

Laney Facilities Planning Committee  
November 21, 2016  
(Approved 12/5/16)

Present: Stephen Corlett, Kim Bretz, Evelyn Lord, Seth Silberman, Trent Hanible, Jacqueline Burgess, Louis Quindlen, Chuen Chan, Alejandro Acosta, Amy Marshall

Excused: Phyllis Carter

Unexcused: Peter Crabtree, Alicia Alston

Guests: Tavi Taos

I. Reviews and Updates

A. Approve Minutes

Minutes were approved by consensus.

B. Laney Facilities Update (Carter/Marshall)

1. Amy Marshall reported that on Friday (11/18) Dr. Ikharo, Laura McCarty, Gary Banks, Peter Crabtree, Kirk Schuler and Amy walked the campus to review all of the known leak areas both historical, new and recently repaired. The tour began in B150 and included areas of Lower A, Lower G and Lower F buildings. Input from end users of most spaces was collected during the tour as well. A list of leaks mapped out on floor plans will be forthcoming. DGS is formulating a plan of action which will be shared at the next FPC meeting.
2. Elevator replacement – contract is being signed now. Plans, fabrication and prep getting underway. Installation for the first elevator is slated to begin in October 2017. Work on the second elevator would begin in early 2018. Phyllis Carter informed the district that schedule was not appropriate and suggested alternates. For the time being, the installation schedule will remain as DGS proposed. There was a question about the funding for the elevator replacements and how much the project is going to cost.
3. If a work order was created for an item on master facilities project / repair list, Amy Marshall is updating the repair list accordingly. Some of the items have been completed so they will need to be updated as well.

C. District Facilities Committee Update(Quindlen)

1. RFP for Master Plan – our committee was concerned that Laney was left out in several areas. It was confirmed that wasn't the intent, rather when the RFP was drafted DGS wanted to be sure that those particular areas that were called out were included with the rest of the colleges. Laura McCarty wrote an addendum (IV) to correct the language in the RFP.
2. TCO is the other big issue especially as it relates to preventative maintenance. There is no schedule for preventive maintenance. There doesn't seem to be data available to determine what it costs to bring a building online and then to maintain it. The Barbara Lee building at Merritt is an example in that the person trained maintain the building systems is no longer employed at Peralta and no one was trained in his stead. The issue is not only the number of engineers assigned to a campus but having people with the necessary skills/knowledge to perform the required tasks.
3. We're still waiting for the Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA) - the actual assessment of the condition of the campus. It should be available any day. We will need that information to help inform the master plan. The FCI (Facilities Condition Index report) is the metrics that indicates

the cost to repair or replace. Side note: we will need to check to see if/how leaks are reported as the assessment was done during a “dry” period.

4. There was discussion regarding TCO for instructional equipment or “teaching assets”. There is a general agreement that there needs to be some framework that includes preventative maintenance on necessary equipment and to accrue for necessary replacement parts and/or new equipment when needed. This would be more than just IELM repairs. The departments that rely on having very expensive equipment to run their programs need to be able to plan and budget for these very necessary service contracts, replacements, calibrating and related certifications. There should be a line item in the department budgets to cover these necessary annual expenses. Amy Marshall will contact DGS to learn if there is an existing framework for TCO instructional equipment. We will also review the FCA and FCI to see what they included (is any teaching equipment in any department listed on either report?) Amy will ask Phyllis Carter to check in with the other college business managers to see how/if they have a system for handling these ongoing preventative maintenance type issues. It was also suggest software upgrades need to be included in this consideration.

#### D. FMP Updates and Timeline (Corlett)

1. The RFP language as discussed earlier was clarified. The contract bids have been submitted and information has been submitted to the committee for review. Stephen Corlett and Blake Johnson represent Laney on that committee. Ranking responses are due from committee members by December 6<sup>th</sup>. The plan is for the committee to have a recommendation ready to be presented for consideration at the December 13<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.
2. There was discussion about the timeline for participation and review. We will have to pay particular attention to the schedule when it comes out so that Laney (faculty, staff, students) can both provide input and have ample time to review plan and provide feedback if needed.
3. There was discussion about the potential vendors for the updated plan, the background of the most recent masterplan and the necessity of this plan to help determine if there will be a 2018 bond initiative.

#### E. Response from Chancellor and Laney President to the FPC questions regarding remaining bond funds:

1. Several questions were posed to the President as a result of the last FPC meeting. President Stanley provided the following answers.
  - Q. What is the shared governance process in regards to allocation of the remaining \$51M available balance the Laney College and part of the Measure A Capital Projects Bond?
    - A. Our current standard shared governance process would be used (no change to this process).
  - Q. The library matching funds are not due until the third year. A total of approximately \$3M would be needed for years 1 & 2 of the new library project. Matching funds would not be due until year 3. Can we reallocate some of the \$48M in current bond funds and raise the necessary matching funds in the 2018 bond initiative?
    - A. Ron Little to pose this question to the state and will let us know what he learns.
  - Q. In the event options are considered for spending part of the bond money now, will the process include obtaining input from the entire campus community? Yes, input will be obtained through the shared governance process (students are a part of the shared governance process).
  - Q. What happens if Governor Brown does not issue the bonds for sale – is there a contingency plan for funds?

- A. There are no alternate plans at this time. There has been some indication that the bonds will be issued though we'll have to wait for confirmation.
- Q. Is there a concern that we could be at risk with the IRS because we haven't spend the bond money in a timely manner?
- A. Ron Little has indicated that it is not likely that we'll have any problems with the IRS related to the bond monies.
  
- 2. It was pointed out that we currently have funds for the library project without a 2018 bond initiative. However, the College is entertaining the possibility of using some of those funds to address urgent facility needs such as infrastructure work and replenish the funds used with monies raised in the 2018 bond. We were also reminded that there was a resolution in the last year or so from the FPC indicating if the funds were available that the college would move forward with the new library learning resources center combined.
- 3. Concern was expressed regarding the lack of feedback or input from students for the new library as far as layout and design. Evelyn Lord reported that the design details still have to be done. They will be soliciting feedback from the college community including students.
- 4. The Chancellor has suggested that we put together the list of high priority items to see what projects might be achievable. We have discussed HVAC, electrical, plumbing, etc. One such project would be the results of the "leak walk". We also have the list of repairs that we compiled of all items small and large. Questions such as do we have adequate power to campus? DGS was asked to do a survey to see if there is adequate power to the campus (and each building individually) and do we have appropriate gas pressure? The Chancellor said the idea is not for anything extra or new rather to fix the current, immediate existing issues.
- 5. There was discussion that whatever work is proposed that the work need to be thoughtfully and carefully planned and budgeted so that we aren't doing partial fixes and that they are strategic in the planning (avoiding things like the Tower building renovations and not doing the elevators at the same time or the problem of underfunding projects such as the work done in the breezeways). There was a suggestion to have a survey done to confirm the electric, water and gas services (how much of each do we have, etc).
- 6. Stephen Corlett will be sending out a list of potential work for everyone to review.
  
- II. Operational Items (Note: with the exception of a comment on Form Cs, there was not enough time to address these topics.)
  - A. Prioritization list process for Form C from APUs
    - 1. There was a question regarding late Form Cs and other forms due with APUs. There may ramifications for late submissions as it relates to the program reviews however the FPC wants to know about any necessary repairs regardless of when forms are submitted.
  
  - B. Review/Update FPC 2016-17 Goals
  
- III. Strategic Planning Topics (Note: out of time, this item will be moved to a future meeting)
  - A. Facilities Master Planning – Strategy
  
- IV. Future Topics/Tabled Items:
  - A. Parking Lot (to be covered, time permitting)
  - B. Review /Revise FPC Scope of Work

Meeting adjourned at 4:15pm  
Next meeting: December 5, 2016