plan (EMP) in CTE. The user group meetings will need to be headed by the construction management company that was just hired. This can be done now instead of waiting on the designing of the building. Need to engage more faculty for these type of meetings. It needs to be clearer when reaching out to the faculty as there wasn’t a clear understanding that the discussion would be geared around facilities. It was suggested that the way to engage faculty is to bring it to the Academic Senate.

Jorge is looking at other California Community Colleges and has found that Pasadena Community College has a separate task group for their FMP. He suggested that maybe the college should look into having their own task group that can be faculty driven.

Tait mentioned that he’s a faculty member that’s been trying to get on the FaST committee for some time. It’s an interesting committee that’s able to make a lot of decisions. As a recommended body, it sometimes feels to the faculty like a lot of decisions are being made and not just giving recommendations. It doesn’t seem like a lot of different constituent groups are being represented fully, which is what the committee members are supposed to be doing. Tait asked how the college could increase the input from groups. It was stated that there are currently 3 faculty members on the FaST committee along with the other constituency groups. Phil explained that the committee members go back to the Academic Senate to report what’s going on in the FaST meetings. Iyun commented that it sometimes creates a false sense when recommendations are not being followed through. Resolutions are made and presented to the Board and the Board is left to do whatever they want. She feels it gives a sense that our voices are not being heard. The past behavior is what helped to create these concerns. Phil feels that the committee constituency representatives are doing a good job of making sure recommendations are followed through and the committee has an opportunity to update the FMP. He feels that any changes made after the recommendation has been brought back to the committee as information.

d. Committee Charge -

The committee reviewed the revisions that Jorge had put together from January. The following suggestions were made for the charge.
- Suggestion to add Maintenance Supervisor in as an ex-officio (District function)
- Change “Guiding Principles” to add in “two unexcused absences” with notifications.
- Suggestion to change membership to 3 faculty and to change Health Services Director to ex-officio.
- Suggestion to change membership to 3 Administrators, 3 students and 3 classified

**MOTION: Move to approved modified charge**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abstention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOTION PASSED**

e. **Elevator -**

Jorge gave the committee an update on the elevator issues. The Technology Building has one of their elevators down since January. The problem in the building is significant in that the elevator was built ten years ago. When a problem arises the fix is difficult. The cost to fix the elevator will be about $120,000, which the District Office will be paying. It’s taken awhile to complete because the District had to gather proposals, identify what the problem was, having the company do some testing and discover the problem. They were able to discover that the base of the elevator needs to be replaced. The shaft needs to be replaced and manufactured perfectly to fit back in the hole. There was a suggestion that the county is backfilling the waterbed underneath, which is corroding the area. It’s going to take about two months to fix the elevator. This is an inconvenience to classes and students with disabilities. Phil and Dennis suggested a new technique that requires the belting system on the top of the elevator. Why spend the money on a system that doesn’t work, why not have it done correctly. Jorge will ask the question to see if this new system could work. The end users need to communicate with the college community, place signage on the elevators and inform SAS (Student Accessibility Services). Tait feels that this falls under the Dean’s to make sure that the communication is moved forward.

f. **Funds for Swimming Pool -**

There’s been some suggestions as to where a swimming pool would best be placed on campus. Some have suggested Lot “F” and the Archery location, but when asked where Archery would go, there wasn’t a suggestion. The college needs someone who can assist in finding a location and the size of the pool. Phil mentioned that if a pool is built in one of those areas, there will also need to be a changing room and showers. Tait thought there was a pretty logical location for the pool except for the logistics of the
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traffic flow. He explained that there’s a viable footprint behind the backside of the gym, facing the football field. He mentioned that there would be suggestions from the Kinesiology Department on locations for the pool. Jorge explained that there was a pool discussion a couple of weeks ago. He asked if there’s information to please get it to the group who’re discussing it. Phil would like to have the swimming pool discussion on the CAC (College Advisory Council) agenda.

g. Adjunct Faculty email -

Phil is still concerned about how many adjunct faculty are locked out of their accounts. He would like for Young to make a request to ITSS to find out how many adjunct faculty accounts does the District currently have and how many had their accounts shut off. He also mentioned that all retired faculty have had their emails kicked out. He’d like to see the District create a distribution list for all retirees. We should look at policy and what other colleges are doing along the same lines.

Meeting adjourned
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"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 & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting – Unofficial Minutes 4/2/2018

Committee Members:
MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (chair), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio)
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I. Approval of Agenda
   P. Crawford/I. Lazik

II. Approval of March 19, 2018 minutes
   P. Crawford/I. Lazik

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Access Control

   Steven Lee spoke on behalf of Maria Avalos. Maria wanted a follow up on the access control project in the Business Building offices. She would like to know about receiving access to locking and unlocking the offices. It was mentioned that this topic was brought up at a previous FaST meeting, but she hasn’t seen anything follow up. The Academic Support/Affairs offices are left unattended many times with confidential records (i.e. social security numbers, etc.) that can sometimes be left out for anyone to see. The Vice President of Academic Affairs also has confidential records (i.e. faculty/staff evaluations), which are being compromised. Her office consist of herself and the Vice President, which currently she’s on vacation and the office is left open and unattended.

   Jorge explained that this project was put in place last year. Unfortunately, the project is 90% completed. The vendor and the construction management company are both no longer on campus. The college is transitioning to a new construction management company, which will take charge of the project. Jorge will follow up with Maria personally.

   b. FMP review process

   New projects are coming up, which require a new process to go through each one. The process needs to consist of prioritization, understanding the implications, and total cost of ownership. How do we implement them and put them in the FMP to go through this cycle.
c. FMP task force model

Jorge feels that a task force should be generated to handle these process since the committee doesn’t have the capacity to work on this one item when there’s an agenda to follow. The task force should consist of staff from the different constituency groups, which will only work on the FMP. The task force will work on discussion of the funding, prioritization projects, funding discussions and decisions that need to be made. Jorge will be looking to the FaST Committee for guidance on how to make this a representative group. So far the task force will need to discuss the following:

1. Child Development Center
2. Swimming Pool
3. Baseball Field
4. Additional items to be considered in the FMP

Each one of these topics will need to be documented, reviewed, analyzed and a completion of a total cost of ownership. Once this is completed they college can then see if they want to consider them.

Iyun asked about the structural part of the task force and if they would be reporting back and updating the committee. How would the decisions be managed by the committee and distributed to the other committees. Jorge mentioned that the task force will be a part of the FaST Committee. The challenge will be on how to communicate internally. The task force should be able to

- Develop technology
- Analyze the standards
- Develop building discussions
- Ensure that the design committees related to the construction projects are communicating the needs and shortcomings that the FaST committee may have before they become issues.

Joe asked if the list of projects that Jorge mentioned are just needs or are they supposed to go on the FMP. His understanding is that before a project can go on the FMP, it needs to be on the Education Master Plan (EMP). Jorge agreed and mentioned that the FMP supports the EMP, and each project would have to go through this process. There’s been plenty of discussion on the facilities side, but there needs to be a discussion on the academic side too.

Janet suggested inviting campus individuals who have expertise in certain areas and offering to pay them for their participation on the task force. Jorge suggested that if we’re exploring for faculty that we should also explore for everyone else (i.e. students). Iyun pointed out that the same people seem to volunteer for committees. Having more committees and task force over takes the same group of people who already serve on other committees. This is a challenge and it questions how the committee can recruit
other people and individuals who could be subject matter experts. Jorge will work on a proposal on the structure to see how it turns out.

d. Architect selection

With the start of the Measure X bond, the college is restarting a process for selecting a group of architectural firms to help both colleges and the District develop the plans for construction. In the past, the process for selecting the architects wasn’t defined. A pool of approved architects was formed. When the architects were put into this pool, the colleges or District could just pull the architect and assign them to a project. These architects’ contracts expire in June. There’s consideration with the District Office to extend some of those contracts for a period of time until the college finishes with a list of projects with the MG 2010 bond. The college doesn’t want to make the mistake of waiting for the transition to new architectural firms and starting from the beginning with no transition. The process for choosing the architects will be very inclusive. It’ll be similar to the CM/PM process. They want to get a large group of people from the constituency groups to be a part of the selection process with the idea that a pool of pre-qualified architects is formed. If you have a project you go through the formal selection process and bidding of the architectural firm. This process will only prequalify the architect and can be contracted through the District. Jorge will send a follow up to the timeline. There’s a difference of opinion on how the group will be represented by the college. Jorge’s perspective is representation to that group should come through the FaST Committee. The challenge is how to recruit people from the FaST Committee to be part of the selection committee. Names will need to be forwarded by May and will go through to Fall 2018.

Janet has noticed that other nearby colleges are growing and she wonders what they’re doing in these type of situations. She wonders what their best practices are and their selection committees. What can be learned about the selection process from other colleges and how they select their architects?

Owen explained that in the case of DeAnza College, the selection of architects for their lawn program was Charles Allen, Director of Facilities, and they had two bond program Directors that did all the RFQs and pre-screening of the architect list. Along with each of their projects DeAnza established a Building Design Committee represented by the groups that would be in the building. They presented the qualification of those firms to the committee, which is typically done by their bond manager. Those groups selected four firms to interview from the pre-qualified list. They had the original statement of qualification. They had a supplemental information that was provided prior to the interview and an in-person interview with the firms. They made their selection based on the interview and moved forward with the project. The process that’s being proposed is similar to the one from DeAnza, but it’s being proposed with a larger group that’s being involved in the establishment of the pre-qualified list. Foothill/DeAnza has a shared governance that involved 10 principles, whereas our district has 10+1. That +1 is what includes some statements that have broader inclusions in bond programs and projects.
Jorge feels that what needs to be done is being practical about the definition of the process. Based on the discussion that was just done with technical experts, he feels the proposed process makes sense. The pool of firms will be filtered, so the committee doesn’t have to be checking their backgrounds. For instance, when the CTE building is up for construction, the full decision of selecting a company from start to finish will be a “college only” process. Same thing with the Child Development Center, which is being funded by a combination of Measure G 2010 and Measure X funds, it’ll be a college driven decision. It’ll require the college to be active participants in those processes. It’ll take a lot of time and effort.

Phil was wondering when the users of the CTE will be meeting to discuss the needs and designs that they’d want with building. Jorge explained that it’s his interest to have a process laid out that shows a step by step process. Prep work has been done in the sense of the Educational Master Plan that outlines things related to CTE. The college also had the consultants that did the FMP and EMP provide an update. A summary of their research was given to the committee. The summary consisted of what community colleges in the bay area have solid CTE programs and how they’re tied to the RSI and what facilities they have. Now the college is getting into more administration (dean, VPAA) to buy in and own this part, which is the programming of the academic phase. Phil has a concern with this because the CTE program doesn’t have a solid Dean or Vice President that’s been in their positions for more than six months. The programs faculty that’ve been here for many years need to be consulted on the building needs. Jorge explained that the newly hired program management company are responsible for taking the lead of the idea to design. Part of this is the programming phase. Jorge asked if the faculty should be involved now or in the summer, because the projects needs to get started as well. Phil feels that the faculty needs to be involved now. Jorge will get back to the committee on the plan.

e. Ben Gross sign

Jorge informed the committee that at the Milpitas Unified School District Board of Trustees had approved to name the site that the College Extension is located on as “Ben Gross Educational Park”. Ben Gross was a former member of the MUSD Board of Trustee members and former mayor of Milpitas. The land was named after him, but the site and building will remain under our District. President Breland will forward to our board as an information item.

V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Other updates

   • Jorge shared with the committee a brochure on a conference that Chancellor Budd sent him, which takes place in Boston, Massachusetts. It’s the College and University Science and Engineering Facilities Conference. It takes place April 23-24, 2018. Jorge mentioned that if anyone was interested in going to let him know and he’ll work on getting funding for the trip.
• Some work has started for the CDC. Jorge passed out a draft proposal of the vision of the program. A meeting has already taken place with the Jorge, VP Montemayor, VP Tran and Dean Bettencourt, to discuss the CDC and how it would look. The document contained a layout of what the CDC floor plans for the modular could look like. The discussion with faculty was defining the capacity of the building (between 60-90 children). The committee consist of full and part time faculty along with the ECE Coordinator. Jorge informed the committee that the agreement with Santa Clara County of Education portables has been terminated to provide the space needed for the CDC.

• Jorge updated the committee on the Technology Center elevator that’s been out of order. The elevator is in the process of being fixed, but it will continue to take time to fix. The problem is with the elevator shaft that goes 85 feet down into the ground, which is what helps to move the elevator up and down. The shaft is leaking the oil that lubricates that elevator system. The parts that are needed to fix the elevator are being manufactured. Phil asked about the possibility of using the more modern elevator systems that have rooftop belts that pull the elevators rather than going in the shaft. Owen explained that in order to go with the more modern system they would have to make the elevator cabs smaller or the shaft larger, which would require a lot more work and funding. To replace the elevator cabs would cost more than fixing just the elevator shaft. Jorge explained that Anthony Jakubowski, Maintenance Supervisor, has provided him with a timeline of the work that’ll be completed with the elevator. It will roughly take about 56 days to complete the work from the first day that they start the work. The college needs to look at the second unit to make sure it’s operable and there’s no problems. Measures are being take to review the classes in case the second elevator goes down. Additional evacuation chairs are being brought in case the second elevator goes down. A personalized note will be sent to the occupants of the building to notify them of what’s taking place with the repairs of the elevator. Phil asked why the 56 days weren’t started earlier. Owen explained that the parts have to be onsite in order for the vendor to start the work. They have to drill an 85 foot hole around the existing casing. Then they’ll need to remove the excess vegetable oil, which can only be done in an 8x8 cube that’s 4 feet below the floor level. It’s not a simple task to remove the component. Also at the end of the construction period is the time period for re-certification of the elevator. The vendor is currently scheduling the crew and tools for the job. The substance (vegetable oil) isn’t hazardous and shouldn’t cause any problem. President Breland asked if the work will disrupted the other elevator. Owen doesn’t believe that it would, but possibly disrupt some classes. Jorge also mentioned that the Technology Building is also scheduled to have air conditioning upgrades completed in the summer. The college is making the necessary planning to schedule and minimize the use of the space.

• Phil asked for an update on when the college would receive access to the first floor of the Technology Building once Workforce Institute moves to the District Office. Jorge explained that the latest update was WFI would be moving to the
District Office by May 1st. Computers would be delivered on April 3rd and furniture to be delivered on April 19th and 24th. Jorge mentioned that when the WFI move takes place the college will start the reconditioning of the space. Discussion has started on who will occupy the space. The college is considering consolidating all the CTE faculty and administrators in one place. This may be the first choice at this point, but a process is still in place to determine how best to utilize the space. The SIMS lab is also tied to this subject. Jorge is speaking with Carlos Rojo, Biology Faculty, along with Janet Chang who was appointed by Academic Senate to serve on the committee for the lab. Janet explained that a meeting took place during spring break to discuss the lab. There was some discussion on having a partnership with a health facility to benefit the prioritization of setting up a simulation lab. Janet will have a report to bring to the committee at the next meeting. Jorge also had a conference call with Carlos and Stanford Professor Andrew Schneider. The idea is to make the space very flexible with new technologies. This way Biology, Medical Assisting and Dental Assisting could all use it.

- Joseph gave the committee an update on the innovation lab of the Robotics and Automation Club. The club has worked with local companies that have gone out of business to donate electronic work benches and shelving. Their lab is considered a makers space where students can work on projects. One example of their projects is their entering the 2018 RoboGames at the end of April. RoboGames is one of the largest robotics competitions in the world. The club will be competing in a firefighting competition, self-balancing robot competition and a ribbon climbing competition that modeled after a space elevator concept. Jorge suggested that the committee members take time to visit. The club has also had some SolidWorks licenses donated to their club. They have a total of 15 licenses, which can be expensive if you’re purchasing them directly. President Breland mentioned that SJCC is one of a few colleges in the nation to have a maker’s space and that the club was also invited to tour SAP headquarters maker’s space.

- Jorge shared with the committee the status of the Maintenance and Operations building and the Physical Education building move. The P.E. staff are already in the building and students are currently using the facility. Most of the work that still needed to be done was completed, but there is still a few things that need to be completed (i.e. floors, paint). The building is 95% completed. The concession modular building will be arriving on April 13/14. April 24th is the scheduled ribbon cutting ceremony along with the Board of Trustees meeting where the college will be showcased. Jorge announced that there was a meeting with Maintenance and Operations team to discuss their building. There are drawings and schematics of the building. There is a lot of input from the Maintenance Department and the college is working to be flexible. When the drawings are 50% completed, it’ll be shared with the FaST committee. Jorge’s hoping to give another update at the next meeting along with Susan Rittel, Bond Manager. The idea is that once the building has gone through DSA approval it should be built in 16 months.
• Iyun asked Chief Morales about the Emergency Preparedness Training that he sent out via email to the campus. She wanted to know what the course was about since it’s a 5 hour training session. Chief Morales explained that these classes are designed to give staff the knowledge for emergency preparedness. Some districts mandate their staff to go through this course, but our district is giving it as an option. Iyun asked what SEMS stood for, which is Standardized Emergency Management Systems. NIMS stands for National Incident Management Systems. These organizations came to light after the 1991 Oakland fires when there were multiple firefighter companies that didn’t know how to interact with each other. They learned how to standardize their response to emergencies with other agencies.

• Jorge updated the committee on the pedestrian crossing signs that were placed in the parking lots between the 100/200 buildings. Chief Morales also mentioned that he’s given his officers the times of the classes, so they can monitor the area.
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I. Approval of Agenda

L. Jimenez/M. Riojas

II. Approval of March 19, 2018 minutes

I. Lazik/J. Chang

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

Susan Hines and Bob Wing informed the committee of another break-in to the Library. Susan would like to meet with the college’s Vice Presidents and District Police to discuss a strategy to secure the building. Bob explained that the alarms in the building were still going off when they arrived. They were informed that it’s District Police’s policy to not respond when the initial alarm is set. They wait until a second alarm is triggered to respond to it. The department had met and discussed the possibility of shattered proof windows, which would also help if there’s an active shooter on campus. Bob mentioned that the Library had volunteered a few years ago to be a part of a pilot program for cameras on campus, but they never heard back about doing the program.

Although the committee doesn’t engage in response during public comments, because of the severity of the situation the committee opened up the topic for discussion.

Jorge explained that the college has come a long way from where it was with safety and security a few years ago. He recognizes that there is still a lot of work to be done to make the campus more secure for students and staff, which is a slow process. Jorge does believe that there needs to be some corrected action on past construction of buildings. He did highlight additions to the District Police’s leadership team and staff with the emergency phones on campus and the upcoming installation of the cameras this summer.

Chief Morales followed up by confirming that the window to the main entrance on the second floor of the building was broken. No entrance was made based on his officer’s evaluation. The officer surveyed the area and wasn’t able to find anything was stolen. He recognizes that the Library is being targeted since this is the third break-in. He explained that when he started with the District there was no policy in place with the District Police for these type of situations. He had to reconstruct the policies, which are revolving and try to find out what works best for both campuses. He did confirm that the policy is to send an officer when a second alarm from another building is set off. The purpose for the policy is that some of his officers live out of San Jose and he doesn’t want them to have to drive all
the way in to town if it’s a false alarm. He is willing to go back and review the policy with his officers to see if it should be modified. Chief Morales explained that there’s a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in place with the San Jose Police Department (SJPD), which was approved by the Board of Trustees on April 10th. The agreement will be for SJPD to respond to calls from the campus. However, they won’t respond to a call that they wouldn’t respond to within the city (property break-ins). If there’s a break-in on campus, SJPD will only respond if they can actually see or have a witness to the break-in through verify response. SJPD’s protocol is to either be able to see someone breaking into the building, have a witness to the crime or there needs to be a proper alarm in place where you can hear all that’s going on in the building. That alarm information will be relayed back to SJPD for verification to send someone to the scene. Chief Morales sympathizes that these property break-ins on campus make staff feel uneasy. He understands that he needs to meet with college Administration to discuss future steps to be taken and reviewing the alarm policy. Before he can make any decisions he needs to base it on his officer’s geographical locations. He feels the best decision would probably be to have physical presence on campus overnight. This is a proposal that he’ll be making to the District Office. He’s hoping that the committee can make a recommendation, which will help him in his pursuit to have the proposal granted.

Phil feels that the college’s should either get rid of the current alarm systems since a response isn’t made when they go off or install an alarm system by a company that can respond immediately. This would be less expensive than having security patrol throughout the night waiting for alarms to go off.

Janet has a concern with the safety of the custodial staff that are still on campus late at night. This too needs to be considered when thinking of how to better secure the campus.

Officer Annino added that there are only four full-time officers. He’s assigned to swing shift on our campus along with being responsible for the Milpitas campus. If something happens, his backup officer has to come from EVC. He believes this is a crisis that’s not being discussed. The District is more reactive than proactive. He explained that there was a sexual assault that happened in Reprographics, which should be enough to make it clear that the District needs to hire more police officers.

Iyun agrees with Officer Annino in regards to the District being reactive and not proactive. She comes on campus very early and it makes her nervous to be in the building alone. She’s noticed that when she comes into the Science Complex that there are signs of someone that’s been in the building that wasn’t supposed to be there. If something were to happen to her it would be too late for the District to anything to correct the problem.

Phil wanted to know why the District Office downtown has an officer in the lobby at all times. He feels that this is taking up an incredible amount of District Police resources for a building that’s far less at risk than the campuses. He’s fine with having that amount of security if it’s the same for all. It makes it look as if those in the District Office are more important than those on campus. The security needs to lay where the most risk is located. Phil would like to see a motion brought forward to change what’s in place now or to have security for all three locations.
MOTION by Phil Crawford/2nd by Joseph Heady:

To put forth a recommendation to take the security resources that are assigned to the District Office and reassign them to higher risk college facilities or in the alternative be able to receive the same security resources as the District Office has assigned to themselves.

Unanimously approved

Janet feels the process needs to be aligned with the District’s mission statement. She thinks that there may be a process that is more powerful outside of the committee. Phil disagrees and feels there isn’t a current process in place. The process reside within the committee. Janet also feels that Phil holds an important position in the Academic Senate to assist in getting this recommendation to move forward. Phil will plan to bring it to the Academic Senate and suggested that the other constituency groups bring it to theirs too. Lyun stated that by starting the motion at the FaST Committee and moving it forward to the CAC (College Advisory Council) this starts a paper trail that shows the concerns from the college.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. Health Services Director position on the committee charge

At the March 19th FaST meeting, the Health Services Director position was changed to an ex-officio position rather than a general member. Janet Chang, Health Services Director, was concerned about her position being changed within the committee when she was absent at this particular meeting. She’s also concerned because the other ex-officio member on the committee are non-voters. It was explained to her that during the discussion at the March 19th meeting regarding her position it wasn’t originally intended for her to become a non-voting member. The idea was to move her to ex-officio, which is a permanent position, to make room for an additional faculty member. The committee reviewed membership and realized that if the Health Services Director is a voting member they’d need to move all ex-officio member to voting members. This may cause an issue since the other ex-officio members are all administrators.

Motioned — J. Chang
2nd — J. Andrade

Recommendation to revoke the change to the charge for the Health Services Director ex-officio position from non-voting to faculty voting.

Yes: 3  No: 4  Abstentions: 1

Motion failed

Jorge clarified that the point of changing the position was to increase the number of faculty that have a say in the committee, which extended the charge to include Technology.
Phil spoke in favor of paying two of the constituency group members (students, faculty) since they are coming to the committee meetings on their own time. There are other constituency groups that are already paid to be on campus (MSC, CSEA) and are more likely to be at the meetings in larger numbers. When it comes to the other constituency groups who come in on their own time they may choose to not come in and do something else because they don’t have anything to benefit. He’d like to leave the group’s membership as it remains, but also he’d like to see more administrators that can bring their expertise.

b. Update on Implementing and Surveillance Camera System

Officer Annino would like an update on the surveillance camera system that’s going to be installed this summer (selection of vendor, start date, etc.). Since this will affect District Police, he’d like to have something to report back to his office.

This is phase II of Physical Security, which includes implementation of cameras, wireless access points and emergency phones. The contractor began work on Wednesday, April 11th and the start date is Monday, April 22nd. It’s a 133 calendar day contract schedule with a target of having it completed prior to the fall semester. There’ll be training provided to District Police and some training for CTSS (Campus Technology Support Services). New monitors and licenses will be installed at the dispatch center at EVC. There will be 65 cameras installed.

Phil asked if the cameras will have monitors at District Police. Owen explained that not all cameras will have a dedicated monitor. Some monitors will have a split screen with call up availability for the dispatcher. It was asked if this will solve the access of the internet via the wifi network or the missing service for Verizon. Owen explained that it’ll solve the access to the internet via the public wifi network, but will not solve the cell phone service situation to be able to make phone calls if you happen to be a Verizon customer. This is different than wireless access point connected to our network.

In regards to the cell phone coverage, Jorge explained that the college has service providers with cell towers by the visitor’s bleachers and the Theater. The only vendor that doesn’t have a contract to have a footprint on campus is Verizon. A meeting took place with Chancellor Seaberry, Heather Lancaster and Owen Letcher to find a way to consolidate a location for these services so the college can have full coverage. The footprint, connectivity and infrastructure are all significant. Owen explained that roughly each provider desires to have 196 fiber optic cables run to each cell tower. Jorge further explained that the college is looking at a new location where they can host all the cell phone providers on campus. This will include Verizon.

c. Parking lot resurface and restriped – possible modifications

Chief Morales brought up the recommendations from a previous meeting to add more visitor parking spaces on multiple sides of the campus. He wanted to know what the plan were for the restriping of the lots and if input could be given on it before it starts.
Jorge explained that he isn’t aware of any project starting to resurface or restrripe the parking lots. He doesn’t have a project funded with bond to do the work. Owen also doesn’t know of a project that’s been established to resurface additional parking lot on campus. The question was raised as to who owns the responsibility of taking care of the parking lots. Chief Morales mentioned that lot “B” is in need of restriping since the markings are fading. He’d like to know how he could go about getting it restriped. Jorge explained that it would possibly be a Maintenance Department function since they have a painter or if work is significant a contract could be coordinated and completed. Owen explained that under the agreement the Grounds Department is responsible for the maintenance of all parking lots. Jorge pointed out how this becomes a problem because no one takes accountability and it isn’t clarified as to who should be taking responsibility for certain projects (i.e. signage, stripping, etc.). Owen explained that it would take a reorganization within the District to realign the services requested. In the absence of leadership and accountability, it’ll become a college project. Jorge and Chief Morales will meet to create a project, have it fully funded and have it completed over the summer.

d. Maintenance & Operations Building.

Tricia Tanimura and Joe Vela from Aedis Architects presented to the committee the floor plans of the new M&O Building. The building will be located near Laswell/Kingman location near the turnaround. The project was originally a one story building, but after a second look and the project requirements, a second story was added to the building. The team met and received feedback from the end users. The team was able to get the project requirements from the end users. Currently the team is looking at confirming space needs for each department. They’re working with the District to finalize the spaces, so they can move forward and complete their design. The first floor will be the Maintenance and Operation department with the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) on the second floor. That second floor space is intended to be very flexible so that it can be used for other purposes. The second floor will also have an open deck area, which can be used as a staff break area.

Jorge concluded that the team met with the users two weeks ago. There were 24 people in attendance with lots of feedback and input. They want to go to DSA by August.

Janet asked based on the number of employees versus the number of square feet that they have is there allowable space for expansion and growth. How much expansion and growth has been worked into the budget? Joe V. explained that they were given a program by the District Office of what they needed to accommodate. Some of the departments were asked to clean out some of their spaces and reduce down to be more efficient in certain areas. There’ll be other departments that’ll move to other places (i.e. Central Plant).

Iyun was wondering what type of glass material is being used and if it’s a good idea to have that much glass in new buildings anymore. Joe V. mentioned that they’re looking at making the glass translucent. They haven’t discussed the safety glazing that has been
mentioned. This type of material is more expensive. The lower glazing translucent would make it difficult to see inside, but able to see out. Jorge mentioned that we can look at double pane glass as an investment for safety and security.

Phil asked if District Police will remain in the Student Center if the Emergency Operations Center goes into the new M&O Building. Jorge mentioned that the college is having discussions with Chief Morales regarding repurpose space. Chief Morales followed up by mentioning that in the discussion there was mention of a possible second parking garage that may go up and possibly moving District Police to the first floor. This would serve a purpose of secure parking for District Police vehicles, which is currently an issue now since they’re parking out in front of the Student Center. Also, Chief Morales feels that they’re current space in the Student Center is valuable and should be considered for Student Services. Phil has a concern with having District Police and the EOC in two different locations. It was explained that the EOC is a campus base center and isn’t for the sole use of District Police. The EOC would be used by college staff to meet in the case of an emergency. District Police would be part of it, but not in charge of it. Phil thought it might be a wiser use of funds to have a mobile EOC that could be used at either campuses rather than dedicating two areas at each college for an EOC. Chief Morales explained that this option was considered, but it was too expensive. He reminded Phil that the space wouldn’t be dedicated to only the EOC. The space could be used as open office space. Joe V. also mentioned that you want your EOC away from campus and being in the M&O Building would be a great location.

Meeting adjourned
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Upcoming Spring Semester Meetings:

Have a great summer!

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of April 16, 2018 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. Providing additional space for the Student Accessibility Services Office T. Paiz
b. Update on simulation lab J. Chang
c. Update on Marker’s Space for Robotics Club J. Heady
d. Committee evaluation J. Escobar
e. Child Development update J. Escobar
f. FMP Sub-Committee J. Escobar
g. Architect selection J. Escobar
h. Relocation to first floor t building J. Escobar
i. STEM Center Proposal J. Escobar
j. CTE FMP progress J. Escobar

V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Five Year Capital Outlay Report O. Letcher

"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 & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting – Unofficial Minutes 5/7/2018

| Committee Members: |
| MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (chair), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz |
| Faculty – Janet Chang (ex-officio), Phillip Crawford, Lynn Lazik |
| Classified – Maria Avalos, Cres Nolasco |
| Associated Student Body – Joseph Heady |
| Guest – Michael Annino, Judith Bell, Robert Gutierrez, Owen Letcher (D.O.), Dennis Meakin, Mark Newton, Tait Rafat |

I. Approval of Agenda with additions P. Crawford/M. Avalos

II. Approval of April 16, 2018 minutes with modifications J. Chang/P. Crawford

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

Judith Bell presented a proposal to the committee in support for a cloud based operation software called eLumen, which is a higher-ed, assessment and curriculum management system that gives real insight into each students’ engagement and progress while satisfying the growing demands of accreditation. It’ll need support for data transfer. They’re asking for a one year subscription with no strings attached in case the college isn’t happy with the software, there’ll be no further commitment. The timeline for the project funding should be at the end of August starting in the fall and pilot 6-8 programs in program reviews similar to SLO assessment. There’s also other tools that can be useful for counselors, which could be another option for them along with Starfish. Curriculum will be a big piece of the software by generating catalogs from curriculum. Jorge asked that Judith send the information to the committee members so they can distribute to their constituency groups for review. She’ll send over links to the website and the demos which are available in video form. Tait asked if the program is significantly more user-friendly than TracDat and Curricunet. Judith explained that it’s much more transparent than TracDat.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. Providing add ‘I space for the Student Accessibility Services Office

Teresa stated that Edina Rutland, Student Accessibility Services Associate Director, spoke at a previous FaST meeting regarding more space for the SAS office. Currently, there are several complaints from students that the testing space is too noisy. In addition, the entranceway isn’t big enough as students block the entrance while waiting
in the waiting room. Teresa mentioned that Edina is trying to find solutions for additional space. Edina followed up that she’s been requesting this for over a year now. The issue is becoming more serious as time goes by. Edina would like the committee to take the matter into consideration, especially with the space allocation that’s being discussed. She believes the summer would be a good time to determine what to do with additional space. She explained that this could be a legal issues since the college isn’t providing accommodations to the SAS students. She suggested possibly expanding out towards the campus store. Jorge explained that the challenge is that the college doesn’t have swing space. The second challenge is when there’s a space allocation need, Jorge’s office doesn’t have the adequate information (number of offices, staffing plan, a need for testing, etc.). Jorge’s office doesn’t get the details and needs, which makes it difficult to take the necessary steps to begin the process. There also needs to be consideration that any of these projects don’t belong to just one department since there’s not enough staffing to take on these roles. The college needs to go through a process.

1. Getting the project started
2. Having funding transferred to the appropriate accounts
3. Having the program management company in place
4. Hiring an architect
5. Getting the programming done
6. Getting design work approved
7. Starting construction

This process takes about a year. Jorge mentioned that ideas have been floating around for the department. One idea is to take a portion of the campus store and expanding the SAS office. The contract with Follett Higher Education Group (campus store) requires that they’re assigned a certain amount of square footage for their operations. That would require altering their contract. This idea would only gain SAS a depth expansion and not width. There wouldn’t be much functionality gained and may not be an optimal option. Another alternative suggested could be to look for another location. This may take the department out of the Student Center, which could defeat other purposes and functionalities.

Phil hopes that in the future architectural designs will have ADA access ability and compliance. This should be a consideration in every services the college has on campus. He questioned why the Student Center has a 40 foot ceiling, which leaves space for an additional floor. Jorge isn’t sure if that is structurally possible, but the college needs to hire someone who can tell the college if that’s an option. There’s also several other departments in the building that also need additional space.
Janet feels that the possible solution for the testing area might be to use temporary space that can be used by several people and departments. Edina feels that would be a challenge with her department being spread throughout the campus. The department needs a permanent place for staff and students to be able to go on a regular basis.

Jorge suggested two areas that could be conditioned for her SAS. In the Learning Resource Center (LRC) where the Kinesiology Department used to be located and the old C.A.R.R. Center. There’s already a computer lab for Edina’s department on that floor. Also, there’s an area in the Career Technical Education (CTE) building. This building will be emptied out soon. It gives proximity to the Adapted P.E. area, which is also under Edina’s department. These might be areas for consideration that can get started in getting quickly. Edina would consider the LRC building idea, but the CTE building is too far for the students.

b. Update on Simulation Lab

Janet gave an update on the history of the simulation lab. She explained that she and instructor Carlos Rojo have been meeting to discuss what should be done with the space. She feels that this is a great opportunity to update the technology in the lab. It was mentioned that Carlos had signed up for a simulation lab certificate at UCSF. He’s also viewed their simulation lab and Stanford University’s lab. Carlos feels that the UCSF lab is the best. UCSF cross trains students who are getting their PhD in biology or chemistry with physicians and nurses. Both Janet and Carlos came to the conclusion that the lab has an opportunity to be accessible to all areas (i.e. biology, physiology). They both like the lab to be multipurpose/multi-accessible. They’ve met with VP Montemayor and VP Tran, which are both on board with their idea. Both will be attending a field trip to UCSF and also doing a webinar from a local vendor. A presentation with their final report will go to Academic Senate in a week.

Phil asked if the project will be on hold until next year’s program review. Jorge believes that the department was already in the process of making adjustments to the programmatic side. They didn’t feel that there was enough information to reassign funds from next year’s budget for the operation of the lab.

c. Update on Maker’s Space for Robotics Club

Joseph Heady gave a presentation on the maker’s space that is being used by the Robotics Club. The club has greatly benefited from the maker’s space. Joseph mentioned that the Robotics Club was able to enter the 2018 RoboGames. They competed in the ribbon climbing robot and self-balancing robot competitions. The club competed with teams from Egypt, Mexico and Brazil in the self-balancing competition, which they placed second in the competition. The Board of Governors Vice President,
Tom Epstein, was given a tour of the lab, which he was excited to see. The club has been working hard with sponsors that they’ve gained from the RoboGames competition. There’s a total of two sponsors supporting their club. Joseph explained how they built the maker space with cabinets and electronic work stations, which were all donated. Joseph also mentioned that he was elected as the 2018-2019 Associated Student Government President.

Tait asked what other clubs are in need of space. Joseph felt that the other clubs are happy with the space they currently have in the office from a conversation that he’s had previously with them. He explained that the Robotics Club is unique in their need for space to store equipment.

d. Committee Evaluation

The committee worked on the College Advisory Council Comprehensive Participatory Standing Committee report for spring 2018. The majority of the reported information was pulled from the agenda and minutes from throughout the year. The committee worked on the success/challenges/accomplishments portion of the report. The report will be presented at the College Advisory Council meeting on May 18th.

e. Child Development Center

It was mentioned that the faculty did a presentation to the Academic Senate last week. Phase 1 of the project will be the “K” building, which will be demolished and a modular will be placed in the location. There’s also the demo room in the Business “B” building (B-106). Faculty, students and staff are pleased with the progress.

Phil mentioned that the Gates Foundation is allocating $200M to the United States for eliminating poverty. Their targeting funding child development for people to have access to child development centers. The college may want to take a close look at this initiative and see when the grants become available. The college may be able to tie the funding into the project where our students are going in to this field for training along with development opportunities for their children. Jorge was familiar with the article that mentioned the grant. He also mentioned that they are looking into phase II & III of the project. Next semester he thinks the foundation will have a better idea of the needs of the college, so the foundation can do some of the work.

Tait asked if the college is displacing the secondary program that is next to the “K” building and if so, what is the reason. Jorge explained that the college renewed the lease in 2013-2014 (TK Portable 1 & 2), which are behind the “K” building. The contracts have a five year term. The contracts need to be terminated before the renewal for an additional five years starts again. The space where the “K” building is located will be
demolished and with the additions of the modular will not leave room for TK Portable 1 & 2. Currently, the "K" building is housing the construction management offices, which is another space that will need to be added. The college asked to terminate the lease and the county will begin looking for another space for their programs. The teachers with the programs contacted the college and highlighted the benefits of being on campus. The college met with them last week to talk about the needs of the program. The college had been communicating with the county administrators, but the teachers were just recently told of the move and were caught by surprise. The college is trying to find a solution have the program stay awhile longer, but eventually the county office will find them another location. The college could possibly adopt a program and allow them to use the facility, but it will not be in the same location. There’s also other agencies nearby who may be able to help the county out, which Jorge will be following up with in the near future.

f. FMP Sub-Committee

Jorge is suggesting to expand the membership of the sub-committee next semester or appointing a task group that can work on projects related to the Facilities Master Plan. This will be a year around discussion and work for the group. Jorge wanted to get the opinion of the committee. Iyun believes it’s a good idea but is afraid it’ll be the same people for the sub-committee and task group. This can be an overburden. Tait asked if membership could be outside of the FaST committee or is it only open to the committee members. Jorge explained that he’s only asking of the committee that he chairs. He isn’t sure if other committee chairs are asking their members to participate.

Volunteered Participants for the sub-committee:

- Phil Crawford
- Joseph Heady
- Tait Rafat
- Dennis Meakin
- Fabio Gonzales
- Cres Nolasco

g. Architect Selection

The District is looking at obtaining a more robust pool of architects. The process to recruit architecture firms has begun. The RFQ (Request for Qualifications) brought in 33 firms. The District would like to find a way of contracting companies that can perform small projects that will consume the Measure G 2010 funding. They would also like to have the companies submit new proposals, go through a qualification process and after
qualified all projects on campus the college can have a committee select a company. This will require a lot of participation. Owen added that the first step would be a pre-qualified list of firms. The list will be generated by the submissions from statement of qualification questions and their response to a series of yes/no questions. The District will then ask the firms to submit their top five projects along with any other projects that they feel their qualified for. This will complete a matrix of project categories. Design committees can then review the matrix and chose the firms that are qualified to due further interviews for selection. It will not be a closed process for a period of time. The District will go through the initial evaluation and then Purchasing will post again on their website that the District is open for acceptance of Statement of Qualifications. If any firm submits following that process, then they'll be added to the list. The selection committee will be of administrators, staff, faculty and students. The committee will have a very explicit criteria screening of applicants. Tait asked if the District is still mandated to picking the lowest bidder. For professional services, the District selects on qualifications. Depending on how the project moves forward, the delivery method will be determined and followed through the District’s traditionally lump sum low bid process. There is also other construction methods that can be considered. The committee has been given the supporting documents and have been asked to review them. The committee will need participation from the FaST committee members along with contacting the constituency groups for participants.

h. Relocation to first floor Technology Building

There’s been conversations with Dr. Watson, Executive Director of Strategic Partnerships & Workforce Innovation, regarding SparkPoint and the transition center that occupies the other side of the first floor of the Technology Building. The college will be looking for options, so they can move out to free the space. After Jorge had consulted with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Interim Vice President of Strategic Partnerships & Workforce Innovations and the College President, they feel that the CTE program, which is currently disbursed in five different locations, would be the most suitable candidate for that location. They would like to move everyone to that location along with individuals who are currently housed in the Business building (B-107). All faculty that are related to the CTE department will also move to the first floor.

Phil asked about what had happened to the idea of having the Academic Senate and Faculty Association move to that location from the Student Center since neither were student focused activity. Jorge explained that once they consolidated all of the CTE department into the first floor of the building it didn’t leave any more room for another department/division. Jorge does agree that the Academic Senate and Faculty Association do need to be moved to free up the area in the Student Center. Iyun asked if there was a list of the offices that were vacated and moved to the first floor. Jorge explained that there was a list and that the college is moving people from
the fourth floor to the first floor of the Technology building. The location will be
repurposed and the plan would be to either move them in before the end of the spring
semester or during the summer.

i. STEM Center Proposal

Dean Mark Newton gave a proposal for a Stem Center at SJCC. Robert Gutierrez and
Dean Newton have been discussing putting together an effort that can invigorate and
support science and stem student in a way that hasn’t been done before. The proposal
that Dean Newton gave to the committee is to show the idea that the college has an
opportunity to follow a model (Stem Core Program), which is great for the Guided
Pathway efforts. The model would have a Retention Specialist that can help students to
realize their abilities and get them into accelerated math classes along with associated
classes (technology, computer programming, three dimensional CAD drawing, etc.).
This STEM Center would exist the same as other community college STEM Centers.
STEM Centers are designed to add excitement, support and contexts to science
education. It would need to be in the proximity of the Science Complex. The proposal
was put together to show the committee that there is a need to have this center on
campus. Something to help transition the college to deal more with getting students in
a stem oriented direction and to support the students in a way that hasn’t been done.
In addition, Dean Newton and Robert Gutierrez visited Hartnell College’s STEM Center
to see the operation. There’s also opportunities that could be associated by getting
another Science Complex, including increasing lab space and possibly having a small
planetarium. This would benefit the astronomy classes and also be used as a
recruitment tool for the college.

Phil asked what blueprint area was being thought of in terms of the geography. Dean
Newton mentioned that his favorite choice, if he could pick, would be across the lawn
from the METAS Center. Another choice would be the end of the staff lot “G” behind
the Cosmetology building.

j. CTE FMP Progress

Jorge gave an update on the progress of the Career Technology Education building.
Jorge asked Cambridge West, the consultants that are working on the Facilities Master
Plan (FMP), to give an update on facilities related to the CTE building. An information
summary from the consultants was given to the committee to review. The summary has
an update on the programs that are vibrant in the area. Jorge asked the consultants to
look at other colleges to see where they’re getting inside funding and what colleges
have built CTE buildings in the last five years. On the academic side, Lena Tran has
begun to review a company (KH). They’re interviewing faculty and staff regarding
programming. Hopefully in the next few months the college will have an architect in place.

k. Swimming Pool

Phil mentioned to approve that the committee already voted to approve the swimming pool and believes it should be paid out of the Measure G 2010 funding. He believes the next thing would be to establish the location and design of the pool. Tait Rafat had submitted some plans for different types of pools (competitive, lap swimming, fitness, etc.). There should be a meeting set up this week to further discussions. He feels that we need to start on this as soon as possible. Jorge mentioned that we’ll need to confirm that the swimming pool is added to the Measure G 2010 FMP discussion as a project. Location will be critical, because it impacts everything else on campus.

Iyun asked Tait if he recalls before that there is a suitable location for the pool already. Tait mentioned that the pool was on the FMP 2025 before it was revised. Phil believes it should serve as a priority. Tait explained that on the FMP 2025 plan the identified location was the location of student parking lot “F”. Jorge explained that the committee will need to review the new FMP since that is tied to the Kingman access location. Jorge assured that they’ll look at other spaces on campus. He suggested the space behind the softball field, near the archery area. This is a great location, but the archery class would have to find a new location. Tait also mentioned another area that could suffice, which would be student parking lot behind the softball field.

V. INFORMATION ITEMS:

a. Five Year Capital Outlay Report

Handouts were given to committee members to review. Owen gave a brief summary on the plan. The plan is required to be submitted to the State Chancellor’s office by June 30th. The plan outlines what the college’s major projects are and if we’re asking for state funding. The district hasn’t been asking for state funding, but if we do the state would allow their portion of the money be in small increments. Owen isn’t recommending that the district ask for state funding given the current bond provision. The state asks that projects are prioritized.

SJCC projects:

- Career Technical Education Complex
- Facilities Campus Operations Building
- Demo of 300, Auxiliary Gym and locker rooms
- Physical Education Complex
Applied Science Building

The PE Complex should come off the list with the submission as it was locally funded and now a complete project. The Applied Science building is on the list because it was a state and locally funded project. At the end of the project some years ago, there were three documents that were required to be submitted. Two of the three document haven’t been submitted to the State Chancellor’s office. Owen is trying to locate those documents, but haven’t found them.

The plan has a section for capacity load rations, which are based on student projections. They begin in the year 2019/2020. They take last year’s student enrollment and project it forward two years and project it beyond that point. It’s all based off the actual square footage reported and the space inventory report. Currently, we have approximately

- 250% in lecture
- around 100% in laboratory space
- office spaces are under 200% capital ratio
- library space for SJCC is around 150-160 square feet percent

There are anomalies in the out year that he’s been unable to find why it’s 1000% in the 6th and 7th years out.

The campus AV/TV spaces on campus, which are spaces occupied by the CTSS staff and any room for the radio station. This is an area by state standards to be low, which most colleges are low.

The Campus Load Distribution page showed that the college’s projected weekly student contact hours are, weather on/off campus or any specialty areas. It shows the list of instruction FTE (full time equivalent faculty). Based on the 2017 data, SJCC had 157 FTE. This number is currently being reported by our Human Resources. He’s not positive if the data is accurate.

The last few pages of the plan shows the project descriptions.

- Career Technical building is a $70M project, new construction, replacement of square footage (100/200 wings) and preliminary plans with occupancy date
- Remaining pages show additional projects with additional details.

The categories for expenditure funds are in accordance with the state funded projects. The plan will go to the Board of Trustees at the June meeting. Phil asked if the demolition of the 300 wing is happening first. Owen explained that in the project schedule the district needs to start the design for the CTE building before the demolition
of the 300 wing. Tait followed up by confirming that the demolition would happen in the year 2020. Owen explained that these were the original projections and they can exceed them. The oddity of the Chancellor Office system, is the first year you can put in is 2020. They push you off two years for the beginning of a project. Dennis Meakin asked if there was a phase for mapping and upgrading utilities. Owen explained that this isn’t a capital improvement project that the state would fund, so they wouldn’t request that in the report. Jorge has concerns with the report being completed by District Office, because there’s a lot of unknowns (i.e. faculty growth projections, ratios, weekly contact hours, enrollment numbers, etc.) Owen explained that these numbers are reported to the Institutional Research and Chancellor’s offices, which feeds the fusion database system. Jorge doesn’t feel that the report is useful for the college’s purposes unless all the data is accurate. Owen stated that as a basic aid district with our own bond funds, it’s a report that is a placeholder report at the state. The state will contact the district and ask if any of the projects on the report need to be state funded. Jorge mentioned that there is one project on the Facilities Master Plan that calls for one project that’ll include state funding.

Meeting adjourned
Facilities, Safety & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting AGENDA  
Student Center (SC-204)  
September 17, 2018  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (chair), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – Phillip Crawford, Dennis Meakin, Scott Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified – Maria Avalos, Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upcoming Fall Semester Meetings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of May 7, 2018 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Need of Sub-Committee for projects - (Jorge)

b. Introductions: Interim Dir. of District Facilities & Bond Program Mgr., PM/CM and Bond PM - (Jorge/Michael Hohl)

c. Issues with PE building – (Michael Hohl)

d. Fume Hoods – (Michael Hohl)

e. Construction Management update summer projects: Wayfinding signage phase II, Physical security phase II, HVAC upgrades - (Jenkins, Gales and Martinez)

f. Planning of CTE building: selection of an architect for programing: KH consulting report - (B&D/Jorge)

g. New project updates: CDC; Swimming Pool; painting buildings; M&O/EOC; Kingman traffic light; site survey; Center for Medical Technology Innovations; cell tower; Parking lot assignment review; painting and restriping - (Jorge/JGM)

h. Space utilization: moves B107; CT offices; CTE and VPSPWI; LRC114; GE118; LRC106 - (Joe)

i. Tech refresh update - (Young)

j. Electronic Scooters on campus - (Maria)

k. Admissions and Records front counter safety – Plexiglas - (Teresa)

"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 & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting – Minutes 9/17/2018

Committee Members:
MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (chair), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz

Faculty – Scott Miller, Dennis Meakin, Phil Crawford

Classified – Steven Lee (proxy for M. Avalos), Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco

Associated Student Body – Joseph Heady

Guest – Michael Annino (District Police), Toby Black (Jenkins/Gales & Martinez, Inc.), Sue Dale (DO), Dalton Gary (JGM), Peiman Gheibi (Library), Dale Harris (District Police), Lamel Harris (Kinesiology), Susan Hines (Library), Michael Hohl (DO), Aboudi Kabbani (Brailsford & Dunlavey, Inc.), Amanda Kestel-Kolstad (Library), Filiz Kuzu (JGM), David Lomax (Faculty), Taylor Montiel (Library), Diana Merino, Emily Rae (B&D), Alaric Robinson (JGM), Ariel Rodeo (CTSS), Edina Rutland (SAS), Bob Wing (Library), Carlos Zavala (JGM)

I. Approval of Agenda

T. Paiz/L. Jimenez

II. Approval of May 7, 2018 minutes

P. Crawford/L. Jimenez

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

Susan Hines brought a concern to the committee regarding third party vendors that were doing work in her area during the summer break. The vendors are not announcing themselves, which poses a concern for the staff. Susan suggested that there be given some type of documentation or communication internally to the Library staff and herself, so they’re aware of who’ll be working in their areas.

The Library staff also explained to the committee their concerns and experiences with the vendors.

- Vendors are unaware of a contact person in the building, pulling away staff from meetings.
- No notifications are given to the staff that vendors are working in the building.
- Vendors are requesting access to the building during off hours.
- During the summer when the building is closed to the public, vendors are leaving doors unlocked allowing people from the outside to come into the building and use equipment without the staff’s knowledge.
- Vendors are not approaching the staff to let them know who they are, but rather the staff are having to approach the vendors.
- Vendors have keys to the area and are not locking the doors when they complete their work.
Edina Rutland supported the Library’s concerns and also explained that her area has had the same issues with third party vendors. She mentioned that they were going through her area as a short cut to get to other areas of the building.

Edina also explained to the committee that some doors on campus are difficult to open for students with disabilities. This can be difficult and can pose a challenge for some students. Her office has received some complaints. She also noticed the need to have doors with automatic access for students with disabilities.

The committee isn’t allowed to engage in discussion during public comments. The chair decided to discuss some of these concerns directly with the committee members and to also give some updates regarding the same areas.

Jorge explained to the committee that the campus doesn’t have an identity management system. Staff and faculty are not mandated to wear ID badges, which can be a problem. The turnover and credentialing is a problem when it comes to vendors on campus. Jorge suggested that the campus work with Chief Morales to find a way to handle the situation of vendor’s on campus.

Phil suggested that there should be some type of color band that can identify someone who’s allowed access to certain campus areas. This could help the staff immediately notice that the vendor has gone through the process to be on campus.

Chief Morales believes that badges are a good idea that could also be used as access control. He explained that no one has full information on everyone who comes on campus, which he admits is an issue. He suggested an email be sent to the person in charge of the building from which the vendor is needing access. He also mentioned that Dale Harris, Interim Emergency Preparedness Coordinator, had sent out a list that identified building marshals, which he said is another suggestion for a point of contact.

Jorge explained that the college just completed an ADA Transition 504 report. The report identifies the issues with the doors. The college is launching and funding a project that will address the issues found on the report. A plan should be ready to present by the next board meeting. The college will look at main entrances and exit doors to be addressed with the concerns that Edina brought to the committee.

David Lomax, faculty, asked the committee about security codes for the classrooms. He’s had numerous problems accessing his classroom without setting off the alarms for the past few years. This has caused problems for him when using the area. He has to wait for someone to come by and turn off the alarm. He’s asked for long-term assistance, but hasn’t been able to get an answer from his department or District Police. He was told by District
Police that they weren’t issuing access codes at this time. Chief Morales explained that the panels that have alarm codes are set up to an analog system. The new system that was recently installed is digital. This has made it impossible for his office to generate new access codes. His office is in the process of working with Human Resources to see what people on the current list are no longer working at the college and see if codes can be regenerated. He doesn’t think this would be a safe way to go because codes will be shared among others. His office has tried to work with several vendors to find a long-term solution, but this would cost millions to do the whole system over. Phil suggested shutting off the alarm. Chief Morales felt that would create a whole other safety issue.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. Need of Sub-Committee for projects –

A sub-committee was generated at the end of spring semester. The committee had a couple of meetings that took place in the summer. Jorge emphasized that there are numerous projects currently going on that need a sub-committee or task force from the FaST committee. He proposed a separate task force, which can also include other members of the community. Dennis Meakin suggested that Anthony Jakubowski, Maintenance Supervisor, be part of the group or ex-officio of the committee. Dennis also volunteered to be a part of the task force.

b. Intro: Interim Dir. Of District Facilities & Bond Program Mgr., PM/CM and Bond PM –

Michael Hohl, Interim Director of Facilities & Bond Program, introduced SJCC’s Bond Program Manager along with the team members for both Jenkins/Gales & Martinez, Inc. and Brailsford & Dunlavey, Inc.

• Susan Dale – Bond Program Manager for SJCC

Jenkins/Gales & Martinez team (Construction Management) -

• Alaric Robinson – Sr. Construction Manager
• Dalton Gary – Project Director
• Carlos Zavala – Construction Manager
• Filiz Kuzu – Construction Manger
• Toby Black – Construction Manager

Brailsford & Dunlavey team (Project Management) -

• Aboudi Kabbani – Project Manager
• Emily Rae – Project Manager
c. **Issues with PE Building**

The Physical Education building was completed in the spring, however, there were issues during construction. There were areas that still needed to be completed (lobby floor, gym, etc.).

Alaric explained that JGM took over the project with challenges (closeout). Closeout is a project that’s closed out with the state. There were warranty and use ability issues. A list was put together with the former District Bond Manager and the PE end users. JGM took that list and started working with the PE staff to compile it with other use ability issues that the department had and came up with a master list that they have been systematically working through. They’ve been working on the list this all summer. Most of the items on the list have been completed. All things that have been in warranty have been fixed or are scheduled to be fixed. There are a few challenges, but everyone is honoring their warranties. It’s just a matter of getting teams out and not affecting Lamel’s ability to use the facility.

Filiz gave a listed update of the building.

(See JENKINS/GALES & MARTINEZ summary update)

Jorge explained that there’s a lot of work and a little frustration because the process can’t be completed while the building is in use. The college will continue to sharpen their skills so that this doesn’t happen again in future construction.

d. **Fume Hoods**

Jorge met with Academic Senate last week. Vice President Jose Cabrera will be talking with faculty to start looking into long term accommodations, so the chemistry labs can be up and running for growth. Jorge mentioned that this is a concern and a priority to the college.

(See Interim District Bonds Manager – Summary Update)

e. **Construction Management update summer projects: Wayfinding signage phase II, Physical security phase II, HVAC upgrades**

(See JENKINS/GALES & MARTINEZ summary update)
f. Planning of CTE building: selection of an architect for programming: KH consulting report

Jorge explained that the college wanted to hire an architect to assist with the programming phase, which consisted of meeting with end users, combining information and putting it in a document to serve as a guide for a design. The process needs to adhere to the outreach policy set by the Board of Trustees. The college is working with B&D to do the work in-house. This will help when the architect is hired because there will be something in place along with the work that's been previously shared with the committee, which came from C.M. Brahmabhett from Cambridge West Partnership, LLC (consulting firm), who worked with the college on the Facilities Master Plan. Vice President Lena Tran also is working with KH Consulting Group, to work on the instructional collection of data.

(See BRAILSFORD & DUNLAVEY summary update)

Jorge explained that they are modifying the approach to help it move faster. They’ll need input, which has been a struggle. They need people who can find time to sit down and give input on these items. The second challenge is getting ideas and go beyond what they have today. What is the end goal? What type of facility is needed to support the educational master plan? There are other colleges across the nation that have developed these programs and buildings to a level that is desirable. Can the college get ideas from them that will allow the college to get ideas and give them to the architects, of what the building should look like and the functionality that the building should have. The conversations that Jorge has had with faculty, Chancellor Breland and the other Vice Presidents has been about big emphasis on the CTE building. The college has never built a building of this size. It could be a $100M project, which will take a big portion of allocation from the Measure X bond. The building could be iconic by being in the center of campus and standing five stories high making it the tallest structure on campus. The building will incorporate classrooms, offices, shop, a large conference area and possibly a maker’s space. The college can’t afford to make any mistakes on the programming. Every year that the construction is delayed, the college will lose 15% in cost escalation. The cost of construction is rising quickly. People need to get engaged and motivated in this project. The investment that the user groups put up front pays on dividends as the building comes together and the program moves into the new spaces.

Phil asked if the college has a user group for this building. The college has the names of 8-10 faculty members. Vice President Tran has also done some research with KH Consulting Group and they are working with faculty to learn the academic programs that should be developed and sustained to move forward. Jorge emphasized how critical it is to have the involvement of the committee on the decisions of this project.
g. New project updates: CDC; Swimming pool; painting buildings, M&O/EOC; Kingman traffic light; site survey; Center for Medical Technology Innovations; cell tower; Parking lot assignment review; painting and restriping –

Jorge went over the new projects that have been previously discussed in the committee meetings.

- **Child Development Center** – The College has done everything to pave the way for a CDC on campus. As soon as the construction/project management offices are relocated, building K will be demolished within the next few months. The college will place portables to host a small CDC. The college wants to modify the Facilities Master Plan to incorporate the projects and have a full CDC to be built in the future. Jorge is working with Fred Ferrer, faculty consultant, who’s helping him layout phases to bring the CDC back. Jorge is planning on giving an update to the Board of Trustees at October board meeting. It’s a multiyear, multiphase approach to the CDC that incorporates the programming and the operation of the center. It starts to take into consideration financial sustainability and total cost of ownership of the facility.

- **Swimming pool** – Discussion has begun on the location of the swimming pool. The college will need to make adjustments to ensure documentation is in place. Jorge has walked the campus with multiple people and the best location they could establish was the back of the archery field near Kingman. There’s space in the area that’ll allow for a pool that will serve multiple purposes. The group has met with faculty to discuss ideas on the use of the facility. The pool will serve the purpose of the students, rehab and our community. It’ll possibly be a six lane pool, which could accommodate 30 students in a class. They’ll need to consider the infrastructure that’s required in the area, but also any other infrastructure surrounding the pool (i.e. lockers, showers). Jorge feels that the location is perfect for access points with parking access through multiple areas. The first part will need to be the completion of the programming. The project will be funded in the next BLR, in October. It will be a 25 meter, six lane shallow water pool.

- **Painting of buildings** – The Theater needs a fresh coat along with other buildings on campus. Some of the buildings colors are fading. There needs to be a cycle, so they don’t start to look like they’re aging. They’ll be putting together a RFP (request for proposal).

- **M&O Building/Emergency Operational Center** – A presentation was given by Chief Morales and Jorge at the Community College Facility Coalition in Sacramento. They spoke about the virtue of having an EOC. Everyone was complimentary on how the EOC will be collated with the M&O Building.
• **Kingman traffic light** – The College will explore getting a permanent, four-way, left-turn traffic light that comes out of the multipurpose field area. Part of this project will be going through the city processes. This will consist of paving and connecting Kingman and Leigh from the parking lot “F”. This will allow access for people to make a left turn on Leigh Avenue and will include additional parking spaces. There’ll also be another drop-off location for the campus.

• **Site survey** – The College will be investing $3M of the bond allocation in the next few years, and a part will be to give an assessment of what’s underground. Before the College continues to build up, we want to understand what’s on the foundation. That particular project will cost about $1M. It’ll be a full assessment/survey of the campus. We should be able to have a tool that gives any department access to a digital map of the campus. The College doesn’t have a document that fully outlines all the mechanical and electrical rooms on campus. There’s only different documents set by different architectural firms, nothing is integrated.

• **Center for Medical Technology Innovations** – The space for the SIMS lab is being upgraded. The College is working with faculty, specifically faculty member Carlos Rojo. It’s going to take about $2-3M to make the center of the line. There was a demo with faculty from the University of San Francisco and Stanford University to give the College some ideas on how to make this a top-notch center. The idea of the center will be to integrate solutions for medical technology, physiology, biology, and augmented and virtual reality all in one place. Some of these centers use life-like mannequins, which can trigger reactions that can be monitored like a real human being. The mannequins can produce heart attacks among other things that can be monitored. The lab will generate new technologies and instruction.

• **Cell towers** – Jorge reminded the committee that currently the cell towers on campus were never certified. Without certification the tower on the theater can’t be touched. The ultimate solution is to move Sprint antennas to another location. The college and District Office met to talk about an ultimate solution. The solution that they came up with was to install a “fake tree” towers and put all providers. This will eliminate the issues that we currently have with some providers, specifically Verizon, which currently customers don’t have reception on campus who belong to them.

Phil asked why the college needs to pay to fix this problem. Why doesn’t Verizon do something to fix the problem? Jorge explained that Verizon doesn’t feel obligated to provide service specifically on campus since they have towers nearby in the city. Verizon wants the institutions to build the infrastructure, so they can tap into it. Verizon uses third party brokers to lease the towers. The College has also explored some inexpensive repeaters, but they’ll only help a
small area. Phil suggested that the College get on Verizon’s Board of Directors agenda to talk about the situation. He thinks that if student’s take the issue to social media it might cause Verizon to rethink their stance on providing services.

- **Parking lot assignment review/ Painting and restriping** – There’s a concern that some of the parking lots are multi-use. The college is unable to keep up with the stenciling. Students park in the wrong place and are ticketed by Campus Police, which creates complaints. There may be a need to look at the restrictions on parking assignments and flexibility on parking fees. Jorge mentioned that the College would be restriping the parking lots with the most faded striping. Chief Morales asked if the College could hire a contractor to come out annually to touch up the parking lots since the lines fade quickly. Jorge explained that this would become a regular college expense, which the college can’t pick up those expenditures after the Resource Allocation Model. Jorge mentioned that there’s been a suggestion to do 20% of the parking lots per year and this might be possible.

**h. Space utilization: moves B107; CT Offices; CTE and VPSPWI; LRC114; GE118; LRC106**

Due to the overuse of space in department areas, the college is forced to look at space utilization to assist some of these departments. The College has had to create swing space as an alternative. The committee approved B107 as swing space last year. The space is now empty, but it will be looked at to place other people in it. Some of the areas that are being considered are:

- Professional Development Center from GE118 to LRC114.
- GE118 could be used for International Students Program
- LRC116 for different learning communities (Umoja, Puente, etc.)

Jorge will keep the committee updated as there’s no major decisions right now.

**i. Tech refresh update**

Young gave an update on the computers that were refreshed by the CTSS team along with upgrades that have been completed on campus.

- GE Building, Business Building and Science Complex have all new Hitachi projectors. The team plans to continue with installing projectors in the other classrooms on campus.
- ESL labs were upgraded with an all in one computer system (touch screen, etc.)
- GE119 (Adjunct Faculty Center) was upgraded with all new computers that have Windows 10.
• Milpitas has all mobile laptop computers systems
• Cosmetology was upgraded with all new cameras and computers
• New copiers are currently being installed across campus (multifunction)
• New monitors were ordered to replace in staff’s office
• District Office will be installing a new work order system (online portal, self-help). Hoping to integrate with Facilities in the future.
• Trying out Apple TV and Chromecast for faculty who are interested in using it.
• I-pads and other mobile devices are being given out to the Ironworkers Program

j. Electronic Scooters on campus

Last week there were 30 scooters dropped off on campus. Jorge has noticed that some students are using the scooters. There needs to be some type of policy, signage and enforcement with these scooters. A policy needs to be drafted and signed and there needs to be a department in charge of enforcement. Chief Morales mentioned that there is a vehicle code policy in place that prohibits riding on sidewalks. You need to have a license and helmet. However, a recent bill was just put through that made it so you don’t have to use a helmet and decreased the miles you can ride to 15mph. He feels that the bill was sent through because of all the companies that are coming up with these ride share ideas. It’s beneficial to have this revenue stream come in to cities. Chief Morales has been researching other colleges that are dealing with these type of vehicles on campus. He reported to the committee that Long Beach College banned the scooters on their campuses. They also placed drop-off zones, so students could still use them to get to campus, but they are not allowed to be on campus. He believes that this would be a good first step for the college to take with these scooters. Chief Morales plans to visit EVC’s Safety Committee to discuss it with them. He doesn’t believe that EVC has them at their campus yet, but it’s only a matter of time before they do. He feels that collectively if both colleges are in agreement, it can move forward to the board.

Phil believes that the scooters are doing well downtown. He notices that people are able to get around downtown pretty good. He believes they might be useful on campus and the idea is to reduce their carbon footprint to reduce greenhouse gases by not using cars. He feels that if the College can find a way to have people get around campus by creating a pathway where these scooters could be used as a convenience for students.

In the short term, Jorge believes the only action that can take place is to remove them from campus. The College will need to contact the company and ask them to remove the scooters or put them in the trash. Secondly, the College can develop a policy that will need to be approve by the committee and then put in the student conduct. The policy
can be bundled with bicycles, skateboarders and smoking. They would all require action by the committee and approved by the College Advisory Council.

Steven brought up a nuisance of the scooters be left at entrances/exits of buildings along with roads and parking lots. Someone might run over the scooters and in that case, what’s the liability? The committee discussed other liability issues that could arise from the scooters. There’s a lot of implications on this subject. Jorge asked Joe to document by taking pictures of situations with the scooters. Steven will speak to Edina regarding students with disabilities’ perspective.

**MOTION:** P. Crawford/2nd D. Meakin
Move to adopt a college policy or procedure that prohibits the scooters, in the same way as bicycles, from internal campus sidewalks.

*Unanimously approved*

**k. Admissions and Records front counter safety**

Teresa and the A&R department has been wanting to install Plexiglas for safety. Currently, the front counter is open and there’s been instances where students have reached over the counter. She mentioned to the committee incidents where students have become angry to the point where she’s had to call Campus Police. This is an ongoing safety issue with her department. Jorge agrees that this is something that needs to be pursued now. Teresa asked if there’s a timeline for installation. Joe mentioned that a vendor will be coming out tomorrow.

**Meeting adjourned**
 Facilities, Safety & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting AGENDA  
Student Center (SC-204)  
October 1, 2018  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members:</th>
<th>Upcoming Fall Semester Meetings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (chair), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz Faculty – Phillip Crawford, Dennis Meakin, Scott Miller Classified – Sandra Gonzalez, Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco Associated Student Body – Joseph Heady | October 15th  
November 5th  
November 19th  
December 3rd |

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of September 17, 2018 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

   a. Election of Chair/Co-Chair

   b. Committee Charge Annual Review

   c. Campus Security (D. Meakin)

   d. Follow up on Disability Access discussed at Board Meeting (J. Escobar)

“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 & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting – Minutes 10/1/2018

Committee Members:
MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (chair), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz

Faculty – Scott Miller, Dennis Meakin, Phil Crawford

Classified – Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco

Associated Student Body –

Guest – Susan Dale (Bond), David Lomax (faculty), Emily Rae (B&D), Ariel Rodeo, Edina Rutland, Officer Pedro Urrutia

I. Approval of Agenda
   D. Meakin/T. Paiz

II. Approval of September 17, 2018 minutes
    S. Miller/D. Meakin

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

Emily Rae (Brailsford & Dunlavey, Inc.) reiterated to the committee the planning process for the CTE Building. B&D is hoping to host a workshop on November 5th, during the FaST meeting time, to help develop a set of guiding principles that’ll be used throughout the design process. Refreshments will be served.

Jorge mentioned that it is flu season and it’s very important this year that everyone get their flu shot. Health Services provides the flu shot for students and staff.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Election of Chair/Co-Chair –

The committee discussed election of the committee chair and co-chair. Jorge recommended to the committee that it be considered to extend membership to a full academic year.

The committee elected the following members:

Teresa Paiz nominated Dennis Meakin for the committee chair position. Dennis accepted the nomination.

   Unanimously approved

1
Joe Andrade nominated Sandra Gonzalez (absent) for the committee co-chair position.

Unanimously approved

b. Committee Charge Annual Review –

The committee did their annual review of the current charge, which was revised and approved by the committee this past March. The committee felt that the charge was fine “as is”.

Joe asked for confirmation on whether he is considered “ex-officio” or a voting member. After review of his position on the charge it was determined that he is a voting member.

c. Campus Security –

Dennis brought a handout regarding AB 3205, which requires all schools in the K-12 grades to have locks that allow doors to classrooms to be locked from the inside of the room. The type of door that Dennis has seen has a deadbolts mounted at the base of the doors, which is a manual lock. These type of locks are very simple to use. Dennis mentioned that locking bars that were supposed to be used last year.

Chief Morales explained that the bars violated a fire code and wasn’t approved by the Fire Marshall. Chief Morales further explained that for a locking mechanism to be considered legal and effective, it has to conform to ADA compliances. The college has been trying to find a security lock mechanism that is ADA compliant for the last two years. The other concern is the funding and standardization from the District. Chief Morales feels that once there’s standard guidelines and funding from the District Office on the locking mechanisms, at that point the colleges can look at implementation.

Jorge also stated that there needs to be an ownership for the lock. Jorge believes this fall on the District. Jorge explained the chain of thought for this by explaining that the Locksmith is a District employee who reports to the Facilities/Bond Manager who ultimately reports to the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services. The door might belong to the college, but the lock is maintained by the Locksmith, which is one person for the whole District. Jorge also brought up the different style of buildings on campus. Some of the older buildings are unable to install the new access control technology. Retrofitting an old campus isn’t impossible, but it’s expensive and isn’t easy. He also reminded the committee that not one solution can fix the problem.

Two years ago the college completed a door and hardware assessment. There are 1500 doors on campus (internal and external). The college now needs to do an assessment of the locks on those doors. There’s a thought that if you replace the cylinder on the
inside, you can put a new cylinder on the inside to open the door. It'll only be accessible from the inside. Jorge feels this could be complicated, because any mechanism that can lock a door from the inside could pose harm for someone who might be held against their will in a room. The person wouldn’t be able to escape if they don’t have a key to that particular lock.

Jorge mentioned some of the mass notification on campus that should be able to assist in the case of emergency (blue phones, mass text messages-emails).

New construction will have access control, cameras and fire alarm panels. This is part of the new standard moving forward.

Dennis inquired about a follow-up to the motion that passed in April.

To put forth a recommendation to take the security resources that are assigned to the District Office and reassign them to higher risk college facilities or in the alternative be able to receive the same security resources as the District Office has assigned to themselves.

Jorge mentioned that there is discussion about resource allocation model at the highest level. Chancellor Breland is looking at new sources of funding that are coming in to the District to take in to consideration for demands and needs. At the Chancellor’s Cabinet meeting, Chief Morales gave an update on what’s going on in education and safety. This created more awareness for the District about the needs at the college level.

Phil asked Chief Morales what the justification is and why it was a priority for having a community officer at the front desk, at the District Office, during the hours that the building is open, but that isn’t the same on either campuses. Chief Morales doesn’t feel it’s a priority and thinks that all resources should be at both campuses. Chief Morales explained that he has a total of four police officers. Monday through Thursday, he has one officer at each college, at all times. Chief Morales did some data research of each campus and found that Monday through Thursday are the busiest days. In order for him to have coverage at all times, he had to switch the hours of his officers to a 9/80 shift. The 9/80 shift consist of the officers working 9 hour days (M-Th), which gives then an overlap. The officers are given every other Friday off. He only has one officer on Fridays, based on the population of the campus. Chief Morales and his Lieutenants are on the campus frequently and make rounds when on campus. His CSOs (Campus Safety Officers) he has one at each college, the District Office and the Milpitas Extension. The District Office made it a priority to have the front desk staffed at all times. Chief Morales requested at various times to release the CSO, but the direction he received was that the District Office wants to have the desk staffed at all times. He explained that part of the reason behind the District Office’s decision is the homeless that can
sometime come into the building. Looking at the crime statistics are a lot different than
the campuses. If it was up to the Chief, he would rather staff the front desk with
contracted security and have his officers at the college or have more staff. Chief
Morales explained that if he was able to have more staff he would be able to have his
staff rotating. If they could rotate, he wouldn’t have to worry about having a fill officer
when the other officers need help.

Phil asked what the status of the student patrol officers (campus cadets). Chief Morales
explained that his office has two. As far as the program goes, it’s getting put together
again since the last instructor left for another job. The program just received another
instructor.

Chief Morales went on to explain that he has 104 hours of service to cover with 80
hours of personnel. This is why he has to get creative with how he distributes the hours
to his staff. This is why he did the data and came up with the shifts during the week
with it being heavier Monday through Thursday. Previously, it was staffed with an
officer on Sundays, one officer on Mondays (days/night) and two officers on Fridays.
This didn’t make sense to him based on the data. He worked with CSEA to have the
current schedule for his officers. He also explained to the committee that when an
officer is out sick or on vacation, he’s down to one officer. Phil asked if the parking
control officers is a separate job classification. Chief Morales explained that he has
three levels of officers.

1. 2 traffic campus safety officer. Their sole responsibility is to just write traffic
tickets and assisting with parking/traffic control.
2. He also created a Campus Safety Officer position. He sent them to a training
school to learn how to use pepper spray, laws of arrest and he gave them
handcuffs. This way they can take on more responsibilities than just handling
traffic. He has four staff members at this level.
3. 4 police officers.

He has three reserves, but they are very limited on the hours that they can work. They
work enough to keep their standard post and they can work a little bit on the weekends.
All his positions are allocated for and he has no vacancies. Prior to Chief Morales joining
the District, the department went with about ten years with only three officers. The
staffing has got a lot better, but no were near where it should be. Linda asked if the
District Office has been approached with having the front desk staffed with contracted
security officers. He explained that it was a CSEA issue. Currently, the college is using a
contracted security company to cover midnight shifts, which was approved by CSEA only
until the end of the year. CSEA would rather the District hire personnel than contract
out. On a positive note, this has produced great benefits for the college by there not
being any overnight break-ins as was the issue prior to the security company coming to
the campus. Phil asked if there was a time that there was a mentioned that in his research, he contacted former Chief of Police, and was able to find out that between 1980-1994, there was overnight coverage. They had 24 hour dispatchers. In the mid-eighties, they had budget issues and the overnight coverage was cut, but the dispatchers remained. During this time, San Jose Unified School District, had a police department that the college dispatchers would work with. Joe asked if in Chief Morales’ research he researched other colleges of the same size as our District to see what type of staffing models they have for security and how do we compare. He explained that Foothill/DeAnza has 10 officers. West Valley/Mission has 8 officers and their hours of coverage go up to 2am.

d. **Follow up on Disability Access discussed at Board Meeting**

Jorge gave an update to the committee. The college has a 504 ABA transition plan in place. Collectively, there was a quick estimation of fixes ($5M), however, there are a lot of small things, which can be difficult to contract out to complete. The college is looking at any new projects that are in place, the college will look around the perimeter of that project to see what else can be addressed as part of the project. Custodial is taking care of some minor projects. The college is looking at the doors that need to be replaced electronically, which should start with exterior doors and following with restroom doors. In response to disability the college is working on the 508 compliance, which is website, videos that are closed caption by law.

**Meeting adjourned**
Facilities, Safety & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
October 15, 2018
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members:</th>
<th>Upcoming Fall Semester Meetings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – Phillip Crawford, Dennis Meakin (Chair), Scott Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified – Sandra Gonzalez (Co-Chair), Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body – Joseph Heady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of October 1, 2018 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Parking Lots (Lot between 100/200 wings, Lot “B”) –

b. Follow-up on Scooters -

c. Committee Goals –

d. Technology –

“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 & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting – Minutes 10/15/2018

Committee Members:
MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz

Faculty – Dennis Meakin (chair), Phil Crawford

Classified – Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco, Sandra Gonzalez (co-chair)

Associated Student Body –

Guest – Neta Assaf (Brailsford & Dunlavey), Yesenia Ramirez, Edina Rutland, Officer Pete Urrutia

I. Approval of Agenda
   S. Gonzalez/C. Nolasco

II. Approval of October 1, 2018 minutes
    S. Gonzalez/T. Paiz

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

   Neta Assaf with Brailsford & Dunlavey announced to the committee an upcoming workshop scheduled for November 5, 2018 from 2-5pm in the Student Center (SC-204). This will be a kick-off planning event for the new Career Technology Education (CTE) Building. Everyone is invited to join the workshop and have your voice help shape the look, feel and function of the new facility.

   Edina Rutland (SAS) thanked the committee for listening to her safety concerns regarding the scooters and accessibility on campus. She understands that there is a plan in place for both areas, which will help eliminate the issues that she brought to the committee.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Parking Lots (Lot between 100/200 wings, Lot “B”) –

      Dennis mentioned that some staff have brought to his attention multiple times that there are parking spaces near the 200 wing (in front of the Ironworkers classes) that have been “blacked out” and no longer say “staff”. Students are parking there now, which is making it an inconvenience for staff in that building. The committee wasn’t aware of the changes that were made to this area about a year ago.

      Motion: 2nd J. Andrade – To have the eight parking spaces put back for staff.

      Unanimously approved
Phil mentioned that there are specifications for signage that needs to be looked at to make sure that it’s done correctly. He feels that the committee should review these specifications before moving forward with having the signage installed. Phil will send the penal code to Chief Morales to review.

Dennis also mentioned that parking lot “B” is another problematic area that he’s been hearing about from staff. He’s been told that the signage is confusing because some signage says “staff” and some says “staff/students”. Sandra explained that one side of the parking lot is for students and the other is for staff. Dennis doesn’t believe that the signage is being followed. Chief Morales explained that the problem is the stencil on the ground, which has been brought to the committee last semester. It was mentioned that there is a project list with the restriping of the parking lots.

b. Follow-up on Scooters –

Chief Morales has been working with the two main scooter companies, Bird and Lime. He’s been speaking with their representatives regarding the hazardous situation that the scooters on campus are creating. One of the issues on campus has been the blockage of doors and walkways, which could become an ADA concern. Chief Morales decided to have his staff confiscate the scooters as found property and book them in at District Police. Chief Morales told the companies that if they wanted their scooters back that they would need to come up with some form of agreement. The companies and Chief Morales came up with a temporary solution, which was to put a geofence around the perimeter of the college. Chief Morales explained that a geofence is used when someone uses the scooter and downloads the app to their phone. When you get on the scooter you need to enter in the serial number, which afterwards you’ll be charged a fee and asked to enter in your credit card number. Once you dismount the scooter you’ll have to take a picture of it and then you’re able to key out of the app, so you’re no longer liable to pay for it. What the geofence does is if you’re inside the geofence you won’t be able to log out of the app. If you leave the scooter in the geofence you’ll continue to be charged. This was a deterrence to not leave the scooters on the campus or additional fees will apply. Chief Morales also suggested to the companies to increase the fees as an incentive to not leave the scooters on campus. Another suggestion that was given was to give out a verbal warning on the app once the user commits to the geofence to let them know not to leave the scooter. Since this has been put in place the issues with the scooters being left on campus has changed dramatically.

Chief Morales has begun to write a board policy on the electronic scooters that he would like to introduce on behalf of both campuses. Joe asked if it was possible to incorporate other electronic devices (bikes, skateboards, etc.). Chief Morales thought it would be best to have them separate since each campus has a different opinion on skateboards.
Jorge commended Chief Morales for taking a stand on the situation. After Jorge sent an email to the campus announcing that he would be getting rid of the scooters, he received multiple emails from both perspectives on the scooters. Some people felt that the scooters were helpful for students to move between classes and others were grateful for the scooters to be gone since they felt they could cause accidents on campus. Jorge feels that there’s going to be more of these types of transportations in the future and feels that at some point the campus will need to embrace them, but in a proper manner. He suggested as the campus develops that it should be considered to put in a pathway for these type of transportations along with rules and regulations. It was also stated that our campus layout is complicated and it’s not that simple to create these pathways.

Jorge mentioned that in relation to the policy is to consider compliance and enforcement. The question was asked who’s going to enforce these scooters. Who’s going to be picking up and dropping off the scooters? Where will they be managed? Is there going to be a fee to the company if the scooters are abandoned? Chief Morales explained that there shouldn’t be abandoned scooters since the geofence is in place. Jorge has a concern with the fees that the student’s will be responsible to pay if they leave the scooters in the geofence. Jorge explained that he had downloaded the app and tried out the scooter. He feels this is a social justice issue for our students as students won’t understand the charges on their credit card by using the app and scooter. He feels that this should be taken into consideration.

Phil explained that he had mixed feelings about the scooters because he’d like to see more “green” lanes on campus. The “green” lanes could be compatible with bikes. This could help get people out of cars and reduces the demand for parking. He feels that we should encourage bikes and electronic vehicles as long as it can be done safely.

It was mentioned that Lieutenant Dziuba is on the traffic committee for the city and they’re estimating that traffic will increase by 40% in the next five years. The scooters are here to stay as it’ll be an alternative for cars. When the scooters are in areas where they’re landlocked and congested as in our college, it creates a safety issue.

Dennis thinks there should be some docking stations so people know where to take them when they’re done using them. Currently, the scooters were being left in front of building entrances and in some cases in front of classrooms, inside of buildings.

c. Committee Goals –

The committee discussed goals for the year.

1. Adoption of the Technology Plan
2. Update the Facilities Master Plan (including the pool and Child Development Center)
3. Programming and Design of the CTE Building

d. Technology –

Young passed out a draft of the SJCC Technology Plan. The cost of the district plan is $150,000.

- $50,000 – District Office
- $50,000 – Evergreen Valley College
- $50,000 – San Jose City College

This is paid out of our college funds, which was one way of documenting a technology plan that’ll be used for the next 5-6 years. The college hired a consulting company to help with the plan and one of the things they did was to conduct a survey. There was a lot of participation from students, staff and faculty. They compiled the information and put it into actionable items. The consulting company did most of the work with the District Office Technology Plan, which was the foundation of the plan given to the committee. EVC added a few things to the plan for them. When it came to SJCC, Jorge felt that it was a “cookie-cutter” plan. He decided to spend time with Young Nguyen, CTSS Supervisor, to make it more actual. It’s taken them about a year to define the plan and make it their own. The priorities that were in the District Office plan was defined for SJCC’s plan. Jorge thanked Young and his team for the work they’ve done on the drafted plan. The plan will remain a working document. The process will be to finish the plan and take it to the College Advisory Council for approval and then to the Board of Trustees once it’s adopted by the college.

Young added that he’d like the committee to take time to read the plan. There’s a lot of projects that the constituency groups may see as a priority, so he’d like to get some feedback from everyone. Young pointed out in the plan the grid that looks at the areas that were mentioned in the survey. These areas are also meant to align with accreditation standards. He wants to make sure that what we do addresses the needs that fall into the standard and other areas.

Meeting adjourned
Facilities, Safety & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
November 5, 2018
2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members:</th>
<th>Upcoming Fall Semester Meetings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz</td>
<td>November 19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – Phillip Crawford, Dennis Meakin (Chair), Scott Miller</td>
<td>December 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body – Joseph Heady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</table>

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of October 15, 2018 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

   a. Designation of new space for Academic Senate, AFT6157, and Classified Senate - (Jorge)

   b. Overnight Security - (Joe)

   c. Visioning Session for the new CTE Building (Brailsford & Dunlavey) -

“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.”
Committee Members:
MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio)

Faculty – Dennis Meakin (chair), Phil Crawford, Scott Miller

Classified – Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco, Sandra Gonzalez (co-chair)

Associated Student Body – Joseph Heady

Guest – Neta Assaf (Brailsford & Dunlavey), C.M. Brahmbhatt (Cambridge West Partnership, LLC),
Sue Dale (Bonds/Facilities), Gina Del Rosario (Cosmetology), Ann Drummie (Brailsford & Dunlavey),
Joyce Fukuman (Construction Tech.), Lamel Harris (Kinesiology), Charles Heimler (Language Arts),
Sandra Honesto (Cosmetology), Jagrup Kahlon (Medical Assisting), Chris March (Machine Tech.),
Vanet Murawksy (Facilities), Beth Penfield (Brailsford & Dunlavey), Emily Rae (Brailsford & Dunlavey),
Yesenia Ramirez (Facilities), Ariel Rodeo (CTSS), Lena Tran (Strategic Partnerships & Workforce
Innovation), Isai Ulate (Machine Tech.), Faustino Villa (D.O. Maintenance)

I. Approval of Agenda
   D. Meakin/ S. Gonzalez

II. Approval of October 15, 2018 minutes
    S. Gonzalez/S. Miller

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

   Due to the special session on the agenda and the larger amount of audience members, the
   chair requested for introductions.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Designation of new space for Academic Senate, AFT6157, Classified Staff & CSEA -

   Jorge announced to the committee his recommendation to provide office space for
   Academic Senate, Classified Senate, AFT3157 and CSEA. There’s currently five offices
   available on the fourth floor of the Technology building. The space will be provided for
   senate and union business and will not be considered a personal office.

   Sandra asked when the college decides to hire more faculty if there will be enough
   space available. The college is required to provide office space for full-time faculty.
   Jorge explained that the full-time faculty who’ve recently retired, the college will not be
   giving those offices away. He explained that the reason for the empty offices on the
   fourth floor of the Technology building is due to the move of faculty to the first floor of
   the building where Workforce Institute used to be. Joe Andrade has been working with
   Aedis Architects on floor plans for the entire campus, so there is documentation of
   occupants in each office space.
MOTION: J. Andrade/2nd S. Miller – To approve the designation of space in the Technology Building (first floor) for the Academic Senate, AFT6157, Classified Senate & CSEA.

Sandra feels this is a great idea as long as it doesn’t take away from groups that are contractually given offices. Jorge stated that the college needs to abide by contract. If the college eventually runs out of space then people who don’t have contractual obligations will have to move out of the space. Once the existing Academic Senate office is vacated, the college will be consider reconfiguring the space for a student lounge.

MOVE TO AMEND THE MOTION: P. Crawford – To strike the Academic Senate from the move to the Technology Building.

Sandra asked what the plans would be for the current office space of Academic Senate and AFT6157. Jorge explained that eventually Middle College’s office, which is in the back would be moved to the Business Building (B107). Possibly the wall would then be taken down to become a student lounge. It was asked if Academic Senate decides to stay in the current office, could the walls be reinforced and give the back office to the students. Jorge feels that bring down the walls would create a bigger space with a line of sight.

Faustino mentioned that the students already have a place to decompress in the Student Center. It’s located in the Cyper Café area. There’s two small rooms, which are used as quiet areas. Jorge responded by saying this isn’t about the Academic Senate. This was regarding a concern of having Academic Senate and AFT6157 in separate offices. Jorge also reminded the committee that Academic Senate would also have the necessary space for their meetings in T415 or they can stay in SC204. Phil feels that could pose a problem since T415 is used as both a classroom and meeting room. Phil would like to bring the idea of the move to the Academic Senate meeting which is scheduled for tomorrow. Jorge offered to be at the Academic Senate meeting to discuss with anyone who may have questions about the move. Jorge did mention that there’s already been some discussion regarding the move with some of the members of Academic Senate and AFT1657.

MOTION TO DEFER THE MATTER TO THE NEXT MEETING: P. Crawford/2nd S. Miller

Yes 3
No 1
Abstain 2
The committee will bring this item back as action at the next meeting. Joe asked if the committee should move forward with Classified Senate and CSEA. Jorge would prefer to do all of them or none at all, because this will take a lot of coordination (i.e. signage, directory, etc.).

V. Overnight Security -

Joe wanted to know if there was a scope of work that the night security is doing for the campus. Do they work seven days a week? Are the officers roaming around the campus and checking on buildings? Joe’s been receiving a lot of comments by his staff that they’re still finding people in the elevators in the morning and night. Chief Morales explained that there are bar codes around campus, which the officers are required to spike the bar codes every hour to make sure they’re walking around campus. Chief Morales mentioned that one of the areas that they’re walking is the Library since there’s been multiple issues with the building. They’re also checking the 100/200/300 wings since those buildings have experienced break-ins too. The officers are checking the Technology Building and also have keys to the Student Center. Chief Morales passed around a list of duties that the security officers are doing at night. The officers have experienced some action at night especially when they started their services in the beginning of the semester. Since being here the last four months, the action has decreased a lot less. The burglaries and activities overnight on campus have stopped. In the hand out there are pictures of suspicious cars that were sent to Chief Morales from the security officers while doing their patrol around campus. Chief Morales reminded the committee that the security company’s contract will end December 31st and will not be renewed.

Cres asked what will happen once the contract ends. Chief Morales explained that the campus will go unsecure. Chief Morales doesn’t have the staff to do overnight patrolling. He doesn’t believe it’s a good idea to have his staff do overnight patrolling. If he had the extra staff he would prefer to have them on patrol while students/staff are on campus at night. To staff someone overnight would require Chief Morales to hire 2 dispatchers and 2-3 Campus Safety Officers. He would have to increase his staff by 20% and none of the staff would be to handle the calls during the day. Chief Morales explained that the agreement with CSEA was to only keep the security company until the end of the year.

Phil understands as a union member the retention of the work in the interest of doing it, but he wouldn’t be ok with his union making a deal with the District Administration that compromises the safety in the interest of having a contracted security company. Phil asked CSEA President, Faustino Villa, if he could speak on the matter.

Faustino explained that CSEA feels that security is very important to the campus. Faustino wasn’t aware of the scenario that Chief Morales spoke about regarding the additional staff needed to cover night shifts. Faustino said he’d never heard of this until today. He
explained that CSEA’s agreement with the District was the work that was being done by the security company belongs to the CSOs and officers since they’re union. CSEA isn’t debating that District Police needs this service, they know they do. Faustino mentioned that CSEA agreed to the temporary service until the end of the year with the notion that if it helped the District would bring someone in permanently to fill the position (hire CSO/Officer). CSEA’s stand is this is union work and it needs to stay in house. How the District handles it needs to be figured out with the Chief. He does believe that there needs to be some protection for SJCC because the campus is close to the hospital and downtown.

Phil understands CSEA position and indicated that what he believes Chief Morales was saying was once he puts the CSOs on the plan, he also needs to put a dispatcher that can protect that person. Leaving a CSO out on the field alone could be a serious liability for the District. Phil believes there also may need to be an armed officer to back the CSO.

Chief Morales explained his stance, which is if he has to staff the overnight shift he’s going to need two people working. Having only one person wouldn’t work because they would be working seven days straight. He mentioned that he’s offered the shift to the current employees, but no one wanted to work it. Faustino explained he was under the impression that only the CSOs were offered the position, not the officers. Chief Morales stated that both were offered and he had the emails to back what he was stating. Chief Morales only has four officers. If one of them wanted to work overnight, they’d also have to work their day shift too.

Phil suggested that there be a sub-committee which would include CSEA to discuss the matter. Try to see if there’s a way to address the issues of CSEA along with the security needs. Faustino stated that it’s not going to be negotiated with the District because it’s a position that’s already existed within the district. Faustino explained again that CSEA isn’t against supporting security, but rather the issue is the District doesn’t want to support hiring a permanent employee. He understand the Chief’s concern regarding cost, but this is something that the District needs to figure out at their level. They need to figure out how to fund this position.

MOTION: P. Crawford/2nd S. Miller – Ask the District to provide the adequate resources that the District Police needs to staff an overnight security shift seven days a week after the security contract expires on 12/31/18.

Yes 5
No 0
Abstain 2

Scott reminded the committee that they had discussed this at the first meeting of the semester. All the information was in the minutes. He asked if Chancellor Breland seen the
discussion? It’s concerning to Scott that Chief Morales needs the resources to make it happen.

Phil asked Chief Morales if it was possible that the Sheriff’s Department or San Jose Police Department could add this person on their channel for dispatch. Chief Morales explained that his office went to an all-digital radio system and both of those departments are not on that channel. They are the only two organizations in the county that haven’t gone to the new radio system. Currently, Chief Morales can talk to all the community colleges, San Jose State University and other small agencies. County Com is not on this new digital system. Silicon Valley Radio Interoperability Authority is an organization that was developed eight years ago. This organization makes it easy for our District Police to get on board due to the cost of the equipment. The only way that District Police has access to SJPD is through their dispatchers calling from their phones.

VI. Vision Session – CTE

C.M. Brahmbhatt, with Cambridge West Partnership, LLC introduced himself to the committee. His organization has been working with the college on the Educational and Facilities Master Plans (EMP/FMP). He explained that things are moving forward with the Child Development Plan and the Child Care Program. The college has asked that they work on how they can update the EMP and FMP. His organization will be reaching out the end users for this particular program (Early Childhood Education), so they can find out what the specific needs are from the department. Once they can identify the program needs they’ll be able to update the FMP. The revised FMP will be brought back to the FaST committee to review. The plan will showcase the size and location of the building. C.M. congratulated the college on the next phase of the current FMP, which is the CTE building. This is one of the biggest buildings that’ll be built on campus.

Brailsford & Dunlavey Presentation

This session is to get as many ideas as possible, so the vision can be defined for the CTE Building. The committee and audience was reminded that the facility will be placed in the area of the 300 building. The building will extend to the front parking and will go five stories high.

The Brailsford & Dunlavey team introduced themselves to the committee and audience. Their location on campus is in the K Building.

Emily Rae did an overview of the CTE Project and what’s been done up to this point. The committee reviewed the following on the presentation.
• Building Project Lifecycle
  ✓ Project Initiation > Form the Project Team > Programming > Design > Design
  Documentation > Construction
• CTE Building Project Schedule
• 6 Month Look Ahead
• Existing Reports
  ✓ Educational Master Plan 2016
  ✓ Facilities Master Plan 2016
  ✓ Educational-Facilities Master Plan Update
  ✓ CTE Task Force
  ✓ KH Employer Survey
  ✓ Current Programmatic Offerings
• SJCC CTE Program Offerings
  ✓ Accounting
  ✓ Business Admin.
  ✓ CIS
  ✓ Cosmetology
  ✓ Dental Assisting
  ✓ Esthetics Services
  ✓ EMS
  ✓ Facilities Maintenance
  ✓ HVAC/R
  ✓ Laser Technology
  ✓ Medical Assisting
  ✓ Real Estate
• Existing Reports review
• The Value of the Work Session
• Visioning Purpose & Outcome Categories
• Visioning Work Session – The Rules
• Visioning Ground Rules
• Visioning Work Session – Educational Outcomes
  ✓ Breadth & Depth of Programs
  ✓ Collaboration & Interdisciplinary Innovation
  ✓ Subject Matter Integration
  ✓ Program Fluctuation
  ✓ Subject Matter Delivery
  ✓ Inward vs. Outward Focus
• Visioning Work Session – Enrollment Management
  ✓ Competitive Amenity/Recruitment
  ✓ Completion Rate
  ✓ When are the lights on?
• Community Impact
  ✓ Community Use
  ✓ Security
  ✓ Campus Connection
  ✓ Intentional vs. Spontaneous Engagement
  ✓ Design Profile
  ✓ Environmental Stewardship

• Financial Performance
  ✓ Revenue Generation
  ✓ Lifecycle Costs

• CTE Building Project Communications
Facilities, Safety & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
November 19, 2018
2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members:</th>
<th>Upcoming Fall Semester Meetings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – Phillip Crawford, Dennis Meakin (Chair), Scott Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified – Sandra Gonzalez (Co-Chair), Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Student Body – Joseph Heady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of November 5, 2018 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Follow up on Academic & Classified Senate, AFT6157 & CSEA office usage (Jorge)

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

   a. Follow up on CAC approval of overnight Security in 2019 – (Dennis)

"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
   S. Gonzalez/T. Paiz

II. Approval of November 5, 2018 minutes
    T. Paiz/ S. Miller

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

   Introductions from the audience was requested by the chair.

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Follow up on Academic Senate, AFT6157, Classified Staff & CSEA office usage -

   Dennis mentioned that this topic was brought to the Academic Senate. They had
discussed continuing to meet in the Student Center. They were in agreement to move
Lenora Pinkston and AFT6157 to the offices in the Technology Building. Phil followed up
by stating that the Academic Senate would like to move into the Technology Building
since they’d have close access to the large meeting room (T-415) and a smaller meeting
room (T-402) for executive meetings.

   Phil mentioned that there was some questions from the Academic Senate about turning
the existing office space into open space. There seems to be a need for more office
space for Counseling and other Student Services staff. They feel that the space could be
better utilized for additional office space. Phil also felt that all decisions should be made
at the next meeting, so the moving can take place during the holiday break and not
interrupt any classes.

   MOTION: P. Crawford/2nd S. Gonzalez – To defer item to the next meeting.

   Unanimously approved
DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. **Follow up on CAC approval of overnight Security in 2019**

Since the College Advisory Council meeting was cancelled due to the closing of the college on Friday, November 16th, Dennis will return to the next meeting scheduled on December 7th to bring the FaST action item for approval of security after the contracted security company is completed.

Lt. Michael Dziuba mentioned that Chief Morales put together a five-page comprehensive review with a cost analysis to Human Resources. He also provided to the committee any information they would like to know about the daily logs. Lt. Dziuba mentioned that their office is in constant contact with the security company and no incidents have happened since the security company has been on campus.

Teresa asked if signs had been posted on Moorpark Avenue for the trailers that were parking on the street. Lt. Dziuba explained that this was a year and half project that Chief Morales worked on to have the signs posted due to multiple jurisdictions. He mentioned that the signs are up for two hour parking.

Phil asked if the five-page document could be forwarded to the committee members. Lt. Dziuba will work with the Chief and Human Resources to see about releasing that document to the committee.

b. **Review of CTE Visioning Grid & Outcomes**

The committee was given the presentation and recorded outcomes from the vision session conducted by Brailsford & Dunlavey. They’re still currently distilling all information and a more readable version will be brought back to the December committee meeting.

Phil suggested that the documentation be sent to the committee as soon as available since it’ll be a lengthy document to read. The committee will need time to review before the meeting.

Dennis mentioned that the sub-committee had been working on a selection process for a consultant to the architects, which has moved forward. The recommendation will go to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Phil thought that the FaST committee were going to receive the Educational and Facilities Master Plan before the meeting. After reviewing the last meeting minutes, it was noted that the committee would like to review both plans. The plans will be
forwarded to the committee via email by the end of the day. Phil mentioned that the review was to make sure to include the swimming pool and the Child Development Center.

Meeting adjourned
Facilities, Safety & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting AGENDA
Student Center (SC-204)
December 3, 2018
2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members:</th>
<th>Upcoming Spring Semester Meetings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSC — Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong> — Phillip Crawford, Dennis Meakin (Chair), Scott Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classified</strong> — Sandra Gonzalez (Co-Chair), Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated Student Body</strong> — Joseph Heady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of November 19, 2018 minutes

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Follow up on Academic & Classified Senate, AFT6157 & CSEA office usage (Jorge)

   b. Review and editing of Educational & Facilities Master Plan

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

   a. CTE Visioning Grid and Outcomes (Brailsford & Dunlavey)

"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 & Technology (FaST) Committee Meeting – Minutes 12/3/2018

**Committee Members:**

**MSC** – Joe Andrade, Jorge Escobar (ex-officio), Young Nguyen (ex-officio), Teresa Paiz, Chief Tom Morales (ex-officio)

**Faculty** – Dennis Meakin (chair), Phil Crawford, Scott Miller

**Classified** – Linda Jimenez, Cres Nolasco

**Associated Student Body** –

**Guest** – Neta Assaf (Brailsford & Dunlavy), Duane Bozic (Kinesiology), Elena Dutra (EOP&S), Fabio Gonzalez (EOP&S), Olga Morales-Anaya (EOP&S), Emily Rae (Brailsford & Dunlavy), Tait Rafat (Kinesiology), Ofcr. Pedro Urrutia (District Police)

I. Approval of Agenda with additions

   S. Miller/P. Crawford

II. Approval of November 5, 2018 minutes

   S. Miller/T. Paiz

III. Public Speak/Follow-ups/Updates – (3 minute limit per speaker)

   Introductions from the audience was requested by the chair.

IV. ACTION ITEMS:

   a. Follow up on Academic Senate, AFT6157, Classified Staff & CSEA office usage -

   Jorge presented the committee with a copy of the floor plan for the 4th floor of the Technology Building. The floor plan shows the current available office space for allocation and designation for the college’s shared governance groups. One of the purposes of moving the Academic Senate and AFT6157 is to allow availability of space in the Student Center for a Multicultural Center for students to interact with each other. Jorge is recommending to the committee to approve the designated space. He'd like to see the move done before the end of the year, if approved. This will also lead to the design work and appropriate modifications for the vacated offices in the Student Center. He’d also like to see a user group developed through Student Affairs to assist in designing the new Multicultural Center. An architect will need to be hired to assist in the design and going through the process of programming for the vacated space.

   Phil mentioned that he had previously questioned whether it was a good idea to take the two offices that are currently occupied by Academic Senate and AFT6157 and turning it into a student lounge area. After further study review, he was unaware that the area behind those offices (Middle College) would be combined to offer space for
students and services. He now understands that this would make sense as he was under the impression that it was going to be the Academic Senate/AFT6157 office area only.

Jorge further stated that Vice President Montemayor has been in discussion with the Middle College program to have their office moved to the Business Building (B-107), which is located next to the Middle College classes. The committee had already approved B-107 as swing space a year ago, so they can use the area until the college can designate a permanent place for them.

Phil suggested that possibly a sub-committee could meet soon to identify office space for the shared governance groups during a time that has minimal activity (intersession). Jorge mentioned that there are currently plans for other moves during the holiday break, but feels that this move should be easy to accomplish if the packing starts soon. Joe agreed that this could be expedited during the holiday break. On the technology part of the move, Young mentioned that Joe and himself have already started to look at the impact of the move during the break and agrees that it is doable.

Phil volunteered to serve on the sub-committee for the move and also suggested Fabio Gonzalez and Alex Lopez. Dennis suggested that there should be a representative from each shared governance group that should serve on the sub-committee. Olga Morales-Anaya and Elena Dutra from EOP&S also volunteered to serve on the sub-committee. Dennis also volunteered to serve on the sub-committee.

Fabio stated that the Student Center has been informed of the move and is aware of the available area in the building and is looking forward to utilizing the space, which he believes will give “life” to the Student Center. Fabio would like to see things move quickly, possibly before the spring semester or at least to start the process. Jorge reminded everyone that there will be a process to follow for the move. He did mention that there is a pool of architects which are categorized by specialties and size of projects that can be chosen. This will help to expedite the process and start the design work and get construction services in place. The sub-committee will try to meet as soon as possible.

**Motion – P. Crawford/2nd T. Paiz:**
To create the sub-committee for the combined open space and relocation of the offices into initially have a sub-committee for the end-user to serve on.

**Unanimously approved**
b. **Review and editing of Educational & Facilities Master Plans**

The college has involved Cambridge West to update the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and incorporate the correct language for the Child Development Center (CDC) and the college’s swimming pool. After reviewing the EMP and Facilities Master Plan (FMP), it was determined that the college needs to be specific in the language so plans can be board approved and aligned with bond council. Jorge provided the committee with an addendum draft for both projects and will share the information with Vice President Montemayor, so it can be moved forward for approval by the College Advisory Council and the Board of Trustees. Once it’s approved, Jorge is expecting that sometime in January both plans should be updated with the provided information. He’s projecting that the projects could be funded as early as February.

Jorge also provided the committee with a PowerPoint presentation document that was given to the Board of Trustees last month. In the presentation there is a case statement that the college is building for the CDC. This presentation highlights the importance of the project and illustrates the multiple phases to complete the project. Lastly, the committee reviewed a campus map that showed the proposed locations of the swimming pool and CDC. All documentations are currently in draft form.

Phil asked if the swimming pool location would have change rooms for both genders. The location of the pool is remote, so there would need to be dressing rooms and showers. Jorge explained that the FMP has to have one selected location as the initial location. If the location isn’t suitable due to physical limitations or access, then the projected map could change. The facilities will have different types of facility usage (swimming pool, changing areas, offices, etc.), which is sparking a conversation on the optimal location of the pool. The college feels that the location that’s currently being proposed has little impact for existing programs or construction footprints.

Teresa asked what department would be put in charge of maintaining the swimming pool. Jorge explained that this would be an academic instruction and the area would be considered a classroom. It would need to be worked out with the faculty on how the pool would be taken care of. It’s also being suggested to look at how it was maintained in the past and what operation model was followed? This would need to be determined when exploring the project.

Phil suggested that the committee add to the addendum for the swimming pool “Community and staff conditioning and fitness”. Phil believes this would help in paying for a portion of the maintenance by having a fee-based community lab usage. The open-lab could pay for any maintenance costs. This would be a heavy usage once we open it up for the community. He suggested that the Kinesiology Department could
train students to be lifeguards during these times. Joe thought that if the college opened it up for community use it would have to sell taxable bonds otherwise the college can’t use regular bonds to build the pool. Jorge explained that Joe is partially correct, but the college doesn’t have a taxable bond allocation either, so he isn’t worried about it. He further explained that there are bond restrictions on building something specifically for rental purposes, but in this case the building of the pool would be primarily for classes with the ability to rent. He doesn’t foresee a problem.

Duane Bozic mentioned when visiting Monterey Peninsula College, he had the opportunity of speaking with the person in charge of their swimming pool. Duane inquired on how the college maintained their pool and was told that a couple of their maintenance staff were trained on how to maintain the pool by an automated service. The service was set up to release chemicals based on the current season. Duane also emphasized if the pool is set up in the location on the map, there would need to be maintenance of the leaves from the nearby trees.

Phil suggested a sub-committee with keynote faculty be created to assist in the planning and maintenance of the pool. Joe suggested that it could be possibly added to the job description of the Athletic Technicians. Jorge explained the importance of the design, depth and size of the pool. We need to have the ability to have 30 people to one lifeguard. These things need to be taken into consideration when designing the pool.

**Motion: P. Crawford/2nd S. Miller**
To re-establish the previous sub-committee for the design of the swimming pool.

Unanimously approved

The past sub-committee consisted of Tait Rafat, Duane Bozic and Phil Crawford. It was suggested that the sub-committee reach out to Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Association since this could be something that could benefit their organization. They should be a part of the process by giving input.

Phil asked what was needed to get the swimming pool and CDC into the FMP. Jorge explained that they need to go into the EMP first. The next step would be to go to the CAC for recommendation for approval. Then both plans should be able to move parallel with each other.

**Motion: P. Crawford/2nd J. Escobar**
That the FaSt Committee supports the Addendums to San Jose City College Educational Master Plan and suggested amendment to forward them to the College Advisory Council.
V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. Standing Committee Report –

Dennis explained to the committee that they need to complete a Standing Committee Report for the College Advisory Council, which needs to be presented at the December 7th meeting. Corinne will work on the report as done in the past. The report will be sent to the committee via email for review. Dennis suggested that if anyone had suggestions to send them in the next couple of days.

Phil suggested on the technology side that the smartboard demos that were being showcased in the summer should be looked into being purchased. He’d like to see some faculty identified who’d like to test out these new boards. He feels that it would greatly enhance the different learning styles of our students. Young mentioned that he was trying to get a list of a few conference rooms and a possible classroom to bring the smartboard demos back. They came during the end of the summer and weren’t showcased as well as they could have been. He’d like the college to use them and give feedback to base a decision on moving forward with purchasing. Jorge stated that the feedback from the staff that were able to view the smartboard, were all positive. It triggers the thought process to what else you could use it for in your everyday meeting tasks.

b. GE Building Elevator –

Scott asked the committee if the elevator in the General Education (G.E.) building was out of service. He was informed that people had to carry someone in a wheelchair up and down the stairs. Jorge explained that when an elevator goes out of service, the Maintenance Department is the one who contacts the vendor to come out to inspect and repair. Jorge hadn’t heard any complaints. He explained that there are infrastructure issues with the G.E. area in that it only has the one elevator and 23 classrooms. When the elevator goes down, there’s nothing anyone can do other than to contact the service company to come out. Elevators will need to be replaced on campus at some point. He feels that the college has been diligent in working with Academic Affairs, so that if there’s students with disabilities or mobile disabilities that they not be schedule to have classes on the second floor. The college works proactively to prevent these issues and Jorge will explore it. He asked that if staff knows of an elevator down, to contact Maintenance so they can work on getting it fixed.
c. CTE Visioning Grid and Outcomes (Brailsford & Dunlavey) –

Emily Rae gave a handout from information compiled during the CTE Building Visioning session on November 5th. The presentation draft broke down the exercises and key ideas that the committee and audience discussed.

The next step is for the committee to review the presentation on their own time and send comments to Emily directly. Emily handed out her business cards to the committee members. HED Architects, has been chosen to do the planning services and will be given a copy of the outcomes and notes from the November session. The outcomes will serve as a foundation for their work.

Phil asked if the CTE Building would be completed by the centennial celebrations. Unfortunately, the work won’t be completed by that time. Jorge mentioned that this project is six months to a year behind. There’s a lot of procurement challenges, which poses a problem with construction costs that continue to rise.

Emily asked if the committee could provide feedback back to her within the next two weeks since this is our last meeting of the semester. She’ll send the presentation to the visioning committee and will submit the final copy, if anything changes.

Meeting adjourned