

PBIM DISTRICT FACILITIES COMMITTEE

DRAFT – May 06, 2016 DFC Meeting Minutes

Date of Meeting: April 1, 2016, 9:00 am to 12:00 pm

Present: Bill Love; ;Molly Sealund; Sadiq B. Ikharo; Shirley Slaughter; **Karen** Shields; Bruce Shapiro;; Rosemary Vazquez; Dettie Del Rosario; ; Ron Perez; Rachel Goodwin; Shuntel Nathaniel;

Absent: Louis Quindlen; Windy Franklin Atheria Smith; Helena Lengel; Siraj Omar; Mary Beth Benvenuti; Brock Drazen; Phyllis Carter; Hoi Ko; Adan Rosillo;

Excused:

Guest: Amy Marshall, Laney; Annette Dambrosio

Chair/Tri-Chairs: Dr. Sadiq B. Ikharo / Louis Quindlen / Molly Sealund

Facilitator/Recorder: Atheria Smith / No Recorder

| Agenda Item | Discussion | Follow-up Action | Decisions (Shared Agreement/ Resolved or Unresolved} |
|--|---|------------------|--|
| Meeting Called to Order | 9:15 am | | |
| 1. Agenda Review | Agenda items, accepted as written. | | Motion by Bill Love, 2 nd by Bruce Shapiro to accept the agenda as amended, passed unanimously |
| 2. Action: Review & Adopt Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 04/01/16 DFC Meeting Minutes | Minutes from the April 1, 2016 DFC meeting was adopted, as written. | | Motion by Bill, 2 nd by Bruce Shapiro to accept the 4/1/16 DFC meeting minutes, passed unanimously. |

PBIM DISTRICT FACILITIES COMMITTEE

DRAFT – May 06, 2016 DFC Meeting Minutes

| Agenda Item | Discussion | Follow-up Action | Decisions (Shared Agreement/ Resolved or Unresolved} |
|---|---|------------------|---|
| <p>III. PCCD Total Cost of Ownership Guidelines (Draft)</p> | <p>Dr. Ikharo distributed the following documents for review and discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DGS Action Plan ACJCC Recommendation #3 Response 2. Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) District Guidelines <p>These are working documents which will be periodically updated as the data changes. Updates will be provided as they arise.</p> <p>The following highlighted points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty needs to be involved in the TCO planning meetings and should be invited to critical meetings; • The TCO guidelines only relates to facilities, why not include program review too? • Laney has the most scheduled and deferred maintenance needs. A serious discussion needs to occur relating to facilities’ needs. This is crucial if the District wants to increase enrollment. The level of failure rate is very high. M&O staff spend an enormous amount of time “putting out fires”, Districtwide; • What is the plan for Merritt, Building D now that it has been decommissioned? Dr. Ikharo explained the States regulations relating to decommissioned community college buildings. There will be no classes scheduled in Building D: • It was suggested to breakdown, by College, the capital asset that are deficient (52%), listed on page 11 of the TCO Guidelines; • The District has a systemic organized response to fix deficiencies. The issues are resources and the inconsistency of State funding; • It was suggested that the Action Plan include the meeting dated the TCO | | <p>Motion by Bill Love, 2nd by Molly Sealund to accept the following documents as presented to the DFC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DGS Action Plan “ACJCC Recommendation #3 Response” 2. “Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) District Guidelines”, with a recommendation to forward these two documents to the PBM at their May 27, 2016 meeting for deliberation. |

PBIM DISTRICT FACILITIES COMMITTEE

DRAFT – May 06, 2016 DFC Meeting Minutes

| Agenda Item | Discussion | Follow-up Action | Decisions (Shared Agreement/ Resolved or Unresolved} |
|---|---|------------------|--|
| | <p>teams met.</p> <p>Annette Dambrosio reported on the timeline to respond to ACCJC’s recommendations. She commended DGS for their work and shared that she is working with IT relating to IT TCO processes regarding integrated facilities and technology planning. Plans include presenting the final document to the Board of Trustees at their September 2016 meeting.</p> <p>She also shared that a survey is forthcoming regarding the PBIM committees’ performance for the 2015/16 school year.</p> <p>Discussion concluded with a vote in favor of accepting both the DGS Action Plan “ACJCC Recommendation #3 Response” and “Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) District Guidelines”, as presented and the recommendation to forwarding these two documents to the PBIM at their May 27, 2016 meeting for deliberation.</p> | | |
| <p>IV. Briefing - April. 29, 2016 PBC Meeting regarding 2016-16 Draft Proposed Scheduled Maintenance Projects</p> | <p>Dr. Ikharo reported on 4/29/16 PBC meeting. At this meeting he presented, on behalf of the DFC, the Resolution, passed by the membership at the 4/1/16 meeting relating to 1.5% budget line item for Facilities Maintenance and Repairs. He provided brief historical information on the process.</p> <p>Dr. Ikharo also presented the 2017 30-day projects and funding amount needed to move forwarded.</p> <p>PBC membership deliberation and in conclusion asked for the following additional clarification:</p> | | |

PBIM DISTRICT FACILITIES COMMITTEE

DRAFT – May 06, 2016 DFC Meeting Minutes

| Agenda Item | Discussion | Follow-up Action | Decisions (Shared Agreement/ Resolved or Unresolved} |
|-------------|---|------------------|--|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback from the colleges on the lists of the 2014-15 and 2015-16 projects. The specific request was to provide update lists of the status of the projects for both of these years which incorporate the college's requests. 2. In the status report for the 2014-15 and 2015 -16 years, the PBC requested that there be an indication of whether the project was completed, in progress, or ongoing. Additionally, the PBC requested identification of the funding source for each project, which might include multiple sources of funding for each project. This is a repeated request. 3. Has the 1% that was allocated last year been fully spent? If not, what amount is left unspent? Why it was not fully expended? 4. In regard to the request for 1.5% of the general fund budget for deferred and ongoing maintenance -- the PBC requested documentation of the deliberations that led to the figure of 1.5%. Also, does this amount include the total cost of ownership for each project? <p>A discussion ensued with the following highlighted points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those of us that live in Oakland want to go to the same quality of campus as our competitors; • 1.5% needs to come from the General Fund not Schedule Maintenance or other funds set aside for special maintenance & repairs; • Laney consumes most of the maintenance and repair monies but there is always a need. | | |

PBIM DISTRICT FACILITIES COMMITTEE

DRAFT – May 06, 2016 DFC Meeting Minutes

| Agenda Item | Discussion | Follow-up Action | Decisions (Shared Agreement/ Resolved or Unresolved} |
|---|--|------------------|--|
| | <p>It was agreed, by consensus, that Dr. Ikharo, on behalf of the DFC membership will provide the additional information requested which will include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expenditure of 2015-16 20-day projects utilizing 1.5% line item, broken down by College and an explanation of the dynamics; • Status reports for Schedule and Deferred Maintenance projects 2014-15, 2015-16 and proposed 2016-17; • Draft TCO Document • Other pertinent information. <p>Information will be present to the PBC at their May 27, 2016 meeting.</p> | | |
| <p>V. Accessment DFC 2015-16 Goals & Objectives. Where they Met?</p> | <p>2015-16 DFC Goals were reviewed. The consensus is that all the 2015-16 Goals & Objectives were met with the exception of Goal #1 which is partially achieved This is a work in progress. The final solution will be derived from the final ADA plan once it is complete.</p> <p>A final copy of this committees goals assessment will be sent to all committee members.</p> | | |
| <p>III. Reports: College Facilities Committees (Each College to give a 5 minute report)</p> | <p><u>Laney</u> – No report.</p> <p><u>COA</u> – No report</p> <p><u>Merritt (Bill Love / Molly Sealund)</u> Molly shared that faculty have expressed their dissatisfaction with the overall design of the Barbara Lee Building, some areas do not meet their needs. Some find it difficult to teach. Faculty is asking for a remedy.</p> <p>Dr. Ikharo responded saying that any design changes would require additional</p> | | |

PBIM DISTRICT FACILITIES COMMITTEE

DRAFT – May 06, 2016 DFC Meeting Minutes

| Agenda Item | Discussion | Follow-up Action | Decisions (Shared Agreement/ Resolved or Unresolved} |
|---|--|------------------|--|
| | <p>funding. However, some small items may be doable. Major construction will require a process.</p> <p>Dr. Ikharo will work with the college for possible resolutions.</p> <p><u>BCC (Karen Shield)</u> What would it take to install a PA system to be used in the event of an emergency? Dr. Ikharo explained that this would first need to be qualified as a projects. He provided information regarding PCCD emergency notification system and noted that all the college, including BCC, have emergency plans.</p> <p><u>Laney College:</u> No repost.</p> | | |
| <p>VII. Recommendation(s) from DFC to PBC (if applicable)</p> | <p>Dr. Ikharo, on behalf of the DFC will provide the PBC membership with the additional information they requested.</p> <p>Dr. Ikharo thank the membership for their participation and mentioned he looks forward to another production year.</p> | | |
| <p>Meeting Adjourned</p> | <p>11:40 am</p> | | |
| <p>Next Meeting</p> | <p>August 2016 Summit. (TBA)</p> | | |

Minutes taken by: Rosemary Vazquez

PBIM DISTRICT FACILITIES COMMITTEE

DRAFT – May 06, 2016 DFC Meeting Minutes

Attachments: All documents and/or handouts for this meeting can be found at: <http://web.peralta.edu/pbi/>

DRAFT