

## 2030 PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

Friday, April 22, 2016

3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Doyle 4246

### MEETING NOTES

ATTENDING: Kris Abrahamson, Maria Banachowicz, Paul Bielen, Shawn Brumbaugh, Rick Call, Toni Chase, Frank Chong, Jana Cox, Scott Conrad, Hector Delgado, Carl Dobson, Robert Ethington, Joe Fassler, Alexa Forrester, Hilleary Izzard, Tara Johnson, Sami Lange, Marty Lee, Matthew Long, Ellen Maremont Silver, Kate McClintock, Liko Puha, Mike Roth, Jane Saldana-Talley (co-chair), Stephanie Sanchez, Leigh Sata (co-chair), Phyllis Usina, Kat Valenzuela, Alicia Virtue,

ABSENT: Laura Aspinall, Henry Beaumont, Robin Fautley, Karen Furukawa-Schlereth, KC Greaney, Lily Hunnemedder-Bergfelt, Doug Kuula, Sean Martin (for Karen Frindell-Teuscher), Kathy Matthies, Leslie McCauley, Jerry Miller, Ricardo Navarrette, Josh Pinault, Doug Roberts, Scott Rossi, Mary Kay Rudolph, Mary Sandberg, Eric Thompson (co-chair), Julie Thompson, Dennis Verity (for Henry Beaumont)

GUESTS: Li Collier (for Ricardo Navarrette), Greg Drukala (for KC Greaney), Kelly Hang (Sally Swanson Architecture), Sally Swanson (Sally Swanson Architecture)

Agenda Items	Discussion	Follow-up
Welcome/Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Outcomes/Agenda</li></ul>	Jane welcomed committee members and guests and reminded everyone that there are only two more 2030 PSC meetings before June. <b><u>Update on subcommittee surveys</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Only three subcommittees have turned survey questions in including FF&amp;E, Health and Safety, and Sustainability. Are the other committees interested in participating?</li><li>Gensler will review and provide additional input on the questions.</li><li>Robert Ethington will work with Bear Facts and the Student Portal to get surveys distributed to students.</li></ul>	Survey questions due to Jane by Monday, April 25.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question: Will the survey be distributed before summer break or in the fall semester? The committee agreed that before break summer is best.</li> <li>• Question: Is this a staff survey or student survey? Will the same questions be utilized on both surveys? Institutional Research will advise on question format and design to ensure we are gathering what is subcommittee seeks in the way of input.</li> </ul>	
<p>Continuous Process Improvement (CPI)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communications/Website</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Subcommittee connections with other groups</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subcommittee Co-Chairs: please sync up and communicate with the established campus committees and workgroups so that work is not duplicated and that communication is fluid. This request is from Dr. Chong. The lists are posted on the bond website under Planning Subcommittees: <a href="http://bond.santarosa.edu/sites/bond.santarosa.edu/files/160410%202030%20Plan%20SC%20Function%20and%20Leadership%20Matrix_jst.pdf">http://bond.santarosa.edu/sites/bond.santarosa.edu/files/160410%202030%20Plan%20SC%20Function%20and%20Leadership%20Matrix_jst.pdf</a></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Website update</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each subcommittee is now represented on the website.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Meeting notes</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current meeting notes were edited to reflect requested changes. Please let us know if you see anything that needs to be changed.</li> </ul>	
<p>Science Building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>STEM Building update</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chancellor’s Office has approved the District’s STEM (FPP) proposal for \$34 million in funding, subject to the statewide bond in November 2016.</li> <li>• Assuming the bond passes, the project would start the design phase in mid to late 2017</li> <li>• The project will replace functions currently in Shuhaw and Bech. [side note: the District will consider an application to the Chancellor’s office for the replacement of Baker and Lark – Biology and Earth and Space Sciences]</li> <li>• The STEM building has been programmed, with the overall amount of lab space determined in earlier discussions with faculty.</li> <li>• The FPP describes the building as L-shaped and 3 stories tall. The final building will be similar in configuration though the project is not designed yet.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Materials: the State does not require full exterior elevations in the FPP application, so the exterior materials are loosely defined. The building does not have to mimic the renderings previously created by the TLCD team.</li> <li>• Question: What happens if the statewide education bond does not pass? The challenge is that the amount of funding available in the Measure H bond is inadequate to pay for all of the capital improvement requests. There will be a process, soon to commence, to prioritize projects regardless of whether the statewide education bond passes. State money will allow the District to proceed further down the list, but project priorities will not change unless there is new information sufficient to influence a re-ordering of the list.</li> <li>• Faculty participation in the design of a project begins when an architect is selected. A “core team” of students, faculty and staff and students will be convened. This process is being utilized in the Burbank Theater renovation.</li> <li>• Question: What will happen to Baker and Lark? Those buildings will continue to be utilized until their turn comes for replacement or modernization.</li> <li>• Question: Is there any discussion about a Science building in Petaluma? The top priority in Petaluma is expanded Science labs to include physics and chemistry. We understand that the second priority is a consolidation of Student Services and the creation of more student engagement/hang-out space.</li> <li>• Question: Planetarium is really old, will anything be done about that? Dr. Chong will meet with members of the faculty and staff about the future of the Planetarium.</li> </ul>	
<p>Subcommittee Presentations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADA and Universal Access</li> <li>• FFE</li> </ul> <p><b>30 Minutes per presentation + 20 minute discussion time</b></p>	<p><b><u>ADA and Universal Access:</u></b>  Matthew Long, Liko Puha, Laura Aspinall (not present), Kelly Hang, Sally Swanson.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation: Surveyed faculty and staff – 19 responses to 7 questions, with compiled results.</li> <li>• Beyond accessibility: our campuses should be comfortable and designed for everyone.</li> <li>• Consensus opinion: No barriers, equal opportunity, open to all.</li> <li>• Strengths: SRJC Disability Resources Department, District Accessibility Committee.</li> </ul>	

- Improvement: Better paths of travel. Better wayfinding. Gender neutral and universal access in bathrooms. Barrier removal, access and parking encouraged.
- Project approach: Coordinate with groups and look at what needs to be addressed.
- Survey on campuses: paths of travel, parking lots, buildings and public rights of way.
- Barrier Assessment: obtain documents, analyze the data and provide report and provide costs, analysis and priorities.
- ADA Transition Plan: develop priorities and implementation schedule; public will have input.
- Rank priorities: Look are severity level of barriers
- Public Participation: Collaboration is the key.
- Universal Design is a new field, but SSA wants to be an innovator in this area. The seven elements of UA include: Equitable Use, Flexibility of Use, Simple and Intuitive, Perceptible Information, Tolerance for Error, Low Physical Effort, Size and Space for Approach and Use.
- Global Universal Design Commission (GUDC): The umbrella to look at all the different groups.
- Body Fit and Comfort, Awareness and Understanding, Wellness, Social Integration, Personalization, Contextual Appropriateness.
- Comments: [Paul Bielen] we did a survey in 2008. That info is available for review, and it is a good baseline. [Liko] we will provide this presentation on our Basecamp.
- Timeline: [Kelly Hang] We will work closely with Gensler to produce a short assessment before summer, with a summary and overview of all the buildings. The extensive survey will look more in depth and will take 4-6 months.
- Sally: prioritization is the main challenge. It takes a long time to prioritize the barrier removal.

**Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment**

Tara Johnson, Lily Hunnemeder-Bergfelt (not present), Toni Chase

- Goals and outcomes: Establish performance specifications and how to apply them.
- Performance vs. Tech Specs: Tech specs are what an item looks like. Performance specs are what an item needs to achieve.
- Key Issues: Learning environment, office environment – student, staff and faculty.
- Next Steps: post performance specs survey online to gather more input on prioritization. Prioritize decision criteria, survey, and provide initial recommendations. Prepare initial recommendation for the next 2030 PSC.
- Tara showed a slide that she liked from Stephanie’s presentation: *“The bitterness of poor quality remains long after the sweetness of low price is forgotten.”*
- Member: we do not want to lose seats in our classrooms, or workspace; it’s about capacity.
- Member: be mindful of sustainability.
- Member: all new furniture should be able to be cleaned and replace key components, which makes a big difference in cost of ownership.
- Member: concerns that the space is comfortable, to create a good learning environment? We have to compare with ADA and Universal Access.
- Member: are chalkboards being considered? Tara pointed out we are not talking about specific things, just talking about Performance CRITERIA and applying the criteria.

Jane added that people have asked questions about what the subcommittees are doing and how we define and apply the standards created? Leigh’s answer is that at the highest level we are looking to create guidelines to make the brand and building projects more consistent. The standards will be applied by the project-specific designers, architects and engineers. Tara noted that the decision criteria created by the FFE committee will be very different from other colleges because of our process and our values are different.

**ADJOURN**

Final Comments and Questions:

Comment [Jane]: By virtue of technology, we have created environments that are not as welcoming as they were before; as we sit behind computer screens we have created unintentional barriers for interaction. She expressed hope that these standards and this process will remind and encourage us to remember that we are in the human interaction business and that it is in our interest to break down barriers to make our students feel more welcomed.

Question and response [Leigh]: Where are the presentations posted and where shall we post them? The presentations will be posted to Basecamp, which everyone should have access to at this time. We won't post to the website, as these are as yet not approved for the public domain.

**Adjourned at 4:28 pm**

Notes compiled by Susan Brouwer

**SPRING – 2016 MEETINGS:**

All meetings are on Friday and times are 3:00-5:00 p.m. in Doyle 4246, except where noted.

- May 13 (3:15-5:00 p.m.) – Agenda: Gensler DRAFT Facilities Master Plan (FMP) presentation + Architecture and Site and Landscape Committee reports.
- May 27 – Agenda: Gensler follow up FMP development + Health and Safety committee report