I. CALL TO ORDER
Ms. Higdon called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. Ms. Higdon stated to the committee that HPEA requested to be taken off the March 13, 2008 agenda as they were attending basketball playoffs. HPEA has requested that their concerns be on the agenda for the April 3, 2008 meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - FEBRUARY 21, 2008
Ms. Bogdanovich moved that the minutes of February 21, 2008 be approved as presented. Dr. Mayfield seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with the following committee members abstaining: Dr. Aborn, Patrick O’Donnell for Lee
III. NAMING OF BUILDINGS (BP/AP 2900)
Dr. Peebles asked what process is going to be used to name the new buildings on campus. He suggested that the respective building user groups bring building name recommendations to the CTC committee for consideration. Ms. Higdon noted that when a building is being funded by State bond money, sometimes the College would have to leave the building name in place for a certain period of time. Ms. Shepley also noted that there are many ways to name buildings. This is often part of an overall planning approach for the entire campus as opposed to building-by-building. It is usually part of an overall goal to also improve the way-finding around the campus. Mr. Ernest responded that it would not be good to strip any kind of identity from the College’s individual programs around campus. It is imperative in terms of way-finding to allow students to understand which building they are entering, i.e. Business Education Building. He requested that the CTC committee be allowed to review those designs that are being considered with regard to way-finding. There are a number of different configurations and designs, along with durability and ADA issues. He would not like to see these really important graphic design decisions being made without being discussed with the CTC committee. A committee discussion ensued with the following suggestions:

- IT requested that building names have unique, abbreviated two (2) letter designations.
- If building names change, it is imperative that the campus community, maps, publications, directories, etc. all have the information and the correct names of the buildings.

Ms. Higdon noted that many colleges, when they start major building projects, hire a sign consultant to assist them with signage on campus along with an overall plan for way-finding. Ms. Bogdanovich made a motion that a sub-committee of the CTC be formed in order have further discussion with regard to both building names and way-finding. Any recommendations/suggestions would be brought to the CTC committee for review. Mr. Fronke seconded the motion. There were no objections. The following committee members volunteered to serve on the sub-committee: Dr. Aborn, Holly Bogdanovich, Roger Ernest, Tim Kyllingstad, Dr. Peebles, Robert Riffle, tBP representative and a student representative.

IV. BUSINESS EDUCATION CONCERNS
Mr. Fronke presented to the CTC committee a handout which outlined the Business Education Division concerns. This handout outlined the following: a) age of the building; b) change in priority; c) safety hazards; d) functionality; and e) suggested solutions. Also included in the handout were the following: a) the list of projects from the educational and facilities master plan – 1997. When it was noted that the Business Education building was the #2 priority, Mr. Fronke mentioned that Ms. Higdon had previously presented to the Faculty Senate that the Business Education Building was never the #2 priority which was untrue; b) WSCH projections from the 1997 master plan. When it was noted that a comment was made by Ms. Higdon at the January 31, 2008 CTC meeting regarding a drop of 50% in WSCH which changed the priority for the Business Education building plans. The information presented by Mr. Fronke showed that the actual decrease in WSCH was 14% and any decisions made should be re-evaluated; c) copies of pictures of the conditions of some of the areas within the BE Building and d) the
Cerritos Community College District statement of net assets as of June 30, 2007. Mr. Fronke requested that the CTC committee review these documents closely as the BE Building is in need of some serious renovation soon. Faculty members from the Business Education Division also spoke to the CTC committee and expressed their frustrations and concerns regarding the current condition of the BE Building.

Ms. Higdon thanked Mr. Fronke for his comprehensive report. It was suggested that the CTC committee take a tour of the BE building to look at the issues Mr. Fronke spoke about. Ms. Higdon asked that Bovis Lend Lease, Robert Riffle and a representative from tBP walk through the BE Building and provide her with a very rough estimate regarding the cosmetic issues in the BE Building. She reminded the committee that any changes to the building would be cosmetic only. Once any structural, electrical, restroom upgrades, etc are done, current building codes are enforced and the College will be in the same position as we were with the Liberal Arts Building.

Concerns were brought forward regarding the structural integrity of the BE Building and if it would be able to withstand an earthquake. Ms. Higdon informed the CTC committee that the BE building was reviewed in detail by the State and it did not make the list of buildings that according to the State were the worst of community colleges that needed to be retro-fitted. She reminded the committee that building codes change. When a building is built, it is built under the code that is in existence at the time that you are constructing it. You are not required to bring a building up to code until you start doing substantial renovations to a building.

Mr. Betancourt requested that while the College looks further into the BE building issues, that it continue to move forward with the current projects and the State funding requests. Ms. Higdon concurred.

V. FIVE-YEAR CONSTRUCTION PLAN

Ms. Higdon noted that included in the handouts was a copy of the College’s draft five year construction plan. This handout had been provided and reviewed by the CTC committee at a previous meeting. At that time, the CTC committee was asked to review the five year construction plan and to bring back to the committee any questions or concerns. Ms. Higdon noted the following: a) the five year construction plan can be changed at any time, even once it has been submitted to the Chancellor’s Office; b) this five year construction plan does not preclude the on-going discussions regarding the quad, HPEA and BE Building concerns.

Mr. Ernest requested clarification of an FPP. He asked if the FPP stipulates the exact architectural configuration of the building. Ms. Shepley replied that the FPP has a project scope which indicates spaces in the building, the general configurations and location. Mr. Ernest inquired if the building site of an FPP can be changed. Ms. Higdon replied that after an FPP is approved for funding it cannot change location. That is a requirement by the State. Mr. Ernest asked if the proposed Burnight Center location that is on the current master plan is solidly locked in. Ms. Higdon replied yes.

Ms. Higdon asked the committee if there were any objections with the College’s five year construction plan. No objections were noted. Ms. Higdon requested that tBP/Architecture submit the College’s five year construction plan to the Chancellor’s Office.

VI. INFRASTRUCTURE PHASE III
Mr. Riffle provided to the committee an infrastructure phase III update. Mr. Jones added that due to the demolition and rebuilding of the Liberal Arts Building, the current phone infrastructure currently housed in Liberal Arts needs to be moved to a new location which has been identified in the LRC.

Ms. Higdon noted that budgeting on constructions projects are done with a rough order of magnitude (ROM) budget. These are estimated budgets. With some additional site information such as the increased scope to complete the loop on campus, the estimated cost to complete this portion of Phase III has increased approximately $3 million (well within the 15% contingency amount allocated for project uncertainties). She informed the CTC committee that the completion of this project is critical to the College and in the long run will save money from our future operating budget. Therefore, the College needs to move forward with the bidding process on Phase III, using GO Bond contingency dollars. She requested that if any committee member had any objections or further questions, please see her immediately. No objections were noted. Dr. Peebles inquired if the College had used GO Bond contingency funds before. Ms. Higdon replied that the College has used GO Bond contingency funds for other projects, the most recent being the change of the Liberal Arts from a remodel to a new building.

VII. FURNITURE UPDATE
Ms. Higdon noted that the College has the opportunity to review classroom furniture from three (3) vendors. An announcement will be sent to the committee informing them of the date and time of the preview. There will be review sheets located in the room. If you could please take a moment to provide any feedback, that would be helpful in the classroom furniture process.

VIII. NEXT MEETING: APRIL 3, 2008 @ 3:30 p.m.
The next meeting is scheduled for April 3, 2008 at 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room.

IX. ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR
Mr. Ernest requested that the Liberal Arts building be placed on the next CTC agenda. He also requested that the CTC committee receive a copy of the 2007 master plan update as well as the project schematic timeline.

X. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.