I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Vela called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - JANUARY 31, 2008 & FEBRUARY 7, 2008
Ms. Higdon moved that the minutes of January 31, 2008 and February 7, 2008 be approved as presented. Dr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Farmer requested a clarification to the February 7, 2008 meeting minutes. On Page 6 under FTES, bullet number five, the sentence should read: Mr. Farmer stressed that while he appreciated the faculty’s important role in the development of new programs (which happens primarily through the curriculum committee), no one should treat requests from faculty or anyone else without a critical eye.

III. STATE-WIDE BOND ISSUE – NOVEMBER 2008
Ms. Higdon stated that she has received information from the State that the new performing arts center will be on the next state-wide bond. As has been stated previously, it is anticipated that the next state-wide bond will be in November 2008. Dr.
Vela reminded the committee that while the College anticipates the next state-wide bond to be in November 2008, things can change and the date may change.

IV. RENDERINGS
Mr. Riffle presented to the committee architect renderings and brief project descriptions of the Classroom/Lab/Office Building #1; Auto Technology; and the pool. Ms. Higdon added that all the respective user groups have already seen the renderings, and with the exception of the Classroom/Lab/Office Building #1, the previous CTC committee has also viewed the renderings.

Dr. Vela added that with the Auto Technology New Building project, this building is being built with the assistance of a capital campaign through the Cerritos College Foundation. This capital campaign began in January 2007, with a goal to raise $4.8 million dollars to help support part of the cost of this facility. This is another example of the District leveraging resources so that bond dollars can be stretched to fund additional approved bond projects.

The committee asked questions regarding campus standards for buildings and if new buildings on campus are to be “green.” Mr. Jones explained to the committee what the campus standards consisted of and also explained that the new buildings on campus will be built pursuant to Title 24 specifications, including many energy efficiencies.

V. WEB SITE
Mr. Riffle described for the committee how to get to the Facilities Master Plan Website. He noted that the Web site is a work in progress and encouraged committee members who have comments or suggestions for the Web site to contact him directly. Ms. Higdon noted the previous CTC minutes would be added to the Web site.

Dr. Vela thanked Mr. Riffle and Bovis Lend Lease for their hard work in developing the Web site.

VI. NAMING OF BUILDINGS (BP/AP 2900)
It was noted that this agenda item was requested by CTC member Dr. Peebles. Since he was absent from this meeting, it was requested that this agenda item be brought back to the next CTC meeting.

Ms. Higdon reminded the committee that no area “owns” square footage on this campus. The exception would be dedicated labs in which only certain classes can be held such as Physics Labs.

Mr. Fronke noted that he believed the room scheduling program, Schedule 25, was purchased with the intent of solving the campus’ classroom scheduling issues. Ms. Krichmar replied that Schedule 25 helped, but one of the flaws is that the College has the ability to pre-assign space, and a lot of pre-assigning of space is occurring. This leaves only the balance of the classrooms available in the system.

Mr. Fronke also noted that students want to have a “home” base with the College trying to promote an environment where students can congregate outside of class. Dr. Vela replied that in Classroom/Lab/Office Building #1 there will be division offices, conference rooms and reading areas, allowing for “homes” for divisions. Regarding classrooms, those classrooms that don't have specialty equipment should be available for other classes through Schedule 25 to increase our efficiency of utilization. Mr. Farmer added
that the College needs to work on beginning and ending times of classes so they are more synchronized for the benefit of students, maximizing their time on campus. Dr. Vela noted that the College does not want to lose the opportunity to qualify for more State funds. It is important to right-size and get room inventory correct to maximize the utilization of rooms.

Mr. Fronke added a cause for concern is that during a previous CTC meeting it was noted that the campus is over-built in some areas. How does the College get back to where we need to be in terms of building what needs to be built? Ms. Higdon replied that when a building is reconstructed as new or a major renovation (structural changes in a building) is undertaken, the College then has the ability to look to see if there are better ways to redesign more efficient use of spaces and more shared spaces – right-sizing.

Mr. Betancourt requested that in the future, the naming of buildings should take into account the following: 1) Does the College get the opportunity to change the name of a building once funds are received from the State; and 2) if a building receives donor funds, is the College going to rename the building?”

Dr. Vela noted that these points will be brought back to another CTC meeting and suggested that the committee read BP/AP 2900 to familiarize themselves with the policies. These policies can be found on the Cerritos College Web site.

VII. ROLE OF USERS’ GROUP & HOW DO WE ADDRESS ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN OF BUILDINGS

Mr. Jones explained to the committee that one of the key roles of the users’ group in either a renovation or a design of a new building is to identify issues diagrammatically and how it relates to resolution for a particular program. Listed below are the roles that users’ groups play in the design/renovation of a building:

- Identify issues diagrammatically and how they relate to resolution for a particular program;
- The next step is the design development phase. This is the phase when the users’ group begins to look more at how each space is used. The users’ group provides the background information of how the physical space in which they have to work needs to be used.
- Once design development is completed, the construction document phase is the final phase in which the users’ group “signs off” on the project. They have been through each step and accepted each step up.

As far as architectural design, the College does have design guidelines for architects and engineers in the form of campus standards. It is not the intent of the College to take away the architects design license, but to guide the architect in representing each building to compliment the other buildings on campus.

A committee discussion ensued regarding the role of the users’ group with the following questions being asked:

- Is there any building in the current master plan that addresses the need for more instructional space for student support programs on campus, i.e., Transfer Center, Puente, Project Hope? It was noted, as previously stated in the last CTC meeting, there is space available for those programs. As far as addressing
space needs for programs/departments, that is one of the roles of the users’ group with space issues discussed at length.

- Once the Administration Building becomes the home for student services programs, can building modifications be made to the Administration Building? It is an option, but at this time it is unknown what the structure can withstand as far as modifications. Discussions would take place between the users’ group and the architects to discuss space requests for each area/department/program. As a reminder, the College must stay within the State standards and building code regulations.

- It was requested that if the Administration Building is expanded that meeting space for Financial Aid, EOPS, and Cal Works be considered.

- How do new campus programs get assigned space? It was noted that buildings are built to last a long time. Programs change, educational approaches change. The College has to be adept to change and the new buildings must be designed to be flexible for future use.

- It was stated that building user groups are not formed until the project is nearer to starting. The next user group that has been formed is the Liberal Arts User Group with their first meeting being held on March 7, 2008.

- If the next state-wide bond passes, the performing arts center would be the next user group to be formed.

- Who handles the security aspects particularly with regard to the on-guard system, and who presents this information to the architects? The on-guard system is in the campus standards. The architects meet with the vendor who supplies the program and this is incorporated into the planning process. Jerry Jones and Tim Kyllingstad will meet to further discuss this issue.

- It was requested that IT be a part of the building users’ groups. It was explained that IT is involved in the project, just later as the user group gets to the detail of the building. In most cases, the architect will meet directly with IT to go over IT specifications.

Ms. Higdon was asked to describe the process for establishing a user group. Since the Liberal Arts Building is the most current building user group, Dr. Rose described for the committee how the users’ group for the Liberal Arts building was formed, ensuring representation from every department. The following is the structure for the Liberal Arts Building User Group:

**Facilities:** Robert Riffle  
**CA/OR:** Jerry Jones  
**Vice President of Business Services:** Jo Ann Higdon  
**Vice President of Academic Affairs:** Mr. Farmer or his designee (since building is instructional)  
**DSPS Administrator:** Dr. Aborn or her designee (College representative for ADA issues)  
**DSPS Representative:** Dr. Kay Follett (DSPS program representative)  
**Representatives from Liberal Arts & CIS:** Barbara Belroy, Roger Ernest, Wendell Hanks, Sala Maunatu, Bernie Negrete, Inge Potter, Linda Rose, Joann Sugiyara-Cheetham and Jack Swanson.
VIII. ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR
Ms. Welliver brought up the following HPEA concerns:

- An additional reason to save all the tennis courts is not just for regional play. All 12 tennis courts would come into need when you have a large tennis class and the instructor can run a singles tournament.

- Was there a study completed for the proposed placement of the CDC? *There was a tremendous amount of discussion two to three years ago with regards to various location options for the CDC. The former CTC committee recommended the current proposed location for the CDC.*

- It was suggested that the committee needs to think of the CDC as not only the place where pre-school children attend school, but to consider it a lab school.

- The soccer field is a time sensitive issue. What is the timeline? What is process for this topic coming back to the committee for a decision? *It was noted that the CTC committee, as well as the architects, were told to begin thinking about a proposed new location for the CDC and all the domino effects of changing its proposed location. The architects did indicate that they would not be available to attend this CTC meeting due to a previous commitment. That was the only reason HPEA concerns were not on the agenda. Dr. Vela reminded the committee that they need to look at the campus as a whole. When things change, and if this committee is supportive of relocating the CDC from its proposed location, then there needs to be some ideas and some suggestions for a new CDC location and for recommended places for the parking spaces that need to be restored if we keep the current soccer field and all the tennis courts. As a reminder, the Board is the decision making body with regards to the adoption of the master plan.*

- It was stated that the Health Occupations (CDC) stakeholders need to be in attendance the next time this topic is discussed.

- It was requested that when a non-instructional building encroaches on an instructional space, that those staff who use that instructional space be involved in the user group process. *The only two non-instructional buildings currently being worked on are the central plant and Facilities Building. If anyone has any concerns with regard to the placement of the Facilities Building, please contact Jo Ann Higdon ASAP.*

- The committee was reminded that as area representatives it is imperative that information from this committee be shared with their respective areas. It is important that the College continue to move forward and not revisit things that are already in process.

In closing this discussion, Dr. Vela noted that this continues to be a very complex issue and needs to be further reviewed. In recap the following is suggested:

- HPEA Division would like to keep the old soccer field.
  - If the old soccer field stays in its location, then another location for the same number of parking spaces would need to be found.

- Move the CDC to another location.
  - Suggested locations for the CDC are: where the current Physical Science Building resides; strawberry fields; near Campus Police/Avalon; and near Health Occupations.

- Committee members were asked to bring back ideas on how to meet the HPEA requests without losing parking spaces and identify a location for the Child Development Center (CDC).
• Have tBP provide the CTC Committee with information regarding loss/gain of square footage for each campus program.
• Have Mr. Farmer provide the committee with soccer FTES information.
• Retain all 12 tennis courts.
  o If all 12 tennis courts remain, another location for the same number of parking spaces would need to be found.

Mr. Fronke requested that Business Division concerns be placed on the next CTC agenda.

IX. NEXT MEETING
The next meeting for the College Committee on Campus Transformation is scheduled for March 13, 2008 at 3:30 p.m. Location to be determined.

X. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 5:28 p.m.