
M E E T I N G M I N U T E S

W O R K S H O P # 7 B : P R O G R A M M I N G

DATE: November 3, 2017 **A/R = Action Required**

TIME: 2:30 pm – 5:00 pm

LOCATION: Fresno City College – OAB 114

RE: Programming: Existing and New Science Building

PRESENT:

Dr. Carole Goldsmith, President FCC
Christine Miktarian, Vice Chancellor, Operations and Information Systems SCCC
Miguel Arias, Board of Trustees SCCC
Eric Payne, Board of Trustees SCCC
Brian Speece, Assistant to Chancellor for Capital Projects SCCC
Don Lopez, VP of Technology FCC
Shirley McManus, Dean of Math, Science and Engineering FCC
Harry Zahlis, Director of Technology FCC
George Cummings, Director of Facilities SCCC
Cris Monahan-Bremer, Marketing Director FCC
Matt Kennedy, Program Manager Kitchell
Michelle Lang, Architect PMSM
FCC Faculty and Staff

Please notify sender within 10 days if there are any changes to be made to these meeting notes.

A/R = Action Required

The purpose of this meeting was to review the existing Science Building and New Science Building programming and discuss which spaces should go in the Existing versus the New Science Building. Discuss next steps and upcoming meetings. The following was discussed:

I. Introduction/Review Process:

A. Dr. Carole Goldsmith gave a brief introduction and history of this project:

1. We are continuing an ongoing conversation that was started in the spring where we had 4-5 workshops with various faculty, staff and community members. Since the workshops in the spring we've had an ongoing dialogue with the Science faculty and will continue to do so.

2. Things have changed since the 2012 Facilities Master Plan and Measure C. At that time the thought was that the Existing Science Building would be eliminated and replaced with a new building. Today we are coming from a different mindset where we would keep both spaces and get the best utilization from both.
3. Process for this project:
 - a. Today will review Old Science Building and New Science Building spaces and start prioritizing which spaces can go where.
 - b. Come up with pros and cons of each
 - c. Eventually will come up with a couple of options/recommendations that can then be taken to the chancellor and the Board of Trustees, they will then vote as to which direction to take.

II. Review of Existing and Draft Program:

PMSM reiterated that by keeping the Existing Science Building (which is 58,000gsf) and adding the new (at 46,000gsf) we have the opportunity to double the space of the program. The task today is to look at the programming and get input as to what can stay in the existing building and what makes sense to go in the new building.

A. PMSM reviewed the existing floor plans and spaces with the group. At this time they also made a list of all the existing spaces to ensure everyone was in agreement with the types of existing spaces they have. The following spaces are in the Existing Science Building:

1. Court Floor:
 - a. General (Math) Classrooms
 - b. Computer Lab
 - c. Faculty Offices
 - d. Large Lecture Hall
 - e. Division/Administrative Offices
 - f. Conference Room
2. First Floor:
 - a. Faculty Offices
 - b. (7) Biology Labs
 - c. Prep Area
 - d. LGI Room
 - e. Faculty Lounge
 - f. Museum
 - g. Tardigrade Research Lab
3. Second Floor:
 - a. (3) Chemistry Labs with support space
 - b. (1) Physics Lab with support space
 - c. (1) Geology Lab with support space
 - o Faculty and staff pointed out that the Geology Lab is shared with Geography and other classes such as Astronomy, Physical Sciences and Natural Sciences.
 - o This lab is also used as the Engineering Lab.
 - d. Engineering Lab (this is an existing program that needs space).
 - o This is different from Prep Room
 - e. (2) LGI Classrooms
 - f. (1) Chemistry Classroom
 - g. (1) Biology Classroom
 - h. (1) Instrument Room

4. Throughout the building:
 - a. Tutorial Space (should have one per floor)
 - b. Student Study Spaces (currently have tables in hallways)
5. The meeting broke into groups to have discussions in terms of thinking about the spaces. They were asked to figure out in general terms what seems to make the most sense to move to the new building versus stay. Below are each tables comments:
 - a. Table 1 Comments:
 - There are divisions that are distinct from one another in terms of the requirements for labs and spaces:
 - Chemistry
 - Biology
 - Engineering & Physical Science (EPS) is sliced in half in terms of requirements:
 - Physics Engineering and Astronomy. These could be closer to chemistry regarding support services.
 - Geology, Geography and Natural Science. Don't need goggles and fume hoods.
 - Need flexible teaching spaces that allow for hands on learning
 - b. Table 2 Comments:
 - Chemistry and Biology are the most related in terms of needs. Both should go to the new building so construction would be easier to construct labs.
 - There needs to be dedicated space for tutorial space on each floor
 - Make sure that there are adequate funds for renovation to repurpose the rooms and provide for those staying
 - c. Table 3 Comments:
 - Biology should remain at the existing building since closer to the greenhouse. Then Biology could take over the existing chemistry labs.
 - Chemistry and EPS should move to new building since vibration dampening is required and the two can share technicians.
 - Discussed whether to keep all lecture type classrooms in one building and labs in another. However this would require transporting supplies across campus when having classroom demonstrations. Because of this they feel science should split up by divisions and have classes and labs in both buildings.
 - d. Table 4 Comments:
 - Design Science is requesting space and recommend this be in the old building. There is a budget associated with this design science, but space is still needed.
 - Commented that the 46,000 sf of new space is the gross square footage, not all of the square footage is useable space and some of the programming will need to be left in the existing building.
 - e. Additional comments:
 - Look at how Greenhouse relates to the programs it supports.
 - The faculty and staff are not asking for more than what they need. They want to have the best for the students.
6. The group voted as to which spaces should stay in the Old Science Building and which should go in the New. The results are as follows:

SPACE	BOTH	NEW	OLD
General Classrooms	17	0	1

Computer Labs	12	2	0
Faculty Offices	24	0	1
Large Lecture Hall	16	0	6
Division Office	0	15	4
Conference Room	13	3	0
Biology Labs	10	10	0
Museum	Locate	Near	Bio.
Tardegrade Lab	Locate	Near	Bio.
Chemistry Labs	0	17	3
Physics Labs	0	13	8
Geology Lab	0	4	16
Engineering Lab	15	4	0
Instrument Room	Locate	Near	Chem
Tutorial Space	24		
Student Study Space	24		

III. Next Steps: PMSM will review the information gathered and look at what this means in terms of square footage. This will help to answer such questions as whether the Chemistry and Biology will fit in a new building or not.

IV. Next Meetings

A. Existing and New Science Building Programming meeting

Date: 11/20/17

Time: 11:30-2:00

Location: Fresno City College

Attendees: Faculty and Staff