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I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Vela called the meeting to order at 3:06 pm.

Each committee member introduced themselves and the area they represent. Ms. Higdon provided a brief explanation to the committee about the roles Bovis Lend Lease and tBP/Architecture have with the College. tBP Architecture serves as the college’s master plan architect. As such, they assist the college with overall direction of programming parameters that follow state standards. Bovis Lend Lease serves as the college’s CA/OR (College Advocate/Owner’s Representative). As such, they provide significant construction management oversight on most college projects.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - DECEMBER 6, 2007
The minutes of the December 6, 2007 meeting were approved as presented. It was noted that subsequent to the last CTC meeting, a representative from the Library/LRC was added to the CTC membership.
III. STATE CAPITAL OUTLAY PROCESS
Ms. Shepley described for the committee the State capital outlay process by which Cerritos College submits their requests to acquire State funding for facility building projects. She noted that in order to participate in the State capital outlay process, the State ensures that you don’t have too much space on campus and that you are working toward maintaining state space standards. In addition, money for State projects comes from the passage of large state-wide bonds for educational facilities. The last state-wide bond was in 2006, which was split between the community colleges, UC’s and CSU’s. The State has expended the funds approved in the 2006 bond, so the new projects that are approved are not getting funded until the passage of the upcoming 2008 state-wide bond. The next state-wide bond will fund several projects that are sitting on a list of approved projects including the College’s Burnight Theater.

Questions:
Mr. Fronke asked if the College has kept in-line with our original plan from 10 years ago to fund projects on campus. Were there years when the College did not submit projects to the State that were in-line to be funded? Mr. Riffle replied that there were projects submitted and that is how the College received funding for the seismic retrofits. In addition, during the last 10 years the Science Building was submitted.

Ms. Higdon added that in the last three years the College has been extremely aggressive and have submitted any project that the College may have had a chance of receiving. Ms. Higdon reiterated Ms. Shepley’s comments with regards to staying within State standards. She noted that facility construction projects at the State level are a competitive process. The State looks at the College’s percentages of use numbers (space utilization rates) and if they are poor, the State will not even look at your project. This is why it is important that the College keeps everything in balance and stays within state space standards including space utilization rates.

Space Inventory and Space Utilization
Ms. Shepley explained that every space on the campus is categorized, added up and compared to your enrollment and your forecasted enrollment. The State is also looking directly at the College’s WSCH, what you have now and what is projected in the future. Currently on campus we are over in several categories. We are in the 125% category. According to the State we have excess space, which means the College needs to look at scheduling and how to use the space more efficiently. The current Master Plan is accomplishing getting the campus right-sized so we can be closer to the amount of space that the State recommends. Mr. Farmer added that it is important to have an effective use of space. The State expects the College to use a lecture classroom 53 hours a week. If the College is not using a lecture classroom for 53 hours a week, then that room is underutilized and underutilization disqualifies the college from getting state funds for buildings.

IV. 2008 INITIAL PROJECT PROPOSAL (IPP) and FINAL PROJECT PROPOSAL (FPP) RECOMMENDATION
Ms. Shepley provided to the committee a hand-out which outlined the 2008 Five Year Plan, Initial Project Proposal (IPP), and Final Project Proposal (FPP) Recommendations. This sheet also showed the status of the previously submitted projects and the recommendation for the five year plan.
Questions:

Mr. Fronke inquired who is making these IPP and FPP recommendations. Ms. Higdon replied that the College facilities staff works in conjunction with the Chancellor’s Office to submit the facility construction projects. Mr. Fronke indicated that he represents the Business Division and at some point in the last 10 years, the Business Education Building renovation/rebuilding has fallen from number two on the list. How did that happen and how does the Business Education Division work towards getting back on the list? Ms. Higdon replied that the campus community needs to understand that there isn’t enough money for all the construction projects, whether it is through our local GO Bond funds or State dollars. Currently, in the Master Plan, the Business Education Division is programmed to be in the Classroom/Lab/Office #2 Building (CLO #2). She also noted that currently in the Facilities Planning Committee, discussions are taking place with regard to aesthetically updating a building that is going to be around for awhile and is further out for renovation or replacement. The College has to be careful on how much repairing is done to a building without kicking in a domino effect of all kinds of construction issues that would make it cost prohibitive. Ms. Higdon also indicated, according to her perspective, that one of the challenges of the Business Education building is that the WSCH/FTES for those programs has not been achieved. If you look at the projected FTES that the 1997 Master Plan was based on we would see that only about 50% of the WSCH/FTES has been generated in the Business Division area.

Dr. Vela reminded the committee that the College is always trying to look at leveraging resources. The charge to our master plan architect (tBP), the Facilities Department, and our CA/OR (Bovis) is to see if there is a case that can be made to the State to qualify for State money. She noted that it has been previously stated that the College would need to go out for another GO Bond in order to do all the projects outlined in the current Master Plan. The size of that bond will be dependent upon a number of variables, i.e., how successful we are at getting State funds, and the result of a capital campaign. She reminded the committee that the Master Plan is a living document, and as such, is reviewed annually.

Ms. Shepley noted that the State will only approve one FPP per year, per campus. For Cerritos College it is as follows:

2007 – Gymnasium
2008 – Burnight Center Theater
2009 – One of these projects: Fine Arts or Child Development Center.

The following questions were asked: 1) Could the CTC Committee have more input into the list; 2) has there been historical tracking with regard to the Master Plan changes; and 3) what is the status of the Social Sciences building remodel project, which included IT and the Humanities/Social Sciences Division Office. After a brief discussion it was decided that Ms. Shepley would provide to the committee at their next scheduled meeting a power-point presentation that would outline the evolution of the Cerritos College Master Plan. This presentation will include the rationale and illustrations of what drove the changes in the Master Plan. Dr. Vela added that communication is important and it is imperative for all committee members to share the information with their constituents.
Ms. Higdon asked for direction from the committee whether tBP could be given direction to move forward with the documents outlined on the 2008 FYCP, FPP, IPP Recommendation sheet.

A lengthy discussion ensued with regard to the projects on the list. The following comments/suggestions arose from the committee discussion:

- Develop a second draft of the form for CTC Committee review and discussion. Ensure that the form is more concrete and provides more explanation/narrative of the projects.
- How does the CTC Committee know that this is the highest priority of what would be funded? What other projects were considered by the Chancellor’s Office?
- A comment was made with regard to the concern from the Committee about how and where decisions have been made. For clarification purposes, it was noted that the committee is not being asked to make a huge decision, the committee is simply being asked to respond to the projects already in the Chancellor’s Office system. To change the projects now would be detrimental to Cerritos College in the future. To agree to let tBP move forward with the list of projects already in the system is keeping the institution exactly where we have been the last few years. That is not to say that the form could be modified to add more information in which more discussion could emanate and move the discussion further.

In closing Dr. Vela requested a vote of the committee with regard to having tBP proceed with the recommendations on the handout. It was noted that this does not negate the need for tBP to add the requested information and narrative. By a show of hands, the committee approved the request with one abstention.

V. **STATE-WIDE BOND ISSUE – NOVEMBER 2008**
Due to time constraints this item was not discussed.

VI. **RENDERINGS**
Due to time constraints this item was not discussed.

VII. **HPEA CONCERNS**
Due to time constraints this item was not discussed.

VIII. **WEB SITE**
Due to time constraints this item was not discussed.

IX. **MEETING TIMES**
Dr. Vela noted that the current meeting times for the CTC Committee are the 1st and 3rd Thursday’s at 3:30 p.m. immediately following Planning and Budget. The meeting schedule for the remainder of the Spring 2008 semester is as follows:

- February 7
- February 21
- March 13
- April 3
- April 17
- May 1
- May 15 (This date may change due to the fact it is during Finals)
X. **ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**
Dr. Peebles requested that an additional agenda item be added to the February 7th meeting: Naming of Buildings (BP/AP 2900).

XI. **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.