

OHLONE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
FACILITIES COMMITTEE
Fremont Campus Room 7101

Minutes of Facilities Committee
February 7, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gari Browning, President/Superintendent
Don Eichelberger, Stegeman & Kastner (Chair)
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
Walt Birkedahl, Building 2: Music/GE
Tim Roberts, Building 2: Music GE
Bruce Griffin, Building 4: Art/GE – IT Staff
Alex Lebedeff, Building 5
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
Kelly Abad, Administrative Services (minutes)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kathy Sparling, Building 1: Floors 3 & 4
Darren Bardell, Building 3: GE
Charlyn Gonda, ASOC
Rick Arellano, Hyman Hall: Floor 1, CS
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
Michael Martinez, Building 10
Phil Zimmerman, Building 10

GUESTS: Casey Michaelis, Gilbane (Measure G)
Chris Wilson, Gilbane (Measure G)
Ann Kennedy, Gilbane/EISPro (Measure G)
Deborah Shepley, HMC
Cheryl Lentini, HMC
Karen Chan, HMC
Cinda Gilliland, HMC
Nancy Coulter, SWA Group
Julian Russell, Staff – Baseball Coach
Sarah Daniels, Staff
Arti Damani, Staff
Kevin Kirk, Staff
Leslie Buehler, Staff

Patrice Birkedahl, Staff / PIO
Steve Osawa, Staff

MEETING: Don Eichelberger opened the meeting at 10:37 a.m.

SCHEDULED ITEM

Deborah Shepley, HMC, started the committee discussion to talk about the remaining planning pieces to finalize the DFMP.

1. Project review timeline

First work session took place in September. The bridge document, timeline for key decisions, existing conditions, “givens” and “variables” were discussed. DFMP goals were updated. Started with 2010 Facilities Master Plan and evaluated campus.

October work session initial options were discussed: getting rid of building 1.

November work session discussion was active. Data numbers by space type: current inventory, recommended space to remove, and adjusted inventory were looked at. This work session focused on what type of experiences the committee would like to create for students, faculty and staff. What type of patterns, flows, and collisions should be considered in planning for the future?

The late November work session included discussion of options. Looked at 9 options and #9 was the preferred option.

December work session: developed option number 9 further and discussed landscape. Option 9: Academic Core features the library in the center, clustering of instructional and faculty office space, central circulation perpendicular to “Main Street,” retains existing “Main Street,” and buildings C, D & E follow natural contour of topography. Placed major emphasis on improving circulation and improve way-finding. Parking recommendations were also discussed.

This sums up the thinking of what we’ve discussed to date.

2. Planning principles

The planning principles used include:

- Support student learning
- Maximize functional space
- Eliminate non-functional space
- Improve efficiency/utilization
- Support sustainable practices
- Evaluate renovation versus replacement
- Improve hillside circulation (ties directly with campus way-finding)
- Improve campus way-finding
- Establish landscape linkages

We really need to improve accessibility throughout the campus. Accessibility is imbedded in the principle to improve hillside circulation but we need to make it more apparent. We should put our planning principles and goals side by side in the DFMP.

3. Lower Campus Options / Upper Campus Refinements / Whole Campus Vision

Since December, HMC has been studying in more detail how people move through campus all the way to mission. The givens and variables were listed.

- **Givens:**
 - Mission Blvd, Witherly Lane, and Pine Street
 - Olive Way Pedestrian Access
 - Existing buildings (Hyman Hall, Child Development Center, Building 10 - facilities, Orchard House)
 - Future Frontage property
- **Variables:**
 - Athletic Fields – Greenbelt
 - Surface Parking vs. Structured Parking – How should parking be distributed?
 - Palm Bosque (not sacred space, but find use for Palms) and Street Circulation
 - Planned Buildings
- **New Given:**
 - Impact of the Solar Field – Opens up the option of looking at this end of the campus with regard to the athletic fields.

**Note: Soccer field should also be blue (labeled as variable).*

HMC went through three options for the lower campus, which can all have different variations. Characteristics and features of each option were mentioned.

- **Option D – Athletic Diamond Gateway**
 - Fields are distributed on either side of Olive Way with Softball to the North and Soccer and Baseball to the South.
 - Mirrored Softball and Baseball diamonds create a secondary gateway complementing the Olive Way axis.
 - *Suggestion: Smaller parking lots located near the field should be added to serve field access.*
- **Option E – Athletic Row**
 - Fields are concentrated on the Southside of Olive Way.
 - Distinct athletic zone and park zone created on either side of Olive Way.
- **Option F – Athletic Node**
 - Fields are split on either side of Olive Way with soccer to the North of Olive Way and Baseball and Softball to the South.
 - Athletic plaza creates a central node for gathering. Node supports all of the field functions around it.

Q: What do you mean by “greenbelt area” if you’re not talking about fields?

A: Could be open play area, tree space, and/or landscaped spaces.

FC: Comment was made about financial problems and how that area could be abandoned if cannot be maintained.

HMC: We will be mindful about the recommended plant lists, etc.

FC: Lot K is being taken out. This lot seems to be used by the athletes and will create a long access way from the parking lots to the fields.

HMC: We do want to hear about the parking distribution for the fields/athletics. We have a lot of white space in the options that we can address parking issues.

FC comments:

- We have to worry about balls being hit in the parking lots. F looks like a better option.
- Some fields need to have more parking close to them than others, so we need to talk about that.
- Options F would create a good area for a centrally located field house. It also leads you on up the hill to some of the other buildings.
- Regarding the concerns with the home runs and the foul balls, it’s pretty easy to put up netting in the hot zones.

HMC: What do you think about these different arrangements?

FC: Julian Russell, Baseball Coach, likes F. He is happy to get a new field.

FC: Would like to have access to control the environment. Going through a one-man entrance or gate management concept is important. It is easier to control when there is a gate.

FC: Like the home plates of softball and baseball being close to each other. Good utilization of space.

Q: Right now we have a program that is displaced, the soccer program. How quickly can we get soccer back on campus? With these three configurations, what would be the best for getting the soccer field done the quickest?

A: F theoretically is taking over parking but not displacing the other fields so that one could have the fastest completion time.

FC: Can we look at the existing fields to identify how it would change? It looks like we are working in the same zone for baseball and softball, but taking over parking for the soccer. This offers some advantages for the phasing process. Not severely disrupting anything. We could redo the baseball field without disrupting the other fields.

Baseball field appears to be within good proximity of the potential parking structures. The field should be facing East Northeast. Not a requirement, but a standard to start from. With our current field, the sun sets right in the hitter’s eye.

HMC: In a survey of all pro fields, none of them face out toward the west. Softball cannot be helped with this configuration.

4. Circulation parking

HMC discussed the target number of parking spaces, which would be increased to 2428 to meet projected enrollment for 2023. 1600/1700 cars will be placed at the upper campus. The balance needs to be filled in down the hill. Does 1700 parking spaces feel right at the top campus?

Cross traffic is being eliminated that goes through the child development center and it will only be parking for the CDC.

Since we're talking about reconfiguring the Palm Bosque, questions have come up about a through route. Could we have a drop off spot near the Palm Bosque area? There are complaints about not having a real drop off. It should be reconsidered. We always talk about the North access or the South access, but we also have a front access near the Palm Bosque.

With regard to opening the route in front of the Palm Bosque, there are techniques to keep this zone safe for pedestrians. Buses could be dropping off there. The bus could continue to come out, without having to turn around. One bus stop could be at the top of campus and one at the bottom. We want to make sure we look at the pedestrian paths and look at treatments for paving, bollards and lighting.

There is a need for sufficient fire access, with enough space between the buildings so the fire trucks can drive through.

FC: The frontage property could create a problem for parking because the buildings have to be built right on mission with their parking behind it.

HMC: We can recommend screening the back of their property. We will make a very careful recommendation about treating the edge. We need to understand the terms of any RFPs going out for the frontage property.

5. Landscape and whole campus vision

Cinda Gilliland, HMC, walked through the presentation on landscaping. We want to build on the memorable aspects the campus already has and create landscape that has a variety of spaces.

Landscape Hierarchy:

- Gateway
- Entry – traffic, gateway space
 - Make traffic areas look like pedestrian zones to slow down traffic.
 - No curbs with use of bollards.
- Gathering Space/Plaza
 - meadow amphitheatre
 - performance space
 - Food service near Main Street with seating outside.
 - Main gathering space.
 - Library terrace has seating area.
- Intersection
- Garden
 - smaller outdoor classrooms

- Academic gardens are smaller more intimate places – at the ends of the buildings, not so much at the central core.

Also included is a seasonal stream – dry creek bed. This is a way to have water flow without the problems of maintaining a fountain.

Do not want to forget the pond (marsh) that we have on the south side.

Landscape zones were also discussed:

- Oak Woodland – enter through groves to the center of campus. Outside edges and oak woodland would be more natural.
- Coastal Scrub – a blend of natural and less natural food.
- Riparian Wetland – enhancing planting that would be around the ponds.
- Orchard – rows of trees or fruiting trees.
- Ornamental
- Roof garden – Can a greenhouse be placed on top of the roof? This can be done.
- Campus Core – Simple groups of trees.

Lighting strategies are important for event fields, parking areas, pathways and lighted bollards.

Site furnishings should be simple and united in style around the campus.

Circulation could flow through the orchard area to olive way so that the circulation can go up the center of campus. Circulation around the pond area would be a plus.

Fremont Campus discussion summary:

- The preferred field arrangement is option 5 for a lot of good reasons. Refinements need to be made to redistribute parking and distance to fields.
- Getting 1700 spaces up the hill feels like a good proportion. Minimum achievable amount needs to be put into the facilities master plan.
- Support from the group to reopen the center of campus circulation again.
- Landscaping continues to be a concern and everything proposed in master plan should be maintainable.
- Sustainability is important: building, landscape, water use, energy use, etc.
- Baseball fields and soccer fields need to be offset so it is not an eyesore. Need to look at the zone where the walkway and the fields start.

6. Newark campus

Started with previous master plan in Newark 2003 and adding projects from there.

Projects:

- Additional parking identified is 300 spaces.
 - Recommendation is not about placement but more about aesthetics. Need to do analysis of how we might treat that area. If buildings were added over time, they would be built down the central spine and we want to keep that in mind. If the

growth strategy is still a plan, we can add dotted lines in the facilities master plan showing future buildings.

- Photovoltaic project – canopies over parking
- Maintenance and operations
- Soil mitigation
- Pedestrian walkway to connect adjacent property at Mowry Avenue.
 - Do we want walkway to be on the campus, close to building or at the end of the current campus? This is a convenience for people to pass through. Existing road could turn into parking keeping with the same concept like it was part of the original design.

7. Next steps

This is the last big meeting forum with the whole committee to discuss the facilities master plan.

Dates to take note of include:

- February 29th - Board Workshop
- March 12th – College Council – Draft DFMP report
- April/May – Finalize the DFMP
- April 11th – Board Meeting – Draft DFMP report
- April 23rd – College Council
- May 9th – Board Approval for DFMP

Dr. Browning asked the members of the facilities committee if they feel they have had an opportunity to interact and feel comfortable with the information presented.

FC: People only ever see this in this meeting and it goes away. Set of slides are never available.

A: The slides are posted on the facilities committee webpage.

FC: I've been in both of the planning processes and am very pleased with the level of response. The two processes have been night and day. This process has been much better than the last.

Q: We would like to see all of this information together. Is there a different forum where this will be available?

A: College Council meetings are open and anyone can participate in the discussion. There will be a PDF of the DFMP to review.

FC: Where will the science area be placed?

HMC: There is a desire for mixing spaces, but Gilbane will be more detailed in phasing the projects. There is more than one option for located labs, etc. so that options can stay open and they will work with our ultimate scheme. They haven't gotten to those next steps. This starts to get to the question about what the DFMP is and what it is not? The DFMP sets up the framework. The next level that follows is programming buildings. Discussion will follow after. Building requirements will then be defined. This is more a matter of deciding what the priorities and needs are and understand that this discussion will be more involved in the construction plan.

FC: Don't know if it needs to be reiterated in the DFMP, but in Fremont master plan there was a link to the Educational Master Plan and the Bond and the Science Center was shown as an urgent need. That information should not be lost.

HMC: The science complex piece could be placed in a few different places and it may not be in the first building. We really need to understand how urgent the science building/spaces need to be constructed.

FC: I hope we don't get caught in the black hole of don't fix it because we're going to get a new building. There needs to be some interim solution for Chemistry.

HMC: It is HMC's responsibility to address the issues and see that it gets captured in this DFMP. We have some ideas on how we can maintain those priorities effectively.

FC: Clustering programs together is being contradicted if we are saying the wet labs will be clustered but the dry labs will be dispersed throughout campus.

HMC: The deliverable will have all of the information gathered, but it will not have what programming will go in which buildings, any phasing of construction or swing space solutions. The DFMP is the foundation to do those things.

FC: I feel that the temporary loser is the Science Center by getting rid of Building 1, since it the center wasn't dependent on Building 1.

Gilbane: It may not be necessary to have to wait for Building 1 to come down. The two front buildings are free from any existing buildings, without displacing anyone else. We will go deeper into looking where the buildings are located and what they may displace.

HMC: We have been thinking about phasing this whole time, but Gilbane will dovetail. Now the real elbow grease work starts to actually build a building. This is being mention because there needs to be an understanding of how much needs to happen before we can break ground.

This DFMP will take the place of all other facilities master plans. You can put the other master plans aside now.

Karen Chan, HMC, shared highlights of her graphic recording.

Meeting concluded at 12:12 p.m.