

P90636.01 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FRESNO  
 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN REPORT

January 29, 2007

January 22, 2007 DRAFT

Complied Questions and issues with consultant response

<i>Date</i>	<i>#</i>	<i>Question / Issue</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Action / Response</i>
1/24/07	001	How about holding another series of presentations? The majority of the faculty were off-campus during this time, and hence not given a chance for input. This might raise some issues!	2/7/07	See presentations on Feb. 13 and 14.
1/24/07	002	Allow more time for questions, comments, and responses. At the meeting I attended, there were only about 5 minutes left after the presentations were over. It felt way too rushed.	2/7/07	Noted and presentation will be adjusted.
1/24/07	003	Even after the presentation, I am still not clear what is going to happen to the farming areas and animals. If an Agricultural Research Center is going in, and the Campus Pointe project is, too, it seems the animals and crops will be too heavily impacted to be allowed to remain. What are the plans for this? A response to this concern would be appreciated.	2/7/07	The animal units in the Ag Research Center are in bad need of renovation. It is impractical to renovate units with out temporary relocation. a better solution and location is being sought for animal facilities. The Farm is working with the master plan team on this.
1/24/07	004	I am also still not clear what (and when) is going to happen with University High School! I was happy to hear that, as Cindy Matson said, "there are ongoing discussions" about this, but would really love to see something more definitive. I hope this comes soon! It would be wonderful to have a one dedicated building for the school, as well as to return the grassy areas now occupied by the UHS modular units back to their natural state.	2/7/07	The recommendation is the locate the UHS north of Barstow in area vacated by parking lot Q, between new play fields and Viticulture and Enology. Traffic is an important driver of where the UHS should go.
1/24/07	005	The overall Master Plan was great. It seems like everything has been thought through, however, I don't remember it being mentioned; will there be an "architectural" standard look for the campus. Presently, none of the buildings look uniform. Even the newer buildings, Science 2, Kremen School of Business, and the upcoming library & water institute, all have different looks.	2/7/07	Key design guidelines in the MP Report <a href="#">have taken a performance approach to architectural design rather than advising a particular stylistic approach. We took this course to respect the wide range of architectural styles already represented on campus, and to avoid unnecessary limitation of design solutions in future projects</a>  The up coming campus image, signage and way finding process will inform more detailed design guidelines and architectural character.
1/24/07	006	I was struck by the thoroughness of the presentations and how approachably the information was presented. My one concern is how all of these ambitious changes would be staged for minimum impact on the campus. Absent careful planning, you could have buildings going up, parking structures erected and pathways/roadways being revamped and rerouted all at once, which would make the campus a very uninviting place to be even for a short while. I hope that an element of the rollout will be the kind of communications we've seen about the Library project and the technology rebuild.	2/7/07	<a href="#">Phasing is an essential part of the design implementation process, and although not explicitly addressed in the master plan is recognized as essential to orderly construction and to the sanity of campus users during construction.</a>

P90636.01 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FRESNO  
 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN REPORT

January 29, 2007

1/24/07	007	Something that I have noticed on the proposed 20 year vehicle plan that concerns me is what seems to be an elimination of the service road that is just north of the amphitheater. This road is currently used by the television studio for loading, the music department for access of the band trucks and the theatre arts department for loading into the scene and costume shops. If we are to use the amphitheater again for performances or graduation we would need this road to load in chairs, equipment, etc..	2/7/07	Every building will be accessible to emergency vehicles. The ban on service vehicles in the center of the campus will be enforced during certain hours of the day to prevent unacceptable conflicts with pedestrians. Special exceptions will be made as necessary . The master plan recommends restoring the amphitheater. Service and other functional issues will be addressed as part of master plan implementation and restoration of the amphitheater.
1/24/07	008	I am not sure if the plan calls for extending Maple to Bullard Avenue. In my mind, that would open up a new, easy route onto campus without interfering with any current buildings. I would imagine the impact on the farm would be minimal, as the current farm road seems wide enough for 2 lanes of traffic as well as bike lanes/pedestrian walkways. I see this as a huge need, as many of the current entrances/exits are backed-up considerably at many times of the day. Adding 15,000 students and the accompanying traffic will require new ways to allow for traffic flow on and off campus. Extending Maple seems to be the easiest way to do this while still allowing easy access to the proposed parking structures.	2/7/07	The master plan has not considered extension of Maple to vehicular traffic. Traffic Studies show that a very low percentage of vehicles arrive on campus from Bullard. Note that Chestnut is being expanded to an arterial and helps campus access from the north. The MP proposal is to formalize pedestrian and bike path in the Maple right of way closely coordinated with the Farm and their operational needs.
1/24/07	009	The other point is not so much a comment on the plans as presented, but on the feasibility. Seems to me that we would be talking about <u>hundreds</u> of millions of dollars to make even the top tier or two of the proposed plan a reality. The plans look great, but how in the world will they be realized? (Not really a question for you to answer, just something that nagged at me the whole time I watched the presentation.)	2/7/07	The University is meeting future growth in a proactive and comprehensive way. A cohesive master plan that addresses land use and campus wide functional issues puts an institution in the best position to make the most out of available resources and helps leverage funding from new sources.
1/24/07	010	I did not hear a lot about future housing although I see the buildings on the future map. My question would be what percentage of the future anticipated student numbers attending fresno State would be students living on campus? With the effort to lower vehicle traffic on campus I would hope an emphasis would be to house more students to help accomplish this goal.	2/7/07	Point taken on the relationship of housing and traffic. The University stakeholders are working on housing and its role in the future of the institution. Attracting graduate and research students requires types of housing other than dorm style. Campus Point has a component of housing
1/24/07	011	One suggestion is related to the shuttle or extended bus service to campus. Cindy Matson mentioned possibly having a shuttle or bus from First to Barstow. I'd suggest having it at least from Fresno St., if not Blackstone as there is a large complex on Barstow west of Fresno Street called Jefferson Commons.	2/7/07	Point taken and the comment will be in the issues list and discussions on transit.
1/24/07	012	Another suggestion is to consider what east coast people do a lot more than west coast – and that is park and ride. I use to park and ride the T in Boston all the time. At the moment, there is a large parking lot at First and Barstow that goes mostly unused – this may change if Porky's ever opens again. But it would be a possibility to have various park and rides with shuttle service to and from the campus. Now that I think about it, there are a number of vacant parking places – Bullard and First, Cedar and Ashlan, Willow and Shaw	2/7/07	Point taken and the comment will be in the issues list and discussions on transit.

P90636.01 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FRESNO  
 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN REPORT

January 29, 2007

1/24/07	013	<p>The three areas/playfields on the map are outlined for soccer. Do you know if they are showing soccer fields for illustrative purposes? We are lacking softball fields and other than the existing softball field between the tennis courts and South Gym no other softball fields are shown. I believe currently the two existing fields are insufficient for Intramurals and I would anticipate the program growing with the popularity of the Student Recreation Center. I would like to suggest a look at the incorporation of softball fields in one of the playfield areas.</p>	2/7/07	<p>The foot print of a soccer field is used to size fields to assure flexibility to accommodate other sports. Programming of the spaces and building sites delineated in the master plan will address these issues and the comments will be forwarded to that process. The SUAM is used as guidance in the programming process.</p>
1/24/07	014	<p>We librarians like to save time, money, and energy by bringing our lunches to work. We would like to have a pleasant, private area outside to eat in good weather. It would be great to have a staff door exiting the South Wing, where most of us work, so that we don't have to carry our food through the new building. (Library users are not allowed to bring food into the building, so it makes us appear hypocritical when we carry our meals in and out.) And we would like to see a drink kiosk outside so that we don't have to stand in line behind 30 students charging their burritos to their meal cards. The architect graciously thanked us for our suggestions, and said that he would try to address them.</p>	2/7/07	<p>Point taken and the comment will be in the discussions on the Library landscape.</p>
1/24/07	015	<p>The Plant Operation Corporate Yard is inside the "core" area of the campus. I suggest that consideration be given to moving it closer to the perimeter of campus. This would free up more core space for students &amp; staff to make things compact. Aesthetically, it would improve the appearance of the core of the campus. Of course, we all know this would be a very costly move but worthy of consideration</p>	2/7/07	<p>The idea of moving Corp/Operations to the edge of campus was discussed and not pursued. The location of Central Plant is effectively fixed, functions directly related to it cannot be removed far from it. However, we are proposing expansion towards Barstow; not encroaching further on central campus.</p> <p>The Corp/Operations can be landscape screened to reduce its impact on the campus.</p> <p>The master plan recommends a new vehicular, pedestrian and visual connection between Viticulture and the Rose Garden that breaks up the block Corp/Operations occupies and helps make it less monolithic.</p>
1/24/07	016	<p>"People Mover Case."              Campus Pointe will need a "connector" to the existing center of campus, as I think all campus planners would agree:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Campus Pointe residents and visitors would like a quick way to get to the center of the Fresno State campus.</li> <li>2) Students would like quick access to the Rec Center, the Save Mart Center and Campus Pointe to attend events, shop, etc.</li> </ol> <p>How do we keep them out of their cars? I'm not convinced a nice, shady cement walkway by itself will do it. My sense of things is that people around here, especially young people, would jump in their cars and drive a block and search around five</p>	2/7/07	<p>'People Mover' appropriately is a term used to describe almost any form of mass transportation. The choice of mode is governed by the number and frequency of people to be moved, the distances involved and the degree to which demand peaks at certain times of the day. In this case, the optimum mode from a cost-benefit point of view is probably a small vehicle with headways of about ten minutes during much of the day that can mix with pedestrian and bicycle flows. Probably a low-emission jitney such as a super-golf cart would fill this specification. As populations increase, and particularly if demand coalesces along a single route, then other people mover</p>

	<p>minutes for a parking place rather than walk it. Who wants to walk somewhere in 90+ degree heat, or on cold, foggy days?</p> <p>My thoughts on a People Mover.</p> <p>Cost?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Since this would be an “alternative” transportation system, would there be special local, state, federal funds available through grants or parking fees?</li> <li>2) Tied to the Campus Pointe project, some of the costs could be wrapped into developer/commercial fees, especially since Pointe commercial businesses would benefit from a system that draws potentially thousands of shoppers &amp; users per week from the center of campus, people that would not come out if it were not easily accessible by a PM.</li> <li>3) Would there be a forward-thinking company out there that would like a big write-off by discounting building costs to a public university where the company’s name could be splashed all over its product?</li> <li>4) An above-ground system, housed on a low platform, would be less expensive than installing one in the ground. Such a system could even be tried on a one- or two-year experimental basis, and if it doesn’t work, it could be easily removed.</li> </ol> <p>Maintenance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It could be built in sections, with an all-weather canopy that shades riders during the summer and protects them from the elements during winter, and would help protect the unit from the elements.</li> </ol> <p>Power?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Would solar power be available? We’re already talking about solar panels on this campus; what about incorporating solar panels into the PM canopy design and converting that to electricity to run the PM? Would there be a solar energy company out their somewhere that would like to have its name all over the People Mover, so that hundreds and thousands of potential customers would see it every time they ride the PM?</li> </ol> <p>Renown</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A People Mover is fun to use. You’re walking, but you’re walking twice as fast with no more effort. You “feel” like you’re moving fast. It’s a gadget. It is something novel, something “cool,” something ingenious that would make Fresno State unique. However, novelty or ingenuity aside, it would have to be USED to make it a success. Studies of other PMs in other locations would help provide info on that.</li> </ol> <p>Personally, I think students would jump on the People Mover in the center of campus and zip out to Campus Pointe to shop, enjoy a Starbucks coffee, see a movie, attend an event or grab a bite to eat.</p>	<p>systems may become more appropriate in future.</p>
--	--	---

P90636.01 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FRESNO  
 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN REPORT

January 29, 2007

		Also, the PM could provide transit to campus from parking in that area		
1/24/07	017	Perhaps it is necessary to make a new policy prohibiting new roads on or around campus unless they include a bike lane and a walk way.  I have witnessed this type of commitments in the past, yet every new road that has been added has neglected to address this issue. It is extremely dangerous to walk or bike when you have to utilize roads with heavy traffic.	2/7/07	Point taken and the comment will be in the discussions on campus circulation. The language in the Key Design Guidelines will be reviewed to make your point.
1/24/07	018	I had a question regarding the proposed rebuilding of the Satellite Student Union. In working with student clubs/organizations on a daily basis there is a concern regarding students not being able to currently plan medium/large events inside the SSU due to the fact the venue is too small (capacity 800) to meet their needs and the Save Mart Center is too large (20,000) and costly. In looking at this I realize there is a major gap in the capacity of the venues on campus geared toward student programming. Can you shed some light regarding the theater size of the proposed new SSU? I would also like to add that the addition of meeting rooms on the perimeter of the new SSU will serve a great asset to students on our campus.	2/9/07	These issues are being examined currently by consultants hired by Auxiliary Services
1/24/07	019	I am not able to figure out what the new building structures designate. For fexample there is a structure to the East of the Art Building and of the same size. I would like to know if there is any further specification for that building. Also there are some new strucutres around Speech arts and to the West of old Music, Are those designated in any way.	2/7/07	The master plan shows “building sites” that meet the goals of the master plan. They may or may not be employed as the programming and specific implementation is developed. As programming for specific projects gets under way the master plan is the first reference point for building sites and associated campus improvements that would accommodate facility, college or departmental expansion.
1/24/07	020	There was no mention of Advancement in the presentation nor in the summary handed out. As the campus grows, the communications and fundraising functions will continue to grow, and that means space for people and operations. We are currently short of space for those functions, which are relatively new focuses for Fresno State. There was a specific mention of the Keats building—where I now sit--being torn down, but nothing about future provisions. (I believe there’s a plan to use vacated space in Thomas—and of course that’s a level of detail that was not addressed in these sessions.) I want to be sure the proportional and necessary growth in personnel and operations for these functions is taken into consideration. We did talk with Paddy, though I’m not sure we were really tuned in to the extent of the planning underway. (Alumni Relations is also part of Advancement, and expansion of the alumni house was mentioned.)	2/7/07	Advancement and many other departments will be re-accommodated in the years ahead as they always have been. Not only those functions with designated new buildings are expected to grow; most departments will grow and change, and their accommodation will grow and change to meet their needs – sometimes in a new building, or in a remodeled or expanded building. The needs of most departments were noted in our meetings with each, and the results have been shared with those responsible for this progressive reallocation of space.  The master plan shows new building sites that accommodate campus growth as well as the users of buildings that are demolished. See tabulations in master plan (page 55)
1/24/07	021	● It was suggested that the amphitheater location be used as a park, play field, hangout space for students and as an amphitheater.	2/9/07	Restoration of the amphitheatre is anticipated. The details have yet to be developed.

P90636.01 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FRESNO  
 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN REPORT

January 29, 2007

	022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide more lighting by the North Gym (between the track and tennis courts).</li> </ul>	2/9/07	The master plan addresses lighting throughout the campus including this area, though deficiencies near the gym are noted.
2/5/07	023	Thanks for the invite. I'm curious what the university plans to do with the North Gym. Currently, Army and Air Force ROTC offices, classroom, and student centers are there. What future real estate plans might impact us?		
2/15/07	023	My comment is that (ZGF) should be asked to write more comprehensive architectural design guidelines that would guide the development of consistent, high quality architectural for the buildings that will be commissioned as the master plan is realized over time.		
2/15/07	024	<p>1) most of the projections are based on the campus growing and i honestly do not know if that will be the case. i am not a demographer, but i think there is evidence we may 'level-off' in enrollment numbers. Much of this depends i suppose on the overall state population projections, siphoning off from uc-merced and the csu's overall plan for our campus, etc</p> <p>2) i appreciate the fact that one of the recommendations is to support office space for faculty. this is desperately needed....private offices are the norm on most campuses across the country and should be here ,as well. again, the csu is involved, since i understand that 'per square foot'/space requirements are set by them?</p> <p>3) i have a lot of questions about campus pointe -- for one, it is a p.r. nightmare for the university right now (2 more letters to the editor just in today's fresno bee) -- but, the most important concern is that those poor folks who buy/rent there will have to deal with the smell from chestnut/barstow, which can be devastating at times (i've driven by that corner nearly every day for 6 years). they don't know what they're getting into and this raises the larger concern of are we going to be an agricultural campus in the future or an 'urban' one -- a word that was used many times yesterday. i think they cannot mix....</p>		
2/15/07	025	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to hear about the Master Plan and its vision for the campus facilities over the next 30 years or so. The presentations provided a strong "global" perspective on the efforts being made to rectify parking problems (always a student concern), enhance traffic distribution and campus access, and maintain or improve the aesthetics of the open space, agriculturally-centered environment.</p> <p>With regards to the parking, I was uncertain as to whether there was a net gain in spaces or whether the hoped-for connections with local transportation and increased non-auto traffic made the need for spaces available fairly constant. I ask largely because I traverse the "Q" lot chaos each morning and know that the "Q" lot is huge. I am not confident that even a quadruple layer in "K" would suffice (although as I look at it further it appears that the green space between the present K lot and the softball stadium will be lost in the construction of this structure). The "D" lot is eliminated so that any increases by the structure in the "E" lot seem to</p>		

P90636.01 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FRESNO  
 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN REPORT

January 29, 2007

	<p>make a "wash". There should be gains in the J lot (especially with gains from filling in the ponding basins), but there is a loss in aesthetics relative, for example, to the University Business Center when a large, multi-level parking structure obstructs its visibility, particularly for off-campus guests. In addition, the large parking structures in J lot seem under-served as to exit and entrance access to the perimeter of campus. Events Center traffic dispersal is already problematic; the restriction to Woodward Avenue as the sole external access only seems to exacerbate this difficulty.</p> <p>One more comment on parking and local bus service. My daughter attended college in the Bay Area and had access to the local transportation (expect BART) through a pre-paid pass that was part of student fees. She was a campus resident, without a car, and appreciated the access it gave her for a nominal (\$18 per semester) cost. I wanted to underscore the value of working with FAX or Clovis Transit to accomplish such an arrangement for our students.</p> <p>With regards to traffic distribution, I am concerned about the loss of San Ramon Avenue (e.g. how do school children get reasonable access to the Planetarium?), and the proposed solution for limited daytime access to buildings requiring truck traffic (blue line accesses) to develop a pedestrian environment in the campus core. From my perspective in Biology, I note that the Science 1 Building is currently serviced by San Ramon Avenue to its north dock and that the building's service need is noted by a blue line to the loading dock area from the San Ramon Avenue remnant to the east. There are some activities which could NOT easily be relegated to evening hours, i.e. deliveries of time and temperature sensitive materials (including some provided by large trucks) that require a staff member's presence for appropriate handling. Thus there will inevitably be needs for exceptions to the daytime restrictions. Are there any other solutions being proposed for these types of problems? (This situation is not confined to Science; I dodge delivery trucks all the time in and around the Bookstore).</p> <p>With regards to the open space, I am all in favor. It is one of the "selling points" of our campus over several other CSU campuses. There do, however, seem to be several losses and few gains. For example, buildings are proposed both in the Maple Avenue corridor and west of the Peace Garden. I am somewhat surprised by the latter as it tends to negate the central "Spine of the Campus Corridor" that was mentioned as connecting the eastern and western components of campus--from Campus Pointe to the Athletic Stadiums. The placement of a building on the eastern side of the football stadium as well as a proposed soccer stadium occupies the large green space (used for tailgates) in the athletic portion of the campus--essentially eliminating it (as does the K parking structure eliminate the other major tailgate area, as mentioned above). I am also concerned about the continuing loss of agricultural land to structures, e.g. the area bordered by</p>		
--	--	--	--

P90636.01 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FRESNO  
 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN REPORT

January 29, 2007

		<p>Woodward on the west, Barstow on the north, Chesnut on the east and the Events Center on the south seems to have more buildings than sheep or crops. There is a loss of community-connectedness with the loss of some of these green spaces.</p> <p>As noted in the Executive Summary, there are more needs than dollars and that nearly every part of the campus could use substantial facilities investments. I hardly agree, but I am distressed by some of the priorities. Among the 10-year projects, the quadrangle buildings, an undefined classroom and faculty offices building, and possibly Agricultural Research are the sole fundamental academic components of thirteen identified facilities for this plan. Certainly modifications to the Corporation yard will provide a strong infrastructure to academic programs, but many of the other 10 items fall into "service" distinct from academic programs themselves. So although student facilities in the Satellite Student Union and University Center could certainly use upgrades, the fundamental academic buildings can more directly influence the quality of education offered to these students. To beat a dead horse again, PLEASE rename Science 2 as "San Ramon Hall", because it is indeed a replacement building for the temporary San Ramon buildings, not a Science Building in anyone's perception, except perhaps the Chancellor's Office guidelines. Dry labs can be and ARE Science labs, but a Science Building having only a few dry labs has meant the loss of wet-lab space for the Science departments (since all experimental science research requiring the infrastructure of a typical science building has necessarily been housed in Science 1), just when the need to expand is paramount to meet the stated goals of the university. The needs for science facilities are met cosmetically at best and the building name obfuscates this need. The Science and Math College isn't the only one hurting for lab space. The College of Health and Human Services has rapidly expanding programs, e.g. Nursing, that have real laboratory space needs too. So while buildings for Research Institutes, Specialized Academic Program Centers or University High facilities are attractive additions to the campus, the need for basic classrooms, labs and faculty offices to conduct quality academic programs should take greater precedence. I would have appreciated stronger attention in the presentation to thoughts on how these needs are being addressed in the Master Plan over both the short and long term.</p>		
<p>2/15/07</p>	<p>026</p>	<p>Let me say that I don't share the concerns of those whose comments I've already read and of many of my fellow attendees. Though there were good questions and valid concerns, I believe all of them were adequately addressed by the presenting parties. Whether it is comfortable or not, our campus is growing and continuing to do so. As responsible facilitators of higher education we must pragmatically evaluate and plan for the inevitable changes that must come from this growth. This process simply cannot please everyone, but it should address the important needs of the academic process. From what I've seen of the Comprehensive Master Plan, it more than accomplishes this.</p>		



P90636.01 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FRESNO  
 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN REPORT

January 29, 2007

<p>2/21/07</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>Barstow avenue from Cedar to Maple is 4 lanes (2 each way). But east of Maple to Chestnut (east exit) is only 2 lanes. Does the plan call for the widening of Barstow? If not, why not? Right now Chestnut from Shaw to Bullard is being widened to 4 lanes, so that will mean the choke point in the network of road capacity will be the east end of Barstow. I have no expertise in planning, but .....! I realize that there are structures at road's edge now, but there seems to be room to widen as most of the structures are antiquated or relocatable -- except for the new International Water building going up on the S.W. corner of Barstow and Chestnut. Still, Barstow could be curved slightly to the north approaching the intersection. My CONCERN is that more buildings of a permanent nature should not be built along that Barstow corridor because it will preclude solving the bottleneck of traffic flow. The OPTION of widening Barstow must be preserved within the plan.</p>		
<p>2/21/07</p>	<p>28</p>	<p>With regards to the parking, I was uncertain as to whether there was a net gain in spaces or whether the hoped-for connections with local transportation and increased non-auto traffic made the need for spaces available fairly constant. I ask largely because I traverse the "Q" lot chaos each morning and know that the "Q" lot is huge. I am not confident that even a quadruple layer in "K" would suffice (although as I look at it further it appears that the green space between the present K lot and the softball stadium will be lost in the construction of this structure). The "D" lot is eliminated so that any increases by the structure in the "E" lot seem to make a "wash". There should be gains in the J lot (especially with gains from filling in the ponding basins), but there is a loss in aesthetics relative, for example, to the University Business Center when a large, multi-level parking structure obstructs its visibility, particularly for off-campus guests. In addition, the large parking structures in J lot seem under-served as to exit and entrance access to the perimeter of campus. Events Center traffic dispersal is already problematic; the restriction to Woodward Avenue as the sole external access only seems to exacerbate this difficulty.</p> <p>One more comment on parking and local bus service. My daughter attended college in the Bay Area and had access to the local transportation (expect BART) through a pre-paid pass that was part of student fees. She was a campus resident, without a car, and appreciated the access it gave her for a nominal (\$18 per semester) cost. I wanted to underscore the value of working with FAX or Clovis Transit to accomplish such an arrangement for our students.</p> <p>With regards to traffic distribution, I am concerned about the loss of San Ramon Avenue (e.g. how do school children get reasonable access to the Planetarium?), and the proposed solution for limited daytime access to buildings requiring truck traffic (blue line accesses) to develop a pedestrian environment in the campus core. From my perspective in Biology, I note that the Science 1</p>		

P90636.01 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FRESNO  
 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN REPORT

January 29, 2007

	<p>Building is currently serviced by San Ramon Avenue to its north dock and that the building's service need is noted by a blue line to the loading dock area from the San Ramon Avenue remnant to the east. There are some activities which could NOT easily be relegated to evening hours, i.e. deliveries of time and temperature sensitive materials (including some provided by large trucks) that require a staff member's presence for appropriate handling. Thus there will inevitably be needs for exceptions to the daytime restrictions. Are there any other solutions being proposed for these types of problems? (This situation is not confined to Science; I dodge delivery trucks all the time in and around the Bookstore).</p> <p>With regards to the open space, I am all in favor. It is one of the "selling points" of our campus over several other CSU campuses. There do, however, seem to be several losses and few gains. For example, buildings are proposed both in the Maple Avenue corridor and west of the Peace Garden. I am somewhat surprised by the latter as it tends to negate the central "Spine of the Campus Corridor" that was mentioned as connecting the eastern and western components of campus--from Campus Pointe to the Athletic Stadiums. The placement of a building on the eastern side of the football stadium as well as a proposed soccer stadium occupies the large green space (used for tailgates) in the athletic portion of the campus--essentially eliminating it (as does the K parking structure eliminate the other major tailgate area, as mentioned above). I am also concerned about the continuing loss of agricultural land to structures, e.g. the area bordered by Woodward on the west, Barstow on the north, Chesnut on the east and the Events Center on the south seems to have more buildings than sheep or crops. There is a loss of community-connectedness with the loss of some of these green spaces.</p> <p>As noted in the Executive Summary, there are more needs than dollars and that nearly every part of the campus could use substantial facilities investments. I hardly agree, but I am distressed by some of the priorities. Among the 10-year projects, the quadrangle buildings, an undefined classroom and faculty offices building, and possibly Agricultural Research are the sole fundamental academic components of thirteen identified facilities for this plan. Certainly modifications to the Corporation yard will provide a strong infrastructure to academic programs, but many of the other 10 items fall into "service" distinct from academic programs themselves. So although student facilities in the Satellite Student Union and University Center could certainly use upgrades, the fundamental academic buildings can more directly influence the quality of education offered to these students. To beat a dead horse again, PLEASE rename Science 2 as "San Ramon Hall", because it is indeed a replacement building for the temporary San Ramon buildings, not a Science Building in anyone's perception, except perhaps the Chancellor's Office guidelines. Dry labs can be and ARE Science labs, but a Science Building having only a few dry labs has meant the loss of wet-lab space for the Science</p>		
--	--	--	--

P90636.01 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY FRESNO  
 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN REPORT

January 29, 2007

	<p>departments (since all experimental science research requiring the infrastructure of a typical science building has necessarily been housed in Science 1), just when the need to expand is paramount to meet the stated goals of the university. The needs for science facilities are met cosmetically at best and the building name obfuscates this need. The Science and Math College isn't the only one hurting for lab space. The College of Health and Human Services has rapidly expanding programs, e.g. Nursing, that have real laboratory space needs too. So while buildings for Research Institutes, Specialized Academic Program Centers or University High facilities are attractive additions to the campus, the need for basic classrooms, labs and faculty offices to conduct quality academic programs should take greater precedence. I would have appreciated stronger attention in the presentation to thoughts on how these needs are being addressed in the Master Plan over both the short and long term.</p>		