Doug opened the meeting at 3:03 pm.

The minutes of March 10, 2008 were approved unanimously. (Brogotti/Lewis)

I. Solar Energy on Aptos Campus:
Doug gave an update on the solar project. The highest likelihood for rooftop mounted panels are on buildings 100, 400, 450, 800, 900 and 1000 based on the review by a structural engineer. Installing panels on all these roofs would generate less than half a megawatt of power. Installing panels on buildings 200, 300 and 600 is not feasible since these buildings will be renovated in the near future. In addition buildings 500 and 700 have had sprinkler systems installed in them and are now unable to accommodate the weight of solar panels. Staff is currently working out the details of the power purchase agreement so the project can move forward for DSA approval. Property and liability of the panels would be the District’s responsibility, but the investors would pay the deductible for any claims that arise. Ryan asked what the structural issue is regarding solar; the issue is that the panels with supports weigh approximately 3 pounds per square foot, and the building roofs were not intended to support that much additional weight.

Ryan asked about the feasibility of installing panels on the parking lot. The parking lot is not a feasible site due to cost; it is less expensive to mount on a rooftop than on the ground. Generating Assets has also explored using various types of panels and at this point, the project is marginal for them. Ryan asked whether the deadline was extended. Yes, the deadline was extended to October 31, 2008. The Investor tax credit is currently before congress. Units must be installed by December 31, 2008 to qualify the investors for the tax credit. Rock noted that there are some solar installers that will be graduating
in June. Victoria asked if staff feels it better to move forward with the project even though technology may be improved in the near future. Doug had been directed to move forward as if the project is feasible. Seven to nine percent of Cabrillo’s total energy usage would come off of the array, and when new buildings come on line, the percentage would go down.

Doug asked regarding the consensus of the group. Cathy noted that given that the project is smaller than originally anticipated, the cost for repairs is unknown, the liability is on the District, she is hesitant. Could potential costs outweigh benefits at this time? Doug noted that the inflationary escalator is 4%; if PGE rates go up 2%, this is a bad deal, if rates go up 10%, it is a good deal. The primary risk is between years 15-25 of the commitment. Bob noted that it is never advisable to compromise roof structure; it is preferable to mount any technology on the side or elsewhere. His main hesitation is to lock into a contract that extends for such a long time. Nano technology is coming online and technology developments always lead to smaller, cheaper, faster products. If the contract was shorter, the District was not locked into 4% increase, or if something could be done on a smaller scale, he would be more supportive. One risk is that the panels could become obsolete with new technology and that the owners might abandon the panels on Cabrillo roofs. Ryan noted that then Cabrillo has the potential of having a solar museum. Brian noted that, in the case of abandonment, the District would be responsible for removing the panels. Rock asked whether there is a minimum for the project to still be viable. If Cabrillo chose not to do this, would those credits be used elsewhere? The collective assumption is that yes, they could but it would be difficult for someone else to make a project happen within the timeframe. Cathy noted that it seems we are putting ourselves out there with risk. If we don’t do anything, we don’t lose anything and if we wait 5 years, there may be better options for our situation. Doug noted that for solar technology to be currently feasible it must be subsidized. For wide applications, the government would have to subsidize it and technology would have to get cheaper and more efficient. Rock noted that one way to think about the project is there is a significant social interest in solar, but we don’t want the project to backfire on us. If we go forward with a minimum footprint, it shows that we are committed but we want to know the risks and want to proceed in a thoughtful way. We want to learn and want the community to learn. We require panels on roofs with no penetration (technology not available yet) or over parking (currently cost prohibitive). That statement would also be a signal to the market that institutions are willing to invest in solar but need certain conditions met. Victoria noted that this is what the committee reviewed before, that, conceptually, everyone is in favor of solar, but this may not be the right project and time. Bob noted that we are a victim of our own success having achieved rates that are enviable. That speaks to staff doing their jobs well.

Doug expanded on the risks involved and noted that as market rates fluctuate, profit will always go to solar companies and not to people purchasing it. The economic decision will be the same; the question is whether the technology is appropriate. Ryan noted that if we wait 5 years, there will be less time for a company to amortize their expenses. It’s the best option we have. If we saved 10% a year on energy costs, we could save that money from the general fund. Victoria commented that there are other cost saving
energy efficiency measures that would translate into less of a rate increase for utilities, not a savings. Brian noted that savings in energy costs could possibly translate into benefits for employees.

Rock asked for clarification on what is compelling about moving forward now. Doug noted that most solar rays that he aware of on community college campuses are mounted on the ground, and those on buildings are more for visual effect. Most college solar projects are funded by a local bond. Paul noted the obvious potential for solar on the new building proposed in Watsonville, the Industrial Technology Education Center (ITEC). The ITEC buildings will be new, built to current code and will not have the issues we have on the 45 year old buildings in Aptos. Bob noted that there is an important difference between being on the leading edge and on the bleeding edge. That is why he is hesitant.

The committee voted with Ryan for moving forward and the rest of the group hesitant at this time. Rock noted that there is some societal benefit to promoting renewable energy sources and our role is to help navigate toward that future. Our contribution to the community is education. If we could do it only on the 900 building and in Watsonville, then look for community support or grant money to proceed. Is there any advantage to investors on a small project with their name on it? It is unclear. It appears companies are changing and evolving very quickly. A number of projects have failed for lack of funding. The consensus of the group was that the risk to the District to cover paying costs of removing and repairing panels is quite high.

Victoria asked what the state facilities committee is doing. A year ago funding was made available for energy conservation projects, but not for solar. Ryan stated that Cabrillo could be a success story, to show that such a project is possible despite challenging circumstances and marginal returns. Bob noted that we would be gambling with student success, and he is hesitant to do commit to what could leave college with a big future debt that would take money away from general mission of serving students. At what cost would we be a leader in this area? A red flag is that investors are hesitant to talk about roof replacement. Doug noted that investments in solar are sold like mortgages where the investors want a return with minimal risk.

Paul suggested shelving this project and move toward making the solar statement in Watsonville. Solar can much more easily be incorporated when buildings are being built rather than retrofitting older buildings and roofs. Also, it seems more prudent to invest in new technology that is not as high a risk.

Brian summarized that when the roof study determined that a limited number of roofs in Aptos could support solar rays; the current project is, at best, a break even proposition with downstream risks. It appears that the economics are better to install solar in Watsonville. Paul noted that the new building could accommodate a commercial system, and arrays over the parking could be maintained by our own students in the photo voltaic class. There is also a wind turbin there. Brian noted other possible steps toward conservation are important to consider, such as the lights on the stadium. Conservation
and energy efficiency are important considerations while it is not as glamorous as a visible solar panel. Even at $180 per hour, having the lights out on football field doesn’t have the same appeal and won’t be on the front page of a paper, even if the results are as environmentally and financially substantive. Conservation seems to be another way to address environmental concerns.

Doug polled the committee regarding continuing the discussion with the solar company. Ryan was for solar and the rest voted to put it on hold (VL, PA, BO, RP, CB, NO, DB) other than maybe a cosmetic installation if the solar company would support. Deb asked about incorporating solar into the Allied Health buildings. Paul will check out the possibilities. Ryan suggested looking into metal roofs. Staff noted that the noise on metals roofs is a disincentive. Brian will take this for discussion with cabinet.

II. **Space Reuse Project:**
Interviews with all instructional components are complete. All notes are posted on the website. One surprise staff found is that people didn’t go in with a “me” attitude, but rather for the collective good. Non-instructional components are being interviewed through this week. Staff is trying to have a cabinet review in May and will present 3 scenarios at flex week in August: 1) current allocations 2) what group adjacencies would make sense, and 3) what may make a little more sense. Deb expressed that faculty and staff fear that 1) decisions will be made during the summer and that 2) the focus is on those moving to a new place; more attention needs to be paid to those staying in place but receiving new neighbors. The concern is the real impact of integration; while changes may happen to others, how will this affect me? Staff noted that at the flex week presentation, some buildings may have the detail of where offices will be, but not all. Each division and department will have a say where people ultimately go. Deb agreed that it is better to have them make those decisions rather than have it handed from above. It has been noted that people are reading notes from areas other than their own; for example it was noted that the CTC was an under utilized space. No one said they had enough space. Generally a person’s current space is his/her minimum acceptable moving forward. Brian will send an all email to communicate that decisions will not be made over the summer and what can be expected in the fall at flex week. Regions will be assigned, but not individual offices.

Staff hopes to have an architect selected for building 300 in May. State money was awarded based on plans submitted two years ago. The space will be renovated into generic (BELA, HAAS) type classrooms.

III. **Industrial Technology Education Center (ITEC) in Watsonville update:**
There will be a hearing on Thursday to discuss permanently closing Trafton Street for a pedestrian plaza. Staff feels that it is very compelling without through traffic.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:19 pm.
Next meeting: August. Date and time to be determined.