COLLEGE COMMITTEE ON FACILITIES PLANNING  
MEETING SUMMARY  
OCTOBER 20, 2009

PRESENT:  Dr. Jim Albanese  
Jenine Nolan  
Dr. Dan Smith  
Roger Ernest  
Karen Welliver  
Tim Kyllingstad  
Linda Kaufman  
Robert Riffle  

ABSENT:  Dr. Connie Mayfield  
Ilva Mariani  

GUEST(S):  Dr. Bryan Reece

1. CALL TO ORDER  
Dr. Albanese called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 18, 2009 MEETING SUMMARY  
The minutes were approved as presented.

3. CONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT  
Mr. Riffle reported on the following:

Aquatic Center: The Aquatic Center is now open. The dedication for this facility is October 21, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. The area surrounding the Aquatic Center (fire road and landscaping) will be going to bid in December. Mr. Kyllingstad asked Mr. Riffle if the new pool was leaking. Mr. Riffle replied that he has not heard of any leaking issues with the new pool.

Auto Technology/Modernization: The staging area for this project (Lot C-10) has begun to be set up. A start-up meeting with the contractor is currently taking place.

Campus-wide Parking: Parking lots C-1 and C-2 will be renovated during the weekends up and through Winter Break, when the majority of the parking lots should be completed. Emails will be sent to the campus community that will alert staff to project dates and the impacts to the campus.

CLO #1: This project is moving along well. Structural steel work continues on the building.
Parking Permit Dispensers: A student in Coordinating Committee commented that there were no parking permit dispensers in the parking lots on the west side of campus (near the former Natural Sciences Bldg). It was noted that the dispensers were removed because of the current construction and not replaced. Dr. Albanese relayed these concerns to the Campus Police Department and they are working on getting them replaced.

Existing Pool Demo: Plans for the demolition of the existing pool continued to be completed by the architect (R2A).

Gym Seismic Project: The state has been slowly reimbursing districts for their construction projects that were on the state bond project list. The College is experiencing lengthy times for reimbursements. The state has sent a letter indicating that if the College does not request reimbursement by May 10, 2010, that we will not receive the funds; and we if we don’t go to bid on this project by June, 2010, the money will revert back to the state. In addition, the State would like Cerritos College to sign a letter acknowledging that while we are requesting state reimbursement, the College will move forward with the construction projects and that we will be liable for funding, should the state not be able to reimburse. Mr. Riffle feels that if we do not sign the letter that future state funded construction projects, i.e. the Burnight Center, could be in jeopardy of future state funding. Mr. Riffle recommended that the College move forward with the Gym Seismic Project to get the reimbursement requests in prior to May, 2010 in order not to lose state money. The Gym Seismic plans and specifications are out of DSA, and we would need to send these plans/specs to the Chancellor’s Office for review and approval. Once approval is received by the College, we could proceed to bid. He noted that the Gym Seismic Project is a $10 million dollar project and if the state does not reimburse us, the funds would need to come from the College’s GO Bond funds. The committee discussed the pros and cons of signing the state letter and in conclusion the committee agreed that Mr. Riffle should move forward with the Gym Seismic Project and send the acknowledgement letter to the state.

Karen Welliver requested that the Gym Seismic User Group have an opportunity to review the final plans/specs.

Liberal Arts Building/DSPS Replacement Project: The Liberal Arts/DSPS User Group was recently tasked with a request from DSPS asking that the DSPS counselor offices migrate from campus standards of 110 square feet to 132 square feet, to better meet the need of the DSPS population. Both the user group and the Liberal Arts Division discussed this request in-depth. In conclusion it was decided to allow the DSPS counselor offices to deviate from the campus standards and be 132 square feet. Mr. Ernest further explained that in order to have the larger DSPS counselor offices the hallways were decreased from 7 feet to 6 feet. This change does meet the minimum requirement for hallways. He also added that the overall net square footage allotted to DSPS did not change.

SCCTT Project: This project is ongoing.
**Speaker Support at Stadium:** The speaker support project has gone through another design rendition. The current design is to have two posts to support the speakers and to put them above the current scoreboard.

4. **STUDENT SUCCESS PLAN**

Dr. Reece reviewed the Student Success Plan which outlined the background and steps to measuring student success. After his review Dr. Reece asked if the Facilities Planning Committee wanted to actively participate in the Academic Infrastructure Report.

A request for the definition of the Academic Infrastructure Report was asked. Dr Reece replied that the task force does not have specifics, but he believes it has to do with IT and classroom infrastructure as well as general learning spaces.

The committee had the following comments:

Ms. Nolan stated the following:

- This requested information exists in every unit, division, area, and college plan.
- SLOs are in their infancy and are not a major tool for assessment at this point.
- ARC data has not evolved enough yet to be trustworthy.
- Student success should be the focus of every aspect of this institution. There is so much information that exists; there is no need to re-invent the wheel.

Dr. Albanese believed that the task force can extract information they need from existing documents. While it is not fair to task this committee to writing a subsection of this report, the committee can assist the task force as needed. He suggested that this topic be placed on future agendas and when the definition of academic infrastructure is more clearly defined, the committee can address it at that time.

Mr. Ernest commented that the academic infrastructure is such an integral part of student success that perhaps the committee should re-think the overall umbrella of what this implies. Since the Campus Transformation Committee is not currently meeting, this request should fall to the Facilities Planning Committee. He also added that the one bullet that seems to be missing is the Facilities Master plan; this is the umbrella in which all of this falls under.

In conclusion, Dr. Reece asked whether or not the Facilities Planning Committee would collaborate on this process. Dr. Albanese replied that the answer is yes, but what the participation would be, what the plan is, and what the specific task is still unknown. The committee will work with the task force, but they should not be presumptuous and assume collaboration means that the committee writes a segment of the plan.
5. **STUDENT DESK RECOMMENDATION**
The examples of the three student desks were brought back to the meeting for committee members to look at, sit in, and provide their feedback. Dr. Albanese indicated that one parameter of our discussion is going to have to be the space consumed by these desks. Mr. Riffle recommended that a group of desks be ordered and placed in classrooms for a sample/trial basis. In conclusion the committee recommended the desk with the adjustable base, chair without the break, the darker colored desktop, and the desktop moved closer to the chair. Facilities and the Purchasing Department will work with the deans to figure out the number and which classroom(s) for a sample/trial basis.

6. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
This agenda item was not discussed.

7. **NEXT MEETING – NOVEMBER 17, 2009**
The next meeting is scheduled for November 17, 2009.

8. **OTHER ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**
No items were presented.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.