1. **Call to Order**
The meeting of the Facilities Committee (FC) was called to order by Chair Linda da Silva at Ocean Campus, Multi-Use Building, Room 140 at 1:15pm.

FC Members/Alternates Present: Steven Brown (Co-Chair, Alternate), Lenny Carlson (Alternate), Rebeca Chavez (Member), Linda da Silva (Chair, Member), Jay Field (Member), Jeffrey Kelly (Alternate), Madeline Mueller (Member), James Rogers (Member), Brenna Stroud (Member)

FMP AWG Resources Present: Pamela Mery

FC Members/Alternates Absent: Erika Delacorte (Member), Joe Jah (Member), Vicki Legion (Alternate), Muriel Parenteau (Member), Becky Perelli (Member), Suzanne Pugh (Member), Bouchra Simmons (Member), Athena Steff (Member), Teresa Villicana (Alternate)

FMP AWG Resources Absent: Jorge Bell

Staff Present: Michael Almaguer, Tom Boegel, Jason Halprin, Aaron Holmberg, Marian Lam, Nathan Steele, Kristina Whalen

Presenters: Amy Jane Frater (tBP), Phil Newsom (tBP)

Members of the Public Present: Tom Havey

2. **Approval of June 26, 2017 Agenda** – Agenda approved unanimously. (Steven Brown/Jay Field)

3. **Unfinished Business** – None

4. **New Business**
   b. Facilities Master Plan – Amy Jane Frater and Phil Newsom of tBP Architecture provided a status update, focusing on projected space eligibility, potential program locations, next steps and timeline.
      1. State Space Standards for Labs
         i. Madeline Mueller questioned the space type designation for Arts as 321 instead of 312. Amy Jane Frater will check if the number is in error.
         ii. Jay Field inquired which space type category computer labs fall under. Amy Jane Frater noted that the space type depends on which specific discipline the lab supports. For example, a math lab would fall under mathematics, a lab in the library serving multiple disciplines under interdisciplinary, and study space specifically for study and not instruction such as tutoring could be an AV/TV instructional lab.
      2. Ocean Campus Space Needs Projection
      3. Amy Jane Frater pointed out that the space needs projection indicates some disciplines have more existing ASF than they are currently eligible for and projected to need in the coming growth period. Those space users may not feel like there is too much space. She explained that could be attributed to outdated space that is not of the quality that is needed, and does not optimize shared resources and optimized utilization.
4. 2016 Capacity Load Ratios
   i. Brenna Stroud inquired if the capacity load ratio percentages could be broken
down by each Center instead of being lumped together. Amy Jane Frater
   responded that since each Center is very small, they tend to have excess space
based on enrollment and it makes sense to roll the numbers together.
   ii. Brenna Stroud commented that the State has made the decision to make more
commitment to the trades by providing specialized funding. She noted that
combining the Centers does not provide a clear picture of the ratios for Centers
that offer trades vs. non-trades. Amy Jane Frater noted that the 2016 capacity load
ratios are a snapshot in time from 2016 to 2017 indicating the areas with
inadequate space to too much space with the goal of getting the ratio to 100%. The
uses of data for State funding for specific disciplines for each Center are not
combined.

5. Potential Program Locations FMP Site Plan
   i. Steven Brown inquired about the bungalows that were converted into smart
classrooms. Amy Jane Frater noted that the bungalows will be eliminated in the
10-year plan and replaced with permanent facilities to provide better access at
more conveniently located spaces. Phil Newsom added that the plan is for the
700 bungalows to be the last bungalows eliminated.
   ii. Jeff Kelly questioned if the tennis courts are greyed on the site plan because they
are not CCSF property. Phil Newsom confirmed that the tennis courts are City
property.

6. Chinatown/North Beach Center
   i. Steven Brown inquired if the lawsuit at the Chinatown/North Beach Center
involves the elevators. Linda da Silva responded that the lawsuit does not
involve the elevators.
   ii. James Rogers inquired if the plan is to activate or rent out the culinary space at
the Chinatown/North Beach Center Annex Building. Linda da Silva noted that
Tannis Reinherz has advised the setup of a café is not conducive to instruction.
Steven Brown believes that the space is restricted from renting out for 5 years
due to State funding requirements.

7. Evans Center
   i. Phil Newsom noted that the Center was designed as a commercial warehouse
space, and the FMP team has not seen evidence of DSA approval.
   ii. Brenna Stroud would like to see projected figures for each instructional
discipline. Amy Jane Frater noted that different disciplines have different
standards.
   iii. Brenna Stroud noted that funding should shift to a higher percentage for the
Center due to $4.5 million State commitment for trades and build that towards
the 2026 projections.
   iv. Phil Newsom noted that the Center has adequate space for its 600 FTES, but the
space but badly configured space. For example, a better use of space is to use
more of the parking space outside for vehicles currently stored inside. Brenna
Stroud noted that the outdoor space is already taken up by welding and
construction.
v. Brenna Stroud expressed concern of moving Southeast to Evans due to space limitation.

vi. Phil Newsom noted that no institutional decisions have been made so the plan is to build as much as rational and make the spaces flexible. For example, the Fire Science program can move in and share the same instructional space as Automotive Technology.

vii. Amy Jane Frater added that the strategy is to look at growth and diminishment, take raw data and interpret it, and test fit and make recommendations for the plan.

8. The next steps are reviewing building diagrams and developing where programs will go. The next Facilities Committee meeting is scheduled for July 24, 2017.

9. Madeline Mueller commented that it is unclear which spaces are designated AV/TV instructional media space. Amy Jane Frater defined these spaces as technology rich space used early on for distance learning that has evolved into a teaching space that can be used for example for Broadcast Media. Madeline Mueller noted that data does not seem to have been corrected. Amy Jane Frater noted that the space inventory has some inconsistencies. Linda da Silva noted that the Facilities Department has not had adequate staffing or direction to adequately maintain space inventory with the rigor required. She provided guidance and allocated resources in the last reporting period to address inaccuracies in space inventory at the Centers, and the focus this current reporting period is on addressing inaccuracies in space inventory at Ocean Campus.

10. Aaron Holmberg inquired how much space is designated for storage. Phil Newsom noted that program related storage should be allocated to the program. Amy Jane Frater explained that a lab service area, chemical room or tool room that is part of the lab and involved in instruction and part of instructional activity should be allocated to the program.

c. Five Year Construction Plan, Final Project Proposals, Initial Project Proposals – Status update, next steps and timeline.

1. Linda da Silva clarified that at the Facilities Committee meeting on May 11, 2017, Item 3a regarding the Five Year Construction Plan project priority list did not include the Gough Street move to the B600/700 bungalows. In the very next Item 4d of that same meeting, the Committee voted to recommend the Gough Street Relocation to the 600/700 Bungalows. The June 2017 Board Item 170622-XIII-179 on the annual adoption of the District’s Five Year Capital Outlay Construction Plan to be submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office acknowledged the Facilities Committee’s recommendation by being included as project numbers 11 and 12 for the Gough Street move.

2. Ocean Campus Arts Complex/Diego Rivera Theater

i. Phil Newsom noted that Items 3 and 4 are related to the Board policy to prioritize the Arts Project and position the project in the best way to achieve State funding. A seismic upgrade category A project provides a one for one with demolition of the existing arts buildings for 100% state funding. Half of available State Capital Outlay funds are allocated to Category A projects; casting the Arts Education Center as a Category A aligns the project with the most available State funding). The 650 seat theater would not be eligible for State funding in a Category A project. The Diego Rivera Theater was separated out as the District’s next priority project, Category D Complete Campus.
ii. Lenny Carlson commented that the Ocean Campus is an incomplete campus and it is not right to break up the theater from the Arts Complex project. He noted that the Three Stages at Folsom Lake College is a performing arts project that was completed with State, local and private funding. He commented that there are billionaires ready to fund CCSF’s project.

iii. Madeline Mueller inquired what happened to the $48M in bond funds for this project.

iv. Madeline Mueller commented that in the past, complete campus category projects had the ability to get to the head if previous approved funding is interrupted.

v. Madeline Mueller commented that a Category A funded project involves tearing down the existing buildings but the current buildings houses a lot more than the Arts. Phil Newsom responded that other programs will need to find new space.

vi. Madeline Mueller noted that practice rooms are currently undersized and inquired if Category A funding will limit the new space to have the same size practice rooms. Phil Newsom noted that the buildings will be designed from inside out.

vii. Jeff Kelly stated that you cannot teach a lighting class without adequate fall protection.

viii. Phil Newsom stated that all three Arts buildings will be replaced to address requirements with a strategy to fulfill instructional needs in advance of completion.

3. Ocean Campus Stem Center
   i. Linda da Silva pointed out that at the June 22nd Board meeting, when the Board was considering Item 170622-XIII-179 on the annual adoption of the District’s Five Year Capital Outlay Construction Plan to be submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office, a public comment was made by a faculty member that Science faculty do not support construction of a new STEM center.
   
   ii. Dean of the School of Fine, Applied, and Communication Arts Kristina Whalen commented that she heard a science professor stating that the current building cannot support modern day instruction.
   
   iii. Lenny Carlson stated that the controversy is related to a previous Trustee arguing for a STEM Center against a Performing Arts Center.
   
   iv. Linda da Silva asked Facilities Committee members to remember that the Committee is a representative committee in participatory governance, that each member has a duty to represent their constituents, that each member should be reporting out and seeking feedback from their constituencies on the issues debated and considered in the Facilities Committee, and that it would be a shame for the Committee members’ work for two years on the FMP to be undermined by failure to do so. She asked the faculty representatives on the Committee to reach out to their colleagues to get clarity on the STEM Center.

4. Evans Center Reconstruction
   i. Brenna Stroud inquired why the Evans Center Reconstruction was bumped down to number 6 when it was number 4 in the first draft. Linda da Silva clarified that the Committee voted for the Evans Reconstruction as number 5 on
the priority list; project 5 became 6 when project 3 PAEC cleaved into projects 3 and 4.

ii. Brenna Stroud expressed concern that a lower priority for Evans Center will affect ongoing issues at Evans. Linda da Silva reminded the Committee that the State will fund up to one project per site per year, so projects 3, 5 and 6 have the equal District priority in the State’s consideration of funding.

5. Madeline Mueller inquired if changes can be made to the FPP after submission to the State. Phil Newsom responded that the overall space and the use is not going to change, but adjustments of space in the design phase can be made (for example turning two labs into one). The FPP has the flexibility built in.

6. Madeline Mueller inquired if there is time to give input for the FPP’s. Linda da Silva responded that the SYCP, FPPs and IPPs are due every year by July 1st, and that input is always welcomed.

5. Future Business
   a. 2016-17 Program Reviews (action)
   b. Facilities Committee Orientation Packet (information)

6. Public Comment on Items not on Agenda - None

7. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 3:10 PM