

2030 PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

Friday, April 8, 2016

3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Doyle 4246

MEETING NOTES

ATTENDING: Kris Abrahamson, Laura Aspinall, Paul Bielen, Shawn Brumbaugh, Scott Conrad, Hector Delgado, Carl Dobson, Robert Ethington, Joe Fassler, Robin Fautley, Alexa Forrester, Tara Johnson, Doug Kuula, Sami Lange, Marty Lee, Matthew Long, Sean Martin (for Karen Frindell-Teuscher), Kathy Matthies, Leslie McCauley, Liko Puha, Mike Roth, Jane Saldana-Talley (co-chair), Stephanie Sanchez, Mary Sandberg, Leigh Sata (co-chair), Eric Thompson (co-chair), Julie Thompson, Phyllis Usina, Kat Valenzuela, Alicia Virtue, Dennis Verity (for Henry Beaumont)

ABSENT: Henry Beaumont, Kate McClintock, Frank Chong, Paul Bielen, Maria Banachowicz, Rick Call, Toni Chase, Jana Cox, Hector Delgado, Karen Furukawa-Schlereth, KC Greaney, Lily Hunnemeder-Bergfelt, Hilleary Iazard, Ellen Maremont Silver, Jerry Miller, Ricardo Navarrette, Josh Pinaula, Doug Roberts, Scott Rossi, Mary Kay Rudolph

GUESTS: David Liebman, Gray Dougherty (Gensler), Dana Dimalanta (Gensler), Keith Fuchsgami (Gensler), Tom Horton (Gensler), Alan Sinclair (Gensler), Hilary Wolf (Gensler), Shao Chen (SSA, INC.), Kelly Hang (SSA, INC.), Sally Swanson (SSA, INC.)

Agenda Items	Discussion	Follow-up
1. Welcome/Introductions Outcomes/Agenda	Jane welcomed all and thanked the group for representing various interests in this integrated planning process. Due to a number of new faces, everyone in the room introduced themselves, including 2030 Plan Steering Committee (2030 PSC) members, tri/co-chairs, and consultants. Regarding the structure of the group: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each subcommittee represents a specific interest group (coordinated with existing campus committees) and the committee work will be brought before the 2030 PSC for review and comment before the information becomes public.• Subcommittee work is advisory and the President and Board will make final decisions.	Documentation from subcommittees will be posted on the website by summer, and are considered public information. Basecamp does not have conferencing capabilities at this time.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members are reminded to communicate with constituent groups they represent. • Members of subcommittees should collaborate and coordinate, supported by the Steering Committee, in order to reduce duplication of effort. • Subcommittees will report-out to the 2030 PSC in April and May. • Basecamp is a great way to watch the work flow, but not the way to communicate to a wider community. 	
<p>2. Continuous Process Improvement (CPI) Basecamp Access Check-In</p>	<p>Update: 2030 PSC members were added to all Basecamp subcommittees and information is now viewed by all. Some overlap is expected, but access is the most important thing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tip: Turn off private conversations between two people to reduce the amount of email received. • Tip: Send personal email so it does not clog up your Basecamp. • Tip: Co-chairs can use the scheduling tool in Basecamp and export to Outlook. It's a two-step process. Contact Alicia Virtue for assistance. • Question: How to coordinate committee scope overlap. Bring this to Leigh and Susan's attention and they will triage the issue. Leigh will work with Gensler consultants to reinforce the message. • Question: Is it possible to create a student survey as a tool to receive input? Answer: Institutional Research will assist in a single survey representing all subcommittees. Send questions to KC Greaney. Provide two to three questions per subcommittee. Six subcommittees expressed interest in a student survey. • Question: There is a lack of participation in some groups. One group stated that only 10 out of 40 members were participating. Jane commented that subcommittees should forge ahead and not worry about the lack of participation. Many are participating by watching the Basecamp sites and will comment if they are passionate about an issue. This process is supported by the President. • A suggestion was made to coordinate meeting schedules so that they are not scheduled over each other. Because it is challenging to coordinate and that the best meeting date is Friday, it was noted that 	<p>PARKING LOT – all Basecamp subcommittees should create a “parking lot” for issues outside their scope, the co-chair can pass on to Susan, Leigh will then triage and redirect to appropriate person/group.</p> <p>Subcommittee Student/Staff Survey DRAFT questions in to KC Greaney by next meeting. 2-3 questions per subcommittee.</p> <p>New members can be added to Basecamp. Please send request to Susan Brouwer.</p>

	<p>members will simply choose the meeting they can attend. Another suggestion was to find someone to “cover” the other meeting for you.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jane thanked the members and expressed appreciation for the open feedback. 	
<p>3. Subcommittee Presentations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration Classrooms • Signage and Wayfinding • Sustainability 	<p>Eric Thompson informed each group they had 20 minutes to present, with 15 minutes of discussion time at the end.</p> <p><u>Demonstration Classrooms:</u></p> <p>The tri-chairs presented the goals and objectives of the committee. The committee identified the issues and discussed possible solutions to the teaching challenges in classrooms. They described the main issues facing students, faculty and staff. The committee will evaluate the furniture and provide feedback and data that may inform the standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephanie O’Brien (Dovetail) is the lead consultant • Eight rooms were selected for this purpose – 6 at Santa Rosa and 2 at Petaluma. • A survey was sent to committee members and the suggested criteria was ranked. • Criteria included: Ease of use, flexibility, and reliability. • Next steps: Define vendors, document ideas, confirm schedule. • PDA is an opportunity to debut the rooms, and allow feedback for the final round of evaluation. • Before and after photos of the eight classrooms will be posted on the website with campus maps/locations. <p><u>Signage and Wayfinding:</u></p> <p>Co-chairs presented background sub-committee details including the diverse sub-committee membership made of classified staff, faculty and administrators from all five district locations. A pre-survey was sent to sub-committee members consisting of twenty-five open ended questions asking for SRJC identity information (words to describe district, important values of the college,</p>	<p>Demonstration Classrooms: Provide before and after pictures and map to the website. Coordinate with Susan.</p> <p>All groups post presentations to Basecamp.</p>

etc.) and brand identity (logos, colors, and visual landmarks that resonate, etc.) with committee members.

Signage concepts from Gensler team.

- Assessment process was collaborative and included campus tours, committee meetings, interactive sessions that informed the design.
- Goals: clear visual language and navigation, incorporating flexibility into the final design. Meet accessibility standards, with some signs in Spanish and English. Provide better visibility and a more cohesive image across campuses.
- Ideas suggested by survey: Community, Tradition, Solid, Quality, History, legacy pride, family.
- Focus on: campus entry, vehicular directional, pedestrian directional, regulatory information and building identification.
- Question: How about electronic signage? Answer: Opting for a low tech approach as electronics are expensive and harder to maintain.
- Wayfinding is migrating towards hand-held devices, but this is out of the scope of work.
- The design should not be indigenous to each campus, but consistent across the District as a way to reinforce the brand.
- Question: the choices seem limited and can Gensler provide a cost for each sign? Answer: A few options will be placed on Basecamp for comment and the process is designed to be collaborative. If the consensus is that Gensler missed the mark, then they will provide additional options. It is hard to define prices at this point, as the quantity and final material choices are not known.
- Student involvement is encouraged.

Sustainability:

This committee has been meeting for over a year as they anticipated being involved in the bond process. The Greenprint document was written a year ago. There are 40 members from all areas of the college.

- The committee hopes that SRJC will become a regional leader in sustainability.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentation included a section on sustainable transportation. The hope is that the physical campus should encourage sustainable transportation choices, including bikes, skateboards and bus ridership, and whenever possible, discourage driving. • Key ideas: Electric charging stations and safe bike routes to or through campus. Request that any building or garage in the back of the SR campus not interfere with a proposed (future) pedestrian and bike bridge over Hwy. 101. • The presentation included information about Sustainability ratings: LEED, LBC, “Passivhaus”, BREEAM and others. The latest version of the building code now requires new construction to meet the equivalent of LEED Silver. • Sustainability goals proposed: LEED Gold, ZNE (zero net energy), dual plumbing systems, building commissioning. • Note: Public buildings will be required to meet ZNE standards by 2030. • A building from Laney College was presented as an example of a public institution making a bold statement and setting a new bar for sustainable construction. The BEST Center, now under construction, will be “Passivhaus” certified – which far exceeds LEED standards. • Question/Comments: Consider a Project Labor Agreement (PLA). • Question: No bikes on campus? The committee agreed that internal sidewalks are for pedestrians, but encourages a bike lane on the perimeter of the SR campus. • Suggestion: Link the SMART train to the SR and Petaluma campuses by bike and encourage the city to add dedicated bike lanes. 	
<p>4. Burbank Auditorium Kick Off Mtg. Project update with input from User Group (Leigh Sata)</p>	<p><u>Update on the Burbank Auditorium:</u></p> <p>The project kicked off with Faculty and a special session included the Executive Architect, TLCD and Design Architect, Mark Cavagnero and Associates. Additional specialists included the Shalleck Collaborative (theater design) and Salter & Associates (acoustics). Leigh presented the architect’s presentation to the 2030 PSC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new black box theater will be located to the south of the existing theater and will be connected by a glass structure. 	<p>Information requested: please provide the swing space plan for classrooms and shows during the renovation period once it has been determined.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing auditorium will be renovated with structural walls preserved. A significant challenge is resolving the differences in the existing floor height. A new outdoor “arts” court is created, linking Forsyth to the black box to the Burbank Auditorium. • The Black Box Theater will hold 200 flexible seats, with a black ceiling and walls, creating a fully flexible theater space for experimental theater. • The goal remains to open the project in 2018 and design process is on track (to date). • Faculty have done a great job committing to the scheduled meetings. • Leslie McCauley stated that the Theater Faculty and Staff are excited to work with Mark Cavagnero – he is a visionary. Adam Shalleck has been instrumental in the development of the project program. • Questions: Will the seating change in the Auditorium? Answer: This is one of the top priorities – to improve site lines and bring the theater space up to conformance with current ADA code. 	
ADJOURN	Meeting adjourned 5:10 p.m. Next meeting: ADA and FF&E Subcommittee presentations	

Notes compiled by Susan Brouwer

Spring Semester 2016 Meeting Schedule:

All meetings are on Friday from 3:00-5:00 p.m. in Doyle 4246.

April 22

May 13 (3:15 to 5:00pm)

May 27