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

II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - APRIL 3, 2008**
Dr. Johnson moved that the minutes of April 3, 2008 be approved as presented. Dr. Smith seconded. The motion passed. The following abstained: Dr. Follett, Dr. Peebles and Dr. Vela.

Ms. Higdon commented regarding the following:

- Per a request made at the Coordinating Committee, the front page of the CTC minutes now reflects the members of the committee along with the area they represent;
- A question was brought forward from the Coordinating Committee as to whether the CTC committee would be willing to put *draft* minutes on-line, prior to them being approved by the CTC committee. She asked that the committee think about this suggestion and bring back their opinions at the next scheduled CTC committee meeting;
- Ms. Kaufman is in the process of getting the CTC minutes on-line.

III. **HPEA CONCERNS**
Dr. Smith brought forward an HPEA proposal. He indicated that the proposal had been extensively talked about in the HPEA area. The proposal states:

- Retain the old soccer field. Use some of the bond funds budget to move the overshoot nets, purchase more overshoot nets, move the scoreboard, demo the field, and build the new parking lot to redo the old soccer field to the same level as the new field. The left over funds should go to the gym budget to replace some of the one million bond dollars that was arbitrarily taken away from the gym project.
- Retain all 12 of the tennis courts. Use some of the funds budgeted to demo the first four courts, move the lights, move the electrical box, and build the parking stalls to refinish the surface of the 12 courts. The remaining funds should also be allocated to the gym project to replace some of the one million bond dollars arbitrarily taken away from the gym project.

Ms. Welliver added:

- The four (4) tennis courts being proposed to be removed from the proposed parking lot are the premier courts. These courts have the best access to the locker room, and are the safest as they are the farthest courts away from the baseball field.
- HPEA feels that the College is not “closed in” space wise. Why is the College taking away instructional space from a department that has shown growth, and that has success in both PE and athletics?
- HPEA does not feel that the proposed CDC location is the ideal spot.
• The gym seismic project is moving forward, but there are hazardous materials issues issues that will need additional funds. It would be helpful if the $1 million dollars in bond funds that was removed from the project be re-allocated to the gym seismic project.
• The HPEA Division is supportive of the HPEA proposals.

Dr. Reece requested clarification of the following:
• The HPEA proposal just presented does not request additional funding. Dr. Smith replied it does not request additional funding.
• The most significant way it would change the current master plan is the re-location of the proposed CDC location. Dr. Smith replied yes.
• Dr. Reece asked if the architects could find an alternate location(s) for the CDC. Ms. Medina replied that shouldn’t the CTC committee not first determine if, in fact, there was a time when Child Development was designated that space for the CDC.

Ms. Higdon replied with the following:
• She asked that the issue of the gym seismic not be discussed at the CTC meeting today. The user’s group recently met and as she stated to the group, when the project is budgeted, that is when the College will know if additional funds are needed to complete the project. If additional funds are needed, she will bring the analysis to the CTC committee for their recommendation.
• She asked for caution regarding dollar amounts and the HPEA proposal. At this time the College does not know what the changes would be, hence there are no dollar amounts attached to it.
• She takes exception to the innuendo that has been addressed several times in different venues that the current proposed location for the CDC was not talked about and thoroughly discussed with the parties involved. Ms. Higdon asked Ms. Nolan to speak to the issue.

Ms. Nolan addressed the committee regarding the proposed CDC site and shared the following:
• She, along with CDC instructors and CDC center staff were part of the discussion process and included in the discussions regarding the best location for the CDC.
• CDC locations are usually in the heart of the campus because they are considered instructional space.
• Basic essential needs for where a CDC should be located are the following:
  o It must be adjacent to parking;
  o Regulation for outdoor space for a child development center is 75 square feet per child;
  o Cannot be located on a busy street;
o Needs to be in the campus community because of the needs of the child development instructional students to do their observations, etc. In addition, kids curriculum is done which utilizes the resources and activities of the campus, both of which require it to be in the center of campus;

o Parental involvement is a large component of a CDC. Parents need to be able to come and go in the facility easily;

o That the proposed location is in proximity to the Culinary Arts area. The CDC has now been funded for a food program.

Ms. Nolan stated that the proposed CDC location meets all of those requirements. The proposed suggestions will not work for the following reasons:

- Corner of Studebaker/Alondra: Busy streets/intersection.
- Strawberry Patch: This area is not located in the campus community and is a distance from Culinary Arts. In addition, this is a valuable piece of property for the College’s future consideration.
- Physical Science area: No adjacent parking and the outdoor space requirements may not be possible.

Dr. Reece stated that the 2006 master plan does not have a consensus on this campus. It was learned at the April 9, 2008 special Board meeting, that the 2006 master plan was written by a small group of people and submitted to the State. After it was submitted to the State, then it was presented to the campus. There was never a vote on the 2006 master plan.

Dr. Vela replied that, as has been stated before, the smaller CTC committee worked by consensus.

Mr. Fronke added that according to the hand-outs provided to the CTC committee previously by tBP, that the proposed CDC location was clearly on the 2004 master plan, and that there appears to have been discussion with the appropriate individuals. But, the 2006 master plan did not follow any sort of shared governance policies. Huge decisions were made without any input from appropriate individuals. The persons who made the changes to the master plan had all been at the College less than 2 years at that time (2006). There was no one involved in moving these buildings around that had any history of being involved in the campus transformation. If he is right, it is time for us as a committee to say “time out” and do something to remedy the problem.

Ms. Higdon stated to the committee that at the moment anything can be changed on the current master plan and not have true ramifications from the State with one exception – the Burnnight Center Theater.

Dr. Vela clarified Mr. Fronke’s comments that it was not a small group of people approving the master plan; what was approved for recommendation to the Board was the Final Project Proposal (FPP) for the Burnnight Center Theater. She then asked Ms.
Shepley to provide to the committee the FPP timeline for the Burnnight Center Theater. Dr. Mayfield expressed to the committee that she remembered other buildings being moved on the master plan as the FPP was being developed. She added that when Susan Yeager from the Chancellor’s Office came to the campus to tour the building, she was not notified.

This began a discussion regarding the 2006 master plan with the following concerns expressed by some members of the committee:

- A great deal of trust has been lost as a result of how the 2006 master plan was developed. There has been misinformation, deliberately withheld information, and some staff has not shared information.
- It is important that all staff involved in the IPP/FPP process fully understand the process.
- The proposed location for the Burnnight Center is not ideal as it is not visible from main thorough fairs.

Below are a couple of responses expressed by some members of the committee:

- The change of the Burnnight Center location was provided to the Fine Arts Department in a meeting in August, 2006. It was also presented to the campus community in two (2) forums. No objections were heard at any of these meetings.
- It was requested that the committee hear from the Fine Arts Dean and representatives from Fine Arts as to whether they want to compromise a $30 million dollar building by not building it at its proposed and state-approved location.

Dr. Mayfield expressed to the committee that she did sign-off of the location of the Burnnight Center. She added that at the time of the meeting she had nowhere near the amount of understanding of the processes at this College to be part of such a momentous decision. It was too much weight and responsibility to place on her in that context. This weight and responsibility grew with time as she saw the hurried process by which the FPP was done and realized she was part of something that she shouldn’t have been part of. She noted that the Fine Arts faculty in 2006 did take a look at the proposal for the Burnnight Center and they were very excited about the fact that they were getting a new building; they did not give a lot of thought as to where the theater would be located on campus. She believes that staff did not realize that they were committed to one location and that it was an irretrievable decision.

Dr. Vela replied that she wanted the committee to know that the FPP was done with the best intentions for the College in advocating for money that would leverage the GO Bond dollars. She said that as a result of hearing good news from Susan Yeager, the timeline for the Burnnight Center was very short. The State informed the College at a late date that the Burnnight Theater was a good candidate for state funding. Dr.
Mayfield, Mr. Farmer and the architects worked very hard in gathering the information needed in order for the FPP to be successful. The FPP was submitted by the deadline of July 1st and at that time the College did not know if it would be approved. Notification of approved FPP’s does not happen until January. In the fall when the campus forums took place, along with the CTC committee meeting and the Board walking tour of the campus, it was not known whether the FPP would be approved for State funding.

Ms. Welliver inquired as to how the Wellness Center IPP got taken out of the loop. Ms. Shepley provided to the committee an explanation of the IPP process and noted that IPP’s must be submitted every year and the State determines whether or not an IPP is approved for further development into an FPP.

Mr. Nance noted that if the College makes the State mad, they may hold that against us for a long period of time. He added that there are rarely perfect solutions for these kinds of situations, but there are acceptable solutions. He asked Dr. Mayfield if the current location of the Burnight Center was an acceptable solution. Dr. Mayfield replied that she has not asked staff directly. From her perspective it is, but she will not speak on behalf of the Fine Arts staff until she asks them directly.

Mr. Nance continued by stating that what the College can take away from this experience is that from this point forward the College has to follow the shared governance process more closely. Things happen at points in time and if you don’t understand the thought process of the people at that point in time, you cannot really understand why the decisions are made.

Dr. Peebles added that the CTC meeting of September 13, 2006 was a quick meeting with an exciting slide presentation from tBP. He added that there were questions and concerns that were brought forward to him as a result of the campus open forums. When he tried to bring those concerns forward to the CTC committee meeting he indicated that Dr. Vela convinced him and the CTC committee that to even stop and ponder the questions for a future meeting date could impact the $30 million dollar Burnnight project. He recalled that there was no vote.

Dr. Smith stated that item #1 on the HPEA proposal is very time sensitive because if a decision is not made soon, there will be no time to re-do the existing soccer field and have it ready for soccer season.

Mr. Ernest added that he has substantial concerns with the master plan. He stated that according to the draft mitigated negative declaration report, the College’s parking ratio is 1:5.8 based on 28,000 students, which gives 4828 parking spaces required. He said based on the parking spaces he has counted, the College does not need the parking lot south of the proposed location for the CDC and also the parking lot on the tennis courts. He added that the College does need to take into account the latest EIR report, since that is needed as the common denominator and he wanted to re-evaluate the rush to parking. Dr. Vela requested that Mr. Ernest’s parking numbers be validated with tBP.
Dr. Vela closed the meeting by stating that the following CTC committee meeting needs to address the following concerns:

- Any recommended modification to the 2007 Board approved master plan
- HPEA concerns
- CDC location
- Parking
- Theater

IV. **MASTER PLAN**
Due to time constraints, this agenda item was not discussed.

V. **SUMMER MEETING SCHEDULE**
Due to time constraints, this agenda item was not discussed.

VI. **NEXT MEETING: MAY 1, 2008 @ 3:30 P.M.**
The next CTC meeting is scheduled for May 1, 2008 at 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room.

VII. **ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**
No items were presented.

VIII. **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.