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I. CALL TO ORDER
Ms. Higdon called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m.

Ms. Higdon shared that an addendum regarding the Five Year Construction Plan was taken to the Board on June 4, 2008. She explained that a correction needed to be made on item #6 (Liberal Arts Building Replacement) on the State form. The numbers reflected on item #6 had the old costs that were associated with the renovation, rather than the new costs for the replacement. The addendum was approved by the Board.

She also reported that the Board unanimously approved the two FPPs (CDC and Fine Arts) to move forward to the State.

Dr. Reece moved that the May 15, 2008, minutes be approved as presented. Dr. Mayfield seconded. Michael Barrita and Dan O’Rourke abstained. The motion passed.
Mr. Fronke requested that the minutes be changed as follows:

*Mr. Fronke stated that he is concerned with the studies done regarding the renovation of the Liberal Arts building. He suggested exploring and comparing the costs of renovation of the Liberal Arts building versus a tear down and rebuilding of a new structure. He thinks there are a lot of other issues we need to resolve as a committee before we get to the point of figuring out exactly where certain buildings are going to be located and when they are going to be built. He added that the issues of CDC, Fine Arts and HPEA have been solved; it’s time to stop there and re-evaluate move forward.*

Ms. Higdon requested that Dr. Bob Hughlett be added as a guest of the May 15, 2008 and May 22, 2008 CTC meetings.

Dr. Reece moved that the May 22, 2008 minutes be approved as presented. Mr. Fronke seconded. ML Bettino, Holly Bogdanovich, Ni Bueno, Dan O’Rourke, and Patricia Robbins Smith abstained. The motion passed.

III. REVIEW OF MASTER PLAN OPTIONS
It was noted that the two options the committee favored the most are on the Cerritos College intranet for committee review.

Ms. Higdon began the discussion by indicating that the two main items the CTC should focus on are the future sites of the Liberal Arts building and the Classroom Lab Office Complex (CLO) #2. She explained that there are time-sensitive issues relating to the Liberal Arts building as the building cannot move forward with design until a site is determined.

Mr. Fronke announced that he did a poll of the Business Division and received feedback from 75% of the staff. They voted unanimously that the moving of the Business Education building to a location other than where it currently exists is unacceptable to
the Business Division. At some point the CTC has to address the Business Division concerns. Also, the Business Division does not like the idea of losing the building’s identity (always been named the Business Education building) and now called “CLO #2,” as well as having a new location.

Mr. Fronke added that a significant department in the Business Division (Court Reporting) is currently housed in the Fine Arts building. When the Fine Arts building is replaced, where will the Court Reporting Department be located? The future location of the Court Reporting Department has yet to be discussed. At some point the location of the Court Reporting Department will have to be addressed as they are housed in a significant part of the Fine Arts building.

Mr. Nance stated that since it appears that the current administration will not unbundle Computer and Information Sciences (CIS) from Business Education that the CIS Department unanimously concur with Mr. Fronke. If CIS is going to be with the Business Division, then they want to be in the current location that the Business Education building is presently located.

Dr. Aborn noted that in the Liberal Arts/DSPS User Group meeting, the group reviewed the proposed options in more detail. The User Group together with the architects talked about the advantages and disadvantages of the different site locations, what the footprint would provide, and what some of the challenges would be related to the building itself. Ms. Shepley added that the User Group reviewed the potential three sites for the Liberal Arts building. The building sites reviewed were: 1) the current location of the Liberal Arts building as designated in the 2007 approved Master Plan; 2) Option D, which places the Liberal Arts building south in the current location of the Physical Science building; and 3) Option E, which places the Liberal Arts building on the corner of Alondra/Studebaker.

Ms. Shepley provided to the committee a brief overview of the pros and cons of the various options. Listed below is the overview:

**MASTER PLAN**

*Pros*
- (none identified)

*Cons*
- Increased disruption to students
- Loss of FTES
- More cost for swing space; more space to move

**OPTION D**

*Pros*
- Open area south of SS for students
- Swing space savings ($); less space
OPTION D - CONTINUED

Cons
- Sandwiched between buildings
- Long and narrow
- Blocks view to CLO #1
- Limited flexibility

OPTION E

Pros
- Open space is better
- More open space around building
- Open space south of SS
- More ops for design flexibility
- Preserves existing landscape
- Easy to find; visible location
- Direct access to SS and Admin
- More outdoor ops for instruction
- Closer access to parking/drop-off
- Easy access to other classrooms
- Swing space savings ($) less space
- Safer evacuation
- Less disruption to students and staff
- Provides improved phone switch option

Cons
- Too close to parking?
- Traffic and noise?

There was general consensus that Option E was preferred.

Dr. Aborn added that from a DSPS perspective there were three things that DSPS constituents felt were most advantageous with Option E. They were: 1) location and proximity to parking and the ability of individuals to easily get to the building; 2) flexibility of design, allowing for more incorporation of accessibility issues that might be helpful for access to both the interior to the campus as well as from the parking lot; and 3) the relationship to the other buildings themselves, the classroom buildings for access purposes.

Mr. Ernest also added that one of the motivating elements in all of the designs was to minimize the number of moves that each one of these departments would have to make because that would represent a substantial savings to the College. From a Liberal Arts standpoint, they were looking at Option D. Option D’s drawback is that it has less density than the initial proposed plan of constructing the Liberal Arts Building where it is
currently located. Option E opened up the space, and he was sympathetic to Mr. Fronke’s and Mr. Nance’s frustration of being moved around. At the same time, Liberal Arts were being sensitive to DSPS issues, parking issues, and accessibility issues.

Dr. Reece inquired about construction option timelines with Option E. Ms. Shepley replied that it doesn’t necessarily change the implementation plan but would require a temporary location for the occupants of the Business Education building. Ms. Higdon added that one of the things to remember is the amount of students that are impacted by what the College does with each of these plans.

Dr. Reece asked: what are the deadlines for the CTC to make a decision on either Option D or Option E? Ms. Higdon responded that she sees two conflicting issues. They are the following:

- The Liberal Arts/DSPS User Group has great synergy and has done a lot of work in terms of the layouts of the Liberal Arts building. It is important to keep the design going. Her fear is that the process will be slowed down too much.
- Regardless of what change is made, it is important that the options have a full campus community viewing and have input from everyone. She stated that Campus Forums and having a study session or first/second readings to the Board are important steps in the process. She reminded the CTC that the Board is the decision maker.

Ms. Shepley added two things happen with the delay in the Liberal Arts building. They are the following: 1) the implementation plan is designed so that as soon as CLO #1 opens, the Liberal Arts Building could begin. If there is an empty Physical Science building and a lot of Technology is empty because of the move to CLO #1, the College would not be taking advantage of the swing space; and 2) the longer we delay construction, the more construction costs could escalate.

Ms. Nolan commented that the CTC needs to look at the functional minimum requirements for each building.

Mr. Fronke noted that when the Master Plan is changed and the College removes the Business Education building, then there is an identity issue. Ms. Higdon replied that there is only money to build one building. When we look at the building which has the most impact on students, faculty, and staff, there is no question that the Liberal Arts building is impacted by the usage. Mr. Fronke added that if CTC adopts Option E, that will put the Liberal Arts building where the Business Education building currently resides. There will be no funding to build a Business Education building. Ms. Higdon responded that there has never been funding for a Business Education building in the current GO Bond. There would need to be another GO Bond issued to support the many projects. She reminded the committee that if State-funded projects (CDC or Fine Arts) get dropped as State funded, then these projects would need to be funded with a
second GO Bond. Other CTC members commented on the need for other projects, as well.

Dr. Reece recommended that Option D and Option E go forward to the Campus Community for review and input at the beginning of the fall semester. Ms. Higdon added that her goal is to take information to the Board in October.

Ms. Nolan noted that CTC needs to have a discussion on the amphitheater concept. Mr. Ernest added that when the CTC begins discussions about the amphitheater, students, theater staff, and Holly Bogdanovich need to be involved in the discussions to ensure that the theater can serve multiple functions.

Mr. Fronke noted that in his review of all the CTC minutes from the past, that anytime discussions of the Business Division were brought forward, they were never addressed. A User Group was never formed for the Business Division. He reiterated that the Business Division continues to be moved aside. Ms. Higdon explained to Mr. Fronke that user groups are not formed until such time a construction project is ready to begin. She asked if it would be helpful if the CTC saw the current usage of the Liberal Arts building vs. the Business Education building. Mr. Fronke asked if Ms. Higdon was implying that the Liberal Arts Division be a priority because it is a bigger division than the Business Division. Ms. Higdon replied that she thought it may be useful for the committee to see the usage comparisons between the buildings. He concurred that the Liberal Arts Division is a larger division, but that does not negate the fact that the Business Division has been set aside.

A lengthy committee discussion ensued regarding presenting the Master Plan options to the campus community via campus forums. Below is a recap of the committee comments/suggestions:

- It is important to get as many people as possible behind a shared idea of a master plan.
- The CTC committee is more inclusive and has more participants, but it is still dominated by managers, supervisors and administrators. The idea is to get the greater community involved with input from faculty, staff, and others. In an educational institution when we can pit efficiency in terms of dollars and times against effectiveness, the College should first look at effectiveness, the rightness of our decisions, and the processes that they place. Efficiency will sometimes have to take a back seat because otherwise we could rush to judgment and/or decisions which in the long run aren’t going to serve our overall community.
- Before campus forums are held, it would be important for the CTC to determine what the role of the participants in the forum will be. We must be clear what the role will be.
- Should the CTC let the campus community know what option the committee prefers?
Ms. Higdon summarized the discussion as follows:

- The CTC is in agreement that the College needs to go through the process of having campus forums as soon as staff/faculty returns in the fall. This is the correct thing to do even though it will delay the Liberal Arts building. The committee concurred.

During the CTC discussion, some members inquired about specific aspects of the Master Plan. Below is a recap of the discussion:

- Can CIS/Business Education all be located within the Liberal Arts Division Building? It was noted that if the Liberal Arts building were expanded to include BE/CIS, the cost would be prohibitive. In addition, it would pull away from CLO #2.
- A question was asked regarding other capital fundraising. Ms. Higdon replied that Steve Richardson, Executive Director of Foundation, could be agendized for a future CTC meeting to discuss capital campaigns.

A discussion then took place regarding how many Master Plan options should be presented and should there be a CTC recommended option announced in the campus forums. The discussion centered around the following options with the current Master Plan being the third option along with Option D and Option E:

- Take two Master Plan options forward to the campus forums and provide no indication in which option the CTC prefers;
- Take three Master Plan options forward to the campus forums and provide no indication of which Master Plan option the CTC prefers;
- Take two/three Master Plan options forward to the campus forums with an indication of which Master Plan option the CTC prefers.

The committee agreed to the last bullet point: Take two/three Master Plan options forward to the campus forums with an indication of which Master Plan option the CTC prefers.

A straw poll was taken by the CTC members as to which Master Plan option is the one most preferred by the CTC. An official vote will be taken at the next scheduled meeting.

Scheme C (Current Master Plan) = 0 votes
Scheme D = 3 votes
Scheme E = 24 votes
IV. **ACTUAL SOCCER FIELD USAGE FIGURES**
Dr. Smith distributed his Soccer Field Use figures. Also distributed were Mr. Farmer’s field usage figures. Due to time constraints, the agenda item was not discussed. It was requested that committee members bring the distributed information back to the next CTC meeting.

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

VI. **NEXT MEETING: JUNE 19, 2008 @ 3:00 P.M.**
The next CTC meeting is scheduled for June 19, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. in the Board Room.

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

VIII. **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting was adjourned at 5:19 p.m.