January 5, 2016

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

Re: 10/21/15 Community 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 Community 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 additional categories added at the conclusion to capture comments that fall outside of the presented projects.

Centennial Structure:
The general consensus was that the proposed location of the Centennial Structure was appropriately located adjacent to the existing Field House. Some concerns were expressed about the structure actually meeting all of the parking needs of the College (even in light of the College’s ability to successfully procure use of the City of Fullerton’s Plummer Structure) as well as the structure’s location being able to accommodate drop off areas and student/vehicular crossing. A comment about future-proofing the structure was received, which would allow the structure to have decks added to it (through initially providing oversized foundations) if the need arises since the current enrollment exceeds the proposed parking availability. Additionally, it was requested to incorporate visual technology to alert students/visitors of space availability within the structure.

Fullerton College Response:
The current update to the FMP adds approximately 963 parking stalls to the campus parking count. No community college campus can afford to account for every parking space need based on peak demand. Fullerton College has approximately 4,000 parking spaces, but needs 12,000 parking spaces during “peak” demand. Parking is an expensive proposition at over $20k per stall, which makes the Centennial Parking Structure a $16.8 million project.

Berkeley Center:
There were no comments regarding the proposed use and changes of use to the Berkeley Center site.

Building 300/500:
There were no comments regarding the proposed use and renovations to Building 300/500.

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:
While there were no specific comments regarding the proposed location of the new Instructional Building, there were some general comments assignable to a new instructional space being considered. There was a concern that there are not enough teachers per student, and some students expressed that there is insufficient bio lab space on campus. There was also a comment that new buildings should include features such as a lactation center for nursing mothers.

Fullerton College Response:
The College expressed that we will be hiring 54 faculty positions next year. Last year the College hired 44 new faculty positions. The College has the State’s support to add faculty, and the College is currently aligned with space allocation at the Chancellor’s Office. Also, it is the College’s intent to incorporate several student and faculty service spaces within the buildings at the appropriate time that the buildings are being programmed.

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

Centennial Way:
There was general consensus that supporting the establishment of Centennial Way as a reinvigorated pedestrian way, but some comments relative to campus circulation were expressed. Vehicular turning movements from campus and from Brookdale were deemed important and may require traffic signalization, which is proposed at two locations with the proposed Centennial Parking Structure. Additionally, as a component of an alternative circulation, bicycle accessibility was identified as an important consideration in the alleviation of on and off campus vehicular congestion.

Fullerton College Response:
The City of Fullerton will require that the College complete a traffic study as part of the environmental impact study. This study may identify impacts to other intersections not addressed during this discussion. Bicycle access is certainly an alternative transportation method consistent also with the City of Fullerton’s transportation goals.

Sherbeck Field:
Concerns were expressed regarding the potential size, seating capacity, types of bleacher system, terms and hours of use, noise and lighting pollution impacting adjacent neighbors, rental of the field, and increased foot and vehicular traffic. A question was raised as to the planned seating capacity and it was stated that a seating capacity of 10,000 was too large. In addition, a separate person expressed a concern about finishing the project in a timely manner as the project began in 2000 with the previous bond program and until the field is completed, money is being used to bus students to alternative locations for events.

Fullerton College Response:
Sherbeck Field is primarily used for instructional purposes and is a learning space for physical education classes, and without a permanent lighting solution, the college is limited to offering classes and events only during daytime hours. We have a great tradition at Fullerton College where family and friends gather for commencement, and since school calendars have changed, we are no longer able to use the field at Fullerton High School. It is anticipated that the field will host approximately 4500-5000 seats on a metal bleacher system, and have focused sports lighting suitable for various events.

In order to complete this project, we have to carefully consider plans of Instructional and community concerns and we hope to realize each of these plans, to have stadium seats and lighting completed. The College will not be completing this project in order to facilitate additional rental opportunities of the facility – it is being completed for student use.
Sustainability:
There was discussion about the College’s sustainability focus and a perspective that Fullerton College is not keeping up with what other institutions of higher learning are accomplishing on this front. Where possible, incorporation of solar panels as a major building sustainability feature should be a priority, as well as other eco-friendly operational ideas such as drinking water bottle refill stations and reverse osmosis water filtering. There was discussion as to whether the buildings would be LEED certified, and if best management practices to accomplish the same goals would suffice. Additional comments regarding partnerships with agencies such as OCTA could be possible to encourage park and ride, ride-sharing and alternative methods to commute.

Fullerton College Response:
The College plans to renovate aged buildings on campus that were built in the 1930’s with new emerging technologies to save energy. The current building codes require the College to implement building conservation, thermal energy savings and renewable energy strategies. While LEED certification itself is being reviewed, it should be noted that the College has installed LED lights in our parking lots and cut back domestic potable water usage. Additionally, the College recently approved EV charging stations and a will be developing a Sustainability Plan to become more efficient and reduce the carbon footprint of the College. While reverse osmosis water filtering is not a new technology, as it is often used in laboratory environments, we realize that it takes 3-9 gallons of water to filter one gallon of drinking water through a reverse osmosis system. The cost/benefit to provide this type of filtration for drinking water, relative to sustainability goals, needs to be evaluated.

General Bond Program Comments:
There was interest expressed regarding the current spending plan, project timing, bond duration and project update information dissemination.

Fullerton College Response:
The District anticipates that the current bond to be spent a 15-20 year period. To facilitate this, there will be an update to the Facilities Master Plan in January 2016 that will be the basis for the required Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which will identify impacts of the individual projects have on the community. For updates and project progress, the College has a website dedicated to updating the campus and community. While the District anticipates receiving $574 million as a result of this bond, it needs to be distributed amongst Cypress College, Anaheim Campus, and Fullerton College. We anticipate spending to be limited, district-wide, to $100 million every 3 years.

The College will need to be careful how we sequence projects in a manner to minimize campus disruptions and to our 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.

General Community Concerns and Considerations:
A concern about the use of the existing Buildings 1955-60 and 1901-1904 was raised and that these buildings do not fit the typology of the Campus.

Fullerton College Response:
The College will utilize these buildings as swing space/temporary classrooms, and if the bond had not passed, they would have been removed as part of the original FMP.

General Comments:
A concern was shared about the proposed parking lot on Chapman/Newell. The concern is regarding the potential historical significance of the three house structures on property the College purchased, and the viability/use of refurbishing the houses for College use. The claim is that it’s always best to rehabilitate structures as it costs less and can be used as affordable housing that the neighborhood needs.
Fullerton College Response:
The College spent $15,000 on a study (with a firm recommended by the City of Fullerton) that determined that there is no historical significance to the three subject structures. With this determination, the College is interested in parking opportunities on this site. While there was discussion regarding student transitional housing, the core mission of the College is student learning. The College recognizes that some students need assistance.

The Veterans Center was discussed, and what opportunities exist to improve their facilities.

Fullerton College Response:
Veterans are important to the College and funding has been allocated to renovate existing facilities.

A concern was raised about trash being left behind by the students on Berkeley and suggested that the College sweep the area once a week and provide more trash receptacles. Additionally, the community members urged students to educate other students that parking within the residential neighborhoods is often very disruptive. Students present acknowledged the concern and stated Associated Students would get involved to help educate the students.

It was suggested that fundraising opportunities exist to name the proposed buildings/structures.

At the Performing Arts Complex, it was requested to maintain the green space and sculpture garden at corner.

Attendee Comment Cards:

- Plan looks OK. Hopefully there won't be any major changes. Current placement of parking structure appears to be the best location. The stadium plan should continue but the community needs to be involved.
  
  Joseph Tenney - contact information provided

- Keep the current sculpture garden in its current location. Move the Performance Center "East".
  Hide the temp. room south of the pool. Put them in the middle of campus.
  
  Jesus J. Silva – contact information provided

- I'm very interested in learning more about the plans for the Performing Arts Complex, as it will be replacing the current building where the Cinema/Television Dept. conducts most of their classes. I would like information (and the ability to provide input) on the facilities that will be available to the Cinema/TV students.
  
  Laura Bouza, Fullerton College, Cinema/Television Faculty – contact information provided

- No comment provided.
  
  Alex Tomczyk – provided contact information

End of notes.

Sincerely,

DLR Group

[Signature]

Michael J. Stephens, AIA
Principal

DLR Group
Riverside, California
p: 951/682-0470