

**Special Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) Minutes
May 21, 2021 9:30 a.m.
Special Meeting**

Recorder: Dawn Renee Neideffer

Note: 10 members required to meet quorum

Attendance:

Chairs (3)	Classified Senate (3)	Rosalie Roque	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jonah Nicholas (DO) non-voting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noell Adams (CC)	Na Liu	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cathy Gould (DO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Rodriguez (LPC)	Heather Hernandez	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Thompson <i>Interim</i> (LPC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Pedro Ruiz de Castilla	Dr. Cynthia Gordon da Cruz	
Administration (5)	Classified Union (3)	Walt Blevins	
<input type="checkbox"/> Dr. Theresa Fleischer Rowland (DO)	<input type="checkbox"/> Virginia Criswell (CC)	Angela Castellanos	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dale Wagoner (CC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stephany Chavez (LPC)	Christine Herrera	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anette Raischbart (LPC)	Cathy Gould (DO)	Paulette Lino	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rajinder Samra (LPC)	Student Senate (2)	Tamica Ward	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Samantha Kessler (CC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Michelle Diaz-Nava (LPC)	Walt Blevins	
Faculty Association (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Stacy Harris (CC)	Julia Dozier	
<input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Drouin (CC)	Guests:	Nathaniel Rice	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Orf (LPC)	Dr. Kristina Whalen	Rajeev Chopra	
Academic Senate (4)	Dr. Dyrell Foster	Danita Romero	
<input type="checkbox"/> Miguel Colon (CC)	Chasity Whiteside		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ashley Young (LPC)	Dave Fouquet		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dr. Patricia Shannon (CC)	Bobby Nakamoto		
Sarah Thompson (LPC)	Sui Song		

Meeting commenced 9:35 a.m.

Agenda Item	Information/Discussion	Action
1.	<p>Welcome Guests and Quorum Check <i>For information</i></p> <p>All welcomed. Quorum met with 11 voting members, excluding VC Nicholas.</p>	None
2.	<p>Approve Today's Agenda <i>For action</i></p> <p>Agenda reviewed, no discussion had. VC Nicholas asked for a motion to approve, Thomas Orf moved and David Rodriguez seconded. <u>Agenda approved, unanimously.</u></p>	May 21, 2021 agenda approved
3.	<p>Approve Previous Minutes from April 16, 2021 <i>For action</i></p> <p>April 16, 2021 minutes were reviewed. No discussion had. Dale Wagoner moved to approve, Thomas Orf seconded. <u>Minutes approved, unanimously.</u></p>	April 16, 2021 minutes approved
4.	<p>Summer Special Meeting Dates <i>For action</i></p> <p>Background: Special Meetings were devised by the Chancellor in the absence of a VC of Business Services to continue committee work on the BAM, especially in light of budgetary changes and questions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Now that there is a permanent VC and regular PBC meetings are happening, the question of whether or not to continue concurrent PBC meetings was raised. Sarah Thompson expressed a desire to have the discussions for the new BAM continue in special meetings. Dave Fouquet noted that regular PBC meetings are running shorter than scheduled and time may allow for BAM work to be done in the regular PBC meetings. Consensus was built with the membership to use special meetings as an overflow, or continuum, of content from the regular meetings as it pertains to building the new BAM. <u>Members approved a special meeting for Thursday, June 17, 2021 at 9:30 a.m., if quorum can be met.</u> A conversation about scheduling additional special meetings will happen at the June 17th special meeting.</p>	Special for June 17, 2021 approved

<p>5.</p>	<p>Review Scope of Special PBC Meetings and Revisit Ground Rules <i>For information</i></p> <p>The scope and ground rules are a living document and standing item for PBC special meetings . The purpose is to establish accountability to each other as the committee continues to proceed in this work. This is a living document and at any time, members are encouraged to offer revisions, additions or comments to the group.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>State of California May Revise <i>For information/discussion</i></p> <p>VC Nicholas reviewed the May revise from the State of California; he is getting clarification from the CCCCCO on the allocation for deferred maintenance and instructional equipment. CLPCCD has historically made this a 50/50 split.</p> <p>Overall, a good [State] budget.</p> <p>Presentation Resource: State of California May Revise 2021</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>BAM/SCFF Model Simulations, Expenditures-Focus <i>For discussion</i></p> <p>A deficit factor of 1% was built into the model-simulation, just as it is in the current model. Resident tuition is not built into the simulation but it can be if desired. Membership to consider what to put in the new model and where to show the expenditures. One scenario is if the District and M&O take their allocation after contractual, regulatory and committed obligations are paid. Part of the rationale in this simulation is a sense of shared responsibility. In looking at the current model, 3A true-ups have not been done in the last year or so, due to loss of staff. True-ups must happen regularly for the model to function. Of all the contractual, regulatory and committed obligations, the utilities expense is a large allocation. Whether to split the cost between all sites evenly or whether to have each site bear the cost on their own is a consideration for the new BAM. Discussion ensued.</p> <p>Consensus was built amongst members to have regular true-ups in the new BAM.</p> <p>Another large expense item in the BAM is the retiree-health benefit liability costs (RUMBL). An irrevocable trust was set up for these expenses. VC Nicholas asked for feedback on a model that paid an amount above the obligatory contribution. Doing this is good for accreditation and shows a continual commitment to pay against this liability while aiding in the accreditation standard. Dave Fouquet asked if the proposed extra contribution to the</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>trust would be above what is already calculated, and VC Nicholas said yes; the actuary report is expected to be received in late summer and the VC would like to have a deposit made by June 30th. This will dramatically change the assumptions the actuary uses and give us a really good sense of what the actual liability is. Currently, because the trust had not been established, the actuary uses a discount rate of approximately 3%. With the trust, this will go upwards of 6-6.5% and will dramatically change what the unfunded liability is.</p> <p>VC Nicholas asked the members to consider having a line item for position control. In this scenario, this expense would be covered right off the bat; thusly, when the allocation is given to the Colleges it is more like disposable income; the salaries and benefits attributable to the general fund are carved out and paid through the model prior to giving those allocations to the respective sites. The allocation would still be a component of position control dollars, but it would be a committed obligation instead of discretionary. There are pros and cons to this simulation. The FON metric is important to consider, as well as incentivizing good behavior. Discussion ensued.</p> <p>Remainder of discussion tabled for next meeting.</p>	
8.	<p>Future Agenda Items <i>For discussion</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Special meeting date for July 2. BAM/SCFF Model Simulations, Expenditure Focus, Position Control in the BAM 3. Review of charter for August agenda 	None

Meeting adjourned 11:30 a.m.