COUNCIL ON BUDGET AND FACILITIES

February 13, 2017
2:00 p.m.
Anaheim Campus Room 105

**Videoconferencing of the meeting will be available at Cypress College Room 301 and the
Fullerton College President's Conference Room A**

AGENDA

I.   Approval of January 9, 2017, Summary Notes (Action)   Irma Ramos

II.   Budget Update   Fred Williams

   ➢ Budget Assumptions

III. Bond Update   Rick Williams

IV.   Other Items (Discussion)   Irma Ramos

NOTE: The numerical order of items on this agenda is for convenience of reference. To promote efficiency and as an accommodation to the parties involved, agenda items may be taken out of order upon request of the Chair or Members of the CBF.

UNAPPROVED SUMMARY

Members Present: Terry Cox, Vivian Gaytan (for Karen Cant), Adam Gottdank, Jolena Grande, Elaine Loayza, Rod Lusch, Sandra Palmer, Irma Ramos, Justin Richardson, Pete Snyder, Kashmira Vyas, Tanya Washington, and Fred Williams. **Members Absent**: Richard Fee, Rodrigo Garcia, Tina Johannsen, Ian Kolaja, and Cherry Li-Bugg.

Guests: Josh Ashenmiller, Deborah Ludford, Nick Wilkening, and Rick Williams.

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m., by Chair Irma Ramos.

I.   **Summary**: The summary of the December 12, 2016, meeting was accepted as amended.

II. Network Refresh:

Mr. Fred Williams introduced Ms. Deborah Ludford to discuss the network refresh, to provide a brief update on where we are in the process, and to answer any questions that members may have.

Ms. Ludford shared that the network refresh project began several months ago and has four phases. We are currently working on Phase 1, Assessment; we sent out an RFP and hired a consulting firm, WTC Consulting, Inc. WTC's scope of work is to assess the District's wire and wireless networks, voice networks, and the inside and outside physical plant which is necessary to support those networks at each of the campuses. WTC's assessment will provide us with responses to the following five points:

1.   Assess the current NOCCCD network and systems environment

2.   Assess the business efficacy of our network support practices

3.   Assess state of the art networking options most suitable for NOCCCD

4.   Provide a list of network options that would meet the business needs of the District for the next 20+ years and recommend at least one alternative

5.   Prepare a report with the necessary information for use in preparing a solicitation of vendors to complete a network design

We expect this phase to take roughly four to five months, to allow for the right amount of investigation, interviews, review of data, and ultimately presentation of findings.

What WTC has discovered so far is that our wireless coverage is not well liked, there is inconsistent access, inconsistent network performance and that there is concern about things like lecture capture, instructional videos and the need for cameras and live-streaming type of activities and because of that they will size the network to do those things from all classrooms.

We have the opportunity to go to a 100 gig network across the District from CENIC, our internet provider, and the state will pay for the connection with CENIC but we need the infrastructure to do that so the design will take that into account. Better reliability and accessibility also came out in the focus groups and it was brought forward as a safety issue. WTC is now in the process of developing the sizing models and preparing an opinion to present to Chancellor's Staff on February 1. The report will be disseminated across the District in order to have a discussion about which of the eight alternatives make the most sense for us.

In Phase 2, Design, we will do another RFP and hire someone to actually design a system that we've selected. Phase 2 will be followed by Phase 3, Procurement, utilizing a competitive bid process to secure the equipment and training and finally Phase 4, Implementation.

Member Questions/Comments:

Will there be a write-up of what you just told us? Ms. Ludford responded, yes; TCC, the working groups, and campus leadership will receive it. It will be out there for discussion on which direction you think the District should go.

Is this a 5-year project? Ms. Ludford responded that Phase 1 is almost complete; Phases 2 should be quick (less than the 4-5 months for Phase 1); Phase 3, Procurement, she's not sure how long that will take; and Phase 4, Implementation, may take 6-9 months.

There seems to be minimal standardization in the workstations in what is available in every classroom, is that part of this? Ms. Ludford responded: No. That is not part of this project; what we are doing is making sure that behind the wall where you plug in all that stuff that it's big enough to handle whatever you throw at it.

It would be helpful if the results of the survey are sent out to everybody again for more input based on the results of the survey because when people take surveys they may be responding based on what's going on at that particular time; if they could see the results it might trigger another response that they didn't think of at the time or they didn't know how to articulate it. Is it possible to have a follow-up survey? Ms. Ludford responded that it is certainly possible; we haven't seen the results of the survey yet; we'll see it when it comes out as part of the report but I certainly will keep that in mind since we will be conducting a technology quality survey this spring.

Will there be an additional round of forums coming? Ms. Ludford responded with "no; they've fulfilled their obligation".

With the announcement that came out from Los Angeles Valley College how is this project going to protect against something like that? Ms. Ludford responded that this project cannot protect us against something like that. Unfortunately, LA Valley College was the victim of a ransomware attack. A ransomware attack is where either an email or some kind of communication or website link is clicked on and something is implanted in your computer and it encrypts your files so you can't use them and then a ransomware letter arrives and asks you for money. It is really hard to protect from ransomware and it's not something your network can stop; it's not something we can do at this level. What it really comes down to is each and every person being vigilant when surfing the net and when using email and making sure that before you click on a link or a file that you know where it came from and that you're comfortable that it's from a reliable source. If in doubt, call your local help desk. Don't think that a cloud solution like one-drive or iCloud can prevent it because they can get to that too so just putting it on the cloud doesn't help.

III. **Budget Update:** Mr. Fred Williams noted that staff will be attending the Governor's Budget Workshop next week and below is what we are hearing for the 2017-18 Budget:

- COLA of 1% - 1.5%

- Very little in terms of growth funding or for the base increase

- There is an incentive similar to the $200 million last year for Workforce Development

- A sizable amount being proposed for Pathways

- As for the tax revenues for late November what we reported out in December was that there was a slight surge in tax revenues coming in November. For the fiscal year, there was an increase over the November projection amounts but overall they're still behind from the projections.

- Mr. Williams provided a hand-out from the OCDE stating that the PERS Board did vote to reduce the discount rate over the next five years from 7.5% to 7% which will ultimately lead to increased contribution rates for PERS employers and/or members.

IV. **Bond Update:** Mr. Rick Williams reported: The Facilities Task Force is meeting next week to discuss the spending plan for Year 1, 2, and 3 on the state bond which will impact the Fullerton College project and possibly a Cypress College project and whether we need to start that in 2018, 2019, or 2020. We will

reconvene with other districts throughout the state on how the approved projects money will be dispersed; this will impact bond spending for the next 5 to 6 years as we will be anticipating state money.

Anaheim Campus
- First Floor Warehouse project high density storage shelving project and user group training completed.

- The Plan Room is next door to the storage area and will hold 30 years of plans we are required to keep on this bond plus the last 90 years of drawings since Fullerton was first designed; everything will be in one room. Digitized information and drawings have been stored off-site but the originals will be stored at the Anaheim Campus; by law we must hold onto those permanently.

- The new Project Manager at Fullerton will begin in February after Board approval.

- The timing of projects in terms of swing space is an issue at Fullerton. We made a request from the Chancellor's Office to postpone the 300 & 500 buildings even though it is one of the approved projects in order for us to get the instructional building completed first so that we won't have to build swing space. If granted, this would help in terms of the sequencing of projects and save approximately $10 million vs building a village of relocatables.

Cypress College
- At this moment, the program reconciliation meeting for the Science, Engineering & Math building is going on. The faculty, shared governance, architect, and the administration of that project has been very strong; LPA, Susan Rittel, and Sundt are all coming together on the program planning for the SEM building. There has been a lot of preplanning and estimating to make sure everything is staying on budget and meeting the needs of the faculty.

- The Veterans Center program reconciliation meeting and rightsizing the building to ensure that it is being planned and meeting needs is also going well.

Fullerton College
- EIR progress: We are considering separating the Sherbeck Field campus project from the overall Master Plan EIR; it will be a separate project EIR for that specific improvement so that we can proceed and plan all the projects on the campus and focus on the field and the detail that is needed to make sure that the community/campus needs and the educational program is met as a separate timeline to the Master Plan of the whole campus.

- Next week Dr. Schulz, Rodrigo Garcia, and Rick Williams will meet with City representatives to discuss historical issues with the EIR how we will address that with the Newell-Chapman project. Anything that we can mitigate projects to complement the Victoria community south of Fullerton. There is a lot of misleading information about what the Master Plan is proposing and we know our consultant DUDEK is really good with clarifying what is required with the City and with the EIR process.

- Still under discussion is the project priority of the instructional classroom building. The other major projects are the parking garage and the M & O building. We hope to have the final priority of those three projects by the next meeting.

V. **Other Items**: Members asked about the loss of a security officer at the Anaheim Campus and if there was a plan to hire a replacement security due to a recent resignation. Mr. Fred Williams responded that there is no plan to hire because we are at original staffing levels for security personnel because we moved the warehouse employee into a security position versus layoff. Evaluation of Security personnel will be included in the Finance & Facilities Administrative Review. Chair Ramos reminded the committee that the next meeting date is February 13, 2017.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.