

2030 PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

Friday, September 23, 2016

3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Bertolini 4246

MEETING NOTES

ATTENDING: Kris Abrahamson, Laura Aspinall, Maria Banachowicz, Shawn Brumbaugh, Frank Chong, Scott Conrad, Hector Delgado, Carl Dobson, Robert Ethington, Joe Fassler, Robin Fautley, Karen Frindell-Teuscher, Alexa Forrester, KC Greaney, Tara Johnson, Sami Lange, Matthew Long, Ellen Maremont-Silver, Kate McClintock, Jerry Miller, Leslie McCauley, Sabrina Rawson, Mike Roth, Mary Kay Rudolph, Jane Saldana-Talley (co-chair), Stephanie Sanchez, Leigh Sata (co-chair), Eric Thompson (co-chair), Phyllis Usina, Kat Valenzuela, Alicia Virtue, Hilleary Zarate

ABSENT: Henry Beaumont, Paul Bielen, Rick Call, Toni Chase, Jana Cox, Lily Hunnemeder-Bergfelt, Karen Furukawa-Schlereth, Doug Kuula, Marty Lee, Kathy Matthies, Terry Mulcaire (for Julie Thompson), Jordan Panana Carbajal, Liko Puha, Doug Roberts, Mary Sandberg, Dennis Verity

GUESTS: Sara Ely, David Liebman, LaMont Powell, Dalene J. Whitlock, Gray Dougherty

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Follow-up |
|--|--|--|
| 1. Welcome/Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions/Outcomes /Agenda | Welcome by Jane <ul style="list-style-type: none">• BOT Special Study Session on September 28th: In addition to the Facilities Master Plan, the eight subcommittees will present. If team leaders are available participate, it would be appreciated.• Furniture Fair will take place at Petaluma and Santa Rosa campuses, organized by Laura Rivera. The idea is to display furniture for faculty, student and administrator feedback. | |
| 2. Continuous Process Improvement (CPI) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review Criteria for project prioritization | Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees Subcommittee Presentations on September 28. 10 minutes for each subcommittee to present. Some chairs were not aware they were being asked to present and requested a copy of the Board agenda. | The agenda for the Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees will be sent to all 2030 PSC members |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>3. Energy Initiative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of energy data • Review of Sustainability goals • Recommendations | <p>Energy Initiative David Liebman [FPPS] and Gray Dougherty [Gensler]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Brown’s Executive Order, Vision Plan and Measure H Goals: zero net energy, zero non-potable water, and carbon neutral by 2030. • Proposed Guidelines: Water and energy efficiency wherever possible, with a goal of one project at each teaching site. • Recommended strategies for sustainability: “Tiered” concept rather than “one size fits all” concept. Encourages sustainability without requiring a specific criteria. This allows flexibility while pushing to meet the Governor’s 2030 executive order. • Master Plan Energy Strategies by the end of Measure H: appropriate sized photovoltaics will save District energy costs, but don’t overbuild, as conservation measures will reduce the need over time. • Consider “modular central plants” which are more energy efficient than individual (building) systems and easier to maintain. Initial project cost is \$7-10M with an estimated 10-year payback. • Sub metering for each building is important and does not have a payback, but is a necessary piece of the energy savings infrastructure. • Water saving strategy includes a sump pump to capture gray water from under Quinn, leading to a \$150K/yr. water savings. Engineers should provide additional feedback on a proposed “black water treatment” plant, which has a short payback but is more technologically challenging. <p>Traffic Study Dalene J. Whitlock [W-Trans Engineering]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The W-Trans team evaluated the Santa Rosa parking situation during the early part of the fall semester. The lack of bicycle commuters was notable, and recommendations will include the implementation of bicycle paths and bicycle parking. • The W-Trans team recommended no new parking on the SRJC campus, there will be a final report issued. | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Questions and Answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: Was consideration given to the distances students are willing to travel to school by bicycle? A: This report does not include a student survey; however, previous surveys show that the lack of dedicated bicycle parking and safe routes to campus are not encouraging to bicycle commuters. • Q: There is no safe bicycle path over the 101 freeway. A: The City of Santa Rosa is looking at a bicycle bridge or undercrossing at Jennings (and other possible locations). These projects are not Measure H funded. • Q: Will there be improvements for bicycle parking? The master plan includes a “Bike Barn.” Feedback on location is welcomed. • Q: Will the City of Santa Rosa consider a bicycle lane on Armory drive? A: Yes, the City has indicated that they are willing to consider this, but it will take advocacy from the community for funding and implementation. <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This transportation (bicycle) plan is exactly what the Sustainability Subcommittee recommended. Kudos! • People do not feel safe riding, and the City should create more dedicated bicycle lanes. This plan will encourage bicycling to campus and is a step in the right direction. • I ride every day, I never feel safe crossing or riding on Mendocino. The least we can do is make our campus welcoming to bicyclers. • Guerneville Rd. does not feel safe and the City should provide protected bike lanes. UC Davis has dedicated roads for bicycles. • The majority of our students live along the 101 corridor, so there is a question of distance travelled for the bicycle commuter. • Access from south and west is most challenging for cyclists. • Encourage SMART train to add a bicycle trail adjacent to the new tracks. • Encourage the City to place barriers in the street to separate bicycles from cars; Windsor is a model for this and the drivers are now more aware. • Students must own a “working” bike in order to take advantage of these new bicycle paths. Students encouraged the District to spend money on bicycles for students rather than a parking garage. | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Draft Measure H Priority List</p> | <p>Measure H Priority List Leigh Sata [Director of Capital Projects] and Gray Dougherty [Gensler]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reminder about the process: The Board will be asked to accept the master plan in October, and implementation planning will begin. State funding is contingent upon the successful passage of Proposition 51 in November. The Board will be asked to approve the Bond Spending Plan (BSP) in December, and a first set of projects would start in early 2017. • The BSP will establish project priorities and will change over time. The plan will be presented to the 2030 Plan Steering Committee on October 14th. The 2030 Plan Steering Committee will provide comments, which will be taken under advisement. • The criteria for project prioritization has been consistent and Dr. Chong reiterated these criteria in a dl.staff.all email last May. The assessment process created additional information and data that must be considered. • The first pass is 16% over budget with a total spend of \$540.6M. Total available funding (including Prop 51 State funds) is \$466.7M. <p>Questions and Answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: Is Lounibos eligible for state funding? A: Yes, but it does not score well due to its age (not that old). • Q: Does Tauzer score well? The state generally does not fund physical education buildings, even those characterized as lab space. The age of the building is a plus, as older projects score well. • Q: Are we considering the total cost of ownership in the decisions? Yes, for example, the plan contemplates a replacement co-generation plant. The system will be easier to maintain over the long term and with energy monitors added to each building, the FacOps team will be better able to track issues and break downs. • Q: Why were the other sites not presented today? A: Santa Rosa is the most challenging and project priority for the other sites is clear. | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|

- Q: What is the swing space project in Analy Village? A: Two large modular buildings for the Communications Department, which will be relocated due to the renovation of Burbank.
- Q: What is the project behind Plover? A: Space for student services, allowing minor reconfiguration to departments in Bertolini, Pioneer, Plover and Analy Village – details still to be worked out.
- Q: Which projects will receive State funding? A: STEM, PSTC lab and Barnett replacement. STEM is approved and the other two projects are in step one of a two-step process.
- Q: Is there enough funding to address ADA issues? A: Funding will be available to address Tier 1 issues as defined by the SSA transition report, which will be finalized in December.
- Q: What happens when a project (such as Burbank) is over budget? A: The design team and faculty/classified staff core team will work together to bring the project back on budget. Renovations are higher risk because some conditions are harder to see behind existing walls.

Comments about STEM:

- STEM Faculty made the case for a larger STEM building than is currently approved by the State, which would include a replacement for Baker and Lark (the State approved plan only replaces Shuhaw and Bech). STEM faculty said that they understood that this would require funding be moved from other projects, but they felt that an “integrated STEM complex” was important enough to warrant this.
- Q: If the ideal version of a STEM building moves forward, could Baker and Lark be re-purposed? A: The assessment reports would be reviewed. Baker and Lark are in better shape than Bech and Shuhaw, as well as the heritage buildings. Also, Baker received Measure A funding.
- Q: Why is Barnett receiving State funding? A: Existing Barnett is in poor shape – it is basically an old grammar school – inefficient and worn.
- Q: Can Lark or Baker be renovated and then re-purposed as the Barnett replacement? A: No, the Barnett replacement is too large.

| | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: How will the final decisions be made? A: Dr. Chong will make a recommendation to the Board and the Board will take action. <p>Final comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the “persistence rate” of students in clubs is higher (95% for those in clubs) than the Districtwide average (75%). It was suggested improvements to student support spaces is of value to the District. • It was noted that the 2030 Plan Steering Committee is an advisory committee and those on the committee were selected to represent a constituency; as such they are expected to report back to their constituent group. It is time to move forward; the process has taken a year to this point and there is a time-value to money. • It was noted that SRJC has had two bonds in 100 years, while peer institutions half as old (such as San Mateo CCD) have had five bonds. Therefore, Measure H will not solve every issue because the backlog is greater. • Appreciation was expressed to Dr. Chong about his willingness to listen, and that it is understood that he will try to do his best to meet the needs of many departments. | |
| ADJOURN | Adjourn: 5:07 pm | |

FUTURE MEETINGS:

- October 21 Wrap Up and Thank you
- Notes compiled by Susan Brouwer