Facilities Committee
MINUTES
Monday, March 18, 2013
Student Services Building, Room 414  3:15 PM

Present:
1. Ken Takeda, VP, Admin. Services, Co-chair
2. Kevin Considine, Faculty Co-chair, AFT rep
3. Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh, President
4. Phyllis Braxton, VP, Student Services (Interim)
5. Karen Burzynski (alternate), AFT Staff Guild
6. Clare Norris for Adrienne Foster, President, Academic Senate
7. Allan Hansen, Manager, Plant Facilities
8. Sheila Jeter-Williams, AFT Staff Guild
9. Jeffrey Lee, Academic Senate rep
10. Abel Rodriguez, SEIU rep/Plant Facilities
11. Jack Ruebensaal, AFT Faculty Guild/ WEC Chair
12. Olga Shewfelt, Chair, AFT Faculty Guild
13. Barry Sloan for Aracely Aguiar, Dean, Academic Affairs/Teamsters rep
14. Robert Sprague, VP, Academic Affairs

Absent:
1. Gabriel Brown, President, ASO
2. Jane Witucki, Academic Senate rep

Guests:
1. Michael Arata, Chair, Humanities & Fine Arts
2. Anna Chiang, Chair, Computer Science
3. Carmen Dones, Chair, Allied Health
4. Lartee Harris, Chair, Business
5. Fran Leonard, Chair, Language Arts & College Council
6. Laura Peterson, Faculty, MPTP
7. Rebecca Tillberg, Dean, Research and Planning

Resources:  Peter Mitsakos, West Edge Architect
Douglas Newby, West Edge Architect
Phil Vogt for Steve Sharr, CPM, Cumming/GKKWorks

Ken Takeda called the meeting to order at 3:21 PM.

1. Review minutes from March 11th Meeting
M/S/P: The minutes were approved as presented.

2. Continue further consideration of the Space Study (P. Mitsakos, D. Newby)

Peter Mitsakos explained that it is in the college’s interest to aim for a more aggressive utilization rate at the time of build out (year 2036) to meet the state’s minimum standard of room utilization. Going only for the minimum utilization will put the college below minimum for the next few years until 2036 which will result in it being unqualified for future building funding from the State.

He reiterated that Scenario C that was presented on March 11 is based on the plan approved by the shared governance in 2011. It includes building TLC as designed and approved by DSA.
Two new scenarios were presented:

**SCENARIO E2**
- It’s a revision of Scenario E; not build TLC.
- The key difference is changing the initial plan of having MPTP at the Jefferson property and moved it to TLC site.
- 7 new buildings (142,090 gross sq. ft.)
- 9 renovation projects (85,882 net sq. ft.): AT-A | CE | SC | MSA | MSB | HLRC | FA-B | GC | PEC
- Relative cost: 20% less than baseline.

**SCENARIO F**
- Re-purposed TLC Building with limited renovation.
- 8 new buildings: 168,205 gross sq. ft.
- 8 renovations: 69,580 net sq. ft.: AT-A | CE | SC | MSA | HLRC | FA-B | GC | PEC
- Relative cost: 13% < baseline.
- Disadvantage:
  - Faculty will have to move offices to TLC to free up space elsewhere which will be converted into instructional rooms.

Bar charts comparing Scenarios C, D, E2 and F in terms of new construction, renovation, parking level, disruption, composition of instructional space, and relative cost were presented. Renovation costs less than new construction; however, keep in mind that not all square footage can be considered equal.

Building TLC as programmed will result in deficiency for the projected growth. Scenarios E2 and F have the most potential. E2 has the lowest overall cost and significantly less disruptive. F has TLC with a reprogrammed floor plan. Peter recommends moving forward with considering and revising scenarios E2 and F.

Committee members and guests brought up questions and voiced their concerns over changes. Among them is a concern over not building the TLC. It was explained that at the time TLC was planned, the college did not have the knowledge and data that now have been generated. Back in 2010, the information that was compiled was in an effort to find places for people whose projects were canceled. The plan was created under the assumption that the existing building program met the needs. New information shows that it is incorrect. Peter advised that building the TLC as designed will not effectively meet the current and future needs of the college. Because of the way the TLC floor plan is designed, conversion to computer labs will not be ideal. Furthermore, TLC has rooms that duplicate the spaces that already existed on campus. Olga Shewfelt demanded that reasons for not building the TLC be put in writing. Peter will provide the requested document within few days.

Allan Hansen reminded the group that the goal of the study is to review the data and decide what is best for the college. The reason projects were placed in moratorium is because the campus is deemed over building.

Karen Burzynski requested that the committee be provided with data showing the number of offices/work stations and/or square footage for each department/division listed in the scenarios.

Olga requested that the following be provided to her to be presented at the AFT Faculty Guild meeting: 1) Rename or renumbered the scenarios. Peter explained that the current naming method enables them to easily keep track of any revisions, but they will try to be more descriptive in the future; 2) conceptuality. What is the choice for each scenario besides the numbers; 3) project cost information. She understands that there are costs and time involved in coming up with a project cost estimate; however, the information is crucial in assisting with the decision-making process and responding to the community.
The president reminded attendees that this is an on-going process. The scenarios will continue to be reviewed to help steer the architects in the direction that meet the college’s need. He requested Peter to provide scenarios that will address the immediate needs of the college without the growth projection.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:14 PM.

Next meetings: **April 15, 2013, at 3:15 PM, Student Services Building, Room 414**