I. Call to Order  
Ms. Jones called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm. Those present were:

Mr. Andy Harrod  
Ms. Donna Jones  
Ms. Jean McHatton  
Ms. Val Moeller  
Mr. Saul Romero  
Ms. Mary Villegas  

Ms. Kimberly Rangell and Mr. Alan Spitalnick were absent. Others present were Dr. Noelia Vela, Ms. Jo Ann Higdon, and Ms. Deborah Shepley.

II. Welcome  
Ms. Jones welcomed each of the committee members.

III. Public Comments  
Mr. Franco expressed his pleasure at attending the meeting.

IV. Approval of Minutes of December 6, 2004 Meeting  
It was moved by Ms. Villegas and seconded by Ms. McHatton that the minutes of December 6, 2004 be approved as presented. The motion passed.

V. Update of Campus G.O. Bond Committee Work  
- **Schedule of Meetings**  
  Dr. Vela provided the committee with a listing of all the meeting dates and times the GO Bond Implementation Committee; GO Bond Implementation Sub-Committee; and Citizens’ Oversight Committee have met. Dr. Vela also provided the committee with a representation and chronology of the number of meetings the campus has had with regard to GO Bond projects and needs. She explained that the first year of passing a GO Bond requires a lot of planning; it is important that before you begin building on the campus that you know the big picture. There are a lot of projects on Measure CC and as the District assesses the needs of the campus it is realized that there are far more needs than resources. It is very important to try and analyze what we have, and what our needs are
before recommendations are presented to the Board. Dr. Vela highlighted a meeting that took place with the Chancellor’s Office on March 21, 2005. She explained that the Chancellor’s Office has staff whose primary responsibility is facilities. They review facilities requests and plans for all 109 community colleges in the State. Every community college has a liaison assigned to them, and it was important to meet with that liaison and have them get a better understanding of the Cerritos College campus and facilities. The participants of the meeting were herself; Jo Ann Higdon, Vice President of Business Services; Robert Riffle, Director of Physical Plant; Deborah Shepley and Tom Beckett from tBP Architecture. The purposes of the meeting were to introduce District staff and tBP Architecture to the Chancellor’s Office staff; establish rapport; impress upon them the District’s interest in complying with the state standards; and at the same time advocating for the campus. Dr. Vela expressed that it is one of her top priorities to maximize the resources for the college.

- **Consultants’ Work Update**
  Ms. Higdon provided a brief summary of the consultants’ who will be providing services to the campus.

  *Environment Impact Report:* This project is 98% completed. Once the report is completed it will go through the publication process and public hearings.

  *Structural Engineer:* Integrated Design Systems (IDS) have been hired to assist the District with the rapid assessments on all campus buildings. They are approximately one-third completed.

  *Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing (Infrastructure):* S & K Engineers have recently been Board approved and will begin work soon. They will assist the college in providing mechanical, electrical and plumbing master planning.

  *Civil Engineer:* A firm will be going for Board approval July 6, 2005. They will assist the District to provide land survey and aerial topography.

  *ADA Transition Plan:* Interviews with five companies will take place in July. This company will assist the District with access planning.

  *Landscape Architect:* EDAW will assist the District by providing landscape design and planning.
• **Status Report of Implementation Plan**

Ms. Shepley shared that the District is in the process of developing an implementation plan. This process began a year ago when a series of meetings were held on campus. The purpose of those meetings were to meet with all campus departments to talk about the individual needs within each of the buildings, summarize the information, and get an understanding of the campus moves that will happen as new buildings are constructed. The implementation plan will have a clear definition of all the projects, the project scopes, and project budgets related to each of those scopes. Ultimately, an implementation schedule will have the order in which all these projects will take place. Additionally, there has been a series of building walk-throughs. These building walk-throughs consist of a cost estimator and other staff from tBP Architecture, along with staff from the college, walking through each of the buildings with a check list identifying those parts of the building that need to be renovated. The cost estimator helps to develop the initial project budgets to begin to get an understanding of the project scopes, and what the associated budgets are. As the consultant reports are developed, this information will also become part of the implementation plan. This will make the project budgets more definitive, so there will be fewer unknowns. The more these studies develop, the more informed this document gets and the more useful it is as a tool used for planning.

Ms. Jones inquired if the consultants hired are going to be for the term of the project, as there is a five-year limit on consultant contracts. Ms. Higdon replied that the same consultants would not necessarily continue. Request for Proposal (RFP) processes may take place throughout the period.

Dr. Vela noted that some terms may be new to the committee. She asked Ms. Shepley to provide a definition of a project scope. Ms. Shepley defined project scope as identifying all pieces and parts of a project so there aren’t any unknowns. The project scope ends up to be a full narrative and checklist of everything that will go into it and prices added to each one of those items so there will be a total project cost associated with that particular project scope. Dr. Vela added that one of the charges she has from the Board is to manage expectations. The district is trying to do as much as possible with the resources available, but also to manage projects appropriately.
• **Status of Campus Standards**

Dr. Vela provided the committee with a brief report of the history of the architectural transformation of the Science and Math Complex and how that transformation worked into developing campus standards.

Ms. Shepley explained that the work on the campus standards began with the slight modifications to the Science and Math Complex. Part of the campus standards are the design guidelines. The design guidelines focus on the look and the feel of the campus and include architectural, landscape as well as details of what goes in the interior of a building. Ms. Shepley presented to the committee a color palette that has been identified as the beginning of the campus standards. This color palette begins to outline those pieces and parts that will be incorporated into all the new and renovated buildings. The color palette was developed based on a series of meetings with the users of the Science and Math Complex as well as the GO Bond Implementation Sub-Committee, and was presented and approved by both the Board of Trustees and the GO Bond Implementation Committee.

Dr. Vela added that in addition to the standards just mentioned, other standards include equipment for the classrooms, wiring, furniture and office and classroom sizes. Ms. Shepley noted that throughout the planning process for the Science and Math Complex, the District was looking for those items that were easy to maintain, durable, and long lasting. There is a tremendous opportunity to upgrade the entire campus and at the same time look for economy of scale and develop good relationships with vendors and manufacturers.

• **Financial Report**

Ms. Higdon presented the latest financial report. This report reflected the same information that was presented at the last meeting with the addition of the proceeds from the bond refunding. Ms. Higdon explained that the GO Bond financial advisor came to the District and suggested we look into refunding the bonds. The Board approved the refunding and the District received approximately $4,035,000.

Ms. Higdon also presented the latest current project list as of 5/31/05. She noted that this list reflects a snapshot of where the District is today. The list will be updated as projects are developed. The following are the changes:
1. The Child Development Center was added. As a result of conversations with both tBP Architecture and the Chancellor’s Office, the District is eligible for state funding for a Child Development Center. A Final Project Proposal (FPP) needed to be submitted to the state in order to get the process going.

2. The dollar amounts have changed slightly on the Science and Math Complex and the amounts reflect what has been Board approved.

3. One item was taken out, the concrete work for the Administrative Quad Area. This item was removed because it should not have been on the list.

Ms. Jones requested that the next time this list is presented to the committee that changes be color coded for easier comprehension. Ms. Higdon agreed and will follow through with this request.

- **Performance Audit**
  Ms. Higdon explained that a performance audit was completed for the period ended December 31, 2004. She noted that there was no legal requirement to have a performance audit mid-year. The reason for the mid-year audit was if the auditors found anything mid-year we then would have an opportunity to correct it prior to year end. Also, there was no additional cost.

  The performance audit included the independent auditor’s report which indicated that we had a clean opinion. The audit included the objectives which document that expenditures charged to the GO Bond fund are in fact what the taxpayers voted on in Measure CC; scope of the audit; background information; and procedures performed. As this audit was for period ended December 31, 2004, the refunding of the bonds is not reflected. This will be reflected in the next audit.

  There were two findings: 1) minutes of the December 6, 2004 were not posted on the website, as they had not been approved by the committee. An agreement with the auditors was made and from now on minutes posted on the web will be labeled “DRAFT – Not Yet Approved” until such time the committee can meet and approve the minutes.  2) the auditors requested that the expenditure for the Administrative Quad Landscaping not be charged against the GO Bond fund.
As a result of the second finding a cross reference sheet will be developed identifying all GO Bond projects on one side and across will have the different types of items approved in Measure CC. By the next committee meeting a draft will be available for the committee to review. This does not mean all projects will be done; if they are on the scope and we are considering doing them, we need to confirm that they fit into one of the categories.

As required by law another performance audit will be done at the end of the fiscal year along with a financial audit.

VI. Report of Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee Members and District Staff
Mr. Romero commented that he is pleased with the architectural design of the Science and Math Complex. Just like the updated Social Sciences building, he believes this new building will be an inviting one to students, indicating this institution is dedicated to education.

Mr. Harrod inquired if there is going to be elevators in the Science and Math Complex. Dr. Vela replied yes, all ADA accessibility issues within and outside the building will be addressed. Ms. Shepley added that it is required for any public institution project [community college or K-12] go through an internal review process. The Division of State Architect (DSA) reviews and approves every project and specifically focuses on: 1) structural conformance; 2) fire and life safety; and 3) accessibility.

Ms. McHatton was pleased with the standardization of the furniture and the carpet.

Ms. Moeller commented that the updated Social Sciences building is very eye appealing and is also pleased that more windows were added to the Science and Math Complex.

Dr. Vela inquired about future meeting dates. After a brief discussion it was decided to hold a tentative date for the next Citizens’ Oversight Committee on Tuesday, November 1, 2005 at 6:00 pm.

VII. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 6:58 pm.