I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Vela called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - JANUARY 31, 2008
The minutes of the January 31, 2008 meeting were not available for committee approval.

III. PRESENTATION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAMPUS MASTER PLANS
Deborah Shepley provided to the committee a detailed power-point presentation which highlighted the evolution of the Cerritos College Master Plan from 1997 to the current 2007 Facilities Master Plan which was adopted by the Board in October 2007. She talked about state space guidelines, the space inventory conducted at the college, the college’s underutilization of space, the addition of a new building (the Skills Lab) with no state knowledge which place the college in bad light with the State Chancellor’s Office staff and the meeting that Dr. Vela, Jo Ann Higdon, Robert Riffle, and she held with the State Chancellor’s staff to ensure them we would follow state guidelines.
Mr. Fronke inquired who was involved in the decisions when changes to the Master Plan were made. Ms. Shepley replied that the Campus Transformation Committee (CTC) approved the recommendations. Once approved by the CTC, then the recommendations were forwarded to the Board for approval. It was noted that the CTC decision-making process was by consensus. Dr. Vela acknowledged that the CTC Committee did not take official votes, but if you look at the College’s shared governance document and how each of the committees are listed in terms of what their charge is and decision-making process, you would see that most of the college and Faculty Senate committees operate under consensus. This does not mean that this process cannot change for this committee. She reminded the committee that as in all shared governance committees, it is the committee members’ responsibility to communicate the information shared at the meetings with their constituents. The various changes to the Master Plan were not just discussed once, there were discussed several times and along the way questions were asked of our master plan architect and there was an evolutionary change.

Mr. Ernest also indicated that he was a part of the CTC (formerly the GO Bond Implementation Committee) and at that time there were only two representatives from faculty that were appointed by the Faculty Senate. He did report back to the Faculty Senate on the proceedings of the committee. It was noted that the Faculty Senate President was also a member of this committee.

Mr. Barrita asked how large a part did the students play in the changes to the Master Plan. He noted that there was a major concern by students on campus regarding the “hill” area on campus. It was his understanding that the last student administration had expressed an interest on retaining this area of campus. Dr. Vela replied that there were always student representatives on the CTC. She acknowledged that there was an expression of concern and interest in student input with regard to the quad areas on campus. There was a special meeting held with the administration, tBP, and the students. There was a record of the interest of the students in terms of maintaining and retaining certain gathering areas.

Dr. Peebles commented that he realizes it was and is important as committee members to share the information with the respective constituent groups. In the past, Master Plan hand-outs were not given to committee members, so the attempts to write down all the changes were at times, challenging. He noted that today is actually the first day that hand-outs have been available to committee members with regard to the Master Plan.

Mr. Nance inquired if the proposed parking lot east of the gym would result in the reduction in the number of tennis courts. Ms. Shepley replied yes, and that this decision was based on a discussion with members of the HPEA Division in terms of the number of tennis courts that were required at the time and the condition of the courts.

Mr. Macias asked if the proposed Master Plan showed the use of Old Falcon Way to increase the flow across campus. Ms. Shepley replied that the idea is to open up Old Falcon Way just for the service vehicles that needed to gain access to the theater loading dock. The College should still encourage cars to use New Falcon Way.

Dr. Reece indicated that three concerns came out of the transition of the Master Plan from 2005-2006. They are: 1) when the students began to complain about the reconfiguration of the quad; 2) HPEA began to complain about instructional space being reduced; and 3) the Business Education (BE) Division began to complain about being
moved from second on the list to a much later date of construction. He noted that as the 2006 Master Plan change was explained to him, the big catalyst to creating the change to the Master Plan was the opportunity for State funding for the theater. He remembers the conversation about the theater when discussed in the campus forums. At that time it was distinctly presented as a building that had funding available, that funding was imminent. He noted that there was a very strong mischaracterization of the funding which really gave the importance for the campus community to buy into the Master Plan change. After the Master Plan was Board approved, it was found out that the theater funding was not imminent and was dependent upon a state-wide bond that hadn’t been scheduled yet. This, in his mind, made a change to the Master Plan with the campus community supporting it in a consensus way with a strong degree of misinformation. With all this said, he is unsure what do about it because he likes the Master Plan, but what he doesn’t like is the way the process was used to get to the Master Plan.

Dr. Vela replied that she remembers very clearly a meeting that several people went to with the Fine Arts faculty. At this meeting it was brought to their attention that there was good news and bad news with regard to the theater. The good news was that the Chancellor’s Office staff had supported the theater project. The bad news was that there was no current funding available for this project. She distinctly remembers saying the project was approved, but is dependent upon the next state-wide bond to pass. It was indicated that the College was not sure of when that state-wide bond would be. She has a different recollection of that meeting. She stated that in no way did she or other staff misrepresent the facts.

Ms. Shepley added that when College staff met with the Fine Arts faculty they were told the earliest the project could start was the summer or fall of 2008.

Dr. Johnson asked if the 2004 increase in the cost of concrete and steel impacted our construction projects. Ms. Shepley replied yes, the increase in costs for those items did have a large impact on the construction projects.

Ms. Quiroz inquired that once certain departments move out of the Administration Building is there room for expansion of the one-stop area. Ms. Shepley replied yes and provided the committee a brief description of the plans for the one-stop area.

Mr. Macias asked with the current Master Plan how many tennis courts are currently being proposed and removed. Ms. Higdon replied that four courts are being removed with eight remaining. It was noted that for regular tennis competitions you need six usable courts. If you are hosting a regional or state tournament, you need 12. In the last five years, Cerritos College has hosted one regional tournament. Dr. Smith added that the courts are used at other times as well.

Mr. Nance asked if all the functions that are moving out of the current Liberal Arts Building are going back in to the proposed new Liberal Arts Building. Ms. Shepley replied yes and indicated that the first Classroom/Lab/Office Building (CLO #1) needs to be constructed and functional before construction can begin on the new Liberal Arts Building. It is anticipated that construction would begin in spring 2010.

Dr. Vela concluded the Master Plan discussion by noting that when a college hires a Master Plan architect, it is their job to make recommendations based on the information available and to bring back to a committee such as this for their review. The Master Plan architect is also responsible for ensuring that the College stays within the state
standards. It is very complex and the College will try and do a better job with the communication.

IV. HPEA CONCERNS
Note: For the purposes of discussion, HPEA refers to instructional space as their field space. That is their “instructional space.” For the record, the only space inventoried on the space inventory is the inside building space (lecture/lab). There is currently no standard on outside space.

Ms. Welliver spoke to the committee regarding the HPEA concerns. She acknowledged that she knows the College has many needs and wants. She began her talk indicating that there are two pending motions and what those motions do not include is that instructional space is being taken away from HPEA. She noted that she understood the need for parking and perhaps the strawberry field could fill that additional parking need. She indicated that there was a survey done which indicated that Cerritos College has too many fields, and HPEA does not agree with that. When the College starts looking at instructional space, the quality of the PE department, the number of students and how we are growing, there is a reason for that. When fields consolidate it does not work. The motion is to not take away the soccer field. Currently the plan is to put the new CDC at the old soccer field location, but the CDC building has yet to be funded by the State. It is suggested to put a parking lot in the old soccer field space until the CDC building is funded, this does not make sense. She indicated that the HPEA Division does not want to lose the soccer field as instructional space, nor do they want to lose the four tennis courts.

Dr. Vela replied that it is important to look at the campus as a whole, but there can be modifications. There are domino effects to any actions taken on the Master Plan. To confirm with what Ms. Welliver said it was noted that the HPEA Division does not want to lose instructional space, the soccer field, and the four tennis courts. It was also noted that a meeting was held with the HPEA dean and the question was asked how many tennis courts would be needed. In almost every instance, the number was eight. Dr. Smith added that although Cerritos College has only hosted one regional tournament in the last five years, the courts are used at other times.

Dr. Reece stated that as the committee has been going through the Master Plans, every instructional program on campus has a certain instructional space or certain capacity in which they need to offer their program. He believes that every program has maintained its existing instructional space, existing capacity or expanded its capacity. The HPEA division is the only department where they have decreased in size.

This began a lengthy discussion with regard to HPEA concerns with the following comments/statements being made:

- It was noted that one of the first priorities on campus was to put the artificial turf in the stadium. This was to utilize the field more so that soccer could practice there. When soccer moved to the stadium then the fields could be consolidated and one less field would be needed. This idea generated a discussion and a meeting was held with PE and the coaches. The charge was to try and achieve as many goals as possible and that was the resulting recommendation from the architects.
- HPEA noted that they never agreed to lose the soccer field.
• It was noted that overall, in order to right-size the campus, it was discussed to create interdisciplinary spaces. This was why in 2004 some of the campus buildings names became generic. The idea for the buildings on campus was to make them very interdisciplinary/flexible spaces that could be used by a number of different areas on campus and maximize the hours that a building could be used, increase the utilization, and ultimately bring the campus into the right-size once the older buildings were removed from the campus.

Parking
• The current ratio is 1:8. With the master plan the ratio becomes 1:5.4. The parking is tied to the number of students on campus.
• Every parking space on campus that is shown in the current master plan is needed for the campus to make it through the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The ratio must be shown on paper for the EIR to go through. It was noted that historically there has been a serious problem with our neighbors with regards to students parking in their neighborhood.
• The committee was reminded that a golf driving range was previously proposed and defeated by the community because of the lights, traffic and golf balls. If parking was to be put in that location, we could have the same problem. If the community becomes unhappy with the College and the decisions we make, the community could put our Master Plan in jeopardy.
• The strawberry field is a valuable piece of land, which could possibly bring future revenue to the College of a half-million dollars. Is a parking lot in that location the best place?
• A parking structure, in today’s dollars, would cost approximately $18 million dollars. These funds would need to be GO Bond dollars as the State does not fund parking structures.
• The question was asked if students would be willing to park in the strawberry fields in order to save soccer field and tennis courts. The reply from the ASCC representatives was that they had spoken to their constituency and they expressed that more parking is not something they desire. When it comes to these key PE areas being in place, this is more important than having to walk a little further to class. It was requested that this statement be put into writing to support this suggestion. This statement was a different scenario today than three years ago.
• It was noted that as the major renovations begin on campus, “lay-down” areas for construction will take up to 600 parking spaces at one time. These spaces will be out of service for a long period of time.

Instructional Space
• It was noted that if instructional space is taken away from PE and an instructional building is put in that place, PE will not ever get back this space. Student programs and instructional programs are more important then where parking lots go. Parking lots are important, but secondary.
• For clarification, it was noted that a soccer field is not being lost; rather a practice field is being lost. As a reminder, the football field has been made available for other sports as well as for a practice field.
• An additional use for the area in which the old soccer field is located is for staging purposes of construction projects in this area.
• A guest of the committee made the following comment: 1) comparison of a golf driving range to a small parking lot is not fair; 2) if PE loses instructional space, they have lost potential for FTES forever; 3) the Child Development Center
located near a weight room and activity area is not the best place for that type of facility; and 4) perhaps a temporary parking lot could be put in the strawberry field, and in the future develop a project that is worth money that might be able to fund a parking structure.

- Facilities requested that the committee keep in mind that specialized turf was required on the new soccer field and this requires different and more upkeep than regular turf.
- The Business Division representative (Mark Fronke) requested that at this time it is not known if the Business Division is going to lose instructional space or not. The plans at this time is for the Business Division to move in the CLO #2 building, and since this building has not yet been designed, it is premature to say that HPEA is the only division to lose instructional space.
- In addition, a comment was made at the last CTC meeting that the Business Division numbers are down. The numbers are not down; the numbers are down to what was projected 10 years ago because staff was told to think high, because this is how buildings get built. The Business Division numbers could be higher if we didn't have a dean who was split between two divisions and if the facilities were not horrible.
- It was requested that the Counseling and Guidance department have designated space on the Master Plan for both classroom and meeting space.
- A possible location for the CDC is where the current Physical Science building is.
- Time is needed to review the documents received at the CTC meeting.
- It was noted that Auto Body lost an amount of space. A vast majority of the user group felt that automotive was being right-sized. More space was dedicated to shared space and to areas of current automotive technology.
- When the Technology Division transitions to the new CLO #1 building, the Technology Division gave up some space.
- A question was asked if there was a dedicated building for programs that focus on under-served students (Puente/Project Hope). It was noted that Cerritos College has space for those programs within the Master Plan.

**FTES**

- A question was asked with regard to FTES and soccer. What is the impact of the existing master plan on FTES in soccer?
- The committee was reminded that instructional space by state standards in the buildings should be used 53 hours a week for lecture classes. Some preliminary calculations have been done by Mr. Farmer and a lot of campus rooms and spaces are not being utilized 53 hours a week. If the College has a space that is used just to sit empty and not generate FTES that is a consideration the committee should use in its thinking when it compares to other uses of space.
- Underutilization of space disqualifies the college from getting state funding for future buildings.
- It was requested Mr. Farmer bring the above FTES information to an upcoming CTC meeting.
- It was noted by Dr. Reece that this is a multi-faceted issue. He stated that one of the core issues is the program needs and our board policy is very clear about saying its program development with regard to College programs relies primarily on the faculty of that respective area. Mr. Farmer's response, with no disrespect for faculty, is that all campus needs need to be looked at critically by other eyes and minds. As the VP of Academic Affairs, he looks at items critically as do deans.
In closing this discussion, Dr. Vela noted that this is very complex issue and needs to be further reviewed. In recap the following is suggested:

- HPEA Division would not like to lose the old soccer field.
  - If the old soccer field stays in its location, then another location for the same number of parking spaces would need to be found.
- Move the CDC to another location.
  - A suggested location for the CDC was where the current Physical Science Building resides.
- Committee members were asked to bring back ideas on how to meet the HPEA requests without losing parking spaces and identify a location for the Child Development Center (CDC).
- Have tBP provide the CTC Committee with information regarding loss/gain of square footage for each campus program.
- Have Mr. Farmer provide the committee with soccer FTES information.
- Retain all 12 tennis courts.
  - If all 12 tennis courts remain, another location for the same number of parking spaces would need to be found.

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.

- Classroom/Lab Office Building #1
- Auto Technology
- Pool

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

VIII. NAMING OF BUILDINGS (BP/AP 2900)
Due to time constraints this item was not discussed.

IX. NEXT MEETING
The next meeting for the College Committee on Campus Transformation is scheduled for February 21, 2008 at 3:30 p.m.

X. ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR
Due to time constraints this item was not discussed.

XI. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 5:43 p.m.