

OHLONE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FACILITIES COMMITTEE
Fremont Campus Room 7101

Minutes of Facilities Committee
September 20, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gari Browning, President/Superintendent
Jim Wright, V.P., Academic Affairs
Ron Travenick, V.P., Student Services
Scott Thomason, Interim Chief Business Officer
Leta Stagnaro, A.V.P., Newark Center
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
Bruce Griffin, Building 4: Art/GE – IT Staff
Peter Lucido, Building 5
Rick Arellano, Hyman Hall: Floor 1, CS
Bob Bradshaw, Hyman Hall: Floor 2, English/ESL, Math, GE
Ann Burdett, Building 6
Ron Quinta, Building 8 and Hyman Hall Floor 1
Chris Warden, Building 9
Brian Adair, Building 10
Michael Martinez, Building 10
Phil Zimmerman, Building 10
Kelly Abad, Administrative Services (minutes)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Darren Bardell, Building 3: GE
David Wood, Hyman Hall: Floor 2, English/ESL, Math, GE
Carmen Madden, Hyman Hall: Floor 2, English/ESL, Math, GE
Fred Alim, Smith Center: Theater/Dance, Broadcasting

GUESTS: Don Eichelberger, Stegeman & Kastner (Measure A)
Ann Kennedy, Gilbane (Measure G)
Dustin Notarianni, Gilbane (Measure G)
Chris Wilson, Gilbane (Measure G)
Deborah Shepley, HMC
Cheryl Lentini, HMC
Charles Dilworth, HMC
Karen Chan, HMC
Arti Damani, Staff
Leslie Buehler, Staff
Patrice Birkedahl, Staff / PIO
Steve Osawa, Staff
Jennifer Parker, Staff

MEETING: Dustin opened the meeting at 10:36 a.m.

SCHEDULED ITEM

1. HMC Update

A. Timeline

Deborah Shepley, from HMC Architecture, went over the timeline for the District's Facilities Committee meetings.

9/20/11 Meeting:

- Review planning process and timeline.
- Review plan recommendations:
 - Fremont MP 2010
 - Newark MP 2003
- Review new information to consider – bridge document
- Review timeline for key decisions
- Define the givens and the variables
- Develop DFMP goals

10/11/11 Meeting:

- Discuss option development: review and evaluate options.
- Possibility of making a decision about building 1 at that meeting and hopefully it can become an early project

10/25/11 Meeting:

- Go over further developed options
- Review and evaluate options: swing space, baseball field

11/8/11 Meeting:

- Solution development
- Review draft DFMP recommendations

11/29/11 Meeting:

- Review draft DFMP recommendations
- District review and comment
- Develop final document

January 2012:

- Approvals and presentation –not sure which board meeting we're targeting.

Q: The District has already started scheduling Spring classes. Will the playing fields conversation would need to be discussed earlier because we have two programs that will be dislocated? Can it be assumed that the bond will be responsible for costs associated with renting other fields?

A: We want Solar up and running by July 1, 2012. Soccer gets impacted immediately by that timeline. Dustin: Construction starts in the Spring. Borrego has to go through the design process. Geo tech may happen as early as right now. It may be a possibility that the bond would be responsible.

B. Bridge Document

Highlights of the bridge document:

- Gas lines at Fremont Campus
- Solar fields
- Parking and baseball field impacts
- Soil issues
- Etc.

No discussion was done on the bridge document because everyone has seen it.

C. District Facilities Master Plan

Givens have programs that aren't going anywhere. The variables are items that can be changed or not cast in stone. Everything that is not a given can be labeled as opportunities. The reason items are flagged as a given is because there is nothing in the plans to move it or do anything with it.

Givens

- Building 7
- Hyman Hall is not going to be rebuilt
- Smith Center
- Building 1]
- Main Street
- Palm Bosque
- Tennis Courts

Variables

- Parking lots
- Fields
- Frontage property
- Buildings 2, 3, 4, 8

Q: What is happening with the CDC?

A: CDC is a given and Building 18 is a variable.

Q: Are the tennis courts a given?

A: As of this date, nothing is changing.

Q: The map shows a building above Hyman Hall. This was a print foot of a possible building and it has never gone away. Is there a reason why it is still there?

A: This is showing another alternate site for building. It is shown on the map, but there is no program for it at this time. It will be taken off of the map because there is no physical building.

We need to take off the building above 12. The solar fields are a given. The map shows the baseball field as a variable because we need to make a decision about it.

Q: Any discussions about building 5 or building 20? Palm Bosque?

A: No discussion about dropping the building or what we will do with them. The Palm Bosque is a part of our campus that we do not want to change.

Building 27 is a given, CDC is a given, 18 is a variable. Remodeling building 6 does seem viable; it is a variable building. District could make criteria for dropping a building if it is older than 20 years. Building 20 is historical. Age criteria does not apply for building 1 because it probably needs to be renovated because it is too hard to tear down.

Tennis courts do not have an intercollegiate program connected to it. It is sacred land to some, but not to the District. It is a variable.

HMC will make adjustments to the variables slide. Building 10 will be added to the variables. Three types of variables: maybe, definite, need to move because of something else.

D. District Facilities Master Plan Goals

DFMP goals: (drafts)

- Accessibility and safety
 - Ensure a safe and accessible campus day and night
 - Improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation patterns
 - Provide adequate parking for students, faculty, staff and visitors
 - Incorporate universal design concepts
- Functionality and infrastructure
 - Maximize functional space and transform to address program needs
 - Provide flexible, interdisciplinary learning environments
 - Right size campus facilities to align with state standards
 - Position the college to maximize funding opportunities – both state and local
- Sustainability
 - Continue to advance sustainable policies related to the facilities athletics and site development
 - Promote environmental awareness, inspire stewardship and instill pride and ownership
 - Establish and maintain high quality, locally sustainable, natural landscape palette

- Promote the use of cost effective renewable, non-depleting, energy sources for all projects
- Image and identity? Referred to in the books as “aesthetics”
 - Improve the identity/image of the campuses within the communities
 - Appreciate the surrounding natural environment
 - Create a variety of indoor/outdoor gathering spaces to promote collaboration

2. Measure G Update

A. Science Center Decision

Chris Wilson, from Gilbane, discussed the Science Center location. Will the Science Center be put on the Newark campus or Fremont campus? Gilbane has done a conceptual estimate of costs and there is a 7% variable between the two options. The 7% variable equals somewhere right around \$1M. If you tear the building down here, you have to put something back in its place. Building 8 is not sufficient for any programs. It is more cost effective to drop and build than to renovate building 8.

Q: Will the District have more space than we should have if the building moves to Newark?

A: Building 8 should probably be taken down if the building was built in another spot. We would have to fix the space where the building sat. If keeping building 8 or any portion of 8 is an option, there are some structural issues. The elevator and cooling tower are logistical issues.

Gilbane outlined 3 options:

- **Demolish and replace in existing location**
 - Advantages:
 - General education program can be at one location
 - Matches bond approval by voters (matches promise of rebuilding Fremont Campus)
 - Disadvantages:
 - Requires swing space during construction
- **Relocate to Newark Campus**
 - Advantages:
 - Swing Space not required
 - Science program can be at one campus
 - Disadvantages:
 - Programs split between campus requiring student to travel between classes
 - Soil remediation costs depending on location
 - Contrary to bond approved by voters
 - Staffing impacts for support services
- **Build south of Building 7 – Alternate location for Building 7 on Fremont Campus**
 - Advantages:

- Advantages from option 1
- Swing space not required
- Potential to minimize interruption to campus during construction
- Disadvantages:
 - Loss of parking spaces at the top of the campus
 - Loss of core campus structure

- **Option 4? – left open as optional**

One idea is to put it south of building 7 so that there are no problems with swing space. We have a three week timeline to make that decision. Think about the options and bring back the answers at the next meeting 3 weeks from now. If building 8 moves to Newark the space left over can be removed and left open.

Comment: For a student to take multiple sciences courses, it is taking students 3 years for a 2 year process. Those high end math courses may need to be at the Newark campus. There will be future discussions about where the campus will go.

Q: This was the discussions that happened at LACCD and there could be a perception within the community that we are not doing what we have promised. It squelches creativity, but the response that came back about all of the allegations, they had great reasons that they did what they did, so it needs to be thought about.

A: If someone in the press wants to make a big deal of it, they can. We are not LA.

Q: I live in Newark and worked on measure G promoting, a question that arose during this time was, why should I vote for something that is going to be happening in Fremont? I'm concerned about the message to the community.

A: Within the Measure A projects, the District spent around \$100M at the Newark campus, so Newark has not been neglected.

The Newark Campus is seen as Ohlone College. There is a concern about students going back and forth for classes. We should look at it from the stand point of what is the best interest of the students.

Between option 1 and option 3 – what would be the least disruptive to students? Some options will be less disruptive and quieter. Decision process is the next step – options of areas – advantages and disadvantages. We'll all be involved. The user group will be involved early in the process.

Reading through program reviews, they indicate the importance of safety in any new facility. Sciences should be clustered. There isn't an overwhelming indication that the facility should be at Newark vs. Fremont, but the equipment is expensive and would like to use lab techs within the whole science discipline.

Dr. Browning: Very good input for today, should we move forward with the decision or wait three weeks? The committee is ok going forward with keeping the Science building at the Fremont Campus. HMC will bring options for locations for the Science building at the Fremont Campus to the next meeting.

A comment was added about the athletic fields. The same criteria about programs should be thought about in regards to the athletic fields as well. One pressing issue is that we are losing a footprint with the solar fields going in. Frontage property development also affects the location of the fields. The Board is relooking at the property. District needs to do something with that to move forward.

B. Science Center Decision

Gilbane showed graphic of Fremont and Newark photovoltaic systems. There may be potential for adding charging stations. The options at Newark were to put solar over parking vs. over the back field on campus. With parking lot option, there is protection from the sun and leaves expansion options for the future. Soil remediation if put on the back of campus. The decision is to go over the parking lots at the Newark Campus.

Q: What are phasing options with loss of parking during construction?

A: Three phases to minimize impact, alternate parking locations, shuttle people in.

Q: Estimate of how many spaces lost due to the structures?

A: Very little amount of spaces lost. 1-2% of spaces may be lost.

Q: What is the clearance for the maintenance of the parking lots?

A: Dustin Notarianni will get that information to Brian Adair.

Q: What is the cost difference of building over parking vs. back portion of campus?

A: \$4 million dollars. There is an opportunity cost of taking that land away. Soil mitigation is another cost.

Gilbane is letting the committee know that Borrego is going forward with the design. Borrego is committed to interacting with the environmental program and will provide kiosks to the District.

Meeting concluded at 12:33 p.m.