PRESENT:

Dr. Lucinda Aborn, DSPS
Holly Bogdanovich, Director of Student Activities
Roger Ernest, Faculty, Liberal Arts Division
Dennis Falcon, Faculty, Hum/SS Division
ML Bettino (Farmer), Vice President, Academic Affairs
Adriana Flores-Church, Bus. Services/Human Resources
Tony Fortner, Faculty, Technology Division
Mark Fronke, Faculty, Business Education Division
Toni Grijalva, CSEA, & Public Relations Rep.
Jo Ann Higdon, Vice President, Business Services
Dr. Stephen Johnson, Vice President, Student Services
Linda Kaufman, Confidential
Lee Krichmar, Information Technology
Tim Kyllingstad, CSEA
Jason Macias, ASCC Student Rep.
Dr. Connie Mayfield, ACCME

Ceci Medina, Faculty, Health Occupations Division
Mario Morales, CSEA
Wes Nance, Faculty, SEM
Dr. Randy Peebles, ACCME
Kim Westby (Quiroz), Student Support Services Division
Dr. Bryan Reece, Faculty Senate
Robert Riffle, Director of Physical Plant
Lola Rizkallah, ACCME
Lynda Sampson, Library/LRC
Dr. Dan Smith, ACCME
Chris Sugiyama, Counseling Services Division
David Tilahun, Admissions, Records and Services Division
Karen Welliver, Faculty, HPEA Division
Dr. Noelia Vela, President

ABSENT:

Michael Barrita, ASCC Student Rep.
David Betancourt, Faculty, Fine Arts Division
Richard Bukowiecki, Campus Police
Patricia Robbins Smith, Adult Edu./Com Services/CITE

GUESTS:

Dr. Carolyn Chambers
Fran De France
Renee DeLong Chomiak
Nathan Durdella
Dr. Bob Hughlett
Tim Juntilla
Brian Kochems

Bernie Negrete
Jenine Nolan
Dodie O’Donnell
Jeanine Prindle
Linda Rose
Nishi Shah-Williams
Debra Ward
I. **CALL TO ORDER**
Dr. Vela called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - APRIL 17, 2008**
Dr. Reece moved that the minutes of April 17, 2008 be approved as presented. Ms. Higdon seconded. The motion passed.

III. **MASTER PLAN**
Mr. Ernest shared with the committee his concerns regarding the current 2007 Master Plan. Along with his concerns, he shared with the committee the following handouts:
- The Facilities Project Flow Chart (2003);
- A “Google” earth image of the campus which showed new prospective locations for the CDC, Performing Arts Center, Fine Arts Complex, Amphitheater and the Business Education/CIS Building;
- And his Facilities Master Plan Proposal dated 05/01/08.

In recap, Mr. Ernest’s concerns are:
- Pseudo marked entrances;
- Water features at entrances that attract children;
- Theater department did not sign off on theater location;
- Student amphitheater is not shown on the master plan;
- The proposed location for the theater is not visible from a main thoroughfare;
- It appears on the master plan that old growth trees would be removed for parking lots. Save the trees!
- It is very important that all stakeholders are fully informed of what an FPP consists of and all information regarding the proposed project.

Mr. Ernest noted that he and Ms. Higdon had a conference call with Susan Yeager, the College’s representative from the Chancellor’s Office. This phone call was to find out if the location of the theater could be moved without jeopardizing the $30 million state funded dollars (now $31.5 million dollars). Mr. Ernest reiterated Ms. Yeager’s comments that if the District asks for a site change on the theater project before it goes to funding, it would probably be disallowed and kicked off the approved list. If the District wants to request a site change, Ms. Yeager recommended that such request should be made after funding, but the District must provide a compelling reason for the site change, and if the Chancellor’s Office doesn’t agree, the funding could still be disallowed.

Dr. Vela noted that she has worked with Mr. Ernest on the CTC committee from the beginning and is always impressed with his thorough thinking about issues. She does recall his comments about quad areas, the concepts of outdoor spaces.

IV. **OTHER MASTER PLAN CONCERNS**
Dr. Vela requested clarification regarding the quad. She wanted to know if the master plan conveyed the details of the quad or just the location. Ms. Shepley replied that the
The Master plan indicates open spaces vs. proposed building locations, but not detail about how that open space would be designed. She added that there were meetings with the students regarding quad spaces but that the design of those spaces would be for a future date. When it is time to work on the design of a quad space, then a user group is formed and a design is completed with the assistance of the user group. The master plan is meant to describe overall intent for developing of the campus, but not the details of all these designs. In addition, if the master plan does not show a tree in a certain location, this should not be construed as a recommendation of removal of an existing tree. It’s a diagram that is meant to guide future development.

Dr. Vela noted that in her past experiences with master plans, she knows that the facilities master plan is only a part of a larger kind of planning for the College. The College is about to embark on a strategic plan. In addition, an educational master plan and technology master plan also drive the College’s facilities master plan.

Ms. Higdon summarized the key elements from the draft of Mr. Ernest’s proposed Facilities Master Plan: He proposes:

- The theater would stay in its proposed location;
- The Business Building would stay in its current location. A new building would be built that would include the CIS department;
- The CDC would move to the West, thus protecting the old soccer field;
- The Fine Arts Complex (not the theater) would move up to the old Burnight Center site;
- Liberal Arts would move to the West of the Library;
- A quad area would be developed in the old Liberal Arts Building site;
- A portion of the strawberry fields would be used for auxiliary parking;
- Per Mr. Ernest, with this proposed plan, parking spaces would be above the EIR recommendation of 4828.

Ms. Higdon noted that the 2 FPPs – Fine Arts Complex and CDC are due to the State July 1, 2008. The College is in a time sensitive situation. She added that once these FPPs are submitted to the State, the location is set.

This began a lengthy committee discussion regarding the FPP process for the 2 outstanding FPPs. The following was discussed:

Ms. Shepley noted that FPPs must be submitted with a site. You cannot describe a project to the State without putting a location on it.

A question was asked how long it would take to modify an FPP if the College decided to change the building location. The response was that the FPP process typically begins in January or early February in order to allow time develop a complete proposal. If a new location is selected for an already completed FPP, the building design will need to be modified to fit the new site and revisions could be completed in a shorter time period. It
is important that if a proposed building location is changed, it must be tied to a well developed and well accepted master plan. You cannot simply look at one project, because you have to look at the overall implications of what that move does for the entire campus.

Ms. Nolan stated that she has strong concerns about the current FPP discussion. The CDC FPP has been in the process for 5 years. If the College decides not to re-submit this CDC FPP, then the whole process would begin from Step 1; and the College is not assured that we would get approval to move to IPP status again for this project. She added that Mr. Ernest’s proposed facilities master plan is just one proposal. The committee needs to review more than just one proposal if building locations are going to be changing. She requested that the committee please take into considerations all the consequences of the actions of not re-submitting the existing FPP’s.

Dr. Vela asked if the College does not submit a FPP for a project that already has an FPP, what will happen. Ms. Shepley replied that the College has 2 choices: 1) the College could simply not re-submit the FPP; or 2) re-submit as an IPP and wait for the State to say the College is approved to go to an FPP.

Dr. Peebles suggested it would be prudent to allow tBP to take all the information that has been shared at the previous CTC meetings and prepare different scenarios for the committee to review.

Dr. Mayfield stated that she does like the idea of the Fine Arts Complex moving forward. As part of the process of preparing for the FPP, a floor plan was developed with the user group. She additionally stated that she is not aware that there was any floor plan developed for the FPP for the Burnight Center. If there was a floor plan developed, she said that she did not see it. Ms. Shepley replied that there is a floor plan for the Burnight Center and it was part of the diagram that was developed in the user group meetings. Dr. Mayfield again stated, she does not recall ever seeing such a floor plan. Ms. Shepley commented that she believed that Dr. Mayfield would recognize it if she saw it again.

Dr. Mayfield added that the floor plan developed for the Fine Arts Complex is U-shaped, and this configuration would not work for the alternative proposed location. If the building moves to the front of the school, a new floor plan will need to be developed. Also, Fine Arts buildings are messy, i.e. kiln. This would also need to be taken into consideration about moving it to the front of the campus.

Ms. Prindle added that she appreciates the efforts Jenine Nolan has done for the CDC FPP, but asked for the committee’s consideration that HPEA has also contributed a great deal of effort to save their old soccer field.

Mr. Fronke stated that it is his opinion that the CTC committee does not get anything done because there are too many people on the committee. We need to figure out a
way that we can form smaller groups that can focus on the things that have to get done. He is in favor of stopping the master plan because in his opinion we know how the master plan was developed and where it is. He thinks it is time to call a “time-out”. But, he added, we have to do that in an intelligent way so that we have groups of people that have the passion and the architects that can meet independently and figure out where we go; what we have to do and can get the information from as many people who want to participate to develop a plan and go forward. As long as we keep coming to these meetings with this many people, nothing is going to get done. We need to figure out how to get the “brain trust” of the CTC committee and use it to figure out what the College will do in the next 5 years to make the master plan something we can all be proud of. He believes that there are a lot of people on this campus who are not proud of the current Master Plan.

Dr. Vela replied by stating that the CTC committee began as a smaller committee that was to be representative of the campus groups, and in fact, a master plan was developed by a small group and experts that the Board hired. In addition, there were forums and there were discussions. There was then a period of time that elapsed during which work was being done very productively on the master plan. Then, a period of time elapsed, approximately a year and a half to two years, before the College really heard complaints. Those complaints came to the Board on December 3, 2007 with a request to re-visit the master plan. There have been comments about the master plan and there have been some good ideas and suggestions. She believes that although the time spent in the CTC has been time consuming, it has not been totally wasted. It is important to air opinions before reconsidering the master plan.

Mr. Fronke replied to Dr. Vela’s statement by stating that he met with Mr. Farmer in August to talk about the process and what had happened. He did not mean to insinuate that the CTC committees have been a waste of time, what he said is that it was going to be difficult for this large of a group to get anything done from a micro standpoint. The master plan was presented after the fact. The fact is that the FPP (for the Burnight Center) was submitted before any forums and before the Board approved the master plan which put the Burnight Theater in its proposed location. He hopes we can stop coming back to the fact that this was an approved master plan because as far as he is concerned it is not. The College submitted an FPP for the Burnight Theater in its current location and the College is stuck with it. This is the clarity and the truth of the situation we are in.

Dr. Smith added that when staff is being told that administration did not hear about this until 2 years ago is incorrect. In actuality, the very first master plan came out and Dr. Peebles came out and said there were some problems with it and he was told to wait, that individual division issues were not going to be discussed at that time, please send concerns by e-mail. HPEA staff voiced their opinion and he was asked to do a field space study. Then HPEA was told the field was going away.
Mr. Nance noted that his experience with sub-committees has not been productive. Discussions go back and forth between the 2 committees and you get less done that way. He added that the committee has aired some major discussions, i.e. soccer field and CDC. Everyone is not going to get everything that they want. He thinks from this point forward you can take the information that we have and make some decisions regarding these things. He thinks this committee could make decisions, but not everyone is going to be happy with all the decisions that will be made. But that will happen whether you have sub committees or not. From CIS’ point of view, we have a building that keeps moving around on this campus. He asked Ms. Shepley who decided that CIS and Business would be in the same building. Ms. Shepley replied that a good facilities master plan is driven by a good educational master plan and an educational master plan is driven by a strategic master plan. That is where you make the decisions on adjacencies. A facilities master plan is driven by an educational master plan with discussions about shared visions and goals at an institution.

Dr. Vela noted that there has been some discussion about the adjacencies and the value of the instructional plan with regards to development of the FPPs. The College does not have an updated educational master plan, and is in the process of updating the strategic plan. Those are the realities and the sequencing has not been perfect with regards to those plans. The short term issues are the CDC and Fine Arts Complex FPPs. The larger issue is incorporating all the statements that have been made.

It was asked how quickly tBP could have 4 or 5 options to review that would consider the discussions that have taken place. Dr. Vela asked if there would be support by the CTC committee to have a consideration of the ideas that have been brought forth, and allow tBP to bring options for review. Ms. Shepley replied that she needs more direction in order to respond to that request. It begins with a shared vision and goals; a set of master plan goals which usually come from strategic/educational master plan. Then we need a shared understanding of the issues.

Mr. Falcon indicated that he is still confused about the theater location. Could we ask for a show of hands or vote that indicates what the committee’s feeling or sense is about the theater location. Dr. Vela replied that the question needs to be split because there are two related questions. For clarification she indicated the following questions:

1. Does the committee like the proposed theater location as proposed in the FPP;
2. Does the committee want to make a recommendation to the Board to give up the State funding, because that is what would likely occur.

Mr. Falcon made a motion that we take a show of hands to see those in favor of the current fixed location of the theater, those for and those opposed because they have questions. Dr. Reece seconded. Discussion was held. Summary of the discussion:

Dr. Smith wanted to know the feelings from theater faculty about the proposed location of the theater.
Dr. Mayfield added that the committee has to acknowledge that the College has an old and deteriorating facility that is prohibiting the College in its current location from offering current and top notch theater programs. As long as the building stands in its current condition, the theater program suffers and that heavily impacts the decision of whether or not the College does not want to give up $30 million dollars.

Dr. Vela indicated there was a motion and called out the question, who likes the theater location?

Vote:
Yes: 6
No: 9
Undecided: 12

Ms. Higdon made a motion to see a show of hands of those who are willing to forfeit the State’s $31.5 million dollars (State increased price). Mr. Nance seconded the motion and called for the question.

Vote:
Yes: 1
No: 20
Undecided: 3

In response to a request that tBP prepare options for the committee to review, Ms. Shepley needed guidance as to which projects were fixed and which were not. Below is the final list:

Fixed Projects – cannot be changed:

Aquatic Center
Central Plant
Auto Tech Renovation
Classroom/Lab/Office Building #1
Burnight Theater

Projects Underway that can be moved:

Liberal Arts
New Facilities Building
Fine Arts Complex
CDC

Dr. Reece inquired if the state-wide bond is not passed this year, what happens to the Burnight FPP. Ms. Shepley indicated that it is still approved; it stays on the list until the
next bond. Typically another state-wide bond would be on the ballot within 6 months to 1 year. Ms. Higdon added that if the state-wide bond did not pass, that the Burnight Theater may need some cosmetic issues completed. That is why it is important to have contingencies in the budget.

tBP was asked to bring to the CTC committee for discussion options regarding any of the projects that could move and what the domino effects would be.

V. **HPEA CONCERNS**
Due to time constraints, this agenda item was not discussed as a stand-alone item.

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

VII. **NEXT MEETING: MAY 15, 2008 @ 2:00 P.M.**
The next CTC meeting is scheduled for May 15, 2008 at 2:00 p.m. in the Board Room. This meeting will focus on a series of options for review and discussion.

Discussion occurred about getting questions from the committee. Ms. Shepley indicated that unless she has specific questions for particular areas on campus, there is not a need.

The CTC will also meet on May 22, 2008 at 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room.

Mr. Ernest asked that whenever this committee makes recommendations to the Board that those recommendations be e-mailed to the constituencies in advance. He believes this should be protocol for the committee.

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

IX. **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.