



MOORPARK COLLEGE

Facilities – Committee on Accreditation and Planning

Plans, monitors, and evaluates facilities and project-specific issues, the Facilities Master Plan, the Accreditation Self-Study, and Monitors the implementation of agenda 3B of the Self-Study relative to Facilities.

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, February 16, 2011 | 1-2:30 p.m., A-138

POSITION/DEPARTMENT	NAME	ATTEND	DIVISION	DEPARTMENT CHAIR OR DESIGNEE	ATTEND
Co-Chair: Vice President, Business Services	Iris Ingram	X	Applied & Social Sciences (2)	Howard Davis Vance Manakas*	X
Co-Chair: Academic Senate Appointee	Phil Abramoff	X	Art, Media, Education, & Enrollment Services (2)	Gerry Zucca Erika Lizée* Joanna Miller (alt.)	X X
Associated Students' Representative (1)	Lisa Audish	X	Language & Learning Resources (2)	Hart Schulz*	X
Deans' Council Representatives (2)	Kim Hoffmans* Lori Bennett	X	Mathematics & Physical Sciences (2)	Marcos Enriquez* Lori Clark	X
Director, Facilities , M&O	John Sinutko*	X	Natural Sciences (2)	Norm Marten Staff Mary Swenson Lan Nguyen (alt.) Michlyn Hines (alt.)	
Student Services Council Representative (1)			Performing Arts and Student Life (2)	Robert Salas*/ Traci Allen	X
ACCESS Representative (1)	Sherry D'Attile		GUESTS	Todd Hampton	X
Information Technology Representative (1)	Dean Adams	X		Darlene Melby	X

Note: * = FCAP Workgroup Member

TOPIC	ACTION
1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS Co-Chair Ingram welcomed everyone in attendance. Introductions were made around the room.	Meeting began at 1:06pm.

TOPIC	ACTION
<p>2. REVIEW & APPROVE MEETING NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ January 19, 2011 The January 19, 2011 FCAP Meeting Notes stand as distributed. 	<p>Co-Chair Ingram called for a motion to approve the January 19, 2011 FCAP Meeting Notes. Mr. John Sinutko motioned for approval. Mr. Vance Manakas seconded. Motion carries.</p>
<p>3. (a) INFORMATION/REPORTS – Mr. John Sinutko</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Health Sciences Mr. Sinutko reported that the equipment and furnishings for the new Health Sciences building, are installed daily. Everything should arrive in the Warehouse or be installed by 2/17/11. In addition, the end-user will need to identify where the equipment will eventually go. ○ EATM Mr. Sinutko stated that the EATM project is behind schedule due to inclement weather preventing the completion of the roof structure. Ms. Joanna Miller inquired as to whether or not the new EATM Auditorium was designated for EATM courses only. Per Co-Chair Ingram, no building or classroom is designated to any one discipline and that everyone will have the opportunity to utilize it (within reason). ○ Fountain Hall Entrance Co-Chair Abramoff mentioned that the Academic Senate was concerned about the current status of the overall project; specifically, the preservation of the existing faculty bricks. Mr. John Sinutko stated that both Co-Chair Ingram and Ms. Darlene Melby met with him on Monday to review the various project funds. At that time, it was decided to combine the various funds and create a project labeled Way Finding. He indicated that once an architect is on board, involvement from the Academic Senate will be sought in order to properly treat, relocate, and preserve the faculty bricks. It was decided that a temporary displaycase would be constructed to house new faculty bricks. Co-Chair Abramoff agreed to supply Mr. Sinutko with the quantity and dimensions of the new bricks. <p>Co-Chair Ingram stated that the Fountain Hall Entrance Project is being looked at in concert with all of the other project demands. The project will move forward, in terms of money, as long as they are able to scrape together enough funds to do it. The project's priority has decreased; however, progress is occurring, slowly.</p>	

TOPIC	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parking Structure Mr. Sinutko reported that he met with DSA on February 8, 2011 to review the proposed Parking Structure project. He indicated that he anticipates plan submittal to DSA by July 1, 2011; DSA will make comments to the plans and return to us by October 3, 2011; corrections will be made and returned to DSA sometime mid-December; DSA approval should occur sometime mid-January; project should go out to bid sometime in February; Board of Trustees would then approve the contractor who won the bid in March; and then work would begin sometime in April 2012. ○ Locally Funded Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roof Replacement Project Mr. Sinutko indicated that a job-walk occurred last week regarding the replacement of 21 roofs campus-wide. Bids are expected to be received by March 2, 2011. The project will begin during the 4-week break before summer session begins. Remaining buildings will receive their roofs before the fall semester begins. ▪ Environmental Science Program Plan (photovoltaic course lab location) Mr. Sinutko reported that nothing new had occurred on this project other than a potential funding source had been identified. <p>(b) FACILITY RESOURCE ALLOCATION WORKGROUP (FRAWG) – Ms. Erika Lizée</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update on Facilities-Cap Workgroup Ms. Erika Lizée reported that she and Dean Kimberly Hoffmans were selected as the Co-Chairs of the new Facility Resource Allocation Workgroup (FRAWG). She noted that each division now has a representative on FRAWG and that they are modeling their workgroup after TRAC. FRAWG has met twice; the first meeting was to select the Chairs and to do introductions; the second meeting was to name the new workgroup; define categories for facilities requests and suggested criteria for prioritization, and to review the various facility requests as provided by Kim Watters. Requests were assigned to FRAWG members who will then gather information, interview, investigate, and report back their findings. Ms. Lizée distributed a draft of FRAWG criteria and an annotated agenda. <p>Discussion was held regarding the various types of facility requests. It was noted that many of the requests appeared to be non-facility related; work orders, technology, and misc./other. It was agreed that FRAWG would create a matrix of these requests and give it to Co-Chair Ingram for her to inform those divisions of alternate solutions.</p>	

TOPIC	ACTION
<p>Ms. Lizée mentioned that the remaining requests would then be placed into three categories: Major facility requests, medium facility requests, and minor facility requests.</p> <p>Ms. Lizée requested clarification as to the role of FRAWG. Lengthy discussion was held regarding the role of FRAWG. Co-Chair Abramoff called for a motion to approve the delegation of prioritization of facility requests to FRAWG within the three categories as outlined in the meeting (major, medium, minor). The three prioritized categories would then be brought forward as a recommendation for the members of FCAP to prioritize and vote on as a whole.</p>	<p>Co-Chair Abramoff called for a motion to approve the delegation of prioritization of facility requests to FRAWG within the three categories as outlined in the meeting (major, medium, minor). Mr. John Sinutko motioned for approval. Ms. Erika Lizée seconded the motion. Mr. Hart Schulz abstained. Motion carries by majority.</p>
<p>4. ACTION</p>	
<p>5. REVIEW/DISCUSSION</p> <p>Co-Chair reminded the members of FCAP that a lot of what gets done through Capital Planning and Facilities is done via a budgeted line item named Scheduled/Deferred Maintenance. Scheduled Maintenance used to be funded by the state; however, that line item no longer receives an allocation by the State of California. We are still required to send a list of Scheduled Maintenance projects to the State Chancellor's Office even though they no longer fund it. Scheduled Maintenance is funded entirely out of local campus resources/operating budget. This would include projects such as the AA Renovation, the roofs, gas lines, etc. These projects are all competing for a pot of money that no longer exists, other than what Co-Chair Ingram has put aside. Given the fiscal issues in the state, our district is relatively okay. If the proposed tax increases to balance the state budget don't pass in June, there would be \$24B worth of cuts, spread across all state services. The community colleges portion of the \$24B is estimated at \$800M. If the proposed tax increases/extensions are passed, the community colleges would suffer a \$400M cut out of a remaining \$12B deficit.</p> <p>Co-Chair Ingram warned that it is possible to do all of the work with prioritizing facilities, and then say that we're not doing any of it because she needs to utilize the funding elsewhere.</p>	
<p>6. ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>Meeting adjourned at 2:15pm.</p>

HANDOUTS	Meeting Calendar 10-11 3 rd Wednesday, 1 p.m., PCR
AGENDA 02/16/11 – MCSHare, Webpage	2010 08/18, 09/15, 10/20, 11/17
MEETING NOTES 01/19/11 – MCSHare, Webpage	2011 01/19, 02/16, 03/16, 04/20
FCAP 2010-11 GOALS – MCSHare, Webpage	

Moorpark College FACILITIES - CAP

RECOMMENDING STRUCTURE	CHARGE AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY	MEMBERSHIP
FACILITIES – Committee on Accreditation and Planning (CAP) <i>Committee of Academic Senate</i>	Plans, monitors, evaluates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › facilities and project-specific issues › The Facilities Master Plan › <i>The Accreditation Self-Study</i> › Monitors the implementation of Agenda 3B of the self-study relative to facilities Ed Code 53200(c): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › processes for institutional planning and budget development 	Co-Chairs: Vice President, Business Services Faculty appointed by ASEC Members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Two faculty from each Division appointed by Academic Senate › Director of F, M&O › Two Deans appointed by EVP › One IT representative › One Student Services Council rep › One student appointed by ASG