CERRITOS COLLEGE

CAMPUS TRANSFORMATION COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes

DATE: October 4, 2007

PRESENT

Campus Transformation Committee
Lucinda Aborn, DSPS/SS
David Betancourt, Faculty, Fine Arts Division
Roger Ernest, Faculty; Liberal Arts
William Farmer, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Toni Grijalva, CSEA
Jo Ann Higdon, Vice President, Business Services
Jerry Jones, CA/OR, Bovis Lend Lease
Linda Kaufman, Confidential
Jason Macias, ASCC
Connie Mayfield, Fine Arts Division/Dean; ACCME
Dan Smith, HPEA/Dean; ACCME
Randy Peebles, Technology/Business Divisions/Dean; ACCME
Bryan Reece, Faculty Senate President
Robert Riffle, Director of Physical Plant
Deborah Shepley, tBP/Architecture
Noelia Vela, President

ABSENT
Les Bell, CSEA
Stephen Johnson, Vice President, Student Services

Guests
Allison Abel, Public Affairs
Mark Wallace, Public Affairs

I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Vela called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 19, 2007
The minutes of April 19, 2007 were approved as presented.
III. PROJECT STATUS

- Soccer Field: The permanent fencing at the soccer field is being installed. The field is also being prepared to replace the irrigation and sod.
- Infrastructure: Phase I of the infrastructure project is underway.
- Automotive Technology New/Remodel: The architects are working on the drawings and it is anticipated that the drawings will be submitted to DSA prior to January 1, 2008.
- Classroom/Lab/Office Building: The architects continue to meet with the user group. The building is currently in the design phase.
- Gym Seismic: The State has approved that the College can move forward with the preliminary plans for this project. A user group will be formed soon to work directly with the architects on this project.
- Pool: The pool project is currently at DSA. Mr. Riffle and the architects will be meeting soon with DSA to clarify any questions DSA has with regard to the project; this is referred to as the “back check” phase of a project.

Dr. Vela inquired if the above construction projects were on schedule. Mr. Jones replied that the pool project is ahead of schedule, and the Classroom/Lab/Office building is behind schedule approximately 30 days. It is hoped that those 30 days can be made up during the construction period.

Dr. Aborn inquired about the status of the infrastructure project. Mr. Jones briefly explained the status of the project noting that the contractor will not be allowed to move forward to the next phase of the infrastructure project until all the surfaced areas that have been interrupted are covered. It is anticipated that Phase II of the infrastructure project will occur during the holiday break.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN UPDATE

Dr. Vela explained to the committee that during the fall semester the College brings to both the Board and the Campus Transformation Committee any update with regard to the Master Plan.

Ms. Shepley presented to the committee a power-point presentation which outlined the updated 2007 Master Plan. She indicated that the major change to the 2007 Master Plan was focused on the Liberal Arts Building. Ms. Higdon explained to the committee that a team of architects and engineers did a detailed analysis of the Liberal Arts Building to understand the required scope of work required by DSA in order to renovate the building. The original budget for the renovation of the Liberal Arts Building was $4.3 million dollars. After the detailed analysis was completed, the new cost to renovate the building was budgeted at more than $17 million dollars. It was explained that this was the cost to bring the Liberal Arts Building up to the new building codes (new building codes will be in effect beginning January 1, 2008). It was asked how much it would cost to tear down the Liberal Arts Building and build a new building. The answer would be that it would cost approximately $15 million dollars to build a new building ($2 million less than a renovation). With the possibility of building a new Liberal Arts Building, the sequencing of other projects was reviewed. This change provided the College an opportunity to review all College needs. The opportunity to relocate DSPS close to the one-stop shop was identified. Thus, the sequencing that was given a closer look was moving DSPS closer to the Student Services area.
Dr. Vela reminded the committee that the master plan is a living document and every time something changes it gives the College an opportunity to look at the whole picture and not have tunnel vision. This was an opportunity for the College to refresh our minds again about all the other needs on campus and the projects that are still on the table. With the detailed analysis completed on the Liberal Arts Building, the College realized this was an opportunity to maximize our resources.

Ms. Shepley thoroughly reviewed with the committee the 2007 Implementation Plan which outlined the proposed construction schedule for all GO Bond construction projects.

Questions/Comments:

Mr. Betancourt asked for the definition of a “ready access project?” Ms. Shepley replied that a ready access project is when the State gives the College all construction funds at one time, rather than distributing the funds in increments. This allows the College to access the funds as needed to complete the construction project. These funds include items such as the design of the project, working drawings, construction and equipment funds.

Dr. Aborn noted that the pool completion is expected in 2009 and the Physical Education structure with the change facilities is not expected to be completed until 2012. Individuals with disabilities utilizing the pool in 2009 would have to use the existing change facilities. She is concerned because the existing change facilities are inaccessible and would not be able to handle the increased number of users. Dr. Smith added that the existing change facilities need to be discussed further.

Ms. Shepley presented to the committee the Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) budget which outlined the state funded projects; Measure CC funded projects; and those projects that are anticipated for a future bond.

Questions/Comments:

Dr. Smith indicated that the gym seismic project originally had $1 million dollars budgeted from Measure CC, and he noticed that it no longer is in the Measure CC budget. Ms. Higdon explained that the gym seismic project was originally a $6 million dollar project. The State has now approved this project at $10.5 million. Ms. Shepley added the gym is an extensive seismic upgrade. The escalated amount will allow the district to do many things to accommodate the upgrade. Dr. Smith asked if paint and bleachers would now be covered in the $10.5 million. Ms. Shepley replied that paint would be covered; bleachers would need to be reviewed further. She added that the thought was as the College was looking to re-distribute the Measure CC funds, since the State has added additional funds to the project, that the $1 million dollars originally in the gym seismic line could be used elsewhere. The College has many other needs that have already been identified.

Dr. Vela indicated that there are opportunities for the HPE/A Division and other divisions on campus to fundraise. There are numerous opportunities for the College to begin to be thinking about fundraising opportunities, there are naming opportunities, donor, grants, etc. to augment Bond funds.
Dr. Vela added that in order to fund the new Liberal Arts Building, money was redistributed from other projects and from contingency. Also, the College is trying to develop a case for as many buildings as we can to qualify for state funds. Dr. Vela reminded the committee that the State allows only one state funded project at a time. It is imperative that the College strategize to maximize the amount of state funding the College can receive. The disadvantage of having state funded buildings is that the College has to wait, but the advantage is that we receive state funds for a building. Dr. Vela noted that the College can impress upon our community that we have been very strategic with the GO Bond funding and have worked hard to qualify for and receive as much money from the State. This information will be important when the College decides to go for another GO Bond.

A question was asked about the square footage of the proposed new Liberal Arts Building. While an exact square footage is unknown at this time, it was noted that it is important to look at the utilization of labs to maximize the utilization of the high-tech center and not have valuable resources go under-utilized. Ms. Shepley added that all buildings are right-sized to ensure that the entire campus is developed to state standards. This is very critical as every year the state scrutinizes the College’s space inventory when they consider whether or not a project should get funding. It is imperative that the College is placed in a competitive position in order to keep receiving the funds.

Dr. Vela closed by saying that the proposed new Liberal Arts Building does not change the master plan, it is a recommendation to build a new building instead of remodeling. In order to do this, the College has to reduce some of the formerly dedicated funds from signage and landscaping, but not away from existing classroom space. She asked the committee for any objections to the proposed 2007 master plan. No objections were made by the committee. Dr. Vela stated that the updated 2007 master plan, as just reviewed by the Campus Transformation Committee, would be presented to the Board at their October 17, 2007 meeting.

V. ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR

Mr. Ernest inquired about integrating shade structures and/or courtyards into the architectural plans for the new buildings. He feels it is important to incorporate these structures in the new buildings; otherwise the College could have these wonderful new buildings that become focused inward, with no inter-change with the inside or outside. Also, by integrating shade structures/courtyards, you invite students to linger on campus and become part of the campus community. Dr. Vela thanked Mr. Ernest for keeping the College mindful of these features. She indicated that in the new Classroom/Lab/Office Building #1, there is a plan for the east end of the building to be designed in such a way that it links with what the classrooms offer inside.

Dr. Mayfield requested that the new building being identified as the Burnight Center Theater be referred to as the Proposed Performing Arts Center. This maximizes opportunities for fundraising and facility naming opportunities.

Dr. Aborn stated the importance of communicating to our constituents, whether they are students, staff, or community members. Due to the urgency of the need for timely and regulation communication, she would like to see the construction website updated, especially when construction is going on that affects the paths of travel. She indicated that it is important information to share with the community, so that the community can embrace the positive changes that are occurring on campus. Dr. Vela noted that Ms.
Higdon is working with Bovis Lend Lease (the College’s CA/OR) to ensure that the website is up and running soon. She also noted that not only are the construction updates presented to various cities, twice a year every house in the District is mailed the “Insight.” The “Insight” updates the community on the latest happenings at the College.

Dr. Smith inquired if the District should have a feasibility study conducted with regard to having another bond. Dr. Vela replied that another feasibility study would need to be done because of the economic climate in the State. At this time the College has not yet determined when to go out for another bond.

VI. **NEXT MEETING**

Dr. Vela reminded the committee that the Campus Transformation Committee will meet again as needed.