Committee: PBIM – District Facilities Committee  
Date: December 11, 2009  
Absent:  Jacquelin Bell, Helene Maxwell, MaryBeth, Benvenutti, Patrick Lardizabal, Diane Rosenblum  
Facilitators:  Rebecca Kenney, Gloria Vogt  
Agenda Item | Discussion | Follow-up Action | Decisions (Shared Agreement/Resolved or Unresolved?)
--- | --- | --- | ---
Meeting Called to Order  | 9:05 am  |  | A quorum was recognized
I. Introduction  | Committee members and guests introduced themselves.  
Chair introduced new members Shirley Coaston and Bill Love.  
Indra Thadani has resigned her membership due to schedule conflicts.  |  |  
A. Minutes Review and Approval  | 10/9/09 minutes, previously emailed to members, was reviewed.  
Suggested change to 10/09/09 minutes:  
- (II – Roles & Charges, second bullet) - Change to – “Add another facility member from each College to the membership; there only academic president & faculty.”  
11/13/09 minutes, previously emailed to members, was reviewed.  | 10/09/09 accepted with suggested change.  
B. Agenda Review  | Agenda was reviewed.  | 12/11/09 Agenda accepted.
### Agenda Item Discussion Follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II.  Process: Profession and Construction Services – Acquisition Process – Update and further discussions of Revised Flowcharts</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Follow-up Action</th>
<th>Decisions (Shared Agreement/Resolved or Unresolved?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dr. Ikharo provided additional information and summarized the development of standard protocols for shared governance project approval process, project development overview and professional services acquisition process. | Flowcharts were reviewed and discussed. Discussion included:  
- PCCD’s General Counsel’s role in reviewing contracts.  
- Project Team makeup; who should serve on this team?  
- The role of project Inspector of Records relating to ADA compliance.  
- The Bidding process for Capital Projects.  
- The role of this committee in regards to recommending rather than approving procedures. | Dr. Ikharo will revise flowcharts and bring them back to this committee for further discussions. | Motion: Continue to define the District’s process with updated flowcharts brought back to this committee for further clarification and discussion - Passed. |

### MOTION

Motion to extend the meeting until 11:15 am unanimously passed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Update on the Short-Term and Master Construction Program</th>
<th>This item was deferred to a further meeting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| IV. Merritt College New Science & Allied Health Building – Architectural Bridging Selection Committee Process and Recommendation & Costs | Dr. Ikharo gave an update, which included background and summary of this project, the RFQ process, information about the committee makeup, the selection criteria and the committee’s recommendations.  
He commented that a rigorous evaluation process was followed to ensure that a consistent and fair evaluation was conducted for each proposal received. The evaluators carefully examined and looked at different aspects of each proposal. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|             | Twenty-eight companies submitted proposals. The following top 3 companies will participate in a final interview:  
  - Flad/WLC Architects  
  - HY Architects  
  - Lionakis Architects  
  The recommended company will then be forwarded to the full board for approval in January/2010. | | |
| V. College of Alameda Buildings C & D - Architectural Bridging Selection Committee Process and Recommendation & Costs | Dr. Ikharo gave an update, which included background and summary of this project, the RFQ process and information about the committee makeup, the selection criteria and the committee’s recommendations.  
He commented that a rigorous evaluation process was also followed to ensure that a consistent and fair evaluation was conducted for each proposal received. The evaluators carefully examined and looked at different aspects of each proposal.  
Twenty-nine companies submitted proposals. The following top 3 companies will participate in a final interview:  
  - Perkins Willis Architects  
  - Steinberg Architects  
  - Gould-Evans Architects  
The recommended company will then be forwarded to the full board for approval in January/2010. | | |

Close 11:15 a.m.  
Next Meeting TBD  
Upcoming Meetings TBD

Minutes taken: Rosemary Vazquez