

Laney Facilities Planning Committee
Monday, September 19, 2016

Present: Stephen Corlett, Kim Bretz, Peter Crabtree, Amy Marshall, Louis Quindlen
Excused: Adan Rosillo, Phyllis Carter, Seth Silberman, Alejandro Acosta, Chuen Chan
Guests: Jacqueline Burgess, Laura McCarty, Sharon Millman, Robert Tracy, Evelyn Lord, Robert Tracy, Heather Sisneros, Michael Wright, Jacinda Marshall

I. Operational Items (Stephen Corlett)

Note: some agenda items were moved to the top of the agenda to accommodate the flow of the meeting.

- A. Stephen welcomed all and described the makeup and scope of the committee. Documents were included in committee binders and/or folders for members and visitors to review. Stephen described the new committee membership model. Last year there was a small change to the committee make up in an attempt to get more representation and participation by “footprint” or area of campus. The model was approved by the Faculty Senate and College at the end of last semester. A few committee member appointments are still outstanding but will hopefully be filled soon. Members and guests introduced themselves.
- B. Stephen Corlett reviewed the scope of the committee and meeting dates and times. The meeting calendar will be distributed at the next meeting, however subsequent meetings will begin at 2:30pm rather than 2:20pm.

II. Reviews / Updates

- A. Approve minutes. A quorum was not present. This item will be moved to next meeting. Amy Marshall was designated as the “minutes taker”.
- B. Laney Facilities Updates/AIP Updates
Facilities Update (Amy Marshall) – an update report was distributed to the committee. After review, a brief recap of the 30 Day Projects (formerly 20 day projects); bond projects, and Measure A was given. Some of the work is ongoing such as the light fixtures and plumbing in chemistry because the scope(s) of work were not clearly delineated to contractors. A lot of work was done around campus – including the long outstanding welding arm projects, the student center kitchens (health department items plus some cosmetic items), chemistry and biology departments (more work to be done in these departments), library, theater and major restroom clean up. There are still obvious outstanding issues – especially the many damaged doors throughout campus.

A brief discussion regarding District General Services (DGS) resources, the new Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) model, the implementation and budget for repairs, and the overall condition of facilities (Laney is below the bottom / worse ranking)

C. Locker Room Updates (Sharon Millman/ Laura McCarty)

Sharon Millman and Laura McCarty introduced themselves. Laura reported on the status of the library, student center, and campus locker rooms. The library is pending the results of the state-wide bond measure on the November ballot.

Laura is in the process of providing an update of the bond funds for the college leadership (status of Measures A & E) to show where all the money has gone to date and what the college has left to devote to the Library, Student Center and Locker rooms.

Locker rooms - the project scope has been scaled back to address the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) Title IX complaint which primarily was to make the team rooms and lockers equivalent for the women's teams.

Sharon Millman reviewed the history of the project to date compiled from meetings she's attended and project files. She provided a drawing of the latest plan signed by the Dance Department, the co-chairs of the Kinesiology Department, the women's locker room attendant and various other college leadership. A lively discussion ensued voicing concerns about the name of the project (team rooms or OCR / Title IX versus locker room renovation) scope, budget, and possible end users were not included in the plans (women's coaches, women instructors, etc. despite their involvement in the early planning stages) and the project had been described as a "locker room renovation" rather than just an OCR / Title IX compliance project. Sharon explained that they are working closely with Phyllis Carter and Denise Richardson on this project and likely more iterations will follow before the scope is finalized.

A request was made that whatever the final scope, it be completed in a manner that the improvements will be able to be utilized when the larger scope of work is done (we don't want to see OCR work done just to get it done and not considered part of the larger locker room renovation project).

D. District Facilities Committee Updates (Louis Quindlen)

Louis reported that the last meeting was spent primarily focused on the recommendations from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding Total Cost of Ownership. A facilities condition index was created (document was included in committee meeting documents) and Laney is rated below substantially below poor condition. We have huge maintenance needs and we don't have sufficient funds to address the needs. We need a long term plan to address the serious budget deficit to address maintenance and operation issues.

Conversation: DGS needs to come up with a plan to deal with our regular general maintenance and deferred maintenance. The lack of service and repair is costing the college more money in the long run.

The question was raised about DGS operations with the restructure of the Bond and M&O departments. Will both departments participate regularly at the District Facility meeting?

Laney 20 year plan – was developed as a “big picture” with input from across campus constituents. It has been our guiding document as to priorities. Our facility plan is supposed to be part of the Education Master Plan. The District will be working on a Facilities Master Plan. We have to be sure to participate in that as it reportedly will drive the Bond spending. The District will be hiring a consultant to work on the master District facility plan.

III. Strategic Planning Topics

- A. Format for upcoming Facilities Issues discussion – Town Hall or Panel Discussion to address the many facility concerns of faculty and staff. The idea of a Town Hall seemed like a good idea. The committee discussed ideas of how to quantify the actual issues and how to have a meaningful, solution oriented discussion with DGS to effect the repairs or plans for repairs. A suggestion was made to work with each department to create a master list of all items that need to be repaired. Items can be pulled from program reviews as well.

- B. Review 2015-16 Goals – Update to 2016-17 Goals – moved to next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:54pm.

Next Meeting: October 3, 2016 at 2:30pm in T850.