

January 5, 2016

1650 Spruce Street
Suite 300
Riverside, CA 92507

o: 951/682-0470
f: 951/682-1801

Mr. Richard Storti
Vice President of Administrative Services
Fullerton College
321 East Chapman Avenue
Fullerton, CA 92832

Re: 10/20/15 Campus Forum Meeting Notes Summary and Responses
DLR Group Project No: 75-15605-00

Dear Richard:

The following is a combined summary of the scribed meeting notes and minutes, with a Fullerton College response where a response was necessary. Some items are simply informational in nature. The below is drafted for publication to conclude the Campus Forum process.

Introduction:

The purpose of the Fullerton College Community Forum is to present the proposed Facilities Master Plan Update prepared by the campus architectural firm, DLR Group, based on input and ideas received at the open forums held in Spring 2015. The forums allow the Campus and Community stakeholders to provide feedback and suggestions through the discussion. There were three Facility Master Plan maps on display: 1) Existing Facility Plan, 2) 2011 Facilities Master Plan used in preparation for the bond, and 3) Proposed Facilities Master Plan Strategic Update prepared by DLR Group.

Fullerton College is currently in the planning stages of developing an updated Facilities Master Plan (FMP). The last update was in 2011. There have been some problematic areas identified on the previous FMP and the college would like to propose some modifications to address these concerns. Some examples of these concerns include the proposed location of a new multi-story parking structure. The former design was problematic with tennis courts on top and the location would cause traffic congestion within the campus. Others were the location of the M&O (currently located north of Berkeley, causing some safety and efficiency concerns), the location of the Welcome Center, and the location of the Instructional Building.

The College held five Open Forums in Spring 2015 and DLR Group has analyzed the input received to prepare an updated facility master plan draft that better meets our campus facility needs.

DLR Group shared input received from Spring Semester 2015 Open Forums. DLR Group analyzed the locations while considering feedback to place structures in areas that would reduce disruption to campus operations, students, and surrounding community. The parking structure is the key "first move" to implement the goals of the updated Facilities Master Plan.

DLR Group stressed transparency and the willingness to listen to the input and incorporate those comments into the design in this collaborative effort. The following 8 projects were presented and discussed:

- a. **Centennial Structure** – A new 4-story Parking Structure with an estimated 210 parking stalls per level will be placed west of the 1700 Building Field House thereby pushing the circulation of traffic within the campus to the perimeter via the current Lot 6. Drop-off areas will be incorporated. Traffic signals may be installed on Berkeley, but a traffic study will need to be conducted to determine if and where they would be installed. This structure would net 450 of the spaces we need. The College is hoping to either purchase the Plummer Parking Structure or enter into a joint use agreement with city.

- b. **Berkeley Center** – This space will be used as interim housing and in the long term, the building will be removed and used as parking and green space at the conclusion of the bond program.
- c. **Building 300/500**: This is a proposed modernization project that has an approved Final Project Proposal approval with the state.
- d. **M&O Relocation and Chiller Plant** – M&O will be relocated to provide centralized service to the campus to minimize traffic crossing on Berkeley and the TES (Thermal Energy Storage) will be moved in proximity to the chiller. Having the M&O across the street posed safety concerns and was inefficient.
- e. **Instructional Building** (described by some as the new home for the Humanities) The location was moved from the corner of East Chapman and Lemon to the center of campus north of the 1200 Bldg. and south of the 1400 Bldg. It was suggested that the building could function as swing space during the program, and eventually become the new home for the Humanities Division.
- f. **Welcome Center** – Relocating the Welcome Center to the corner of East Chapman and Lemon provides a “front door” to those who want to restart their education. With the Instructional Building moving to the center of campus, this frees up the corner to provide a one-stop Welcome Center and builds a stronger connection to welcoming students. There is a plan to have an adjacent parking lot offering short-term guest parking/staff lot.
- g. **Centennial Way** – Centennial Way will be reinvigorated as a pedestrian promenade.
- h. **Sherbeck Field** – Complete the Sherbeck Field project, which includes a reasonable amount of seating and lighting.

The content of the detailed Minutes have been segregated into the eight (8) project categories above, with a few categories added at the conclusion to capture comments that fall outside of the presented projects.

Centennial Structure:

There was a question whether the short-term parking and new parking structure would make up for the lost parking spaces from Parking Lot B, removed for the Instructional Building, and Staff Lot 3, removed for the new M&O Bldg. Additionally, concern was raised relative to the massing of the Centennial Structure adjacent to the recently completed Field House, and whether the structure would be an appealing addition. Also discussed was a need to consider a pedestrian bridge over the intersection to avoid traffic congestion near and around the parking structure, and incorporate more drop-off areas. It was proposed that the parking structure could be re-oriented east/west within Lot 5 and utilize one of the decks to serve as a press box for Sherbeck Field, and utilize the mass of the structure to block noise from the field.

It was discussed that Fullerton College would like to partner with the City of Fullerton in regards to the Plummer Parking Structure to potentially build a new structure which could add an additional 600 parking spaces and could serve multiple-purposes during the weekend, during off-peak time, and the city/high school could benefit from it. There was a concern that the College needs to be mindful of the height of the structure as there is a neighborhood south of that structure and the College should respect them the same as the neighbors on Berkeley. For additional off-campus parking, it was noted that if the proposed Chapman-Newell Parking lot is built, it will add 80 spaces.

With the building of a new parking structure, a student raised a concern about the College raising the student parking fee to park on campus as CSUF has done. Additionally, as projects are built, Parking Lot B2-East may need to be used as a construction staging area which will place approximately 200 parking spaces off-line. There was also an inquiry regarding building a parking structure partially underground.

Fullerton College Response:

The parking structure is planned to be approximately 40 feet from the Field House and the facade will be aesthetically pleasing and designed to be compatible with existing architecture. There are creative ways in which to mitigate vehicular and pedestrian interfaces as pedestrian bridges are expensive to build. The reoriented location of the structure was analyzed, and it was clear that the community would oppose a large mass with in their view. While the structure could block noise from the field, it would generate more noise

itself more often than the field, and the structure would be lighted everyday as opposed to the few dozen evening events that could be planned for the field. The District has met with the City Manager and they will not build a structure that will adversely impact the neighbors and, if the District is able to acquire additional residential property for parking, then this may alleviate the issue altogether. With regard to building any type of subterranean parking, it's expensive (\$40k per space versus \$20k per space) and the water table prevents us from going deeper than one level. Finally, there is no plan to propose an increase to student parking permit fees.

Berkeley Center:

A question was raised about the possibility to use Berkeley Center for housing athletes and homeless foster youth because of a need to not only engage students but care for students holistically. Newspapers have reported that the rising costs of housing have resulted in more homeless students, veterans, or women who want to leave abusive relationships. Another question asked if any future use of Berkeley Center would otherwise prohibit or limit structure possibilities at Horticulture.

Fullerton College Response:

The cost to retrofit or renovate Berkeley Center for student housing is tremendously expensive. The plan is to utilize Berkeley Center as swing space for academic programs and return the property to parking or open space at the conclusion of the bond program.

Building 300/500:

There was concern about the plans for the Building 300/500 renovation as well as discussion over the process of renovation of older buildings that requires the use of greater area to accommodate ADA standards, hallways and bathrooms. These, as well as structural or code provisions sometimes results in the loss of classroom and office space.

Fullerton College Response:

The State is considering a \$9 Billion K-14 Bond. If a State bond passes, the District may be able to capture those monies to start the Building 300/500 Building projects sooner than the 10-year mark on our current timeline. The College understands that the ultimate programming of the existing buildings will be challenging, and will convene stakeholder groups to participate in this process.

M&O Relocation and Chiller Plant:

There were no comments regarding the proposed relocation of M&O, addition to the Central Plant or relocation of the Thermal Energy Storage.

Instructional Building:

The concept of the relocation and implementation of the new Instructional Building was well received. It was suggested that the Instructional Building be built with the Humanities class size of 30 in mind. In order to free up swing space in other buildings (currently Humanities is housed in nine separate buildings), it was proposed that the College move forward quickly with the construction of the Instructional Building. Discussion ensued regarding the height of the building and that circulation space be designed to encourage activity and collaboration within the areas of their classrooms, including the outdoor spaces.

Fullerton College Response:

The College and architects suggested the use of kiosks (standing tables) and window seats, and provide for the ability for students to feel welcomed, congregate, and have access to plug-in technology within the immediate area of their classrooms. User Groups will be formed to talk about the details during design.

Welcome Center:

There were no comments regarding the proposed relocation of the Welcome Center.

Centennial Way:

There was a comment received that suggested that the College remove parking from core of the campus and move it to the perimeter in order to limit traffic congestion. This might serve to help make the campus appear more collegiate. Centennial Way is currently not being utilized as an integral and energized part of the campus.

Fullerton College Response:

The College would like to reinvigorate Centennial Way, and make it a revitalized and active pedestrian circulation spine that connects the Horticulture area at the north end to the Performing Arts Complex at the south end.

Sherbeck Field:

There were no comments regarding the proposed completion of Sherbeck Field.

Performing Arts Concerns:

There were concerns that the theatre has one classroom and they are looking to add another classroom, and within the digital arena there needs to be a consolidation of the arts. The Performing Arts Complex (PAC) will house a new theatre, and as the College moves closer to finalizing the plan, have user groups to assist in determining the specific needs for state-of-the-art facilities. Faculty from the Fine Arts department inquired as to when the Performing Arts Complex will be built.

Fullerton College Response:

It is difficult to determine the exact timing of the PAC completion. The College has a series of initiatives planned and we need to move forward with environmental impact studies which could take a year, then the sequencing of projects need to be finalized to minimize disruption to the campus as the College does not have enough space to complete all projects at one time. The College does anticipate that the complex will be completed in two phases.

Physical Education Concerns:

The Physical Education Department indicated a need for additional storage facilities and service facilities for the Aquatics Program that were removed from previous planning efforts. Additionally, since the College is one of 30 with an intercollegiate team, a third sand Volleyball court is necessary in order to be a host college. Another concern was expressed regarding the poor condition of certain elements of Building 1200. This is important because when prospective students go through the recruiting process and tour the campus, it becomes apparent how nice the exterior of other buildings look compared to Building 1200.

Fullerton College Response:

The College will review supplementing some of the aquatics storage and athletic program facility needs.

General Bond Program Comments:

There was discussion on process. It was explained that once the location of the new buildings are determined, then a sequencing plan will be established along with a timeline that limits the disruptiveness to the campus and neighbors. It was expressed that one of the major problems with last bond was the disruptiveness and lack of consequential planning. It makes strategic sense to implement the parking structure first in order to free up space to do construction on the other projects.

Fullerton College Response:

The College is determined to carefully sequence projects in a manner to minimize campus disruptions that affect our students, campus and community. The College will need to preliminarily prioritize the projects, review with agencies having jurisdiction and the community, prepare EIR, and update the FMP to reflect the sequence and timing. DLR Group will help guide the College by suggesting what makes the most sense with our sequencing, and will study successful projects others have done through benchmark studies to help expedite our plan. Our priority is to be a learning institution and we need to work with our neighbors, listen to students, those who work in the space, and give community members a chance for input and collaboration.

General Campus Concerns and Considerations:

We should ask the community to help us with Fullerton High School property where they have the baseball diamond and 4-H Youth Program (sheep farm) located to the north of the campus.

A question was asked about the yellow area on East Chapman Avenue that was determined to be a stamped pavement enhancement to alert the public of the entrance to the college.

There was a concern about where the new location of the Food Bank will be located.

Attendee Comment Cards:

- Thanks for the open forums.
- FYI: Sculpture instruction is currently located behind/within Wilshire Auditorium (2100 Building)
- I'd Like to Ask that our needs be considered when renovating the 2100 building.
Klutch Stonaway (Fine Arts)

- We must balance our community College needs:
 - o Parking
 - o Housing
 - o Homelessness
 - o Hunger**Olivia Veloz – contact information provided**

- Please address the needs for locker rooms, storage, office, restrooms for the pool area.
Rhett Price – contact information provided

- For new parking structures; plan how to separate pedestrians from vehicles – efficient movement or people and vehicles; Note: No traffic circle.
Steve Selby – contact information provided

- The environmental committee would be interested in knowing if there is a way to take the waste from the cafeteria; incorrect orders, extra food for the day, egg shells and other waste – could be used as compost around campus? To provide an area on campus for composting.
Raisa Bokhari – contact information provided

- Any instructional buildings with faculty offices should have individual offices. Students should have the opportunity to meet with their instructors privately to discuss their grades. English instruction in particular has students who wish to discuss sensitive topics. Students are very likely to talk to their English teachers about topics and issues that they won't share with others on campus. No student should have to discuss his/her grades in front of a stranger.
Joe Carrithers – contact information provided

- The Humanities Division is the largest on campus, with classes spread over nine buildings. Build that division its own building and you will free up swing space that is so crucial to the entire process. Make the instructional building a Humanities Building and build it to the disciplines specifications and do it early in the process.
Mike Mangan – contact information provided

- Comment on future Baseball Complex. Great forum, listened to all concerns. Thank you.
Nick Fuscardo

- Would like to see student housing incorporated into the plan, considering that many students are recruited from out of state. Housing need is a big issue as many students don't complete their education due to lack of housing.

Tami Brooks – contact information provided

- Great forum to listened to all concerns. Thank you.

Gina Bevel

- There is an urgent need for housing, specifically for low-income, and for insecure students. If we want our campus to be equitable we must do whatever it takes to meet the needs of the students both educationally and in terms of basic needs. We must prioritize low-income housing on campus.

- The new classroom building, north of the 1200 building, should be a Humanities Building. Most of the reasons were already stated. Here is another: Humanities and Social Sciences share a natural affinity. Their buildings should be next to each other.

Josh Ashemiller (FC History Dept.) – contact information provided.

- Presentation was very clear and presenters are easy to work with. So many compelling priorities! Let's build a Humanities Building!

Mark Knoerschild – contact information provided

- For the planned surface parking South Chapman (80 spaces); what is the cost/space including purchase price and "improvements"?
- Have we scrapped the idea of sharing field space with the adjacent high school?

Molly McClanahan

Division of Natural Sciences Proposal (narrative as submitted in writing):

Background:

When the current Natural Science building (400 Building) was proposed, it was designed to be effectively smaller than the building it was replacing. Because the new building has to meet ADA requirements in the same footprint, it accommodates fewer students than the building it replace. Obviously too, the new building cannot handle any growth.

With that in mind, the Board of Trustees, when they approved the construction of the building, understood that Natural Sciences would be among the first in line for new space when money became available. It seems as though that provision was not incorporated into the new Master Plan.

Our current building is woefully insufficient to meet our current needs. Natural Sciences classes are among the most impacted classes on campus. We have an extremely large unmet demand and have the capacity for a lot of growth.

We are embarking on a new Biotech program which has no home. The foods lab is dated and inadequate in terms of safety and ADA requirements. We are limited in how many lab sections we can offer. We are hiring new faculty and have no space for them.

With the passage of Measure J, and the proposed refurbishing of the Horticulture Building, we have an opportunity to rectify the situation. Our proposal is that we build a **Vocational Sciences Building** in lieu of merely a refurbished Horticulture building. There is adequate space in that area for a larger building.

Proposal:

The new building can house those programs in Natural Science that lead to vocational degrees:

- 2 Horticulture labs
- 2 Foods/Nutrition labs
- 2 Cell Bio/Biotech Labs
- 1 Microbiology/Biotech lab
- 1 Anatomy lab
- 1 Physiology/overflow lab

Rationale:

All of the vocational classes would be housed together. This might be useful in applying for grants and vocational funds.

Microbiology requires similar equipment and almost identical lab tech skills as Cell bio and Biotech. Moving Microbiology frees up room 423. With the addition of one more fume hood (the ducting is already in place) it can also be used for Chem 101, thereby creating another Chemistry lab which is sorely needed.

Physiology shares many lab set-ups with Cell Bio. Physiology lab room is not specified so it can be used by Nutrition and/or Horticulture for additional classes.

Anatomy is self-contained and does not need support and so it can easily be move. The Anatomy and Cell Bio rooms in the 400 building can easily be used by Biological Science or Environment Science classes without modification.

The two Foods/Nutrition labs would provide modern space for the program to continue and would allow that program to meet more of its demand and grow.

The addition of Supplemental Instruction space might allow us to generate FTES in the same way that the Math Lab currently does.

Approximate space requirements:

This proposal would require approximately a two story, 20,000 s.f. building on the site of the current Horticulture Building and the paved space to its west.

labs @ 1400 s.f. per lab = 12,600
prep areas = 2,500
6 office @ 125 s.f. = 750
room for supplemental instruction/STEM activities = 1000 s.f.
Total (not counting bathrooms, utilities, etc.) = 16,850 s.f.

End of notes.

Sincerely,

DLR Group



Michael J. Stephens, AIA
Principal