

**CAMPUS FOOD SERVICES AD-HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

MARCH 20, 2018

**RFP No. 18C0001
FOOD AND/OR CONCESSION SERVICES
FOR VARIOUS CAMPUS LOCATIONS**

PRESENT: Richard Crother - Theater	Francis Samaniego – ASCC (Alternate)
Stephanie A.F. Barlow – Purchasing	Phillip Herrera - ASCC
Mark B. Logan – Purchasing	Christopher Richardson - HPEA
Ramona Mellgoza - Purchasing	Elizabeth Miller – Student Services
Mayra Radillo – Purchasing	Rachel Mason – Bus. Ed./Hum./SS
Angela Teshima - IERP	Andrea Wittig – President’s Office

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:07 am on March 20, 2018 in the Auto Partners Building, Room 12B by Mark B. Logan.

II. MEDIA

Attendees were reminded to sign the attendance sheet. Since Mr. Samaniego was attending as an alternate for Christopher Rodriguez, introductions were conducted around the table. Mr. Logan reported that minutes from the March 6th meeting are currently underway and the draft is not ready for review. Once the draft is complete, it will be emailed out to all the members for review and approval at the April 3rd meeting. The goal is to send out the draft of the March 20th minutes in the same email as well.

Mr. Logan indicated that he had sent several emails regarding the meetings which stated that these Committee meetings were to be for District employees and students only. Just prior to the meeting start, two members of Fresh & Natural stopped by. Vendor feedback is welcome, but the appropriate venue is the quarterly meeting that Ms. Miller holds. Mr. Logan inquired if the Committee concurred with this statement. Mr. Herrera concurred with the statement and indicated that he also hopes to attend the quarterly meetings as well. Mr. Logan suggested that Ms. Miller meet with the vendors a little more often, at least, until the RFP is released. Ms. Miller recommended adding one additional vendor meeting and asking them if they felt they needed a second. Mr. Richardson inquired about the process from the prior RFP, and if the Committee could use some of the information to streamline and expedite the current process. He prefers the nature of the Committee to be clear so that he can confidently present at Faculty Senate.

Mr. Logan stated that he has sent out two campus-wide emails to communicate regarding the Ad-Hoc Committee, but we have still not had any additional attendees. Mr. Crother suggested that the constituent groups should send out emails as well. Mr. Richardson inquired as to why members of

the various constituent groups would be interested in attending. Mr. Logan responded that the presumption is that the same people interested in the previous RFP would be making an effort to get involved. Ms. Mason suggested that an email could be sent to the Instructional Deans to agendaize the Ad-Hoc Committee meetings at their next Division meetings. Ms. Miller responded that she believed the expectation of the Committee members is that will naturally communicate with our constituent groups.

Mr. Logan informed the committee that the Committee website will be updated soon to show the meeting dates and locations for future meetings.

III. FOOD SERVICES SURVEY

Mr. Logan presented a draft of the RFP timeline for review and indicated that the RFP document would be online through Teams for changes. The survey would be available from IERP for review at the April 3rd meeting, with the intent to have a final draft on April 17th and release on the 18th. The survey would aid the Committee in fine tuning the survey. Ms. Teshima inquired as to how detailed the Committee wanted the information formatted, since this could take an additional week for her department. Mr. Logan responded that more comprehensive information would be best. The Committee had several options moving forward, and one would be to add an additional meeting on May 8th.

Ms. Barlow provided the Committee with a brief overview of using Microsoft Teams for shared documents. Mr. Logan initiated discussion on the survey question submittals. Ms. Wittig clarified that several of the questions she listed could be combined into one, possibly with a ranking. Ms. Teshima reminded the Committee that there would need to be a question to separate student responses from employee responses and to be sure that the questions would resonate with the survey takers.

Mr. Herrera indicated that when thinking about the survey questions, he wanted to ensure that the locations which were more valuable to the core values of campus were known. Ms. Teshima stated that perhaps we could determine which vendors were the top three, and then tease out through the survey if the students actually frequent the locations. Mr. Logan stated that he was working on obtaining the sales data for the vendors. The last RFP broke out an aggregate of sales of all locations, and aggregate sales of all vendors in food court. The information was not shown for vendors individually, however; this is extremely sensitive information and confidential. Mr. Richardson inquired as to why we wouldn't want to share the information, and if there was a legal reason. Mr. Crother felt that it might open the District up to a potential legal concerns. Mr. Herrera felt that it was not necessary to reveal the sales numbers on each vendor separately. He indicated that sales on this campus were not real world numbers, and what drives sales on campus is convenience and immediate needs. The Committee discussed and clarified the submitted possible survey questions to determine if it was better suited to a survey or to the RFP. Mr. Herrera acknowledged that there was still some research to finish regarding some of his submitted questions. There was discussion regarding what "locally owned" and "independent" meant specifically, since at times this could be subjective. The general consensus was that it meant "mom and pop" shops. Mr. Crother stated that people on campus would like to see food diversity, meaning no single vendor for entire campus. Subway is only one location which works toward

diversity of food choices. Mr. Herrera seconded that the disapproval was one large company taking over all locations. Frantone's was defended because of locality.

IV. NEXT STEPS

Ms. Teshima indicated that she has enough information to begin working on the survey, and should have the survey ready for review either later this week or early the following week.

Mr. Logan stated that the RFP doc will be posted to Teams, and inquired if the committee required more discussion on the timeline and the possibility of an additional meeting on the schedule for May.

V. ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR

There were no items from the floor.

VI. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be April 3, 2018 in LC-51.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm.