MINUTES
Santa Barbara Community College District
Board of Trustees
Study Session
Thursday, March 11, 1999

All Board Members were present with the exception of Dr. Joe Dobbs.

A. Facilities Development for the Santa Barbara Community College District

The March 11 meeting marked the third Board Study Session in which the focus of the meeting was on the development of College facilities. The last meeting outlined the instructional, student services and administrative facility requirements expected to result from projected enrollments for the College as well as present deficits and facility requirements for the educational program. The focus for the Study Session was to review specific plans for the Schott Center and the buildings to be considered for inclusion in the bond issue and their location. The development of an information campaign to inform the voters of the District regarding College needs and the proposed method of meeting those needs was also to be discussed.

1. Items for Review

   a. Schott Center Plan

      Since the last meeting, Chairman of the Facilities Committee, Mr. Eli Luria, expressed concern regarding the placement of new buildings at the Schott Center. He met with the architect and Continuing Education staff and discussed developing a new drawing to provide open space to make the Center more "campus like."

      The drawing of the redesigned area was made available by Architect Don Ziemer. The new drawing provided more underground parking and a building located on the perimeter across from the faculty/administrative offices. This resulted in a courtyard and more of an open campus effect. The new design included approximately 2,000 additional square feet of classrooms/offices and parking for 41 additional vehicles.

      From the standpoint of attractiveness and functionality, the plan was an improvement over the initial plan. The cost increase, however, was $2.5 million. The Board discussed the advantages, recognized that there is only one opportunity to develop the Center, and that a long-term view is essential.

      Because of the cost variable, it was agreed that Mr. Luria and the Superintendent/President would meet with Mr. Ziemer and Vice President Romo to identify options that could maintain the advantages of the new plan but seek to reduce the cost considerations.

      A discussion took place as to how the cost for the new Center could be met. The matter will be reviewed by the Facilities Committee.

   b. Options for Development of Campus Facilities

      The Board discussed two options for development of facilities on campus.
Option A: Plan with parking funded by District finance plan.

Option B: Parking funded by Certificates of Participation (COP) and paid with a mandatory users parking fee.

The Superintendent/President noted prior to discussion that there is still a question as to whether Santa Barbara City College meets the two criteria required for a District to be able to exercise the option of a mandatory parking fee.

Significant discussion took place on this issue. Primarily points were that the fee should not be so high that it discourages student enrollment and that the fee should be for users; i.e., not charged to all students but students who obtain a parking permit.

Option B was seen as preferable if the District can pursue it. The fee should not exceed $65. Options such as a combination of funding, partial fee and District financing, could enable the parking structure to be built. In discussing the student parking, the Board emphasized the desire to work closely with the City to engage in a jointly financed program in which campus parking would be developed consistent with the City’s desire to develop beach-front parking. Efforts will continue to work with the City to achieve that end. A discussion also took place about the location of campus parking and potential construction difficulties related to that.

It was clear that more discussion is needed before final resolution of the parking situation is reached.

If Option A has to be pursued, state funding to assist in providing access to the Gymnasium was viewed as essential in keeping this project high in the priority. Other than the Gym access with four classrooms, the priority was accepted.

c. Location of Buildings on the Main Campus

The Superintendent/President reviewed his understanding of buildable campus sites reached from discussions with the Board. The Board had engaged in a thorough analysis of potential building sites on the campus and as a result three sites were identified in the long range development plan. These sites for new buildings were west of the Garvin Theatre, east of the Student Services Building, and north of the Campus Center where the International Student Building is now located. Further, that no other building sites were seen as appropriate given the desire to maintain the openness of the campus. Thus, additional campus needs for facilities may have to be accommodated in an off-campus area. No one at the meeting disagreed with the conclusion that this principle has guided Board planning.

The discussion then involved the location of the buildings on campus. The Superintendent/President noted that from the standpoint of building size the location of the High Technology Building on the West Campus presented a possible conflict with residential views. Also Vice President Friedlander has stated that for program effectiveness, the Technology Building would best be located on the site east of the Student Services Building. The Multipurpose Classroom Building which is approximately one-third the size of the Technology Building would be located in the footprint west of the Garvin Theatre.

Following considerable discussion on the topic, the general consensus was in support of the Technology Building being on the East Campus.
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d. Preparation for Possible District Bond Issue

Discussed was the need to select a bond counsel and a resource person or group to assist in developing an information campaign. The campaign will be to inform District voters of College needs for a bond paid through property taxes as the source of supporting those needs. It was agreed that decisions needed to be made. The Superintendent/President discussed the relative merits of working with firms that take no money up front, but are paid only if the bond issue passes. This approach versus payment for the services and no money out of the bond. The recommendation of the Superintendent/President to payment of services with only money coming from the bond for direct expenses was identified as the desirable direction. The Superintendent/President will develop a recommendation for the next Board.

e. Selection of an Architect

The Board discussed issuing an RFP and to consider architects via an interview with the Facilities Committee of the Board. A decision would be made at that time as to whether it was desirable to hire an architect for each project or to have a single architect for the three on campus projects.

B. CCCT Board Election

It was agreed that Board members would provide their input to Dr. Dobbs for a slate of candidates to be supported by the Board of Trustees.

C. Project Redesign

No information was presented.

D. Proposed Joint Legislative Meeting with Allan Hancock and Cuesta CCDs

It was agreed that from the time standpoint, the return on investment for such a joint meeting was limited. Board President Luis Villegas will contact Mr. Rosebrock from Allan Hancock CCD and explain to him how we proceed with our legislative breakfast meetings and invite Mr. Rosebrock to participate. The Superintendent/President will also discuss this with Superintendent/President Ann Foxworthy.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.
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