



**Laney Facilities Planning Committee Meeting  
Minutes and Notes  
April 17, 2017**

(approved 5/1/17)

**Chairs:** Stephen Corlett and Phyllis Carter

**Note Taker:** Amy Marshall

**Committee Members:** Peter Crabtree, Chuen Chan, Kim Bretz, Evelyn Lord, Jacqueline Burgess, Seth Silberman, Alejandro Acosta, Alisha Alston, Trent Hanible, Louis Quindlen

**Absent:** Chuen Chan, Alisha Alston, Trent Hanible

**Guests:** Dolores Bernal

AGENDA ITEM	FACILITATOR(S)	DISCUSSION POINTS	RESULTS/FOLLOW UP ACTION and RESPONSIBLE PARTY(IES)
Approve Minutes from 4/3/17 Meeting	<b>Stephen Corlett / Phyllis Carter</b>	Approve minutes from April 3, 2017. Minutes reviewed. Change Seth Silberman from unexcused to present.	Minutes approve by quorum.
Facilities and Technology Master Plan – Upcoming Meetings	<b>Stephen Corlett / Amy Marshall</b>	Steinberg, Laura McCarty, Atheria Smith and members from all the shared governance committees were invited to attend. Steinberg will provide an overview of their charge and attendees will have an opportunity to provide feedback and ask questions so that we have a clear path to move forward with the FTMP and the Survey.	Campus FTMP Meeting dates to be determined at 4/24 meeting with Steinberg.
Infrastructure Working Group	<b>Stephen Corlett / Amy Marshall</b>	Report from last Infrastructure meeting were distributed. IWG did not meet subsequent to last FPC meeting. Progress report at 5/1 FPCM.	N/A
ACCJC Midterm Report Progress		<b>Time did not permit to discuss this topic.</b>	
Resolution for the Laney Facilities Master Plan (revised)	<b>Stephen Corlett</b>	Draft Resolution from April 3 FPC meeting with edits was reviewed. Reminder that resolution was proposed to be sure that items on the FTMP get addressed (repairs, modernization and/or new construction). New projects should not be considered or added until exiting, agreed upon priorities have been completed. Resolution relates to all funding sources, not just bonds. Projects must be fully funded. This resolution is specific to the 2017 FTMP.	Edited draft of the resolution will be set to FPC for review and possible approval at 5/1/17 meeting.  Kim Bretz will draft a process statement for the FTMP

<b>Facilities Planning Committee</b> <b>April 17, 2017</b> <b>Page 2</b>			
<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>FACILITATOR(S)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION POINTS</b>	<b>RESULTS/FOLLOW UP ACTION and ESPONSIBLE PARTY(IES)</b>
Facilities Master Planning – FPC Recommendations	<b>Stephen Corlett</b>	FPC should have a list of questions / concerns to bring to meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can process / procedural topics be included in FTMP?</li> <li>• Steinberg needs to see campus self-study and TCO</li> <li>• Like a glossary of terms included in FTMP (TCO, Value Engineering , etc)</li> </ul>	Stephen Corlett will create the list of questions/concerns for Steinberg.
<b>Motion to extend meeting</b>		<b>Motion made and approved unanimously to extend the meeting until 4:10pm.</b>	<b>Meeting extended until 4:10pm.</b>
Summary of 5-year Plans from District – Annual Reporting to State 2010-2016		<b>Time did not permit to discuss this topic.</b>	
Meeting adjourned	<b>Stephen Corlett</b>		<b>Meeting adjourned at 4:11pm. Next Meeting 5/1/17.</b>

**Notes:**

**Discussion regarding Facilities Master Plan:**

Build into the FTMP a design review process because projects change sometimes with critical components left out which then cost the campus more money in the long run. The BEST Center is a prime example. Original plans called for things such as a basement, access to the roof and finished walls. The intent was to have a complete teaching facility for CTE. With no access to the roof and no basement it eliminates teaching opportunities that were originally build into this program. Decisions related to the changes in this project were seemingly made at the District level with no consultation to the program managers/end users. Similar issue with Tower (elevators, HVAC). End users have to have input into decisions made on changes to plans. There needs to be some acknowledgement from campus end users that value engineering changes / deliverables are acceptable before such changes are accepted by DGS.

**Resolution:**

The FPC wants to be assured that the items in the FTMP are completed rather than have new projects bypass the prioritization and get constructed such as the Field House instead of the library and student center. The goal is to have a resolution indicating that prioritized projects are fully funded and completed before new projects are undertaken. Additionally, the FTMP should direct the spending of the bond money unlike what seems to be the last bond where there wasn't a clear master plan and questions about how to spend the money were made subsequent to the passing of the bond.

- FPC is a recommending body to the President. The Senate can have similar resolutions. This resolution being discussed is to create a policy statement as it relates to facility priorities and the master plan. Additionally, it provides support to the college president as it relates to concerns of the college community.

### **Facilities Planning Committee**

**April 17, 2017**

**Page 3**

- Resolution needs to allow for emergencies such as major infrastructure failure.
- Needs to have wording that covers current projects as well as any new projects.
- Need to clear up source of funds – not just related to new bond but remaining bonds funds as well other sources of funds. Last bond passed in 2006 and master plan followed in 2009 and 2012.
- Consider keeping the language broad as possible it relates to particular bond measures. The problems that are happening at Laney are happening at other campuses as well as it relates to “value engineering”.
- The point is not that changes to the prioritized projects cannot be changed, rather that changes in the original agreed upon deliverables are brought back to the campus (maybe the shared governance process) before changes are approved and/or implemented.
- Regarding changes to scope of work on projects – keep language broad to include changes in deliverables must be brought back to shared governance at campus for approval and that all project objectives must be achieved.
- Discussion regarding “value engineering” and the idea that in effect value engineering is planned obsolescence. By using cheaper materials and cutting corners, the building will not last as long or serve the intended purpose of the building.
- Resolution versus FTMP – perhaps rather than a resolution there needs to be language in the FTMP to cover the FPC concerns discussed on this topic. The FTMP is a Board of Trustees approved document. Resolutions don’t necessarily carry the weight of the FTMP. Need to find out from Steinberg if process language can be included in the FTMP.
- TCO needs to be included in FTMP.
- Discussion regarding resolution – perhaps there should be one stating the FPC intentions and one stating those intentions should be included in FTMP.
- Distinction needs to be made between change in a specific project and changes to the prioritization of projects. There may be a project that is not on the prioritization list that may need to be added, and potentially could be if it was brought back to – and approved by - the college shared governance. There also may be a specific project that has proposed changes to the deliverables that could be approved if agreed upon by college shared governance.

### **Facilities Technology Master Plan**

Several questions for Steinberg were discussed:

- Need to know the denotative and connotative meanings of terms such as Total Cost of Ownership (TCO), Value Engineering, etc.
- Need to know if processes can be included.
- Can supporting source documents be included and/or referenced (self-study, assessments, FCI, etc.)
- Can repairs be listed and/or included in the FTMP or only modernization and/or new construction?
- Need to be sure TCO covered in new plan.
- How do we address prioritization?
- Can we make infrastructure priority one?
- What is allowable in a bond? How many variations of a bond or what are the qualifiers for a bond?
- How is the infrastructure being addressed in FTMP – will it be a document review or will specialists come to the campus to inspect?

Question asked about source of information – are Steinberg and DGS our sources of information – will the FPC rely exclusively on the responses of these two sources or are there other resources that can provide answers to our queries?

Question – why are there continued references in the news about the A's interested in the Laney campus property?