Facilities Committee  
MINUTES  
Monday, April 29, 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. Aracely Aguilar, Dean, Academic Affairs/Teamsters rep  
5. Phyllis Braxton, VP, Student Services (Interim)  
6. Karen Burzynski (alternate), AFT Staff Guild  
7. Adrienne Foster, President, Academic Senate  
8. Allan Hansen, Manager, Plant Facilities  
9. Sheila Jeter-Williams, AFT Staff Guild  
10. Jeffrey Lee, Academic Senate rep  
11. Olga Shewfelt, Chair, AFT Faculty Guild  
12. Robert Sprague, VP, Academic Affairs  
13. Jane Witucki, Academic Senate rep

Absent:
1. Gabriel Brown, President, ASO  
2. Abel Rodriguez, SEIU rep/Plant Facilities  
3. Jack Ruebensaal, AFT Faculty Guild/ WEC Chair

Guests:
1. Fran Leonard, Chair, Language Arts & College Council  
2. Alice Taylor, Chair, Accreditation Steering Committee

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

1. **Review/approve minutes of April 15, 2013 Meeting**  
M/S/P: The minutes were approved as presented.

2. **Further consideration of Campus Space Study**  
President Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh made a presentation on the construction planning. He reviewed the priorities that should steer the decision making process in selecting the most optimum construction plan. The construction plan that was approved in 2011 (build TLC as designed), for the purpose of discussion is referred to as “Option 1,” is expensive and will not give the college an optimum and cost effective outcomes. The college will end up with new spaces that will not meet its current and future needs and old spaces that are outdated and expensive to maintain.

The president made a proposal on of “Option 2.” He emphasized that Option 2 that is shown today is only a rough concept and that nothing has been decided or vetted with stakeholders. The idea is to introduce a more optimum option other than Option 1. The final design of Option 2 should fulfill the college’s needs up to year 2026 and allow a fairly uniform growth across the board rather than just few programs.

The president expressed that he will not be able to justify to the Board of Trustees the plan of building Option 1. Should the college community wants him to present Option 1, he will do so;
however, he will also present the data-driven and more functional Option 2 as the plan he supports.

Discussion/Q&A:

a. TLC in Option 1 is already approved by DSA and ready to go. How long will we have to wait to plan for Option 2? Option 2 requires a complete reprogramming and redesign. Completion time is estimated for Summer 2017. Option 1 TLC will be an approximately six-month process of just finding a new design-build team.

b. A report by Steve Sharr stated that $13.7M has been expended on TLC to date. These expenditures include programming, design, DSA review, mobilizing and demobilizing the contractors, site work, inspection and testing, information-technology improvements to the campus fiber optic system and data center, program/project management, and site maintenance. Because data analysis shows that going through with building the TLC as designed will not result in the college effectively meeting its space needs, approval from BuildLACCD, District Facilities Planning and Development, and the Board of Trustees will not be attainable.

c. What about the EIR deadline for construction of December 2013? Any new construction that begins after December 2013 will trigger a review of the EIR. Research has been done to this effect. Should the changes result in greater impact to the environment, necessary mitigation must be done.

d. The two concepts should be presented to the constituency before Facilities Committee makes any decision.

e. What is the amount for both Options? $54 million.

3. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 PM.

Next meetings: May 20, 2013, at 3:15 PM, Student Services Building, Room 414