AGENDA

1.0 CALL TO ORDER  12:00  p.m.

1.1 Members Present:  Joan Bennett, Tom Andrews, Michael Baldini, Charles Meng, Bruce Ketron, JoAnn Busenbark, Margaret Lee, Emery Meeks

1.2 Staff Present:  Dr. Chris McCarthy, Dr. Ed Shenk, Dr. Sally Fitzgerald, Scott Miller

1.3 Pledge of Allegiance
The audience recited the pledge of allegiance.

1.4 Adoption of Current Agenda

2.0 INFORMATION ITEMS AND PROGRAM REPORTS

2.1 BOARD RETREAT ON FACILITIES MASTER PLAN
The Board of Trustees had expressed interest in a fuller discussion of issues related to the Facilities Master Plan, the Bond Implementation Plan, and the design process than is possible during a regularly scheduled meeting. This retreat was designed to provide that additional time for further discussion. Dan TerAvest, Director, Campus Planning and Construction led the review. Alan Butler and Brian Wright of TLCD Architecture and Bill Mastick of Quadriga Landscape Architects were available to provide answers and clarification to the questions posed by board members.

The workshop covered four areas: 1) The Facilities Master Plan; 2) The Planning Process; 3) Phase-In; and 4) Identity Issues.

Mr. TerAvest explained that Volume III of the Master Plan will serve as the institutional memory and that it will grow and evolve as projects and master plan concepts are studied and implemented. Using a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. TerAvest reviewed existing campus conditions; master planned buildings; proposed vehicular circulation; proposed pedestrian and bicycle circulation; and landscape and open space plans.

Mr. TerAvest reviewed the phases of the design process, including: programming, schematic design, design development, construction drawings, approvals, bids, and construction. He
explained who participates in the design process and their roles. Stakeholders are instructors, department chairs, staff, and administrators who set the broad design goals, develop specific design criteria, and work directly with the design professionals to review plans at successive stages of design. Campus Planning includes the Director, Campus Planning and Construction staff and project managers. They act as liaison between groups, monitor project scope and budget and conformance to Facilities Master Plan and Environmental and Planning requirements. The Infrastructure Group (Facilities, Public Safety, Information Technology, Accessibility, Hazmat/CEQA coordinate infrastructure space requirements and address concerns for maintenance and operations, security, accessibility, and environmental constraints. The Core Committee (President, Vice-President, Instruction, Vice President, Student Services, Vice President, Business and Finance, and Director, Campus Planning, and Dean, Research, Planning, and Development) provide regular oversight and input on programs and plans as they progress through the design process. The core group makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees. Presentations are made to the board only on major projects.

There are seven major bond projects: Performing Arts Building, Library, Business and Computer Classrooms, Science Wing, Visual Arts, Field House, and Central Plant. The plan also includes 21 modernizations. Mr. TerAvest reviewed project phasing and project critical paths.

Mr. TerAvest explained that the bond budget was based on a 3% annual inflation rate. However, in 2004-2005, there was an inflation rate of between 30% and 40%, though the current projection is for inflation to level off at 6-7%. The impact of this on bond projects is that we either have to lower the quality of bond projects or reduce the number of projects. The board briefly weighed these options that would require further future discussion.

Mr. TerAvest reviewed issues of campus identity, including: signage, logos, and consistent color schemes. He displayed various options for a new logo, and the board commented. Joan Bennett said she liked our current logo. JoAnn Busenbark said, given all the change on campus, a new logo seemed appropriate.

**ITEMS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION**

During the workshop, Board members raised a number of issues for further consideration. Mr. Baldini suggested looking into other sources of funding that might be available for developing campus roadways. He asked about extending Gasser Drive along the railroad to alleviate traffic along Highway 221. Dan TerAvest said he would look into it.

Mr. Ketron asked about the plans for developing the college’s property at the corner of Imola and Soscol. He wanted to be sure that whatever plans we develop do not affect future use adversely (the proposal for Magnolia, for example). JoAnn Busenbark suggested we agendize this discussion for a future meeting.

It was agreed that a board member would be added to the Core Group on a once-a-month basis. That group would be called the “Super-Core” group. Charles Meng will be on the Super Core Group, and JoAnn Busenbark or Michael Baldini will be the backup when Mr. Meng cannot attend.
It was agreed that Dan TerAvest would keep the board informed after each Tuesday Core Group meeting regarding any major decision that was made.

JoAnn Busenbark stressed the importance of community input to major projects, such as the new theatre. She suggested soliciting input from the community after consensus has been reached on campus. That sequence would not slow down the process. The board may request further discussion on this issue.

Joan Bennett asked when the board could provide its input to the design process, most importantly, on the seven major projects—and particularly on the exteriors. It was agreed that a discussion item on design goals would be planned for a future agenda.

The board discussed how to complete projects at a high level of quality, given the significant increase in building costs. One option would be to reduce the number of projects; the other option is to cut back on the projects undertaken. JoAnn Busenbark said she would have to see the specifics prior to making a decision. Charles Meng favored pursuing quality. Joan Bennett stressed safety. Further discussion will be occur at a future meeting.

3.0 **ACTION ITEMS**

3.1 **Approval of a Letter of Support to the City of American Canyon**

The City of American Canyon has requested a letter of support from the Board of Trustees that indicates its support for entering into discussion with the city regarding establishing a Napa Valley College presence in the American Canyon Town Center.

M/S/C (Lee/Meng) to approve the development of a letter of support to the City of American Canyon regarding a college presence in the American Canyon Town Center.

4.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Bennett adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.