

**Minutes of the Study Session of the Board of Trustees
San Mateo County Community College District
January 8, 2020 – San Mateo, CA**

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

Board Members Present: President Karen Schwarz, Vice President Thomas A. Nuris, Trustee Maurice Goodman, Trustee Richard Holober, Trustee Dave Mandelkern (via phone)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CLOSED SESSION ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

President Schwarz said that during closed session, the Board will (1) hold a conference with legal counsel regarding two cases of anticipated litigation as listed on the printed agenda, (2) consider employee discipline, dismissal, release, (3) hold a conference with the labor negotiator as listed on the printed agenda, and (4) conduct a public employee performance evaluation as listed on the printed agenda.

STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS ONLY

No statements at this time.

RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

The Board recessed to closed session at 5:05 p.m.

RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION

The Board reconvened to open session at 6:12 p.m.

Board Members Present: President Karen Schwarz, Vice President Thomas A. Nuris, Trustee Maurice Goodman, Trustee Richard Holober, Trustee Dave Mandelkern (via phone), Student Trustee Jordan Chavez

Others Present: Interim Chancellor Michael Claire, Chief Financial Officer Bernata Slater, Skyline College Vice President of Student Services Angelica Garcia, College of San Mateo Acting President Kim Lopez, Cañada College President Jamillah Moore

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF REPORTABLE ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

President Schwarz stated the Board took no reportable action during the closed session.

DISCUSSION OF THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

President Schwarz stated a request was made to move agenda item 20-1-1A (Approval of Personnel Items) to follow item 20-1-3A (Approval of Revision to Miscellaneous Pay Rates Salary Schedule); no objections were made and the request was granted by the Board. Additionally, District staff have also asked for agenda item 20-1-4A (Adoption of the 2020-2021 Academic Calendar) be removed as it will be brought back for the January 22nd Board meeting; no objections were made and the request was granted.

Due to the oversight of including Trustee Mandelkern's address in the agenda and in accordance with the Brown Act, Trustee Mandelkern stated he would not be able to participate in any of the voting topics this evening. He requested the Board move the Statements from the Public on Non-Agenda Items section ahead of the minutes' approval so that once this is completed, he would take his leave and not participate in any voting. No objections were made and the request was granted.

STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

President Schwarz asked if there were any statements from the public on non-agenda items.

Dr. Michael Reiner stated that he believed an article from the AFT Advocate in November was alarming, stating AFT and CSEA raised concerns about intimidating comments made during a Skyline College public presidential forum. Dr. Reiner stated while this incident occurred, the college presidents did nothing and the Interim Chancellor praised the individual for

their “passion.” A request was apparently made to investigate the event, but nothing has happened since; Dr. Reiner believes this is due to the “veil” of HR and various personnel values. Dr. Reiner believes this incident is counterproductive to our continuing “Contemporary Conversation Regarding Race, Class, Gender, Privilege and Equity” series because issues of identity and discrimination played a significant role. Dr. Reiner stated that he personally experienced the culture of Skyline College and can attest to the concerns expressed by AFT and CSEA. He said he also wrote an essay about the Holocaust and anti-Semitism and their relationship to social justice, thinking it would be a welcome addition to the conversation on diversity and inclusion; instead, he said he was met with resistance and, as a person of Jewish faith, was offended and worried whether he had stepped into an environment hostile to his ethnicity. Dr. Reiner appealed to the Board, based off of the concerns brought forth by AFT and CSEA. He stated he was a member of the administration at Skyline College for only four months before he was “cut off at the knees without warning for telling inconvenient truths” and requested this circumstance not happen to others for simply trying to do the right thing.

Even though Board members usually don’t comment during this portion of the Board meeting, Trustee Holober stated this was his first instance of hearing about Dr. Reiner’s concerns and personal experiences and requested further investigation into these allegations. Trustee Nuris asked if there was any due process or some sort of vehicle to initiate this type of investigation aside from the grieved individual looking into it themselves; Interim Chancellor Claire responded by saying the District does have an investigative process and an independent investigator can be brought in to review these matters.

President Schwarz proceeded to call upon the individual who submitted a public comment card. Kyle, a student at Cañada College, greeted everyone and requested to discuss the Kinesiology, Athletics and Dance (KAD) Department at Cañada College. Recently, Kyle was dropped from two KAD classes required for his educational progress and has determined the reason why is because the KAD Department at Cañada College has no support. He is on campus almost every day and sees flyers for various classes and programs, but nothing for KAD; he would like to know who is in charge of this and why is KAD not being supported? Some KAD classes have low enrollment and, in turn, students get dropped from these canceled classes. Kyle, however, does not believe low enrollment is necessarily a bad thing, especially in dance classes where students can learn more intimately with their instructor; he understands this may not be practical, but it promotes a great learning environment. On the other hand, Kyle mentioned he is apprehensive about taking a math class this semester and there being 29 other students for just one professor. Currently, Kyle is part of Cañada College’s Math Jam program where he and eight other students have the opportunity to work with one professor and three tutors; he described it as “wonderful” and “loves it” because there 30 students are not jam-packed into one class and help is readily available when he needs it. While still in high school, Kyle was told about the smaller class sizes at Cañada College, but when he actually attended, this wasn’t the case; class sizes were just as big as other colleges. With this mindset, Kyle believes smaller class sizes would equate to better learning environments and more successful students and knows other students would agree.

At this point in time, President Schwarz announced Trustee Mandelkern would take his leave from the Board meeting. Trustee Mandelkern thanked everyone for their time and said goodbye.

MINUTES

It was moved by Trustee Holober and seconded by Student Trustee Chavez to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 20, 2019. The motion carried, all members voting Aye.

NEW BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF REVISIONS TO STUDENT ASSISTANT SALARY SCHEDULE (20-1-2A)

It was moved by Trustee Nuris and seconded by Trustee Holober to approve the revisions.

President Schwarz asked if there were any public comments or questions; there were none. She then asked if the Board had any comments or needed clarification. Student Trustee Chavez stated he is currently a student assistant at the College of San Mateo (CSM) and would like to abstain from this vote. President Schwarz accepted his recusal from the vote.

Trustee Holober stated he is happy the Board is voting on this topic because it is the right thing to do.

The motion carried, all members voting Aye.

APPROVAL OF REVISION TO MISCELLANEOUS PAY RATES SALARY SCHEDULE (20-1-3A)

It was moved by Trustee Goodman and seconded by Trustee Holober to approve the revisions.

President Schwarz asked if there were any public comments or questions; there were none. She then asked if the Board had any comments or needed clarification. Trustee Holober asked if the individuals listed under this proposal would become District employees; Human Resources Director David Feune confirmed they would. Trustee Holober continued to say he was primarily concerned about the Community and Contract Education Instructor positions, asking if they are currently contractors of the District or a provider with whom we contract. Director Feune understands that these positions are independent contractors of the District. In addition, Trustee Holober asked if these positions would be bargaining unit positions. Director Feune indicated the positions would not be bargaining unit positions and they would be subject to a non-bargaining unit schedule. Aside from the art model position, Trustee Holober stated that the pay range seemed vast (\$50 to \$200 per hour or \$50 to \$350 per hour) and wanted to know if this reflects our current experience. Director Feune stated this was the only information provided to him by the director of those programs, meaning he would be unable to answer Trustee Holober's question properly. Interim Chancellor Claire noted, from his time as the Dean of Community Education, that his best guess for the wide range of pay is because the amount the community education service provider receives depends on the enrollment of the class – the higher the enrollment, the higher the pay. Interim Chancellor Claire doubts we will ever see any position paid \$350 an hour.

Another aspect of the “Contract Education Instructor (not-for-credit)” position Trustee Holober requested clarification on was who the contracting entity is; he said the verbiage seems to suggest there is an outside education provider. Due to no individuals from the Corporate Education department being present at the meeting, Director Feune was unable to answer this question; his understanding is that it is direct and he is unaware of any outside entities that Corporate Education works with. Trustee Holober was concerned, stating if someone is our employee, we hire them and set their pay; if a third-party was involved in setting the pay, he would really want to know a lot more because it seems to go against the concept of that individual being our employee. Trustee Holober wondered if this specific item could be pulled from the vote so that more information could be presented at a later date.

President Schwarz asked Director Feune if he was aware of any timelines related to this position; Director Feune stated he was aware of some for the Community Services position, but was unsure in regards to the Contract Education Instructor. He continued to say the program starts on Monday, but didn't know which side of the house will be starting next week or through the next Board meeting on January 22nd.

Interim Chancellor Claire acknowledged Trustee Holober's concerns and questions, stating the Board could pull this one item in order to retrieve the information Trustee Holober is asking for. If adjustments need to be made once started, Interim Chancellor Claire recommended we could make those internally. President Schwarz stated she would be more comfortable with Interim Chancellor Claire's suggestion.

Trustee Holober also stated he was uncertain about the “Community Services Instructor/Short Course (Teacher) Instructor” position, quoting the report “Per contractual agreement between CCCE and business and industry customers...” He understands this to be a short-term deal that we would work out and set the pay for; if this is truly the case, Trustee Holober is fine with it. He would prefer some clarification on this to make sure what he understands is indeed true and the company is not involved in setting the pay.

Trustee Nuris asked if it would be a fee-based type class and if we were to hire an employee, then the employee would probably be paid under this formula based upon how many people are coming into that class. Trustee Nuris reasoned that we would be setting the salary to the employee because we would be negotiating with whomever we are providing the service for. Trustee Holober stated if there is some joint employer (like how the Contract Education Instructor seems to suggest), he would like this item pulled for the time being until further clarification can be provided.

President Schwarz clarified that the Board is pulling the “Contract Education Instructor (not-for-credit)” position from the personnel report, with the intent of more information being provided and having it brought forth again at the next meeting.

The modified motion carried, all members voting Aye.

APPROVAL OF PERSONNEL ITEMS: CHANGES IN ASSIGNMENT, COMPENSATION, PLACEMENT, LEAVES, STAFF ALLOCATIONS AND CLASSIFICATION OF ACADEMIC AND CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL (20-1-1A)

It was moved by Trustee Nuris and seconded by Trustee Goodman to approve the actions in the revised report.

Trustee Holober referenced the Registrar position classification (Item E-4), stating he still has the same concern he brought up several meetings ago; he would like to have a moratorium on the reclassification of these administrative positions until the District has an opportunity to conduct a survey and the Board can review how these reclassifications occur. Trustee Holober has reviewed the 20% (on average) increase range and believes it can wait. He would not be voting in favor of that and asked if it could be removed from the vote (as he was fine with the rest of the report). Interim Chancellor Claire stated that this position is staffed at each college (three positions total) and someone could come and speak on the position, but clarified with Trustee Holober that what he is looking for is an actual review of how the District conducts its reclassifications and the processes that are currently in place. Trustee Holober stated he has a concern which was expressed at past board meetings; he believes there is a process by which employees are ratcheted up dramatically in pay by reclassification and he requested whenever a reclassification occurs, the current and new salary ranges be posted on the agenda. Trustee Holober believes if the pay increases are around the 20% range, we need to stop, take time to reflect, review how we are currently processing reclassifications and come up with a more objective process. Interim Chancellor Claire stated we could most definitely discuss the current process now or defer it to a later meeting; he stated it would be the Board's decision to have a review of process for this specific case now or later. Trustee Holober opposed this, stating his concern lies in how the District has been processing reclassifications for years. He stated that every few meetings, the Board is presented with reclassifications that add up to very substantial pay increases for administrators and executives; however, the Board never really sees it because the dollar amounts are not provided. Trustee Holober continued that, in addition, the process of who is being reclassified, how that employee received a reclassification, how it gets to the attention of the individuals that evaluate the worth of the job and how they compare your peers, either at community colleges or public and private entities all needs to be made more systematic.

Trustee Goodman concurred with Trustee Holober, stating in light of his comments, he was not in favor of supporting the item at this time and would like to hold it off for a future meeting. Trustee Nuris noted the agenda item, stating "The recommended change reflects an increase in scope of work and responsibility." He questioned if there was some sort of process that was followed to determine if these increases should be made; were we using a process that was already "on the books." Director Feune responded, stating the amount and level of work conducted by the three Districtwide Registrar positions (including how the position has changed over time) was brought to the attention of HR. A subsequent review and thorough desk audit was conducted for each position at each college; after looking at the salary ranges of other positions to see where the Registrar's duties and responsibilities would fall into place, the amount and level of work was determined to be similar to that of the Director of Financial Aid. Trustee Nuris asked if this was typically the process that would be used to assess if an adjustment in pay is needed (positions conducting like work would receive like pay). Director Feune said depending on the desk audit and the information received, this is the standard process that is followed. He stated that part of the process is identifying consistency within the job's duties and responsibilities and the desk audit is extremely useful in determining this information. Interim Chancellor Claire stated it may be useful if HR staff shared with the Board the desk audit model and questions that are used in determining if these adjustments are warranted or not. In addition, he assured that not every request for a desk audit is granted and quite a few have actually been denied because they don't meet the guidelines. Interim Chancellor Claire said he understands the trustees' concerns regarding this whole process and would like to present a walkthrough, whether it be at the Board retreat or some other venue. He wants to be clear that this is a matter that is taken very seriously and not something that is done automatically.

Director Feune added that the adjustment request can be initiated by the employee or the manager, which answered President Schwarz's question. Director Feune continued to state that in the past, both employees and their immediate managers have brought forth concerns of working out of class or beyond their position duties and have requested a desk audit. President Schwarz stated she was very interested in learning more about the forums that are used; in addition, she stated the information brought forth this evening has been explained very well and it seems the process was conducted thoroughly. President Schwarz cautioned the Board, stating she would hate to see this as more of an issue with the personality of an individual or with an individual who has a lesser tenure; they are there to solely discuss the position. To this extent, President Schwarz objected to removing the item from the agenda and urged the Board to move forward with a vote; President Schwarz stated she was open to the Board learning more about the whole process down the road.

Trustee Nuris stated that since he is not an “HR person,” he is reliant upon individuals in HR doing their job properly; he respects their opinion because they advise the Board. Trustee Nuris said that so long as he has confidence in HR’s judgment and processes are completed in a thorough and approved way, he can make an informed decision based on information received from individuals in our administration who he would rely on. Trustee Nuris admitted he didn’t understand how we arrived at this point as well, but now that an explanation of the process and a knowledgeable recommendation have been provided to the Board, he feels very comfortable making an informed decision at this point.

Trustee Goodman believes this is the second or third time the Board has asked for specific information when discussing this type of agenda item. It has been brought to the Board’s attention that it could be a matter of a desk audit, but it could also be an employee having a different workload or different scope of work due to another employee not performing their job duties and responsibilities; would you pay an employee differently because someone else is not doing their job? Trustee Goodman understands that asking and answering some of these questions are part of the process and very crucial piece in assisting the Board with their final decision. When dealing with this type of agenda item, Trustee Goodman believes there is no room for ambiguity and salaries need to be documented, as Trustee Holober requested; because of this, he is not ready to make a decision on this item. Since the Board would be tied at a 2/2 vote and Trustee Mandelkern is not present to vote, Trustee Goodman requested for the item to be pulled for now and brought forth at a later date. In addition, he called the question in order to cease further dialog on the matter.

President Schwarz clarified that a question was brought forth by a Board member and a very detailed explanation as to what happened was given; she trusts the people that are employed and believes they performed a very thorough job. At this point, President Schwarz is more than willing to move forward with the item, but acknowledged Trustee Goodman’s point of the vote being a split 2/2, stating it is a shame because employees are essentially “on the line.” She reiterated the Board should move forward with this item and in the future be more informed before a vote such as this one. In addition, President Schwarz stated Director Feune thoroughly explained the whole process to the Board; she understands it and is totally comfortable with what was done. This process was not intended to judge if one employee works harder than another; it is not a matter of “people” – it is a matter of equalizing positions.

Trustee Holober stated he appreciates Director Feune’s explanation and questioned if the District benchmarks against any external employers; Director Feune stated we currently do not benchmark. Trustee Holober stated he would like to see this changed, and what he is concerned about is what he believes to be the continuous “ratcheting up” of administrative and executive position pay over the last few years. He said he would want benchmarking against our peers and would like it to be known that his belief is not commentary on the individual, but commentary on what has been the practice for many years. Trustee Holober is not sure if other Board members would agree, but he would like to review the process and make changes if necessary. As an option to move forward, he is suggesting pulling the one classification for now so that the Board can vote on the others.

President Schwarz clarified there is a motion and a second on the entire personnel report, but now there is a suggestion to pull Section E-4 from said report; Trustee Goodman also clarified the question has already been called. Trustee Nuris suggested the Board pull E-4 from the report and conduct two separate votes. Director Feune made one comment regarding Section J of the personnel report; they would need to pull the 20 “Contract Education Instructor” positions due to this arrangement, which the Board understood. The Board voted on the remaining portion of the personnel report, all members voting Aye.

Trustee Nuris then made a separate motion to vote on Section E-4 and Student Trustee Chavez seconded the motion. The motion failed, with President Schwarz and Trustee Nuris voting aye and Trustee Goodman and Trustee Holober voting nay.

Interim Chancellor Claire stated a “deeper dive” into the process should be presented to the Board; more specificity and rationale will be provided so that the Board has a better background on positions in question. Trustee Goodman stated it would be best to conference with Trustee Holober to figure out the format the entire Board would like to see in the future. President Schwarz stated the Board receives the agenda days in advance of meetings, and it would be beneficial if Board members could ask questions (and hopefully receive answers) ahead of time so that it doesn’t impede the voting process.

Trustee Holober reiterated his concern, stating he is hoping not to have the same explanation again and would like to place this on hiatus until the Board has discussed and decided on if this process is the one we would continue to follow in the future. He would like to have benchmarking and believes it would be educational to the Board to see what is happening

with like jobs/positions in the rest of the Bay Area. President Schwarz asked if it was possible to have a study session regarding these issues; Interim Chancellor Claire said that it would be. Trustee Nuris stated he agrees with his colleagues and supports their concerns, but he does believe a process was already in place and the work was done following the administrative recommendation. He believes that until we change the rules for administration, they need to follow the rules they have been given. He has an issue if the Board was trying to change the rules after the fact, but sees no harm in discussing changing the rules going forward.

CSEA First Vice President Juanita Celaya thanked Trustee Holober and Trustee Goodman for their continued awareness of this issue. CSEA believes there are deep flaws in the reclassification process and have been trying to negotiate a more fair and neutral process that removes favoritism into their contract. Ms. Celaya commented that with the approval of revisions to the student assistant salary schedule, a student assistant at the highest level of their salary schedule will now be paid more than the lowest paid CSEA position.

STUDY SESSION

UPDATE ON DISTRICTWIDE CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS (20-1-1C)

Interim Chancellor Claire explained that he believes this study session will be the start of a continued discussion with the Board and it will provide an opportunity to address some of the concerns brought forth by Board members and members of the public, including cost escalation. Interim Chancellor Claire stated he has no problem explaining how projects increase monetarily and looks forward to everyone attempting to be on the same page. This presentation is meant to show where we currently are with our districtwide projects and their costs and will be used as a stepping stone moving forward.

Jose Nuñez, Vice Chancellor of Facilities Planning, Maintenance & Operations, stated he will be overseeing the presentation and it will be primarily handled by Director of Capital Projects Chris Strugar-Fritsch and Energy and Sustainability Manager Joseph Fullerton. Director Strugar-Fritsch began by addressing “Economic Market Conditions,” stating this is the third time it has been presented to the Board; first in September 2015 and then an update in January 2018. This was started because back in 2015, Director Strugar-Fritsch and his team began to see evidence of cost escalations and they wanted to keep the Board informed of this growing concern.

Director Strugar-Fritsch explained that there are over \$50 billion in construction projects just in San Francisco alone. In 2018, started construction projects were peaking at 45% from year to year; since then, there have been fewer construction starts. This usually translates to contractors being more available, better pricing and bids becoming more competitive, but it has not happened for a couple of reasons. Most of the construction projects that occurred in 2018 were for commercial buildings (the Chase Center, Apple’s Cupertino campus, etc.) and no big projects like those have been scheduled in the near future. In addition, the Trump administration placed more taxes and tariffs on construction-related expenses and the importing of materials between the United States, Canada and China, which led to a decrease in construction starts and/or pushing out the start date of the projects. Even though construction projects have slowed down, there are signs that contractors are wanting to get back into the market and increase their project output.

Director Strugar-Fritsch continued that another reason why movement is on the upswing is due to Prop 51; when Governor Brown was in office, money was simply not flowing. Now that Governor Newsom is in office, projects are starting to get funded again; in fact, three of our District construction projects got funded under Newsom’s administration. More money is being put into the marketplace and more projects are being planned and developed. Bay Area community colleges and unified school districts are starting to pass bond measure programs to fund billion-dollar project lists. Multi-billion dollar projects, such as the construction of San Francisco International Airport – Terminal One and the BART extension into Santa Clara County, are high in materials, labor and costs and they are having a profound effect on the Bay Area. Prop 13 will be proposed in March 2020 and this will provide \$15 billion to K-12, community colleges and UC/CSU campuses. Kaiser Permanente revealed plans for its new headquarters, which would rival the Salesforce Tower. The redevelopment of Treasure Island, San Francisco’s central subway system and the unexplained Candlestick redevelopment – all of these projects are gaining more funding and are now in the pipeline.

Director Strugar-Fritsch stated that even though construction rates are low, construction costs are on the rise for about 3-4% in a one-year term throughout the Bay Area. Since our bond measure was approved, the District has experiencing around a 50% increase in construction costs. Director Strugar-Fritsch continued to say local experts are expecting costs to increase further in 2020. During the last recession, the dollar was worth around \$1.30; now, the dollar is worth about \$0.50, so we

have to keep this in mind when asking why costs have increased so much. The San Francisco Bay Area has not just the highest construction costs in the United States, but in the entire world; we outrank New York (by about 12%), Dubai, London and Zurich. Director Strugar-Fritsch stated that we are no longer in a buyer's market – it is now a seller's market – and individuals have acclimated to the sticker shock and it has become the new normal.

Director Strugar-Fritsch continued that between 2018 and 2019, employment in the construction industry went up by about 4%; this means we have a high demand and a labor shortage in qualified workers. During the last recession, so much of our labor force moved out of the Bay Area because of the high cost of living. Now that we are experiencing a “construction boom,” it is hard to retain that labor force because many of those individuals have to travel back to the Bay Area now. With the influx of out of town individuals needing their travel expenses, temporary housing and other needs covered, it translates to a higher demand for supplies in the Bay Area. All of the traveling done by the labor workforce has led to higher rates of burnout, which means productivity has gone down drastically. Out of town workers that are skilled in the job are usually not familiar with the way it needs to be completed in California, so this leads to low productivity as well. Equipment and labor that is deemed as “smart” needs a higher level of skilled worker; because so many buildings are needing to switch over to smarter and more efficient equipment, the demand for this kind of skilled worker is skyrocketing. Concrete is an in-demand commodity in construction, as it is one of the most used materials. If one was to need a concrete pour it now has to be planned weeks in advance.

Every time a code change happens, the Title 24 Energy Code becomes stricter, Director Strugar-Fritsch said. Part of the District's program for building projects is creating them to be “zero net energy ready.” Zero net energy means a building is going to consume equal or less than the amount of energy it takes to operate it, and the State of California mandated all buildings need to be zero net energy ready by 2030. The District is currently in the process of creating infrastructure and going through the necessary steps it takes to get every building zero net energy ready. This, in turn, adds more costs to District projects. Integrated systems, such as security cameras and networking cables, have high costs and if they are mandatory in every building, the cost escalation is furthered. When planning a new construction project, many things need to be taken into consideration; one key factor many do not think about is dirt. What do we do with the displaced dirt as we are running out of places to put it? The price of “disposing” dirt has gone up because there are so many projects happening at once and no one knows what to do with all of the displaced dirt. In addition, if dirt is contaminated with naturally occurring minerals, there are very strict guidelines to abide by when trying to figure out what to do with it. The same thing can be said about the air quality; the District must follow certain guidelines when using construction vehicles that emit gases into the atmosphere. Since there is so much work available now, contractors can pick and choose the work they want to bid on. In the past, the Facilities team has advised the Board not to go with certain contractors because they are only looking for little to no risk so that they may maximize their profit.

Trustee Holober questioned if when a project is in the planning stages, does cost escalation get factored in for the time between the projected start and end dates? Director Strugar-Fritsch stated that they do interact with cost consulting agencies, but sometimes their numbers are not always correct because it is hard to predict the future; they tend to rely on historical trend data, but try to figure in another 10%, which is not always accurate. Due to this, the District has had to suspend or reduce some of our proposed projects and buildings over the years. There have been times in the past where a project is on the verge of going through and Vice Chancellor Nuñez has had to advise the Board that due to circumstances out of the District's control, we cannot proceed with the planned project. Vice Chancellor Nuñez stated that the District could be perfectly on track for a project to begin, but once we see the cost escalation hit a certain point, the project is deemed no longer viable and we essentially shelve it until a later date.

Currently, the District's total program budget is about \$493 million; this funding is accumulated from Measures H and A, local funds, grants, Prop 39, insurance settlements, state scheduled maintenance funding and state capital outlay. Cañada College currently has \$70 million worth of work in place, Skyline College has \$57.2 million, College of San Mateo has \$3.8 million and the District itself has \$11.9 million of work in place. Some of the projects currently under construction are:

- Cañada College Kinesiology and Wellness Building (Building 1)
- Cañada College Building 9 Exterior Envelope Repair
- Cañada College Multiple Program Instructional Center (Building 13)
- Cañada College Building 13 FPP Swing Space to Building 22
- College of San Mateo Theatre Modernization (Building 3)
- College of San Mateo Student Life & Learning Communities Modernization (Building 17)

- College of San Mateo Edison Parking Lot
- College of San Mateo Water Supply Tank Replacement
- Skyline College Workforce & Economic Development Prosperity Center (Building 2)
- Skyline College Social Science & Creative Arts Building (Building 1)
- Skyline College Pacific Heights (Building 19) Swing Space for Building 2
- Skyline College Demo/Salvage 5 Portables & Replace with 4 New Portables

Trustee Goodman asked about the District safety plan at all three campuses and inquired if there were any considerations taken for the implementation of ample lighting, extra security cameras and broader cellular service coverage. Vice Chancellor Nuñez stated the issue with the cellular service is more provider-based; the District has attempted to add mesh systems so that service is better, but due to all of the concrete walls, it will not be 100 percent. Trustee Goodman asking if there is currently someone tasked with reaching out to the various cellular service providers and if the Board could receive an update on where they are with providing better coverage at the campuses. Vice Chancellor Nuñez agreed and stated they will.

Trustee Holober asked if a summary of projects that have yet to be submitted for bid could be provided. Director Strugar-Fritsch stated the Edison Parking Lot, three capital state-funded projects and the Pacific Heights Swing Space will be submitted for bid shortly. He also stated there are other miscellaneous smaller-scale projects on the horizon, but these projects do not have the scale of design and monetary requirements as the projects previously discussed.

Dr. Michael Reiner, a member of the public, questioned some of the schematics and configurations of the projects forecasted at Skyline College and how he perceives them not to be conducive to the teaching plan or in favor of the students. Director Strugar-Fritsch responded by saying the slides presented high-level schematic plans only and the presentation did not include detailed instructional technology elements. He continued to state that if one was to go to the actual classrooms, they would see the classrooms and labs have flexible furniture and they were built to be more modular; the students themselves are able to rearrange the classroom/lab as they see fit. Dr. Tammy Robinson, Vice President of Instruction at Cañada College, added that the college has switched over to putting computers on carts so that they can be used on as-needed basis in various campus spaces. Faculty has been involved at every step of the process and the college is working to make sure everything that is not affixed to the floor and is as flexible as possible.

Joseph Fullerton, Energy and Sustainability Manager, began his portion of the presentation by introducing the solar energy storage project he and his team have been working on – how it will work, what it can do for us and how we can procure it. In addition, Mr. Fullerton stated the project needs to be beneficial to the community and educational to the student body. This storage project would really be used to offset the cost of electricity the District currently pays for, especially at night. Mr. Fullerton stated the District would procure this energy storage through a power purchasing agreement and leveraging federal tax incentives; by using this method, the District would end up paying less onsite rather than going through various PG&E outlets throughout the state. The District would also be able to lock in a fixed rate for the entirety of the agreement; energy costs, while not quite as drastic as construction costs, are escalating as well and this would be a way to offset a cost in the future. Mr. Fullerton continued to state that the energy storage project would cut carbon emissions, which is something we need to do from a state regulatory perspective and is part of our social responsibility and campus ethos. Along the way, Mr. Fullerton and his team are making sure students can learn from their sustainability projects – something they call “active learning;” students engaged at every step of the project and its design.

Mr. Fullerton stated that microgrids are what the District would be looking at if it wanted to “unplug” from the grid and island itself as much as possible from outside energy providers. If the District wanted to do this, it would need to focus on essential needs of our campus, such as sewage. Mr. Fullerton stated if the District were to install solar panels to accomplish the storage project, areas over parking lots at each campus have been identified for this to happen. Many more steps need to be taken for this project to get up and running; as of now, the seed money is there, but the actual money to complete it is not available right now. Discussions between faculty, staff, students, community members, etc. need to occur and submissions and proposals need to be brought before the Board. Trustee Nuris raised a question of security if the District were to cover the parking lots with solar panels. Vice Chancellor Nuñez stated the District would combat this by installing security cameras here as well. Vice Chancellor Nuñez reiterated that the energy storage project would be used so that essential campus needs are met if the District were to ever island off from the grid; it is not designed to support a whole campus, just basic necessities.

Trustee Goodman raised a question regarding possible future student housing coming into conflict with the areas that are designated for solar paneling, especially at Skyline College. Mr. Fullerton stated this is something he and his team already thought of and showed the possibility of moving the solar panels if need be. Right now, nothing is set in stone and they are open to the idea of moving things around. President Schwarz asked if the panels could be moved to the roofs of buildings; Mr. Fullerton stated there are certain issues that come from roof paneling, such as costs and maintenance, placing them on buildings that already have an existing electrical structure and just the idea of placing things above students' heads. Some of the newer buildings that were recently completed meet the necessary electrical infrastructure, but it would be a big ordeal to make sure all buildings do. Michele Rudovsky, Director of Maintenance and Operations, added that the area of roofs pales in comparison to the area the District would receive from using parking lots. Mr. Fullerton stated the Facilities team is not opposed to it and will eventually try to put energy panels wherever they can.

Trustee Nuris asked about technology improving down the road and how this affects projects. Mr. Fullerton stated the technology used for the panels themselves is not advancing very fast, but the lithium-ion batteries used for storage are advancing at an incredibly fast rate. His team is monitoring this growth and will be making appropriate decisions as the District gets closer to finalizing the project. Mr. Fullerton gave another example of the boilers used on each campus; they are around 65 years old and need to be replaced with electric boilers, so the Facilities team is designing a system that will support that electrical demand. Trustee Nuris also asked if the District had thought about other natural sources of power, such as wind. Mr. Fullerton stated they have thought about it, but wind-powered devices, such as windmills, create more problems; there are issues with blades hitting birds and materials rusting, especially at Skyline College. Trustee Holober asked if a more detailed discussion on financing with the private entity that the District would be working with and what funding would look like could be presented at a future meeting, specifically before Mr. Fullerton and his team are already moving forward with it.

Maxine Turner, a member of the public, commented on some of the cost escalation concerns and how she still did not understand everything, but was hopeful it would be explained further at a future meeting. She also commented on the fact that most of what the community and other individuals voted for was money to go toward upgrading and retrofitting buildings and equipment, not constructing new buildings like the ones presented today. Ms. Turner stated that she believes these projects were not presented to the public and she believes as the District moves forward, the District should really examine what processes need to be explained to the public. Ms. Turner would like more details on how building costs escalated and an improvement on transparency.

President Schwarz thanked Vice Chancellor Nuñez, Director Strugar-Fritsch and Mr. Fullerton for their very detailed presentation and members of the public for their poignant comments. She hopes that the Board will take into consideration what was heard and presented today when moving forward with their future decisions. Interim Chancellor Claire reminded those in attendance that this is only Phase One; the District welcomes input and ideas and will take feedback into consideration down the road.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL TOPICS FOR BOARD RETREAT AGENDA (20-1-2C)

Interim Chancellor Claire stated he went through the last year of Board minutes to capture any suggestions for topics and believes identifying the gap between the District's long-term funding outlook and long-term financial needs would be a great topic for the retreat. Trustee Goodman suggested speaking about workload expectations, the environmental strategic action plan and the next phases of plans for food/housing insecurities and mental health and wellness strategies. Trustee Holober requested an update on our dual enrollment program, a systematic review on job reclassifications and what better rules and procedures we can put in place regarding accountability. Trustee Goodman agreed, stating the retreat would be the perfect opportunity to inform the Chancellor and staff of the vision of the Board. Trustee Nuris agreed as well, stating the retreat would be a great way to identify some areas where the Board could give direction, especially in communicating with high schools, as the District's largest transfer partners. Since the District has already begun the process for hiring a permanent Chancellor, Student Trustee Chavez requested some information on setting the tone for hiring the new president of Skyline College. Trustee Goodman stated he would like to have a permanent Chancellor so that that person could participate in the decision of the new Skyline College president. President Schwarz stated she would assume we would discuss this as we go along and that it does not necessarily warrant time spent talking about it at the retreat. Student Trustee Chavez had no problem with this, but raised some student concerns regarding faculty competence and how it ties back to the college president's hiring credibility. Trustee Nuris suggested if Student Trustee Chavez could go back to the students

to obtain more information and feedback so that it could be presented in a more concise method; both President Schwarz and Trustee Nuris stated that since Student Trustee Chavez is the voice of the students and can give a firsthand account as to what is happening, they would love to hear a more detailed report on these concerns.

Interim Chancellor Claire stated he is grateful for the feedback and will work with President Schwarz on narrowing down the topics and setting the agenda.

STATEMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Student Trustee Chavez relayed a student concern and asked if there was any headway on a new ID system that was going to be implemented.

Trustee Goodman would like the Board to think about joint study sessions/joint meetings with other Boards. He would also like the Board to discuss environmental justice at a future meeting.

Trustee Holober had no comments.

Trustee Nuris thanked everyone who presented tonight, stating it was good hear about how things are moving along.

President Schwarz asked for Measure L to be discussed on the next agenda.

ADJOURNMENT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

The Board adjourned by consensus at 9:00 p.m.

RETURN TO CLOSED SESSION

The Board returned to closed session at 9:05 p.m. to continue consideration of the closed session items listed on the printed agenda.

RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION

The Board reconvened to open session at 9:45 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF REPORTABLE ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

President Schwarz said the Board took no reportable action during closed session.

Submitted by

Michael Claire, Secretary

Approved and entered into the proceedings of the May 13, 2020 meeting.

Thomas A. Nuris
Vice President-Clerk