Committee: Steve Veres, Chair; Scott J. Svonkin, Vice Chair, and Ernest H. Moreno, Member

Trustee Veres called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

None.

REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTIONS

Presentations/Initiative Reviews

- Los Angeles Pierce College Draft Master Plan Review

A document entitled “Pierce College 2014 Draft Facilities Master Plan Update” was distributed.

Mr. James D. O’Reilly, Chief Facilities Executive, Facilities Planning and Development, indicated that Dr. Kathleen F. Burke, President, Los Angeles Pierce College (LAPC) was present to discuss the Pierce College 2014 Draft Facilities Master Plan Update. He further stated that as a result of the moratorium LAPC was directed to reevaluate the Facilities Master Plan. He applauded Dr. Burke and LAPC for their effort during the moratorium in response to the new direction; they kept within their budget and will be on schedule to finish the projects.

Dr. Burke introduced Mr. Stan Barankiewicz, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Attorney, and Mr. Ed Cadena, College Program Manager (CPM) Director. Dr. Burke discussed the document with respect to the purpose of the Facilities Master Plan Update, the 2011 Educational Master Plan (2012-2017), 2010 Long Range Facilities Master Plan (updated from 2002), Approved 2010 Facilities Master Plan Update, Educational Master Plan Growth Factors, geographic areas served by the campus, priorities & changes, CEQA conclusions, horticulture details, and Central Plan Expansion details.

A question and answer session was conducted regarding the LAPC 2014 Draft Facilities Master Plan Update.

Trustee Veres requested that a college-by-college comparison be conducted along with a narrative for future Facilities Master Plan presentations explaining the reasons for the increase and/or decrease with respect to long-term enrollment growth.

Dr. Burke continued to discuss the documents with respect to the Expanded Automotive & New Technical Education Facilities, Detail, Digital Arts & Media, Existing Built Conditions, and the 2014 Facilities Master Plan Update/Changes.

Motion by Trustee Svonkin, seconded by Trustee Moreno, to recommend to the full Board the approval of the Pierce College 2014 Draft Facilities Master Plan Update.

Without objection, so ordered.

APPROVED: 3 Ayes
LACCD Connect Project Validation

A Document entitled “Connect LACCD Feasibility Study Report” was distributed.

Dr. Adriana D. Barrera, Deputy Chancellor, indicated that this project has been in the planning stages since the passage of Measure J. She indicated that Mr. Jorge Mata, Chief Information Officer, with his many years of experience as an Information Technology (IT) Manager, facilitated the project with the LACCD Information Technology managers.

Mr. O’Reilly gave an overview of the Connect LACCD project and introduced Mr. William Sewell, Deputy Program Director, LACCD Bond Program Management Office, he discussed his 40 years of extensive experience in the IT energy and data center solution business.

Mr. Sewell gave a PowerPoint presentation and discussed the document regarding the Connect LACCD project with respect to the project objectives, project validation process, current state, current utilization measurement, today’s usage statistics, anticipated growth, how much new capacity is needed, the solutions, the summary, the findings, and the recommended next steps.

A questions and answer session was conducted regarding the various components of the Connect LACCD project.

For the Record: Trustee Svonkin stated that staff’s recommendation is that there is no immediate change to the LACCD Network that is required to meet capacity demands until 2018.

Trustee Moreno requested that an evaluation be conducted of Measure J proceeds that were utilized for IT purposes and that the administration take action to ensure that future Measure J funds are being expended appropriately on IT projects.

Chancellor Francisco C. Rodriguez responded that Trustee Moreno’s remarks are well taken and his concerns are noted.

There being no objection, Trustee Veres stated that the Committee accepts the following staff’s recommended next steps: Implement the minimal upgrade option, carefully monitor and document bandwidth usage for the next twelve months, and define the long-term solution and implement it.

Without objection, so ordered.

APPROVED: 3 Ayes

Los Angeles Valley College Media Arts-Performing Arts (MAPA) Project Business Case Analysis

A document entitled “Valley College Media & Performing Arts Project Business Case Analysis” was distributed.

Mr. O’Reilly gave an overview of the presentation and introduced Ms. Terri Mestas, Director, LACCD Bond Program Management Office.

Ms. Mestas gave a PowerPoint presentation and discussed the document with respect to the proposed – Media Arts and Performing Arts (MAPA) project history, existing conditions, Scenarios Analyzed, Program Validation, Cost Analysis, LAVC’s project budget status, Schedule Analysis, DSA approved program facts, and Summary.

Trustee Svonkin inquired how many students are currently served in the building and how many will be served in the new MAPA center.

A question and answer session was conducted regarding the issues and concerns with respect to the MAPA Project Business Analysis.
Trustee Veres expressed his concern regarding the cost of the MAPA center with respect to minimal student usage and the sources of funds to maintain the MAPA center. He emphasized the importance of including a business plan, information on the current and future service area population demographics, enrollment growth data, and a plan to raise funds. He requested that staff provide this information and any other pertinent information and bring back this item to the Committee for further discussion.

Mr. O'Reilly indicated that various other departments would also be utilizing the LAVC College Media Arts-Performing Arts (MAPA) center.

- **College Budget Recovery Plans**
  
  Withdrawn.

- **Delegated Authority Policy**

  Mr. O'Reilly indicated that this item is withdrawn.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

SUMMARY – NEXT MEETING

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 6:31 p.m.