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Mission Statement

Mission
The mission of Ohlone College is to serve the community by offering instruction for basic skills, career entry, university transfer, economic development, and personal enrichment for all who can benefit from our instruction in an environment where student learning success is highly valued, supported, and continually assessed.

Vision
Ohlone College will be known throughout California for our inclusiveness, innovation, and superior rates of student success.
Core Values

- Supporting and promoting Student Success.
- We provide lifelong learning opportunities for students, college personnel, and the community.
- We open access to higher education and actively reach out to underserved populations.
- We promote diversity, inclusiveness, and openness to differing viewpoints.
- We maintain high standards in our constant pursuit of excellence.
- We value trust, respect, and integrity.
- We promote teamwork and open communication.
- We practice innovation and actively encourage risk-taking and entrepreneurship.
- We demonstrate stewardship for our human, financial, physical, and environmental resources.

College Goals

1. Through innovative programs and services, improve student learning and achievement.
2. Support the economic vitality of the community through educational programs and services that respond to identified employment needs.
3. Promote continuous, needs-based learning and professional development opportunities for all District personnel.
4. Use human, fiscal, technological, and physical resources responsibly, effectively, and efficiently to maximize student learning and achievement.
5. Lead and educate the community in environmental sustainability.
6. Enhance college-wide interaction with, and acceptance of, diverse peoples, cultures, arts, and perspectives.
7. Increase access to higher education of under-served and under-represented demographic groups in the District and local communities.
8. Engage all members of the college community in active, continual institutional improvement.
The passage of the $349 million General Obligation Bond Measure G in November 2010 presented Ohlone College with the exciting opportunity to transform the college for the 21st century and create an extraordinary learning environment for our students for the next 50 years. Since its opening, Ohlone has educated over 300,000 community members. The buildings and spaces created as a result of this plan promise to better the lives of even more in the future.

The District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP) represents Ohlone’s vision of the ideal learning environment. Changes resulting from the plan will have significant impact on our students, so our intent is to do the best job conceivable to revitalize the college. This exciting plan speaks to the open thinking and student centeredness we all desire.

The DFMP reflects thoughtful planning. It is based on a carefully developed and up-to-date Educational Master Plan that projects the future enrollment of the District, considers the need for new programs, and improves teaching and learning opportunities in significant ways. The DFMP also draws from the 2010 Ohlone Fremont Campus 15 Year Facilities Master Plan and the 2003 Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology Master Plan. Both of these plans were developed over a long period of time and were grounded in research on how students learn.

The process to develop the DFMP was highly collegial and included input from all stakeholders. Students, faculty, and administrators with specialized knowledge have contributed their best thinking. The plan has also benefited from expert consultants who have listened closely to the needs of the college as expressed throughout the process and translated the experiences we desire for our students into a plan that can be realized. Finally, the Ohlone Community College District Board of Trustees has reviewed the plan from a high level perspective and approved it to go forward.

Citizens’ support for Measure G signifies the trust the Tri-Cities community has in Ohlone College. Throughout the creation of the Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology supported by Measure A, and through all of the college’s planning processes for Measure G, we at Ohlone have been committed to doing our best to make the college a place that serves the educational needs of the community. The Ohlone College District Facilities Master Plan is our pledge to use this money well.

Sincerely,

Gari Browning

Gari Browning, Ph.D.
President/Superintendent
Ohlone Community College District
Introduction

The California Community College system of two-year public institutions is composed of 112 colleges statewide, organized into 72 districts. Ohlone College, established in 1965, serves the cities of Fremont, Newark, and part of Union City which comprise the Ohlone Community College District.

The District is comprised of two campuses: the Fremont Campus, a 534 acre campus located on the former Huddleson Ranch property along Mission Boulevard in Fremont, and the Newark Center, an 82 acre campus located along Cherry Street in Newark.

Ohlone College offers 191 degrees and academic programs. The College enrolls approximately 19,000 students per year at the Fremont and Newark campuses and online. Every year more than 500 students transfer from Ohlone College to four-year colleges and universities and about 600 students graduate with degrees or earn vocational certificates. Ohlone College employs about 465 part-time and full-time faculty and 235 support and management personnel.

Document Organization

The 2012 District Facilities Master Plan document is designed to inform the reader of the planning work that was done throughout 2011–2012. It includes a summary of the process, the steps that were followed, and the discussion that led up to the recommendations.

Following this introduction, the document is organized into two sections:

- Fremont Campus
  - Existing Conditions
  - Analysis and Options
  - Recommendations
- Newark Center
  - Existing Conditions
  - Recommendations
The 2012 District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP) presents a translation of the Ohlone College educational program needs into a series of site and facilities recommendations. It includes the analysis of existing conditions, the quantification of planning data to forecast projected space needs, facilities planning principles to guide development and the identification of site and facilities recommendations for each campus.

Once adopted, this 2012 DFMP will replace the individual campus Facilities Master Plans previously prepared:

- Ohlone Fremont Campus 15 Year Facilities Master Plan, approved April 2010.
- Ohlone College Newark Center for Technology & Health Sciences Master Plan, approved December 2003.

In November of 2010, Measure G was passed to address the majority of recommendations included in the 2010 Fremont Campus Facilities Master Plan. Following the passage of Measure G, several new pieces of information were discovered that impacted some of the original Fremont Campus recommendations and identified new issues to address at the Newark Campus. This DFMP builds upon the Measure G Bridge Document, developed in June 2011, that identified the factors impacting the recommendations contained in the previous Facilities Master Plan documents.

The purpose of this document is to update and consolidate all previous facilities master plan documents into a single District Facilities Master Plan. This document will serve as the District’s planning roadmap moving forward and incorporates and supersedes all previous recommendations.
Master Planning Process

Following the passage of Measure G in November 2010, a series of meetings were developed and held at regular intervals to begin planning out the projects to be included in Measure G. In accordance with the District’s governance process, the DFMP process maximized participation and involved stakeholder representatives from all areas of the college: administration, faculty, staff, and students. The meeting structure developed and extended into the DFMP planning process which included a series of meetings with the College’s Executive Team, the Bond Implementation Group (BIG), and the full Facilities Committee.

DFMP meetings began in September of 2011 and included multiple work sessions, as well as workshops with and presentations to the College Council and Board of Trustees. In addition to traditional recording methods, all work sessions were graphically recorded to visually capture the interactive discussions. These graphic recordings are shown on the following pages.
Meeting 1: Goal Setting

The initial DFMP meeting included the review, refinement and updating of the goals developed in the previous master plans.

The overall timeline for the master plan development and key decision points were discussed in order to focus the process and ensure that concurrent processes were coordinated. This included the coordination of initial bond projects, and the alignment of a variety of infrastructure and implementation planning efforts.
Meeting 2: Analysis

Building on the analysis developed as part of the 2010 Fremont Campus Facilities Master Plan, new concepts for understanding the campus organization were introduced and key issues were identified.

Of particular note were the analysis of the original campus facilities and the evaluation of renovation vs. replacement. This meeting also included the analysis of the existing space inventory and the projected master plan space needs.
Meeting 3: Framework

This active discussion included the development of a planning framework. The group participated in a hands-on session where the notion of campus framework was explored. Ideas about interactions on campus, program adjacencies, and flow were all explored in small groups and then reported out to the larger group. Common themes emerged and formed the framework for the development of options.
Meeting 4: Options

A series of options for the upper or eastern portion of the Fremont Campus were explored, approaching the organization of the campus from several different viewpoints.

The group discussed each concept and agreed on one preferred direction to be developed further.
Meeting 5: Refinement

The preferred direction from the previous session was developed and refined and presented for review and discussion with the group. Landscape concepts were also introduced, along with discussion to establish priorities for the lower campus.
Meeting 6: Whole Campus Vision

At this point in the process, the lower campus options at Fremont were reviewed along with a whole campus vision for circulation, parking, and landscape development.

The group identified a preferred option for the lower campus parking and fields area and discussed the overall recommendations. The discussion included review of the frontage development parcels and how to define the interface between the development zone and the campus.

This meeting also included discussion regarding the Newark Campus and confirmed areas that needed to be addressed in the DFMP.
Master Planning Process (cont’d) //

**College Council and Board Presentations**

During the planning process, College Council and Board workshops were held to share progress, broaden the perspective, and maximize engagement. These discussions provided an opportunity for a more in depth review as well as additional dialogue and discussion.

**Documentation and Approvals**

The process concluded with the development of the draft report, multiple readings, and final adoption.
The following documents were referenced during the DFMP planning process:

**Educational Master Plan**


**Previous Master Plans**

- 2010–2015 Ohlone College Strategic Plan.
- Measure G Bridge Document, dated July 19, 2011
- Ohlone Fremont Campus 15 Year Facilities Master Plan, dated April 2010.
Introduction //

Background

The Fremont Campus is located on Mission Boulevard in Fremont and was constructed over 35 years ago. Most of the campus buildings were constructed in 1974-75 except the Smith Center (1995), Hyman Hall (2001), Student Services Center (2009), Child Development Center, and the Orchard House (1890). Campus buildings are largely concentrated on the upper portion or east side of the campus. The elevation change from Mission Boulevard to the easternmost portion of the campus is approximately 65 feet, with the western half of the campus relatively flat in grade and the eastern half sharply sloping uphill.

The 2010 Facilities Master Plan evaluated a number of factors with regard to building condition and effectiveness and recommended replacement of several of the 1975 era buildings and renovations to the remaining buildings on campus. The District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP) updates that analysis and extends those recommendations to further respond to the District’s goals for the future.

Goals of the DFMP

The goals established by the District in the 2010 Facilities Master Plan were validated and brought forward to form the basis for the DFMP.

- Accessibility & 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 to improve accessibility for all.

- Functionality & Infrastructure
  / Maximize functional space and renovate to address program needs.
  / 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 facilities, athletics, and site development.
  / Promote environmental awareness, inspire stewardship, and instill pride and ownership.
  / Establish and maintain a high quality, locally sustainable, and natural landscape palette.
  / Promote the use of cost effective, renewable and non-depleting energy sources for all projects.

- Image & Identity
  / Improve the identity and image of the campuses within their communities.
  / Create a variety of indoor-outdoor gathering spaces to promote collaboration.

- Aesthetics
  / Improve the overall campus aesthetics to support the collegiate learning environment.
The planning process began with the analysis of existing conditions in order to identify the key planning issues the DFMP would address. The information was based on campus tours, meetings, and discussions with the College. The findings are summarized in a series of graphic plates that illustrate patterns and characteristics to guide future development.

This section consists of the following elements:

- Campus Plan
- Campus Development History
- Vehicular Circulation
- Parking
- Pedestrian Circulation
- Campus Zoning
- Campus Landscape Character
- Renovation vs. Replacement
Existing Conditions

Campus Plan //

Founded in 1965, Ohlone College’s Fremont Campus is located near Mission San Jose, in the foothills of Fremont, California. The 534-acre campus sits on the previous Huddleson Ranch property. Due to the hillside topography of the site, only about 118 acres of the site are usable by the College. The remaining property provides a buffer for the College. Funding for the first site and the first permanent buildings was provided by a local bond measure and from state and federal sources.

Building List

- Building 1
- Building 2
- Building 3
- Building 4
- Building 5
- Building 6
- Building 7 (Student Services Center)
- Building 8
- Building 9 (Gymnasium)
- Building 10 (Warehouse/Maintenance)
- Swimming Pool
- Building 12 (Hyman Hall)
- Building 14
- Building 16
- Building 18
- Building 19 (Child Development Center)
- Building 20 (Orchard House)
- Building 22 (Smith Center)
- Building 24
- Building 27
- Building 29
Existing Conditions

Campus Development History

The Ohlone Community College Fremont Campus was developed in the 1970’s. The Orchard House (20) and Foundation Building (27) are the only structures remaining that existed on the site prior to the campus’ inception. Several buildings were added since 1990, some of which replaced earlier buildings.

The adjacent graphic illustrates the development of the campus with buildings color-coded, based on the decade of original construction.

1890
- Orchard House (20)

1960s
- Foundation (27)

1970s
- Blanchard Center (1)
- Northwest Classroom (2)
- North Forum (3)
- Northeast Classroom (4)
- Student Center (5)
- Southeast Classroom (6)
- Building 7 (Replaced)
- Southwest Classroom (8)
- Gymnasium and Pool (9)
- Warehouse/Maintenance (10)

1990s
- Student Health Center (Replaced)
- Building 18
- Smith Center (22)

2000s
- Student Services Center (7)
- Hyman Hall (12)
- Portable Classrooms (14 and 16)
- Child Development Center (19)
**Existing Conditions**

**Vehicular Circulation //**

Vehicular circulation patterns are illustrated on the adjacent graphic. Campus entry points and major vehicular circulation routes are shown, along with areas allocated for parking, public transit stops, and existing stoplights.

The following issues and comments were discussed during the planning process:

- Visibility of the campus from Mission Boulevard is limited and will be further impacted by future Frontage Development.
- Mission Boulevard signage and wayfinding from the street into and through the campus are not effective and need improvement.
- Through circulation across the campus is limited for safety reasons, but in practice has not been successful and needs to be re-evaluated.
Existing Conditions

Parking //

The parking analysis graphic highlights the existing parking areas of the campus and lists the total number of parking spaces.

The parking lots are over capacity during the first few weeks of each semester. During the majority of the semester there is an adequate amount of parking to support campus activity.

The current total of approximately 2,350 spaces is undersized for the College’s projected enrollment for the year 2023. The projected enrollment growth identified on page 1.30 of this chapter, will require additional spaces to be added in order to improve the ratio to 1:5 (number of spaces to student enrollment). This ratio is within the typical standards for community colleges located in a suburban environment with access to public transportation.

The following comments were discussed during the planning process:

• On peak days, typically during the start of semesters, parking lots are at capacity and insufficient to accommodate projected enrollment growth.
• The concentration of available parking spaces on the upper portion of the campus is insufficient to accommodate the activities and functions located there.
• The neighbors to the north of the campus have concerns regarding the traffic and amount of parking facing their properties.
**Existing Conditions**

**Pedestrian Circulation**

The pedestrian circulation patterns and student gathering areas are illustrated on the adjacent graphic. Pedestrian paths from parking lots, drop-offs, and bus stops are included, along with the primary and secondary routes throughout the campus.

The following issues and comments were discussed during the planning process:

- East-west circulation on campus traverses a 65’ elevation gain, ineffectively handled by a series of steps, ramps, and elevators.
- The upper campus’s “Main Street” offers one of the most successful pedestrian experiences on campus, with views, level grades, gathering spaces, and connections to amenities.
- Olive Way is a strong pedestrian connection from the campus to Mission Boulevard.
- The campus is difficult to navigate and requires circulating both outside and through building hallways to get across campus on a level plane.
- Inviting student gathering areas are limited on campus.
- Wayfinding is not effective; it is difficult to identify accessible routes through the campus.
Existing Conditions

Campus Zoning //

The adjacent graphic illustrates the functional zoning of the existing site and facilities. Colors indicate the current assigned functions and general zoning of uses.

The following issues and comments were discussed during the planning process:

- The campus zoning is clear and is organized in relation to the topography and works well.
- There are three major zones on campus, moving east from Mission Boulevard:
  - Frontage Development Zone.
  - Lower Campus Zone – parking and fields areas.
  - Upper Campus Zone – majority of buildings and instructional spaces.

1 Upper Campus
2 Palm Bosque
3 North Perimeter Portable
4 Lower Campus Athletic Fields
PG&E and City of San Francisco Power Transmission and Communication Lines
**Existing Conditions**

**Property Easements Affecting Fremont Campus Development**

The Fremont campus site is constrained by the hillside protection zone and several easements.

The zigzag line of the “Toe of the Hill” separates the developable land from the hillside protection zone. This area is green on the adjacent map.

The following easements cross into the property areas follows:

1. PG&E and City and County of San Francisco power transmission and communication lines (approx. 675 foot wide).
3. PG&E gas line easement – east/west (75 foot wide).
4. PG&E electric transmission line (unconfirmed).
5. State of California Department of Water Resources – 20 foot wide easement connecting up the center to the north/south water easement line.
6. City of Fremont non-exclusive roadway easement at the residential edge along the north of the property (20 foot wide).
7. Alameda County Water District tank well and pipeline easement following east/west property line.

The development of the campus is limited due to the easements that cross the property. Because of these easements the academic core was located along the east edge of the property and designed for views to the west.

The powerlines separate a southern section of the Fremont property making the area less desirable for College uses.

Reference: 2010 Fremont Campus Facilities Master Plan, prepared by tBP/Architecture
Existing Conditions

Campus Landscape Character //

Primed for renewal, the Fremont Campus is showing its age. The combination of use by students and the environment over the years have taken their toll on the vitality of the landscape character. Landscape elements such as planting, paving, water features, site furnishings, and general campus cohesiveness no longer reflect the vibrancy of the academics and student body at Ohlone.

The following issues and comments were discussed during the planning process:

- The Palm Bosque is not well located nor utilized and could be redeveloped.
- “Main Street” is a successful social space but lacks engagement with the surrounding building edges.
- More inviting social spaces are needed in association with the grade changes between the upper and lower campuses.
- Vehicular access across campus needs to be re-opened to improve circulation.
- The Upper Pond is a valuable space that can be brought back into the campus core.
- Mass plantings of eucalyptus have been deemed undesirable for their litter and fire potential.
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Existing Conditions

Replacement vs. Renovation

To establish the baseline and starting point for developing planning options, the campus buildings were analyzed in the following areas to determine whether recommendations for replacement or renovation were appropriate for the DFMP solution:

- Age
- Condition
- Appropriateness (to the functions or uses housed in them)
- Efficiency (usable vs. non-usable space)
- Flexibility (adaptability to changing uses)
- Performance (energy performance, water usage, etc.)
- Accessibility
- Life Safety
- Cost to upgrade
- Seismic.

Based on this analysis, several buildings were targeted for demolition and replacement and are identified in the adjacent graphic. All other remaining buildings on the campus are recommended for varying degrees of renovation or modernization.
Building 5
Analysis and Options

Introduction

The Ohlone Community College District Educational Master Plan 2010–2015 provided the basis for all facilities planning discussions. It served as the foundation for the development of the 2010 Fremont Campus Facilities Master Plan and forms the basis for this 2012 District Facilities Master Plan. All discussions related to facilities and the planning data collected and analyzed in 2010 were used to guide decisions related to facilities in 2011/2012.

This section includes the following information developed during the planning process:

Data
A summary of the methodology used to establish the amount and type of space necessary to support the programs of instruction and student support services through the year 2023.

Framework
The framework established to guide the initial development of the Fremont Campus options.

Planning Principles
The principles used to guide the further development of the options into the DFMP recommendations.

Options
An overview of the options explored during the planning process.
Analysis and Options

Calculating Space Needs //

The inventory of facilities is an important tool in planning and managing college campuses. The California Community Colleges Facilities Space Inventory database (FUSION) includes descriptive data on buildings and rooms for each college district. This information is essential for developing the annual Five Year Construction Plan, planning for capital outlay construction projects, projecting future facilities, and analyzing space utilization.

The State Chancellor’s Office mandates an annual inventory of all facilities in the district. By combining existing and future enrollment and program forecasts with appropriate space standards, space needs for current and future needs are developed. Space capacity is the direct relationship between the amount of space available, by type, which may be used to serve students, and the number of students participating in campus programs.

Space capacity analysis enables an institution to identify the types of space it needs and the types of space it holds in excess. The analysis of space forms the core of the facilities plan.
Space capacity analysis typically includes the following categories of space:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Room Use Numbers</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>100s</td>
<td>Classrooms + support spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>200s</td>
<td>Labs + support spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Conference Room</td>
<td>300s</td>
<td>Offices + support spaces; all offices, including administrative and student services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Study</td>
<td>400s</td>
<td>Library, study, and tutorial + support spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Media</td>
<td>530s</td>
<td>AV/TV; Technology + support spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>520, 540 to 800s</td>
<td>Non-capacity load categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The line item on the left for space type “other” includes a number of spaces on campus that are considered to be in non-capacity load categories. These are spaces that are not analyzed by the State Chancellor’s Office in relation to utilization and efficiency, but are important as part of the college’s inventory related to maintenance and operations. Types of spaces included in “other” include the following:

- Physical Education (Teaching Gym)
- Clinic/Demonstration
- Assembly/Exhibition
- Food Service
- Meeting Rooms
- Lounge
- Merchandise Facility
- Data Processing
- Physical Plant
- Health Services
Analysis and Options

Space Utilization And Planning Standards

To determine space capacity requirements for a college’s campus, the enrollment and program forecasts are applied to a set of standards for each type of space. Title 5 of the California Administrative Code prescribes standards for the utilization and planning of most educational spaces on public community college campuses. These standards, when applied to the total number of students, or weekly student contact hours (WSCH), produce total capacity requirements that are expressed in assignable square feet (space available for assignment to occupants). The Title 5 space standards used to determine both existing and future capacity requirements is listed in the table to the right:

Each component of these standards is applied with an appropriate form of enrollment to produce a total assignable square feet (ASF) capacity requirement for each category of space. The sum of these categories represents the total building requirement for the College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Rates/Allowances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>ASF/Student Station</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station Utilization Rate</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average hours room/week</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>ASF/Student Station*</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station Utilization Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average hours room/week</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices/Conference Room</td>
<td>ASF per FTEF</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Study</td>
<td>Base ASF Allowance</td>
<td>3.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASF/1st 3,000 DGE</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASF/3001–9,000 DGE</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASF/DGE&gt;9,000 DGE</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Media AV/TV/Radio</td>
<td>Base ASF Allowance</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASF/1st 3,000 DGE</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASF/3001–9,000 DGE</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASF/DGE&gt;9,000 DGE</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2010 Ohlone College Space Inventory Report was used as the basis for the analysis of space. The table below includes a summary of the capacity load categories of space on the Fremont Campus and their respective totals.

It is important to note that the Space Inventory Report includes all facilities on campus that are in use, including temporary facilities. As described in the analysis of existing facilities, there are several facilities that are recommended as part of this master plan to be removed. The following table represents an adjusted inventory in which the removal of temporary facilities and several buildings is accounted for. The new column is referred to as the “adjusted inventory.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Current Inventory (ASF)</th>
<th>Removed Inventory (ASF)</th>
<th>Adjusted Inventory (ASF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>32,356</td>
<td>-22,942</td>
<td>9,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>58,837</td>
<td>-23,251</td>
<td>35,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Conference</td>
<td>45,188</td>
<td>-17,776</td>
<td>27,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Study</td>
<td>30,066</td>
<td>-21,234</td>
<td>8,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Media</td>
<td>7,117</td>
<td>-106</td>
<td>7,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>113,182</td>
<td>-20,831</td>
<td>112,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>306,746</strong></td>
<td><strong>-106,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>200,606</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buildings Removed: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 14, 16, 18 (includes temporary facilities)
Master plan enrollment forecasts were developed as part of the 2010 Fremont Campus Facilities Master Plan and used as the basis for this 2012 District Facilities Master Plan. The forecast was based on the analysis of the State Chancellor’s Office Enrollment and WSCH Forecast 2010–11, as well as the Fremont Campus Environmental Scan and Program Review Key Indicators.

The following table summarizes the enrollment and WSCH forecasts for the Fremont campus of Ohlone College. Enrollment and WSCH for the fall term is used as the primary determinant to define facilities space needs.

### Headcount Enrollment

The table below summarizes the projected future headcount enrollment for the Fremont campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Headcount Enrollment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9,712</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>11,271</td>
<td>Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>12,143</td>
<td>Projected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projecting Future Space Needs

The methodology for projecting future space needs is summarized as follows:

- Enrollment forecasts and WSCH projections were applied in combination with appropriate space planning standards to result in a total space requirement in ASF by type of space.
- The 2010 space inventory for each campus was adjusted to reflect the proposed removal of temporary facilities.
- Following the analysis of existing conditions, and the identification of permanent facilities to be removed, the inventory was adjusted a second time to remove these spaces and create a baseline for determining future space needs. This was referred to as the “adjusted inventory.”
- The “adjusted inventory” for each campus was subtracted from the total space requirements described above to result in the net ASF need by type of space for the 2020 master plan horizon.
- The result, net assignable square footage by type of space, served as the basis for developing options for each campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Adjusted Inventory (ASF)</th>
<th>2023 Master Plan Space Needs</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>9,414</td>
<td>32,429</td>
<td>(23,015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>35,586</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>(41,414)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>27,412</td>
<td>46,760</td>
<td>(19,348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>8,832</td>
<td>36,236</td>
<td>(27,404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Media</td>
<td>7,011</td>
<td>12,635</td>
<td>(5,624)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>112,351</td>
<td>79,115</td>
<td>(33,236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>200,606</td>
<td>284,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The planning data section highlights that there is currently a need for additional assignable square feet (ASF) to accommodate the projected growth. Following the removal of several buildings, this need increases and provides an opportunity to improve the overall efficiency and utilization of facilities.

Building efficiency is calculated by dividing the assignable square feet (ASF) by the gross square feet (GSF). The ASF is the assignable or usable space within a building, and the GSF is the added space required for circulation, stairs, elevators, restrooms, etc. The State Chancellor’s Office recommends grossing factors for community college facilities which average approximately 65% for instructional facilities.

Buildings 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 14, 16, and 18 total 106,140 ASF and 187,342 GSF. The average efficiency for these buildings is 57% — well below the recommended efficiency. The identified 2023 master plan space needs indicate that following the demolition of these inefficient facilities, there is a need to construct 116,805 ASF or 179,700 GSF at a recommended 65% efficiency. The table on the right summarizes this analysis.

The total GSF space removed from the Fremont Campus is replaced with new facilities with less overall GSF space. In other words, additional ASF is provided, designed to support the program needs in more efficient, smaller and less costly facilities. The replacement facilities, coupled with the renovation and repurposing of existing facilities, provide the opportunity to improve the Fremont Campus’ overall efficiency, utilization, maintenance and operation costs.

The plan to the right illustrates the campus plan with all buildings recommended for demolition omitted, forming the basis for the development of preliminary concepts.
Analysis and Options

Planning Framework

Based on the information gathered in the analysis of existing conditions and the planning data to calculate space needs, the stage was set to begin the exploration of options for the Fremont Campus. With the recommended removal of five buildings in the heart of the campus, the development opportunities were extensive.

In order to develop a framework for planning, the planning team posed the following questions:

*What types of campus experiences would you like to create for your students, faculty, and staff?*

*What type of patterns, flows and collisions should be considered in planning for the future?*

In response to these questions, the Facilities Committee was divided into small groups and engaged in a hands-on activity. The groups created visual diagrams (shown below) illustrating the patterns, flows and experiences they wanted to incorporate into the “future campus.” This followed with a reporting out of the developed ideas and a group discussion identifying common themes.

These themes informed the development of options for the Fremont Campus.
Diagrammatic Options with Framework Overlays

3 INITIAL SCHEME
4 THE CENTRAL GREEN
5 URBAN & NATURAL

6 ACADEMIC VILLAGE
7 ACADEMIC TERRACES
8 ACADEMIC FAMILY
Planning Principles
Following the analysis of existing conditions, the analysis of the planning data and the development of the planning framework, a set of facilities planning principles was developed to guide discussions related to site and facilities development options. The principles are summarized below and represent the overall direction for recommendations related to the Fremont Campus.

- Support student learning.
- Maximize functional space.
- Eliminate non-functional space.
- Improve efficiency/utilization.
- Support sustainable practices.
- Evaluate renovation versus replacement.
- Improve hillside circulation.
- Improve campus wayfinding.
- Establish landscape linkages.

Options
Several options were explored during the DFMP process. The options included a variety of innovative ways to incorporate the facilities planning principles into a series of development options for review and discussion with the campus groups. The initial concepts considered two general approaches:

- Exploring the north-south movement working with the natural topography to traverse the campus at a series of level terraces.
- Enhancing the east-west axis and movement pattern up the hill, bringing more of the campus down the hill to the west to better connect to the lower campus.

Multiple options were explored, evaluated and developed, ultimately leading to what emerged as the Preferred Option. The Preferred Option represented a synthesis of the best features in each concept and was a product of the evolutionary process.
Upper Campus Options
The upper campus options shown on the preceding page illustrate a sampling of all the variations explored.

Option 9 formed the bases for the final recommended plan.

Lower Campus Options
The lower campus options shown on the following page illustrate the three primary directions explored.

Option F formed the basis for the final recommended plan.
Upper Campus Options

1. PRELIMINARY SCHEME
2. PRELIMINARY SCHEME
3. INITIAL SCHEME
4. THE CENTRAL GREEN
5. URBAN & NATURAL
6. ACADEMIC VILLAGE
7. ACADEMIC TERRACES
8. ACADEMIC FAMILY
9. ACADEMIC CORE
Lower Campus Options

d DIAMOND GATEWAY

e ATHLETIC ROW

f ATHLETIC NODE
The District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP) recommendations for the Fremont Campus present an overall picture of the future developed campus and includes proposed sites for new facilities, recommendations for renovations of existing facilities, and site development projects. The recommendations included in this section address the discussion that took place during the planning process and describe the building and site projects.

Facilities Recommendations

Overview

The recommendations are organized into the following sections:

- Facilities Recommendations
- Site Improvement Recommendations
- Phasing Priorities

While drawings in the DFMP appear specific, the forms are conceptual sketches that highlight the location and purpose of improvements. The final design of each site and facility project will take place as projects are funded and detailed programming and design occurs.
Facilities Recommendations

Facilities Planning Principles //

The Facilities Planning Principles form the basis for all projects identified in the DFMP. The recommendations for site and facilities improvements will strengthen the campus community by reorganizing the site and facilities to support the campus goals and vision. An overview of this application is summarized below:

The Fremont Campus has a loose organizational structure with aging facilities, landscape, and public spaces. New investment is directed toward creating a vibrant academic core with flexible, interdisciplinary buildings grouped around useful and welcoming north-south terraces, connected by an east-west axis.

Support Student Learning

- Replacement facilities are positioned to allow classroom, laboratory, and office spaces to coexist on the same floors, responding to the desired “framework” established during the DFMP process to mix academic programs, faculty, students, and staff together to encourage collaboration.
- The Library and Learning Resource Center are located at the heart of the academic core of the campus, creating a hub for student learning and easy access to instructional support services.
- A pattern of buildings and open spaces is created to encourage collaboration and interaction both within the facilities and in the spaces “in between.”
- A variety of spaces for formal and informal gatherings encourage students to spend time on campus and to interact with other students and faculty.
Maximize Functional Space

- Existing facilities are modernized to address safety, accessibility, and maintenance needs.
- Existing facilities are renovated and repurposed to address identified program needs.
- The campus core is revived and re-established with the construction of new multi-level facilities.
- A robust utility and technology infrastructure is provided to support all facilities.

Eliminate Non-Functional Space

- Temporary facilities are removed and functions are relocated to permanent buildings.
- Aged facilities, not feasibly renovated or repaired, are demolished and functions relocate to new buildings or renovated spaces.
- Non-functional and under-utilized spaces are removed or renovated to support identified program needs.

Improve Efficiency and Utilization

- Functions are consolidated to improve efficiency and the sharing of resources.
- Flexible, multi-purpose spaces are provided to maximize scheduling and utilization.
- Inefficient and aging buildings are replaced with new, high performing facilities that improve the overall operational efficiencies of the campus’ buildings.

Support Sustainable Practices

- Campus buildings and open space are developed as a living lab to inspire and educate the campus community about environmental stewardship.
- Building design strategies target high performance buildings, net-zero energy use and carbon neutrality, waste reduction, and water conservation and reclamation and maintainability.
- Indoor environments support health and learning.
- Natural habitats are restored and preserved around campus edges and landscape strategies support native plants, low water usage, and low maintenance solutions.
Facilities Recommendations

Facilities Planning Principles (cont’d) //

**Improve Hillside Circulation and Campus Wayfinding**

- The campus entry experience from Mission Boulevard is improved to enhance the College’s presence on Mission Boulevard and create identifiable campus entry points.
- Parking is concentrated at the upper campus through the addition of parking structures to improve direct and level connections to the campus core.
- Building elevators and ramps are used to transition between levels on the campus hillside and provide a clear, accessible route through the campus.
- Pedestrian and vehicular entrances and circulation are clearly identified and defined throughout the campus to assist in wayfinding.
- Vehicular circulation is re-opened through the campus to improve circulation.

**Establish Landscape Linkages**

- Outdoor spaces are developed to support instruction and to extend the learning environment beyond the walls of the buildings.
- The intersections of the developed central axis and terraced landings create spaces and opportunities for casual interaction, encouraging “collisions,” conversations, and a sense of community.
- The placement of the new buildings provides opportunities to create quiet outdoor spaces for small academic gardens away from the central axis.
- Fields are clustered around Olive Way where new gathering space and nearby parking support events and interaction on the lower campus.
- The entry at the base of the upper campus is redesigned to provide pedestrian drop off, vehicular through-circulation, bus stop, and repurposing of the iconic palms.
Facilities Recommendations

Campus Zoning //

Mission Boulevard Frontage Development

Campus identity begins along Mission Boulevard, at the north and south main entrances, both equally important. The campus’ main pedestrian entrance, Olive Way, will be strengthened with by the creation of a new entry plaza. This will be signaled by a break in the olive trees lining Mission Boulevard, which will be retained to the greatest extent possible.

Lower Campus Athletic Fields and Plaza

The soccer field will be moved from south of Pine Road to the lower campus. A new athletic plaza will be created along Olive Way adjacent to the historic farm house, between the soccer, baseball, and softball fields. The baseball and softball fields will be realigned to bring the entrances to their bleachers close to the athletic plaza. A new support building will house spaces for restrooms and concessions associated with athletics events and programs taking place there.

Upper Campus Core

The central axis and main street core create opportunities for interaction by focusing campus pedestrian circulation into a common space, and by providing attractively designed buildings, plantings, and furnishings. Food service elements can also be located along these pathways and intersections to encourage lingering and conversation.
Facilities Recommendations

Campus Core //

The new building footprints have been sized to allow classroom, laboratory, office, and study/gathering spaces to coexist on the same floors. This will support the College’s desire to mix academic programs, faculty, students, and staff together in order to encourage connections and conversations across the many elements of its community.

Vertical circulation and main entries for the new buildings will be gathered adjacent to the east-west axis. These elements should be visible, so that vertical circulation is easily located. Inside the buildings, kitchenettes, study areas, conference spaces, and other social gathering and general-use spaces should be located either adjacent to the central axis or adjacent to the quieter academic gardens to encourage casual interactions.

While the architectural design of the new buildings is yet to be determined, high performance facilities that support effective learning environments, strengthen the sense of community, and strive towards carbon neutrality are recommended. This direction will help to improve the local and regional social, cultural, academic, and environmental climates.

A Library and Learning Resource Center is proposed at the center of the campus core, connecting Buildings C and D with a Library Plaza. The slope of the site allows the Library and Learning Resource Center to be centrally located and easily accessed. It is nestled into the hillside and creates multiple level entries along the east-west axis and from the terraces on either side. An entry pavilion on the library plaza is located on the roof of the lower portion of the facility and maximizes views to the surrounding community. Public spaces in the learning commons are recommended to be grouped along the west side where there will be abundant natural light, while shelving, computing, and service spaces may be placed along the darker eastern side of the floor levels.
Renovations, Modernizations, Demolition, and Removal //

Facilities Recommendations

Renovations

The renovation of an existing facility will include the complete or partial repurposing of that facility to accommodate new functions. Renovation projects will allow campus functions to be rezoned to improve student access to services, create engaging spaces that foster collaborative learning, improve operational efficiency, and address the secondary effects of constructing new space.

Modernizations

In addition to the buildings that have been identified for renovation, many existing buildings on the campus require significant repairs. Although the buildings are maintained, many are aged and have systems and finishes needing replacement. A prudent planning process must anticipate the need for repairs and upgrades at some point in the course of the master planning horizon. Modernization work is recommended for all facilities for which a significant change in use is not planned. Through these projects, the College will accomplish the following objectives:

- Repairs and upgrades for safety and accessibility (ADA compliance).
- Upgrades of technology systems.
- Refreshment of finishes and furniture systems.
- Upgrades for sustainability and efficiency.

Buildings to be Renovated/Modernized (full or partial)

- Building 5
- Building 6
- Building 9 (Gymnasium)
- Building 12
- Building 22 (Smith Center)

Demolition and Removal of Facilities

The removal of temporary facilities will take place as functions move to new or repurposed permanent space. Permanent facilities which have aged beyond their useful lifespan will be demolished as functions move to new or renovated facilities.

Buildings to be Demolished and Replaced

- Building 1
- Building 2
- Building 3
- Building 4
- Building 8
- Building 14 (Temporary Facility)
- Building 16 (Temporary Facility)
- Building 18 (Temporary Facility)
1. Building 6 Classroom Interior
2. Building 6 Exterior
3. Portable Building 14 Exterior
4. Portable Building 16 Exterior
Site Improvements Recommendations

Overview //

In addition to the facilities recommendations, a series of site improvement projects have been identified in the DFMP to enhance the campus environment and integrate open space within the academic and social programs. The design of open spaces, academic gardens, parking lots, and walkways can play a critical role in the overall aesthetic of the campus by developing a cohesive identity, social culture, and creative learning environment that complement and support the academic programs.

The Fremont Campus has a remarkable setting with sweeping views of the bay and close proximity to the natural environment of rolling, grassy hills and wooded ravines. The campus outdoor environment should be interconnected with an enhanced and improved landscape network that encourages students to spend more time outdoors in both academic and social settings.

A sustainably-minded campus should also pay close attention to the use of native species, enhancement of the natural ecosystem, replenishment of ground water, reduction of waste, and opportunities for outdoor education.

The recommendations for site improvement projects are included on the following pages. Descriptions of these projects are organized into groups based on campus location and/or project type. It is important to note that while drawings appear specific, the recommendations are conceptual sketches that require further study and discussion with a designated user group.
Site Improvement Recommendations

Circulation //

Both vehicular arrival and circulation to parking and pedestrian arrival and circulation through campus are important parts of a campus’ identity and function. The experience of the campus identity begins at these circulation routes. Clear wayfinding and pleasant paths of travel set the stage for a positive experience while on campus for both pedestrians and drivers.

Vehicular Circulation

Vehicular circulation on the Fremont Campus has been made more difficult by limiting the ability of cars to drive between the north and south sides of the campus. The DFMP recommends reopening vehicular access to the main campus drop-off area at the base of the upper campus. The move to close this route was a well-intentioned effort to protect pedestrians, but had the unintended consequences of shifting the issues down to the lower campus where parking circulation comes into conflict with pedestrians at Olive Way.

The DFMP proposes reopening cross campus vehicular circulation and reintroducing the main drop-off. This will create a plaza and drop-off zone that mitigate potential pedestrian/vehicular conflicts by utilizing traffic calming devices. Raising the plaza to curb height, creating flush curbs, utilizing special paving, and using bollards to separate the cars from the purely pedestrian zones have all been shown to create a pedestrian-primary situation where drivers are more observant and drive more slowly.

Emergency and service vehicle circulation is also an important part of overall campus safety and functionality. The DFMP identifies pathways into and through the campus core to maintain appropriate access.
Site Improvement Recommendations

Circulation (cont’d) //

Parking
The recommended parking count for the Fremont Campus is 2,472 spaces, utilizing a typical planning ratio of 1:5, based on the projected student enrollment for a suburban campus. This is an increase of 122 spaces from existing parking totals.

In order to improve access to the upper areas of the campus, a shift in parking is recommended. The DFMP recommends that a majority of the parking be relocated to the upper part of the hillside, closer to the functions and activities located there. With the use of terraced parking structures on the north and south ends of the upper campus, a target of 70% of the total required parking spaces is recommended.
Site Improvement Recommendations
Circulation (cont’d) //

Pedestrian Circulation
The campus’ pedestrian circulation is the glue that holds the campus community together and presents rich opportunities to develop connections, both personal and intellectual, and to enrich the overall campus experience. Pedestrian circulation routes are recommended to be pleasant and interesting. Seating opportunities along paths of travel are to be sited to take advantage of views and sun/shade, or provide a place to sit and talk at path intersections.

The dramatic campus hillside setting presents distinct challenges for circulation to the many levels of the campus. The development of accessible north-south pathways is recommended to work with the existing campus topography. Where vertical connections to the various levels of the campus are required, pedestrian routes should be accommodated out-of-doors. When an outdoor accessible route is not easily located, building elevators in clear, intuitive, and clearly signed locations are recommended.
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Site Improvement Recommendations

Circulation (cont’d) //

**Lighting**

The campus as a whole should be lit at night to provide a sense of safety, to facilitate wayfinding, and to reinforce campus circulation hierarchies. Appropriate nighttime lighting should also be provided for the athletic fields and select plaza areas, like the Main Street, Library and Lower Terraces.
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Site Improvement Recommendations

Landscape Vision and Design Principles

The primary landscape and open space objectives aim to improve the Fremont Campus site’s overall usability while defining an identity that encourages a sustainable environment and way of life. The DFMP recommendations strive to create a network of destinations and pedestrian corridors that integrate outdoor spaces with the existing and future academic and social functions on campus. This is achieved by focusing on three unifying goals:

- Identity
- Environment
- Sustainability

Identity

The identity of the Fremont Campus is defined by its existing landscape features and natural setting, and its views out to the bay. Olive Way, the Palm Bosque, the Upper Pond, the remnant fruit orchards, and the surrounding hillsides are memorable parts of the campus experience. The campus identity is recommended to be enhanced by building upon and amplifying these features.

The campus open space is recommended to be designed to create and visually promote the overall identity of the campus and its commitment to the education, health, and well-being of its students, faculty, staff and surrounding community. The DFMP proposes distinct moves within the landscape to clarify campus navigation and way-finding, while creating destinations that provide a strong sense of place throughout the school grounds.
1. ATHLETICS PLAZA
2. MEADOW AMPHITHEATER
3. LOWER TERRACE
4. LIBRARY TERRACE
5. MAIN STREET TERRACE
6. ACADEMIC GARDENS
7. UPPER POND
8. SOUTH POND
9. BASEBALL
10. SOFTBALL
11. SOCCER
Site Improvement Recommendations

Landscape Vision and Design Principles (cont’d) //

Environment

The Fremont Campus landscape should support and encourage a healthy, social, studious, and comfortable lifestyle. The DFMP recognizes the existing social patterns and customs within the campus and builds upon them to create a fabric of meaningful outdoor spaces that can be utilized year-round for a variety of purposes. The grounds should be developed to offer a robust and diverse set of uses including educational, demonstrational, social, and recreational spaces.

Sustainability

The landscape approach and identity strives to embrace an overall commitment towards sustainability. Within the campus, a visual presence can be achieved through the demonstration, education, and use of integrated sustainable technologies. From an operations standpoint, the selection of appropriate landscape methods and materials can impact the maintenance and environmental quality of the campus to ensure its long term survival.
Site Improvement Recommendations

Landscape Hierarchy //

Arrival and Entry
The overall aesthetic of the campus should be established from the visitor’s first moment of arrival. A sense of the identity of Fremont Campus and its commitment to the education, health and well-being of the campus community and its neighbors should be conveyed through the use of clear graphics and wayfinding and an evocative and sustainable plant palette. Arrival to the campus as a whole should be celebrated, and entry into the campus core should be experienced as crossing a threshold.
Landscape Hierarchy (cont’d) //

Main Street Terrace
The Main Street Terrace is the main campus social gathering space. Already a hub of activity on campus, its legacy should continue and be designed as a destination and as a metaphorical stage. Focal points, comfortable seating and eating areas, and open plaza activity, maximize the potential for social encounters and for seeing and being seen, while the bosques create outdoor rooms for gathering.
Site Improvement Recommendations

Landscape Hierarchy (cont’d) //

Library Terrace
On the roof of the library building, the Library Terrace should intermix seating with planted areas, extending library activities out of doors. The library is an intersection of quiet contemplative needs with the dynamic interactions of students and information technology. The space is relatively large overall but the intent should be to create many intimate areas for individuals or small groups engaged in, or seeking, quiet activity and study.
Academic Gardens

The primary landscape areas associated with the Academic Zone of campus are five academic gardens, one at each of the five proposed new buildings. Each garden, located on the outer north and south exposures of the new academic buildings, should offer a distinct, contemporary garden character, have the most amount of planting of the upper campus spaces and be considered as extensions to their adjacent buildings, academic programs, and lesson plans.

Programmatic elements, such as seating, may be duplicated from garden to garden; however, the larger programmatic gestures should emphasize difference and variation to allow each garden space to have a unique character and concept. This strategy will create identifiable places and destinations within the campus that function both as outdoor classrooms and as contemplative, restorative spaces for individuals.
Lower Terrace
Situated between Buildings A & B, the Lower Terrace creates an important north-south campus connection. The Lower Terrace provides opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration, small group gatherings, and outdoor meetings. There should be some provisions for shade and planting, but this is identified as a plaza space for sunny encounters.
Landscape Hierarchy (cont’d) //

Meadow Amphitheater
The Meadow Amphitheater takes advantage of the opportunity presented by the grade change and the need to provide an accessible route from the lower campus to the upper campus to create an amphitheater-like space. In addition to providing an artfully accessible route, the space should be designed to provide a sunny place to relax in the middle campus area and as an informal outdoor performance space.
Site Improvement Recommendations

Landscape Hierarchy (cont’d) //

Athletics Plaza
The Athletics Plaza provides a central gathering place for the lower campus and the activities that take place there. The existing historic Orchard House provides a focal point and anchor for the plaza and, at the same time, is given a place of importance in the campus fabric that it currently lacks. The Athletics Plaza should be a flexible space with some seating opportunities that allows for medium sized gatherings and concessions that are associated with athletics events. Pedestrian access to each of the three athletics fields should be available from the Athletics Plaza.
Nature Areas
The Nature Areas should be designed to draw people to the pond and wetland with restored and enhanced wetland planting, paths and a covered seating and nature viewing areas. A trail around the pond should be developed to provide a quiet walking and sitting experience for staff and students. Encouraging riparian ecological communities to flourish with native plants both enhances the strength of the ponds by tying them into the local systems and eliminates a fire hazards in the current eucalyptus grove at the pond. Together, the southern wetland and the pond offer opportunities for ecological research and appreciation as well as rich amenities to the campus programs.
Landscape Strategy //

The main landscape strategy for Fremont Campus is to build on the existing campus identity. Low maintenance, low water-use plants are preferred throughout, but the planting strategy should be one of a continuum that emphasizes the lowest impact plants at the edges with more ornamental, higher impact plants being reserved for the campus core.

To accomplish these goals and to emphasize a sense of place and identity, utilizing the native habitat communities of the oak woodland and the sage scrub is recommended, especially at the edges. Adjacent to the wetland and pond areas native riparian/wetland plants are preferred, enhancing their educational and habitat value. While plants from the native plant palette, most adapted to the garden, are welcomed and encouraged throughout the campus, the other main plant communities recommended in this document: the orchard in the Lower Campus and the ornamental at the Campus Core, represent primarily non-native plant communities.

Selected plant species should be planted in similar hydrozones and reviewed against Water Use Classifications of Landscape Species (WUCOLS) and Bay Friendly Landscapes checklists as required by AB 1881 and City of Fremont Landscape Plan Checklist. Turf/lawn areas should be limited to sports and active use open areas, such as the Meadow Amphitheater. Drought tolerant grass species should be used and consideration taken for allowing grasses to grow with seasonal mowing in lesser used edge locations.
Site Improvement Recommendations

Landscape Strategy (cont’d) //

Oak Woodland & Coastal Sage Zone
The environmental setting for the Fremont Campus is one largely dominated by a Coastal Sage Scrub plant community with Oak Woodlands occupying the wetter ravines and lower elevations. These communities have been impacted by the arrival of Europeans and subsequent populations, but through generations of evolution are still the plants best adapted to the local conditions of soil, rainfall, and climate. As a result they are uniquely adapted to survive, and, with the proper maintenance, even thrive at the Fremont Campus.

Riparian Zone
Ponds and wetlands are a great place to create habitat for native vertebrate and invertebrate communities and this plan recommends clean up of the southern wetland to encourage pedestrian access and wildlife viewing. Once the dense underbrush and non-native plants are removed, the pond habitat can be restored and enhanced using native wetland and riparian plants. Plant selection should focus on plants that provide wildlife value like food, shelter, nesting materials, perches, etc.
Orchard Zone
The character of the lower campus with its olive and orchard trees and historic farmhouse is an important component of the Fremont Campus identity. The DFMP recommends reinforcing that identity with plants and trees that borrow from the farm, using tree species planted in rows and grids, and linear shrub, perennial and grass plantings.

Campus Core Zone
The campus core contains the areas most closely viewed and experienced and regularly occupied by students, teachers, staff and visitors. For these reasons the plant palette for the campus core is somewhat lusher, adding more ornamentals to a selection of garden-friendly native plants. This strategy reserves the plantings that have a slightly more intense use of limited resources (water and maintenance) for the areas that provide the most impact. Emphasis should be on high performing ornamentals, attractive plants with seasonal interest and relatively low maintenance demands. Examples on campus of successful plants, like the crepe myrtles on Main Street should be the backbone of the ornamentals list.
Phasing Priorities

The projects identified in this DFMP and included in the Measure G Bond Program will be implemented in a phased manner over the next several years. During the DFMP process, several priorities were identified for phasing the work and a number of activities were put in motion to prepare for the Measure G construction program.

The Photovoltaic (PV) Installations at both campuses were identified as high priority projects, due to the opportunity for the college to benefit from the collection of energy credits.
New Instructional Space for the Science Programs at the Fremont Campus was identified as a high priority, due to the poor condition of Building 8 and the multiple portable buildings currently serving the student demand.

A Technology Master Plan will be developed for the Fremont Campus in order to be prepared with both temporary solutions during construction and permanent approaches to the technology infrastructure. The plan will address the current and future needs of the campus for infrastructure and technology in the classrooms.

Site Infrastructure investigation and analysis will be performed to determine the scope of infrastructure improvements that are needed throughout the implementation of the DFMP. Infrastructure will be planned to maintain existing facility operations as well as create nodes of connection for future facilities so that existing operations are not impacted during the changes. Included in this work are electrical service, sewer lines, storm drain systems, fire and domestic water service, gas service, and telecommunication networks.

The proposed locations of the new buildings in the upper campus took into consideration the possibility of building the two new westernmost buildings without impact to existing building functions. Following the completion of these buildings, academic functions vacating from buildings to be demolished can move into these new buildings without the need for temporary classrooms. This would minimize swing space requirements and reduce costs. Careful planning will be required, taking into account many additional factors, to determine the most appropriate phasing of the new buildings and demolition of the existing facilities.
Recommendations
Stairways along Hillside
Introduction //

The Ohlone College District Board of Trustees formally adopted the Newark Center for Technology & Health Services Master Plan in December 2003. Since the adoption of the 2003 Master Plan and subsequent development and construction of the Newark Center, a series of areas was identified in the Measure G Bridge Document to address in the DFMP. This section describes the updates for the Newark Center portion of the DFMP.
The 83-acre Newark Center campus development was completed in 2008, with the construction of the 129,492 SF Newark Center for Technology & Health Sciences and development of 27 acres of the site. The goals of this project as stated in the 2003 Master Plan included the following:

- The building design will acknowledge municipal requirements.
- The building design will respond to climate and energy use.
- The building design will accept current and anticipated technology.
- Campus design will be characterized by a compact building organization, with significant presence on Cherry Street.

Some of the other key goals that the Newark Center was able to achieve include the shaping of open space and sustainable landscape development; a building organization that reflects the College’s desired programmatic and functional requirements and relationships; and establishment of guidelines and precedents in its execution that have helped inform the District in their facilities development planning for the future.

This section consists of the following elements:

- Campus Plan
- Vehicular Circulation
- Parking
- Pedestrian Circulation
- Bridge Document Impacts.
Existing Conditions

Campus Plan //

The Newark Center campus is located on Cherry Street in Newark, CA. It is bounded on the north by Cherry Street, where the main entrance is located, on the south by the Union Pacific Railroad tracks, and on the east and west by adjacent properties. The campus itself contains an internal loop road, with primary parking lots to the south and smaller lots to the east and west, with the building centrally located on the north end of the site.

The Newark Center for Technology & Health Sciences is a two-story facility with a central circulation and social hub and four building wings. The design and construction of the facility earned LEED-NC 2.1 Platinum certification and the building itself is used by the College as a teaching resource.

The southern half of the site is undeveloped and the 2003 Master Plan established a pattern for future development that would continue to the south and follow the basic pattern of the existing building and parking development.
Existing Conditions

Vehicular Circulation //

A well-defined internal road system was an important goal of the campus’s original development and an important planning concept to carry forward into any future development.

Vehicular circulation patterns are illustrated on the adjacent graphic. Campus entry points and major vehicular circulation routes are shown along with areas allocated for parking, public transit stops, and existing traffic lights.
Existing Conditions

Parking //

The 507 parking spaces located at the Newark Center have generally been adequate to serve the campus. However, at peak times, and because events and activities between the two campuses occasionally result in additional demand, some additional need has been identified.
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PROPERTY LINE
EXISTING FACILITIES
PARKING COUNT

EXISTING PARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT</th>
<th># OF SPACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXISTING PARKING COUNT:

LOT A WITH PV ARRAY
LOT B WITH PV ARRAY
LOT C WITH PV ARRAY
LOT D WITH PV ARRAY

MOWRY AVENUE
ADDISON ROAD
CHERRY STREET
MOWRY AVENUE
ADDITION ROAD
STATION ROAD
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD
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The goals of the Newark Center development included pedestrian circulation and links both to and within the campus that provide physical cohesion and a sense of approachability, as well as outdoor spaces to gather and socialize.
We all should know that diversity makes for a rich tapestry, and we must understand that all the threads of the tapestry are equal in value no matter what their color.

Maya Angelou (April 4, 1928), U.S. poet and historian.
The District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP) recommendations address five areas identified in the Bridge Document impacting the Newark Center. These include:

- The installation of a Photovoltaic (PV) array on the site
- Additional parking
- Pedestrian linkage through the site and to the adjacent properties on each side
- General soils mitigation throughout the site
- Maintenance facilities.

These projects have already been identified in the Measure G Bond Bridge Document, and the PV installation is an immediate priority. During the DFMP process, various options were presented for discussion to identify how each of these items should be accommodated. The following recommendations capture the options discussed and the resulting recommendations.
Recommendations

Planning Analysis and Options

The recommendations that follow address projects that were identified in early drafts of the Newark Center Master Plan, but for which funding was not available at the time. The recommended projects are intended to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the Newark site and its offerings, and allow the College to take advantage of solar incentive programs available to them.

The recommendations include four site improvement projects and one facilities project as illustrated on the adjacent diagram.
2012 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

PROPERTY LINE
EXISTING FACILITIES
PROPOSED FACILITIES
PROPOSED ADDITIONAL PARKING
PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY EXTENSION
PV ARRAYS
FUTURE FACILITY BUILD-OUT
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The Photovoltaic (PV) Installation proposed for the Newark Center campus is a 1 Mega Watt (MW) array and two locations on the campus were discussed: 1) distributed over the parking lots and 2) in the southeast corner of the undeveloped portion of the site. The first option, the parking canopy solution, was preferred for several reasons:

- It offers shade to the parking areas and therefore provides a dual advantage.
- It does not impact locations for future development and utilizes portions of the site already developed.
- It provides a visual statement of the Newark Campus sustainability efforts.
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SOLAR PV SYSTEM SITES
CARPORT STRUCTURES OPTION
GROUND MOUNTED OPTION
Over time, the Newark Center has been able to track the parking demand and identify actual need based on campus activity. As identified in the Bridge Document, an additional 300 parking spaces are recommended for the Newark Campus in order to address the projected student enrollment.

A phased approach for developing additional parking has been developed:

- Distribute increases in the existing parking lots by cutting into existing planting islands and capturing additional spaces; estimated to yield approximately 120 additional spaces.
- If the full 300 additional spaces are required, it is recommended that an additional lot of approximately 180 parking spaces (Lot E) be constructed south of existing Lot B.
### RECOMMENDED PARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT</th>
<th>EXISTING SPACES</th>
<th>PROPOSED SPACES</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>507</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
<td><strong>769</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Recommendations

Pedestrian Linkage to Adjacent Properties //

The 2003 Master Plan noted the importance of creating and maintaining pedestrian linkages within and outside the campus. The District has been in conversation with the City of Newark and the developer/owners of the properties to the east and west, and has identified a rough location for a pedestrian pathway that traverses the campus from east to west, to link both ends of the campus to the adjacent properties.

The adjacent diagram illustrates the zone identified for the placement of the connection, which can be further defined as conversations continue with the adjacent property owners, and design of the project is initiated.
RECOMMENDED PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

- PROPERTY LINE
- EXISTING FACILITIES
- PROPOSED FACILITIES
- CAMPUS ENTRY
- PRIMARY PEDESTRIAN ROUTES
- SECONDARY PEDESTRIAN ROUTES
- COMMUNITY ACCESS ROUTE

- AREAS OF STUDENT GATHERING
- BICYCLE PARKING
- BUS STOPS
- CROSSWALKS
- STOPLIGHTS
- FUTURE FACILITY BUILD-OUT

HMC Architects
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Soils Mitigation

During the development of the Newark Center, soils in the immediate area of the building and site development were mitigated for contamination from past uses. Due to budget issues at the time, mitigation of the entire site was deferred, but listed for future incorporation. The DFMP carries forward the recommendation for mitigation of the remaining soils on the property.
In order to create greater efficiency in storing supplies and maintaining the site and building, a Maintenance and Warehouse Facility was identified as one of the recommended projects in the Bridge Document. The preferred location discussed is illustrated in the diagram. The final size of the facility will be determined when the project is executed.