

Laney Facilities Planning Committee
Meeting Minutes and Notes
Monday, April 3, 2017
(approved 4/17/17)

Present: Phyllis Carter, Amy Marshall, Peter Crabtree, Evelyn Lord, Alejandro Acosta, Peter Crabtree, Chuen Chan, Jacqueline Burgess, Louis Quindlen, Seth Silberman

Excused: Stephen Corlett, Kim Bretz

Unexcused: Alisha Alston, Trent Hanible

Guests: Tammiel Gilkerson, Laura McCarty, Atheria Smith, Donald Moore, Corey Harris, Dolores Bernal, Lonzell Hayes (ASLC)

I. Reviews/Updates

Phyllis Carter introduced Tammiel Gilkerson, the new Laney College President. Members and guests all introduced themselves to President Gilkerson.

A. Approve minutes from 3/20/17 meeting: Minutes were approved by quorum.

B. Facilities and Technology Master Plan: Laura McCarty gave a brief overview of the masterplan timeline, outreach efforts and actions to date and described how the survey came to be (sent to committee for feedback with quick turn-around request, with response only from Evelyn Lord). She presented some ideas to discuss for ways to move forward:

1. Have Steinberg come for a survey workshop or Laney could do their own survey meeting. Depending on the results either the survey could be edited or perhaps an addendum to the existing survey. Concern was expressed that Steinberg hasn't been to campus to work with any of the committees or shared governance groups so that the voice and concerns of campus stakeholders and/or end users could be heard. Donald Moore, Faculty Senate President, passionately explained that for faculty the number one concern is the facilities. It's at a crisis point now and the current survey creates a false dichotomy. Atheria Smith explained that the intent of the survey was to gather information for a starting point for discussion and formulation of the master plan. Unfortunately the short turnaround time for feedback didn't allow time for most stakeholders to participate. Additionally no one reached out to Atheria Smith or Laura McCarty to ask for more time or to express their concerns so the survey was distributed. Their presence at the meeting was to try to work out a plan moving forward to get the survey out and set up subsequent meetings with Steinberg. The faculty will participate but not until there is a confirmed meeting with Steinberg. They want Steinberg at Laney to hear concerns and to work with stakeholders. Part of the frustration with this process is that it seems that Steinberg has been on board for at least 4 months and has made no efforts to reach out to Laney stakeholders (the client). Laura McCarty explained that although Steinberg was on the board agenda in December they were not approved until February 28th so it's only been about 5 weeks.
2. Campus visits: originally planned for April, the concept was to do the surveys and tabulate the results then have a series of face to face meetings to hear input. Those

meetings could be web-streamed live and then stored on Youtube. Maybe there could be multiple campus visits with themed based meetings such as one of the

Facilities Planning Committee

April 3, 2017

Page 2

meetings specifically on technology, one on infrastructure, one for student experience so that all participants could participate instead of or in addition to meeting with technology committee, sustainability committee, faculty senate, ASCL etc. It was agreed to set up an initial planning meeting with Steinberg with representatives from all committees and any other stakeholders.

3. Need to determine the way to move forward and get meetings scheduled so they can happen before people are gone for the summer. It will also allow the master plan project to remain on schedule. The April 17th Facilities Planning Committee will tentatively be the date for the first Steinberg meeting. Atheria Smith will confirm with Steinberg and provide them with the Facilities Condition Index, the Laney "Fix it list" and the Laney Self Study (both available on the Laney website but Phyllis Carter will send to Atheria). A request was made to include the topic of facilities maintenance (preventative, deferred) and how to deal with related items such as possible asbestos and lead contaminants. Additionally, we need to address why the goals of the last master plan and bond plan were not met – what went wrong in execution and how do we create a plan that the college wants with realistic goals that can be accomplished. A lot of money was spent from the last bond but not a lot related to the master plan was accomplished. We want to be sure that TCO is included in the plan as well. On a related note, there is a district committee working on TCO and the action plan follow up for ACCJC.

Actions needed: **1.** send survey to all members on the facilities committee, technology committee, president of Faculty Senate, and ASLC for feedback to discuss with Steinberg representatives. **2.** Public Information Officer to send out Facilities Master Plan informational email – what is a Facilities Master Plan, it's purpose, past success/failures. **3.** Provide the following documents to Atheria for Steinberg: FCI; Self Study; Fix it List; Deferred Maintenance lists 14/15, 15/16, 16/17; summary of program reviews.

- C. Infrastructure Working Group (IWG): The group met on March 30th. The executive summary and draft meeting minutes from that meeting were distributed to the FPC for review.

1. Water testing is ongoing – tracing where the water is going. They are tracing the path of travel and determining the source of leaks which includes drains, pipes and membrane breaches to name a few. Project manager, Stephen Daniels, is also using the FCI report as a resource for tracing the leaks. The leaks are divided in to various types (roof, plumbing, planter/drain lines from upper quads, shear wall etc.) and different contractors are addressing their areas of expertise. Stephen Daniels is the point person on the leak project. They expect to have specs for an RFP by the end of April. It was suggested that Stephen Daniels reach out to the end users of each area to be sure that all of the leaks have been identified. Perhaps a written status of

each area could be posted in each department so that end users would be kept in the loop.

Facilities Planning Committee

April 3, 2017

Page 3

2. HVAC work is ongoing. The 14-15 scheduled maintenance work is moving forward with work going on in the chemistry labs to take care of negative air pressure, the variable frequency drives in the theater and G building to help better regulate the temperature and continue to work on filters and air handlers, which they can handle in house. The reports provided to the FPC committee outline the other current activities for the IWG.
3. Pool work will be done in June. It shouldn't require the pool to be drained.
4. Blue phones – only one company bid on the RFP so DGS is reaching out to potential contractors to try to move this project forward.

D. Committee Membership Attendance Requirements. As a reminder, it was discussed at the last meeting that the committee will look for replacement members if someone misses three meetings without good reason. Dolores Bernal mentioned that she is not a member of the committee but would be willing to serve.

Motion: A motion was made to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. The motion was passed unanimously.

II. Operational Items

- A. Statement on Pedestrian safety at campus crossings: Evelyn Lord created an initial report. Stephen Corlett may have created the statement for the President. Evelyn will follow up with Stephen Corlett.
- B. Facilities Condition Index (FCI) Summary of Buildings: Louis Quindlen prepared an executive summary for the deficiencies in Laney buildings. There was little correlation between the FCI and the Laney Fix It List. The FCI referenced possible asbestos and lead paint. It's also likely that they didn't bring in structural engineers or otherwise specialists so it's difficult to determine whether the commentary in the report was based on useful life or actual inspection. There is a key at the beginning of the report. The college average condition is 56%, the state average is around 28%. The higher the number the worse off the condition. The FCI report doesn't set a required level, it's just a statement of the condition. While it should be a guideline for creating the budget for maintenance and replacement however Peralta hasn't been using it for that purpose.
Action: provide copy of the summary prepared by Louis to Steingberg and to Stephen Daniels.
- C. Resolution for the Laney Facilities Master Plan Projects: The revised resolution was distributed.

A motion was made to pass the revised resolution. Discussion followed including changing “guarantee to guaranteed”. There was concern about not being able to move forward with other projects if the first project isn’t complete. The response was that the intent is that

Facilities Planning Committee

April 3, 2017

Page 4

projects can be concurrently in tandem and don’t necessarily have to be done in order however the District would not be allowed to spend funds on a project that wasn’t approved and on the list. A question was asked if we need to articulate what type of funding – construction bond versus other type of funding? The general consensus was no, it could be left as is. Concern was raised that there would be pressure on the FMP because there has to be an approved FMP. Do other source documents need to be included in this resolution? Is this resolution for the remaining bond monies or future facilities master plan? Perhaps there needs to be board policy on this topic rather than a resolution. What is the most effective strategy to make the idea of the resolution become reality? The “whereas” section needs to identify where/to whom the resolution is directed to. Perhaps we need to rework this resolution as a whole to indicate that there should be no new construction before the existing issues are resolved. There were concerns raised about what should and could be in the master plan (repairs versus modernization/capital projects). How can we create and maintain a safe, secure, viable campus. **No vote was taken. Action:** Phyllis to take comments back to discuss with Stephen to re-work the resolution. Committee members are asked to send Phyllis any comments.

Topic not covered:

- A. Summary of 5-year plans from District – annual reporting to State 2010-2016

Next Meeting April 17, 2017

2:30 – 4:00 pm, Room-T850