

OHLONE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FACILITIES COMMITTEE
Fremont Campus – Room 1407

Minutes of Facilities Committee
April 22, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gari Browning, President/Superintendent
Mike Calegari, V.P., Administrative Services
Jim Wright, V.P., Academic Affairs
Joanne Schultz, Building 1: Floors 1 & 2
Elva Duval, Building 1: Floors 1 & 2
Kathy Sparling, Building 1: Floors 3 & 4
Walt Birkedahl, Building 2: Music/GE
Tim Roberts, Building 2: Music GE
Darren Bardell, Building 3: GE
Bruce Griffin, Building 4: Art/GE – IT Staff
Zuhal Bahaduri, Building 5: Cafeteria, Bookstore, Monitor
Mark Robbins, Building 5: Cafeteria, Bookstore, Monitor
Ann Burdett, Building 6
Ron Quinta, Building 8 and Hyman Hall Floor 1
Bob Bradshaw, Hyman Hall: Floor 2, English/ESL, Math, GE
Carmen Madden, Hyman Hall: Floor 2, English/ESL, Math, GE
David Wood, Hyman Hall: Floor 2, English/ESL, Math, GE
Fred Alim, Smith Center: Theater/Dance, Broadcasting
Chris Warden, Building 9
Lucky Lofton, Building 10

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ron Travenick, V.P., Student Services
Leta Stagnaro, A.V.P., Newark Center
Kevin Feliciano, Building 5: Cafeteria, Bookstore, Monitor
Steve Miller, Newark Center
Rick Arellano, Hyman Hall: Floor 1, CS

GUESTS: Carlene Nolan Pederson, tBP
Gary Frye, tBP
Mikelyn Stacey, Dean, Math, Ohlone College
Arti Damani, Bond Accountant, Ohlone College

MEETING: Mike Calegari opened the meeting at 1:04 p.m.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

1. Review Relocatable Science Village

Mike Calegari, Vice President of Administrative Services, briefly discussed the science labs. Looking at the labs and condition and come up with a solution to get Ohlone through the next 3-5 years until we build a new building. Instead of remodeling, there is an option to relocate these labs into portable buildings. San Joaquin Delta College has a set up like this at their Mountain House site. The labs would be fully functional and include all of the spaces needed for lab aids, storage, and hazardous materials. The district is looking into the cost of this option.

Gary Frye, tBP Architecture, stated that the possible location for the portable labs would be near Hyman Hall or in the area where buildings 25, 26, 14, 15, and 16 are currently located. The area near Hyman Hall would be much more preferable because of the flat elevation. Parking near Hyman Hall could move to the area where the portable buildings (14, 15, 16, 25 and 26) are currently located. Another possibility would include having the portable labs at Newark until the new building is built. Parking at the Newark Center would have to be addressed.

2. Review Master Plan Assumptions

Carlene Nolan-Pederson and Gary Fry, tBP Architecture, discussed the Master Plan assumptions for Ohlone College. Assumptions are defined as information gathered as an agreed upon base; a starting point, basic supporting factor or underlying principle. Then the design concept comes next and is defined as a generalized design idea guiding the creative direction of the planning process. The planning principle or goals would be the next step and these are defined as the intended result toward which effort is directed. The committee went through each of the assumptions and discussed, notes of the discussion are mentioned below in the assumptions list.

The Fremont Campus Master Plan is based on the following assumptions:
(Not in any particular order)

- The plan will fulfill the mission and goals of the college.
- Parking availability will be increased on the mid and upper level campus.
 - In the past, the District opened an RFP to create a parking structure on campus. The RFP failed to bring any viable offers.
 - The trek from the lower end of campus to the upper end is daunting.
- The Mission Blvd acreage will be developed in the future.
 - The District had opened an RFP and requested bids two times. Neither time succeeded, but there is still interest by developers in this property. This is an ongoing project and will be kept as an assumption as not to be forgotten.
- Instructional spaces and programs will be clustered by discipline on the campus.

- In the education master plan, there are proposed clusters including a Fine Arts complex, Science building and Deaf Studies. There is a need for adequate general purpose classrooms as well.
- There is a need for a more specific assumption for Business and Administrative Services. This department is all over the campus in pockets with regard to staff and files. Some work and files are repetitious because the department is not clustered.
- Ultimately there will be no portable buildings in the future.
- Improved indoor and outdoor gathering spaces will be developed.
 - ASOC, faculty and staff are interested in having these spaces on campus.
- Appropriate food service areas will be developed on the major levels of the campus.
 - Food service on the frontage property was an idea to help serve the needs of students, faculty and staff. In the meantime, there should be satellite areas on campus for food services.
- Campus accessibility for all students, staff and faculty will be achieved.
 - This is not easy to undertake and fulfill, but making the campus more accessible for all is an ongoing process and a major goal.
- The upper loop road will remain closed to traffic circulation.
 - This loop road will remain a fire access only. If opened, the volume of traffic would be a challenge and could be a problem with our neighbors on Witherly Lane.
- A new lower north-south campus loop road will be constructed.
 - A way to get from the north to south ends of campus needs to be proposed so that cars do not have to travel on Mission Boulevard to get across campus.
- The Fremont campus maintenance warehouse will remain in the current location.
 - Originally wanting to have the warehouse at the upper end of campus has proven to not be the best alternative. 18 wheelers constantly driving up to the top of campus would cause problems. Another alternative would be to have a cluster of maintenance workers at the higher end of campus in a satellite situation. Something has to be done to improve efficiency.
- Athletic fields will be relocated.
- The locations of the two campus entries from Mission Blvd. will remain as is.
 - Need to look at Olive Tree area to make it an inviting pedestrian entrance.
- The upper level pond will remain.
- The plan will determine the future of the water features on campus.
 - At this time the water features are not operating. There is a total cost of ownership that has exceeded the District's resources.
- City bus transportation will remain as currently routed on campus.
 - It was proposed to have the bus route stay at the lower end of campus, but this proposes an accessibility issue and drop offs will need to stay at the upper end of campus.

- Existing buildings that need replacement will be removed and replaced by new buildings.
- Natural day lighting is important for all renovations and new construction.
 - The views should be accounted for when constructing new buildings.
 - Natural lighting can be accomplished through windows and skylights.
- The college will adhere to the sustainable policies of the Board.
 - The idea of a solar farm was proposed by possibly putting it on surplus land. District goals include energy efficiency and energy sustainability.

3. Review Themes for Future GO Bond Measure

Lucky Lofton, Director of Facilities, discussed the need for themes for the potential General Obligation Bond Measure. He requested that the group brainstorm for ideas of what the themes would be to market to the voting public. The committee needs to be focused on ideas that would get the voters to support another bond.

Some of these ideas include:

- Operational and academic performance.
- How will a college built in 1970 educate people in 2010, 2020, 2030?
- Sell seismic upgrades.
- Better accessibility and parking, for disabled persons, staff, faculty, and students.
- Map of Campus with years built on each building.
- Protecting Ohlone's future.
- We need to get the business community to support our campaign.
- Safety issues. Science labs to recognize safety concerns, new equipment and new technology.
- "We're the 1st 2 years of Cal Berkeley"
- "Academic Excellence"
- "Maintain a competitive edge"
- Growth theme
- Lacking technology. Currently teaching into the future with lack of technology.
- Long term plan at college to be and remain excellent.
- Public would be supportive of energy efficiency.

The District will start to meet with Bond Counsel at the end of April and have a survey sent out in May. The above list of themes will be brought to the first meeting to craft the bond campaign.

4. Review Phasing

Carlene Nolan-Pederson went through the proposed phases of the Master Plan. The phases are described below:

Phase 1 – 2010 to 2016

- Renovate Building 1 to Accommodate Secondary Effects
- Main Street Development with Cyber Café (ongoing)

- Demolish buildings 14 – 26.
- Increase parking on upper campus on site of buildings 14 – 26.
- Portable Science Village east of Hyman Hall Location.
- Demolish Building 8.
- Renovate/Modernize building 3 and building 6.
 - FPP to the state to modernize into deaf studies and general classrooms.
Looking at Jan 2010 design if approved.
- Construct new Science building near existing building 8 site.
- Library (Building 1) South Side Library Plaza Development.
- Central pathway enhancement.
- Relocate baseball diamond and athletic snack shack development.
- Construct new parking facility on baseball diamond site.
- Living learning wetland enhanced development.
- Modernize cafeteria and bookstore.
- Library remodel/renovation.

Phase 2 – 2014 to 2020

- Developer agreement for Mission Property.
- Enhance crosswalks on Mission.
- Construct south parking garage.
 - Tiered parking structure on the south side of the Student Services Building.
- Develop Mission property.

Phase 3 – 2018 to 2024

- Construct new arts complex building number 2.
- Remove building 2 and expand the library plaza.

Phase 4 – Future Campus

- Construct north parking garage
- Design and construct new anchor building number 3 and 4 at end of Main Street.

All projects will be paid for by a mix of state funds and bond funds. State funding will possibly pay for modernization of buildings. The District can submit a FPP each year to modernize another building.

The college pool is a \$300K expense just to operate. Renovating the pool could substantiate into costs savings for the District. It is advised to show operating savings to the public during the campaign.

It was suggested that the soccer field be located in phase 1 instead of phase 2 because the field is deteriorating at a rate that would not allow for competition in the next few years.

Making an athletic field buffer between frontage property and parking would create a potential barrier for illegal parking, i.e. students parking on frontage property and/or patrons parking on campus lots. College patrons renting out fields would also be patrons of the frontage property. A crosswalk to the other side of Mission needs to be addressed.

5. Topics for Next Meeting

Planning Design Concepts
Master Plan Physical Planning Goals

The meeting concluded at 3:00 p.m.