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I. **CALL TO ORDER**
Ms. Higdon called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MAY 15, 2008**
The minutes of the May 15, 2008 were not available for approval.

III. **REVIEW OF MASTER PLAN OPTIONS**
Ms. Shepley reminded the committee that the last time CTC met (05/15/08) tBP was asked to develop schemes D & E further. Ms. Shepley then presented the committee a PowerPoint presentation of schemes D & E further developed.

Elements common to both schemes included:
- Inclusion of a new drop-off area to the east side of the proposed site for the new Child Development Center.
- Parking lot areas that totaled approximately 5,000 spaces.
- The existing amphitheatre remaining in place.

Comments/statements:

Ms. Higdon noted that the College is not cutting the trees on campus indiscriminately.

Mr. Fronke requested time to discuss the issue about tearing down the Liberal Arts and Business Education building. He noted that he believes it is important for the CTC to understand what happened from a decision making standpoint to decide that the College needed to tear down two buildings and what the genesis of that decision was and the document that supports that decision. He stated that was questioning the process as no one from the Business Education Division was consulted about tearing down the building. He said the College extrapolated this report because the Liberal Arts Building is cheaper to tear down than to renovate an existing building then it must be true for the Business Education Building. He added that there is a huge flaw in the master plan that the Business Education Building moves from where it currently exists to the proposed location without any input from Business Education staff. It was based on the assumption that it is cheaper to build a new building than to renovate the existing.

Ms. Shepley replied that as part of the 1997 Educational and Facilities Master Plan, that included third party reports from structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing engineers, it was recommended that Business Education, Physical Science, Natural Science and Lecture Hall all be removed. The reports indicated that those buildings should not be renovated; but rather demolished and replaced. There were many factors that were considered, such as the age of the building, hazardous materials and what would need to be required in order to comply with the current building code at the time.
(1997). At that time, the Liberal Arts Building was not recommended to be removed, but renovated. The Liberal Arts project started as a renovation, but as further studies and detailed information came forward, it was apparent that based on the new building codes (2007), the cost to renovate the Liberal Arts building exceeded the cost to build a new building.

Mr. Fronke replied that the buildings mentioned are all gone except for the Business Education building and nothing has happened in the 10 years since the master plan to warrant either a tear down or replacement of the building. It is time that the CTC start talking about prioritizing the Business Education Building. This issue needs to be addressed sooner than later.

Dr. Vela added that an additional impact to the construction process is that the College is trying to attract money from the State. Mr. Fronke replied that he has heard that argument before, and unfortunately for the people in the Business Division, it doesn’t mean anything other than they got ignored and that is the way it is going to be.

Ms. Higdon stated that she did report to the Board at the May 21, 2008 meeting that it was the CTC’s recommendation that the Fine Arts and CDC FPPs move forward and the Board did not give any differing direction, although it could not make any decision because the item was not agendized. One Board member did make it clear that there were some questions that needed to be answered; among them FTES information for soccer, tennis and PE courses.

IV. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR SOCCER & TENNIS

Mr. Farmer distributed to the committee three documents:
- Tennis FTES Produced: Summer 2005 - Spring 2008
- Soccer FTES Produced: Summer 2005 - Spring 2008
- Weekly Soccer Schedule Fall 2007

He asked for committee comments. The following was provided:

- Many of the facilities in the HPEA area do not generate as many FTES as a classroom does. A classroom can be used all day long.
- The only class looked at was soccer. Other classes use that field, for example, golf, and weight training.
- The team classes (practices) are held from 2:00 – 6:00 p.m. Athletic teams practice more than 10 hours a week.
- Not included in the grid are the games. The College could have up to 30-40 games every fall semester. In addition, out of season games are played now.
- Track is a high use facility
  - High schools are using the track for track meets
    - Could help with enrollment/recruiting
  - The track usage by high schools created problems for HPEA as the off season football classes are on the track
Football coach has worked a plan by using old soccer field

- Field is not like a classroom, it has to be mowed, fertilized, arreated, lined for competition and time for rehabilitation.
- Many other colleges have to run team classes (practices) in the morning due to limited field space.
  - Problem with that is that it is during the peak academic period
  - After having practice, athletes may not feel like working out then having to go to a lecture class
- HPEA is disappointed that they have to justify field space.
- Dismayed that putting a parking lot at field space is equivalent to student success.
- There are no lights on the field, hence no field usage from 7:00 -10:00 p.m.
- It was suggested that the graph be “grayed-out” during times of darkness so that those do not appear as available field times.
- Average the number of hours per week that the field is being maintained.
- Have the graph reflect how many games are on the field during the year, including the non season games.

Mr. Farmer’s response to the above suggestions:

- He was simply responding to a request from the committee.
- He now has an added request from a Board member. He wants to give accurate data to the Board. He thanked the committee for sharing their opinions.

Other options were discussed with Dr. Smith regarding the remaining fields and if they could be converted to parking. Dr. Smith provided his reasons as why the remaining fields could not be used for parking.

Mr. Farmer stated that he is not singling out HPEA to justify their space anymore than he would look at how every division uses its space. The difference is that with regular classes he can verify classroom usage with the class schedule. Because the fields are used for games and other activities, he cannot as easily account for the field usage. He noted that the College needs to justify our space because we know from Ms. Shepley that we have too much space, and that we don’t use it efficiently. We, as a College, need to ensure that we use all our space efficiently so we can qualify for more space from the State.

Ms. Higdon asked Ms. Shepley what would be the best way to make schemes D & E available to the committee for further review. After discussion it was decided that the two schemes would be placed on the Cerritos College intranet for the committee to review.

Dr. Vela added that what the schemes present do not address another interest of the Board - to preserve the strawberry field acreage for future investments. What the two proposed schemes present is an erosion of a future potential revenue generating asset.
Dr. Vela also added that the Board has not taken official action on the CDC and Fine Arts FPPs. It was suggested that Ms. Higdon prepare a board item for the June 4, 2008 meeting that requests the approval to proceed with the CDC and Fine Arts FPPs in the locations discussed at the CTC meeting.

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

VI. NEXT MEETING: JUNE 5, 2008 @ 3:30 P.M.
The next CTC meeting is scheduled for June 5, 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 5:20 p.m.