

Kevin Dayton

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2002 9:49 AM
To: Kevin Dayton
Subject: [REDACTED]

Minutes

[Look At Agenda](#)

[Look At High-lights](#)

Sonoma County Junior College District

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FACILITIES COMMITTEE

April 2, 2002

Minutes

President's Office

Present: Trustee Burdo, Trustee Call, Trustee Zumwalt, Robert F. Agrella, Curt Groninga, Jay Carpenter, Ricardo Navarrette, Ron Root and Luann Campbell

Absent: Ed Buckley

Guests: Kevin C. Dayton, Larry Bastianon, Arlo Miller, Wendell Nordby, Gregorgy Babcock, Larry Dashiell, Jerry Minton

Closed Session: No actionable discussions nor decisions were made.

Open Session:

1. **Culinary Arts at The Brickyard:** Curt Groninga provided an update on the Culinary Arts Building at the Brickyard Project. Bids are to be opened on Monday, April 8th and reported to the Board on April 9th for action. Curt is in discussion with the building owner regarding existing and future terms.

2. **Project Labor Agreements:** A general discussion regarding the Union Trade Council's proposal regarding Project Labor Agreements. It is the College's understanding that developing a PLA is optional. For those municipalities, K12 districts and few community college districts who have established PLA's, they were apparently developed in response to specific concerns or history of construction labor problems which the College has not yet faced. A number of guests appeared to present their thoughts on the concept of developing Project Labor Agreements. This

will be an information item at the May Board meeting.

3. Library Preliminary Planning: Curt Groninga and Alan Butler (TLCD) reviewed the status of the scope and cost estimates at the Preliminary Design stage. The project is in scope and reflects the projected costs for a project of its magnitude commencing construction in the Summer of 2003. SRJC would be responsible for approximately 29% of total project costs (\$12.8 million) and the State would be responsible for approximately 71% of total project costs or \$32.2 million) for the \$45 million Library design, construction and equipment. BFC directed staff to investigate the viability of generating a thirty to forty year initial roof design and warranty.

3. Request For Proposals (RFP) for Planning Services: BFC reviewed the proposed Request for Planning Services for the Strategic Capital Projects Plan. Staff was directed to issue the RFP to a number of known higher education physical space and master plan consulting firms.

4. Five-Year Capital Outlay Program Review: BFC reviewed the Five Year Capital Outlay Program prior to submission to the Board and to the State of California.

5. Development of Qualification Criteria for Engineers and Architects: As a preliminary planning document, Curt Groninga reviewed concepts leading to the development of criteria for the selection of minor capital outlay and major capital outlay project architects and engineers. Additionally, he reviewed possible land acquisition criteria with the BFC. It was decided to review a more comprehensive set of recommended criteria for projects and land acquisition at the May Board Facilities Committee meeting.

Board Facilities Committee

Minutes

April 2, 2002

Page Two

6. Shone Farm Classroom Project: Curt Groninga and Jay Carpenter reviewed the status of the Richard L. Thomas classroom facility. It is scheduled for occupancy prior to the commencement of the Fall Semester.

8. Shone Farm Reservoir Project: Curt reviewed discussions regarding the possible development of a fifty million gallon reservoir at Shone Farm.

9. Baker Hall Remodel Design Update: Curt and Jay provided a brief update on the design status of Baker Hall. Final drawings should be complete prior to the completion of this semester and the project would be ready to bid in late May or early June.

10. Plover Remodel Final Project Proposal Update: Curt explained that the Final Project Proposal was being developed solely as a state funded (some SRJC) project and that any expansion planning would be deferred until the planning consultants could take a look at the potential project and space assignment needs.

Kevin Dayton

From: Nora Christine [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2002 4:14 PM

To: Kevin Dayton [REDACTED]

Subject: Santa Rosa Board Facilities Committee meeting

Dear Independent Contractors:

The purpose of this email is to inform you that our Board Facilities Committee (SRJC) will be meeting on May 7th in the Pedroncelli Board room at 2:00 p.m. At that meeting the members plan to continue their discussion of the proposed labor agreement. Let me know if you would like an agenda sent to you, and if you would be interested in attending.

Christine Nora

[REDACTED]
Santa Rosa Junior College
(707) 524-1529

Recipients of this email are:

Kevin Dayton - ABC

Kevin Dayton

From: Nora Christine [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2002 10:36 AM

To: Kevin Dayton [REDACTED]

Subject: Santa Rosa JC Board Facilities meeting

For your information, attached is a copy of the Board Facility Committee meeting agenda for next Tuesday, May 7.

Please note that the meeting will be held in the **Pedroncelli Board room at 2:00 p.m. This meeting room is located at 2032 Armory (campus police building on corner of Armory and Elliott).**

Recipients of this email are:

Kevin Dayton-ABC

Michael Allen

cn

A PULITZER PRIZE-WINNING NEWSPAPER

The Press

DEMOCRAT

Santa Rosa, California

Michael J. Parman, Publisher
Catherine Barnett, Executive Editor
Robert L. Swofford, Managing Editor
Peter Golis, Editorial Director

The New York Times
 Company 

LET THE PUBLIC SPEAK

Labor agreement

EDITOR: The Santa Rosa Junior College Board of Trustees recently voted against the interests of our community and taxpayers. The board rejected a project labor agreement (PLA) for the college's \$251 million school construction bond Measure A, despite the fact that PLAs have a proven track record ensuring that projects are completed on time and on budget. The board has ignored the following basic facts about PLAs:

- PLAs are negotiated agreements used to coordinate multiple contractors and tight construction schedules.

- PLAs have been used successfully in California construction since 1940. The most recent example of a PLA in the North Bay is the Buck Center, in Novato. The job was completed on time and on budget with a minimum amount of problems. The same cannot be said of two other projects in the area, The Geysers Pipeline project and the Santa Rosa Convention Center. Both projects are over budget and behind schedule.

- PLAs eliminate hidden costs, reduce shortages of skilled workers and increase productivity and safety.

- PLAs save taxpayers money by reducing expensive change orders and increasing safety. Workers' compensation losses at project sites with PLAs are 72 percent lower than the statewide construction average.

- Both union and non-union contractors operate under PLAs. The California Supreme Court recently confirmed that PLAs "exclude no contractor, union or non-union, from bidding."

PLAs are clearly beneficial to our community. We ask that the board consider these facts when it comes to future PLA decisions.

STEVE BENJAMIN
Business manager
IBEW Local 551
Santa Rosa

UNION LIES

Published on August 17, 2002
© 2002- The Press Democrat

BYLINE: DAVID RODERICK, Hopland

PAGE: B6

COLUMN: Let the Public Speak

EDITOR: Steven Benjamin's misleading response to the Santa Rosa Junior College Board of Trustees' recent vote to reject the proposed project labor agreement (PLA) is continued proof that union political monopolies are being rejected by the 85 percent non-union public.

Mr. Benjamin's half-truths and direct lies are typical of the jack-boot response of union power manipulators.

PLAs don't guarantee completion schedules; construction companies do.

How do PLAs eliminate hidden costs and increase productivity? Unions have no incentive for productivity. The current labor dispute at the Port of Oakland is proof of that.

PLAs don't save taxpayers money by reducing cost change orders, nor do they increase worker safety. The PLA for the L.A. Metro and the PLA for SFO's expansion are proof of that.

It isn't true that both union and non-union contractors operate under PLAs. Non-union contractors can only participate in PLAs if they hire union workers from union halls or sign one-time union labor agreements. The Buck Center (a massive waste of money) in Novato had a large sign reading "Proud To Be 100 percent Union!" posted at the main entrance.

Unions want government-mandated payrolls; a larger payroll equals more union dues, which equals more money to continue the political control cycle. This leads to the government needing more revenues to pay for this cycle, which is paid by the majority of union-free workers.

Thank God the JC board was able to see what the proposed PLA was: a bag full of union garbage.

DAVID RODERICK



Site Search

 Today's News

 Archives

Go >

-Advanced Search

Home

News

Business

Sports

Going Out

Lifestyle

Photos

Opinion

Classified

Coupons

Personals

Yellow Pages

Search Sonoma

Special Sections

Contact Us

About Us

Home Delivery

Work for Us

Advertise

Site Map

Home > Search >

Archives

THANKS TO SRJC

Published on September 2, 2002

© 2002- The Press Democrat

BYLINE: TOM LeDUC, Santa Rosa

PAGE: B6

COLUMN: Let the Public Speak

EDITOR: I would like to congratulate the Santa Rosa Junior College Board of Trustees for voting in the interests of the whole community and all taxpayers. They accomplished this when they voted to reject a "Project Labor Agreement" on all construction work that is to take place under Measure A -- \$251 million worth of work.

PLAs are **agreements** put forth by special interest groups whose only purpose is to discriminate against certain members of the community like me who happen to be non-union. My company, LeDuc & Dexter Inc., has been providing plumbing, heating and fire sprinkler systems and services to the residents and businesses of Sonoma, Marin, Napa, and Mendocino counties since 1982 -- almost 20 years. We provide jobs to more than 70 people with over 250 dependents. My partner, Art Dexter, and I are both Sonoma County natives and have lived and worked here all of our lives. We have a great company with a great reputation and deserve the right to bid on all construction projects whether we are union or open shop. The last thing we need in this community is extortion and discrimination being codified into law. By rejecting a PLA, the SRJC trustees made sure that this was not the case.

TOM LeDUC

Santa Rosa