

2030 PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE – MEETING NOTES

Monday, July 27, 2015

12:30 - 2:30 pm, Doyle 4246

Attending: Karen Frindell-Teuscher, Robin Fautley, Katie Seder (for Hilleary Izard), Eli Egger, Josh Pinaula, Frank Chong, Jane Saldana-Talley, Mary Kay Rudolph, Ricardo Navarrette, Scott Conrad, Jeanne Fadelli (for KC Greaney), Tony Ichsan, Robert Ethington, Jerry Miller, Kris Abrahamson, Russ Bowden (for Alicia Virtue), Leigh Sata, Sarah Hopkins (For Karen Furukawa), Mike Garcia (for Ellen Maremont Silver), Sarah Laggos (for Kate McClintock), Jaqueline McGhee (for Julie Thompson),

Absent: Eric Thompson, Kathy Matthies, Doug Roberts, Lauralyn Larsen, Deb Albers, Terry Mulcaire

Agenda Items	Discussion	Follow up
Welcome Outcomes/Agenda	Jane briefly discussed the role of the Steering Committee. The President will announce the group in the Fall. Group members are asked to send proxies if unable to attend. There is a lot to be done in a short time frame.	Members will identify proxies when unable to attend.
2. Continuous Process Improvement	Hilleary liked the agreement and principles and noted that classified staff wish to participate in the user groups.	
3. Organization of the Process -Internal Communications -PDA session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ellen Maremont Silver, PR Director, will focus primarily on external communications (maybe help some with internal). • Alicia Virtue will help with internal communications, using a technology that is user friendly to post agendas, minutes, and information. Alicia noted that she would prefer not to put something forward that requires a learning curve for participants. She will seek guidance from Leigh. This will be more of a communication spot, a parking lot for information. Alicia feels the committee needs an individual (hub) to manage a site for the group. Jane noted that some work groups were tech savvy and using the communication tool for group work (such as posting drafts). The Lib Guide could be used, but Alicia has a great collaborative tool in mind. Jane noted that communication needs to launch sooner rather than later. 	<p>Communications work group (internal): Jane Saldana Talley Scott Conrad Leigh Sata Frank Chong</p> <p>All members of the steering committee should attend the PDA session if possible.</p>

	<p>A site or tool would be accessible from the SRJC home page and separate from the planning web page. Scott stated employees are confused about what will happen when, so it would be good to have a timeline soon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDA is coming up August 14. Review the description of the “SRJC’s 2030 Facilities Master Plan: Next Steps.” The desire is to videotape, and Russ confirmed that is possible. Scott noted that the bond includes technology, so please make that clear in any presentations that the plan is for both facilities and technology. 	
<p>4. Conversation with Leigh Sata, SRJC Director of Capital Projects</p>	<p>Leigh Sata shared a Powerpoint presentation and examples of facilities master plans from other institutions. Leigh confirmed the process would be collaborative, which can be challenging with a tight timeline. Collaboration leads to a stronger product.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Comprehensive Facilities Condition Assessment of all campuses and centers, infrastructure, repair and improvements, consider total cost of ownership (like buying quality furniture). 2) Analyze the data, FTES growth, and current space utilization. Where is the college heading? Strategic initiatives and future partnerships? Specialized CTE programs? Where do we start? 3) Each building will have a separate user group, called “champions.” For example if five departments will use a building, each will have a “champion.” 4) Lots of input. Need to put a special focus on large FTES generating departments. Simple things could be done to improve high volume areas such as Behavioral and Social Sciences that are not equipment intensive but require good teaching spaces. The college will address some areas that might not require a complete renovation 	<p>Forward copy of power point to committee</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none">5) Facilities Master Plan – includes architects and drawing of campus 30-40 years from now.6) Landscape Master Plan – outdoor learning, gardens, light and shade.7) Consider ADA issues.8) Consider restroom upgrades.9) Identify building sites. Examine “portable village” (e.g. Analy Village). Long term, will those be eliminated?10) Student surveys indicate a parking deficit on the Santa Rosa campus.11) Spending and implementation plan – after agreement is reached, the money needs to be allocated. Focus on “first tier” projects and an incremental plan, 5, 10, and 15 years. The bond will not be sufficient to address all needs.12) Site layout – the principles of organization. Not about personal likes and dislikes. Example: “Science on display,” natural light in classrooms, starting points for architects.13) Edges (in landscape), paths, seating, walls, walks that form edges.14) Design standards. There is a technical component to these. Sustainability, energy, standard lighting, signage, exterior lighting, and standardized fixtures. A palette of plantings for the landscape.	
--	---	--

	<p>15) Sustainability. Work with existing committees. Bike share. Alternative ways to get to campus. Look at both economic, social, and environmental sustainability. Examine issues of water efficiency.</p> <p>16) Fixtures, Fittings and Equipment. Look at flexible classrooms, moveable furniture, and peer-to-peer learning. Some early projects could experiment with classroom design.</p> <p>17) Information technology. Standardized media packages for classrooms.</p> <p>18) Parking and site structure.</p> <p>19) ADA transition plan. Specialty architects document all ADA issues. Cite code sections and cost of improvements. (Note – contact Patie Wegman for the current inventory of ADA issues.)</p> <p>20) Signage. Building signage should be consistent, attractive, and adequate way finding, a “sign family.” Need a signage subcommittee.</p> <p>21) Process and Timing. An RFP/Q has been drafted to go out to architects and educational planning firms. That should be released with due date around September and possible Board approval in October.</p> <p>22) Board of Trustees role. Final Campus Master Plan will be approved by the Board. Once first list of projects identified, committees will be created for each major building.</p> <p>23) Subcommittees – there will be lots of opportunities to participate – may need to meet every week or once or twice a month.</p>	
--	--	--

24) Timelines – Leigh demonstrated a typical 4-year timeline, which provides for construction and move in timelines.

Questions

- VPAA noted that there are a lot of standing committees (parking, ADA, ITG) that could be utilized to contribute to the plan.
- Russ asked about program need planning vs. building planning. Leigh is familiar with a model where Master Plan architects analyze existing buildings. At the building level, the architect analyzes the space needs of those who will occupy the building and areas of potential growth.
- Sometimes the state formulas force the college to build too small – this can be addressed by using local money to build buildings with growth capacity.
- Landscaping. Existing campuses are well maintained and beautiful. Leigh agreed. However, opportunities exist to integrate inside/outside connections. New regulations about maintaining water run off on site require different approaches to landscape (return water to aquifer). This also affects parking lots. Petaluma already has some of these features.
- How will transportation fit in? SRJC is a commuter campus with most students arriving by car. Examine bus stops, bus shelters, and arrival by bus. Assess the impact of the SMART train and cross-town connections. Are cars coming too far into the heart of campus?
- Hilleary noted SEIU interest in staffing issues for any buildings and an interest in labor agreements. Leigh noted various means of handling project labor agreements.
- Jerry encouraged Leigh to show lots of examples during planning such as allowing the public and students to see labs and collaboration at work (science on display concept). These things attract and hook

	<p>students. Leigh responded with examples from Biotech and Auto, exciting learning environments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jacqueline McGhee (AFA) raised a question about “learning on display.” This might be a working condition aspect of the contract. Most common in Science and CTE. There needs to be a balance between public view and teaching needs. 	
<p>5. Principles of the Process Robin Fautley</p>	<p>The Committee reviewed a draft of Principles with changes tracked. #1 and #11 appear repetitive – suggestion to insert “responsiveness to community” in number 1 and delete 11. Revise #1 to remember that faculty and staff needs should be taken into account. The College Community will use these new facilities. These needs are not in opposition.</p> <p>#6 – add “prioritize” to #6 in last sentence?</p> <p>#7 – “refined” – use “thoughtful”? “Effective”? Focus on well organized? Others liked the “elegant” term (enjoyed by scientists and others). “Elegant” = pleasingly graceful. In science, an elegant solution has a specific meaning.</p> <p>#13 – “reads” is good – the community should read it. It should be a constant reference point. When architects and engineers work for the college, they will read it and use it. “Refers to” seems enough. Document – it may not be a document – it is a “resource.” Introduce the word “use” to simplify. Use “timeline” instead of “benchmarks.” Use “evaluate” instead of measure success. More work needed on #11.</p> <p>#12 – revise #12 to refer more to facilities vs. strategic plan.</p>	<p>Robin will clean up draft and bring the final back to the committee.</p>
<p>6. Stakeholders</p>	<p>SRJC took the Strategic Plan and implemented as goals in PRPP. Facilities needs are documented in the PRPP. But, the vision may need to be longer range. The PRPP doesn’t include everything. Educational plan, facilities, and technology will require further work to integrate.</p> <p>Kris suggested that stakeholders be linked to the identified workgroups – for example the sustainability work group may want to connect to sustainability</p>	<p>Eric is refining the Stakeholder list.</p>

	expertise in the community. Those considering the STEM building could consult with engineers and scientists. Leigh noted that the college should drive the construction and planning of the buildings themselves.	
7. 2030 Plan Steering Committee meetings	PDA is the next gathering on August 14. Our next meeting might be the end of August. Fridays may be the best days. How often do we need to meet? Twice a month? Monthly? Aggressive timeline.	Jane will establish meeting dates.
8. Next Steps	PDA invitation – Work with Dr. Chong on an invitation to attend the session.	Jane will follow up on invitation to PDA.

Next meeting to be announced.

Notes submitted by Kris Abrahamson