I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Albanese called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 4, 2008
Dr. Reece moved that the September 4, 2008 minutes be approved as presented. Dr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed.
III. **CAMPUS PARKING PRESENTATION**

John McMurray from tBP/Architecture provided the following two (2) handouts:

- Current Parking Breakdown/Re-striping Breakdown
- Master Plan document with parking breakdown for each parking area.

During his discussion the following was noted:

- The College has angled parking at 60 ft centers. 90° parking works with 60 ft centers.
- When the College re-stripes the parking lots, the net gain of parking spaces is +617.
- The College gains more stalls in a given space if we go to 90° rather than diagonal.
- The College has the ability, without losing any spaces, to have diamond shaped planters in the parking lots.
- The ADA issues are all addressed.
- The motorcycle class parking needs have been addressed.
- It was noted that “head-in” signs for the parking spaces will be addressed at a later time.

The committee made the following comments/suggestions regarding the two (2) documents:

- It was noted that C17 & Gridley Road were not converted to perpendicular parking. It was explained that those two (2) lots were not wide enough for the 60 ft clearance needed for 90° parking.
- The area between the pool and tennis courts could be developed for additional parking.
- It was asked if there were any plans for designated motorcycle parking with in-ground locks. It was noted that, at this time, there are no plans. Motorcycle parking issues can be brought forward when the parking lots are being re-done.
- It was asked if there was any code about supplying hook-ups for electric vehicles. It was explained that there is no code, but the District will follow-up with AQMD to see if they bring any program forward.
- The College needs to be looking at the allocation of blue curb stall parking and where these stalls will be located. The new pool will have a draw with individuals with disabilities and the College needs to keep in mind the distance that would be traveled from blue curb stalls to the location of the change facilities and the pools.

Dr. Albanese thanked the committee for their input and suggestions. He noted that the College does not have the resources to do all the parking lots. At some point, the College needs to address the question as to why Cerritos College has one of the lowest parking fees in the State. Parking fees can be used for maintenance of parking lots. The College will need to address parking fees at a future date with the entire campus community.
IV. **CAMPUS FORUM SURVEY RESULTS**

Dr. Reece presented a handout that summarized the results of the Facilities Master Plan Survey. As a result of the survey, the 187 responses reflected the following:

Question 1: To rate their preference with each facilities master plan.

Plan #1 (CTC Recommended Plan):
- 22.9% strongly rejected/rejected
- 59.4% preferred/strongly preferred

Plan 2 (CTC Alternate Plan):
- 34% strongly rejected/ rejected
- 44.4% preferred/strongly preferred

The results look to support what the committee agreed upon as the recommended plan.

Question #2 – To rate their preference with each (4) items.

- 48.1% strongly disagreed/disagreed that emphasizing convenient parking is more important than preserving green-spaces/landscaping.
- 51.6% agreed/strongly agreed to locating new buildings in the most ideal locations is more important than preserving mature trees.
- 51.1% strongly disagreed/disagreed to maximize parking efficiency; we should designate some parking spaces exclusively for compact cars.
- 54% agreed/strongly agreed that if it proves more efficient, we should consider converting diagonal parking spaces to perpendicular parking spaces.

Question #3 – what number of parking spaces do you think is adequate for parking on campus.

- 55.2% wanted an above average of 4500 parking spaces.

The comments for the survey were distributed. Because of the length of the document and the time needed to review the comments, Dr. Albanese suggested that the comments portion of the survey document be brought back to the next CTC meeting. The committee agreed.

Dr. Reece asked if the two documents (survey and comments) should be distributed to the campus community. The committee agreed that the two documents should be distributed.

Mr. Livingston commented that he thought the survey was very biased by indicating that Plan 1 was the CTC preferred plan. He thought people should just look at the plans and make their own decision. Dr. Reece explained that this very discussion took place at previous CTC meetings and the CTC voted to have a CTC recommended plan.
Dr. Reece suggested that the CTC make a recommendation to the President that Plan 1 be brought forward to the Board for approval as far as the placement of buildings, so that the College can move forward with the Liberal Arts Building.

Mr. Ernest stated that if the committee is going to make a recommendation of one plan to another, then we need to understand the costs of that plan, specifically as it speaks to swing space for Business Education and Fine Arts. Also, he feels badly that the Business Division feels at “loggerheads” with the rest of this committee and that from their perspective, they do not have an adequate solution to the questions they have raised. In addition, he feels badly that HPEA have felt marginalized.

Dr. Mayfield moved that the CTC submit a recommendation to the president based on the survey results that we just collected that Plan 1 be recommended to the Board of Trustees as regards to the location of the buildings. Dr. Aborn seconded. The motion passed.

The vote:
27 Yes
2 opposed
1 Abstention

V. **NEXT MEETING: OCTOBER 16, 2008 at 3:30 p.m.**
The next meeting is scheduled for October 16, 2008 at 3:30 p.m.

VI. **ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**
Dr. Peebles suggested that future/potential agenda items be placed on each CTC agenda. Dr. Albanese agreed to this suggestion. Dr. Peebles requested that Building Identification be a future agenda item. Dr. Albanese requested that the committee review the Board Policy/Administrative Procedures for naming of buildings.

Mr. Fortner suggested future agenda items of a recycling center and green study park.

Mr. Livingston added that the Business Division wants affirmation that there is a workable plan and that they will be able to maintain their programs. The Business Division has legitimate concerns and they would like to be addressed. If it is not discussed, the College would be doing a disservice to the Business Division. Dr. Albanese noted that he would discuss his request with Mr. Farmer.

Mr. Ernest requested that economic future and construction be added to a future agenda.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.